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# 1. Introduction

This paper is to trigger the following email discussion of IDC TDM solutions:

* [AT119-e][652][IDC] TDM solution (Xiaomi)

      Scope: based on companies’ contributions submitted in 8.10.3

      A) Identify the use cases or scenarios (e.g. WLAN, BT multimedia, BT voice) for the TDM solution

               B) TDM solutions for identified use cases/scenarios

      Intended outcome: Report to Wednesday session in R2-2208922

      Deadline: Wednesday 2022-08-24 00:30 AM UTC.

## 1.1 Contacts

Contact person for each participating company:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Xiaomi | Yumin Wu | wuyumin@xiaomi.com |
| Samsung  | Weiwei Wang  | ww1016.wang@samsung.com |
| ZTE | Wenting Li | Li.wenting@zte.com.cn |
| Lenovo | Lianhai | Wulh5@Lenovo.com |
| Apple | Yuqin Chen | yuqin\_chen@apple.com |
| vivo  | Xiaodong Yang | Yangxiaodong5g@vivo.com |
| Qualcomm | Sherif ElAzzouni | selazzou@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Nokia | Benoist Sébire | benoist.sebire@nokia.com |
| Sharp | LIU Lei | lei.liu@cn.sharp-world.com |
| OPPO | Xinlei Yu | yuxinlei@oppo.com |
| Intel | Yujian Zhang | yujian.zhang@intel.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Jagdeep Singh  | jagdeep.singh6@huawei.com |
| Ericsson | Henrik Enbuske | Henrik.enbuske@ericsson.com |
| LGE | Hanseul Hong | hanseul.hong@lge.com |
|  |  |  |

# 2. Discussion

The objective related to the IDC TDM solution is quoted as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| This WI expects to address interference between 3GPP (including various MR-DC architectures, i.e. NR-DC and EN-DC) and non-3GPP RAT (e.g. WiFi).* Introduction of TDM solution (e.g. indication of UE preferred TDM pattern for UL/DL). (RAN2, RAN4).Note: The TDM solution is considered complementary to the FDM solution.

Note: LTE IDC solution should be considered as the baseline for the solutions developed in this WI. |

## 2.1 Scenarios and use cases

According to the 3GPP TR 36.816, the TDM solutions are designed to resolve the IDC issues in various usage scenarios. Since the Rel-18 IDC WID already states that “LTE IDC solution should be considered as the baseline for the solutions developed in this WI”, we consider that the following LTE TDM solutions (or the Rel-18 NR TDM solutions taking the following LTE TDM solutions as baseline) could be applied for the use cases as described in the 3GPP TR 36.816.

* Solution 1: TDM assistance information (i.e. UE reporting of its preferred TDM parttern via *TDM-AssistanceInfo-r11*)
	+ Solution 1.1: DRX based solution (i.e. UE reporting of its preferred DRX configuration via *drx-AssistanceInfo-r11*)
	+ Solution 1.2: HARQ process reservation based solution (i.e. UE reporting of its preferred UL/DL subframe pattern via *idc-SubframePatternList-r11*)
* Solution 2: Network controlled UE autonomous denial (i.e. UE autonomous denial based on the configuration of *autonomousDenialParameters-r11*)

The corresponding usage scenarios for each solution are also quoted from 3GPP TR 36.816, as given blow.

