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1. Introduction

In RAN #94 e-meeting, a new Rel-18 work item on further NR coverage enhancements was approved [1] and updated in RAN #96 [2]. The objective of the work item is to specify further uplink coverage enhancements for PRACH, power domain and DFT-S-OFDM. Detailed objectives are listed as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| * Specify following PRACH coverage enhancements (RAN1, RAN2)
* Multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams for 4-step RACH procedure
* Study, and if justified, specify PRACH transmissions with different beams for 4-step RACH procedure
* Note 1: The enhancements of PRACH are targeting for FR2, and can also apply to FR1 when applicable.
* Note 2: The enhancements of PRACH are targeting short PRACH formats, and can also apply to other formats when applicable.
* Study and if necessary specify following power domain enhancements
* Enhancements to realize increasing UE power high limit for CA and DC based on Rel-17 RAN4 work on “Increasing UE power high limit for CA and DC”, in compliance with relevant regulations (RAN4, RAN1)
* Enhancements to reduce MPR/PAR, including frequency domain spectrum shaping with and without spectrum extension for DFT-S-OFDM and tone reservation (RAN4, RAN1)
* Specify enhancements to support dynamic switching between DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM (RAN1)
 |

This contribution is a summary of the following email discussion:

[110bis-e-R18-Coverage-01] Email discussion on PRACH coverage enhancement by October 19 – Nanxi (China Telcom)

* Check points: October 14, October 19
1. Summary of contributions

## 2.1 Multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams

Based on companies’ contributions, sometimes the term “PRACH repetition” is utilized to indicate “multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams”. Thus, it needs to be clarified that the term “PRACH repetition” only indicates “multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams”, it doesn’t put any additional restrictions on multiple PRACH transmissions.

### 2.1.1 Resource configuration for multiple PRACH transmissions

#### Issue #1: Resource configuration

Based on the contributions, majority companies [China Telecom, Huawei, ZTE, vivo, Spreadtrum, OPPO, CATT, Intel, Sony, Panasonic, NEC, Lenovo, Mavenir, Xiaomi, CMCC, ETRI, MediaTek, Apple, Sharp, LG, NTT DOCOMO] discuss the resource configuration/allocation for multiple PRACH transmissions. In summary, there are four main options proposed:

* Option 1: Shared preambles and ROs as legacy, i.e., without additionally defined ROs.
	+ FFS: Partitioning the existing legacy RACH Occasions for Single and Multi PRACH transmissions.
* Option 2: Separate PRACH preambles with shared ROs.
	+ FFS: Whether it is possible to utilize the separate PRACH resources for requesting Msg3 repetition.
* Option 3: Additional separate ROs with shared PRACH configuration.
	+ e.g., introduce a frequency and/or time domain offset to define additional ROs.
	+ FFS: Whether the legacy ROs can be used for multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: Separate preambles for different number of PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: SSB-to-RO mapping.
* Option 4: Separate PRACH configuration.
	+ e.g., similar to NB-IoT mechanism for PRACH repetition, including the configuration of time and frequency domain resource, repetition number etc., for different coverage levels.

Based on companies’ contributions, some Pros and Cons of the above options are summarized in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **Pros** | **Cons** |
| Option 1 | * Additional PRACH resources are not needed, the spec. impact is minor.
 | * High collision possibility for PRACH transmission.
* Difficult to distinguish with multiple Msg1 transmissions and single Msg1 transmission.
 |
| Option 2 | * Simple and limited spec. impact.
 | * There are many existing UE features distinguished through different preamble index, incl., CBRA/CFRA, 2-step/4-step, msg.3 repetition, SI request, etc. The capacity of PRACH repetition would be limited.
* Transmission delay of PRACH repetitions will be increased following the existing SSB-to-RO mapping.
 |
| Option 3 | * May help to implicitly identify the number of PRACH repetition.
* No need to further partition the preambles
 | * May result in hard RO reservation.
 |
| Option 4 | * No need to consider the coexistence of legacy UE without multiple PRACH.
* Flexible design of association between SSB and RO.
* Easy to trace the start point and end point of multiple Msg1 transmissions.
 | * Time-frequency resources may overlap in multiple groups of ROs. gNB needs to perform blind detection to distinguish PRACHs with single or multiple transmission, or ensures that there is no time-frequency resource overlap between ROs in different PRACH configurations.
* When switching between the modes of single and multiple PRACH is applied, it is not convenient for gNB and UE.
 |

Besides, companies have the following additional views on resource configuration:

* [Huawei] The enhanced PRACH and the legacy PRACH resource allocation should be independent, repetition ROs should be shared among different repetition levels by using different preamble sets.
* [ZTE, Intel] Multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam on the ROs associated with the same SSB.
* [Apple] There is no need to introduce new PRACH configuration with more time domain ROs for repetition.
* [Nokia] Investigate mechanisms for transmission of the PRACH repetitions targeting reduction of the probability of collision. Mechanisms based on suitable RO configurations, and different from RO reservation, should be prioritized over mechanisms based on preamble configurations. RAN1 to focus its study and investigations only on flexible RO reservation/configuration. Legacy hard RO reservation is not preferred.
* [Nokia] RAN1 to investigate mechanisms for optimization of the PRACH frequency allocation size to maximize the deliverable EPRE throughout PRACH repetitions.
* [Samsung] The RO determination for multiple PRACH transmission should be based on existing NR RACH framework. The concept of RO bundle can be considered, a RO bundle is formulated with a number of RO inside one RO bundle.



#### Issue #2: ROs pattern for multiple PRACH transmission

Companies [ZTE, China Telecom, vivo, CATT, TCL, NEC, Lenovo, MediaTek, NTT DOCOMO] propose that ROs utilized for multiple PRACH transmissions shall not be overlapped in time domain, i.e., multiple PRACH transmissions shall not be performed in the FDMed ROs. Otherwise, there will be little or even no performance improvement on PRACH detection due to transmit power division in the FDMed ROs. In addition, [LG] proposes that RAN1 to discuss how to determine which RO among the FDMed ROs with same beam index is used for PRACH repeated transmission.

While [Ericsson] thinks that in addition to multiple PRACH transmissions multiplexed in the time domain, the simultaneous PRACH transmissions is a possible option, especially for a UE with multiple Tx chains. Thus, [Ericsson] proposes to study simultaneous PRACH transmissions in Rel-18, including the association of different preambles in a RO and different FDMed ROs to one RACH attempt from a UE.

Moreover, two companies [Ericsson, Huawei] proposes that the repetition ROs should be assigned continuously in time domain.

[Mavenir] proposes a RO locations determination method for multiple PRACH transmission as follows: RACH occasion index [m, n] = first RACH occasion index+ n\*period+ m\* RO interval, where n is from 0,1,2… to (⌈total number of RO in RO period/ period ⌉ -1), m is from 0,1,2…to (total number of PRACH repetition and sweeping-1), where total number of PRACH repetition and sweeping is the number of PRACH repetition multiply by the number of PRACH sweeping.

#### Issue #3: Same or different preamble(s) during multiple PRACH transmission

Companies [CATT, Intel, Apple] think that the same PRACH preamble should be utilized for multiple PRACH transmission, which allow gNB to perform combining on multiple detection statistics for better performance. While two companies [ZTE, Samsung] are open to discuss whether same or different preambles apply to the multiple PRACH transmissions. Two cases are given by [Samsung] to show the use case of same and different preambles:

* Case 1: If the gNB can identify that the multiple PRACHs are from the same UE, then using the same preamble for all transmitted ROs is preferred.
* Case 2: If PRACH transmission is regarded independently to each other, then different preambles in different PRACH transmissions can be considered as well.

### 2.1.2 RAR window and RA-RNTI calculation

#### Issue #4: RAR window

According to TS 38.213, in response to a PRACH transmission, the UE attempts to detect a DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by a corresponding RA-RNTI during a window that starts at least one symbol after the last symbol of PRACH occasion corresponding to the PRACH transmission. When multiple PRACH transmissions is applied, the design of RAR window may need to be modified correspondingly. Based on the contributions [ZTE, China Telecom, Spreadtrum, vivo, CATT, Intel, Sony, Panasonic, Lenovo, CMCC, ETRI, MediaTek, InterDigital, Samsung, Sharp, LG, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm], there are two main options proposed for RAR window design for multiple PRACH transmissions as follows.

* Option 1: One RAR window per each PRACH transmission
	+ Note: the RAR window can follow the legacy design.
* Option 2: One RAR window per *K* PRACH transmissions.
	+ Note: *K* is less than the number of multiple PRACH transmissions.
* Option 3: One RAR window for all of the multiple PRACH transmission.
	+ FFS: the start position of the RAR window.



Illustration of Option 1



Illustration of Option 2 (*K* = 2)





Illustration of Option 3

For Option 1, it is workable for gNB to detect the PRACH transmission and transmit RAR regardless of whether it has the knowledge about the number of PRACH transmissions. Each PRACH detection will be handled individually as legacy way, the corresponding RAR window starts also in a legacy manner.

For Option 2 and Option 3, gNB needs to know the number of PRACH transmissions as well as the corresponding ROs utilized for PRACH transmissions. The start position of the RAR window needs further discussion.

Besides, companies [Sony, ZTE, China Telecom, Spreadtrum, Panasonic] propose to considered/supported early termination of multiple PRACH transmissions if possible, i.e., terminate the follow up PRACH transmission in advance once UE successfully receives RAR.

#### Issue #5: RA-RNTI calculation

According to current spec. TS 38.321, RA-RNTI is calculated as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| RA-RNTI = 1 + s\_id + 14 × t\_id + 14 × 80 × f\_id + 14 × 80 × 8 × ul\_carrier\_idwhere s\_id is the index of the first OFDM symbol of the PRACH occasion (0 ≤ s\_id < 14), t\_id is the index of the first slot of the PRACH occasion in a system frame (0 ≤ t\_id < 80), where the subcarrier spacing to determine t\_id is based on the value of μ specified in clause 5.3.2 in TS 38.211 for μ = {0, 1, 2, 3}, and for μ = {5, 6}, t\_id is the index of the 120 kHz slot in a system frame that contains the PRACH occasion (0 ≤ t\_id < 80), f\_id is the index of the PRACH occasion in the frequency domain (0 ≤ f\_id < 8), and ul\_carrier\_id is the UL carrier used for Random Access Preamble transmission (0 for NUL carrier, and 1 for SUL carrier). |

For multiple PRACH transmissions, the RA-RNTI calculation is related to RAR window design. Based on the companies’ contributions [ZTE, China Telecom, Spreadtrum, CATT, Mavenir, CMCC, InterDigital, LG, Qualcomm], there are two options proposed for RA-RNTI calculation as follows:

* **Option 1**: Multiple RA-RNTI candidates within one RAR window, i.e., UE attempts to detect a DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by one of the multiple RA-RNTI candidates during a RAA window.
* **Option 2**: Single RA-RNTI within one RAR window, i.e., UE attempts to detect a DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by a corresponding RA-RNTI during a RAA window.
	+ **Option 2-1:** The corresponding RA-RNTI is calculated based on RO for the last PRACH repetition.
	+ **Option 2-2:** The corresponding RA-RNTI is calculated based on RO for the first PRACH repetitions.
	+ **Option 2-3:** The corresponding RA-RNTI is calculated based on RO for a predefined PRACH repetitions except the last and first one.

For Option 1, it indicates that UE should assume multiple RA-RNTIs candidates within one RAR window. This may happen for the case that multiple RAR windows are utilized and there is overlapping between RAR windows.

For Option 2, it indicates that UE only expects one RA-RNTI candidate within one RAR window, UE doesn’t need to assume multiple candidates of RA-RNTI and UE will not increase the complexity on the reception of RAR. Option 2 is workable for single RAR window design.

### 2.1.3 Determine the number of multiple PRACH transmissions

#### Issue #6: Candidate value

As companies point out, the performance gap for FR2 PRACH channel has been derived based on MIL criterion referring to the coverage range of PUCCH format 1 in TR 38.830 based on the link budget evaluation in Rel-17 as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scenarios | Target metrics | Channels  | MIL |
| Number of samples | Relative difference vs. PUCCH Format 1 |
| Urban 28GHz TDD NLOS O2I | Scenario dependent targetISD=200m | PRACH Format B4 | 6 | **-1.92** |
| Urban 28GHz TDD NLOS O2O | Scenario dependent targetISD=200m | PRACH Format B4 | 5 | **-7.57** |

Besides, companies have the following observations which may facilitate the determination of number of multiple PRACH transmission:

* [Huawei] Different beams covering different areas have different coupling loss due to the outdoor to indoor penetration and the tree penetration, which implies that different beams require different coverage enhancements.
* [ZTE] If the joint detection of the received PRACH repetitions can be performed at gNB side, the simulation results showed about **1.7~3.7 dB** and **3.7~5.2 dB** gain can be obtained by employing **2 repetitions** and **4 repetitions** respectively in case of PRACH repetition with same beam (@28GHz). It seems the 4 repetitions can hardly compensate the -7.57dB gap. So at least, **up to 8 repetitions** should be supported.
* [vivo] In Urban O2O scenario @28GHz, the performance gain of PRACH repetition is about **4.3dB** for **2 PRACH repetition** and **7.9dB** for **4 PRACH repetition**. In Urban O2I scenario @28GHz, the performance gain is about **3.1dB** for **2 PRACH repetition**, **6.3dB** for **4 PRACH repetition** and **9.3dB** for **8 PRACH repetition**. The additional gain of PRACH repetition with RO hopping is about 0.67dB compared to that of PRACH repetition without RO hopping.
* [Xiaomi] For FR2 in Urban@28GHz O2O scenario, about **2.9dB** and **5.1dB** performance gain can be obtained with **2** and **4 PRACH repetitions**, respectively.
* [Intel] About **2.1dB performance gain** can be achieved for PRACH transmission when **repetition level is doubled**. (@700MHz, PRACH format 0)

Regarding the candidate values, {2, 4, 8} PRACH transmissions are proposed by companies, detailed views are summarized as follows:

* [ZTE] The number of PRACH repetitions with **2, 4** and **8** is proposed for multiple PRACH transmissions.
* [LG] Support the repetition numbers of PRACH as similar level of repetition numbers for Msg. 3 PUSCH (e.g., 2, 4, and 8).
* [vivo] **Up to 4 PRACH repetitions** with same beam should be considered to compensate the maximum performance gap identified in Rel-17 when frequency hopping is not assumed.
* [Xiaomi] The maximum number of repetitions for PRACH enhancement is **8**.
* [MediaTek] At least, 4 or more transmissions should be allowed as the maximum transmission number in a single PRACH repetition set.
* [OPPO] Number of PRACH transmission among different PRACH repetition attempt can be same or different.
* [TCL] Collision factor between UEs should be considered when to determine the maximum number repetition of PRACH transmission.

#### Issue #7: Determination of the number of multiple PRACH transmission

As majority companies [ZTE, Huawei, Spreadtrum, vivo, China Telecom, OPPO, CATT, Intel, NEC, Lenovo, Xiaomi, CMCC, FGI, MediaTek, Apple, InterDigital, Samsung, LG, Qualcomm, Nokia] propose that the determination of the number of PRACH repetitions can be based on the SSB RSRP measurement. **One or more new SSB-RSRP thresholds** can be configured (e.g., in SIB 1) for different PRACH coverage levels, i.e., different number of PRACH repetitions.

Besides, some companies [ZTE, vivo, Panasonic, Qualcomm] think that multiple PRACH transmissions can also be enabled during the PRACH re-attempts in case of transmitting power or number of PRACH retransmissions reaching a threshold. In addition, [Panasonic] propose to support to use multiple PRACH transmissions **only after UE reaches maximum transmission power**.

Other companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* [vivo] Some of the configured parameters for Msg3 repetition could be considered to determine whether PRACH should be repeated. For example, RSRP threshold used for triggering Msg3 repetition can be no less than the RSRP threshold for triggering PRACH repetition.
* [Ericsson] Methods of determination and indication of repetition level of Rel-13 LTE eMTC/NB-IOT are used as starting points for Rel-18 multiple PRACH transmissions.
* [TCL, Lenovo] The number of multiple PRACH transmissions can be indicated explicitly via PRACH configuration table, e.g., add the number of repetitions in each line of the PRACH configuration table.
* [Nokia] UE selects a number of Msg1 repetitions based on expected UL link budget as a function of e.g., SS-RSRP measurements and corresponding number of Msg1 repetitions.

#### Issue #8: Multiple PRACH transmissions mapping to valid ROs

According to current spec., validation rules for ROs have been specified, and a UE only transmits PRACH in valid PRACH slots. Regarding multiple PRACH transmission, the validation rule also needs to be considered. [Ericsson] proposes that validation rules are **applied after** ROs for multiple PRACH occasions are determined for a specific number of PRACH transmissions, while [Qualcomm] propose that the counting of PRACH repetitions is **based on the valid ROs**. Moreover, [Qualcomm] propose that PRACH repetitions are only transmitted in the valid ROs associated with the same SSB at different time with the following order:

* First, in increasing order of time resource indexes for time multiplexed PRACH occasions within a PRACH slot.
* Second, in increasing order of indexes for PRACH slots.
* Third, in increasing order of indexes for PRACH association period.

### 2.1.4 Power control

Companies [Huawei, ZTE, CMCC, OPPO] discuss the power control and power ramping for multiple PRACH transmission. Regarding the power control part, [Huawei] observes that the power control formula of multiple transmission specified in eMTC PRACH coverage enhancement can be reused. Regarding the power ramping part, the following views are summarized:

* Within one PRACH attempt consists of multiple PRACH transmission,
	+ **Option 1:** Transmission power for each PRACH transmission is the same. The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss should be applied for each PRACH transmissions.
	+ **Option 2:** Transmission power is ramped one by one during multiple PRACH transmissions.
	FFS: The initial power and power ramping step.
* For inter-PRACH attempts, the power of PRACH is ramped with the increase of PRACH repetition attempt.
FFS: Whether similar power ramping principle as Rel-15 is reused, i.e., the power ramping counter increases during the RACH re-attempt if the selected UL Tx beam and the selected SSB doesn’t change, otherwise, the power ramping counter should be kept unchanged.

### 2.1.5 Others

* **SSB-to-RO mapping**

[Xiaomi] consider the following potential solutions for the mapping between SSBs and PRACH resources: The UE selects multiple TDMed valid ROs associated with the same SSB for mulitple PRACH transmssions. Multiple TDMed PRACH resources for PRACH repetitions are taken as one RO, and are associated with the same SSB.

[Nokia] RAN1 to analyze and specify optimizations to the framework for mapping of ROs-to-SSB indices targeting consecutive PRACH repetitions while limiting the number of SSB indices per time occasion.

* Multiple PRACH transmissions on multi panels

Considering UE who supports transmission on multiple panels, [ZTE] proposes three options for multiple PRACH transmissions on multiple panels.

* Option 1: Multiple PRACH transmissions always transmit in one panel. This is traditional way, through which channel reciprocity under TDD can be ensured.
* Option 2: Multiple PRACH transmissions simultaneously transmit in multiple panels. This needs higher UE capability. The benefit is aggregated transmitting power and panel diversity gain.
* Option 3: Multiple PRACH transmissions are hopping among the multiple panels. The benefit may be the panel diversity gain. But the latency of panel switch may not satisfy the multiple PRACH transmissions if the ROs for multiple PRACH are successive.
* Phase continuity for multiple PRACH transmissions

[NEC] observes that If multiple PRACH is transmitted on time continuous ROs with the same frequency and beam resources, and if PRACH is format A1/A2/A3, then there is no gap between each transmission but the phase is not continuous. Discontinuous phase will cause larger PAPR. Thus, it is suggested to study PRACH signal generation across time continuous PRACH occasion to maintain a continuty transmission phase.

## 2.2 Multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams

### 2.2.1 Potential use cases

#### Issue #9: Association between SSB and multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams

Notice that the objective doesn’t have a limitation on whether multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams is associated with same or different SSBs, companies [China Telecom, CATT] think there is a need to clarify this issue. Additional companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* [China Telecom] For multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams while associated with the same SSB, separate PRACH detection and RA-RNTI calculation mechanism may be helpful for UE Tx beam indication. For multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams while associated with different SSBs, some modification is needed for cell search procedure. Moreover, further discussion on how to perform multiple PRACH transmissions is needed for the following cases: the UE selected SSBs are associated with the same RO; the ROs associated with the selected SSBs are FDMed.
* [ETRI] Discuss whether a UE can generate multiple beams for PRACH from one SSB. If a UE can derive multiple beams from one SSB, then the UE may have multiple antenna panels or large antenna array in an antenna panel. Each antenna panel can be associated to a beam for PRACH, or an antenna array can generate multiple sharper beams than a SSB’s and all of those beams correspond to the same SSB. The latter case implies that the UE should monitor multiple SSBs for the Msg1 transmission. In addition, study the need for a switching gap between consecutive PRACH transmissions with different beams.

Moreover, based on the contributions, companies [ZTE, CATT, China Telecom, Intel, Spreadtrum, ETRI, Nokia, Ericsson, Samsung, Lenovo, TCL] identify three useful cases for multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams as follows:

* Case 1: UE Tx/Rx beam correspondence cannot be guaranteed, more than one PRACH are transmitted on ROs associated with the same SSB.
* Case 2: According to SSB-based measurement, the UE can determine a UL beam. Based on this beam, the UE can use multiple finer beams to send PRACH to obtain additional beamforming gain.
* Case 3: If multiple SSB measurements satisfy the threshold, UE transmits all/part of PRACHs in the ROs associated with corresponding SSBs, i.e., PRACH repetitions with different beams on the ROs associated with the different SSBs.



For Case 1 and Case 2, multiple PRACH is transmitted on ROs associated with the same SSB. While for Case 3, multiple PRACH is transmitted on ROs associated with different SSBs, which indicates that UE needs to select more than one SSB during the cell search phase, and this breaks the principle of initiating the RACH process oriented to an SSB.

In summary, Companies [TCL, Intel, Lenovo, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, Nokia, Ericsson] propose to support multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams, while companies [vivo, Sharp, MediaTek, CMCC, InterDigital, LG] think multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams should be deprioritized/not supported. Based on companies’ contributions, some Pros and Cons of multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams are summarized in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Props | Cons |
| * Latency reduces in multiple transmission with different beams as ROs of different beams are used for repetition.
* Multiple PRACH transmission with different beams increases robustness even for UE with beam correspondence.
* PRACH transmission with different beams could increase the possibility of being detected by any of the TRPs which may locate in different directions.
* Msg3 transmission may be transmitted with the best narrow beam observed during PRACH.
 | * BS has to indicate the association groups of beams, UEs select association group for repetition correspondingly, and extra operation is required to determine the RAR beam, which results in an increased complexity and signaling cost.
* The benefits and target scenarios are not clear.
* UE complexity will increase obviously.
* Larger spec. impact.
 |

### 2.2.2 Performance gain

Based on the contributions, companies [vivo, Ericsson, Nokia] provide some link-level simulation results as follows:

* [vivo] The performance gain of single beam repetition is **2.1dB better than that of multiple beam repetition** for the case of 8 PRACH repetitions. (@28GHz, PRACH format B4, CDL-A (DS 100ns) for different beams, TDL-A (DS 100ns) for single beam, soft combination within one PRACH signal for same beam)
* [Ericsson] For the same number of PRACH transmissions, **the transmission with different beams** (beam sweeping) has a **loss of about 5dB** compared with transmissions **with the same best beam**. **A single PRACH transmission with the best beam performs better than UE sweeping four beams**. (@28GHz, PRACH format B4, CDL-A (DS 100ns))
* [Ericsson] PRACH transmissions with **different beams (beam sweeping) outperforms** the transmissions with the **same wide beam** by **about 1dB** for the same number of transmissions. (@28GHz, PRACH format B4, CDL-A (DS 100ns))
* [Ericsson] About **2dB gain is observed when the number of PRACH transmissions doubles**, and the gain slightly decreases when the number of PRACH transmissions increases. It is observed for PRACH transmissions with the same best beam, the same wide beam, or with different beams. (@28GHz, PRACH format B4, CDL-A (DS 100ns))
* [Nokia] 4 PRACH repetitions with **a same wide beam** provide around **5dB gain** compared to single PRACH transmission with a wide beam. (@28GHz, PRACH format B4, CDL-A with 100ns delay spread, non-coherent combining at the receiver)
* [Nokia] 4 PRACH repetitions with **different beams provide a gain** of around **7dB** compared to the case of one single PRACH transmission with narrow beam pointing to the direction of maximum energy for the channel model under consideration. (@28GHz, PRACH format B4, CDL-A with 100ns delay spread, the single PRACH transmission pointing to the direction of maximum energy for the channel model, receiver does not perform repetition combining)
* [Nokia] Multiple PRACH transmissions with **different narrow beams perform** **better** than multiple PRACH transmission with a same wide beam. (Comparison of SNR values at 99% detection probability, 4 PRACH transmissions with same wide transmission beam is -13dB, 4 PRACH transmissions with different narrow beams is -17dB)

Regarding the simulation, companies [MediaTek, Ericsson] proposed to consider the following two cases:

* Case 1: UE without *beamCorrespondence* feature support.
* Case 2: UE with *beamCorrespondence* feature support.

