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# Introduction

This document summarizes the discussions during RAN1#112bis-e on the following CRs.

[112bis-e-R17-FR2\_2-02] Email discussion on Rel-17 FR2\_2 maintenance for other channel access mechanism issues by April 20 – Timo (Nokia)

[R1-2302468](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302468.zip) Correction on the indication of short control signal        vivo

[R1-2303795](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2303795.zip) Corrections to spatial domain filter determination for directional LBT in TS38.214       Huawei, HiSilicon

# Discussion

## Issue#1, 1st round discussion

Following and LS from RAN1, RAN2 implemented a new RRC parameter *ra-ChannelAccess-r17* which allows for controlling whether LBT is required for first message of random access procedure, or not.[R1-2302468](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302468.zip) proposes to implement the corresponding chance in TS 37.213.

**Question 1**: Do you agree with the issues identified in R1-2302468? If not, please elaborate your reasons.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Company** |
| **Agree** |  |
| **Not agree** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Issue#2, 1st round discussion

[R1-2303795](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2303795.zip) suggests that for a UE that is configured with *TCI-State* in *dl-OrJoint-TCIStateList* or *TCI-UL-State*, the spatial domain filter to perform channel access should be a spatial domain receive filter instead of a spatial domain transmit filter, as is currently written in TS 38.214. Hence the CR proposes to delete the word “transmit” in the related part of the specification.

**Question 2**: Do you agree with the issues identified in R1-2303795? If not, please elaborate your reasons.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Company** |
| **Agree** |  |
| **Not agree** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusion