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### 1 – Introduction

This contribution provides a summary of the following email discussion:

[103-e-NR-eIAB-02] Email discussion on other enhancements for simultaneous operation of IAB-node’s child and parent links – Luca (Qualcomm)

* 1st check point: 11/5
* 2nd check point: 11/10
* 3rd check point: 11/12

There are three areas of discussion:

* Timing modes, covered in section 2.
* Interference management, covered in section 3
* Power control, covered in section 4

Active discussion items where companies input is sought are yellow highlighted.

FL agreements or conclusions from email discussion are green highlighted.

FL proposals that have become obsolete because superseded by updated proposals based on feedback and discussion are grey highlighted.

### 2 – Discussion on timing modes

**Topic 2.1**

This discussion topic relates to the discussion on Case 6 and Case 7 timing modes, which were agreed in RAN1#102-e to be supported.

Related input from contributions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon  R1-2007595 | ***Observation 1****: Introducing additional TA for IAB MT for Case 6 timing leads to several issues, such as implementation complexity of MT, new mechanism for determining/sending additional TA command.*  ***Observation 2:*** *To achieve slot level alignment of MT and DU simultaneously reception, negative TA is required to be implement at IAB MT, and negative TA leads to symbol puncturing, it may impact PUCCH transmission.*  ***Proposal 1****: Dynamic switching between legacy UL Tx timing and Case 6 timing should be supported.*  ***Proposal 2****: To achieve Case 6 timing, IAB MT can determine its Tx timing by referring to co-located DU Tx timing.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Case 7 timing is supported to enhance self-interference cancelation for multiplexing scenario Case 4.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *Dynamic switching between legacy UL Tx timing and Case 7 timing should be supported.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Case 7 timing can be achieved under current TA framework, i.e. existing TA for legacy UL Tx timing plus an offset.*  ***Proposal 6****: Symbol level alignment should be supported for Case 7 timing.* |
| vivo  R1-2007685 | **Proposal 1: Enhance negative TA indication method to support Case #7 timing mode as defined in TR38.874.** |
| Fujitsu  R1-2007786 | **Observation 1: Symbol-level alignment for case#7 timing in which UL RX timing is ahead of DL RX timing by a few symbols can be achieved by using the legacy TA mechanism.**  **Observation 2: Slot-level alignment for case #7 can be achieved by introducing a symbol level timing shift in addition to the symbol-level alignment. The IAB node can schedule the child node and/or UEs which**  **is capable or not capable of symbol level timing shift in the same slot.**  **Proposal 1: Support slot-level alignment of case #7 timing for simultaneous operation of MT RX/DU RX in Rel-17.**  **Observation 3: In a scenario where simultaneous TX is operated by using a single panel, UL TX timing is not adjusted by the TA.**  **Observation 4: In a scenario where the UL TX and the DL TX are operated by using separate panels, the requirement on the degree of timing alignment for simultaneous TX is not clear. From the perspective of RX operation at the parent node, it may still be useful to apply TA to the UL TX in a slot used for simultaneous TX.**  **Proposal 2: Clarify the requirement on the degree of timing alignment of case#6 timing for multi panel scenarios.** |
| CMCC  R1-2008030 | **Observation 1: When multiple child nodes supporting Case 6 timing are scheduled in the same occasion, the UL reception timing at the IAB node may not be aligned. The misalignment that cannot be**  **covered by the CP will cause performance degradation.**  **Observation 2: When a legacy UE is scheduled with a child node supporting Case 6 in the same occasion, of which the propagation delay is twice larger than that of the child node, negative TA should**  **be introduced to the UE.**  **Observation 3: Either slot-level alignment or symbol-level alignment can be used for supporting Case 7 timing. For the slot-level alignment, negative TA should be introduced. For the symbol-level alignment, the current TA mechanism can be reused.**  **Proposal 1: The support of the Case 6 timing should be controlled by the parent node.**  **Proposal 2: The following solutions can be considered to achieve the alignment to support Case 7 timing:**   * **Alt 1: Introduce negative TA for IAB nodes to achieve the slot-level alignment of the MT DL and DU UL timing;** * **Alt 2: Reuse the current TA mechanism, symbol-level alignment of the MT DL and DU UL timing is applied**   **Proposal 3: Timing mode should be defined (either a new timing mode or an enhanced Case 7 timing) to facilitate the simultaneous operation of MT-Tx and DU-Rx.** |
| Samsung  R1-2008185 | ***Proposal 1: For multiplexing Case A, Case #1 and Case #6 timing are always time multiplexed in Rel-17.***  ***Proposal 2: For multiplexing Case B, symbol alignment is supported in Rel-17.*** |
| AT&T  R1-2008313 | **Proposal 4: Case 6 and Case 7 timing is only applied in resources which are orthogonal from those used by access or TDM-only backhaul links.** |
| LG Electronics  R1-2008407 | ***Observation 1:*** If it is assumed for Case 7 timing that the both slot and OFDM symbol boundary of IAB-DU is aligned with received time duration (i.e., slot and OFDM symbol) of IAB-MT, the slot boundary of IAB-DU needs to be changed for receiving UL signal.  ***Observation 2:*** Even if the slot boundary of IAB-DU is not aligned with that of received signal of IAB-MT, Case 7 timing can be operated based on the assumption of OFDM symbol level alignment between IAB-DU and IAB-MT.  ***Proposal 1:*** Discuss whether the assumption that slot-level timing alignment within IAB-node (i.e., between IAB-DU Rx and IAB-MT Rx) is needed or not for operating the cases of timing alignment for IAB. And, discuss whether slot boundary of IAB-DU for both downlink and uplink should be kept or not for operating the timing alignment cases for IAB.  ***Proposal 2:*** Discuss TA indication mechanism and UE behavior for enabling case 7 timing.   * The examples of solutions captured in TR38.387 can be starting points for discussion. * Which type of container (e.g., MAC-CE, RRC) is used for TA indication   ***Proposal 3:*** Case 7 like Timing (e.g., Case 7D timing) is supported for multiplexing scenario Case D (simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Rx). Unified mechanism is designed for Case 7 timing and Case 7 like timing.  ***Proposal 4:*** Discuss an indication mechanism and UE behavior for enabling case 6 timing.   * The examples of solutions captured in TR38.387 can be a starting points for discussion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips  R1-2008859 | ***Proposal 1: Parent node can indicate which timing between case-1 timing and case-6 timing is used for UL transmission at a particular slot to its child node.***  ***Proposal 2: UL-Tx timing of case-6 timing should be further studied by RAN4.***  ***Proposal 3: Symbol level alignment between IAB node’s UL-Rx timing and DL-Rx timing should be supported as a solution to resolve potential negative TA issue of case-7 timing.***  ***Proposal 4: So-called “case-7 timing” is not supported for multiplexing case D (i.e., simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Rx).***  ***Observation 1: In multiplexing Case A, TDM-based resource allocation among access UEs and different child IAB nodes should be applied to resolve the UL Rx timing asynchronization issue caused by case-6 timing alignment.***  ***Observation 2: Case-6 timing will also seriously affect RAN4’s specification work.***  ***Observation 3: Slot level alignment of case-7 timing may have more compatibility issues with legacy access UEs.***  ***Observation 4: Whether “case-7 timing” is supported for simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Rx depends on the clear decision whether MT-Tx/DU-Rx still needs to support when multi-panel does not have good isolation. If no, the FFS should***  ***be completely omitted.***  ***Observation 5: The so-called “case-7 timing” for simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Rx is a new kind of timing mode which has not been discussed during Rel-15 SI.***  ***Observation 6: If MT-Tx/DU-Rx timing alignment was supported, several serious problems may happen due to chain reaction:***  ▪ ***The time offset between UL-Rx timing and DL-Tx timing (i.e., Tdelta) would be increased as IAB node’s hopping number increases.***  ▪ ***Any adjustment of UL-Tx timing of an IAB node would lead to adjustments of UL-Tx timing on all its follow-up hops.*** |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  R1-2008864 | **Observation 1: The spec impact when introducing new timing information to support Case #6 timing mode is minimal as most of the design and signalling of Case #1 can be reused.**  **Proposal 1: The following shall be supported for Case#6 timing.**  o **Signaling the time difference of the DL Tx and UL Rx timing at the parent node in order to correct potential misalignment of the DL Tx timing at the child node (Alt.2 agreed for Case#6 in the Rel-16 IAB SI).**  o **Use the existing timing delta MAC-CE to indicate the time difference of the DL Tx and UL Rx timing at the parent node.**  **FFS: Required range and granularity for the time difference of the DL Tx and UL Rx timing at the parent node.**  **Observation 2: Case#7 timing can apply the same principles as Case#1 with the exception to consider possible negative values of TA. This could be compensated with proper TA control on the child link(s) to reach symbol**  **alignment of MT and DU RX signals.**  **Observation 3: Rel.17 T\_delta signalling and its value range can be used with Case#7 timing.**  **Proposal 2: Alternatives for Case #7 timing control, discussed during the SI phase, can be taken as the basis for possible Rel.17 timing enhancement.** |
| ETRI  R1-2009019 | **Proposal 1**: We propose discussing possible specification impacts of the timing alignment method that aligns DU-Rx timing to MT-Tx timing for supporting simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Rx. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility  R1-2009109 | **Proposal 1: Deprioritize timing alignment for Case C and Case D duplexing.**  **Proposal 2: Support configuration and control signaling for applying Case‐6 and Case‐7 timing alignment at enhanced IAB nodes.**  **Proposal 3: Define signaling to communicate information of the parent link propagation delay to child IAB nodes.** |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC.  R1-2009191 | **Proposal 1: Indication of implementing multiple transceivers/antenna panels should be reported.**  **Proposal 2: MT UL Tx timing should be controlled by TA as in Rel-15/16 for all cases (“case #1”, “case #6”, and “case #7”)**  **Proposal 3: IAB node should set its DL Tx timing ahead of its DL Rx timing by TA for case #6 timing mode.**  **Proposal 4: IAB node should set its DL Tx timing ahead of its DL Rx timing by TA/2 + T1/2 for case #7 timing mode. T1 is signalled from the parent node, which is the offset between parent DU Tx and DU Rx.**  **Proposal 5: IAB node should recognize TA types (case #1, case #6, case #7) to derive DL Tx timing.**  **Proposal 6: Negative TA value should be supported for case #7 timing mode.**  **Proposal 7: Detailed signalling design for negative TA in MAC RAR should be specified and following alternatives can be considered.**  **Alt.1: Indicate negative or positive for TA value in MAC RAR using 1 reserved bit**  **Alt.2: Reserved values of TA in MAC RAR (values from 3847 to 4095) is used to indicate negative TA,**  **e.g.** 𝑵𝑻𝑨\_𝒏𝒆𝒈𝒂𝒕𝒊𝒗𝒆 =(𝟑𝟖𝟒𝟔 - 𝑻𝑨\_𝒏𝒆𝒈𝒂𝒕𝒊𝒗𝒆) ∗ 𝒈𝒓𝒂𝒏𝒖𝒍𝒂𝒓𝒊𝒕𝒚 |
| Qualcomm Incorporated  R1-2009270 | **Observation 2.1:**  **Operation in Case 6 timing mode of an IAB-node may cause uplink interference at the IAB-DU receiver of its parent node and/or may require special handling in the uplink scheduler of its parent node to TDM users to**  **avoid such interference. This concern is addressed by letting the parent node be in control of Case 6 timing at a child node.**  **Observation 2.2:**  **Case 6 timing at a given IAB node can be achieved by the parent node controlling the IAB node UL timing appropriately.**  **Observation 2.3:**  **OTA synchronization for IAB can be achieved using the Rel-16 mechanism concurrently with Case 6 timing controlled by the parent node.**  **Proposal 2.1:**  **Case 6 timing is supported using Rel-16 mechanisms.**  **Observation 2.4:**  **Operation in Case 7 timing mode may require in some conditions a negative effective TA on the uplink transmission timing. Specifically, this would occur when the one way delay to the parent node is larger than the**  **round trip delay to the child node.**  **Proposal 2.2:**  **The effective TA for UL timing control is extended to the negative domain for the IAB-MT.** |
| Ericsson  R1-2009302 | **Observation 1 For Case‐6, the UL reception of an IAB‐node is delayed due to the propagation delay of the child backhaul link and for Case‐7, the UL reception of an IAB‐node is delayed due to the propagation delay of the parent backhaul link.**  **Observation 2 For both Case‐6 and Case‐7, a Rel‐15 UE can have a negative timing advance for certain link conditions.**  **Observation 3 A UE connected to an IAB‐node that operates with timing aligned transmission or reception, may require a negative TA.**  **Observation 4 NR does not support Rel‐15/16 UEs, connecting to an IAB‐node operating with timing aligned transmission or reception, having a negative TA already during the RA phase. And as a consequence, such UEs might not be able to complete RA to IAB‐node**  **operating in a Case‐6 or Case‐7 timing configuration on access links.**  **Observation 5 In Case‐7, no additional signaling is required to align the UL reception timing of an IAB-node to its DL reception timing.**  **Observation 6 In Case‐6, a T\_delta‐based OTA timing alignment does not require any principal change of method and signaling type compared to Case‐1, only a new range specification.**  **Proposal 1 Specification on simultaneous transmission or reception is limited to only consider operation on backhaul links.**  **Proposal 2 Adopt Scenario 2 as defined in RAN4 (i.e., transmissions on BH links only in DL time slots) as baseline for studies related to simultaneous transmission or reception of IAB-nodes.**  **Proposal 3 Adapt T\_delta based Rel‐16 Case‐1 timing alignment as baseline for Case‐6 timing synchronization.** |
| Intel corporation  R1-2008995 | **Proposal 4:** To enable Case#7 timing at an IAB node, the solution of transmitting Case#1 TA with an additional positive TA offset to its child IAB node is preferred. The IAB node also needs to time multiplexing uplink transmission at different child nodes with Case#1 TA and calculated Case#7 TA.  **Proposal 5:** To enable Case#6 timing at an IAB node, the solution of transmitting Case#1 TA with an additional positive TA offset (if needed) from its parent node is preferred. The parent node also needs to time multiplexing uplink transmission at different IAB nodes with Case#1 TA and calculated Case#6 TA.  **Proposal 6:** A unified TA transmission scheme (always transmitting Case#1 TA with additional positive TA offset if needed) can be applied for both Case#6 and Case#7 timing.  **Proposal 7:** For enabling dual-connectivity in IAB,only inter-carrier DC is supported inRel-17.  **Proposal 8:** Further discussion on DCI format 2\_5 handling for IAB dual-connectivity scenarios is needed.  **Proposal 9:** Further discussion on support of Case#7 timing for IAB dual-connectivity scenarios is needed. |

