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# Introduction

In this contribution, we summarize the email reflector discussions for [103-e-NR-52-71-Waveform-Changes]. Chairman has approved the following email discussion:

* [103-e-NR-52-71-Waveform-Changes] Email discussion/approval on required changes to NR using existing DL/UL NR waveform until 11/2; address any remaining aspects by 11/10 – Daewon (Intel)

# Summary of issues and discussions

## 2.1 Numerology (SCS and CP Length)

### 2.1.1 Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [1]:
	+ Proposal 1: The decision of adding an additional SCS numerology to NR for 60 GHz band should be based on a careful compromise between receiver complexity necessary to keep the existing SCS (240kHz) and the amount of necessary changes to the existing design for the addition a new numerology (480kHz or 960 kHz) including a possible loss in spectrum efficiency.
	+ Proposal 2: For the maximum carrier bandwidth choice for the operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz NR should support the largest bandwidth for the FFT size and sampling rate with minimum impact to existing design, for 120, 240, 480, 960 kHz, maximum supported BW of 400, 800, 1600, 3200 MHz, respectively.
* From [2]:
	+ Proposal 1: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, higher subcarrier spacing (numerologies) than 120 kHz should be adopted only if there is a significant performance gain in terms of phase noise reduction in comparison to existing subcarrier spacing (numerologies).
	+ Proposal 2: For supporting NR operation between 52.6GHz and 71GHz in Rel. 17, if 480kHz SCS is agreed to be supported, then only normal cyclic prefix is sufficient
	+ Proposal 3: For supporting single carrier bandwidth of ~2GHz for NR operation between 52.6GHz and 71GHz in Rel. 17, subcarrier spacing of 960kHz with normal cyclic prefix can be supported and higher subcarrier spacing value should not be further considered in NR Rel. 17.
	+ Observation 16: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, then the selection of SCS value should not limited based on the frequency range .Other factors of channel conditions such as phase noise, ICI, Doppler, CQI, etc. plays an important role in determining the SCS value:
		- For DL channel, UE has all the required estimates related to channel, receiver phase noise and other impairments, etc.
	+ Proposal 12: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, then UE assistance for SCS/BWP selection could be considered to take in to account all the channel measurements and receiver impairments that are more prominent at higher frequency range.
* From [3]:
	+ Proposal 5: If the existing FR2 SCSs are adopted for above 52.6 GHz, the physical layer design of FR2 should be reused for the licensed band and used as a baseline for the unlicensed band with possible modifications due to the regulatory requirements such as LBT and OCB.
* From [4]:
	+ Proposal 1: 240 KHz SCS for SSB can be an option for unlicensed band above 52.6GHz.
* From [5]:
	+ Observation 5: (960K, NCP) could achieve the highest peak data rate which is more than 7 times as that of (120K, NCP).
	+ Proposal 1: For BWP numerology, (960K, NCP) is preferred for scenarios targeting high peak data rate and (120K, NCP) is preferred with no spec impact for scenarios targeting large coverage.
	+ Proposal 13: Timeline definition, basic time unit and super long CP per half frame should be discussed for new defined numerology such as (960K, NCP).
* From [7]:
	+ Observation 1: Larger subcarrier spacings such as 480 kHz and 960 kHz mitigate the RF impairments in higher frequency especially for higher modulation order.
	+ Observation 2: Limiting subcarrier spacing choices to keep the maximum FFT size as in Rel-15/16 can reduce implementation burden for redesigning FFT engine.
	+ Proposal 3: The candidate new subcarrier spacing is limited to the subcarrier spacing that is within minimum and maximum FFT sizes in Rel-15.
	+ Proposal 4: Considering the available spectrum, corresponding maximum channel bandwidth and the coexistence, 960 kHz should be considered for the specification support.
	+ Proposal 5: Considering the different amounts of RMS delay spreads for possible scenarios, supporting multiple subcarrier spacings for higher frequencies would be beneficial.
* From [8]:
	+ Proposal 2: SCS 480 KHz is supported for control and data channels for the maximum system bandwidth up to 1.6 GHz in NR operation up to 71 GHz.
	+ Proposal 3: For NR operation on above 52.6GHz and up to 71GHz, the CP length of 240 kHz SCS for both data and control channels are sufficient to cover both indoor office and outdoor UMi Street-canyon deployment scenarios for battling of ISI. The CP length of 480 kHz SCS for both data and control channels are sufficient to cover indoor office deployment scenarios for battling of ISI.
	+ Proposal 4: The system complexity and benefit of introducing the larger SCS more than 480 KHz for phase noise mitigation shall be carefully analyzed.
	+ Proposal 5: Introducing larger SCS, such as 960 kHz is not essential for the mitigation of ICI caused by large phase noise.
* From [10]:
	+ Observation 1: Considering outdoor deployment scenario, and close to zero specification effort, it seems that subcarrier spacing (µ=3) for physical data channels is valid option for 60 GHz scenario.
	+ Observation 2: Considering indoor deployment scenario from specification effort, coexistence with WiGig, low delay spread, and low implementation complexity, it seems that only one additional subcarrier spacing, particularly value of (µ=6) for physical data channels would be sufficient for 60 GHz scenario.
	+ Proposal 6: Support 960kHz for CP-OFDM to enable use of high-order modulations with low complexity CPE compensation.
	+ Proposal 8: Support 960kHz SCS for DFT-s-OFDM to robustly enable all MCSs.
	+ Proposal 10: Prioritize NCP in 60 GHz studies. ECP can be considered later, if needed.
	+ Observation 24: RAN1 shall agree on which new SCS are supported, if any.
* From [13]:
	+ Observation 2: The selection of SCSs for Rel-17 NR above 52.6 GHz needs to consider the impacts of frequency band, bandwidth, phase noise, CP overhead and multi-path delay.
	+ Proposal 3: Numerology (SCS as well as CP) of NR above 52.6 GHz can be scaled by an integral multiple of current numerology supported by Rel-15/16 NR, i.e. Δf = 2μ × 15 kHz (μ can be set as 3, 4, 5, 6).
	+ Proposal 4: 960 kHz can be defined as the SCS for 2.16 GHz channel bandwidth if it is supported for Rel-17 NR beyond 52.6 GHz.
	+ Observation 3: If SCSs larger than 240 kHz are supported, the short CP may be not enough to cover delay spread, beam switching time and possible timing errors.
* From [14]:
	+ Consider sub-carrier spacings up to 480 kHz for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
	+ For selection of suitable SCS for the 52.6 – 71 GHz frequency range, it is important to perform link level evaluations with sufficiently large post-beamforming RMS delay spreads that are representative of a suitable range of deployment scenarios including the indoor factory scenario analyzed above (e.g., up to at least 40 ns using the agreed TDL-A model). It is important to consider the margin left over for other sources of time synchronization error such as initial timing error, timing advance setting, timing advance adjustment granularity, and timing differences expected in multi-TRP deployments.
	+ Extended CP is not to be considered further for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
	+ A higher UL SCS puts tighter requirements on UE initial UL timing accuracy.
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: To avoid further tightening the UE requirement on UL timing error in relation to 1/SCSSSB compared to current specifications, the UL SCS should not be more than twice that of the SSB SCS. Using existing Rel-16 specifications for SSB, this can be achieved with 240 kHz SCS for SSB and 480 kHz for UL SCS.
	+ A higher UL SCS puts tighter requirements on the absolute UE UL timing advance adjustment accuracy.
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: For 960 kHz, maintaining UL timing within the CP becomes very challenging even without taking multi-TRP deployments into account. When taking multi-TRP deployments into account, it becomes practically infeasible.
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: A higher UL SCS puts tighter requirements on UE UL timing and thus it is essential that the SCS selection and UE UL timing requirements are discussed jointly.
* From [15]:
	+ Proposal #1: Consider the followings as candidate numerologies to support NR in FR-X band by taking frequency utilization efficiency, unlicensed band operation, the ICI mitigation, and the UE implementation into account.
	+ SCS for other channels/signals
		- Introduce new value as 240 kHz and 480 kHz (and/or 120 kHz)
	+ Study further on potential impacts (and relevant handling) due to the shortening of OFDM symbol duration and CP length by adopting larger SCS value.
		- Whether/how to handle impact to cell coverage and/or beam switching time (e.g. by employing the extended CP, grouping multiple OFDM symbols as a unit, and/or putting symbol gap between consecutive DL/UL signals/channels)
* From [16]:
	+ Proposal 1: It is proposed to consider up to 480KHz SCS for 52.6GHz~71GHz.
* From [17]:
	+ Proposal 1: The subcarrier spacing should be discussed and decided with higher priority.
	+ Proposal 2: Support data transmission for 240 KHz for NR above 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
	+ Proposal 3: Support new subcarrier spacing of 480 KHz and 960 KHz for NR above 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
* From [20]:
	+ Observation 3: Wider SCS has robustness to frequency offset and phase noise, but impacts on CP duration.
	+ Proposal 2: Support up to 960 kHz SCS, in order to support 2.16 GHz bandwidth by single carrier.
* From [21]:
	+ Observation 4: the delay spread to be supported sets a lower limit on the SCS.
	+ Observation 7: A maximum SCS of 480 kHz has been used for multiple elements of the Rel-15/Rel-16 specification. The use of SCS > 480 kHz should be justified to reduce the specification impact.
	+ Proposal 4: Select 120 kHz, 240 kHz and 480 kHz as SCS candidates for NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz.
	+ Proposal 5: RAN1 to study the need for selecting 960 kHz as an SCS candidate considering specification impact and possible phase noise model changes from RAN4.
* From [22]:
	+ Proposal 1: 240kHz SCS should be supported for 52.6-71GHz. 480kHz SCS is FFS.
* From [24]:
	+ Proposal 1. The support of extended CP for large numerology or SCS like 480 KHz and above should be studied for NR operation from 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* From [26]:
	+ Proposal 4: The study for the high frequency regime should prioritize NCP.
* From [29]:
	+ Observation 6: MIMO timing alignment error (TAE) should be considered during the selection of supported subcarrier spacing set for NR in 52.6–71GHz.
	+ Proposal 2: Support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for NR operating in 52.6 – 71GHz.
	+ Observation 10: Extended CP may not be needed for NR in 52.6–71GHz if MIMO TAE requirement less than 65ns is defined.
	+ Observation 11: Advanced phase noise compensation methods, such as direct de-ICI compensation method, may not be suitable for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
* From [30]:
	+ The following two combinations of maximum channel bandwidth and numerology shall be supported:
		- Maximum carrier bandwidth of 2.16 GHz with SCS of 960 kHz;
		- Maximum carrier bandwidth of 400 MHz with SCS of 120 kHz.
		- Further study whether ECP is needed for 960 kHz SCS.
		- Further study whether the support of other SCS is needed.
		- Further study whether mixed numerology is needed.
* From [31]:
	+ Proposal 1: For numerology, at least one higher SCS than 120 kHz should be introduced for 52.6 – 71 GHz NR.
		- The number of SCSs to be newly supported for 52.6 – 71 GHz should be minimized
		- For 960 kHz SCS if supported for 52.6 – 71 GHz, extended CP should be considered

### 2.1.2 Discussion

##### Moderator Summary of observations and proposals from Contributions:

* Companies views are somewhat diverse and there seems to be few sub issues, (1) supporting a single SCS or multiple SCS, (2) CP length, (3) supported SCS (for channels/signals other than SSB and PRACH)
	+ Many companies seem to hint at supporting multiple SCS, although always not explicitly mentioned.
	+ Many companies are gravitating towards use of NCP and FSS on ECP usage.
	+ Companies has diverse view on supported SCS, ranging from 120 kHz to 960 kHz.
* Given that SCS and CP length are fundamental aspects needed for further progress on physical layer aspects, try to see we can come to a conclusion (if possible).

##### 1st round of Discussion:

Chairman has suggested to gather input from companies on various aspects related to numerology. Please provide comments and input for each of the topics. The moderator will try to collect the inputs from the companies and summarize them.

* Number of numerologies
* Specification impacts of numerologies
* Whether design can operate with a single numerology
* Maximum supported numerology
* NCP/ECP
* Observations on performance from evaluations
* Implementation Complexity
* Scenarios enabled by different SCS

###### Company comments on number of supported numerologies:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | The numerology selection should be based on few basic principles such as performance, complexity of implementation , impact on the existing specification. Moreover, in the 60 GHz unlicensed band one should consider the abundence of spectrum and the almost inexistent incumbent deployments. Based on the link evaluations we observed that SCS 240 MHz is a very good compromise of the above criteria. It offers minimal changes to the existing specifications, it operates very well in channel of relative larger delay spread, and with a reduced ICI filtering, it performs very well at lower and high MCS.  |
| LG Electronics | Taking into account issues such as implementation complexity, specification impact, and so on, it might be beneficial to minimize the number of numerologies that will be supported for NR above 52.6 GHz. However, how many numerologies are to be supported will be influenced by other aspects (e.g., performance) as well. Therefore, the necessity of each candidate numerology should be justied first. |
| Ericsson | Agree that number of numerologies needs to be limited, e.g., to two. 120 kHz is a natural candidate due to existing FR2 implementations. The value for a (single) larger candidate numerology must be justified considering performance, implementation complexity, and specification impact. It is vital to have a firm view on feasible UE processing timelines and UE and BS timing error tolderances with respect to CP duration, otherwise high performance, and low latency cannot be achieved. Timing error tolerances, while in RAN4 purview, need to be understood in RAN1 before numerology can be decided. Furthermore, SCS and maximum channel BW needs to be selected together (see below for comments on max channel BW). |
| Nokia, NSB | We prefer to minimize the number of newly introduced SCS, this to minimize the specification effort. Based on our analysis, only one additional subcarrier spacing, particularly value of (µ=6) for physical data channels would be sufficient for 60 GHz scenario. Up to two new SCS values could be an acceptable compromise for us. As we already re-iterated, different SCS are suitable for different types of deployments, in terms of delay spread, coverage and ISD determining the required timing tolerances.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | In our understanding the point here would be only one numerology or multiple numerologies are supported, regardless of the exact SCS value(s) (i.e. regardless of whether to support higher SCS than FR2). Our view is at least two SCS values are necessary, one is to achieve wider BW which would be necessary for 3GPP to be competitive against 11ad/ay (of cource the exact BW will be discussed in section 2.2, but we assume at least larger BW than FR2 should be supported), and the other is to reuse the existing NR. It would be hard for only a single SCS to achieve these two goals in our view. In this sense, given carrier bandwidth, the numerology can be unique. Multiple numerologies are used to support different carrier bandwidth. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We suggest to consider the requirements for different use cases that need to be supported and identify if one or more numerologies are needed to satisfy those requirements. Then further consideration is needed on the specification impact, UE capability, implementation complexity and performance gap with those numerologies would be needed.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree to limit the number of numerologies in 60GHz considering the spec impact. The required numerologies should be associated with the supported channel bandwidth, e.g. 120kHz with 400MHz channel bandwidth, and if the maximum supported channel bandwidth goes up to 1.6GHz, it’s clear that at least 480kHz should be supported accordingly due to the maximum FFT size limitation. So we suggest to consider the combination of supported numerologies and channel bandwidth, and at least support 2 candidate numerologies for different channel bandwidth. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The choice of numerology(ies) should follow from the observations on performance evaluations, adequate support of targeted use cases and scenarios including aspects such as coverage, feasibility, and specification effort. Our observations point toward supporting at least one of 120 kHz or 240 kHz SCS for scenarios maximizing coverage, including the support of bandwidths smaller than the maximum supported bandwidth, and requiring multiple channels for sharing regulated spectrum block sizes either licensed (e.g. with 4 operators) or unlicensed (with channel selection e.g. based on sensing and avoiding). Additionally supporting a larger SCS in the specifications can be considered if it is justified by a relevant use case and scenario. |
| Samsung | RAN1 shall strive minimum number of numerologies supported. The discussion can start from single numerology to be supported, and investigate whether it is suitable for all the development scenarios. If not, naturally we should consider multiple numerologies to support.  |
| vivo | Not sure that the number of supported numerologies is the total number for all channels including channels other than SSB and PRACH. Actually, the total number of numerologies are different for different channels in FR1/FR2, e.g. 1.25k/5k/15k/30k is supported for PRACH. From our point of view, to minimize implementation effort, support up to 2 numerologies for each of the above channel is preferred.  |
| InterDigital | We also sympathize that we need to limit the number of new SCSs as much as possible, however, the selections should be based on evaluation results. According to our evaluation results as well as others, Supporting up to two SCSs seems beneficial considering scenarios, delay spreads, coverage and so on.  |
| Qualcomm | We share the same view that the number of supported numerologies should be kept to minimum to minimize the specification load. Thus, an existing FR2 numerology, 120kHz, is the natural starting point. However, as many companies already pointed out, a single SCS is not versatile enough to support various applications and deployment scenarios envisioned for the 60GHz band. Thus, one additional SCS higher than 120kHz, i.e., two numerologies in total, would be enough. |
| MediaTek | Existing FR2 numerology of 120 KHz SCS should be supported and serve as the baseline. Based on evaluation results from multiple companies, the setting allows proper operation @ 60GHz (with performance degradation for high MCS cases due to PN). An additional numerology (e.g., SCS of 960KHz) could be supported if evaluation results show significant performance enhancements compared to the baseline. |
| CATT | The principle of numerology for NR operation in 52.6-71 GHz is to reuse most of current specifications for FR2 with required enhancement by introducing new numerology. The introduced of additional numerology needs to have strong justification with minimum specification impacts and implementation complexity.  |
| Sony | From the perspective of co-existence with 802.11ad/ay, we believe at least 960kHz SCS is necessary to achieve 2.16GHz with a single carrier. In addition, it has been shown in multiple LLS results that the 960kHz SCS can provide better performance than smaller SCSs due to its advantage on combat the ICI, especially for high MCS. Therefore, 960kHz SCS should be supported in frequency range between 52.6 GHz-71GHz. For licensed band operation between 52.6-71GHz, we could pick up another SCS when comprehensively considering performance, complexity, standard effort, etc. So far, 240kHz SCS for data/control channel or signals seems to be a good candidate. Stepping forward from FR2 (only up to 120kHz for data/control channel), 240kHz with half symbol duration of 120kHz may introduce shorter latency and higher bandwidth. Meanwhile the complexity and performance can somehow expected from the experience of adopting 120kHz SCS. So in total, we think at least two SCS for 52.6-71GHz are needed.  |
| Intel | One new SCS is preferred for us. However, we could agree with two new SCS values to facilitate the support of various deployment scenarios and to optimize system configurations. |
| Xiaomi | Agree to support as few as SCS as possible to alleivate spec effort and implementation complexity, a possible way can be supporting one SCS as mandatory and (maybe,if needed) some other SCS as optional. |
| OPPO | We prefer to support up to 2 numerologies, i.e., 120kHz and 960kHz. |
| Spreadtrum | The number of SCS should be kept to a minimum to minimize the specification effort. We prefer to introduce one new SCS. |
| Apple | The choice of numerology should be based on factors such as performance, implementation complexity and specification impact. Two SCSs can be supported with 1 new SCS specified e.g. 480 kHz. |

###### Company comments on specification impacts of numerologies:

*Moderator note:* For this, I suspect that this can be a long list for each subcarrier spacing. Formulating an exhaustive list during SI may not be feasible, as we may find other aspects as work progresses. Therefore, I would like to ask companies to provide a high-level description of what they think is the most impacting. We could put a disclaimer to this list to state that this is not an exhaustive list.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | This request from moderator is not clear to me. Seems redundant. Detailed impacts are addressed in this document sections 2.3-2.13 |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s note that we don’t need to put our efforts on making exhaustive list for specification impacts. At the same time, observing high-level view on which specification impact can be foreseen seems essential. With this regard, we provide the below table which can be used for the starting point.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 120 kHz SCS | 240 kHz SCS | 480 kHz SCS | 960 kHz SCS |
| SS/PBCH block | SS/PBCH block time domain pattern is already supported in Rel-15. | SS/PBCH block time domain pattern is already supported in Rel-15. | SS/PBCH block time domain pattern is not supported in Rel-15/16. | SS/PBCH block time domain pattern is not supported in Rel-15/16. |
| Signal or channel other than SS/PBCH block | Already supported in Rel-15. | Not supported in Rel-15/16. | Not supported in Rel-15/16. | Not supported in Rel-15/16.Time unit should be updated since it is defined as  where$ Δf\_{max}=480∙10^{3}$ Hz. |

 |
| Ericsson | Agree that the above table can be used as a starting point. UE processing timelines and timing error tolerances need to be established for numerologies not currently supported in Rel-15/16. |
| Nokia, NSB | With respect to 480kHz or 960kHz we expect the same amount of specification impact in RAN1. With 240kHz we believe that slot-based scheduling could still be operated, and clearly no new SSB SCS are required. We see that 960kHz can be operated also with existing Time unit. |
| NTT DOCOMO | In general wider SCS (which would be beneficial to support wider BW) could need quite some specification impacts, as captured in the last e-meeting and to be captured in this e-meeting. For the same SCS as FR2 (if supported), few impacts are assumed on PHY in our view. Another point is whether to support mixed numerology operation or not, which could also require specification impacts as well.  |
| Lenovo/MotorolaMobility | Agree with Futurwei’s comments that this is redundant. Infact, based on the summary of sections 2.3-2.13, a high level table could be created to summarize the necessary impacts with different numerologies on different channel/signals/procedures |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If larger SCSs e.g. 960/1920 kHz are supported, the short CP may be not enough to cover delay spread, beam switching time and possible timing errors. To handle above issues, it will cause larger specification impacts. The specification impacts brought by 240/480 kHz will be smaller. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The TR should eventually capture the outcome of the study analyzing the specification effort for each candidate numerology. Here we try to provide a more exhaustive list of specification effort for 120 kHz and 240 kHz SCS:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SCS | PHY impact (other than common impact for unlicensed support) |
| 120 kHz | - PTRS for CP-OFDM: for better BLER performance with high MCS, higher density PTRS or new PTRS patterns (such as block-PTRS) may need to be designed- PTRS for DFT-s-OFDM: for better BLER performance with high MCS, new PTRS pattern with more PTRS groups within one DFT-s-OFDM may need to be designed- For unlicensed: PRACH ZC lengths such as 571 and 1151 may be considered |
| 240 kHz | - PTRS for CP-OFDM: for better BLER performance with high MCS, higher density PTRS or new PTRS patterns (such as block-PTRS) may need to be designed- RO configuration- structure of DM-RS- PDCCH Monitoring- HARQ process |
| 480 kHz | - ECP is needed to account for the combined effect of some or all of delay spread, time alignment error, analog beam switching time, DL/UL switching time, and Multi-TRP delay.- SSB patterns- SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern- Scheduling, processing, HARQ timelines- RO configuration- Structure of DM-RS- PDCCH Monitoring |
| 960 kHz | - ECP is needed to account for delay spread and time alignment error.- SSB patterns- SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern- Scheduling, processing, HARQ timelines- RO configuration- Structure of DM-RS- PDCCH Monitoring |

  |
| Samsung | Other than 120 kHz SCS, we expect all other SCSs have similar work load for the potential specification impact. Also, to clarify, even multiple candidate numerologies are supported, the system can still operate with one of them, depending on its development scenario. So no mixed numerology is needed to be supported, which can further simplify the specification impact.  |
| vivo | We don’t think spec impact should be a criterion for numerology selection. It is a waste of time to compare then select a numerology based on the spec impact since the numerology with less spec impact may not meet the requirement of target use case. The most important criterion is whether to fulfill the target use case by the numerology. Agree with moderator’s comment, the spec impact could be a long list which needs much time and any introduced new numerologies (e.g. 480KHz/960KHz) almost share the same spec impact in RAN1.  |
| InterDigital | We agree with Samsung that we also expect all newly introduced SCSs require similar work loads for the specification impact. In addition, we don’t think that ECP is essential specification support such as 480 kHz and 960 kHz. Based on the operator’s implementation, 480 kHz and 960 kHz can be used only when the SCSs are beneficial with NCP.  |
| Qualcomm | Except 240kHz SCS, we think the specification impact of adding a new numerology, such as 480kHz or 960kHz, would not differ much. However, based on the collected view throughout the SI meetings and previous experience in Rel-15 and Rel-16, we don’t think the work load is unmanageable for the given TU. |
| MediaTek | Agree with Samsung that for all numerologies other than 120KHz SCS (if introduced), the specification impacts are similar. |
| CATT | Introducing a numerology would not only affect all specifications of physical layer structure, procedures, processing timeline but also the interaction with existing feature, such as cross-carrier scheduling. We should introduce the minimum number of new numerologies. |
| Sony | Since it is not exhaustive list, the most impacting factor to us is the maximum channel bandwidth the SCS could provide, considering the co-existence issue with 802.11ad/ay, as well as the EVM performance with the strong phase noise assumed in this frequency range. |
| Intel | Similar specification impact from SCS larger than what is currently supported in FR2. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with LG and HW that we can start by listing a table for SSB/other channel for various SCS and analysis its impact on spec/implementation complexity and so on. |
| OPPO | We share same view as Samsung. |
| Spreadtrum | We envision similar specification impacts for 480kHz SCS and 960kHz SCS. |
| Apple | We think that LG’s table could serve as a good starting point for discussion. |

###### Company Comments on whether design can operate with a single numerology:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Prefer a single numerology that performs well at lower and higher MCS, that mitigates ISI due to larger delay using NCP and offers longer SSB cover range.  |
| LG Electronics | Similar to start of NR-U SI discussion, we can conclude that being able to operate all DL (and/or UL) signal/channels with the same numerology for a carrier is beneficial in terms of lower complexity and no required measurement gap. However, it doesn’t necessarily mean that we necessitate to design 480 kHz SS/PBCH block in case 480 kHz SCS is to be introduced, e.g., considering non-stand-alone case. |
| Ericsson | From a coverage point of view, it is beneficial to operate an initial DL/UL BWP using existing FR2 numerologies for SS/PBCH and PRACH. Additional BWP(s) can be configured with larger numerology to achieve higher data rates as needed, and when coverage allows. In this sense, support of different numerology for SS/PBCH block and data/control is acceptable compared to re-design of all existing signals/channels to guarantee coverage. Agree with LG in that for NSA operation, it is not necessary to support 480 kHz SS/PBCH block to be able to operate in a 480 kHz BWP. Existing FR2 numerologies (120/240 kHz) work well. |
| Nokia, NSB | For 480kHz or 960kHz SCS, design of corresponding SSB/PRACH SCS is required to achieve single numerology deployments, but design could be straightforward. Single or mixed SCS deployments should be implementation option and dependent on scenario of use. |
| NTT DOCOMO | In our understanding, this is related to whether to support mixed numerology operation or not. As we described above, mixed numerology operation would require a certain amount of specification impacts. It also lead to implementation complexity. Therefore a single numerology operation can generally be preferred in our view. On the other hand, below aspects may need to be considered:* Among signals/channels other than SSB, it may not be neccesary to support mixed numerology operation as well as FR2. On the other hand, some channels with fixed duration (e.g. PRACH, PUCCH) may suffer from coverage issue due to shortened OFDM symbol length by higher SCS. Mixed numerology b/w channels with fixed duration and others can be beneficial.

Between SSB and data, in our evaluation lower SCS performs better slightly. Thus, if higher SCS is applied to data, mixed numerology between SSB and data can be beneficial.  |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Based on stringent requirements in terms of BLER and/or throughput, we think that a higher numerology such as 960kHz would be more suitable. However, for less stringent requirements such as higher BLER and/or lower MCS, lower numerology should suffice. So, in our view, supporting two numerologies would be reasonable. Also, agree with LG and Ericsson’s comment that it is not necessary to support same set of numerologies for SSB/PBCH and other data/control channels |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We don’t see the need to restrict data/control channels using the same numerology with SSB/PBCH and PRACH since the requirements for these signals are different. To achieve a high data rates, a larger channel bandwidth and associated SCS is needed. As for SSB/PBCH and PRACH channel, the existed NR numerology is enough considering the coverage. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with Ericsson that support of different numerology for SS/PBCH block and data/control is acceptable compared to re-design of all existing signals/channels to guarantee coverage. From the network point-of-view, we don’t think it is necessary that the same numerology be used by all UEs, in case multiple numerologies for data are supported. If there is a need for a mode where all signals and channels operate with the same numerology, then 120 kHz SCS achieves that based on current specifications. |
| Samsung | In Rel-16 NR-U, we discussed this issue, and the conclusion was supporting same numerology for all the channels and signals is beneficial for implementation. RAN1 shall at least provide the feasibility to support implementing all the channels and signals using the same numerology.  |
| vivo | Single numerology is preferred for implementation simplicity if a single numerology can fulfil the requirements for all expected deployment scenarios. However, in case that’s not possible, we’re open to have different numerologies between SSB and other channels if needed. |
| InterDigital | While single numerology can achieve simple implementation and specification support, we are open to have different numerologies especially for SSB and PRACH considering coverage issues. |
| Qualcomm | Mixed numerology operation is an intrinsic feature of NR, and we think it should also be supported in the 60GHz band. However, we think at least the same numerologies should be supported for different channels. If we introduce a new SCS (e.g., 960kHz) only for data channels and not for SS/PBCH, then it may induce practical issues, particularly in SA operation; some details if the issues are discussed in our comments in Section 2.3. |
| Mediatek | We prefer single numerology operation. However, if SCS of 480 KHz or 960 KHz is supported, we are also fine with having the SSB operating at 120 kHz SCS. |
| CATT | Single numerology works fine without further complication.  |
| Sony | Don’t prefer single numerology operation. There seems no clear evidence to restrict all channels/signals to operate with the same SCS. On the contrary, the NR system are designed with different performance requirements for different channels/signals. Assuming 960kHz SCS supported for data channel, e.g. PDSCH, we may not need to support 960kHz SSB for DL coverage and synchronization.  |
| Intel | The ability for a deployment to utilize same numerology for all channel and signal operations is preferred as it would allow gNB and UE to streamline operations. We recognize that some specific deployment might benefit from having mixed numerology operation. However, we do not think that this potential benefit should purpose as a justification for mandating only mixed numerology operation by having only misaligned numerology among SSB/COREST#0 and other control/data channels signals as it significantly complicates implementation and deployment for scenarios that do not require such operation. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with LG and Ericsson. But also think that even design can operate on a single numerology, UE/gNB may be able to support multiple SCSs.  |
| OPPO | Mixed numerology works fine and we don’t see the necessity to support single numerology operation. |
| Spreadtrum | In order to simplify the implementation, we prefer single numerology operation. |
| Apple | We agree with Ericsson and Huawei that there is no need to mandate the same numerology for the SS/PBCH and data channels. The current numerology for SS/PBCH shows good performance in this spectrum band and changing this would require (a) a re-design of the entire SS/PBCH block and (b) result in non-reuse of existing FR2 implementations.  |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with single numerology for SSB and PRACH and are open with different numerologies for SSB and PRACH design. |

###### Company Comments on maximum supported subcarrier spacing and NCP/ECP usage:

*Moderator note:* Provide inputs on supported maximum subcarrier spacing and NCP/ECP usage for the supported subcarrier spacing.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei |  Prefer NCP, and a maximum SCS of 240 kHz |
| LG Electronics | We prefer SCS up to 480 kHz, with NCP. |
| Ericsson | Agree with LG – consider up to 480 kHz with NCP. Use of ECP is unjustified – we have demonstrated that 960 kHz + ECP has a 6 dB degradation compared to 480 kHz + NCP at 10% PDSCH BLER when comparing on the basis of equal data rate; ECP requires a larger effective code rate to support the same data rate. |
| Nokia, NSB | We observed that when SCS is selected correctly for the target scenario, NCP is sufficient for up to 960kHz. Based on that we propose to prioritize NCP in 60 GHz studies. ECP can be considered later, if needed. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are ok with 960 kHz as max. candidate SCS. Also ok with NCP as a baseline and ECP for further study and/or discussion.  |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | For 1% BLER requirement (with higher MCS), 960kHz performs significantly better and for that reason we think that 960 kHz could be considered as the maximum SCSFor CP, there is no need for ECP for SCS upto 480kHz and ECP should only be supported with 960kHz, if agreed |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer SCS up to 480kHz, with NCP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our observation is that NCP is not sufficient for SCS larger than 240 kHz when we consider the combined effects of all or some of delay spread, time alignment error, analog beam switching time, DL/UL switching time, and Multi-TRP delay. If a SCS like 120 or 240 kHz is supported for scenarios that require relative large CP, then there is no need to optimize the CP for larger SCS like 480 or 960 kHz (if supported) for indoor environments with small delay spread where the target would be to support very large aggregated bandwidths (> 2 GHz) rather than coverage. |
| Samsung | 960 kHz SCS has much better performance gain over other SCS regarding the 1% BLER, so we consider 960 kHz SCS as the maximum SCS, and can further study whether ECP is needed for 960 kHz SCS.  |
| vivo | Prefer NCP and a maximum supported SCS of 960 kHz |
| InterDigital | Our preference is supporting SCSs up to 960 kHz with NCP |
| Qualcomm | Based on our observation from a system-level analysis, we think NCP is enough for a higher SCS up to 960kHz, particularly in the scenarios that 960kHz is beneficial over 120kHz, e.g., indoor, unlicensed, wide band, and high peak rate applications. The scenarios that see large delay spreads are usually large coverage, licensed, small bandwidth, and low-to-medium peak rate applications, and can be covered by 120kHz SCS.  |
| MediaTek | We prefer maximum SCS of 960KHz and NCP only. |
| CATT | NCP is sufficient for SCS below 480 kHz. The support of 960 kHz SCS needs strong justification.  |
| Sony | We prefer SCS up to 960kHz with NCP, and ECP can be FFS. |
| Intel | 960 kHz SCS with NCP. The applicability of ECP is FFS depending on RAN4 feedback on MIMO TAE requirements. For smaller SCS than 960 kHz, NCP seems to be sufficient (based on our analysis). |
| OPPO | NCP is enough. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer SCS up to 480kHz with NCP. |
| Apple | SCS up to 480 kHz with NCP.  |
| Convida Wireless | Agree for SCS up to 960 KHz. The need to support of ECP for large SCS e.g., 480 KHz and above should be further studied for NR operation from 52.6 to 71 GHz. |

###### Company Comments on implementation complexity:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | {120 kHz, 240 kHz } low spec impact, with ICI filter perform well for low and high MCS, {480 kHz,960 kHz } substantial changes to the specs, potential lower spectrum efficiency with the use of ECP. |
| LG Electronics | At least, numerologies that are already supported for FR2 should be also supported for frequency range over 52.6 GHz, which can minimize additional implementation complexity. |
| Ericsson | Clearly, implementation burden is eased by minimization of the enhancements that are specified for operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz. Only enhancements that have a clear technical and performance benefit should be considered. |
| Nokia, NSB | Unlike 480kHz SCS, 960kHz SCS may be operated up to 64QAM without ICI compensation. ICI compensation clearly increases complexity. Particularly 64QAM with 480kHz has trouble in wide channels, such as 1600MHz, which is a scenario for high SCS deployments. Furthermore, 960kHz will minimize the number of component carriers (as we shown in our TDOC) needed for support of certain bandwidth, this also clearly decreases the implementation complexity  |
| NTT DOCOMO | As we described on ”whether design can operate with a single numerology”, mixed numerology could lead more complexity to implementation.  |
| Lenovo/MototolaMobility | Effort should be to support one or more numerology withtout significant impact on implementation complexity. Therefore, all the enhancements that should be considered should aim towards reasonable complexity |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Reuse FR2 numerologies as much as possible and minimize specification impacts to reduce implementation complexity, except for some necessary enhancements for above 52.6 GHz e.g. to match larger bandwidth.Compared with CPE compensation, ICI shows larger implementation complexity and better performance especially for lower SCS. In our opinion if the ICI compensation could be based on the existed Rel-15 PTRS pattern, the increased complexity is worth it since the spec impact could be alleviated. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Implementation complexity is well understood for SCS already supported by NR. If the only major enhancement for PHY is the design of denser PTRS and the implementation of ICI compensation at the receiver then this is clearly less challenging than the brand new design required to support the shorter sampling rates, processing timelines and switching times required with 480 or 960 kHz SCS.We do not think that the complexity of CA is prohibitive up to 8 component carriers, since requirements for such band combinations are already specified in 5G. Reaching aggregated channel bandwidth on the order of 2 GHz does not require more than 5 carriers with 120 kHz SCS.  |
| Samsung | It is not quite desirable to introduce too much change to the implementation side, e.g. more advanced receiver algorithmAlso, it would be beneficial to provide the implementation possibility to use a single carrier to achieve wide carrier bandwidth (e.g. 2.16 GHz), which implies a preference to 960 kHz SCS |
| vivo | The implementation complexity should be compared when achieving the same target which fulfill the requirement of a particular use case, e.g. peak data rate, maximum channel bandwidth and etc. For example, in the following table, supporting the same peak data rate 10Gbps, (960K, NCP) needs the minimum number of carriers and doesn’t need ICI. In this sense, (960K, NCP) has the least implementation complexity.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Numerology** | **Maximum supported MCS** | **Peak Data Rate for a single carrier** | **Number of carriers for 10Gbps data rate** |
| (120 K, NCP) w/o ICI | MCS 16 | 758 Mbps | 14 |
| (240 K, NCP) w/o ICI | MCS 16 | 1516 Mbps | 7 |
| (120 K, NCP) with ICI | MCS 22 | 1516 Mbps | 7 |
| (240 K, NCP) with ICI | MCS 22 | 3032 Mbps | 4 |
| (480 K, NCP) w/o ICI | MCS 22 | 4603 Mbps | 3 |
| (960 K, NCP) w/o ICI | MCS 22 | 5754 Mbps | 2 |

 |
| InterDigital | We also agree with Nokia that applying ICI filter increases UE complexity and carrier aggregation based specification support increases control signaling overheads.  |
| Qualcomm | Implementation complexity is also bundled with UE capability and processing timeline discussion, which will follow in later sections. Therefore, we don’t think it is a critical factor for the numerology selection, unless the basic operations, such as RF, FFT, etc., are feasible. |
| MediaTek | Complexity should be defined w.r.t. FR2 baseline. From this perspective, options with more specification impacts lead to more implementation complexity. Regarding ICI filter/equalizer, we think simple linear equalizer could enhance performance significantly without much increase in complexity. |
| CATT | Higher SCS implies higher sampling rate and faster processing time. We should consider the practical implementation on the sampling rate.  |
| Sony | We share a similar view as Nokia that supporting 960 kHz SCS can minimize the number of CCs for supporting 2.16 GHz, also it can reduce the complexity in ICI compensation design. So, we think that supporting 960 kHz SCS can be a benefit to reduce the implementation complexity. |
| Intel | From perspective of time required for signal processing, it’s similar complexity of SCS larger than what is currently supported in FR2. However, the considered SCS values other than 960 kHz require advanced ICI compensation techniques to operate with 64QAM. The complexity of these techniques is higher than in case of simple CPE compensation used for SCS = 960 kHz to enable 64QAM. Moreover, even with ICI compensation the SCS values smaller than 960 kHz cannot operate with some higher-order MCSs (e.g. MCS 28) and/or small frequency allocations. In other words, ICI compensation cannot be considered as a universal solution for SCSs up to 960 kHz. |
| OPPO | We share same view as Nokia. |
| Apple | Essentially, the discussion on the maximum SCS is a trade-off between signal processing complexity (assuming an ICI filter) and complexity brought about by the increased timing constraints as we increase the size of the SCS. Both issues should be considered. Note that as pointed out by Huawei and Ericsson, the phase noise model used for evaluations is relatively conservative compared with reality and may result in an over-design in our choice of SCS. As such, there may not be a need to implement aggressive PN ICI compensation  |

