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# Introduction

This contribution provides a summary of the following email discussion:

[102-e-NR-eIAB-01] Email discussion on enhancements to resource multiplexing between child and parent links of an IAB node by 8/28 – Thomas (AT&T)

* Prioritize topics to be resolved in RAN1#102-e by 8/19

# Simultaneous Operation of Access and Backhaul Links

## Definition of Rel-17 Multiplexing Scenarios (High priority):

**Goal:** Confirm which scenarios are the focus for Rel-17 and describe key attributes of the scenarios which are relevant for RAN1 (e.g. FR1 vs. FR2, in-band/out-of-band, TDD spectrum considerations such as RAN4 Scenarios 1/2, high-level antenna designs/RF architectures, deployment considerations etc.)

From the eIAB WID:

* **Specification of enhancements to the resource multiplexing between child and parent links of an IAB node, including:**
  + **Support of simultaneous operation (transmission and/or reception) of IAB-node’s child and parent links (i.e., MT Tx/DU Tx, MT Tx/DU Rx, MT Rx/DU Tx, MT Rx/DU Rx)**
  + **Support for dual-connectivity scenarios defined by RAN2/RAN3 in the context of topology redundancy for improved robustness and load balancing.**

**Summary of input contributions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ZTE (R1-2005467)** | ***Proposal 2: To de-prioritize simultaneous DU-Tx/MT-Rx, DU-Rx/MT-Tx and DU-Tx/MT-Tx in RAN1 Rel-17 normative work.***   * ***The above three duplex operations can still be implemented in practice, e.g., by using multi-panel antenna and separate PA to isolate the DU-Tx/Rx and MT-Tx/Rx in their analog forms. In this case, there is no FDM/SDM relation in between per RAN1 perspective.*** |
| **CEWiT (R1-2006329)** | **Observation 1:** An IAB node can have TDM, FDM, FDM with HDC, SDM, SDM with HDC and IBFD multiplexing capabilities and can support TDM, DUTx-MTTx, DURx-MTRx, DURx-MTTx and DUTx-MTRx modes of operation |
| **ETRI (R1-2006361)** | ***Observation 1:*** Unless a feasible solution for intra-node interference suppression/cancellation is identified, support of MT-TX/DU-RX or MT-RX/DU-TX with two non-overlapping frequency channel allocations should be prioritized rather than the fully or partially overlapping frequency channel allocation.  ***Observation 2:*** In paired spectrum case, the best configuration of MT-TX/DU-TX and MT-RX/DU-RX is the same as the best configuration of MT-TX/DU-RX and MT-RX/DU-TX.  ***Proposal 1:*** For MT-TX/DU-RX and MT-RX/DU-TX in paired spectrum, we propose considering the configuration of an IAB node in which the opposite directions of the parent and child nodes use the same frequency bands and discussing the relevant specification impacts.  ***Proposal 2:*** We propose studying the support of MT-TX/DU-TX and MT-RX/DU-RX with fully-overlapping frequency band and the feasibility and specification impact including necessary interference management mechanisms and a new timing advance at the child node.  ***Proposal 3:*** It is proposed that the resource multiplexing configurations other than “MT-TX/DU-RX and MT-RX/DU-TX in unpaired spectrum” be considered as higher priority. |
| **LG (R1-2006382)** | ***Proposal 1: To support simultaneous operation of MT and DU, co-located inter-panel operation and intra-panel operation should be considered.*** |
| **Ericsson (R1-2006903)** | Proposal 1 Simultaneous transmission based on FDM/SDM principles, i.e., *half-duplex transmission*, and simultaneous reception based on FDM/SDM principles, i.e., *half-duplex reception,* are technically feasible and should be RAN 1’s priority in Rel-17.  Proposal 2 Simultaneous MT RX and DU TX, i.e., *downstream full-duplex*, and simultaneous MT TX and DU RX, i.e., *upstream full-duplex*, are not prioritized in Rel-17.  Proposal 3 RAN4 IAB Scenario 2 is adopted as the baseline for IAB simultaneous-operation discussion.  Proposal 4 RAN1 to exclude simultaneous-operation discussion for the case when an IAB-node simultaneously receives from the parent IAB-DU and from a served UE. |

The four main multiplexing scenarios from the Rel-17 WID are (also based on the no-TDM multiplexing capabilities):

**Case 1: Simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Tx**

**Case 2: Simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Rx**

**Case 3: Simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Tx**

**Case 4: Simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Rx**

Companies have suggested that whether a given case is supported/prioritized depends on additional considerations such as spectrum type, frequency allocation, deployment considerations etc. As a first step, the different cases should be mapped to these factors based on the level of prioritization: high/low/excluded from Rel-17. (Note that low priority in this context means that the scenario is supported but potentially with only limited specification effort.)

**Question 2.1.1: Unpaired Spectrum**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Prioritization/support in Rel-17 | | |
| High Priority | Low Priority | Exclude |
| AT&T | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| Huawei | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| Ericsson | Case 1, Case 2 |  | Case 3, Case 4 (unless a quantitative proof of concept is provided, accounting for that the channel is part of the isolation problem) |
| Nokia | Case 1, Case 2 |  | Case 3, Case 4 |
| Intel | Case 1, Case 2 |  | Case 3, Case 4 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Case 2 | Case 1 (w/o support of case-6 timing) | Case 3, Case 4. (Exclusion is per specification wise. Both cases are still possible in implementation in case the isolation problem is gone. ) |
| NTT DOCOMO | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| Samsung | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| LG Electronics | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| Fujitsu | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| Qualcomm | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| CMCC | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| vivo | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| CEWiT | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |

**Question 2.1.2: Paired Spectrum**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Prioritization/support in Rel-17 | | |
| High Priority | Low Priority | Exclude |
| AT&T | Case 3, Case 4 | Case 1, Case 2 |  |
| Huawei | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| Ericsson |  | Case 1, Case 2 (is simultaneous DL/UL in paired spectrum not already covered?) | Case 3, Case 4 (same problem as for unpaired spectrum) |
| Nokia |  | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |
| Intel | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Case 2, Case 1 (w/o support of case-6 timing) | Case 3, Case 4.  (same consideration as in Q2.1.1) |
| NTT DOCOMO | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| Samsung | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| LG Electronics | Case 3, Case 4 | Case 1, Case 2 |  |
| Fujitsu |  | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |
| Qualcomm | Case 3, Case 4 | Case 1, Case 2 (Case 2 already possible in FDD?) |  |
| vivo | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| CEWiT | Case 3, Case 4 | Case 1, Case 2 |  |

**Question 2.1.3: FR1 bands**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Prioritization/support in Rel-17 | | |
| High Priority | Low Priority | Exclude |
| AT&T |  | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |
| Huawei | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| Ericsson |  | Case 1, Case 2 (only relevant for TDD and there are only 1 or 2 TDD bands in FR1) | Case 3, Case 4 |
| Nokia |  | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Case 2 (TDD) | Case 2 (FDD), Case 1 (w/o support of case-6 timing) | Case 3, Case 4.  (same consideration as in Q2.1.1) |
| NTT DOCOMO | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| Samsung | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| LG Electronics | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| Fujitsu | Case2 | Case1 | Case 3, Case 4 |
| Qualcomm | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| CMCC |  | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |
| vivo | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| CEWiT | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |

**Question 2.1.4: FR2 bands**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Prioritization/support in Rel-17 | | |
| High Priority | Low Priority | Exclude |
| AT&T | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| Huawei | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| Ericsson | Case 1, Case 2 |  | Case 3, Case 4 (same problem as for unpaired spectrum) |
| Nokia | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Case 2 (always TDD in FR2) | Case 1 (w/o support of case-6 timing) | Case 3, Case 4.  (same consideration as in Q2.1.1) |
| NTT DOCOMO | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| Samsung | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| LG Electronics | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| Fujitsu | Case1, Case2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| Qualcomm | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| CMCC | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |
| vivo | Case 1, Case 2 | Case 3, Case 4 |  |
| CEWiT | Case 1, Case 2, Case 3, Case 4 |  |  |