|  |
| --- |
| 3GPP TR 36.816: Usage scenario for TDM solutions in generalSCO, eSCO, A2DP and ACL protocols are assumed to be supported by in-device BT radio when analyzing the TDM solutions for LTE-BT coexistence. Beacon, power saving and DCF protocols are assumed to be supported by in-device WiFi radio when analyzing the TDM solutions for LTE-WiFi coexistence. |
| 3GPP TR 36.816: Usage scenario for Solution 1.1DRX solution could be used also for shorter interference patters. E.g. with BT voice, it is possible to configure DRX cycle to 10 ms or 5 ms and then achieve a desired gap pattern with appropriate setting on drx-OnDurationTimer, drx-InactivityTimer, drx-retransmissionTimer and DRX offset. In some cases, drx-retransmissionTimer of 0 ms needs to be introduced to avoid the UE to be DRX Active in the subframes that are reserved for ISM traffic.  |
| 3GPP TR 36.816: Usage scenario for Solution 1.2In this solution, e.g. a number of LTE HARQ processes or subframes are reserved for LTE operation, and the remaining subframes are used to accommodate ISM/GNSS traffic.The information that UE provides should allow the network to ensure at least a pair of clean BT Tx/Rx instances in each BT interval, and as much as possible capacity to LTE. |
| 3GPP TR 36.816: Usage scenario for Solution 2UE can autonomously deny LTE resources due to some critical short-term events of ISM side, e.g. some events during BT/WiFi connection-setup or other important signalling.During stable situation of ISM operation, some LTE resources can be denied by UE autonomously to protect ISM data packets, so e.g. the BT eSCO connection or WiFi connection with PS-Poll can be maintained. |

[8] considers “WLAN beacon and BT eSCO as target use cases to assess TDM solutions”. [6] asks “whether to support coexistence use case with Bluetooth voice”. From the rapporteur’s understanding, RAN2 can firstly discuss/confirm whether the TDM solution use cases as described in 36.816 should also be considered in Rel-18 IDC solutions.

#### Question 1: Do you agree that the use cases as described in 36.816 for LTE TDM solutions are considered for developing the Rel-18 IDC TDM solution?

The examples for the TDM uses cases in 36.816 are listed as follows:

* BT voice [6]
* WLAN beacon [8]
* BT eSCO [8]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** **(**Yes or No**)** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Since the Rel-18 IDC WID is targeting at reusing the LTE TDM solutions as baseline, we think that the use cases as described in 36.816 for LTE TDM solutions should also be considered for NR. It is quite obvious that the services/signalling via the BT or WLAN wiil not change when the UE is using LTE or NR. |
| Samsung  | Yes  |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes at least | New spectrum considered for NR and ISM between 3 GHz and 7 GHz need to be added as well as maybe B41 |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We agree the reasoning provided by Xiaomi and also think that these scenarios could be considered for NR. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |

[9] considers that the TDM soluton should be able to resolve the IDC issues of the adjacent channel interference and the intermodulation distortion (IMD) interference. The corresponding scenarios from [9] are listed as follows:

* Scenario 1: Adjacent channel interference between NR and non-3GPP that includes the following sub scenarios
	+ Scenario 1-1: Adjacent channel interference between NR Stand Alone (SA) or MN of NR-DC and non-3GPP
	+ Scenario 1-2: Adjacent channel interference between SN (NR) of MR-DC and non-3GPP
* Scenario 2: Intermodulation Distortion (IMD) interference from simultaneous Tx in MR-DC to non-3GPP that includes the following sub scenarios
	1. Scenario 2-1: IMD interference from simultaneous Tx in EN-DC to non-3GPP
	2. Scenario 2-2: IMD interference from simultaneous Tx in NR-DC to non-3GPP

From the rapporteur’s understanding, RAN2 can firstly confirm whether the design of the Rel-18 TDM solution should target at resovling the adjacent channel interference issue and the intermodulation distortion interference issue, like the LTE TDM solution as described in 3GPP TR 36.816. The MR-DC impacts can be discussed later when RAN2 has selected the TDM solutions to be specified, as different TDM solutions may cause different specification impacts for different MR-DC architectures.

