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# Introduction

According to the companies’ inputs in RAN1#110 meeting, discussion on following essential aspects are summarized as below:

* Side control information: Beam information
* Side control information: ON-OFF information
* Side control information: TDD information
* Side control information: Timing information
* Side control information: PC information

Companies are encouraged to provide the inputs for corresponding topics.

# Topic-1 Beam information

## **Company view (Round-1)**

In RAN1#109e, it has agreed that:

***Agreement***

*At least for FR2, beam information is beneficial and recommended as the side control information for network-controlled repeater to control the behaviour of NCR at least for access link*

* *FFS: Detailed mechanism of indication.*
* *Note: There are no supporting evaluation results on FR1 at this point to reach similar conclusion*

Regarding the inputs to justify the benefits on FR1, in this meeting, [ZTE, CMCC,ETRI, Rakuton] highlights that the beam information should also be recommended for FR1. The performance improvement for FR1 is also justified by the simulation results from [ZTE, ETRI] as below:

* [Source-1, ZTE] shows that with indicated beam information, the SINR performance on FR1 in the O2I scenario have been dramatically improved with deployment of NCR, and NCR provides obvious SINR improvement compared to legacy RF repeater in all cases. NCRs with beam information can also improve the SINR performance on FR1 in realistic outdoor scenario.
* [Source-2, ETRI] shows that a small payload of SCI (e.g. 4 bits) can provide SINR gains for more than 80% of indoor UEs. And the side effect from repeater at FR1 can be resolved by a proper CSI feedback and scheduling in the practical environments. Besides, dynamic repeater gain/power control can provide additional SINR gain over semi-static repeater gain/power configuration in FR1 as well as in FR2.

However, as highlighted by [Huawei],

* [Source-3, Huawei] The target coverage for FR1 can be achieved without NCR while the target coverage performance can only be achieved with NCR for FR2. NCR provides much more coverage extension benefits for FR2 than FR1.

In addition, additional results from [CMCC] to justify the benefits on FR2 is also provided as:

* [Source-4, CMCC] The NCR with beamforming has a valid SINR gains over gNB only and legacy RF repeater. Compared with gNB only, NCR has a SINR improvement about 1.42 dB, 1.44 dB, and 3.06 dB at 5%-tile, 50%-tile, and 95%-tile CDF. NCR could improve the coverage and SINR of the UE compared with gNB only and deployment with legacy RF repeaters.

Then, from FL’s perspective, according to the inputs, it’s reasonable to make the same recommendation on FR1 and also fine to capture all inputs into TR 38.867.

***Proposal 1-1:*** *For FR1, beam information is also beneficial and recommended as the side control information for network-controlled repeater to control the behaviour of NCR at least for access link*

Companies are encouraged to share your views.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | Ok with the proposal. Note that the support of FR1 does not mean that extra standard work is needed on the top of FR2 beam indication design. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Panasonic | Considering the companies simulation results, it is beneficial to support the beam information for FR1. The beam information could be optionally disabled/enabled for FR1. |
| Sony | Okay with this proposal. |
| CATT | OK |
| KDDI | We are fine with this proposal. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. FR1 could follows the same beam indication mechanism of FR2. |
| China Telecom | Fine. |
| Intel | Fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Fine with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Ok with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don't support the proposal.  NCR is expected to improve network coverage which is obviously beneficial for FR2 according to the Rel-17 coverage enhancement studies. For FR1, there were already quite some technologies specified in Rel-17 and some will be specified in Rel-18. At least according to our evaluation, there is no coverage issue for FR1. On the evaluation results provided by ETRI, our observation is that there is even a slight loss ~0.5dB for 5% SINR. We don't understand how this conclusion can be drawn. |
| CEWiT | Fine with the proposal |
| AT&T | We think that the proposal is ok and agree with Samsung that this proposal does not require additional specification enhancements with the assumption that for an FR1 gNB that does not use beamforming, beam indication signaling does not have to be provided to reduce control overhead, i.e., optional. |
| Vivo | OK |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal, although there is limited inputs, the benefit is still justified in some scenario. We understand that the gain may not be significant compared to FR2, but still there is improvement and detailed observation will also be captured as proposed in next proposal to provide the whole picture. |
| MTK | Ok with the proposal. |
| LG | Fine with the proposal. We think not only it is helpful in performance perspective, but also the unified design for FR1 and FR2 is desirable. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| IITK | Fine with the proposal |

***Proposal 1-2:*** *Capturing following observations into TR 38.867:*

* *For FR1:*
* *[Source-1, ZTE] shows that with indicated beam information, the SINR performance on FR1 in the O2I scenario have been dramatically improved with deployment of NCR, and NCR provides obvious SINR improvement compared to legacy RF repeater in all cases. NCRs with beam information can also improve the SINR performance on FR1 in realistic outdoor scenario.*
* *[Source-2, ETRI] shows that a small payload of SCI (e.g. 4 bits) can provide SINR gains for more than 80% of indoor UEs. And the side effect from repeater at FR1 can be resolved by a proper CSI feedback and scheduling in the practical environments. Besides, dynamic repeater gain/power control can provide additional SINR gain over semi-static repeater gain/power configuration in FR1 as well as in FR2.*
* *[Source-3, Huawei] The target coverage for FR1 can be achieved without NCR while the target coverage performance can only be achieved with NCR for FR2. NCR provides much more coverage extension benefits for FR2 than FR1.*
* *For FR-2:*
* *[Source-4, CMCC] The NCR with beamforming has a valid SINR gains over Gnb only and legacy RF repeater. Compared with Gnb only, NCR has a SINR improvement about 1.42 Db, 1.44 Db, and 3.06 Db at 5%-tile, 50%-tile, and 95%-tile CDF. NCR could improve the coverage and SINR of the UE compared with Gnb only and deployment with legacy RF repeaters.*

Companies are encouraged to share your views.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | Ok to capture the observation. |
| Apple | Generally Ok to capture the observation. Perhaps for source-1, ZTE, it might be more meaningful to capture some concrete values for gains rather than just saying “dramatically improved” |
| Sony | Ok with the proposal, but agree with Apple that for the final text source-1, it would make more sense to provide some figures indicative of the improvement. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| China Telecom | Fine with the proposal, also shares the similar view as Apple i.e., providing some detailed gain is more meaningful. |
| Intel | Fine with the proposal, and also share similar view as other companies that detailed gain is more desirable. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine to capture some observations from simulation results provided by companies. Agree with Intel that the wording is not accurate. In addition, we would like to understand the assumptions for the evaluation.  For the evaluations provided by ZTE, we are wondering why in the simulation, 9 NCRs are deployed in a macro area in FR1 while only 3 NCRs deployed in FR2 according to simulation results from last meeting.  For the evaluations provided by ETRI, we are wondering why wideband SINR can go up to 60~70dB with NCR. |
| CEWiT | Fine with the proposal |
| AT&T | Generally ok, However, for *[Source-3, Huawei] “The target coverage for FR1” it is unclear/ambiguous what is implied by target coverage.* |
| Vivo | we prefer to capture our result for FR2 as well, i.e., a simple summary as following  Deployment of NCR with semi-static AL beam control provide improvement of SINR compared with gNB only deployment. Deployment of NCR with dynamic AL beam control provide additional improvement of SINR compared deployment of NCR with semi-static AL beam control. |
| Fujitsu | We are generally fine with the proposal. We share the same view with Apple. |
| ZTE | Fine |
| Xiaomi | Support |

Meanwhile, to enable the proper operation of NCR-Fwd, discussion on NCR’s capability on beam information is also proposed by companies:

* Adaptive beam vs Fixed beam for backhaul link

In RAN1#109e, both of them are supported.

**Agreement**

*Both fixed beam and adaptive beam can be considered at NCR for both C-link and backhaul-link.*

* *FFS: the mechanism for indication and determination of beam.*
* *Note: Fixed beam refers to the case that beam at NCR for both C-link and backhaul-link cannot be changed.*

According to the contribution in this meeting,[Fujitsu, CATT, xiaomi, Apple] propose that both fixed beam and adaptive beam at NCR should be supported, while [Samsung, CMCC] mention the support of these two options is subject to NCR’s capability, and a capability information should be reported to gNB to distinguish those two methods[CMCC]. [Ericsson] proposes that architecture with shared repeater-MT and repeater-Fwd antennas on the BS-side should be prioritized such that NCR-Fwd beamforming can rely on NCR-MT beamforming using the legacy UE beamforming framework.

* Beam information, e.g., at least for access link

As highlighted by companies including NCR [ZTE, vivo, CATT, NEC, Intel, xiaomi, China Telecom, CMCC, CEWit, Ericsson], the capability should be defined regarding the NCR’s beam for access link. The detailed information includes the number of supported beams should be considered [ZTE, vivo, CATT, NEC, Intel, xiaomi], [CATT, NEC, Intel] mention that the beam width, beam direction, and beam type can also be considered, and [Ericsson] mentions the reciprocity/non-reciprocity and coherent/non-coherent codebooks can also be reported. Besides, the maximum number of beams for access links is also concerned by companies [Huawei, CATT]

Then, from FL’s perspective, the following proposal is proposed:

***Proposal 1-3:*** *Following aspect can be considered as the NCR capability*

* *Characteristic of beam at NCR-Fwd for backhaul link:*
  + - *Adaptive beam or fixed beam for backhaul link at NCR-Fwd*
* *Characteristic of Beam at NCR-Fwd for access link including number of supported beams, beam type, number of simultaneously operated beam.*

