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# Introduction

This contribution provides a summary of the discussion in RAN1#106-e for the following email discussion:

[106-e-NR-eIAB-01] Email discussion on enhancements to resource multiplexing between child and parent links of an IAB node – Thomas (AT&T)

* 1st check point: August 19
* 2nd check point: August 25
* 3rd check point: August 27

# Simultaneous Operation of Access and Backhaul Links

**From the eIAB WID:**

* Specification of enhancements to the resource multiplexing between child and parent links of an IAB node, including:
  + **Support of simultaneous operation (transmission and/or reception) of IAB-node’s child and parent links (i.e., MT Tx/DU Tx, MT Tx/DU Rx, MT Rx/DU Tx, MT Rx/DU Rx)**
  + Support for dual-connectivity scenarios defined by RAN2/RAN3 in the context of topology redundancy for improved robustness and load balancing.

**Summary of input contributions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon (R1-2106454,R1-2107665)** | ***Proposal 1:*** *the IAB node should report conditions for different multiplexing cases per {MT-CC, DU cell}-pair as follows:*   * *Multiplexing case A (Simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Tx): Case #6 timing, additional uplink PC parameters, guard band, and desired Tx beam* * *Multiplexing case B (Simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Rx): Additional downlink PC parameters, guard band, preferred TCI, and orthogonal DMRS ports* * *Multiplexing case C (Simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Tx): Additional downlink PC parameters, guard band, preferred TCI, and orthogonal DMRS ports* * *Multiplexing case D (Simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Rx):* *Additional uplink PC parameters, guard band, and desired Tx beam*   ***Proposal 2:*** *To support the parent node indicating restricted beams to IAB node, dedicated reference signals and preferably SRS should be defined/configured.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *The IAB node can report the preferred TCI of IAB-MT as a condition for simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Rx.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *To facilitate the co-existence of TDM and FDM slots and backward compatibility, a two-step H/S/NA configuration is supported in Rel-17*   * *Step 1: Configure time domain H/S/NA for each slot in one period by reusing Rel-16 mechanism* * *Step 2: Configure frequency domain H/S/NA for a subset of the slots within one period, which overrides the time domain H/S/NA configuration in the slots*   ***Proposal 5:*** *Reuse Rel-16 DCI format 2\_5 to indicate the availability of frequency domain soft resources.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *For intra-CC FDM, the guard band should be placed in MT resources.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *If an IAB-MT is additionally provided TDD-UL-DL-ConfigDedicated-IAB-MT, the parameter tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated-IAB-MT overrides all symbols per slot over the number of slots as provided by tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *To increase the resources for simultaneous operation, the specification should allow the collision between tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated-IAB-MT and cell-specific signals/channels. In the slots with the collision, the IAB node should ignore tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated-IAB-MT. The list of cell-specific signals/channels includes:*   * *SS/PBCH block* * *CORESET for Type0-PDCCH CSS set* * *PRACH*   ***Proposal 9:*** *Donor CU can provide two sets of resource configurations to each DU cell: a basic resource configuration for access UEs and one additional resource configuration for child IAB node MTs, and the DU cell should maintain two sets of DU resource configurations simultaneously.*  ***Proposal 1:*** *Number of guard symbols for MT and DU flexible symbols = min(Number of guard symbols for MT and DU downlink switching, Number of guard symbols for MT and DU uplink switching)*  ***Proposal 2****: Introduce negative value of Ng to support efficient resource utilization.* |
| **Vivo (R1-2106617)** | **Proposal 1: IAB MT reports to parent node the supported timing mode, guard symbol, interference information, DL/UL power control information and desired DL/UL beam to assist parent node to indicate the applicability of a given multiplexing case.**   * The required guard symbol should be reported per timing mode. * FFS whether some of the information is indicated from parent node to IAB node, and the IAB node decides the applicability of a given multiplexing case accordingly.   **Proposal 2: Support both semi-static and dynamic adaptation of an IAB-node’s multiplexing operation on a given set of time/frequency resources.**  **Proposal 3: Support to indicate the allowance of a given multiplexing case on a given set of time/frequency resources by parent node/CU.**  **Proposal 4: Support IAB node to report the expected operation (e.g., simultaneous operation or TDM operation) on a given set of time/frequency resources to parent node/CU.**  **Proposal 5: The Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration and frequency domain configuration should be jointly applied.**  **Proposal 6: The availability indication of the frequency resource should be applied to H/S resource in the time domain.**  Proposal 7: Support separate indication of time and frequency resources availability in DCI format 2\_5, where different fields in DCI format 2\_5 are used for time and frequency resource availability indication.  Proposal 8: The child node can dynamically report recommended CRI(s)/SRI(s) to the parent node per multiplexing case.  Proposal 9: Regarding applicability of the indicated restricted beams from parent node to child IAB-DU, the following should be supported.   * The beam restriction is applied to the occasions of simultaneous DU TX and MT TX at child IAB node. * The beam restriction is not applied cell-specific signaling transmission, e.g., SSB and periodic CSI-RS.   **Proposal 10: Parent node indicates a set of restricted beams in the form of CRI of child DU.**  **Proposal 11: Clarify the applicability of the beam restriction indications from different parent nodes in case of dual connectivity of the child IAB node.**  Proposal 12: If multiple timing modes are configured in TDMed manner for an IAB node, additional guard symbol types should be defined for new transition cases, e.g.,   * The transition between Case 1 timing mode and Case 6 timing mode; * The transition between Case 1 timing mode and Case 7 timing mode； * The transition between Case 6 timing mode and Case 7 timing mode. |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell (R1-2106828)** | ***Proposal 2.1: Separate TDM H/S/NA configuration is given just for preparing changes in multiplexing capability requiring switching to TDM. Otherwise, TDM configuration e.g. in some slots may be obtained with a proper FDM configuration (same H/S/NA type indicated for all RB sets).***  ***Proposal 2.2: If the Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration and frequency domain configuration are jointly applied,******specify a method for resolving conflicts between conflicting FDM and TDM configurations.***  ***Observation 2.1: Frequency resource set allocation that does not align with RBG boundaries, can result in reduced spectral efficiency for PDSCH and PUSCH using resource allocation type 0.***  ***Proposal 2.3: Limit the number of configurable frequency resource sets to M.***  ***Proposal 2.4: DCI 2-5 format is kept, and definition of an availability combination is enhanced to frequency domain.***  ***Proposal 2.5: Indicate beam restrictions independently for nodes operating in case A and case B multiplexing modes.***  ***Proposal 2.6: Identify at least one signaling mechanism for how beam restriction/preference will be indicated form the parent node to the child node.***  ***Observation 2.2: Support for panel-resolution restriction and preference indication is not well motivated.***  ***Proposal 2.7: Support semi-static signaling for configured beam restriction for simultaneous MT/DU operation.***  ***Proposal 2.8: To report changes on active beams used for IAB-MT reception or IAB-MT transmission, introduce new dynamic signaling (MAC-CE) such that the IAB-MT can report the preferred/restricted beams (e.g., a sub-set of TCI states from the activated TCI states of PDCCH/PDSCH) for the IAB-MT to support SDM operation.***  ***Proposal 2.9: For FDM/SDM operation, allowed direction of the transmission for the IAB DU in F-S resources may be further controlled by the parent node by using a dynamic indication.***  ***Observation 2.3: Rel-16 signaling framework of reporting desired guard symbols can be reused for indicating required guard symbols of FDM/SDM operation.***  ***Proposal 2.10: For FDM/SDM operation, Rel-16 defined MAC-CE on desired Guard symbols shall be reused to provide additional information related to simultaneous operations. RAN1 shall further investigate 1) the maximum number of guard symbols for simultaneous operation switching modes 2) the interpretation or extension on number of indicated fields.***  ***Observation 2.4: Guard band indication may be necessary from an IAB node operating in case#7 timing mode towards its parent. The parameters of the guard band sizes must account for expect power imbalance between the signals being multiplexed.*** |
| Samsung (R1-2106907) | *Proposal 1: N is determined based on the bandwidth part size of IAB-MT.*  *Proposal 2: Guard band can be generated by each IAB node or parent IAB.*  *Proposal 3: The following H/S/NA resource types are supported for FDM*  *- H type for frequency resource: the IAB DU can assume it can use the frequency resource regardless of the MT’s configuration on the frequency resource*  *- S type for frequency resource: the IAB DU can assume it can use the frequency resource without an impact on the MT’s configuration on the frequency resource*  *- NA type for frequency resource: the IAB DU cannot assume it can use the frequency resource*  *Proposal 4: Either the Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration or frequency domain configuration is applied for a given resource.*  *Proposal 5: The existing beam management framework is reused for SDM as much as possible.*  *Proposal 6: Both semi-static and dynamic adaptation for IAB node's multiplexing operations are supported.* |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (R1-2107188) | Proposal 1: Support joint application of time- and frequency-domain H/S/NA configurations.  Proposal 2: Specify rules for determining H/S/NA resource types for time-frequency resources based on separate configurations in time and frequency domains.  Proposal 3: Support conditional availability indication as a balance between existing best-effort non-TDM and TDM-only availability indication.  Proposal 4: Extend DCI 2-5 to cover frequency-domain availability indication by replacing a unit of slots by a unit of N PRBs or N RBGs.  Proposal 5: No need to introduce scaling of N based on system BW or IAB-MT BWP.  Proposal 6: Support per-panel granularity by allowing dynamic indication of restricting/using beams and their associated antenna panels for specific time-frequency resources.  Proposal 7: Support early beam/panel indications for the upstream link in addition to downstream indications.  Proposal 8: Support applicability of beam/panel indications to specific time-frequency resources.  Proposal 9: Support signaling IAB node capabilities for timing alignment and multi-panel and baseband characteristics.  Proposal 10: Support dynamic signalling for communicating operation constraints such as beam, power, interference, and timing alignment constraints along with information of time, frequency, and spatial resources.  Proposal 11: Support a guard symbol for switching between timing modes. |
| Qualcomm (R1-2107365) | **Observation 2.1:**  **For frequency domain multiplexing, Alt1 can be viewed as a special case of Alt2, where switching between configurations is one specific scheme within the general space of joint application.**  **Proposal 2.1:**  **To help with down-selection for frequency domain multiplexing, clarify whether the frequency domain configuration in Alt1 and Alt2 refers to a configuration in frequency-domain only or a configuration in time-frequency grid.**  **Proposal 2.2:**  **Support *RB-set based H/S/NA time-domain configuration* within the general scheme space of Alt2, wherein Rel-16 H/S/NA time-domain configuration is applied within each RB set.**   * **Each RB set can be configured as (starting PRB, number of consecutive PRBs).** * **Different Rel-16 time-domain H/S/NA patterns can be configured for different RB-sets.** * **If an RB set overlaps with any of SSB, Type0-PDCCH, periodic CSI-RS, PRACH, or SR at a symbol, this RB set at this symbol shall be treated as “Hard”.**   **Observation 2.2:**  **The *RB-set based H/S/NA time-domain configuration* provides a good trade-off between configuration flexibility and signalling overhead.**   * **Alt1 can be achieved by *RB-set based H/S/NA time-domain* configuration as a special case, wherein the same H/S/NA pattern is applied over a 1st subset of time-resources cross RB-sets and different H/S/NA patterns over different RB-sets are applied over a 2nd subset of time-resources.**   **Proposal 2.3:**  **Support joint TDM and FDM indication for soft resource availability, wherein DCI2\_5 format is kept unchanged and RRC configured table for availability combinations can be extended to allow for indication of availability in frequency-domain in granularity of RB set.**  **Proposal 2.4:**  **Update resourceAvailability mapping table defined in TS38.213 so that the indication of availability can be applied over soft resources in frequency-domain for DL or UL or Flexible symbols.**   * **E.g. replacing “soft DL/UL/Flexible symbols” with “soft resources in DL/UL/Flexible symbols”**   **Proposal 3.1:**  **Support dynamic indication by the IAB-node to its parent-node (via MAC-CE) to indicate whether the semi-static capability for enhanced multiplexing is applicable at the time.**  **Proposal 3.2:**  **Support indication of conditions required to realize the enhanced multiplexing capability by the IAB-node to donor CU (via F1-AP) and/or parent node (via MAC-CE), such as**   * **Required timing mode,** * **DL RX/UL TX power constraints,** * **Required number of guard tones for FDM.** * **Required number of guard symbols for adaptation of enhanced multiplexing operation.** * **A set of applicable beam directions (SSBs/TRPs) or child nodes.**   **Proposal 3.3:**  **Extend the Rel-16 DU resource management to spatial-domain by indicating DU resource type (Hard/Soft/NA) per SSB area or per TRP or per child node by donor CU to an IAB-node DU.** |
| ETRI (R1-2107479) | **Proposal 1: Introduce L2 (MAC CE) based report/indication on conditions/parameters to facilitate adaptation between multiplexing operation modes, where the report/indication includes the following contents, at least:**   * **Supported multiplexing mode (FDM and/or SDM).** * **Required timing mode.** * **Required DL/UL power control support.** * **Information on the “non-preferred” beam.** * **Required number of guard symbols for switching of multiplexing mode.** * **Required guard band for FDM**   **Proposal 2: Introduce higher-layer parameter(s) to configure the following information:**   * **Periodicity or timing of report/indication on conditions/parameters to facilitate adaptation between multiplexing operation modes.** * **Recommendations on the conditions/parameters from parent node perspectives.**   **Proposal 3: Enhance DCI format 2\_5 to enable frequency domain resource availability indication.**   * **Opt.1: Extend of the mapping between values of resourceAvailability elements and types of soft symbol availability to frequency domain resource availability (to fit Alt. 2: The Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration and frequency domain configuration are jointly applied).** * **Opt.2: Introduce a new RNTI to indicate frequency domain resource availability (to fit Alt. 1: Either the Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration or frequency domain configuration is applied for a given resource).**   **Proposal 4: Support Alt. 2 (the Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration and frequency domain configuration are jointly applied).**  **Proposal 5: Consider specification supports on handling of cell-specific or semi-static signals/channels when the signals/channels are associated with the non-preferred DU beams.**  **Proposal 6: Consider specification supports to report non-preferred MT beams for simultaneous operations.**  **Proposal 7: Define preferred/non-preferred beams by one or more among the following options:**   * **Option 1: TCI state ID** * **Option 2: Spatial relation information ID** * **Option 3: RS ID (including CSI-RS, SRS, SSB, etc.)**   **Proposal 8: RAN1 to strive concurrent support of “Rel-16 simultaneous TCI/spatial relation update” and “Rel-17 simultaneous DU/MT operations”.**  **Proposal 9: Clarify that there is no impact on IAB-MT behavior due to conflicts between cell-specific signals/channels and other resource configurations of the IAB-MT, when the IAB node supports SDM between DU and MT resources at least.**  **Proposal 10: Study BD/CCE limits enhancement to allocate more BD/CCE budgets for the cells with simultaneous operations**. |