**FL Proposal 2.1**

**Case 7 timing is supported with at least symbol level alignment.**

* **FFS whether slot level alignment needs to be supported.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.1?** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Yes | In our view, slot level alignment is beneficial to minimize interference and useful for certain implementations (including shared MT/DU panels). At the same time, since it requires new negative TA functionality it should be limited to only resources multiplexing child and parent backhaul links |
| Ericsson | No | Symbol level alignment is a prerequisite for OFDMA and is hence supported by all timing cases. Instead we think the proposal should state that slot level alignment may not be required, e.g.,  **Case 7 timing supports slot level misalignment with symbol level alignment.** |
| Nokia | Yes | It is much easier to support symbol level alignment without needing of negative TAs |
| Samsung | Yes | We think symbol level alignment can enable Case 7 timing without the introduction of negative TA |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | We support slot level alignment, since it’s beneficial for interference and resource handlings. And also we concern the impact for the implementations if we use the symbol level aliment which is newly installed for the NR system. |
| CMCC | Yes | Either slot-level alignment or symbol-level alignment can be used for supporting Case 7 timing, since the symbol-level alignment can avoid introducing negative TA enhancement, we support this proposal to minimize the spec impact. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes | Negative TA can be avoided in symbol-level alignment |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes | Symbol level alignment has obvious benefit for avoiding negative TA. |
| Intel | No | We prefer slot-level alignment with the solution of always transmitting Case#1 TA with an additional positive TA offset.  Firstly we agree with AT&T that “slot level alignment is beneficial to minimize interference and useful for certain implementations (including shared MT/DU panels)”.  Secondly, there are three possible issues for Case#7 timing at an IAB node:   * Issue 1: The child IAB MT may have negative Case#7 TA value. * Issue 2: The IAB node may have different DU RX timing for child nodes shifted to Case#7 timing and legacy child nodes which are still in Case#1 timing. * Issue 3: The child IAB node may have issue deciding its own DL TX timing with Case#7 TA.   For symbol-level alignment solution, issue 3 still needs to be addressed (for example, with additional signaling to inform the child IAB node not to adjust its DL TX timing according to the Case#7 TA).  Thirdly, in our contribution R1-2008995, we propose to remain Case#1 TA with an additional positive TA offset. With this solution, child IAB node is always able to use the Case#1 TA to adjust its DL TX timing and no negative TA is needed (compatible with legacy UEs and Rel-16 IAB nodes) |
| vivo | Yes | Fine with either symbol level or slot level alignment. |
| LG | Yes | We are fine to support slot level misalignment with symbol level alignment for Case 7 timing. |
| Fujitsu | No | We prefer slot-level alignment. We share similar views with AT&T and NTT DOCOMO, slot level alignment is beneficial to minimize interference and useful for certain implementations. It will also help reducing the number of unusable symbols or the guard period at least for out-of-band scenarios. |
| CEWiT | No | We have similar view as AT&T. Slot level alignment has preference over symbol level alignment. Resource partitioning limit simultaneous mode of operation to IAB nodes and handle the problem of negative TA. |
| Intel2 | No | In additional to our previous comments, we also want to point out that slot-level alignment with the solution of always transmitting Case#1 TA with additional positive offset can also be applied to Case#6 Timing. The issues of negative TA and the issue of IAB node or child IAB node cannot decide its DL TX timing are solved.  More details can be found in our contribution of R1-2008995, which is not included in the summary. |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 2.1:**

The intent of the proposal was to specify that case 7 timing is allowed with symbol alignment (between MT Rx and DU Rx) without requiring slot level alignment. That does not preclude to additionally specify that slot level alignment should also be supported – which was the purpose of the FFS sub-bullet.

The alternative proposal would be to strictly require slot level alignment and preclude all of of the other 12 combinations with symbol alignment and slot misalignment. This may be too restrictive as companies have indicated potential issues for certain configurations. As a result, perhaps both alignment options should be allowed. So the proposal is amended as follows

**FL Proposal 2.1.v2**

**The following modes of operation are supported for Case 7 timing:**

* **symbol level alignment without slot level alignment**
* **slot level alignment**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.1.v2?** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The following was agreed during the GTW session on November 4th :

**Agreement**

Select one or both of the following modes of operation for Case 7 timing in RAN1#104-e:

* symbol level alignment without slot level alignment
* slot level alignment

**FL Proposal 2.2:**

**Case 1, Case 6 and Case 7 timing modes need not to be restricted to specific multiplexing modes (e.g. Case A, B, C, D).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.2?** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Yes | We do not see a clear need for any such restriction given that these additional timing modes will be optional to implement in practice. |
| Ericsson | No | It is our understanding that Case 6 timing is associated with Case A MUXing and Case 7 timing is associated with Case B MUXing and would prefer a more concrete proposal for timing and multiplexing combinations. |
| Nokia | Yes | Case #6 and Case #7 are directly related to different cases and should be specific to those modes. However, we think that additional spec work is not required for this. |
| Samsung | No | We think timing mode is tied with multiplexing mode. In addition to that, whether a timing mode is also applied for other multiplexing mode(s) may be up to implementation. |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | We don’t see the necessity of supporting the timing modes for Case C and D. Since to support case C and D, IAB needs to operate MT and DU individually (with implementing dual panels / transceivers), and isolation between MT and DU may be guaranteed by implementation. |
| CMCC | Not sure | Not sure if we fully understand the intention of this proposal. Basically, Case#6 timing is defined to support simultaneous MT-Tx and DU-Tx (Case A), and Case#7 timing is defined to support simultaneous MT-Rx and DU-Rx (Case B or D), only Case #1 timing can be adopted for Case 3. However, in some cases, e.g., to avoid impact on legacy UE scheduling, or to mitigate potential interference, Case#1 timing and Case#6/7 timing can be operated in a TDM way, I’m wondering if this is the intention to say that the timing modes need not to be restricted to specific multiplexing modes. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No | This discussion seems too early at this point. We can leave it to a later time when we have more progress on specifying duplexing enhancements, signalling, etc. |
| Huawei | Not sure | Typically, Case #6 may be required in MT TX/DU TX, and Case #7 may be required both MT TX/DU RX and MT RX/DU RX. Case #1 is a bit different since it concerns IAB-DU Tx timing. From this perspective, the motivation to restrict the timing mode to a certain multiplexing case is not clear.  In addition, we share the similar view that dynamic switching between different timing modes should be supported to allow scheduling flexibility. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Not sure | In our understanding, at least for Case 6 and Case 7 timing, they should be specifically designed for Case A and B. |
| Intel | No | We think Case#6 timing is defined to support simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Tx, and Case#7 timing is defined to support simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Rx. |
| vivo |  | Not sure about the intention. In timing mode AI, it is preferred to discuss how to support case #1/6/7 timing mode, including mixture of them. The timing mode is implicitly associated with the multiplexing cases, no need for explicit specification impact. |
| LG |  | For multiplexing mode A, Case 1 and/or Case 6 can be applied.  For multiplexing mode B, Case 1 and/or Case 7 can be applied.  For multiplexing mode C, Case 1 can be applied.  For multiplexing mode D, Case 1 and/or Case 7 (or Case 7 like) can be applied.  So far, we are understanding that timing case 1 can be applied for all of multiplexing modes. On the other hand, some timing case (i.e., Case 6) can be applied for only multiplexing mode A, other timing case (i.e., Case 7) can be applied for multiplexing mode B (and mode D).  In this sense, the proposal could be allowable at least for timing case 1, and timing case 7 (if case 7 can be applicable for multiplexing mode D). But, the timing case 6 may be applicable for only multiplexing mode A.  But, it is hard to catch the motivation or intention of the FL proposal 2.2. Could you clarify the motivation or intention of the FL proposal 2.2? |
| Fujitsu | Yes | Such restriction seems not necessary from the specification’s perspective. |
| CEWiT | No | Timing and multiplexing modes are directly related, at least for the modes involving half duplex constraint. Also, the parent and the IAB node should have a clear understanding of the multiplexing mode and timing to signal the parameters such as TA and guard. |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 2.2:**