Regarding the simulation assumptions, companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* [Ericsson] Simulate UEs with up to eight antenna elements (with 4 dual polarized antenna pairs). CDL-A in 38.901 is used for simulation.
* [Nokia] RAN1 to use LLS for investigating the performance of multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams. Analyze only an urban scenario at 28GHz with a more realistic number of UE antenna elements equal to 4.

### 2.2.3 Others

* Resource configuration

[Huawei] PRACH resource assignment in multiple transmissions with different beams is similar to that in multiple transmissions with the same beam, but at a granularity of beam groups rather than beams.

* Power control

[Huawei] The power control of multiple transmission with different beams should be studied.

[ZTE] The power should remain unchanged in case of multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams.

* Transmission scheme

[NEC] For multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams, opportunity type is applied, where opportunity type means to detect preamble on each of PRACH occasion among multiple occasions.

[Samsung] UE will be allowed to select multiple DL beams (e.g., SSBs) to enable the multiple PRACH transmission. For example, each SSB with only one RACH transmission is kept as in current NR RACH framework. As an example shown in following figure, each SSB associated with two ROs. Then the UE could select two SSBs and transmit one PRACH with each of the selected SSB, overall two PRACH transmissions from the same UE are allowed. By using this method, the potential benefit is that mostly the RACH resource and determination procedure could follow current RACH framework, connection latency can be additionally improved, and different TRPs can be accessed by the UE, but how to handle the multiple RACH procedure or follow-up feedback from gNB needs further study.



Fig.2 – Illustration of RO bundle with associated SSBs.

* Indication of the best UL Tx beam

[Mavenir] Under the PRACH sweeping scenario, it is beneficial to indicate to UE the best Tx beam of preamble transmission detected by the network, which could be used by UE for Msg3 transmission. 3 potential options are provided and could be considered and discussed as below:

* Option1: by MAC RAR.
* Option2: by PDSCH (Msg2) DMRS.
* Option3: by PDSCH (Msg2) CRC mask.
* Beam association

[Huawei] Beam association group where each beam in this group is used to transmit the same preamble repeatedly is the main characteristic in multiple transmission with different beams. The number of beam association groups and the number of associated beams in one group should be small values.

## 2.3 Interaction between multiple PRACH transmissions and other transmission with repetition

When multiple PRACH transmissions is enabled, it may have some interaction with other transmissions, e.g., Msg3 repetitions. Companies [ZTE, Spreadtrum, OPPO, vivo, CATT, Intel, FGI, Qualcomm, Ericsson] think the coupling/interaction between PRACH repetitions, Msg.3 repetitions (and PUCCH repetitions for HARQ-ACK of Msg4) should be investigated. Moreover, companies [OPPO, CMCC] propose to study joint design of PRACH and Msg.3 repetition.

Besides, [Ericsson] has the following observations based on link-level simulation and propose to study how Msg3 performance can be improved by PRACH transmissions with different beams:

* In FR2, the required SNR for Msg3 with 8 repetitions and inter-slot frequency hopping at 10% BLER is 1.7 dB higher than that of a single PRACH transmission with a wide beam and 8 dB higher than a single PRACH transmission with the best beam for 1% missed detection. The gap could be 4.5 dB more for 10% mis-detection rate.
* With Rel-18 PRACH enhancement, the performance gap between Msg1 and Msg3 would grow. Msg3 needs further enhancement to be on par with Rel-18 PRACH.

## 2.4 CBRA and CFRA

Based on the contributions, companies [ZTE, Spreadtrum, vivo, Panasonic, NTT DOCOMO, Ericsson, Sony, Qualcomm, Ericsson] propose to support multiple PRACH transmission for both **CBRA** and **CFRA**. Applying multiple PRACH transmissions to CFRA can improve PRACH detection rate in SNR limited scenarios, which is essential to the cases of handover and beam failure recovery. Moreover, for CFRA, it is more flexible for network to configure the PRACH resources for PRACH repetition as dedicated signalling can be applied.

## 2.5 Others

* Frequency hopping

[Intel, Apple] propose to support PRACH frequency hopping. In addition, [Intel] observes that for 2 and 4 PRACH repetitions with frequency hopping, ~2.5dB performance gain can be achieved compared to PRACH repetitions without frequency hopping.

* Coverage enhancement for FWA scenario

[ZTE] proposes to study potential coverage enhancements for PRACH in FWA scenario to address the demands from practical network deployment.

* Impact of maximum permissible exposure (MPE)

[Samsung] proposes to further study multiple PRACH transmission enhancements when UE experiences MPE issues, e.g., impact of MPE on: number of multiple PRACH transmission, power settings, the trigger for multiple PRACH transmission.

* Switching Tx filter within RO boundaries

[Nokia] Investigate mechanisms for switching Tx filter within RO boundaries for short PRACH formats.

1. Email discussion (1st round)

## 3.1 Multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams

### 3.1.1 Resource configuration for multiple PRACH transmissions

#### Proposal 1

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, down-select from the following options.**

* Option 1: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with shared preambles on shared ROs, i.e., no separate ROs or preambles are defined for multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: detailed scheme, e.g., partitioning the existing legacy ROs for single and multi PRACH transmissions.
* Option 2: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with separate preamble on shared ROs.
	+ FFS: detailed scheme, e.g., whether to utilize the separate PRACH resources for requesting Msg3 repetition.
* Option 3: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs, where the ROs are determined based on legacy PRACH configuration.
	+ FFS: detailed scheme, e.g., introduce a frequency and/or time domain offset to define additional ROs, whether utilizing separate preambles for different number of PRACH transmissions, SSB-to-RO mapping.
* Option 4: Multiple PRACH are transmitted based on separate PRACH configuration.
	+ FFS: detailed scheme, e.g., consider a NB-IoT-like mechanism for PRACH repetition, the separate PRACH configuration including time and frequency domain resource, repetition number etc., for different coverage levels.
* Other options are not precluded.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Intel | We would like to understand better on the intention of the proposal. Is this mainly for differentiation between single PRACH transmission and multiple PRACH transmissions with same Tx beams or between different PRACH repetition levels for multiple PRACH transmission with same Tx beam? For Option 1, we do not know how the PRACH performance improvement can be achieved if the gNB does not know whether this is for single PRACH transmission or multiple PRACH transmission. For Option 2 and Option 3, we suggest to remove the detailed schemes after e.g., We have different understanding on the examples. For instance, for Option 3, “introduce a frequency and/or time domain offset to define additional ROs”, as this is based on legacy PRACH configuration, it is not clear to us why we need to introduce time/freq. offset. For Option 4, we do not quite follow separate PRACH configuration. Does that mean we will introduce a new PRACH configurable row in the PRACH configuration table? We do not think this is desirable considering the large spec impact. Based on the discussions above, we suggest to remove Option 1 and Option 4. We also think a combination of Option 2 and Option 3 can be supported, similar to Msg3 PUSCH repetition. **For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, ~~down-select from~~ consider the following options.*** ~~Option 1: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with shared preambles on shared ROs, i.e., no separate ROs or preambles are defined for multiple PRACH transmissions.~~
	+ ~~FFS: detailed scheme, e.g., partitioning the existing legacy ROs for single and multi PRACH transmissions.~~
* Option 2: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with separate preamble on shared ROs.
	+ FFS: detailed scheme, ~~e.g., whether to utilize the separate PRACH resources for requesting Msg3 repetition.~~
* Option 3: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs, where the ROs are determined based on legacy PRACH configuration.
	+ FFS: detailed scheme, ~~e.g., introduce a frequency and/or time domain offset to define additional ROs, whether utilizing separate preambles for different number of PRACH transmissions, SSB-to-RO mapping.~~
* ~~Option 4: Multiple PRACH are transmitted based on separate PRACH configuration.~~
	+ ~~FFS: detailed scheme, e.g., consider a NB-IoT-like mechanism for PRACH repetition, the separate PRACH configuration including time and frequency domain resource, repetition number etc., for different coverage levels.~~
* Other options are not precluded.
 |
| CATT | Our understanding of the proposal is to discuss whether the RO/preambles are shared or separated for single PRACH transmissions and multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam. But the proposal seems not clear.For Option 1, we share the same view as Intel and also suggest removing Option 1.The difference between Option 3 and Option 4 is not clear. Our understanding is that both options support separate PRACH configurations (i.e. ROs) for PRACH repetitions and single PRACH transmissions. The difference is that Option 3 does not introduce new entries in the existing PRACH configuration tables defined in 38.211 while Option 4 does. We think it is second-level details and can be included in the FFS and there is no need to differentiate Option 3 and Option 4 at this point. |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal to further discuss the four options.For option 1, we think possible performance gain can come from the multiple PRACH transmissions even though gNB does not know whether this is for single PRACH transmission or multiple PRACH transmission. For example, if the successful detection probability for one PRACH transmission is p, then the successful detection probability for N independent PRACH transmissions can be 1- (1-p)^N. We agree with the pros/cons analysis in section 2.1.1. From our perspective, we are open to two kinds of solutions:* Simple spec impact, without joint detection for multiple PRACH transmissions, i.e. gNB does not know multiple PRACH transmissions are subject to repetitions for single PRACH transmission or independent multiple PRACH transmissionS.

More spec impact, with joint detection for multiple PRACH transmissions, i.e. gNB can know multiple PRACH transmissions are subject to repetitions for single PRACH transmission or independent multiple PRACH transmissions. |
| Panasonic | We would like to clarify the meaning of main bullet. Does “multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams” mean that* Alt. 1: There are multiple PRACH transmissions and multiple beams
	+ A subset of multiple PRACH transmissions is sent based on each of multiple beams
* Alt. 2: There are multiple PRACH transmissions and a same beam, i.e., there is a typo in “same beams”

Can FL clarify the intention of the main bullet (Alt. 1 or Alt. 2 or other)? |
| FL | Thanks for the comments. The initial intention of the proposal is to identify how to configure/allocate the resources for multiple PRACH transmission. Based on the contributions, from FL perspective, companies’ related proposals can be summarized into the above options. Regarding how to separate single PRACH transmission and multiple PRACH transmissions, it may be related to the resource configuration, which can be further discussed.@ Panasonic, from FL point of view, it indicates Alt.2, if companies prefer to delete the “s” as “multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~”, I’m ok to revise this. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer option 2. We are fine with the proposal, though similar to Intel and CATT, we think option 1 can be removed.  |
| LG | Regarding the Option 1, it does not distinguish the RO and the preamble index between single transmission and multiple transmissions, so if we support Option 1, the gNB may not know which preamble is for repeated transmission. Therefore, the gNB should accumulate all preambles respectively, and at the same time, the gNB should send the RAR for all successful preambles, even if the preambles were actually used for repeated transmissions. It means the UE should monitor the RARs after every single preamble transmission, then the UE complexity will be increased.Regarding the Option 3, it is an appropriate option when RACH resources are not significantly needed, such as IAB. In other words, it may be not preferred for PRACH repetition because it is difficult to allocate a large number of ROs using offsets from legacy PRACH configurations.Therefore, we prefer to remove the Option 1 and Option 3 in this proposal. |
| vivo | To avoid long latency and reduce the impact to legacy PRACH transmission，we propose to have first repetition to be shared with legacy RO and configure a set of ROs after (via a slot level offset) a set of legacy ROs (e.g. legacy ROs in one PRACH slot) for remaining PRACH repetitions. This would be a combination of option 2 and option 3 if we understand the definition of option 2 and 3 correctly.For option 1: Is it correct understanding that this is for the case of multiple independent PRACH transmission wherein gNB doesn’t have to know whether the PRACH transmissions are from single UE or from multiple UEs? If the answer is yes, then these multiple PRACH transmissions could be mapped to different SSBs since it’s up to UE to determine the SSB for PRACH resource selection for different PRACH transmissions.For option 4, this is completely independent separate RO configuration for PRACH repetition, right? But this seems covered by option 3. Regarding whether different repetition levels should be supported, we’re open to discuss and it depends on how we determine the maximum number of repetitions being discussed in other section.Another comment is for “**same beams**” the main body text, it should be “**same beam~~s~~**” given only single is assumed for all repetitions. |
| Samsung  | If the intention of the proposal is to discuss whether to allow shared RO/preamble and/or separate RO/preamble for multiple PRACH transmission, we think this proposal could be simplified as following: **For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, considering to use shared RACH resource and/or separate RACH resource (including RO and/or preamble) with legacy single PRACH transmission.****FFS details.** |
| CMCC | Our first preference is to make gNB knows that how many times a UE transmit PRACH based on mechanism like a separate RO and/ or separate preamble. We do not want gNB to blind detect all the possible candidate of repetition factors, which may cause too much complicity. |
| Spreadtrum | We have a confusion about the definition of the “shared RO” and “separate RO”. For the example sentence "**partitioning the existing legacy ROs for single and multi PRACH transmissions.**" in Option1, if the existing legacy ROs will be partitioned for single and multi PRACH transmissions, from our point of view, it should be called separate RO and shared preamble are not exists. So we proposed the example sentence should be moved to Option 3.  |
| ZTE | Explanation for option 4, the separate PRACH configuration means the whole structure of the RRC configuration for PRACH is new compared to the legacy RRC configuration. An example is the NB-IoT RACH resource configuration. We also think option 1 is not helpful for gNB to identify whether the multiple PRACH transmission is used and the reception combination gain cannot be achieved which deviates from the motivation of this WI. For Option 3, the mechanism is similar as IAB RACH. The proportion of UEs at the cell edge need the coverage enhancement is not so much, and the resource allocation is feasible for the PRACH repetition. I share the view from CATT, that we could merge the Option 3 and Option 4 to a higher level Option as “**Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs**”We observed some companies propose the multiple PRACH transmissions can be based on the separate RO and share RO together if any, then we suggest adding the following Option 5, * Option 5: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs and shared ROs if any,
	+ FFS: detailed scheme.

It is possible that the different options can be used for different cases respectively. And it is also possible the combination of some options is feasible. |
| Lenovo | We don’t think option 1 is needed. Same with CATT and other, option 3 and option 4 can be combined, since they both are regarding configuring separate ROs for PRACH repetition. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share the concerns already expressed by other companies on Option 1. We do not see the rationale behind it since it does not provide any constructive means to gNB for differentiating among different UEs (repeating and not repeating Msg1) and exposes gNB to high false alarm rate (i.e., gNB assesses that Msg1 is being repeated when this is not happening).Option 2, 3 and 4 do not have the same problem.We share Intel’s opinion on the ambiguity brought by everything after the “e.g.” in all sub-bullets. We are not sure all companies have the same feeling about what we write after an “e.g.”, hence we prefer removing it.Concerning Option 3, we are not sure its current wording is sufficient, since it exposes RAN1 to ambiguities in the understanding (which may trigger very long and unneeded discussions later on similar Rel-17 maintenance discussions on FH for DMRS bundling). With this spirit in mind, we suggest the following modification to Option 3:* Option 3: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs, where the ROs are determined based at least on legacy PRACH configuration.

Additionally, we have a first question for the FL:*What is the meaning of RO determination in the proposed Options? Is it a determination of the resources among which the UE can choose one or more to transmit Msg1, or is it rather the selection of the ROs used for the transmission out of the available configured ROs?*We believe this clarification is very important to avoid misunderstandings.Finally, we would also like to highlight that we see no comment (but from one company) on the following fundamental aspects that should be considered for ensuring that the performance of PRACH repetitions is on par with the expectations:* Collision probability
* Possibility for gNB to understand how many times a UE is repeating PRACH
* Possibility for gNB to identify one UE during PRACH repetition to reduce probability of misdetection.
* Efficiency of the PRACH configuration

In this context, we think this can be achieved only if a structured approach to RO configuration is considered, i.e., if certain relationships are introduced among the ROs selected by UE to transmit Msg1 with repetitions. Such relationships would form sequences/bundles/groups of ROs that are used by the UE to transmit Msg1, such that gNB may know how many times Msg1 is being repeated and which ROs are to be checked for the presence of a repetition. This would provide a lot of information to gNB to implement highly performing detection algorithms and ensure that the expected performance increase is observable on the field. This brings us to ask a second question for the FL:*Do options 2, 3 and 4 allow for such discussion to take place after this proposal is agreed, or should a suitable Option 5 be included?* |
| Sony | I have similar views with Spreadtrum regarding Option 1, on what is the meaning of “shared” preambles on “shared” ROs. Does this mean:1. The gNB does not distinguish between PRACH repetitions and legacy single PRACH transmissions? That is, the UE just transmit multiple PRACH and hope one of them gets through whilst the gNB does not combine any of the repetitions?
2. The legacy ROs and preambles are partitioned, where some ROs are use for part of PRACH repetitions, e.g. the 1st repetition can use the same preamble/RO as the legacy UE, whilst remaining repetitions uses different preamble/ROs?
3. The legacy ROs and preambles are partitioned and distinct. That is we have less preambles/ROs for legacy UEs.

Same question on the word “shared” in Option 2, would appreciate some clarification.Option 3 is also confusing. This can mean:1. The legacy ROs are partitioned into 2 partitions where, one partition is exclusively for legacy whilst another partition is for Rel-18 PRACH repetitions.
2. Brand new ROs are defined and are configured exclusively for Rel-18 PRACH repetitions whilst the legacy ROs are not touched and used only for legacy UEs.

I believe Option 4 is a new definition of RO, as it referred to NB-IoT where one RO consists of multiple PRACH resources. That is 1 RO can be 8 slots long.We would appreciate clarification on all the options. |
| MediaTek | We support the FL’s proposal. We prefer Option3 or Option4. These options are similar, and they can be combined together. We have concern on Option1 and Option2 due to higher risk of collisions. With multiple UEs transmitting multiple PRACH transmissions, collision risk will become too high for CBRA if shared ROs are used. |
| InterDigital | We are OK with the proposal to study these options.  |
| Fujitsu | For option1, it is hard for gNB to distinguish legacy PRACH from multiple PRACH, accordingly the contention rate between legacy and multiple PRACH transmission will increase. For other options, we are open to discuss. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the part of option3 that multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs. We support that introducing some new PRACH configurations to configure different ROs for different SSB beams, such like, only selecting a part of SSBs for enhancement or enhancing SSBs differently by their enhancement levels. It is motivated to adapt to the different coverage deficit of different FR2 beams. |
| Ericsson | Firstly, we would echo other’s companies comment/clarification that we should further discuss, rather than down-select among the proposals at this first meeting on PRACH enhancements. Regarding Option 1, firstly, we have the similar comment as Spreadtrum that the sub-bullet "partitioning the existing legacy ROs for single and multi PRACH transmissions" may result in separate ROs for single and multiple PRACH transmissions and conflicts with the main bullet. As many companies mentioned, Option 1 means there is no partitioning between single and multi PRACH transmissions, and thus, gNB can't tell the PRACH repetition factor from the received preamble(s). We share the same view as Intel and CATT. If there is no indication to gNB of K, the PRACH repetition factor, it is difficult for gNB to associate multiple PRACHs with a UE, the performance gain is question mark. Furthermore, how can we specify the candidate values of K?Regarding “the ROs are determined based on legacy PRACH configuration” in Option 3, in our view, “legacy PRACH configuration” includes those specified in Rel-17 RACH Indication and Partitioning framework WI, led by RAN2, for example, *additionalRACH-ConfigCommonList-r17*, copied below. In Rel-17, RedCap, Small Data, Coverage Enhancement, and Slicing need early indication. The Rel-16 PRACH configuration alone is not sufficient to accommodate all the new partitions. In Rel-17 these features can form feature combinations (FC) and be assigned additional ROs different from legacy ROs by *rach-ConfigCommon-r17* of *additionalRACH-ConfigCommonList-r17* in order to reduce the impact on legacy UEs. It is a more mature method than "a frequency and/or time domain offset to define additional ROs", which doesn't belong to legacy PRACH configuration. It is left to RAN2 how to configure separate ROs for Rel-18 multiple PRACH transmissions, together with other Rel-18 features which request early indication.We provide a revision as follows.Updated Proposal 1**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, consider one or more of the following options.*** [omitted]
* Option 3: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs, where the ROs are determined based on legacy PRACH configuration.
	+ FFS: detailed scheme, e.g., ~~introduce a frequency and/or time domain offset to define additional ROs, whether utilizing separate preambles for different number of PRACH transmissions~~, SSB-to-RO mapping, configuration of separate ROs for Rel-18 multiple PRACH transmissions, like reusing *additionalRACH-ConfigCommonList-r17* (RAN2).
* [omitted]

We share Intel’s concern on Option 4 and would like to understand the “separate PRACH configuration” are legacy configurations or new ones? If it means legacy configurations, it is the same as Option 3. |
| Sharp | We generally have same view with Intel. |
| OPPO | We share the view that option2 and option3 are main candidate options for further study. It is preferred to have TDM ROs spanning short time duration for multiple PRACH, in order to reduce latency of multiple PRACH transmission. Multiple PRACH on shared ROs requires optimized parameter configured for SSB-to-RO mapping to achieve short latency. There will have some restriction to legacy PRACH resource configuration. Separate ROs for multiple PRACH allow optimization on the ROs configuration, for e.g. time continuous ROs, fine SSB-to-RO mapping, and so on. Therefore, we prefer option3. In this stage, we can leave high level option2 and option3 as candidates. The detailed scheme can be further studied.  |
| Apple | From our side, the option 2 and option 3 can be further studied, and these two options can work together without the need of down selection. For Option 3, it’s not clear that the RO is based on legacy configuration, why SSB-to RO mapping needs to study further. |

To facilitate the discussion, companies are also encouraged to provide your preference on the above options.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Preferred Options** |
| Intel | We prefer Option 2 + Option 3. |
| CATT | Option 2+ Option 3 (Option 4 is combined with Option 3) |
| FGI  | Option 3 or option 4 |
| DOCOMO | We prefer “option 2 + option 3” or option 4. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer option 2. |
| LG | We prefer to support Option 2 and Option 4. |
| vivo | We prefer Option 2 + Option 3 if our understanding of the definition of options is correct. |
| Samsung  | All option 2,3,4 could be considered further. |
| CMCC | We prefer to further study all the options except option 1 |
| Spreadtrum | Option 3 or option4 |
| ZTE | We prefer Option 3 and other pptions are not precluded as we can accept the different options can be used for different cases respectively or the combination of some options.  |
| Lenovo | We prefer Option 2 and Option 3/Option 4 (FFS which option to configure separate ROs) |
| Sony | The options need clarifications but we are supportive of defining new/additional ROs for Rel-18 PRACH repetitions where some of the repetitions, e.g. the 1st repetition, can use legacy ROs. The gNB should know whether an RO belongs to a repetition or not so that it can combine them otherwise we lose the main benefit of repetition, i.e. combining gains.Option 1 and Option 3 seem to be suggesting what we prefer, if the word “share” in option 1 means the some ROs can be used for legacy and Rel-18 PRACH repetition whilst others are exclusively for Rel-18 PRACH repetitions. |
| MediaTek | We prefer Option 3 and Option 4. |
| ETRI | Prefer option 3 and 4. Option 2 can be further discussed. |
| InterDigital | Prefer Option 2 and Option 3 to facilitate identification/correlation at gNB receiver. |
| Fujitsu | Option 2, Option3 or Option4 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer the multiple PRACH are transmitted on the separate ROs that are independent from the legacy ROs. In this way, BS can distinguish the enhanced UEs from legacy UEs, and combine the power of multiple transmitted preambles for better coverage performance. It avoids impacting on legacy UEs, such as, increasing collision probability of legacy UEs due to occupying legacy PRACH resource for repetition. It also helps reduce transmission latency for the PRACH repetition.We prefer to define different coverage enhancement levels (i.e. number of repetitions) for SSBs and assign different ROs for SSBs according to their enhancement levels. We have to note that different analog beams are hard to generate in the same time slot and the TDMed PRACH ROs are limited, which implies a conflict. To deal with this conflict, the number of additional TDMed ROs associated with different beams should be limited to different small values for low-latency preamble repeat transmissions as SSB beams could have significantly different coupling loss. For example, only select a part of SSBs for enhancement, or rank SSBs enhancement level and enhance SSBs differently by their enhancement levels.Moreover, in the enhanced PRACH resource, enhanced UEs should be permitted to select PRACH repetition times adaptively to improve PRACH resource efficiency. It implies that repetition ROs should be shared among different repetition levels by using different preamble sets. |
| Ericsson | Option 2 and modified Option 3, with a question to Option 4 |
| Sharp | Option 2 + Option 3 |
| OPPO | Option 2 and Option 3 as candidates for further study. In our view, we prefer option3.  |
| Apple  | Option 2 + Option 3 |