| LG Electronics (R1-2107553) | ***Proposal 1: Time resource for TDM and non-TDM operation of an IAB-node can be semi-statically configured by the network.***  ***Proposal 2: During the time resource for non-TDM operation, the multiplexing operation mode of an IAB-node can be determined implicitly based on semi-static D/U/F resource type of MT and DU at least.***  ***Proposal 3: Discuss to report the applicability of the given multiplexing operation mode to the parent node at least for DU flexible resource.***  ***Proposal 4: Discuss to support guard symbols for timing boundary overlapping in case of timing mode transition for an IAB-node.***  ***Proposal 5: Discuss to adapt the required guard symbols according to the applied timing mode.***  ***Proposal 6: Guard band for FDM between MT and DU is determined by DU and allocated in DU frequency resource.***  ***Proposal 7: Either the Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration or frequency domain configuration is applied for a given resource.***  ***Proposal 8: Switching granularity between Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration and frequency domain H/S/NA configuration is aligned to switching granularity of multiplexing operation mode.***  ***Proposal 9: The same candidate values are used for the configuration of resource granularity N regardless of the RBG size of the corresponding MT.***  ***Proposal 10: Reference SCS is configured for frequency domain H/S/NA configuration.***  ***Proposal 11: The time domain and frequency domain soft resource availability indication are indicated independently within a DCI.***  ***Proposal 12:******Adopt that the beam resource of the IAB-DU of the child node is semi-statically controlled by the parent DU.***  ***Proposal 13: Support that child node reports information on beam pair(s) capable of simultaneous operation between DU and MT (i.e., simultaneous Tx-Tx, simultaneous Rx-Rx, simultaneous Tx-Rx, and simultaneous Rx-Tx) to its parent DU*** |
| Intel (R1-2107607) | **Proposal 1:** Either the Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration or frequency domain configuration is applied for a given resource. Per-slot level or per-resource type level switching granularity is preferred.  **Proposal 2:** For frequency-domain soft resource availability indication, enhancements of DCI format 2\_5 are based on the following semi-static configurations:   * Whether frequency-domain H/S/NA is applied per-slot level or per-resource type level * The maximum number of soft regions of one frequency-domain H/S/NA application   **Proposal 4:** Add reference SCSs for soft resource availability indication configuration in the RRC IE *AvailabilityCombinationPerCell*.   * For unpaired spectrum operation, a reference SCS configuration is provided by *subcarrierSpacing-AI* and, when a supplementary UL carrier is configured for the serving cell, a reference SCS configuration is provided by *subcarrierSpacing2-AI* for the supplementary UL carrier. * For paired spectrum operation, a reference SCS configuration for a DL BWP is provided by *subcarrierSpacing-AI* and a reference SCS configuration is provided for an UL BWP by *subcarrierSpacing2-AI*.   **Proposal 5:** For DCI format 2\_5 operation in paired spectrum with a reference SCS configuration provided for the reference DL BWP of the serving cell and a reference SCS configuration provided for the reference UL BWP of the serving cell:   * If : for each values provided by *resourceAvailability*, the first values for the combination of availability indication values are applicable to the reference DL BWP and the next value is applicable to the reference UL BWP. * If : for each values provided by *resourceAvailability*, the first value for the combination of availability indication values are applicable to the reference DL BWP and the next values are applicable to the reference UL BWP. |
| AT&T (R1-2107692) | **Proposal 1: Support dynamic adaptation of multiplexing capability for a subset of time/frequency resources of a given backhaul link via enhancements to DCI Format 2\_5 and adaptation of the desired/available guard symbols per multiplexing capability via enhancements to MAC-based signaling between an IAB node and its parent node.**  **Proposal 2: If an IAB node is configured with a frequency-domain H/S/NA configuration, either the Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration or frequency domain configuration is applied for a given resource with per-resource type within a slot granularity.**  **Proposal 3: The configured resource size for an IAB-DU’s frequency domain H/S/NA granularity is a set of N RBs, where N is exactly the number of PRBs that are configured for the corresponding MT’s RBG.**  **Proposal 4: The parent node can dynamically indicate to the child node a set of restricted beams at the IAB-DU of the child node which are associated with a given set of H/S/NA resource(s) and multiplexing capabilities at the IAB-DU.**  **Proposal 5: The child node can dynamically report to the parent node a set of recommended beams, not preferred beams, or both recommended and not preferred beams of the IAB-MT of the child node which are associated with different QCL assumptions of the IAB-MT using the existing beam-management framework and potential extensions to support panel-level granularity (if supported by the Rel-17 MIMO WI).** |
| Apple (R1-2107758) | **Proposal 1**: For simultaneous operation, either parent IAB-DU or IAB-DU can initiate and control the flow.  **Proposal 2**: The entity with higher data priority will control the flow by initiating the scheduling on high priority link and/or indicating the desired parameters to the other link  **Proposal 3**: For the case of parent IAB-DU indicating IAB node about the receiving beams/panels for Lp,DL and LA,UL / Lc,UL links, the indication can be dynamic and/or semi-static:   * Dynamic e.g. through TCI index in DCI for scheduling PDSCH Lp,DL * Semi-static, e.g. through MAC-CE/RRC to IAB-MT or through F1 interface to IAB-DU   **Proposal 4**: For the case of IAB indicating desired reception beams/panels on Lp,DL and LA,UL / Lc,UL links, the indication to parent IAB-DU can be dynamic and/or semi-static:   * Dynamic e.g. through UCI transmission from IAB-MT to parent DU * Semi-static, e.g. through MAC-CE from IAB-MT or through F1 interface from IAB-DU * Alternatively, IAB-MT performs SR or initiates PRACH to indicate desired receiving beam on Lp,DL   **Proposal 5**: To achieve a simultaneous reception within an IAB node, i.e. DU-Rx & MT-Rx, a two-step indication is deployed   * Step1: Parent IAB-DU indicates initial beam/panel, K0, SLIV, etc, and a grace time for IAB node in which IAB-MT can indicate its desired parameters like beam/panel, K0, SLIV, etc * Step2: IAB indicates its desired parameters (beam/panel, K0, SLIV, Tx power, etc), for example, on PUCCH indicated by DL DCI from parent IAB-DU   **Proposal 6**: To utilize SDM resource multiplexing, support PDSCH allocation for IAB-MT with crossing the slot border. |
| ZTE (R1-2107824, R1-2107826) | [Observation 1: It may aggravate interference and resource collision if a given resource were applied with both Rel-16 H/S/NA and frequency-domain H/S/NA.](#_Toc79164566)  [Observation 2: Semi-static H/S/NA configuration is not applicable for SDM due to time-variant channel conditions.](#_Toc79164567)  [Proposal 1: For the minimum resource size (a set of N RBs) for configuring the frequency domain granularity,](#_Toc79164569)  [• Candidate values for N can be 1, 4, 8, 16.](#_Toc79164570)  [• It is up to CU implementation how to set the actual value of N.](#_Toc79164571)  [Proposal 2: Frequency-domain H/S/NA should be configured per RB set within a carrier.](#_Toc79164572)  [• One RB set is configured as a multiple of N RBs.](#_Toc79164573)  [• Each RB set is defined based on a reference carrier/SCS, FFS how to determine the reference carrier/SCS of a DU cell.](#_Toc79164574)  [Proposal 3: For a given resource of an IAB DU cell, IAB node can be configured with either Rel-16 H/S/NA or frequency-domain H/S/NA.](#_Toc79164575)  [Proposal 4: Rel-16 DCI Format 2\_5 is reused to indicate soft resource availability for TDM and FDM slots:](#_Toc79164576)  [• For TDM slot, availability indication is valid for all soft symbols in the slot](#_Toc79164577)  [• For FDM slot, availability indication is only valid for all soft resource in the slot.](#_Toc79164578)  [Proposal 5: Additional enhancements to DCI Format 2\_5 are not necessary.](#_Toc79164579)  [Proposal 6: It is sufficient to indicate the one of the preferred beams and the not preferred beams for IAB node MT, and it is not necessary to indicate both of them at the same time.](#_Toc79164580)  [Proposal 7: It is not necessary to limit the applicability of beam indication to specific multiplexing cases or time-frequency resources.](#_Toc79164581)  [Proposal 8: H/S/NA configuration per beam (i.e. additional semi-static configuration signaling) is not supported.](#_Toc79164582)  [Proposal 9: Per-panel granularity for resource management in the spatial domain is not supported.](#_Toc79164583)  [Proposal 10: Different beam indications (i.e. child IAB-MT beam indication and parent IAB-DU beam indication) are applied to different links, i.e. backhaul link and access link of an IAB node.](#_Toc79164584)  [Proposal 11: Rel-16 guard symbols mechanism is reused in Rel-17 IAB.](#_Toc79164585)  [Proposal 12: Guard band for FDM between backhaul link and access link at an IAB node depends on implementation.](#_Toc79164586)  [Observation 1: If more than one SCS-specific carrier for an IAB-node DU cell is reported to CU, IAB-node DU should know which carrier (e.g. either which one of the SCS-specific carriers or the carrier defined/determined by CU) is used by CU to define the RB sets for H/S/NA resource configuration in frequency domain.](#_Toc79164250)  [Proposal 1: A reference carrier used for H/S/NA resource configuration in frequency-domain for an IAB-node DU cell should be specified.](#_Toc168)  [Proposal 2: Parent nodes should be made aware of the carrier frequency information and reference carrier of an IAB DU cell.](#_Toc10069)  [• FFS: how to indicates the IAB-node DU cell H/S/NA resource configuration in frequency-domain to the parent node by CU](#_Toc27790) |
| NTT DOCOMO (R1-2107877) | **Proposal 1: Semi-static configuration of H/S/NA resource type in frequency domain can be provided per RB set (e.g., *N* RBs) per slot per D/U/F resource type.**  **Proposal 2: To save signaling overhead, H/S/NA in freq. domain can be provided only for some time units indicated by explicit signaling and/or determined by predefined rules.**   * **For a given symbol, if frequency domain H/S/NA is not provided, time domain H/S/NA can be applied** * **For a given symbol, if both frequency domain H/S/NA and time domain H/S/NA are provided, whether frequency domain H/S/NA or time domain H/S/NA is applied can be determined by predefined rules considering e.g., multiplexing capability, MT/DU’s DL/UL direction, timing mode, power control, beam indication, etc.**   **Proposal 3: DCI format 2\_5 framework can be reused, and *ResourceAvailability* can be enhanced to indicate availability per RB set per slot per D/U/F resource type.**  **Proposal 4: In addition to legacy beam reporting, IAB node can report M best beams that are suitable for simultaneous MT/DU operation via CSI reporting framework.**  **Proposal 5: Restricted DU beams can be configured for each SSB/CSI-RS of MT serving cell via RRC signaling.**  **Proposal 6: If case#6 timing mode is required for simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Tx, simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Tx can be performed only if case#6 UL Tx timing is indicated by parent node; otherwise, simultaneous Tx cannot be performed.**  **Proposal 7: On a DU flexible symbol, parent node can configure/indicate IAB node MT Tx/Rx, and IAB node DU will Tx/Rx on the symbol based on MT transmission/reception direction and its multiplexing capability.**  **Proposal 8: Whether different value range of the number of guard symbols is needed for the new timing modes needs to be studied.**  **Proposal 9: Guard symbol is provided for each combination of MT case1 Tx/case6 Tx/case7 Tx/Rx and DU Tx/Rx.**  **Proposal 10: Guard band can be handled by IAB node implementation.** |
| Ericsson (R1-2108107,2108109) | *Proposal 1 The frequency domain granularity, i.e., the N RBs in an RB set is related to MT’s number of PRBs in an RBG, NRB(RBG), such that:*  *N = {1, 2, 4, 8} × NRB(RBG) or N = {1, 2, 3, 4} × NRB(RBG).*  *Proposal 2 If a resource is configured as Hard, the IAB-DU can transmit, receive, or either transmit or receive according to its configuration only if it does not impact the IAB-MT’s actual ability to operate in any other resource according to the configuration of that resource.*  *FFS: How to address the Soft Indicated Available IAB-DU resources.*  *Proposal 3 Time-domain H/S/NA configuration is always provided to the IAB-node even if ”TDM not required” is indicated to the IAB-donor-CU.*  *Proposal 4 Support separate TDM and FDM configurations in an IAB-node.*  *Proposal 5 Support operation in either TDM or FDM modes on a per-slot basis.*  *Proposal 6 Support indicating both time-domain and frequency-domain H/S/NA in the same gNB-DU Cell Resource Configuration (9.3.1.107 in TS 38.473 [7]).*  *Proposal 7 The frequency-domain H/S/NA is provided per slot.*  *Proposal 8 Support multiple frequency domain DCI format 2\_5 associated to the same time slot.*  *Proposal 9 Resources for SDM are available in FDM (and TDM for IAB nodes that do not require TDM) Soft resources through implicit indication.*  *Proposal 10 Beam restrictions (contrary to interference management restrictions) are only applicable to resources where SDM is used (i.e., Soft).*  *Proposal 11 Explicit availability indication overrides SDM beam restrictions in Soft resources.*  *Proposal 12 The child node indicates a set of preferred beams to the parent node, which can include preferred IAB-MT DL RX beams and/or IAB-MT UL TX beams.*  *Proposal 13 A parent node can be made aware of all IAB-DU resource configurations, including both time-domain and frequency-domain H/S/NA configurations.*  *Proposal 14 The parent IAB-node is dynamically provided with changes of the IAB-node’s ability to exploit a multiplexing capability.*  *Proposal 15 The multiplexing ability reporting is signaled separately from the operational conditions/parameters for determined multiplexing operation modes.*  *Proposal 16 Whether or not to switch to FDM/SDM should be based on the ACK/NACK response from the parent IAB-node.*  *Proposal 17 Whether the simultaneous operation is TX or RX is determined according to the UL/DL configuration of the IAB-DU.*  *Proposal 18 In a slot when FDM configuration is not provided, TDM configuration applies.*  *Proposal 19 Fallback to TDM does not need an ACK response from the parent IAB-node.*  *Proposal 20 RAN1 should consider how an IAB-node can determine which timing mode to use for which multiplexing mode.*  *Proposal 21 RAN1 should consider how to configure timing for IAB node(s) based on multiplexing ability (including parent IAB-node (Case-6) and child IAB-node (Case-7)).*  *Proposal 22 In a slot when FDM configuration is not provided, Case-6 timing is not required.*  *Proposal 23 Desired/Provided Guard Symbols are signaled in multiple groups that covers all relevant switching combinations among Case #1, Case #6 and Case #7 timing alignments.*  *Proposal 24 Dedicated transmission directions in terms of DL/UL for cell-specific signals/channels should be maintained when configuring simultaneous operation at an IAB-node.*  *Proposal 25 For an IAB-MT,*  *a. an indicated transmission overrides a configured SSB reception,*  *b. an indicated reception overrides a configured PRACH transmission, and*  *c. an indicated transmission overrides a configured SIB reception.*  *Proposal 26 Rel-17 enhancement on DCI format 2\_5 should at least consider extension of the maximum payload size of DCI format 2\_5 to increase the number of IAB-DU cells that can be provided with availability information for Soft resources. FFS: Further enhancement to further increase the number of IAB-DU cells that can be indicated AI.*  *Proposal 27 One resourceAvailability element of the availabilityCombinations table is reserved to signal to the IAB-DU that “No Availability Indication is provided” in DCI format 2\_5 for slots which receive multiple Availability Indicators.* |
| CEWiT, Tejas Networks, IITM, IITH, IITB (R1-2108161) | **Proposal 1:** Mechanism to inform multiplexing capability of parent nodes to IAB node is supported  **Proposal 2:** Signalling of multiplexing capability and supported modes from IAB node to CU and parent-DU is supported  **Proposal 3:** Following alternatives are proposed for configuring active mode of operation at an IAB node   * Alt1: Donor configuring the active mode of operation of IAB node * Alt2: Parent node configuring the active mode of operation of IAB node   **Observation 1:** IAB node and its parent node should have same understanding of the active mode of operation of the IAB node at every time instant  **Proposal 4**: Parent node updating the parameters like TA and guard required at IAB node based on active mode of operation of parent node and IAB node before mode switching is supported  **Proposal 5:** Dynamic switching between multiplexing modes of IAB node is supported under the control of parent node  **Proposal 6:** Mechanism to fall back to TDM mode from simultaneous mode at IAB node is supported  **Observation 2:** Frequent switching between multiplexing modes leads to signaling storm  **Proposal 7:** Define minimum duration for active mode of operation  **Proposal 8:** An IAB node apply either the time domain H/S/NA configuration or frequency domain H/S/NA configuration for a given resource based on the active mode of operation  **Proposal 9:** The switching between time domain H/S/NA configuration and frequency domain H/S/NA configuration occur based on the granularity of active mode of operation  **Observation 3:** Explicit signalling of IA for a S resource is needed based active mode of operation  **Proposal 10:** In case of IAB-MT, the resource configuration given by *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated-IAB-MT* override the configuration of cell specific signal/channel |