The intent of the proposal was to avoid complex discussions and specifications to enforce applicability of timing modes to specific modes of operation without a strong justification. It is understood that certain timing modes were introduced to facilitate operation of certain multiplexing modes, however, also considering that these modes are expected to be optional, there does not seem a need for any specification work to restrict applicability to a given multiplexing mode. As, an example, TDM operation with Case 7 seems a valid scenario (note the Case 7 is a special instance of Case 1 in the sense that Case 1 has a degree of freedom on the UL Rx boundary of the DU). As a result, a slightly modified proposals is provided:

**FL Proposal 2.2.v2:**

**Case 1, Case 6 and Case 7 timing modes are not restricted to specific multiplexing modes supported in Rel-17.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.2.v2?** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Partially | We agree with the intention. However, the current proposal is a bit misleading. Suggested change below  **Dynamic switching among Case 1, Case 6 and Case 7 timing modes are ~~not restricted to specific multiplexing modes~~ supported in Rel-17.** |
| Nokia | No | Timing modes may not be mentioned in the specs, Even for Case #1 scenario, it is mainly signalling that we mentioned. We do not say TDM is applied for Case #1 and so on. Therefore, this proposal may not be needed. |
| Ericsson | No | For the half-duplex MUX cases, there is a clear mapping between MUX case and timing case. If the MUX case is changed, we expect there to be a corresponding change in the timing case. We think this proposal predominantly address the issue of what timing to assume in full duplex and for that reason we don’t think it needs to be discussed before we have agreed to give full duplex the same prioritization as half-duplex in Rel-17. |
| Samsung | No | We think at least Case #6 and #7 timing mode are tied with multiplexing mode (e.g., Case A and Case B). In addition to that, whether a timing mode is also applied for other multiplexing mode(s) may be up to implementation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes(should be a conclusion) | We share similar views as Nokia. We are okay that to design the multiplexing mechanism, it can be assumed that a particular time mode is associated with the a multiplexing mode, but in the specs, we don’t think this kind of corresponding relationship is required to specify. Thus it should be a conclusion instead of proposal. |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No | As we pointed out during the GTW session, we think it is too early to discuss this detail at this point. We can leave matter to later when we have more progress on specifying duplexing enhancements, signalling, etc. |
| Intel | No | We share similar view with Ericsson and Samsung. |
| AT&T | Yes | But OK to start with the alternative proposal from Huawei as a starting point as the details of the timing cases are worked out |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 2.2b.v2:**

Based on the feedback this proposal is withdrawn.

**FL Proposal 2.3**

**Rel-16 OTA time synchronization is supported when operating in Case 6 and Case 7 timing modes.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.3?** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Not sure | Perhaps it is better to be more specific and discuss what modifications are necessary for T\_delta and associated signaling to support Case 6/7 timing modes? Also we think it should be discussed how new timing modes coexist with Rel-16 operation and each other. |
| Ericsson | Yes | A new range for T\_delta will likely be needed, but this can likely be comprised within the existing signalling format. |
| Nokia | Not sure | The intention of the proposal is not clear to us. What is meant by Rel-16 OTA time synchronization here ? is that T\_delta that is needed defined for Case #1, or include any other aspects. For Case #6, it is not required to have Case #1 timing. |
| Samsung | Yes | It should be a baseline because Case 1 is needed to align DL TX timing even when operating in Case 6 and Case 7. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | If the proposal indicates that Rel-16 OTA time synchronization (Case 1) and Case 6/7 are switching dynamically, we support since switching Case 1 and Case 6/7 is necessary according to operating simultaneous Tx/Rx or not. And if the proposal indicate to support Case 1 and Case 6/7 at the same timing, we don’t see the necessity to support. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | The wording needs clarification. “Rel-16 OTA time synchronization” means case-1 in DL, which is supported by case-6 and case-7 by definition. We understand that case-6 and case-7 will essentially alter UL timing without changing case-1 for DL timing. If that’s the intention, we agree with this proposal. |
| Huawei | No | Operating OTA timing should not be a prerequisite to operation Case 6 timing or Case 7 timing. For example, even for a node utilizing GNSS for DL synchronization, Case 6 can be supported.  In addition, IAB-MT should always have maintain a legacy uplink TA to support TDM mode, and it can switch among the legacy TA and Case #6/#7 in different slots. In this case, there is no need to introduce new T\_delta range for Case #6/#7 because the IAB node can perform OTA based on the legacy TA. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes. | To align DL Tx timing in Case 6/7, Rel-16 OTA time synchronization(Case 1) should be used as baseline. |
| Intel | Yes | We assume this proposal is to indicate Case#1 timing is always supported for Case#6 and Case#7. May need some wording clarification. |
| vivo | Maybe yes | Case #6/7 timing mode requires DU DL TX timing alignment, it should not be the intention of the proposal. If the intention is to support case 1 timing and case 6/7 timing in TDMed manner, we can support the proposal. The reason is that, even we support simultaneous operation, it does not means the simultaneous operation is always enabled, sometimes it needs to fallback to TDMed operation, i.e., case 1 timing. |
| LG |  | It is hard to catch the intention of FL proposal 2.3. Could you elaborate the intention and motivation of FL proposal 2.3? |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 2.3:**

The intent of the proposal was to specify that, regardless of the Case 1, Case 6, Case 7 timing mode, an IAB-node can rely on the OTA timing synchronization mechanism defined in Rel-16 (based on TA and T\_delta) to set its DL Tx timing. The rationale is that all these timing modes share the same overall DL Tx timing alignment requirement across IAB-nodes with overlapping coverage, hence it is desirable for the OTA timing synchronization mechanism to be available for all the timing modes. As a result the proposal is clarified as follows:

**FL Proposal 2.3.v2**

**An IAB-node operating in Case 6 or Case 7 timing modes can rely on the OTA timing synchronization mechanism defined in Rel-16 (based on TA and T\_delta) to set its DL Tx timing.**

* **FFS any required change to the range of T\_delta**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.3.v2?** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | We concern how to derive IAB-MT UL Tx timing. Based on the agreement, IAB-MT UL Tx timing is derived by IAB-DU Tx timing (TA + T\_delta), so that it doesn’t follow Rel-15/16 UE mechanism (UL timing is controlled by TA) and it may a large impact for IAB-MT behaviour. |
| Huawei | No | We don’t see the need to agree on the main bullet since the MT UL Tx timing does not have any relevance to DU DL Tx timing.  We don't think the FFS bullet is needed since there is no need to enhance Case 1 DL Tx timing synchronization. |
| Nokia | No | For Case #6 support, we do not think that T-delta or TA is needed. |
| Ericsson | Agree with intention but not the formulation. | We base our comments on the outcome of the online session. OTA is optional in Rel-16. As the FL proposal is formulated in the session notes, it can be interpreted as OTA is mandatory which we agreed in the online session is not the intention with the formulation. Instead, we propose the following:  **The OTA timing synchronization framework (based on TA and T\_delta) is extended to include Case 6 timing.** |
| Samsung |  | In our view, Case 1 is needed to align DL TX timing even when operating in Case 6 and Case 7. But, we don’t think some change on T\_delta is needed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes(with comments) | Reading FL proposal, we understand the intention is to clarify how to derive DL Tx time for case 6 or case 7. If correct, we think for case 6 or case 7, to set its DL Tx timing, the OTA timing synchronization mechanism defined in Rel-16 (based on TA and T\_delta) should be reused. |
| CEWiT | Yes | DL Tx timing can be evaluated by the Rel-16 OTA timing synchronization mechanism. But the TA and T\_delta values signalled by parent will change based on timing case. Therefore, extension of range of T\_delta may be required |
| Intel | Partially | We understand the intention to keep Rel-16 (TA+T\_delta/2) DL TX timing calculation framework. We further think the main proposal needs to be more clarified that the TA means Case 1 TA and delete the FFS bullet as below.  **An IAB-node operating in Case 6 or Case 7 timing modes can rely on the OTA timing synchronization mechanism defined in Rel-16 (based on Case 1 TA and T\_delta) to set its DL Tx timing.** |
| AT&T | Yes | Prefer the wording from Ericsson slightly to avoid ambiguity |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 2.3.v2:**

Based on the feedback the alternative proposal from Ericsson is found to more clearly represent the intent of the original proposal and it is hence proposed as the next revision:

**FL Proposal 2.3.v3**

**The OTA timing synchronization framework (based on TA and T\_delta) is extended to include Case 6 timing.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.3.v3?** | **Comments** |
| LG | Partially | If single TA value is used even when multiple cases of timing mode are applied, it is expected that DL Tx timing can be set by using the OTA timing synchronization mechanism. But, if multiple TA values are used for each cases of timing mode, it needs to define a reference TA value for OTA timing synchronization mechanism. For example, Case 1 TA can be a reference TA value. |
| vivo | Yes | TA should be case 1 TA as reference; No need to change T\_delta. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Huawei | No | We don't think the OTA timing synchronization framework needs to be extended other than reusing the Rel-16 Case-1 scheme (based on TA and T\_delta). Case 6 timing is about how to align MT UL Tx timing with DU Tx timing and it has nothing to do with how to set the DU DL Tx timing. Even in case the DU DL Tx timing synchronization is based GNSS or other solutions, Case 6 can still work. Hence, we fail to see the need to extend OTA timing synchronization framework. |
| Intel | Yes with comments | We agree with LG and Vivo that Case 1 TA should be further specified.  **The OTA timing synchronization framework (based on Case 1 TA and T\_delta) is extended to include Case 6 timing.** |
| Samsung |  | Similar view with HW. It is not clear whether there is a need to extend OTA timing synchronization framework. |
| CMCC | Not sure | The proposal seems confused. In our view, the IAB nodes in the NW, no matter Case 6 or Case 7 timing is used, should align its DL Tx timing based on the OTA timing synchronization. However, we fail to see the relationship with Case 6/7 timing. We think maybe this proposal is not needed, or at least too early to be discussed in this stage. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes, with comments | The main advantage of this approach is to accommodate all the three cases (existing Case 1 and new Case 6 and Case 7) under the same framework. We propose to include Case 7 in the proposal and leave the details to further discussion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | No | Based on Rel-16 Case 1 timing, the DL Tx timing has been determined. In our opinion, for Case 6 timing, it means that the UL Tx timing should be its DL Tx timing. We don’t think any enhancement on the OTA timing synchronization (Case 1 TA and T\_delta) is necessary. |
| NTT DOCOMO |  | We need to clarify whether “TA” in the proposal refer to "case1 TA" or "case6 TA". If we specify “Case 1 TA” for the proposal, in our understanding, DU DL Tx timing is derived by “Case 1 TA and T\_delta”, and IAB may have the information of “Case 6 TA” for MT UL Tx timing derivation. And the Tx timing derived by “Case1 TA and T\_delta” and “Case 6 TA” are the same. If IAB always receive two TA values, it seems fine, but does IAB always need to receive both TA values ? We prefer to consider both DU DL Tx and MT UL Tx derivations together, with considering signalling overhead. |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes/Partly | For Case #6, we agree that it can be supported by extending T\_delta, but not fully clear what is the extension foreseen under TA.  Maybe we could reword as below,  **FL Proposal 2.3.v3**  **The OTA timing synchronization framework (based on TA and/or T\_delta) is extended to include Case 6 timing.**  HW mentioned, *“Case 6 timing is about how to align MT UL Tx timing with DU Tx timing and it has nothing to do with how to set the DU DL Tx timing*.” : we think Case #6 has to support alignment between DU Tx with MT Tx as well. It is not always possible to rely on GNSS, and that is why we discuss timing modes in this sub-agenda such that OTA based solution can be applied. The same thing was done for Case #1.  ZTE also mentioned “*We don’t think any enhancement on the OTA timing synchronization (Case 1 TA and T\_delta) is necessary*.”. it is not clear how the UL Rx and DL Tx difference at the parent is indicated to the child node such that they adjust DL Tx and Ul Tx timing. The proposal from ZTE is not clear. |
| Huawei |  | Reply to Nokia:  Regarding Nokia’s comment “*we think Case #6 has to support alignment between DU Tx with MT Tx as well.*” This is exactly what we are trying to argue, “*Case 6 timing is about how to align MT UL Tx timing with DU Tx timing”.* We don’t understand the issue here.  Regarding Nokia’s comment “*It is not always possible to rely on GNSS, and that is why we discuss timing modes in this sub-agenda such that OTA based solution can be applied. The same thing was done for Case #1.*” We are not arguing that Case #6 timing has to reply on GNSS but rather it should be generic so that it can be applied regardless of how DL Tx timing synchronization is achieved. Our view is even for Case #6 timing, the IAB-MT should always support a legacy UL timing so that the IAB-MT can be co-scheduled with Rel-15 UEs. Therefore, the DL Tx timing synchronization can be based the Rel-16 OTA scheme, i.e. Case 1 timing based on T\_delta and TA.  Overall, our view is that it is not reasonable for IAB-MT to operate with Case 6 timing all the time. If one think about the overall procedure, we cannot assume that the parent node has the idea of the propagation delay between itself and a child node so that it can set the timing difference between the UL Rx and DL Tx properly to support the Case #6 timing at the child node. |