#### Proposal 2

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, only TDMed ROs can be utilized for the transmissions.**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Intel | A clarification question: does this imply that multiple PRACH transmissions in different ROs cannot be multiplexed in a FDM manner in different time instances? Our understanding is that we also need to consider the freq. hopping for multiple PRACH transmissions to improve the link budget, similar to what was defined for eMTC. |
| CATT | We agree with the proposal. |
| FGI | We agree with this limitation for this release. |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Panasonic | Assuming multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam (not beams), we support that only TDMed ROs can be utilized for the transmissions. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| LG | Support in principle. To be clearer, we can modify the proposal 2 as follows.**Proposal 2a****For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, only ROs located at different times (e.g., starting OFDM symbol or RACH slot) ~~TDMed ROs~~ can be utilized for the transmissions.** |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal in principle.We assume this does not preclude the RO hopping for multiple PRACH transmissions, to make it clear, it might be good to add an FFS on whether RO hopping can be supported. On top of that, considering only single beam should be assumed for multiple PRACH transmissions, we propose to have following updates.Proposal 2**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, only TDMed ROs can be utilized for the transmissions.*** FFS whether RO hopping is supported for multiple PRACH transmissions.
 |
| Samsung | We share the intention of the proposal, some wording change:**At least TDMed ROs can be utilized for the multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams in one attempt.****FFS other options.** |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | We agree with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. @Intel, frequency hopping is not a FDM manner and won’t be precluded by this proposal. |
| Lenovo | Support the proposal in general. To avoid any misunderstanding, suggest revising the proposal to “**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, FDMed ROs in a same time instance is not supported. ~~only TDMed ROs can be utilized for the transmissions.~~”** |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with the spirit of the proposal and support LG’s modification |
| Sony | Support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| ETRI | Support |
| InterDigital | Agree with proposal, can be fine with Samsung wording change. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with FL’s proposal in principle. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support that only TDMed ROs can be utilized for multiple PRACH transmissions for power accumulation. |
| Ericsson | We support TDMed PRACH transmissions. Meanwhile, we have some thoughts on simultaneous PRACH transmissions.UEs with multiple Tx chains may benefit from Tx diversity, and might also in some cases benefit from additional power. In such UEs, simultaneously transmitting of PRACHs on different Tx chains carrying different PRACH preambles or in different ROs at least does not reduce Tx power (unlike single Tx). There may also be benefits in latency, since preambles transmitted by a UE are then spread less over time (but are spread over frequency or sequence). Also, we note that this is similar to frequency hopping, and where frequency hopping has gains, there should also be Tx diversity. **So, we would propose to further study simultaneous PRACH transmissions from different Tx chains, and therefore not limit to only TDMd ROs**. |
| Sharp | We support the FL proposal. |
| OPPO | We support TDMed ROs for multiple PRACH transmissions.  |
| Apple | We support this proposal. |

#### Proposal 3

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, same PRACH preamble is utilized during the transmissions.**

* + FFS: whether a different preamble can be utilized for re-transmission.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Our understanding is that for each re-transmission, UE can randomly select one preamble for PRACH. It is not clear to us whether the FFS is needed. To make the proposal clear, we suggest the following update:**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, same PRACH preamble is utilized during the multiple PRACH transmissions.*** + ~~FFS: whether a different preamble can be utilized for re-transmission.~~
 |
| CATT | We have the same understanding as Intel and agree with the update from Intel. |
| FGI | We propose to modify the proposal a little bit for further clarifying E.g., the same PRACH preamble is utilized during each attempt of a RA procedure |
| DOCOMO | We think it may be related with whether joint detection is required, and also related with Proposal 1. For example, if option 1 in Proposal 1 is supported, joint detection is not possible. It seems not necessary to keep the same preamble on different repetitions. |
| Panasonic | Assuming multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam (not beams), we support that same PRACH preamble is utilized during the transmissions. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with proposal. In general, we think either the same preamble should be used for all the repetitions or the preambles for different copies should be determined uniquely based on the preamble of the first copy.  |
| LG | Agree with Intel. |
| Vivo | We share similar view as Intel that for PRACH retransmission (reattempt after RAR window and back off time), PRACH sequence is selected by UE implementation, it could be random. “multiple PRACH” seems not necessarily repeated in the main bullet.Furthermore, only single beam should be assumed for PRACH transmissions.According to above, we propose to have following updates:Proposal 3**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, same PRACH preamble is utilized during the transmissions.*** ~~FFS: whether a different preamble can be utilized for re-transmission.~~
 |
| Samsung | Suggested change:**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, at least support same PRACH preamble is utilized for all transmissions in the multiple PRACH transmissions ~~during the transmissions.~~*** + FFS: whether a different preamble can be utilized **in different ~~all~~ transmissions in the multiple PRACH transmissions** ~~for re-transmission~~.
 |
| CMCC | Fine. |
| Spreadtrum | We suggest making some minor changes to this proposal like “**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, same PRACH preamble is utilized during the transmissions in one RACH attempt.**” |
| ZTE | We think this proposal is fine for CBRA. For CFRA, as the preamble for different repetitions can be configured directly by gNB, it is feasible to further optimize the preamble for multiple PRACH transmissions to achieve the performance gain due to the reduction of collision probability by randomized preamble indexes. So we suggest updating the proposal for further study. Updated Proposal 3**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams under CBRA, same PRACH preamble is utilized during the transmissions.*** + FFS: whether a different preamble can be utilized for re-transmission.
	+ FFS: whether a different preamble can be utilized during multiple PRACH transmissions under CFRA.
 |
| Lenovo | Support the proposal in general. Prefer to remove the FFS. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Intel. Not sure that differentiation between CBRA and CFRA is needed. We do not understand which collision probability should be reduced for CFRA by randomizing preamble indices, since CFRA should never have collisions. |
| Sony | Support the proposal with an editorial:**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, same PRACH preamble is utilized during the transmissions.*** + FFS: whether a different preamble can be utilized for re-transmission.
 |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal. We prefer removing the FFS. UE should be able to use a different preamble for the next PRACH transmission set (after/if the first PRACH attempt fails), which is the legacy behavior for single transmission case.  |
| ETRI | Support |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal without FFS. Multiple preamble indices may also complicate MAC procedure.  |
| Fujitsu | We have similar view with Intel, and support updated Proposal by Intel. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For lower complexity, we support that the same preamble should be utilized during the transmission for multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam. |
| Ericsson | We support repetition of the same preamble. Meanwhile, we would like to study the benefit of transmissions of different preambles. For example, a UE at cell border transmits preamble#0 multiple times would cause large interference to the same PRACH transmissions from another UE in the neighboring cell. The selection of different preambles is based on a preamble pattern. The interference can be mitigated if the two UEs use different preamble patterns.  |
| Sharp | We are OK with the Intel’s modification. |
| OPPO | We support same preamble is used for one multiple PRACH transmissions attempt with same beam. Whether the same preamble is used among more than one multiple PRACH transmission attempts is FFS.We propose to have following updates:**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, same PRACH preamble is utilized during ~~the transmissions~~ one multiple PRACH attempt.*** + ~~FFS: whether a different preamble can be utilized for re-transmission.~~

FFS: whether same preamble can be shared for more than one multiple PRACH attempts. |
| Apple | We support this proposal and Intel’s updates. |

### 3.1.2 RAR window and RA-RNTI calculation

#### Proposal 4

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, down-select one option from the following options.**

* Option 1: One RAR window per each PRACH transmission, the RAR window follows the legacy design.
* Option 2: One RAR window per *K* PRACH transmissions, a RAR window starts after *K* PRACH transmissions.
	+ Note: *K* is less than the number of multiple PRACH transmissions.
* Option 3: One RAR window for all of the multiple PRACH transmission.
	+ FFS: the start position of the RAR window.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the proposal. For Option 2, we may need to add a sub-bullet for the determination of K values.* Option 2: One RAR window per *K* PRACH transmissions, a RAR window starts after *K* PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: details on K
	+ Note: *K* is less than the number of multiple PRACH transmissions.

One thing for clarification: for Option 1 and 2, if multiple RAR windows overlap in time, do we consider it as single RAR window or still multiple RAR windows?  |
| CATT | In our understanding, Option 2 includes Option 1 when *K*=1 so Option 1 can be removed.One minor editorial comment for Option 3: * Option 3: One RAR window for all of the multiple PRACH transmissions.
 |
| FGI | It seems current proposal 2 is a kind of implementation of proposal 3 i.e., K=FFS of option 3. |
| DOCOMO | Generally fine with the proposal. It should be noted that RAR solution is highly dependent on whether gNB can identify multiple PRACH repetitions, i.e. the PRACH resource configuration design will impact feasibility of these options.  |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal 4. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal. We prefer option 3. |
| LG | Regarding Option 1, it has the advantage of not having to change the specification, but the UE complexity will be increased since the UE should monitor multiple RARs during multiple PRACH transmissions. Regarding Option 2, it is not beneficial since the specification should be changed and the UE complexity will be increased as well. Therefore, we prefer to support Option 3.  |
| vivo | Some minor updates from our side on top of the updates from Intel:Proposal 4**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, down-select one option from the following options.*** Option 1: One RAR window per each PRACH transmission, the RAR window follows the legacy design.
* Option 2: One RAR window per *K* PRACH transmissions, a RAR window starts after *K* PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: details on K
	+ Note: *K* is less than the number of multiple PRACH transmissions.
* Option 3: One RAR window for all of the multiple PRACH transmission.
	+ FFS: the start position of the RAR window.

Option 3 is preferred to avoid RAR window optimization. |
| Samsung | We did not see the use case or motivation of option2 so far, but we can live with it in current listed options  |
| CMCC | Generally fine with this proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with proposal 4. We prefer option 3. For options 1 and 2, there may be some overlap between two or more RAR windows. UE may need to detect DCI scrambled with two RA-RNTIs in the overlapping area, which may increase the UE complexity. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal.  |
| Lenovo | Support the proposal. And actually option 2 can include option 1 when K=1. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with CATT, Option 2 with K=1 is identical to Option 1.We do cannot see any reference to RA-RNTI in these options. We propose adding an FFS about it for Option 2 and Option 3. We are not ready to assume that all will work out properly (it may, but what if RAN1 finds problems down the road?) |
| Sony | It should be noted that RAR Window and RO are separately configured at the moment and so K in Option 2 may not even be a fixed value. There is no reason where there can be a RAR window after 2 ROs and then another RAR window after another 3 ROs. Also depending on how RAR Window and ROs are configured there may not even be a RAR Window during the ROs. Trying to fix K to some arbitrary value would just introduce extra specs complexity that we think is totally unnecessary.We would suggest an FFS on the value K in Option 2, to make it more aligned with current specification, i.e.:* Option 2: One RAR window per K PRACH transmissions, a RAR window starts after K PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: details on K, e.g. K may depends on RAR Window configuration
	+ Note: K may be less than the number of multiple PRACH transmissions.
 |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal. We have preference for Option 2 or Option 3 for the moment. However, we prefer to make the down-selection at a later stage. The reason is, we see some interplay with other aspects of PRACH configuration. For example, it’s important to know the maximum transmission number that we support for multiple PRACH transmissions. In addition, the time/frequency PRACH resources, and the triggering mechanism of a specific transmission number at UE are also related to this down-selection for RAR window. |
| ETRI | Support |
| InterDigital | We are ok to have proposal to list these options, but do not see much justification for Options 1 and 2. |
| Fujitsu | We are generally fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Option 3 for lower complexity. |
| Ericsson | Generally fine with the spirit of the proposal, except for the typo on Option 3 as pointed out by CATT. Also, at this stage of the work, we think the proposal should be “further study” rather than downselect, i.e.:**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, further study at least ~~down-select one option from~~ the following options** |
| Sharp | We are OK with the FL proposal. |
| OPPO | We support option3 for less PDCCH monitoring.  |
| Apple | Option 2 and Option 3 can be merged for down selection purpose. |

To facilitate the discussion, companies are also encouraged to provide your preference on the above options.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Preferred Options** |
| Intel | Option 3.  |
| CATT | Option 3 |
| FGI | Option 3 |
| DOCOMO | If gNB can identify multiple PRACH repetitions, option 3 is preferred. Otherwise, option 1 is the only feasible solution. |
| Panasonic  | We prefer Option 1 such that early termination of multiple PRACH transmissions is possible to terminate the subsequent PRACH transmission(s) in advance when UE successfully receives RAR. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 |
| LG | Option 3. |
| vivo | Option 3 |
| Samsung  | Slightly option 3, but can open to discuss option 1 as well. |
| CMCC | We prefer to study Option 1 and 3, depending on whether gNB can detect the tansmissions from same UE. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 3 |
| ZTE | We prefer Option 3 as one RAR window has less impact on UE implementation. We can also accept Option 1, as Option 1 has less spec impact but need minor enhancement of UE capability on the detection of multiple RARs scrambled with different RA-RNTIs in the overlapping area of RAR windows. |
| Lenovo | We are open to study all the options |
| Nokia/NSB | Option 3 with FFS on RA-RNTI details. |
| Sony | It is unclear why Option 3 has less specs impact. We would have thought Option 2 has the least specs impact since in the legacy system (Rel-17 and below) the RAR Window and RO are separately configured. So why do we need to force a RAR Window after X number of ROs? In the current system the RAR Window overlap some of the ROs used for multi-PRACH transmissions, so we do not see why we need to change that.Hence based on this we prefer Option 2. |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal. We have preference for Option 2 or Option 3 for the moment. However, we prefer to make the down-selection at a later stage. The reason is, we see some interplay with other aspects of PRACH configuration. For example, it’s important to know the maximum transmission number that we support for multiple PRACH transmissions. In addition, the time/frequency PRACH resources, and the triggering mechanism of a specific transmission number at UE are also related to this down-selection for RAR window. |
| ETRI | Option 3 |
| InterDigital | Option 3 |
| Fujitsu | Option 3 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For lower complexity, we support that one RAR window for all of the multiple PRACH transmission, where the RAR window starts after the last repetition RO. |
| NEC | Option 3 |
| Ericsson | Our current preference is Option 3. Regarding FFS, we prefer that RAR window starts after the last PRACH transmission to maximize the combination gain for a UE. |
| Sharp | Option 3 |
| OPPO | Option3 |
| Apple | Option 3 |

### 3.1.3 Determine the number of multiple PRACH transmissions

#### Proposal 5

**Support at least {2 ,4, 8} for the number of multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams.**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |
| FGI | We agree to have these options |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Panasonic | Assuming multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam (not beams), we support the proposal 5. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| LG | Support. |
| vivo | According to companies’ evaluation results, at least {2, 4} repetitions are needed if we look at 1% Pmiss (note that 10% Pmiss was assumed for PRACH repetition in eMTC) and do not consider RO hopping.We do not see the need to consider 8 repetitions which would cause more RO overhead or RA collision to the existing system. If more than 4 repetitions are pursued though not needed, retransmissions can be utilized already when RAR window expires.Therefore, we propose following updates:Proposal 5**Support at least {2 ,4~~, 8~~} for the number of multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~.** |
| Samsung  | Support.  |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support.@vivo: if 8 is removed you can never exceed 6 dB gain over the baseline (theoretically). 8 repetitions are needed to close the performance gap for FR2, which is more than 7 dB. |
| Sony | Support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | We are supportive of {2,4,8}. Since the FL’s proposal states “at least”, we suggest including an FFS for additional transmission numbers:Proposal 5**Support at least {2 ,4, 8} for the number of multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams.*** **FFS additional number of multiple PRACH transmissions**
 |
| ETRI | Support |
| InterDigital | Support. |
| Fujitsu | We are generally fine with the proposal, and it seems this proposal is associated with issue #8 below. When we say the number of multiple PRACH transmissions (e.g., 4), we want to clarify if it means actual transmitting number (based on Qualcomm’s approach) or configured number (based on Ericsson’s approach). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support that the maximum repetition times for different SSBs can be different and can be up to 8. |
| Ericsson | While this is a reasonable list of number of transmissions, we don’t agree to this list at this stage. Several questions are to be sorted out in order to decide on candidate numbers.The first question is it is a wide beam or a refined narrow beam for the multiple PRACH transmissions with the same beam. A UE capable beam correspondence can transmit multiple PRACHs with the refined narrow beam. While for a UE incapable of beam correspondence, it has two options, either transmitting PRACHs with a same wide beam multiple times or sweeping beams, if supported. Simulation in our contribution [25] shows beam sweeping outperforms the transmissions with the same wide beam by about 1dB for the same number of transmissions. The discussion on multiple PRACH transmissions with the same beam can consider UEs capable of beam correspondence, i.e., PRACH transmissions with the same refined narrow beams, and UEs incapable beam correspondence, i.e., PRACH transmissions with the same wide beams. Another question is about the enhancement target for PRACH transmissions with the same refined narrow beam. @Vivo, @Nokia, the coverage gap for PRACH by “Relative difference vs. PUCCH Format 1” in TR 38.830, where PUCCH format 1 is used as a baseline to compare all UL and DL physical channels. It is not clear to us why PRACH would be set the same performance target as PUCCH format 1. What’s more, the study in Rel-17 is based on a single PRACH transmission with a wide beam. If the baseline is to use a refined narrow beam, the coverage gap relative to PF1 would be much smaller than the “Relative difference vs. PUCCH Format 1” in TR38.830.Instead, we found out in FR2, the required SNR for Msg3 with 8 repetitions and inter-slot frequency hopping at 10% BLER is 1.7 dB higher than that of a single PRACH transmission with a wide beam. Namely, the basic Rel-15 PRACH transmission outperforms the best performance of Rel-17 Msg3 repetition. With a large repetition factor for PRACHs, the performance of RACH process is still blocked by Msg3 and won’t get improved. Therefore, Msg3 performance can be taken into account when discussing the candidate numbers of multiple PRACH transmissions. We would like to study how Msg3 performance can be improved by multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams.**Proposal:****When studying the number of PRACH repetitions to be supported,** * **Consider at least where the same beam is a wide beam or a narrow beam.**
* **Consider at least the (M,N,P)=(2,2,2) UE antenna configuration assumed in TR 38.830**
* **Use the difference in array gain between wide and narrow beams as one factor in determining the amount of repetitions of a wide beam.**
	+ **At least latency and PRACH overhead are other factors to be considered.**

**Evaluate the difference in Msg3 and PRACH performance**  |
| Sharp | Agree with the FL proposal. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple  | Support. |

#### Proposal 6

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, new SSB-RSRP threshold(s) can be introduced for indicating the number of PRACH transmissions.**

* + FFS detailed scheme, e.g., the number of SSB-RSRP thresholds.
	+ FFS: whether multiple PRACH transmissions is enabled only when the transmission power or number of PRACH retransmissions reaching a threshold.
	+ FFS: whether multiple PRACH transmissions is enabled only UE reaches maximum transmission power for PRACH transmission.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Intel | In Rel-17, we introduced RSRP threshold for the request of Msg3 PUSCH repetition. Our understanding is that we may consider a unified solution for PRACH repetition and Msg3 repetition. In this case, at least when a single PRACH repetition level is configured, we may not need to introduce a new RSRP threshold. Instead, we can consider to reuse the existing one for Msg3 repetition.  |
| CATT | We think it is better to replace “new” with “separate”.We are fine with the proposal with the above replacement. |
| FGI | Agree. We also prefer to have proper linkage between triggering multiple Msg1 transmissions and request for Msg3 repeat. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Panasonic | Assuming multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam (not beams), we support the proposal 6. |
| Qualcomm | Similar to Intel, we think linkage to the SS-RSRP threshold for Msg3 repetition request should be consider. Therefore, we suggest adding the following bullet:* + FFS: linkage to the SS-RSRP threshold for Msg3 repetition request.
 |
| LG | Support in principle. Also we agree with Intel’s comment as well.  |
| vivo | Considering PRACH performance is normally better than Msg3 transmission when repetition and retransmission are not applied, therefore a lower threshold may be needed for PRACH repetition compared to the threshold used for request of Msg3 repetition.Whether this RSRP threshold should be new or it’s just an offset to the RSRP threshold for request of Msg3 repetition can be further studied.The 2nd and 3rd bullet may be not associated to the RSRP measurement condition, “only” would be better to be removed at this stage.In current spec. SS-RSRP is used, so it’s better to use same term.According to above, we have following proposed updates:Proposal 6**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, ~~new~~ SS~~B~~-RSRP threshold(s) can be ~~introduced~~ applied for ~~indicating the number of~~ requesting multiple PRACH transmissions.*** + FFS detailed scheme, e.g., the number of SS~~B~~-RSRP thresholds, the determination of SS-RSRP thresholds.
	+ FFS: whether multiple PRACH transmissions is enabled ~~only~~ when the transmission power or number of PRACH retransmissions reaching a threshold.
	+ FFS: whether multiple PRACH transmissions is enabled ~~only~~ UE reaches maximum transmission power for PRACH transmission.
 |
| Samsung | We understand the intention is to apply RSRP to determine the use of multiple PRACH transmission. Thus some following change is suggested:**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, ~~new~~ the SSB-RSRP threshold(s) can be introduced for determining the use of multiple PRACH transmission ~~indicating the number of PRACH transmissions~~.****FFS: details.** |
| CMCC | If this threshold also determine whether or not PRACH repetition is activated, then the numbers of multiple PRACH transmissions should include {1}, or it should be **“new SSB-RSRP threshold(s) can be introduced for indicating the number of PRACH transmissions / for enabling multiple PRACH transmissions.”** |
| Spreadtrum | Generally fine with this proposal.If poor uplink coverage exists, it may have the requirement of both PRACH and Msg3 repetition. So we share the same view with Qualcomm. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal.@Intel, Qualcomm, We are not sure the threshold for Msg3 repetition and PRACH repetition is the same as the two channels has different detection and decoding performance requirement. If we want to reuse the threshold for Msg3 repetition, the coupling relationship between PRACH repetition and Msg.3 repetition should be studied first. Moreover, there is only one threshold for Msg3 repetition which is not sufficient for the demand of multiple thresholds for different repetition factors of PRACH. |
| Lenovo | Fine with the proposal.  |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the spirit of the proposal, but we have several issues with the wording:* It is not clear why SSB-RSRP threshold(s) should indicate the number of PRACH transmissions. We think they should be used to determine the number of PRACH transmissions (and we would add “at least”, and further elaborate on the first FFS to ensure we can study whether they are sufficient or not…).
* The second and third FFS points are unclear and ambiguous.
* We understand the word “new” may not be acceptable to some companies.