Companies are encouraged to share your views.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | Support the proposal in general.  Suggest to modify the proposal as “*Characteristic of beam at NCR-Fwd for backhaul link at least including…*” and “*Characteristic of Beam at NCR-Fwd for access link at least including…*”, in view of extensive set of manufacture declarations agreed in RAN4 for the Rel-17 NR FR1/FR2 repeater (R4-2211151), which can be further discussed in the normative phase of Rel-18 NCR. |
| Pivotal commware | We are not against adaptive, as long it is not mandated that this functionality needs to be “run-time” (as that would add implementation burden). Having it **Configurable** (ahead of time, at the slow time scale, perhaps as Operator sees it fit) rather than **Adaptive** would be our wording of choice. |
| Apple | For the “beam type” for access link, it would be good to clarify what exactly it entails. Otherwise, it is quite a broad term. Is the intention here to state narrow or wide beam? |
| Panasonic | We think both adaptive and fixed beam for backhaul links are necessary for FR2 operation. |
| Sony | We support the proposal with Samsung’s modification. |
| CATT | Ok with principle, but for the main bullet it’s better to say “ at least the following…” |
| CMCC | Generally fine with the proposal.  From our understanding, the beam type refers to wide beams and narrow beams. But for the ‘simultaneously operated beam’. does it mean simultaneously transmissions and receptions ? if that is the case, whether and how the NCR could combine the uplink and forward should be clarified. |
| China Telecom | We are also not sure about the term “beam type”, we think some clarification is needed. Meantime, we think “number of simultaneously operated beam” can be replaced by “number of supported beams”. |
| Intel | We’re generally fine with the proposal, except ‘Number of simultaneously operated beam’. Does it mean, NCR-Fwd access link can support multiple beams simultaneously even for the same CC or different beam for different CC? Support of simultaneously operated beams would increase cost, overall RS overhead and signaling overhead.  Regarding beam type, in our understanding, it is wide or narrow beam. |
| Lenovo | We are generally fine with the proposal. Agree with Samsung to add “at least”. We are fine with the “beam number”. We also share similar view with Apple and CMCC that “beam type” and “ simultaneously operated beam” needs more clarification. |
| Spreadtrum | Support in principle, but the definition of “beam type” needs to be clarified. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | On first sub-bullet, it is not clear to us why adaptive beam or fixed beam for backhaul link of NCR-Fwd should be NCR capability. Given that NCT-MT has a similar functionality as UE with respect to beam management. Adaptive beam indication which can be supported for C-link can also be easily supported for backhaul link of NCR-Fwd.  On the second bullet, we are in general okay for the capability reporting. Related to this, we also would like to emphasize that from configuration point of view, the maximum number of SSB beams and CSI-RS beams should be limited for NCR-Fwd access link. The reasons are two folds:   1. To enable beam sweeping for NCR-Fwd access link, the gNB has to allocate additional backhaul beams for the NCR-Fwd, leading to an increase of overhead. And the overhead increases with number of access beams at the NCR-Fwd and the number of associated NCRs. 2. If the maximum number of SSB beams and CSI-RS beams are not limited, an NCR may only generate a large number of narrowest beams on access link. As a result, either a high gNB overhead is introduced or NCR coverage is reduced, and the gNB configuration flexibility is impacted.   Therefore, we suggest a separate proposal  *The maximum number of SSB beams and CSI-RS beams at NCR-Fwd for access link.* |
| CEWiT | Support proposal with Samsung’s modification |
| AT&T | Generally support. Suggest the following:  ***Proposal 1-3:*** *The following NCR capability aspects can be considered as a starting point:*   * *Beam characteristics (i.e., adaptive beam or fixed beam) at NCR-Fwd for backhaul link.* * *Beam characteristics at NCR-Fwd for access link including the following: number of supported beams, beam type, number of simultaneously operated beam.* |
| NEC | It’s OK for us in general. We think beam type is a little unclear, it can be taken placed by a non-confusing words, such as “beam width”.  With regard to the detailed characteristics, we agree with Samsung’s suggestion. |
| vivo | Regarding AL beam, we support beam number, e.g., the number of beams depends on NCR’s antenna array conf., number of simultaneous beams depends on NCR panel conf. however, the beam type is not a clear concept, more discussion is needed. |
| Fujitsu | We prefer a proposal with “at least”. Regarding “number of simultaneously operated beam”, as questioned by other companies, more discussions are needed. And the “number of simultaneously operated beam” can be kind of covered by “number of supported beams”. So, we suggest removing “number of simultaneously operated beam” for now. |
| ZTE | Fine with proposal and “at least” can be added. |
| MTK | We are ok with the proposal with the following update:   * *FFS: Characteristic of Beam at NCR-Fwd for access link may include~~ing~~ number of supported beams, beam type, number of simultaneously operated beam.*   “*Number of supported beams”* is reasonable to us. It allows gNB to know how many candidate beams can be for NCR-Fwd in access link.  “*Number of simultaneously operated beam*” is for a more advanced NCR can support simultaneous reception from more than one Rx beams. However, as pointed out by CMCC, we are not clear how the NCR works for forwarding after the reception by two Rx beams; should it be left to NCR’s implementation? If it’s up to NCR’s implementation, NW can treat the ‘simultaneous reception’ as another candidate Rx beam. Then it is not clear why NW needs to know this capability.  “Beam type”: we think it is difficult to define ‘beam type’, if the intention is to distinguish wide beam and narrow beam. |
| LG | We are generally fine with the proposal.  For the second bullet, we are fine for ‘number of supported beams’. However, some clarification may be necessary for ‘beam type’ and ‘number of simultaneously operated beam’. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We generally fine with the proposal. We also would like to clarify the “beam type”, and “number of simultaneously operated beam”. |
| Xiaomi | We are generally fine with the proposal. The definition of beam type seems not clear. |
| IITK | Support Samsung’s modification |

More specifically, to enable the proper indication of beam information in the side control information, details, e.g., mechanisms of beam determination and indication for each links, are also highlighted:

* ***NCR-UE link (i.e., access link)***

In RAN1#109e, the following agreement is achieved

***Agreement***

*In the access link beam indication, an access link beam can be indicated by:*

* *Option 1: A beam index*
  + *FFS: How to indicate the corresponding time domain resource of the beam.*
* *Option 2: An index of a source RS (e.g. a TCI-like indicator)*
  + *FFS: The definition of the source RS.*
  + *FFS: How to indicate the corresponding time domain resource of the beam.*
  + *FFS: The definition of the association between the source RS and the beam.*
* *Note: The above does not imply that the NCR can or cannot generate and transmit reference signals to a UE or receive and process reference signals from a UE.*

*RAN1 to select one of the two options, combine the two options, or select both options in RAN1#110*

Then, regarding the remaining FFS on how to indicate the applicable time of beam indication, following options shared by companies can be considered:

* Option1: Implicitly aligned with the beam indication. [ZTE, CMCC, Intel, DCM]. In this way, the beam will be applied over the time resource until another indication
* Option2: Explicitly indicate the starting time unit and duration for each beam

In this way, these parameters can be indicated via additional field, e.g., SLIV. [ZTE, Intel, Samsung]

* + Additional, for semi-static configuration (e.g., beam pattern or periodically beam indication), additional indication of the information including periodicity is also needed.

Then, from FL’s perspective, following proposal is provided:

***Proposal 1-4:****The time domain resource corresponding to an access link beam can be determined with following options:*

* + *Option 1: Explicitly indicating the starting time unit, the duration (e.g., via SLIV) and/or periodicity per beam indication*
  + *Option 2: The corresponding time domain resource is from one beam indication to another beam indication.*

*Note: One or multiple beams (e.g., beam pattern over consecutive time resources) can be indicated per beam indication.*

Companies are encouraged to share your views.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | In principle, we are supportive of the two options mentioned by FL. In terms of option 1, another way to indicate time domain resource is slot index (which is already specified for Rel-17 IAB).  Also, another option can be considered here is implicit time domain resource indication, e.g., NCR determines the symbols/slots for SSB/PRACH according to SSB index information. The symbols/slots for the SSB/PRACH can be obtained from system information.  Hence, we suggest the following modification.  ***Proposal 1-4:****The time domain resource corresponding to an access link beam can be determined with following options:*   * + *Option 1: Explicitly indicating time domain resource (e.g., via SLIV, slot indexes) and/or periodicity per beam indication*   + *Option 2: The corresponding time domain resource is from one beam indication to another beam indication.*   + *Option 3: Implicit time domain resource determination (e.g., NCR determination of the symbols/slots for SSB/PRACH/PDCCH for SI, paging, etc. based on SSB index indication)*   *Note: One or multiple beams (e.g., beam pattern over consecutive time resources) can be indicated per beam indication.* |
| Pivotal Commware | We are supportive of Option 1: A beam Index.  W.r.t Option 2 “Note”: We think that having multiple beams on Access side adds too much to complexity. (Even, most gNBs today do not have this capability). |
| Apple | We are generally fine with the moderator’s proposal.  One question for clarification – in addition to the time domain resources for beam, it also needs to know whether the indicated beam on corresponding time domain resources is for uplink reception from UE or downlink forwarding to UE. Do we need to discuss this under this proposal or have separate proposal/discussion? In our view, UL/DL TDD configuration can implicitly be used for that. |
| Panasonic | We prefer Option 2 as it has a reduced singling overhead. |
| Sony | We are in principle fine with this proposal. |
| CATT | Not sure how to interpret : Option 2: The corresponding time domain resource is from one beam indication to another beam indication.  This option seems only talk about the duration of the beam indication. Also this does not preclude explicit indication of other beam characteristics. This seems to say that the beam indication seems to be effective until a new beam indication is received. But anyway , the original wording is not clear. |
| KDDI | We are basically fine with this proposal. And we prefer Option 2 for signaling overhead reduction. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the updates from Samsung for option 1, which is copied as below. The option 2 is more like the unified TCI which should depends on NCR’s capability.  ***Proposal 1-4:****The time domain resource corresponding to an access link beam can be determined with following options:*   * + *Option 1: Explicitly indicating ~~the starting time unit, the duration~~ the time domain resources (e.g., via SLIV, slot indexes) and/or periodicity per beam indication*   I’m not sure our position is 100% correctly captured. Although we are fine with “Implicitly aligned with the beam indication” as we proposed in our contribution that the beam indication should be combined with time domain indications. But the latter part “In this way, the beam will be applied over the time resource until another indication” is not clear. There could be two different understandings. For example, the Beam A is indicated for slot 0 but not to slot 1~9 and the beam B is indicated for slot 10. The 1st interpretation is that, the beam A would be applied only to the slot 0 but not to slot 1 to 9. The 2nd interpretation is that, the beam A would be used from slot 0 to slot 9 until another beam indication, which is the beam B for slot 10. |
| China Telecom | Generally fine with the proposal, Samsung’s modification on Option 1 is also fine with us. |
| Intel | We are generally fine with two categories for time domain resource indication, i.e., explicit or implicit, but we have different understanding for implicit.  There can be multiple options for implicit way, e.g.,   * Option 2-1: An indication signaling indicates only one beam without indication of time domain resource, and the indicated beam applies to all subsequent slots/symbols until a new signaling is received (2nd interpretation as mentioned by CMCC) * Option 2-2: An indication signaling indicates one or multiple beams without indication of time domain resource, and the indicated beams apply to a set of time units starting in a reference symbol/slot (as start of 1st slot/symbol), with pre-configured duration and granularity (which is similar to DCI format 2-4 , shown in Figure below). * Option 2-3: An indication signaling indicates one or multiple beams without indication of time domain resource, and the indicated beams apply to a set of time units determined by symbols/slots for cell-specific signals (as proposed by Samsung).   For implicit way, our preference is option 2-2.    Figure for option 2-2 (gNB configures period and granularity first by RRC, then, the time domain resource is determined accordingly. No need of time domain resource indication in each beam indication signaling) |
| Lenovo | We support both options. We think they may apply to different cases considering signaling overhead and indication efficiency. We also think some kind of default beam index should be determined in case there is no indication. Regarding implicit determination, our view is that for the same carrier case, if SSB/RACH time domain resource is available at NCR-MT, it can be used by NCR-Fwd to determine the corresponding beam indication. For other cases, SSB/RACH time domain resource may also need to be explicitly configured with a beam index. Meanwhile, there are also multiple beam indications for difference RS/channel configuration for NCR Fwd. We think this case should also be considered. |
| Spreadtrum | We think option 2 can be optionally supported for the purpose of signaling overhead reduction, some other implicit ways for indicating resource allocation can also be supported as well. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think both options can be supported. |
| CEWiT | Support Option 1 with modifications suggested by Samsung |
| AT&T | We support the option to re-use, as a starting point, the existing Rel-17 IAB method to indicate time domain resource via slot indices. Besides the advantage of reusing existing signaling for IAB, this is also beneficial for NCR to coordinate interference management (e.g. ON/OFF of Fwd link) in a similar manner. |
| NEC | We think the detailed indication method for the timing resource can be discussed after that for the access beam is determined. |
| vivo | We think one of option 1/2 should be down-selected, the intention to support both is not clear.  We support option 1 with Samsung’s modification. However, the example seems redundant, if examples to be listed, symbol level indication should be included as well.  For option 2, the beam for DL and UL can be separated as well, the wording seems not so clear. |
| Fujitsu | For the main bullet, we prefer “at least with following options:”  For option 2, we feel it fails to capture the case where multiple beams are indicated per beam indication. We suggest the following modification.  *Option 2: The corresponding time domain resource is implicitly determined according to the application time of beam indication.* |
| ZTE | Fine to take all options in normative phase, but still prefer to take Option-1 as the simplest way. |
| MTK | We are ok with the proposal.  The note can be another proposal by itself. NW can provide an indication for multiple beams (beams are applied in TDM manner for example) is one indication signaling to save overhead and overcome latency issue for beam switching. |
| LG | We are ok with two approaches (explicit and implicit way), but two options in the proposal seems too restrictive. In our view, other implicit ways to determine the applied time for the beam indication can be also considered. For example, the side control information can be applied for specific time resources aperiodically, but the time resource can be determined implicitly. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal after modifying Option 1 based on Samsung’s proposal (i.e., “*Option 1: Explicitly indicating time domain resource (e.g., via SLIV, slot indexes) and/or periodicity per beam indication*” |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal and option 1 is preferred. |
| IITK | Support Option 1 with modifications suggested by Samsung |

Regarding how to represent the beam information, two options (beam index or source RS ID) including definition of RS, according to contributions in RAN1#110 meeting, following views are share by companies:

* [Spreadtrum, ZTE,Fujitsu, NEC,Intel, Qualcomm, Ericsson] prefer the beam index is used to indicate the beam for access link due to less impact on specification and overhead;
* [InterDigital, Lenovo, Apple, China Telecom] support the source RS index can be used for the beam information of access link.
* [Samsung, CAICT,vivo, China Telecom, LG] support both two options can be supported for the beam of access link.