#### Question 2: Do you agree that the Rel-18 IDC TDM solution(s) targets at resolving the adjacent channel interference issue and the intermodulation distortion interference issue, as LTE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** **(**Yes or No**)** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Yes | It is better to confirm the interference issues to be resolved by the Rel-18 IDC TDM solutions, so that all issues will be resovled properly by TDM solutions.  |
| Samsung  | Yes  |  |
| ZTE | See comments | Our understanding is that the LTE TDM solution is mainly for the adjacent channel interference. For the IMD, as described in Q4, “the *TDM-AssistanceInfo-r11* is independent from the UL CA frequencies reported for inter-modulation (i.e. *affectedCarrierFreqCombList* and *affectedCarrierFreqCombInfoListMRDC*). “ So how to understand “as LTE” in this Question?Does this question means to extend the TDM solution also to the UL CA case? |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | Note that in band blocking requirements as well as adjacent channel selectivity performance should be considered as we expect that ruggedness against IMD problems should be tested while the aggressor is turned on (RAN4) |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Comment | IDC TDM should mainly focus on adjacent channel interference and as a second priority look into IDM should that be required. |
| LGE | Yes |  |

## 2.2 TDM solutions using LTE baseline

According to the 3GPP TS 36.331 and the Section 5.2.1.2 and 5.2.2.1 of the 3GPP TR 36.816, the TDM solutions specified for LTE IDC include the followings:

* Solution 1: TDM assistance information (i.e. UE reporting of its preferred TDM parttern via *TDM-AssistanceInfo-r11*)
	+ Solution 1.1: DRX based solution (i.e. UE reporting of its preferred DRX configuration via *drx-AssistanceInfo-r11*)
	+ Solution 1.2: HARQ process reservation based solution (i.e. UE reporting of its preferred UL/DL subframe pattern via *idc-SubframePatternList-r11*)
* Solution 2: Network controlled UE autonomous denial (i.e. UE autonomous denial based on the configuration of *autonomousDenialParameters-r11*)

The rapporteur’s understanding is that RAN2 can firstly confirm what has been stated in the IDC WID, i.e. using the LTE TDM solutions as baseline.

#### Question 3: Do you agree that the LTE TDM solutions are considered as the baseline for developing the Rel-18 IDC TDM solution, as indicated in the WID?

(Rapporteur’s comment: Further downselection from the the LTE TDM solutions can be discussed separately.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** **(**Yes or No**)** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We think that it is better to confirm the design principle as indicated in the WID, so that companies can have the common understanding while selecting TDM solution(s) for mitigating IDC interference. Other TDM solutions can still be considered when time allows. |
| Samsung  | Partial Yes | The DRX part in LTE can be the baseline The subframe pattern part in LTE is not aligned with NR since NR has a more flexible slot structure so the timer domain pattern should take TDM configuration of NR (e.g., slot) into account. |
| ZTE | Partially Yes | Similar view as Samsung, and maybe MUSIM gap-like scheme can also be considered |
| Lenovo | See comments | The granurality between NR and LTE is difference as Samsung mentioned. The important point is that UE needs to report the time-domain information to network. Then, the network reconfigures TDM to UE. RAN2 needs to evaluate/discuss which one (DRX-like or MUSIM gap-like is better.  |
| Apple | See comments | We can confirm DRX like (or MUSIM gap like) solution as the main motivation is to get an off time duration. For HARQ process reservation based solution, we have a big question mark if it is still needed since NR HARQ pattern is much more flexible.For autonomous denial, we don’t have strong views but RAN4 work would be required on the allowed denial rate. |
| vivo | No  | We prefere use MUSIM gap like method. MUSIM gap has been introduced in R17 it is better to use it. LTE methods are not suitable for NR, like company comments. DRX give more timer maintance, and some power saving signallings like DCP will also impact DRX. DL/UL subframe pattern is needed for LTE due to sync HARQ. Auto deny will give more RAN4 works.  |
| Qualcomm | No  | Agree with Samsung and Apple. Since there is already one LTE solution that we think would be inapplicable and a fairly new solution (MUSIM-like gaps) that we think have promise and an active discussion going on, then it’s not preferrable to have a baseline agreement that excludes a solution already in discussion. We can discuss the few proposed solutions based on merit without a baseline.  |
| Nokia | - | Agree with Samsung |
| Sharp | Partially Yes | DRX based solution can be considered as baseline. HARQ process reservation based solution needs more discussion considering the difference from LTE. |
| OPPO | Partially Yes | Note that the TDM solution is considered complementary to the FDM solution. Therefore, we may need more effort on the enhancement of FDM solutions, and try to re-use LTE TDM solutions as baseline, as indicated in the WID.For the LTE TDM solutions, in our understanding, DRX based solution in LTE is suitable as the start point for discussion. |
| Intel | Partially Yes | Our understanding is that DRX solution (including DRX assistance information) can be the baseline for NR TDM solution.As for subframe pattern, if it is necessary to support coexistence use case with Bluetooth voice, a simple TDM pattern with fine granularity (compared with DRX assistance information) can be considered since there is no synchronous HARQ constraint in NR.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Partially Yes | We believe that the DRX based solution (Solution 1.1) as in LTE should be considered first and should have highest priority among all the TDM solutuons as we think this solution can strainght away be applicable to NR. We also think that HARQ process reservation based solution (Solution 1.2) is not applicable to NR due to different HARQ structures. |
| Ericsson | No | Agree with Samsung. |
| LGE | No | We are okay to consider solution 1.1, i.e., DRX based solution, since it has been included in LTE.However, we don’t want to consider solution 1.2 and solution 2 because they causes lots of additional discussion caused by flexible numerologies in NR. It would not be completed in the limited TU.In addition, we prefer the simple solution for TDM, so we are open to discuss whether to use MUSIM gap-like solution, instead of DRX based solution. |