Comments on prioritization of cases

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | The reason why we propose to put low priority to case 3/4 for paired spectrum and FR1 is that it may be difficult to implement full duplex in lower frequency band when MT and DU are on the same panel. However, we do not no need to exclude any case at the current stage. |
| Intel | We want to further clarify/confirm our understanding on those factors for the four simultaneous cases.   * Paired/Unpaired spectrum are usually used to describe per-link DL/UL transmission; now it is used to describe per-node parent BH and child BH transmission. * FR1/FR2: Does FR1 mean parent BH and child BH both in FR1? Also, FR2 means parent BH and child BH both in FR2? Then, do we need another case of FR1/FR2 combination? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We de-prioritize simultaneous Tx mainly because case 6 timing has several problems regarding to limitation upon performance (e.g., dedicate DU slots on a per child link basis) and complexity in specification (e.g., potential impact to case-1 timing and new RAN4 requirement for UL-Tx timing). |
| Samsung | In general, we don't see a reason to deprioritize some cases regarding duplexing or freq. range at this stage. |
| LG Electronics | For reducing latency and enhancing spectral efficiency, all simultaneous operations should be considered in Rel-17 eIAB WI. |
| Fujitsu | Case 1/2 for FR1 should be given higher priority than Case 3/4 for FR 2 considering their feasibility. |
| CMCC | For FR1，case 3 and 4 could not work due the self-interference. And in case 1 and 2, the cross link interference will be severe. |
| vivo | We also want to clarify the paired/unpaired spectrum. Is it refer to the relation between one MT link and DU link, e.g., MT DL and DU UL? |
| CEWiT | Agree with LG’s comments. Self-interference issue can be handled in an implementation specific way. It will not put a limit on the supported modes. |
| Ericsson | Case 1 and Case 2 with BH operations limited to DL slots will result in an interference situation that is similar to what exists today. Hence, from an interference p.o.v., the specification work can be expected to be relatively straight forward. Also timing-wise, there are solutions presented that will work from a node perspective. Only simple power control is likely required. By restricting BH operations to DL slots, UEs will not need to consider the special cases with negative TA for IA/RA.  For Case 4, on the other hand, IAB-MT may transmit in UL slots. This will result in **extreme interference for access links** and/or require **substantial, UE-like power control** to align with access link transmissions. The required power control implies that substantially more linear and hence **less efficient PAs will be required**. Due to the co-existence of access and BH links, and the corresponding weaker transmit power that would imply, the BH link can be expected to be significantly less robust and more varying and as a result the BH link will use a lower and varying MCS resulting in **reduced and unpredictable system throughput**. This may be acceptable for a UE but not for a node or network that is expected to operate with a high reliability. Furthermore, by including Case 3 and Case 4, **specification work will be more complex** due to two cases, the feasibility of which many companies have doubts about. Unfortunately, this increased complexity risk spilling over to specification of Case 1 and Case 2 which is why Ericsson would prefer to focus entirely on these.  In our understanding, operation according to Case 3 is related and limited to DL slots. If Case 4 is also limited to take place in DL slots, some of the above disadvantages would be eliminated. No access link interference would exist implying more stationary and robust links with less power variations from UE needs. As a result, more efficient PAs can again be used. Link and network robustness would still suffer from self-interference, including channel aspects, though. Taken the above into consideration, we think that companies may be willing to agree to the following:  **Proposal: DL slots are the baseline for non-TDM IAB backhaul operations.**    Based on the above comments from companies, it is evident that Case 1 and Case 2 have support from all companies whereas many companies have doubts of Case 3 and Case 4 and the latter cases need to be further discussed in terms of interference and BH link reliability and network stability.    As a part of that discussion we think that the multi-panel configuration should be defined so we share a common understanding of the capabilities such nodes, e.g., w.r.t.   * Antenna/RF isolation * Interference cancellation * Baseband timing capabilities   Related to this, we would be willing to agree to the following:  **Proposal: Support at least Case 1 and Case 2 resource multiplexing.**  **FFS: Simultaneous operation including access and/or BH links**  **FFS: Multi-panel capabilities w.r.t., e.g.,**   * + **Antenna/RF isolation**   + **Interference cancellation**   + **Baseband timing capabilities**   **FFS: Multi-panel Case 3 and Case 4 case from interference, link stability and network reliability perspectives to consider support for also these cases.** |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | [update in MotM2]  In general, unpaired spectrum can be given higher priority than paired spectrum. In each category, Case 1/2/3/4 should be considered with equal priority in order to make the standardization work and the specification as transparent to implementations as possible. By a similar rationale, we prefer equal priority for operation at FR1 and FR2 (or a combination as Intel has pointed out). |
| Ericsson | Case 1 and Case 2 with BH operations limited to DL slots will result in an interference situation that is similar to what exists today. Hence, from an interference p.o.v., the specification work can be expected to be relatively straight forward. Also timing-wise, there are solutions presented that will work from a node perspective. Only simple power control is likely required. By restricting BH operations to DL slots, UEs will not need to consider the special cases with negative TA for IA/RA.  For Case 4, on the other hand, IAB-MT may transmit in UL slots. This will result in **extreme interference for access links** and/or require **substantial, UE-like power control** to align with access link transmissions. The required power control implies that substantially more linear and hence **less efficient PAs will be required**. Due to the co-existence of access and BH links, and the corresponding weaker transmit power that would imply, the BH link can be expected to be significantly less robust and more varying and as a result the BH link will use a lower and varying MCS resulting in **reduced and unpredictable system throughput**. This may be acceptable for a UE but not for a node or network that is expected to operate with a high reliability. Furthermore, by including Case 3 and Case 4, **specification work will be more complex** due to two cases, the feasibility of which many companies have doubts about. Unfortunately, this increased complexity risk spilling over to specification of Case 1 and Case 2 which is why Ericsson would prefer to focus entirely on these.  In our understanding, operation according to Case 3 is related and limited to DL slots. If Case 4 is also limited to take place in DL slots, some of the above disadvantages would be eliminated. No access link interference would exist implying more stationary and robust links with less power variations from UE needs. As a result, more efficient PAs can again be used. Link and network robustness would still suffer from self-interference, including channel aspects, though. Taken the above into consideration, we think that companies may be willing to agree to the following:  **Proposal: DL slots are the baseline for non-TDM IAB backhaul operations.**    Based on the above comments from companies, it is evident that Case 1 and Case 2 have support from all companies whereas many companies have doubts of Case 3 and Case 4 and the latter cases need to be further discussed in terms of interference and BH link reliability and network stability.    As a part of that discussion we think that the multi-panel configuration should be defined so we share a common understanding of the capabilities such nodes, e.g., w.r.t.   * Antenna/RF isolation * Interference cancellation * Baseband timing capabilities   Related to this, we would be willing to agree to the following:  **Proposal: Support at least Case 1 and Case 2 resource multiplexing.**  **FFS: Simultaneous operation including access and/or BH links**  **FFS: Multi-panel capabilities w.r.t., e.g.,**   * + **Antenna/RF isolation**   + **Interference cancellation**   + **Baseband timing capabilities**   **FFS: Multi-panel Case 3 and Case 4 case from interference, link stability and network reliability perspectives to consider support for also these cases.** |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | [update in MotM2]  In general, unpaired spectrum can be given higher priority than paired spectrum. In each category, Case 1/2/3/4 should be considered with equal priority in order to make the standardization work and the specification as transparent to implementations as possible. By a similar rationale, we prefer equal priority for operation at FR1 and FR2 (or a combination as Intel has pointed out). |
| Huawei2 | We discussed the application scenarios of Case 1/2/3/4 in our contribution and below is a summary:  Case 1:   * It is preferable to apply Case 1 in downlink slots (Case B) since this can avoid UE-to-UE interference. * Case 1 can be applied for parent BH and child BH/AL. * Case #6 timing mode is required for parent BH UL. * Power control is beneficial to mitigate the interference   A picture containing object, clock  Description automatically generated   1. Case A: MT-TX/DU-TX at Donor cell UL occasion   A picture containing object, clock  Description automatically generated   1. Case B: MT-TX/DU-TX at Donor cell DL occasion   Case 2:   * It is preferable to apply Case 2 in uplink slots (Case B) since this can avoid UE-to-UE interference. * Case 2 can be applied for parent BH and child BH/AL. * Case #7 timing mode is required for parent BH UL. * Power control is beneficial to mitigate the interference   A picture containing object, clock  Description automatically generated   1. Case A: MT-RX/DU-RX at Donor cell DL occasion   A picture containing clock  Description automatically generated   1. Case B: MT-RX/DU-RX at Donor cell UL occasion   Case 3:   * Case 3 can only be applied in downlink slots * Case 3 (if possible) can be applied for parent BH and child BH/AH. * It is impossible to adjust DU Tx timing hence timing alignment cannot be ensured   A picture containing clock  Description automatically generated  Case 4:   * Case 4 can only be applied in uplink slots * Case 4 (if possible) can be applied for parent BH and child BH/AH. * The UL Rx timing can be adjusted on the child link to achieve timing alignment.   A picture containing clock  Description automatically generated  Overall, we think Case 1/2/4 can be supported in both DL slots and UL slots. There is no need restrict to the simultaneous operation only in DL slots. For example, Case 2 can be applied in UL slots which does not incur complicated interference situations. On the other hand, whether to apply it to DL slot or UL slot seems more like a deployment and configuration choice.  Given there are still some concerns on Case 3 and Case 4. Hence, the proposal from Ericsson seems okay, suggested change below  **Proposal: Support at least Case 1 and Case 2 resource multiplexing.**   * **FFS: Simultaneous operation including access and/or BH links** * **FFS: Case 3 and Case 4 from interference, link stability and network reliability perspectives to consider support for also these cases.** |

**FL Conclusion 2.1.5**: **More discussion is needed on potential prioritization of certain spectrum types/frequency ranges for the different multiplexing cases.**

**FL Proposal 2.1.6**: **At least existing Rel-16 bands supporting IAB can be considered when evaluating the feasibility/impact of supporting different multiplexing cases.**

RAN1#102-e Decisions

**Agreement**

At least existing Rel-16 bands supporting IAB can be considered when evaluating the feasibility/impact of supporting different multiplexing cases.