Besides, as for the option 2 (i.e., the source RS index), the mapping relationship between index and beam for the access link should be defined and known by gNB [Samsung, ZTE, LG]. [Samsung] highlights that the association (e.g., the association between wide beam and narrow beam) between the beams for access link should be known by the gNB and NCR, where the association of the beams for access link can be provided by gNB to NCR, or provided by NCR to gNB, or predefined with specific rules.

Then, from FL’s side, regarding the down-selection between Option-1 and Option-2, it’s obvious that at least Option-1 with beam index is recommended as majority for beam indication and details including association between beams and index/RS can be discussed in 9.8.2

Companies are encouraged to share your views.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | It is understood that option 1 is majority view and we are fine to support it. Also, we would like to point out the benefit of option 2 in some case such as the beam indication of SSB / PRACH. For example, option 2 can be used for the beam indication of PRACH occasion (for forwarding), where the SSB index associated with the PRACH occasion can be used as source RS. In this case, the use of beam index is unnecessary. |
| Pivotal Commware | Support Option 1: Beam Index. |
| Apple | In our view, both options are fundamentally same. Basically, in option 1, a fixed set of logical beam indices are used to indicate, while in option 2, the index of DL RS can be reused for beam indication. Also, we would like to ask for clarification that is it the common understanding that for both options the spatial filter used by NCR is up to implementation (i.e., gNB simply indicates logical index, bur physical directivity of beam is up to NCR implementation)? If this is the case, then in our view option 2 is preferable as it can reuse the existing TCI framework.  Another aspect related to beam indication (we also discussed in our contribution) is if we should consider configuring NCR’s wide area of coverage. In our view, it is beneficial if gNB can configure NCR to have beams indicated within a specific coverage area. This would allow to also avoid unnecessary interference outside the desired coverage area. Otherwise, with logical beam indication, it will be completely up to NCR’s implementation |
| Sony | We prefer option 1, i.e., a beam index. |
| CMCC | Functionally, both option 1 and option 2 are used as a tag to identify the access beam for forwarding. But option 2 may requires the NCR-MT to read the content of the forwarded data. And the definition of the source RS is different from the original one in the spec, which is used for the reception and decoding, not the transmission. |
| China Telecom | We think both source RS index and beam index can be considered for beam indication. We think the down-selection can be done after the detailed mapping between the beam and RS/beam index has been discussed. Regarding option 1, the association between beam index and source RS index may also be needed for TCI indication. For instance, if gNB wants to indicate some transmission is QCLed with some reference signal, gNB needs to ensure that the transmit beam of NCR for access link is the same for this transmission and the source reference signal. |
| Intel | We prefer option 1 as a unified solution for all channels/signals.  Besides, we’d like further discuss how to determine beam type, spatial relation, UL/DL beam as next level discussion. |
| Lenovo | Our preference is option 2 by RS index.  The first reason is that this is more aligned with legacy beam operation with association between RS index and spatial domain transmission/reception filter/TCI framework.  Another reason is that no matter beam index or RS index is adopted, to determine the suitable beam index or RS index for a UE, measurement and reporting should be performed. Measurement should be based on CSI-RS/SSB/SRS if we want to reuse legacy measurement framework as much as possible. So at least based on measurement and reporting, the association between a RS index and a beam/spatial domain filter for access link can be determined. There is no additional signal/effort for the association.  Regarding the statement that for a RS index, the repeater doesn’t know it is for access link or for backhaul link. Our view is that the indication for backhaul link and for access link may be indicated separately. So if the indication/side control information is for access link, NCR will know that the RS index is for beam setting for the access link. There is also no additional work.  Regarding CMCC’s comment of reading content of forwarded data, we don’t think that is necessary. If there is data for a UE and it is associated with a beam, the corresponding beam for access link at NCR side can be indicated by beam related side control information. We also don’t prefer NCR to read UE’s content to avoid security issue. |
| Spreadtrum | Prefer option 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Option 1. |
| CEWiT | Support Option 1, i.e., beam index based |
| AT&T | Fine to go with the majority view, but prefer option 1. |
| NEC | We support Option 1. |
| Vivo | We are fine with option 1. Besides, we also think the spatial relationship, UL/DL beam correspondence should be discussed for option 1 as well. |
| ZTE | Ok with the proposal. |
| MTK | We also think the two options are very similar. As companies may have different interpretation on what the RS source is in option 2, it is premature to say which one is better, or they are actually the same. It may be easier to define what properties are needed first for such a beam index or a source RS (or a tag as CMCC mentioned). |
| LG | We are ok to support Option 1 only. |
| Qualcomm | We support Option 1 (i.e., beam index). |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Option 1. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer Option 2, i.e., RS ID based. |
| IITK | Support Option-1 |

Regarding whether to support slot-level and/or symbol-level beam indication, [vivo] support at least symbol-level access link beam indication. Further, [vivo] highlights that single symbol level or symbol group level indication can be FFS. [Fujitsu,CATT,Intel, Samsung] both slot-level and symbol-level can be supported.

From FL’s perspective, it’s straightforward to support both slot and symbol level (Option-3) as recommendation. The details and potential down-selection can be considered in 9.8.2.

Companies are encouraged to share your views:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | Ok to support both slot and symbol level beam indication. |
| Pivotal Commware | We support Option 1: Slot Level. We think Symbol level adds to much complexity. |
| Apple | Our first preference is symbol level indication, but additionally we are also fine with both slot level indication |
| Panasonic | We prefer to support both slot and symbol levels. |
| Sony | Okay to support both slot and symbol level granularity for beam indication. |
| CATT | Support this proposal |
| KDDI | We prefer to support both slot and symbol level beam indications. |
| CMCC | We support both slot level and symbol level. Symbol level indication could be used for such as SSBs. And the slot level could be used for the slot-level scheduled transmissions. |
| China Telecom | Ok to support both. |
| Intel | Support option 3. |
| Lenovo | Fine to support both slot level and symbol level indication. |
| Spreadtrum | Support both slot and symbol level beam indication. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support both. |
| CEWiT | Ok to support both slot and symbol level |
| AT&T | Suggest to support slot level beam indication. We would also support symbol-level indication for forward compatibility (e.g. mini slots and beam management). |
| NEC | Ok to support both granularity. |
| Vivo | OK to support option 3 |
| ZTE | Ok with the proposal. |
| MTK | Ok to support both. |
| LG | Support both slot and symbol level beam indication. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with both symbol-level and slot-level indications. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support both. |
| IITK | Fine to support both |

As agreed in RAN1#109e e-meeting, both semi-static and dynamic beam indication can be studied considering different NCR’s deployment scenario. Based on this agreement, [vivo, Sony, CATT, CMCC, Fujitsu, Xiaomi, Samsung] propose both semi-static and dynamic access link beam indication should be supported. Further, [CATT, Xiaomi, Samsung] highlights that semi-static configuration is indicated at least for broadcast transmission, while dynamic indication can be used for UE specific transmission.

As for the signaling of semi-static and dynamic indication, [xiaomi] mentions that at least RRC signaling can be used for semi-static beam indication, and dynamic signaling such as repeater control information can be used for dynamic beam indication.

Moreover, [CATT] propose that dynamic indication can override the semi-static configuration for broadcast transmission, while it cannot override the semi-static configuration for UE-specific transmission.

Then, from FL’s perspective, both dynamic and semi-static are recommended for beam indication as agreed in last meeting, additional details can be considered in 9.8.2 if any.

Companies are encouraged to share your views:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | Ok to support both dynamic and semi-static beam indication. |
| Pivotal Commware | We support semi-static. We think dynamic would add complexity. |
| Apple | We support both dynamic and semi-static beam indication |
| Panasonic | We think both dynamic and semi-static beam indications are required. |
| Sony | Support both dynamic and semi-static beam indication. |
| CATT1 | support |
| KDDI | We support both dynamic and semi-static beam indication. |
| CMCC | We support both dynamic and semi-static beam indication. Semi-static beam indication could be considered as the baseline configuration. And dynamic indications could be used as additional indications where the semi-static indication does not cover or could be an updates or overrides of certain slots. |
| China Telecom | Support |
| Intel | Support both dynamic and semi-static indication. |
| Lenovo | Support both semi-static and dynamic indication. |
| Spreadtrum | Support both dynamic and semi-static beam indication. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Given that semi-persistent beam indication is supported the UE, we believe it will be good to also support semi-persistent beam indication for NCR. Hence, we suggest the following update  Dynamic, semi-persistent, and semi-static are recommended for beam indication of access link for NCR-Fwd. |
| CEWiT | Support both semi-static and dynamic |
| AT&T | Ok to support both dynamic and semi-static beam indication. |
| NEC | Ok to support both semi-static and dynamic indication for access beam, then a suggestion on the proposal is shown as follow:  *“both dynamic and semi-static are recommended for access beam indication as agreed in last meeting”* |
| Vivo | Support both dynamic and semi-static indication. |
| ZTE | Ok with the proposal. |
| MTK | Ok to support both dynamic and semi-static beam indication. |
| LG | Support both semi-static and dynamic indication. |
| Qualcomm | We support both dynamic and semi-static beam indication. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support both dynamic and semi-static indications. |
| Xiaomi | Ok to support both dynamic and semi-static beam indication for access link. |
| IITK | Support both semi-static and dynamic indication |

* ***gNB-NCR link (including c-link and backhaul link)***

In last meeting, it has been agreed that both fixed beam and adaptive beam can be considered for the C-link and backhaul link of NCR.