|  |
| --- |
| 3GPP TS 36.331: Solution 1.1 and Solution 1.2 included within the *TDM-AssistanceInfo-r11*1> if there is at least one E-UTRA carrier frequency, for which a measurement object is configured, that is affected by IDC problems:2> include the field *affectedCarrierFreqList* with an entry for each affected E-UTRA carrier frequency for which a measurement object is configured;2> for each E-UTRA carrier frequency included in the field *affectedCarrierFreqList*, include *interferenceDirection* and set it accordingly;2> include Time Domain Multiplexing (TDM) based assistance information, unless *idc-HardwareSharingIndication* is configured and the UE has no Time Doman Multiplexing based assistance information that could be used to resolve the IDC problems:3> if the UE has DRX related assistance information that could be used to resolve the IDC problems:4> include *drx-CycleLength*, *drx-Offset* and *drx-ActiveTime*;3> else (the UE has desired subframe reservation patterns related assistance information that could be used to resolve the IDC problems):4> include *idc-SubframePatternList*;3> use the MCG as timing reference if TDM based assistance information regarding the SCG is included; |

As highlighted above, the *TDM-AssistanceInfo-r11* reported by the UE is complementary to the frequency information included in the IDC report. Namely the *TDM-AssistanceInfo-r11* can only be reported when the *affectedCarrierFreqList* is reported for the adjacent channel interference, and the *TDM-AssistanceInfo-r11* is independent from the UL CA frequencies reported for inter-modulation (i.e. *affectedCarrierFreqCombList* and *affectedCarrierFreqCombInfoListMRDC*).

[4][11] considers that the impacts of BWP switching should be considered for the TDM solution. From the rapporteur’s understanding, this depends on whether/how the FDM solution of IDC is impacted by the BWP switching, as the TDM solution of LTE is currently associated to the reported frequency. The BWP switching issue can be discussed later once the FDM solution is clear.