**FL Proposal 2.4**

**Case 6 timing at an IAB-node is under the control of the parent node to which the UL transmission is intended for.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.4?** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Not sure | It is unclear what is the implication of the proposal on the co-located child DU Tx timing. At the same time some level of parent node awareness/control of the usage of Case 6 timing seems to be needed. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes, partly | May be the wording is not fully clear. But we agree that as we did in the SI stage, the use of Case #6 in UL at the IAB MT should be at least controlled by the parent as parent node UL Rx is impacted by this. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | We support that the parent node control the UL transmission timing of IAB-MT. |
| CMCC | Yes | This is a consensus in R16 SI phase, and we should use this as a starting point for discussion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Not necessarily | Similar to our comment on FL Proposal 2.2, it seems too early to have this discussion. We need to raise this matter once we have progress on specifying enhanced duplexing, how each duplexing case is configured or signalled, etc. |
| Huawei | Yes | This principle was agreed during the SI phase and maybe it is beneficial to further clarify what “control” means again. Our understanding is that gNB should be in charge when Case 6 timing should be applied by IAB-MT. This can be done via a trigger/indication from the gNB etc.  One more thing need to be noted is that legacy UL Tx timing should also be supported by IAB-MT so that it can be co-scheduled with other Rel-15 UEs. In case of SDM operation, the IAB-MT can switch to Case 6 timing. Dynamic switching between Case 1 and Case 6 should be controlled by the parent node. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes | In the perspective of parent receiving, the actual UL transmission timing of an IAB-node should be known by its parent node. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | Parent node can control TDMed operation between multiplexing cases, by using case 1 and case 6/7. |
| LG |  | If my understanding is correct, our common understanding is that when parent node allows for IAB-node MT to operate Case 6 timing for UL transmission, Case 6 timing can be operated. |
| Fujitsu | Not sure | The parent node should be aware of the usage of case 6 timing, but it may not always control the UL timing at the IAB MT directly by TA. |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 2.4:**

The intent of the proposal was to specify that operation in Case 6 timing mode at a given IAB-node needs to be authorized by its parent node since there are implications on the UL Rx timing of the parent node. The proposal has been reworded for improved clarity in accordance with the original intent:

**FL Proposal 2.4.v2**

**Case 6 timing mode operation at an IAB-node is authorized by the parent node to which the UL transmission is intended for.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.4.v2?** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | We also support that the UL transmission timing of IAB-MT is controlled by TA for Case 6 timing mode with following Rel-15/16 UE mechanism. And also support the dynamic switching between Case 1 and Case 6, and timing mode needs to be indicated by a parent node or IAB-CU. |
| Huawei | Yes | Fine with proposal and further details on how to achieve Case 6 timing can be FFS |
| Nokia | Yes, partly | Wording is not fully clear. Authorized means additional two way signalling ?  We could simply say the following,  **Case 6 timing mode operation at an IAB-node is supported only when the parent confiugres/indicates the possibility of using Case 6 timing mode in UL. ~~is authorized by the parent node to which the UL transmission is intended for.~~**   * **FFS: details of configurations/indication.** |
| Ericsson | Prefer *control* to *authorize* | We think the parent node should not only authorize but also control UL timing. If not, it will imply requirements on the parent node to track or estimate receive timing that is usually set by the parent node and then kept constant. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes(prefer ‘control’) | We share same views as Ericsson. Whether case 6 time is applied on a UL transmission should be under the control of parent node. |
| CEWiT | Yes | We agree with Huawei regarding the FFS point |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Not necessarily | We still believe this should be discussed later when we have more agreements on realization of duplexing enhancements. At this point, we can agree with the proposal if “is authorized by” changes to “can be controlled by.” |
| Intel | Yes |  |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 2.4.v2:**

In response to the concern by Lenovo, Motorola, this proposal has its roots on a similar agreement during the Study Item phase and it addresses the concerns that have been raised by several companies that operation in Case 6 timing by a given node has an impact on the parent node, and hence such operation needs to be under the control of the parent node.

Given the large majority support from the other companies that have commented it is proposed to move the proposal into a tentative agreement:

**FL Proposed Agreement 2.4**

**Case 6 timing mode operation at an IAB-node is controlled by the parent node to which the UL transmission is intended for.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **If you have a strong objection to FL Proposed Agreement 2.4 please elaborate:** |
| LG | We are fine with FL Proposed agreement 2.4. |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | We support it. |
| Huawei | Fine with the proposal |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |

### 3 – Discussion on interference management

**Topic 3.1**

This discussion topic relates to the discussion on the relevant interference scenarios that should be further discussed.

Related input from contributions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon  R1-2007595 | ***Observation 5:*** *For uplink full-duplex, IAB node may not be able to cancel the self-interference if the power gap between the interference and desired signals is too large, and the power gap can be reduced by enhanced power control of MT.*  ***Observation 6:*** *For downlink full-duplex, IAB node may not be able to cancel the self-interference if the power gap between the interference and desired signals is too large, and the power gap can be reduced by decreasing DU transmission power which is an implementation issue.*  ***Observation 8:*** *Different from conventional CLI scenarios including BS-BS and UE-UE interference, the interference from IAB backhaul link is relative stable and can be well managed.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *For the enhancements on CLI and interference measurements of BH links, the interference between MT and DU, inter-UE interference, interference from UE to MT, interference from MT to UE should be studied.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *To handle various types of interference, regardless of interference source is MT or DU, a unified CLI measurement and management framework can be adopted in IAB.* |
| vivo  R1-2007685 | **Proposal 5: Reuse Rel-16 CLI framework for interference management in IAB network, e.g. intended TDD configuration exchange between gNBs and the related CLI measurement and report schemes.**  **Proposal 7: In the moment of simultaneous MT Tx/DU Rx, MT determines UL transmission power based on MT-to-DU self-interference.**  **Proposal 8: In case simultaneous MT Rx/DU Tx or MT Rx/DU Rx is enabled, support measurement/report of DU-to-MT self-interference or UE/MT-to-MT interference respectively.** |
| CMCC  R1-2008030 | **Proposal 5: The measurement to prevent the self-impulse interference in simultaneous transmission and reception of IAB should be discussed and introduced.** |
| Samsung  R1-2008185 | ***Proposal 4: Rel-16 CLI is a starting point at least for MT-to-MT interference in Rel-17.*** |
| AT&T  R1-2008313 | **Proposal 1: DU‐DU and MT‐MT CLI measurements such as short‐term (L1/L2) and long term (L3) measurements, multiple antenna and beamforming based measurements should be studied to enable CLI mitigation in IAB.**  **Proposal 2: Specify, if needed, enhancements to UE‐UE Rel. 16 CLI measurement framework.**  **Proposal 3: Specify DU‐DU CLI measurements techniques to enable CLI mitigation for IAB.** |
| LG Electronics  R1-2008407 | ***Proposal 5:*** Discuss which cases of inter-IAB-node interference scenario is/are targeted for Rel-17 eIAB.   * Case 1: Victim IAB-node is receiving in DL via its MT, interfering IAB-node is transmitting in ULvia its MT; * Case 2: Victim IAB-node is receiving in DL via its MT, interfering IAB-node is transmitting in DLvia its DU; * Case 3: Victim IAB-node is receiving in UL via its DU, interfering IAB-node is transmitting in UL via its MT; * Case 4: Victim IAB-node is receiving in UL via its DU, interfering IAB-node is transmitting in DL via its DU.   ***Proposal 7:*** Discuss whether/how to operate measurement of intra-IAB interference. |
| CEWiT, Tejas Networks, Reliance Jio, IITM, Saankhya Labs, IITH  R1-2008816 | **Observation 3:** The amount of SI cancellation is implementation specific. Having multi-panel does not fully ensure that there will be no residual SI.  **Observation 4:** Techniques to handle the residual amount of SI will be independent of whether the system is single panel or multi-panel. The technique should be equally applicable to both single and multi-panel to ensure better performance.  **Proposal 2:** SI handling methods should be supported for both single panel or multi-panel systems to ensure better performance. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC.  R1-2009191 | **Proposal 10: No additional mechanism is necessary for cross link interference for IAB.** |
| Qualcomm Incorporated  R1-2009270 | **Observation 3.1:**  **There are two self-interference components:**  ‐ **Local coupling between the transmit and receive antennas**  ‐ **Reflection of the transmitted signal, by a remote object, back to the receive antennas**.  **The amount of self-interference (and hence the efficiency of full-duplex capability) depends on TX and RX beamforming configurations and may change over time (due to change in the reflections).**  **Observation 3.2:**  **To determine how efficiently an IAB-node can operate in the full-duplex mode, it needs to periodically perform SI measurements.**  **Observation 3.5:**  ‐ **A standardized DU-to-DU CLI management is needed for inter-operability and especially in IAB, for a CU to determine proper resource configurations for its IAB-DUs.**  ‐ **MT-to-MT CLI measurements/reports may not be always sufficient to provide the required information about the collocated DU-to-DU CLI.**  **Observation 3.7:**  **A DU may or may not be capable of supporting dynamic TDD across its served cells – e.g. (DU cell m TX, DU cell n RX).** |
| Ericsson  R1-2009302 | **Observation 7 IAB‐nodes transmitting in UL slots may jeopardize fundamental network functions on both the same and adjacent carriers.**  **Proposal 4 Interference caused by operation of IAB‐nodes is assessed in relation to the interference if the IAB‐node was an ordinary gNB.** |

The majority view is that Rel-17 IAB should consider interference scenarios showing up among IAB-nodes (including MT-to-MT, DU-to-DU, MT-to-DU, DU-to-MT).