We suggest the following rewording**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, ~~new~~ at least SSB-RSRP threshold(s) ~~can be introduced for indicating~~ are used to determine the number of PRACH transmissions.*** + FFS detailed scheme, e.g., the number of SSB-RSRP thresholds or whether other measured/computed metrics or conditions should be used together with SSB-RSRP thresholds.
	+ ~~FFS: whether multiple PRACH transmissions is enabled only when the transmission power or number of PRACH retransmissions reaching a threshold.~~
	+ ~~FFS: whether multiple PRACH transmissions is enabled only UE reaches maximum transmission power for PRACH transmission.~~
	+ FFS: linkage to the SS-RSRP threshold for Msg3 repetition request.
 |
| Sony | Support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| ETRI | We support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | Fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support that new SSB-RSRP threshold(s) should be introduced for indicating the number of PRACH transmissions. FFS: the relation between the PRACH repetition times and the retransmission times. |
| NEC | Support. |
| Ericsson | We share the view with companies about the threshold for Msg3 repetition. The point is the RSRP(s) for UE determination of repetition factors is not the one for SSB selection. Transmission power of PUSCH is discussed in section 3.1.4 and can be removed from there for now. In addition, the threshold is only for CBRA. Therefore, we suggest the following. Updated Proposal 6**For CBRA of multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, ~~new~~ SSB-RSRP threshold(s) different from rsrp-ThresholdSSB can be ~~introduced~~ considered for ~~indicating~~ determination of the number of PRACH transmissions.*** + FFS detailed scheme, e.g., the number of SSB-RSRP thresholds.
	+ ~~FFS: whether multiple PRACH transmissions is enabled only when the transmission power or number of PRACH retransmissions reaching a threshold.~~
	+ ~~FFS: whether multiple PRACH transmissions is enabled only UE reaches maximum transmission power for PRACH transmission.~~
 |
| Sharp | We are generally OK with the proposal though vivo or Samsung’s modification is more preferred. |
| OPPO | We share the same view with Nokia. To list all the proposed options for further study, we propose to include the scheme of interaction between and multiple PRACH and Msg3 repetition request.  |
| Apple | We support this proposal. |

#### Discussion for issue #8

FL comment: As summarized in section 2.1.3 Issue #8, companies discuss the mapping between multiple PRACH transmissions and valid RO. [Ericsson] proposes that validation rules are **applied after** ROs for multiple PRACH occasions are determined for a specific number of PRACH transmissions, while [Qualcomm] propose that the counting of PRACH repetitions is **based on the valid ROs**.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above issue.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Our understanding is that it should be based on valid ROs. Otherwise, we may complicate the SSB to RO association for multiple PRACH transmissions.  |
| CATT | We think this can be discussed later after discussing the SSB-to-RO mapping for PRACH repetitions. |
| FGI | Since the multiple PRACH transmissions may occupy ROs (TDMed is assumed) spreading along with several association periods/configuration periods. It is possible to meet cases that ROs are not valid. We agree to have such restriction and to further discuss definition of the valid ROs. |
| DOCOMO | We think it is more reasonable to be based on valid ROs. |
| Panasonic | We think both approaches can work. Qualcomm’s approach can obtain more actual repetitions than Ericsson’s approach, but it requires more discussion because Ericsson’s approach just uses the existing mechanism. |
| LG | We slightly prefer the first option proposed by Ericsson, but we can discuss further this issue. |
| vivo | Share similar view as Intel that in legacy SSBs are only mapped to valid ROs. If invalid ROs are considered to repetitions, then there would be no SSBs mapped to that repetition.So valid RO should be considered for multiple PRACH transmission if we reuse legacy ROs for all repetitions.However, if we configure separate ROs after some legacy ROs, then those ROs could be invalid but may be counted for PRACH repetitions though they may be not actually used for some PRACH repetitions.Therefore, this depends on how we configure the ROs for PRACH repetitions and we propose to come back to this discussion when PRACH resource configuration is clear. |
| Samsung | This issue could be deferred until more clear resource design of multiple PRACH has come out. |
| CMCC | The understanding about the valid ROs for gNB and UE should be aligned. |
| Spreadtrum | We think PRACH repetitions should be based on the valid ROs since the repetitions number reached the expectation. |
| ZTE | If Multiple PRACH transmissions will use part of shared ROs, the original principle should be followed, i.e., mapping based on valid RO.If Multiple PRACH transmissions will only use separate RO, we can further study whether the validation rules are applied after ROs determination. The obvious gain should be observed if we want change the rules. Primitively, I think a unified rule, i.e., multiple PRACH transmissions based on valid ROs is better for the compatibility. |
| Lenovo | We think it should be based on valid ROs.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Is seems reasonable to assume this can be based on valid ROs. We are open to discuss more, and we welcome more details concerning the issues other companies see with using valid ROs. |
| Sony | We think both can be used. As per CATT & Samsung comments, we also think we can come back to this issue later once we decide on how the RO/preamble resources are defined for Rel-18 PRACH repetitions. |
| MediaTek | PRACH repetitions should be based on valid ROs. |
| ETRI | We think the valid ROs are considered. |
| InterDigital | This may depend on whether one assumes that the UE can initiate a set of PRACH repetitions in any RO or only in specific RO’s identified for starting a set of repetitions. In the latter case, the intent would be to ease identification of the set of RO’s in which repetitions are transmitted from network perspective. In this case it would be more logical to apply validation rule after determining the set of RO’s. Otherwise, the validation rule could be applied before to prevent that the UE cancels a repetition.  |
| Fujitsu | We are open to discuss further to determine valid ROs. |
| Ericsson | We would like to clarify that our proposal is that a UE determines a number of available ROs by MAC entity, where the number equals a determined repetition factor, and then physical layer performs the legacy validation check and collision handling. If some PRACHs don’t meet the validation check, they are dropped not postponed.The validation rules are copied from 38.213 below.

|  |
| --- |
| For paired spectrum or supplementary uplink band all PRACH occasions are valid. For unpaired spectrum, - if a UE is not provided *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon*, a PRACH occasion in a PRACH slot is valid if it does not precede a SS/PBCH block in the PRACH slot and starts at least $N\_{gap}$ symbols after a last SS/PBCH block reception symbol, where $N\_{gap}$ is provided in Table 8.1-2 and, if *channelAccessMode* = "*semiStatic*" is provided, does not overlap with a set of consecutive symbols before the start of a next channel occupancy time where the UE does not transmit [15, TS 37.213].- the candidate SS/PBCH block index of the SS/PBCH block corresponds to the SS/PBCH block index provided by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *SIB1* or in *ServingCellConfigCommon* , as described in clause 4.1- If a UE is provided *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon*, a PRACH occasion in a PRACH slot is valid if - it is within UL symbols, or - it does not precede a SS/PBCH block in the PRACH slot and starts at least $N\_{gap}$ symbols after a last downlink symbol and at least $N\_{gap}$ symbols after a last SS/PBCH block symbol, where $N\_{gap}$ is provided in Table 8.1-2, and if *channelAccessMode* = "*semiStatic*" is provided, does not overlap with a set of consecutive symbols before the start of a next channel occupancy time where there shall not be any transmissions, as described in [15, TS 37.213]- the candidate SS/PBCH block index of the SS/PBCH block corresponds to the SS/PBCH block index provided by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *SIB1* or in *ServingCellConfigCommon*, as described in clause 4.1. |

It is good that all ROs are valid. However, SSB and RACH are separate RRC configurations with different periodicities provided by gNB, so 3GPP defined validation rules just in case. RACH configuration gets complicated with Rel-18 multiple PRACH transmissions, e.g., the association of resources in multiple ROs with a repetition factor. Our intention is that if gNB configures a set of resources for a given repetition factor, UEs won’t generate a new set for the same repetition factor.As discussed in Proposal 1, the transmissions in certain ROs may implicitly indicate the repetition factor. For example, all four ROs are configured with preambles for K=2. Transmissions in RO#1 and RO#2 are associated with two PRACH transmissions of a RACH attempt. RO#3 and RO#4 are another association for K=2. If RO#1 is considered as invalid, for RO determination based on valid ROs, the UE transmits PRACHs in RO#2 and RO#3 respectively, which would be considered as two PRACH attempts by gNB. We prefer that in this case, the UE either transmits in RO#2 only or in the set of RO#3 and RO#4.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 |  | 3 | 4 |

We see the merit of RO determination based on valid ROs, like fewer PRACH cancellation, but different from PUSCH repetition based on available slot, where K is indicated by gNB, now gNB needs to determine K from the received preambles and ROs. In NR up to Rel-17, available RO is determined by MAC entity, and a UE transmits PRACH if physical layer checks it is valid, and there is no collision which leads to PRACH dropping. If some ROs determined by MAC entity violate validation rules and some others have collisions and should be dropped, would MAC layer select more ROs to compensate the former ROs only or both? |
| OPPO | PRACH repetition should be based on specific valid ROs for PRACH repetition. We prefer to discuss specific SSB-to-RO mapping for PRACH repetitions, and then define the valid ROs for PRACH repetitions. |
| Apple | From performance perspective, the valid ROs should be used to make sure the enough repetition number.  |

### 3.1.4 Power control

#### Proposal 7

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, down-select one option from the following options.**

* Option 1: Transmission power ramping is not applied during the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for each PRACH transmissions.
* Option 2: Transmission power ramping is applied per PRACH transmission during the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: The initial power and power ramping step.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Intel | We would like to understand better on the motivation of Option 2. It is not clear to us why we need to introduce power ramping during multiple PRACH transmissions. This may create severe near far issue for PRACH detection, especially when the number of repetitions is large.  |
| CATT | We are also not clear about the motivation of Option 2 and prefer Option 1. |
| FGI | We prefer option 1. |
| DOCOMO | Open to further discuss pros/cons/motivations for the two options. We slightly prefer option 1 now. |
| Panasonic  | Assuming multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam (not beams), we support Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer option 1.  |
| LG | We prefer to support Option 1. |
| vivo | Fine to discuss the 2 options.For option1, we should also discuss whether separate power control parameters are needed when repetition is enabled compared to PRACH transmission without repetition.For option 2, in our understanding, if UE would do power ramping after finishing all repetitions, then power ramping during the repetitions would be helpful so that UE can reach highest power as early as possible. Note that PRACH repetitions can be combined in different segments or noncoherently if more repetitions are introduced. Currently we do not think that many repetitions are needed, 2 or 4 repetitions are enough as we discussed in earlier section.Proposal 7**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, down-select one option from the following options.*** Option 1: Transmission power ramping is not applied during the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for each PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: The initial power and power ramping step
* Option 2: Transmission power ramping is applied per PRACH transmission during the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: The initial power and power ramping step.
 |
| Samsung | We did not see the reason why in the multiple PRACH transmission of the same attempt, there should be different power applied. Thus, we did not support option2 even listed as one option to be discussed. We can discuss how to do power ramping for RACH re-attempt/retransmission.  |
| CMCC | We prefer option 1. |
| Spreadtrum | Option1 can be used as a basic option, but Option 2 should not be excluded in current stage. We agree to further discuss the pros/cons/motivations for option 2. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. We prefer Option 2 as the multiple PRACH transmission can be regarded as the legacy PRACH retransmission compressed in time domain. Then the power ramping principle can also be used for multiple PRACH transmissions in one attempt. A question to be clarified? Does the sub-bullet under Option 1 can also be applied for Option 2. I think the sub-bullet implies for each PRACH, UE will try to measure the SSB again, and the pathloss may be different among all the measurements.We can update the Option 2 as below if my understanding is right.Option 2: **Transmission power ramping is applied per PRACH transmission during the multiple PRACH transmissions.*** + FFS: The initial power and power ramping step.
	+ FFS: The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for each PRACH transmissions.
 |
| Lenovo | We prefer option 1. We think all the transmission within the repetition should be seen as one PRACH attempt. |
| Nokia/NSB | We assume that UE may resort to PRACH repetitions when power ramping is not an option, i.e., UE is already at max power. In this case, Option 1 is the only possibility and is our preference. |
| Sony | We prefer Option 1. We would thought the UE would be at the cell edge if it needs to use Rel-18 PRACH repetitions and highly likely it would be transmitting at max power. Power ramping may not even be an option, i.e. Option 2 may not even be feasible. |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal. Firstly, we think that the same FFS can also be included for Option 1. With multiple transmissions, a different power ramp value could be considered than the legacy single transmission case. In addition, we also suggest a minor re-wording for Option-2 to include other cases e.g., where only one power ramp is performed within a set of 4 or 8 PRACH transmissions.Proposal 7**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, down-select one option from the following options.*** Option 1: Transmission power ramping is not applied during the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for each PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: The initial power and power ramping step.
* Option 2: Transmission power ramping can be ~~is~~ applied per PRACH transmission during the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: The initial power and power ramping step.
 |
| ETRI | Support the proposal and we prefer option 1. |
| InterDigital | Support option 1 only. Don’t understand why UE would increase power before having a chance to receive response from gNB. |
| Fujitsu | We prefer option 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 seems to be a potential enhancement for retransmission. |
| NEC | We prefer option 1. |
| Ericsson  | We are fine with the proposal in principle and prefer Option 1. However, we do not see the need to downselect at this stage. Suggest:**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams, ~~down-select one option from~~ further discuss at least the following options.****[omitted]** |
| Sharp | We prefer Option 1. |
| OPPO | We slightly prefer option1. Option2 can be further studied.  |
| Apple | Option 1 is preferred. |

## 3.2 Multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams

### 3.2.1 Potential use cases

#### Discussion for issue #9

FL comment: As summarized in section 2.2.1 Issue #9, the objective doesn’t have a limitation on whether multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams is associated with same or different SSBs, companies [China Telecom, CATT] think there is a need to clarify on this issue.

* Option 1: Multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams are associated with the same SSB.
* Option 2: Multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams are associated with different SSBs.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above options.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Intel | We think at least Option 1 can be supported for Rel-18 given the benefit of improving reliability and reduced latency, especially for initial access. We are open to consider to study Option 2 if time permits.  |
| CATT | We think Option 1 can be prioritized for further study. |
| FGI | We slightly prefer option 1. |
| DOCOMO | We are open to discuss the two cases. |
| Panasonic  | We would like to clarify the meaning of “different beams”.* For Option 1, does “different beams” refer to different finer beams?
* For Option 2, does “different beams” refer to different finer beams or different SSB-based beams?
 |
| Qualcomm | We are open to discuss both cases. However, we think option 2 can be more problematic (may need more time for discussion).  |
| LG | Support for multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams requires additional specification changes (e.g., best beam indication) compared to supporting only multiple PRACH transmissions with the same beam. Moreover, the discussion of improving Msg3 PUSCH coverage using Tx beam diversity is not the scope of Rel-18 CE. Therefore, we think that multiple PRACH transmission with same beams are prioritized in Rel-18 CE. After that, if discussion time is available, then this issue can be discussed further. |
| vivo | Option1 to us is up to UE implementation, which is already what UE does in current spec. There’s no requirement for UE to use the SSB beam for PRACH transmission. In our understanding, if the narrower beams are intended for beam refinement of Msg3 or later uplink transmissions, this would require long latency to complete the beam sweeping meaning that UE can already do retransmission in which uplink beam sweeping can also be performed. In addition, this is out of the scope of this work item and we should focus on PRACH enhancement itself.For Option 2, when PRACH repetitions are mapped to different SSBs and different beams are used, UE would select best beam for multiple PRACH transmissions. There’s no need to introduce such multiple beam PRACH transmission.According to the discussions in section 3.1, 2 to 4 repetitions with same beam can already compensate the performance gap, there’s no need to discuss multiple beam PRACH repetition transmissions which will also have large spec. impact. |
| Samsung | For discussion purpose, we think eventually both options can have some use cases. Option 2 could be used for the method that allowing multiple SSB selection to facilitate multiple PRACH transmission. Also it could be used for UE with multiple panel, which is decoupled with whether associated same/different SSB. |
| CMCC | We think option1 can be further study firstly. For the option 2, gNB may can not decided how to merge ROs associated with different SSBs |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer option 1. For option 2, it should be further clarified the way in which multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams are associated with different SSBs, such as 1:1 mapping or N:1 mapping, etc. |
| ZTE | Similar as Intel, at least Option 1 can be supported for Rel-18. Actually, the specification work for multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams is not much more than that for the multiple PRACH transmissions with the same beam. Most rules can be reused. For some specific enhancement such as best beam indication, if any, the implicit indication can be considered and the specification work is not big issue. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Disagree with LG and fully agree with ZTE. RAN1 should at least study PRACH repetitions with different Tx beam as the WID stipulates. Otherwise, there would be no element to consider when decisions will have to be made. In this context, we agree with most of the previous comments. The natural understanding is Option 1, and indeed this was the understanding that was used during Rel-17 SI. This option should be prioritized. Its is also extremely important for FR2 deployments where PA limitations at the UE are more severe than in FR1. |
| Sony | At the moment it isn’t clear we need yet another PRACH repetition method. The gains in introducing (yet another) PRACH repetition with different beams over with same beam needs to be significant. We suggest we start with same beam repetition first and see if the methods can be used for different beams. |
| MediaTek | We prefer Option 1. We see some complexity issues with Option-2 despite not clear benefits. |
| ETRI | We think that both cases are considered. |
| InterDigital | Suggest prioritizing Option 1. Motivation for Option 2 is unclear, and it also seems more complex. |
| NEC | We think option 1 is not clear. Does it mean from UE’s perspective, different transmission beams can be selected by UE associated with the same SSB? But from network’s perspective, only one reception beam associated with the same SSB is used? |
| Ericsson | We prefer Option 1, but think both can be further discussed. |
| OPPO | We prefer option1 for less standard efforts. Option2 can be further studies on performance and necessity. |
| Apple | We are fine to study further both cases, option 1 makes more sense. |

### 3.2.2 Performance gain

FL comment: Based on the contributions, companies compared the performance between multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam and different beams, link-level simulation results are provided. FL propose to discuss the following observations.

#### Observation 1

* One source (R1-2208671) shows the performance gain of single beam repetition is **2.1dB better than that of multiple beam repetition** for the case of 8 PRACH repetitions. (@28GHz, PRACH format B4, CDL-A (DS 100ns) for different beams, TDL-A (DS 100ns) for single beam, soft combination within one PRACH signal for same beam)
* One source (R1-2209672) shows that for the same number of PRACH transmissions, **the transmission with different beams** (beam sweeping) has a **loss of about 5dB** compared with transmissions **with the same best beam**. PRACH transmissions with **different beams (beam sweeping) outperforms** the transmissions with the **same wide beam** by **about 1dB** for the same number of transmissions. (@28GHz, PRACH format B4, CDL-A (DS 100ns))
* One source (R1-2210165) shows that 4 PRACH repetitions with **different beams provide a gain** of around **7dB** compared to the case of one single PRACH transmission with narrow beam pointing to the direction of maximum energy for the channel model under consideration. (@28GHz, PRACH format B4, CDL-A with 100ns delay spread, the single PRACH transmission pointing to the direction of maximum energy for the channel model, receiver does not perform repetition combining)
* One source (R1-2210165) shows that multiple PRACH transmissions with **different narrow beams perform** **better** than multiple PRACH transmission with a same wide beam. (Comparison of SNR values at 99% detection probability, 4 PRACH transmissions with same wide transmission beam is -13dB, 4 PRACH transmissions with different narrow beams is -17dB)

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above observation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Agree that PRACH repetition with multiple narrow beams could help the beam management of latter uplink transmissions after PRACH transmission according to the evaluations though the gain may be different due to different precoders and CDL models considered. However, This is not in scope of this study. And for PRACH itself the repetition with same beam is already enough to compensate the gap with a small number of repetitions. Furthermore, note that PRACH retransmission would also help UE to try different narrow beams so that UE can pick a best uplink narrow beam for latter retransmission or repetitions. All these can be performed up to UE implementation.Moreover, supporting beaming sweeping in uplink would also be a new UE capability compared to legacy PRACH transmission and the PRACH repetition with same beam. This means another level of PRACH partitioning would be needed which would be too complex for this work item.According to above, we think PRACH repetition with multiple beams should be deprioritized and we focus on design of PRACH repetition with same beam.  |
| Samsung  | Among some of the simulation, especially for comparing the multiple PRACH with different beam with same beam, e.g., the one from [R1-2208671], we think the assumption that UE always know the best UL tx beam is not always applicable, it should be explicitly noted when states the observation based on the simulation results.  |
| ZTE | Multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams is suitable for the UEs incapable of beam correspondence as UE may not find the best beam in the first attempt. For the simulation, the comparison baseline should be the performance of single PRACH transmission with wide beam or randomized selected finer beam. From some simulations results, it can be observed that the coverage gain from the transmission with different beams is obvious. |
| Nokia/NSB | Gains are rather obvious when looking at results shared by companies. Shouldn’t we ensure we agree on a suitable parameterization of the simulator for allowing everyone to study this part of the PRACH enhancements with the same assumption?There are several examples of parameterizations in companies’ contributions and we could start by finding commonalities to then fine tune details (we assume that assumptions in TR 38.830 should be given the priority, whenever possible)We are a bit surprised that this discussion is being given so little attention in the summary. |
| Sony | At least 2 companies (R1-2208671 & R1-2209672)shown loss in using PRACH repetitions with different beams compared to PRACH repetitions with same beam. One company (R1-2210165) shows gain in using different “narrow” beams which I believe are different beams corresponding to a wide SSB beam, which can be a UE implementation since from gNB point of view, UE still transmit within the corresponding SSB beam.Given the initial observation, it is hard to justify pursuing Rel-18 PRACH repetitions with different beams in addition to Rel-18 PRACH repetitions with same beam. |
| MediaTek | We expect a significant difference in achievable performance gains with depending on UE’s beamCorrespondence capability. We suggest that the performance gains of PRACH transmissions with different beams should be studied in two separate cases depending on whether UE supports beamCorrespondence or not. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams seem not justified yet. The reasons are given as follows. First, UEs transmit PRACH repeatedly with the best beam measured can provide more power accumulation. Second, considering the increased complexity, whether the advantages of multiple transmission with different beams is strong enough to support its standardization should be discussed. |
| Ericsson | Large differences in terms of the performance of PRACH transmissions with different beams are observed in the above results. In order to align among companies, we think some basic simulation assumptions are needed for study of both same and different beam repetition, including UE/gNB antenna configuration, CDL modelling, how multiple beams are generated, etc. **Proposal**:**Simulation parameters for PRACH repetition with same beam and with different beams are identified. The list of parameters should include at least:*** **Number of UE antenna elements**
	+ **The FR2 UE antenna configuration from 38.830 can be used, i.e. (M,N,P)=(2,2,2)**
* **Channel model**
	+ **At least CDL-A is used**
* **ISD=200m**
* **Carrier frequency: at least 28 GHz**
* **PRACH format**
	+ **At least B4**

**Metric: Missed detection rate vs. SNR, at false alarm rate of 0.1%** |

1. Email discussion (2nd round)

## 4.1 Multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams

### 4.1.1 Resource configuration for multiple PRACH transmissions

#### Proposal 1-v1

**FL comment:** Based on companies’ comments in the 1st round, FL has the following clarifications.

The intention of Proposal 1

@all

From FL perspective, proposal 1 is for resource configuration and allocation for multiple PRACH transmissions, as for differentiation between single PRACH transmission and multiple PRACH transmission, that is a next-step issue.

Thus, the “ROs determination” in Option 3 only determine the ROs can be used to transmit the multiple PRACH. Meantime, as many companies have commented, it is important for gNB to know which ROs or RO bundle is used for multiple PRACH transmissions. Or else, the blind detection at the gNB side will become very complicated. That is also the reason why we need to discuss the ROs pattern issue in Proposal 2, and preamble issue in Proposal 3.

Since for different kinds of resource configuration method, the differentiation mechanism may be different. Thus, from FL’s understanding, we should first put the potential resource configuration methods on the table, and then for each option we can further discuss how gNB can know which ROs or RO bundle is used for multiple PRACH transmissions. That’s the intention of this proposal.

Clarification on the options

@Intel, @CATT, @vivo, @ Ericsson

For option 1, there is one possibility that UE can select ROs associated with different SSB, as some company has proposed in their Toc. The key point of Option 1 is that we don’t need to add new ROs, we totally utilize the legacy ROs to support multiple PRACH transmission.

For Option 3 and Option 4, the mechanism of them is different. From FL perspective, we cannot simply combine them.

For Option 3, it is an IAB-like approach. In addition, using the legacy ROs for multiple PRACH transmission is not precluded, as some companies want this.

For Option 4, it utilizes a NB-IoT like mechanism, which need to configure individual parameters as time and frequency domain resource, repetition number etc., for different coverage levels. As ZTE has clarified, Option 4 means the whole structure of the RRC configuration for PRACH is new compared to the legacy RRC configuration. An example is the NB-IoT RACH resource configuration.

Clarification on Shared RO/Preamble and Separate RO/preamble

@ Spreadtrum, Sony

“Shared RO/preamble” means the legacy RO/preamble, and is shared by multiple PRACH transmissions and legacy single PRACH transmission.

“Separate RO/preamble” means the RO/preamble is only used by multiple PRACH transmissions.