#### Question 4: Do you agree that the UE reports the TDM assistance information for IDC affected frequency list (i.e. not for the frequency combination list of UL CA), as LTE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** **(**Yes or No**)** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Yes | As indicated in the WID, “the TDM solution is considered complementary to the FDM solution”. This is also aligned with the LTE design principles. On the other hand, since the LTE baseline solution of TDM assistance information is independent from the UL CA frequencies reported for inter-modulation interference, we think that clear motivations need to be provided on designling new TDM assistance information for UL CA. |
| Samsung  | Yes with comments  | TDM information for the affected frequency list can be the baseline. However, this does not preclude the other frequency granularity, which needs the progress for FDM solution. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes with comments | TDM assistance information for IDC affected frequency list can be considered as baseline. additional information could be futher considered. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Good baseline for now. We can revisit later if a need arises to expand the scope. |
| Nokia | Yes but | Agree with Samsung & Lenovo. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Intel | See comments | It is no clear to us why we should link TDM assistance information with affected frequency list instead of frequency combination list. From LTD IDC discussion history, yes, UL CA combination assistance information was introduced after TDM assistance information and affected frequency list. But this should not exclude the usage of TDM assistance information when there is an issue of inter-modulation (which results in report of UL CA combination). Our view is that there is no need to have TDM optimizations for inter-modulation issues, but we should not exclude the usage of TDM assistance information for inter-modulation issues either. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes  |  |
| Ericsson | Yes, comment | TDM assistance information should build on the FDM IDC framework including enhancements there, i.e reporting frequencies or other granularity/items in reporting. |
| LGE | Yes | We can take the LTE approach as a baseline. |

For Solution 1-1, [1][2][3][4][5][6][7][8][9][11][12] propose to allow the UE to report its desired DRX configuration. The rapporteur’s understanding is that same as LTE, the UE can report its desired DRX pattern (including DRX cycle, DRX starting offset and DRX active time) for affected NR frequency list (i.e. not for the frequency combination list of UL CA).

#### Question 5: Do you agree that the UE can report its preferred DRX pattern (including DRX cycle, DRX starting offset and DRX active time), as LTE?

(Rapporteur’s comment: Whether multiple DRX(s) within or across different cell groups or whether more paramters are needed can be a separate discussion.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** **(**Yes or No**)** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Yes | It seems that the UE reporting of its desired DRX pattern for affected NR frequency list can reuse the LTE DRX solution for IDC. Signaling details on whether to consider the latest NR DRX design (e.g. the milli-second granularity of NR DRX configuration or the multiple DRX(s) within a CG) can be discussed further. |
| Samsung  | Yes  |  |
| ZTE | FFS | We are open to take DRX like or MUSIM like scheme |
| Lenovo | See comments | RAN2 needs to perform fo down-selection of DRX pattern and MUSIM gap-like first. |
| Apple | Yes with comments | For DRX operation, one problem is UE needs to maintain many timers. That is why we feel MUSIM gap is also a good candidate. |
| vivo |  No  | MUSIM like scheme is better.  |
| Qualcomm | Yes but | We think DRX solution can offer some utility to the WLAN use case where the non-3GPP technology can use some interference free time to operate (e.g. receive a beacon). We not however that the DRX solution does not solve all the IDC use cases, e.g., anything BT would be too short to control via a DRX cycle without greatly affecting UE latency and power. So we support DRX with the caveat that it cannot be the only solution. |
| Nokia | Yes but | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Sharp | Yes | The detailed content in preferred DRX pattern can be further discussed considering current NR DRX. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes  | DRX-based TDM solution has been well designed in LTE and we don't see any issue to apply it in NR. Additionally, we think that the network should be able to configure whether UE suggested TDM pattern information is allowed to be sent by the UE or not. This will prevent the UE from sending the UE suggested TDM pattern information unnecessarily if the network does not want to use it for resolving the IDC issues |
| Ericsson | Yes | Agree w Huawei. Additions can be explored if not sufficient (as a next step). |
| LGE | FFS | RAN2 needs to first discuss whether to use MUSIM gap-like solution or DRX based solution first. We prefer to take simpler one. |

For Solution 1-2, [1][3][4][6][11] considers that the NR flexible numerology and UL/DL configuration may need to be considered while defining the finer granularity for UL/DL transmission/reception. [8][12] considers that Solution 1-2 is not feasible for NR due to “the large number of possible TDD configurations” and “the flexible HARQ timing in NR”. From the rapporteur’s understanding, Solution 1-2 is to provide more flexibilities for the gNB, so as to have more efficient use on the frequency resources, especially for TDD frequencies. For example, when the interference is DL-only interference to a TDD frequency, using the DRX to stop the UL slot seems over-kill. Same problem can also happen for UL-only interference from a TDD frequency.