Considering the details for these two options, [Apple] mentions that the fixed beam can be regarded as baseline, and it can be hard coded or determined based on SSB and/or CSI-RS. For the adaptive beam indication, reusing legacy UE beamforming framework for NCR-MT can be considered [vivo, CATT, Samsung, sharp, Ericsson, IntelDigital, China Telecom, CEWit]. More specifically, the adopted legacy beam indication mechanism can be considered as following:

* Rel-15/16 beam indication mechanism should be adopted as basic assumption, while Rel-17 unified beam indication is an optional feature;
* [Samsung] proposes that both Rel-15/16/17 beam indication framework (i.e., unified TCI framework) can be considered
  + [Sharp] mentions that the same beam management’s methods in Rel-17 can be applied and reused for NCR C-link and backhaul link.

Regarding the implicit/explicit beam indication of NCR backhaul link, following views are shared by companies:

* [ CATT, NEC, Intel, Qualcomm, Apple, China Telecom] support that additional signaling is needed to indicate the beam information of backhaul link
* [Huawei, Nokia, MediaTek, Sharp, Ericsson, CAICT] support the implicit indication of backhaul link beam configuration.
* [ZTE,Vivo,Sony, Samsung, Lenovo, LG, Fujitsu, xiaomi, InterDigital, NEC, Intel] support both explicit and implicit scheme.

More specifically, [Samsung] highlights that for explicit indication, TCI ID or RS ID can be considered for beam indication of backhaul link. While for implicit indication mechanism, except follow the beam on C-link, a default beam can be considered[Fujitsu, xiaomi, Intel, LG, Ericsson, Vivo], e.g., beam for CORESET#0 [Fujitsu, xiaomi], the TCI state QCL’d with SSB identified by NCR-MT during initial access[Intel], the latest beam/TCI used by NCR-MT[Intel, LG], the most recent PDSCH TCI state[Ericsson], the DL beam of backhaul link can follow the configured TCI state for PDCCH or indicated TCI state for PDSCH on the control link, while the UL beam of backhaul link follows the UL beams of C-link.[Vivo]

Moreover, [NEC] mentions that a relationship between the beam of NCT-MT and backhaul beams of NCT-Fwd should be predefined or pre-configured. And though there is an agreement that the same assumption of beam correspondence is applied for DL/UL of the backhaul link at NCR-Fwd as the DL/UL of the C-link at NCR-MT, [Samsung] highlights that for backhaul link beam indication, and the case that the beam correspondence of NCR-Fwd does not hold should be considered. [CMCC] highlights that the self-interference issue should be considered for the beam determination and indication of backhaul link.

Then, from FL’s perspective, indication of beam for backhaul link seems necessary based on majority’s inputs. Details of signalling design can be considered in 9.8.2.

Companies are encouraged to share your views:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | We are supportive of the indication of beam for backhaul link. |
| Pivotal Commware | We support fixed beam that can be hard coded, or OEM configured. If adaptive (we prefer “configurable” to “adaptive”), we support additional signalling to indicate the beam info.  Regarding reusing “legacy signalling” beamforming framework for NCR-MT: As we pointed out in our contribution R1-2205813, the legacy signalling would not be sufficient in NSA cases, nor in FR1 + FR2 SA cases. |
| Apple | We prefer fixed beam indication for backhaul link. However, if justified, we are also fine to consider adaptive beam indication as well. |
| CATT1 | support |
| KDDI | We support. |
| CMCC | The indication of beams for BH link should be supported. Whether fixed or adaptive beams should be supported depends on NCR’s capability. If the fixed beam is reported, the NCR cannot change BH beams since a directional antenna could be used and the direction is fixed manually. If the adaptive beams is reported, the NCR could have the capability to adjust the beam of BH according to the control information from gNB. |
| China Telecom | Support |
| Intel | Support |
| Lenovo | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | Regarding adaptive beam for BH link, in our views, it is beneficial to have common understanding on whether NCR-MT can support beam management procedure. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support explicit beam indication for backhaul link of NCR-Fwd. |
| CEWiT | Support |
| AT&T | We are ok to support explicit indication of beam for the backhaul link |
| NEC | We support it. |
| Vivo | We support the additional explicit indication for BH beam. |
| ZTE | Ok with the proposal. |
| LG | If the ‘indication’ includes both of implicit and explicit indication, we are fine with FL’s opinion. |
| Qualcomm | We support. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think explicit signaling may not be necessary, since for the time unit only for backhaul link, Rel-17 unified TCI framework used for C-link can be also used for the backhaul link. |
| Xiaomi | Support beam indication for BH link. |
| IITK | Support |

* ***Others***

The following aspects related to the beam information are also proposed by companies:

* [vivo] proposes to study the necessity to introduce beam restriction, to alleviate th e potential interference due to the auto-excitation of NCR

For this issue, from FL’s perspective, it can be implemented by Gnb’s scheduling on beam indication if the some beam are not preferred.

* [Qualcomm] proposes that multi-beam NCR operation, where NCR may be able to forward DL signals (or receive UL signals) to (or from) multiple beam directions on the access link, can be considered in RAN1.

From FL’s perspective, it’s up to the assumption on NCR’s capability as above.

Companies are encouraged to share your views:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | Open to discuss multi-beam NCR operation. As mentioned by the FL proposal 1-3 for NCR capability, if the number of simultaneously operated beam reported by NCR is more than one, this aspect need to be considered. |
| Pivotal Commware | We think single beam would be a good start. As mentioned earlier, even many gNBs today do not have multi-beam capability. |
| Apple | As commented in one of our previous comments, we are also open to consider coverage region control by Gnb to serve specific regions or avoid interference in certain regions. In our view, it is beneficial if Gnb can configure NCR to have beams indicated within a specific coverage area. This would allow to also avoid unnecessary interference outside the desired coverage area. Otherwise, with logical beam indication, it will be completely up to NCR’s implementation |
| Sony | We find the multi-beam NCR operation proposal interesting and are willing to discuss further. |
| CMCC | As mentioned in our contribution, we support to considerer the self-interference issue from the transmission of AC beam to the reception of the BH beam, which is similar to the auto-excitation mentioned above. |
| Intel | In our view, multi-beam NCR operation increases cost, and overall RS overhead and signaling overhead. |
| Spreadtrum | Regarding adaptive beam for C-link and B-link, there is another issue on how to identify the candidate beams. If NCT-MT support beam management procedure, NCT may not be able to forward DL signals when P3 procedure is conducted. Some configuration restriction will be needed. On the other hand, if NCT-MT doesn’t support beam management procedure, the candidate Rx beams for NCR need to be indicated by gNB. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with FL analysis. |
| vivo | Self-interference/auto-excitation issue should be discussed, the solution can be open for now, e.g., by controlling BH/AL beam, or by controlling NCR gain.  The multi-beam operation can be discussed assuming multi-panel at NCR. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with Samsung that FL proposal 1-3 already captures aspects of multi-beam operation from the NCR’s capability reporting point of view. The other aspect that needs discussion/consideration is the related side control information from gNB to NCR. |

# Topic-2 ON-OFF information

## **Company view (Round-1)**

For the ON-OFF information, potential solutions in either explicit or implicit ways are highlighted as below in RAN1#109e:

**Agreement**

*ON-OFF information is beneficial and recommended for network-controlled repeater to control the behaviour of NCR-Fwd.*

* *FFS: Detailed mechanism of ON-OFF indication and determination*
* *FFS: explicit indication or implicit indication of ON-OFF information*

**Agreement**

*The following options can be considered to indicate the ON-OFF information from gNB to NCR for controlling the behaviour of NCR-Fwd:*

* *Option 1: Explicit indication with on-off state (e.g., via dynamic or semi-static signalling) or on-off pattern (e.g., periodic/semi-static ON-OFF pattern or new DRX-like pattern for ON-OFF)*
* *Option 2: Implicit indication via the signalling for other information (e.g., beam, DL/UL configuration, or PC information)*
  + *Note: This example does not imply that PC information is necessary or not.*
* *Other solutions (e.g., potential combination of explicit and implication solution) can be further discussed.*

Agreement

*For indication of NCR-Fwd ON-OFF for efficient interference management and improved energy efficiency, both dynamic and semi-static indication can be considered*

* *FFS: RAN1 to consider whether/how to handle the forwarding of broadcast and cell-specific signals/channels.*

In this meeting, according to the contributions, following views are shared by companies to further prioritize the candidates including:

* [Nokia, Intel, CMCC, CAICT, vivo, Sony, Apple, Panasonic, NEC, Samsung, Fujitsu, LGE, Lenovo, InterDigital, CEWiT, IITK, ZTE] support explicit indication.
  + [Sony, CMCC, Apple, vivo, ZTE] support single or multiple on-off states indication
  + [vivo, Sony, CMCC, Lenovo] support explicit pattern based on-off indication
  + [Sony, Apple] support DRX-like indication
* [Huawei, Sony, Fujitsu, Interdigital, Panasonic, NEC, Xiaomi, China Telecom, Samsung, MediaTek, CEWiT, IITK, Qualcomm, Apple, LGE, Ericsson ] support implicit indication determined by other side control information:
  + Beam information: [Huawei, Sony, Xiaomi, China Telecom, MediaTek, Qualcomm, Apple, LGE, Ericsson]
  + Power control information: [Huawei, Panasonic, Sony]
  + TDD UL/DL information: [Sony]

Moreover, [LG, CATT, Interdigital] mentions that it is not desirable for NCR-Fwd to operate as always ON.

From FL’s perspective, both options can be considered to control the DL and UL behavior of NCR-Fwd in normative phase. In addition, as the default state for NCR-Fwd, to avoid unnecessary interference, the NCR-Fwd should be set as “OFF” until the reception of side control information.

***Proposal 2-1:*** *As the default state, the NCR-Fwd is expected to be “OFF” before the reception of indication for ON-OFF.*

Companies are encouraged to share your views.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | Support.  The NCR is controlled by the gNB, so in the absence of any gNB indication, the NCR should be OFF. It can be further discussed whether dedicated gNB indication for ON/OFF is needed, or whether other indications can be used to determine ON/OFF. |
| Pivotal Commware | We are OK with Proposal 2-1. Support explicit pattern based on-off indication or explicit TDD UL-DL pattern. |
| Apple | In principle, we are fine with proposal, but would propose following update to capture both implicit and explicit indication:  ***Proposal 2-1:*** *As the default state, the NCR-Fwd is expected to be “OFF” , unless otherwise explicitly or implicitly configured/indicated by network* |
| Panasonic | We think the default state should be defined after designing the ON-OFF indication. |
| OPPO | The proposal should clarify what “default state” means and when this default state takes in effect (e.g., in NCR-MT power-on and/or RLF?). If the purpose is to avoid running repeater amplifying in an environment with no gNB, the reception of any side information DCI, not necessarily on-off indication, is qualified to indicate the existence of a gNB and therefore to turn on the NCR-Fwd so as to “accept remote UE into coverage”. Here we assume a condition for gNB to turn off NCR-Fwd is no UE access is identified in NCR coverage. |
| CATT | Is semi-statically configured ON-OFF state considered as ‘reception of on-off state” ? |
| KDDI | We support Proposal 2-1. |
| CMCC | Our understanding of the on-off state is whether the NCR turns on the amplifier and forwards the data, which means whether the function of forwarding is on or off. Then, the default state of OFF is preferred, since when there is no traffic for NCR forwarding, the amplifier should be turned off to reduce the amplified noise. |
| China Telecom | Fine with Apple’s modification. |
| Intel | Is it correct understanding that default state is applied before FIRST indication of ON-OFF? After NCR receives first indication, it is FFS whether the default off state is applied to time domain resources between two on/off indications, which depends on proposal 2-2 ? |
| Lenovo | Fine with the proposal to support a default state where the NCR doesn’t perform forwarding of data. Meanwhile, we are fine with both explicit and implicit on/off indication, and we think they can be combined together. |
| Spreadtrum | Before we discuss the default state, we think the definition/application scope of “OFF state” (e.g., whether the “OFF” control information applies only to the UL or DL transmission of the NCR-Fwd, or it applies to both UL and DL transmission)should be determined first. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the modification from Apple. |
| CEWiT | Fine with Apple’s modification |
| AT&T | We prefer an explicit solution. It better supports interference coordination and network-designed energy saving patterns as well. Not saying implicit doesn’t work, but explicit indication has advantages from an operations perspective. |
| NEC | Agree. The time or the condition that NCR-Fwd is expected to switch on for the first time can be discussed further, which may be associated with NCR-MT. |
| vivo | Support |
| Fujitsu | We think more discussions are needed and how to indicate ON-OFF should be discussed first. As commented by many other companies, this is related to how (implicitly/explicitly) ON-OFF indication is supported. For example, if beam indication is used to implicitly indicate ON-OFF, NCR-Fwd may turn ON according to received beam indication, even before/without reception of ON-OFF indication. |
| ZTE | Ok with the proposal with modification as below  ***Proposal 2-1:*** *As the default state, the NCR-Fwd is expected to be “OFF”, unless otherwise explicitly or implicitly configured/indicated by network to update the “ON-OFF” state.* |
| MTK | We are ok with Apple’s update. |
| LG | Fine with Apple’s modification. |
| Qualcomm | We do not support the proposal in its current form, because we have not yet agreed whether there will be any “indication for ON-OFF”. Hence, we support the modification proposed by Apple. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| IITK | Support Apple’s modification |