**FL Proposal 2.1.7:**

* **The following resource multiplexing cases are considered in Rel-17:**
  + **Multiplexing Case 1: Simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Tx**
  + **Multiplexing Case 2: Simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Rx**
  + **Multiplexing Case 3: Simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Tx**
  + **Multiplexing Case 4: Simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Rx**
* **Case 1 and Case 2 support for single/multi-panel IAB nodes operating in unpaired spectrum and FR1/FR2 bands is considered with highest priority**
* **Case 3 and Case 4 support for multi-panel IAB nodes operating in unpaired spectrum and FR2 bands is considered with highest priority**

**Discussion: Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.1.7?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | No | In addition to what we have described above there is the matter of specification complexity. Mux Case 3 and Mux Case 4 will imply more complicated situations requiring correspondingly more advanced solutions and more specification work:   * More interference affecting both network nodes, UEs and even other networks * More sophisticated power control if UL is used * Possibly new requirements on IAB nodes themselves   Furthermore, the important matter of implementability and reliability for Case 3 and Case 4 does not motivate an equal priority compared to Case 1 and Case 2.  **We can however agree to Huawei’s proposal above.** |
| Huawei | Yes | None |
| Qualcomm | Yes | None |
| Samsung |  | We think no need to differentiate FR1/FR2 for Case 3 and Case 4 support because we don’t see different spec. supports for FR1/FR2.  Would like to propose the following change:  **Case 3 and Case 4 support for multi-panel IAB nodes operating in unpaired spectrum ~~and FR2 bands~~ is considered with highest priority** |

**FL Observation 2.1.8: It is clear that companies have different views on which scenarios should be the focus for different multiplexing cases. Especially for Case 3 and Case 4, given the large range of possible scenarios and the very large range in potential issues/solutions required, it is suggested to focus on a limited subset of scenarios to determine whether the Cases can be supported or not. Companies can provide analysis/solutions for other cases, but these may not be considered with highest priority.**

**FL Proposal 2.1.9:**

* **The following resource multiplexing cases are defined in Rel-17:**
  + **Multiplexing Case 1: Simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Tx**
  + **Multiplexing Case 2: Simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Rx**
  + **Multiplexing Case 3: Simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Tx**
  + **Multiplexing Case 4: Simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Rx**
* **Support for Case 1 and Case 2 is considered at least for the following scenarios:**
  + **Single or multi-panel IAB nodes operating in unpaired spectrum (FR1 and FR2 bands)**
* **Support for Case 3 and Case 4 (based on feasibility from an interference, link stability and network reliability perspective) is considered at least for the following scenarios:**
  + **Multi-panel IAB nodes operating in unpaired spectrum and FR2 bands**

**Discussion: Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.1.9?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Yes, with modifications | Agreeing to Case 3 and Case 4 before they have been proven feasible is the wrong order and will cause unnecessary specification work.  We would be able to agree to the following as a third bullet:   * **Support for Case 3 and Case 4 (conditioned on feasibility from an interference, link stability and network reliability perspective) may be considered at least for the following scenarios:**   + **Multi-panel IAB nodes operating in unpaired spectrum and FR2 bands**   Finally, we share the Chairman’s view that the names of the different multiplexing cases could be more descriptive. For that reason, we propose to use the following names instead:  Tx half-duplex = Case 1  Rx half-duplex = Case 2  DL full duplex = Case 3  UL full duplex = Case 4 |
| Samsung |  | We think no need to differentiate FR1/FR2 for Case 3 and Case 4 support because we don’t see different spec. supports for FR1/FR2.  Would like to propose the following change:  **Multi-panel IAB nodes operating in unpaired spectrum ~~and FR2 bands~~ (FR1 and FR2 bands)** |
| LG Electronics |  | We are fine with Ericsson’s proposal for changing the name of simultaneous operation Cases.  Also, it is fine to keep the original sentence of 3rd bullet. And, propose to delete ‘FR2 band’ in sub-bullet.   * **Support for Case 3 and Case 4 (based on feasibility from an interference, link stability and network reliability perspective) is considered at least for the following scenarios:**   + **Multi-panel IAB nodes operating in unpaired spectrum ~~and FR2 bands~~ (FR1 and FR2 bands)** |

**FL Proposal 2.1.10:**

* **The following resource multiplexing cases are defined in Rel-17:**
  + **Multiplexing Case 1: Simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Tx (i.e. Tx Half Duplex)**
  + **Multiplexing Case 2: Simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Rx (i.e. Rx Half Duplex)**
  + **Multiplexing Case 3: Simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Tx (i.e. DL Full Duplex)**
  + **Multiplexing Case 4: Simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Rx (i.e. UL Full Duplex)**
* **Support for Case 1 and Case 2 is considered at least for the following scenarios:**
  + **Single or multi-panel IAB nodes operating in unpaired spectrum (FR1 and FR2 bands)**
* **Support for Case 3 and Case 4 (conditioned on feasibility from an interference, link stability and network reliability perspective) is considered at least for the following scenarios:**
  + **Multi-panel IAB nodes operating in unpaired spectrum (FR1 and FR2 bands)**

**Discussion: Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.1.10?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Vivo | Yes | None |
| CEWiT | Yes | None |
| Fujitsu | Yes to the first two bullets | The 3rd bullet should be FFS since there is no conclusion on the feasibility discussion. |
| Ericsson | Conditional Yes | Conditioned on there is a common understanding that this agreement does not imply that Case 3 and Case 4 are agreed to be supported at this point. FFS for 3rd bullet also acceptable. |
| Huawei | Yes | None |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | Yes |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes for the first two bullets. | The 3rd bullet should be FFS or off the list. RAN1 may not be able to commit to such feasibility study that can give a full picture of the feasibility itself. As ZTE mentioned earlier, there are well-known issues beyond baseband or digital domain, such as AGC/ADC and inter-modulation, which are normally out of RAN1 scope. |
| Qualcomm | Yes, in principle, but it is not clear what we are precisely agreeing to. | It is not very clear what “support for X is considered” means. Does it imply support or is still an open question whether X is supported?  Moreover it is not clear what is the difference w.r.t. “support for X is considered, conditioned on Y”. |
| Intel | Yes | None |
|  |  |  |

**FL Proposal 2.1.11:**

* **The following resource multiplexing cases are defined in Rel-17:**
  + **Multiplexing Case 1: Simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Tx (i.e. Tx Half Duplex)**
  + **Multiplexing Case 2: Simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Rx (i.e. Rx Half Duplex)**
  + **Multiplexing Case 3: Simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Tx (i.e. DL Full Duplex)**
  + **Multiplexing Case 4: Simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Rx (i.e. UL Full Duplex)**
* **For Case 1 (Tx Half Duplex) and Case 2 (Rx Half Duplex) at least the following scenarios should be further considered:**
  + **Single or multi-panel IAB nodes operating in unpaired spectrum (FR1 and FR2 bands)**
* **For Case 3 (DL Full Duplex) and Case 4 (UL Full Duplex) at least for the following scenarios should be further considered:**
  + **Multi-panel IAB nodes operating in unpaired spectrum (FR1 and FR2 bands)**
* **FFS: Required level of specification impact to support the different cases. Especially for Case 3 and 4, any additional specification support in Rel-17 should be conditioned on feasibility from an interference, link stability and network reliability perspective**

**Discussion: Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.1.11?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Yes to bullet 1 and 2 | Given the scope of work for studying case 3 and 4, their study should be down-prioritized in Rel-17. |
| Samsung | Yes in principle | In principle, we are OK with the FL proposal. But, we are little bit reluctant to use the terminology “DL full duplex” or “UL full duplex” and then it is very clear for us to use “simultaneous MT TX or RX / DU TX or RX” which are already specified in WID. Similarly, “TX half duplex” and “RX half duplex” is redundant and can be removed.  In addition, in FFS, we see vague wordings like “link stability” and “network reliability” because it is very unclear how to measure/estimate the metrics in the future. If our understanding is correct, they have some overlap and then if interference is strong, link stability and network reliability would be impacted. So, we think it would be sufficient to have “conditioned on feasibility from an interference perspective”  Also, regarding the main bullet, does “defined in Rel-17” mean “supported in Rel-17”? We’d like to clarify the meaning. |
| LG Electronics | Yes to bullet 1,2 and 3 | Generally, we are fine with the FL proposal.  In FFS part, we see that further clarification regarding on the sentence ‘any additional specification support in Rel-17 should be conditioned on feasibility…’ is necessity.  For multiplexing Case 2, we should consider the possibility that there are the various type of inter-link interference depending on received power, numerology, signal/channel type, etc. Furthermore, depending on the feasibility of receiver (i.e., MT side and/or DU side), the required level of specification impact could be different.  If this understanding is aligned with the intention of the sentence in FFS part, the sentence should be applied to not only Case 3/4 but also Case 2. |
| vivo | Yes | Since there is a FFS to case 3 and case 4, it is already clarified limited spec. impact is expected for case 3/4. It is better to keep the bullet-3. We also share concern from SS, link stability and network reliability are not correct wording from spec. perspective. |

## Key requirements/issues for Rel-17 Multiplexing Scenarios (Med priority):

**Goal:**  Identify and describe key performance metrics and targets for prioritized multiplexing scenarios (e.g. latency reduction, system capacity improvement, etc.) as well as issues which may limit the benefits or impact feasibility, including the impact on non-IAB networks.