**ISSUE 2.1: FREQUENCY DOMAIN MULTIPLEXING**

**Proposal 2.1.2:**

* **For a given symbol, if the frequency domain H/S/NA configuration is not provided, the time domain H/S/NA is applied**
* **For a given symbol, if both frequency domain H/S/NA and time domain H/S/NA are provided, whether frequency domain H/S/NA or time domain H/S/NA is applied can be determined by predefined rules e.g., based on multiplexing capability, MT/DU’s DL/UL direction, timing mode, semi-static/cell specific configurations, etc.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.1.2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support the proposal** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | The first bullet is clear and OK for us.  Disagree with the second bullet. We agree that both frequency domain H/S/NA and time domain H/S/NA can be provided to an IAB DU, but these two kind of HSNA should be configured on separate DU symbols. From our point of view, CU is aware of almost all the listed factors(e.g., multiplexing capability, MT/DU’s DL/UL direction, .etc) that may be used to determine the applied type of HSNA configuration, and it is more suitable to let CU make the final decision and provide only one type of configuration for a given symbol , and this can make IAB node and its parent node as well as the CU have a consistent understanding on the used HSNA configuration on the IAB node, this also has less signalling overhead and spec changes. |
| **Ericsson** | Support |
| **LG** | We support the proposal. |
| **CEWiT** | Support |
| **Intel** | We support the proposal. |
| **Apple** | Why is it limited to pre-defined rules? IAB node can be dynamically indicated about which one to apply. |
| **Samsung** | We are OK with the first bullet. For the second bullet, we share similar view with Apple and then it is possible to further discuss whether frequency domain H/S/NA or time domain H/S/NA is applied can be determined by implicit way such as predefined rule in the proposal 2.1.2 or explicit way such as a signaling from parent node. |
| **ETRI** | Support |
| **Qualcomm** | We have following comments:   * In our understanding, the frequency-domain H/S/NA configuration is to configure H/S/NA pattern in time-frequency grid. To avoid possible confusion, we suggest to use terms “Rel-17 time-frequency H/S/NA configuration” and “Rel-16 time domain H/S/NA configuration” in the agreement for clarification. * In order to cover the special case that Rel-17 time-frequency H/S/NA configuration may be provided only over a subset of RB sets in frequency-domain, we suggest to replace “For a given symbol” with “For a given RB set at a symbol” for both bullet points.   + In this way, the 1st bullet can be generalized such that Rel-16 time-domain H/S/NA is applied whenever the Rel-17 time-frequency H/S/NA configuration is not applicable in time and/or frequency domain.   For 2nd bullet point, in our opinion, one key issue for predefined rules is that the switching conditions defined by these rules needs to be identified by both parent and child node without ambiguity, which can be challenging depending on the rules. |
| **vivo** | Support |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We support the first bullet.  For the second bullet, it seems that there is an underlying assumption that TDM and FDM may coexist and dynamic switching between them is supported. Given that the H/S/NA are semi-static resource configurations which does not change very often, it is not clear why the donor CU would configure two set of DU resource configuration for the IAB node. On the other hand, the predefined rules are very unclear as it is now. |

**Proposal 2.1.2b:**

* **For a given RB set at a symbol, if the frequency domain H/S/NA configuration is not provided, the time domain H/S/NA is applied**
* **For a given RB set at a symbol, if both frequency domain H/S/NA and time domain H/S/NA are provided, FFS whether frequency domain H/S/NA or time domain H/S/NA is applied based on explicit or implicit indication/determination at the child IAB node.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.1.2b?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support** |
| **ETRI** | **Support**  **Re the second bullet, the following revision can be considered, we think:**  **• For a given RB set at a symbol, if both frequency domain H/S/NA and time domain H/S/NA are provided, FFS whether frequency domain H/S/NA or time domain H/S/NA is applied based on explicit indication from the parent node or implicit ~~indication/~~determination at the parent/child IAB nodes.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | As we pointed, the benefit is unclear to configure both time domain H/S/NA and frequency domain H/S/NA for a given symbol, but the current bullets seems to imply that this has been supported. The original first bullet is clear, it is for the case that only time domain H/S/NA is configured on the symbol as Rel-16, we can support it, and need further study on the other cases. And we propose to update the proposal as:   * **For a given ~~RB set at a~~ symbol, if the frequency domain H/S/NA configuration is not provided, the time domain H/S/NA is applied** * **FFS whether both frequency domain H/S/NA and time domain H/S/NA can be provided for a given symbol.** |
| **CEWiT** | Support |
| **Ericsson** | Support in general.  The second bullet should move the FFS to the beginning of the bullet.  We think that TDM is always provided for fallback and this is also indicated by the following agreement from the last meeting:  *For frequency domain multiplexing, H/S/NA configurations for an IAB-node are provided separately in addition to the Rel-16 H/S/NA*  Hence, we cannot agree to ZTE’s proposal. |
| **Samsung** | Support. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Support the first bullet.  For the second bullet, we still don’t see why H/S/NA resource configurations need to be changes very often for FDM. We would be okay with ZTE’s modification or remove it for now. |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal. Agree with Ericsson that TDM config is appropriate as a fallback or tied to dynamic capability indication. Support priority for FD config over TDD config. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | First bullet: Support  Second bullet: We do not have an agreement yet on whether to apply H/S/NA in time and frequency separately or jointly. It was left FFS in the last meeting. We’ll support the second bullet if rephrased as “whether frequency domain H/S/NA and/or time domain H/S/NA.” |
| **Qualcomm** | Support.  One minor comment for the 2nd bullet point, to incorporate possible different approaches, maybe the 2nd bullet point can be modified below:  **“For a given RB set at a symbol, if both frequency domain H/S/NA and time domain H/S/NA are provided, FFS ~~whether~~ how frequency domain H/S/NA or time domain H/S/NA ~~is~~ shall be applied ~~based on explicit or implicit indication/determination~~ at the ~~child~~ IAB node”** |

**Proposal 2.1.2c:**

* **For a given RB set at a symbol, if the Rel-17 [time-]frequency domain H/S/NA configuration is not provided, the Rel-16 time domain H/S/NA is applied**
* **FFS: For a given RB set at a symbol, if both the Rel-16 time domain H/S/NA configuration and Rel-17 [time-]frequency domain H/S/NA configuration are provided, one of the following alternatives is selected:**
  + **Alt. 1: Rel-17 [time-]frequency domain H/S/NA configuration always overrides Rel-16 time domain H/S/NA configuration**
  + **Alt. 2: Explicit indication to select either the Rel-16 time domain H/S/NA configuration or the Rel-17 [time-]frequency domain H/S/NA configuration**
  + **Alt. 3: Implicit rule(s) defined to select either the Rel-16 time domain H/S/NA configuration or the Rel-17 [time-]frequency domain H/S/NA configuration**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.1.2c?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **Intel** | We prefer previous version of proposal 2.1.2b.  We think this proposal 2.1.2c does not make any progress regarding selecting between joint or separate frequency-domain H/S/NA or Rel-16 time-domain H/S/NA application.  Besides, we don’t think it is agreed that frequency-domain H/S/NA configuration is to configure H/S/NA pattern in time-frequency grid. We have agreed that:   * *For frequency domain multiplexing, H/S/NA configurations for an IAB-node are provided separately in addition to the Rel-16 H/S/NA* * *The minimum resource size for configuring the frequency domain granularity is a set of N RBs:*   + *Candidate values for N: {4, 8, 16, other values TBD}*   + *N is at least the # PRBs that are corresponding to the MT’s # PRBs of an RBG).*   + *FFS: Scaling or configuration of N based on system BW or size of IAB-MT BWP*   Those agreements mean frequency-domain H/S/NA and time-domain H/S/NA are separately configured; and frequency-domain H/S/NA is configured with granularity of N RBs. |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | If dynamic HSNA configuration selection were supported via explicit indication Alt 2 or implicit determination Alt3, our concern is that:   1. It is difficult to make a consistent understanding on the selected HSNA configuration on the IAB node among the IAB node, its parent node(s), CU. 2. Semi-static HSNA configurations would be coordinated for the purpose of CLI and resource multiplexing in DC(e.g., agreement #4 in 8.10.1 email discussion and CLI agreement in 8.10.2 of last GTW session). How to make the the peer node/neighbour node know the dynamic selected HSNA configuration at the IAB node?   For Alt1, we can live with it, although we think the best way is let CU to configure these two kind of HSNA on separate DU symbols to avoid such overriding. |
| **CEWiT** | Support. For the FFS point, prefer Alt. 3. The selection of H/S/NA configuration should be based on active mux mode at the IAB node, which should be known to the IAB node and its parent node. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support the proposal.  We prefer Alt.3 for benefit of resource efficiency, more specifically, if simultaneous operation is not performed on a symbol, time domain H/S/NA and TDM behavior can be used, that is, MT or DU can Tx/Rx on all frequency resources on the symbol  We can also accept Alt.1 for simplicity.  We do not support Alt.2. We think it is not necessary to have an explicit indication. The reason is if the explicit indication is semi-static, it can be realized by not providing R17 H/S/NA (according to the 1st bullet). If it the explicit indication is dynamic, it can be realized by configuring R17 [time-]frequency resource types with all RBs as soft and indicating soft availability indication. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We are fine with the proposal and think the bracket for [time] can be removed.  We support Alt.1, essentially this is there is only one set of H/S/NA resource configuration for each resource type with a slot.  For Alt.2 and Alt.3, we would like understand why semi-static H/S/NA resource configurations need to be changed dynamically for FDM. |
| **vivo** | The dynamic change between frequency and time H/S/NA may impact NW interference management as mentioned by ZTE and Huawei. However, if some RBs are left always for Rel-16 H/S/NA, at least resource type on some time-frequency resource would be stable, such negative impact is somehow [alleviate](http://www.baidu.com/link?url=EwX3-B8AauIMCjeF_bGZTQWcqtY6gRql5ooH0fq8w6ENeKzRZP9ZN1rwG-czIgPEIXYIV2QZFL7A1lpGn6RvbCVv96l6gKTWrYsBAil8APm)d.  For the first bullet, we understand there would be no dedicated indication to indicate no Rel-17 H/S/NA on a given RB set. We hope it can be clarified. |
| **Qualcomm** | We support the proposal.  Our understanding of the RAN1#106-e agreement below (also based on the related discussion during the GTW call) is that the Rel-17 H/S/NA configuration also has a time domain component. If that is not the common understanding, further discussion is needed.  **Agreement**  The semi-static configuration of H/S/NA resource type in frequency domain is provided per RB set, per D/U/F resource type within a slot. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | We support the main proposal, but not the list of alternatives.  In our view, separate configuration and joint application of time and frequency H/S/NA is the best combination in terms of:   * flexibility * backward compatibility and reusing Rel-16 signaling * providing the option of fallback to TDM in the case that simultaneous operations cannot be realized momentarily   This approach is line with the current agreements, but not listed in the list of alternatives. |
| **Intel** | We think further clarification is needed on common understanding of “separate” and “joint” application of frequency-domain H/S/NA and time-domain H/S/NA.  In our understanding, if both frequency-domain and time-domain H/S/NA are configured for one slot or one resource-type,   1. “Separate” application means for one slot or one resource-type, either time-domain H/S/NA or frequency-domain H/S/NA is applied.   In other words, we can apply time-domain H/S/NA without considering frequency-domain H/S/NA configuration, or apply frequency-domain H/S/NA without considering time-domain H/S/NA configuration.   1. “Joint” application means for one slot or one resource-type, we have to consider both time-domain H/S/NA and frequency-domain H/S/NA, which means we have to create the following decision table.  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Time/frequency-domain H/S/NA | Time-domain H | Time-domain S | Time-domain NA | | Freq-domain H |  |  |  | | Freq-domain S |  |  |  | | Freq-domain NA |  |  |  |   We support separate application. |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal. |
| **Ericsson** | [Please note that this comment is changed from our comment provided in v035 having studied the matter further.]  The current proposal is heading in the direction of a joint configuration, which according to the comments from Proposal 2.1.2, does not seem to be the majority view. Additionally, we don’t think a joint configuration will work. Considering H/S/NA definitions for TDM, injecting an FDM H/S/NA configuration within the TDM H/S/NA configuration will violate the TDM H/S/NA definition and the interpretation of, e.g., a TDM Soft IA indication. That would require separate Rel-16 and Rel-17 TDM H/S/NA definitions. Hence, we share Intel’s view that this matter **needs further discussion**.  Regarding the FFSs, we think that the *configuration* should be separated from the *ability under existing conditions* to execute said configuration. For example, what if power control changes such that it no longer allows simultaneous operation? Hence, a separate indication of the *enablement* is needed. We think this excludes Alt.1 and may be a combination of Alt.2 and Alt.3 but we can agree to the above for now. |

**Proposal 2.1.4: To support soft resource availability in the frequency domain, the existing DCI 2\_5 format is reused and the values of configured availability combinations extended to support indication of availability in the frequency-domain with the granularity of an RB set.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.1.4?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support the proposal** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | We prefer to fully reuse current DCI 2\_5 format without enhancement, and the values in 2\_5 is used to indicated the availability of all the soft RB sets. We think it is not necessary to indicate the AI per RB set since FDM is already supported by semi-static per RB set HSNA in frequency domain.  **To support soft resource availability in the frequency domain, the existing DCI 2\_5 format is reused ~~and the values of configured availability combinations extended to support indication of availability in the frequency-domain with the granularity of an RB set~~.** |
| **Ericsson** | Support |
| **LG** | We are fine with the proposal. |
| **CEWiT** | Support proposal |
| **Intel** | We need more details of this proposal regarding “the values of configured availability combinations extended to support….”. This part seems contradictive to Proposal 2.1.5. |
| **Apple** | This proposal can be discussed together with 2.1.2 |
| **Samsung** | OK |
| **ETRI** | Support |
| **Qualcomm** | Support. |
| **vivo** | Support |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Do not support.**  The potential benefit to extend the indication of availability in the frequency-domain with the granularity of an RB set is not justified considering FDM is already achieved by semi-static configuration. Alternatively, this can be discussed when the framework of semi-static FDM configuration is stable. |

**Proposal 2.1.5: To support soft resource availability in the frequency domain, multiple DCI format 2\_5 can be received corresponding to the same time resources of the child IAB-DU cell.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.1.5?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **We would like to understand the intention of this proposal. We think more clarification is needed.**  **One interpretation is each DCI format 2\_5 indicates resource availability for different RB sets, e.g. one DCI format 2\_5 indicates availability for RB sets #1, a second DCI format 2\_5 indicates availability for RB set #2. If this is the interpretation of this proposal, we do not support. We think one DCI format 2\_5 is sufficient to indicate an availability combination that include availability of all RB sets. We don’t see the need to have multiple DCI format 2\_5.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Share similar view with Docomo, this proposal is also not clear to us. |
| **Ericsson** | Support |
| **LG** | If Proposal 2.1.4 is agreed, in our understanding, frequency domain availability for multiple RB sets can be indicated by a DCI. Then, we don’t think this proposal is necessary. If multiple DCIs are received corresponding to the same time resource, the indicated availability information should be the same. |
| **CEWiT** | Share similar view with Docomo. one DCI format 2\_5 is sufficient to indicate availability of all RB sets. |
| **Intel** | We do not support this proposal.  It will be overwhelming signaling overhead if multiple DCI format 2\_5 are needed to indicate one slot or one resource type with multiple RB set configuration. |
| **Apple** | No support. We share similar view as DCM and Intel |
| **Samsung** | In our understanding, this discussion is related to whether one DCI format 2\_5 can support indicating resource availability for multiple RBs in freq. domain. So, we think this proposal can be further discussed after discussing the details of DCI format 2\_5 design in freq. domain. |
| **ETRI** | Share similar view with Docomo. |
| **Qualcomm** | We are not clear about the multiple DCI format 2\_5 in this proposal. Are different DCI 2\_5s corresponding to different RB sets for the child IAB-DU cell? If yes, it seems to us that this proposal may not be needed if proposal 2.1.4 with extension of RRC-configured availability combinations to frequency-domain can be agreed. |
| **vivo** | Support  Child node may receive one DCI 2-5 for frequency soft resource, another for time soft resource… |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Do not support.** There is no clear need to supportindication with multiple DCI format 2\_5. |

**Proposal 2.1.9: To support soft resource availability in the frequency domain, the existing DCI 2\_5 format is reused and the values of configured availability combinations extended to support indication of availability in the frequency-domain with the granularity of an RB set.**

**FFS: Select one of the following alternatives:**

**Alt. 1 (Multiple RB sets per single DCI). A single DCI format 2\_5 can be received indicating availability for multiple RB sets which correspond to the same time resources of the child IAB-DU cell.**