Many companies also believe self-interference (intra-IAB-node) scenarios, showing up in multiplexing cases C and D, should be further discussed.

A few companies suggest considering the interference between IAB-nodes and non-IAB nodes (e.g. interference between MTs and UEs, or interference between IAB-DUs and non-IAB DUs). Also, only two companies propose to further consider UE-to-UE interference.

**FL Proposal 3.1:**

**Interference management for the following IAB interference scenarios should be discussed:**

**Inter-IAB scenarios including:**

* + **MT-to-MT, DU-to-DU, DU-to-MT, and MT-to-DU.**

**Intra-IAB-node (self-interference) scenarios:**

* + **Interference between a collocated DU and MT.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 3.1?** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Yes | Since the level of self-interference can potentially be greater than inter-IAB node interference at the victim node, we are OK to differentiate the scenarios for study. However, we do not believe this precludes a common solution framework for measurement and mitigation (e.g. DU Tx -> MT Rx could be handled with a common set of reference signals/signalling regardless of whether the functions are co-located). |
| Ericsson | Partially | First, interference to nodes outside the IAB network must also be considered, in particular for UL slots. Second, we don’t think a discussion about full duplex specific issues is warranted until full duplex has been agreed. |
| Nokia | Yes, partly | Agree with the first part, not with the self-interference scenarios. That is not having any spec impact. |
| Samsung | Yes | We are fine to discuss interference management at least for inter-IAB node scenario. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes for inter-IAB | For the self-interference, it may be covered by implementation. |
| CMCC | Yes | To our understanding, the interferences for both inter- and intra-IAB node are not fully semi-static, but may be “dynamically” changed according to the scheduling and surrounding environment. Therefore, we support interference management mechanisms for both cases. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | Discuss both inter-node and intra-node |
| Huawei | Partially | For Intra-IAB node interference, beside self-interference, the interference between MT and DU (for SDM Rx scenario) should be included as well.  We suggest to remove Self-interference from “Intra-IAB-node (self-interference) scenarios”. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Partially. | For inter-IAB scenarios, from our point of view, inter IAB node CLI is similar as inter gNB CLI in Rel-15, so it can be handled by the CLI schemes introduced so far in RAN1.  For inta-IAB-node scenarios, the interference between DU and MT should be focus on multiplexing Case A and B. |
| Intel | Partially | We are not sure about the self-interference case, either full-duplex becomes agreed or self-interference can left to implementation. |
| vivo | Yes | Share view with CMCC |
| LG | Yes | We are fine with the FL proposal 3.1 to discuss Interference management for both Inter-IAB scenarios and Intra-IAB-node (self-interference) scenarios. |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 3.1:**

While most companies agreed (at least partially) with the proposal, the main concern from some companies seems to be about the self-interference (SI) scenario.

We note that multiplexing modes C & D, that would potentially lead to SI, are already supported by the Rel-17 IAB WID. Some (at least 3) companies suggested SI management could be left to implementation and hence would not have any specification impact, while other (at least 7) companies proposed to discuss SI handling.

The intent of this proposal is to indeed list the relevant interference scenarios that should be further considered/discussed. The proposal does not necessarily suggest any new specification (as this is the subject of Topic 3.2). Hence, for example, an implementation-specific solution can still be the outcome of the discussions in Topic 3.2.

The comment by Huawei about intra-IAB-node and SDM-RX interference is acknowledged. However, the interference scenario in SDM-RX is associated with (parent-node DU to IAB-node DU) and (child-node MT to IAB-node MT), and hence can be categorized as (DU-to-DU) and (MT-to-MT) inert-IAB interference scenarios.

Ericsson’s comment about interference to outside IAB network is acknowledged and addressed in the updated FL proposal below.

**FL Proposal 3.1.v2:**

**Interference management for the following IAB interference scenarios should be discussed:**

**Inter-IAB scenarios, including:**

* + **MT to MT, DU to DU, DU to MT, and MT to DU.**

**Intra-IAB-node (self-interference) scenarios:**

* + **Interference between a collocated DU and MT.**

**Interference to non-IAB nodes, including:**

* **IAB-DU to non-IAB-DU**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 3.1.v2?** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | We still think SI may be handled by implementation, but fine for the discussion. |
| Huawei | Yes | Fine with the scenarios. |
| Nokia | Partly | No for second bullet. We do not think Ran1discussions has any impact on second bullet. |
| Ericsson | Partially | We think the major interference to outside networks is **IAB-MT transmissions in UL**. For self-interference our position hasn’t changed, and we also agree with Intel’s view in the matter. |
| Samsung | Partially | SI can be left to implementation |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Partially. | For inta-IAB-node scenarios, e.g. multiplexing case B, the information between parent and IAB node, such as power control, beam adaption, may be good for mitigating the CLI.So we think the Intra-IAB-node (self-interference) scenarios should be treated as high priority.  For other scenarios, we don't see the need for enhancement on Rel-15/16 CLI, but we are okay to discuss. |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes, with a comment | The word “collocated” is not needed. Is this what is intended:  **Intra-IAB-node (self-interference) scenarios:**   * + **Interference between a DU and MT of an IAB-node.** |
| Intel | Yes | We still keep our view in the last round, but can agree this FL proposal for further discussion. |
| AT&T | Yes |  |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 3.1.v2:**

Based on the feedback the proposal is amended to make the SI part FFS and to also include the IAB-MT UL transmission scenario as an interference source to the non-IAB network.

**FL Proposal 3.1.v3:**

**Interference management for the following IAB interference scenarios should be discussed:**

**Inter-IAB scenarios, including:**

* + **MT to MT, DU to DU, DU to MT, and MT to DU.**

**Interference to non-IAB nodes, including:**

* **IAB-DU to non-IAB-DU**
* **IAB-MT to non-IAB-DU**

**FFS Intra-IAB-node (self-interference) scenarios (Interference between a DU and MT of an IAB-node).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 3.1.v3?** | **Comments** |
| LG | Partially Yes | For inter-IAB scenario, it is not clear to include DU to MT and MT to DU.  For intra-IAB node scenario, SI measurement is very importance work for operation. Also, we should discuss how to measure SI and/or whether the SI measurement can be operated by implementation or not. Hence, we suggest to delete FFS.  **~~FFS~~ Intra-IAB-node (self-interference) scenarios (Interference between a DU and MT of an IAB-node).** |
| vivo | No | Self-interference scenario should be listed. We have agreed that the dynamic ability of IAB simultaneous operation. Such dynamic ability is highly depends on the SI for case C/D.  We understand the intention is to encourage companies to input enh. points for further discussion, before detailed technical discussion it is not fair to preclude any scenario. It is noted that case C/D is still in scope, if the objection is to deprioritize case C/D, it should be discussed in AI 8.10.1. |
| Ericsson | Yes | We think self-interference can be left for implementation. |
| Huawei | Partially | We prefer to the FL Proposal 3.1.v2 without FFS for “Intra-IAB-node (self-interference) scenarios”. |
| Intel | Yes | We agree with Ericsson that self-interference can be left for implementation. |
| Samsung | Partially | Prefer removing the last bullet since it is still controversial |
| CMCC | Yes | As per FL’s response that “We note that multiplexing modes C & D, that would potentially lead to SI, are already supported by the Rel-17 IAB WID”, we believe intra-IAB-node (self-interference) scenarios should be carefully considered. To make progress, we are OK to leave it as FFS here, we can further study whether it is up to implementation, or solved by solutions with spec impact. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | It is not clear whether SI can be addressed by implementation only. We propose to keep the FFS. |
| CEWiT | Partially yes | Same view as LG on intra-IAB scenario |
|  |  |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes | We can agree with Ericsson that self-interference for multiplexing case C and case D can be left for implementation. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | We are fine to further discuss self-interference. |
| Noka/NSB | Yes | Agree with E/// and ZTE. |

**Topic 3.2**

This discussion topic relates to the discussion on the interference management (measurement and mitigation) solutions for the relevant interference scenarios.