**Summary of input contributions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Huawei (R1-2005260)** | ***Observation 1:*** *The capabilities for simultaneous operations can be categorized into two types:*   * *Unrestricted capabilities of simultaneous operations: IAB node can implement simultaneous operations without restriction* * *Restricted capabilities of simultaneous operations: IAB node can implement simultaneous operations only if some conditions are met*   ***Observation 2:*** *Based on the type of the capabilities for simultaneous operations, IAB node and its parent node can determine the modes of simultaneous operations, which include:*   * *Mode 1: The IAB node can implement simultaneous operation in both hard and soft resources* * *Mode 2: The IAB node can implement simultaneous operation only in soft resources based on the dynamic scheduling and indication from parent node*   ***Proposal 4:*** *To determine the simultaneous operation mode of an IAB node, the parent node should be aware of the type of simultaneous operation capabilities of the IAB node.* |
| **Vivo (R1-2005399)** | **Error: Reference source not found** |
| **ZTE (R1-2005467)** | ***Observation 1: For simultaneous DU-Tx/MT-Rx and simultaneous DU-Rx/MT-Tx, although RAN4 may need to work on the corresponding requirements (up to RAN4), the two full-duplex operations can be considered as implementation issues from RAN1 perspective.*** |
| **Intel (R1-2005893)** | **Observation 1:** For the simultaneous operations of IAB-node’s child and parent links:   * MT RX/DU RX: With slot alignment, the child MT needs to know the parent backhaul propagation delay , which needs additional signaling. * MT RX/DU TX: Slot alignment scheme is not possible and cannot be supported. * MT RX/DU RX: There are two ways to fulfill with slot alignment scheme and in one of the two ways, the child MT needs to know the parent backhaul propagation delay and the parent timing advance parameter , which needs additional signaling.   **Proposal 1:** For simultaneous operation of IAB-node’s child and parent links, w/o slot alignment scheme is preferred. No additional timing adjustment is needed and current TA control mechanism, timing relationship between parent IAB node, IAB node and its child node can be remained.  **Proposal 2:** When one of the SDM/FDM multiplexing mode (MT Tx/DU Tx, MT Tx/DU Rx, MT Rx/DU Tx, MT Rx/DU Rx) is supported, the corresponding transition guard symbols (desired and provided) are not needed, as summarized in Table 1. |
| **Samsung (R1-2006165)** | ***Observation 1: There is no need for further specification support in terms of resource configuration in Rel-17 IAB in order to support simultaneous operation in child and parent link.***  ***Observation 2: Without sufficient interference handling between the parent and child link for Case#3 and Case#4, simultaneous operation is not feasible.***  ***Observation 3: For Case#3 and Case#4, physical isolation of DU and MT antennas could contribute in interference handling. However, physical isolation alone might not be enough and additional mechanisms could be necessary.***  ***Observation 4: Without proper time alignment of child link and parent link, ISI/ICI could obstruct frequency domain processing.***  ***Proposal 1: For simultaneous operations of an IAB node with benefits of spectral efficiency and latency, RAN1 should provide spec. supports to allow efficient operations considering implementation limitations such as near-field channel estimation for interference handling.*** |
| **CEWiT (R1-2006329)** | **Observation 2:** The multiplexing capability and the supported modes of operation of the child node are crucial information required at donor and parent nodes to configure resources to child node efficiently.  **Observation 3:** Resource allocation of IAB-MT and IAB-DU are important factor in determining the active mode of operation of the IAB node  **Observation 4:** The active mode of operation of an IAB node depends on the capability and supported modes of operation of the IAB node, resource configuration of IAB-MT and IAB-DU, capability and active mode of operation of the parent node and the network conditions  **Observation 5:** Multiplexing capability information of parent might be useful to the child in certain cases. |
| **LG (R1-2006382)** | ***Proposal 4: For an IAB-node, simultaneous and non-simultaneous operation can be transited in implicit or explicit manner.*** |
| **Qualcomm (R1-2006825)** | **Observation 1:**  **For improved system performance the IAB-DU resource configurations for a pair of parent and child IAB-nodes need to be commensurate with the duplexing capability of the child IAB-node.**  **Observation 2:**  **The Rel-16 framework for is already suitable to support efficient semi-static IAB-DU resource configuration as a function of duplexing capabilities of IAB-nodes.**  **Observation 3:**  **Duplexing capability is in general conditional and not necessarily an absolute property that applies independently of the IAB-MT and IAB-DU beams direction and shape.** |
| **Ericsson (R1-2006903)** | Observation 1 Simultaneous TX/RX of an IAB-node is not feasible in RAN4 IAB Scenario 1 where the IAB-MT transmits in UL slots while the IAB-DU transmits in DL slots and the IAB-MT receives in DL slots while the IAB-DU receives in UL slots.  Observation 2 For an {MT CC, DU cell} pair where the IAB-node is indicated *no-TDM* capable, DU time-domain resources are implicitly *Soft* with respect to the corresponding MT CC. |

Many factors have been listed as impacting the potential performance/feasibility of the different cases described in Section 2.1. These include:

* Antenna design (same panel or multi-panel operation)
* Cross-link and self-interference limitations (R1-2006165):

|  |
| --- |
| **Simultaneous operations** |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

* Need for power control at IAB-DU as well as IAB-MT
* Inclusion of exclusion of access (UE) and backhaul (child/parent) links
* Inclusion or exclusion of control vs. data signals/channels
* Timing alignment requirements (figures from R1-2005893):
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* Static vs. dynamic determination of IAB-node multiplexing capability
* DL/UL spectrum operation (i.e. RAN4 Scenario 1 vs. Scenario 2 in R1-2006903):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **DL** part of TDD pattern | **UL** part of TDD pattern |
| **Scenario 1** | IAB-MT | RX | TX |
| IAB-DU | TX | RX |
| UE | RX | TX |
| **Scenario 2** | IAB-MT | RX or TX |  |
| IAB-DU | RX or TX |  |
| UE | RX | TX |

The relevance and impact of these different factors on the different multiplexing cases should be further considered before moving to discuss potential solutions and enhancements, but as pointed out by different companies, some factors are heavily dependent on IAB node capability, implementation considerations which may be outside the scope of RAN1, or have dependencies on deployment/spectrum regulatory limitations. The table below attempts to capture different factors and highlights their relative impact on the feasibility of a given multiplexing case.

**FL Survey 2.2.1: Do you agree with the following impact table for different multiplexing cases? Are there any additional (high-level) factors which should be considered?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Antenna/RF front-end impact** | **Interference type** | **Power control** | **Resource partitioning** | **Timing** |
| **Case 1** | N/A | CLI (aggressor) | Existing PC | May impact access UEs DL performance | MT/DU timing alignment possible with Case 6 timing |
| **Case 2** | Intra-panel – Maybe (depending on receiver implementation)  Inter-panel – Maybe (depending on isolation) | CLI (victim) | May be needed if parent link received power >> child link received power | May impact access UEs UL performance (in RAN4 Scenario 1) | MT/DU timing alignment possible with Case 7 timing |
| **Case 3** | Intra-panel – Yes  Inter-panel – Maybe (depending on isolation) | CLI + self-interference | May need to consider self-interference isolation requirements | Consider both access and backhaul links | Timing alignment not possible |
| **Case 4** | Intra-panel – Yes  Inter-panel – Maybe (depending on isolation) | CLI + self-interference | May need to consider self-interference isolation requirements | Consider at least backhaul links  Impact on access links depends on isolation and RAN4 Scenario 1/2 | Timing alignment possible with parent timing advance and backhaul propagation delay known at child |