**Alt. 2 (Single RB set per DCI). Multiple DCI format 2\_5 can be received indicating availability for different RB sets which correspond to the same time resources of the child IAB-DU cell.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.1.9?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support** |
| **ETRI** | **Support.**  **Our preference is Alt.1 (fine to down-select one in this meeting)**  **We think vivo’s alternative can be captured as below:**  **Alt.3: Two DCI format 2\_5 can be received indicating frequency domain availability and time domain availability for a given time resources of the child IAB-DU cell.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | It seems all the alternatives imply that the availability is indicated per RB set.As we pointed. And we propose to add another alternatives as:  **To support soft resource availability in the frequency domain, the existing DCI 2\_5 format is reused ~~and the values of configured availability combinations extended to support indication of availability in the frequency-domain with the granularity of an RB set.~~**  **FFS: Select one of the following alternatives:**  **Alt. 1 (Multiple RB sets per single DCI). A single DCI format 2\_5 can be received indicating availability with the granularity of an RB set for multiple RB sets which correspond to the same time resources of the child IAB-DU cell.**  **Alt. 2 (Single RB set per DCI). Multiple DCI format 2\_5 can be received indicating availability with the granularity of an RB set for different RB sets which correspond to the same time resources of the child IAB-DU cell.**  **Alt.3 A single DCI format 2\_5 can be received indicating availability of all the soft resources which correspond to the same time resources of the child IAB-DU cell.** |
| **CEWiT** | Support |
| **Ericsson** | Support in general.  Considering guard band issues, we doubt that more than one contiguous band will be indicated IA for Soft resources. For that reason, we think a single DCI format 2\_5 indication would suffice but would need to be able to indicate multiple RB sets. For that reason, we support Alt. 1.  We could also support ZTE’s proposal without the added text in Alt. 1. We also note that the deleted text in the main part would need resolution at some point and would hence like to see it included, at least in an FFS. |
| **Samsung** | Support |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | ZTE’s modification is fine to us. |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal. Our preference is Alt. 2 on the understanding that DCI 2\_5 would provide an availability indication per DU cell, per RB set. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | We support the main proposal.  Re: FFS, it is not clear why we need to select one of the alternatives. Both may be possible depending on the AI combinations configured for that time resource. |
| **Qualcomm** | Support. We are OK with ZTE’s modification to include other alternatives. We prefer Alt1. |

**Proposal 2.1.9a: To support soft resource availability in the frequency domain, the existing DCI 2\_5 format is reused according to one of the following alternatives:**

* **Alt. 1: A single DCI format 2\_5 can be received indicating availability for multiple RB sets which correspond to the same time resources of the child IAB-DU cell.**
* **Alt. 2: Multiple DCI format 2\_5 can be received indicating availability with the granularity of an RB set for different RB sets which correspond to the same time resources of the child IAB-DU cell.**
* **Alt. 3: A single DCI format 2\_5 can be received indicating availability of all the soft resources which correspond to the same time resources of the child IAB-DU cell.**

**FFS: Extension of the values of configured availability combinations to support indication of availability in the frequency-domain for one or more RB sets.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.1.9a?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **Intel** | **We support the proposal and prefer Alt.1.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Alt3 is preferred.  And it is a little unclear to the indication granularity of Alt1, e.g., whether the availability is indicated ‘per RB set’ . |
| **CEWiT** | Support the proposal. Prefer Alt. 1, with the understanding that DCI format signal availability of each RB set for DL/UL operation within a slot. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Support the proposal  We prefer Alt.1. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Fine with the list of options and prefer Alt.3. We suggest discussing the number of resource partitions for frequency domain H/S/NA configurations first in order to facilitate the decision here. Our understanding is that even the granularity of frequency domain H/S/NA configurations is in the number of N PRBs, this does not mean we need to support BW/N RB sets in the frequency domain.**  **For the FFS bullet, the motivation is not clear, we prefer to remove it.** |
| **vivo** | Support the proposal, alt.1 and alt.3 are preferred. |
| **Qualcomm** | We support the proposal. Preference for Alt. 1. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | We support the proposal and prefer Alt. 1. The other alternatives seem special case of Alt. 1 based on configuration of AI combinations in the frequency domain. |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal with a preference for Alt. 1. Alt. 2 seems to be the most flexible since it allows for fully independent configuration RB sets, but there may be significant signaling overhead and undue burden on blind decode operations for DCI recovery. Alt. 3 appears to be the simplest in terms of specification impact by may also limit parent flexibility with regard to multiplexing. Alt. 1 appears to be a compromise between Alt. 2 and Alt. 3. |
| **Ericsson** | **Support the proposal** with the below modifications.  A DCI is an index indicating a table entry. We think the real issue here is if a single DCI or multiple DCIs should be allowed per child IAB-DU cell and time resource. Then, whether the DCI(s) indicate one or more RB sets (Alt.1/3 vs Alt.2) is secondary and could depend on the table entries. Furthermore, when assessing the above alternatives, we think companies will need to consider the limited flexibility of DCI format 2\_5, considering, e.g., #RB set combinations, FDM Soft configuration combinations in the time domain etc.  Finally, we propose a reformulation of Alt.2:  **Alt. 2: Multiple DCI format 2\_5 can be received indicating availability with the granularity of ~~a~~one or more RB set(s) for different RB sets which correspond to the same time resources of the child IAB-DU cell.** |

**Proposal 2.1.6: The frequency domain granularity N of an RB set is M times the number of PRBs in an RBG of the IAB-MT, RBG\_MT:**

**N = M × RBG\_MT**

**Where M = {1, 2, 4, 8, 16}**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.1.6?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Do not support.**  **We think it is more straightforward that N is configured directly without linkage with MT RBG size.**  **Because the size of MT RBG is configured per MT DL/UL BWP. If N is provided based on the size of MT RBG, the reference MT BWP need to be provided, which is more complicated.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Disagree,  It is more simple to configure N directly, we do not see the benefit to specify the bonding of N and RBG\_MT. And it is also not clear how this would work, for example, multiple BWPs/RBG\_MTs may be configured, which RBG would be used? and the dynamic BWP switching may be performed, whether N is also dynamically changed according to the MT\_BWP switching? |
| **Ericsson** | Support, although we doubt the justification for 16 since the maximum number of RBGs for any size of BWP is 18 and hence only two resource availability types (H/S/NA) would be included.  With respect to comments by Docomo and ZTE, we think RBG scaling is needed if we are to honor the agreement from RAN1#105, stating that “*N is at least the # PRBs that are corresponding to the MT’s # PRBs of an RBG.*” Without scaling, it would mean that N ≥ 16 RBs since the largest RBG size is 16 RBs. Clearly, this size is not desirable for smaller BWPs. |
| **LG** | Regarding on RBG\_MT, some clarifications are required.  First, since the RBG size is determined according to the BWP size, the RBG size may be different for each BWP of the MT. When the MT has multiple BWPs, RBG\_MT means the RBG size for which BWP?  In addition, when considering a multiple carrier environment, there may be multiple MT-CCs that should be FDMed with a specific DU-cell. It means that there can be multiple corresponding MT-CCs for a DU-cell. At this time, RBG\_MT for determining the value of N means the RBG size for which MT?  Considering these things, rather than the value of N corresponding to the RBG size of the MT, we prefer to keep the same candidate values for N regardless of RBG size of the corresponding MT. Then, the determination of the value N is up to the CU. |
| **Intel** | We are okay with this proposal. |
| **Samsung** | We think it is simple approach to just follow freq. domain granularity as in the existing specification 38.214, i.e., RBG size (N) based on BWP size of IAB MT. In addition, as commented by other company, it would be good to clarify how RBG\_MT can be defined. |
| **ETRI** | Share similar view with Samsung. |
| **Qualcomm** | Support.  We also propose to support configuration of multiple RB sets, wherein each RB set can be configured with a different size in the granularity of N PRBs as proposed in this proposal. |
| **vivo** | Disagree  it is more straightforward that N is configured directly, use of scaling factor seems no technical benefit. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **We have concerns on the proposal.**  First of all, it is unclear why the RBG size of IAB-MT should be coupled with frequency resource allocation for IAB-DU. It seems that according to some companies, this would benefit the resource alignment between the MT and the DU. However, it should be noted that resource alignment can be achieved regardless. The current specification already support fractional RBGs at the BWP boundary. If one would like to align the RBGs between the IAB-MT and IAB-DU (which we believe there is no need at all since this does not have any impact on scheduling). This can be achieved by CU configuration.  Moreover, the RBG size of IAB-MT is determined by the BWP size and RRC configuration of IAB-MT. Considering the IAB-MT can have multiple serving cell and multiple BWPs with one serving cell, the RBG-MT is not a single value in typical scenario. Therefore, we may need other complicated rules to further determine the reference RBG\_MT size, and linking RB set with RBG\_MT cannot bring any benefit.  Regarding the agreement in RAN1#105 “*N is at least the # PRBs that are corresponding to the MT’s # PRBs of an RBG.*”. Our understanding is that this bullet only implies how the value of N is selected which does not necessarily mean that N should be dependent on the BWP size of the IAB-MT. |

**Proposal 2.1.6b: Select one of the following alternatives for the frequency domain granularity N of an RB set:**

**Alt 1 (RBG scaling). N = M × RBG\_MT, where M = {1, 2, 4, 8} and RBG\_MT is the number of PRBs in an RBG of the IAB-MT.**

**Alt 2 (BWP scaling). N = the number of PRBs in an RBG of the IAB-MT based on the BWP size of IAB MT.**

**Alt 3 (No scaling). N is a configured number of PRBs, where N = {1, 4, 8, 16}.**

* **Note: It is assumed the CU configures N such that N >= RBG\_MT**

**FFS: Value(s) of N in case of multiple configured BWPs at the IAB-MT.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.1.6b?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support** |
| **ETRI** | **Support** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | We support Alt 3 **without the note.**  The note has not been discussed and agreed, and be technical, the reference SCS of DU configuration may larger than the SCS of the BWP of MT, it is not reasonable to set N >= RBG\_MT.  Without the note, and it seems the last FFS is only related to Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| **Ericsson** | Support, although we don’t think Alt. 3 is feasible for several reasons. First, there is no guarantee that N>=RBG\_MT as agreed in RAN1 #105, second, the value N=1 may not be included in the set for the same reason, third, 16 is too small for being the maximum RB set. |
| **Samsung** | Support |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Not support.  As we commented previously, the motivation of Alt.1 and Alt.2 are not clear to us. We support Alt.3 without the note |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal. Our preference is Alt. 2. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | We are fine with either Alt-1 or Alt-3 without the note.  It is true that the note under Alt-3 follows a previous agreement, but unless N is an integer multiple of RBG\_MT, what is the benefit of N >= RBG\_MT? The argued benefit for that previous agreement was aligning RB sets with RBGs, but that only happens if N := M × RBG\_MT for some integer M, which seemingly takes us back to Alt-1. |
| **Qualcomm** | Support. |

**Proposal 2.1.6c: N is a configured number of PRBs, where the CU configures N such that N >= the number of PRBs in an RBG of the IAB-MT based on the BWP size of IAB MT.**

* **N = {2, 4, 8, 16}**
* **FFS: Value(s) of N in case of multiple configured BWPs at the IAB-MT**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.1.6b?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **Moderator (AT&T)** | **Very divergent views on Alt 1/2/3. Combining them seems to be the best way forward which does not violate previous agreements, but avoids explicit scaling. I hope it can be an acceptable compromise.** |
| **Intel** | **We are okay with the proposal.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Do not support.  We think the previous Alt3 without the note also follows the previous agreement.  ***Agreement***  *The minimum resource size for configuring the frequency domain granularity is a set of N RBs:*   * *Candidate values for N: {4, 8, 16, other values TBD}* * *N is at least the # PRBs that are corresponding to the MT’s # PRBs of an RBG).* * *FFS: Scaling or configuration of N based on system BW or size of IAB-MT BWP*   First, ‘at least’ is used in previous agreement, and values other than #PRBs of MT-RBG are not excluded.  Second, from our understanding, the yellow part is just some kind of recommendation on the configuration of N.  We think the controversial point is whether N should be coupled with RBG-MT via specification, we propose to leave it for further study if we can not make a consensus.  **N is a configured number of PRBs~~, where the CU configures N such that N >= the number of PRBs in an RBG of the IAB-MT based on the BWP size of IAB MT~~.**   * **N = {2, 4, 8, 16}**   **FFS:**   * **Whether the CU configures N such that N >= the number of PRBs in an RBG of the IAB-MT based on the BWP size of IAB MT** * **Value(s) of N in case of multiple configured BWPs at the IAB-MT** |
| **CEWiT** | **Support** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support.** |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **We still don’t understand why the RBG size of IAB-MT should be coupled with frequency resource allocation for IAB-DU. It seems that there is a concern on the previous agreement “*N is at least the # PRBs that are corresponding to the MT’s # PRBs of an RBG.*”. We don’t see an issue here since this agreement only implies the candidate value of N should at least include the one that is equal to the size of a RBG. This does not necessarily mean that N should be dependent on the BWP size of the IAB-MT. Given that N is configurable, we think the following should be sufficient.**  **Proposal 2.1.6c: N is a configured number of PRBs~~, where the CU configures N such that N >= the number of PRBs in an RBG of the IAB-MT based on the BWP size of IAB MT.~~**   * **N = {2, 4, 8, 16}** * **~~FFS: Value(s) of N in case of multiple configured BWPs at the IAB-MT~~** |
| **vivo** | We agree with ZTE and Huawei, how to configure N is up to implementation, no need to specify a restriction for it. We only needs to decide values for N in spec. |
| **Qualcomm** | We would not object to the proposal, but agree with ZTE and Huawei and would prefer their revised proposals. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | We agree with Huawei’s comment and revised proposal. |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal in principal, but the original proposal indicates that N is the bandwidth resolution of an RB set. It may help to state that explicitly, for clarification, in the current proposal as well. |
| **Ericsson** | **We do not support this proposal.** By not introducing RBG scaling according to the proposal, we restrict the RB set size to 16 which is undesirable for larger BWPs. That is, a more narrow BWP will have a coarse configuration granularity and a wider BWP a minimum granularity. In order to maintain consistent behavior over any BWP size, scaling relating to BWP size is required. Companies opposed to such scaling should clarify why they think different configuration granularity is desirable for different BWP sizes. Furthermore, relating to Proposal 2.1.9a, some of the available bits in DCI format 2\_5 would need to be used to accommodate for this difference in configuration granularity reducing configuration flexibility in other dimensions. |

**ISSUE 2.2: SPATIAL DOMAIN MULTIPLEXING**

Proposal 2.2.1: Spatial domain restrictions/recommendations from a child or parent node can be indicated to be applicable to specific time-frequency resources.