Hope the above clarifications can solve the majority concerns. Based on companies’ comments, there are many concerns on Option1, FL suggests to preclude Option 1. Thus, FL proposes the updated Proposal 1 as:

**Proposal**

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, ~~down-select from~~ consider one or multiple of the following options.**

* ~~Option 1: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with shared preambles on shared ROs, i.e., no separate ROs or preambles are defined for multiple PRACH transmissions.~~
	+ ~~FFS: detailed scheme., e.g., partitioning the existing legacy ROs for single and multi PRACH transmissions how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission.~~
* Option 2: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with separate preamble on shared ROs.
	+ ~~FFS: detailed scheme, e.g., whether to utilize the separate PRACH resources for requesting Msg3 repetition how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission.~~
* Option 3: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs, where the ROs are determined at least based on legacy PRACH configuration, e.g., IAB-like approach.
	+ ~~FFS: detailed scheme, e.g., introduce a frequency and/or time domain offset to define additional ROs, whether utilizing separate preambles for different number of PRACH transmissions, SSB-to-RO mapping~~
* Option 4: Multiple PRACH are transmitted based on separate PRACH configuration, e.g., NB-IoT-like approach.
	+ ~~FFS: detailed scheme, e.g., consider a NB-IoT-like mechanism for PRACH repetition, the separate PRACH configuration including time and frequency domain resource, repetition number etc., for different coverage levels.~~
* Option 5: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs and shared ROs.
* Other options are not precluded.
* FFS: detailed schemes, including how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission for all the above Options.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Thank you for the updated proposals and clarificiations. We are not comfortable with how the FL suggests clarifying the content of Option 3 and Option 4, while we understand the spirit of the modifications. We think we should not mention specific examples which refer to other features which may mislead companies and narrow down the discussion in a very sub-optimal way. We propose to modify Options 3 and 4 as follows:**Option 3**: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs, where the frequency-time location of the separate ROs is determined at least based on legacy PRACH configuration, e.g., additional configuration may be considered.**Option 4**: Multiple PRACH are transmitted based on separate PRACH configuration, e.g., a new RRC structure may be considered. |
| Intel | We share similar view as Nokia that the structure of Option 3 and Option 4 can be improved.We do not fully understand Option 4. If this means that a new PRACH configuration will be introduced, then we cannot support it as this would complicate the design and increase the spec work substantially. For Option 5, does share ROs mean share ROs with separate preambles? If this is the case, our understanding is that this is a combination of Option 2 + Option 3, which is already covered by the main bullet “one or multiple”  |
| Sony | We share similar views with Nokia and are fine with Nokia’s modification for Option 3.For Option 4, if NB-IoT is the target, then it is an entire change to how an RO is defined. I think it is not simply just a “separate PRACH configuration” but a new PRACH structure.**@Intel:** I think Option 5 is using ROs to differentiate between Rel-18 PRACH repetitions and legacy PRACH, whilst there may be no partition in the preamble. The “share” part is some of the ROs can be used for Rel-18 and legacy PRACH whilst some are exclusive for Rel-18 PRACH only or legacy PRACH only. |
| LG | Regarding the Option 3, it is an appropriate option when RACH resources are not significantly needed, such as IAB. In other words, it may be not preferred for PRACH repetition because it is difficult to allocate a large number of ROs using offsets from legacy PRACH configurations.Regarding the Option 5, if separate preamble index in shared RO is not considered, it does not distinguish the preamble index between single transmission and multiple transmissions. Therefore, the gNB should send the RAR for all successful preambles, even if the preambles were actually used for repeated transmissions. It means the UE should monitor the RARs after every single preamble transmission, then the UE complexity will be increased.Therefore, we prefer to remove the Option 3 and Option 5 in this proposal. |
| FGI | We support Nokia’s improvements. |
| ZTE | Fine to preclude Option 1, as we share the same page that gNB need to distinguish the multiple PRACH transmission from single PRACH transmission.For Option 3, we talk about the IAB-like, but it doesn’t mean only time (frame/subframe…) offset is allowed, we can also consider the frequency offset to solve the concerns on the insufficient time resource and large latency. This can solve @LG’s concern, so we suggest changing Option 3 as:

|  |
| --- |
| Option 3: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs, where the ROs are determined at least based on legacy PRACH configuration, e.g., IAB-like approach, not precluding the frequency offset parameters. |

Then we are fine with the revision on Option 3 from Nokia in principle.Obviously, Option 4 need much more specification work, for example, as some companies said, the table for new PRACH configuration index may need to be investigated.@Intel, We share the view on Option 5 from Sony.For the comment on Option 5 from LG, it is nature to partitioning the preambles in the shared ROs, actually, this issue has been ever discussed in the NR Rel-15 and 2-step RACH.We also fine the main bullet has been changed to “**consider one or multiple of the following options”.** It means we have more flexibility toallocate the RO resources for multiple PRACH transmission. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal 1-v1 |
| InterDigital | Fine with Nokia’s revisions. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with Nokia’s modification on option 3 and option 4.The correct understanding of option 5 is not clear to us. |
| Lenovo | We support the proposal in general, and fine with Nokia’s revisions on option 3 and option 4.  |
| CATT | We agree with the comments from Nokia to remove the examples.We are fine with the Nokia’s update for Option 3 but not fine with Nokia’s update for Option 4. Our understanding of Option 4 is that separate PRACH configuration from legacy PRACH configuration is provided for multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, but the separate PRACH configuration does not necessarily need to be new RRC structure. It can be the same as the current NR PRACH configuration structure, but only separate from that for PRACH transmissions without repetition.We also do not understand Option 5.For the FFS, we suggest to simply say FFS details if an FFS is needed. We do not need to specifically mention one aspect especially it seems clear to us which ROs are for multiple PRACH transmissions at least for some of the options. |
| OPPO | Fine with Nokia’s revisions. |
| Spreadtrum | Thanks FL for the updated proposals and clarifications. We are fine with Nokia’s modification for Option 3.Regarding the Option 4, we have the same concern with Sony, which may have the maximum spec impact. |
| **FL** | @Intel, @DOCOMO, @CATT, FL share the similar view as Sony that for Option 5, it doesn’t need to separate the preambles between single PRACH transmission and multiple PRACH transmission. So combined Option 2 and Option 3 cannot derive Option 5.@ LG, If shared preambles are used, gNB may need to detect single PRACH transmission on the shared RO and multiple PRACH transmission on the shared RO and separate RO, respectively. It may result in some problems.Thus, proponent companies for Option 5 are encouraged to consider the issue proposed by LG. Or if combined of Option 2 and Option 3 is also acceptable for the proponents for Option 5? If the answer is yes, we may remove Option 5.Based on the current discussion, FL wants to updated the proposal based on the Nokia’s revision, FL suggest to put the “e.g.,” part in the sub-bullet to make it more acceptable.**Proposal 1-v2****For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, ~~down-select from~~ consider one or multiple of the following options.*** Option 2: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with separate preamble on shared ROs.
* Option 3: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs, where the frequency-time locations of the separate ROs are determined at least based on legacy PRACH configuration.~~, e.g., IAB-like approach.~~
* e.g., additional configuration may be considered.
* Option 4: Multiple PRACH are transmitted based on separate PRACH configuration~~, e.g., NB-IoT-like approach~~.
* e.g., a new RRC structure may be considered, or a separate PRACH configuration with the same structure as legacy.
* Option 5: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs and shared ROs.
* Other options are not precluded.
* FFS: detailed schemes, including how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission for all the above Options.

@all, companies can further discuss based on the updated proposal. |
| Apple | For Option5, more clarifications are needed to align the understands among companies.  |
| ZTE | Clarification for Option 5. I copy a proposal and a figure from **Sony**’s contribution, I think this can explain the principle of Option 5.**Proposal 3: Some of the RACH Occasions used for Multi PRACH transmissions can also be used for Single PRACH transmission, e.g. the RACH Occasion for the 1st PRACH transmission of a Multi PRACH transmission can also be used for Single PRACH transmission.** |
| Sharp | We are OK with the updated FL proposal. |
| Samsung  | After reading the proposal, we have a basic clarification question, that is: the “shared RO” or “separate RO” is discussed for RACH resource for multiple PRACH and legacy single PRACH; or it is for multiple PRACH itself? For example, the option 2, it could be understood as the each one of the multiple PRACH transmissions are transmitted in the same (shared) RO with different preambles. We hope to avoid such ambuguilty, thus we suggested to formulate the proposal by ***The RACH resource (RO and/or preamble) used for Multiple PRACH transmission could be determined based on one or multiple following options:**** ***Option 1: only shared RO but different preamble with legacy single PRACH transmission;***
* ***Option 2: only separate RO with legacy single PRACH transmission based on legacy or new PRACH configuration***
	+ - ***FFS: any enhancement on top of the legacy PRACH configuration if it is used;***
* ***Option 3: combination of option 1 and 2***
* ***Other options are not precluded.***
* ***FFS: detailed schemes, including how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission for all the above Options.***

  |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal. We prefer Option 4. |
| CMCC | For Option5, does it mean that the PRACH repetition would be transmitted on both separate ROs and shared ROs for a couple of multiple PRACH transmissions? We just want to check whether this understanding is correct. Generally we are fine with this Updated proposal, anyway we can further discuss details. The Nokia’s modification also acceptable. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is good to remove “IAB like approach” and “NB-IoT like approach”.It is necessary to keep the subbullet of Option 3 as it is now.But could FL please clarify what the difference between Option 3 and Option 4 now?Both Option 3 and Option 4 seems to overlap by using the legacy PRACH configuration structure. |
| Fujitsu | We support the updated proposal 1-v2. For option 5, however, it is needed to clarify what preamble (share or separate) is used in the transmission.  |
| Ericsson | Thanks FL for the clarification and update. The revised Option 3 is fine to us.Thanks for ZTE’s explanation on Option 5, then it seems Option 5 and Option 4 can be merged.Regarding Option 4, our understanding of NB-IoT is that different PRACH configurations are applied to different coverage levels. The same PRACH configuration applies to PRACH repetitions of a given coverage level for a RACH attempt. Is it the intention of Option 4? |
| Qualcomm | We support proposal 1-v2. |

#### Proposal 2-v1

**FL comment:** The majority companies support multiple PRACH transmission in a TDMed manner. The main spirit of the original proposal is stable. Based on the GTW’s discussion, FL proposed the updated Proposal 2.

**Proposal**

* **For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, at least ROs located at different time instances can be utilized for the transmissions.**
* **FFS: whether the starting RB of ROs can be different at different time instances is supported for multiple PRACH transmissions.**
* **FFS: whether ROs located in the same time instance can be utilized for the transmissions.**

**Support only TDMed RO manner:** CATT, FGI, DOCOMO, Panasonic, Qualcomm, LG, vivo, Saumsung, CMCC, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Sony, MediaTek, ETRI, Fujitsu, Huawei, HiSilicon, Sharp, OPPO

**Support Not limited to TDMed manner**: Samsung, InterDigital, Ericsson.

**FFS frequency hopping**: vivo, Intel

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | We do not see the need for the second FFS, however we acknowledge that a technical reason for its presence has been given by proponents. We can live with it for the time being if the proposal is agreeable to all other companies. |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the proposal. We share similar view as Nokia that the second FFS may create some issues for PRACH performance.  |
| Sony | Fine with the proposal. |
| LG | We are generally fine with the proposal. But, regarding the second FFS, if multiple FDMed ROs are used for multiple PRACH transmission, the PRACH transmit power will be reduced at each RO and it does not helpful for coverage enhancement. Therefore we prefer to delete the second FFS in this proposal. |
| FGI | Agree with the proposals but contradict with 2nd FFS since proposal already stated different time. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. |
| Panasonic  | We are fine with the proposal.We think “at least” in main bullet is sufficient to cover 2 FFS points, but we can live with them for a sake of progress.  |
| InterDigital | OK with the proposal. We are also fine if the second FFS is removed. |
| DOCOMO | Generally fine with the proposal. And we also not prefer to keep the second FFS bullet.  |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal in general.  |
| CATT | We also prefer to remove the 2nd FFS but we can live with it for the sake of progress.We suggest to revise the first FFS as follows.* **FFS: whether the starting RB of ROs can be different at different time instances ~~is supported~~ for multiple PRACH transmissions.**
 |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal.  |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| FL | @Intel, @LG, @DOCOMO, @CATT, based on the GTW discussion, some company think the FDMed RO pattern may need to be further studied for simultaneous PRACH transmissions from different Tx chains. So, for the sake of progress, FL would be appreciated if you can live with the 2nd FFS. |
| Apple | Fine with this proposal. |
| Sharp | We are OK with the FL’s proposal. |
| Samsung  | Support the proposal We think the second FFS has some use case for case like multi-panel at UE especially with multi-RF chain with individual power limitation.  |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal. We also prefer to remove the 2nd FFS, given that there seems to be more objecting companies that supporting ones. But, we can live with it.For the 1st FFS, we should correct the typo as mentioned by CATT. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal removing the 2nd FFS. Since the “at least” in the main part could cover all the other cases. we prefer to support the proposal without the 2nd bullet.If possible we can replace the 2nd FFS with “other solutions are not precluded”. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For the second FFS, there is UL power splitting issue between FDMed ROs, resulting in coverage degradation. Prefer to delete it, but OK with it if it is majority view |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal except the second bullet. As mentioned by LG, FDMed RO can reduce the Tx power of PRACH, accordingly it seems not to be well-motivated topic under coverage enhancement agenda. |
| Ericsson | Thanks for the update.Regarding the second FFS, PRACH transmissions in FDMed ROs is primarily beneficial for UEs with multiple Tx chains, where the PAPR does not increase (unlike the single Tx chain case) and it can reap both frequency and antenna diversity gain. We suggest to simply the proposal as follows.**Proposal*** **For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, at least ROs located at different time instances can be utilized for the transmissions.**
* **FFS: whether the starting RB of ROs can be different at different time instances is supported for multiple PRACH transmissions.**
* **FFS: ~~whether ROs~~multiple PRACH transmissions located in the same time instance ~~can be utilized for the transmissions.~~**
 |
| Qualcomm | Fine with the proposal |

#### Proposal 3-v1

**FL comment:** Based on the comments, the majority support the proposal with the original FFS removed. Some company prefer the wording as **during one RACH attempt**. But from FL perspective, current wording indicates the same thing. The proposal is updated as follows.

**Proposal**

* **For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, at least same PRACH preamble is utilized during the multiple** **PRACH transmissions.**
	+ **FFS: whether ~~a~~ different preambles can be utilized in different PRACH ~~all~~ transmissions during the multiple PRACH transmissions ~~for re-transmission~~.**
	+ **FFS: whether only applied to CBRA.**

**Support to use same PRACH preamble**: Intel, CATT, FGI, DOCOMO, Panasonic, Qualcomm, LG, vivo, Samsung, CMCC, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Sony, MediaTek, ETRI, InterDigital, Fujitsu, Huawei, HiSilicon, Ericsson, Sharp, OPPO

**FFS to study different preambles**: Samsung, ZTE, Ericsson

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | We would like to understand why the second FFS is needed. We suggest removing it. |
| Intel | We do not think PRACH preamble randomization would help much for the performance/design given this is cell specific configuration for PRACH transmission. It would only complicate the PRACH detection implementation. We suggest to remove the first FFS.  |
| Sony | We are fine with the proposal. We think the FFS for CBRA can be removed but don’t mind keeping it since it is an FFS. |
| LG | We are generally fine with the proposal. We think the second FFS may not be needed.  |
| ZTE | Support to keep the 1st FFS. We can find if any benefit from the different preambles for a PRACH bundle. No need to decide quickly in the early stage.@Nokia, Sony, LG, Fine to remove the 2nd FFS, as the 1st FFS has covered the 2nd FFS. |
| Panasonic  | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | Fine with the proposal. Also think that the second FFS is unnecessary. |
| DOCOMO | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. We don’t think using different preamble in different RO is beneficial, but fine to keep it FFS. |
| CATT | The current proposal seems saying that for multiple PRACH transmission, at least to utilize same preamble and may use different preamble in addition, which we believe is not the intention. In addition, the FFS point seems suggesting that same preamble transmission may not be supported for CFRA, which we do not understand why. I assume the intention of the FFS is to say for CFRA, different preambles may be utilized. If that is the case, it is already covered by the first FFS. So our suggestion is as follows.* **For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, at least support multiple PRACH transmissions with same PRACH preamble ~~is utilized during the multiple PRACH transmissions~~.**
	+ **FFS: ~~whether~~ multiple PRACH transmissions with  ~~a~~ different preambles ~~can be utilized in different PRACH all transmissions during the multiple PRACH transmissions for re-transmission~~.**
	+ **~~FFS: whether only applied to CBRA.~~**
 |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal.We share the same view with remove 2nd FFS. |
| FL | @ CATT, the 2nd FFS indicates whether this **only** applied for CBRA, since some company think for CFRA the preambles utilized during the multiple PRACH transmission can be different. For your revision on the main bullet, from FL’s point of view, it indicates the same thing as current version. Companies can further discuss the wording.@ ZTE, thank for the compromise. |
| Apple | OK with this proposal. |
| Sharp | We have same view with CATT that the main bullet needs some modifications.**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, at least use of same PRACH preamble ~~is utilized~~ during the multiple PRACH transmissions is supported.** |
| Samsung  | Support the proposal in general, but we think keep “in one attempt” is important since current wording could be understood as there could be only one preamble being selected during all multiple RACH transmissions within one procedure. The attempt is used in RAN2 spec TS38.321, i.e., “select the same group of Random Access Preambles as was used for the Random Access Preamble transmission attempt corresponding to the first transmission of Msg3.” And it has been used for discussion purpose in RAN1 before as well, so we think it’s ok to keep it since it will make the meaning more clear.* **For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, at least same PRACH preamble is utilized during the multiple PRACH transmissions in one attempt.**
	+ **FFS: whether ~~a~~ different preambles can be utilized in different PRACH ~~all~~ transmissions during the multiple PRACH transmissions in one attempt ~~for re-transmission~~.**
	+ **FFS: whether only applied to CBRA.**
 |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal. For the 1st FFS, we do not think that using different preambles for each transmission is a good approach due to detection complexity. But we can live with the FFS. |
| CMCC | Fine. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK to add “in one attempt” as suggested by SamsungThe second FFS seems unnecessary and can be removed according to the discussions. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal with concerning that we really need the second FFS. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Fine with the proposal |

### 4.1.2 RAR window and RA-RNTI calculation

#### Proposal 4-v1

**FL comment**: Proposal 4 is for RAR-window design for multiple PRACH transmissions. Based on the GTW discussion, some company has concern on “down select”. Thus, FL proposes the updated proposal as follows to make a progress.

**Proposal**

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, ~~down-select one option from~~ consider the following options.**

* Option 1: One RAR window per each PRACH transmission, the RAR window follows the legacy design.
	+ FFS: RA-RNTI.

**Support:** DOCOMO (if gNB can NOT identify multiple PRACH repetitions), Panasonic, Samsung, CMCC, ZTE

* Option 2: One RAR window per *K* PRACH transmissions, a RAR window starts after *K* PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: details on K, e.g., K may depend on RAR Window configuration.
	+ FFS: RA-RNTI.
	+ Note: *K* isless than the number of multiple PRACH transmissions.

**Support:** Sony, MediaTek

* Option 3: One RAR window for all of the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: the start position of the RAR window.
	+ FFS: RA-RNTI.

**Support:** Intel, CATT, FGI, DOCOMO (if gNB can identify multiple PRACH repetitions), Qualcomm, LG, vivo, Samsung, CMCC, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, MediaTek, ETRI, InterDigital, Fujitsu, Huawei, HiSilicon, NEC, Ericsson, Sharp, OPPO

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Ok |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the proposal. Our understanding is that we will select only one option, so current proposal does not make much progress.We suggest to put “FFS: RA-RNTI” in a single place to avoid duplication. In addition, for “FFS: details on K, e.g., K may depend on RAR Window configuration”, we think examples “~~e.g., K may depend on RAR Window configuration~~” can be removed. We can further discuss the details.  |
| Sony | I would like some clarification regarding the configuration aspects.The RO and RAR Windows are separately configured. The RO has its only periodicity and occasions and the RAR windows has its own periodicity and duration. If in the legacy system the RAR window is say configured to occur very frequently, say there are 3 short RAR windows overlapping 8 ROs. Does Option 3 means we no longer can use the legacy configuration? That is using Option 3, we must remove 2 RAR windows configured for legacy so that there is only 1 RAR Window for a PRACH with 8 repetitions?How does this work if there can be 4 or 8 repetitions? Do we configure 2 RAR Windows for 2 occurrence of 4 PRACH repetitions or 1 RAR window for the one occurrence of 8 PRACH repetitions? |
| LG | We are generally fine with the proposal. But, regarding the main bullet, the previous wording is better because we agree that we will select only one option. We prefer option 3. |
| FGI | Prefer option 3. |
| ZTE | Option 1 should be clarified as NTT DOCOMO has set the precondition for Option 1. If gNB can NOT identify multiple PRACH repetitions, the only way for RAR window is multiple RAR window approach. But frankly, if gNB can identify multiple PRACH repetitions from the PRACH resource partitioning, it is also very helpful for the coverage enhancement as well as single RAR window. The difference between multiple RAR windows and single RAR window is not the condition that whether gNB can identify multiple PRACH repetitions or not. The main differences is:Multiple RAR window approach can have the minimum spec impact but need higher UE capability to support multiple RAR receptions before the end of previous RAR window(s), this means in the overlapping area of RAR windows, UE need detect multiple RA-RNTIs simultaneously if RA-RNTI calculation follows the legacy mechanism, this is the challenge for UE.For Option 2, the motivation is still unclear. The RAR window is not set based on the ROs duration and period, the RAR window is triggered by the event of PRACH transmission, the occurrence is randomized, and the start point of RAR window is not fixed at a place. |
| Panasonic  | Support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | Ok with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | Generally fine for the proposal. In our understanding, maybe we can try to achieve common understanding on whether it would be required that gNB can identify multiple PRACH repetitions. If that is the common understanding, then we prefer option 3. If it is possible that gNB doesn’t need to identify multiple PRACH repetitions, option 1 should be supported. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal in general. We share similar view with Intel on the RA-RNTI part and K value determination. |
| CATT | We prefer to do some down-selection for now. But we can live with it for now for the sake of progress.If we keep all the three options, as we commented earlier, there is overlap between Option 1 and Option 2 since Option 2 with K=1 is the same as Option 1.To differentiate the two options, K=1 should be precluded from Option 2. For the first FFS of Option 2, we agree with Intel that the example is better to be removed. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. We prefer Option3.  |
| Spreadtrum | Prefer Option 3.For options 1 and 2, there may be some overlap between two or more RAR windows. UE may need to detect DCI scrambled with two or more RA-RNTIs in the overlapping area, which may increase the UE complexity. |
| Apple  | OK with this proposal. Option 3 is preferred. |
| Sharp | We are OK with the proposal though we prefer down-selection.For the number of RAR window, we have same view with ZTE.From our view, to obtain full gain by the PRACH repetition, the gNB should be able to identify multiple PRACH repetitions. Therefore, we prefer Option 3. |
| Samsung  | We are fine to list all “theoretical” options even there was clear majority view and some of the possibility did not make much sense. We hope the window is kept open for good reason and look forward to see company who wants to keep the window open will provide some good options and arguments. |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal. We prefer either Option-2 or Option-3. Our first preference would be Option-3, if the PRACH configuration offers sufficient number of RSRP threshold values in cell configuration. In this case, UE can determine the necessary number of PRACH transmissions precisely based on RSRP measurements without transmitting more than necessary. For example, if only one RSRP threshold is defined, UE would either transmit a single PRACH or max. number of PRACH transmissions (e.g., 8) depending on its RSRP measurement being below or above that threshold. However, only two transmissions might have been sufficient for successful PRACH attempt. For this case, Option 2 would be more favorable from our perspective along with multiple RAR windows.  |
| CMCC | Ok with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To address Sony’s comment, suggest to refine Option 3* Option 3: One RAR window that a UE monitors starts after all of the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: the exact start position of the RAR window.
	+ FFS: RA-RNTI.
 |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. It seems that Option1 is a subset of Option2 when K=1. |
| Ericsson | Thanks for the update.A question for Option 1, if RAR window follows the legacy design, why doesn't RA-RNTI? If it is the correct understanding, we can remove the FFS of Option 1.To address Sony’s comment, we suggest * Option 3: Only one RAR window for all of the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: the start position of the RAR window.
	+ FFS: RA-RNTI.
 |
| Qualcomm | Fine with the proposal. Option 3 is preferred. |

### 4.1.3 Determine the number of multiple PRACH transmissions

#### Proposal 5-v1

**FL comment:** Since the majority companies are fine with number {2, 4, 8}, while one company think 8 is not supported, one company think it is too early to discuss the detailed number. Thus, FL proposes to make it a working assumption.

**Working assumption**

**Support at least {2 ,4, [8]} for the number of multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~.**

* + FFS other numbers.

**Support {2, 4, 8}:** Intel, CATT, FGI, DOCOMO, Panasonic, Qualcomm, LG, Samsung, CMCC, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Sony, ETRI, InterDigital, Fujitsu, Huawei, HiSilicon, Sharp, OPPO

**Support to delete 8**: vivo

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above working assumption.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Ok |
| Intel | We still prefer to keep 8, but we can okay to move forward.  |
| Sony | Fine to make it a Working Assumption. |
| LG | Support |
| FGI | Agree with the proposal and FFS. |
| ZTE | If it is a working assumption, i.e., not so stable, it is better to remove the square brackets as almost all companies support 8. If more companies think 8 is not needed, they can challenge the WF at next meeting. |
| Panasonic  | Support the working assumption to move forward. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Fine with the proposal.  |
| CATT | Support |
| OPPO | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Apple | Ok with this proposal. |
| Sharp | Support |
| Samsung  | Support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support the proposal. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine |
| Fujitsu | Support |
| Ericsson | These numbers are common repetition factors for other physical channels, and are logical in that sense. We have no concern with studying these numbers, but it is too early in our view to prioritize them, since they should first be justified for PRACH repetition. It may also be important to align the number of repetitions between repetition with same and different beams, in case it is decided that repetition with different beams is supported. As we commented in the first round, some companies suggest PRACH enhancement target to be “Relative difference vs. PUCCH Format 1” in TR 38.830. The first question is why PRACH would be set the same performance target as PUCCH format 1. What’s more, the Rel-17 coverage enhancement SI is based on a single PRACH transmission with a wide beam. For a UE capable of beam correspondence, the performance of a single PRACH transmission with a narrow beam is 6dB better than that with a wide beam for UE antenna configuration [2, 2, 2] and PRACH mis-detection rate of 1% [25]. So, the coverage gap captured in TR 38.830 doesn’t fit such kind of UEs.More of our concerns can be found in our comment in round 1. We propose the following aspects to consider when determining the candidate numbers. More detailed simulation assumptions including UE angle sets for PRACH transmissions with the same wide beam and the same narrow beam are provided in section 4.2.2.Proposal:When studying the number of PRACH repetitions to be supported, * Consider at least where the same beam is a wide beam or a narrow beam.
* Consider at least the (M,N,P)=(2,2,2) UE antenna configuration assumed in TR 38.830
* Use the difference in array gain between wide and narrow beams as one factor in determining the amount of repetitions of a wide beam.
	+ At least latency and PRACH overhead are other factors to be considered.
	+ Consider the same or different candidate values for multiple PRACH transmission with different beams.
* Evaluate the difference in Msg3 and PRACH performance
 |
| Qualcomm | Fine with the proposal |

#### Proposal 6-v1

**FL comment:** Proposal 6 is about how to determine the number of PRACH transmissions. The majority support this proposal with some wording changing. Regarding the FFS part for enabling PRACH transmission, it was suggested to be deleted since it does not have a directly relationship of the number issues. The updated proposal is as follows.