**Discussion:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Some further clarifications are needed | In general, we think it is helpful to list all some high-level impacting factors for all cases which can be used to have some comparisons and even do further prioritizations on the supported cases. However, some further details may be needed for each of impacting areas. This is not easy task but may be a good guidance for all the companies to prepare further discussions  For case 1, we think it is possible for both intra-panel and Inter-panel case as long as there is sufficient isolation. If the power gap between MT and DU is large, it may also have some RF impact. In this case, power control enhancement may be helpful. And the impact on resource partitioning in the table is not clear to us.  For Case 2, it is not clear what “May impact access UEs UL performance (in RAN4 Scenario 1)“ in the resource partitioning column means here. |
| Ericsson | In general, yes. | We are not convinced that inter-panel is feasible for IAB full duplex since the level of **isolation is at least partly depending on the channel which is outside of the control of the IAB node**. Hence, it will be very difficult to guarantee any isolation between the MT and DU.  Case 1 and Case 2 should be further limited to BH + BH operations in DL, i.e., UL access links are excluded from the simultaneous operation since otherwise legacy UEs may not be able to perform IA/RA. That is, **use RAN4 Scenario 2 as baseline for further discussions for case 1 and Case 2**.  The level of **interference on non-IAB nodes** is highly related to when transmissions take place (UL and/or DL slots). See Fig. 1 in R1-2005261.  **Rel-15 UEs** will be particularly victimized from interference since they **are incompatible with Rel-16 CLI** functionality. This must be particularly considered. |
| Nokia/NSB | Further discussion is needed. | The priority shall be Case 1 and 2. The following input is based on that,  Antenna/RF front-end impact : Don’t see this as an issue for case 1 and case 2 as the TDD constraint will be maintained in this case.  CLI: This we tend to agree as IAB node MT and DU is in Tx for case 1, therefore may create CLI towards other nodes. Case-2 is interference coming from others and not something IAB discussion can handle. We also think that regardless of these cases, CLI can occur between nodes and investigations on coordination mechanism is needed.  Power control: Need further discussion on case-1/2. Case-1 may use NR power control mechanisms, but if we focus on CLI and other aspects, that may not be enough.  Resource partitioning: Resource multiplexing between parent and child links may be needed to address cross link interference.  Timing: Agree with the case-6 and 7 impact. |
| Intel | In general, yes | In general, we think multi-panel operation is more preferred over single-panel operation for simultaneous transmission. Also, we are not sure whether slot-level timing alignment are required for simultaneous transmission. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Partially agree | **For factor “Antenna/RF front-end impact”:**  We are not sure what “N/A” means for Case 1. It seems simultaneous Tx from DU and MT should have at least one RF architecture impact regarding to whether DU and MT share the same PA or not.  **For factor “Power control”:**  Existing PC may not be able to completely solve the problem of power sharing. In addition, there is no DL power control in current spec.  **For factor “Interference type”:**  A more serious issue of “self-interference” in case 3 an case 4 is that, from baseband receiver processing point of view, either the interfering Tx signal is distorted (due to cap of ADC in case of no AGC) or the interfered Rx signal is somehow distorted (due to severe suppression of ADC in case AGC is used). In other words, the interference signal may not be in compliance with “Tx-constructed” formulation and possibly expand from RB x to RB y.  **For factor “Resource partitioning"**:  We are not sure we understand the intention of whole column.  **For factor “Timing”**:  In case 4, “timing alignment possible with parent timing advance” looks ok in theory but can have serious problem in practice:   * Any (controlled or autonomous) adjustment of UL-Tx timing of an IAB node on i-th hop may lead to adjustments of UL-Tx timing in IAB nodes that are on all follow-up hops. The worse is that these adjustments inside IAB nodes may not be able to well sync-up with each other and it is hard for IAB node and its parent to know when the sync-up is well-done. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Partially Yes | We think Case 3 and Case 4 may be realized by only inter-panel configuration. IAB node should have multiple transceiver for DU and MT for the cases, and if IAB-node has an intra-panel for DU and MT, we have no idea of how to isolate the signal for the transceivers, especially for intra-band FDM. The only way to isolate the signals for the transceiver may be the inter-panel configuration, and self-interference may be up to IAB-node implementation. |
| Samsung | Further discussion | Power control: The existing PC may not solve the power sharing issue (and also considering CLI to other IAB node)  Resource partitioning: we are not sure the intention.  CLI: “CLI” in case 3 and 4 is not clear. The interference caused by case 3/4 seems to be similar to conventional “inter-cell interference”. The “CLI” was caused by TDD rather than case 3/4. Maybe better to be classified as inter-cell interference.  Timing: timing alignment is something better to have, but is not mandatory requirement for case 3/4. |
| LG Electronics | Further Clarification is needed. | **Antenna/RF front-end impact**  The meaning of ‘Antenna/RF front-end impact’ is unclear. Could you elaborate your intention for this column?  Also, could you explain the meaning of some words (i.e., ‘Maybe’, ‘Yes’, ‘isolation’)  **Power control**  For case 1, we need to discuss which power control mechanism (e.g., gNB like power control, UE like power control) can be applied for IAB-MT. Also, considering on maximum tx power limitation (for gNB and UE) defined in RAN4, we need to discuss whether existing PC mechanism is changed for IAB-MT.  **Timing**  We think **timing alignment may or may not be required depending on implementation of antenna/RF front-end**.  For example, if it is assumed that MT and DU have independent panels and parent and child link are physically separated (e.g., MT and DU are allocated separately), the amount of interference across the panels can be negligible, and simultaneous Tx and/or Rx can be performed without interference across the links. Therefore, timing alignment for simultaneous Tx and/or Rx is not required.  If antenna panels for MT and DU are co-located or an antenna panel is shared by MT and DU, impact of interference between parent and child link should be considered for simultaneous operation. Also, timing alignment for simultaneous Tx and/or Rx is not required.  **For case 3 (MT Rx/DU Tx)**  Self-interference (DU Tx to MT Rx) can be diminished by antenna separation. If self-inference is sufficiently reduced by antenna separation, timing alignment between MT Rx/DU Tx is not required.  On the other, if further reduction of self-interference is necessity, additional implementation (e.g., self-interference cancellation) is required. Especially, **for operating frequency domain SI-cancellation which is relatively simple for implementation**, timing alignment between MT Rx/DU Tx is required. For MT Rx/DU Tx case, it is needed that **MT Rx is aligned within CP length of OFDM symbol for DU transmission**. |
| Fujitsu | In general, yes | We think the default value of TA offset should also be taken account for timing alignment. Slot level alignment may not be possible for case 1. |
| Qualcomm | Generally yes. | We agree with Intel that duplexing enhancements should be more reasonably associated with multi-panel implementations, hence perhaps this scenario should be prioritized.  It has been observed and discussed in the past that these enhanced duplexing capabilities may not be available all the time, depending on dynamics, including the surrounding environment impacting the wireless channel. However this should not preclude a framework that enables utilization of these enhanced duplexing capabilities when conditions allow it. |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | Yes | We agree that a list of issues may be helpful to overview at this stage. Single-panel scenarios may naturally require more work than multi-panel scenarios.  [update in MotM2]  In the latest discussion at GTW2, it was mentioned that the column on timing can be removed as the topic is covered in 8.10.2. But so are power control and CLI. Hence, we can keep the structure of the table as is if the goal is to have an overview of the impacts and not an agreement on details. |
| vivo |  | Not sure about the intention of RF impact analysis, is that the RF constrain we assume for further discussion or we needs to identify something to facilitate RAN4 discussion. If the intention is to make assumption for further RAN1 discussion, we think intra-panel and inter-panel can be the scenario for case 1 as well.  Regarding to power control, we think PC enhanment should be considered for case 1 as well. As commented by some other companies, at least we need to discuss the power sharing between DU and MT, which may incur different power control mechanism as existing one.  For resource partitioning, both AL and BH may be impacted in case 1 and case 2, power and interference both AL and BH may be impacted. Such impact may incur some scheduling constrain or resource partitioning constrain. |
| Intel2 |  | We just found out there are some misalignment with the definition of Case3 (MT TX/DU RX) / Case 4 (MT RX/DU TX) and the timing illustration figures (Figure 3 in the right lower corresponding to MT RX/DU TX, which is Case 4; Figure 4 in the left lower corresponding to MT TX/DU RX, which is Case 3).  Hence, in the above summary table, for the last **Timing** column,   * “Timing alignment not possible” should apply for Case 4 (MT RX/DU TX); * “Timing alignment possible with parent timing advance and backhaul propagation delay known at child” should apply for Case 3 (MT TX/DU RX). |
|  |  |  |

**For further discussion in RAN1#102-e**

For different multiplexing cases (cases 1, 2, 3, 4), identify factors that needs to be considered in Rel-17 IAB including:

* Antenna/RF front-end impact
* Interference type and interference handling
* Power control
* Resource partitioning
* Impact on access link UEs
* Where the multiplexing cases are applicable to paired or unpaired spectrum
* Problems due to timing misalignment

## FL Proposal 2.2.2:

## Further consider whether there is a need to differentiate the following IAB node capabilities for different resource multiplexing cases (i.e. identify potential specification impact):

## Baseband timing (mis)alignment between IAB-MT and IAB-DU

## Separate vs. shared antenna panels/RF front-end for IAB-MT/IAB-DU

## Self-interference cancellation

**Discussion: Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.2.2?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Yes | From the online sessions it is clear that these different aspects are not yet fully understood nor is there a common understanding. |
| Huawei | Yes to the first bullet | It will be good to clarify the intention of the proposal, i.e. whether the “capabilities” are only listed to facilitate further discussions or the “capabilities” are defined to support different multiplexing cases. If the intention is the latter one, we have the following comments:General comment on IAB node capability:From capability signaling point of view, all four resource multiplex cases are supported without any restriction in Rel-16. This essentially implies that simultaneous operations can only be supported when there is sufficient isolation between MT and DU. This is fine for Rel-16 since “non-TDM” operation is not the focus.In Rel-17, RAN1 is tasked to enhance the support of simultaneous operation, i.e. simultaneous operation can also be supported when the isolation between MT and DU is not sufficient.Compared to Rel-16, simultaneous operation for IAB would require some conditions. These conditions may include timing alignment, enhanced power control, etc i.e. simultaneous operation is only possible when these conditions are metComment on separate vs. shared antenna panels/RF front-end for IAB-MT/IAB-DU： We don’t see the need to define such capabilities. Even with such definitions, the parent node or CU still have no idea whether simultaneous operation can actually be supported or not.Comment on Self-interference cancellation: We don’t see the need to define this capability. The IAB node can operate in case 3/4 and perform SI cancellation without informing the CU or its parent node. |
| Qualcomm | Yes, in principle | Our understanding is that the objective of this proposal is to include the listed dimensions as factors to be considered in the treatment of the enhanced multiplexing cases. |
| Samsung |  | The intention of this proposal is not clear to us. If the bullets are listed to just facilitate discussions for identifying necessary spec supports for different cases rather than to define such capabilities, we think it is good to start. Although the capability can be discussed later, it is expected to be sufficient to define single capability of which multiplexing scenario(s) is supported by IAB node. The condition(s) for the capability of each case would be implementation-specific. |