#### Question 6: Do you agree that the UE can report its preferred UL and/or DL transmission occasion(s), as LTE?

(Rapporteur’s comment: The details on the UL and/or DL transmission occasion can be discussed further, once the proposal is agreed.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** **(**Yes or No**)** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We think that the finer granularity on indicating UL and/or DL transmission occasion is important for TDD band, since DRX would stop both UL and DL at the inactive period. The IDC interference could be DL-only or UL-only from time to time.  |
| Samsung  | Yes  | In our understanding, the intention of preferred DL/UL transmission is corresponding to preferred subframe pattern reporting in LTE. For NR case, the DL/UL transmission occasions may have more fine granularity. Thus, when designing the detailed TDM pattern, the preferred DL/UL occasions can take NR slot structure into account. |
| ZTE | No | It would increase RAN4’s work on the related requirement, we don’t think it can be finished in this WID. |
| Lenovo | Yes | It may align with the objective. |
| Apple | No | In LTE IDC, HARQ process reservation based solution was to keep the HARQ process un-interrupted. However in NR, we don’t think the issue is still justified as the HARQ timeline becomes much more flexible.  |
| vivo | No  |  |
| Qualcomm | No | The TDD patterns in LTE are a completely different framework from NR: subframe TDD vs symbol TDD, different HARQ times, etc, so we think the LTE solution is inapplicable in NR. Instead what is proposed would be a redesign of a completely new UL/DL pattern solution that we think is not good for NR, e.g., in TDD it is unclear what the UE needs to request and how it can modify this for every possible TDD pattern. These kinds of problems make the MUSIM solution much simpler and preferable.  |
| Nokia | Yes | Also we consider finer granularity could make sense we would like to possible consider some enhancemetns to accommodate NR specifics. |
| Sharp | Yes | The pattern of preferred UL and/or DL transmission occasion(s) for NR may be different from LTE. |
| OPPO | No | The LTE solution cannot be directly used for NR. Therefore, we may not have time to specify it in WID. |
| Intel | See comments | If it is necessary to support coexistence use case with Bluetooth voice, a simple TDM pattern with fine granularity (compared with DRX assistance information) can be considered since there is no synchronous HARQ constraint in NR.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Agree with Apple. For the HARQ pattern to work, the UE needs to know the UL scheduling pattern of the NW for the HARQ process. In NR this is upto the gNB scheduler implementation. So for NR IDC we think the HARQ process reservation based solution is not applicable. |
| Ericsson | No | Given the number of TDD patterns, HARQ and also the complexity for RAN4, this should not be pursued. |
| LGE | No | Considering the limited TUs, this solution should not be considered, since it would cause a lot of further discussion. |

|  |
| --- |
| 3GPP TS 36.331: Solution 2 considered as a TDM solution according to “5.2.2.1 TDM solutions” of 3GPP TR 36.8162> if *autonomousDenialParameters* is included:3> consider itself to be allowed to deny any transmission in a particular UL subframe if during the number of subframes indicated by *autonomousDenialValidity*, preceeding and including this particular subframe, it autonomously denied fewer UL subframes than indicated by *autonomousDenialSubframes*; |

For Solution 2, [1][3][4] considers that the LTE solution can be reused for NR. As quoted above from 3GPP TS 36.331, since LTE autonomous denial is based on the granularity of subframe, NR could also reuse the same granularity of subframe.

