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# Introduction

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

[100b-e-NR-unlic-NRU-InitAccessProc-02] Email discussion/approval on following issues related to RA procedure by 4/24; if necessary, followed by endorsing the corresponding TPs by 4/29 – Amitav (Charter)

* MsgA PRACH-PUSCH gap for NR-U
* Remaining details of RACH occasion validation for FBE access

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

# Company views

## MsgA PRACH-PUSCH gap for NR-U

Proposal 1: Apply the same PRACH-PUSCH gap defined in R16 to msgA PRACH for NR-U.

Proposal 2: Apply CP extension to PUSCH to enable no-gap msgA.

Proposal 3: Support a zero symbol gap (N = 0) between the PRACH and PUSCH parts of MsgA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| ZTE | Among the 3 proposals, we prefer Proposal 3. We agree that symbol gap N=0 is beneficial to NRU LBT, but we think this has already been supported in 38.213, i.e. N should be 2 or 4 for licensed band, and it can be derived that N could be 0 or any other value for NRU, thus we don’t need to make any further modifications. I don’t think we should limit N=0 for NRU to decrease the configuration flexibility.As for proposal 1, it’s against the agreement made in 2-step RACH WI.Proposal 2 is an optimization issue.In 38.213:For a Type-2 random access procedure, a UE transmits a PUSCH, when applicable, after transmitting a PRACH. The UE encodes a transport block provided for the PUSCH transmission using redundancy version number 0. If *useInterlacePUSCH-Common* is not provided, the PUSCH transmission is after the PRACH transmission by at least $N$ symbols where $N=2$ for $μ=0$ or $μ=1$, $N=4$ for $μ=2$ or $μ=3$, and $μ$ is the SCS configuration for the active UL BWP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support proposal 1 that is the same gap as agreed in 2 step RACH WI. It should clarified that the agreement made in 2 step RACH WI do not imply anything for NR-U. The intention of the “Note” under the agreement is to inform NRU we should make decision by our own on unlicensed band. The specification text in 38.213 does not include any paragraph for the case where *useInterlacePUSCH-Common* is provided, so this case is currently unspecified. That’s why we are discussing now which solution to adopt.There were comprehensive technical discussions on the motivation to leave the gap between PRACH and PUSCH, such as coverage mismatch between PRACH and PUSCH, 2-step PUSCH occasions overlapping with 4-step PRACH occasions and network detection complexity, etc. These issues are still valid on unlicensed band from our perspective. Thus, we think adopting the same gap as two step RACH is reasonable. Furthermore, motivations to adopt no gap for NR-U are not convincing. We think that the licensed band design is sufficient for 2-step RACH in unlicensed band. If a UE has to perform LBT between PRACH and PUSCH of msgA then the UE will either pass LBT and still be able to transmit msgA faster than by 4-step RACH even with a 2 or 4 symbols gap, or the UE will fail LBT which probably indicates that it would be better for the UE to choose another 20 MHz channel for initial access in unlicensed band because the current 20 MHz channel is already heavily congested because the UE would have passed one LBT and failed one LBT in a short time interval. |
| vivo | Support proposal 1 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## RACH occasion validation for FBE access #1

Proposal: To accommodate DL processing time at UE, a PRACH resource is considered invalid if it overlaps with the first X symbols at the front of each FFP when FBE operation is indicated, where X could be configured or fixed in spec.

FL suggestion is to first discuss the above proposal before moving to potential TP.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| ZTE | We don’t agree with this proposal, it’s not reasonable to define a ‘X’ to indicate the possible SSB or other DL signal position which shouldn’t be limited at the front of a FFP.  |
| vivo | Support this proposal. Defining a ‘X’ is not to indicate the possible SSB or other DL signal position. For FBE, UE needs to confirm the DL transmission before RACH transmission. However, confirm the DL transmission needs processing time. Here the first X symbols in each FFP will be the minimum processing time to confirm DL transmission, i.e. the symbols where UE has no possibility to transmit any UL transmissions. Similar with the idle time that is invalid time for both DL and UL, the first X symbols in each FFP is invalid time for UL transmissions. So it should be considered as invalid if a configured PRACH resource overlaps with this invalid time for UL transmissions. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## RACH occasion validation for FBE access #2

Update TS 38.213 for RACH occasion validation in FBE mode when UE is not provided tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon, and for Type-2 RA procedure.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| ZTE | Support. We suggest to adopt the TP7 in [3]. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. The text proposal are in TP#2 in [1]. |
| vivo | Support. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Proposal**: A PRACH resource in the channel occupancy of a Fixed Frame Period is valid only if a UE detects any DL transmission in the serving cell before the PRACH resource in the same FFP.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| ZTE  | Support.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. The text proposal are in TP#2 in [1] |
| vivo | Fine with it as a clarification. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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