Regarding another leftover issue on how to handle the forwarding of broadcast and cell-specific signals/channels, [Huawei, vivo, Fujitsu] propose that the broadcast and cell-specific signals (e.g., SSB, PRACH)/channel forwarding can be always activated. Also, [LG, CATT, Interdigital] mentions that it is not desirable for NCR-Fwd to operate as always ON. From FL’s perspective, the forwarding of broadcast and cell-specific signal/channel can be either controlled by pre-defined pattern or by assumed to be ON always as pre-defined rule as listed in following proposal:

***Proposal 2-2:*** *Forwarding of broadcast and cell-specific signals/channels (e.g. SSB, PRACH, common DCI) by NCR-Fwd is controlled by following option:*

*Option-1: The NCR-Fwd’s behaviours over corresponding time domain resource is indicated by explicitly signalling*

*Option-2: The NCR-Fwd is assumed as “ON” over the corresponding time domain resource once the NCR-Fwd is “ON” from default state.*

Companies are encouraged to share your views.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views | |
| Samsung | Support to consider the two options, and suggest to add another option and an FFS as follows.  ***Proposal 2-2:*** *Forwarding of broadcast and cell-specific signals/channels (e.g. SSB, PRACH, common DCI) by NCR-Fwd is controlled by following option:*  *Option-1: The NCR-Fwd’s behaviours over corresponding time domain resource is indicated by explicitly signalling*  *Option-2: The NCR-Fwd is assumed as “ON” over the corresponding time domain resource once the NCR-Fwd is “ON” from default state.*  *Option-3: The NCR-Fwd is by default “ON” over the corresponding time domain resource, but the gNB can turn OFF the NCR-Fwd using semi-static or dynamic ON/OFF indication.*  *FFS: whether corresponding time resources include all SSB indexes or only SSB indexes that are configured/determined for NCR-Fwd operation.* | |
| Pivotal Commware | Option 1 and 2 are both reasonable (to have timing for NCR FWD on-off), however, we do not understand Proposal 2-2 in how would NCR-FWD know how to differentiate been cell specific and other channels (other than having preconfigured timing to be on and off)?  Also, what would be the purpose of having NCR only forwarding SSBs/common signals and nothing else? | |
| Apple | The intention of this proposal is a bit unclear to us. Why do we explicitly need to capture this only for broadcast and cell-specific channels/signals. Most likely, NCR may not need to know specifically which channel/signal is forwarded. | |
| Panasonic | We think the Option-1 has a better configuration flexibility. | |
| OPPO | The issue for Option-1: The gNB should know which broadcast/cell-specific signal reaches any UE by only going through NCR-Fwd so as to obtain its “corresponding time domain resources” and which broadcast/cell-specific signal reaches a UE without going through NCR-Fwd so as to avoid applying ON-OFF to those signals/channels. But how does gNB make the clean cut in between?  The issue for Option-2: As a RF unit, NCR-Fwd would not be able to know by itself which time-frequency resources are “corresponding to broadcast/cell-specific signals/channels”. The information has to come from NCR-MT relating to C-Link. However, the broadcast/cell-specific signals/channels on C-Link may not give a full picture of the broadcast/cell-specific signals/channels that are on NCR-backhaul/access links. | |
| Sony | We agree with other companies that the NCR, not knowing about the contents of the channels it is forwarding, has no clear way to tell broadcast channels from cell-specific ones. We are not sure either that broadcast/cell-specific channels need special consideration. A general ON/OFF mechanism should work for all channels. For example, a periodic/semi-static ON/OFF pattern can be used for broadcast channels and signaling of ON/OFF state can be used for cell-specific channels. | |
| CATT | Default state need to be defined. “*resource once the NCR-Fwd is “ON”*  need to be defined.  *Corresponding time domain resource*  need to be defined. | |
| CMCC | Although both options have the same effect that cell-specific channels and signals are forwarded to the UEs. But the option 2 may require the NCR to decode the forwarded information to be aware of which are the cell-specific channels/signals. But in the option 1, it is left to gNB’s configuration or indications. Our understanding is that gNB should have the full information of UEs and the common channels/signals. It could make the best decisions for data forwarding. And the option 1 does not need NCR to decode the forwarded information. | |
| Intel | We think option 1 is sufficient. It is fully under gNB control.  For option 2, NCR needs to know which broadcast channels and symbols for the channels. For example, how NCR knows whether all SSBs or only some of SSBs should be ON ? We need additional standard effort. Option 1 can avoid such unnecessary efforts. | |
| Lenovo | We think these two options are applied for different scenarios. If the broadcast configuration is available at NCR, e.g. by sharing same carrier between NCR MT and NCR Fwd, Option 2 can be assumed, otherwise, Option 1 can be adopted for a transparent operation. Regarding details of option 2, we think it can always be on, we don’t think other kind of signaling/control is necessary. | |
| Spreadtrum | We suggest postponing the discussion until the common understanding on the meanings of “ON-OFF” indication and default state are achieved. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Need further clarification on the implication of Option 1 and Option 2. In addition, Option-2 seems to imply that there will be indication to turn the NCR ON. This has not been agreed anywhere. | |
| CEWiT | Fine with Apple’s modification | |
| AT&T | We think that we can capture several options in the TR, with corresponding, pros and cons for each method given it may not always be desirable for NCR-Fwd to operate as always ON. | |
| NEC | We agree with this proposal. | |
| vivo | We think option 1 and option 2 are the same mechanism, i.e., indicate time resource of the corresponding broadcast and cell-specific signals/channels, and ON-OFF state indication for the resource  Proposal:  Time resource and ON-OFF state of broadcast and cell-specific signals/channels (e.g. SSB, PRACH, common DCI) is informed to NCR; FFS the indication mechanism | |
| Fujitsu | We share the same view with Apple.  By implicit/explicit indication of ON-OFF, gNB can set the resources for broadcast and cell-specific signals/channels the NCR should forward as “ON”. NCR does not need to have any special handling of these signals. | |
| ZTE | These two corresponds to different ways for ON-OFF design, e.g., explicit or implicit. We are prefer to take Option-1 since it’s more straightforward. | |
| MTK | Not support. Because NCR-Fwd’s behavior over corresponding time domain resource is fully controlled by gNB, we don’t see the need of this proposal. Forwarding broadcasting and cell-specific signals/channels or not is transparent to NCR. | |
| LG | | For Option 2, in our view, the NCR-Fwd needs to be performed forwarding operation only for some SSB indices to be forwarded among all SSBs transmitted by the gNB, and to operate as OFF on the time resource where the remaining SSB indices are transmitted. Considering this, it is not appropriate for the NCR-Fwd to operate always as ON on time resources where all of the SSBs transmitted by gNB. Instead, if the NCR-Fwd can determine whether the SSB is to be forwarded or not, it can be determined by the NCR that NCR-Fwd operates as ON always on the time resource where SSB is forwarded by NCR-Fwd.  If the ‘broadcast and cell-specific signals/channels (e.g. SSB, PRACH, common DCI)’ in the main bullet means the entire broadcast and cell-specific signal/channels transmitted by the gNB, we cannot support the proposal. Instead, if the NCR-Fwd can determine the broadcast and cell-specific signal/channels for its forwarding operation, and assume the corresponding time resource is always ‘ON’, we can support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | | The proposal, especially Option-2, is not clear, and hence we cannot support it in its current form.  In our view, in any case, there needs to be an explicit signaling from the gNB. This needs to first be clarified and agreed. Next, there can be signaling optimization proposals to be discussed. |
| NTT DOCOMO | | We prefer Option 1, since we also think NCR may not know the contents/types of the signals/channels, and to realize the Option 2, additional information for the contents/types are necessary. |
| Xiaomi | | We share similar view with Fujitsu and Apple that use a general ON/OFF mechanism for all channels. |
| IITK | | We support Option-1 |

Moreover, [Intel, China Telecom, OPPO] mention the time domain granularity of on-off information, where [Intel, OPPO] propose that the granularity of on/off can be symbol-level or slot-level, [China Telecom] proposes that slot-level ON-OFF indication can be considered and symbol-level ON-OFF indication is not supported. From FL’s perspective, following proposal can be considered:

***Proposal 2-3:*** *Slot-level on-off indication is supported for NCR-Fwd.*

Companies are encouraged to share your views

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal |
| Pivotal Commware | Agree with Proposal 2-3. |
| Apple | In our view, both slot level and symbol level on-off should be supported. Especially for implicit ON-OFF indication, if we rely on beam indication and if we agree for both slot and symbol-level beam indication, then it should imply both symbol-level as well as slot-level on-off for NCR-Fwd as well |
| Panasonic | We think slot-level can be optionally supported. |
| OPPO | To clarify, we did not propose slot/symbol-level ON-OFF in our contribution. Our view is kind of opposite: we at least concern about the impacts of dynamic on-off to UE’s assumption of quasi-colocations. |
| CATT1 | Prefer to add “ at least” at the beginning |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal. But we also support the symbol-level on/off. Since some of the signals, such as SSBs, should be forwarded in a symbol-level and which may requires forwarding in a different beam in different symbols. I am not sure the slot-level on-off can fulfill the forwarding of the SSBs. What will happen if one SSB in a slot is required to be forwarded but the other SSB is not. |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| Intel | We think symbol-level on/off is also necessary, e.g., for SSB. |
| Lenovo | We also think both slot-level and symbol-level should be supported. We also prefer to add “at least” for the current proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support both slot-level and symbol-level ON-OFF. |
| CEWiT | Support |
| AT&T | We are fine with the intent of the proposal, only suggesting a minor modification:  **Proposal 2-3:** Slot-level *granularity for* on-off indication is supported for NCR-Fwd. |
| NEC | We support it in general. The granularity is determined by scenarios and capability of NCR-Fwd. We suggest adding “at least” in the proposal. |
| vivo | Both slot level and symbol level can be supported. We share view with Intel that symbol-level on/off is also necessary for SSB/…, and this proposal seems contradictory with proposal 2-2. |
| Fujitsu | We think both slot-level and symbol-level can be considered. |
| ZTE | Support |
| MTK | Support. |
| LG | We share the view with Lenovo. |
| Qualcomm | We do not support. We first need to see if there is an agreement on the need of having explicit ON-OFF indication. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| IITK | Support |

Regarding others including:

* [Spreadtrum] highlights that the behavior of NCR-Fwd after receiving “OFF” control information, i.e., whether the “OFF” control information applies only to the UL or DL transmission of the NCR-Fwd or it applies to both UL and DL transmission should be specified firstly.
* [Samsung] supports RB-specific (or RB-group-specific) ON-OFF indication when considering the frequency domain resources.
* [Qualcomm] proposes that a repeater supporting multiple passbands may have the capability to selectively forward signals in different passbands, i.e, support frequency-selective forwarding (or frequency-selective ON-OFF information) should be further studied.
* [Ericsson] proposes that on-off state of NCR-Fwd can follow the RRC state of NCR-MT when NCR-MT is in inactive or idle state.