Related input from contributions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon  R1-2007595 | ***Observation 5:*** *For uplink full-duplex, IAB node may not be able to cancel the self-interference if the power gap between the interference and desired signals is too large, and the power gap can be reduced by enhanced power control of MT.*  ***Observation 6:*** *For downlink full-duplex, IAB node may not be able to cancel the self-interference if the power gap between the interference and desired signals is too large, and the power gap can be reduced by decreasing DU transmission power which is an implementation issue.*  ***Observation 7:*** *Some specification enhancements can be considered to better support full duplex implementation, such as on self-interference channel estimation.*  ***Proposal 9****: Enhancements on CLI to support the simultaneous operation of IAB MT and DU including inter-multiplexing chain scenarios, at least should consider*  - *Interference measurement*  - *Interference coordination/management*  ***Proposal 10:*** *To handle various types of interference, regardless of interference source is MT or DU, a unified CLI measurement and management framework can be adopted in IAB.* |
| vivo  R1-2007685 | **Proposal 5: Reuse Rel-16 CLI framework for interference management in IAB network, e.g. intended TDD configuration exchange between gNBs and the related CLI measurement and report schemes.**  **Observation 1: The CLI interference measurement and report mechanism specified in Rel-16 can be directly reused in IAB network.**  **Proposal 6: For CLI mitigation, exchange of resource configuration between IAB nodes should be specified, including TDD configuration and/or resource type configuration. Related signaling is up to RAN3.**  **Observation 2: DU implementation can handle the interference measurement regarding DU Rx interference.**  **Proposal 7: In the moment of simultaneous MT Tx/DU Rx, MT determines UL transmission power based on MT-to-DU self-interference.**  **Proposal 8: In case simultaneous MT Rx/DU Tx or MT Rx/DU Rx is enabled, support measurement/report of DU-to-MT self-interference or UE/MT-to-MT interference respectively.** |
| CMCC  R1-2008030 | **Proposal 5: The measurement to prevent the self-impulse interference in simultaneous transmission and reception of IAB should be discussed and introduced.** |
| Samsung  R1-2008185 | ***Proposal 4: Rel-16 CLI is a starting point at least for MT-to-MT interference in Rel-17.*** |
| AT&T  R1-2008313 | **Proposal 1: DU‐DU and MT‐MT CLI measurements such as short‐term (L1/L2) and long term (L3) measurements, multiple antenna and beamforming based measurements should be studied to enable CLI mitigation in IAB.**  **Proposal 3: Specify DU‐DU CLI measurements techniques to enable CLI mitigation for IAB.** |
| LG Electronics  R1-2008407 | ***Proposal 6:*** For the Case 1 (Victim IAB-node is receiving in DL via its MT, interfering IAB-node is transmitting in UL via its MT) of inter IAB-node interference scenario, Rel-16 CLI measurement and handling  mechanism can be applied.   * Considering the IAB specific TDD configuration (i.e., U-F-D), measurement resource configuration and/or signalling for network coordination (i.e., intended UL/DL configuration) can be modified.   ***Proposal 7:*** Discuss whether/how to operate measurement of intra-IAB interference. |
| CEWiT, Tejas Networks, Reliance Jio, IITM, Saankhya Labs, IITH  R1-2008816 | **Observation 1:** Using Rel. 16 CLI management scheme, which is not designed specific to IAB network, the CLI measurement accuracy of SRS RSRP will be degraded due to factors like network synchronisation error, unknown propagation delays between the IAB nodes, very less CP duration in FR2, different TA across nodes, large distance between child and parent node etc.  **Proposal 1:** Mechanism specific to IAB network to improve the CLI measurement accuracy as compared to Rel. 16 CLI management is needed.  **Observation 2:** Resource partitioning methods can help to overcome the impact of simultaneous operation of IAB node on access UEs.  **Proposal 2:** SI handling methods should be supported for both single panel or multi-panel systems to ensure better performance.  **Observation 5:** IAB node MT might need time-frequency resources for SI measurement, which are free from backhaul reception and transmission. This requires cooperation with the parent.  **Proposal 3:** SI measurement occasions are required at an IAB node operating in Case C and Case D. The following options can be considered in configuring SI measurement occasions  **Alt 1:** Parent node configures measurement occasions to IAB-MT at regular intervals  **Alt 2:** IAB node requests for measurement occasions to parent node and parent-DU configures it  **Alt 3:** IAB node configures measurement occasions and report it to parent node in advance  **Observation 6:** Severe SI/CLI will not always allow an IAB node to work in  simultaneous Tx and/or Rx mode of operation efficiently.  **Proposal 4:** In case of severe interference, IAB node signals fall back request to parent and donor node, and switches to TDM mode with default configuration after receiving confirmation from the parent node. The default configuration of the fall back TDM mode is configured by the parent node either semi-statically or dynamically.  **Proposal 5:** For Case D, there should be a feedback mechanism regarding the  interference at an IAB node from MT to the parent to aid power control. |
| ZTE, Sanechips  R1-2008859 | ***Proposal 9: The existing TCI scheme can be a starting point in support of CLI mitigation for multiplexing Case B.***  ***Proposal 10: The existing SRI scheme can be a starting point in support of CLI mitigation for multiplexing Case A.*** |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  R1-2008864 | **Proposal 3**: **An IAB node can be configured to be made aware of the semi-static DU resource configuration (D/U/F/H/S/NA) of its parent IAB node(s) and neighboring nodes.** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility  R1-2009109 | **Proposal 5: Consider enhancements for improving resource management and timing adjustment for CLI measurements in IAB systems.** |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC.  R1-2009191 | **Proposal 10: No additional mechanism is necessary for cross link interference for IAB.** |
| Qualcomm Incorporated  R1-2009270 | **Observation 3.2:**  **To determine how efficiently an IAB-node can operate in the full-duplex mode, it needs to periodically perform SI measurements.**  **Proposal 3.1:**  **SI measurement can be performed autonomously by an IAB-node.**  **Proposal 3.2:**  **Extend the enhanced multiplexing capability indication as follows:**   * **(a) support local refinement indication of the enhanced multiplexing capability (i.e. whether the capability is available to what degree under which conditions) to the parent-node (e.g. via MAC-CE)** * **(b) support indicating to the CU the configuration(s) required to enable an enhanced multiplexing capability**   + **e.g. for which beams (SSBs) or which served child-nodes, the IAB-node can operate in the enhanced multiplexing mode.**   **Observation 3.3:**   * **Rel-16 CLI framework does not support coordination across CUs to indicate the SRS configurations for UEs/IAB-MT’s CLI measurement.** * **Rel-16 CLI signaling (intended TDD configuration) should be extended to support IAB-specific resource configurations.**   **Proposal 3.3:**  **Send an LS to RAN3 to (a) support exchange of SRS configurations among CUs for CLI measurements, and (b) extend the intended TDD configuration signaling to support IAB-specific resource configurations.**  **Observation 3.4:**   * **Rel-16 CLI measurements are RRC configured, and reports are L3 reports. Hence the DU (or parent-node DU) is not involved in configuring the measurements of its UEs (or child MTs) and more importantly does not know about the result of their CLI measurements.** * **IAB-MTs may be subject to strong and persistent CLI from other IAB-nodes.**   **Proposal 3.4:**  **An IAB-DU is provided with the result of CLI measurements by its child MTs, e.g. which child MTs are subject to strong CLI from neighboring nodes.**  **Observation 3.6:**  **An IAB-DU can autonomously measure CLI from neighboring DU cells, based on the available information at the IAB-MT (e.g. SMTC).**  **Proposal 3.5:**  **Support IAB-DU reporting the result of its CLI measurements to the CU, e.g. the list of neighboring DU cells with strong CLI can be reported.**  **Proposal 3.6:**  **Support IAB-DU reporting multiplexing capability across its served cells (DU cell m TX, DU cell n RX).** |
| Ericsson  R1-2009302 | **Observation 8 IAB‐nodes transmitting in DL slots will mostly limit interference to within the IAB network.**  **Proposal 5 Limit IAB‐node transmissions to DL slots.**  **Proposal 6 Adopt RAN4’s Scenario 2 for Rel‐17.** |

The majority view is to extend the Rel-16 CLI to handle inter-IAB interference scenarios. Companies propose various ideas to extend Rel-16 CLI:

* Specify DU-to-DU CLI management
* Extend the information exchange (e.g. the resource configuration, result of CLI measurements, etc.) among different entities
* Enhance the CLI measurement accuracy (e.g. via timing adjustment, etc.)
* Extend CLI measurements (e.g. introducing short-term measurements, multi-beam measurements, etc.)

To handle intra-IAB interference (self-interference):

* For self-interference (SI) measurement: some companies propose to specify SI measurement configurations, others suggest leaving the measurements to implementation.
* For SI report: most of the companies, commenting on this topic, believe an IAB-node should notify the network about the result of its SI measurement – e.g. via SI measurement report, sending minimal indication (e.g. a fallback indication, or conditions required to support operating in the enhanced multiplexing modes), UL Tx power adjustment suggestion to the parent-node, etc.

To further mitigate the interference, in various scenarios, companies also propose:

* Enhanced DL/UL power control (which is the subject of the next Section),
* Resource and beam coordination.

**FL Proposal 3.2a:**

**Extend the Rel-16 CLI framework to handle inter-IAB interference scenarios.**

* **FFS: specify DU-to-DU CLI management**
* **FFS: extend the information exchange (e.g. the resource configuration, result of CLI measurements, etc.) among different entities**
* **FFS: enhance the CLI measurement accuracy (e.g. via timing adjustment, etc.)**
* **FFS: extend CLI measurements (e.g. introducing short-term measurements, multi-beam measurements, etc.)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 3.2a?** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Mostly | As we mentioned in the comments to Proposal 3.1, it is unclear if SI measurement requires an independent framework from interference measurement for other multiplexing cases and it is good to strive for as much of a common framework at this stage.  So we would prefer a bit more generic wording of the proposal:  **Extend the Rel-16 CLI framework to handle ~~inter-~~IAB interference scenarios.** |
| Ericsson | Partially | We think we should discuss whether DU-to-DU CLI management can recycle the existing RIM framework. Furthermore, MT-to-MT can follow existing UE-to-UE CLI management. Per Proposal 3.1, also DU-to-MT and MT-to-DU interference management may need to be included. |
| Nokia | Yes | We think that wording should be bit relaxed here as specification impact is not fully clear with different proposals.  Extend the Rel-16 CLI framework to handle inter-IAB interference scenarios.   * FFS: ~~specify~~ consider required enhancements on DU-to-DU CLI management * FFS: extend the information exchange (e.g. the resource configuration, result of CLI measurements, etc.) among different entities (e.g. between parent-child nodes, adjacent IAB nodes) * FFS: enhance the CLI measurement accuracy (e.g. via timing adjustment, etc.) * FFS: ~~extend~~ required enhancements on CLI measurements (e.g. introducing short-term measurements, multi-beam measurements, etc.) |
| Samsung |  | We are fine to discuss some enhancements. But, it should be clarified what the issues cannot be addressed by the Rel-16 CLI framework are. |
| NTT DOCOMO |  | We are open for the discussion, though we think enhancements on CLI may not be necessary, e.g. DU to DU CLI measurement may be handled by Rel-16 RIM (Remote Interference Management), or deployment. |
| CMCC | Yes, in principle | Besides DU-to-DU CLI management, should be consider enhancements on DU-to-MT and MT-to-DU interference scenarios (for inter-IAB nodes)? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes, partially | We have some comments on the first FFS, for CLI management, other case beside DU-to-DU should also be included. We suggest using a unified framework to deal with all kinds of interference scenarios. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree in principle | Firstly we think whether the IAB CLI measurement can be handled or not by the schemes introduced in Rel-15 or Rel-16 should be investigated. Till now we don’t see there is a strong motivation to enhance Rel-16 CLI mechanism for inter-IAB scenarios, e.g. DU-to-DU CLI management. |
| Intel | Partially | We are fine to discuss those scenarios, but existing CLI/RIM framework should be re-used. |
| vivo |  | We are OK to discuss the enhancement. |
| LG |  | We are fine to discuss an enhancement of CLI measurement and reporting. Also, we are open to discuss for intra-IAB interference scenario. |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 3.2a:**

The majority of the companies are open to discuss any enhancements that might be needed to handle IAB-related interference scenarios. Quite a few companies proposed Rel-16 interference management frameworks (e.g. CLI, and RIM) should be the starting point, and it should be further discussed/clarified if any enhancements would be needed.

Also, some (at least 2) companies suggested to discuss enhanced solutions for MT-to-DU and DU-to-MT scenarios.

Note that FL proposal 3.1.v2 lists the relevant IAB interference scenarios, including MT-to-DU and DU-to-MT, and the updated proposal below allows for discussion on enhancements that might be needed for these scenarios.

**FL Proposal 3.2a.v2:**

**Use the Rel-16 interference management frameworks (e.g. CLI, RIM) to handle IAB interference scenarios (NOTE: as identified in FL proposal 3.1.v2), and discuss if any of the following enhancements are needed (not an exhaustive list):**

* **FFS: extend the information exchange (e.g. the resource configuration, result of CLI measurements, etc.) among different entities (e.g. between parent-child nodes, adjacent IAB nodes, between network and IAB-node, etc.)**
* **FFS: required enhancements on CLI measurement accuracy (e.g. via timing adjustment, etc.)**
* **FFS: required enhancements on CLI measurements (e.g. introducing short-term measurements, multi-beam measurements, etc.)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 3.2a.v2?** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | We are open for the discussion. |
| Huawei | Yes | More like a FL recommendation for further discussion. |
| Nokia | yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | [Editorial] Referencing to another proposal may cause problems in future references. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes |  |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| AT&T | Yes |  |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 3.2a.v2:**

Given the support from the companies that have commented it is proposed to move the proposal into a tentative agreement:

**FL Tentative Agreement 3.2a:**

**Use the Rel-16 interference management frameworks (e.g. CLI, RIM) to handle IAB interference scenarios, and discuss if any of the following enhancements are needed (not an exhaustive list):**

* **FFS: extend the information exchange (e.g. the resource configuration, result of CLI measurements, etc.) among different entities (e.g. between parent-child nodes, adjacent IAB nodes, between network and IAB-node, etc.)**
* **FFS: required enhancements on CLI measurement accuracy (e.g. via timing adjustment, etc.)**
* **FFS: required enhancements on CLI measurements (e.g. introducing short-term measurements, multi-beam measurements, etc.)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **If you have a strong objection to FL Proposed Agreement 3.2a please elaborate:** |
| LG | We are fine with FL Tentative Agreement 3.2a. |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | We support it. |
| Huawei | Fine with the agreement. |
| Intel | Fine with the agreement. |

**FL Proposal 3.2b:**

**An IAB-node capable of operating in multiplexing Case C (MT-Rx/DU-Tx) and/or Case D (MT-Tx/DU-Rx) should perform self-interference (SI) measurement.**

* **FFS: specify SI measurement configuration or leave it to implementation.**
* **FFS: report of SI measurement result.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 3.2b?** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Yes | But see our response to Proposal 3.2a. |
| Ericsson | No | As stated earlier, we don’t think a discussion about full duplex specific issues is warranted until full duplex has been agreed. Despite that, we think any self-interference measurements would be up to implementation. |
| Nokia | No | This does not have spec impact and should be pure implementation handling. |
| Samsung |  | We are fine to discuss it. But, it highly depends on whether or not Case C and Case D is supported in Rel-17. |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | For the self-interference, it may be covered by implementation. |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Not sure | These could be implementation issues, but we are open to discuss them and see if there is any specification impact. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree in principle. | We think IAB-node can evaluate the multiplexing capability of Case C (MT-Rx/DU-Tx) and/or Case D (MT-Tx/DU-Rx) by itself, so the SI measurement can be left to implementation. |
| Intel | No | We agree with Ericsson’s comments. |
| vivo | Yes | Measurement can be left to implementation, the reporting part can be focused. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 3.2b:**

We first note that multiplexing modes C & D, that would potentially lead to SI, are already supported by the Rel-17 IAB WID.