###### Company Comments on Scenarios enabled by different SCS:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Indoor/Outdoor enabled by :{120 kHz,240 kHz,480 kHz }, Indoor mainly{960 kHz }. We do not see necessary to have special numerology for indoor only scenarios if there are numerologies that perform equally well both in idoor and outdoor scenarios. |
| Ericsson | We do not see that 960 kHz enables any more scenarios than 480 kHz SCS. In fact, 960 kHz is penalized, even indoors, due to timing error tolerances exhausting the CP budget. Furthermore, environments such as InF-DH with larger delay spread become especially problematic. |
| Nokia, NSB | 120kHz provides an evolutionary solution for outdoor deployments, and with ICI compensation may enable support of up to 64QAM.Unlike 480kHz and below, 960kHz SCS provides a competitive solution to WiGig for indoor deployments, when it comes to high peak data rates and low cost implementations (no ICI compensation needed with 960kHz SCS). |
| NTT DOCOMO | No strong view from our side. One possible point may be whether it is operated in licensed or unlicensed band. Given 11ad/ay, wider BW may be more required in 60 GHz unlicensed band, which could be achieved by higher SCS. On the other hand, similar BW to FR2 could be reused in 60 GHz licensed band, which could be achieved by the existing (or relatively smaller) SCS, expecially for outdoor scenario.  |
| Lenovo/MotorolaMobility | In addition to deployment scenarios, also the target requirements for different use cases that would be supported in those scenarios are important |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think each of {120 kHz,240 kHz,480 kHz} could be used for both indoor and outdoor. We do not think it is necessary to determine numerologies according to usage scenarios. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Since 3GPP is primarily designing solutions for cellular networks, it is important to ensure that some configurations are available that maximize the coverage, and those scenarios are best served with 120 kHz SCS and relatively smaller carrier bandwidths. It is not clear that using a larger SCS like 960 kHz with the same maximum FFT size allows achieving larger throughputs than 120 kHz with the same FFT size. Achieving larger throughput is achieved by CA on top of the largest supported single carrier bandwidth. So in any case, CA needs to be supported and as written in response to the question on complexity, we don’t see any feasibility issue with CA. Just matching the maximum single carrier bandwidth as WiGiG does not ensure the same peak rate. |
| Samsung | From our observation, two numerologies, 120 kHz and 960 kHz SCS, are sufficient to cover all the development scenarios, and each has its own benefit. * 120 kHz SCS is more suitable for larger coverage and low MCS scenario
* 960 kHz SCS is more suitable for higher throughput and high MCS scenario
 |
| vivo | In general, there are two kinds of scenarios, indoor and outdoor.For outdoor scenario, 120KHz is a good candidate with large coverage;For indoor scenario, one of the target use case is to enable application with peak data rate around or above 10Gbps, (960K, NCP) is preferred with minimum implementation complexity as discussed above in complexity part. |
| InterDigital | We do see a necessity of supporting 960 kHz SCS as 960 kHz SCS achieves the best performance without implementing any additional interference mitigation algorithm. According to our evaluation results, 960 kHz fully satisfies the requirement that some scenario requires. For other scenarios, we are open to consider 120 kHz or 480 kHz. |
| Qualcomm | We share the same view as Nokia and vivo. 120kHz is predominant for outdoor, large coverage, relatively small bandwidth, and high EIRP scenarios, while 960kHz is for indoor, large bandwidth, unlicensed, high peak rate scenarios. |
| MediaTek | 120KHz SCS should be able to support both indoor and outdoor scenarios, while 960KHz could support indoor, high throughput scenario. |
| CATT | For 52.6-71 GHz, the propagation and penetration losses are severe. There is very little benefit to support different numerology. Single numerology is sufficient for both indoor and outdoor. |
| LG Electronics | We share the view with Ericsson and ZTE. SCSs up to 480 kHz can be used for any deployment scenarios. |
| Sony | Our understanding on determining numerologies is that we perhaps need to pay more attentions on the key performance metrics in EVM, co-existence with 802.11 ay/ad implementation complexity, etc, rather than the scenarios (either indoor or outdoor). |
| Intel | While it is difficult to list all potential deployment scenarios and the recommended bandwidths with corresponding SCS, we acknowledge that supporting various deployment cases with a single SCS could be difficult.For the deployment scenarios tested (outdoor LPN-like scatter deployments, Indoor deployments), SCS = 960kHz seems to be able to meet the requirements. While it may be possible to obtain longer coverage with use of smaller SCS, it’s not clear to us whether 60 GHz operation actually needs to target for coverage. There are various other FR1 and FR2 bands supported in NR, that have far better coverage that can be exploited if coverage is important. We believe the main usage for 60 GHz lies in extreme high throughput and low latencies that make the band attractive and the NR technology competitive with rivals such as WiGig technology.To support other use cases and deployment scenarios such as indoor factory hall, we think supporting 480 kHz SCS could be sufficient. |
| Xiaomi | A higher SCS, such as 960kHz can be used in scenarios with lower delay spread,mainly for indoor. For outdoor, larger delay spread can be expected and is more suitable for lower SCS such as 120kHz. And for sure, lower SCS can also apply to indoor scenario,but may not be able to achieve that high data rate as 960kHz |
| OPPO | We think that 960 kHz is at least for peak-data-rate-driven scenario. |
| Apple | We do not think it is necessary to tie SCSs to specific scenarios. On the peak data rate issue, this can be achieved with CA.  |

##### Moderator summary of comments received:

* For number of supported numerologies
	+ Majority of the companies mentioned number of supported numerologies should be minimized.
	+ Some companies have noted that introduction of a supported numerology should taking into account performance, implementation, impact on specification, and justified by relevant user case and scenario.
	+ Some companies have noted that selection of the numerologies should also be associated with supported bandwidths, and numerology and bandwidths supported should be decided together.
	+ Some companies have noted while keeping supported number of numerologies to a minimum is important, single numerology may not be versatile enough to support various applications and deployment scenarios.
	+ A company have noted RAN1 should start with single numerology and introduce more only if needed.
	+ Some companies have mentioned they would be able to accept up to two numerology.
		- Some subset of companies has mentioned if two numerologies are supported, one should be from the supported numerology in current NR specification and the another should be a new numerology.
* For specification impact of numerologies:
	+ Some companies commented defining a non-exhaustive table is redundant as companies have provided potential specification impact and issues in other sections of this summary.
	+ Most companies seem to agree that specification impact and effort other than currently supported SCS, 120 kHz, would be similar.
	+ Some companies mentioned that effort to standardize 240kHz could be relatively smaller.
	+ A company mentioned that specification impact should not be sole criteria for selection of numerology and support and fulfillment of target use case and scenario is key.
	+ Below table can be starting point to compile potential specification impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SCS | Potential PHY impact |
| Common to all SCS | Support of unlicensed operationIf mixed numerology is supported, additional PHY impact from supporting mixed numerology operation.SSB and CORSET#0 offsets from supported channelization |
| 120 kHz | Potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM |
| 240 kHz | Potential PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDMRO configurationPotential enhancement to DM-RSPDCCH monitoringHARQ processPotential enhancement to DM-RSPDCCH monitoringHARQ process |
| 480 kHz | Note: Similar specification impact envisioned between 480 and 960 kHz.Potential consideration of ECPSSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patternsScheduling, processing, HARQ timelinesRO configurationPotential enhancement to DM-RSPDCCH monitoringHARQ process |
| 960 kHz |

* For whether design can operation with single numerology
	+ Some companies commented that operation with a single numerology beneficial, and there will be some associated effort in supported mixed numerology.
	+ A company commented that mixed numerology operation is functional and there is no need to support single numerology operation.
	+ Some companies commented SSB SCS could be an exception to the single numerology operation.
	+ Some companies commented need to have same SCS between SSB and other channels may not be warranted.
* For maximum supported subcarrier spacing
	+ Many companies seem to agree that for SCS up to 480 kHz NCP is sufficient.
	+ Some companies observed that NCP is sufficient for 960 kHz. Some companies commented ECP could be considered further and a company commented ECP can be considered depending on RAN4 feedback.
	+ A company commented that use of 960 kHz with ECP may result in performance degradation compared with 480 kHz with NCP.
	+ As for the largest subcarrier being considered:
		- 120 kHz: no company provided comments
		- 240 kHz: 3 companies
		- 480 kHz: 7 companies
		- 960 kHz: 11 companies
* For implementation complexity
	+ Based on comments from companies, implementation complexity discussion spans complexity involving processing ICI compensation, ability to support faster processing latency, complexity in supporting a number component carriers to reach a target throughput.
	+ A company noted that overall implementation complexity is dependent on the supported features from UE capability and processing timeline (to be yet defined for SCS not supported in current NR).
* For scenarios enabled by different SCS
	+ Companies have commented one specific SCS may not necessarily support more deployment scenarios compared to another specific SCS. So, the discussion on whether a SCS supports more or less deployment scenarios might not be the best discussion direction.
	+ Based on commented received, larger SCS seems to be geared towards indoor scenarios or peak data-rate driven scenarios, while smaller SCS seems to be geared towards indoor and outdoor scenarios or coverage driven scenarios.

##### Conclusions from GTW Session

* **Agreement:**
	+ Numerologies below 120 kHz or above 960 kHz are not supported for any signal or channel.
* **Agreement:**
	+ For operation in 52-71 GHz:
		- 120 kHz should be supported
		- Up to two additional SCS may be considered and at least one should be supported
		- FFS: Applicability of additional SCS to particular signals and channels

##### 2nd round of Discussion:

If narrowing down the applicable SCS is difficult at this time due to diverse views from companies, as chairman guidance, moderator asks to focus on compiling relevant information that may be able to be captured into the TR for conclusion of applicability and issues for each candidate SCS.

For this moderator suggest to split the conclusions into three categories, (1) issues/observations that are applicable to all numerologies or with regards to overall system operation and standardization efforts (and not limited to a specific numerology), (2) issues/observations that are applicable to smaller subcarrier spacing (e.g. 120 or 240kHz) and larger subcarrier spacing (e.g. 480 or 960kHz), (3) issues/observations for each specific numerology, 120, 240, 480, and 960 kHz.

Please provide comments on the bullet listed text. If there are additional aspects that should be listed, please suggest them as well. We can discuss further about the ordering of the bullets. Moderator suggest first focus on getting each bullet stable and work further on how to order them. Bullets are enumerated so that they can be referenced.

(1) Issues/observation that are applicable to all numerologies, or with regards to overall system operation and standardization efforts (and not limited to a specific numerology)

1. It was observed that amount of specification effort increases with the number of numerologies enabled and supported for 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz frequency.
2. In order to minimize specification effort while maximizing supported use cases and deployment scenarios applicable for 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz frequency, It is recommended to support 120 kHz subcarrier spacing with normal CP length, and at least one more subcarrier spacing. It is recommended to consider supporting at most up to three subcarrier spacings, including 120 kHz subcarrier spacing. Applicability of the supported subcarrier spacing to particular signals and channels should be further discussed in the corresponding WI phase.
3. [Move this item after (4)] In order to bound implementation complexity, it is recommended to limit the maximum FFT size required to operate system in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz frequency to 4096 and to limit the maximum of RBs per carrier to 275 RBs.
4. It is recommended that numerologies 240 kHz, 480 kHz, and 960 kHz are considered as candidates for additional numerologies in addition to 120 kHz, and numerologies outside this range are not supported for any signals or channels.
5. Selection of the additional subcarrier spacing (on top of 120 kHz) should consider versatility of being able to support various applications and deployment scenarios with all the subcarrier spacings that would be supported by specification, accounting for what is already supported in Rel-15 and Rel-16 specifications.
6. Some companies have noted that ability for a deployed system to operate with a single numerology for all channels and signals is beneficial, and some companies have further noted benefit remains even if SSB numerology is different. Some companies have noted mixed numerology operation is functional and is supported in Rel-15 and Rel-16 specifications (i.e. 240 kHz SSB subcarrier spacing with 120 kHz subcarriers for PDCCH/PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH/PRACH in an initial BWP and also activation of a dedicated BWP with SCS for PDCCH/PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH different than the initial BWP) and consideration of single numerology operation is not needed. [For example, using 120 kHz subcarrier spacing for initial BWP and higher subcarrier spacing for dedicated BWP].
7. Overall implementation complexity for supporting a specific subcarrier spacing may need to consider the following, but not limited to:
	1. processing complexity for equalization including inter-carrier interference mitigation (if required to support higher modulation orders) and compensation, [FFT utilization], and FFT complexity per unit time,
	2. complexity in support of multiple component carriers to reach a specific throughput
	3. [complexity associated with supporting given requirements on UE processing times (e.g. N1, N2, N3, Z1, Z2, Z3, etc) and UE PDCCH processing budget as a function of subcarrier spacing].
	4. supported features indicated by UE capability signaling or implemented by the gNB
	5. complexity to support a required timing error toleranace including the at least one of initial timing error, timing advance setting, TA granularity, MIMO TAE, and multi-TRP timing alignment as a function of SCS
	6. complexity in supporting higher sampling rates and increased channel bandwidths
8. [It is observed that in general, larger subcarrier spacing may have benefit of short symbol/slot length to provide low latency service as well as high precision for positioning application. Channel with shorter symbol has potential gain of more opportunity of transmission without LBT.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments on (1)** |
| Nokia, NSB | 1. “RAN1 observes amount of specification effort increases with ~~larger~~ the number of numerologies enabled and supported for 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz frequency.”

4) ”RAN1 recommends consideration of numerologies 240 kHz, 480kHz and 960 kHz,”1. Some companies have noted that ability for a deployed system to operate with a single numerology for all channels and signals, with the possibility of exception to SSB numerology, is beneficial. Some companies have noted mixed numerology operation is functional and consideration of single numerology operation is not needed.  For example using 120kHz for intial BWP and higher SCS for dedicated BWP.
 |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Agree with Nokia’s proposed updates to 1) and 4)I suppose Nokia’s last proposed update is to 6) not 8). We don;t think that there is a need to add the example as the text is quite self explanatory. Agree with rest of the bullets as well. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with the proposal with Nokia and Lenovo’s update. |
| InterDigital | Agree with the proposal from Moderator and updates from Nokia and Lenovo with the following update.4) RAN1 reccomends consideration of numerologies 240 kHz, 480 kHz and 960 kHz as additional numerlogies in addition to 120 kHz. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s proposal + Nokia or InterDigital’s update to 4). Agree with Lenovo that we don’t need to add the examples to bullet 6). |
| NTT DOCOMO | We share LGE’s view.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with the updates from Lenovo/InterDigital on Nokia comments. In addition, 2) and 4) on consideration of numerologies can be further merged. |
| vivo | Agree with the proposal with Nokia and Lenovo’s update. |
| Apple | * For item 7(a), the term ”equalization”, does this refer to equalization for demodulation or equalization for ICI ? If demodulation equalization, is it the same as item (c) ? We would like this to be clarified.
* We should switch items (4) and (3). Items (2) and (4) should be next to each other or merged.
* We share LGs views on the additional modifications.
 |
| Samsung | For item 6), the benefit of using single numerology should not exclude SSB, but we understand some companies believe the benefit could exclude SSB, so we suggest the following change: 6) Some companies have noted that ability for a deployed system to operate with a single numerology for all channels and signals~~, with the possibility of exception to SSB numerology,~~ is beneficial, and some companies have further noted the ability is beneficial even with possibility of exception to SSB numerology. Some companies have noted mixed numerology operation is functional and consideration of single numerology operation is not needed. |
| Moderator | Updated the proposal based on comments received. Updated the proposals to avoid using the term ”RAN1 recommends” as the TR should not only include aspects recommended by RAN1. |
| Ericsson | 2) Since this is the last meeting of the study item with think it should be additionally captured that RAN1 has not yet concluded on the FFS. This can be captured in 2) or 5) as follows:"RAN1 has not yet concluded on the applicability of the supported SCSs to particular signals/channels"5) This should also account to what is support in the spec already for FR2. Hence suggest the following wording:"Selection of the additional subcarrier spacing (on top of 120 kHz) should consider versatility of being able to support various applications and deployment scenarios with all the subcarrier spacings that would be supported by specification, accounting for what is already supported in Rel-15/16 specifications."6) The following wording precludes the activation of a dedicated BWP with a different SCS than an initial BWP. If that is the intention, it should be clarified:"Some companies have noted that ability for a deployed system to operate with a single numerology for all channels and signals, with the possibility of exception to SSB numerology, is beneficial. This precludes activation of a dedicated BWP with SCS different than the initial BWP." 6) In the following wording, it should be captured that mixed numerology is supported in specficiations already:"Some companies have noted mixed numerology operation is functional and is supported in Rel-15/16 specifications (240 SSB, 120 data/control/RACH), and consideration of single numerology operation is not needed."7a) The impact of FFT complexity *per unit time* and FFT utilization needs to be accounted for, since this is different when comparing two different SCSs supporting a given bandwidth and data rate. Hence we suggest the following update:"a. processing complexity for equalization and potential inter-carrier interference mitigation and compensation, including FFT complexity per unit time and FFT utilization"7b) We don't think this bullet is a correct characterization of complexity. What should be the target throughput? Is it 1 Gbps, 10 Gbps, 100 Gbps, 1000 Gbps? How should the target be decided in 3GPP? Why stop at a specific throughput?7c) This bullet is not clear. Is it meant to capture processing timelines? If so, it should be reworded, e.g., as follows:"c. ~~ability to process signals in time frames relative to symbol duration for each subcarrier spacing~~ Complexity associated with supporting given requirements on UE processing times (e.g., N1, N2, N3, Z1, Z2, Z3, etc.) and UE processing budget (i.e., BD/CCE budget) as a function of SCS." 7e) The impact of timing error tolerance impacts UE complexity, especially if a particular SCS requires a tight requirement. Suggest adding the following bullet:"e. Complexity to support a required timing error toleranace including the combination of at least initial timing error, timing advance setting, TA granularity, MIMO TAE, and multi-TRP timing alignment as a function of SCS." |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Item 1 may seem obvious but ok to have.Item 3 talks about maximum FFT size, so why do we need ”less or”? Could we just agree that the maximum FFT size is 4096? Item 3 talks about the maximum number of RBs per carrier. In our view we should also put a limit to the minimum number of RBs per carrier. We would propose 32 RBs as the minimum as in Rel-15/Rel-16.Item 5 may be confusing because ”to support various applications and deployment scenarios with all the subcarrier spacings” could be understood as each numerology support all scenarios. Item 6: we are ok with Samsung’s suggestion |
| Xiaomi | Agree with Moderator’s proposal + Nokia or InterDigital’s update to 4), and also agree to Ericsson’s example of adding (240 SSB, 120 data/control/RACH) for mixed numerology. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree to the moderator’s proposal + Ericsson’s proposed update to bullet 5) and bullet 7c) |
| Sony | Agree with bullets from FL |
| CATT |  NR has defined the basic time unit with forward compatibility in Rel-15. The consideration of the basic time unit is the implementation complexity. In NR, the basic time unit is specified as follows,The basic time unit *Tc* in NR is defined as  where*Δf* max*=480* kHz *Nf* = 4096. Additional aspects in implementation complexity7 (e) The time unit and sampling interval of new SCS should consider the NR basic time unit.  |
| Moderator | Updated the proposal based on comments received.For Ericsson’s comment to add to (6), “This precludes activation of a dedicated BWP with SCS different than the initial BWP.” Not sure if the text is relevant since the text previous to this talks about some companies believing a benefit of single numerology support. Not sure this means specification will forbid any other operation than single numerology.For CATT comment, moderator asked whether the additions by Ericsson on timing (e) and update to (c) takes this into account. From moderator’s understanding Tc is not the sampling rate used by implementation but rather just a reference number in which the specification is written. For any larger bandwidths then current supported, implementation will need to support higher sampling rate and of course this should be considered, but not sure how that is relevant with NR basic time unit. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with updated proposal except the addition of example at the end of bullet 6. As commented earlier, we don’t see the need to explicitly give an example related to this bullet. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal. |
| OPPO | Agree with the updated Moderator’s proposal. |
| Ericsson 2 | Comment #1:Addressing the Moderator's question regarding our previous comment on 6): As suggested by the moderator, if the first sentence does not preclude that the spec supports activation of a dedicated BWP with SCS different than the initial BWP, then we are okay to not state that. However, we would still like to capture that some companies view is that operation with mixed numerology in this way is beneficial. Hence, we suggest the following update:Some companies have noted that ability for a deployed system to operate with a single numerology for all channels and signals is beneficial, and some companies have further noted the ability is beneficial even with possibility of exception to SSB numerology. Some companies have noted mixed numerology operation is functional and is supported in Rel-15 and Rel-16 specifications (i.e. 240 kHz SSB subcarrier spacing with 120 kHz subcarriers for PDCCH/PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH/PRACH in an initial BWP and also activation of a dedicated BWP with SCS for PDCCH/PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH different than the initial BWP) and consideration of single numerology operation is not needed.Comment #2:7a) We still think that FFT utilization for the supported carrier bandwidths is an important factor of complexity (dimensioning of FFT resources). Hence we still think 7a) should include this as follows:7 a. processing complexity for equalization including potential inter-carrier interference mitigation and compensation, and FFT complexity per unit time and FFT utilization,Comment #3We agree with CATT's addition of "7 (e) The time unit and sampling interval of new SCS should consider the NR basic time unit." |
| NTT DOCOMO | We agree with Moderator’s proposal. Ericsson’s proposal is also ok. |
| Nokia | Maybe a better formulation could be6) Some companies have noted that ability for a deployed system to operate with a single numerology for all channels and signals is beneficial, and some companies have further noted the benefit remains even if SSB numerology is different.Not should what is meant by “potential”, could be clarified 7)Overall implementation complexity for supporting a specific subcarrier spacing may need to consider the following, but not limited to:processing complexity for equalization including ~~potential~~ inter-carrier interference mitigation (if required to support higher MOs) and compensation, and FFT complexity per unit time,Should be in square brackets or removed, because for example if absolute values are not reduced with SCS, there is no complexity increasecomplexity associated with supporting given requirements on UE processing times (e.g. N1, N2, N3, Z1, Z2, Z3, etc) and UE PDCCH processing budget as a function of subcarrier spacing.This should be change to some companies see a potential complexity increase to support a required timing error toleranace including ~~the combination of at least~~ at least one of initial timing error, timing advance setting, TA granularity, MIMO TAE, and multi-TRP timing alignment as a function of SCSAlso, we would like to capture the following benefit of higher SCS:8)RAN1 observes that in general, larger subcarrier spacing may have benefit of short symbol/slot length to provide low latency service as well as high precision for positioning application. Channel with shorter symbol has potential gain of more opportunity of transmission without LBT. |
| Apple 2 | Typo:1. It is recommended that numerologies 240 kHz, 480 kHz, and 960 kHz are considered as candidates for additional numerologies in addition to 120 kHz, and numerologies outside this range are not supported for any signals or channels.
 |
| Moderator |  Updated based on comments. |

(2) issues/observations that are applicable to smaller subcarrier spacing (e.g. 120 or 240kHz) and larger subcarrier spacing (e.g. 480 or 960kHz)

*Moderator note: for observations based on evaluated cases, those can be address in 8.2.3 discussion thread, and moderator suggests focusing on aspects that aren’t able to be directly derived by evaluations.*

1. RAN1 observes in general smaller subcarrier spacing may potentially provide larger coverage due to use of smaller bandwidth and gears towards (but not limited to) indoor and outdoor scenarios or coverage driven scenarios.
2. RAN1 observes in general larger subcarrier spacing may potentially provide higher peak data rates due to use of larger bandwidth and gears towards (but not limited to) indoor and outdoor scenarios or peak data-rate driven scenarios.
3. RAN1 observes that in general, larger subcarrier spacing may require tighter timing accuracy requirements (e.g. initial timing error, timing advanced and its granularity, MIMO TAE, etc).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments on (2)** |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |
| Qualcomm | Agree |
| InterDigital | Agree |
| LG Electronics | Agree |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree |
| vivo | Agree |
| Apple | Agree |
| Samsung | Agree |
| Xiaomi | Agree  |
| Sony | Agree |
| Ericsson | We think that the partitioning needs modification. Point 2) is not limited to "indoor," for example outdoor IAB (backhaul) scenarios. Adding "outdoor" to Point 2), then means that both 1) and 2) are applicable to indoor and outdoor, thus it is not necessary to differentiate anymore. Secondly, Point 2) is not true when comparing equal total bandwidth between two SCSs which can be achieved with either multi-carrier or single carrier operation.It is also fundamental that larger SCS requires tighter timing accuracy requirements than smaller SCS.1. RAN1 observes in general smaller subcarrier spacing may potentially provide larger coverage than for a larger SCS for a given bandwidth ~~due to use of smaller bandwidth and gears towards (but not limited to) indoor and outdoor scenarios or~~ and is beneficial for coverage driven scenarios.
2. RAN1 observes in general larger subcarrier spacing may potentially provide higher peak data rates than a smaller SCS if operating with a smaller bandwidth ~~due to use of larger bandwidth and gears towards (but not limited to) indoor scenarios or~~ and it beneficial for peak data-rate driven scenarios.
3. RAN1 observes that in general, larger SCS requires tighter timing accuracy requirements due to shorter CP than smaller SCS (initial timing error, timing advance setting, TA granularity, MIMO TAE, and multi-TRP timing alignment).
 |
| Moderator | Added (3) with minor updates.For suggested changed by Ericsson for (1) and (2). If we are comparing the same bandwidth, not sure if we can say smaller SCS has larger coverage, since this would depend on span in time domain. It may overly complicate the observation. Suggest discussing this further in GTW. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We don’t see the need for updated proposal as the previous proposal from moderator was acceptable and also, we are not sure about the what range of values would larger SCS imply.  |
| LG Electronics | Agree with updated Moderator’s proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal. |
| OPPO | Agree with the updated Moderator’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Since there is strong support for the moderator's proposal, we are okay with the update. However, we would still like to add "outdoor" to point 2) to cover outdoor IAB (backhaul) scenarios. |
| InterDigital | Agree with the updated proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | Agree with Moderator’s updated proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Moderator’s updated proposal.  |
| Nokia | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| Moderator | Updated outdoor as per Ericsson’s comment. |

(3) issues/observations for each specific numerology, 120, 240, 480, and 960 kHz.

*Moderator note: for the list in (3)-2 and (3)-3, we can continuously build up as we get further agreements and progress.*

1. Some companies noted that standardization effort to support 240 kHz, 480 kHz, and 960 kHz numerologies are comparable. Some companies noted that standardization effort for 240 kHz numerology could be relatively smaller compared to 480 kHz or 960 kHz numerologies.
2. The following, which is not an exhaustive list, are some potential physical layer impact that are common to all numerologies:
	1. supporting unlicensed operation
	2. if mixed numerology is supported, supporting mixed numerology operation.
	3. SSB and CORSET#0 offsets needed for supported channelization
3. The following, which is not an exhaustive list, are some potential physical layer impact areas for each numerology:
	1. 120 kHz:
		1. Potential consideration of PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM
	2. 240 kHz:
		1. Potential consideration of PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM
		2. If common SSB/CORESET0 numerology (240/240) is supported, SSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns
		3. RO configuration
		4. Scheduling, processing, HARQ timelines
		5. [Potential enhancement to DM-RS]
		6. PDCCH monitoring
	3. 480 kHz:
		1. [Potential consideration of ECP depending on deployment scenarios]
		2. If 480 kHz SSB is supported, SSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns
		3. Scheduling, processing, HARQ timelines
		4. RO configuration
		5. [Potential enhancement to DM-RS]
		6. PDCCH monitoring
		7. Potential consideration of PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM
	4. 960 kHz:
		1. Potential consideration of ECP depending on deployment scenarios
		2. If 960 kHz SSB is supported, SSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns
		3. Scheduling, processing, HARQ timelines
		4. RO configuration
		5. [Potential enhancement to DM-RS]
		6. PDCCH monitoring
		7. updates to smallest time unit, Tc, used in specification

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments on (3)** |
| LG Electronics | Even though we agree that similar specification impact can be expected for 480 and 960 kHz SCSs, we prefer to separate them. To be specific, for 480 kHz, potentail PT-RS enhancement can be considered as well. Furthermore, for 960 kHz, time unit needs to be re-defined since it is currently defined as  where$ Δf\_{max}=480∙10^{3}$ Hz. |
| Nokia, NSB | 1) We agree with LG that potential PTRS enhancement are applicable also to 480kHz not only 240kHz. 2) Potential consideration of ECP depending on deployment scenario3) Time unit update: Or understanding is that current timing unit is applicable to up to 2000MHz irrespective of SCS. So 960kHz with 2k FFT may work as well with current Tc. Moreover, changes to Section 4.3.2 of TS 38.211 are expected anyway with introduction of new SCS, even if Tc is updated |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with LG’s suggestion to separate impact areas for 480kHz and 960kHz. Also, agree that PT-RS enhancement should be considered for 480kHz as well. |
| Futurewei | Agree with Moderator’s proposal. Our simulations showed that time density increase of PTRS is good enough for de-ICI at all SCS where de-ICI is applied, including 240kHz and 480kHz |
| Qualcomm | Agree with LG’s view. |
| InterDigital | We agree with Nokia that the current timing unit may be applicable and degree of specification impacts of 960 kHz can be similar with other additional SCSs |
| NTT DOCOMO | We agree with LGE to separate 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with LG’s view. |
| Vivo | Agree with LG’s view |
| Apple | 1. We agree with LG’s views that 480 kHz and 960 kHz should be separated.
2. Also see the need for a potentital ECP depending on fthe deployment scenario
3. We see the need for a time unit update for 960 kHz.
4. The PTRS for 480 kHz can be investigated.
5. For 960 kHz, we may need to consider that the beam switching time may not fit within a CP and symbols may need to be dedicated for beam switching. Also the effect of TAE, and delay spread may need to be considered.
6. Additional issues for 480/960 include, PDCCH monitoring limits (is this captured under processing?), and beam management.
 |
| Samsung | We are generally OK with other companies above comments, but would like to keep the specification impact in high-level in the TR.  |
| Moderator | Updated the proposal based on comments received. Updated the proposals to avoid using the term ”RAN1 recommends” as the TR should not only include aspects recommended by RAN1. |
| Ericsson | Specific comments on the bullet points:1. 960 kHz SCS requires changes to fundamental time unit and impacts RAN1/2/4 specs
* Regarding Nokia’s point about 960 kHz with 2k FFT, this would require close to 100% FFT utilization assuming 2 GHz bandwidth which is not feasible (Rel-15 is based on ~77% or less).

2) It seems this point belongs in Section (1) since it is stated that “common to all numerologies”3) We think it could be useful to convert this bullet to a table3b ii) It should be clarified that “if needed” applies to if common numerology supported, i.e., 240/240 for SSB/CORESET0* + 1. If ~~needed~~ common SSB/CORESET0 numerology (240/240) supported, SSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns

3c ii) It should be clarified that this bullet applies if 480 kHz SSB is supported* + 1. SSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns if 480 kHz SSB supported

3d ii) It should be clarified that this bullet applies if 960 kHz SSB is supported* + 1. SSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns if 960 kHz SSB supported

3b v), 3c v), and 3c v) Potential enhancement of DMRS is more applicable to 960 kHz. The room for improvement compared to ideal (genie) channel estimator is very small for 480 kHz, and zero for 240 kHz3b c i) It seems not right to put ECP on the same level for 480 and 960 kHz SCS |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 2c) CORSET 🡪 CORESETAgree with point #5 from Apple, which could be clarified as “Scheduling, processing, HARQ timelines (including considerations of beam switching time)” |
| Xiaomi | Agree with the updated proposal |
| LG Electronics | We share the view with Ericsson in that the need of ECP for 960 kHz is much higher than that for 480 kHz. With the understanding that RF impairments correspond to analog beam switching time, TAE, and so on, their impact to 480 kHz + NCP seems not significant. With this regards, we would suggest to remove “and RF impairments” for 3) c i. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with the moderator’s proposal  |
| Sony | Regarding (3)-1, we believe the standard effort of supporting 240kHz SCS is only slightly less than that of supporting 480kHz and 960kHz, because at FR2 only SSB can be supported with 240kHz. Moreover, our general impression on selection numerology is that one may need to prioritize performance of new numerology over standard effort. Regarding (3)-3, we agree with LGE that it seems necessary to separate 480kHz and 960kHz. Technically, as mentioned above, the smallest time unit, Tc, is only applicable to 480kHz, but not to 960kHz, due to its definition.  |
| CATT | We agree with LG’s view that the basic time unit (Tc) needs to be specified for SCS=960 kHz. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the suggested wording, with respect to further companies’ comments here is the follow up1. RF impairments and requirement tightening, if any, are subject of RAN4, not RAN1. RF impairments should be removed from both 480 and 960kHz bullets
2. ECP need is clearly scenario-dependent and correctly captured by FL
3. For DMRS, we do not see a need for all considered SCS, therefore word “potential” is appropriate here
4. For beam switching gap: the need is to be further studies, and has potential impact only to 960kHz SSB design, if any, which is already listed.
 |
| LG Electronics | Thanks for the update. Further comments:1. Tc: As Moderator pointed out in (1) Issues/observation that are applicable to all numerologies, it is not the matter of implementation. But it’s the matter of definition in specification. In current specification, $Δf\_{max}$ is defined as 480 kHz, which needs to be modified if 960 kHz SCS is supported. It’s acknowledged that if up to 2000 MHz BW is defined for 960 kHz SCS, then Tc itself will not be changed since Nf=2048 is sufficient for 960 kHz SCS.
2. RF impairments: As commented earlier, could you clarify which RF impairments are considered for ECP with 480 kHz? From our understanding, 480 kHz SCS + NCP seems robust to RF impairments.
3. SSB: For 480 kHz SCS, we may not need to introduce new SSB pattern and system can operate with legacy 240 kHz SCS SSB. Therefore, we suggest to add “if needed” for the corresponding bullet.

In summary, we suggest the following updates.* 1. 480 kHz:
		1. Potential consideration of ECP depending on deployment scenarios
		2. If needed, SSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns
		3. Scheduling, processing, HARQ timelines
		4. RO configuration
		5. Potential enhancement to DM-RS
		6. PDCCH monitoring
		7. Potential consideration of PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM
	2. 960 kHz:
		1. Potential consideration of ECP depending on deployment scenarios and RF impairments
		2. SSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns
		3. Scheduling, processing, HARQ timelines
		4. RO configuration
		5. Potential enhancement to DM-RS
		6. PDCCH monitoring
		7. Potential update on definition of the basic time unit (Tc)
 |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal. |
| OPPO | Agree with the updated Moderator’s proposal + updates from LG. |
| Ericsson 2 | Comment #1:Agree with LG's update to 3 d. vii., but it is not "Potential", it will require update. One addition point is that companies supportive of 960 kHz also wish to define channel bandwidth as 2 GHz. It is not possible to use 2k FFT in this case, since the FFT utilization will be 100%.vii. ~~Potential~~ Update on definition of the basic time unit (Tc), impacting RAN1/2/4 specificationsComment #2It is incorrect to add "potential DMRS enhancements" to all SCSs. Clearly, this is more related to the larger SCSs, and particularly 960 kHz. Comment #3We agree to LGs' proposed updates above. |
| InterDigital | Agree with Moderator’s updated proposal and do not support LG’s update. Clearly, 480 kHz experiences RF impairments and that’s why 480 kHz shows worse performance than 960 kHz in some scenarios. In addition, we don’t need “if needed” as we are discussing “potential” specification impacts anyway. For 960 kHz, we don’t think we need to add “potential update on definition of the basic time unit (Tc)” and it can be handled by another way as well (e.g., by dividing into two). Anyway, specification implementation is up to the editor and we suggest focusing on actual specification impacts.  |
| Futurewei | We agree with LG and Ericsson updates. RAN4 usually targets 90% of FFT utilization in defining the channel badwidth. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Potential DM-RS enhancements can be removed at least from the set of 240 kHz. SCS. Ok to the other parts. Erisson and LGE modifications are also ok.  |
| Nokia, NSB | 1. We are still wondering why RAN1 has expertise to discuss any RF impairments
2. We may not need to introduce new SSB for 960kHz either

And thus we are not OK with any update from LG, plus as commented before, RF impairments should be removed from RAN1 discusion. |
| Apple 2 | * Typo: are some potential physical layer impacts that are …
* Agree with LG on : Potential update on definition of the basic time unit (Tc)
 |
| Moderator | Updated based on comments. Placed [] brackets for somewhat contentious bullets. |
| Samsung2 | One comment on 2.c. It should a beneral description of CORESET#0 configuration including the CORESET#0 and SSB offset.c. CORESET#0 configuration, e.g. SSB and CORSET#0 offsets needed for supported channelization |

##### 3rd round of Discussion:

Please provide comments on the bullet listed text. If there are additional aspects that should be listed, please suggest them as well. We can discuss further about the ordering of the bullets. Moderator suggest first focus on getting each bullet stable and work further on how to order them. Bullets are enumerated so that they can be referenced.

(1) Issues/observation that are applicable to all numerologies, or with regards to overall system operation and standardization efforts (and not limited to a specific numerology)

1. It was observed that amount of specification effort increases with the number of new numerologies enabled and supported for 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz frequency.
2. In order to minimize specification effort while maximizing supported use cases and deployment scenarios applicable for 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz frequency, It is recommended to support 120 kHz subcarrier spacing with normal CP length, and at least one more subcarrier spacing. It is recommended to consider supporting at most up to three subcarrier spacings, including 120 kHz subcarrier spacing. Applicability of the supported subcarrier spacing to particular signals and channels should be further discussed in the corresponding WI phase.
3. In order to bound implementation complexity, it is recommended to limit the maximum FFT size required to operate system in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz frequency to 4096 and to limit the maximum of RBs per carrier to 275 RBs.
4. It is recommended that numerologies 240 kHz, 480 kHz, and 960 kHz are considered as candidates for additional numerologies in addition to 120 kHz, and numerologies outside this range are not supported for any signals or channels.
5. Selection of the additional subcarrier spacing (on top of 120 kHz) should consider versatility of being able to support various applications and deployment scenarios with all the subcarrier spacings that would be supported by specification, accounting for what is already supported in Rel-15 and Rel-16 specifications.
6. Some companies have noted that ability for a deployed system to operate with a single numerology for all channels and signals is beneficial, and some companies have further noted benefit remains even if SSB numerology is different. Some companies have noted mixed numerology operation is functional and is supported in Rel-15 and Rel-16 specifications (e.g. 240 kHz SSB subcarrier spacing with 120 kHz subcarrier spacing for PDCCH/PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH/PRACH in an initial BWP and activation of a dedicated BWP with SCS different than the initial BWP) and consideration of single numerology operation is not needed.
7. Overall implementation complexity for supporting a specific subcarrier spacing may need to consider the following, but not limited to:
	1. processing complexity for equalization including inter-carrier interference mitigation (if required to support higher modulation orders) and compensation, (for some implementations) FFT utilization, andFFT complexity per unit time, and given bandwidth,
	2. complexity associated with supporting multiple component carriers to reach a specific throughput
	3. complexity associated with supporting given reduced (in abosolute time) requirements on UE processing times (e.g. N1, N2, N3, Z1, Z2, Z3, etc) and UE PDCCH processing budget as a function of subcarrier spacing.
	4. supported features indicated by UE capability signaling or implemented by the gNB
	5. complexity associated with supporting required timing error toleranace which may need to considerinitial timing error, timing advance setting, TA granularity, MIMO TAE, multi-TRP timing alignment as a function of SCS, whether mixture or a single subcarrier spacing for signals is configured, and deployment scenarios.
	6. complexity associated with supporting higher sampling rates and with channel bandwidth larger than 2 GHz

*Moderator note: move (8) to second part of the discussion.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments on (1)** |
| Ericsson 3 | 1) Suggest adding the following: "… specification effort increases with the number of new numerologies …" since, for example, 120 and 240 kHz (SSB) are supported already in specications6) Editorial correction: "… (i.e. 120 or 240 kHz SSB subcarrier spacing with 120 kHz subcarriers for PDCCH/PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH/PRACH in an initial BWP and also activation of a dedicated BWP with 120 or 240 kHz SSB with SCS for PDCCH/PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH different than the initial BWP)"7e) We do not agree to the wording "at least one", since all listed components fall into the UL timing error budget. Perhaps the alternative wording would be more acceptable to companies:* 1. complexity to achieve an UL timing error budget as a function of SCS which inlcludes ~~support a required timing error toleranace including the at least one of~~ initial timing error, error in timing advance setting, error due to TA granularity, MIMO TAE and, depending on deployment, multi-TRP timing alignment ~~as a function of SCS~~
 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (3) | We agree with moderator’ updated proposal and don’t necessarily agree with Ericsson’s proposed updates.   |
| InterDigital | We generally agree with the proposal from Moderator. On 1): We are fine with the suggested update from EricssonOn 6): We prefer to change “i.e. 240 kHz SSB subcarrier spacing” to “e.g. 240 kHz SSB subcarrier spacing” as we have other mixed numerology cases. On 7): We prefer the proposal from Moderator. We do not agree with Ericsson’s update. |
| NTT DOCOMO 3 | We generally agree with Moderator’s updated proposal and ok with Ericsson’s suggestion.  |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s updated proposal + updates from Ericsson |
| Nokia, NSN | We are fine with For 7a: Generally speaking “FFT utilization, and FFT complexity per unit time” are not issues related to “implementation complexity for supporting a specific subcarrier spacing”. * FFT utilization depens on the number of PRBs (rather than SCS)
* FFT complexity per time unit should be the same for different subcarrier spacings, e.g. when comparing the scenarios with equal BW.

processing complexity for equalization including inter-carrier interference mitigation (if required to support higher modulation orders) and compensation, ~~FFT utilization~~, and FFT complexity per unit time and given BW,For 7c: Some clarifications are necessary here stillcomplexity associated with supporting ~~given requirements~~ reduced (in absolute number) requirements on UE processing times (e.g. N1, N2, N3, Z1, Z2, Z3, etc) and UE PDCCH processing budget as a function of subcarrier spacing, if scheduling and monitoring unit is maintained to be one slot.For 7e: * initial timing error depends on whether mixture or a single SCS for signals is configured
* typical indoor deployment scenario, there are no issues related to TA setting, TA granularity
* MIMO TAE, this is outside the scope of RAN1

For 7f: “complexity in supporting higher sampling rates and ~~increased channel bandwidths~~ with CBW>2GHz |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Moderator’s updated propose with Ericsson’s suggested changes and Nokia’s suggestion on 7 a) and c). |
| Moderator | In (1), added new as per Ericsson’s suggestion.In (6), updated to e.g., adding the SCS for SSB seem redundant as it is already mentioned in the same sentence, simplified the text a bit.In (7), companies seem to have some different thoughts on how to formulate 7e. I’ve made some modification in hopes this might be ok for all. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s further update to the proposal, except the addition of 120 in the example in bullet 6. Text before the example says mixed numerology, so 120kHz for SSB and 120kHz for other channels is not really aligned with the text. So the previous version with 240kHz for SSB and 120kHz for other channels is fine as it is. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Moderator’s updated proposal, and some additional mofidications:6) Editorial correction: "… (e.g. ~~120 or~~ 240 kHz SSB subcarrier spacing with 120 kHz subcarrier~~s~~ spacing for PDCCH/PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH/PRACH in an initial BWP and activation of a dedicated BWP with SCS different than the initial BWP)" |
| OPPO | We agree with FL proposal and the suggestions proposed by Ericsson and Nokia |
| Nokia, NSB | We are still not OK with 7-e, it should clearly state that complexity depends on whether mixture or a single SCS for signals is configured and deployment scenarioAlso MIMO TAE should be removed and discussed in RAN4.complexity to support a required timing error toleranace which may need to considerinitial timing error, timing advance setting, TA granularity, ~~MIMO TAE~~, and multi-TRP timing alignment as a function of SCS, whether mixture or a single SCS for signals is configured and deployment scenario |
| Apple | Not sure of what is meant by the phrase “and given bandwidth”. Is this in addition to FFT time complexity ? or FFT complexity per time unit per given BW ? If the first, then remove “and” before FFT time complexity.If first may change to FFT complexity for a given BW per time unit ?Make language for 7.b, 7.c, 7.e and 7.f same i.e. “Complexity in support of” or “complexity associated with supporting”For c., even if scheduling and monitoring unit is greater than a slot, we still need to discuss the complexity. |
| Moderator | Updated based on comments received. |
| Ericsson 4 | Comment #1We disagree with the comment that FFT utilization is not part of complexity to support a given SCS. It is true that FFT utilization depends on the number of PRBs; however, what is important to consider is the FFT utilization for the maximum number of PRBs for a given SCS corresponding to the maximum supported channel bandwidth. If the FFT utilization is low (e.g., less than 50%), then there is a complexity associated with this – the FFT engine needs to be overdimensioned to support that SCS and maximum channel bandwidth. For reference, the maximum FFT utilization for Rel-15/16 is approximately 77%.In summary, we are okay to add "for a given bandwidth" proposed by the moderator, but we have the same question as Apple that the wording is not very clear. Hence we propose the following:* 1. processing complexity for equalization including inter-carrier interference mitigation (if required to support higher modulation orders) and compensation, FFT utilization correspoinding to maximum supported channel bandwidth, and FFT complexity per unit time for a~~nd~~ given bandwidth,