Proposal

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, at least ~~new~~ SSB-RSRP threshold(s) ~~can be introduced for indicating~~ are used to determine the number of PRACH transmissions.**

* + FFS detailed scheme, e.g., the number of SSB-RSRP thresholds or whether other measured/computed metrics or conditions should be used together with SSB-RSRP thresholds.
	+ FFS: linkage to the SS-RSRP threshold for Msg3 repetition request.
	+ FFS: whether only applied to CBRA
	+ ~~FFS: whether multiple PRACH transmissions is enabled only when the transmission power or number of PRACH retransmissions reaching a threshold.~~
	+ ~~FFS: whether multiple PRACH transmissions is enabled only UE reaches maximum transmission power for PRACH transmission.~~

**Support**: CATT, FGI, DOCOMO, Panasonic, Qualcomm, vivo, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Sony, MediaTek, ETRI, InterDigital, Huawei, HiSilicon, NEC, Sharp, OPPO

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | We would like to understand why the thirds FFS is needed. We suggest removing it. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Sony | Fine with the proposal. |
| LG | Support |
| FGI | We are fine with the proposal and FFS. |
| ZTE | From my perspective, the proposal skips the discussion on how to trigger the multiple PRACH transmission and go directly to how to determine the number of PRACH repetitions. The last two deleted FFS seem for the purpose of triggering, I hesitate if we can have a new place to discuss the triggering mechanism or leave this issue to RAN2. @Nokia, for the 3rd FFS, it is fine to keep it. As in CFRA case, the number of PRACH transmissions can be directly indicated to UE from gNB, the threshold may not need. |
| Panasonic  | Support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| DOCOMO | Generally OK with the proposal, but we want to confirm the understanding of the third FFS. Is the intention that “whether the relation between SSB-RSRP threshold and repetition factor applied only to CBRA”?  |
| Lenovo | Fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Generally fine with the proposal. SSB-RSRP based solution is also a condition for enabling multiple PRACH transmission. SSB-RSRP thresholds may further be used to determine the number of multiple PRACH transmission. For the deleted FFS part for enabling multiple PRACH transmission, it needs further study on the number of PRACH transmission when multiple PRACH is enabled by, e.g. transmission power or number of PRACH retransmissions reaching a threshold. We suggest to have joint or separate proposals to address how to enable multiple PRACH transmission and how to determine the number of multiple PRACH transmission.  |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal and FFS. |
| FL | @Nokia, @DOCOMO, the 3rd FFS indicates whether the main bullet is applied only to CBRA, since some company think for CFRA, there may be different mechanism. |
| Apple | We suggest updating the proposal as below. Until now it was not agreed to support multiple level of PRACH repetition. In the first sub-bullet, the number of SSB-RSRP thresholds could relate to the number of PRACH transmission and it is still FFS.**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, at least ~~new~~ SSB-RSRP threshold(s) ~~can be introduced for indicating~~ are used to determine the ~~number of~~ multiple PRACH transmissions.** |
| Sharp | Support |
| Samsung  | We agree with apple’s comment on the main bullet to delete the “number of”, instead , we can revise it as “the application of multiple PRACH”;Besides, we did not prefer to keep so many FFS and not even relevant to each other, because to us, there is certainly other apect to consider, e.g., the impact of FBE, as presented in our Tdoc; **For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, at least ~~new~~ SSB-RSRP threshold(s) ~~can be introduced for indicating~~ are used to determine the ~~number~~ application of PRACH transmissions.*** + FFS details~~ed scheme, e.g., the number of SSB-RSRP thresholds or whether other measured/computed metrics or conditions should be used together with SSB-RSRP thresholds.~~
	+ ~~FFS: linkage to the SS-RSRP threshold for Msg3 repetition request.~~
	+ ~~FFS: whether only applied to CBRA~~
 |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal. |
| CMCC | Before talking about determination of the number of repetitions, should we first discuss how to trigger the multiple PRACH transmission. This issue may also relay to the procedure of how to configure the multiple PRACH transmission. If only one repetition factor is configured at gNB side, then the only thing UE can determine is whether or not multiple PRACH transmission is applied, in this case determination of number of repetitions is not exist. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are generally fine with this proposal except FFS: linkage to the SS-RSRP threshold for Msg3 repetition request. Since Msg3 repetition is determined and indicated in RAR by BS, it seems no enough motivation to study it in this WID. Therefore, we suggest to remove it or change it as,* + FFS: whether to link ~~linkage~~ to the SS-RSRP threshold for Msg3 repetition request.
 |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support |

### 4.1.4 Power control

#### Proposal 7-v1

**FL comment:** Proposal 7 is about power ramping. Based on companies’ comments, the proposal is updated as follows.

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, down-select one option from the following options.**

* Option 1: Transmission power ramping is not applied during the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for each PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: The initial power and power ramping step.

**Support**: CATT, FGI, Panasonic, Qualcomm, LG, Samsung, CMCC, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Sony, ETRI, InterDigital, Fujitsu, NEC, Ericsson, Sharp, OPPO

* Option 2: Transmission power ramping can be ~~is~~ applied per PRACH transmission during the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: The initial power and power ramping step.
	+ FFS: The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for each PRACH transmissions.

**Support/open**: Spreadtrum, ZTE, OPPO

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Ok |
| Intel | We do not think Option 2 would work as mentioned in previous round of discussions. We suggest to remove Option 2 and focus on Option 1 only.  |
| Sony | Fine with the proposal and to leave the two options open. However, we prefer Option 1. |
| LG | Agree with Intel. We prefer to support option 1. |
| FGI | We agree with proposals. |
| ZTE | We admit the power ramping benefit can be achieved by Option 2.Option 2 can be regarded as the legacy PRACH retransmissions compressed in time domain. Then the power ramping principle can also be used for multiple PRACH transmissions in one attempt. The near far issue can be solved by carefully configuring the ramping parameters, it is not a big issue.  |
| Panasonic  | Support the proposal. We prefer Option 1.  |
| InterDigital | Fine with proposal (still prefer option 1). |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal, and prefer option 1. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| CATT | Agree with Intel to remove Option 2. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal.Our first priority is Option 2, and our second priority is Option 1. |
| FL | @Intel, @CATT, In fact, there are some companies what Option 2. Thus, FL suggest we don’t make a down selection currently. |
| **Apple** | OK with this proposal, Option 1 is preferred. |
| Sharp | OK with the FL proposal. We prefer Option 1. |
| **Samsung**  | We can live with still keep option 2 in the proposal even though we did not it make any sense.  |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal. Option-1 is preferred. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. Prefer option 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK. Prefer Option 1. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal, and prefer option 1. |
| Ericsson | Fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Fine with the proposal. Prefer Option 1. |

## 4.2 Multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams

### 4.2.1 Potential use cases

#### Discussion for issue #9

**FL comment:** The intention of this clarification is to identify the cases to study, since we need to identify if it is necessary to specify multiple PRACH transmission with different beams.

@ NEC, yes, option 1 means UE can transmit different Tx beams on different PRACH transmission within one RACH attempt. From FL’s understanding, gNB detects PRACH in the legacy way, it doesn’t impact the gNB behaviour. The supportance of each option is shown as follows:

* Option 1: Multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams are associated with the same SSB.

**Support:** Intel, CATT, FGI, DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Samsung, CMCC, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, MediaTek, ETRI, InterDigital, Ericsson, OPPO

* Option 2: Multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams are associated with different SSBs.

**Support:** DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Samsung, ETRI, Ericsson

Thus, FL has the following proposal:

#### Proposal 8

* Study at least the following case for multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams.
	+ **Multiple PRACH transmissions on the ROs associated with the same SSB, UE use different Tx beams to transmit the multiple PRACHs.**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Noikia/NSB | Ok |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Sony | We can study this case but would prefer to deprioritise it to ensure we have time to finish the feature for Multiple PRACH Tx with same beam. |
| LG | Agree with Sony. It can be further discussed with low priority.Moreover, we don’t want to introduce additional specification changes (e.g., best beam indication) if we support the multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams associated with the same SSB. |
| FGI | We support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal. In the WI scope, one of object is to study, and if justified, specify PRACH transmissions with different beams. Down selecting the PRACH transmissions with different beams in the early stage deviates from the motivation of WI. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| DOCOMO | Since multiple PRACH transmissions for CFRA is not precluded, maybe we can also consider the same CSI-RS.* **Study at least the following case for multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams.**
* **Multiple PRACH transmissions on the ROs associated with the same SSB/CSI-RS, UE use different Tx beams to transmit the multiple PRACHs.**
 |
| Lenovo | We prefer to study both option1 and option 2 at this stage. |
| CATT | We agree with the intention of the proposal to focus on option 1 for now. But the proposal seems not exactly the same as Option 1 since only ROs are considered in the proposal. For example, if one RO is associated with multiple SSBs, the proposal seems can also cover Option 2? Why not just use the wording of Option 1? |
| OPPO | Support the proposal.  |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal.  |
| Apple | Ok with this proposal. |
| Samsung | Ok with the proposal, but we think the motivation for different UL Tx beam has nothing to do with different associated SSBs. We hope it should be deprioritized for the case of different SSBs.  |
| MediaTek | Support the proposal. |
| CMCC | Fine. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with Sony that it is beneficial and necessary to deprioritise this case. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support |

### 4.2.2 Performance gain

**FL comment**: Based on the comments, companies want to align the simulation assumptions to better study the performance gain of multiple PRACH transmission with different beams. Thus, FL has the following proposal.

#### Proposal 9

* Companies are encouraged to provide simulation results for multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams in the next meeting.
	+ **Simulation assumptions in TR 38.830 are used for the simulation.**
	+ **Both UE capable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* and UE incapable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* can be considered in the simulation.**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Ok |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the proposal. One clarification question: for “UE capable of beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping”, does that mean UE would perform beam sweeping using narrow beam for PRACH transmission?  |
| LG | Ok |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| CATT | Fine. |
| FL | @ Intel, it indicates whether UE is capable of beam correspondence. If a UE is incapable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping*, it has to rely on multiple UL transmissions with beam sweeping. |
| Samsung  | Support the proposal.  |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 9 is good as a starting point. We observed some different choices of simulation assumptions in TR 38.830 between companies, and it is important that these are aligned so that we can reach the same conclusions from the simulations.One key point is that companies should provide results with both same and different beam, since their relative performance can be a primary factor in determining whether or not to specify different beams. Therefore we propose:* Companies are encouraged to provide simulation results for multiple PRACH transmissions with different and same beams in the next meeting.

Regarding the detailed simulation parameters:1. The simulation can focus on FR2, since the WID says “The enhancements of PRACH are targeting for FR2”.
2. Metric: Missed detection rate vs. SNR, at false alarm rate of 0.1%
3. CDL-A channel defined by Table 7.7.1-1 in 38.901 is used for PRACH transmissions with the same beam and PRACH transmissions with different beams.
4. UE antenna [2 2 2] from TR38.830 is used for PRACH transmissions with the same beam and PRACH transmissions with different beams.
5. The narrow or wide beam used by UEs with different capabilities of beam correspondence is summarized as follows.

Table: multiple PRACH transmissions for different UE capabilities

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| UE capabilities | multiple PRACH transmissions with the same beam | multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams |
| UE capable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* | The best beam of 8 candidate beams is used, which matches the channel best | The beams are generated in accordance with PRACH repetition factor. |
| UEs incapable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* | a wide beam, generated by a pair of dual polarized antennas |

1. According to 3 and 4, in our simulation, there are always two vertical beams. Horizontal beams cover AOD -180~180 evenly. We set the first horizontal beam with an angle of -pi. The angel sets are suggested as follows.

2 repetitions* 1. Azimuth angle set =a wide beam
	2. Zenith angle set = [0, pi/2]

4 repetitions1. Azimuth angle set = [-pi, 0], AOD degrees -180~180 evenly divided by 2 horizontal beams
2. Zenith angle set = [0, pi/2]

8 repetitions1. Azimuth angle set = [-pi, -pi/2, 0, pi/2], AOD degrees -180~180 evenly divided by 4 horizontal beams
2. Zenith angle set = [0, pi/2]
 |

1. Email discussion (3rd round)

## 5.1 Multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams

### 5.1.1 Resource configuration for multiple PRACH transmissions

#### Proposal 1-v2

**FL comment**: Based on the comments, FL suggest we delete Option 5 and consider to use the combination of Option 2+Option 3 to realize Option 5. The only difference lies in that separate preambles are needed. As LG comment, if shared preambles are used, gNB may need to detect single PRACH transmission on the shared RO and multiple PRACH transmission on the shared RO and separate RO, respectively. It may result in some problems.

FL would like to check if the proponent companies for Option 5 can also accept the combination of Option 2 and Option 3. If not acceptable, proponent companies for Option 5 are encouraged to consider the issue proposed by LG.

@LG, since the main bullet is “consider” the following options, FL suggests we keep option 3. Moreover, it can be observed in the 1st round discussion that there are a lot of companies would like to consider Option 3.

@ZTE, the current version of Option 3 doesn’t preclude the frequency offset parameters. Please check if it is acceptable for you.

@ Samsung, thanks for the effort to improve the wording, FL suggest we continue the discussion based on the original options. The wording of “with legacy single PRACH transmission” is added to make it clearer.

@ Huawei, the difference of Option 3 and Option 4 lies in the how the ROs are determined. For Option 4, a new RRC structure is not precluded, while it can also be realized by a separate PRACH configuration with the same structure as legacy (e.g., we use different row index to indicate the exact PRACH configuration based on the PRACH configuration table for legacy single PRACH transmission and multiple PRACH transmissions). In some sense, Option 3 and Option 4 can be merged as something like “Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs”, but the separate Option 3 and Option 4 makes a step further considering how the resource is configured. Thus, FL suggest we separate them.

**Proposal**

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, consider one or multiple of the following options.**

* Option 2: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with separate preamble on shared ROs with legacy single PRACH transmission.
* Option 3: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs with legacy single PRACH transmission, where the frequency-time locations of the separate ROs are determined at least based on legacy PRACH configuration.~~, e.g., IAB-like approach.~~
* e.g., additional configuration may be considered.
* Option 4: Multiple PRACH are transmitted based on separate PRACH configuration with legacy single PRACH transmission~~, e.g., NB-IoT-like approach~~.
* e.g., a new RRC structure may be considered, or a separate PRACH configuration with the same structure as legacy.
* ~~Option 5: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs and shared ROs.~~
* Other options are not precluded.
* FFS: detailed schemes, including how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission for all the above Options.

Companies are encouraged to provide additional views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Samsung  | We can be ok with proposal for sake of progress, even though some over complicated things have been mixed, such as whether reuse or not the legacy PRACH configuration index, we think this could be belong the FFS detailed schemes.  |
| LG | We are generally fine with the proposal. We prefer to support the Option 2 or the Option 4. |
| DOCOMO | We are generally fine with the principle. As the FL commented that combination of option 2 and option 3 is not precluded (that’s why option 5 is deleted), can we update option 3 as following?* Option 3: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs with legacy single PRACH transmission, where the frequency-time locations of the separate ROs are determined at least based on legacy PRACH configuration.~~, e.g., IAB-like approach.~~
* e.g., additional configuration may be considered.
* FFS preambles for multiple PRACH on separate ROs
 |
| ZTE | Fine with the Option 2/3/4.For the separate PRACH configuration of Option 4, below is a simple example to show our thought: some IEs in the current configurations could be new configurations for multiple PRACH transmissions.

|  |
| --- |
| prach-ConfigurationIndex INTEGER (0..255), msg1-FDM ENUMERATED {one, two, four, eight}, msg1-FrequencyStart INTEGER (0..maxNrofPhysicalResourceBlocks-1), |

This is just an example but not limit to this example, the detail needs more investigation.For concern from LG, I also share the view with FL, if shared RO and separate RO are both used by multiple PRACH transmissions, it is better to use separate preamble to identify the multiple PRACH transmissions by gNB. While it is not easy to say Option 5 is the simple combination of Option 2 and Option 3, so I suggest Option 5 as individual option. Option 5 is an alternative aiming the case that the ROs configured by Option 3 or Option 4 cannot avoid the collision with legacy ROs. But I respect the FL’s proposal on the removal of Option 5. Let’s see more companies’ view. |
| vivo | For proposal 5, according to the discussions, it seems to mean some of the PRACH repetitions are transmitted on shared ROs (where preamble partitioning will be performed) and remaining repetitions are transmitted on separately configured ROs after the shared ROs. If this is the understanding we think this can be captured in the first sentence of this proposal to allow a combination of a set of options.Generally, we have 3 types of resource configuration, * Type 1: all repetitions are transmitted on shared ROs,
* Type 2: all repetitions are transmitted on separate ROs,
* Type 3: some repetitions (e.g. first repetition) are transmitted on shared ROs while remaining repetitions are transmitted on separate ROs.

In our view to solve the latency issue and reduce the impact to legacy, type 1 (i.e. all repetitions are transmitted on shared ROs) should deprioritized. Type 2 may solve the issue if the separate PRACH configuration is different from legacy PRACH configuration. Type 3 can solve the issue given the separate RO after the shared ROs can be scheduled on consecutive UL slots.As for the FL proposal, * option 2 corresponds to Type 1, we do not think this option alone is a good option given the latency, the impact to legacy single PRACH transmission and the complexity to specify a pattern of RO set for multiple PRACH transmissions. We can keep it here as a combination of option 2 and other options may be needed.
* Option 3 corresponds to Type 2, which requires another PRACH configuration index but using same PRACH configuration table as legacy, this will not solve the latency concern which is why a subbullet is needed to make it possible to insert some ROs between the sparse ROs separately configured. We propose to have some updates to the sub-bullet to make it clear.
* Option 4 corresponds to Type 3, where additional ROs are separately configured relative to the legacy ROs used for single PRACH transmission and the legacy ROs are shared by both single and multiple PRACH transmissions where PRACH partitioning is needed. Some updates are needed to reflect this.

According to above, we propose to have following updates:

|  |
| --- |
| ***Proposal*****For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, consider one or multiple or a combination of multiple of the following options.*** Option 2: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with separate preamble on shared ROs with legacy single PRACH transmission.
* Option 3: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs with legacy single PRACH transmission, where the frequency-time locations of the separate ROs are determined at least based on legacy PRACH configuration.~~, e.g., IAB-like approach.~~
* ~~e.g.,~~ additional configuration may be considered to configure a subset of ROs for multiple PRACH transmissions.
* Option 4: Some of the ~~M~~multiple PRACH are transmitted based on ~~separate~~ additional PRACH configuration specific for multiple PRACH transmission~~with legacy single PRACH transmission, e.g., NB-IoT-like approach~~.
* e.g., a separate set of ROs can be configured relative to legacy ROs shared by multiple PRACH transmission. ~~a new RRC structure may be considered,~~ ~~or a separate PRACH configuration with the same structure as legacy~~.
* ~~Option 5: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs and shared ROs.~~
* Other options are not precluded.
* FFS: detailed schemes, including how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission for all the above Options.
 |

 |
| FL | @DOCOMO, I think the “FFS: detailed scheme” in the last bullet is enough. FL suggest not to put additional FFS under each Option.@vivo, actually, Option 4 doesn’t corresponds to Type 3, it corresponds to type 2. The combination of Option 2 and Option 3 corresponds to Type 3. As it was clarified in the 2nd round discussion in Section 4.1.1. The different between Option 3 and Option 4 lies in the difference of RO configurations. |
| CMCC | Generally Fine with this proposal. Just a small modification about the preamble. If Option 2 mentioned “with separate preamble” , should Option 3 also including “with separate/shared preamble”? Adding a FFS like “ separate/shared preamble” may also be helpful. |
| CATT | We have the following comments:* + - * 1. The meaning of “separate ROs with legacy single PRACH transmission” and “separate PRACH configuration with legacy single PRACH transmission” are not clear to us.
				2. “legacy PRACH configuration” in Option 3 is not clear
				3. The “including…” part in FFS is not needed.

Please find our suggestions below.**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, consider one or multiple of the following options.*** Option 2: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with separate preamble on shared ROs with legacy single PRACH transmission.
* Option 3: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs from ROs for~~with~~ legacy single PRACH transmission, where the frequency-time locations of the separate ROs are determined at least based on ~~legacy~~ PRACH configuration for legacy single PRACH transmission. ~~e.g., IAB-like approach.~~
* e.g., additional configuration may be considered.
* Option 4: Multiple PRACH are transmitted based on separate PRACH configuration from the PRACH configuration for ~~with~~ legacy single PRACH transmission~~, e.g., NB-IoT-like approach~~.
* FFS separate PRACH configuration is based on existing RRC structure or new RRC structure
* ~~e.g., a new RRC structure may be considered, or a separate PRACH configuration with the same structure as legacy.~~
* ~~Option 5: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs and shared ROs.~~
* Other options are not precluded.
* FFS: detailed schemes~~, including how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission for all the above Options.~~
 |
| Sharp | We support the FL’s proposal. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal in general. For option 3 and option 4, we still don’t think how to configure separate ROs for PRACH repetition is the focus at this stage. The signalling design is the next step after separate RO configuration is agreed, and maybe not even in RAN1.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Unfortunately, we are not ok anymore with the proposal. The part “with legacy single PRACH transmission” is too unclear and could lead to companies stating that certain directions should be precluded because they are not aligned with legacy PRACH transmission. We are not ready to agree on such a big constraint at the beginning of the release, considering how important this new feature is and how much there is still to study.If the concern is about preventing preamble-to-RO relationships other than “only 1 preamble is transmitted per RO” then we can simply add a note that applies to all Options, which explicitly states this fact. We do not need anything else.Finally, we think that it could better if wrote Option 4 in a way which could highlight the differences with Option 3 in a more straightforward way as follows:**Option 4**: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs, where the frequency-time locations of the separate ROs are determined at least based on separate PRACH configuration* e.g., a new RRC structure may be considered, or a separate PRACH configuration with the same structure as legacy.

This would have the merit of not creating ambiguous understanding of the differences between the two Options. |
| Fujitsu | We share similar view with CMCC that it is needed that how to determine the preamble in Option 3. |
| Spreadtrum | We share similar view as Nokia that the meaning of “legacy single PRACH transmission” are not clear. We are fine with Nokia’s modification for Option 4. |
| Sony | We share similar view with CATT, Nokia & Spreadtrum. The “legacy single PRACH transmission” makes the proposal more confusing and it isn’t even clear why we needed this sentence. I would thought Option 3 is as described by vivo as Type 2, where multi PRACH transmissions are all transmitted on separately configured ROs. The current proposal does not describe this. |
| MediaTek | We support the FL’s proposal. |
| Intel | Our view is that the difference between Option 3 and Option 4 is mainly whether a new PRACH configuration will be introduced on the support of multiple PRACH transmissions. It is not clear to us how many companies support Option 4, which would introduce a huge spec impact with new PRACH configuration. The wording can be improved as suggested by other companies.  |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Ericsson | The example of Option 4 “a separate PRACH configuration with the same structure as legacy” belongs to Option 3, “where the frequency-time locations of the separate ROs are determined at least based on legacy PRACH configuration”, as well. If this is a correct understanding, there seems to be some overlapping between Option 4 and Option 3 and the difference between them is not very clear to us. Or does Option 3 intend to have no RRC spec impact and have only RAN1 spec impact? |
| ZTE | @Ericsson, the example showed for Option 4 is different with Option 3, as the prach-ConfigurationIndex, msg1-FDM, msg1-FrequencyStart is new parameter for multiple PRACH transmission configuration. Moreover, if possible, the PRACH configuration table may be a new table for multiple PRACH transmissions.But for Option 3, the new introduced time or frequency offset is based on the legacy PRACH RO. |
| OPPO | We support the FL’s proposal. |

#### Proposal 2-v2

**FL comment:** Based on the comments, the majority companies are fine with the proposal and the 1st FFS. Regarding the 2nd FFS, some companies prefer to remove it. From FL perspective, it is suggested to keep the 2nd FFS since some company think it may have some use case. Considering this is the 1st meeting for Rel-18 cov, FL suggests we keep the 2nd FFS in order to make a progress.