Most (at least 9) companies suggested they are open to discuss SI. Moreover, the majority view is that the SI measurement may be done in an implementation-specific way.

**FL Proposal 3.2b.v2:**

**An IAB-node capable of operating in multiplexing Case C (MT-Rx/DU-Tx) and/or Case D (MT-Tx/DU-Rx) should perform self-interference (SI) measurement.**

* **SI measurement can be performed in an implementation-specific way** 
  + **FFS: if SI measurement should be based on a unified interference management framework.**
* **FFS: discuss any required enhancements to support reporting of SI measurement result.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 3.2b.v2?** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO |  | We are open for the discussion. It seems that whether IAB-node perform SI measurement or not is not necessary to be specified, so that “should” in the main sentence may be “may”. |
| Huawei | Okay | We are okay to discuss this further. |
| Nokia | No | We do not think this is needs Ran1 time. |
| Ericsson | No | Our position hasn’t changed from earlier: half-duplex should be prioritized in Rel-17. |
| Samsung | No | No need to spend time if it is implementation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | No | Based on the first round discussion, we agree not to discuss it in RAN1. |
| CEWiT |  | We have concern regarding the first bullet point. Does it mean there will be no spec impact for SI measurement? Then, the FFS part is not clear to us.  In our understanding, SI measurement might not be completely implementation specific. For eg., since the MT is controlled by the parent, the DU cannot measure SI from MT whenever required. This will hamper the performance. There should be some common understanding between the parent and child regarding the measurement occasions. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Partially | We agree with the main proposal.  The first bullet and its sub-bullet are contradicting. We will agree with the three bullets if they are all FFS. |
| Intel | No | We think this is a big jump from further discussion on **FL Proposal 3.1.v2** , No further agreement on SI should be made beyond FL Proposal 3.1.v2. |
| AT&T | Partially | Agree with Lenovo, Motorola Mobility that implementation based is never precluded, but focus should be on the FFS points |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 3.2b.v2:**

Based on the feedback this proposal is withdrawn.

**FL Proposal 3.2c:**

**Consider resource and beam coordination techniques to mitigate/avoid interference.**

* **FFS: limit IAB‐node transmissions to DL slots.**
* **FFS: whether Rel-16 resource management framework is sufficient.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 3.2c?** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Yes | This may have some dependencies with discussions in Agenda 8.10.1 on whether/how the Rel-16 resource indication framework is extended to support new multiplexing cases, so we don’t think the second FFS bullet is needed here (but also doesn’t hurt) |
| Ericsson | Yes | Regarding limitations to DL slots, we think that a discussion of IAB backhaul operations in UL slots must address legacy UE timing issues (potential negative TA during RA) w.r.t. Case 6 and Case 7 timing (either here or in the timing section). |
| Nokia | Yes | We are open to discuss issues within this. |
| Samsung | Yes | We are open to discuss the interference issues. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes, with comments | We agree with the main proposal. The FFS items need more details. |
| Huawei | Yes | We are open to discuss the resource and beam coordination, but we would like also note that proper measurement mechanism is even more important before coordination.  For the first FFS sub-bullet, we are not sure whether there is any specification impact from such restriction. In addition, this does seems like an implementation/deployment choice. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree in principle. | For the first FFS part, we don’t think the limitation that IAB-node UL and DL transmissions should be on DL slots is necessary, so it is expected to be removed. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes | We are fine to consider resource and beam coordination. |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 3.2c:**

All responding companies agreed to this proposal. Two companies had concerns about the first FFS item, which can be addressed as part of the FFS discussion.

A slightly modified proposal is provided.

**FL Proposal 3.2c.v2:**

**Consider resource and beam coordination techniques to mitigate/avoid interference.**

* **FFS: limit IAB‐node (DU and MT) transmissions to DL access slots.**
* **FFS: whether Rel-16 resource management framework is sufficient.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 3.2c.v2?** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Partially | We prefer to remove the first FFS bullet since it is more like an implementation choice and does not have specific impact. |
| Nokia | Partly | Agree with HW that first sub-bullet is not required. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Restricting IAB backhaul operations to DL slots would significantly simplify interference management why it is a valid point to discuss in this context. |
| Samsung | Partially | Open to discuss it. But, we do not think the first FFS is necessary. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Partially | It’s not clear to us whether IAB-node transmissions on UL/Flexible slots are feasible or not. We prefer to remove the first FFS bullet. |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes, with comments | We agree with the main proposal. We would like to ask for clarification on the FFS bullets during the GTW session. |
| Intel | Partially | We share similar view as Huawei/Nokia/Ericsson to remove the first FFS. |
| AT&T | Yes | But agree with Huawei that the first subbullet may not be the only solution and may not be a mandatory condition |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 3.2c.v2:**

Based on the feedback the first FFS bullet is modified to be more specific on what RAN1 should discuss. For the second discussion point, if, through the discussion, it is determined some enhancements to the resource management framework are needed for interference management, the corresponding enhancements will be discussed under 8.10.1.

**FL Proposal 3.2c.v3:**

**Consider resource and beam coordination techniques to mitigate/avoid interference, including (not an exhaustive list):**

* **FFS: whether limiting IAB‐node (DU and MT) transmissions to DL access slots has RAN1 impact or it can be handled by implementation.**
* **FFS: whether Rel-16 resource management framework is sufficient.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 3.2c.v3?** | **Comments** |
| LG | Yes | We are fine to discuss resource and beam coordination techniques to mitigate/avoid interference. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Partially | We hold the view that the first FFS bullet is an implementation issue hence will not have any impact on specification. On the other hand, this issue was also discussed in 8.10.1 hence there is no need to repeat the discussion in 8.10.2. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Ericsson 2 |  | Reply to Huawei’s comment:  We do think that restricting backhaul operations to DL slots is a relevant topic FFS (and it is only an FFS). As we present in out contribution, both interference and management, timing and power control may be substantially simplified if backhaul is restricted to DL slots. For example, one of the worst interference cases (next to a DU transmission in an UL slot), IAB-MT interference into an IAB-DU (or into another IAB or non-IAB network node) receiving an UE UL transmission, would be entirely avoided. Furthermore, since timing settings for simultaneous MT and UE transmissions would need to follow legacy (i.e. Case-1) principles, MUX Case A would also be difficult to achieve at the child IAB node. Hence, this is not only an implementation issue but an issue that will also have spec impact. |
| Samsung | Yes | Share similar view with HW about the first FFS. The interference impacts on access link in a UL slot is not much different from dynamic TDD in Rel-16. But, open to further discuss. |
| CMCC | Yes | We are open to study both resource and beam coordination mechanisms, since the bullets are FFS, we think the current proposal is fine to us. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Huawei |  | Reply to Ericsson’s comment:  Our understanding is that there is no fundamental difference with respect to interference types no matter whether IAB‐node transmissions are limited DL access slots or not, i.e. the interference types include DU-to-DU, DU-to-MT, MT-to-DU, MT-to-MT, etc. Regarding timing and power control, we believe the same mechanisms can be used regardless such as the parent node can indicate the timing mode or power control parameters that should be used at the IAB-MT at a given time. So it is still not clear why there is RAN1 impact here. But since it is anyway an FFS. We can live with it. |
| Nokia | Yes | A similar view as HW on FFS bullets. |

### 4 – Discussion on power control

**Topic 4.1**

This discussion topic relates to the discussion on the need for enhanced power control and the related solutions.