Comment #2On 7.e, we can accept the moderator's updated proposal, except for the removal of MIMO TAE as a source of timing error. We acknowledge that MIMO TAE requirement is not decided in RAN1; however, the intention of this bullet is not to say that RAN1 will decide this. The intention of the bullet is that there is a complexity associated with achieving a total UL timing error budget in relation to the CP duration, and clearly selection of SCS needs to take this into account. The total UL timing error budget includes the multiple error sources listed in the proposal, including MIMO TAE. |
| Intel | For the FFT utilization, not sure if Ericsson comments are correct.The UE should support efficient DFT/iDFT engine that works with factors of 2, 3, and 5 for DFT-s-OFDM in uplink. In theory, nothing prevents the receiver to utilize not strictly power of 2 DFT engine for downlink. In such case, 2000 (2^5 \*5^3), 2025 (3^4 \* 5^2), 2160 (2^3 \* 3^3 \* 5), etc number of tones could be utilized for iFFT process. Not sure if low FFT utilization necessarily results in more complexity for receivers as there are methods to deal with this. Our preference is to remove FFT utilization. If this needs to be kept, then it should be stated, “(for some implementations) FFT utilization” |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Ericsson’s comment to include MIMO TAE as well in 7.e. |
| Moderator | Updated based on comments. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal |
| InterDigital | We support Nokia’s update on removing FFT utilization. If UE is equipped with a FFT with proper size, the UE complexity does not change per FFT utlilization.  |
| Moderator | Highlighed the FFT utilization for further discussion. |

(2) issues/observations that are applicable to smaller subcarrier spacing (e.g. 120 or 240kHz) and larger subcarrier spacing (e.g. 480 or 960kHz)

*Moderator note: for observations based on evaluated cases, those can be address in 8.2.3 discussion thread, and moderator suggests focusing on aspects that aren’t able to be directly derived by evaluations.*

1. It is observed that in general smaller subcarrier spacing may potentially provide larger coverage due to use of smaller bandwidth and gears towards (but not limited to) indoor and outdoor scenarios or coverage driven scenarios.
2. It is observed that in general larger subcarrier spacing may potentially provide higher peak data rates due to use of larger bandwidth and gears towards (but not limited to) indoor and outdoor scenarios or peak data-rate driven scenarios.
3. It is observed that in general, larger subcarrier spacing may require tighter timing accuracy requirements (e.g. initial timing error, timing advanced and its granularity, MIMO TAE, etc).
4. It is observed that in general, larger subcarrier spacing may have potential benefit of short symbol/slot length to provide lower latency servicescompared to what was required for Rel-15 and 16 NR. It should be noted that potential benefits to lower latency is subject to potential changes to PDCCH monitoring and PDSCH and PUSCH scheduling..
5. It is observed that channel access with shorter symbol duration has potential gain of more opportunity of transmission with LBT.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments on (2)** |
| Ericsson 3 | Regarding the 2nd sentence in 4), isn't it supposed to be written as "with LBT?" It is true that the symbol/slot duration is shorter; however, as proposed by many companies PDCCH monitoring and PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling should be done per multiple slots, or on a slot bundle basis. So, doesn't this mean that the opportunities for transmission with LBT are actually reduced due to less flexible scheduling (with high SCS)? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (3) | In general, we are not really sure about the 4th bullet and if it should be included here. Would like some further clarification on high precision for positioning and also more opportunity of transmission without LBT |
| InterDigital | On Ericsson’s comment, we don’t think that we should always PDCCH monitoring and PDSCH/PUSCH scheudling should be done per multiple slots. In our view, the multi-slot based monioring and scheduling should be based on gNB configuration and we do see ”potential” gain based on scenarios.  |
| NTT DOCOMO 3 | Same view as Lenovo on 4th bullet. The other bullets are fine for us.  |
| LG Electronics | We prefer to remove bullet 4) since low latency gain is quite marginal for SCS larger than 60 kHz and accuracy of positioning is related to bandwidth. |
| Nokia, NSN | There is an obvious typoIt is observed that in general, larger subcarrier spacing may have benefit of short symbol/slot length to provide low latency service as well as high precision for positioning application. Channel with shorter symbol has potential gain of more opportunity of transmission ~~without~~ with LBT. |
| Qualcomm | For 4), the aspects of positioning and more Tx opportunity with LBT may need further discussion. We are fine with other proposals. |
| Moderator | Looks like (4) has some concerns from some companies. I’ve put them in bracket to note for further discussions. Please provide further comments on how to progress. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Bullet 4) would need further discussion |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Same views as LG for 4th bullet. The other bullets are fine for us.  |
| OPPO | We agree the 4th bullet is for with LBT case.  |
| Apple | Agree that (4) may need further discussion. should we have a bullet that disusses the “complexity associated with supporting given reduced (in abosolute time) requirements on UE processing times” e.g. larger subcarrier spacing may require smaller UE processing times ? |
| Moderator | Suggest to discussion (4) in GTW. For teh additional bullet suggestion from Apple. Please provide further comments. |
| Intel | The general statement about lower subcarrier spacing potentially providing lower time latency should be true. While different implementations may not be able to achieve the potential latency gains, there will always be some implementation that are able to benefit from this. So if possible, we should try to keep (4) latency aspects.Also (4) opportunity for transmission with LBT should be also factual. We understand that some companies have mentioned in certain environments the gains from usage of time unit does not appear. However, the potential benefits from smaller time scale units shoul exist.Given that the bullet describes these gains as ”may” and ”potential” we think the description is correct and should be kept. |
| LG Electronics | When we focus on providing low latency service, which target in terms of latency is referring to? From our understanding, 60 kHz SCS is sufficient to meet target requirement for low latency so far. Low latency gain that can be aquired from SCS larger than 60 kHz SCS seems marginal. Thus, we still prefer not to have bullet (4). |
| MediaTek | Regarding bulllet 4), we prefer to remove it or further discussion may be needed. Many enhancements have been studied so far in this agenda item to address processing burden at UE side due to larger subcarrier spacing, e.g., multi-slot scheudling, larger scheduling unit, reduced UE PDCCH monitoring, etc., and it is not clear to us the low latency benefit from larger subcarrier spacing can be preserved with those potential enhancements. On the other hand, it is not clear to us lower latency than current NR operation can support is one of the objectives in this study according to SID. Therefore, we prefer not to capture bullet 4) as one of the aspects we used to evaluate new SCS.  |
| Moderator | Seperated out (4) from the rest of the bullets which seem more stable.Split (4) into (4) and (5) and put conditions that companies had concerns about. Let see if this would be ok. |
| Xiaomi | For the bullet 5), We are not clear why channel with shorter symbol has potential gain of more opportunity of transmission with LBT. |
| vivo | We support to keep bullet 4) as it is just technically correct statement. On the argument of low latency service not in the scope of SID, we’d like to refer companies to TR 38.807 where multiple use cases identified for NR beyond 52.6 GHz have the requirement of low latency. |

(3) issues/observations for each specific numerology, 120, 240, 480, and 960 kHz.

*Moderator note: for the list in (3)-2 and (3)-3, we can continuously build up as we get further agreements and progress.*

1. Some companies noted that standardization effort to support 240 kHz, 480 kHz, and 960 kHz numerologies are comparable. Some companies noted that standardization effort for 240 kHz numerology could be relatively smaller compared to 480 kHz or 960 kHz numerologies.
2. The following, which is not an exhaustive list, are some potential physical layer impact that are common to all numerologies:
	1. supporting unlicensed operation
	2. if mixed numerology is supported, supporting mixed numerology operation.
	3. SSB and CORESET#0 offsets needed for supported channelization
3. The following, which is not an exhaustive list, are some potential physical layer impact areas for each numerology:
	1. 120 kHz:
		1. Potential consideration of PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM, if needed
	2. 240 kHz:
		1. Potential consideration of PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM, if needed
		2. If common SSB/CORESET0 numerology (240/240) is supported, SSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns
		3. RO configuration
		4. Timelines for scheduling, processing and HARQ
		5. Potential enhancement to DM-RS, if needed
		6. PDCCH monitoring
	3. 480 kHz:
		1. If 480 kHz SSB is supported, SSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns
		2. Timelines for scheduling, processing and HARQ
		3. RO configuration
		4. Potential enhancement to DM-RS, if needed
		5. PDCCH monitoring
		6. Potential consideration of PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDMt, if neeeded
	4. 960 kHz:
		1. Potential consideration of ECP depending on deployment scenarios
		2. If 960 kHz SSB is supported, SSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns
		3. Timelines for scheduling, processing and HARQ
		4. RO configuration
		5. Potential enhancement to DM-RS, if needed
		6. PDCCH monitoring
		7. updates to smallest time unit, Tc, used in specifications depending on supported maximum BW

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments on (3)** |
| Ericsson 3 | [Potential Enhancements to DM-RS]Our view is that these are not needed for SCS <= 480 kHz. We have shown through evaluations that the performance gap between practical channel estimation and ideal (genie) channel estimation is small indeed, leaving little room for improvement for SCS <= 480 kHz.3 c vii) We prefer to remove this bullet. With proper de-ICI filtering, PTRS enhancement is not needed.3 d vii) This impacts multiple specs:* + 1. updates to smallest time unit, Tc, used in RAN1/2/4 specifications
 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (3) | We agree with the moderator’s proposal and suggest keeping the bullet for [Potential Enhancements to DM-RS], at least in our evaluations, we see some considerable degradation in performance for both 480kHz and 960kHz in comparison to ideal channel estimation.Agree with Ericsson’s proposed update to 3 d vii) |
| InterDigital | We support Moderator’s proposal with removing all brackets.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are open with whether to limit SCS range for DMRS enhancement. At least it should be included in the list for 960 kHz SCS. Given that at least one company(s) is proposing with relevant evaluation, we think it should be ok to include 480 kHz SCS for DMRS enhancement.  |
| Nokia, NSB | For 3c/i: remove brackets Depends on delay spread of the scenarioFor 3d/vii: if CBW>2 GHz It seems that companies say that 4k is supported so Tc is needed. On the other hand, Tc is not needed if 960kHz is limited to max 2k FFT. Therefore, could the following wording be acceptable? updates to smallest time unit, Tc, used in specification depending on supported maximum BW. For example, if channel BW is 1.6GHz, 960kHz can be implemented with 2k FFT, FTT utilization is at preferable level and sampling rate may be unchanged compared to R16. An advantage is CPE-only compensation is needed up to MCS22. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with Modrator’s updated proposal. Although we don’t think 3 b v) is quite necessary, we are okay with that because it’s a “potential” issue. |
| Moderator | Let’s not worry to much over “potential” considerations. I’ve put “if needed” for all PTRS and DMRS aspects. Hopefully this is ok.For d-vii, put “s” for plural. If this is to be captured in TR, there seems to be no need to state RAN1, 2, or 4. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | As mentioned by moderator that these are all potential consideations, the proposal should be fine. But, we are also fine with the new updates by moderator |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We generally agree with the proposal from Moderator. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Bullet 2c: correct typo CORESET (not CORSET) |
| OPPO | 3c/v: to remove the brackets3d/v: to remove the brackets3d/vii: agree with Nokia |
| Apple | Are fine with Moderator’s proposal |
| Moderator | Corrected typo, CORESET. |
| Ericsson 4 | We find it a bit strange that all enhancements are considered for all SCSs. However, "if needed" and "potential" are used everywhere, so we don't have a particular objection.We still see no need for ECP, so we suggest that bullet 3-c-i is removed |
| LG Electronics | We have the same view with Ericsson for the remaining square bracket, that is, suggest to remove 3-c-i. |
| InterDigital | In our view, ” i. Scheduling, processing, HARQ timelines” is confusing as the bullets may indicate ”timelines for scheduling, processing and HARQ” or ”Scheduling, processing and timelines for HARQ”. Our understanding is the first one and if our understanding is correct, we suggest to update the bullets as ”Timelines for scheduling, processing and HARQ”.  |
| Moderator | Remove 3-c-i. Updated scheduling, processing, HARQ timelines as suggested by InterDigital. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal. |

##### Conclusions from GTW Session:

Agreement:

Capture the following observations in the TR. Editorial modifications and changes to references can be made when capturing the observations in the TR.

1. It was observed that amount of specification effort increases with the number of new numerologies enabled and supported for 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz frequency.
2. In order to minimize specification effort while maximizing supported use cases and deployment scenarios applicable for 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz frequency, It is recommended to support 120 kHz subcarrier spacing with normal CP length, and at least one more subcarrier spacing. It is recommended to consider supporting at most up to three subcarrier spacings, including 120 kHz subcarrier spacing. Applicability of the supported subcarrier spacing to particular signals and channels should be further discussed in the corresponding WI phase.
3. It is recommended that numerologies 240 kHz, 480 kHz, and 960 kHz are considered as candidates for additional numerologies in addition to 120 kHz, and numerologies outside this range are not supported for any signals or channels.
4. In order to bound implementation complexity, it is recommended to limit the maximum FFT size required to operate system in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz frequency to 4096 and to limit the maximum of RBs per carrier to 275 RBs.
5. Selection of the additional subcarrier spacing (on top of 120 kHz) should consider versatility of being able to support various applications and deployment scenarios with all the subcarrier spacings that would be supported by specification, accounting for what is already supported in Rel-15 and Rel-16 specifications.
6. Some companies have noted that ability for a deployed system to operate with a single numerology for all channels and signals is beneficial, and some companies have further noted benefit remains even if SSB numerology is different. Some companies have noted mixed numerology operation is functional and is supported in Rel-15 and Rel-16 specifications (e.g. 240 kHz SSB subcarrier spacing with 120 kHz subcarrier spacing for PDCCH/PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH/PRACH in an initial BWP and activation of a dedicated BWP with SCS different than the initial BWP) and consideration of single numerology operation is not needed.

Agreement:

Capture the following observations in the TR. Editorial modifications and changes to references can be made when capturing the observations in the TR.

Overall implementation complexity for supporting a specific subcarrier spacing may need to consider the following, but not limited to:

* processing complexity for equalization including inter-carrier interference mitigation (if required to support higher modulation orders) and compensation, andFFT complexity per unit time for a given bandwidth,
* complexity associated with supporting multiple component carriers to reach a specific throughput
* complexity associated with supporting given reduced (in abosolute time) requirements on UE processing times (e.g. N1, N2, N3, Z1, Z2, Z3, etc) and UE PDCCH processing budget as a function of subcarrier spacing, if scheduling and monitoring unit is maintained to be one slot.
* supported features indicated by UE capability signaling or implemented by the gNB
* complexity associated with supporting required timing error tolerance which may need to considerinitial timing error, timing advance setting, TA granularity, MIMO TAE (TAE value will be defined by RAN4), multi-TRP timing alignment as a function of SCS, whether mixture or a single subcarrier spacing for signals is configured, and deployment scenarios.
* complexity associated with supporting higher sampling rates and with channel bandwidth larger than 2 GHz

Agreement:

1. It is observed that for a single carrier with the same number of transmitted symbols, in general, smaller subcarrier spacing may potentially provide larger coverage due to use of smaller bandwidth and gears towards (but not limited to) coverage driven scenarios.
2. It is observed that for a single carrier, in general, larger subcarrier spacing may potentially provide higher peak data rates due to use of larger bandwidth and gears towards (but not limited to) peak data-rate driven scenarios.

##### 4th round of Discussion:

(2) issues/observations that are applicable to smaller subcarrier spacing (e.g. 120 or 240kHz) and larger subcarrier spacing (e.g. 480 or 960kHz)

Please provide comments on the following suggested agreement. Moderator has put together some observations on phase noise and beam switching based on comments from the GTW session. Please provide further comments on them.

1. It is observed that, in general, larger subcarrier spacing may require shorter sample interval and tighter timing accuracy requirements (e.g. initial timing error, timing advanced and its granularity, MIMO TAE, etc).
2. It is observed that in general, larger subcarrier spacing may potentially lead to tighter UE processing requirements per slot.
3. It is observed that in general, larger subcarrier spacing may have potential benefit of short symbol/slot length to support lower latency requirements compared to what was supported for Rel-15 and 16 NR.
4. It is observed that channel access with shorter symbol duration has potential gain of more opportunity for transmission with LBT assuming slot-based monitoring (for the DL) and LBT duration less than or equal to a symbol duration.
5. It is observed that, in general, larger subcarrier spacing has higher resilience towards phase noise. Also, in general, the performance impact from phase noise may depend on various properties of the transmission, such as modulation order and coding rate, and phase noise profile of the UE and gNB.
6. It is observed that, in general, larger subcarrier spacing will result in shorter CP duration and relatively larger portion of CP duration or even possibly symbol duration may be utilized by beam switching depending on the subcarrier spacing and required time for beam switching.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments on (2)** |
| vivo | We support to keep old bullet 4) (new bullet 3) as it is just technically correct statement. On the argument of low latency service not in the scope of SID, we’d like to refer companies to TR 38.807 where multiple use cases identified for NR beyond 52.6 GHz have the requirement of low latency. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine to accept the proposal with following modification to 6)1. **It is observed that, in general, larger subcarrier spacing will result in shorter CP duration and relatively larger portion of CP duration or even possibly partial or complete symbol duration may be utilized by beam switching depending on the subcarrier spacing and required time for beam switching.**
 |
| Nokia, NSB | 1. requirements on timing and sampling rate has been covered by previous agreement (”complexity associated with supporting required timing error tolerance” or ” complexity associated with supporting higher sampling rates and with channel bandwidth larger than 2 GHz” ), it is not clear what is the new information here
2. could be combined with 3)

It is observed that in general, larger subcarrier spacing may have potential benefit of short symbol/slot length to support lower latency requirements compared to what was supported for Rel-15 and 16 NR, if the tighter UE processing requirements (e.g. N1, N2, N3, Z1, Z2, Z3, etc) are introduced1. We suggest a simpler wording with more technical background regarding the LBT

It is observed that in general, channel access with shorter slot duration may access channel  earlier when LBT is passed (up to 15us for 960kHz compared to 480kHz SCS), assuming slot-based scheduling.1. OK, but assumption should be clarified

Assuming low complex CPE compensation, It is observed that, in general, larger subcarrier spacing has higher resilience towards phase noise. Also, in general, the performance impact from phase noise may depend on various properties of the transmission, such as modulation order and coding rate, and phase noise profile of the UE and gNB.1. OK with further clarification

It is observed that, in general, larger subcarrier spacing will result in shorter CP duration and relatively larger portion of CP duration or even possibly symbol duration may be utilized by beam switching depending on the subcarrier spacing and required time for beam switching. R17 requirements for beam swithing delay need to be further studied in RAN41. Add one more bullet on delay spread

It is observed that in general, maximum delay spread supported by a SCS is propotional to its CP length. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |

(3) issues/observations for each specific numerology, 120, 240, 480, and 960 kHz.

Please provide comments on the following suggested agreement.

1. Some companies noted that standardization effort to support 240 kHz, 480 kHz, and 960 kHz numerologies are comparable. Some companies noted that standardization effort for 240 kHz numerology could be relatively smaller compared to 480 kHz or 960 kHz numerologies.
2. The following, which is not an exhaustive list, are some potential physical layer impact that are common to all numerologies:
	1. supporting unlicensed operation
	2. if mixed numerology is supported, supporting mixed numerology operation.
	3. SSB and CORESET#0 offsets needed for supported channelization
3. The following, which is not an exhaustive list, are some potential physical layer impact areas for each numerology:
	1. 120 kHz:
		1. Potential consideration of PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM, if needed
	2. 240 kHz:
		1. Potential consideration of PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM, if needed
		2. If common SSB/CORESET0 numerology (240/240) is supported, SSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns
		3. RO configuration
		4. Timelines for scheduling, processing and HARQ
		5. Potential enhancement to DM-RS, if needed
		6. PDCCH monitoring
	3. 480 kHz:
		1. If 480 kHz SSB is supported, SSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns
		2. Timelines for scheduling, processing and HARQ
		3. RO configuration
		4. Potential enhancement to DM-RS, if needed
		5. PDCCH monitoring
		6. Potential consideration of PTRS enhancement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDMt, if neeeded
	4. 960 kHz:
		1. Potential consideration of ECP depending on deployment scenarios
		2. If 960 kHz SSB is supported, SSB patterns, and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns
		3. Timelines for scheduling, processing and HARQ
		4. RO configuration
		5. Potential enhancement to DM-RS, if needed
		6. PDCCH monitoring
		7. updates to smallest time unit, Tc, used in specifications depending on supported maximum BW

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments on (3)** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Generally, we are okay with moderator’s proposal, but would recommend to add if needed at the end of 3rd main bullet and revmove individual if needed from sub-bullets. |
| Nokia, NSB |  We prefer to keep ”if needed” along with every ”potential” |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |

### 2.1.3 Discussion on applicable SCS as outcome of SI

It was further discussed during GTW session about being able to provide a recommended SCS (from RAN1 perspective) as the outcome of the SI. If SI can conclude on the SCS, it would immensely reduce the workload during the WI and have RAN1 have meangingful process towards completion of Rel-17.

Companies are suggested to provide some way forward and suggestion on how we can proceed towards having a applicable (or recommended) SCS as the outcome of the SI.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  |
| Ericsson 3 | Our preference is to further consider only 240 and 480 kHz; however, we understand that there is not consensus on this. If consensus cannot be achieved with further discussion in the SI, our strong preference is to leave open all 3 subcarrier spacings (240, 480, 960 kHz) to be narrowed down in the WI. We note that this is in-line with the SI objective and does not prevent closing of the SI:* Study of required changes to NR using existing DL/UL NR waveform to support operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz
	+ Study of applicable numerology including subcarrier spacing, channel BW (including maximum BW), and their impact to FR2 physical layer design to support system functionality considering practical RF impairments [RAN1, RAN4].
	+ Identify potential critical problems to physical signal/channels, if any [RAN1].

Regarding 240 kHz specifically, we are not okay to remove this from consideration, particularly for SSB. First of all, specifications already support 240 kHz SSB in FR2, so additional design work is minimal. 240 kHz is benefical from a number of perspectives, e.g., frequency and time offset estimation, beam sweep overhead, beam switching time, etc. These are all dependencies that have not yet been fully investigated and concluded and require detailed work in the WI. For example, due to the higher carrier frequency, use of 240 kHz SSB keeps the same relative frequency estimation error $∆f/SCS$ as for FR1 and FR2 for a fixed ppm value. This is beneficial from the perspective of establishing UE requirements in RAN4. 240 kHz SSB is also beneficial from a time offset estimation perspective in order to maintain similar UE requirements on initial UL timing error as in FR2 when operating with a larger SCS (e.g., 480 kHz) for data/control. It is premature to narrow down the numerologies for consideration until detailed discussions on these issues have occurred during the WI. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (3) | We also agree with moderator that if are able to finalize the additional SCS value(s) during this meeting, then it would be really helpful for the WI. At least, we suggest to eliminate one of three remaining values among 240kHz, 480kHz and 960kHz.Our preference is to remove 240kHz in this meeting. In our view, based on evaulations and also suggested recommendations on how to select the additional SCS values, we don’t see any benefit of 240kHz in comparison to 120 kHz. Basically, it doesn’t provide any versatility in terms of use-cases/scenarios in comparison to 120kHz and should be quite straightforward to eliminate.Depending up on remianing time, it can be further discussed if both 480kHz and 960kHz are needed or only one of them.In our view, we would prefer to support both 480kHz and 960kHz as they both could cater to differnt use cases and requirements.  |
| InterDigital | Our preference is to remove 240 kHz as we already have 120 kHz for large delay spread cases. Among 240 kHz, 480 kHz and 960 kHz, 240 kHz clearly shows lowest performange. Between 480 kHz and 960 kHz, our first preference is to support 960 kHz, but we are open to support 480 kHz, considering different use cases and requirements, if both SCSs can be supported.  |
| NTT DOCOMO 3 | Our view is to keep the current range of candidate SCS (240, 480, 960 kHz) as it is, and leave further narrowing-down to WI phase. For removal of 960 kHz, further technical discussion together with e.g. CBW would be necessary to achieve any consensus, which would not be sufficiently held in this meeting considering the remaining time and divergent views from companies. For removal of 240 kHz, it also need further discussion especially from other aspects than the one for 480/960 kHz SCS. For example, 240 kHz SCS is supported for SSB in Rel-15 NR already, while 480/960 kHz SCS are not. Some aspects, e.g. whether to reuse FR2, mixed numerology with data, etc..., should be further discussed. We don’t think it would be possible in this meeting.  |
| LG Electronics | We share NTT DOCOMO’s view to keep candidate SCS values {240, 480, 960 kHz} as is, although our preference is to support {240, 480 kHz}. Before narrowing down, discussion on applicability of each candidate SCS value considering various aspcets (e.g., specification impacts, performance, RF impairments) should be preceded. |
| Nokia, NSB | Based on technical argumentation and observations, both 480 and 960 kHz have pros & cons. Both can be justified by technical arguments. Both can be seen as techically feasible. And both have comparable specification impact.Therefore, we propose to support the following SCSs [120, 480 and 960] kHz. 960kHz SCS is the best option to minimize the PN impact, enable simple PN compensation, and peak data rates. 480kHz may be good option and has large enough CP for certain high delay spread scenarios, where the delay spread may impact on the performance of 960kHz SCS. There are many different opinions on different SCSs based on evaluations, and clearly some compromise is required to find a good conclusion.We also assume that 240kHz SSB can be supported. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We share similar view with NTT DOCOMO and LG to keep the candidate SCS {240, 480, 960 kHz} in SI and leave further narrowing-down to WI phase. If some decision should be made in SI, we prefer to support {240, 480 kHz}. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If it is not possible to down-select as a recommendation of the SI, then we agree that this down-selection can be done in the WI phase, e.g. at the first meeting of the WI. |
| OPPO | We propose to remove 240 KHz, and our preference is to support 960KHz, and we are open for 480KHz.  |
| Moderator | Provided a summary of inputs so far. Please continue to provide inputs. Few companies mentioned, to leave the options for SI. It will be great if companies can further provide what kind of further information would be needed (that is not available in RAN1 #103e) and/or what discussions should be discussed before trying to conclude the numerology in the SI. |
| Intel | We support down-selection during SI. The new information between now and the next meeting with regards to subcarrier spacing is likely to be small, as companies already presented abundance of information that factors into account various aspects. It could be difficult to agree, but pushing the decision to the next meeting will be just pushing off more work.Given that 120kHz SCS is supported, we believe support of 960 kHz SCS make to the most sense. We are open to additionally supporting 480 kHz SCS. Do not think 240kHz needs to be considered further as it cannot address all the usage scenarios and there could be significant challenges to make Rank 2 and higher MCS to work properly. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We strongly suggest to remove 240kHz in the SI and reduce the required effort in WI. Furthermore, a step ahead would be agree on 960kHz. 480kHz can be further discussed. We also agree with Inter’s view that nothing much is expected to change between now and the 1st meeting for WI and we should try to do at least some downscoping of SCS values during this weekFrom the options listed below, our first preference is:Support 240, 960 kHzSecond preference is:* Support 960 kHz, FFS: 480 kHz

Third preference is:* Remove 240 kHz, FFS: 480, or 960, or 480 and 960 kHz.

We do not support following bullets:* Do not narrow down further in SI
* Support 240, 480 kHz
 |

Summary of inputs so far:

* Do not narrow down further in SI
* Support 240, 480 kHz
* Support 960 kHz, FFS: 480 kHz
* Support 480, 960 kHz
* Support 240, 960 kHz
* Remove 240 kHz, FFS: 480, or 960, or 480 and 960 kHz.

*Moderator suggest trying to see if we can agree to one of the above options as the conclusion for SI. Although not strictly required by the SID, being able to conclude during SI mean more time for the details in WI and higher overall specification quality. Moderator strongly recommends narrowing the scope for WI.*

## 2.2 System Bandwidth & Channelization

### 2.2.1 Observations and Proposals from Contributions

From [3]:

* + Observation 6: There is no significant difference between using multiple component carriers with a smaller SCS or a single carrier with a larger SCS in terms of signalling overhead and spectral efficiency. UE capabilities for aggregating up to 8 component carriers is already specified for NR.
	+ Proposal 2: 400 MHz can be the starting point for the maximum bandwidth of a single carrier in the frequency band between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz.
	+ Proposal 3: For NR system operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, NR should be designed with minimum 32 RBs per carrier. The supported minimum carrier bandwidth for a cell is 50 MHz.
	+ Proposal 4: The choice of supported maximum carrier bandwidth for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz should ensure a minimum of at least 6 channels in any regulated range.
* From [5]:
	+ Observation 4: (960K, NCP) and (960K, ECP) could achieve a comparable maximum carrier bandwidth (i.e. 2 GHz) as 802.11ad/ay.
	+ Proposal 12: NR design in the frequency range of 52.6 – 71 GHz should support multiple channel bandwidths for different deployment scenarios and considering different available regional frequency allocations.
* From [7]:
	+ Proposal 1: Study multiples of 400 MHz up to 2 GHz should be considered for frequencies from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
	+ Proposal 2: Study potential coexistence issue with other RAT in the spectrum of 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
* From [8]:
	+ Proposal 1: The maximum system bandwidth should be supported at least 1 GHz and up to 1.6 GHz. The system analysis of supporting more than 1.6 GHz system BW should be carefully evaluated before making the decision.
* From [10]:
	+ Proposal 1: Define channelization according to 2.16 GHz CBW, which is preferred from coexistence point of view.
	+ Proposal 2: Support sub-channelization for 2.16 GHz channels to facilitate smooth coexistence for narrowband operation.
	+ Observation 3: For given bandwidth, 960 kHz SCS supports considerably smaller number of component carriers (CC) compared to 480 kHz SCS. Reduced number of CCs allows for smaller system complexity, smaller system overhead and better RF efficiency (e.g. lower MPR).
	+ Proposal 3: For operation without CA, support two CBWs: 400 MHz (120 kHz SCS) and 2.16 GHz (960 kHz SCS)
	+ Proposal 4: Support CA within a 2.16 GHz channel, and between 2.16 GHz channels
	+ Proposal 5: Consider n x 400 MHz, n=[2, 3, 4, 5] as the supported channel BW options for CA operation within a 2.16 GHz channel.
* From [13]:
	+ Proposal 1: The following options are proposed for determining channel bandwidth(s) for Rel-17 NR beyond 52.6 GHz, wherein Option 2 is preferred.
		- Option 1: Align the channelization of Rel-17 NR with Wi-Fi design at least in unlicensed band (e.g. 57 GHz - 71 GHz) and support 2.16 GHz channel bandwidth
		- In other licensed frequency band (e.g. 52.6 GHz - 57 GHz) or in a controlled environment without Wi-Fi devices, it can be designed uniformly with unlicensed band (i.e. 2.16 GHz) or independently (e.g. 400/800/1600 MHz)
		- Option 2: No need to align the channelization of Rel-17 NR with Wi-Fi design even in unlicensed band. Support the same bandwidth(s) (e.g. 400/800/1600 MHz) in licensed and unlicensed frequency bands
		- Option 2-1: No need to support a nominal channel bandwidth of 2.16 GHz
		- Option 2-2: Support a nominal channel bandwidth of 2.16 GHz by the aggregation of above basic bandwidth(s) (e.g. 400/800/1600MHz)
	+ Observation 1: Considering the requirement of OCB and the limitation of the maximum number of available RBs, it is difficult to use less than 480 kHz as the candidate SCS for 2.16 GHz bandwidth if it should be supported.
	+ Proposal 5: In addition to the existing supported 120 kHz, 240/480/960 kHz can be served as the candidate SCS(s) for the maximum carrier bandwidth(s) 400 MHz, 800 MHz and/or 1600 MHz channel bandwidth.
* From [14]:
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808. If NR adopts the same channelization design as IEEE 802.11ad/ay, large wastage of spectrum would occur in many regions.
		- 240 MHz at the lower edge of the band is unused in all regions
		- 800 MHz at the upper edge of the band is unused in USA and Europe
		- 680 MHz of the 5 GHz allocation in China is unused
			* In recognizing the need to have at least three channels for cell planning [22], IEEE 802.11aj standard defined four 1.08 GHz channels nested within the two 2.16 GHz channels for the 60 GHz band in China. As a result, the spectrum wastage issues are left unaddressed in the 802.11aj channelization.
		- 280 MHz of the 7 GHz allocation in Canada/Brazil/Mexico is unused
			* In the IMT (licensed) allocation in Europe, one out of the 2 available 2.16 GHz channels is unusable since it extends outside the IMT allocation
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: It is beneficial to define NR channelization to allow full utilization of the various regional frequency allocations around the world. It is not necessary to align NR channelization with IEEE 802.11ad channelization from a coexistence point of view.
	+ There is no regulatory or practical need to align the channel bandwidth (e.g., 2.16 GHz) with other technologies operating in the same 60 GHz band for coexistence purposes.
	+ Capture the following observation in the TR: Targeting 2.16 GHz channel bandwidth results in low FFT utilization compared to Rel-15/16, causing larger computation overhead, and thus larger power consumption.
	+ Consider channel bandwidths up to 1.6 GHz for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* From [15]:
	+ Proposal #1: Consider the followings as candidate numerologies to support NR in FR-X band by taking frequency utilization efficiency, unlicensed band operation, the ICI mitigation, and the UE implementation into account.
	+ Maximum carrier BW
		- 800 MHz for the SCS of 240 kHz
		- 1.6 GHz (and/or 800 MHz) for the SCS of 480 kHz
* From [16]:
	+ Proposal 2: The maximum supported channel bandwidth in 52.6GHz ~71 GHz should be 1.6GHz.
	+ Proposal 3: Carrier aggregation is needed to achieve competitive high peak data rate with 802.11ad/ay in 52.6GHz ~71 GHz
* From [20]:
	+ Proposal 1: NR devices support that transmissions occupy a 2.16 GHz bandwidth in 60GHz unlicensed spectrum.
	+ Observation 1: CA (either inter-band or intra-band) can be supported, but we prefer not to rely on CA with maximum bandwidth 400MHz per carrier to achieve 2.16GHz bandwidth.
	+ Observation 2: To support 2.16 GHz bandwidth by single carrier, 960 kHz SCS is required.
	+ Proposal 2: Support up to 960 kHz SCS, in order to support 2.16 GHz bandwidth by single carrier.
* From [21]:
	+ Observation 1: There is a need for multi-carrier operation to achieve the high bandwidth allocations in the unlicensed band between 52.6GHz and 71 GHz.
	+ Proposal 1: NR operation above 52.6 GHz should support multi-carrier operation to achieve 2 GHz bandwidth utilization. The BW candidates should be in multiples of 400 MHz.
	+ Proposal 2: A UE should be able to indicate a capability for a component carrier bandwidth/SCS combination to achieve 2 GHz transmission.
* From [24]:
	+ Proposal 2. To support various wide bandwidth and use cases for NR operation from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, a wide range of numerologies with the carrier aggregation need to be studied, also considering the LBT bandwidth (or the RB set) for co-existing issues, UE capability, processing time and power consumption.
* From [26]:
	+ Proposal 1: For physical control, data, and random access channels and for SSB in the high frequency regime from 52.6GHz to 71GHz, SCSs of 120kHz and 960kHz should be considered.
* From [31]:
	+ Proposal 2: For bandwidth, at least wider maximum channel bandwidth than 400 MHz should be defined for 52.6- 71 GHz.
		- 2 GHz or slightly smaller but sufficiently wide bandwidth such as 1 GHz should be considered.
		- FFT size should remain the same or smaller than 4k
		- Wider minimum channel bandwidth for 52.6 – 71 GHz than 50 MHz should be considered.

### 2.2.2 Discussions

Focus for discussion for Wednesday or Thursday GTW (10/28 or 10/29) session (if possible)

##### Moderator Summary of observations and proposals from Contributions:

* Companies views are somewhat diverse and there seems to be few sub issues, (1) minimum channel bandwidth, (2) maximum channel bandwidth, (3) channelization
	+ Note: there may be other issues not listed above. The above are few outstanding issues that moderator noted and does not hint higher priority or otherwise.
* Similarly, system bandwidth is another fundamental aspect needed for further progress on physical layer aspect. Try to see we can come to a conclusion (if possible).

##### 1st round of Discussion:

Chairman has suggested to gather input from companies on various aspects related to numerology. As such, companies are encouraged to provide additional inputs on channel bandwidth and related aspects.

###### Company Comments on supported minimum and maximum channel bandwidth:

Moderator note: provide inputs on supported minimum and maximum channel bandwidth, including potential specification implications, motivation, advantages and disadvantages, and other related aspects.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Min BW: 400MHz; a bandwidth of eight times carrier BW should be supported. For a CC of 400 MHz the max supported should be 3200 MHz for a single connectivity. For dual connectivity it would correspond to 6400 MHz. |
| LG Electronics | Max BW: 1.6 GHz; As we commented in Section 2.1, given the maximum SCS of 480 kHz (based on our preference) and the maximum FFT size of 4096 (based on earlier RAN1 agreement), the channel bandwidth can be up to 1.6 GHz. |
| Ericsson | Maximum carrier BW = 1.6 GHz based on 480 kHz SCS. Minimum carrier bandwidth can be further discussed considering both unlicesned and licensed operation. At most the the minimum should be 400 MHz; smaller values can still be discussed. See comment below on channelization.With a maximum carrier BW of 1.6 GHz, the FFT utilization can be maintained at Rel-15/16 levels. In contrast, a 2160 MHz carrier BW results in <50% FFT utilization, thus impacting power consumption and/or chip area. |
| Nokia, NSB | For operation without CA, support two CBWs: 400 MHz (120 kHz SCS) and 2.16 GHz (960 kHz SCS):* Considering outdoor deployment scenario, and close to zero specification effort, it seems that 400 MHz CBW (& 120 kHz SCS) for physical data channels is valid option for 60 GHz scenario.
* Considering indoor deployment scenario from specification effort, coexistence with WiGig, low delay spread, high peak data rate, and low implementation complexity, it seems that 2.16 GHz CBW (& 960 kHz SCS) for physical data channels would be the best option for 60 GHz scenario.

