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# Introduction

Three email discussions have been sanctioned in RAN1#100b-e on initial access procedures for NR-U. This first discussion that aims to converge by 4/24 has the following scope:

[100b-e-NR-unlic-NRU-InitAccessProc-01] Email discussion/approval on following issues related to SS/PBCH blocks by 4/24; if necessary, followed by endorsing the corresponding TPs by 4/29 – Amitav (Charter)

* Finalize remaining details of parameter Q signalling and interpretation
* Correct the citation of TS 38.104 in TS 38.213 Subclause 4.1 in relation to the definition of L\_max

These issues have been selected based on the preparatory discussion summarized in [14].

# Company views

## Signaling of Q in MIB based on RAN2 LS response

The issue is summarized in [14] with the following proposal:

**Proposal.** Based on LS response from RAN2, the UE interprets ~~ssb~~SubcarrierSpacingCommon (1 bit) and LSB of ssb-SubcarrierOffset (1 bit) of the Rel-15 MIB for providing the value of ssbPositionQCL-Relationship-r16. These changes are reflected in TS 38.213 Clause 4.1.

For example, TP for section 4.1 in 38.213:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 4-1: Mapping between the combination of subCarrierSpacingCommon and LSB of ssb-SubcarrierOffset to

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *subCarrierSpacingCommon* | LSB of *ssb-SubcarrierOffset* |  |
| scs15or60 | 0 | 1 |
| scs15or60 | 1 | 2 |
| scs30or120 | 0 | 4 |
| scs30or120 | 1 | 8 |

 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Samsung | Support the TP.  |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal and corresponding TP. In addition to TP, it would be better to modify the following typo in the paragraph related to this table.

|  |
| --- |
| For operation with shared spectrum channel access, a UE assumes that SS/PBCH blocks in a serving cell that are within a same discovery burst transmission window or across discovery burst transmission windows are quasi co-located with respect to average gain, QCL-TypeA, and QCL-TypeD properties, when applicable [6, TS 38.214], if a value of is same among the SS/PBCH blocks. is an index of a DM-RS sequence transmitted in a PBCH of a corresponding SS/PBCH block, and is either provided by *ssbPositionQCL-Relationship-r16* or, if *ssbPositionQCL-Relationship-r16* is not provided,obtained from a *MIB* provided by a SS/PBCH block according to Table 4-1. *~~ssbS~~subcarrierSpacingCommon* indicates SCS of RMSI only for the case of "operation without shared spectrum".The UE assumes that within a discovery burst transmission window, a number of transmitted SS/PBCH blocks on a serving cell is not larger than . The UE can determine an SS/PBCH block index according to , or according to where is the candidate SS/PBCH block index. |

By the way, isn’t it necessary to send an LS to RAN2 to inform this proposal (if agreed)? |
| ZTE | Support the TP. |
| Sharp | Support the TP. Agree with the typo fix proposed by LG.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the TP. Agree with the typo fix proposed by LG.On the other hand, we don’t think that a Reply LS to RAN2 is needed, as the ACTION from the RAN2 LS does not expect it *(ACTION: RAN2 respectfully asks RAN1 to take the above RAN2 feedback into account)*. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the TP. Unless we change anything compared to RAN2's LS, we don't see a need to reply to RAN2. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Whether configuration of Q for RRM measurements and SCell/SCG (re)config is mandatory, or a default value of Q=8 can be assumed by UE.

Summary: For RRM measurement configuration from *MeasObjectNR* and *SIB2/SIB4*, down-select one of the following:

* Option 1: Network always provides a common Q value (*ssb-PositionQCL-Common-r16*) per frequency to UE.
* Option 2: If no Q value is provided, UE assumes Q=8.

For SCell addition, SCG addition, and reconfiguration with sync, down-select one of the following:

* Option 1: The Q value of the cell to be added is always provided to UE via dedicated RRC signaling, i.e. ssb-PositionQCL-r16 in *ServingCellConfigCommon*.
* Option 2: If no Q value is provided, UE assumes Q=8.

FL proposal is to discuss the principle before bringing in a TP.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Samsung | For both questions, prefer Option 1. No matter which option is agreed, an LS to RAN2 is needed. If we remember correctly, this issue was discussed offline before, and several companies mentioned Option 1 such that RAN1/RAN2 don’t need to discuss the default RRC parameter value.  |
| LG Electronics | Prefer Option 2 for neighbor cell RRM measurement and Option 1 for SCG/SCell addition. |
| ZTE | We prefer Option 2 for both conditions. We have an agreement before to define a default Q=8 for SSB detection during initial cell search, similarly, we think that it’s more natural to define a default value of Q for the above 2 conditions. |
| Sharp | We slightly prefer Option 1. |
| Nokia, NSB | We prefer Option 1 for both. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We prefer Option 2 in bith cases, sharing ZTE's motivation. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Whether the number of candidate SS/PBCH blocks from the first transmitted SS/PBCH block to the last transmitted SS/PBCH block should not be greater than Q.

Detailed discussion is given in Sec. 4 of [12].

FL proposal is to discuss the principle before bringing in a TP.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Samsung | We are OK with the proposal as a clarification.  |
| LG Electronics | OK with the proposal in principle. |
| ZTE | We don’t think this proposal is just a clarification issue, it’s also related to LBT failure in some cases. For example, assume Q=8 and SSB position is 10000001, if there is a LBT failure on candidate index position 8, the next QCLed candidate index will be 16 and the number of candidate SSBs will be larger than Q.Besides, even for consecutive SSB transmission, if channel access type is Type 2A with 1ms maximum duration, there could be a LBT failure risk to make the number of candidate SSB larger than Q. |
| Sharp | We support the clarification. |
| Nokia, NSB | We do not support this for a similar reason than the one provided by ZTE. In the case e.g. LBT category 2 is used several LBT successes may occur within a single DRS Tx window.Anyway in our view this topic should be left to gNB implementation. As far as the UE is concerned we have the following RAN1 agreement: *From a UE’s perspective, the number of transmitted SSBs within a DRS transmission window is not larger than Q*, hence no need to limit transmission at gNB side. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Correct the citation of TS 38.104 in TS 38.213 Subclause 4.1 in relation to the definition of L\_max

**Summary**: Correct the citation of TS 38.104 in TS 38.213 Subclause 4.1 in relation to the definition of (applies to both licensed and shared spectrum operation)

Alt. 1: Remove citation

Alt. 2: Point to TS 38.133 instead and notify RAN4 that the word “candidate” should be removed in the paragraph above Table 8.1.1-2 in 38.133 to be consistent with Rel-16 notation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Samsung | Alt 1. TS 38.133 has no intention to define L\_max in our understanding. It even refers back to TS 38.213 for the value of L\_max, so we don’t think Alt 2 could work. However, in deed the word “candidate” should be removed in TS 38.133.  |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Samsung. |
| ZTE | We prefer Alt 1 and the word “candidate” should be removed in the paragraph above Table 8.1.1-2 in 38.133. |
| Sharp | Alt.1. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Alt 1, i.e. remove citation **and** define in TS 38.213/4.1 (which is the Samsung’s proposal as we understand it).On the other hand, we agree with Samsung that the “candidate” wording should be removed in 38.133 subclause 8.1.1. This can be left to RAN4 themselves (our preference). |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt 1. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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