Companies are encouraged to share your views.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | Open to discuss RB-group-specific / frequency-selective ON-OFF. From interference management perspective, it is preferred that gNB can control the ON-OFF state of the NCR-Fwd on different RB groups or passbands based on the configuration or scheduling decisions, to avoid amplification of noise and interference in non-scheduled RBs or passbands. |
| Pivotal Commware | RB selective or frequency selective forwarding would assume baseband processing. This adds to complexity, latency and of course cost. |
| Apple | We also support frequency-selective ON-OFF |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine to study this further. |
| CEWiT | Support frequency selective ON-OFF |
| AT&T | We are open to discuss these enhancements, and also support frequency-domain ON-OFF |
| NEC | We suggest to discuss carrier-level ON/OFF state with multi-carrier NCR-Fwd. |
| Vivo | Open to frequency domain on-off |
| Fujitsu | We are open to further discussion on ON-OFF for multi-passband NCR-Fwd. |
| ZTE | The band-based/carrier based can be considered. Regarding the RBs-levels, it requires additional efforts. |
| LG | To support forwarding operation for multi-carrier, frequency-selective ON-OFF operation is necessary behavior. |
| Qualcomm | We support frequency-selective ON-OFF.  To Pivotal Commware, depending on the freq-domain granularity, we may not need baseband processing. In our view, passband-based filtering can be done in the RF/IF domain. |

# Topic-3 TDD configuration

## **Company view (Round-1)**

For the TDD configuration, in RAN1#109e, the following agreement has achieved with pending FFS on the flexible symbols:

**Agreement**

*For the TDD UL/DL configuration of network controller repeater:*

* *At least semi-static TDD UL/DL configuration is needed for network-controlled repeater for links including C-link, backhaul link and access link.*
  + *FFS: handling of flexible symbols*
* *Note1: The same TDD UL/DL configuration is always assumed for backhaul link and access link*
* *Note2: The same TDD UL/DL configuration is assumed for C-link and backhaul link and access link if NCR-MT and NCR-Fwd are in the same frequency band.*

In this meeting, majority re-iterate that dynamic TDD via DCI is not preferred for the deployment of NCR since it increases signaling overhead, complexity and cost. However, [Fujitsu, Panasonic, CAICT, LGE] share the view that the NCR should be able to support both semi-static and dynamic slot configurations for flexible scheduling. Then, from FL’s perspective, based on the discussion in last meeting, we need to focus on the NCR’s behavior over flexible symbol. And regarding this topic, following views are shared by companies:

* Option 1: Unspecified NCR behavior or left to gNB/NCR implementation in flexible symbols
  + Support: Intel (unspecified NCR behavior as Rel-17 RF repeater), ETRI (by NCR implementation), MediaTek (blindly forward both DL and UL signals), Ericsson (up to the gNB to not schedule flexible symbols with conflicting indications in an NCR and associated UE)
* Option 2: Specify a default behaviour over flexible
  1. Alt-1: NCR forwarding is not required in flexible symbols:
     + Support: Fujitsu, CATT, CMCC, Apple, KDDI, ZTE
  2. Alt-2: NCR-Fwd is set to off
     + Support: Huawei/HiSilicon (OFF if not indicated by Option 3,Alt-1), vivo (OFF if not indicated by Option 3,Alt-1), LGE (OFF if not indicated by Option 3,Alt-1), Samsung (OFF if not indicated by Option 3, Alt-2), ETRI
* Option 3: Enable dynamic indication of DL/UL
  1. Alt-1: Further dynamically indicate them to a DL/UL direction
     + Support: Huawei/HiSilicon (DCI 2\_0), vivo (DCI 2\_0), LGE (DCI 2\_0 or SCI), Sony (DCI 2\_0 or new SCI), InterDigital (SCI), ETRI (DCI 2\_0), Sharp (SCI)
  2. Alt2: Indicate a DL/UL direction jointly with other side control information
     + Support: Qualcomm, Samsung ( jointly with a dynamic beam indication in a same L1/L2 signaling)

Among the above options, Option-1 is feasible but may introduce unexpected amplified noise/interference since no mandatory behavior of NCR’s defined. Regarding the Option-2, the alt-2 can be achieved if the OFF-state is explicitly over these symbols under same framework as highlighted in section-3. However, during these flexible, other operation including DL-UL switching, timing adjustment are also expected, which is different as behavior in purely OFF state. For Option-3, actually, it’s same as Dynamic TDD in either Alt-1 or Alt-2, as discussed before, the behavior is limited to enable the dynamic TDD. Then, From FL’s perspective, the Alt-1 in Option-2 can be considered as the baseline:

***Proposal 3-1:*** *For the flexible symbol, no forwarding behavior is expected for the NCR-Fwd over these symbols.*

Companies are encouraged to share your views and if there are concerns, please directly propose the corresponding updates.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | Do not support.  There is no such thing as “no forwarding behavior” for a Repeater. Once the NCR is ON, the NCR applies the amplification gain to any incoming signal – the NCR cannot select not to amplify-and-forward in certain symbols/slots when it is ON.  Alt-1 of Option 2 (set to OFF) can be considered as baseline, but it limits the gNB scheduling. When gNB decides to choose a flexible symbol for DL or UL scheduling, the gNB sends a DL scheduling assignment or an UL grant to the corresponding UE Accordingly, the gNB indicates the beamforming information to the NCR, so can jointly indicate the DL/UL link direction to the NCR. |
| Pivotal Commware | We support Proposal 3-1. Perhaps, this would be going back to semi-static: Define UL and DL symbols, or OEM configurable. Then, operator/OEM defines how they want to handle flex: maybe as UL only or DL only.  Turning NCR-FWD off during flex adds unnecessary tight switching mode times. |
| Apple | In our view, both the alt1 and alt 2 can be combined under option 2. Basically, for flexible symbols, no forwarding is expected and NCR-Fwd can be OFF. |
| Panasonic | For the flexible symbol just configured by semi-static configuration, we don't agree with this proposal, as it brings a lot of scheduling restrictions. For the flexible symbol not indicated by SFI or the symbol indicated as flexible symbol by SFI, we are ok to support the proposal. |
| OPPO | We would like to ensure the above proposal does not eventually confuse UE. Does Proposal 3-1 mean it is gNB’s responsibility to not configure SPS/CG in flexible symbols for UE served by NCR-Fwd? Also, because “flexible” symbol configuration can be UE-specific, this proposal means gNB should unambiguously know which UE is served via NCR-Fwd and which UE is not, correct? If yes, we wonder how gNB can ensure to do this by specification, since this is not IAB. |
| Sony | We can support Proposal 3-1 as some sort of “default behavior,” but excluding the possibility of using flexible symbols to forward information to/from UEs behind an NCR seems too restrictive. |
| CATT | OK |
| KDDI | We can support Proposal 3-1 |
| China Telecom | Fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | Our preference is up to NCR implementation, i.e. option 1. If dynamic TDD is not supported (it is not suitable for NCR), the number of flexible symbols would be very limited, e.g., only 4 symbols in commercial deployment. It is unlikely that gNB would schedule any DL/UL for UEs in the flexible symbols.  Within limited flexible symbol, NCR mainly prepares switching/adjustment without forwarding. Even if NCR forwards some signals, the interference duration would be very short due to limited duration of (flexible symbols– switching/adjustment time). Therefore, it is sufficient to reuse Rel-17 RF repeater behavior, i.e., up to implementation.  Regarding the difference between ‘off’ and ‘no forwarding’ (option 2-1 and 2-2), we’d like to share our understanding. ‘off’ would be the same as ‘no forwarding’. Similar to DRX, we only specify UE does not need to monitor PDCCH, we don’t say which component UE should turn off. For NCR, ‘off’ for on/off operation or in flexible symbol means no forwarding rather than requiring the NCR to turn off all components. |
| Lenovo | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | Support Option2 in principle. However, it seems Alt-1 and Alt-2 are not exclusive from each other. Suggest to further clarify the difference between Alt-1 and Alt-2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share similar view with others that “no forwarding” is same as “OFF”. |
| AT&T | Agree with some of the Samsung comments. Also, Proposal 3-1 should not be the only solution supported |
| NEC | We should clarify interpretation of the flexible symbols at first. For example, whether the flexible symbol is indicated by TDD-UL-DL-ConfigCommon or TDD-UL-DL-ConfigDedicated or DCI 2-0? |
| Vivo | We support the proposal. However, it should be clarified the flexible symbol is semi-static configured flexible symbol not indicated to be UL/DL by SFI, and dynamic indicated flexible symbol |
| Fujitsu | For clarification, we also support Alt-1 of Option 3 with DCI 2\_0. And NCR should not forward on flexible symbols based on semi-static TDD configuration and dynamic TDD configuration by DCI 2\_0 (if supported). |
| ZTE | No forwarding is slightly different as “OFF”, actions including Timing adjustment is also required. |
| MTK | Do not support the proposal. We think it’s a limitation to set NCR-Fwd as off during the flexible symbols as from UE perspective, gNB may transmit PDSCH or allow UE to begin its UL transmissions, e.g., PUSCH, PRACH as long as the corresponding DL indication/UL grant is indicated to UE. We don’t see the benefit to turn off NCR-Fwd if the above mentioned transmissions is triggered for an UE. Moreover, as many companies mentioned, this proposal imposes additional restrictions for gNB scheduling. |
| LG | Ok with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Samsung, and our preferred option remains to be Alt 2 of Option 3.  Nonetheless, it must first be clarified what “flexible” really refers to. Is it the semi-static indication via TDD configurations (common and dedicated)? Does it include SFI too? What about “flexible” symbols that can be relabeled as downlink or uplink based on the NCR-MT’s legacy rules? |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |

Regarding the proposal from [CEWiT/IITK] that in addition to providing the TDD configuration, the gNB should specify to which links (e.g., control link, backhaul link or access links) the TDD configuration is applicable. From FL’s perspective, it has already concluded that in RAN1#109e that same TDD configuration is always assumed for both backhaul and access link.

[Fujitsu, Ericsson, ZTE, Intel] also mentions that the TDD UL-DL configuration dedicated to NCR-Fwd is not necessary. From FL’s perspective, we can conclude it in 9.8.2.