With 960kHz it is possible to operate channel BW of up to 2GHz, with current sampling rate and possibly with 2k FFT. Alternatively, 3k FFT can be used (FFT size as such is an implementation issue). W.r.t. minimum BW, SSB/PRACH numerologies need to be decided first. |
| NTT DOCOMO | For maximum bandwidth, one important aspect is to consider 11ad/ay where a single channel spans 2.16 GHz. We need to consider it to be competitive. For minimum bandwidth, it would be necessary to consider the number of SSB rasters to be required if SA initial access to 60 GHz is supported. Smaller BW would cause more SSB rasters.  |
| Lenovo/MotorolaMobility | Depending upon the maximum numerology to be supported, the maximum channel bandwidth could be agreed. For example, with 480kHz, maximum carrier BW of 1.6GHz would be supported. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer a maximum channel bandwidth 1600MHz. As for the co-existence with WiFi system, 2.16GHz could be achieved by carrier aggregation.For minimum channel bandwidth, the candidate values less than 400MHz could also be considered, e.g. 100MHz or 200MHz. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For 120 kHz SCS, maximum BW of a single carrier is 400 MHz. If a larger SCS is additionally supported then a larger maximum BW of a single carrier can be supported for that SCS, such as 1.6GHz. Larger bandwidths can be achieved with CA, e.g. 8 carriers would allow at least 3.2 GHz of aggregated BW with 120 kHz SCS, or larger with a larger SCS. Minimum single carrier BW should be carefully considered since it allows increasing the coverage especially where regulations put a strict limit on PSD and EIRP. A minimum BW of 50 MHz or 100 MHz should be allowed with 120 kHz SCS. If a larger SCS is additionally supported then a larger single carrier minimum BW can be supported for that SCS. As long as the number of RBs is not smaller than 32, there is no reason to exclude carrier bandwidths smaller than the maximum supported by a 4096 FFT size. |
| Samsung | Maximum channel bandwidth can be determined as the system bandwidth using the largest candidate SCS and FFT size of 4096. Also, achieving 2.16 GHz BW as a single carrier is beneficial for simple implementation (we should not mandate using CA to achieve 2.16 GHz). Minimum channel bandwidth can be determined as the system bandwidth including the SS/PBCH block bandwidth using the smallest candidate SCS |
| vivo | Max BW: 2GHz/2.16GHz for (960 kHz, NCP), 400MHz for (120 kHz, NCP) |
| InterDigital | Supporting 2 GHz bandwidth provides significant benefits on the coexistence and the control overhead reduction. For minimum bandwidth, we can start from 400 MHz, but can consider smaller than 400 MHz. |
| Qualcomm | We support maximum bandwidth of 400MHz and 2.16GHz for 120kHz and 960kHz SCSs, respectively.  |
| MediaTek | Maximum channel bandwidth for 120 KHz SCS is 400MHz. Maximum channel bandwidth for larger subcarrier spacing should scales accordingly (e.g., 3.2GHz for 960KHz SCS). Channel bandwidth smaller than the maximum channel bandwidth should be allowed. |
| CATT | Minimum BW = 50 MHz (FR2 minimum BW)Maximum BW = 400 MHz, 800 MHz, 1.6 GHz. |
| Sony | Max BW: 2.16GHz with 960kHz SCS. The main motivation behind this choice is that we have to consider 802.11ad/ay which could occupy 2.16GHz bandwidth with a single channel.  |
| Intel | In order for 60 GHz operation to have a distinct identity and differentiating factor compared to other (lower frequency) bands, the mimimum channel bandwidth supported should be in the order of 400 MHz to 800 MHz.It does not seesm attractive trying to deploy a narrower system bandwidth (than 400MHz) to obtain larger coverage, since NR operating with FR1 and/or FR2 band can provide even better coverage while supporting similar bandwidth.Maximum channel bandwidth (of a single component carrier) could be around ~2 GHz (or to maximize spectral efficiency, about 3 GHz using 960kHz). |
| OPPO | Support maximum bandwidth: 400 MHz, 800 MHz, 1.6 GHz, FFS 3.2 GHz. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer maximum channel bandwidth of 400MHz for 120kHz and 1600MHz for 480kHz. |
| Apple | Maximum bandwidths of 400 MHz and 1.6 GHz. 2.16 GHz can be achieved by CA. Minimum BWs can be selected to minimize the wastage of spectrum when aligning with existing 2.16 GHz 802.11ad/ay channels. |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer 400 MHz BW for SCS = 120 kHz as baseline. We are open for 3200 MHz for SCS 960 KHz as maximum BW for FFS. |

###### Company Comments on channelization from RAN1 perspective:

Moderator note: channelization is defined in RAN4. Please try to limit the inputs on channelization that would be relevant for RAN1 design and to comments on aspects where RAN1 might have the best expertise.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | BW of 400 MHz should be used for initial channel access and for the basic LBT procedure. |
| Ericsson | It is important to choose channelization that avoids spectrum wastage in the various regions of the world. For example, in China and the IMT allocation in Europe, 5 GHz is allocated, and with a maximum bandwidth on the order of 1640 MHz, the 5 GHz allocation can support 3 channels thus fully utilizing the 5 GHz allocation without wastage. This is to be compared, e.g., to a wastage of approximately 680 MHz if channels must be strictly aligned with .11ad channelization in which case only two 2.16 GHz channels are supported in the 5 GHz allocation.In our contribution (R1-2007982), we have provided a detailed analysis about the drawback of aligning the channelization with .11ad. The main drawbacks are: 1. extensive evaluation results from different companies shows there are no coexistence issues even without deploying LBT
2. If NR adopts the same channelization design as IEEE 802.11ad/ay, large wastage of spectrum would occur in many regions:
* 240 MHz at the lower edge of the band is unused in all regions
* 800 MHz at the upper edge of the band is unused in USA and Europe
* 680 MHz of the 5 GHz allocation in China is unused
	+ In recognizing the need to have at least three channels for cell planning, IEEE 802.11aj standard defined four 1.08 GHz channels nested within the two 2.16 GHz channels for the 60 GHz band in China. As a result, the spectrum wastage issues are left unaddressed in the 802.11aj channelization.
* 280 MHz of the 7 GHz allocation in Canada/Brazil/Mexico is unused
* In the IMT (licensed) allocation in Europe, one out of the 2 available 2.16 GHz channels is unusable since it extends outside the IMT allocation
1. If .11ad channelization is used, only 2 non-overlapping 2.16 GHz channels are available, and 680 MHz would be wasted. Instead, NR can divide the 5GHz allocation into 3 non-overlapping 1.6 GHz nominal channels which (1) increase the number of available channels, and (2) full use of the allocation.
2. the 802.11ad standard itself supports partially overlapping channels for channel bandwidths >2.16 GHz
3. In R1-2007982, we demonstrate that misaligned channels do not create a coexistence problem either. We evaluated Coexistence scenario between two operators (a) both operators use aligned 2 GHz channels, and (b) Operator #2 uses three 1.6 GHz channels misaligned with the two 2 GHz channels used by Operator #1. We show that misaligned channels do not cause any coexistence issue.
 |
| Nokia, NSB | Channelization should be based on existing WiGig channels with 2.16 GHz bandwidth. Narrowband operation (n\*400 MHz) within a 2.16 GHz channel should be arranged around 5 sub-channels each 432 MHz. The goal of channelization/subchannelization is to ensure smooth coexistence with WiGig and between NR nodes. It has been already agreed that LBT is supported to address coexistence issues, and thus we cannot agree that coexistence issues are fully non-existence. With respect to unused spectrum as pointed up by Ericsson, it can be clearly used by 3GPP technology which will support also channel BWs which are smaller than 2.16 GHz, such as 200 or 400 MHz with 120kHz SCS. For large BW deployments and peak data rates, if gNB wants to operate with 1.6GHz then there is waste of 600MHz as well in 7 GHz allocation of Canada/Brazil/Mexico, for example.Therefore, the 1.6GHz channelization with 480kHz cannot ensure efficient usage of available spectrum either. And one requires 17,5 carriers of 400MHz to cover 7GHz spectrum, which is far away from being low complex solution. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | A more flexible channelization for Rel-17 NR above 52.6 GHz is preferred to avoid frequency resource waste and achieve a flexible operation above 52.6 GHz. 400 MHz can be used as a basic granularity for channelization. We think it is not necessary to strictly align the channelization of Wi-Fi as it will greatly limit the design of Rel-17 NR and cause a waste of spectrum resources. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The choice of supported maximum carrier bandwidth for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz should ensure a minimum of at least 6 channels in any regulated range. This is relevant for both licensed operation (with typically 3 or 4 MNOs) as well as unlicensed operation (where as reference 5 GHz band allow up to 23 non-overlapping 20 MHz channels). From coexistence perspective we don’t see a need to align with the channelization of WiGig. |
| Samsung | There is no need to mandate same channelization as WiFi, but we should provide a feasibility to implement same channelization as WiFi.  |
| vivo | Our preference is not to define a single channel bandwidth for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz should as we commented to the question above on the minimum and maximum channel bandwidth. With multiple channel bandwidth defined, we don’t see a serious problem of spectrum waste for different regions. |
| InterDigital | We agree with Samsung that a feasibility to implement same channelization with 802.11ad/ay should be supported.  |
| Qualcomm | Share the same view as Samsung |
| MediaTek | At least channelization of integer multiples of 400MHz should be supported. |
| CATT | Channelization should align with NR channelization and be independent to that of WiFi.  |
| LG Electronics | We share the view with Samsung. Channelization alignment with WiGig does not need to be mandated. Even though same bandwidth as WiGig is required, CA based approach should be sufficient. |
| Sony | We think the channelization in this frequency range, especially in the unlicensed spectrum, should be aligned with IEEE 802.11 to ensure the best co-existence performance.  |
| Intel | In order to have better coexistence with other technologies, the specification should at least support channelization that can be aligned with WiGig channels with 2.16 GHz bandwidth.Even the harmonized ITS band was moved from 63-64 GHz to 63.72 – 65.88 GHz (band 4 of WiGig) to align the bands. So, we believe there is a great value in supporting scenarios where alignment can happen. In addition to channels that could be aligned with WiGig channels, we can further discuss on support of other channels that can maximize spectrum usage for 56 ~ 71 GHz band. Additional spectrum could be efficiently utilized by supporting a select range of bandwidth possibly from (400 or 800) to 3 GHz. |
| OPPO | The decision on channelization depends on the nominal channel bandwidth discussion outcome. If 400MHz, 800MHz, or 1.6GHz channel bandwidth is adopted, channelization of integer multiples of 400MHz should be supported. |
| Spreadtrum | We share the same view as Samsung. |
| Apple | Channelization should be aligned to the 802.11ad/802.11ay channels to avoid crossing 2.16 GHz channel boundaries. The individual channels may have bandwidths less than 2.16 GHz.  |
| Convida Wireless | Whether aligning the channelization of 802.11ad/ay or not should be further studied. In addition, we agree with Samsung that feasibility to implement the same channelization with 802.11ad/ay should be supported. |

##### Moderator summary of comments received:

* If NR adopts the same channelization design as IEEE 802.11ad/ay, following spectrum may be unused:
	+ 240 MHz at the lower edge of the band in all regions
	+ 800 MHz at the upper edge of the band in USA and Europe
	+ 680 MHz of the 5 GHz allocation in China
	+ 280 MHz of the 7 GHz allocation in Canada/Brazil/Mexico
* Some companies have noted support of channelization that are aligned IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelization is beneficial to ensure best coexistence. While some companies have noted alignment of channelization is not necessary.
* Some companies suggested use of integer multiple of 400 MHz channel bandwidths.

##### 2nd round of Discussion:

Similarly with SCS, moderator would like to encourage companies comment on the following bullets. Please feel free to suggest additional bullet that could be agreeable as well.

*Moderator note: bullet 3 seems to be something few companies suggested, not entirely sure it is stable enough for agreement, but we can discuss the proposal.*

1. [Some companies have noted support of channelization that are aligned IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelization is beneficial for coexistence. While some companies have noted alignment of channelization for coexistence is not necessary. One company has evaluated misaligned wideband channels with 1.6 GHz and 2 GHz with no coexistence mechanism and have not identified issues.]
2. [Some companies proposed that 2 GHz channel bandwidth raster should consider raster points to be aligned with WiGig channelization.
3. [Some companies proposed that 1.6 GHz should be the maximum channel bandwidth and channel does not necessarily need to be aligned with WiGig channelizations.]
4. [Some companies observed that support of channel bandwidth such as 200 or 400 MHz may enable efficient usage of available spectrum by 3GPP technology. Some companies observed that only supporting channelization that are alignemed with WiGig channelization result in smaller number of supported channels for some regions of the world.]
5. [Some companies have observed that channelization based on granularity of minimum supported channel BW would be benefitial and could provide efficient usage of available specturm. Other companies has observerd that support of channel BW such as (1.6 GHz or 2.4GHz) would enable efficient usage of 5 GHz allocation in China and 5 GHz IMT allocation in Europe.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB |  We do not agree with Proposal 1) and 3) because * alignment with Wifi does not mean 3GPP cannot use that spectrum. Channel BW as small as 50MHz, 100MHz, 200MHz, are considered in RAN4 for the band.
* and aggregations of smaller channels may be used to form large channels such as 1600MHz or 2000MHz

As we pointed out even n x 1600MHz channels cannot fill in the spectrum fully, but it does not mean that band cannot be fully utilized. Therefore, we suggest following should be captured instead* Some companies propose that 2GHz channel BW raster should consider points aligned with the WiGig channelization
* Support of channel BW such as 200/400MHz may enable efficient usage of available spectrum by 3GPP technology
 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with Nokia’s view on 1) and support their suggested updated for first bullet |
| Futurewei | We agree with Moderator’s proposals. Having integer multiples of 400 MHz may satisfy Nokia’s 2GHz BW proposal as well. The frequency raster alignment will be decided in RAN4. We did not see any strong reason that would require raster alignment for coexistence with 802.11ad.  |
| Qualcomm | We do not support Proposal 1. In our view, supporting the same channelization as 11ad/ay means a compatible channelization, not limited to the exact same channelization. That is, NR can support the 11ad/ay channelization at minimum, and can support more than that, e.g., by appropriately defining the raster, as Nokia commented. |
| InterDigital | We agree with Nokia’s comments and proposed updates.  |
| LG Electronics | We agree with Moderator’s Proposals 1) and 2). But Proposal 3) seems not a RAN1’s consensus and can be decided by RAN4. From our understanding, Proposal 1) includes not only single carrier within one WiGig channel, but also multiple carriers within one WiGig channel. In this sense, we suggest minor wording change for Proposal 1):1. RAN1 observes that if NR adopts the channelization design aligned with IEEE 802.11ad/ay, following spectrum may be unused:
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | We share QC’s view.  |
| ZTE | We agree with Moderator’s proposals.  |
| vivo | For proposal 1, agree with QC that the same channelization doesn’t mean the only choice and it could be more flexible than 802.11ad/ay. |
| Apple | For (1), the 800 MHz at the edge of the band in USA has been assigned as channels #7 and #8 in 802.11ay. For the rest of the spectrum wasted in USA, the FCC seems to be discussing extending the allowable spectrum to 75 GHz. In fact, 802.11ay has added channels #7 and #8 to the spec. [Federal Communications Commission FCC 16-89 Before the ...docs.fcc.gov › public › attachments › FCC-16-89A1](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwiviMHKncPsAhUXqJ4KHVOUC-UQFjAAegQIBxAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fdocs.fcc.gov%2Fpublic%2Fattachments%2FFCC-16-89A1.pdf&usg=AOvVaw310Pkujj7MomSjm2kBzCj_).From the document, Request: Conclusion:802.11ay Channelization (up to 8 channels)We agree with Nokia’s update to the first bullet. Given the possibility of wastage when using 400 MHz, we think that having the option of 200 MHz may be beneficial. |
| Samsung | We agree with Qualcomm’s comment. Supporting WiFi channelization (or something similar) is just one feasibility 3GPP should provide, and we can provide more channelizations. Details should be discussed in RAN4.  |
| Moderator | Updated the proposal based on comments received. Updated the proposals to avoid using the term ”RAN1 recommends” as the TR should not only include aspects recommended by RAN1. |
| Ericsson | Comment #1:We strongly disagree with point 2). While companies claim that that alignment is ensures best coexistence, no company has demonstrated through evaluations that misalignment causes a coexistence issue. First, based on system level evaluations from many companies in multiple scenarios, it has been demonstrated that the distribution of interference level is well below the LBT threshold indicating lack of a coexistence issue to start with. Second, one company in [14] has specifically investigated through system level evaluations whether or not misalignment of channels causes a coexistence issue: 1. (b)

Figure 4: Coexistence scenario between two operators (a) both operators use aligned 2 GHz channels, and (b) Operator #2 uses three 1.6 GHz channels misaligned with the two 2 GHz channels used by Operator #1. In both cases (a) and (b), Operator #1 deploys its AP(s) at the red location in the office box, and Operator #2 deploys at the blue location.The system evaluations show that Operator #1 is equally affected by Operator #2 regardless of whether Operator #2 uses two 2 GHz or three 1.6 GHz channels that are misaligned with Operator #1's channels.Third, channelization that is designed to align with the 5 GHz allocation in China and the 5 GHz IMT allocation in Europe results in only two available 2.16 GHz channels. In contrast, use of 1.638 GHz channels fully utilizes the 5 GHz allocation and provides three channels. Provision of 3 channels eases frequency planning between operators and even further demotivates an aligned design for the purposes of coexistence.We also point out that it does not make sense that companies would use flexible sync/channel raster as an argument to motivate a channelization aligned with 802.11ad/ay – doesn't this acknowledge that misaligned channels do not create a coexistence problem in the first place? 802.11ay itself supports misaligned channels as shown in the diagram in Apple's comments above. Based on actual performance, we see no need for 3GPP to design for 2.16 GHz BW channels what are aligned to the IEEE 802.11ad/ay channelization grid for the purposes of coexistence. Comment #2:We disagree to the conclusion that "*Support of channel BW such as 200/400MHz may enable efficient usage of available spectrum by 3GPP technology*" It seems like a strange design indeed to aggregate narrow and wide channels in the same band simply to recover from the inefficiencies of an aligned channelization design. Furthermore, what SCS would be used, e.g., for a 200 MHz carrier compared to the wider carrier? Would it be different? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Please update Item 2 as “some companies have noted alignment of channelization is not necessary **for coexistence”**. We agree with the related comments from Ericsson on coexistence.Item 3: we see no reason to only support 400 MHz with 120 kHz SCS. Smaller carrier bandwidths should be naturally supported, down to 100 MHz without any additional spec impact (or even down to 50 MHz since there are benefits for maximizing PSD and EIRP and thus coverage). |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s proposal |
| Sony | Agree with Nokia’s view and we are okay with FL’s statement in 2). |
| CATT | We agree with Ericsson’s analysis on the co-existence in proposal 2: Channelization aligned with 802.11 ad/ay for co-existence. In 3GPP, we don’t define the operation band with overlapped channels. We also don’t agree with Proposal 4 for the channel raster aligned with WiGig channelization |
| Nokia, NSB | With respect to Ericsson comment #1: Making conclusion based on one company results would not be appropriate in our opinion. Furthermore, if I count correctly, then 1.6\*3=4.8GHz, it seem that majority view was to base channelization based on multiple of 400MHz, we are not clear where the 1.64GHz channel BW came from. Finally, it is not clear how channelization of 1.64GHz fits European and US bands.With respect to Ericsson comment #2: No strange design, NR-U 5/6Ghz is based on that principle of nested 20,40,60 and 80MHz channels. And agree with Huawei, that in the end, channelization will be defined perhaps even down to 50/100MHz. Finally, nobody wants to preclude 1.6GHz channelization, 2GHz channelization could be aligned with Wigig and even 2.4GHz channelization could be supported with 960 kHz SCS to fill the 5GHz spectrum with two carriers.In general, we are fine with FL proposal. |
| Moderator | Put brackets for (4) and (5) given the discussions. Suggest to resolve this during GTW. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are okay with moderator’s updated proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the updated Moderator’s proposal although we don’t think it is necessary to align the channelization with IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay. |
| Ericsson | Given the above comments and company contributions, we think that the below is a more fair representation of company views, and also captures that evaluations have been performed investigating alignment.We do not agree to simply removing the original bullet 1) and replacing it with 5). If 1) is not agreeable, then we are okay with augmenting bullet 5) as shown below1. [Some companies have noted support of channelization that are aligned IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelization is beneficial for coexistence. While some companies have noted alignment of channelization for coexistence is not necessary.] One company (Ericsson [14]) has evaluated misaligned wideband channels (1.6 GHz an and 2 GHz) and found no coexistence problem.
2. Some companies proposed that 2 GHz channel bandwidth raster should consider raster points to be aligned with WiGig channelization. Other companies have proposed that 1.6 GHz is the maximum channel bandwidth and the channels need not be aligned with 802.11ad/ay channelization.
3. Some companies have observed that [Support of channel bandwidth such as 200 or 400 MHz may enable efficient usage of available spectrum by 3GPP technology.]. While other companies have observed that alignment with 802.11ad/ay channelization causes a loss in the number of supported wideband channels (1.6 GHz or 2 GHz) in some regions of the world, e.g., 5 GHz allocation in China and 5 GHz IMT allocation in Europe.
 |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with moderator’s updated proposal, but the use case for the proposal 5, i.e., support of 200 MHz needs further study. |
| Futurewei | We support Ericsson’s updates to the Moderator’s updated proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Ericsson’s updates to the Moderator’s updated proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Several comments to Ericsson’s updates:* For 2), from our review of [14], the evaluation assumes all nodes with two different operators don’t perform LBT.
* For 4), our view is that even with 1.6 GHz maximum BW, channelization alignment with WiGig can be done by CA framework.
* For 5), it seems that two statesments are irrelevant.

Based on above comments, we propose the following updates on top of Ericssons’ suggestion.1. [Some companies have noted support of channelization that are aligned IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelization is beneficial for coexistence. While some companies have noted alignment of channelization for coexistence is not necessary.] One company (Ericsson [14]) has evaluated misaligned wideband channels (1.6 GHz an and 2 GHz) and found no coexistence problem with no LBT mode.
2. Some companies proposed that 2 GHz channel bandwidth raster should consider raster points to be aligned with WiGig channelization. Other companies have proposed that 1.6 GHz is the maximum channel bandwidth and the channels need not be aligned with 802.11ad/ay channelization, or the channels can be aligned with 802.11ad/ay channelization by aggregating carriers.
3. Some companies have observed that [Support of channel bandwidth such as 200 or 400 MHz may enable efficient usage of available spectrum by 3GPP technology.].
4. Some companies have observed that alignment with 802.11ad/ay channelization causes a loss in the number of supported wideband channels (1.6 GHz or 2 GHz) in some regions of the world, e.g., 5 GHz allocation in China and 5 GHz IMT allocation in Europe.
 |
| Nokia, NSB | 1) Ericsson in their simulations did not employ any form of channel access mechansim, such as LBT. If such a mechanism is used, the conclusion on the benefit from aligned channelization could be different. And needs to be further studied. 2)Let me reiterate that having an option to align channels with WiGig does not cause any loss to utilizationTherefore, we suggtest the following wording which hopefully could be acceptable to Ericsson.1. [Some companies have noted support of channelization that are aligned IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelization is beneficial for coexistence. While some companies have noted alignment of channelization for coexistence is not necessary.] One company (Ericsson [14]) has evaluated misaligned wideband channels, using no coexistence mechanism, (1.6 GHz and 2 GHz) and found no coexistence problem.
2. If 2Ghz chanalization is support, companies proposed that RAN4 should introduce also 2 GHz channel raster points that are aligned with WiGig channelization. Some companies in RAN1 do not support 2GHz channel BW.

 4) Some companies have observed that channelization based on granularity of minimum supported channel BW would be benefitial and could provide efficient usage of available specturm. Other companies has observerd that support of channel BW such as (1.6 GHz or 2.4GHz) would enable efficient usage of 5 GHz allocation in China and 5 GHz IMT allocation in Europe.  |
| Moderator | Seems like all bullets will require some further discussion. I’ve put bracket to indicate discussion needed for all bullets.  |

##### 3rd round of Discussion:

Similarly with SCS, moderator would like to encourage companies comment on the following bullets. Please feel free to suggest additional bullet that could be agreeable as well.

*Moderator note: bullet 3 seems to be something few companies suggested, not entirely sure it is stable enough for agreement, but we can discuss the proposal.*

1. Some companies have noted support of channelization that are aligned IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelization is beneficial for coexistence. While some companies have noted alignment of channelization for coexistence is not necessary. One company has evaluated misaligned NR wideband channels with 1.6 GHz and 2 GHz without LBT and have not identified coexistence issues between NR and NR. Alignment of channelization between a NR channel and IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channel in this context refers to a NR channel that is contained within one of the channels defined for IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay and NR channel bandwidth does not cross over channel boundaries of IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay.
2. Some companies proposed that 2 GHz channel bandwidth should be supported andhave the raster points for 2 GHz channel bandwidth to be aligned with IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelization.
3. Some companies proposed that 1.6 GHz should be the maximum channel bandwidth and channels do not necessarily need to be aligned with IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelizations.
4. Some companies observed that support of channel bandwidth such as 200 or 400 MHz may enable efficient usage of available spectrum by 3GPP technology. Some companies observed that only supporting channelization that are alignemed with IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelization result in smaller number of supported channels for some regions of the world.
5. Some companies have observed that channelization based on granularity of minimum supported channel BW would be benefitial and could provide efficient usage of available specturm. Other companies has observerd that support of channel BW such as 1.6 GHz or 2.4GHz would enable efficient usage of 5 GHz allocation in China and 5 GHz IMT allocation in Europe. Some companies have observed that 1.6 GHz allows for 3 channels instead of two in these regions, easing frequency planning between operators.
6. Some companies proposed to support more than one channel bandwidths for a given SCS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson 3 | 1) The following is more accurate: "…without ~~no coexistence mechanism~~ LBT and have not identified coexistence issues"3) Editorial correction: "… and channels do~~es~~ not necessarily need to be aligned …"5) It seems a bit strange that 2.4 GHz has been added since the proponent argues for alignment with WiGig channelization – clearly such a BW would cross over to adjacent WiGig channels. However, even if this observation is left in place, it does not address our key observation. Hence to accurately reflect our observation, we prefer the following:"Some companies have observed that channelization based on granularity of minimum supported channel BW would be benefitial and could provide efficient usage of available specturm. Other companies has observerd that support of channel BW such as (1.6 GHz or 2.4GHz) would enable efficient usage of 5 GHz allocation in China and 5 GHz IMT allocation in Europe. Some companies have observed that 1.6 GHz allows for 3 channels instead of two in these regions, easing frequency planning between operators" |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (3) | We agree with moderator’s proposal |
| InterDigital | We support Moderator’s proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO 3 | We support Moderator’s proposal. The modification raised by Ericsson 3 would also be ok.  |
| LG Electronis | Comment for bullet 3). We think that even with maximum channel BW of 1.6 GHz, channel alignment with WiGig, if deemed necessary, can be enabled by CA framework. With this regard, the following modification is suggested.1. Some companies proposed that 1.6 GHz should be the maximum channel bandwidth and channel does not necessarily need to be aligned with WiGig channelizations and channel can be aligned with WiGig channelizations by aggregating channel bandwidths, if needed.
 |
| Nokia | We support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Moderator’s updated proposal. |
| Moderator | Updated the text based on comments received.For LG’s update, I have a feeling companies might has some different understanding on what it mean to have ‘aligned channelization’. Moderator understood them as defining a (NR) channel that does not overlap with two (WiGig) channels simultaneously. So, moderator assumes carrier aggregation is not needed to have aligned channelization. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with further updates by moderator |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Moderator’s proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The difference between bullet points #1 and #2 is not very clear.We would also like to observe that some companies propose to support channel bandwidths smaller than the maximum channel bandwidth (for a given SCS). It may be obvious, but the current set of observations may seem to imply that only one value of channel bandwidth is supported for each SCS. |
| OPPO | Agree with the proposal |
| Apple | Should have all references to 802.11ad/802.11ay and remove reference to WiGig. WiGig and 11ad have same number of channels (6 channels) while 11ay has more (8 channels) |
| Moderator | Updated #2 based on comments from Huawei. Added (6) based on comments from Huawei.  |
| Samsung | One comment to “One company has evaluated misaligned wideband channels with 1.6 GHz and 2 GHz without LBT and have not identified coexistence issues.” If we understand correctly, the evaluation is for two NR operators with different channel bandwidth, then how can this result prove fair coexistence with WiFi? This sentence should be removed since it’s not related to the first senence of this bullet.  |
| Ericsson 4 | Support the updated proposalWe do not agree to remove the sentence as suggested by Samsung. The evaluations are in the context of misaligned channels in general, and is thus relevant. If clarification is needed, then we suggest the following.One company has evaluated misaligned NR wideband channels with 1.6 GHz and 2 GHz without LBT and have not identified coexistence issues. |
| Intel | We think if the text on coexistence should be kept in (1), then it should be further clarified that this is coexistence between NR RATs.One company has evaluated misaligned NR wideband channels with 1.6 GHz and 2 GHz without LBT and have not identified coexistence between NR and NR RAT issues. |
| LG Electronics | Need to clarify ‘aligned channelization’: From our understanding, it implies that multiple NR channels (< 2 GHz) can be located within a WiGig channel and a NR channel won’t across multiple WiGig channels. With this understanding, we suggest the following, but Moderator or other companies may need to check whether that is aligned with their understanding or not.Some companies proposed that 1.6 GHz should be the maximum channel bandwidth and channels do not necessarily need to be aligned with IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelizations and NR channels can be aligned with IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelizations by locating multiple NR channels “nested” within a channel defined for IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay, if needed. |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with modorator’s updated proposal. |
| Ericsson 5 | We are not aligned with LG's interpretation of the meaning of "aligned channelization." :-) We specifically investigated whether or not there is a coexisitence issue between three 1.6 GHz NR channels and two 2 GHz NR channels where the 1.6 GHz channels cross the 2 GHz channel boundaries, thus emulating that the 1.6 GHz channels are NOT necessarily nested within the channel boundaries defined by 802.11ad/ay.Hence, we don't agree with LGEs suggested modification to bullet 3). Perhaps LGE's suggestion is better suited for bullet 2). |
| ~~InterDigital~~ | ~~We support Nokia’s update on removing FFT utilization. If UE is equipped with a FFT with proper size, the UE complexity does not change per FFT utlilization.~~  |
| LG Electronics | In case proponents supporting bullet 3) have different preferences, the argument that raised by us can be well-suited for bullet 1). So we sugget to modify bullet 1), as follows.1. Some companies have noted support of channelization that are aligned IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelization by locating one or multiple NR channels “nested” within a channel defined for IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay is beneficial for coexistence. While some companies have noted alignment of channelization for coexistence is not necessary. One company has evaluated misaligned wideband channels with 1.6 GHz and 2 GHz without LBT and have not identified coexistence issues.
 |
| Moderator | Quick question to Ericsson. Isn’t emulating non-nested structure the same as “misaligned”? Maybe the alignment description should belong to (1).I’ve tried to reformulate based on LG’s suggestion. Please check to see if this is ok. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal. |
| Futurewei | I noticed that you used in the last proposal:1. “this context refers to a NR channel that is nested within one of the channels defined for IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay and does not cross over channel boundaries of IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay. Alignment of channelization of a NR channel and IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channel does not strictly mean alignment of all NR channels.”

I think that we should define clearly the term  “nested”, and clarify what do we understand by  “alignment does not strictly mean alignment”, otherwise it leaves room for misunderstandings and false interpretations. |
| Moderator | Deleted the second text on alignment definition as it might have been causing more confusion.Updated the definition for nested based on comments from Futurewei. |

##### 4th round of Discussion:

Please provide comments on the proposal.

1. Some companies have noted support of channelization that are aligned IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelization is beneficial for coexistence. While some companies have noted alignment of channelization for coexistence is not necessary. One company has evaluated misaligned NR wideband channels with 1.6 GHz and 2 GHz without LBT and have not identified coexistence issues between NR and NR. Alignment of channelization between a NR channel and IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channel in this context refers to a NR channel that is contained within one of the channels defined for IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay and NR channel bandwidth does not cross over channel boundaries of IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay.
2. Some companies proposed that 2 GHz channel bandwidth should be supported andhave the raster points for 2 GHz channel bandwidth to be aligned with IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelization.
3. Some companies proposed that 1.6 GHz should be the maximum channel bandwidth and channels do not necessarily need to be aligned with IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelizations.
4. Some companies observed that support of channel bandwidth such as 200 or 400 MHz may enable efficient usage of available spectrum by 3GPP technology. Some companies observed that only supporting channelization that are alignemed with IEEE 802.11ad and 802.11ay channelization result in smaller number of supported channels for some regions of the world.
5. Some companies have observed that channelization based on granularity of minimum supported channel BW would be benefitial and could provide efficient usage of available specturm. Other companies has observerd that support of channel BW such as 1.6 GHz or 2.4GHz would enable efficient usage of 5 GHz allocation in China and 5 GHz IMT allocation in Europe. Some companies have observed that 1.6 GHz allows for 3 channels instead of two in these regions, easing frequency planning between operators.
6. Some companies proposed to support more than one channel bandwidths for a given SCS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s proposal  |
| Nokia, NSB | With respect to Some companies have observed that 1.6 GHz allows for 3 channels instead of two in these regions, easing frequency planning between operators.Would 1.2GHz allow to support 4 channels? Even better?  |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |

## 2.3 SSB

### 2.3.1 SSB numerology – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [2]:
	+ Proposal 7: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, coverage enhancement of channels and signals used for initial access should be considered for NR beyond 52.6 GHz.
* From [3]:
	+ Observation 5: A SCS larger than 240 kHz for SSB is not well-justified.
	+ Proposal 1: Support 120 kHz or 240 kHz SCS with NCP for physical layer signals, control/data channel, and PRACH, SSB, for both licensed and unlicensed band operations.
	+ Observation 7: The numerology of 120 kHz or 240 kHz SCS with NCP is sufficient for initial access.
* From [5]:
	+ Proposal 2: For SCS pair for SSB and initial DL BWP, support (120K, 240K), (120K, 120K) and (960K, 960K) to maintain 4-bit koffset indication as in FR2.
	+ Observation 10: For frequency domain offset estimation during SSB detection, using SSB with low SCS such as 120K/240KHz may increase hardware complexity or cell search latency.
	+ Observation 11: For number of buffering samples during SSB detection, using SSB with high SCS such as 960KHz will need larger buffer cost compared to that in FR2 if adopting the same SSB period (20ms).
	+ Observation 12: For 960KHz SSB, NCP length is not enough to accommodate the time for beam switching.
* From [7]:
	+ Observation 3: Limiting subcarrier spacing choices to keep the minimum FFT size to 512-points can avoid redesign of SS/PBCH block.
* From [8]:
	+ Observation 2: The complexity of SCS indication in the PBCH increase as the total number of SCS supported for FR2 increases.
* From [9]:
	+ Observation 1: FR2 existing SCS and new numerologies can provide a large number of potential SS/PBCH candidate positions to combat channel uncertainty issues.
	+ Proposal 2: It is proposed to investigate how to transmit the indication about additional SS/PBCH candidate positions which can become available with existing FR2 numerologies or future new numerologies.
* From [10]:
	+ Observation 16: To provide enough high time synchronization accuracy for the initial uplink transmission when applying 960 kHz SCS the following options could be considered:
		- 1) Introduce 960 kHz SCS for SSB
		- 2) Use RS available also for IDLE mode Ues like DMRS of CORESET#0 in occasions configured for Type0-PDCCH monitoring.
	+ Proposal 13: Regarding SSB numerologies: 1) Support existing SSB numerologies and 2) support 960 kHz SCS for SSB or provide UE with additional RS available in IDLE mode to provide sufficient time synchronization accuracy to operate mixed SCS scenario of 240kHz SSB and 960 kHz SCS uplink control and data.
	+ Proposal 14: With 960 kHz SCS no explicit beam switching is needed between successive SSB blocks.
* From [14]:
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: By proper choice of SSB SCS, the initial cell search complexity can be kept at the same level as for FR1 and FR2.
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: From a frequency error perspective, an SSB SCS of 240 kHz is sufficient for the 52.6-71 GHz frequency range to maintain similar relative error values as for FR1 and FR2.
	+ For NR operations in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band, consider only 120 and 240 kHz SCS for SS/PBCH blocks, as already supported in Rel-15/16.
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: It is beneficial for SSB coverage to reuse the FR2 already supported subcarrier spacings of 120kHz and 240kHz.
	+ Only support existing FR2 SSB subcarrier spacings of 120 kHz and 240 kHz.
* From [15]:
	+ Proposal #1: Consider the followings as candidate numerologies to support NR in FR-X band by taking frequency utilization efficiency, unlicensed band operation, the ICI mitigation, and the UE implementation into account.
	+ SCS for SSB transmission
		- Reuse the existing value of 240 kHz (and/or 120 kHz)
* From [19]:
	+ Observation 2: Using larger SCS than FR2 SCS can lead to lower SSB detection complexity due to less frequency shift hypotheses.
* From [21]:
	+ Proposal 6: The use of SCS above 240 kHz should be justified for the signals in the SS/PBCH block including the PSS, SSS and PBCH.
* From [22]:
	+ Proposal 2: SSB design for SCS 240kHz and 480kHz could be considered.
* From [29]:
	+ Proposal 5: For SSB, subcarrier spacing no smaller than 240 kHz is considered for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. Only support same subcarrier spacing between SSB and CORESET #0 configuration.

### 2.3.2 SSB pattern and SSB/CORESET multiplexing – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [2]:
	+ Observation 11: With higher SCS values such as 480kHz and 960kHz, if existing SSB structures are used, then the minimum bandwidth requirements for UE will increase significantly in order to accommodate the required number of frequency resources within a time-symbol for PBCH/PSS/SSS and only multiplexing pattern 1 could be supported
	+ Proposal 6: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, new SSB structures should be investigated
* From [3]:
	+ Proposal 6: The SSB patterns of Case D and Case E can be reused in frequency range above 52.6 GHz for licensed band operation.
	+ Proposal 7: More than 64 candidate SSB indexes should be introduced in NR-U-60.
	+ Proposal 8: The SSB and CORESET0 multiplexing patterns in Rel-15 can be reused for licensed band operation.
	+ Proposal 9: The SSB and CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 2 and 3 are preferred for unlicensed band operation in frequency range above 52.6 GHz when LBT is necessary.
* From [5]:
	+ Proposal 3: The following SSB-Coreset 0 multiplexing patterns are supported for each SCS pair:
		- (120K, 240K): Pattern 1, Pattern 2
		- (120K, 120K): Pattern 1, Pattern 3
		- (960K, 960K): Pattern 1, Pattern 3
	+ Proposal 5: 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).
	+ Proposal 6: The following alternatives could be considered to solve beam switching problem for contiguous candidate SSBs:
		- Alt. 1: New SSB pattern introducing gaps between contiguous candidate SSBs;
		- Alt. 2: The same QCL assumptions for contiguous candidate SSBs (e.g. case D in [4]);
		- Alt. 3: Hopping transmission for contiguous candidate SSBs (e.g. case E in [4]).
* From [6]:
	+ Proposal 1: For maximum commonality, SSB patterns and multiplexing pattern of SSB and CORESET#0 are same for licensed and unlicensed operation, and the functions/mechanisms (e.g. LBT) dedicated for unlicensed operation can be configurable by RRC signaling.
* From [8]:
	+ Proposal 6: The same SSB patterns are supported for licensed and unlicensed bands and NRU mechanism for additional transmission opportunity is reused.
	+ Observation 1: No additional gap should be considered to accommodate beam switching delay if only 120 KHz/240 KHz SCS is used for NR operation up to 71GHz.
	+ Proposal 7: The beam switching delay during beam sweeping should be taken into consideration in the SSB burst design for higher SCS.
	+ Proposal 8: For NR operation in unlicensed spectrum in 52.6-71 GHz, the transmission window defined in Rel-16 NR-U is supported.
	+ Proposal 9: More than 64 SSB transmission opportunities shall be defined within a 5ms SSB burst set to support up to 64 beams for SSB beam sweeping in case of occasional LBT failure. The additional bit(s) for the extension of SSB index need to be further study.
	+ Proposal 10: Patterns 2 and 3 of SSB and CORESET for Type0-PDCCH can multiplex with periodic CSI-RS/paging PDCCH&PDSCH in frequency.
* From [9]:
	+ Proposal 1: Introduce groups of SCS in FR2 and all control/data communication will use the SCS from one such group.
* From [10]:
	+ Observation 15: Benefits of reusing FR2 numerologies for both SSB and Type0-PDCCH would be:
		- No CP length or coverage reduction
		- Possibility to reuse FR2 implementation for the initial access
	+ Observation 17: FR2 SSB time domain mapping pattern of SSBs can be reused above 52.6 GHz if the FR2 SSB numerologies are used.
	+ Observation 18: If LBT was used for the SSBs, to provide multiple SSB transmission opportunities for the same beam in the DRS window against LBT failures, two principles could be considered:
		- Max number of SSB positions remains 64 while some of the positions (e.g. last N positions) can be used as a back-up positions for the SSBs which were not transmitted due to LBT failure. The maximum number of SSB beams would be 64-N. There can be further sub-options as follows:
			* Back-up positions could be used in cyclic manner as in Rel. 16 NR-U.
			* gNB could select certain SSB (not transmitted in the original SSB position) to be transmitted in the back-up position. This case would require that SSB transmitted in the back-up position would indicate the beam index explicitly.
		- Increase max number of SSB positions beyond 64, e.g. up to 128, and use similar cycling mechanism as in Rel. 16 NR-U. This option would require increasing the SSB index space and signalling from 64 to 128.
	+ Observation 19: Existing FR2 SSB and Type0-PDCCH multiplexing patterns are a good starting point for above 52.6 GHz operation.
* From [13]:
	+ Proposal 2: Rel-17 NR can maintain the maximum SCS with 240 kHz for SSB and/or 120 kHz for Type0-PDCCH, and reuse the initial access procedure in Rel-15/16 NR.
	+ Proposal 7: SSB pattern needs to be re-considered irrespective of whether higher SCS is supported or not in Rel-17 NR above 52.6 GHz.
	+ Proposal 8: Transmission opportunities, timing and QCI of Rel-17 SSB should be considered.
	+ Proposal 9: The following multiplexing patterns and combinations of SCSs of SSB and Type0-PDCCH are preferred for Rel-17 NR beyond 52.6 GHz, that is, 60 kHz SCS for Type0-PDCCH is not supported.
		- (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): (120, 120) kHz
			* Multiplexing patterns: 1, 3
		- (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): (240, 120) kHz
			* Multiplexing patterns: 1, 2
* From [14]:
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: It is observed that from a UE complexity point of view it is beneficial to define the same SS/PBCH patterns for licensed and unlicensed operation.
	+ Existing SS/PBCH time domain patterns D and E as specified in Rel-15/16 are proposed to be used also for operation in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band.
	+ Proposal 26 Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: It is observed that with 120 and 240 kHz SCS for SS/PBCH block transmissions, the CP length is at least 293 ns which is sufficient for beam switching which typically requires < 100 ns
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: SS/PBCH / CORESET0 multiplexing patterns 2 and 3 are restricted to very small RMSI payloads due to the small number (2) of available OFDM symbols for RMSI PDSCH.
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: For the maximum number of beams (64), it is observed that SS/PBCH / CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 1 can carry larger payload than multiplexing patterns 2 and 3 due to the fact that SS/PBCH and RMSI PDCCH/PDSCH are time division multiplexed.
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: Existing Rel-15/16 framework for initial access including SS/PBCH-CORESET0 multiplexing patterns, multiplexing of SS/PBCH and other signals/channels, and Type0-PDCCH CSS configurations have significant flexibility to cover a large number of deployment scenarios in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band.
* From [15]:
	+ Proposal #3: Consider the enhancements for the SSB transmission to provide more opportunities in FR-X unlicensed band.
	+ Proposal #4: Study further how to multiplex SSB and corresponding CORESET#0 in case of using new numerologies such as 240/480 kHz SCSs for the DL signal/channels other than SSB.
* From [19]:
	+ Observation 3: introducing additional beam switching gap is needed when SSB SCS is beyond 480 KHz.
	+ Proposal 1: Strive for a unified SSB time pattern independent of with/without LBT modes.
	+ Observation 4: a gap duration larger than 23 us may be enough for LBT gap duration.
	+ Observation 5: Rel. 15 FR2 SSB time pattern can support Omni-directional or directional LBT without further introducing LBT gap.
	+ Observation 6: The resource limitation for SSB-CORESET pattern 2 and pattern 3 is not obvious and can be workaround.
	+ Observation 7: It seems not necessary to preclude pattern 2 and pattern 3 for SSB CORESET#0 multiplexing.
* From [21]:
	+ Observation 9: Introduction of a DRS transmission window introduction will depend on (a) the 10% regulatory rule (b) relative duration of signals that may need to be transmitted without LBT and (c) the overall interference provided by these signals.
	+ Proposal 7: Allow SSB transmission without LBT in an LBT environment provided load of non-LBT transmission is less than 10% within an observation window of 10 ms.
		- Define a DRS transmission for scenarios where the control signaling exceeds this threshold.
	+ Proposal 8: Support Pattern 1, 2 and 3 with additional support of 240 kHz for the SSB and 240 kHz for the Type0-PDCCH for SSB and Type0-PDCCH/RMSI multiplexing.
* From [23]:
	+ Proposal 1: For 52.6-71 GHz band, the existing SCSs, i.e., 120 kHz and 240 kHz, and multiplexing pattern between SSB and CORESET#0 in FR2 for SS/PBCH blocks should be reused.
	+ Proposal 2: For 52.6-71 GHz band, the existing time domain patterns designed in FR2 for SS/PBCH blocks at least for licensed spectrum should be reused.
* From [27]:
	+ Proposal 1: 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., equal or larger than 960kHz) taking into account a beam switching gap due to a RF interruption time of Tx/Rx beams and/or LBT gap in unlicensed spectrum.
	+ Proposal 2: 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.
* From [29]:
	+ Proposal 4: When a large subcarrier spacing is defined, SSB pattern and multiplexing of SSB and CORESET0/RMSI need to be updated to accommodate beam switching time.
* From [30]:
	+ Proposal 3: RAN1 shall study the SS/PBCH block pattern for the new numerology, taking into account the beam switching time between neighboring SS/PBCH blocks.
	+ Proposal 4: RAN1 shall study the multiplexing pattern of SS/PBCH block and CORESET#0, and supporting both Pattern 2 and Pattern 3 is beneficial for the flexibility of allocating the CORESET#0.
* From [31]:
	+ Proposal 3: Whether to introduce gap symbol(s) for beam switching time should be discussed not only for SSB but also for any signal/channels with beam switching in case that higher SCS such as 960 kHz is supported.
	+ Proposal 4: For SSB and CORESET multiplexing, following aspects should be discussed
		- Which SCS(s) is supported for SSB and which combination(s) of SCS between SSB and CORESET#0 is supported
			* Whether only single numerology is supported as in Rel-16 NR-U or not
			* Whether the number of supported SCSs for SSB should be minimized
		- Which multiplexing pattern between SSB and CORESET#0 is supported for each combination of SCS between SSB and CORESET#0
			* What are minimum channel bandwidth, minimum required CORESET#0 bandwidth and minimum required bandwidth for RMSI PDSCH
			* Whether beam sweeping overhead should be minimized by FDM between SSB and CORESET#0 and/or RMSI PDSCH