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.2.1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support in general.**  **But we would like to make sure we have correct understanding on this proposal. Does the proposal mean the spatial domain restrictions/recommendations indicated by parent node or child node are applicable to specific time-freq. resources and we will further discuss applicability? If so, we suggest having an FFS to make it clear.**  Proposal 2.2.1: Spatial domain restrictions/recommendations from a child or parent node can be indicated to be applicable to specific time-frequency resources.   * **FFS: applicability of spatial domain restrictions/recommendations from child node or parent node.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Agree in principle, and if my understanding is correct, this proposal is for dynamic indication/reporting from a parent or child node, and we propose to update the proposal as:  **Spatial domain restrictions/recommendations from a child or parent node can be dynamically reported/indicated to be applicable to specific time-frequency resources.** |
| **Ericsson** | We can support limiting spatial restrictions to slots in which simultaneous operation is performed. In addition, a natural restriction is that simultaneous operation itself is restricted to Soft resources (that we admittedly have not yet agreed to) with the existing interpretations of H/S/NA. Furthermore, the interpretation in case of a missing indication is undefined.  We propose the following modification:  ***Spatial domain restrictions from a parent node or recommendations from a child node can be limited to a subset of the T/F resources in which simultaneous operation is configured.***  Furthermore, we do not support dynamic reporting. The MT link can be assumed to be fairly stationary and any introduced signaling should reflect that. |
| **LG** | Because of two different subjects (i.e., a child node a parent node) for spatial domain restriction/recommendation are mixed in one sentence this sentence makes confuse the intention of the proposal.  Could you elaborate the motivation of Proposal 2.2.1? |
| **CEWiT** | Support proposal |
| **Intel** | We are okay with this proposal. |
| **Apple** | Support |
| **Samsung** | We share a view with Ericsson/LG. It would be good to make it clear like ”~~restriction from a parent node or recommendation from a child node~~” |
| **ETRI** | We believe it would be better to use the unified terminologies (i.e. restricted beams at the IAB-DU of the child node, recommended beams, not preferred beams, or both recommended and not preferred beams of the IAB-MT of the child node) based on the previous agreements below for more efficient discussions:   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  In case of simultaneous MT/DU operation,   * the parent node can dynamically indicate to the child node at least a set of restricted beams at the IAB-DU of the child node * the child node can dynamically report to the parent node a set of recommended beams, not preferred beams, or both recommended and not preferred beams of the IAB-MT of the child node   + FFS: Whether the specification supports all reporting combinations. |   We also propose to discuss which option(s) can be utilized to indicate such information:   * Option 1: TCI state ID * Option 2: Spatial relation information ID * Option 3: RS ID (including CSI-RS, SRS, SSB, etc.)   Otherwise, I’m afraid that we may just pick a subset of candidates without any concrete discussions? |
| **Qualcomm** | Support. |
| **vivo** | Support the proposal |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **We are fine with this in general.** But the proposal is not clear with respect to specific T-F resources. |

**Proposal 2.2.2: Spatial domain restrictions from a parent node or recommendations from a child node can be limited to a subset of the time/frequency resources in which simultaneous operation is configured.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.2.2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support** |
| **ETRI** | **We think the “spatial domain restriction/recommendation” stands for beam.**  **If this understanding is correct, we can accept the time resource part but need FFS for frequency domain. In some of implementations, multiple different beams may not be available at the same time.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | It is unclear about ‘ in which simultaneous operation is configured’, I do not remember we have achieve agreement for such configuration. |
| **CEWiT** | Support |
| **Ericsson** | Support, possibly change “can be limited to a subset” to “is limited to the subset.” |
| **Samsung** | Support |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Support |
| **Nokia** | Proposal seems unclear and it would be helpful to be more specific about the terminology being used. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | We support: “Spatial domain restrictions from a parent node or recommendations from a child node can be limited to a subset of the time/frequency resources.”  The rest, “in which simultaneous operation is configured,” is intended to clarify the application and does not need to go into the spec. We suggest moving that to a note. |
| **Qualcomm** | We agree with Lenovo to remove “~~in which simultaneous operation is configured~~” |

**Proposal 2.2.2b: Spatial domain restrictions from a parent node or recommendations from a child node can be limited to a subset of time resources [in which simultaneous operation is configured].**

* **FFS: handling of frequency resources in case of FDM operation**

**Proposal 2.2.3: Semi-static signaling is supported for indication of restricted SSB beams of an IAB-DU.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.2.3?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | More clarification is needed, e.g.,  whether such restricted SSB beams is apply to specific multiplexing cases or specific time-frequency resources.  The necessity to support this since dynamic indication of restricted beams has been supported. |
| **Ericsson** | In general, we support the intention, but we don’t think involvement from the donor-CU is necessary. Instead, we propose this being handled between parent and child IAB nodes by infrequent, aperiodic MAC-CE signaling. Additionally, SSB beams should not be restricted, but operation in the direction of said SSB beams.  ***Aperiodic MAC-CE ~~Semi-static~~* *signaling is supported for indication of ~~restricted~~ SSB beams of an IAB-DU in the direction of which simultaneous operation is restricted.*** |
| **LG** | We are fine with Proposal 2.2.3. |
| **CEWiT** | Share similar view with Ericsson. Indication of restricted SSB beams of an IAB-DU is handled between parent and IAB node |
| **Intel** | We agree with Ericsson’s comments. |
| **Apple** | We share similar view as Ericsson |
| **Samsung** | OK |
| **ETRI** | We think the following modification can address Ericsson’s concern:  **Semi-static signaling is supported for indication of *~~restricted~~ SSB beams of an IAB-DU in the direction of which simultaneous operation is restricted.***  We don’t see the motivation to introduce dynamic preference update for SSB beams. And the dynamic signaling part will be discussed by proposal 2.2.4 anyway. |
| **Qualcomm** | Support. |
| **vivo** | Semi-static signaling means signaling from CU, e.g., RRC/F1… if the intention is to use MAC CE, it is better to directly propose it. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | No. we should first discuss the proper reference signals/channel for the indication. To our understanding, SSB beams and PDSCH beams can be different; in this case, restrict SSB beams can be invalid. |

**Proposal 2.2.3b: Aperiodic signaling is supported for indication of SSB beams of an IAB-DU in the direction of which simultaneous operation is restricted via one of the following options:**

* **Alt. 1: MAC-CE signaling**
* **Alt. 2: Semi-static signaling (e.g. F1/RRC)**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.2.3b?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support in general.**  **But we think “aperiodic” is not needed in the main bullet.** |
| **ETRI** | **Same comment with Docomo** |
| **Ericsson** | **Support, prefer Alt. 1 since this is a configuration that should be limited to the parent DU and IAB node.** |
| **Samsung** | **Share a view with Docomo/ETRI** |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | No.  **This proposal is similar to the one below, we are not convinced that SSB beams are the best choice for IAB-DU to indicate since the SSB beams and PDSCH beams can be quite different. Suggested change below**  **Proposal 2.2.3b: ~~Aperiodic~~ Signaling is supported for indication of ~~SSB~~ beams of an IAB-DU in the direction of which simultaneous operation is restricted via one of the following options:**   * **Alt. 1: MAC-CE signaling** * **Alt. 2: Semi-static signaling (e.g. F1/RRC)** * **FFS: Definition of beams (e.g. TCI state ID, Spatial relation information ID, RS ID (including CSI-RS, SRS, SSB, etc.))** |
| **Nokia** | **Support with preference for Alt. 1** |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Introducing such signaling does not seem beneficial if semi-static. The IAB-CU has full control over SSB configurations. Hence, we may assume that the primary application would be in “non-mobile” scenarios with relatively static/persistent signal strengths, beams, etc. Then, the IAB-CU can simply reconfigure SSBs rather than restricting some of them. 🡪 We **do not support Alt-2**.  We are **fine with Alt-1** if the MAC CE signaling is meant by the parent node.  We suggest removing the word “aperiodic.” Instead, a bullet point may be added stating that the MAC CE signaling is not necessarily periodic or expected by the IAB node. |

**Proposal 2.2.3c: MAC-CE signaling from a parent node is supported for indication of beams of an IAB-DU in the direction of which simultaneous operation is restricted via one of the following options:**

* **FFS: Definition of beams (e.g. TCI state ID, Spatial relation information ID, RS ID (including CSI-RS, SRS, SSB, etc.))**

**Proposal 2.2.3d:**

**MAC-CE signaling from a parent node is supported for indication of at least SSB beams of an IAB-DU in the direction of which simultaneous operation is restricted**

* **FFS: Definition of beams (e.g. TCI state ID, Spatial relation information ID, RS ID (including CSI-RS, SRS, SSB, etc.))**
* **FFS: Applicability to other beams**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.2.3d?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **Intel** | **We support the proposal.** |
| **ZTE, Sancechips** | Support in general. |
| **CEWiT** | **Support** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support** |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **We think SSB beams may not be the best choice for IAB-DU to indicate since the SSB beams and PDSCH beams can be quite different. We could reuse the similar wording for “the child node indication of recommended beams to the parent node” below**  **Agreement**  The child node indication of recommended beams to the parent node can include both IAB-MT DL beams and/or IAB-MT UL beams.   * FFS: Indication via MAC-CE or UCI transmission * FFS: Definition of IAB-MT DL beams and/or IAB-MT UL beams (e.g. TCI state ID, Spatial relation information ID, RS ID (including CSI-RS, SRS, SSB, etc.)) * FFS: Whether indication of “not preferred” beams is supported   **We suggest the following**  **Proposal 2.2.3d:**  **MAC-CE signaling from a parent node is supported for indication of ~~at least SSB~~ beams of an IAB-DU in the direction of which simultaneous operation is restricted**   * **FFS: Definition of beams (e.g. TCI state ID, Spatial relation information ID, RS ID (including CSI-RS, SRS, SSB, etc.))** * **FFS: Applicability to other beams** |
| **vivo** | We prefer modification from Huawei. PDSCH beam can be more suitable choice. In this case, SSB index may not be indicated at all. |
| **Qualcomm** | We support the proposal. We are also OK with Huawei’s proposed modification. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | We agree with Huawei’s comment and support the revised version. |
| **Nokia** | The first FFS is now unclear since it seems SSB beams are defined at least. Is the first FFS with regard to other parent DU beams that may be indicated to the IAB node, or with regard to other IAB beams that may be restricted implicitly by the indicated restriction? Another alternative that has not been discussed may be the indication of restricted parent beams (e.g. SSB, TCI state ID, etc.), which may place implicit restriction on IAB DU beams by association. |
| **Ericsson** | **We support the proposal.**  As pointed out in one of the online sessions, we sympathize with Huawei in that there may be more accurate alternatives out there. However, they would also imply an increased complexity and increased specification effort – time that we don’t have. It would be possible to specify a more complex scheme but that would require increased signaling, since the nodes would additionally need to agree on which CSI-RS signals to transmit and measure on. This differs from what exists today within the beam management framework in the sense that IAB nodes would need to identify **all** interfering CSI-RS beams, not only the best. Since these are unlikely to be measured simultaneously, the measurement and reporting scheme would also be more time and resource consuming. Since there is a mapping between CSI-RS and SSBs, and IAB-specific SSBs are specifically introduced for this purpose whereas CSI-RS beams are typically not received by a DU, SSB is a sufficiently good alternative that we can manage in Rel-17. And it is essential that we specify some beam restriction functionality in order for SDM to function properly. |

**Proposal 2.2.4: The child node indication of recommended/not prefered beams (e.g. corresponding to a subset of TCI states) to the parent node can include both IAB-MT DL RX beams and/or IAB-MT UL TX beams. Signaling alternatives include:**

* **Alt. 1 UCI transmission**
* **Alt. 2 MAC-CE**
* **Alt. 3. SR/PRACH**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.2.4?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support Alt.1.**  **We think it is reasonable that CSI reporting framework is reused. In our understanding the beam management mechanism should be IAB-MT reports recommended beams as SSBRI/CRI in beam reporting, then parent node decide DL Rx beam (as DL TCI) and UL Tx beam (as spatial relation, SRI) of MT.**  **We suggest adding reporting beams corresponding to SSBRI/CRI as an example.**  **Proposal 2.2.4: The child node indication of recommended/not prefered beams (e.g. corresponding to a subset of TCI states, or corresponding to SSBRI/CRI) to the parent node can include both IAB-MT DL RX beams and/or IAB-MT UL TX beams. Signaling alternatives include:**   * **Alt. 1 UCI transmission** * **Alt. 2 MAC-CE** * **Alt. 3. SR/PRACH** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Agree in principle, and Alt1/Alt 2 has less spec impact and is preferred. |
| **Ericsson** | We can **support *recommended* beams**, but **do not support *not preferred*** beams since there is no guarantee that the child node will be able to receive all not preferred beams. Furthermore, we think **MAC-CE** should be used for this and are willing to agree to that already now. |
| **LG** | In current specification, there is not exact description for indicating DL Rx beam and UL Tx beam. We think the definition and index of IAB-MT DL Rx beam and IAB-MT UL Tx beam should be clarified first. |
| **Intel** | We are okay with this proposal. |
| **Apple** | We support this proposal and have a preference on Alt1. |
| **Samsung** | OK with listing signaling alternatives. We prefer Alt.2 because in our understanding, Alt1 and Alt3 may have much RAN1 specification impacts such as UCI reporting and UCI multiplexing. |
| **ETRI** | The following modifications are suggested:  **The child node indication of recommended/not prefered beams ~~(e.g. corresponding to a subset of TCI states)~~ to the parent node can include both IAB-MT DL RX beams and/or IAB-MT UL TX beams via [MAC-CE and/or UCI transmission].**   * **FFS, definition of IAB-MT DL RX beams and/or IAB-MT UL TX beams (e.g. TCI state ID, Spatial relation information ID, RS ID (including CSI-RS, SRS, SSB, etc.))**   Re the Ericsson’s comments on the “not preferred”, we think UE reception cannot be an issue since the non-received beams will be not preferred regardless of the reasons, anyway. |
| **Qualcomm** | We Support Alt1 and Alt2, and have following comments.   * In Rel16, beam indication for DL channels is based on TCI framework and beam indication for UL channels is based on spatialRelationInfo. In Rel17, there is on-going discussion on unified TCI framework for both DL/UL. It seems to us that using Rel-17 unified framework may be a cleaner approach, but it is not clear to us whether at this point only Rel16 beam indication framework can be used for Rel-17 IAB. * We do not support Alt3 using SR/PRACH. It seems that this approach may only be able to indicate recommended beam. In addition, if Proposal 2.2.1 is agreed, it is not clear how to indicate associated time-frequency resources using SR/PRACH. |
| **vivo** | We only support one of “recommended/not prefered beams”, preferable recommended beam. Alt1/2 can be further considered, alt3 seems not possible due to limited payload size, if no further clarification on alt3, we suggest to remove the alt3. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **OK. For the signaling, we prefer Alt. 2.** |

**Proposal 2.2.4b: The child node indication of recommended beams to the parent node can include both IAB-MT DL RX beams and/or IAB-MT UL TX beams via MAC-CE and/or UCI transmission.**

* **FFS, definition of IAB-MT DL RX beams and/or IAB-MT UL TX beams (e.g. TCI state ID, Spatial relation information ID, RS ID (including CSI-RS, SRS, SSB, etc.))**
* **FFS indication of “not preferred” beams**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.2.4b?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support** |
| **ETRI** | **Support**  **We still believe that the “not preferred beam” should be captured together in the main bullet.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Agree in principle, but we do not think both MAC CE and UCI are needed, MAC CE is slightly preferred. |
| **CEWIT** | Support |
| **Ericsson** | Support, share ZTE’s view on signaling preference. |
| **Samsung** | Only MAC-CE is supported because we don’t see two signaling is needed. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Support. Also prefer MAC-CE. |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal. Agree that MAC-CE is preferred to UCI. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Fine |
| **Qualcomm** | Support. |

**ISSUE 2.3: MULTIPLEXING OPERATION ADAPTATION**

**Proposal 2.3.1: To facilitate adaptation of multiplexing operation modes, the IAB node should report the following conditions/parameters for different multiplexing cases per {MT-CC, DU cell}-pair:**

* **Timing mode (e.g. Case #6/#7)**
* **Guard band**
* **Downlink or uplink PC parameters**
* **Desired IAB-MT Tx and/or Rx beam(s)**
* **Orthogonal DMRS ports**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.3.1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **First, we think reporting these conditions per MT serving cell is sufficient. We don’t think the report needs to be per {MT-CC, DU cell} pair, because parent node may not know how DU will Tx/Rx on which DU cell for a given slot. We would like to understand from other companies e.g. if different conditions/parameters are provided for {MT-CC#1, DU cell#1} and {MT-CC#1, DU cell#2}, how parent node will use these information.**  **For guard band, we think it can be handled by IAB node implementation and does not need to be reported to parent node.**  **For desired IAB-MT Tx and/or Rx beam(s), we would like to understand whether it is the same report as proposal 2.2.4, if so, we think it can be discussed under proposal 2.2.4.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | For the main bullet, share similar view as Docomo, it is not necessary to report these conditions/parameters per {MT-CC, DU cell}-pair, per MT CC or per DU cell reporting is sufficient.  For the sub-bullets:  For PC parameters and timing modes, we think it is better to discuss these in 8.10.2, actually, there already some discussion about these, i.e., PC assistance information report from IAB node to its parent node.  For guard band, it can be left to implementation, e.g., it is up to IAB DU implementation to insert proper guard band. |
| **Ericsson** | We should separate capability signaling from control signaling. We think the above is a mix of both. Also, the descriptors are a bit brief to be properly understood.  We **support** to the following capabilities:   * Timing mode requirements for simultaneous (Tx or Rx) operation * DL and/or UL power control capability * MT Tx/Rx beam prioritization   We do **not support**:   * Guard band – this should be handled internally by the DU since it is dynamic, e.g., due to its relation to power control.   Regarding orthogonal DMRS ports, we think further discussion is needed. In our understanding, this is beneficial for MIMO transmissions that a (LoS) parent-child link would not benefit from. |
| **LG** | We are generally fine with proposal.  But, regarding the guard band, we think it is up to DU implementation, so related reporting is not required. |
| **CEWiT** | Support |
| **Intel** | We understand the motivation of this proposal, but some clarification is needed.  For the reporting of timing mode (e.g. Case#6/Case#7), since timing mode should be controlled by the parent node, does this reporting happen before or after parent control of timing mode? (If it is before, it means “recommended timing mode”; if it is after, it means “confirmation of current timing mode”) |
| **Samsung** | In general, we support a report of some capability information such as timing mode, desired TX/RX beam in the sub-bullets. Further discussion is needed for others. For example, it should be further discussed whether guard band is up to either parent IAB or IAB DU. |
| **ETRI** | Support in principle.  Not sure whether “Orthogonal DMRS ports” should be supported or not. |
| **Qualcomm** | Support with minor comment below.  Our understanding is that these conditions are optional, and they may or may not be required based on IAB-node’s implementation. So we suggest to modify the proposal as follows:  “To facilitate adaptation of multiplexing operation modes, the IAB node should report any combinations of the following conditions/parameters if they are required for different multiplexing cases per {MT-CC, DU cell}-pair:” |
| **vivo** | The report should be per {MT-CC, DU cell} pair, since multiplexing case is indicated per {MT-CC, DU cell} pair.  Regarding the guard band, similar reporting mechanism as guard symbol can be assumed, either parent or child can leave a guard band. We think report of guard band to CU can be beneficial, since CU can configured frequency H/S/NA according to the size of guard band and traffic load of the IAB node. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Support.**  Regarding the guard band, it may not always be possible to leave the guard band at the DU. For example, the cell specific signals/channels are regarded as Hard resources at the DU, it will be impossible to always reserve sufficient guard band for these signals/channels. In this case, the guard band can be reserved at the MT, and the parent node should know the desired guard band of IAB node for different multiplexing cases.  Regarding DMRS antenna port, an IAB node may need to perform joint processing to support a specific multiplexing case, e.g. interference rejection combining for simultaneous MT Rx/DU Rx. In this case, orthogonal DMRS antenna ports are preferred. Specifically, IAB-MT and IAB-DU can use orthogonal DMRS antenna ports so that channel estimation accuracy can be improved which is essential for IRC receivers. |