Meanwhile, [Pivotal Commware, AT&T] highlights the issue of TDD configuration acquisition in three scenarios including EN-DC~~, N~~SA in same FR and ~~N~~SA in different FRs. [Intel] proposes that the NCR-Fwd has same large-scale property for backhaul links and control link(s) and same TDD configuration for different carriers. From FL’s perspective, since we already concluded to focus on the in band case in RAN#96, no additional optimization is expected in this release.

Companies are encouraged to share your views.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | If Proposal 3-1 is adopted as is (Option 1 or 2), we prefer to support NCR-specific TDD configuration. |
| Pivotal Commware | As we mentioned in R1-2205813, it is important to recognize how would NCR get the tdd info. Having custom, NCR – geared DCI to communicate that info would be one solution, out-of-band/OEM/preconfiguring would be another. And then, there is a hybrid approach. |
| Apple | In our view, same TDD configuration can be assumed for all the NCR links and it can be cell-specific. |
| Lenovo | We think same TDD configuration can be assumed for the three links. |
| CEWiT | We agree that same configuration applies for BH and AL. An NCR can be configured to work in following modes at a time   * Control link only * BH and AL only * Control link, BH and AL   Therefore, along with providing TDD configuration, an NCR should be informed about one of the above modes active at that time. |
| AT&T | We don’t fully agree with the FL assumptions , for example, although we concluded in RAN#96 to focus on the in-band case, it could be noted in the Study that we can re-use IAB procedures for initial access to enable all three scenarios as highlighted in [Pivotal Commware, AT&T]. |
| Fujitsu | We share the same view with FL. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with FL’s perspectives. |

# Topic-4 Timing information

## **Company view (Round-1)**

In RAN1#109e, there is following FFS on the impact of internal delay on the timing relationship of NCR-Fwd:

**Agreement**

For the timing of NCR, the following assumption is considered as baseline:

* The DL receiving timing of the NCR-Fwd is aligned with the DL receiving timing of the NCR-MT.
* The UL transmitting timing of the NCR-Fwd is aligned with the UL transmitting timing of the NCR-MT.
* FFS: the impact of internal delay on the following timing relationships:
  + The DL receiving timing and DL transmitting timing of the NCR-Fwd
  + The UL transmitting timing and UL receiving timing of the NCR-Fwd

Regarding this issue, [Huawei, ZTE, vivo, Fujitsu, NICT,CATT, Panasonic ,Intel, Lenovo, Apple, Ericsson] highlights that the DL transmitting timing and UL receiving timing of the NCR-Fwd is up to NCR’s implementation without extra signalling. [Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, vivo, Intel, Samsung, LGE] further highlight that the DL transmitting timing of the NCR-Fwd is the DL receiving timing of the NCR-Fwd adding with DL internal delay while the UL receiving timing of the NCR-Fwd is the UL transmitting timing of the NCR-Fwd subtracting with UL internal delay. In addition, [Samsung] proposes that the same internal delay for DL and UL can be assumed.

However, [Sharp] mention that some side information may be necessary for RACH procedure and separate TA adjustment at NCR.

Thus, from FL’s perspective, we can conclude that no additional signalling is expected to control the timing relationship due to the internal delay, and the following proposal is provided to describe the NCR-Fwd’s behaviour:

***Proposal 4-1:*** *For the timing of NCR, the following assumption can be considered and captured into TR 38.867.*

* *The DL transmitting timing of the NCR-Fwd is delayed after the DL receiving timing of the NCR-MT (or the NCR-Fwd) by the internal delay;*
* *The UL receiving timing of the NCR-Fwd is advanced before the UL transmitting timing of the NCR-MT (or the NCR-Fwd) by the internal delay.*
* *The same internal delay for DL and UL of the NCR-Fwd is assumed.*

Companies are encouraged to share your views and if there are concerns, please directly propose the corresponding updates.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | Support the proposal. |
| Pivotal Commware | Support Proposal 4-1. |
| Apple | Support |
| Sony | Support. |
| KDDI | Support. |
| CMCC | Fine with the proposal |
| Intel | Support |
| Lenovo | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| CEWiT | Support |
| AT&T | Ok with the proposal |
| NEC | Fine with it. |
| Vivo | Support |
| Fujitsu | Fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support |
| LG | Ok with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |

Meanwhile, many companies [Nokia, ZTE, Samsung, vivo, CEWiT/IITK,LGE, NTT DOCOMO] share the views that the internal delay information is necessary for the Gnb configuring appropriate guard intervals needed for DL-UL switching and timing adjustment, so they support that the internal delay should be reported to the Gnb.

Thus, from FL’s perspective, the following proposal is recommended:

***Proposal 4-2:*** *The value of internal delay is reported to the network as NCR capability.*

Companies are encouraged to share your views and if there are concerns, please directly propose the corresponding updates.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | Support the proposal. |
| Pivotal Commware | Support the Proposal 4-2. |
| Apple | We are fine to consider the possibility of reporting internal delay by NCR |
| Panasonic | Our understanding is the internal delay of NCR is seen as propagation delay to/from UE. Therefore, we are not sure the need of the reporting. On the other hand, we expect the maximum delay is specified within RAN4 specification. |
| Sony | We are not sure that this reporting is needed. This can probably be handled by RAN4 requirements. |
| CATT1 | OK |
| KDDI | We support proposal 4-2. |
| Intel | We share same view with Sony. |
| Lenovo | We share similar view with Panasonic that the propagation delay can be seen as propagation delay. We don’t think reporting is necessary. |
| Spreadtrum | Share same view with Sony. |
| CEWiT | Support |
| AT&T | We think that the internal delay information is needed for the gNB configuring appropriate guard intervals necessary |
| Vivo | Support |
| Fujitsu | For now, we also don’t think the reporting is needed.  First, since there is no specially handling of internal delay of legacy RF repeater, we assume there should be no big problem for NCR.  Second, different from the case of legacy RF repeater, the gNB knows the existence of NCR. It can be up to gNB’s implementation to make appropriate guard intervals considering the existence of NCR. For example, gNB can set one more symbol as guard. The knowledge of exact value of internal delay may not further help gNB to configure the guard intervals. |
| ZTE | Support |
| LG | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support in principle. It should perhaps be clarified the gNB is included in the ‘network’. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think the internal delay can be included in the propagation delay. |

# Topic-5 Power control information

## **Company view (Round-1)**

Regarding the power control, the essential remaining issue is whether to enable this feature for NCR in Rel-18. According to the inputs, it can be found that:

* [Huawei, Spreadtrum, ZTE, vivo, Fujitsu, CATT, CMCC, MediaTek, CEWiT, IITK, Qualcomm, Lenovo, LGE, KDDI, Ericsson(only for self-oscillation)] still prefer to support this feature for NCR, while [Sony, Intel, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, Apple] prefer to deprioritize the power control information.
* [ZTE, Panasonic, Fujitsu, OPPO, CATT, KDDI] support the semi-static indication mechanism of amplifying gain, while [Huawei, NCE, ETRI] supports the dynamic power control. [LGE] supports both semi-static and dynamic power control.
* [Apple] highlights that it is beneficial to apply power control for both UL and DL, and common set of power control parameters or separate set of power control parameters can be considered. [vivo] mentions that power control based on the MT’s RSRP feedback on the C-link can be considered, assuming that C-link and backhaul link satisfy the average gain assumption.

Then, from FL’s perspective, following is proposed as trade-off:

***Proposal 5-1*** *Semi-static indication of power control information is beneficial and recommended to control the behaviour of NCR-Fwd for both DL of access-link and UL of backhaul-links.*

Companies are encouraged to share your views and if there are concerns, please directly propose the corresponding updates.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Samsung | We do not support power control information as side control information by following reasons:  For coverage enhancement, we think it is not beneficial to increase gain for coverage which may cause additional interference. Coverage enhancement scheme in the spec is enough.  For interference management, gNB already has capability to combat interference.  For oscillation, we think passive and active cancellation technique can reduce the impact of oscillation. So, it can be left for implementation.  Therefore, we need more justification to introduce power control. |
| Pivotal Commware | We do not support Power Control as semi-static configurable parameter. We do support max gain/max EIRP as OEM/Operator/out-of-band configurable parameter.  As we pointed out in R1-2205813 through two examples (UL and DL) power control needs to act at a fast scale, and only NCR itself is in the position to accomplish that (such as, reduce gain immediately to mitigate oscillation). We also think it can be left to implementation. |
| Apple | We are fine to support the proposal |
| CATT1 | Support |
| KDDI | We support the proposal. |
| CMCC | We are fine to support a semi-static configured power control and open for the dynamic indications. |
| Intel | We are not convinced by the material gain provided by NCR power control with additional cost .  Existing UE side power control would be sufficient for coverage. On/off operation is already quite efficient for energy saving. And self-interference for oscillation can be resolved by implementation. |
| Lenovo | Support. We are also open for dynamic PC indication. |
| Spreadtrum | Supportive. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support.  Moreover, we think dynamic power control is also required. At least when the backhaul link beams are changed (e.g., by DCI), the NCR-Fwd received power is expected to be changed. And the amplifying gain should be changed accordingly, otherwise the forwarding performance may be impacted by power saturation, self-oscillation, or a reduced output power.  ***Proposal 5-1*** *Semi-static and dynamic indication of power control information is beneficial and recommended to control the behaviour of NCR-Fwd for both DL of access-link and UL of backhaul-links.* |
| AT&T | We do not fully support the proposal. NCR-Fwd operating on RF layer cannot selectively adjust power corresponding to different UEs. In the uplink direction, the most transparent way is for UEs to adjust power levels as necessary, i.e., UL power control is realized by UE power control only, and not by NCR. For oscillation-mitigating power control (gain control), given that oscillations can occur on the fast time scale, the most efficient approach is for gain control (UL and DL) to be left to implementation on the NCR, while the maximum gain values (both UL and DL) could be parameters configurable by OAM and/or network operator. In this approach, there is no need to introduce any new lower layer control or signaling. |
| NEC | Support it in general. We suggest to add “at least” and a FFS for dynamic indication in the proposal. |
| Vivo | For some case, the interference/noise mitigation by using gain control cannot be replaced by ON-OFF, so power control should be supported |
| Fujitsu | We support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Fine to take this as compromise. |
| MTK | Although we are supportive for power control, we have concern on how NCR can always accept the power control command, while input power always varies and NCR also needs to mitigate oscillation by its own gain control, as Pivotal Commware suggested. Semi-statically configuring max gain/max EIRP may be a proper baseline in Rel-18. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal.  We would like to further clarify that, at least in UL, remote UE’s TX power adjustment (e.g., TX power reduction to handle interference at gNB’s RX) could be at the cost of reducing UE’s end-to-end UL SINR. Alternatively, NCR’s TX power or amplification gain for UL forwarding can be adjusted to meet the desired level of received power at the gNB with less impact (and sometime with no impact – e.g., when BH SNR is sufficiently high that should be typical) on the E2E UL SINR. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think power control information is not necessary. Since for DL, gNB may not have the information to control the NCR DL power, and for UL, current UL power control for UE is sufficient to change the input UE power at NCR. |

Regarding the FFS in the agreement achieved in last meeting:

**Agreement**

*The controlling of the amplifying gain of NCR-Fwd is considered to enable the power control of NCR-Fwd if PC is recommended as side control information for NCR in Rel-18*

* *FFS: Controlling of the transmission power of NCR-Fwd*

[Huawei, ZTE, vivo, Fujitsu, MediaTek, LGE, KDDI] propose that amplifying gain control is sufficient and equivalent to transmission power control, so there is no need to additionally support amplifying gain control. However, [Spreadtrum, CMCC] still prefer to support both amplifying gain control and transmission power control.