### 2.3.3 Initial access related aspects – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [8]:
	+ Proposal 13: In initial access, the beam adaptation for Msg3 and Msg4 transmission can be adapted based on the beam measurement report from UE.
* From [9]:
	+ Observation 2: The transmission of minimum system information with a large number of active beams makes the system inefficient and imposes beam switching constraints, resulting in reduced scheduler flexibility.
	+ Observation 3: For shared carriers, the transmission of minimum system information with a large number of active beams brings additional issues related to channel ownership, and potential requirements to perform channel access procedures while switching the beams.
	+ Proposal 3: It is proposed to investigate efficient transmission of MSI including the multiplexing patterns for both licensed and shared carriers.
* From [10]:
	+ Observation 13: PBCH using QPSK has DMRS in each OFDM symbol where PBCH Res are allocated.
	+ Observation 14: PBCH using current FR2 numerologies is robust against phase noise.
* From [14]:
	+ Capture the following text in TR 38.808: Increased SCS translates to a loss in coverage for initial access signals and channels (SS/PBCH block, PRACH), fixed payload channels (e.g., PDCCH/PUCCH), and variable payload channels (e.g., PDSCH/PUSCH) due to shorter OFDM symbol duration.
	+ For operation in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band, basic tools in the Rel-16 specifications, e.g., FR2 initial access framework, BWP switching, CA/DC activation already support both standalone and non-standalone deployments that can ensure coverage. It is not needed to specify coverage enhancement approaches for larger SCS for initial access signals and channels or for control/data channels.
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: The distribution of interference + noise in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band is typically well below the LBT threshold of -47 dBm, and thus deferral due to LBT failure is rare. Hence, it is not beneficial to introduce a transmission window for SS/PBCH + RMSI transmissions.
* From [20]:
	+ Proposal 5: Beam alignment during initial access procedure should be considered for NR above 52.6 GHz

### 2.3.4 Discussions

##### Moderator Summary of observations and proposals from Contributions:

* Diverse views among companies on this issue. There are several sub-issues: (1) supported SSB/CORESET multiplexing pattern, (2) SSB pattern within the slots, (3) DRS window, (4) QCL assumption, (5) how to deal with beam switching (if needed to be considered), (6) whether or not to support different SSB and CORESET #0 numerology
	+ Note: there may be other issues not listed above. The above are few outstanding issues that moderator noted and does not hint higher priority or otherwise.
* Some conclusion on SSB numerology might be needed for further progress on this topic.
* Diverse views on SSB numerologies among companies.
* General consensus is that just from performances perspective, SSB is not as affected by phase noise compared to PDSCH/PUSCH.
* Similar to SSB numerology, it would be great the comments and discussion can include number of supported SSB SCS, specification impact for different supported numerologies, maximum supports SCS, implementation complexity, and scenarios enabled by different numerologies. There could be other aspects, please comment further.
* Since above aspects that span SSB and CORESET#0 design, it would be great if SSB pattern and SSB/CORESET multiplexing section can focus on (but not necessarily limited to) specification impact, single numerology operation aspects, scenario enabled by SSB and CORESET#0 design. The rest of the issues can be also discussed in SSB numerology (section 2.3.1)

Moderator suggests conducting further discussion on SSB. Based on submitted proposals, the discussion could include number of supported SSB SCS, specification impact for different supported numerologies, maximum supports SCS, implementation complexity, and scenarios enabled by different numerologies. There could be other aspects, please comment further.

###### Company Comments on applicable SSB and related issues (including number of supported SSB SCS, implementation complexity, scenario enablement):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Support for the existing SSB numerology 240 kHz with NCP should be considered  |
| Nokia, NSB | We think that R15 SSB SCS are sufficient, on the other hand, if the preference is to enable single SCS deployments, designing SSB putterns for 480 or 960kHz could follow R15 principles and would be straightforward. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with the observation on performance from the moderator’s summary. As already agreed for observations from LLS and link budget analysis, smaller SCS have an advantage for SSB coverage.If one SCS is supported as 120 kHz or 240 kHz, then the same SCS can be used for SSB.If an additional SCS is supported as 480 kHz or 960 kHz for data/control, a smaller SCS could be used for SSB even if it comes at the cost of some complexity. Designing SSB for 480 kHz or 960 kHz SCS is of course feasible, but it comes at the cost of coverage. |
| Ericsson | Our view is that existing FR2 numerologies for SSB (120 kHz, 240 kHz) are sufficient, and ensure coverage. We don’t see a need to design SSB for larger SCS due to the loss in coverage that has been observed in evaluations. We don’t see that support of additional numerologies for SSB enables any different use cases compared to existing FR2 numerologies. |
| Qualcomm | We support matched numerologies between SSB and other physical channels, i.e., 120kHz and 960kHz SCSs for SSB. Having the same numerology for SSB and the active BWP will facilitate multiplexing (i.e., in the standalone scenario), any scheduling restriction or BWP switching is not required for UE to measure the SSB, e.g., for RLM/BFD. |
| MediaTek | We prefer to prioritize existing FR2 SSB SCSs, i.e.,120kHz and 240kHz, to avoid spec and implementation impacts. However, we also support single numerology deployment and therefore, we prefer to remove 240kHz if 240kHz is not supported in >52.6GHz spectrum. |
| CATT | SSB numerology is aligned with the numerology of all other physical channels.  |
| Samsung | We should at least support the possibility to enable single numerology development for the whole system, which is beneficial from both network side and UE side. From network perspective, using single numerology is easy for implementation and could save resources (e.g. guard band in mixed numerology); and from the UE perspective, single numerology can also be easy for implementation and save the measurement gap. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We agree the existing FR2 SSB SCS can be reused as SSB is not affected by phase noise. We additionally believe that higher SSB SCS could be beneficial to support higher data SCS without mixed numerology. As no phase noise issue for SSB detection is observed and SSB in higher SCS works somehow as well as the existing SSB SCS in FR2, new SSB SCS aligned with potential data SCS should be considered. |
| LG Electronics | We think that existing FR2 SSB SCSs are sufficient considering specification impact, UE implementation, and coverage. Even though 480 kHz SCS is to be supported, 120/240 kHz SCS SSB and 480 kHz SCS data can be operated together, similar to 15/30 kHz SCS SSB and 60 kHz SCS data in FR1. |
| Intel | Only SSB numerology above 240 kHz should be considered when factoring into account recevier complexity to handle initial frequency offset.Also based on the coverage enhancement studies, it is evident that SSBs have one the largest coverages compared other channels supported in NR (for the same SCS). Therefore, we do not see a strong need to support SSB SCS with large difference to data/control channel.There are also less motivation to support different SCS between SSB and CORESET #0 as this simply complicate SI multiplexing without providing useful system benefits.SSB SCS same as data/control SCS should enable all scenarios intended for data/control transmission.If we factor our preferences with data/control numerology, we believe supporting 960 kHz and 480 kHz for SSB SCS is most logical choice. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | In terms of coverage and spec impacts, we think reusing FR2 numerologies for SSB i.e. 120 kHz, 240 kHz is sufficient. We don’t think that it is necessary to restrict SSB to use the same SCS as data/control channels. |
| Xiaomi |  Consider the current SCS for FR2 and as our analysis on SSB pattern, as well as the complexity and smaller specification impact, we think 240kHz (for SSB)/120KHz (for data) could be a basic candidate SCS pair for both licensed and unlicensed implantation. However, for ultra wideband application in unlicensed band, a higher SCS pair can be considered.  |
| OPPO | Reuse FR2 initial access procedure by considering existing SSB 120 kHz + CORESET #0 120 kHz or SSB 240 kHz + CORESET #0 120 kHz. After initial access procedure, a higher SCS can be configured for data transmission. |
| Lenovo,MotorolaMobility | We also support to have have same numeroloies between SSB and other physical channels and have similar views as Qualcomm.For this reason, SCS values beyond 240kHz should be considered for SSB |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer to at least reuse the existing FR2 SSB SCS. Higher SSB SCS can be considered in the perspective of using a single numerology. |
| Apple | We prefer to reuse the existing FR2 SSB SCSs.  |
| Vivo | At least single numerology for SSB and Coreset#0 is supported for each data/control numerology. Prefer to reuse FR2 design as much as possible. For already agreed 120KHz numerology for data/control, 120KHz SSB is supported for single numerology and 240KHz SSB is still supported as FR2 does (which may ease the implementation complexity on Frequency sync);For any new numerology (e.g. 960K) for data/control, at least the same numerology is supported for single numerology. |

###### Company Comments on SSB pattern and SSB/CORESET multiplexing and related issues (including specification impact, single numerology operation, scenario enablement):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Our approach is based on minimum changes to the existing design, a lower implementation complexity and a simplified usage in the unlicensed band. Use the same SSB and CORESET# numerology, use existing FR2 multiplexing pattern, reuse initial access procedures Rel15/16, no additional beam switching time gap necessary (100ns switching time is less than NCP of 240 kHz SCS) |
| Nokia, NSB | First shared channel and SSB SCS shall be agreed, to proceed here. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Considering the minum reuqired bandwidth for SSB, coverage requirements and beamforming related aspects, new SSB design could be considered, dependipn upon the new SSB numerology, if any |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | These considerations are secondary to the choice of SCS for data, control, SSB. SSB pattern and SSB/CORESET multiplexing are also impacted when LBT is used before SSB transmission. |
| Ericsson | We see that existing FR2 SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing patterns are sufficient, especially Pattern 1 (TDM mux of SSB/RMSI) operating with either (120/120) or (240/120) kHz SCS. This can enable practical RMSI payloads (~700 bits). Patterns 2 and 3 (FDM mux of SSB/RMSI) are limited by 2 OFDM symbols for RMSI which is insufficent for ptractial RMSI payloads. Our view is that an initial BWP (assuming standalone) can be operated using FR2 numerologies. The BWP can be switched to a larger numerology based on data rate needs. This BWP can operate with 480 kHz SCS for data/control/reference signals and 240 kHz SSB, for example. |
| Qualcomm | We support the same numerology for SSB, data, and CORESET#0. Within the supported numerologies, mixed numerology operation may still be supported. Also, depending on the combination of SSB and COREST#0 numerologies, the existing CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern may be reused with some enhancement. Regarding the SSB pattern, we can reuse the legacy FR2 pattern for 120kHz SCS. For 960kHz SCS, if supported, we think a SSB pattern with an additional beam switching gap (at least one-symbol duration) between adjacent SSB bursts should be supported as an option, in addition to the existing patterns.Regarding DRX window and QCL assumption, the same principle as Rel-16 NR-U can be applied, with potential increase in the transission opportunities and the SSB ID space. |
| MediaTek | If 120kHz or 240 kHz SSB SCS are supported, we prefer to reuse the existing FR2 SSB designs, e.g., SSB pattern and SSB/CORESET multiplexing, to minimize the spec impact. |
| CATT | The numerology of SSB, CORESET#0, and all physical channels should have same numerology. The slot structure shoud be reused for the SSB location. SSB pattern for 120 kHz could be reused for other numerology if introduced.  |
| Samsung | Similar to the comment for SSB, at least some numerology of SSB and CORESET#0 should be supported.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | After discussing about 2.3.1, we can discuss further on this. It would be preferred to reuse the existing SSB pattern and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing approach in NR FR2 in order to minimize the specification efforts, but assuming data SCS can be higher than FR2 NR, specification efforts would be necessary anyway.  |
| LG Electronis | We agree that existing SSB pattern and SSB/CORESET multiplexing patterns should be prioritized. In addition, DRS window and QCL assumption introduced for Rel-16 NR-U can be considered to combat with LBT failure in unlicensed spectrum operation. |
| Intel | Supporting 120kHz or 240 kHz SSB SCS does potentially allow for reuse of existing NR specification.For each newly supported SSB SCS (currently not supported) in NR specification does require RAN1 to effort in standardizing the specification.Coupled with data/control subcarrier spacing, enabling single numerology operation by supporting the same SCS for SSB as data SCS is still preferred. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The SSB patterns and multiplexing patterns between SSB and Type0-PDCCH in FR2 can be reused for above 52.6 GHz in terms of coverage and spec impact. |
| Xiaomi | Reusing the current design and enhancing where it is necessary. |
| OPPO | Support reusing current SSB pattern and SSB/CORESET multiplexing patterns. |
| Spreadtrum | The existing FR2 SSB pattern and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns should be reused to minimize the specification impact. |
| Apple | Ideally, the SCSs for the SSB and data need to be decided first. However, we prefer to maximally reuse the R15 design. |
| Vivo | Regarding SSB pattern, if SSB and coreset#0 share the same numerology (e.g. (120K, 120K) and (960K, 960K)), the design of (120K, 120K) in FR2 is reused, i.e. Case D SSB pattern, support multiplexing pattern 1 and 3 in these cases. If not, especially when SCS for Coreset #0 is larger than SSB SCS, the new multiplexing pattern needs to be designed. Regarding extending the number of candidate SSBs, it depends on whether LBT is needed for SSB transmission. If no need to have LBT, the reuse of NRU mechanism is not needed. |

###### Company Comments on initial access:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Use FR2 initial access design as the basic framework |
| Ericsson | Agree with Futurewei, that FR2 initial access should be the basic framework with 120 kHz PRACH and 120/240 kHz SSB. |
| CATT | We agree to use FR2 initial access as the principle. Enhancement, e.g., support 64 beam sweeping for the operation in unlicensed spectrum, could be considered.  |
| Apple | Same view as FutureWei |

##### Moderator summary of comments received:

* Some companies commented in order to enable single SCS deployments, the supported SCS of SSB should be the same the data/control SCS.
* Some companies commented use of 120 kHz and/or 240 kHz SCS for SSB is preferred as existing NR design can be reused.
* Some companies commented that when 480 kHz or 960 kHz SCS is used for data/control, use of 120 kHz or 240 kHz for SSB SCS is beneficial from coverage perspective. One company noted that SSB has one the largest coverages compared other channels for the same SCS, and larger coverage for SSB is not needed.
* One company noted SSB SCS above 240 kHz should be considered when factoring into account receiver complexity to handle initial frequency offset.
* Some companies commented for 120kHz and 240kHz SSB SCS, re-use of existing NR design for SSB patterns and SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns is preferred.
* One company commented SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern 2 and 3 provide limited symbols for system information transmissions are not suitable for practical system information payload sizes.
* Companies commented the FR2 initial access framework could be the basis for initial access for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.

##### 2nd round of Discussion:

Based on discussions above, moderator has put together some bullets that could be used for further discussion and conclusions/observations. If there are other statement that companies believe would be useful to conclude and agree, please provide your suggestions as well.

1. Some companies noted SSB SCS selection should consider SCS of data/control channels and enablement of single subcarrier spacing operation.
2. Some companies noted use of support and use of 120 kHz and/or 240 kHz SCS for SSB and 120 kHz subcarrier spacing for CORESET#0 in initial BWP and activation of dedicated BWP with 120 or 240 kHz SSB with an SCS for data/control different than the initial BWP may enable re-use of existing NR specification and minimize standardization effort.
3. [It was identified to further investigate considerations of SSB patterns, if needed, considering:]
	1. unlicensed band operation if LBT is required for SSB, e.g. SSB cycling transmission within a DRS transmission window.
	2. Beam switching time between SSB,
	3. Coverage of SSB
	4. Minimum bandwidth requirements for intial access
4. [It is observed that SSB is not as affected by phase noise compared to PDSCH/PUSCH just from performance perspective.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics | We suggest to add the consideration of SSB pattern suitable for unlicensed band operation, e.g., SSB cycling transmission withini a DRS transmission window. |
| Nokia, NSB | If LBT is used for SSB, we share the same view as LG that additional transmission opportunities for the SSB could be considered within a DRS transmission window.With respect to 3) we do not support, as capacity of PDSCH depends on minimum supported channel BW |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We suggest to add that new SSB pattern could be considered for higher SCS (beyond 240kHz) by taking into account the coverge issue and minimum channel BWAlso, agree with LG’s and Nokia’s suggestion |
| Futurewei | We support Moderators first two observations.For the third one we propose FFS as the supported channel BW is not discussed yet. |
| Qualcomm | We are generally fine with 1) and 2). For 3), as Nokia and Futurewei commented, the issue is dependent on the minimun and initial bandwidth selection. Thus it would be removed or revised to clarify that it is contingent to the minimum channel bandwidth discussion. |
| InterDigital | We are also fine with 1) and 2). 3) can be considered as FFS. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support 1) and 2), and share Nokia’s view on 3).  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We share similar views with LG, i.e. adding the consideration of SSB patterns/positions within a DRS transmission window.In addition, we support the bullet 1) and 2). 3) can be deleted or leave it as FFS since the channel BW is not decided yet. |
| Vivo | Fine with 1) and 2) but doesn’t agree with 3.  |
| Apple | For (3), given the small number of Ues per beam, we may be required to transmit up to the 64 SSBs. Using pattern 1 will require multiple symbols per SS/PBCH transmission which may increase overall overhead. FD multiplexing of pattern 3 may be better in this case.On the use of SSB within a DRS window, this may not be necessary if we decide on using short control signaling without LBT. We may need to make a decision on this or have both options in any text that is written. |
| Samsung | For 2), it’s not straightforward to conclude the specification impact is small. For example, if only supporting FR2 SCS of SSBs, but supporting a new SCS for CORESET#0 (e.g. 480 kHz or 960 kHz), RAN1 may need to design the CORESET#0 configuration for mixed numerology, which could be harder than supporting CORESET#0 configuration with single new numerology. In this sense, 2) is only true when the proposing companies only support (SSB\_SCS, COREST#0\_SCS) = (120 kHz, 120 kHz) or (240 kHz, 120 kHz), otherwise the specification cannot be reused. For 3), it’s not correct to conclude there is issue with coverage. One aspect is mentioned above (i.e., BW), and another aspect is the periodicity for Pattern 2/3 can be smaller than Pattern 1, so there could be more PDSCH combining within a TTI of RMSI for Pattern 2/3.  |
| MediaTek | Support 1) and 2), and share Qualcomm’s view on 3). |
| Moderator | Updated the proposal based on comments received. Updated the proposals to avoid using the term ”RAN1 recommends” as the TR should not only include aspects recommended by RAN1.Removed (3) based on comments received and added (4) based on LG’s comments. |
| Ericsson | Regarding point 3), we point out that with current specifications, the number of PRBs supported for CORESET0 are either 24 or 48 for Patterns 2 and 3. Hence, multiplexing of SSB (20 PRBs) and CORESET0/RMSI requires minimum 44 PRBs. If the minimum bandwidth is 400 MHz, there are 35 or fewer PRBs for 960 kHz SCS, which is insufficient for FDM multiplexing.Regarding Samsung’s comments, it is feasible to operate with an initial BWP supporting (120,120) or (240,120) for (SSB,CORESET0) SCS supported by existing specifications and then switch to a dedicated BWP based on higher numerology for data/control based on data rate need.We do not agree with Point 4). It has not been demonstrated that a DRS window is needed in the first place. System simulations from multiple companies have shown that the performance with LBT is worse than without LBT, since the interference level is rarely above the -47 dB ED threshold. Moreover, SSB transmissions can fall under the the classification of short control signaling as defined in ETSI BRAN (EN 302 567), and can proceed without LBT as long as it does not exceed 10% within a 100 ms observation period. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agreed in our earlier response with the observation on performance from the moderator’s earlier summary. We are not sure why it is no longer proposed: ”General consensus is that just from performances perspective, SSB is not as affected by phase noise compared to PDSCH/PUSCH”Perhaps this set of observations could also capture the specification effort for various combinations of SCS for SSB and CORESET0.Item 4) : typo unlicened |
| LG Electronics | Agree with updated Moderator’s proposal with editing typo as Huawei pointed out.Response to Ericsson regarding item 4): Under the other thread (8.2.2), it has been discussed (but not converged) whether to fallback to LBT mode even for regions where where no LBT is mandated, and whether to introduce additional restriction to allow no LBT for short control signaling. If there is a concern for item 4), we can slightly modify as follows:4) It was identified to further investigate considerations of SSB patterns suitable for unlicened band operation if LBT is required for SSB, e.g. SSB cycling transmission within a DRS transmission window. |
| Sony | Agree with Lenovo that as for higher SCS, e.g. 480kHz or 960kHz, new SSB pattern should be considered not only due to DRS transmission window, but also beam switching time.  |
| CATT | If LBT is required for SSB, the number of SSB transmission opportunity needs to increase in order to support up to 64 beams in SID.The beam switching time needs to be considered in the SSB pattern design in order to support SSB beam sweeping. |
| Nokia, NSB |  OK with the FL proposal and with LG update to 4) |
| Moderator | Updated based on comments. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We propose following update to bullet 4)1. **It was identified to further investigate considerations of SSB patterns considering:**
* **Unlicensed band operation if LBT is required for SSB, e.g. SSB cycling transmission within a DRS transmission window**
* **Beam switching time between SSBs, coverage issue with higher SCS (if agreed), minimum badwidth requirement for initial access**
 |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s updated proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal. |
| OPPO | Agree with the updated Moderator’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Comment #1:Regarding bullet 2), we are not okay to remove the "even if data/control channel may have different SCS". Our thinking is that, as in Rel-15, 120/240 kHz SSB + 120 kHz RMSI can be supported in an initial BWP and 120/240 kHz SSB can be supported on a dedicated BWP with higher numerology.1. Some companies noted use of support and use of 120 kHz and/or 240 kHz SCS for SSB and 120 kHz subcarrier spacing for CORESET#0 in an initial BWP and activation of dedicated BWP with 120/240 kHz SSB with an SCS for data/control different than the initial BWP may enable re-use of existing NR specification and minimize standardization effort.

Comment #2:Regarding bullet 4, we prefer to remove this bullet, but if companies still wish to investigate, then we propose the following instead, since even if LBT is required for SSB, it is not clear that the introduction of a DRS window is beneficial1. It was identified to further investigate whether or not considerations of SSB patterns suitable for unlicensed band operation are needed if LBT is required for SSB, e.g. SSB cycling transmission within a DRS transmission window.
 |
| InterDigital | Generally fine with the updated proposal, however, we are not fine with the bullet 4). In our view, necessity of SSB enhancement is not general observation, but proposal from some companies. In addition, rather than capturing all possible examples as shown in the comment from Lenovo, we prefer to focus on the topic. Based on our views, we propose following update on bullet 4)Some companies proposed to further investigate considerations of SSB patterns suitable for unlicensed band operation if LBT is required for SSB. |
| Futurewei |  We are OK with Moderator’s latest proposal with the updated bullet 4) proposed by Ericsson. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Ericsson’s update to 4). The other parts from Moderator is ok.  |
| Nokia | Agree with updated Moderator proposal. With respect to Lenovo proposal. Coverage is scenario dependent. nothing needs to be further investigated. For beam switching delay, we could ask RAN4 to check if R15 maximum beam switching time is possible to reduce based on current status of technology.We are OK with Ericsson updated to 2) and 4) |
| Apple 2  | Minor edits:1. may enable re-use of existing the NR specification and minimize the standardization effort.

Some companies noted use of support and use of 120 kHz and/or 240 kHz SCS:Not sure what this means … us of 120 KHz or support of 120 kHz ?Edit: performance~~s~~ perspective |
| MediaTek | For bullet 2), we prefer the previous wording where CORESET#0 SCS related aspect is not explicitly mentioned and consider Ericsson’s latest comment as an example. In our view, even SSB and other channels have different SCSs, the spec impact of applying exising SSB SCS is still relatively less than the case where new SSB SCS in introduced, e.g., SSB pattern design. Therefore, we suggest the following modification on 2)1. Some companies noted use of support and use of 120 kHz and/or 240 kHz SCS for SSB (even if data/control channel may have different SCS) ~~and 120 kHz subcarrier spacing for CORESET#0~~ may enable re-use of existing NR specification and minimize standardization effort at least in the case of 120 kHz and/or 240 kHz SCS for SSB in an initial BWP and activation of dedicated BWP with 120/240 kHz SSB with an SCS for data/control different than the initial BWP.

Regarding 5), didn’t we already capture similar observation as an agreement in 8.2.3? Do we need to capture 5) here again? Agreement:Capture the following observations in the TR (updates to references and other editorial modifications can be made for inclusion in the TR):7 sources ([61, Ericsson], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [64, OPPO], [21, Apple], [25, NTT DOCOMO], [12, Intel]) reported evaluation results of PSS/SSS detection performance in terms of SINR in dB achieving cell ID detection probability of 90% by one-shot detection from PSS/SSS. 4 sources ([61, Ericsson], [26, Qualcomm], [56, vivo], [21, Apple]) reported PBCH performance in terms of SINR in dB achieving PBCH BLER target of 10%. 2 sources ([5, vivo], [14, 61, Ericsson]) compared link budget of SSB for different SCS. * For PSS and SSS detection performance, all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 kHz) show comparable performances with the non-optional (non-optional to be replaced by references to channel model in Tables to be added when capturing in TR) channel models and delay spread values.
	+ The performance degrades as the increase of SCS.
	+ Note: The following references are used to derive the observations.
	+ 6 out of 7 sources reported minor performance difference (< or ~ 1 dB) between adjacent SCS for all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 kHz). The other source ([21, Apple]) reported more than 3 dB performance gap of 960 kHz SCS compared to other 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS. It also reported that the gap of 960 kHz increases as the delay spread increases.
* For PBCH BLER performance, all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 KHz) show comparable performances with the non-optional (non-optional to be replaced by references to channel model in Tables to be added when capturing in TR) channel models and delay spread.
	+ The performance degrades as the increase of SCS.
	+ All 4 sources reported minor performance difference (< or ~ 1 dB) between adjacent SCS for all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 KHz).
	+ The performance gap between 120 and 960 kHz is up to ~ 1.8 dB.
* In terms of SSB link budget, smaller SCS have better coverage than larger SCS
	+ The MCL and MIL difference between 120 kHz SCS and 480 kHz SCS is about 5 dB. The MCL and MIL difference between 120 kHz SCS and 960 KHz SCS is about 8 dB.
 |
| Moderator | Updated based on comments reeived. Added brackets [] to indicate further discussion needed. |

##### 3rd round of Discussion:

Based on discussions above, moderator has put together some bullets that could be used for further discussion and conclusions/observations. If there are other statement that companies believe would be useful to conclude and agree, please provide your suggestions as well.

1. Some companies noted SSB SCS selection should consider SCS of data/control channels and enablement of single subcarrier spacing operation.
2. Some companies noted support and use of 120 kHz and/or 240 kHz SCS for SSB and 120 kHz subcarrier spacing for CORESET#0 in initial BWP and activation of dedicated BWP with an SCS for data/control different than the initial BWP may enable re-use of existing NR specification and minimize standardization effort.
3. It was identified to further investigate considerations of SSB patterns, if needed, considering:
	1. unlicensed band operation if LBT is required for SSB, e.g. SSB cycling transmission within a DRS transmission window.
	2. Beam switching time between SSB,
	3. Coverage of SSB
	4. Minimum bandwidth requirements for intial access
4. It is observed that SSB is not as affected by phase noise compared to PDSCH/PUSCH just from performance perspective.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson 3 | Support moderator's updated proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (3) | We agree with moderator’s updated proposal  |
| InterDigital | We support Moderator’s proposal.  |
| NTT DOCOMO 3 | We generally agree with moderator’s updated proposal. Just an editorial correction for (2):2) Some companies noted support and use of 120 kHz and/or 240 kHz SCS for SSB and 120 kHz subcarrier spacing for CORESET#0 in initial BWP and activation of dedicated BWP with 120 or 240 kHz SSB with an SCS for data/control different than the initial BWP may enable re-use of existing NR specification and minimize standardization effort. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s updated proposal + updates from NTT DOCOMO |
| Nokia, NSB | Support FL proposal |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Moderator’s updated proposal. |
| Moderator | (2) is a copy of paste from one of the earlier TPs. Updated to have the text aligned. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the updated proposal by moderator |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Moderator’s updated proposal. |
| OPPO | Agree the proposal |
| Apple | Agree with Moderator’s proposal |
| Ericsson 4 | Support the Moderator's proposal |
| LG Electronics | Support the Moderator’s proposal. |
| MediaTek | Regarding bullet 4), although more detailed observation has been captured as an agreement (shown in our previous comment), we are ok to capture the same observation again here if majority of companies are fine with it. However, we prefer to add one more agreed observation as follows:4) It is observed that SSB is not as affected by phase noise compared to PDSCH/PUSCH just from performance perspective. It is also observed that the performance degrades as the increase of SCS. |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with modorator’s updated proposal. |
| Moderator | For Mediatek comment on performance degradation, I am not sure if this is actually true. All evaluations show similar performance for different SCS for SSB (see below).* For PSS and SSS detection performance, all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 kHz) show comparable performances with the non-optional (non-optional to be replaced by references to channel model in Tables to be added when capturing in TR) channel models and delay spread values.
	+ The performance degrades as the increase of SCS.
	+ Note: the following is reference when derive the observations.
	+ 6 out of 7 sources reported minor performance difference (< or ~ 1 dB) between adjacent SCS for all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 kHz). The other source ([21, Apple]) reported more than 3 dB performance gap of 960 kHz SCS compared to other 120, 240 and 480 kHz SCS. It also reported that the gap of 960 kHz increases as the delay spread increases.
* For PBCH BLER performance, all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 KHz) show comparable performances with the non-optional (non-optional to be replaced by references to channel model in Tables to be added when capturing in TR) channel models and delay spread.
	+ The performance degrades as the increase of SCS.
	+ All 4 sources reported minor performance difference (< or ~ 1 dB) between adjacent SCS for all evaluated candidate SCSs (120, 240, 480 and 960 KHz).
	+ The performance gap between 120 and 960 kHz is up to ~ 1.8 dB.
* In terms of SSB link budget, smaller SCS have better coverage than larger SCS
	+ The MCL and MIL difference between 120 kHz SCS and 480 kHz SCS is about 5 dB. The MCL and MIL difference between 120 kHz SCS and 960 KHz SCS is about 8 dB.
 |

##### 4th round of Discussion:

Please provide comments on the proposal.

1. Some companies noted SSB SCS selection should consider SCS of data/control channels and enablement of single subcarrier spacing operation.
2. Some companies noted support and use of 120 kHz and/or 240 kHz SCS for SSB and 120 kHz subcarrier spacing for CORESET#0 in initial BWP and activation of dedicated BWP with an SCS for data/control different than the initial BWP may enable re-use of existing NR specification and minimize standardization effort.
3. It was identified to further investigate considerations of SSB patterns, if needed, considering:
	1. unlicensed band operation if LBT is required for SSB, e.g. SSB cycling transmission within a DRS transmission window.
	2. Beam switching time between SSB,
	3. Coverage of SSB
	4. Minimum bandwidth requirements for intial access
4. It is observed that SSB is not as affected by phase noise compared to PDSCH/PUSCH just from performance perspective.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s proposal  |
| Nokia, NSB | OK with the proposal |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |

## 2.4 PRACH

### 2.4.1 Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [3]:
	+ Proposal 10: For unlicensed band, ZC lengths such 571 and 1151 can be considered for 120 kHz SCS.
	+ Observation 8: Due to the possibility of LBT failure, the support for non-consecutive Ros in the time domain could be beneficial.
* From [5]:
	+ Proposal 4: Format 0-3 with special SCS is not supported and the candidate PRACH numerologies for format A, B and C are the same as the candidate BWP numerologies.
	+ Proposal 7: Both coverage and capacity should be studied for PRACH design with new defined numerology.
	+ Proposal 8: With the usage of higher SCS, the issue of preamble sequence generation needs to be considered to match the certain coverage area.
* From [8]:
	+ Proposal 11: Consider supporting the increasing of symbols in time domain to enhance coverage and the extending of frequency domain by repeating and concatenating the RACH preamble sequence in the unlicensed spectrum.
	+ Observation 3: The current RO configuration of FR2, based on the 60 KHz slot as the basic unit, which supports two slots configuration when SCS is120KHz.
	+ Proposal 12: When the specification supports SCS=240/480 KHz, reusing 120 KHz configuration for each two slots within 60 KHz slot.
* From [10]:
	+ Observation 20: 960 kHz SCS for PRACH can support required range for the indoor scenario.
	+ Proposal 15: Support 960 kHz SCS for PRACH.
	+ Observation 21: Introducing longer sequence lengths for short time domain PRACH preambles, e.g. the ones supported in Rel. 16 NR-U (571 and 1151), would allow transmitting device to achieve 40 dBm EIRP maximum in CEPT scenarios c1 and c2.
	+ Proposal 16: Support PRACH sequence lengths 571 and 1151 for NR above 52.6 GHz.
	+ Observation 22: It would be better to define fixed LBT gap 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 [13]:
	+ Proposal 10: It is preferred to reuse the existed numerology for PRACH.
* From [14]:
	+ Include the following Observation in TR 38.808. Maximum isotropic loss (MIL) and maximum coupling loss (MCL) degrade as the subcarrier spacing is increased, negatively impacting coverage. PRACH 120 kHz SCS is defined for FR2 already in Rel-15 and for the 52.6–71 GHz range yields 4–5 dB better coverage than 480 kHz SCS and 8–9 dB better coverage than 960 kHz SCS.
	+ If PRACH uses 120 kHz SCS, data transmission can still use higher subcarrier spacings through BWP switching.
	+ Reuse existing FR2 PRACH subcarrier spacing of 120 kHz for 52.6–71 GHz.
	+ Include the following observation in TR 38.808: For operation in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band, it is beneficial to support all existing Rel-15/16 sequence lengths L = 139/571/1151 to allow for larger transmit powers in some scenarios depending on the assumed beamforming gain, regulatory regime, and UE power limits.
	+ Support PRACH with sequence lengths L = 139/571/1151 (as defined for FR2 in Rel-15/16) for 52.6–71 GHz.
	+ Reuse FR2 PRACH configuration tables for 52.6–71 GHz.
	+ Include the following observation in TR 38.808. It is not beneficial to optimize RACH configurations to enable LBT gaps between back-to-back PRACH occasions in the same slot for operation in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band.
* From [15]:
	+ Proposal #6: Design wide-band PRACH and interlaced or multi-RB based PUSCH/PUCCH considering regulatory requirements such as nominal channel BW, occupied channel BW, maximum allowed output power, and maximum power spectral density.
* From [19]:
	+ Observation 12: it is beneficial to introduce larger SCSs for PRACH transmission.
* From [29]:
	+ Proposal 7: When a large subcarrier spacing is defined, PRACH configuration related aspects need to be investigated.
* From [30]:
	+ Observation 2: The LBT result of the selected RO is highly relying on the usage of previous RO.
	+ Observation 3: The consecutive configuration of RO could further increase the LBT failure probability
	+ Proposal 5: Non-consecutive RO configuration is beneficial for alleviating the RACH LBT failure, and shall be supported for 60 GHz unlicensed band.
* From [31]:
	+ Proposal 5: For PRACH sequence, short PRACH sequence supported in Rel-15 NR should be a baseline.

### 2.4.2 Discussions

##### Moderator Summary of observations and proposals from Contributions:

* There are several sub-issues: (1) supported PRACH SCS, (2) RACH RO configuration, (3) Supported PRACH sequence lengths, (4) support of interlace PRACH
	+ Note: there may be other issues not listed above. The above are few outstanding issues that moderator noted and does not hint higher priority or otherwise.

###### Company Comments on PRACH and related issues (including specification impact, single numerology operation, implementation complexity, scenario enablement, etc):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Use longer PRACH sequences 571/1151, support non-consecutive RO with fixed (short) LBT , prefer SCS of 240 kHz for PRACH  |
| Nokia, NSB | We believe that answers here are dependent on whether mixed SCS deployments are preferred or not, but (1) we do support 960kHz for PRACH, (2) RACH RO depends on whether short control signals will require LBT or not (3) both long and short PRACH from 5GHz should be supported, (4) Do not support interlace for PRACH |
| Lenovo/MotorolaMobility | Considering coverage aspects, enhancements to PRACH could be considered |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Considering coverage, 120 kHz SCS is recommended for PRACH. ZC lengths such 571 and 1151 that are already supported for NR-U in FR1 can be extended to 120 kHz SCS for FR2. The impact of LBT on the interval of RO should be considered. |
| Ericsson | As demonstrated in evaluations, PRACH coverage degrades significantly as SCS increases. Hence, in our view 120 kHz PRACH is sufficient. The longer sequence lengths 571/1151 can be useful to increase Tx power under a PSD constraint (if UE conducted power is not limiting). |
| Qualcomm | We support the same numerologies for PRACH and other channels, i.e., 120kHz and 960kHz.For the preamble length selection, the consideration of max EIRP/PSD limit in the unlicensed band and the consideration of coverage should be balanced. Thus, longer sequence length, e.g., 571, with existing preamble format A, B, and C can be considered. Also, we don’t see any strong motivation for interaced PRACH. |
| MediaTek | Similar to SSB aspect, we prefer single numerology operation. Longer PRACH sequence can be considered to address coverage issue. However, interlace design for PRACH is not preferred. |
| CATT | The numerology of PRACH should be same as SSB and other physical channels. Considering narrow beam operation and higher SCS in 52.6-71 GHz, RACH format with coverage extension should be considered.  |
| Samsung | Similar comment, it is necessary to support the feasibility of using single numerology for implementation. In this sense, if a new SCS is supported for UL data/signal, it should also be supported for PRACH. In addition, we understand the non-consecutive RO should be included in the “ (2) RACH RO configuration”, otherwise, it should be separately listed.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Interlaced allocation is NOT necessary in our view as it is not mandatory to always ensure OCB requirement in unlicensed band. The other aspects are debatable and we are quite open at this stage. Our current views are (1) ok to support PRACH of higher SCS and (3) configurable PRACH sequence length could be beneficial.  |
| LG Electronics | At least, 120 kHz PRACH should be supported. If new SCS larger than 120 kHz is introduced for UL signal/channel, RACH with that new SCS also can be considered. |
| Intel | Uplink coverage bottleneck among channels supported in NR (with the same SCS) is bottlenecked by PRACH but other channels such as PUSCH, and possible PUCCH (with PSD limitations).Therefore, from our understanding the use case supporting (significantly) different SCS for PRACH compared to data/control transmission does not exist.Therefore, we prefer to support of the same SCS for PRACH as data/control.Support of longer sequences (such as 571 or 1151) may have additional benefits from larger transmis power (under the presence of PSD limitation), therefore we suggest to also support longer sequences (L=571, 1151) in addition to L=137.If longer sequences for PRACH is supported we do not see the need to support interlace PRACH transmission. |
| OPPO | We support reusing current 120kHz PRACH. Regarding PRACH transmission in active BWP, new SCS, e.g., 960 kHz can be considered. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer single numerology for PRACH and other channels. To this end, if a new SCS is intrdouced for UL signal/channel, it should be also supported for PRACH. |
| Vivo | Prefer single numerology for PRACH and data/control channels. Long sequence could be supported for high transmission power. No need to support interlace PRACH transmission |

##### Moderator summary of comments received:

* Some companies suggested to use longer PRACH sequences such as L=571 and L=1151 to benefit from higher transmit power when PSD limits apply.
* Some companies suggested supporting non-consecutive RO to aid LBT.
* Some companies noted interlace design for PRACH is not necessary.
* Some companies suggested using same numerology for PRACH and other uplink channels.
* Some companies commented that 120 kHz PRACH would be sufficient even if other channel may use different subcarrier spacing.