**Proposal 2.3.1b: To facilitate adaptation of multiplexing operation modes, the IAB node should report any combinations of the following conditions/parameters if they are required for different multiplexing cases:**

* **Recommended timing mode (e.g. Case #6/#7)**
* **Guard band (FFS: DU, MT, or both)**
* **Downlink or uplink PC parameters**
* **Desired IAB-MT Tx and/or Rx beam(s)**
* **Orthogonal DMRS ports**

**FFS: Reporting per MT-CC, DU-cell, or {MT-CC, DU cell}-pair**

**FFS: Whether multiplexing operation adaptation is signaled separately**

**Note: Details for timing mode/PC parameters should be discussed in 8.10.2**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.3.1b?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **ETRI** | **Support in general**  **Thanks, Huawei, for the detailed elaborations. But we still have a clarification question on “orthogonal DMRS ports”.**  **Does it mean that some of IAB nodes may be able to perform DU/MT simultaneous operations even based on the overlapped (or non-orthogonal) DMRS ports? We thought that this orthogonal (from one of time/frequency/OCC perspectives) DMRS ports allocation for DU and MT is a mandatory condition for DU/MT simultaneous operations without a specific signaling.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Guard band is not needed, and the forth sub-bullet is similar as 2.2.4b. |
| **Ericsson** | We think this proposal needs to be better defined. In what direction and to whom is this signaling performed? Some comments on respective bullet:   * **Signaling whether Case-6 and/or Case-7 timing can be maintained.** Timing requirements for a certain multiplexing mode should be part of capability signaling. In addition to that, dynamic timing changes may cause the IAB node to be temporarily uncapable of a certain timing mode. * We do not agree to guard band. * We are not able to agree to DMRS at this point. How it will fit into the signaling is not very clear to us. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Support.  For guard band, we suggest companies check our previous comments. It is not possible to handle it at the DU for all cases.  To ETRI and Ericsson: Thanks for the question. We would like to further clarify why we think DMRS port is needed. Orthogonal DMRS ports are critical for joint Tx/Rx to ensure channel estimation performance. However, the orthogonality between MT and DU cannot be achieved since IAB-MT is scheduled by parent node. Therefore, it will be good if the IAB-DU can report a set of DMRS ports it will not use for Tx/Rx so that the parent can make use of these antenna ports for MT. |
| **Nokia** | We agree with Ericsson that reporting target is not clear.  If reporting is to parent node, then as ZTE notes reporting IAB MT beams is discussed in previous proposal.  Regarding case 6/case 7 timing, it is unclear how this is intended to be used. It is not clear if the preferred timing mode is tied to a specific multiplexing mode, and if so we agree with Ericsson that this is more appropriate as general capability signaling since it is not clear why the IAB node may have a changing preference for timing mode associated with a multiplexing operation.  We also do not think the benefit of signaling DMRS port is clear. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Fine with the proposal, except “orthogonal DMRS ports” in the list. But some rephrasing seems needed:   * “should report” 🡪 “may report” * “any combinations” 🡪 “a combination” * Remove “if they are required”   Having to report any combination if required does not read right. |
| **Qualcomm** | Support. |

**Proposal 2.3.1c: To facilitate adaptation of multiplexing operation modes, the IAB node may report to a parent node a combination of the following conditions/parameters for different multiplexing cases:**

* **Whether Case-6 and/or Case-7 timing can be maintained**
* **[Guard band (FFS: DU, MT, or both)]**
* **Downlink or uplink PC parameters**
* **[Orthogonal DMRS ports]**

**FFS: Reporting per MT-CC, DU-cell, or {MT-CC, DU cell}-pair**

**FFS: Whether multiplexing operation adaptation is signaled separately**

**Note: Details for timing mode/PC parameters should be discussed in 8.10.2**

**Proposal 2.3.1d:**

**To facilitate adaptation of multiplexing operation modes, the IAB node may report to a parent node a combination of the following conditions/parameters for different multiplexing cases:**

* **Whether Case-6 and/or Case-7 timing [is currently applicable/required/feasible] can be maintained**
* **Downlink or uplink PC parameters**
* **FFS: Guard band (FFS: DU, MT, or both)**
* **FFS: Orthogonal DMRS ports**

**FFS: Reporting per MT-CC, DU-cell, or {MT-CC, DU cell}-pair**

**FFS: Whether multiplexing operation adaptation is signaled separately**

**FFS: Details on how the report is made**

**Note: Details for timing mode/PC parameters to be indicated should be discussed in 8.10.2**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.3.1d?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **Intel** | **For the first sub-bullet, we are still wondering whether Case6/Case7 timing indication related signaling should be combined with active multiplexing modes adaptation between IAB node and its parent. If so, this signaling is not needed.** |
| **CEWiT** | Support proposal.  For the first sub-bullet, support IAB node reporting whether case 6/ case 7 timing is feasible  Regarding the Note:  The discussion on following conclusion is going on in AI 8.10.2. Hope it’s not contradicting  FL Conclusion 1.3c:  Details on the design of the indication of when Case 6 timing (and Case 7 timing, if agreed) is performed at the IAB-node are to be discussed under 8.10.1. |
| **NTT Docomo** | For first sub-bullet, we agree that whether case6 timing is required need to be reported. And we are also fine with these FFSs.  For case7 timing in the first sub-bullet, we are still not clear on the intention of this case7 timing, is this case7 timing to support simultaneous Rx at parent node? Or is this case7 timing to support simultaneous Rx at IAB node itself? We think some clarification will be beneficial. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **There is no need to report Case 7 timing and the timing mode is a condition for IAB node to operate a certain multiplexing case. For guard band and orthogonal DMRS ports, we still believe they are necessary as explained previously. We suggest the following**  **Proposal 2.3.1d:**  **To facilitate adaptation of multiplexing operation modes, the IAB node may report to a parent node a combination of the following conditions/parameters for different multiplexing cases:**   * **Whether Case-6 ~~and/or Case-7~~ timing ~~[~~is currently ~~applicable/~~required~~/feasible] can be maintained~~** * **Downlink or uplink PC parameters** * **~~FFS:~~ Guard band (FFS: DU, MT, or both)** * **~~FFS:~~ Orthogonal DMRS ports**   **FFS: Reporting per MT-CC, DU-cell, or {MT-CC, DU cell}-pair**  **FFS: Whether multiplexing operation adaptation is signaled separately**  **FFS: Details on how the report is made**  **Note: Details for timing mode/PC parameters to be indicated should be discussed in 8.10.2** |
| **vivo** | Parent node needs to know whether simultaneous TX or RX requires case 6 timing mode or not. For case 7, we also concern on the motivation. |
| **Qualcomm** | We support the proposal. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Support |
| **Nokia** | We are still unclear on the motivation of some of the proposed indications:  **Timing mode applicability:**  It seems that it may be better to treat indication for case #6 and case #7 separately. As we noted previously, case #7 timing mode is assumed to be under the control of the IAB node itself, and it is not clear to us why the parent node would need to know this information.  We understand that there may be some need to indicate if an expected guard interval is necessary, but we would still like to see more detailed discussion on why timing mode specific guard intervals are necessary.  With regard to case #6 timing, we understand that UL timing for the IAB MT is under the control of the parent and so there is clearer need for the parent to know when case #6 timing is being used, but since the parent node is controlling both legacy UL timing and case #6 timing, and would be the victim of any additional interference from improper timing, the parent should not need additional indication.  **PC parameters:**  PC parameters are still under discussion, and proposals for PC enhancements explicitly state which parameters will be indicated in support of Rel-17 power control.  Should we understand that this proposal is for a separate indication of redundant parameters?  If that is the case, we do not support.  If it is not the case, then they can be removed from the proposal. |
| **Ericsson** | **We support the proposal.**  Regarding Case-6 timing, we think that the IAB node transmitting in Case-6 timing will always be able to do so. It may instead be the parent node that may be unable to receive a Case-6 transmission. This may be handled by a request/acknowledge protocol.  Contrary, for Case-7 timing, it may be the transmitting IAB node that is unable to meet timing constraints as posed by the receiving Case-7 parent node. Here, signaling to the parent node makes sense. |

**Proposal 2.3.2:**

**Multiplexing capability adaptation is signaled separately from the operational conditions/parameters reported for different multiplexing operation cases.**

* **FFS: Need for explicit parent acknowledgement for multiplexing capability adaptation**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.3.2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Do not support.  Here the benefit to dynamically report the multiplexing **capability** is not clear. And for the multiplexing **mode** adaptation as discussed in 2.3.1, it is more suitable to let such adaptation under the control of the parent node, i.e., the procedure could be: 1)IAB node can report the operational conditions/parameters to facilitate adaptation of multiplexing operation modes, 2)and the parent node can indicate the adaptation of multiplexing operation modes to the IAB node. |
| **Ericsson** | Support |
| **LG** | We’d like to clarify the meaning of ‘multiplexing capability adaption’. If it means adaptation of an IAB-node’s multiplexing as agreed in RAN1#104bis-e, it would be better to use ‘multiplexing operation mode adaptation’ rather than ‘multiplexing capability adaptation’.  Under the assumption the proposal is for the adaptation of a multiplexing operation mode, the intention of the proposal is still not clear. Is the subject transmitting the proposed signaling in the main bullet IAB-MT? Or is it the parent DU/CU? We basically think that the multiplexing operation mode of IAB-node is configured from the network explicitly and/or implicitly. In addition, if necessary, it may be considered that the IAB-MT reports the applicability of the configured multiplexing operation mode to the parent-DU. |
| **CEWiT** | Support |
| **Intel** | We think further clarification is needed.   1. Is this signaling from IAB node🡪parent node or parent node🡪IAB node? 2. Should we consider combine Case#6/Case#7 control signaling from parent node and multiplexing adaptation from parent node signaling? |
| **Samsung** | OK |
| **ETRI** | We think this should be a follow-up discussion after proposal 2.3.1.  We do not support the FFS point, since we think each configuration for multiplexing operation(s) can do the same role. |
| **Qualcomm** | Support. |
| **vivo** | Agree the main bullet.  Regarding the FFS, it is preferred to further study parent indicates the multiplexing mode or child report the desire to enable/disable a given multiplexing mode. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We think they can be covered by a unified framework |

**ISSUE 2.4: GUARD SYMBOL INDICATION ENHANCEMENTS**

**Proposal 2.4.1: MAC-CE signaling of Desired/Provided Guard Symbols is enhanced to support indication of guard symbols required for switching among Case #1, Case #6 and Case #7 timing cases.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.4.1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **We think the proposal need to be clarified that guard symbols are reported/provided for switching between a MT Tx/Rx with Case #1, Case #6 and Case #7 timing cases and a DU Tx/Rx**  **Because in our understanding, the motivation of indication of guard symbols is for switching between MT and DU due to timing misalignment between MT and DU.**  **We suggest following revision.**  **Proposal 2.4.1: MAC-CE signaling of Desired/Provided Guard Symbols is enhanced to support indication of guard symbols required for switching between a MT Tx/Rx with Case #1, Case #6 and Case #7 timing cases and a DU Tx/Rx  ~~among Case #1, Case #6 and Case #7 timing cases.~~** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | It is more simple to reuse the Rel-16 mechanism, and the number of guard symbols actually reserved may depend on the implementation. |
| **Ericsson** | Support |
| **LG** | In our perspective, there are two discussion points regarding on guard symbols enhancements.   1. Introduction of guard symbols for timing case switching   If operating timing mode for a IAB-node is switched, overlapping between timing boundaries before and after switching of the timing mode may occur. For example, the UL Tx timing of MT for case 1 timing mode and case 6 timing mode may be different, so overlapping between the UL Tx timing boundaries may occur, and a guard symbol for this overlapping case needs to be introduced.   1. Adaptation of guard symbols for MT/DU transition for different timing cases   Considering that additional timing cases are supported in Rel-17, the amount of guard symbols required for MT/DU transition (which is introduced in Rel-16) when the IAB-node operates in case 6 or 7 timing mode is different from the amount of guard symbols applied for the case 1 timing mode. Therefore, it seems necessary to adapt the required guard symbols for MT/DU transition according to the timing mode.  We think Proposal 2.4.1 handles the first points, and we are fine with the proposal.  In addition, it seems necessary to handle the issue on the adaptation of guard symbols for MT/DU transition. |
| **CEWiT** | Support |
| **Intel** | We are okay to support this proposal. |
| **Samsung** | OK |
| **ETRI** | Support |
| **Qualcomm** | Support. |
| **vivo** | support |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We support to introduce new Desired/Provided Guard Symbols for Cases 6/7 timing. However, the guard symbols are defined for switching between MT and DU. It is a bit misleading to say switching among Case #1, Case #6 and Case #7 timing cases. We are fine with the modification from DCM. |

**Proposal 2.4.1b: MAC-CE signaling of Desired/Provided Guard Symbols is enhanced to support indication of guard symbols required for switching between a MT Tx/Rx with Case #1, Case #6 and Case #7 timing cases and a DU Tx/Rx.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.4.1b?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support.**  Reply to LG’s comment in last round that guard symbols need to be enhanced for switching between MT UL Tx with different timing cases. We think it is not needed. Guard symbols are defined for switching between MT and DU because IAB node and parent node need to exchange the information of timing misalignment between MT and DU. Although overlapping may occur between MT UL Tx with different timing cases, it can be handled by parent node’s implementation. |
| **ETRI** | **Support** |
| **CEWiT** | **Support** |
| **Ericsson** | **Support** |
| **Samsung** | **Support** |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Support** |
| **Nokia** | **Support the proposal.** |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | **Support**, although the previous wording was clearer. |
| **Qualcomm** | Support. |

# Resource allocation for dual-connectivity scenarios (i.e. IAB-MT with concurrent BH links with two parent nodes)

**From the eIAB WID:**

* Specification of enhancements to the resource multiplexing between child and parent links of an IAB node, including:
  + Support of simultaneous operation (transmission and/or reception) of IAB-node’s child and parent links (i.e., MT Tx/DU Tx, MT Tx/DU Rx, MT Rx/DU Tx, MT Rx/DU Rx)
  + **Support for dual-connectivity scenarios defined by RAN2/RAN3 in the context of topology redundancy for improved robustness and load balancing.**