#### Question 7: Do you agree that the UE can be configured to autonomously deny the NR UL transmission, as LTE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** **(**Yes or No**)** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Yes | According to 3GPP TR 36.816, the autonomous denial solution seems to be the only TDM solution to deal with the “infrequent short-term events”, e.g. “BT/WiFi connection-setup or other important signalling”. Compared with DRX and UL/DL reservation, the autonomous denial solution is more efficient for aperiodic and even-driven control signalling via WiFi or BT. |
| Samsung  | Yes with comments  | We agree the autonomous denial should be supported in Rel-18. However, the LTE autonomous denial is configured per-UE. With the MR-DC configuration, we may need enhance it in Rel-18. |
| ZTE | No | Same reason as Q6 |
| Lenovo | Yes | The autonomously deny can be controlled by network. |
| Apple | No strong view |  |
| vivo | No  |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | For some important non-3GPP transmission events, there is a lot of utility in allowing the UE to autonomously deny the NR transmission. Having an autonomous denial solution configured by the NW would be both useful and applicable for coexistence and guaranteeing no interference during important non-3GPP transmissions. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Sharp  | No strong view |  |
| OPPO | No |  |
| Intel | No strong view | If autonomous denial is supported, the specification impact can be similar to LTE: RAN2 signaling and RAN4 performance requirements. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No strong view | We can condider it after the more general DRX based solution for NR is finalised as the autonomously denial solution is to be used in very specific scenarios e.g for receiving WiFi beacon. |
| Ericsson | No | We do not think this is needed for NR IDC. |
| LGE | No | Considering the limited TUs, this solution should not be considered, since it would cause a lot of further discussion. |

## 2.3 Other solutions

According to companies’ contributions submitted to RAN2#119-e meeting, a few other solutions for TDM are also provided as follows:

* Solution A: MUSIM gap-like [2][5][8][10][12]
* Solution B: Hardware sharing indication [1]

|  |
| --- |
| 38.331: Solution AMUSIM-GapInfo-r17 ::= SEQUENCE { musim-Starting-SFN-AndSubframe-r17 MUSIM-Starting-SFN-AndSubframe-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Cond aperiodic musim-GapLength-r17 ENUMERATED {ms3, ms4, ms6, ms10, ms20} OPTIONAL, -- Need S musim-GapRepetitionAndOffset-r17 CHOICE { ms20-r17 INTEGER (0..19), ms40-r17 INTEGER (0..39), ms80-r17 INTEGER (0..79), ms160-r17 INTEGER (0..159), ms320-r17 INTEGER (0..319), ms640-r17 INTEGER (0..639), ms1280-r17 INTEGER (0..1279), ms2560-r17 INTEGER (0..2559), ms5120-r17 INTEGER (0..5119), ... } OPTIONAL -- Cond periodic} MUSIM-Starting-SFN-AndSubframe-r17 ::= SEQUENCE { starting-SFN-r17 INTEGER (0..1023), startingSubframe-r17 INTEGER (0..9)} |

As quoted above for Solution A, the UE can report its desired gap pattern. [6] states that Solution A should not be considered, as the DRX solution is more flexible and suitable for resolving the IDC intereference issue. From the rapporteur’s understanding, if the gap-based solution is adopted, we would anyway need a new reporting signalling separate from MUSIM, since the TDM assistance information is complementary to the affected frequency reported by the UE. The gNB needs both the IDC frequency information and the time-domain information together in order to resolve the interference issue.