##### 2nd round of Discussion:

Based on discussions above, moderator has put together some bullets that could be used for further discussion and conclusions/observations. If there are other statement that companies believe would be useful to conclude and agree, please provide your suggestions as well.

1. In order to benefit from higher transmit power when maximum PSD regulatory requirements exist, RAN1 recommends support of longer PRACH sequence lengths, L=571 and L=1151, defined in Rel-16 NR specification, to be used for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
2. It is recommended to not support interlace design for PRACH for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
3. [It is recommended to further investigate support configurations that enablenon-consecutive RACH occasions in time domainto aid LBT processes if LBT is required.]
4. Some companies noted that PRACH SCS selection should consider SCS of data/control channels and enablement of single subcarrier spacing operation.
5. Some companies noted that 120 kHz SCS for PRACH (even if data/control channel may have different SCS) may be sufficient to support NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz [from coverage perspective].
6. [It was identified that potential enhancements for PRACH should consider system coverage for PRACH with subcarrier spacing larger than 120 kHz, if supported.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | 3) RAN1 recommends support of non-consecutive RACH occasion (in time) configurations to aid LBT processes when LBT is required |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with Nokia’s proposed update.Also propose to add new bullet:* If higher SCS is agreed to be supported for PRACH, then enhancements should be considered by taking into account the coverage for PRACH
 |
| Futurewei | Agree with Moderator recommendations and Nokia’s update. |
| Qualcomm | According to the companies’ view during the 1st round of discussion, the main motivation of supporting 120kHz PRACH only seems to be the coverage. Thus, it could be clarified:1) Some companies noted that 120 kHz SCS for PRACH (even if data/control channel may have different SCS) may be sufficient to support NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz from the perspective of coverage. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with Moderator’s proposals.  |
| LG Electronics | We agree with Moderator’s proposals + updates from Nokia and Qualcomm. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We agree with Moderator’s proposals + updates from Nokia and Qualcomm. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 1. RAN1 recommends ~~support~~ further study of non-consecutive RACH occasion (in time) configurations to aid LBT processes when LBT is required

We agree with Nokia’s updates, but we don’t see common support on non-consecutive RACH occasion configurations, it may depend on different conditions(e.g. whether LBT is required or not), so we suggest that we need to further study the benefit and spec impact to see if we should introduce non-consecutive RO configuration in 60GHz. |
| Vivo | We agree with Moderator’s proposals + updates from Nokia and Qualcomm. |
| MediaTek | We agree with Moderator’s proposals + updates from Nokia. Regarding Qualcomm’s update, we don’t think specifying the coverage aspect is necessary and we prefer to keep the original moderator’s proposal.  |
| Moderator | Updated the proposal based on comments received. Updated the proposals to avoid using the term ”RAN1 recommends” as the TR should not only include aspects recommended by RAN1. |
| Ericsson | We disagree with point 3) on support of non-consecutive RACH occasions. As observed by almost all companies in the channel access discussion, PRACH transmission from a UE falls under the classification of short control signaling as defined in ETSI BRAN (EN 302 567), and can proceed without LBT as long as it does not exceed 10% within a 100 ms observation period. Given this, and the fact that selft deferral due to interference exceeding the LBT threshold has been shown by many companies to be rare, it is not beneficial to design for LBT gaps between RACH occasions.We disagree with the broad formulation of point 6). It should be predicated on if single numerology operation is supported, and if PRACH SCS with greater than 120 kHz SCS is supported. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderato’s proposal  |
| Sony | Agree with 3) on non-consecutive RACH occasion.  |
| CATT | Agree with moderator’s proposal |
| Nokia, NSB |  Again, 3) is clearly stating when LBT is required , not sure what is Ericsson’s concernOn 6) Coverage requirements are deployment specific, but we could consider RACH enhancements for higher SCS later in work item. |
| Moderator | Put (3) and (6) in brackets. Suggest to further discuss in GTW. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with updated proposal from moderator |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal. |
| OPPO | Agree with the updated Moderator’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Our preference is to remove bullets 3 and 6.However, if companies still want to discuss further, then we think the following is a better starting point for discussion. For point 3, even if LBT is required, it is still not clear that LBT gaps are beneficial.1. [It is recommended to further investigate whether or not to support configurations that enablenon-consecutive RACH occasions in time domainto aid LBT processes ~~when~~ if LBT is required.]
2. [It was identified that potential enhancements for PRACH should consider system coverage for PRACH with subcarrier spacing larger than 120 kHz, if supported.]
 |
| Futurewei |  We support moderator’s proposal with the updates for bullet 3) proposed by Ericsson, as there is no clear evidence that such configurations are necessary for the LBT process. |
| NTT DOCOMO |  We support moderator’s proposal with the updates for bullet 3) proposed by Ericsson. |
| Nokia | We are fine with the Steve’s updates |
| Moderator | Updated based on comment. Suggest to further discuss (3) and (6). |

##### 3rd round of Discussion:

Based on discussions above, moderator has put together some bullets that could be used for further discussion and conclusions/observations. If there are other statement that companies believe would be useful to conclude and agree, please provide your suggestions as well.

1. In order to benefit from higher transmit power when maximum PSD regulatory requirements exist, RAN1 recommends support of longer PRACH sequence lengths, L=571 and L=1151, defined in Rel-16 NR specification, to be used for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
2. It is recommended to not support interlace design for PRACH for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
3. It is recommended to further investigate whether or not to support configurations that enable non-consecutive RACH occasions in time domainto aid LBT processes if LBT is required.
4. Some companies noted that PRACH SCS selection should consider SCS of data/control channels and enablement of single subcarrier spacing operation.
5. Some companies noted that 120 kHz SCS for PRACH (even if data/control channel may have different SCS) may be sufficient to support NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz [from coverage perspective].
6. It was identified that potential enhancements for PRACH should consider system coverage for PRACH with subcarrier spacing larger than 120 kHz, if supported.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson 3 | For the reasons provided in our comments above (rare deferral due to LBT, and the applicability of short control signaling (SCS) provisions in ETSI BRAN), our first preference is to remove bullet 3). However, if this is not agreeable, we prefer to add the following wording:[It is recommended to further investigate whether or not to support configurations that enable non-consecutive RACH occasions in time domain to aid LBT processes if LBT is required.] |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (3) | We agree with moderator’s proposal and are fine with suggested addition by Ericsson to bullet 3 |
| InterDigital | We support Moderator’s proposal and are fine with the update from Ericsson. |
| NTT DOCOMO 3  | We agree with moderator’s propsoal with Ericsson’s update.  |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s updated proposal + updates from Ericsson |
| Nokia, NSB | Remove square brackets, otherwise, OK with the FL proposal |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Moderator’s updated proposal with Ericsson’s suggested change. |
| Moderator | Updated based on coments received. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the updated proposal by moderator |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with moderator’s updated propsoal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It may be obvious, but for clarity we could add “uplink” before “data/control channel” in bullets 4 and 5 |
| OPPO | Agree with Ericsson’s modification |
| Apple | Agree with Moderator’s updated proposal. Fix Typo’s in the following (essentially add spacing where needed):It is recommended to further investigate whether or not to support configurations that enablenon-consecutive RACH occasions in time domainto aid LBT processes if LBT is required. |
| Moderator | Corrected spacing typo. |
| Ericsson 4 | Support Moderator’s updated proposal |
| LG Electronics | Support the Moderator’s proposal. |

##### 4th round of Discussion:

Please provide comments on the following proposal.

1. In order to benefit from higher transmit power, when maximum PSD regulatory requirements exist, RAN1 recommends support of longer PRACH sequence lengths, L=571 and L=1151, defined in Rel-16 NR specification, to be used for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
2. It is recommended to not support interlace design for PRACH for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
3. It is recommended to further investigate whether or not to support configurations that enable non-consecutive RACH occasions in time domainto aid LBT processes if LBT is required.
4. Some companies noted that PRACH SCS selection should consider SCS of data/control channels and enablement of single subcarrier spacing operation.
5. Some companies noted that 120 kHz SCS for PRACH (even if data/control channel may have different SCS) may be sufficient to support NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz [from coverage perspective].
6. It was identified that potential enhancements for PRACH should consider system coverage for PRACH with subcarrier spacing larger than 120 kHz, if supported.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s proposal  |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |

## 2.5 PDCCH

### 2.5.1 PDCCH – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [5]:
	+ Proposal 9: Coverage enhancement mechanism such as PDCCH repetition should be studied for PDCCH design especially for high SCS.
* From [7]:
	+ Proposal 7: Study channel estimation performance impact of PDCCH and PUCCH with a larger subcarrier spacing.
* From [10]:
	+ Proposal 23: Support improved PDCCH coverage for the cases of high SCS.
* From [14]:
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: For operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz, it is beneficial to support UE PDCCH processing capabilities per multi-slot monitoring period that scale with the size of the monitoring period when the UE is configured with a monitoring period larger than a slot.
* From [19]:
	+ Observation 11: it is beneficial to increase symbols and reduce RBs for the CORESET configuration for a given large SCS if introduced.

### 2.5.2 PDCCH Monitoring – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [2]:
	+ Observation 12: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, then the PDCCH monitoring capability would be further reduced and the number of PDCCH candidates per slot would be lower.
	+ Observation 13: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, then the PDCCH processing in every slot might not be scalable with increasing subcarrier spacing, due to limitations with UE processing capability.
* From [3]:
	+ Observation 10: Detection probability of PDCCH may decrease for 960 kHz with the limited maximum number of non-overlapped CCEs per slot which may be lower than 16.
* From [10]:
	+ Observation 25: For high SCS, such as 960 kHz and above, PDCCH monitoring capabilities, and especially channel estimation capability of number of unique CCEs per slot is expected to reduce below tolerable limit.
	+ Proposal 17: Increase of the minimum scheduling/ PDCCH monitoring unit to avoid excessive increase in PDCCH monitoring rate and excessive reduction in per-slot monitoring capabilities.
	+ Proposal 18: Determine BD/CCE limits based on nominal scheduling/monitoring unit such as slot of e.g. 120kHz (defined in R15)/240kHz (FFS).
	+ Observation 26: GC-PDCCH is an essential part of unlicensed system, and there seems to be need to supportbeam-dependent information, particularly if some form of directional LBT is chosen as coexistence mechanism.
	+ Proposal 19: Changes to DCI format 2\_0 may be beneficial for at least unlicensed 60GHz NR operation.
* From [15]:
	+ Proposal #7: It would be beneficial in terms of UE implementation complexity or power consumption to perform slot(or symbol)-group level processing instead of every slot(or symbol) processing, e.g. PDCCH monitoring and CSI processing unit availability check.
* From [20]:
	+ Observation 4: The increase of SCS causes frequent PDCCH monitoring, which is not desirable for the UE power consumption.
* From [21]:
	+ Proposal 13: To reduce PDCCH monitoring complexity, reduce the limits per slot or define PDCCH monitoring limits over a group of slots.
	+ Proposal 14: Use beam cycling to improve the coverage of PDCCH with gaps between CORESETs to account for any beam-switching times.
* From [22]:
	+ Proposal 3: The enhancement for PDCCH monitoring for 52.6-71GHz should also consider the requirements from PDSCH scheduling.
* From [23]:
	+ Proposal 3: For new SCS, if agreed, the following aspects should be prioritized to address UE PDCCH monitoring complexity concerns.
		- investigation on the maximum number of BDs/CCEs for PDCCH monitoring per slot
		- potential limitation to PDCCH monitoring configurations, e.g., ks=1 and Ts>1 in search space set configuration
		- related UE capabilities for PDCCH monitoring and processing
* From [29]:
	+ Proposal 9: When a large subcarrier spacing is defined, maximum number of BDs/CCEs for PDCCH monitoring needs to be investigated.
* From [30]:
	+ Proposal 7: RAN1 shall study the mechanism to reduce PDCCH monitoring burden at UE side for new numerology.

### 2.5.3 DCI Formats – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [2]:
	+ Proposal 9: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, then consider enhancements to current PDCCH design that includes the following possibilities:
		- To introduce new single DCI format that could simultaneously schedule DL transmission and UL grants for one or more transmission time intervals
		- To limit the monitoring to PDCCH in slots when the UE receives a multi-slot scheduling grant
* From [4]:
	+ Observation 1: The current DCI 0-2/1-2 can be reused to allow frequency domain resource by multi-PRB granularity.
* From [6]:
	+ Proposal 2: If time domain scheduling enhancements for PDSCH is needed, multi-PDSCH scheduled by one DCI should be supported for less standardization workload.
* From [7]:
	+ Observation 8: If the maximum FFT size of Rel-15/16 is kept, it is observed that maximum number of RBs and required payloads of DCI for frequency domain resource allocation do not increase.
* From [10]:
	+ Proposal 20: Support Multi-PDSCH DCI for reaching peak data-rates for the cases of high SCSs
		- R16 Multi-PUSCH DCI design principle shall be the starting point.
* From [13]:
	+ Proposal 12: The combination of multi-PDSCH scheduled by one DCI and enhanced dynamic HARQ-ACK codebook and one-shot HARQ-ACK feedback should be studied.
* From [14]:
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: For operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz it is beneficial to support scheduling multiple PDSCH using one DCI by extending the multi-PUSCH scheduling feature introduced in Rel-16 to the scheduling of multiple PDSCH using one DCI in Rel-17
* From [15]:
	+ Proposal #8: Consider to support multi-PDSCH scheduling by a single DCI.
* From [20]:
	+ Proposal 3: Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling by one DCI should be supported for NR above 52.6 GHz.
* From [28]:
	+ Proposal 1: Consider enhanced multi-carrier operation where a single DCI can schedule multiple cells, including Scells with a dormant BWP, for energy-efficient and low-latency NR performance.
* From [30]:
	+ Proposal 8: RAN1 shall study more flexible resource allocation in both time and frequency domain for different scenarios, including increasing the time-domain scheduling unit to be larger than one symbol, multi-PDSCH scheduling by one DCI, one TB mapped to multiple slots and subcarrier bundling/sub-PRB.

### 2.5.4 Discussions

##### Moderator Summary of observations and proposals from Contributions:

* Many discussions and issue seem to be dependent on supported SCS, and BD and UE complexity.
* Several companies discussed PDCCH monitoring issue for larger subcarrier spacing and need to provide enhancements to conserve UE complexity/power.
* One company noted that it may be beneficial to support UE PDCCH processing capabilities per multi-slot monitoring period that scale with the size of the monitoring period when the UE is configured with a monitoring period larger than a slot.

###### Company Comments on PDCCH:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | The use of SCS (240kHz) can provide enough coverage for PDCCH. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Increased number of symbols for CORESET should be considered. Also, based on the channel estimation performance for PDCCH, CORESET design in terms of DM-RS pattern should be investigated |
| InterDigital | In our view, if new SCSs are supported, at least supporting same SCSs between PDCCH and PDSCH should be considered.  |
| Qualcomm | We support the same numerologies for data and control, i.e., 120kHz and 960kHz. Regarding the view on the PDCCH coverage enhancement, we think it should be handled in the CE session. Also, since PDCCH uses QPSK and relatively robost to chanel estimation error, we don’t think the PDCCH DMRS enhancement is critical, compared to the cases of PDSCH/PUSCH with high MCSs. |
| CATT | If the narrow beamforming operation is used for NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz, the number of CORESETs could be extended to support dynamic beam switching of PDCCH.  |
| Apple | We are fine with same numerology for data and PDCCH. |
| Vivo | In our view, PDCCH coverage enhancement should be considered here, e.g. increase the number of Coreset symbols or PDCCH repetition. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support improved PDCCH coverage for the case of a high SCS. Both single numerology (i.e. increased number of symbols available for PDCCH) and mixed numerology (i.e. different SCS for PDCCH and PDSCH) approaches can be considered.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | oderato Nokia view that mixed numerology can be considered to ensure PDCCH coverage.  |
| MediaTek | oderato the same view with Qualcomm on single numerology for data and channel and PDCCH coverage. We think the coverage issue needs to be justified with evaluation result first in order to discuss the potential coverage enhacnement. |

###### Company Comments on PDCCH Monitoring:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Reducing PDCCH monitoring to reduce UE monitoring complexity should be supported |
| Lenovo/MotorolaMobility | Reduced PDCCH monitoring would be needed for higher SCS, if agreed to be supported. Consider limitations on search space configurations, DCI formats to be monitored and reduced need for PDCCH monitoring on consecutive slots. |
| Qualcomm | For higher SCS, multi-slot-based PDCCH monitoring capability would be discussed to reduce complexity. The span-based PDCCH monitoring capability, which was introduced in Rel-16, can be a baseline. |
| CATT | Current specification is very flexible in configuring UE PDCCH monitoring. If higher SCS is introduced, the number of PDCCH candidates in a slot for blind decoding would be reduced. No additional enhancement is needed.  |
| Apple | Reduced PDCCH monitoring capabilities are essential especially if higher SCS values are chosen. We may (a) reduce PDCCH monitoring per slot or (b) perform PDCCH monitoring over a group of slots. The specifics can be discussed in the WI but depend on the SCSs selected. |
| Vivo | Support PDCCH monitoring capability definition enhancement from slot/mini-slot level to slot group level |
| Convida Wireless | Reducing UE monitoring PDCCH complexity should be studied for higher SCS if supported.  |
| Nokia, NSB | For the case of a high SCS, increase of the minimum scheduling/ PDCCH monitoring unit to avoid excessive increase in PDCCH monitoring rate and excessive reduction in per-slot monitoring capabilities. |
| MediaTek | To achieve reduced PDCCH monitoring, we think existing SS set configuration is well-equipped and futher discussion on the potential configuration limitation is needed. We also support related UE capabilities should be specified. In particualr, per slot and span-based PDCCH monitoring capabilities should be discussed |
| Sony | We support reducing PDCCH monitoring for higher SCS. It would be beneficial to reduce UE power consumption. |

###### Company Comments on DCI Formats:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Support multi-PDSCH scheduling per DCI |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | New DCI format to support both multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH scheduling could be considered |
| InterDigital | In our view, time-domain scheduling enhancement should be considered to reduce the scheduling signal overheads, however, we are not sure that we need to introduce new DCI format for it.  |
| Qualcomm | We support a new DCI format for multi-PDSCH scheduling. |
| CATT | Multi-slot scheduling or slot-aggregation could be considered.  |
| Apple | Support multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCH scheduling |
| vivo | Support new DCI for multi-PDSCH scheduling |
| Convida Wireless | New DCI format can be studied or considered for NR 52.6 -71 GHz.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Support Multi-PDSCH DCI for reaching peak data-rates for the case of a high SCS |
| Sony | Support multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCH scheduling per DCI. |

##### 2nd round of Discussion:

~~Moderator has yet to provide some suggestion for agreement for this topic. Moderator plans to suggestions later. Meanwhile, if companies have suggestions on what RAN1 may be able to agree to and capture to the TR, please comment further.~~

Based on discussions so far, moderator has put together some bullets that could be used for further discussion and conclusions/observations. If there are other statement that companies believe would be useful to conclude and agree, please provide your suggestions as well.

1. It was identified that the potential enhancements to PDCCH monitoring (e.g. reducing the capability of non-overlapped CCE monitoring), multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling ~~with a single DCI~~ with a single DCI (using existing DCI formats or new DCI format(s)), and PDCCH coverage should be further investigated for higher subcarrier spacings, including the need for such enhancements.
2. [It was observed that PDCCH processing capabilities per multiple slots for larger SCS (e.g. 480 or 960 kHz) can maintain scheduling framework same as for smaller SCS (e.g. 120 kHz) when the UE is configured to monitor the PDCCH every multiple slots]
3. [It was identified that the UE PDCCH monitoring capabilities should be further investigated for higher subcarrier spacings.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB |  We added input to first round questions, sorry for delay |
| LG Electronics | * We support the same numerology between PDCCH and PDSCH. In case of mixed numerology of PDCCH and PDSCH, switching time between control and data channels might be necessary, which is similar to BWP switching delay.
* PDCCH coverage issue can be considered if high SCS (e.g., 480 kHz or 960 kHz) is supported.
* PDCCH monitoring per multiple slots can be considered if high SCS (e.g., 480 kHz or 960 kHz) is supported, but this aspect seems to overlap with Section 2.1.2 (3).
* We support a DCI scheduling multiple PDSCH, but it seems to be tied with PDCCH monitoring reduction. In addition, it would be premature to discuss whether a NEW DCI format is needed or not, in order to support multi-PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI.
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | On PDCCH, as we added on the relevant table above (sorry for late), we agree PDCCH coverage should be considered in case of larger SCS. Mixed numerology of PDCCH with smaller SCS and data with larger SCS, or increasing CORESET symbols could be possibility. On the other two tables, we are supportive to discuss what companies described in general.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCH scheduling. |
| MediaTek | We added our view to first round questions. As we mentioned in the first round, we think QPSK has been shown to be robust in >52.6GHz band operation cross different SCS candidates and hence PDCCH coverage issue needs to be identified first with evaluation result before further disucssion on the potential enhacnement. Regarding multi-PDSCH scheudling, in our understanding, this feature is to address scheduling efficiency issue in high SCSs, e.g. 960 kHz, and we don’t think the enhancement is needed at least for 120kHz scenario. Also, as pointed out by LG, multi-PDSCH scheduling is tied to PDCCH reduction and we should first establish better understanding on PDCCH monitoring configuration limitation and related UE monitoring capabitlies before the multi-PDSCH scheudling discussion, including new DCI format for such feature.  |
| Moderator | Added text proposal based on comments received. |
| Ericsson | In reference to the above 3 tables:* We do not see the need to enhance the coverage of PDCCH for SCS up to 480 KHz
* The potential reduction of UE PDCCH processing capabilities per slot impose substantial negative impacts to Rel-17 NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz. The UE PDCCH processing capabilities per multi-slot monitoring period can maintain same scheduling framework and flexibility as in rel-15, when the UE is configured to monitor the PDCCH every B slots

Multi-PDSCH scheduling using single DCI should be supported. However, it is premature to decide if it is a new DCI format or ollowing similar extension as done for rel-16 multi-PUSCH scheduling. Those design details can be left for the WI phase. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t anticipate the need for specific design considerations for PDCCH, except potentially in relation to scheduling enhancements for large SCS like 480 kHz and 960 kHz. |
| Xiaomi | Agree Ericsson on their second bullet about UE PDCCH processing capabilities per multi-slot.Agree to support multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with the moderator’s proposal.Regarding the Ericsson’s comment on PDCCH coverage and new DCI format, we think that the moderator’s proposal clearly states that “including the need for such enhancements”. So, in our opinion, the moderator’s proposal doesn’t imply any decision to support the enhancements, but rather the need for consideration/further investigation |
| Sony | We apologized for the late input. We added our view on 1st round question |
| CATT | The coverage of PDCCH and PDSCH could be extended through beamforming, where multiple PDCCH monitoring with different TCI states would play a important role. We support Moderator’s summary.  |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the following wording from Ericsson*The potential reduction of UE PDCCH processing capabilities per slot impose substantial negative impacts to Rel-17 NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz. The UE PDCCH processing capabilities per multi-slot monitoring period can maintain same scheduling framework and flexibility as in rel-15, when the UE is configured to monitor the PDCCH every B slots*We think that PDCCH coverage enhancement is something to further investigate, this being applicable to both 480 and 960kHz SCS. |
| Moderator | Added (2) (small reformulation of Ericsson’s suggestion) in brackets [It was observed that PDCCH processing capabilities per multiple slots monitoring periods can maintain same scheduling framework when the UE is configured to monitor the PDCCH every multiple slots].Moderator put them in brackets, since its bit difficult to understand the content of “same scheduling framework”. The text talks about processing capability per multiple slots and states it can have same framework, but if the framework for capability is per slot, not sure what same framework the text is referring to. We may need to work on the text bit further. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We prefer the previous version of moderator’s proposal with further update as follows1. **It was identified that the potential enhancements to PDCCH monitoring, multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI (using existing DCI formats or new DCI format(s), if needed), and PDCCH coverage should be further investigated for higher subcarrier spacings, including the need for such enhancements.**

For first bullet, if we remove single DCI, then actually it doesn’t really say much about what enhancements to multi-PDSCH/PUSCH enhancement. Single DCI may or may not mean a new DCI, if that is the concern. Updated accordinglyRegarding second bullet, as moderator pointed out, it is not clear to us what exactly does same scheduling framework mean. It can be quite a wide assumption. |
| LG Electronics | Support Lenovo’s update for the first bullet. For the second bullet, we think it needs to be impoved for clarity, e.g., It was observed that PDCCH processing capabilities per multiple slots for larger SCS (e.g., 480 kHz) can maintain scheduling framework same as for smaller SCS (e.g., 120 kHz) when the UE is configured to monitor the PDCCH every multiple slots |
| Spreadtrum | For the first bullet, we support Lenovo’s update. For the other bullets, we agree with moderator’s updated proposal. |
| OPPO | We support Lenovo’s update for the first bullet with the following updates:1. **It was identified that the potential enhancements to PDCCH monitoring (e.g., reducing the capability of non-overlapped CCE monitoring for a larger SCS, if introduced), multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI (using existing DCI formats or new DCI format(s), if needed), and PDCCH coverage should be further investigated for higher subcarrier spacings, including the need for such enhancements.**
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support Lenovo’s update for the first bullet that ‘with a single DCI’ should be kept, and it can be exitsted DCI formats or new DCI formats.  |
| InterDigital | For the first bullet, we support the updated proposal. For the second bullet, we agree with Ericsson.  |
| Futurewei | We agree with FL’s updated proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Lenovo’s update. Ericsosn’s proposed 2) is ok for us. Or we can say “some companies observed …” at the beginning of 2).  |
| Ercisson | What we meant with “The UE PDCCH processing capabilities per multi-slot monitoring period can maintain same scheduling framework and flexibility as in rel-15, when the UE is configured to monitor the PDCCH every B slots”Is that it should be possible to achieve the same PDCCH processing capability as a smaller SCS when the UE is configured to monitor the PDCCH every B slots, where a B slot duration is equivalent to a slot duration of the smaller SCS. In a sense, UE PDCCH processing capabilities per multi-slot monitoring period scales with the size of the monitoring period.The first bullets says enhancements for multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling using single DCI (if not removed), are we talking about a single DCI that schedules both PDSCH and PUSCH ? or a DCI for each. Maybe that can be clarified. Also enhancements for multiple PDSCH is a bit confusing since it did does not exist before unless we are referring to enhancing the PDSCH repetition. So better to clarify what we meen with enhancements for multiple PDSCH scheduling.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Regarding the clarification on whether single DCI schedules both PDSCH and PUSCH or single DCI for each of them, in our view, both possibilities should be considered at this point and further discussion should be during WI phase when we can decide to go in either direction or both of them.  |
| Nokia | Single DCI shall not be removed |
| Apple  | Agree with Ericsson and Nokia on the need for investigation of the subject matter in the second bullet i.e. multi-slot PDCCH monitoring to manage PDCCH monitoring complexity. We are fine with the first bullet or OPPO’s update. |
| Samsung | We support multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI, but we’re not sure what’s the difference between capturing it under PDCCH and under scheduling (2.6). If here is more about PDCCH design, while 2.6 is more about other scheduling aspects, we support the 1st bullet updated by Lenovo to explicitly address DCI format, and suggest to delete 3-b “applicable DCI format(s) (including potential new formats) for multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH” in section 2.6  For the second bullet, we agree with Ericsson. |
| MediaTek | For the first bullet, ”enhancement to PDCCH monitoring” is not clear to us. In our understanding, the enhancement is referred to reduction of UE PDCCH monitoring. If that’s the case, then restriction of PDCCH monitoring is more clear, e.g., restriction on SS set configuration. If not, then we suggest to add this aspect to the proposal and also clarify the meaning of ”enhancement to PDCCH monitoring.”We also see that the UE PDCCH monitoring capability discussion is missing in the proposal and we are not sure this aspect is part of ”enhancement to PDCCH monitoring.” Therefore, we suggest to add 1. It was identified that the UE PDCCH monitoring capabilities should be further investigated for higher subcarrier spacings.
 |
| Moderator | Updated based on comments. We may need to discuss further on all the bullets. |

##### 3rd round of Discussion:

Based on discussions so far, moderator has put together some bullets that could be used for further discussion and conclusions/observations. If there are other statement that companies believe would be useful to conclude and agree, please provide your suggestions as well.

1. It was identified that the potential enhancements to PDCCH monitoring including potential limitation to UE PDCCH configuration,, multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI (using existing DCI formats or new DCI format(s)), spatial relation management for GC-PDCCH, capability related to PDCCH monitoring, and PDCCH coverage should be further investigated for higher subcarrier spacings, including the need for such enhancements.
2. It was observed that PDCCH processing capabilities per multiple slots for larger SCS (e.g. 480 or 960 kHz) can maintain scheduling framework same as for smaller SCS (e.g. 120 kHz) when the UE is configured to monitor the PDCCH every multiple slots.
3. .

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson 3 | We prefer removing (e.g. reducing the capability of non-overlapped CCE monitoring). Other than that, the proposal looks OK. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (3) | We agree with the moderator’s updated proposal and also fine with suggested update by Ericsson |
| InterDigital | We support Ericsson’s update. |
| NTT DOCOMO 3 | We agree with moderator’s updated proposal Also fine with Ericsson’s update. |
| LG Electronics | Bullet 3) seems overlapped with other bullets. However, we can live with them if majority is fine. |
| Nokia, NSB | (1) Not sure “e.g. reducing the capability of non-overlapped CCE monitoring “ can be called an enhancement. 😊 |
| Qualcomm | We support moderator’s updated proposal. |
| Moderator | Added capability to (1) and removed bullet (3). Deleted the example. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal. |
| OPPO | Agree with FL proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB |  Since GC-PDCCH spatial aspects have been removed under PUCCH section, would be good to capture here instead. To clarify to LG, we copy and paste the section One more issue related to DL control seems to be operation of DCI format 2\_0 in beam based system. In Rel. 15, DCI format 2\_0 contained only SFI, and from SFI point of view, UL and DL direction is clearly beam agnostic due to strong self-coupling between different panels. On the other hand, in R16 DCI format 2\_0 contains also other information, such as COT or SS-group switching trigger, RB-sets. Any of these pieces of information could become beam dependent. However, support for beam-dependent configurations of DCI format 2\_0 is not possible in FR2 currently, UE can be indicated with change of active-TCI, but DCI format 2\_0 PDCCH candidates, payload location remains the same and thus cannot be beam specific. **Observation 26:** *GC-PDCCH is an essential part of unlicensed system, and there seems to be need to supportbeam-dependent information, particularly if some form of directional LBT is chosen as coexistence mechanism.****Proposal 19:*** *Changes to DCI format 2\_0 may be beneficial for at least unlicensed 60GHz NR operation.***Text proposal:** Further potential enhancements to spatial relation management for GC-PDCCH(s) may be considered. |
| Apple | Agree with Moderator’s proposal. Support Nokia’s update. |
| Moderator | Updated based on comments received. |
| LG Electronics | Support the Moderator’s proposal. |
| MediaTek | We support Moderator’s proposal in general with one clarification question on the first bullet. It is still not clear to us the subject of “potential enhancements to PDCCH monitoring.” Does it include the limitation to UE PDCCH monitoring configuration as we agreed in the last meeting to investigate? If so, can we modify the first bullet as: 1. It was identified that the potential enhancements to PDCCH monitoring (e.g. limitation to UE PDCCH monitoring configuration), multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI (using existing DCI formats or new DCI format(s)), spatial relation management for GC-PDCCH, capability related to PDCCH monitoring, and PDCCH coverage should be further investigated for higher subcarrier spacings, including the need for such enhancements.

Otherwise, if potential enhancements to PDCCH monitoring referred to other aspects of enhancements, we prefer to have a separate sentence to include limitation to UE PDCCH monitoring configuration as one of the aspects in the first bullet. |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with oderator’s updated proposal. |
| Moderator | Added suggested text from Mediatek. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal. |

##### 4th round of Discussion:

Please provide comments on the proposal.

1. It was identified that the potential enhancements to PDCCH monitoring including potential limitation to UE PDCCH configuration,, multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI (using existing DCI formats or new DCI format(s)), spatial relation management for GC-PDCCH, capability related to PDCCH monitoring, and PDCCH coverage should be further investigated for higher subcarrier spacings, including the need for such enhancements.
2. It was observed that PDCCH processing capabilities per multiple slots for larger SCS (e.g. 480 or 960 kHz) can maintain scheduling framework same as for smaller SCS (e.g. 120 kHz) when the UE is configured to monitor the PDCCH every multiple slots.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s proposal  |
| Nokia, NSB |  Agree |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |

## 2.6 PDSCH/PUSCH

### 2.6.1 Scheduling Aspects – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [2]:
	+ Proposal 9: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, then consider enhancements to current PDCCH design that includes the following possibilities:
		- To introduce new single DCI format that could simultaneously schedule DL transmission and UL grants for one or more transmission time intervals
		- To limit the monitoring to PDCCH in slots when the UE receives a multi-slot scheduling grant
* From [4]:
	+ Observation 1: The current DCI 0-2/1-2 can be reused to allow frequency domain resource by multi-PRB granularity.
* From [6]:
	+ Proposal 2: If time domain scheduling enhancements for PDSCH is needed, multi-PDSCH scheduled by one DCI should be supported for less standardization workload.
* From [7]:
	+ Observation 7: The enhancement of time domain resource allocation may be a crucial part for efficient operation in higher frequencies.
	+ Proposal 10: Study the enhanced time domain resource allocation method considering the scheduling efficiency, the UE implementation impacts and the specification impacts.
	+ Observation 8: If the maximum FFT size of Rel-15/16 is kept, it is observed that maximum number of RBs and required payloads of DCI for frequency domain resource allocation do not increase.
	+ Proposal 11: The benefits from frequency domain resource allocation enhancements should be carefully studied.
* From [10]:
	+ Observation 23: Scheduling principle needs to be revisited for the cases with high SCS.
	+ Proposal 20: Support Multi-PDSCH DCI for reaching peak data-rates for the cases of high SCSs
		- R16 Multi-PUSCH DCI design principle shall be the starting point.
	+ Observation 27: There seems to be no need to modifying the existing frequency domain resource allocation mechanisms with high SCSs.
	+ Proposal 21: Reuse NR R15 RBG size determination, which is FR and SCS agnostic.
* From [13]:
	+ Proposal 12: The combination of multi-PDSCH scheduled by one DCI and enhanced dynamic HARQ-ACK codebook and one-shot HARQ-ACK feedback should be studied.
* From [14]:
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: For operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz it is beneficial to support scheduling multiple PDSCH using one DCI by extending the multi-PUSCH scheduling feature introduced in Rel-16 to the scheduling of multiple PDSCH using one DCI in Rel-17
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: For operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz, it is beneficial to reduce the FDRA fields size by supporting larger RBG sizes.
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: For operation in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band, consider gNB initiated polling approach for UL traffic management to reduce UL data latency.
* From [15]:
	+ Proposal #8: Consider to support multi-PDSCH scheduling by a single DCI.
* From [20]:
	+ Proposal 3: Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling by one DCI should be supported for NR above 52.6 GHz.
	+ Observation 5: Multi-PUSCH scheduling introduced in Rel-16 NR-U can be reused for NR above 52.6 GHz.
* From [21]:
	+ Proposal 15: Support frequency domain scheduling enhancements, time domain scheduling enhancements and updates to the Scheduling request for NR operation above 52.6 GHz.
* From [26]:
	+ Proposal 5: Multi-slot-based UE capabilities can be considered for new SCSs with short slot lengths.
	+ Observation 9: The span-based UE capability in Rel-16 can be a baseline for multi-slot-based UE capability for high SCSs.
* From [28]:
	+ Proposal 1: Consider enhanced multi-carrier operation where a single DCI can schedule multiple cells, including Scells with a dormant BWP, for energy-efficient and low-latency NR performance.
* From [29]:
	+ Proposal 10: When a large subcarrier spacing is defined, multi-TTI based scheduling can be considered to relax scheduler implementation and higher layer processing burden.
* From [30]:
	+ Proposal 8: RAN1 shall study more flexible resource allocation in both time and frequency domain for different scenarios, including increasing the time-domain scheduling unit to be larger than one symbol, multi-PDSCH scheduling by one DCI, one TB mapped to multiple slots and subcarrier bundling/sub-PRB.
* From [31]:
	+ Proposal 7: How to allocate resource for data in frequency domain needs to be considered especially for higher SCS if introduced.
		- PDSCH/PUSCH allocated on more than 14 symbols would be beneficial.
		- In 60 GHz unlicensed band, the necessity of interlaced PUCCH/PUSCH would be questionable.
		- Enhancements on RB allocation for PUCCH format 0/1 should be considered.
	+ Observation 11: The current granularity in time/frequency domain in Rel-15/16 may be too fine, assuming less opportunity for FDM between Ues due to narrower beam width and larger number of symbols required for coverage performance.

### 2.6.2 PUSCH Interlace Transmission – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [2]:
	+ Proposal 13: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz in unlicensed band in Rel. 17, study the enhancement of PRB/sub-PRB interlacing designs for NR with higher SCS, if agreed to be supported.
* From [3]:
	+ Observation 12: Sub-PRB based resource allocation for PUSCH is not necessary due to an increased channel estimation complexity and a higher payload for FDRA.
	+ Proposal 12: PRB based interlace resource mapping for PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS should be studied further in NR-U-60.
* From [9]:
	+ Observation 4: Due to very wide BW, the number of PRBs per interlace will increase significantly.
	+ Proposal 5: RAN1 shall study the possibility to assign NR-U PUCCH onto partial interlaces for high BW channels.
* From [10]:
	+ Observation 28: OCB requirement or PSD limitation does not require interlaced UL allocation on 60 GHz unlicensed band.
	+ Proposal 24: No interlaced transmission is defined for 60 GHz unlicensed band.
* From [13]:
	+ Proposal 11: It may not be necessary to support interlaced uplink transmission for unlicensed operation in 52.6~71 GHz band.
* From [14]:
	+ PRB-based interlacing is not beneficial for SCS ≥ 120 kHz
	+ Sub-PRB interlacing is not beneficial for SCS ≥ 960 kHz
	+ Both PRB and sub-PRB interlacing is not beneficial for large frequency resource allocations
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: Neither PRB or sub-PRB interlacing is beneficial for the expected large frequency resource allocations applicable for NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz spectrum. The support of UL interlace allocation is not considered for NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz.
* From [19]:
	+ Observation 10: interlace seems not necessary in 60GHz unlicensed operation, due to the OCB requirement does not need to be constantly met and the power boosting benefit seems disappear with wider RB bandwidth envisioned in 60GHz.
* From [20]:
	+ Proposal 4: Sub-PRB based interlace design should be supported for 60 GHz unlicensed spectrum.
* From [22]:
	+ Proposal 4: In order to meet the requirements of minimum OCB, some enhancement on interlace design with unregular RB number might be considered.
* From [23]:
	+ Proposal 4: PRB and sub-PRB Interlace are not supported for UL transmission in 60 GHz band.
* From [30]:
	+ Proposal 9: RAN1 shall study sub-PRB level interlace for UL transmission.

### 2.6.3 Transmission Rank – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [10]:
	+ Proposal 11: Consider supporting rank-2 SU-MIMO for DFT-s-OFDM in 60GHz band.
* From [14]:
	+ Do not further discuss Rank-2 transmission for DFT-s-OFDM in the 52.6 – 71 GHz SI/WI. This should be addressed under a MIMO SI/WI.
* From [28]:
	+ Proposal 2: It is beneficial to allow higher UL throughput without sacrificing power efficiency by enabling more than 1 spatial layer with UL transform precoding.

### 2.6.4 HARQ Processes – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [4]:
	+ Proposal 6: HARQ-ACK feedback mechanism for multi-TTI scheduling should be studied.
* From [5]:
	+ Proposal 11: The default set of PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator should be adapted to the SCS of PDSCH.
* From [14]:
	+ Because of larger processing latencies, the numbers of DL and UL HARQ processes may need to be increased. Otherwise, physical layer specification and implementation changes compared to Rel-15 may be needed to sustain high data throughput.