**Summary of input contributions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon (R1-2106454)** | ***Proposal 10:*** *For inter-carrier intra-band DC, simultaneous Rx/Tx is not supported in Rel-17 for IAB.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *To avoid inefficient resource partitioning between IAB-MT and IAB-DU in case of DC, resource coordination between the two parent nodes is supported so that more resources can be released to the IAB-DU.* |
| **Vivo (R1-2106617)** | **Proposal 13: RAN1 supports both intra-carrier DC and inter-carrier DC.**  **Observation 2: Semi-static U/D/F configurations are aligned between the associated IAB-MT’s cells belonging to MCG and SCG after coordinating the IAB-MT’s TDD configurations from different parent nodes.**  **Observation 3: UL/DL conflict between the associated IAB-MT’s cells belonging to MCG and SCG may still appear at the semi-static flexible symbols.**  **Proposal 14: Dynamic grant or dynamic SFI indication overrides semi-static grant in case of UL/DL conflict.**   * FFS UL/DL conflict between dynamic grants or between dynamic SFI indications. * FFS UL/DL conflict between semi-static grants.   **Proposal 15: Consider the impact of parent node’s H/S/NA when specifying the prioritization rules in case of UL/DL conflict.**  Proposal 16: RAN1 specifies IAB DU behavior when IAB DU receives conflicted indications for Rel-17 features from two parent nodes, e.g., restricted beam indication, multiplexing case indication, etc.  Proposal 17: Support child node to report soft resource availability from one parent node to the other parent node in DC scenario. |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell (R1-2106828)** | ***Observation 3.1: For intra-donor DC scenario, it can be assumed that the TDD configurations are aligned within the IAB network and therefore common for the DC parent nodes.***  ***Observation 3.2: In inter-carrier DC scenario, simultaneous Rx/Tx operation at the IAB MT may occur if the DCI 2\_0 sent by parents are indicating conflicting DL/UL.***  ***Proposal 3.1: In intra-donor inter-band inter-carrier DC scenario, if the IAB MT does not support simultaneous Tx and Rx on different carriers, it does not expect to receive conflicting DCI 2\_0 from different parents.***   * ***Note: This must be handled by the CU and the parent nodes.***   ***Proposal 3.2: In inter-donor inter-band inter-carrier DC scenario, if the IAB MT does not support simultaneous Tx and Rx on different carriers, it must apply conflict resolution rules when it receives indications/configurations of conflicting DCI 2\_0 and/or semi static TDD configurations from different parents.***   * ***FFS: required resolution rules***   ***Proposal 3.3: In inter-carrier DC, the indication of availability of soft resources via DCI format 2-5 from a parent node is only valid for the IAB-DU cell(s) which uses the same carrier(s) in the backhaul link for the same parent.***  ***Proposal 3.4: Support per-child-link resource configurations for an IAB-DU in the case of dual connectivity.*** |
| **Samsung (R1-2106907)** | *Proposal 7: The reference cell concept from Rel-16 CA is sufficient when there are configuration and scheduling collisions between MCG and SCG.*  *Proposal 8: Consider per-backhaul link signaling between IAB MT and different parent IABs in Table 1.* |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (R1-2107188)** | Proposal 12: Support signaling from an IAB node in the DC mode to its parent node for informing the parent node of the status of availability of soft resources. Further discuss specification of mechanisms to handle availability indication collisions by two parent nodes in the DC mode.  Proposal 13: In order to reuse the Rel-16 CA TDD prioritization rules:   support inter-donor signaling for inter-parent coordination;   include scenarios of resource conflicts due to timing misalignment. |
| **Qualcomm (R1-2107365)** | **Observation 4.1:**  **In Rel16, the CA TDD prioritization rules are defined only for the case when DCI2\_0 is not configured for a UE, and it is stated in the spec that UE does not expect any directional collision among serving cells after applying the procedure.**  **Observation 4.2:**  **In Rel16, the CA TDD prioritization rules can be divided into two sets**   * **Set1 for confliction avoidance, wherein rules are defined as “*UE does not expect …*.” over a potential conflicting scenario. These rules impose constraint on gNB’s resource configuration or MAC scheduler to avoid specified conflicting scenario.** * **Set2 for confliction resolution, wherein rules are defined for UE to select one operation over the other operation when a confliction scenario occurs.**   **Observation 4.3:**  **The reuse of Rel-16 CA TDD prioritization rules to NR-DC can be possible if the required resource coordination between Donor CUs to avoid the specified confliction scenarios is supported.**  **Proposal 4.1:**  **To minimize spec impact, support of reusing CA TDD prioritization rules to NR-DC and rely on proper resource coordination between parents/Donors for achieving these rules.**   * **FFS: resource coordination messages**   **Observation 4.4:**  **In FR2 or higher band, due to analog beam constraint, a dual-connected UE/MT may not have the capability to simultaneously receive from two parent nodes and/or simultaneously transmit to two parent nodes, and the impact to support multiple-parent in IAB needs to be investigated.**  **Proposal 4.2:**  **For an IAB-node with multi-parents, the DCI2\_5 received from one parent indicates availability of soft resources at an IAB-DU cell relative to the serving cells of IAB-MT in the cell group associated with this parent node.**  **Proposal 4.3:**  **The RAN1-105e agreement on availability of soft resources at an IAB-node shall be modified as “*For an IAB-MT with multiple serving cells (including the case with two parent nodes), a per-cell IAB-DU soft resource is considered as available if the resource ~~is either explicitly indicated (via DCI 2\_5), or implicitly determined as available with respect to all serving cells~~ can be determined as available with respect to all serving cells of IAB-MT, where the determination with respect to a serving cell can be done either by explicit indication via DCI2\_5 or implicit determination.”*** |
| **ETRI (R1-2107479)** | **Proposal 11: Clarify the possible target scenarios for intra-band inter-carrier DC as follows:**   * **Case #1: The IAB-MT has two parent DUs through intra-band inter-carrier DC while the IAB-DU establishes a single set of cells to the MT of child node within a single band (i.e. without configuring DC for the child node).** * **Case #2: The IAB-MT has two parent DUs through intra-band inter-carrier DC and the IAB-DU also configures DC to the MT of child node.**   **Proposal 12: For Case #2 in proposal 7, adopt the TP in Table 8.** |
| **LG Electronics (R1-2107553)** | ***Proposal 14: It is not sufficient to reuse Rel-16 CA TDD prioritization rules for NR-DC. Enhancements to handle UL/DL conflict issue in NR-DC should be discussed.***  ***Proposal 15: It is necessary to support a MT which cannot perform simultaneous Tx/Tx and Rx/Rx for two parent links.*** |
| **Intel (R1-2107607)** | **Proposal 3:** For the semi-static DU resource configurations, additionally support per-backhaul link (e.g. per child IAB-MT link) configuration. |
| **AT&T (R1-2107692)** | **Proposal 6: Per-backhaul link resource configurations and multiplexing capability indications independent of the per-IAB-DU configuration and multiplexing capability indication are supported in Rel-17. Coordination signaling to exchange the per-link resource configurations and multiplexing capability indications between up to two parent IAB-nodes/donors should be additionally supported in Rel-17.** |
| **ZTE (R1-2107824)** | **Proposal 13: To minimize the transmission direction conflict at the IAB MT side：**  **• Coordinating the Semi-static or cell-common high layer configuration(such as SSB , CORESET 0 configuration, Valid PRACH occasion and TDD configurations) from/for different parent nodes are needed at least for inter-donor scenarios。**  **• From RAN1 perspective, the Semi-static or cell-common high layer configuration from/for different parent nodes are assumed not conflicted for intra-band inter-carrier DC.**  **Proposal 14: Coordinating the dynamic indication/scheduling form different parents is not supported, the dynamic indication conflict can be left to implementation in DC scenario.**  **Proposal 15: When IAB MT detect more than one DCI format 2\_5, the IAB-MT expects that each of the more than one DCI formats 2\_5 from the same CG indicates a same value for the availability combination of the soft resources in the slot.**  **Proposal 16: For explicitly availability indication case, a per-cell IAB-DU soft resource is considered as available with respect to a IAB MT serving cell only if the IAB MT is explicitly indicated as IA by DCI 2\_5 from the CG that the serving cell belongs to.** |
| **Ericsson (R1-2108107)** | **Proposal 28 For inter-carrier DC, the IAB-donor-CU can be made aware of the IAB-MT’s capability regarding simultaneous transmission and reception on multiple serving cells in a frequency band, configured by the two parent nodes. FFS: How CUs are made aware of the capability in case of inter-donor DC scenarios.**  **Proposal 29 If an IAB-MT is not capable of simultaneous transmission and reception on any pair of the multiple serving cells in the frequency band configured for two parent nodes, the IAB-MT does not expect any conflict. FFS: Whether the IAB-MT can assume all serving cells configured for the two parent nodes have aligned UL/DL directions.**  **Proposal 30 In intra-donor-DC and inter-donor-DC operations, a parent-node can be made aware of the DU resource configuration (UL/DL/FL, H/S/NA) of the other peer parent node that connects to the same IAB-node.**  **Proposal 31 In intra-donor-DC and inter-donor-DC operation, one parent IAB-node is not expected to indicate the DL/UL direction of a flexible symbol which is in conflict with the time-wise aligned non-flexible symbol at the other parent IAB-node.**  **Proposal 32 RAN1 considers the following options to handle potential indication conflict of overlapping flexible symbols between two parent IAB-nodes:**  **Option 1: If the dual-connected IAB-node is not capable of simultaneous transmission and reception on any pair of the multiple serving cells in the frequency band configured for two parent nodes, semi-static flexible symbols are not expected.**  **Option 2: If a conflict occurs, the dual-connected IAB-node is expected to perform DL reception than UL transmission.**  **Option 3: If a conflict occurs, the dual-connected IAB-node is expected to perform UL transmission than DL reception.** |

**ISSUE 3.1: ENHANCEMENTS FOR NR-DC SUPPORT**

**Proposal 3.1.1: To support extension of CA TDD prioritization rules to NR-DC, the following resource coordination mechanisms between parents/donors are supported:**

* **For intra-donor inter-donor DC scenarios, a parent-node can be made aware of the DU resource configuration (UL/DL/FL, H/S/NA) of the other peer parent node that connects to the same IAB-node.**
* **At least for inter-donor DC scenarios, coordinating the semi-static and/or cell-common higher layer configuration (e.g. SSB, CORESET 0, and RACH and configurations) from/for different parent nodes.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 3.1.1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Agree with the main bullet and the second sub-bullet.  For the first sub-bullet, semi-static TDD and HSNA configurations for the two parent nodes should be aligned(i.e., there is no conflicting between the parents), this can be achieved by the donor-CU in intra-donor cases, while in the inter-donor case the configurations can be aligned via the coordination of the donor-CUs. So it is not necessary to make a parent-node be aware of the DU resource configuration of its peer parent node. |
| **Ericsson** | Support |
| **LG** | We support the proposal. |
| **CEWiT** | Support |
| **Intel** | We are generally okay with the proposal.  For the first bullet, does that mean for both “intra-donor” and “inter-donor” case? |
| **Samsung** | OK |
| **Qualcomm** | Support in general with some comment on 2nd sub-bullet point.  According to TS 38.473 Rel16, the MIB and SIB1 are only included in “gNB-DU system information” IE from DU to CU but not in the “gNB-CU system information” IE from CU to DU. This means MIB and SIB1 are currently configured by OAM for an IAB-DU cell, and they cannot be overridden by CU for coordination between parent nodes within the same donor. Therefore, for 2nd bullet point, the coordination of semi-static and/or cell-common higher layer configuration from/for different parent nodes may also be needed for intra-donor DC scenarios. We suggestion to modify the 2nd bullet point as  “~~At least~~ For intra-donor and inter-donor DC scenarios, …” |
| **vivo** | Support |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | The intention for exchanging H/S/NA configuration between parent nodes should be clarified. We think the collision should be avoided by donor-CU, but not by parent nodes. |

**Proposal 3.1.1b: To support extension of CA TDD prioritization rules to NR-DC, the following resource coordination mechanisms between parents/donors are supported:**

* **For intra-donor and inter-donor DC scenarios, in addition to coordination at the donor CU(s), a parent-node can be made aware of the DU resource configuration (UL/DL/FL, H/S/NA) of the other peer parent node that connects to the same IAB-node.**
* **For intra-donor and inter-donor DC scenarios, coordinating the semi-static and/or cell-common higher layer configuration (e.g. SSB, CORESET 0, and RACH and configurations) from/for different parent nodes.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 3.1.1b?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | We still have some concern on the first sub-bullet, the benefit to make a parent-node be aware of the DU resource configuration of the other parent is not clear, coordination at the donor CU(s) is sufficient to align the semi-static TDD and HSNA configurations for the two parent nodes |
| **CEWiT** | Support |
| **Ericsson** | Support |
| **Samsung** | Support |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We have a similar view with ZTE that the coordination is done within CU instead of parent nodes. |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Fine |
| **Qualcomm** | Support. |

**ISSUE 3.2: FLEXIBLE SYMBOL CONFLICTS**

**Proposal 3.2.1’ The following solutions are supported to handle potential indication conflict of overlapping flexible symbols between two parent IAB-nodes:**

* **In inter-donor DC scenarios, if the IAB MT does not support simultaneous Tx and Rx on different carriers, it must apply one of the following alternatives of conflict resolution rules when it receives indications/configurations of conflicting DCI 2\_0 and/or semi static TDD configurations from different parents:**
  + **Alt. 1: If the dual-connected IAB-node is not capable of simultaneous transmission and reception on any pair of the multiple serving cells in the frequency band configured for two parent nodes, semi-static flexible symbols are not expected.**
  + **Alt. 2: If a conflict occurs, the dual-connected IAB-node is expected to perform DL reception than UL transmission.**
  + **Alt. 3: If a conflict occurs, the dual-connected IAB-node is expected to perform UL transmission than DL reception.**
  + **FFS: Consideration of the impact of parent node’s H/S/NA when specifying the prioritization rules in case of UL/DL conflict.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 3.2.1’?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Alt1 is preferred, both Alt 2 and Alt 3 would cause packet loss. |
| **Ericsson** | Support |
| **LG** | We are ok with the proposal. |
| **CEWiT** | Support |
| **Intel** | We are okay with the proposal. |
| **Samsung** | As another alternative, we’d like to add “if a conflict occurs, the dual-connected IAB node is expected to perform a scheduling from MCG.”  BTW, even if the conflict is resolved by one of alternatives, whether the IAB MT can transmit UL or receive DL in the end may depend on IAB DU resource configuration. At least for IAB DU with Hard/available soft resource, it may be beneficial for IAB MT to select aligned transmission direction with the IAB DU. |
| **ETRI** | Support.  OK to add Samsung’s alternative. |
| **Qualcomm** | **We have the following comments:**   * **We assume that the term “overlapping flexible symbols between two parent nodes” refer to “a set of symbols that are semi-statically configured as flexible by both parent nodes”.** * **Under above assumption, Alt1 to exclude semi-static flexible symbols in inter-donor DC can be too restrictive. It can be seen that if proposal 3.3.1 on inter-donor message coordination can be agreed, the agreement on “not expect to receive conflicting DCI2\_0s from two parent nodes” on overlapping flexible symbols can also be achieved for inter-donor DC case, as shown below.**    + **E.g. The overlapping flexible symbols may be partitioned in-time between two parent nodes via H/S/NA configuration, i.e. A H/S-Flexible symbol at one parent is indicated as NA-flexible at another parent node. With message exchange on H/S/NA and D/U/F configuration between two parent nodes via Donor CUs, each parent may just override semi-static H/S-flexible symbols to DL/UL via DCI2\_0. In this way, the DCI2\_0 received from two parent nodes will not be conflicted.** * **We suggest deferring the discussion of this proposal after decision of proposal 3.3.1 can be made.** * **Beside handling potential conflicting cases on “overlapping flexible symbols”, we may also want to extend the case to “symbols configured as semi-static flexible by one or both parent node.”** |
| **Vivo** | To address the issue, one way is never to allow TDD conflict between MCG and SCG by properly setting TDD and H/S/NA for the parent, the direction of alt.1 is fine. However, it is too restricted to forbit semi-static flexible symbol. There would be some configuration which can avoid the TDD conflict as well, e.g., configuration avoids overlapping of flexible symbols between 2 parent node; or if one parent is configured with Flexible, the corresponding time resource of the other parent can be configured as NA.  Hence for alt.1, the wording should be “if the IAB MT does not support simultaneous Tx and Rx on different carriers, it does not expect to be scheduled with conflicting UL/DL from different parents”  The last FFS can be removed, if proposal 3.1.1 is supported. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **We share similar view with QC that if the inter-donor coordination is allowed, it is possible avoid the indication conflict by proper resource configurations.** |