**Proposal**

* **For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, at least ROs located at different time instances can be utilized for the transmissions.**
* **FFS: whether the starting RB of ROs can be different at different time instances ~~is supported~~ for multiple PRACH transmissions.**
* **FFS: ~~whether ROs~~ multiple PRACH transmissions located in the same time instance ~~can be utilized for the transmissions~~.**

Companies are encouraged to provide additional views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Samsung  | Generally fine, we did not want to be too picky on the wording. But the second FFS is for multiple PRACH in same time instance but different frequency instance, right? I hope company want bring same time/frequency instance in feature. |
| LG | Regarding the second FFS point, we think the multiple PRACH transmissions with FDMed ROs located in the same time instance is not beneficial for UEs with single Tx chain. So, if it is beneficial only for Ues with multiple Tx chains, the second FFS bullet can be modified as follows.**Proposal*** **For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, at least ROs located at different time instances can be utilized for the transmissions.**
* **FFS: whether the starting RB of ROs can be different at different time instances ~~is supported~~ for multiple PRACH transmissions.**
* **FFS: ~~whether ROs~~ multiple PRACH transmissions located in the same time instance for Ues with multiple Tx chains ~~can be utilized for the transmissions~~.**
 |
| DOCOMO | Even though we don’t prefer the second FFS bullet, but we are fine to accept the proposal. |
| ZTE | Generally fine. The case of multiple Tx chains is valid, so I am open to keep the 2nd FFS. If no other cases are involved, the revision of 2nd FFS from LG is also fine. |
| Vivo | Fine. |
| CMCC | Just like we comment in last round. We are fine with the proposal removing the 2nd FFS. Since the “at least” in the main part could cover all the other cases. we prefer to support the proposal without the 2nd bullet.If possible we can replace the 2nd FFS with “other solutions are not precluded”. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Sharp | We are generally OK with the FL’s proposal. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal in general.With the first FFS, it might lead to understanding that the baseline is that the starting RB of ROs is the same, which was not discussed yet. To avoid this, we suggest revise the first sub-bullet to “FFS: how to determine the ROs at each time instance for multiple PRACH transmissions”.  |
| Nokia/NSB | The second FFS would be clearer if it was clearly stated that it is about FDMed ROs, and not multiple preambles over the same RO. Thus, we suggest modifying as follows: **FFS: ~~whether ROs~~ multiple PRACH transmissions over different ROs located in the same time instance for UEs with multiple Tx chains ~~can be utilized for the transmissions~~.** |
| Fujitsu | OK with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Generally fine. |
| Sony | Fine with proposal but think that the 2nd sub-bullet is not necessary. |
| MediaTek | We are OK with the FL’s proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with the update from Nokia and LGE to make it clear, although we do not think the second FFS is needed.  |
| Qualc | Fine with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support this proposal except the second FFS.For the second FFS, there is UL power splitting issue between FDMed ROs, resulting in coverage degradation. Prefer to delete it, but OK with it if it is majority view. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the proposal and would like to study the second FFS for UE with multiple Tx chains, where the PAPR does not increase (unlike the single Tx chain case) and it can reap both frequency and antenna diversity gain.We are fine to add “for UEs with multiple Tx chains” in the second FFS. The current wording also includes CDMed transmissions in the same RO, where each PRACH is transmitted with a Tx chain. |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. For us, the second FFS is not preferred. |

#### Proposal 3-v2

**FL comment:** It seems the majority companies support this proposal. FL would like to check if there is additional concern.

**Proposal**

* **For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, at least support to use same PRACH preamble ~~is utilized~~ during the multiple PRACH transmissions in one attempt.**
	+ **FFS: whether different preambles can be utilized in different PRACH transmissions during the multiple PRACH transmissions in one attempt.**
	+ **~~FFS: whether only applied to CBRA.~~**

Companies are encouraged to provide additional views **if you have some concern** on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Samsung  | We support this proposal. |
| LG | Support |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support |
| vivo | In our understanding, the multiple PRACH transmissions mentioned here must finish in one attempt. If this is the common understanding and the intention of adding “in one attempt”, there seems no issue without adding “in one attempt”. It would be good to clarify the intention of this update. |
| FL | @vivo, from FL’s understanding, it indicates the same thing w/ or w/o “in one attempt”, while some company think it is more clear to add it. I think this is not a big deal. |
| CMCC | Fine. |
| CATT | Support the proposal. |
| Sharp | We support the FL’s proposal. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Ok |
| Fujitsu | Fine |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Intel | We also think the whole discussion is for multiple PRACH transmissions within one attempt. If needed, we may need to update the other proposals. We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | support this proposal. |
| Ericsson | We are generally fine with the proposal, with a small comment. “Attempt” can be changed to “RACH attempt”. |
| OPPO | Support |

### 5.1.2 RAR window and RA-RNTI calculation

#### Proposal 4-v2

**FL comment:** As some companies comment the motivation of Option 2 is unclear. FL would like to check if it is acceptable for all companies to delete Option 2. If some company indeed want to consider Option 2, FL then suggest to keep it to make a progress.

@ Sony, Option 3 needs gNB and UE have the same understanding on the ROs for multiple PRACH transmissions, in this case, one RAR window can be applied. In Section 2.1.2, two illustrations are summarized how Option 3 works. Hope this can solve your concern.

@ Ericsson, because there may be overlapping between multiple windows, it may impact the RA-RNTI. Thus, FFS RA-RNTI is needed for Option 1.

@Huawei, there may be different detailed options for Option 3 as illustrated in Section 2.1.2, the start position of the RAR window can be further studied.

**Proposal**

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, ~~down-select one option from~~ consider the following options.**

* Option 1: One RAR window per each PRACH transmission, the RAR window follows the legacy design.
	+ FFS: RA-RNTI.

**Support:** DOCOMO (if gNB can NOT identify multiple PRACH repetitions), Panasonic, Samsung, CMCC, ZTE

* Option 2: One RAR window per *K* PRACH transmissions, a RAR window starts after *K* PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: details on K~~, e.g., K may depend on RAR Window configuration~~.
	+ FFS: RA-RNTI.
	+ Note: *K* is larger than one and less than the number of multiple PRACH transmissions.

**Support:** Sony, MediaTek(2nd)

* Option 3: Only one RAR window for all of the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: the start position of the RAR window.
	+ FFS: RA-RNTI.

**Support:** Intel, CATT, FGI, DOCOMO (if gNB can identify multiple PRACH repetitions), Qualcomm, LG, vivo, Samsung, CMCC, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, MediaTek(1st), ETRI, InterDigital, Fujitsu, Huawei, HiSilicon, NEC, Ericsson, Sharp, OPPO

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We support the proposal |
| LG | We can support this proposal, and we prefer to support Option 3 only. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support.  |
| Vivo | Fine with the proposal. Option 3 is preferred. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Sharp | We support the FL’s proposal. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Ok |
| Fujitsu | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Sony | **@FL:** I think the figures in Section 2.1.2 does not answer my question. My question is more of a configuration issue. How would you configure one RAR window for 2 sets of RO with 4 repetitions and 1 set of RO with 8 repetitions, if these 8 ROs are used for 4 and 8 repetitions?I think Huawei’s explanation is good IF that is the intention, that is the UE monitors ONE RAR Window rather than multiple RAR windows. Hence the it is possible to configure one RAR window for each of the 2 sets of 4 PRACH repetitions and 8 PRACH repetitions. I would prefer that this is made clear, i.e.:* Option 3: Only one RAR window is monitored by the UE for all of the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: the start position of the RAR window.
	+ FFS: RA-RNTI.

Option 2 seems to restrict the configuration of RAR Window. I must say it was rather confusingthe initial proposal. If nobody wants Option 2, I would like to change it to (or otherwise add an Option 4):* Option 2: The UE monitors any available RAR window after one or more PRACH transmissions of a multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ The start position of the RAR window is up to network configuration
	+ FFS: RA-RNTI.

That is the UE would monitor the RAR window as per legacy behaviour and the RAR window starts at the 1st PDCCH Type 1 CSS after one or more multi PRACH transmission. I believe this is the closest to the legacy behaviour. |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK. We prefer option 3. |
| Ericsson | Thanks for the clarification. We are fine with the proposal and also fine with Option 2 removed. |
| OPPO | Support |

**Q1: Is it acceptable for you to delete Option 2?**

Companies are encouraged to **answer Q1**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | If we use the same standard rule for today GTW for DWS, option2 should be deleted.  |
| LG | Yes. |
| DOCOMO | Fine to delete. |
| ZTE | Fine to delete as the motivation is not convincing. |
| Vivo | Fine. |
| CMCC | Yes. |
| CATT | Yes |
| Sharp | Fine. |
| Lenovo | We think the option 2 could be kept considering that it is the first meeting for Rel-18 coverage. We can do down-selection in feature meetings.  |
| Nokia | Yes |
| Fujitsu | Yes |
| Spreadtrum | Yes  |
| Sony | Yes, but replace with (or add an Option 4): * + Option 2 (or Option 4): The UE monitors any available RAR window after one or more PRACH transmissions of a multiple PRACH transmissions.
		- The start position of the RAR window is up to network configuration
		- FFS: RA-RNTI.
 |
| MediaTek | No. We prefer to keep Option-2 although Option-3 is our first preference. The motivation is about making sure that UE does not have to transmit more PRACH transmissions (in one attempt) than necessary. If we define sufficient number of RSRP thresholds in cell configuration, Option-3 will work fine. Otherwise, Option-2 here may be preferable. We would like to make a down-selection after we reach agreements on RSRP thresholds and supported PRACH transmission numbers. |
| Intel | Yes |
| Qualcomm | Yes |
| Ericsson | Yes. |
| OPPO | Yes |

### 5.1.3 Determine the number of multiple PRACH transmissions

#### Proposal 5-v2

**FL comment:** It seems the majority company support the proposal, while Ericsson show some concerns. Based on ZTE’s comment the square of 8 is removed, considering it is a working assumption.

@Ericsson, the simulation assumptions provided in TR 38.830 seems enough. It may not need to discuss additional simulation parameters here. Moreover, there is “FFS other numbers” as a sub-bullet, other numbers are not precluded. Considering the overwhelming majority view and it is a working assumption, companies can revisit it later, I’m not sure why Ericsson is still objecting the proposal. Hope Ericsson can be constructive.

**Working assumption**

**Support at least {2 ,4, ~~[~~8~~]~~} for the number of multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam.**

* + FFS other numbers.

**Support:** Nokia/NSB, Intel, Sony, LG, FGI, ZTE, Panasonic, InterDigital, DOCOMO, Lenovo, CATT, OPPO, Spreadtrum, Apple, Sharp, Samsung, MediaTek, CMCC, Huawei, HiSilicon, Fujitsu, Qualcomm

**Concern:** Ericsson

Companies are encouraged to provide additional views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposal, in addition. We wonder similar as the question for different lt x beam in discussion in issue #9, should we clarify this is for same associated SSB or different associated SSB? |
| LG | Support |
| **ZTE** | Support. For the comments from Ericsson, I think the simulation could be done is for the case of different beams. This WF is aiming only for case of same beam. If the number of repetition would be different between different beams and same beam, we can discuss the number of repetitions for different beam later. |
| Vivo | The maximum number of repetitions needed should be justified by simulations from companies instead of voting or theoretical assumptions.At least according to our evaluations, even assume the ~7.5dB gap which may be too high as pointed out by Ericsson, only 4 repetitions are needed for single beam case.Therefore, we are fine to only agree on the numbers that are identified as necessary according to all companies’ results and leave all other values to be covered by the FFS bullet at this stage.**Working assumption****Support at least {2 ,4~~, [8]~~} for the number of multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~.*** FFS other numbers.
 |
| CMCC | Fine. |
| CATT | Support |
| Sharp | Support. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the spirit. @Samung: Our understanding is that this is for the same associated SSB. If this is not the case, it would be good to clarify. @vivo: we asked this question already but did not obtain any reply: How can you exceed 6 dB of performance increase with only 4 repetitions? If no power ramping during the repetitions occurs then at the most you can experiences a x4 SNR increase, hence 6 dB.  |
| Fujitsu | Fine |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Sony | Support removing the square brackets for 8 (i.e. include “8”) |
| MediaTek | We support the FL’s proposal (i.e., with removed square brackets for 8) |
| Intel | At least based on our simulation results, ~2dB gain can be achieved when doubling the repetition levels. If we target 6dB performance improvement, 8 repetitions are necessary. We think 8 should be included for multiple PRACH transmissions.  |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Ericsson | Again, we think that {2,4,8} are intuitive numbers to support, and we see the motivation from that perspective. However, agreeing to them now gives priority to them without reaching common understanding on why they are more valuable than other numbers. Such an understanding could help e.g. if UEs that use wide beams would use different number of repetitions than a UE with a same narrow beam and/or if repetitions with a different beam are used.There are two different UE behaviors of the legacy single PRACH transmission, and these are possible for Rel-18 multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam. A legacy UE capable of beam correspondence transmits a single PRACH with a refined narrow beam, otherwise it would transmit with a wide beam. Rel-18 multiple PRACH transmissions with the same beam needs to take into account both, namely, the same narrow beam and the same wide beam. In our view, a common understanding on this is needed before we study, discuss and agree on the number of repetitions. On the other hand, these numbers are common repetition factors for other physical channels and are logical in that sense. Therefore, we advise to study these candidate numbers.Different from other proposals of PRACHs with the same beam, the discussion on repetition factor will certainly happen to multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams, if supported. Therefore, we propose to consider whether the same candidate values can apply to multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams.We suggest the following (which can be an agreement if that helps progress).**~~Support~~Consider at least {2 ,4, ~~[~~8~~]~~} for the number of multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, including scenarios using the same narrow beam and the same wide beam.*** + FFS other numbers.
	+ Review whether the same candidate values can apply to multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams, if supported, and update if needed.
 |
| OPPO | Support |

#### Proposal 6-v2

**FL comment:** @DOCOMO, @Nokia, the 3rd FFS indicates whether the main bullet is applied only to CBRA, since some company think there may be different mechanism for CFRA.

@all, as some companies comment, the enable of multiple PRACH transmission may need to be discussed first. From FL’s understanding, the original Proposal is also workable even the network only configure one kind of number for multiple PRACH transmission, i.e., only one SSB-RSRP threshold is used. Nevertheless, FL prepares two versions of the proposals, one is the original (Proposal-A), the other (Proposal-B) with the main bullet replaced by “**determine the application of** **multiple PRACH transmission**”, and the determination of the number of PRACH transmission can be included in detailed scheme. FL would like to check companies’ views on the two versions. Hope we can have some progress.

**Proposal-A**

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, at least SSB-RSRP threshold(s) are used to determinethe number of PRACH transmissions.**

* + FFS detailed scheme, e.g., the number of SSB-RSRP thresholds or whether other measured/computed metrics or conditions should be used together with SSB-RSRP thresholds.
	+ FFS: whether to link ~~linkage to~~ the SS-RSRP threshold for Msg3 repetition request.
	+ FFS: whether only applied to CBRA

**Proposal-B**

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, at least SSB-RSRP threshold(s) are used to determine ~~the number~~ the application of multiple PRACH transmissions.**

* + FFS detailed scheme, e.g., determination of the number of PRACH transmissions, the number of SSB-RSRP thresholds or whether other measured/computed metrics or conditions should be used together with SSB-RSRP thresholds.
	+ FFS: whether to link ~~linkage to~~ the SS-RSRP threshold for Msg3 repetition request.
	+ FFS: whether only applied to CBRA

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Samsung  | We prefer Proposal – B with adding another FFS as following. As we commented several times in earlier round, the FFS are too detailed. If FL and proponent want to keep the FFS lists, we want to add our preferred aspect to be studied as well.**Proposal-B****For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, at least SSB-RSRP threshold(s) are used to determine ~~the number~~ the application of multiple PRACH transmissions.*** + FFS detailed scheme, e.g., determination of the number of PRACH transmissions, the number of SSB-RSRP thresholds or whether other measured/computed metrics or conditions should be used together with SSB-RSRP thresholds.
	+ FFS: whether to link ~~linkage to~~ the SS-RSRP threshold for Msg3 repetition request.
	+ FFS: whether only applied to CBRA
	+ FFS: the impact from FBE.
 |
| LG | We prefer to support Proposal-A. |
| DOCOMO | We prefer Proposal -B. |
| ZTE | Both are fine. Proposal-A seems going further more. We slightly prefer Proposal-A.  |
| vivo | Proposal-B is preferred given there’s no consensus in RAN1 on always supporting multiple number of repetitions in the same serving cell.However, we suggest removing all FFS at this stage. |
| CMCC | We prefer Proposal-B. Since “application” only have two states, the “(s)” in main bullet could be deleted. |
| CATT | If we consider number of PRACH transmissions in Proposal-A includes number of repetition=1, proposal-A covers proposal-B and additionally includes different numbers of repetitions>1. We think a same approach can be used to determine from a set of numbers of repetitions>1 as well. So we prefer Proposal-A.One general question to both proposals, are they applicable to a RACH procedure or per attempt? According to the current proposal, it seems imply that for each RACH attempt, UE needs to determine the number/application of repetitions based on RSRP, which is not clear yet.  |
| Sharp | At this stage, we prefer Proposal B since the configuration of various number of PRACH repetitions may cause PRACH resource fragmentation (including preambles and ROs) and need more study. |
| Lenovo | We prefer proposal A, but can live with option B. |
| Nokia/NSB | The impact from FBE on PRACH is unclear to us. Can Samsung elaborate a bit more on that? We think we should be open at the beginning of the release, as we explained earlier, however some intuition on how keeping a certain FFS in would be interesting to have.Concerning Proposal A vs Proposal B we think that the former includes the latter, since the used of the threshold(s) can be designed to yield 1 repetition if no threshold is met. This is what RAN1/RAN2 typically do in these cases. We think that any design would be very unlikely. We prefer Proposal A. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer Proposal B. Since we think we should first discuss the triggering mechanism of PRACH repetition. |
| Sony | We prefer to support Proposal-A. The number of PRACH transmission can be 1. The same mechanism was used for eMTC and NB-IoT, which was a good approach and so we think this should be resused. |
| MediaTek | We prefer Proposal-A, but we can live with Proposal-B. |
| Intel | We support Proposal – A. Proposal A includes Proposal -B.  |
| Qualcomm | We prefer proposal A |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Prefer proposal A |
| Ericsson | We prefer Proposal-A.According to the discussion of Proposal 1-v2, separate preambles or RO resources are configured for multiple PRACH transmissions and single PRACH transmission. The presence of configuration for separate resources for multiple PRACH transmissions is a clearer indication on whether multiple PRACH transmissions is enabled by gNB than the presence of SSB-RSRP threshold(s).  |
| OPPO | We prefer proposal B. The determination of repetition number can be studied further.  |

**Q1: Is it acceptable for you to merge all the three FFS into one simple FFS, as “FFS details.”**

Companies are encouraged to **answer Q1**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| LG | Yes.  |
| DOCOMO | No strong view on whether to merge or not merge. |
| ZTE | Slightly to preserve the FFS. |
| Vivo | Yes. |
| Sharp | OK but current three FFS may be useful for further consideration. No strong view. |
| Lenovo | We think the these FFS could be kept, which is helpful for future discussion. |
| Nokia/NSB | We prefer not merging for the sake of clarity. |
| Spreadtrum | Slightly prefer not to merge the FFS. |
| Sony | Merging the FFS just makes the proposal confusing and unclear what we try to achieve by making things more confusing. So we do not think they should be merged. |
| MediaTek | Slight preference not to merge for clarify. If companies have concern, we can consider adding a generic “FFS other aspects” in addition to the current list of FFS. |
| Intel | We are fine to keep, but if companies keep adding the details, we can go with FL’s suggestions. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer not to merge FFSs |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Prefer to keep them for more information. |
| Ericsson | We prefer to keep the current three FFS and are fine without any FFS. |
| OPPO | We prefer to keep the current FFS.  |

### 5.1.4 Power control

#### Proposal 7-v1

**FL comment:** Based on companies’ comments, some company wants to make a down-selection in this meeting. From FL perspective, since it is the first meeting, it is suggested to keep both of the two options to make a progress.

**Proposal**

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, down-select one option from the following options.**

* Option 1: Transmission power ramping is not applied during the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for each PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: The initial power and power ramping step.

**Support**: CATT, FGI, Panasonic, Qualcomm, LG, Samsung, CMCC, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Sony, ETRI, InterDigital, Fujitsu, NEC, Ericsson, Sharp, OPPO

* Option 2: Transmission power ramping can be applied per PRACH transmission during the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: The initial power and power ramping step.
	+ FFS: The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for each PRACH transmissions.

**Support/open**: Spreadtrum, ZTE, OPPO

Companies are encouraged to provide additional views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Samsung  | No objection to keep it. But based on the standard rule in today GTW, the option 2 should be removed.  |
| LG | We agree with FL’s comment, but it would be better to save time for discussion through down selection in this meeting. We prefer to support Option 1. |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal, and prefer option 1. |
| ZTE | The object of WI doesn’t talking about the detail of transmission power ramping, so my suggestion is not precluding alternatives at the early stage. |
| Vivo | Both options are possible in our view and this is just the matter of whether we also allow the the UE to have the power ramping counter to increase during repetitions or we force UE to wait until next reattempt. Initial view from our side is that it’s better to allow the power ramping as early as possible for coverage enhancement, if UE already reaches maximum power after some repetitions, it doesn’t hurt. We can understand if the TA is changed during repetitions, segment detection may be needed to combine each subset of PRACH repetitions, but with same timing assumption, there seems no issue of combining multiple PRACH repetitions non-coherently. Anyway, any argument of saying some option would not work should be justified by simulations.According to above, at this stage, we would prefer to have both options open.One more comment is that the 2nd FFS bullet in 2nd option is also valid for first option given the pathloss reference may be different for different repetitions no matter whether power ramping counter is increased or not during the repetitions. Thereby we propose to have following updates:*Proposal 7-v1****For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam~~s~~, down-select one option from the following options.**** Option 1: Transmission power ramping is not applied during the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for each PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: The initial power and power ramping step.
	+ FFS: The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for each PRACH transmissions.
* Option 2: Transmission power ramping can be applied per PRACH transmission during the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: The initial power and power ramping step.
	+ FFS: The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for each PRACH transmissions.
 |
| FL | @vivo, it seems your update is the same as the first bullet of Option 1.  |
| CMCC | Fine to keep both options. |
| CATT | We prefer to remove Option 2 but can live with is for now.The following bullet of Option 1 is not clear to us. Does it mean that UE needs to independently calculate transmission power for each PRACH transmission within an attempt and the result is expected to be the same for each transmission?* + The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for each PRACH transmissions.
 |
| Sharp | We are OK with the FL proposal though Option 1 is preferred. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. We prefer option 1.  |
| Nokia/NSB | The proposal looks fine. However, going for Option 1 straight away would be consistent with what we have done in the GTW earlier today, as Samsung said. Any different outcome in the next meetings is very unlikely and we should avoid inefficiencies if possible. |
| Fujitsu | Fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal, and first preference would be Option 2, since power ramping during the PRACH repetitions would be helpful so that UE can reach highest power as early as possible. We suggest the keep the two option and don’t make a down selection in this stage. |
| Sony | We are fine to down select this meeting if possible but generally fine with the proposal. |
| MediaTek | We are fine with FL’s proposal. Option-1 is preferred. |
| Intel | It is still clear to us the benefit of option 2. This is completely different from existing design for power ramping as it is triggered when UE does not receive RAR or contention resolution is not successful. We still have strong concerns on the near far issue and potential combining gain may be lost. We are fine to keep Option 1.  |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal. Option 1 is preferred. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK. Just for clarification, is it for initial transmission only or also cover retransmission? |
| Ericsson | Just to be sure, we’d like to check our understanding that the following is equivalent to the FL proposal. If it is equivalent, we can support the proposal.The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for ~~each~~ all PRACH transmissions. |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. We can live with both options.  |

## 5.2 Multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams

### 5.2.1 Potential use cases

#### Proposal 8-v2

**FL comment:** @Sony, @LG, @Huawei, for current scope, since it is study, and if justified, specify PRACH transmissions with different beams, at least we should first study it.

The updated proposal is as follows based on companies’ comments.

**Proposal**

* Study at least the following case for multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams.
	+ **Multiple PRACH transmissions ~~on the ROs~~ are associated with the same SSB/CSI-RS, UE use different Tx beams to transmit the multiple PRACHs.**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Samsung  | Be ok with proposal, but wonder any technical reason to exclude “studying” the other case for different SSB? To us, the multiple PRACH with same tx beam did not preclude the different SSB/CSI-RS, why here it’s clear to exclude it? The reason other than it looks complicated, it looks take more time.  |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support. |
| Vivo | Agree with Sony and other companies in last round discussions that this discussion should be treated with low priority given the beam determination via retransmission is already possible and PRACH repetition with single beam can already be able to compensate the gap. In addition, the motivation of such beam sweeping to improve msg3 is not in scope of this work item.Therefore, we don’t support this proposal at this stage before we conclude the necessity of PRACH repetition with different beams. In our view, PRACH repetition with single beam is enough to in this work item according to the evaluations performed so far. |
| FL | @vivo, as study of multiple PRACH transmission with different beams is also part of this WI. FL don’t understand how can we conclude the necessity before we study?@Samsung, other cases for different SSB are not precluded, since it is “at least”. |
| CMCC | Open to further study this case. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Based on companies’ view, we prefer to add one FFS, “FFS: multiple PRACH transmissions are associated with different SSB/CSI-RS”.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Fine with the spirit but we don’t understand why “on the ROs” has been deleted. It adds clarity, suggest rewriting the sub-bullet as follows:* UE uses different TX beams to transmit the multiple PRACH over ROs associated with the same SSB/CSI-RS

Similar to what we suggested for the proposal on the “same beam” we propose adding a note that states that It is assumed that only one preamble is transmitted over one RO. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Sony | We are fine to study this but would prefer that we make it a low priority given that we have an objective to specify for multiple PRACH transmissions with the same beam. |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal. |

### 5.2.2 Performance gain

#### Proposal 9-v2

**FL comment**: @Ericsson, from FL perspective, the simulation assumptions provided in TR 38.830 covers most of the detailed parameters you mentioned, which seems enough for the simulation work.