### 2.6.5 Processing Timelines – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [3]:
	+ Proposal 11: Reuse the processing timeline for FR2 for 120 kHz. If a new SCS is supported, reusing processing timeline for FR2 based on a fixed time unit defined as a slot duration of 120 kHz can be considered with slot bundling within the fixed time unit for PDSCH/ PUSCH resource allocation, mapping, and PDCCH monitoring.
* From [4]:
	+ Proposal 2: For PUSCH scheduled by RAR or by the fallback RAR, Δ value should also be considered for new SCS if agreed.
	+ Proposal 3: Specify different default K1 value sets for different SCS, and each K1 set with a maximum number of 8 values to keep the K1 bit field in DCI 1-0 unchanged.
	+ Proposal 4: Configure different K1 value sets for different SCS, and each K1 set with a maximum number of 8 values to keep the K1 bit field in DCI 1-1/DCI 1-2 unchanged.
	+ Proposal 5: Impacts on PDSCH/PUSCH processing time(N1/N2) should be considered if defining maximum number of BDs/CCEs for PDCCH monitoring per multiple slots.
* From [7]:
	+ Proposal 8: Study required UE processing time for higher frequencies considering the differences on antenna/panel structure, beam width, BWP size and new subcarrier spacings.
	+ Observation 6: Existing processing time determination methods are based on worst case scenarios and may require more redundant processing time for higher frequencies.
	+ Proposal 9: Study application of different processing time requirements based on parameters which contribute UE processing time.
* From [13]:
	+ Proposal 14: If introducing new numerology, the impacts on processing time and scheduling operation should be considered.
* From [14]:
	+ UE processing timelines for SCS > 120 kHz need to be further tightened vis-à-vis those for 120 kHz SCS to enable high performance NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
	+ The times provisioned for UE processing grow exponentially with the numerology. Large processing latencies restrict the achievable throughputs, defeating the purpose of enabling large bandwidths with large sub-carrier spacings.
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: For selection of suitable SCS for the 52.6 – 71 GHz frequency range, the expected increases in processing latencies and decreases in processing capabilities associated with large SCS are important factors. To enable high performance NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz, UE processing timelines and capabilities for SCS > 120 kHz need to be further tightened. Such issues put pressure to define SCS(s) as low as possible preferably leveraging existing SCS(s) in the current spec, i.e., ≤480 kHz.
	+ Add the following aspects to the list of processing timelines for new SCS (if agreed) that are not currently supported,
		- Processing capability for PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant
		- Dynamic SFI and SPS/CG cancellation timing
		- Timeline for HARQ-ACK information in response to a SPS PDSCH release/ dormancy.
		- Minimum time gap for wake-up and Scell dormancy indication (DCI format 2\_6)
		- BWP switch delay
		- Multi-beam operation timing (timeDurationForQCL, beamSwitchTiming, beam switch gap, etc.)
		- Timeline for multiplexing multiple UCI types
	+ RAN1 should investigate the different factors that contribute to the PDSCH processing time and consider possible latency reduction opportunities.
* From [21]:
	+ Proposal 11: To reduce the timing constraints due to increasing the SCS, modify the UE timing parameter values and their associated signaling.
	+ Proposal 12: To accommodate timeline changes from the increased number of slots due to a possible increase in the SCS , increase the number of HARQ processes and/or increase the number of slots a HARQ codebook is tied to.
* From [29]:
	+ Proposal 8: When a large subcarrier spacing is defined, processing time related aspects, including PDSCH/PUSCH processing time, CSI computation time, etc., need to be investigated.
* From [30]:
	+ Proposal 6: RAN1 shall study proper value for processing timing for new numerology, and enhancement for relevant procedures and signaling with the consideration of UE complexity, latency and signaling overhead.
* From [31]:
	+ Proposal 10: For higher SCS, the appropriate configuration of k0, k1, k2 need to be discussed to meet UE minimum processing timeline.
		- If the current candidate values don’t meet UE processing limitation, extending, limiting or shifting the range of k0, k1, k2 may be necessary.

### 2.6.6 Discussions

##### Moderator Summary of observations and proposals from Contributions:

* Some companies notes some interlace operations may be needed. Some companies commented to study PRB and sub-PRB interlace design, while some companies comments sub-PRB interlace design is not need and some companies commented interlace transmission is not needed altogether.
* Some companies suggested to support rank 2 transmission for DFT-s-OFDM. It should noted that some companies have commented that this design should be conducted under MIMO SI/WI.
* Some companies have commented HARQ feedback mechanism if multi-TTI scheduling is supported require further study.
* A company noted that processing latencies requirements tend to decrease with increase in SCS and may pose challenges to implementation.
* A company noted that following processing timelines for new SCS (if agreed) needs to be defined:
	+ Processing capability for PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant
	+ Dynamic SFI and SPS/CG cancellation timing
	+ Timeline for HARQ-ACK information in response to a SPS PDSCH release/ dormancy.
	+ Minimum time gap for wake-up and Scell dormancy indication (DCI format 2\_6)
	+ BWP switch delay
	+ Multi-beam operation timing (timeDurationForQCL, beamSwitchTiming, beam switch gap, etc.)
	+ Timeline for multiplexing multiple UCI types

###### Company Comments on PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling aspects:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei  | Support multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Agree with Futurwei to consider supporting single DCI that can schedule both multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH. This would allow for reduced PDCCH monitoring, longer scheduling units for both PDSCH and PUSCH, and avoid long continuous transmissions for either PDSCH or PUSCH |
| InterDigital | As mentioned above, time-domain scheduling enhancement should be considered for both PDSCH and PUSCH.  |
| Qualcomm | We support multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheculing. Two different aspects can further be discussed: a single DCI scheduling multiple TBs (one TB per slot, similar to Rel-16 NR-U UL) or a single TB mapped to multiple slots. Also, related to the multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, the followings can furhter be discussed:* HARQ-ACK feedback enhancement (see Section 2.6.4)
* DMRS enhancement: e.g., DMRS bundling/skipping
* DCI piggyback on PDSCH

Furthermore, due to the overlapping scope of multi-TTI scheduling with CE and UE power saving discussions, inter-WI alignment would be necessary. |
| Apple | Support multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCH scheduling. Also support scheduling over a group of slots i.e. longer scheduling units. Unlike in R-16 NR-U, the multi-PDSCH scheduling does not have to be for a continuous set of transmissions.  |
| Vivo | Support multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Support multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI. |

###### Company Comments on PUSCH interlace transmissions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Sub-PRB interlace may not be beneficial at lower SCS (240 kHz) |
| Qualcomm | There is no OCB issue in 60GHz operation and power boosting is not applicable with both 120KHz and 960kHz SCS. So interlacing is not necessary. For 120KHz SCS, sub-PRB level interlace may increase transmit power under PSD limitation, but the associated spec impact is too high. |
| Vivo | We didn’t see strong motivation to support interlace |
| Nokia, NSB | OCB requirement or PSD limitation does not require interlaced UL allocation on 60 GHz unlicensed band. Hence, interlaced transmission is not needed for 60 GHz unlicensed band. |

###### Company Comments on Transmission Rank:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | The rank discussion for DFT-s-OFDm belongs to MIMO SI/WI |
| InterDigital | We also think that rank-2 transmission can be considered as rank-2 transmission can be supported with by utilizing X-pol antennas in LOS channel. In addition, we are not sure that the discussion belongs to MIMO SI/WI as we are discussing specification for 52.6 – 71 GHz while delegates in MIMO SI/WI is discussing MIMO operations in FR1 and FR2. |
| Qualcomm | We support rank-2 DFT-s-OFDM. Although we agree with the view of [14] and Futurewei, rank-2 DFT-s-OFDM is an issue of particular interest in the 52.6-71GHz SI/WI. Therefore, it could be addressed in the 52/6-71GHz SI/WI. |
| Vivo | Agree with Futurewei |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with Qualcomm |

###### Company Comments on HARQ Processes:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | We support HARQ enhancement in the following aspects:* HARQ supporting multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
	+ Joint feedback in a single or multiple PUCCHs for a single DCI-scheduled SCHs
* Increased number of HARQ processes
 |
| Apple | The number of HARQ processes may need to be increased. In addition, we support creating HARQ slot groups i.e. inverse of the HARQ-sub-slots in Rel-16. |
| Vivo | Support HARQ enhancement regarding multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling |

###### Company Comments on Processing Timelines:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Having a single SCS of 240 kHz would not require re-evaluating the processing timelines already supported. We may reuse the FR2 timelines. |
| Qualcomm | We should simply acknowledge the fact that, in terms of the number of symbols, the processing timeline will be longer for higher SCSs. The detailed numbers and related capabilities can be left for WI phase. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with Qualcomm |

##### 2nd round of Discussion:

Moderator has provided some suggestion for conclusion/observation to be captured for the TR. Please provide further comments on the suggestion and if companies have suggestions on what RAN1 may be able to agree to and capture to the TR, please comment further.

1. Some companies have noted that interlace transmissions for PUSCH do not provide benefit over uplink allocations currently supported by NR for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, while some companies have noted support of interlace transmissions for PUSCH may be needed to improve transmit power and possibly to meet OCB requirements when necessary.
2. It was identified that for new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, will at least require investigation on the need for enhacnments and standardization, if needed, of the following processing timelines:
	1. Processing capability for PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant
	2. Dynamic SFI and SPS/CG cancellation timing
	3. Timeline for HARQ-ACK information in response to a SPS PDSCH release/dormancy.
	4. Minimum time gap for wake-up and Scell dormancy indication (DCI format 2\_6)
	5. BWP switch delay
	6. Multi-beam operation timing (timeDurationForQCL, beamSwitchTiming, beam switch gap, beamReportTiming, etc.)
	7. Timeline for multiplexing multiple UCI types
	8. Minimum of P\_switch for search space set group switching
	9. appropriate configuration(s) of k0 (PDSCH), k1 (HARQ), k2 (PUSCH),
	10. PDSCH processing time (N1), PUSCH preparation time (N2), HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3)
	11. CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3, and CSI processing units
	12. Any potential enhancements to CPU occupation calculation
	13. Related UE capability(ies) for processing timelines
	14. minimum guard period between two SRS resources of an SRS resource set for antenna switching
3. It was identified that new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, may require further investigation of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling and standardization, if needed. The following aspects should be at least investigated for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling:
	1. whether to support a single TB and/or multiple TBs scheduled over multiple slots
	2. applicable DCI format(s) (including potential new formats) for multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH
	3. [Enhancement on multiple beam indication (multiple TCI states) ]
	4. DM-RS enhancements such as DM-RS bundling, or changes to the time-domain pattern
	5. HARQ enhancements for multi-PDSCH

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | Adding 3) RAN1 identifies that for new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, will require standardization of multi-PDSCH scheduling? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with Nokia’s proposed addition and further additions on similar point as follows:1. RAN1 identifies that for new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, will require standardization of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling and at least following specification enhancements should be considered:
	1. Single TB and multiple TB scheduling over multiple slots
	2. New single DCI format for multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH scheduling
	3. Multiple beam indication (multiple TCI states) and corresponding validity in time
	4. DM-RS enhancements such as DM-RS bundling, time-domain pattern.
 |
| Futurewei | Agree with Moderator’s proposal. We support multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH scheduling.  |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Nokia and Lenovo, Motorola Mobility’s view. We can further add HARQ enhancement for multi-TTI scheduling. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with Moderator’s proposal and adding multi-PDSCH scheduling and correponding HARQ enhancement. |
| LG Electronics | In general, fine with Moderator’s proposal. For Proposal 2), we are not convinced that the above list is the full set of processing timelines that will nessesitate specification work. We suggest to add ”at least” in Proposal 2) and include timeline for PUSCH in response of UL grant, timeline for HARQ-ACK information in resonse to PDSCH (not SPS PDSCH), minimum of P\_switch for search space set group switching, etc, as follows:1. RAN1 identifies that for new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, will require standardization of the at least following processing timelines:
	1. Processing capability for PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant
	2. Dynamic SFI and SPS/CG cancellation timing
	3. Timeline for HARQ-ACK information in response to a SPS PDSCH release/ dormancy/PDSCH.
	4. Minimum time gap for wake-up and Scell dormancy indication (DCI format 2\_6)
	5. BWP switch delay
	6. Multi-beam operation timing (timeDurationForQCL, beamSwitchTiming, beam switch gap, etc.)
	7. Timeline for multiplexing multiple UCI types
	8. Timeline for PUSCH in response of UL grant
	9. Minimum of P\_switch for search space set group switching
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the suggestion from Nokia, Lenovo and LGE.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with Moderator’s proposal and adding multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH scheduling by single DCI.  |
| Vivo | Agree with LGE’s update especially for ”at least” |
| Apple | Would want to confirm that this agreement will be captured in addition to what the agreement on timeline had in RAN1 #102-e i.e.:Consider at least the following aspects of processing timelines for new SCS (if agreed) that are not currently supported,* appropriate configuration(s) of k0 (PDSCH), k1 (HARQ), k2 (PUSCH),
* PDSCH processing time (N1),
* PUSCH preparation time (N2),
* HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3)
* CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3, and CSI processing units
* Any potential enhancements to CPU occupation calculation
* Related UE capability(ies) for processing timelines
* minimum guard period between two SRS resources of an SRS resource set for antenna switching

For bullet” Multi-beam operation timing (timeDurationForQCL, beamSwitchTiming, beam switch gap, etc.)” add ” BeamReportTiming” |
| MediaTek | We are ok with Nokia and Lenovo, Motorola Mobility’s view. Regarding capturing multi-PDSCH scheduling aspect in TR, we suggest to add descripion on the purpose of introducing such feature. |
| Moderator | Added the suggestions made by companies. |
| Ericsson | The listed processing timelines come on top of the agreed ones from last meeting (N1, N2,N3, Z1, Z2,Z3, etc..) |
| Xiaomi | Agree with the updated FL proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Further details on multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling DCI can be discussed in WI phase, so we suggest to remove whole sub-bullets under item 3). Otherwise, at least the followings should be clarified:* Premature to conclude that new DCI format is necessary
* Intent of multiple beam indication (multiple TCI states) and corresponding valid time duration of the indicated beams
* Intent of DM-RS bundling
 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s proposal + Ericsson’s comment.Regarding the comment from LG, here are some of our views:* In our understanding, nowhere it says that it is concluded to support a new DCI format, but just that it should be considered and further investigated which multiple companies have pointed out
* Regarding multiple beam indication, our thinking is that if multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH will be supported using single DCI, then just indicating a single TCI state/beam (for each of PDSCH/PUSCH) might not remain valid over the entire duration of transmission over multiple slots. Therefore, multiple beams might need to be indicated and also the duration for which they are applicable.
* Regarding DM-RS bundling, in our view, this would be applicable mainly if a single TB is scheduled over multiple slots and in that case DM-RS enhancements could be considered, and DM-RS bundling could be used for better channel estimation
 |
| CATT | Agree with moderator’s proposal and processing timeline commented by Ericsson. |
| Nokia, NSB |  Agree with LG, at least multi-PUSCH is designed with DCI format 0\_1 in R16, not sure why new DCI format should be used for 1\_1. And which fields (such as TCI) are only once or multiple times is the Work Item discussion. So perhaps we should remain silent on those, or formulate it as * 1. Wheather New single DCI format for multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH scehduling is required

Also better to formulate as following* 1. Whether to support Single TB and/or multiple TBs scheduled over multiple slots
 |
| Moderator | Revised the proposal based on comments. Added “if needed” to the list of considerations. Maybe this can resolve seom concerns. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We would prefer the previous version from moderator to bullet 3 and corresponding sub-bullets. But, taking into account the comments from Nokia and LG, we sugguest following update to the previous proposal from moderator:1. **It was identified that for new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, may require further investigation and standardization of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. The need for the following aspects should be at least investigated for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling and standardized, if needed:**
	1. **Single TB and multiple TBs scheduled over multiple slots**
	2. **New single DCI format for multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH scheduling**
	3. **multiple beam indication (multiple TCI states) and corresponding valid time duration of the indicated beams**
	4. **DM-RS enhancements such as DM-RS bundling, or changes to the time-domain pattern**
	5. **HARQ enhancements for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling**

Also, we suggest similar wording to the main bullet 2 for consistency.1. **It was identified that for new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, will at least require the investigation on the need for enhancements of the following processing timelines and standardized, if needed:**
 |
| LG Electronics | Thanks for clarifications. Still we need to make details on multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling soften on top of Lenovo’s modification, e.g.,1. **It was identified that for new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, may require further investigation and standardization of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. The need for the following aspects should be at least investigated for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling and standardized, if needed:**
	1. **Single TB and multiple TBs scheduled over multiple slots**
	2. **New single DCI format for multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH scheduling**
	3. **Enhancements on multiple beam indication (multiple TCI states)**
	4. **DM-RS enhancements such as DM-RS bundling, or changes to the time-domain pattern**
	5. **HARQ enhancements for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling**
 |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the updated Moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the 3rd bullet, we prefer to parallel existed DCI and new DCI, besides, we don’t see the need to enhance PUSCH HARQ for 60GHz, so we suggest the following revision:1. It was identified that for new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, may require further investigation and standardization of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. The following aspects should be at least considered for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, if needed:
	1. whether to support a single TB and/or multiple TBs scheduled over multiple slots
	2. Single DCI design(existed DCI format or new DCI format) for multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH
	3. multiple beam indication (multiple TCI states) and corresponding valid time duration of the indicated beams
	4. DM-RS enhancements such as DM-RS bundling, or changes to the time-domain pattern
	5. HARQ enhancements for multi-PDSCH~~/PUSCH~~
 |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the updated proposal and Lenovo’s update.  |
| Futurewei | We are fine with FL’s updated proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | On 3b, we think the original proposal from Moderator (i.e. applicable DCI format(s) (including potential new formats) seems a good compromise among companies, while no strong view from our side. We support Moderator’s proposal.  |
| Ericsson | First bullet : interlacing is not needed to meet the OCB requirement since the OCB requirement is meet even with the existing NR resource allocation. Hence, that part should be removed. Third bullet: since multi-PDSCH/PUSCH is discussed here in more details maybe it can be removed from the proposal in section 2.5.4. Also we propose the following rewording: It was identified that ~~for~~ new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, may require further investigation ~~and standardization~~ of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, and standardization if needed. The following aspects should be at least considered for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling~~, if needed~~: |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with updates from LG, ZTE and Ericsson. Further updated proposal could be as follows:1. **It was identified that for new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, may require further investigation of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, and standardization, if needed. The need for the following aspects should be at least investigated for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling and standardized, if needed:**
	1. **Single TB and multiple TBs scheduled over multiple slots**
	2. **Single DCI format (using existing DCI format or a new DCI format) for multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH scheduling**
	3. **Enhancements on multiple beam indication (multiple TCI states) for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling**
	4. **DM-RS enhancements such as DM-RS bundling, or changes to the time-domain pattern**
	5. **HARQ enhancements for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling**
 |
| Nokia | Removing PUSCH from HARQ is clear, otherwise we are fine with the proposal. Do not agree with Lenovo/Ercisson updates, if higher SCS is supported, such 480 and or 960, multi-PDSCH is clearly benefitial. |
| Apple 2 | We are fine with the current FL proposal. Agree that last bullet should remove PUSCH. |
| Samsung  | We are generally fine with FL’s updated proposal. But for 3) c, we share the similar view with NOKIA that no need to capture the detials of bit fields (e.g. TCI) in the DCI (which is captured by b) to support multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling in SI, it should be WI work. We suggest to delete c.  |
| Moderator | Made updated based on comments. Added brackets to 3-c to indicate further discussion needed. |

##### 3rd round of Discussion:

Moderator has provided some suggestion for conclusion/observation to be captured for the TR. Please provide further comments on the suggestion and if companies have suggestions on what RAN1 may be able to agree to and capture to the TR, please comment further.

1. Some companies have noted that interlace transmissions for PUSCH do not provide benefit over uplink allocations currently supported by NR for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, while some companies have noted support of sub-PRB or PRB interlace transmissions for PUSCH may improve transmit power and possibly be needed to meet OCB requirements when necessary.
2. It was identified that for new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, will at least require investigation on the need for enhacnments and standardization, of the following processing timelines:
	1. Processing capability for PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant
	2. Dynamic SFI and SPS/CG cancellation timing
	3. Timeline for HARQ-ACK information in response to a SPS PDSCH release/dormancy.
	4. Minimum time gap for wake-up and Scell dormancy indication (DCI format 2\_6)
	5. BWP switch delay
	6. Multi-beam operation timing (timeDurationForQCL, beamSwitchTiming, beam switch gap, beamReportTiming, etc.)
	7. Timeline for multiplexing multiple UCI types
	8. Minimum of P\_switch for search space set group switching
	9. appropriate configuration(s) of k0 (PDSCH), k1 (HARQ), k2 (PUSCH),
	10. PDSCH processing time (N1), PUSCH preparation time (N2), HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3)
	11. CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3, and CSI processing units
	12. Any potential enhancements to CPU occupation calculation
	13. Related UE capability(ies) for processing timelines
	14. minimum guard period between two SRS resources of an SRS resource set for antenna switching
3. It was identified that new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, may require further investigation of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling and standardization, if needed. The following aspects should be at least investigated for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling:
	1. whether to support a single TB and/or multiple TBs scheduled over multiple slots
	2. applicable DCI format(s) (including potential new formats, if needed) for multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH scheduling
	3. Enhancement on multiple beam indication and association with multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
	4. DM-RS enhancements such as DM-RS bundling, or changes to the time-domain pattern
	5. HARQ enhancements for multi-PDSCH
	6. Applicability of Rel-16 multi-PUSCH transmission

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson 3 | Related to the first bullet : we still think ” meet OCB requirements” since that is fullfilled regardless of the suppot of interlacing. That can not be a motivation to support interlacing. Related to the second bullet, the listed processing delays are not defined in the specs for the higher subcarrier spacings, therefore ”if needed” is misplaced here. Since if a new SCS is agreed, those values are definitely needed. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (3) | Generally, we are fine with moderator’s proposal and propose further updates to 3)For 3) b. Some companies commented earlier that this might be smilar to the proposal regarding DCI format discussion in section 2.5. So we suggest to use similar wording:* 1. **~~applicable~~ Single DCI format(s) (~~including potential new formats~~ using existing DCI format or new DCI format(s), if needed) for multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH scheduling**

Regarding 3) c., some companies commented that we don’t need to discuss specific DCI fields right now, infact at least our intention is not to discuss any DCI fields as such, rather high level issues and corresponding enhancements that need to be considered, if multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling will be supported. Issue being that whether a single beam can be applied to multiple PDSCH/PUSCH transmissions across multiple slots. For B52.6GHz, with very narrow and directional beams, some enhancements might be needed as single beam might not be enough to be used across multiple slots. So we can suggest further update to 3) c., for not pointing specifically to TCI field, but keeping it generic as follows:* 1. **Enhancements on multiple beams indication ~~(multiple TCI states)~~** **and association with multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling**
 |
| InterDigital | We support Moderator’s proposal.Regarding the second bullet, we prefer to keep ”if needed” as we think that enhancements on all bullets may not be needed. For example, ”m. Related UE capability(ies) for processing timelines” is very broad.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support moderator’s proposal and also ok with the updates from Ericsson and Lenovo.  |
| LG Electronics | We still prefer to remove the whole bullet 3) since the necessity of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling by a single DCI is already captured in section 2.5.4 and further details can be discussed in WI phase. |
| Nokia, NSB | At 1) Some companies have noted that interlace transmissions for PUSCH do not provide benefit over uplink allocations currently supported by NR for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, while some companies have noted support of sub-PRB interlace transmissions for PUSCH may ~~be needed to~~ improve transmit power and possibly to meet OCB requirements when necessary.At 3) It would be good to note that multi-PUSCH is already designed in R16. |
| Moderator | Update based on comments.For 3b, `not sure if the addition of ”single” is clarifying things further. If there is one DCI format, then (s) would not apply. I think the text should be broad enough to satisfy Motorola/Lenovo’s concern.For bullet 3, the whol bullet states ”if needed”. There could be some level of duplication. If the TP are provide more information, moderator thinks it should be ok. Let try to see if we can suggest changes that would make thing bit more acceptable. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the updated proposal and suggest to remove the brackets from the main bullet 3 as majority of companies seems to be okay and all these are potential enhncements, if needed.Regarding bullet 3, we agree with moderator’s view that it should be good to capture the details in the TP when at least some companies have discussed/identified potential issues/enhancements for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, as we are doing for other topics as well.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It seems that ” Minimum of P\_switch for search space set group switching” should rather be related to PDCCH. |
| OPPO | Agree with the proposal |
| Apple | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Moderator | Put 2h in brackets for discussion. |
| LG Electronics | Two comments:From our review, some companies addressed PRB-based interlace in addition to sub-PRB based interlace.1. Some companies have noted that interlace transmissions for PUSCH do not provide benefit over uplink allocations currently supported by NR for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, while some companies have noted support of sub-PRB or PRB interlace transmissions for PUSCH may improve transmit power and possibly be needed to meet OCB requirements when necessary.

For bullet 2-h, as we commented during the last GTW session, we prefer to put all of stuffs related to processing timelines together at once. For instance, 2-d is related to DCI 2\_6 PDCCH monitoring and 2-n is related to SRS. Do we need to categorize them as well? |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with modorator’s updated proposal. |
| Moderator | I think for some timing aspects, there could be some dependency between PDCCH and PDSCH, for example k0, so at this point even if this section was for PUSCH/PDSCH, it is ok as long as the technical content is correct. When this section gets reflected to the TR, rapporteur can make sure the text does not hint to limit the discussion only for PUSCH/PDSCH.Deleted the bracket for 2h.There was some comments during GTW on addition of “if needed” to some sub-components of 3. Given that “if needed” is the main bullet for (3), moderator’s think there is not further need to add “if needed individually to sub-components. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal. |

##### 4th round of Discussion:

Please provide comments on the proposal below.

1. Some companies have noted that interlace transmissions for PUSCH do not provide benefit over uplink allocations currently supported by NR for NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, while some companies have noted support of sub-PRB or PRB interlace transmissions for PUSCH may improve transmit power and possibly be needed to meet OCB requirements when necessary.
2. It was identified that for new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, will at least require investigation on the need for enhacnments and standardization, of the following processing timelines:
	1. Processing capability for PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant
	2. Dynamic SFI and SPS/CG cancellation timing
	3. Timeline for HARQ-ACK information in response to a SPS PDSCH release/dormancy.
	4. Minimum time gap for wake-up and Scell dormancy indication (DCI format 2\_6)
	5. BWP switch delay
	6. Multi-beam operation timing (timeDurationForQCL, beamSwitchTiming, beam switch gap, beamReportTiming, etc.)
	7. Timeline for multiplexing multiple UCI types
	8. Minimum of P\_switch for search space set group switching
	9. appropriate configuration(s) of k0 (PDSCH), k1 (HARQ), k2 (PUSCH),
	10. PDSCH processing time (N1), PUSCH preparation time (N2), HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3)
	11. CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3, and CSI processing units
	12. Any potential enhancements to CPU occupation calculation
	13. Related UE capability(ies) for processing timelines
	14. minimum guard period between two SRS resources of an SRS resource set for antenna switching
3. It was identified that new subcarrier spacing, if agreed, may require further investigation of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling and standardization, if needed. The following aspects should be at least investigated for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling:
	1. whether to support a single TB and/or multiple TBs scheduled over multiple slots
	2. applicable DCI format(s) (including potential new formats, if needed) for multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH scheduling
	3. Enhancement on multiple beam indication and association with multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
	4. DM-RS enhancements such as DM-RS bundling, or changes to the time-domain pattern
	5. HARQ enhancements for multi-PDSCH
	6. Applicability of Rel-16 multi-PUSCH transmission

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s proposal  |
| Nokia, NSB | Applicability of Rel-16 multi-PUSCH ~~transmission~~ scheduling |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal and Nokia’s update |

## 2.7 Reference Signals

### 2.7.1 PT-RS - Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [2]:
	+ Proposal 4: For supporting NR operation between 52.6GHz and 71GHz in Rel. 17, no PT-RS configuration should also be supported, depending up on the MCS range, if higher subcarrier spacing values are agreed to be supported.
* From [3]:
	+ Observation 11: Block PTRS enables low complexity ICI compensation for smaller SCSs such as 120 kHz and 240 kHz and helps the smaller SCS to perform even better than a larger SCS such as 960 kHz. A new PTRS pattern with more PTRS groups within one DFT-s-OFDM symbol should be considered.
* From [5]:
	+ Proposal 10: DM-RS/PT-RS enhancement should be further studied to solve the problem caused by RF impairment such as phase noise, I-Q imbalance and PA non-linear work range.
* From [10]:
	+ Observation 8: For ICI compensation, two approaches are discussed,
		- Enhanced PT-RS design (e.g. localized/block PT-RS)
		- Implementation-based method (e.g. data-aided direct filtering.)
	+ Proposal 7: Support ICI compensation for NR beyond 52.6GHz, and study and compare different ICI compensation schemes with respect to performance as well as implementation complexity.
	+ Proposal 9: Consider defining new PTRS configurations for DFT-s-OFDM.
* From [11]:
	+ Proposal 1: Support block-based PT-RS patterns for OFDM waveform.
	+ Proposal 2: Support cyclic PT-RS sequence for OFDM waveform.
	+ Proposal 3: A PT-RS sequence for OFDM waveform composed of KP samples includes a cyclic prefix of floor(KP/2) samples.
	+ Proposal 4: Support density extension of current Rel.15 PT-RS for DFTsOFDM waveform.
* From [14]:
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: Clustered PT-RS structure can frequently collide with existing NR reference symbols (such as CSI-RS and TRS) with no simple avoidance solution.
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: A clustered PT-RS structure does not offer any performance advantage over the existing Rel-15 NR distributed PT-RS structure.
	+ Retain the same Rel-15 distributed PT-RS structure for OFDM for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* From [15]:
	+ Proposal #5: Investigate the necessity to enhance the structure of DM-RS for data as well as control DL/UL channels and that of PT-RS for DFT-s-OFDM considering UE multiplexing and efficient data transmission.
* From [19]:
	+ Observation 8: with legacy PTRS pattern, phase noise impact is more visible for MCS 22.
	+ Observation 9: the ICI compensation can further reduce the BLER floor compared with simple CPE compensation, but displays a 2~2.5 dB gap to phase noise off performance.
* From [21]:
	+ Observation 2: The total PN increases when compared to below 52.6 GHz operation.
	+ Observation 3: By using PN ICI compensation, we can reduce the maximum SCS selected when compared with CPE compensation only.
	+ Proposal 3: Consider the use of a new PTRS and/or Phase Noise ICI compensation to improve performance to limit need for specifying higher SCS.
	+ Proposal 9: Support an update to Rel-15 PTRS to enable improved ICI compensation.
* From [26]:
	+ Proposal 2: As PTRS enhancement for assisting ICI compensation, increasing the frequency domain PTRS density for small RB allocation can be considered. New PTRS patterns other than the Rel-15 design, such as the block PTRS pattern is not necessary.
* From [30]:
	+ Proposal 11: RAN1 shall study the enhancement to reference signals (e.g. chunk based PT-RS pattern) for the new carrier frequency range to mitigate the impact of ICI, taking into consideration of the impact from the new numerology.

### 2.7.2 DM-RS - Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [2]:
	+ Proposal 5: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, new DM-RS configurations should be considered with following criterion:
		- High frequency density of the DM-RS for high SCS for better channel estimation when channel coherence bandwidth is less than the configured SCS
		- Reduced number of DM-RS ports as the performance gain of high rank MIMO channels is expected to be limited in high FR2
* From [5]:
	+ Proposal 10: DM-RS/PT-RS enhancement should be further studied to solve the problem caused by RF impairment such as phase noise, I-Q imbalance and PA non-linear work range.
* From [7]:
	+ Observation 5: The performance loss from channel estimation error gets reduced as DM-RS density increases especially when a higher modulation order is used.
	+ Proposal 6: Study enhanced DM-RS designs for a larger subcarrier spacing for PDSCH and PUSCH.
* From [10]:
	+ Observation 30: Existing Rel-15 DMRS type-1 is a feasibile solution for 480kHz and 960kHz sub-carrier spacing options.
	+ Observation 31: Existing Rel-15 DMRS type-1 is also feasible solution with higher transmission ranks (e.g. rank 2) for 480kHz and 960kHz sub-carrier spacing options.
	+ Proposal 26: Use existing Rel-15 DMRS type-1 for 480 kHz and 960 kHz sub-carrier spacing options. No need to design any new DMRS structure for 480 KHz and 960 sub-carrier options in Rel-17.
* From [14]:
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808. For 480 kHz SCS and below with large delay spread, the room for performance improvement with a change to the Rel-15 DMRS design is very limited.
* From [15]:
	+ Proposal #5: Investigate the necessity to enhance the structure of DM-RS for data as well as control DL/UL channels and that of PT-RS for DFT-s-OFDM considering UE multiplexing and efficient data transmission.
* From [21]:
	+ Proposal 10: To account for transmission with large SCSs in low coherence BW channels,
		- turn on or off the FD-OCC based on the scenario the channel is in
		- configure the UE with a DMRS pattern robust to frequency selective fading
* From [25]:
	+ Proposal 3: For DMRS enhancement for high SCSs, higher DMRS RE density and new multiplexing patterns should be studied.
* From [29]:
	+ Proposal 6: For subcarrier spacing 480 kHz and 960 kHz, PDSCH (and potentially PUSCH) reception performance is impacted by frequency domain OCC in DMRS, and therefore we suggest that RAN1 further investigate on frequency domain OCC for DMRS.
* From [31]:
	+ Proposal 6: How to allocate resource for RS (e.g. DMRS, PTRS) in frequency domain needs to be considered for higher SCS if introduced
		- DMRS density in frequency domain may not be sufficient
		- DMRS ports multiplexing may not work well

### 2.7.3 TRS - Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [10]:
	+ Observation 32: For P-TRS transmissions in the cell, it would be beneficial to have a mechanism to be able to transmit P-TRSs dropped due to LBT failure.

### 2.7.5 Discussions

##### Moderator Summary of observations and proposals from Contributions:

* Some companies provided suggestions for enhanced PTRS design that may improve to combat phase noise by enabling ICI compensation.
* A companies noted that one of the enhanced PTRS design being proposed by some companies, block PT-RS design, may collide with other NR reference signals.
* Some companies noted enhancements for DMRS may be needed for larger SCS and noted frequency domain OCC is being impacted by frequency selectivity for larger SCS.
* Some companies noted that existing DMRS does not exhibit issues and existing design is suitable.
* A company noted P-TRS transmission may be dropped do to LBT failure and RAN1 may need to investigate further into this issue.

###### Company Comments on PT-RS:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | New PTRS design may not be necessary. The time density of PTRS signal may be increased.  |
| Qualcomm | New PTRS pattern, such as a block PTRS pattern, is not needed if a proper ICI cancallation scheme (e.g., direct de-ICI filtering) is used. |
| CATT | No new PTRS pattern is needed |
| Intel | Prefer to keep current PTRS patterns. |
| Mitsubishi | Current PTRS pattern is not sufficient and needs to be improved. Block PTRS with cyclic sequencs shows significant performance improvement over both CPE and de-ICI filtering applied onto the legacy Rel.15 PTRS pattern. Disagree with Futurewei on the possibility of increasing the time density, the higher layer parameter *timeDensity* can already be set to *LPT-RS* = 1 (every OFDM symbol not carrying DMRS) in the current specification. At least two companies show that increasing the current PTRS density in the frequency domain does not procure significant performance improvement either. In our evaluations we observed significant performance improvement when passing from a block PTRS structure with “ordinary” random sequence to a block PTRS structure with cyclic structure. The receiver of the block PTRS structure with cyclic sequence is less complex than the de-ICI filter for block structure with random sequence as explained in our contribution. Our contribution did not explicitly show the results of block PTRS with random structure because they were close to de-ICI filtering onto legacy PTRS sequence (plotted in our contribution), with an identical 5-tap receiver.  |
| vivo | No new PTRS pattern is needed |
| Nokia/NSB |  For 960kHz SCS, CPE compensation is enough to support higher MCS, while additional ICI compensation is required for SCS lower than 960kHz. For low complexity indoor device, higher SCS with CPE compensation is beneficial without having complex ICI compensation. For coverage extension, lower SCS with ICI compensation is applicable. For ICI compensation, it is required to study possible enhancement of PT-RS with the consideration of complexity and the performance for both CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM.   |
| InterDigital | We agree that no new PTRS pattern may not be needed |
| ZTE, Sanechips | No new PTRS pattern is needed. |

###### Company Comments on DM-RS:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | New DM-RS design for SCS less or equal to 480 kHz may not be necessary |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | New DM-RS design should be considered to increase the frequency density for improved channel estimation performance with higher SCS, while also reducing the number of DM-RS ports compared to exiting DM-RS configurations |
| Qualcomm | For higher SCS, such as 960kHz, higher DMRS RE density and a new DMRS port multiplexing pattern can be investigated to compensate the channel estimation performance degradation. |
| CATT | No new DM-RS pattern is needed |
| Intel | Modification to current DM-RS might be needed especially for high SCS to prioritize FDM of DM-RS ports over CDM. |
| Apple | May need to modify the DMRS (e.g. the FD OCC) in the case of a high SCS and small coherence BW. |
| Nokia/NSB | For CP-OFDM, no new DM-RS pattern is required. Current DM-RS configuration supports upto 2 ports without FD-OCC by scheduling DM-RS port {0,2}. For UL DFT-s-OFDM, in order to reduce PAPR and cross-correlation between sequences, DM-RS pattern without Comb (as used for PUCCH format 3/4) can be considered for PUSCH DMRS.   |
| InterDigital | For high SCS, enhancement on higher DMRS density and DMRS port multiplexing patterns can be investigated.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with Futurewei’s comments, that is, new DM-RS design for SCS less or equal to 480 kHz may not be necessary (refer to the agreements in 8.2.3). For SCS 960 kHz, it still needs to be further evaluated. |

###### Company Comments on TRS:

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

##### 2nd round of Discussion:

Moderator has yet to provide some suggestion for agreement for this topic. Moderator plans to suggestions later. Meanwhile, if companies have suggestions on what RAN1 may be able to agree to and capture to the TR, please comment further.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | LBT failure may prevent transmission of P-TRS that is the main QCL source for different signals and channels. Thus, UE may not have up to date QCL source for coming signals/channels to be received (or to be transmitted) and that would impact negatively on the downlink performance but as well the uplink performance. It would be beneficial to have a mechanism to be able to transmit P-TRSs dropped due to LBT failure. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Generally, agree with Nokia’s view on periodic RS transmission as QCL source in case of LBT failure. Could be more generic and instead of P-TRS, periodic CSI-RS should be considered |
| InterDigital | We additionally shared our views for 1st round discussions.  |
| LG Electronics | For PT-RS, enhancement of PT-RS can be considered in the environment that ICI compensation is required.For DM-RS, enhancement of DM-RS can be considered for the case of high SCS and small coherence bandwidth.For P-TRS, we agree with Nokia that if LBT is required for P-TRS, it would be beneficial to increase transmission opportunities of P-TRS. |
| NTT DOCOMO | For PT-RS, any enhancement would not be necessary. For DM-RS, we agree enhancements would be necessary, e.g. new design with larger frequency domain density and limiting CDM. For P-TRS, we agree with Nokia.  |
| ZTE, Sanchips | We added our views in 1st round discussions. |
| Mitsubishi | PT-RS enhancements are needed to enable efficient ICI compensation and increase system throughput by avoiding unnecessarily high SCS and enabling the use of medium/high MCS. |
| Ericsson | We disagree with the need for defining multiple transmission opportunities for periodic-TRS, for the same reason that it is not beneficial to support a transmission window for DRS (SSB transmissions). It is simply not motivated in 60 GHz spectrum where it has been shown through system level evaluations that deferral due to interference exceeding the LBT threshold is rare, and typically results in worse system performance than without LBT.Moreover, aperiodic-TRS can be scheduled prior to a transmission. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | RAN1 should recommend to investigate and specify the type of PTRS enhancements needed for supporting large MCS with ICI compensation, unless it is deemed that the largest MCS(s) don’t need to be supported. Note that this should be required for all considered values of SCS at large MCS.We would like RAN1 to note that if an interlace structure is defined for PUSCH or PUCCH, then an interface structure should also be defined for SRS.  |
| Sony | We apologize that we did not provide our view in the 1st on DMRS. We think higher density in frequency domain of DMRS would be needed to support larger SCS. |
| CATT | We should first identify the issues of PT-RS, DRMS and TRS first before consider enhancements for NR operation in 52.6-71 GHz. So far, there is no specific issues, including LBT failure in transmission PT-RS, required further enhancement in the RS pattern. |
| OPPO | We think if large SCS e.g., 480 kHz or 960 kHz is introduced, DMRS pattern should be enhanced for RANK 2 transmission. |
| InterDigital | We think that the current proposal is fine with the updates (A companies 🡪 A company). We can discuss needs of actual specification enhancements and details in the WI. |
| Futurewei  | We are OK with FL initial proposal with the following change to the first bullet:* “Some companies provided suggestions for enhanced PTRS design that may improve to combat phase noise by enabling ICI compensation. *Some companies observed that the existing PTRS design works fine for enabling ICI compensation*.”
 |
| Ericsson 3 | PTRSEnhancemes to PT-RS design, e.g., clustered/block PTRS are not needed. We have shown through evaluations that use of direct de-ICI filtering in combination with Rel-15 PT-RS has superior performance to clustered PTRS.DMRSEnhancements to DM-RS design are not necessary for 480 kHz and less. We have shown through evaluations that the performance gap between practical channel estimation and ideal (genie) channel estimation is small indeed, leaving little room for improvement for 480 kHz and less.TRSMultiple transmission opportunities for periodic-TRS are not needed for the same reason that it is not beneficial to support a transmission window for DRS (SSB transmissions). It is simply not motivated in 60 GHz spectrum where it has been shown through system level evaluations that deferral due to interference exceeding the LBT threshold is rare, and typically results in worse system performance than without LBT. Moreover, aperiodic-TRS can be scheduled prior to a transmission. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (3) | **PT-RS**We are okay to further discuss and consider if any enhancements would be needed for PT-RS**DM-RS**We have shown in our evaluations that the channel estimation performance is relatively bad for both 480kHz and 960kHz and therefore, new DM-RS patterns should be investigated. Also, we don’t think it is needed to support very large number of orthogonal DM-RS ports configurations for B52.6GHz with high SCS values such as 480kHz and 960kHz. For these reasons, we suggested to consider new DM-RS patterns with higher frequency overhead and less number of orthogonal ports, as a function of numerology. **Periodic CSI-RS (TRS)**We think that in case of LBT, enhancements to periodic CSI-RS transmission would be needed to handle LBT failurein the specifc beams directions where CSI-RS are configured to be transmitted.  |

##### 4th round of Discussion:

Based on discussions so far, moderator suggest the following texts to be considered for the TR. Please provide further comments.