**Proposal 3.2.1b: Select one of the following alternatives to handle potential indication conflict of symbols configured as semi-static flexible by one or both parent nodes in inter-donor DC scenarios if the IAB MT of the dual-connected IAB-node does not support simultaneous Tx and Rx on different carriers:**

* **Alt 1. The IAB MT does not expect to receive conflicting DCI 2\_0 from different parents.**
* **Alt. 2 The IAB MT does not expect to be configured with semi-static flexible symbols.**
* **Alt. 3: If a conflict occurs, the IAB MT is expected to perform DL reception than UL transmission.**
* **Alt. 4: If a conflict occurs, the IAB MT is expected to perform UL transmission than DL reception.**
* **Alt. 5: If a conflict occurs, the IAB MT is expected to perform as scheduled by MCG**
* **FFS: Consideration of the impact of parent node’s H/S/NA when specifying the prioritization rules in case of UL/DL conflict.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 3.2.1b?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support** |
| **ETRI** | **Support** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Agree in principle, Alt 1 is slightly preferred. |
| **CEWiT** | Support. Alt 1 is preferred. |
| **Ericsson** | We think the proposal should be limited to the case where both parent nodes are configured as flexible and that non-flexible configurations should have priority over flexible configurations. That is reflected by the following modified proposal:  **In case of inter-donor DC, where a slot is configured as flexible by one parent, but not the other, an IAB-MT is expected to operate according to the non-flexible configuration.**  **Select one of the following alternatives to handle potential indication conflict of symbols configured as semi-static flexible by ~~one or~~ both parent nodes in inter-donor DC scenarios if the IAB MT of the dual-connected IAB-node does not support simultaneous Tx and Rx on different carriers:**  … |
| **Samsung** | Support |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Support in principle. Alt.1 would need some clarifications when the symbol is configured as semi-static flexible by one parent node. In this case, the UE does not expect to be indicated with conflict indication from the parent node, not “different parent node”. In addition, it is not only DCI format 2\_0, dynamic DCI can also indicate UL/DL direction for flexible symbols. |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Support |
| **Qualcomm** | Support in general.  For Alt1, we suggest to extend the scope to include confliction avoidance of dynamic scheduling grants from two parent as commended by Huawei.  “**Alt1**. **The IAB MT does not expect to receive conflicting DCI formats including DCI2\_0 and dynamic scheduling grants from two parent nodes.”**  The above updated Alt1 aligns with existing Rel16 CA TDD prioritization rules without the need of introducing new rules for NR-DC, and we prefer Alt1. |

**Proposal 3.2.1c: Select from the following alternatives to handle potential indication conflict of symbols configured as semi-static flexible by one or both parent nodes in inter-donor DC scenarios if the IAB MT of the dual-connected IAB-node does not support simultaneous Tx and Rx on different carriers:**

* **Alt. 1: The IAB MT does not expect to receive conflicting DCI formats including DCI2\_0 and dynamic scheduling grants from different parents.**
* **Alt. 2: The IAB MT does not expect to be configured with semi-static flexible symbols.**
* **Alt. 3: If a conflict occurs, the IAB MT is expected to perform DL reception than UL transmission.**
* **Alt. 4: If a conflict occurs, the IAB MT is expected to perform UL transmission than DL reception.**
* **Alt. 5: If a conflict occurs, the IAB MT is expected to perform as scheduled by MCG**
* **Alt. 6: If a conflict occurs, where a slot is configured as flexible by one parent, but not the other, the IAB-MT is expected to operate according to the non-flexible configuration.**
* **FFS: Consideration of the impact of parent node’s H/S/NA when specifying the prioritization rules in case of UL/DL conflict.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 3.2.1c?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **Moderator (AT&T)** | **It would be great to downselect some options before agreeing to this list. Can companies state their preferred alternative and/or major technical concerns with other alternatives?** |
| **Intel** | **We do not prefer Alt.1 (dynamic coordination between parents are not feasible) or Alt.2 (too strict for semi-static configuration). We can choose from conflict resolution based solutions (Alt.3-Alt.6).** |
| **ZTE, Sancechips** | We think Alt 6 can be a special case of Alt 1, in Alt 6 case, a slot is configured as F by one parent A and is configured with DL/UL by the other parent B, the IAB MT does not expect to receive conflicting direction indication/scheduling from parent A.  And we continue to support Alt 1 that Rel-16 CA TDD prioritization rules can be reused. |
| **CEWiT** | Support Alt 1. |
| **NTT Docomo** | We don’t think Alt.1 is feasible if a symbol may be configured as flexible by both parents.  We prefer Alt.5 or 6 to resolve conflict. We can also accept alt.2 to avoid conflict. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Fine with list of options and prefer Alt.1. Our understanding is that Alt.1 only requires semi-static resource coordination.** |
| **vivo** | Support alt.1. we wondering why to restrict dynamic grant only. SPS or CG can be restricted as well. |
| **Qualcomm** | We support the support the proposal with preference on Alt1, where the Rel-16 CA TDD prioritization rules can be reused without the need of new rules |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | We prefer Alt. 1 or Alt. 2.  Alt. 3 and Alt. 4 seem a bit arbitrary. Alt. 5 may result in recurring errors at SCG. Alt.6 may also result in recurring errors in case of no coordination between parent nodes. |
| **Nokia** | We believe that it may be easier to have separate proposals for (1) situations in which symbols are configured as flexible by both parents, as opposed to (2) scenarios in which the symbol is configured as flexible by one of the parent nodes.  Our preference would be Alt. 1 for scenario (1), and an implicit decision rule such as Alt. 5 or Alt. 6 for (2).  It should be noted that as currently constructed Alt. 6 does not seem feasible on its own since no solution is provided for scenarios in which both parent nodes have flexible config. |
| **Ericsson** | **We prefer Alt.6 for the case with one parent configured F. For the case with both parents configured F, we prefer down-selecting among Alt.3, Alt.4 and Alt.5.** |

**ISSUE 3.3: MULTI-PARENT SOFT RESOURCE AVAILABILITY INDICATION**

**RAN1#105-e agreement: For an IAB-MT with multiple serving cells (including the case with two parent nodes), a per-cell IAB-DU soft resource is considered as available if the resource is either explicitly indicated (via DCI 2\_5), or implicitly determined as available with respect to all serving cells.**

**Proposal 3.3.1 The RAN1-105e agreement on availability of soft resources at an IAB-node is modified/extended according to one of the following alternatives:**

* **Alt. 1: “For an IAB-MT with multiple serving cells (including the case with two parent nodes), a per-cell IAB-DU soft resource is considered as available if the resource ~~is either explicitly indicated (via DCI 2\_5), or implicitly determined as available with respect to all serving cells~~ can be determined as available with respect to all serving cells of IAB-MT, where the determination with respect to a serving cell can be done either by explicit indication via DCI2\_5 or implicit determination.”**
* **Alt. 2 “For an IAB-MT with multiple serving cells (including the case with two parent nodes), a per-cell IAB-DU soft resource is considered as available if the resource is either explicitly indicated (via DCI 2\_5), or implicitly determined as available with respect to all serving cells. For an IAB-node with multi-parents, the DCI2\_5 received from one parent indicates availability of soft resources at an IAB-DU cell relative to the serving cells of IAB-MT in the cell group associated with this parent node.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 3.3.1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support to modify with Alt.1.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | According to current text, Alt 2 is slightly preferred.  Need more clarification for Alt 1, ‘the explicit indication via DCI2-5’ means:   * Interpretation 1:a DCI2-5 from the serving cell, or * Interpretation 2: A DCI2-5 from the CG that the serving cell belongs to, no different from Alt 2, or * Interpretation 3:a DCI2-5 from any serving cell |
| **Ericsson** | Do not support. We think the present formulation is sufficiently clear. |
| **LG** | We are fine with the proposal and prefer Alt. 2.  When the IAB-MT has multiple serving cells belonging to one parent node, it is not necessary to receive soft resource availability indication from all serving cells. When the availability of soft resource is received from one serving cell belonging to the same CG, it indicates availability for serving cells belonging to the corresponding CG. |
| **Intel** | Do not support. We think the present formulation is sufficiently clear. |
| Samsung | OK with Alt.2. We share a view with LG. |
| Qualcomm | We think that both Alt1 and Alt2 intend to clarify the potential ambiguity in the RAN1-105e agreement, wherein the availability of an IAB-DU soft resource should be determined with respect to all serving cells but in RAN1-105 the phrase “with respect to all serving cells” may be miss-interpreted as only for implicit method. Note that the DCI2\_5 received from one parent node only indicates availability of an IAB-DU cell soft resource with respect to the IAB-MT serving cells in the cell group associated with this parent node, as clarified in Alt2.  We suggest to combine the Alt1 and Alt2 as an updated agreement follows:  “For an IAB-MT with multiple serving cells (including the case with two parent nodes), a per-cell IAB-DU soft resource is considered as available if the resource ~~is either explicitly indicated (via DCI 2\_5), or implicitly determined as available with respect to all serving cells~~ can be determined as available with respect to all serving cells of IAB-MT, where the determination with respect to a serving cell can be done either by explicit indication via DCI2\_5 or implicit determination. For an IAB-node with multi-parents, the DCI2\_5 received from one parent indicates availability of soft resources at an IAB-DU cell relative to the serving cells of IAB-MT in the cell group associated with this parent node.” |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Don’t support.** We don’t see the need to have further clarifications. |

**Proposal 3.3.2: A child IAB node can report soft resource availability from one parent node to the other parent node in DC scenarios.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 3.3.2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **We don’t see the report is necessary. And it is hard to report a dynamic indication from one parent node to the other.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Do not support. It is difficult to report such kind of dynamic indication timely. |
| **Ericsson** | Do not support. Share views of Docomo and ZTE. |
| **LG** | We think that the proposed report will be helpful in terms of resource utilization, but it is not considered to be of high priority as an optimization issue. |
| **CEWiT** | Do not support. Share similar view with Docomo |
| **Intel** | Do not support. Share views of Docomo and ZTE. |
| **Samsung** | Do not support. Share a similar view with Docomo/ZTE. |
| **ETRI** | Do not support. Share views of Docomo and ZTE. |
| **Qualcomm** | Do not support, because it is not clear to us the purpose of this signaling. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **No.**  We think IAB-MT need some time to perform DCI format 2\_5 decoding, information encoding, and PUCCH transmission for the reporting. Considering the parent node need to receive the reporting and perform coordination afterward, the mechanism cannot be valid. |

**ISSUE 3.4: MULTI-PARENT RESOURCE COORDINATION**

**Proposal 3.4.2: Per-child-link resource configurations can be configured for an IAB-DU in DC scenarios.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 3.4.2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Do not support. The benefit is unclear. With current per DU cell configuration, per-child-link resource scheduling at IAB DU can also be done, no more per-link configuration is needed from CU. |
| **Ericsson** | Support |
| **CEWiT** | Support |
| **Intel** | Support |
| **Samsung** | OK |
| **Qualcomm** | Support. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **No.**  The motivation to introduce per-child-link resource configuration is not clear. To our understanding, if the main motivation is to coordinate the resources between two parent nodes, this per-child link resource configuration scheme does not work since only the parent nodes can get the resource partitioning from these configurations. There is no way for the IAB node to know the resource partitioning between parent nodes. To achieve this, it will be beneficial to provide two DU configurations to the child nodes. Basically, each of the configuration is associated to one parent node. In this case, both the parent nodes and child node can be aware of the per-backhaul link configuration. Therefore, instead of introducing a per child-MT DU resource configuration, we think per-parent backhaul link H/S/NA resource configurations should be considered. |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Do not support |

**Proposed Conclusion 3.2.4b: Decide in RAN1#106bis-e whether per-child-link NA resource configurations can be configured for an IAB-DU in DC scenarios.**

* **FFS: Whether the per-backhaul-link configuration is provided at the child or parent node.**
* **FFS: Support for additional H/S per-child-link resource configurations**

**Discussion: Views on proposed conclusion 3.4.2b?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **Intel** | **We support this proposal.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Agree in principle. |
| **CEWiT** | Support |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **The proposal is not inclusive and if decision is to be made in next meeting, we suggest the following**  **Proposed Conclusion 3.2.4b: Decide in RAN1#106bis-e whether per-~~child~~-backhaul-link ~~NA~~ resource configurations can be configured for an IAB-DU in DC scenarios.**   * **FFS: Whether the per-backhaul-link configuration is provided at the child or parent node.** * **FFS: whether the per-backhaul-link configuration should be made aware of at the child or parent node.** * **~~FFS: Support for additional H/S per-child-link resource configurations~~** |
| **Qualcomm** | We support the proposal, with the suggestion to use consistent naming, per-child-link vs. per-backhaul-link, as also suggested by Huawei. We are OK with the additional suggestions from Huawei. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | We are not sure about the purpose of this proposed conclusion. Per-link configurations have been brought up for a few meetings now without much substantial technical discussion in the contribution papers. The issues raised so far have not been addressed. Furthermore, with respect to WI objectives, the approach is not essential.  Nevertheless, if the group is going to have a consensus on reaching a conclusion in this meeting, we support Huawei’s revised version and agree with Qualcomm on consistent naming. |
| **Nokia** | We would prefer to discuss more technical objections to the current proposal in the current meeting, given the time available for Rel-17 features.  To address HW’s concerns as noted in our previous email discussion, we agree that traffic variability is expected generally among links, however we feel that the expected traffic demands between MCG and SCG are more severe and more persistent, and so better motivate the use of per child link configurations.  Regarding concerns about differentiating which parent node is serving at a given time, we are unclear on the issue and would like to have a clearer understanding of what HW means by per-backhaul link DU configurations. We do not see ambiguity on parent link config as a significant issue in Rel-17 since DC is only supported for inter-carrier scenarios and so the question of which parent is serving the node should be unambiguous. |
| **Ericsson** | **Support** |

# Summary

**Agreement**

The following solutions are supported to handle potential indication conflict of overlapping flexible symbols between two parent IAB-nodes:

* In intra-donor DC scenarios, if the IAB MT does not support simultaneous Tx and Rx on different carriers, it does not expect to receive conflicting DCI 2\_0 from different parents.

**Agreement**

The IAB-donor-CU can be made aware of the IAB-MT’s capability regarding simultaneous transmission and reception on multiple serving cells in a frequency band, configured by the two parent nodes in intra-donor DC scenarios.

**Agreement**

The semi-static configuration of H/S/NA resource type in frequency domain is provided per RB set, per D/U/F resource type within a slot.

**Agreement**

A Reference SCS is configured for frequency domain H/S/NA configuration.

**Agreement**

Spatial domain restrictions from a parent node or recommendations from a child node is limited to a subset of time resources in which simultaneous operation is applied.

* FFS: Handling of frequency resources in case of FDM operation
* FFS: Support for implicit/explicit indication of the simultaneous operation mode

**Agreement**

The child node indication of recommended beams to the parent node can include both IAB-MT DL beams and/or IAB-MT UL beams.

* FFS: Indication via MAC-CE or UCI transmission
* FFS: Definition of IAB-MT DL beams and/or IAB-MT UL beams (e.g. TCI state ID, Spatial relation information ID, RS ID (including CSI-RS, SRS, SSB, etc.))
* FFS: Whether indication of “not preferred” beams is supported

**Agreement**

MAC-CE signaling of Desired/Provided Guard Symbols is enhanced (e.g. using the same Rel-16 MAC-CE design) to support indication of guard symbols additionally required for Case #6 and Case #7 timing cases.

* FFS: Number of guard symbols associated with Case #6 and Case #7 timing modes
* FFS: Need for explicit indication of guard symbols switching between timing cases

**Agreement**

To support extension of CA TDD prioritization rules to NR-DC, the following resource coordination mechanisms between parents/donors are supported:

* For intra-donor and inter-donor DC scenarios, in addition to coordination at the donor CU(s), a parent-node can be made aware of the DU resource configuration (UL/DL/FL, H/S/NA) of the other peer parent node that connects to the same IAB-node.
* For intra-donor and inter-donor DC scenarios, coordinating the semi-static and/or cell-common higher layer configuration (e.g. SSB, CORESET 0, and RACH and configurations) from/for different parent nodes.