#### Question 8: Do you think think that MUSIM gap-like solution should be included in Rel-18 IDC work?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer****(Yes or No)**  | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | No | It seems that if we reuse the LTE TDM solutions, the interference issues including both the adjacent channel interference and the intermodulation distortion interference can be resolve already. The MUSIM gap-like solution seems redundant, as it has the same benefit as the DRX solution, and is less flexible than the DRX solution considering the gap values. |
| Samsung  | No  | It seems that MUSIM gap-like solution does not have additional benefit on top of 1) preferred DRX and 2) preferred DL/UL pattern.  |
| ZTE | FFS | We are open on this issue but slightly prefer to take the MUSIM like scheme |
| Lenovo | Yes | RAN2 needs to evaluate/discuss which one (DRX based and MUSIM based) is more suitable. |
| Apple | Yes | MUSIM gap is simpler with regards to UE implementation. |
| vivo | Yes  | Agree with Apple. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We think MUSIM-like gaps is the best solution on the table currently with respect to both simplicity and the ability to provide long and short gaps (i.e. unlike DRX this can target all use cases). It is much simpler than UL and DL patterns and can be tailored and optimized to minimize the mutual impact between 3GPP and non-3GPP. Thus, we think MUSIM should be prioritized in our discussions. |
| Nokia | FFS | As long as a gap pattern is indicated, it is perhaps a modelling issue how we call it. |
| Sharp | No | Agree with Xiaomi and Samsung. |
| OPPO | No | Agree with Xiaomi |
| Intel | No | A criterion for IDC TDM solution is that the ratio between the duration where NR cannot be used and the periodicity should be in a reasonable range e.g. between 20~80% to allow flexible resource distribution between NR and other RATs. DRX allows such flexible ratio while the existing NR gap solutions does not provide flexible gap ratios. For MUSIM gap: the maximum value of *musim-GapLength-r17* is 20 ms.Even if the flexibility is not an issue, using existing MUSIM gap for IDC purpose might not be desirable it is configured for different purposes, and is associated with different UE assistance information. From gNB implementation’s perspective, gNB can choose suitable solution to solve IDC problem based on UE assistance information. There is no need to have further standardization efforts (e.g. additional gap lengths / periodicities for IDC purposes) for MUSIM gap solution. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | DRX-based TDM solution has been well designed in LTE and we don't see any issue to apply it in NR, so we think it should be considered as the baseline. Benefit of MUSIM gaps instead of DRX based solution is unclear. Proponents of MUSIM gap can provide a comparative analysis with the DRX based solution. |
| Ericson | No | For MUSIM the value of periodic scheduling gaps need to be evaluated by RAN4 and is likely to anyway also need a similar structure and reporting as a DRX based solution would. |
| LGE | FFS | We are open to discuss whether to use MUSIM gap-like solution if it is simpler than DRX-like solution. If it is agreed, there is no need to use DRX-like solution (i.e., can take either one, but not both). |

Regarding the hardware sharing indication (i.e. the UE reporting of *hardwareSharingProblem-r13*), the rapporteur’s understanding is that the “*hardwareSharingProblem-r13*” is not part of the *TDM-AssistanceInfo* in LTE, and is also not part of the TDM solutions as listed in the IDC 3GPP TR 36.816. If companies want to introduce the hardware sharing indication also for NR, more clarifications (e.g. whether/how to use the legacy indication or a new indication for LTE and NR for MR-DC) are needed.

#### Question 9: Do you think think that Hardware sharing indication should be included in Rel-18 IDC work?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer****(Yes or No)**  | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | No | Regarding the hardware sharing indication, it seems that this is not in the scope of the WID. If most companies think this solution should be included, we are also ok to include it, but we may need to update the WID. |
| Samsung  | Maybe? | Hardware sharing support may be considered if majority companies agree to have it in Rel-18. |
| ZTE | No | Agree with Xiaomi |
| Lenovo | No  | Agree with Xiaomi. |
| Apple | See comments | We are fine with xiaomi’s proposal that if companies have interests to include hardware sharing, it can be brought to RAN plenary. |
| vivo | No  |  |
| Qualcomm | No |  |
| Nokia | Maybe |  |
| Sharp | No |  |
| OPPO | No |  |
| Intel | No | Agree with Xiaomi. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Agree with Xiaomi. |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| LGE | No |  |

# 3. Conclusion

TBD
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