1. It is recommended to investigate whether or not enhancements to PT-RS for the subcarrier spacings to be supported in specifications are needed. PT-RS enhancements, if needed, may need to consider the following:
	1. Support of high MCS values
	2. Applicability of ICI compensation techniques
2. It is recommended to investigate whether or not enhancements to DM-RS for the subcarrier spacings to be supported in specifications are needed. DM-RS enhancements, if needed, may need to consider the following:
	1. Coherence bandwidth and its impact to orthogonal codes used for DM-RS
	2. Frequency domain density
3. Some companies noted LBT failure may prevent transmission of periodic reference signals, such as P-TRS, and negatively impact performance. Some companies noted deferral of periodic reference signals may be rare and may not significantly impact system performance and use of aperiodic reference signals could be used to negate the potential impact from LBT failure.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree and support moderator’s proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO 4 | We support moderator’s proposal.  |
| Nokia, NSB | 1)2) ”Recommended” is rather strong statement. ”May require further investigation” would be language used in other agreements so far.We are fine with 3) |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |

## 2.8 PUCCH

### 2.8.1 PUCCH – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [7]:
	+ Proposal 7: Study channel estimation performance impact of PDCCH and PUCCH with a larger subcarrier spacing.
* From [9]:
	+ Proposal 4: RAN1 shall study high BW formats, up to 2.16 GHz, for NR-U PUCCH in 60 GHz band.
	+ Observation 5: Due to increased BW, Rel16 NR-U PUCCH format would have a very low spectral efficiency in the 60GHz band (down to less than 1%)
	+ Proposal 5: RAN1 shall study the possibility to assign NR-U PUCCH onto partial interlaces for high BW channels.
* From [10]:
	+ Observation 29: There is need to enhance PUCCH Format 0 and 1 transmissions to achieve higher transmit power when PSD limits apply.
	+ Proposal 25: Support contiguous multi-PRB allocation for PUCCH format 0 and format 1 or use of PUCCH format 2 and format 3 for SR and before dedicated PUCCH configuration for 1 or 2 bit payloads.
* From [14]:
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: it is beneficial to enhance PUCCH format 0 and 1 to span multiple RBs to allow larger transmit power.
* From [23]:
	+ Proposal 5: Potential enhancements for PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions to achieve higher transmit power should be considered in WI, e.g., PUCCH repetition in time/frequency domain.

### 2.8.2 SR – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [14]:
	+ Proposal 49 Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: For operation in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band, consider enhancements to SR (PUCCH) resource configuration and spatial relation management to reduce UL data latency

### 2.8.3 PUCCH Interlace Transmission – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [2]:
	+ Proposal 13: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz in unlicensed band in Rel. 17, study the enhancement of PRB/sub-PRB interlacing designs for NR with higher SCS, if agreed to be supported.
* From [3]:
	+ Proposal 12: PRB based interlace resource mapping for PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS should be studied further in NR-U-60.
* From [9]:
	+ Observation 4: Due to very wide BW, the number of PRBs per interlace will increase significantly.
	+ Proposal 5: RAN1 shall study the possibility to assign NR-U PUCCH onto partial interlaces for high BW channels.
* From [10]:
	+ Observation 28: OCB requirement or PSD limitation does not require interlaced UL allocation on 60 GHz unlicensed band.
	+ Proposal 24: No interlaced transmission is defined for 60 GHz unlicensed band.
* From [13]:
	+ Proposal 11: It may not be necessary to support interlaced uplink transmission for unlicensed operation in 52.6~71 GHz band.
* From [14]:
	+ PRB-based interlacing is not beneficial for SCS ≥ 120 kHz
	+ Sub-PRB interlacing is not beneficial for SCS ≥ 960 kHz
	+ Both PRB and sub-PRB interlacing is not beneficial for large frequency resource allocations
	+ Capture the following observation in TR 38.808: Neither PRB or sub-PRB interlacing is beneficial for the expected large frequency resource allocations applicable for NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz spectrum. The support of UL interlace allocation is not considered for NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz.
* From [19]:
	+ Observation 10: interlace seems not necessary in 60GHz unlicensed operation, due to the OCB requirement does not need to be constantly met and the power boosting benefit seems disappear with wider RB bandwidth envisioned in 60GHz.
* From [20]:
	+ Proposal 4: Sub-PRB based interlace design should be supported for 60 GHz unlicensed spectrum.
* From [22]:
	+ Proposal 4: In order to meet the requirements of minimum OCB, some enhancement on interlace design with unregular RB number might be considered.
* From [23]:
	+ Proposal 4: PRB and sub-PRB Interlace are not supported for UL transmission in 60 GHz band.
* From [30]:
	+ Proposal 9: RAN1 shall study sub-PRB level interlace for UL transmission.

### 2.8.3 Discussion on PUCCH

##### Moderator Summary of observations and proposals from Contributions:

* Some companies notes some interlace operations may be needed. Some companies commented to study PRB and sub-PRB interlace design, while some companies comments sub-PRB interlace design is not need and some companies commented interlace transmission is not needed altogether.
* Some companies noted that PUCCH Format 0 and 1 may be limited in transmit power when regulatory PSD limitation apply and suggest supporting enhancements for PUCCH format 0 and 1.
* A company noted enhancements to SR to improve UL data latency may be needed.

###### Company Comments on PUCCH:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Potential enhancements for PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions to achieve higher transmit power should be considered |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Agree with Futurewei’s comments |
| Qualcomm | Enhancement of PUCCH format 0/1 to support wider bandwidth may be needed for better coverage. |
| Nokia, NSB | There is need to enhance PUCCH Format 0 and 1 transmissions to achieve higher transmit power when PSD limits apply. |

###### Company Comments on SR:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | Consider potential enhancements for SR, CG-PUSCH and GC-PDCCH spatial relation updating mechanisms. |

###### Company Comments for PUCCH interlace transmission:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Some per PRB interlace may be considered to achieve a mode with minimum OCB |
| Qualcomm | There is no OCB issue in 60GHz operation and power boosting is not applicable with both 120KHz and 960kHz SCS. So interlacing is not necessary. For 120KHz SCS, sub-PRB level interlace may increase transmit power under PSD limitation, but the associated spec impact is too high. |
| Vivo | No need for interlace |
| Nokia, NSB | OCB requirement or PSD limitation does not require interlaced UL allocation on 60 GHz unlicensed band. Hence, interlaced transmission is not needed for 60 GHz unlicensed band. |

##### 2nd round of Discussion:

Moderator has provided some suggestion for conclusion/observation to be captured for the TR. Please provide further comments on the suggestion and if companies have suggestions on what RAN1 may be able to agree to and capture to the TR, please comment further.

1. It is recommended to further investigate on potential enhancements to PUCCH Format 0,, and 4 1 to enable higher transmission power when regulatory limits apply. Further potential enhancements to SR, P/SP-SRS, CG-PUSCH and GC-PDCCH spatial relation management may be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with Moderator views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |
| Futurewei | Agree |
| Qualcomm | Agree |
| InterDigital | Agree |
| LG Electronics | In addition to PUCCH formats 0 and 1, we think enhancements to other PUCCH formats can be considered, since up to 16 PRBs (i.e., maximum number of PRBs for PUCCH formats 2 and 3) may not be sufficient when regulatory PSD limits apply. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Enhancements of other PUCCH formats (e.g. 2 and 3) can be considered. Only 1 RB allocation can happen even for PUCCH format 2/3 in our view, which should be avoided as well as PUCCH format 0/1.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree. |
| Vivo | Agree with Moderator view |
| Apple | Agree |
| Moderator | Updated the text according the comments received. |
| Ericsson | We suggest removing “PSD” from the proposal, and generalizing it to “regulatory limits”FCC requirement does not specify an explicit PSD limits. However, the transmit power scales based on bandwidth for transmit bandwidth <100MHz. the transmit power for PUCCH format 0/1 which occupy single resource allocation would be very limited. Hence, it would be beneficial to extend the PUCCH transmission to multiple resources. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with the Moderator’s updated proposal |
| Xiaomi | Agree with FL proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s updated proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s proposal |
| CATT | Agree with moderator’s proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with latest wording Since we added PF2/3 I think we could add also a sentence:1. Further potential enhancements to SR, CG-PUSCH and GC-PDCCH spatial relation may be considered
 |
| Moderator | Updated based on comments. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are okay with updated proposal |
| LG Electronics | As to the third sentence suggested from Nokia, this agenda is for PUCCH. From our understanding, spatial relation of SR-PUCCH or CG-PUSCH (which are characterized by periodic or semi-persistent transmission) can be updated more dynamically, compared to current specification. With this regard, we can add P/SP-SRS as well as SR-PUCCH and CG-PUSCH. However, GC-PDCCH has nothing to do with UL transmission, doesn’t it? At least, it should be clarified what further potential enhancements to GC-PDCCH spatial relation means. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal. |
| OPPO | Agree with the updated Moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We suggest to also consider PUCCH Format 4:1. It is recommended to further investigate on potential enhancements to PUCCH Format 0, 1 and 4 to enable higher transmission power when regulatory limits apply. Further potential enhancements for other PUCCH Formats (e.g. 2 and 3) may be considered for the same reasons. Further potential enhancements to SR, CG-PUSCH and GC-PDCCH spatial relation may be considered.
 |
| Ericsson 2 | Regarding the extra text that was added:We don't understand why PF2/3 needs enhancements – up to 16 PRBs can be configured, hence multiple PRBs can be configured to overcome regulatory power limits (unlike Rel-15 PF0/1 which support only 1 PRB)Hence, we suggest the following:~~Further potential enhancements for other PUCCH Formats (e.g. 2 and 3) may be considered for the same reasons.~~ Further potential enhancements to SR, CG-PUSCH and GC-PDCCH spatial relation management may be considered. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the updated proposal.  |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the Moderator’s updated proposal |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Moderator’s updated proposal.In our understanding, 1 RB could also be configured for PUCCH format 2/3. Also the Moderator’s update say that “Further potential enhancement MAY BE considered”. Then we think it should be ok to remain here.  |
| LG Electronics | Response to Ericsson: Depending on PSD regional regulatory requirements, we may need to support more than 16 PRBs to fully utilize allowed power for UL transmission, especially for 120 kHz or 240 kHz SCS. That could be one reason to need potential enhancements also for PUCCH formats 2 and 3. |
| Nokia, NSB |  I think (e.g. 2, 3 and 4) fits more, because PF4 is > 2 bit format |
| Moderator | Updated based on comments. |

##### 3rd round of Discussion:

Moderator has provided some suggestion for conclusion/observation to be captured for the TR. Please provide further comments on the suggestion and if companies have suggestions on what RAN1 may be able to agree to and capture to the TR, please comment further.

1. It is recommended to further investigate potential enhancements to PUCCH to enable higher transmission power when regulatory limits apply. Further potential enhancements to spatial relation management for configured and/or semi-persistent UL signals/channels may be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson 3 | We are fine with further investigating enhancements to PF 0/1 – this should be the main emphasis. Enhancements to PF4 are not well motivated for operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz, since PF3 already supports multiple PRBs, and the user-multiplexing aspect of PF4 is not crucial for operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz due to narrow beam operation and lack of multiple users to multiplexWe agree with LGs comments, that the need for enhanced spatial realation management for GC-PDCCH is not clear, and also, this has nothing to do with uplink.We disagree that enhancements to spatial relation management for p/sp-SRS are needed. P-SRS is RRC configured, so it doesn't quite make sense to introduce dynamic spatial relation indication for p-SRS. Furthermore, in Rel-15/16 spatial ralation indication for sp-SRS is through MAC-CE, so is dynamic already. Enhancements to make it more flexible and reduce signaling overhead were already introduced in Rel-16.Hence, we recommend the following changes:Further potential enhancements to SR, ~~P/SP-SRS~~, CG-PUSCH and ~~GC-PDCCH~~ spatial relation management may be considered.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (3) | We agree with moderator’s proposal  |
| InterDigital | We are fine with Moderator’s proposal with following editorial update:PUCCH Format 0, 1, and 4 to enable |
| LG Electronics | We identified the need of enhancements for PUCCH formats 2 and 3 as well, that is, more than 16 PRBs to fully utilize allowed power for UL transmission can be required. Therefore, we suggest more generalized proposal for the first sentence, instead of focusing on specific PUCCH format, as follows:It is recommended to further investigate on potential enhancements to PUCCH to enable higher transmission power when regulatory limits apply.For the second sentence, it is understood that dynamic beam indication of periodic or semi-persistent UL transmission can be needed considering beam blockage of 60 GHz. We don’t think this issue falls into only a specific UL channel such as SR-PUCCH. Instead, same management can be extended to CSI-PUCCH, P-SRS as well. Even though similar topics are already discussed in Rel-17 FeMIMO, if some companies prefer to capture these topics also for this SI, we can accept the following generalized statement:Further potential enhancements to spatial relation management for periodic and/or semi-persistent UL transmission may be considered. |
| Nokia, NSB | 1. It is recommended to further investigate on potential enhancements to PUCCH Format 0, 1, and 4 to enable higher transmission power when regulatory limits apply. Further potential enhancements to SR, P/SP-SRS, CG-PUSCH and GC-PDCCH spatial relation management may be considered.
 |
| Moderator | Updated based on comments received. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s updated proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support moderator’s updated proposal. |
| OPPO | Agree with FL proposal |
| Apple | Agree with moderator’s proposal. Fix typo ” investigate ~~on~~ potential” |
| Ericsson 4 | Regarding the 2nd sentence, we would rather not remove SR and CG-PUSCH, since latency for these channels can be a problem in the Rel-15 framework with beam based operation. However as a compromise, we could accept the following to capture that while these signals/channels are configured with a periodicity, they may not be transmitted periodically:Further potential enhancements to spatial relation management for configured and/or semi-persistent UL signals/channels ~~periodic and/or semi-persistent UL transmission~~ may be considered. |
| NTT DOCOMO 4 | We support moderator’s updated proposal.  |
| LG Electronics | Fine with Ericsson’s modification. |
| Moderator | Updated based on Ericsson’s suggestion. |

##### 4th round of Discussion:

Please provide comments on the proposal below.

1. It is recommended to further investigate potential enhancements to PUCCH to enable higher transmission power when regulatory limits apply. Further potential enhancements to spatial relation management for configured and/or semi-persistent UL signals/channels may be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s proposal  |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |

## 2.9 Measurements

### 2.9.1 RLM and RRM - Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [3]:
	+ Proposal 13: Study the use of aperiodic CSI-RS for BFR procedure in NR-U-60.
	+ Proposal 14: RSSI measurement with directional reception should be studied in NR-U-60.
* From [14]:
	+ Scheduling restrictions during RRM, RLM and beam management procedures are the responsibility of RAN4 and thus need not to be discussed further in RAN1.

### 2.9.2 CSI Processing Timelines - Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [2]:
	+ Proposal 8: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, then potential enhancements should be considered on how to efficiently utilize UE’s limited processing capability to reduce latency and efficiently handle processing/preparation of CSI reports associated with multiple numerologies in parallel:
		- Same reference symbols duration (possibly the shortest duration corresponding to maximum supported SCS value) could be used for checking CPU availability corresponding to different CSI reports associated with different SCS values

### 2.9.3 Discussion on Measurements

##### Moderator Summary of observations and proposals from Contributions:

* Some company suggested areas in measurements for further study. The following are some areas for further study:
	+ Aperiodic CSI-RS for BFR
	+ RSSI measurements with directional reception
	+ Processing/preparation of CSI report to enable lower latency

###### Company Comments on RLM and RRM:

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

###### Company Comments on CSI processing timelines:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/MotorolaMobility | Consider CSI processing timeline enhancements for better availability for CPUs for multiple CSI reports associated with different numerologies. |

##### 2nd round of Discussion:

There was a suggestion from Motorola/Lenovo. Let’s see if this is ok with the companies.

1. It is recommended to investigate whether or not ehnhancements to CSI processing unit (CPU) availability check is needed when the UE is required to process CSI reports corresponding to multiple numerologies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics | CSI computation delay requirements such as Z1/Z2/Z3 are required to be defined if high SCS is supported. In addition, as Lenovo pointed out, enhancements on CPU availability check is necessary for the case where UE performs CPU occupation rule on multiple numerologies. |
| Xiaomi | CSI computation delay requirements such as Z1/Z2/Z3 needs to be defined if high SCS is supported. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with LG’s and Xiaomi’s comments |
| CATT |  If higher SCS is introduced, the CSI processing time and the number of CSI feedbacks need to be investigated.  |
| Ericsson 3 | Agree with above comments; however, isn't this already covered in Section 2.6.6? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (3) | From the general processing timeline point of view, section 2.6.6 covers the CSI part. We suggest to add some further details here related to CPU availability check. We suggest following proposal:**Enhancements to CSI processing unit (CPU) availability check should be invesitgated when the UE is required to process CSI reports corresponding to multiple numerologies, for example, if a UE needs to process CSI reports associated with 15kHz, 120kHz, 480kHz, then a common symbol duration could be considered for CPU availability check for all the reports to allow equal possibility to acquire CPU (regardless of CSI report associated numerology)** |
| Moderator | Put down a trim down version of Motorola/Lenovo’s suggestion. Let see if this is ok with the companies.As for discussion on Z1/Z2/Z3, I believe they are covered by a different TP. If there are additional information that could be listed, please suggest further. Moderator thinks we can consider them even if there are somewhat duplicative as long as it contains more information compared to other TP. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree to capture the proposal. Just a typo corrected:1. **It is recommended to investigate whether or not ehnhancements to CSI processing unit (CPU) availability check ~~uis~~ is needed when the UE is required to process CSI reports corresponding to multiple numerologies.**
 |

##### 4th round of Discussion:

Please provide comment on the proposal below.

1. It is recommended to investigate whether or not ehnhancements to CSI processing unit (CPU) availability check is needed when the UE is required to process CSI reports corresponding to multiple numerologies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s proposal  |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. Fix typo: ” e~~h~~nhancements” |

## 2.10 TDD Configuration and Transition Time

### 2.10.1 Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [3]:
	+ Observation 9: Overhead caused by DL/UL switching (14 μs) is large under SCS of 480 kHz (half a slot) and 960 kHz (almost a full slot).
* From [14]:
	+ TDD switching time requirements for the 52.6 – 71 GHz band are the responsibility of RAN4 and thus do not need to be further discussed in RAN1.

### 2.10.2 Discussions

##### Moderator Summary of observations and proposals from Contributions:

* A company noted that current FR2 DL/UL switching time period may be large for 480 and 960 kHz SCS.

Moderator has yet to provide some suggestion for agreement for this topic. Moderator plans to suggestions later. Meanwhile, if companies have suggestions on what RAN1 may be able to agree to and capture to the TR, please comment further.

##### Company Comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | Overhead caused by DL/UL switching depends on the the switching periodicity. The granularity to adjust the switching gap increases with the increasing SCS. Based on that, with given switching peridicity, a high SCS has opportunities for smaller GP overhead compared to a low SCS. |
| Qualcomm | In our view, the discussion point about DL/UL switching for a high SCS is a new UE capability, such as extending the UE capability ”tdd-MultiDL-UL-SwitchPerSlot”. |
| LG Electronics | Absolute time needed for DL/UL switching for higher SCS values should be studied in RAN4. |
| ZTE | Firstly, we think DL/UL switching time period can be used as a factor to consider SCSs for above 52.6 GHz, e.g. the overhead caused by DL/UL switching time for 960 kHz is so large. Secondly, if larger SCSs (e.g. 480/960 kHz) are supported finally, DL/UL switching time for the SCSs can be discussed and decided by RAN4. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think that the DL/UL switching time will need to be considered by RAN4 if it is agreed to support a large SCS such as 480 or 960 kHz SCS. The overhead is something that will have to be considered in the decision to support such large SCS since there a minimum switching time will need to be ensured. |
| CATT | DL/UL switching time in TDD configuration needs to be considered in the determination of SCS.  |
| Futurewei | The DL/UL switching time needs to be a factor for a new SCS selection |
| Ericsson 3 | Agree with the above comments that TDD DL/UL switching time is the responsibility of RAN4. Agree with the comments from LG, ZTE, Huawei, CATT, and Futurewei. |
| Moderator | Discussion on the beam switching time can be absorbed to discussion in 2.1.2. Suggest to close this section for discussion and follow up discussion in 2.1.2 4th round discussions. |

## 2.11 Multi-Carrier Operations

### 2.11.1 Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [13]:
	+ Proposal 13: Multi-carrier operation (carrier aggregation and bonding) can be considered to achieve a wider bandwidth, e.g. 2.16 GHz if it should be supported.
* From [14]:
	+ For operation in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band, it is beneficial to support both single and multi-carrier operation to achieve wideband operation as is already supported in Rel-15/16. The maximum carrier bandwidth still requires further discussion.
* From [15]:
	+ Proposal #10: Consider carrier-group based operation for NR unlicensed band in frequency range above 52.6 GHz, with consideration of multi-RAT coexistence as well as control signalling efficiency.
* From [24]:
	+ Proposal 4. The signaling overhead for scheduling large number of aggregated carriers should be studied for NR operation from 52.6 to 71 GHz.

### 2.11.2 Discussions

##### Moderator Summary of observations and proposals from Contributions:

* Some companies noted that multi-carrier operation should be considered to achieve wideband operation and to support higher data rates.
* Some companies noted that multi-carrier operation may need to consider multi-RAT coexistence, and may need to consider control signaling efficiency.

There was a suggestion from Ericsson. Let’s see if this is ok with the companies.

1. Both single and multi-carrier operation should be considered to achieve wideband operation and to support higher data rates.

###### Company Comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Support multi-carrier operation for wider bandwidth |
| Convida Wireless | Support multi-carrier operation for enabling wider bandwidth. |
| Qualcomm | Support multi-carrier operation for wider bandwidth |
| CATT | CA should be supported |
| Apple | Support CA for wider bandwidth operation. |
| Vivo | Support multi-carrier operation |
| Nokia, NSB | Support CA within a 2.16 GHz channel, and between 2.16 GHz channels |
| InterDigital | Agree |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s proposals. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Moderator’s proposal.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support multi-carrier operation for wider bandwidth |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support multi-carrier operation (CA).We don’t see the need for the second bullet point, which should be removed.It is understood that multi-RAT coexistence can be ensured when a 3GPP technology (i.e. LAA or NRU) operates with carrier aggregation. There is no need to conduct such study again.The control signaling efficiency of CA is what it is, it is not a show-stopped for deploying CA. 3GPP has already defined band combinations with up to 8 carrier in Rel-16.It can be discussed whether to target specifying techniques to improve (reduce) the overhead of CA. Techniques such as scheduling multiple PDSCHs or PUSCHs with a single DCI on the same carrier (already mentioned earlier by multiple companies) or on different carriers (as discussed in Rel-17 DSS WI) have the potential to reduce the control signaling overhead, and could be applied above 52.6 GHz. |
| Xiaomi | Support multi-carrier operation for wider bandwidth |
| LG Electronics | Response to Huawei regarding second bullet point: At least our consideration for that aspect is multiple carriers composing of LBT bandwidth can operate at once and share LBT result or channel occupancy duration between carriers, which can be helpful to better coexistence and control signaling reduction. In this sense, we support Moderator’s proposal as is. |
| Ericsson 3 | Regarding LG's comment about multi-RAT coexistence and LBT bandwidth; this is a topic for the channel access AI in 8.2.2; hence the 2nd bullet should be removed.Regarding single, multi-carrier operation, both are valid modes of operation supported by NR, and we see no need preclude either.A simple conclusion for the TR can be as follows:* ~~Some companies noted that~~ Both single and multi-carrier operation should be considered to achieve wideband operation and to support higher data rates.
* ~~Some companies noted that multi-carrier operation may need to consider multi-RAT coexistence, and may need to consider control signaling efficiency.~~
 |
| Moderator | Added suggestion from Ericsson for discussion. Please comment further. |

*Moderator note: Most companies if not all seems to support enablement of multiple carriers. However, this would be something bit odd to state in the TR since moderator expect CA, which is one of the fundamental features for NR to be not supported if not stated otherwise. Therefore, moderator thinks may not have much value to capture such statement.*

##### 4th round of Discussion:

Please provide comment on the proposal below.

1. Both single and multi-carrier operation should be considered to achieve wideband operation and to support higher data rates.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with the moderator’s proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | Despite potential enahncements we still think that CA has drawbacks with respect to singlaling overhead and UL throughput (in addition to complexity we agreed already). And utilization of wide-band carriers is clearly benefitial, this is why NR introduced carrier greater than >20MHz. On the other hand, there is also no need to preclude CA. **Proposal:** Considering peak data rates in UL (subject to MPR) and signalling overhead, wideband carrier utlization is benefitial. Multi-carrier operation is also recommended to be supported. |
| Apple | We agree with the moderator’s proposal.  |

## 2.12 Beam Management

### 2.12.1 Beam Management – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [7]:
	+ Observation 9: Due to the narrow beamwidth in higher frequencies, UE may experience reliability issue to recover dynamic blockage via the existing BFR operation.
	+ Proposal 12: Enhanced BFR operation to provide better reliability and efficiency should be studied for higher frequencies.
* From [10]:
	+ Proposal 22: Consider potential enhancements for SR, CG-PUSCH and GC-PDCCH spatial relation updating mechanisms.
	+ Proposal 28: If new subcarrier spacing is introduced the UE shall provide timeDurationForQCL for that subcarrier spacing.
* From [14]:
	+ Capture the following text in TR 38.808: For operation in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band, due to the large number of beams expected to be used, it is beneficial to enhance triggering of aperiodic CSI-RS and SRS resources to support flexible multi-slot triggering with a single DCI.
* From [15]:
	+ Proposal #9: Study potential enhancements for beam management CSI-RS or SRS considering beam switching time and coverage loss for large SCS.
* From [21]:
	+ Proposal 16: Support multiple non-periodic A-CSI-RS to mitigate the problem of LBT failure or allow for gNB scheduling flexibility in BFD.
	+ Proposal 17: Support modification of the hypothetical PDCCH used in BFD in the case that the RS for BFD is not sent by the gNB.
	+ Proposal 18: Support modification of the following capabilities/concepts based on the SCSs selected and the need for symbol level beam switching:
		- BeamSwitchTiming, BeamReportTiming, TimeDurationforQCL, maxNumberRxTxBeamSwitchDL, tdd-MultiDL-UL-SwitchPerSlot, SFI Pattern
* From [23]:
	+ Proposal 6: Aperiodic CSI-RS should not be used for BFR purpose.
* From [30]:
	+ Proposal 10: RAN1 shall consider the beam adjustment mechanism in initial access procedure to alleviate the beam alignment delay.
* From [31]:
	+ Observation 10: SSB beam may not be narrow enough for subsequent transmissions considering large propagation loss.
	+ Proposal 8: Coverage enhancements for transmissions during initial access should be discussed.
	+ Proposal 9: BFR procedure enhancement needs to be considered with at least following points
		- The number of candidate beams included in set
		- The minimum time gap to apply new beam configuration after receiving BFR response from gNB
		- Simultaneous update of beam configuration for multiple Scells
		- Monitoring aperiodic transmissions for beam failure detection

### 2.12.2 Beam Switching – Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [2]:
	+ Observation 14: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, beam switching issue would appear between the contiguous transmissions (such as SSB beams) since the CP length would not be enough for beam switching, and an extra gap such a might be needed to prevent performance degradation.
	+ Proposal 10: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, then to allow the beam switching between contiguous transmissions, ECP or a symbol gap could be applied before beam switching, otherwise NCP is applied to all other symbols
	+ Observation 15: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, then to increase the possibility of periodic RS transmissions for LBT based channel access in unlicensed bands, it is not resource efficient to schedule a burst of resources within RS period
	+ Proposal 11: For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17 in unlicensed bands, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted and directional LBT is supported, then potential enhancements related to periodic transmissions of RS such as periodic/semi-persistent CSI-RS should be considered to deal with LBT failure:
		- RAN1 could study on the potential dynamic switching of beam for periodic RS transmission on same time-frequency resources after consecutive LBT failures on one of the configured beams
* From [10]:
	+ Proposal 27: No beam switching gap handling is needed for the signals and channels for which 960 kHz or lower subcarrier spacing is applied.
	+ Proposal 29: If new subcarrier spacing is introduced the UE shall provide beamSwitchTiming for the A-CSI-RS triggering for that subcarrier spacing.
* From [14]:
	+ Capture the following text in TR 38.808: For operation in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band, Rel-15/16 already supports functionality to configure gaps between CSI-RS and SRS resources for beam management. Furthermore, for SCS <= 480 kHz, the CP duration is sufficient for beam switching which typically requires < 100 ns.
* From [31]:
	+ Proposal 11: Whether to introduce beam switching gap (i.e., whether guard period is necessary for beam switching between transmissions/receptions with different beam directions) should be discussed for potential high SCS.

### 2.12.2 Discussions

##### Moderator Summary of observations and proposals from Contributions:

* Some companies noted that improvement for BFR operation, spatial relation update mechanism, triggering of CSI-RS and SRS resources may be needed.

Moderator has yet to provide some suggestion for agreement for this topic. Moderator plans to suggestions later. Meanwhile, if companies have suggestions on what RAN1 may be able to agree to and capture to the TR, please comment further.

###### Company Comments on Beam Management:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Balanced coverage between SSB beam and the beam for data transmission should be considered |
| Lenovo/MotorolaMobility | Beam-management related work in MIMO WI in Rel-17 would be applicable to B52.6GHz as well, so only very specific enhancement needed for higher SCS could be considered here. |
| Convida Wireless | Beam management enhancement could be considered. A-CSI-RS approach could be used. Coverage enhancement for SSB beam could also be considered and discussed. |
| InterDigital | We don’t think that beam management in MIMO can be fully applicable for 52.6-71GHz. As a system in 52.6-71GHz supports generally narrower beams than FR2, the system requires dramatically increased number of beams to maintain the coverage. Given that, in our view, beam related enhancements should be considered.  |
| Qualcomm | Beam-management in FR2 should be the baseline. Other than LBT-related issues, we think the BM enhancement should be in the MIMO WI. |
| CATT | Beam management enhancement should be considered  |
|  |  |
| Apple | Beam management should account for the possible loss of periodic CSI-RS due to LBT failure in BFD. Solutions include using an A-CSI RS, creating additional CSI-RS transmissions and enabling a modification of the BFI\_counter in the case that the failure was due to a non-transmission as opposed to poor performance. |
| Nokia, NSB | In general, we share the view from Qualcomm. One LBT-related issue is LBT failure on P-TRS transmission that is the main QCL source for different signals and channels.  |
| LG Electronics | Beam management considering beam switching time and coverage loss needs to be enhanced, especially for 960 kHz + NCP. For example, CSI-RS or SRS for the purpose of beam management needs to be triggered to span over multiple slots. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We agree with InterDigital’s and LGE’s view that other than LBT aspects should also be considered in 52-71GHz item.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We share similar views with Lenovo and Qualcomm. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Overlap with the Rel-17 MIMO must be avoided. We agree with Qualcomm’s comment. The next step would need to identify which aspects of beam management may need enhancements in relation to LBT. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with Qualcomm’s comments |
| Sony | In general, we think the BM issues that related with narrower beam, higher SCS and LBT procedure should be considered.  |
| Ericsson 3 | Certainly beam management in FR2 should be the baseline, and in general, beam management enhancements are suited for the MIMO WI.However, there can be some targeted enhancements that could be considered specific to operation in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band. For example, as pointed out in some comments above, there are expected to be a large # of beams. Furthermore, the scheduling granularity may not be on a per slot basis for the larger SCSs due to PDCCH monitoring constraints. Hence, like for PUSCH and PDSCCH where it is being discussed to schedule multiple slots with a single DCI, the same can be considered for triggering of aperiodic CSI-RS/SRS resources by DCI. Hence, we think the following can be captured in the TR:Further investigate potential enhancements to triggering of aperiodic CSI-RS/SRS resources to support flexible multi-slot triggering with single DCI |

###### Company Comments on Beam Switching:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | For lower SCS of 240 kHz beam switching gap is not necessary |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | For higher SCS, beam switching should be investigated for supporting contiguous transmissions on different beams |
| Qualcomm | For higher SCS, the necessity of the beam switching gap should be discussed. |
| Apple | The effect of beam switching should be discussed for higher SCS. Also, any associated capabilities need to be modified. |
| Nokia, NSB | We consider that assumption for the beam switching time is << 70 ns meaning that normal cyclic prefix length of 960 kHz subcarrier spacing is long enough to handle beam switching and no explicit beam switching gap is needed (e.g. between successive SSB blocks). |
| LG Electronics | For 960 kHz SCS + NCP, beam switching time should be considered. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We agree it should be discussed for larger SCS.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For SCS <= 240 kHz, the CP duration is sufficient for beam switching. For higher SCS >240 kHz (esp. for 960 kHz), additional nhancement for beam switching should be considered. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree that beam switching should be discussed for higher SCS since even if CP is long enough it will result in reduced robustness to multipath delay spread. |
| CATT | Beam switching delay should be considered for higher SCS when the CP length is shorter than beamswitching time.  |
| Ericsson 3 | Agree with previous comments that for robustness, the beam switching time + delay spread needs to be considered in relation to the CP duration. According to 38.817 Sec 9.10.2, “The worst-case beam switching time is hence based on the analogue implementation and is estimated as < 100ns.” Hence delay spread + beam switching time should be considered for 960 kHz where the CP duration is 73 ns. For 480 kHz and lower, the CP duration is sufficiently long to account for beam switching and delay spread. |

##### 4th round of Discussion:

Moderator is not sure, what agreement on beam management should be appropriate for the SI. Please feel free to suggest proposals for agreement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, we can try to capture potential beam-manahement enhancements that are specific to high SCS values and it should be noted that the beam management enhancements in feMIMO WI for FR2 would be applicable for B52.6GHz as well. Although, in other sections, some aspects of beam management have been considered, but nevertheless, we suggest following proposalsfor beam management:**For new additional numerologies (such as 240kHz, 480kHz, 960kHz) , at least following enhancements for beam management procedures should be considered and standardized, if needed:*** **For contiguous transmissions/repetitions on different beams, whether and how to handle the beam switching gaps that can be potentially larger than the cyclic prefix value**
* **Multiple beam indication for multi-slot scheduling**
* **Potential enhancements to CSI-RS and SRS for beam management**
 |
| Nokia, NSB |  Proposal: Minimum requirement on beam switching delay in > 52.6 GHz spetrum should be further studied. (applicable to RAN4) |
| Apple | There may be a need to enhance CSI-RS and SRS behavior for beam management. In addition, enabling a modification beam management behavior may be necessary e.g. modify increment of BFI\_counter in the case that the failure was due to a non-transmission as opposed to poor performance. |

## 2.13 Issues with RF impairments

### 2.13.1 Observations and Proposals from Contributions

* From [5]:
	+ Observation 8: The impact of I/Q imbalance needs to be evaluated by RAN4 to decide whether it is necessary to consider additional design on standard to mitigate the side effect.
	+ Observation 9: The PA model for frequencies above 52.6GHz and the PAPR performance need further evaluation by RAN4 to decide whether it is necessary to consider additional design on standard to mitigate the side effect.
* From [10]:
	+ Proposal 12: Send an LS to RAN4 on updating the MIMO TAE minimum requirements.
* From [14]:
	+ Capture the following in TR 38.808: Link evaluation based on phase model Ex 2, with characteristics not reflecting realistic devices or current state of the technology, can lead to pessimistic assessment of smaller sub-carrier spacings. It is important for 3GPP to adopt more suitable phase noise models in the discussion and system designs for NR operation in 52.7 – 71 GHz range.

### 2.13.2 Discussions

##### Moderator Summary of observations and proposals from Contributions:

* A company noted that impact of I/Q imbalance requires to be evaluated and depending on the severity RAN1 may need to address the issues.
* A company noted that MIMO TAE may need to be looked into for NR operating in 60 GHz band.
* A company noted that phase noise model from TR 38.803 may not reflect state of art technology and provide pessimistic assessment of suitable subcarrier spacings.

Moderator has yet to provide some suggestion for agreement for this topic. Moderator plans to suggestions later. Meanwhile, if companies have suggestions on what RAN1 may be able to agree to and capture to the TR, please comment further.

###### Company Comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| InterDigital | As RAN1 is not the expert group on phase noise, we still prefer to have an agreed phase noise assumption if RAN1 needs to consider new phase models.  |
| LG Electronics | It should be noted that current MIMO TAE requirement is not suitable for NR to be operated with 960 kHz SCS + NCP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We expect RAN4 to discuss these issues, thus RAN1 may not need to capture any consideration related to RF in the RAN1 part of the TR. If those aspects have not been investigated in SI phase by RAN4 then they will need to be investigated in WI phase. We don’t consider that this would prevent closing the study. |
| Ericsson 3 | Agree with comments from Huawei and LG |

##### 4th round of Discussion:

Moderator is not sure, what agreement on other RF aspects should be appropriate for the SI, especially more so since RAN4 is the expert domain for this issue. Please feel free to suggest proposals for agreement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Agree with Huawei and Ericsson on the phase noise issue raised in discussion round 3. Our understanding is that RAN4 is discussing this issues and will be sending an LS response on the phase noise issue. |

# Summary of Conclusions

To be filled once agreements/conclusions are made in RAN1.

Agreement:

R1-2007958 is endorsed with the “smallest of Z\_min” modifed to “smallest value of Z\_max” and setting Z\_min equal to 0 in Section A.3. Modifications to fix errors will be made as part of upcoming updates.

Agreement:

Numerologies below 120 kHz or above 960 kHz are not supported for any signal or channel.

Agreement:

For operation in 52-71 GHz:

* 120 kHz should be supported
* Up to two additional SCS may be considered and at least one should be supported
* FFS: Applicability of additional SCS to particular signals and channels

Agreement:

Capture the following observations in the TR. Editorial modifications and changes to references can be made when capturing the observations in the TR.

1. It was observed that amount of specification effort increases with the number of new numerologies enabled and supported for 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz frequency.
2. In order to minimize specification effort while maximizing supported use cases and deployment scenarios applicable for 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz frequency, It is recommended to support 120 kHz subcarrier spacing with normal CP length, and at least one more subcarrier spacing. It is recommended to consider supporting at most up to three subcarrier spacings, including 120 kHz subcarrier spacing. Applicability of the supported subcarrier spacing to particular signals and channels should be further discussed in the corresponding WI phase.
3. It is recommended that numerologies 240 kHz, 480 kHz, and 960 kHz are considered as candidates for additional numerologies in addition to 120 kHz, and numerologies outside this range are not supported for any signals or channels.
4. In order to bound implementation complexity, it is recommended to limit the maximum FFT size required to operate system in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz frequency to 4096 and to limit the maximum of RBs per carrier to 275 RBs.
5. Selection of the additional subcarrier spacing (on top of 120 kHz) should consider versatility of being able to support various applications and deployment scenarios with all the subcarrier spacings that would be supported by specification, accounting for what is already supported in Rel-15 and Rel-16 specifications.
6. Some companies have noted that ability for a deployed system to operate with a single numerology for all channels and signals is beneficial, and some companies have further noted benefit remains even if SSB numerology is different. Some companies have noted mixed numerology operation is functional and is supported in Rel-15 and Rel-16 specifications (e.g. 240 kHz SSB subcarrier spacing with 120 kHz subcarrier spacing for PDCCH/PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH/PRACH in an initial BWP and activation of a dedicated BWP with SCS different than the initial BWP) and consideration of single numerology operation is not needed.

Agreement:

Capture the following observations in the TR. Editorial modifications and changes to references can be made when capturing the observations in the TR.

Overall implementation complexity for supporting a specific subcarrier spacing may need to consider the following, but not limited to:

* processing complexity for equalization including inter-carrier interference mitigation (if required to support higher modulation orders) and compensation, andFFT complexity per unit time for a given bandwidth,
* complexity associated with supporting multiple component carriers to reach a specific throughput
* complexity associated with supporting given reduced (in abosolute time) requirements on UE processing times (e.g. N1, N2, N3, Z1, Z2, Z3, etc) and UE PDCCH processing budget as a function of subcarrier spacing, if scheduling and monitoring unit is maintained to be one slot.
* supported features indicated by UE capability signaling or implemented by the gNB
* complexity associated with supporting required timing error tolerance which may need to considerinitial timing error, timing advance setting, TA granularity, MIMO TAE (TAE value will be defined by RAN4), multi-TRP timing alignment as a function of SCS, whether mixture or a single subcarrier spacing for signals is configured, and deployment scenarios.
* complexity associated with supporting higher sampling rates and with channel bandwidth larger than 2 GHz

Agreement:

1. It is observed that for a single carrier with the same number of transmitted symbols, in general, smaller subcarrier spacing may potentially provide larger coverage due to use of smaller bandwidth and gears towards (but not limited to) coverage driven scenarios.
2. It is observed that for a single carrier, in general, larger subcarrier spacing may potentially provide higher peak data rates due to use of larger bandwidth and gears towards (but not limited to) peak data-rate driven scenarios.
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