## FL Proposal 2.2.3:

## The following resource partitioning scenarios are considered for different resource multiplexing cases:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Case 1** **MT-Tx/DU-Tx** | **Case 2 MT-Rx/DU-Rx** | **Case 3 MT-Rx/DU-Tx** | **Case 4 MT-Tx/DU-Rx** |
| **Resource Type** | Alt. 1: DL + UL  Alt. 2: DL only | Alt. 1: DL + UL  Alt. 2: DL only | DL only | Alt. 1: DL + UL  Alt. 2: DL only |
| **Access/Backhaul applicability** | Access + Backhaul | At least backhaul  FFS: Access + Backhaul | Access + Backhaul | At least backhaul  FFS: Access + Backhaul |

**Discussion: Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.2.3?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Maybe, possibly with some modifications | Considered for what? Further assessment or to be specified?  Our understanding of the partitioning of the Alts. 1 (DL+UL) is that DL operations takes place in DL slots and UL operations in UL slots. In any case this must be the case for access links. If so, the Access/Backhaul applicability is unnecessary and/or ambiguous in what alternative it refers to, and may either be deleted, or it should be mapped to the different alternatives for each case as we present below for Case 4.  For Case 4, we believe that the different options should be  Alt. 1: UL only (BH+Acc)  Alt. 2: DL only (BH)  We support Alt. 2 for Case 1 and Case 2. |
| Huawei | Partially | On “Access/Backhaul applicability”, we think we can also list two alternatives  Alt. 1: Backhaul  Alt. 2: Access + Backhaul    On resource type for case 4, we think it should be UL only. We are not sure how this can be done in DL slots… |
| Qualcomm | Clarifications needed | MT and DU operate in different resource domains (upstream link for MT and downstream link for DU), so we should clarify to which domain DL and UL apply.  The same applies to access / backhaul applicability. |
| Samsung |  | For Case 4, MT-TX and DU-RX can occur on both UL and then as an alternative, UL only should be added |

## FL Observation 2.2.4: As pointed out by Huawei, Rel-16 already “supports” the different multiplexing cases via the no-TDM capability indication. However given that the behavior is left to implementation, Rel-17 should discuss and understand what characteristics of the IAB node implementation will impact the operation of different cases. Based on the conclusions of that analysis, different solutions may need to be developed depending on the level of support for the characteristics at the IAB node and that may (or may not) lead to a need for indication of the characteristic to the parent node/network. Note that the details of solutions (and additional ones like power control/CLI management) for improving the performance of different multiplexing cases are out of scope here and should be discussed in 8.10.2.

## FL Proposal 2.2.5:

## Further consider whether there is a need to differentiate the following IAB node characteristics (which may or may not be visible to the parent node/network) in order to support different resource multiplexing cases (i.e. identify whether there is a need for potential specification impact/enhancements compared to Rel-16 if the characteristic is or is not supported by an IAB node):

## Baseband (mis)timing alignment between IAB-MT and IAB-DU

## Separate vs. shared antenna panels/RF front-end for IAB-MT/IAB-DU

## Self-interference cancellation

**Discussion: Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.2.5?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Yes with modifications | This will need to be done with or without an agreement.  Self-interference is only valid for Case 3 and Case 4 and considerations should consider general interference and overall network impact as well.  The properties of *multi-panel* are yet to be defined and without these the above becomes ambiguous. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| LG Electronics | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes to the 1st bullet | The properties of separate panels and self-interference cancellation are still ambiguous. They may have additional specification impact only for Case 3 and Case 4. If really needed, RAN4 would be the appropriate WG to define self-interference cancellation capability. |
| Ericsson2 | Yes with modifications | The characteristics are also heavily dependent on UL/DL slot resource partitioning for BH. Hence, we propose to modify the end of the main sentence to:  *…to support different resource multiplexing cases (i.e. identify whether there is a need for potential specification impact/enhancements compared to Rel-16 if the characteristic is or is not supported by an IAB node) or DL/UL slot resource partitioning:*  Additionally, we think the above three bullets should be complemented with **power control mechanisms** as a differentiating characteristic, since using DL slots or UL slots for BH will likely require very different power control requirements since one is shared with other DUs whereas the other may be shared with UEs .  Regarding multi-panel, what is the view companies have regarding their architecture? Is it just different antenna elements or does it also include different baseband units? **Without a common multi-panel understanding, it will be difficult to specify IAB multi-panel behavior.** |
| Huawei | Yes to the first bullet | * In general, there is no need to specify every single attribute of an IAB node unless there is a need of interaction between the IAB node and the parent node/network so that a specific functionality can be supported properly. In the context of simultaneous operation for IAB node, timing alignment and power control belongs to such attributes since they require interaction/cooperation between parent node and IAB node.  Comment on separate vs. shared antenna panels/RF front-end for IAB-MT/IAB-DU： We don’t see the need to define such capabilities. Single vs. multiple panel/RF front-end are just implementation choices and there is no need to inform the parent about it. Even with such definitions, the parent node or CU still have no idea whether simultaneous operation can actually be supported or not.Comment on Self-interference cancellation: Our initial thought is that there is no need to define this capability. At least for case 4, the IAB node can operate case 4 and perform SI cancellation without informing the CU or its parent node. It is difficult to quantify the capability of SI cancellation. |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | Yes |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes if such characteristic differentiation is per RAN1 discussion wise but not per specification wise. | It is too early at this time to commit certain IAB node characteristics is not spec-transparent. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the objective stated in FL Observation 2.2.4.  Hence we agree in principle to the proposal, but suggest some rewording to better align with the objective. | Suggested modified proposal: Further consider whether the following characteristics of the IAB node implementation will impact the operation of different resource multiplexing cases (i.e. identify whether there is a need for potential specification impact/enhancements compared to Rel-16 if the characteristic is or is not supported by an IAB node):Baseband (mis)timing alignment between IAB-MT and IAB-DUSeparate vs. shared antenna panels/RF front-end for IAB-MT/IAB-DUSelf-interference cancellation |
| Intel | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

## FL Proposal 2.2.9:

## Further consider whether the following characteristics of the IAB node implementation will impact the operation of different resource multiplexing cases, including resource partitioning (i.e. identify whether there is a need for potential specification impact/enhancements compared to Rel-16 if the characteristic is or is not supported by an IAB node):

## Baseband (mis)timing alignment between IAB-MT and IAB-DU

## Separate vs. shared antenna panels/RF front-end for IAB-MT/IAB-DU

## Self-interference cancellation

## Power control mechanisms

**Discussion: Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.2.9?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Yes to first two bullets | Agree with earlier Ericsson comments that self-interference is associated with Case 3 and Case 4.  Given our time constraints we believe these should be deprioritized for R17.    Regarding separate panel comment from Ericsson.   Perhaps we can simply categorize the antenna panel configurations as described:   1. Common panels, common baseband 2. Separate panels, separate baseband 3. Separate panels, common baseband   Having described as above, I am not sure there is that much difference between config 1 and 3.    Config 3 looks like a multi-panel implementation and we see little distinction between 1 and 3.    However, we can think of a corner case for Config 3 where the panels are isolated from each other but require timing alignment.   In the latter case, timing alignment may be required.   We recommend omitting or de-prioritize config 3.    Config 2 is a useful distinct configuration where one can imagine that whole separate MT implementation is used.  In this config, resource multiplexing for FDM may still be required but timing alignment would not. |
| Samsung | Yes | We are fine to further consider aspects in the FL proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Yes | Generally fine with FL proposal.  In addition, for multiplexing Case 2, we should discuss which IAB implementation for decoupling two mixed signal (i.e., DL signal from parent IAB-DU and UL signal from child IAB-MT/UE) can be assumed for Rel-17 specficiation work. In this aspect, one more *characteristics of the IAB node implementation* should be included in the list   * Received signal decoupling |
| vivo | First 2 bullets are OK | We are not sure about the intention of 3rd and 4th bullet. Since interference, PC, timing... will be discussed in 8.10.2. it is clear that we will justify such aspects, it seems to be redundant to repeat such factors. |

## FL Observation 2.2.6: While all access UE transmission occur in either DL or UL resources depending on the signal/channel, it has been proposed that for different multiplexing cases, there may be a need to restrict the IAB node transmissions/receptions to only DL resources (e.g. to avoid interference to UEs or non-IAB networks deployed in adjacent spectrum bands). Additionally it is proposed that the multiplexing cases only apply when the MT/DU transmissions/receptions involve either a parent node link or child node link and not access UEs.