Related input from contributions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon  R1-2007595 | ***Observation 3:*** *Transmission power gap may degrade the quality of the weaker signal, and this may be mitigated by uplink power control of MT or the downlink power control of DU.*  ***Observation 4:*** *Reception power gap may lead to performance deterioration of the link with lower reception power, and this issue can be mitigated by network implementation.*  ***Observation 5:*** *For uplink full-duplex, IAB node may not be able to cancel the self-interference if the power gap between the interference and desired signals is too large, and the power gap can be reduced by enhanced power control of MT.*  ***Observation 6:*** *For downlink full-duplex, IAB node may not be able to cancel the self-interference if the power gap between the interference and desired signals is too large, and the power gap can be reduced by decreasing DU transmission power which is an implementation issue.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *Enhanced power control mechanism should focus on IAB MT.* |
| vivo  R1-2007685 | **Proposal 2: RAN1 to consider the following power control enhancement options for the purpose of Rx PSD imbalance mitigation at IAB node, with preference to option 1:**  - **Option 1: IAB node to send desired TX power adjustment information to parent node to assist the DL transmission power control of parent node.**  - **Option 2: IAB node to consider DL reception power from parent node upon performing its UL power control.**  **Proposal 3: For the purpose of Tx PSD imbalance mitigation and transmission power sharing between DU and MT at IAB node, the total transmission power and EPRE split between DU and MT should be coordinated, e.g., via CU.**  - **Power coordination schemes specified for NR-DC is taken as the starting point.**  **Proposal 4: Regarding transmission power sharing between DU and MT, RAN1 to study the impact on power sharing mechanism of NR-DC operation.**  **Proposal 7: In the moment of simultaneous MT Tx/DU Rx, MT determines UL transmission power based on MT-to-DU self-interference.** |
| CMCC  R1-2008030 | **Proposal 4: The power control should be enhanced for both uplink and downlink considering the issue of transmit power imbalance, signal blockage due to AGC and interference of simultaneous**  **transmission and reception.** |
| Samsung  R1-2008185 | ***Proposal 3: Discuss reception power imbalance and transmission power splitting issues in Rel-17.*** |
| AT&T  R1-2008313 | **Proposal 5: DL and UL power control enhancements should be supported to allow for inter‐ and intra‐panel SDM/MPTR of backhaul and access links.** |
| LG Electronics  R1-2008407 | ***Proposal 8:*** It should be clarified or identified which type of UL power class is applied for IAB-MT.  • Power class of normal UE should be applied for IAB-MT during the time designated for UE transmission.  • Power class of gNB can be applied for IAB-MT during time designated for gNB transmission.  ***Proposal 9:*** The details of configuration to designate power class for IAB-MT should be discussed.  ***Proposal 10:*** It should be discussed whether DL power control depending on the type of resources is considered or not when simultaneous operation is applied (e.g., IAB-MT Rx/ DU Rx, Rx/Tx).  ***Proposal 11:*** The IAB-MT assisted DL power control should be discussed. |
| CEWiT, Tejas Networks, Reliance Jio, IITM, Saankhya Labs, IITH  R1-2008816 | **Proposal 5:** For Case D, there should be a feedback mechanism regarding the  interference at an IAB node from MT to the parent to aid power control. |
| ZTE, Sanechips  R1-2008859 | ***Proposal 5: Beam depended DL power control of IAB-DU should be considered (e.g., different PC parameters could be associated with different TCI states, or CSI-RSs).***  ***Proposal 6: Expected DL Rx power level or equivalent parameters could be indicated from child node to IAB node to assist the DL power control of IAB-DU.***  ***Proposal 7: UL power control mechanism of NR access UEs can be used as a starting point of UL power control mechanism for MTs to minimize the impact on specification.***  ***Proposal 8: For UL power control of child-MT, different maximum allowed Tx power can be indicated to IAB node for different multiplexing scenarios or time resources.*** |
| Intel corporation  R1-2008996 | **Proposal 1:** Baseline DL power control mechanisms (open-loop and closed-loop DL power control) should be supported to fulfil child node assisted DL power control.  **Proposal 2:** Introduce TPC for DU from parent DU to IAB MT for parent node assisted DL power control.  **Proposal 3:** Child node assisted or parent node assisted UL power control can be fulfilled with existing UL power control mechanisms. |
| ETRI  R1-2009019 | **Proposal 2**: Discuss how to split transmit powers between the MT and DU at an IAB node when in a MT-TX/DUTX mode.  **Proposal 3**: Discuss uplink and downlink transmit power mechanism to avoid received power imbalance at the MT and DU of the IAB node.  **Proposal 4**: Discuss transmit power control scheme considering self-interference cancellation capability of the IAB node. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility  R1-2009109 | **Proposal 4: Support power control configurations and signaling at least for Case A and Case B duplexing.** |
| Sharp  R1-2009137 | **Proposal 1:**  The scope of the power control enhancements should be limited. In the WID, the limitation is mentioned between parent-child links, and so the *control* should take place between these links, but also CLI *measurements* should be limited to minimize signaling.  **Proposal 2:**  Specification of power control for IAB nodes should appropriate as much as is feasible from the existing power control framework of NR.  **Proposal 3:**  The scope of the power control enhancements should consider MT/DU power transmit requirements and capabilities dependent on the RF parameters involved, duplex capability, etc. We do not see this as in conflict with FL proposal 5.1 from RAN1 #102-e.  **Proposal 4:**  FL Proposal 5.1b can be agreed with the understanding that “assistance information” can include, but is not be limited to configured total power allocations for IAB-nodes. In addition, said assistance information may re-use mechanisms from LTE €ICIC, reference signals, and so forth. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC.  R1-2009191 | **Proposal 8: Power adjustment between DU DL and MT UL should be considered.**  **Proposal 9: Assistant information for DL power control at parent node can be semi-statically and/or dynamically reported by IAB-node for simultaneous MT and DU reception.** |
| Qualcomm Incorporated  R1-2009270 | **Observation 4.1:**  **In case of (MT TX, DU TX), the potential power issues may happen only if MT and DU share the same Pas and antennas for their concurrent transmissions. In which case,**  ‐ **TX power imbalance seems to be less of a concern.**  ‐ **TX power sharing rules are needed.**  **Observation 4.2:**  **In case of (MT TX, DU TX), and if TX power adjustment is needed to address either a power sharing or a power imbalance issue, the IAB-node prioritizes between its MT’s UL TX and DU’s DL TX based on the DU’s resource type (HARD and SOFT).**  **Note: SSB and CSI-RS should be transmitted with constant power.**  **Observation 4.3:**  **In case of (MT RX, DU RX), MT’s received DL signal can be too strong that it may block DU’s reception of an UL signal.**  **Proposal 4.1:**  **Support CU providing an IAB-DU, for each of its served cells, an indication of the max allowed DL TX power.** |
| Ericsson  R1-2009302 | **Observation 9 Power control in DL broadcast signals and channels will affect cell coverage.**  **Observation 10 To suit all IAB‐DU power control requirements would necessitate slot‐by‐slot or symbol-by‐symbol power control which is infeasible.**  **Proposal 7 The specification should allow for different IAB‐MT power control capabilities, considering existing and future HW architectures.**  **Proposal 8 DL power control is optional for IAB‐DU.**  **Proposal 9 Further study DL power control for PDCCH and PDSCH.** |

Based on the contributions, there is consensus that enhanced power control mechanisms may be helpful to address Rx power imbalance, Tx power imbalance, Tx power sharing, and self-interference mitigation.

Most companies propose to introduce enhancements to both DU’s DL and MT’s UL power control. A few companies suggest that power control may be handled by implementation within the existing power control framework. A few companies also raised concerns about IAB-node implementations that may have limited MT/DU power control capability.

Some companies propose an IAB-node may provide assisting information to help the parent-node with the parent-node’s DL and/or IAB-node’s UL Tx power adjustment. Some companies also suggest the coordination (e.g. in terms of max Tx power) can be done centrally (e.g. by CU).

**FL Proposal 4.1:**

**Introduce enhanced DL and UL Tx power control mechanism.**

* **FFS: DL/UL power control with assistance information from the child node**
* **FFS: DL power control with assistance information from the parent node**
* **FFS: Central power control coordination (e.g. semi-static max DL/UL Tx power limits)**

**Any power control mechanism should consider:**

* **existing base station design principles related to transmission power.**
* **network constraints in regard to transmitted reference signals.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 4.1?** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Yes | Since the optimal Tx power/power control mechanisms may be highly correlated with the resource multiplexing case, coexistence of different power control mechanisms within an IAB node and across the network may need to be further considered as well:  **FFS: Coexistence of different power control mechanisms within an IAB node and in the network** |
| Ericsson | Partially | This topic is also highly depending on what multiplexing cases are eventually agreed and is for that reason a bit premature to agree on. Further, we think FFS #2 is wrongly formulated since the parent node should have no role in controlling the IAB-DU’s DL transmit power. |
| Nokia | Yes, partly | It is not clear what we introduce when all sub-bullets are FFS.  We are ok to further study these, so wording should be changed.  FL Proposal 4.1:  ~~Introduce~~ Further study requirement of enhanced DL and UL Tx power control mechanism considering the following,   * FFS: DL/UL power control with assistance information from the child node * FFS: DL power control with assistance information from the parent node * FFS: Central power control coordination (e.g. semi-static max DL/UL Tx power limits)   Note : Any power control mechanism should consider the following aspects   * existing base station design principles related to transmission power. * network constraints regarding transmitted reference signals. |
| Sharp | Yes, with clarification | We mostly agree with AT&T and Ericsson, but we think the involvement of the parent node in FFS #2 depends on clarifying exactly what the assistance information is, and that the involvement in the parent node in DL power control might involve solely transmission from CU as to configuration of TPC parameters and such via the parent node. |
| Samsung | Yes | We are fine to further discuss power control issues including FFS parts. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes, in principle | We believe some clarifications should be made for the FFS points. For example, for the 2nd FFS bullet, I believe the meaning is DL power control with assistance information from the parent node for Tx imbalance mitigation at IAB node. Then, the question, why and what assistance information is needed from parent node? To my understanding, the UL power control is indicated by parent node, then the IAB node can manage its DL power control by itself. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes, partially | We are open to discuss these issues. The main bullet is a bit strong since the details listed in sublets are still FFS. Hence we are supportive to the direction suggested by Nokia. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes. | For both FDM/SDM in each multiplexing case, DL and UL Tx power control should be considered. |
| Intel | Yes, in principle | We have some doubts regarding whether enhancements on UL power control are needed. |
| Vivo |  | Firstly, we have similar concern as CMCC regarding 2nd FFS bullet.  Secondly, could you clarify the enhancement point for UL power control in 1st bullet. Moreover, in 2nd bullet, why ‘UL power control with assistance information from the parent node’ is not included. |
| LG | Generally yes | We are generally fine with FL proposal 4.1, but some points need to be clarified for aligning the level of understanding.  **FFS: DL power control with assistance information from the parent node**  In our understanding, this bullet is inserted as a power control mechanism to resolve the Tx power imbalance in simultaneous transmission. Further clarification would be appreciative.  **FFS: Central power control coordination (e.g. semi-static max DL/UL Tx power limits)**  It is understood that the statement implies the configuration of the max Tx power limit for the DL/UL resource to be done in a centralized manner. However, further clarification is required whether the subject of central power control is CU or parent IAB.  **Existing base station design principles related to transmission power.**  It seems reasonable to consider the existing gNB Tx power control mechanism, but we are not sure what the existing base station design principle is. More detailed explanation or example for it would be grateful.  **Network constraints in regard to transmitted reference signals.**  In our understanding, the constraint on the reference signal is understood to mean that a constant power and/or ratio with other signal should be maintained during the predefined duration. Additional explanation/clarification would be appreciative. |
| Fujitsu | Yes, partly | We also think it need to be clarified what kind of behavior is assumed in FFS #2. |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 4.1:**

Most companies seem to generally agree with this proposal. Some companies questioned specific proposals (e.g. FFS item 2), which can be addressed during the related FFS discussion. One company suggested to extend the FFS item 2 to also include UL power control.

**FL Proposal 4.1.v2:**

**Further study requirement of enhanced DL and UL Tx power control mechanism considering the following:**

* **DL/UL power control with assistance information from the child node.**
* **DL/UL power control with assistance information from the parent node.**
* **Central (e.g. by CU) power control coordination (e.g. semi-static max DL/UL Tx power limits).**
* **Coexistence of different power control mechanisms within an IAB node and in the network.**

**Note. Any power control mechanism should consider the following aspects:**

* **Existing base station design principles (e.g. power control and dynamic range capability, etc.) related to transmission power.**
* **Network constraints in regard to transmitted reference signals with constant power.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 4.1.v2?** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Yes | More like a FL recommendation for further discussion. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes |  |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes (with comments) | We are okay to agree this FL proposal for further discussion. But we think child node or parent node assisted UL power control can be fulfilled with existing UL power control mechanisms. |
| AT&T | Yes |  |

**FL response to feedback on FL Proposal 4.1.v2:**

Given the support from the companies that have commented it is proposed to move the proposal into a tentative agreement:

**FL Tentative Agreement 4.1:**

**Further study requirement of enhanced DL and UL Tx power control mechanism considering the following:**

* **DL/UL power control with assistance information from the child node.**
* **DL/UL power control with assistance information from the parent node.**
* **Central (e.g. by CU) power control coordination (e.g. semi-static max DL/UL Tx power limits).**
* **Coexistence of different power control mechanisms within an IAB node and in the network.**

**Note. Any power control mechanism should consider the following aspects:**

* **Existing base station design principles (e.g. power control and dynamic range capability, etc.) related to transmission power.**
* **Network constraints in regard to transmitted reference signals with constant power.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **If you have a strong objection to FL Proposed Agreement 4.1 please elaborate:** |
| LG | We are fine with FL Tentative Agreement 4.1. |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | We support it. |
| Huawei | Fine with the proposal |
| Intel | Fine with the proposal |