The updated proposal is as follows based on companies’ comments.

**Proposal**

* Companies are encouraged to provide simulation results for multiple PRACH transmissions with different and same beam(s) in the next meeting.
	+ **Simulation assumptions in TR 38.830 are used for the simulation.**
	+ **Both UE capable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* and UE incapable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* can be considered in the simulation.**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| **Samsung**  | **Fine.**  |
| ZTE | I wondering the purpose to provide the simulation for the case of the same beam. We have supported the case of same beam, right? For the baseline, I think the single PRACH transmission is enough.The case of UE incapable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* should be prioritized. The case of UE incapable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* could be provided optionally by each individual company. |
| vivo | Same comments as that for P8 and we should prioritize the single beam PRACH repetition discussions. |
| Nokia/NSB | The case of UE incapable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* should be prioritized. |
| MediaTek | We should prioritize UE incapable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping*. |
| Intel | Agree with Vivo and Nokia’s comments. We had similar question in the first round of discussions.  |
| Ericsson | Thanks FL for the clarification. We noticed that some companies used different simulation assumptions in TR 38.830 in the simulations submitted to this RAN1 meeting, e.g., frequency band in FR1, UE antenna configuration of {1,4,2} and TDL-A channel. The latter two are for FR1 in TR 38.830. In the WID, it says “Note 2: The enhancements of PRACH are targeting short PRACH formats, and can also apply to other formats when applicable.” Since the WID says “The enhancements of PRACH are targeting for FR2”, we propose to focus on FR2 simulation assumptions in TR 38.830. Without these refinements, simulation assumptions may still not be well aligned in the next RAN1 meeting. Regarding prioritizing UEs without beam correspondence capability, we agree that there are of course more gains for such a UE. However, UEs that are capable of beam correspondence may also benefit from beam sweeping, since beam correspondence is imperfect. Precluding study of such UEs at this time seems premature to us. Therefore, we propose:* Companies are encouraged to provide simulation results for multiple PRACH transmissions with different and same beam(s) in the next meeting.
	+ **Simulation assumptions in TR 38.830 are used for the simulation.**
		- **The simulations focus on FR2.**
		- **Metric: Missed detection rate vs. SNR, at false alarm rate of 0.1%**
		- **CDL-A channel defined by Table 7.7.1-1 in 38.901 is used for PRACH transmissions with the same beam and PRACH transmissions with different beams.**
	+ **Both UE capable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* and UE incapable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* can be considered in the simulation.**
		- **UE antenna [2 2 2] from TR38.830 is used for PRACH transmissions with the same beam and PRACH transmissions with different beams.**
 |

**Q1: Do you think it is necessary to align the simulation assumptions other than those included in TR 38.830?**

Companies are encouraged to **answer Q1**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Samsung  | Company should report the beam is selected for same beam or different beam, as well as the single beam case for comparison, e.g., assuming there is always best beam available UE side. |
| ZTE | No, the simulation assumptions in TR 38.830 are enough. But we are fine to hear more companies’ views. |
| vivo | Same comments as that for P8 and we should prioritize the single beam PRACH repetition discussions. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with ZTE |
| Ericsson | We noticed that among the simulations submitted to this RAN1 meeting, different methods of narrow beam were used in terms of PRACH transmissions with the same narrow beam and PRACH transmissions with different beams. Since we only have three meetings to conclude the study on PRACH transmissions with different beams, it would be better to reach some agreement on simulation assumptions on narrow beam, so that results based on aligned assumptions can be provided in the following meetings.The narrow or wide beam used by UEs with different capabilities of beam correspondence is summarized as follows in our understanding.Table: multiple PRACH transmissions for different UE capabilities

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| UE capabilities | multiple PRACH transmissions with the same beam | multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams |
| UE capable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* | The best beam of 8 candidate beams is used, which matches the channel best | The beams are generated in accordance with PRACH repetition factor. |
| UEs incapable of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* | a wide beam, generated by a pair of dual polarized antennas |

According to the UE antenna configuration {2,2,2} recommended for FR2 in TR38.830, in our simulation, there are always two vertical beams. Horizontal beams cover AOD -pi~pi evenly. We set the first horizontal beam with an angle of -pi. The angel sets are suggested as follows.* 2 repetitions
	+ Azimuth angle set =a wide beam
	+ Zenith angle set = [0, pi/2]
* 4 repetitions
	+ Azimuth angle set = [-pi, 0], AOD degrees -180~180 evenly divided by 2 horizontal beams
	+ Zenith angle set = [0, pi/2] +
* 8 repetitions
	+ Azimuth angle set = [-pi, -pi/2, 0, pi/2], AOD degrees -180~180 evenly divided by 4 horizontal beams
	+ Zenith angle set = [0, pi/2]

We are open to discuss other rationales of beam forming and corresponding angle sets. In summary, we propose:* Companies providing simulation results for multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams should identify, for each number of repetitions:
	+ The number of beams, the beam widths, and the boresights that are used
 |

## 5.4 CBRA and CFRA

**FL comment:** Based on companies’ contributions, companies [ZTE, Spreadtrum, vivo, Panasonic, NTT DOCOMO, Ericsson, Sony, Qualcomm, Ericsson] propose to support multiple PRACH transmissions for both **CBRA** and **CFRA**.

#### Discussion for CBRA and CFRA

Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether to support multiple PRACH transmissions for **both CBRA and CFRA**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Samsung  | The use of multiple PRACH could be studied for CFRA at least. |
| LG | We think that it can be general to support multiple PRACH transmissions for both CBRA and CFRA.  |
| ZTE | Both should be supported. |
| vivo | There’s no justification to prove that there would always be no coverage issue in CFRA, therefore it should be supported in both CBRA and CFRA. |
| CATT | We think we can first focus on CBRA and CFRA can be discussed later. |
| Sharp | OK to support for both CBRA and CFRA. |
| Lenovo | We are open to support PRACH transmissions for both CBRA and CFRA.  |
| Nokia/NSB | If this can come with no CFRA-specific optimization, then it is ok. If CFRA-specific efforts are to be made than we prefer not pursuing this direction. |
| Spreadtrum | We think both should be supported. |
| Sony | Support both CBRA and CFRA. It would be puzzling to believe that the UL coverage would automatically be solved if UE is in CFRA, since UE power is the same and the cell size is also the same. |
| MediaTek | Both CBRA and CFRA should be supported. Our discussions should include what aspects of multiple PRACH transmissions for CFRA should be different, if any, from CBRA case. |
| Intel | Both CBRA and CFRA should be supported.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is too early to support CBRA here. It is unclear how a gNB has sufficient information to determine the number of repetitions for PRACH in CBRA. |
| Ericsson | Applying multiple PRACH transmissions to CFRA can improve PRACH detection rate, which is essential to the cases of handover and beam failure recovery. We support to study multiple PRACH transmissions for CFRA. |
| OPPO | We think both can be supported.  |

1. Email discussion (4th round)

## 6.1 Multiple PRACH transmissions with same beams

### 6.1.1 Resource configuration for multiple PRACH transmissions

#### Proposal 1-v3

**FL comment:**

@all, based on companies’ comments, FL think it is better to simplify the options to check if we can have some progress here. Thus, FL proposes a new proposal with merging the original Option 3 and Option 4 simply as “Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs with separate or shared preamble”. In the new proposal, Option A is the original Option 2, Option B is the merge of original of Option 3 and Option 4.

**Proposal -new**

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, consider one or multiple of the following options.**

* Option A: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with separate preamble on shared ROs.
* Option B: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs with separate or shared preamble.
* Other options are not precluded.
* FFS: detailed schemes, including how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission for all the above Options.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Sony | Support |
| Intel | We think this is a good starting point. We have some comments as follows:* For Option B, we suggest to remove the “separate or shared preamble”. It is not clear to us if this is separate ROs, why do we need to consider shared preambles?
* Our understanding is that the intention of this proposal is to differentiate the multiple PRACH transmission with single PRACH transmission. If this is correct understanding, it would be good to mention this in the main bullet. It can also be understood to differentiate the multiple PRACH transmissions with different repetition levels.
 |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Thanks for the FL’s effort. We are in general fine with this clear version. Similar comment as Intel, it is good to clarify what’s the meaning of “shared preamble” in option B. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal to make some progresses in this meeting. Clarification on difference between Option 3 and Option 4:In the example showed in round 3 for Option 4, the prach-ConfigurationIndex, msg1-FDM, msg1-FrequencyStart etc. are new IEs for multiple PRACH transmission configuration. Moreover, if possible, new PRACH configuration table may be needed for multiple PRACH transmissions.But for Option 3, the new introduced parameters, such as time or frequency offset, are based on the legacy PRACH RO. |
| **Samsung**  | Thx FL for the update.We proposed to add “with legacy single PRACH transmission”, and some company comments not clear what it is. But we think it’s important to keep that to make the proposal clean, otherwise, the proposed option could be understood as each of the multiple PRACHs are using shared RO. To address company’s unclearness, we add another note.In addition, for the change in option B, technically, the “shared preamble” is not correct given separate RO is used. Then we can only say the preamble is from same or different preamble sets with legacy single PRACH transmission.Suggested change:**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, consider one or multiple of the following options.*** Option A: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with separate preamble on shared Ros with legacy single PRACH transmission.
* Option B: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs with preamble from different or same ~~separate or shared~~ preamble set(s) with legacy single PRACH transmission.
* Other options are not precluded.
* FFS: detailed schemes, including how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission for all the above Options.
* Note: the shared RO and the same preamble set(s) refer to the RO and preamble set(s) derived for existing Type-1 and/or Type 2 random access.
 |
| **FL** | @ Intel, @ Lenovo, since separate ROs are utilized, it is already possible to differentiate the multiple PRACH transmission with single PRACH transmission. Thus, we may not need to have some limitations on the whether the shared or separate Preamble are utilized. In addition, as commented in last round, some company want to explicitly add “with separate or shared preamble”. From FL’s understanding, whether we add this or we don’t, it indicates the same thing, while adding this may be clearer.@Samsung, FL prefer not to add “with legacy single PRACH transmission” since companies commented on this. Let’s see more companies’ views.@ Intel, I think to make it clearer in the main bullet seems reasonable, also this may somewhat solve Samsung’s concerns.@all, please discuss based on the updated version.**Proposal -new-2****For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, to differentiate the multiple PRACH transmissions with single PRACH transmission, consider one or multiple of the following options.*** Option A: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with separate preamble on shared ROs.
* Option B: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs with separate or shared preamble.
* Other options are not precluded.
* FFS: detailed schemes, including how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission for all the above Options.
 |
| LG | We have some comments on the Option B. Does the intention of "separate or shared preamble" mean separate/share between UEs with repeated transmissions and UEs with single transmission? If correct, we cannot understand why the separate preambles are needed even though the separate ROs are configured. Also, we cannot understand how the preambles can be shared when the ROs are configured separately.Therefore, we prefer to delete the "separate or shared preamble" in the Option B. Alternatively, we think it may be better to keep the previous three options (i.e., Option 2/3/4) for further discussions in this stage. |
| **Xiaomi** | Support |
| **CATT** | We have sympathy with Samsung that “shared’ and “separate” in the proposal is not clear and can be interpreted differently. In addition, as we commented multiple times, we do not think “including…” part in the FFS is needed in the proposal. We suggest the following update.**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, consider one or multiple of the following options.*** Option A: Multiple PRACH are transmitted ~~with separate preamble~~ on shared ROs with ROs for legacy single PRACH transmissions with separate preambles from the preambles for legacy single PRACH transmissions.
* Option B: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs from ROs for legacy single PRACH transmissions with separate or shared preamble from/with the preambles for legacy single PRACH transmissions.
* Other options are not precluded.
* FFS: detailed schemes~~, including how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission for all the above Options~~.
 |
| Ericsson | Thanks for FL’s explanation and update.We are generally fine with the new red text with a small wording modification.Same as other companies view, regarding Option B, there would be no shared preambles in a separate RO, because all preambles of a separate ROs are used for Rel-18 multiple PRACHs. We suggest the following changes in blue.**Proposal -new-2****For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, to differentiate the RACH resources of the multiple PRACH transmissions ~~with~~ from that of a single PRACH transmission, consider one or multiple of the following options.*** Option A: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with separate preamble on shared ROs.
* Option B: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs ~~with separate or shared preamble~~.
* Other options are not precluded.

FFS: detailed schemes, including how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission for all the above Options. |
| Sharp | We are fine with the modification by Ericsson. |
| FL | @LG, @Ericsson, I’m not sure if companies are fine to delete “with separate or shared preamble”, but we can have a try. Or else, we may have no progress here. From FL perspective, if the original three Options are kept, no agreements can be achieved in this meeting, since company have divergent understanding. That’s why FL propose this new proposal, try to simplify the situation.@Ericsson, from FL’s understanding, the intention of differentiate the RACH resource is to differentiate the multiple PRACH transmissions from single PRACH transmission, so that gNB can perform e.g., joint detection. How do you think?@CATT, please check the revised main bullet, I hope this can solve your concern. As for FFS part, FL suggests we keep it, since many companies think this issue is quite important.@all, please check the latest version bellow.**Proposal -new-3****For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, to differentiate the multiple PRACH transmissions with single PRACH transmission, consider one or multiple of the following options.*** Option A: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with separate preamble on shared ROs.
* Option B: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs ~~with separate or shared preamble~~.
* Other options are not precluded.

FFS: detailed schemes, including how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission for all the above Options. |
| Spreadtrum | Thanks for the FL’s effort. We think differentiate the multiple PRACH transmission with single PRACH transmission is the first step. Next we can discuss how to configure / allocate the resources for multiple PRACH transmission. So we suggest we can add an FFS like discussed earlier on the Option B.**Proposal -new-3****For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, to differentiate the multiple PRACH transmissions with single PRACH transmission, consider one or multiple of the following options.*** Option A: Multiple PRACH are transmitted with separate preamble on shared ROs.
* Option B: Multiple PRACH are transmitted on separate ROs ~~with separate or shared preamble~~.
* FFS: Whether the frequency-time locations of the separate ROs are determined at least based on shared / separate PRACH configuration
* Other options are not precluded.

FFS: detailed schemes, including how gNB know which ROs are to be checked for multiple PRACH transmission for all the above Options. |

### 6.1.3 Determine the number of multiple PRACH transmissions

#### Proposal 6-v2

**FL comment:** Based on companies’ comments, it seems companies’ preferences are divergent, as summarized below.

**Proposal 6-v2-A**

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, at least SSB-RSRP threshold(s) are used to determinethe number of PRACH transmissions.**

* + FFS detailed scheme, e.g., the number of SSB-RSRP thresholds or whether other measured/computed metrics or conditions should be used together with SSB-RSRP thresholds.
	+ FFS: whether to link ~~linkage to~~ the SS-RSRP threshold for Msg3 repetition request.
	+ FFS: whether only applied to CBRA

**Preferred**: LG, ZTE, CATT, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Sony, MediaTek, Intel, Qualcomm, Huawei, HiSilicon, Ericsson

**Proposal 6-v2-B**

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, at least SSB-RSRP threshold~~(s)~~ ~~are~~ is used to determine ~~the number~~ the application of multiple PRACH transmissions.**

* + FFS detailed scheme, e.g., determination of the number of PRACH transmissions, the number of SSB-RSRP thresholds or whether other measured/computed metrics or conditions should be used together with SSB-RSRP thresholds.
	+ FFS: whether to link ~~linkage to~~ the SS-RSRP threshold for Msg3 repetition request.
	+ FFS: whether only applied to CBRA

**Preferred**: Samsung, DOCOMO, vivo, CMCC, Sharp, Spreadtrum

**FL comment:** FL shares the same understanding as some company that Proposal 6-v2-B can be covered by Proposal 6-v2-A. For example, if there is only one kind of number of multiple PRACH transmission, e.g., {2}, for Proposal 6-v2-B, if the measured SSB-RSRP is lower than a threshold, then multiple PRACH transmission is applied, and the number of multiple transmissions is 2. In the same case, if we go with Proposal 6-v2-A, as it indicates, “SSB-RSRP threshold(s) are used to determine the number of PRACH transmissions”, which can also be applied when there is only one number configured or predefined, i.e., if the measured SSB-RSRP is lower than a threshold, then the number of multiple transmissions is 2. The two proposals seem to be equivalent if there is only one configured or predefined number for multiple PRACH transmissions. FL suggest company to check if you can support or live with Proposal 6-v2-A as follows:

**Proposal 6-v2-A**

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam, at least SSB-RSRP threshold(s) are used to determinethe number of PRACH transmissions.**

* + FFS detailed scheme, e.g., the number of SSB-RSRP thresholds or whether other measured/computed metrics or conditions should be used together with SSB-RSRP thresholds.
	+ FFS: whether to link ~~linkage to~~ the SS-RSRP threshold for Msg3 repetition request.
	+ FFS: whether only applied to CBRA
	+ FFS: the impact from FBE.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Sony | Support |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal |
| Samsung  | Two comments:* + - 1. The FFS added by us is with a typo, it should be MPE rather than FBE, sorry about the mistake;
			2. We are not ready to agree to directly agree to multiple level of repetition number at the same time; given the comments that the proposal 6-v2A has larger move than v2B, we think we should start from v2B.
 |
| FL | @ Samsung, as explained in the above FL comment, this proposal doesn’t indeed result in multiple level of repetition number, because the number of SSB-RSRP thresholds still needs FFS. If there is only one SSB-RSRP, then it can be utilized to determine whether multiple PRACH transmission is applied, meantime it determines the number of PRACH transmissions. Start from v2B is actually not a good choice, since there are many companies prefer v2A. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal with replacing “FBE” by “MPE”. |
| CATT | Our earlier question was not answered. We think the proposal is fine for the first RACH attempt during a RACH procedure. But for the subsequent RACH attempt(s), more discussions are needed on whether the number of repetitions is determined based on RSRP. For example, in eMTC, the repetition level ramps up based on the maximum number of attempts per CE level. For the last FFS on impact from FBE, we would like to clarify what needs to be studied. |
| Ericsson | Since the impact from MPE was not discussed in the previous rounds, we would like to understand more before agreeing to add it as an FFS. “at least” in the main bullet includes other factors different from SSB RSRP threshold, like MPE. If so, we suggest to remove the last sub-bullet.We are fine with other parts of the proposal. |
| Sharp | We are OK with the FL’s proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We share the same view with Ericsson about removing the last sub-bullet. We are fine with the other part of the proposal. |

### 6.1.4 Power control

#### Proposal 7-v2

FL comment: Based on the GTW discussion. FL would like to check if the updated proposal is acceptable. It should be noted that we only discuss whether the power ramping is applied within the multiple PRACH transmissions in a RACH attempt. We didn’t discuss the power ramping between two RACH attempts. One for clarification, from FL’s understanding, this can be applied for the initial multiple PRACH transmission or multiple PRACH re-transmissions if any, just if it is for one RACH attempt.

Proposal

**For multiple PRACH transmissions with same beam in one RACH attempt, down-select one option from the following options.**

* Option 1: Transmission power ramping is not applied during the multiple PRACH transmissions.
* Option 2: Transmission power ramping can be applied per PRACH transmission during the multiple PRACH transmissions.
	+ FFS: The initial power and power ramping step.
	+ FFS: The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for each PRACH transmissions.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Sony | Support the proposal. Our preference is Option 1 but to keep the 2 options open for now. |
| Intel | During the online discussions, it is not clear to us if transmission power ramping is not applied, why same transmission power is not used for multiple PRACH transmissions. Our view is that during one PRACH attempt, a transmission power is determined for all the PRACH transmissions. We suggest to consider the original version with update in Option 1 with “same transmission power is applied during the multiple PRACH transmissions”  |
| DOCOMO | We share same view as Intel that transmission power for multiple PRACH transmissions would be the same, if power ramping is not applied for the multiple PRACH transmissions in one attempt. But we are fine with the proposal to move forward. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. We prefer option 1.  |
| ZTE | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | Two comments:The “in a RACH attempt” should be kept in main bullet;Given very few interests on option2, we don’t think any explicit effort on these two FFS are needed. And proponent for option2 should really report why/how to make option2 work in the first step. |
| LG | The Option 1 is not clear to us whether Option 1 only means that transmit power ramping is not allowed during repeated transmissions, or even includes the UE maintaining the same transmit power during repeated transmissions.We think it is beneficial to maintain the transmission power during repeated transmissions, therefore, to make it more clearer, we prefer to add original sub-bullet “The same measurement of the same reference signal to calculate the pathloss is applied for each PRACH transmission” in the Option 1. Alternatively, it is OK to modify the main bullet as proposed by Intel. |
| Xiaomi | We share the similar view with DOCOMO. |
| CATT | We share the same understanding as Intel that Option 1 can be revised as suggested by Intel.We agree with Samsung that “in a RACH attempt” should be kept and the proposal applies to each attempt. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the current Proposal 7-v2, with “in one RACH attempt” in the main bullet. |
| Sharp | Although we think same transmission power should be assumed for a RACH attempt, we are OK with the FL’s proposal to consider whether the ramping counter is fixed or not in the RACH attempt. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |

## 6.2 Multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams

### 6.2.1 Potential use cases

#### Proposal 8-v2

**FL comment**: @all, since it is study, and if justified, specify PRACH transmissions with different beams, at least we should first study it. FL think this proposal can help us more focus on the study and to justify the benefit of multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams. As for the wording of the first bullet, I think Nokia provides a clearer version, let’s check if companies are OK with the following proposal.

**Proposal**

* Study at least the following case for multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams.
	+ **~~Multiple PRACH transmissions on the ROs are associated with the same SSB/CSI-RS, UE use different Tx beams to transmit the multiple PRACHs.~~**
	+ **UE uses different TX beams to transmit the multiple PRACH over ROs associated with the same SSB/CSI-RS**
	+ **FFS: UE uses different TX beams to transmit the multiple PRACH over ROs associated with different SSBs/CSI-RSs.**
	+ **Note: It is assumed that only one preamble is transmitted over one RO.**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Sony | We can support the proposal albeit we think the study should be treated with lower priority than multi-PRACH with same beam. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. Wording change might be needed, since the main bullet is regarding “study…”, while there is “for future study” in the sub-bullet. Maybe simply add a “whether” after “FFS”.  |
| ZTE | Support the proposal in principle. Just one comment on the Note, why put “**It is assumed that only one preamble is transmitted over one RO.**” Under the case of different beams, is this issue only valid for different beams? Or we can discuss the note in other place. |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposal. But just for the note, I guess we have heard company’s proposal to keep the “code-domain” multiple preambles even in one RO in the discussion with same tx beam.  |
| FL | @ZTE, the noted is added based on companies’ comments last round, as clarified by Samsung, from FL’s understanding, the Note is added to avoided CDMed approach. @Lenovo, actually, I don’t think add a “whether” makes too much difference. But it’ll be fine if companies want this. Let’s wait for more views. |
| LG | Agree with Sony. Regarding the Note, we can add “per UE” after the “only one preamble” to make clearer.* + **Note: It is assumed that only one preamble per UE is transmitted over one RO.**
 |
| Xiaomi | Support this proposal with low priority. |
| CATT | For the first sub-bullet, is the intention to include FDMed ROs as well? If so, why FDMed ROs can be supported but CDMed approach is precluded? |
| Ericsson | The discussion point is about if the multiple PRACH transmissions can be associated with more than one SSB, rather than TDMed, FDMed or CDMed PRACH transmissions. Since it was agreed to further study the simultaneous transmissions of different preambles in a RO by a UE with multiple Tx chains, we suggest to remove the last sub-bullet of note to be consistent. Another comment is regarding the FFS. If the same RO is associated with the different selected SSBs, the first two sub-bullets would end up the same. To facilitate the study, an assumption for the FFS can be that different SSBs correspond to different ROs.We propose the following.**Proposal*** Study at least the following case for multiple PRACH transmissions with different beams.
	+ **~~Multiple PRACH transmissions on the ROs are associated with the same SSB/CSI-RS, UE use different Tx beams to transmit the multiple PRACHs.~~**
	+ **UE uses different TX beams to transmit the multiple PRACH over ROs associated with the same SSB/CSI-RS**
	+ **FFS: UE uses different TX beams to transmit the multiple PRACH over ROs associated with different SSBs/CSI-RSs, where the different SSBs/CSI-RSs are not associated with the same RO.**
	+ **~~Note: It is assumed that only one preamble is transmitted over one RO.~~**
 |
| Sharp | OK. Same view with Sony. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
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