## FL Proposal 2.2.7:

## The following resource partitioning scenarios alternatives are supported for different resource multiplexing cases:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Case 1** **MT-Tx/DU-Tx** | **Case 2 MT-Rx/DU-Rx** | **Case 3 MT-Rx/DU-Tx** | **Case 4 MT-Tx/DU-Rx** |
| **Resource Type for IAB node transmissions /receptions (not access UEs)** | Alt. 1: DL + UL  Alt. 2: DL only | Alt. 1: DL + UL  Alt. 2: DL only | DL only | Alt. 1: DL + UL  Alt. 2: DL only |
| **Access/Backhaul applicability** | Alt. 1: Backhaul only  Alt. 2: Access + Backhaul | Alt. 1: Backhaul only  Alt. 2: Access + Backhaul | Alt. 1: Backhaul only  Alt. 2: Access + Backhaul | Alt. 1: Backhaul only  Alt. 2: Access + Backhaul |

**Discussion: Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.2.7?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Yes, with modifications | Our baseline is that BH operations should not take place in UL slots since that can cause a more severe interference situation in another DU receiver. This is also the reason why we have Case 1 related timing requirements.  For Case 1 we think it should be entirely focused on DL with two alternatives involving either BH only or BH+Access.  Furthermore, the Access/Backhaul applicability alternatives for Case 2 should be switched. Now, Case 2, Alt. 2 implies a UE UL operation in a DL slot. It is also worth to consider that if the MT receives in an UL slot, there must be a DU transmitting in a UL slot.  Finally, for Case 3 there may not be the same rationale for different Access/Backhaul applicability alternatives. Case 3, DL Full duplex, may address both access and backhaul. However, for Case 4, i.e., UL full duplex, could be performed in DL if restricted to BH only, or in UL and then for both access and BH. |
| Samsung |  | For Case 4, MT-TX and DU-RX can occur on both UL and then as an alternative, “UL only” should be added |
| LG Electronics |  | For Case 4 (UL full duplex), we can consider one more alternative (i.e. “UL only”) |

## FL Proposal 2.2.8: Further consider which of the following resource partitioning scenarios are supported for different resource multiplexing cases:

## Resource Type for IAB node transmissions /receptions (not access UEs):

## DL only, UL only, DL + UL

## Access/Backhaul link applicability

## Alt. 1: Access + Backhaul

## Alt. 2: Backhaul only

**Discussion: Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.2.8?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | No, better to be more constructive | Regarding the UL-DL discussion, do we still follow the basic assumption made by RAN4, i.e., Same TDD pattern is assumed between different operators, And then we try to minimize the CLI when introducing the new multiplexing mode? If our understanding is correct, DU transmission on UL part should be precluded as mentioned by E///. Regarding whether MT/UE can transmit on DL part, our understanding is at least MT transmission on DL should be allowed, since MT will be collocated with DU. UE transmission on DL is also not preferred, this incur CLI to neighbour cell as well.  Regarding the BH-AL link discussion, **this should be decoupled with the UL-DL discussion**. AL link can be involved, only if legacy UE behavior is not impacted. We can firstly focus on BH link from specification perspective, and then justify whether the feature can be applied to AL depending on whether legacy UE behavior or performance are severely impacted or not. |
| CEWiT | Yes | None |
| Fujitsu | Yes | None |
| Ericsson | Yes with modifications | We share vivo’s view that the proposal could be more constructive, but we still support it if it is the best we can do. The main reason for that is that it will encourage companies to address the content of the proposal for future meetings. This we think is key in agreeing to properly functioning multiplexing cases in terms of interference, power control and possibly also timing.  However, we would like put a focus on the respective scenarios’ implication on interference, since that will be very different in UL slots compared to DL slots. For that reason, we propose the following slightly modified proposal text:  *Further consider which of the following resource partitioning scenarios are supported*, *including their respective implication on interference, for different resource multiplexing cases:* |
| Huawei | Yes with some suggested changes | We are supportive of this proposal.  “Resource Type for IAB node transmissions /receptions (not access UEs)” is not fully clear. I assume the intention is to say “slot type of the donor node for IAB node transmissions /receptions.” |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo |  | The “Access/Backhaul link applicability” is unclear. Enhanced IAB nodes are expected to serve all UEs including legacy UEs. Any specified multiplexing mechanism should be applied to a UE only if the UE can support it. This will be an implementation matter. We specify backhaul links and leave access-link applicability to implementation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The bullet for “resource type” needs clarification. | In simultaneous operation, whether a resource is categorized as DL or UL or DL+UL is an attribute of multiplexing scheme. But the “resource type” bullet seems to say the D/U/D+U is a choice whether a specific multiplexing scheme can apply. For example, if we are looking at Tx half-duplex in a DL resource, how is this “DL resource” defined? i.e., For a resource to be used for DL on child link and UL on parent link, what conditions are used to qualify the resource to be DL? |
| Qualcomm | Not clear. | The proposal is not very clear as currently worded. |
| Intel | Not clear. | We also think this proposal is not very clear and hard to understand. More detailed description/contents need to be added. |
|  |  |  |

## FL Proposal 2.2.10: Further consider different resource partitioning scenarios for access and backhaul links, including their respective implication on interference, for different resource multiplexing cases. Examples include:

## Whether a given case is only applicable for certain resource types: e.g. DL only, UL only, DL + UL

## Whether a given case is only applicable for backhaul links or both access and backhaul links

## Note: This does not imply any impact on legacy UE behavior

**Discussion: Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.2.10?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Yes, with clarification needed | This proposal is not clear. Need more clarification and discussion to understand this.  If the intention is that DL only and UL only to imply full-duplex operation.  These scenarios should not be considered if we do not agree to support case 3 and 4 multiplexing. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| LG Electronics | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | As starting point to trigger discussion in following meets, it is fine to keep the proposal. |

## Solutions/enhancements for Rel-17 Multiplexing Scenarios (Low priority):

**Goal:**Summarize proposed new features and enhancements to existing Rel-16 resource allocation functionality (e.g. semi-static resource coordination, DCI Format 2\_5 enhancements, prioritization rules, guard symbols etc.) as a starting point for future discussion

**Summary of input contributions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Huawei (R1-2005260)** | ***Proposal 1:*** *If an IAB-MT is additionally provided TDD-UL-DL-ConfigDedicated-IAB-MT, the parameter tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated-IAB-MT overrides all symbols per slot over the number of slots as provided by tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *To increase the resources for simultaneous operation, the specification should allow the collision between tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated-IAB-MT and cell-specific signals/channels. In the slots with the collision, the IAB node should ignore tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated-IAB-MT. The list of cell-specific signals/channels includes:*   * *SS/PBCH block* * *CORESET for Type0-PDCCH CSS set* * *PRACH*   ***Proposal 3:*** *Donor CU can provide two sets of resource configurations to each DU cell: a basic resource configuration for access UEs and one additional resource configuration for child IAB node MTs, and the DU cell should maintain two sets of DU resource configurations simultaneously.* |
| **Vivo (R1-2005399)** | * Error: Reference source not found   **Error: Reference source not found**  **Error: Reference source not found**  Error: Reference source not found  Error: Reference source not found |
| **ZTE (R1-2005467)** | ***Proposal 1: The similar semi-static resource partitioning scheme to Rel-16 mechanism of CU time-domain H/S/NA configuration can be the starting point of resource partitioning scheme in frequency domain.*** |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell (R1-2005535)** | **Proposal 2.1: For FDM and SDM operation of the IAB node, the frequency and spatial availability of a resource shall be additionally indicated via semi-static signalling.**  **Proposal 2.2: For FDM operation, a dynamic indication of frequency availability of soft resources shall be controlled by the parent via introducing frequency availability indication.**  **Proposal 2.3: For SDM operation, a dynamic indication of spatial restrictions (or availability) of soft resources shall be further studied to enable efficient SDM operation at the IAB node.**  **Proposal 2.4: For FDM/SDM operation, allowed direction of the transmission for the IAB DU in F-S resources may be further controlled by the parent node by using a dynamic indication.** |
| **Intel (R1-2005893)** | **Proposal 3:** For the semi-static DU resource configurations, support additional supplemental per-link configuration. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (R1-2005927)** | **Proposal 1:** Extend IAB resource configuration and availability indication to the frequeny domain.  **Proposal 2:** Support early TCI indication by IAB nodes to facilitate SDM. |
| **AT&T (R1-2005951)** | **Proposal 2: Consider specifying support for mechanisms to enable non-TDM STC/SMTC configurations, including overlapping hard and soft configured IAB-DU resources.** |
| **CMCC (R1-2006228)** | **Proposal 1: The symbols of an IAB node MT that are configured to transmit or receive SS/PBCH block, PRACH, and CORESET for Type0-PDCCH CSS set should not be overridden by the slot format provided by the additional *TDD-UL-DL-ConfigDedicated-IAB-MT*.** |
| **CEWiT (R1-2006329)** | **Proposal 1:** IAB node signals its multiplexing capability and supported modes to CU and parent-DU  **Proposal 2:** The following alternatives can be considered in determining active mode of operation of an IAB node  Alt 1: Active mode of operation of IAB node is determined by donor and is explicitly signalled to the parent node  Alt 2: Active mode of operation of IAB node is implicitly derived based on the resource configuration  **Proposal 3:** CU signals H/S/NA to all IAB nodes and it is left to the implementation as to whether use it or not  **Proposal 4:** IAB node derive implicit IA for the S resource when operating in simultaneous Tx and/or Rx mode  **Proposal 5:** Parent signals IA in DCI format 2\_5 for all IAB nodes irrespective of its active mode of operation and the IAB node operating in simultaneous Tx and/or Rx mode Tx/Rx in S resource irrespective of IA  **Proposal 6:** Mechanism to inform parent’s multiplexing capability to child should be supported. |
| **LG (R1-2006382)** | ***Proposal 2: Receiver-side SDM can be applied for at least PDSCH and PUSCH.*** |
| **NTT DOCOMO (R1-2006744)** | **Proposal1: Rel-16 signaling of semi-static configuration of hard/soft/NA resource type for DU symbols and dynamic indication of availability for DU soft symbols should be reused.**  **Proposal2:** **Based on the Rel-16 signaling, following new IAB node behavior should be defined.**   * **On a DU hard/soft-IA symbol, DU can perform either Tx or Rx, and MT can also perform either Tx or Rx on the symbol if multiplexing capability of the transmission/reception direction combination of MT and DU is reported by IAB node.** * **On a DU NA/soft-INA symbol, MT can perform either Tx or Rx, and DU can also perform either Tx or Rx on the symbol if multiplexing capability of the transmission/reception direction combination of MT and DU is reported by IAB node.**   **Proposal3: On a DU hard/soft-IA flexible symbol, parent node can configure/indicate/schedule IAB node MT Tx or Rx on the symbol, and IAB node DU will perform either Tx or Rx on the symbol based on MT transmission/reception direction and its multiplexing capability.**  **Proposal4: Both semi-static signaling and dynamic indication of frequency resources should be considered to support FDM resource multiplexing.** |
| **Qualcomm (R1-2006825)** | **Proposal 1:**  **IAB-DU semi-static resource configuration for enhanced duplexing capabilities (i.e. simultaneous operation (transmission and/or reception) of IAB-node’s child and parent links) is supported using the existing Rel-16 resource management framework.**  **Proposal 2:**  **Rel-17 includes enhancements for the dynamic nature of the duplexing capability of an IAB-node. Details are FFS.** |
| **Ericsson (R1-2006903)** | Proposal 5 H/S/NA configuration for a given DU time-domain resource is only explicitly provided to the IAB-node/transmission-direction combination which is indicated as TDM required.  Proposal 6 A default resource attribute for the IAB-DU H/S/NA resource configuration is *Soft*.  Proposal 7 Specify a mechanism for frequency-domain resource multiplexing between MT and DU of an IAB-node. |