From FL’s perspective, we can conclude that controlling of amplifying gain is sufficient for power control of repeater.

Companies are encouraged to share your views.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Pivotal Commware | For the reasons already mentioned, we do not support outside control of NCR gain, but we support capping the gain or EIRP to what Operator considers desirable. So, OEM configurable parameter as max gain/max EIRP. |
| Apple | We are fine to consider amplifying gain for power control of repeater |
| Panasonic | We agree that amplifying gain control should be sufficient. |
| CATT1 | support |
| CMCC | Fine to support amplifying gain control. But we should also consider to keep the received power level from NCR uplink is similar as the normal UE to facilitate the UE multiplexing. |
| Lenovo | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| Fujitsu | We share the same view with FL. Controlling of amplifying gain is sufficient |
| ZTE | Support |
| MTK | We are ok to support the proposal since the amplifying gain control is sufficient for NCR. |
| Qualcomm | We do not agree and think both amplification gain and [max] transmission power controls are needed.  We note that NCR-Fwd may operate in a TX-power-limited region (e.g., when the level of rxed power is sufficiently high and NCR cannot drive its amplification gain to its max level), in which case the actual amplification gain will depend on the level of RX power. And the level of RX power changes dynamically, at least for UL RX. Hence, we do not think amplification gain control is equivalent to TX power control. |

Meanwhile, other aspects related to the power control information are also proposed by companies including:

1. [Huawei, Panasonic, CEWiT, IITK, LGE] considers the beam specific power control information is beneficial. [Panasonic] mentions that a repeater should report the current transmission power on each beam/direction to the gNB to help the gNB to better schedule the UEs or avoid using certain beams. Besides, the repeater could be configured with minimum signal power threshold for each beam/direction, thus the repeater could identify the link failures and stops amplifying if the perceived power is below the threshold.
2. [Nokia] highlights that it may be beneficial for the NCR to indicate saturation and/or oscillation states to the parent gNB so that appropriate gain levels can be configured

In addition,

* Regarding [ETRI]’s proposal to capture the observation into TR 38.867, it has conducted by rapporteur in the last draft [R1-2206017](file:///C:\Users\younsun\Documents\3GPP%20documents\RAN1%20tdocs\TSGR1_110\Docs\R1-2206017.zip).
* Regarding [Qualcomm]’s propose to study the power control mechanisms of NCR-MT’s and remote UE’s UL signals in case of FDM-based transmission of UL of backhaul link and C-link, from FL’s perspective, legacy mechanism can be directly used if different RF chains are expected for C-link and F-link to enable the FDM-based transmission (e.g., as NCR’s capability). Otherwise, TDM-based is still the baseline as agreed in RAN1#109e.
* Regarding [Qualcomm]’s propose to enable the gNB should to determine the NCR’s output power operating region (gain-limited vs TX power-limited) for both backhaul and access links, from FL’s perspective, once the controlling of amplify gain is supported, the output power operation region can also be controlled.

Companies are encouraged to share your views on the necessity of above issues.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Pivotal Commware | Regarding 1: NCR is transparent to UE. If signal is weak, UE will never act on or report that beam to gNB. Among beams NCR forwards, UE will pick the best one.  Regarding 2: This loop would be too slow to work efficiently. NCR must be able to deal w/ oscillation itself. |
| Panasonic | We think the NCR should report the limitations (due to saturation, and self-oscillations) on beams to the gNB. |
| Lenovo | Agree with other companies that beam specific PC indication is beneficial. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support beam-specific power control. Taking DL power control as an example, in conventional network, the gNB will transmit cell-specific signals/channels using a wide beam and transmit unicast channels using a narrow beam. However, the EPRE for cell-specific signals/channels and unicast channels are same at the gNB.  With a NCR, the DL RSRP of the cell-specific signals/channels received at the NCR backhaul link will be smaller than the unicast channels. If a same amplifying gain is applied for both channels, the EPRE of cell-specific signals/channels will be smaller than the unicast channels at the NCR access link. This results a large gap between cell-specific signals/channels and unicast channels compared to the control network. Hence it will be good to adopt different amplifying gains to compensate the gap. |
| Vivo | We are fine to discuss the association between beam and gain |
| Qualcomm | Regarding “from FL’s perspective, legacy mechanism can be directly used if different RF chains are expected for C-link and F-link to enable the FDM-based transmission (e.g., as NCR’s capability)”, does FL suggest FDM-based transmission can only be supported if we have different RF chains? In our view, NCR may have the capability to support FDMing using a shared RF chain. However, we should then be careful about TX power related aspects – like in the legacy CA/DC scenarios, where different rules are defined (e.g., if a total TX power is to be shared across different cells.) |

# Others

In addition, some other aspects are highlighted by companies including:

* Issues-1: cost comparison cross different techniques
* [Source-1, Huawei] To achieve the same target coverage, NCR-based network deployment requires many more additional nodes than IAB-based network deployment. The equipment cost of NCR must be significantly lower than IAB node in order to be more cost efficient compare to IAB based deployment.
* [Source-2, ZTE] shown that lower cost can be achieved by deploying NCRs for coverage enhancement compared to IAB due to the lower equipment cost (e.g., <30%) and site cost (e.g., < 50% compared to IAB node).

From FL’s perspective, this aspect is out of scope and different views are shared among companies in previous discussion. Then, no additional action is expected.

* Issues-2: Multiple pass-band of NCR-Fwd.
* As highlighted that NCR-MT only has a single carrier in R18 [Fujitsu], while NCR-Fwd can support multiple carriers [Intel, LG, NEC]. [Spreadtrum] also highlights that architecture of Type 1-C repeater in the current specification can be regarded as NCR-Fwd, then the capability of processing two or more passbands simultaneously should be supported at least in FR1.

While [Sony] hold the opposite view that Multi-band NCRs and multi-FR NCRs are not studied in R18.

* In addition, [LG] highlights that whether side control information is indicated independently or commonly for the multi-carrier within same frequency band should be studied.

From FL’s perspective, we already concluded that for signalling design, we will focus on the in-band mode. If multiple pass-bands are available at NCR-Fwd, the potential forwarding behaviour at NCR-Fwd side can be done by implementation if same configuration, e.g., TDD, timing and beam, can be assumed cross all pass-band. No further optimization is expected in this release.

* Issues-3: Fallback mode of NCR

Regarding the operation mode of NCR, [Spreadtrum] proposes that the function of fallback mode from NCR to Rel-17 RF repeater should be supported in R18 NCR. When R18 NCR operates in fallback mode, NCR-MT is shut down by gNB and not expected to receive any side control information except mode switching signaling from gNB, and NCR-Fwd works as Rel-17 RF repeater without the control of NCR-MT.

From FL’s perspective, it can be achieved by implementation once the signalling design for SCI is concluded. The NCR can be configured to perform the amplifying and forwarding if the SCI is indicated via semi-static way. No further consideration is needed.

Companies are encouraged to share your views if any

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments and Views |
| Pivotal Commware | Respectfully, for the fallback to Rel17 RF repeater, it is not only that NCR-MT is shut down. No intelligence whatsoever (including tdd UL-DL schedule) is assumed to be known or available to RF repeater (as per RAN4 WI). RF repeater is much simpler, as just grab-and-amplify, and generally transmits in both UL and DL direction, if there is an input/signal. So, the fallback would assume large architectural and HW changes.  Therefore, we oppose the fallback mandate. |
| Spreadtrum | “Fallback mode” is just a name, just like NCR is used to be “smart repeater”.  Our main goal is to propose one structure for Rel-18 NCR, which can simultaneously support R18 network controlled repeater and R17 RF repeater. It is highly related to issue 2 “Multiple pass-band of NCR-Fwd”, which is one potential NCR device capability, not by implementation.  This “Fallback mode” will easy R18 NCR deployment together with R17 RF repeater at the same site.  By using Type 1-C repeater architecture, it can be easily integrating R18 NCR and R17 in one device. It can work like DSS mode. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | On the cost analysis, we think it would be beneficial to capture the evaluations results given that NCR is an enhancement over conventional RF repeaters to extend the network coverage in a cost-effective manner. It was also highlighted in the SID that cost efficiency is a key consideration point for network-controlled repeaters. |
| NEC | Multi-band discussion is necessary for interference management and energy saving of NCR. |
| LG | To support forwarding operation for multi-carrier, frequency-selective side control information such as ON-OFF or beam indication is necessary. |

# Proposals for discussion at GTW sessions

# Conclusion

# Appendix

R1-2205813 Power Control and Side Control Information for NCRs Pivotal Commware, AT&T

R1-2205875 On the side control information and performance evaluation for NCR Huawei, HiSilicon

R1-2205939 Discussion on side control information to enable NR network-controlled repeaters Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell

R1-2206001 Discussion on side control information to enable NR network-controlled repeaters Spreadtrum Communications

R1-2206018 Discussion on side control information for NCR ZTE

R1-2206055 Discussion on side control information to enable NR network-controlled repeaters vivo

R1-2206128 Additional considerations on side control information to enable NR network-controlled repeaters Sony

R1-2206174 Discussion on side control information for NR network-controlled repeaters Fujitsu

R1-2206183 Discussions on side control information for NR network-controlled repeaters InterDigital, Inc.

R1-2206208 Side control information for network-controlled repeaters NICT and Toyota InfoTechnology Center

R1-2206330 Discussion on side control information for NCR OPPO

R1-2206413 Side control information to enable NR network-controlled repeaters CATT

R1-2206435 Discussion on side control information for network-controlled repeaters Panasonic

R1-2206478 Discussion on side control information to enable NR network-controlled repeaters NEC

R1-2206597 Discussion on Side control information to enable NR network-controlled repeater Intel Corporation

R1-2206656 Discussion on side control information to enable NR network-controlled repeaters Xiaomi

R1-2206698 Discussion on side control information for network-controlled repeaters China Telecom

R1-2206840 Side control information to enable NR network-controlled repeaters Samsung

R1-2206927 Discussion on side control information to enable NR network-controlled repeaters CMCC

R1-2206957 Discussion on side control information for network-controlled repeater ETRI

R1-2206981 Side control information for network-controlled repeaters MediaTek Inc.

R1-2207075 Discussion on Side control information to enable NR network-controlled repeaters CEWiT, IITK

R1-2207120 Discussion on side control information for NCR Rakuten Mobile, Inc

R1-2207127 Discussion on side control information to enable NCR operations Sharp

R1-2207247 On side control information for network controlled repeaters (NCR) Qualcomm Incorporated

R1-2207297 Discussion on side control information for network-controlled repeater Lenovo

R1-2207300 Discussion on side control information to enable NR network-controlled repeaters CAICT

R1-2207345 Discussion on side control information for NR network-controlled repeaters Apple

R1-2207366 Discussion on side control information for NCR LG Electronics

R1-2207420 Discussion on side control information to enable NR network-controlled repeaters NTT DOCOMO, INC.

R1-2207460 Discussion on side control information to enable NR network-controlled repeaters KDDI Corporation

R1-2207680 Control information for enabling NCR Ericsson