**FL Proposal 2.3.1: The Rel-16 semi-static and dynamic resource allocation mechanisms are the starting point for supporting Rel-17 multiplexing cases.**

* **At least resources used for simultaneous IAB-DU and IAB-MT PDSCH and/or PUSCH transmission and reception (depending on the supported multiplexing case) can overlap in time when soft resources are configured at the child IAB-DU.**

**Discussion:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.3.1?** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Yes | Agree with the proposal. Simultaneous operation in hard resource are also possible in some cases. One simple example is when there is sufficient isolation between parent link and child link. Another example is when the IAB node MT support case #6 timing then simultaneous Tx (Case 1) can also be possible in hard resources. |
| Ericsson | Big picture, yes | We agree to the principle proposal “The Rel-16 semi-static and dynamic resource allocation mechanisms are the starting point…”.  The implications of the sub-bullet are not clear to us since even if the IAB-DU is configured hard, if the parent node knows the IAB capabilities, the parent node would/could schedule MT |
| Nokia | Yes | Agree with Huawei that hard resources may overlap in time as well. Additionally, allowing resources to overlap in time may be contingent on channel conditions. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree the main proposal, but the sub-bullet is a bit pre-mature at this time. | We prefer to have a basket agreement by covering all resource types (e.g., H/S/NA) together, rather than agreeing something first for the soft resource in the first meeting. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree with main text | We have two concerns for the sub bullet.  1. It seems that dynamic indication (IA/INA) for the Soft resource is missing. For example, if a parent node want to use a backhaul link (between parent node and IAB node), the parent node indicates INA for IAB-DU soft resource. And IAB-DU can be Tx or Rx if the transmission/reception direction is the same as that of IAB-MT.  2. “child IAB-DU” should be “IAB-DU” since we think simultaneous operation between IAB-DU and IAB-MT is not related to the configuration of its childe node DU. |
| Samsung | Yes for the main bullet | Not sure the sub-bullet whether the resource can overlap in time only when soft resources are configured at the child IAB-DU. |
| LG Electronics | Yes | In addition to Rel-16 semi-static and dynamic resource allocation mechanism, we can discuss on simultaneous operation based on priority rule defined in Rel-16 as below:   * Hard or soft-IA resource:   + DU can perform Tx/Rx   + MT also can perform Tx/Rx if simultaneous operation is possible * NA or soft-INA resource:   + MT can perform Tx/Rx   + DU also can perform Tx/Rx if simultaneous operation is possible |
| Fujitsu | yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes to the main bullet only . | The sub-bullet does not seem needed. |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | Yes, only for the main bullet | The sub-bullet can be discussed as an option once we agree on the main bullet. |
| CMCC | Yes for the main bullet |  |
| vivo | Yes | Yes in principle. The sub-bullet needs further discussion, Hard resource of the DU can be used by MT BH as well. We should discuss a whole cases before supporting a certain case. |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |

**FL Proposal 2.3.2: The following categories of enhancements should be further considered to support simultaneous operation of access and backhaul links (not an exhaustive list):**

* **Enhancements to the semi-static IAB-DU resource configuration** 
  + **Examples include support for frequency domain partitioning, partitioning of TDM/non-TDM resources, and multiple active resource configurations**
* **Enhancements to the semi-static IAB-MT resource configuration**
  + **Examples include overriding additional symbols of the dedicated and common TDD UL/DL configurations**
* **Enhancements to support the dynamic indication of available resources to support SDM/FDM of access and backhaul links**
  + **Examples include dynamic indication of availability based on multiplexing type or capability**
* **Enhancements to the rules governing collisions of Hard/NA resources of the DU with cell-specific/semi-statically configured signals and channels at the IAB-DU and/or IAB-MT**
* **Enhancements to inter-IAB signaling**
  + **Examples include reporting of parent’s multiplexing capability, guard symbol configurations, early TCI indication**

**Discussion:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.3.2? Are additional categories missing (at a very high level)** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Yes | We understand the intention of the list is to provide guidance for further discussion on the potential enhancement. We propose one additional bullet   * Enhancements to IAB node capability signaling with respect to simultaneous operation based on Rel-16 IAB signaling framework, e.g. conditional simultaneous operation. |
| Ericsson | Maybe | We can agree that the listed categories should be studied, but we do not want to commit to specifying aspects that turn out not being needed. We would prefer to have a clear understanding on the high-level scenario assumption before going into technical details of solutions. |
| Nokia | Yes | We would recommend including potential enhancements to beam measurement/reporting necessary for supporting SDM operation. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Prefer not to treat it as a proposal that needs to end up with an agreement. | The list seems more like a recommendation for the FFS, rather than a solid technical proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Mostly Yes | In our understanding, 2nd bullet is for TDD pattern, not for the resource management, thus it’s better to capture this point in the bullet, for example “Enhancements to TDD UL/DL configuration for IAB-MT”. |
| Samsung |  | OK with the listed categories as the potential enhancements for study. But we would like to add one more bullet in the list:   * **Enhancements to support near-field TX-RX interference channel estimation for interference handling for simultaneous TX and RX cases** |
| LG Electronics | Yes | We are fine with FL Proposal 2.3.2 as a starting point for discussion. |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | No objection but tend to agree with ZTE and Ericsson. |  |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | Yes, with comments | [update in MotM2]  We propose to use the terms “child and parent links” as mentioned in the WID, or “upstream and downstream links” for a more general reference to cover multi-hop backhaul + access. |
| CMCC | Yes | Our understanding is that this proposal is to trigger the discussion about the potential enhancements. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CEWiT | Yes | Dynamic indication should also be applicable for full duplex operations. Therefore, we propose   * **Enhancements to support the dynamic indication of available resources to support “non-TDM operation” of access and backhaul links**   Besides that, we agree with Huawei’s comment on the inclusion of additional bullet. |

**FL Proposal 2.3.3: The Rel-16 semi-static and dynamic resource allocation mechanisms are the starting point for supporting Rel-17 multiplexing cases.**

* **At least resources used for simultaneous IAB-DU and IAB-MT PDSCH and/or PUSCH transmission and reception (depending on the supported multiplexing case) can overlap in time when soft resources are configured at the child IAB-DU.**
* **FFS Hard/NA resource types**
* **FFS Cell-specific/semi-static signals and channels at the IAB-DU and/or IAB-MT**

**Discussion: Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.3.3?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Mostly agree | On the first FFS bullet, we are not sure why NA resources are included for simultaneous operation. This basically contradicts with the definition of NA resources and may imply that the IAB DU may deviate from the configuration from CU. |
| Qualcomm | Yes to main bullet. Not clear the first sub-bullet is needed | What it is being described in the first sub-bullet is not precluded in Rel-16. So it is not clear what the objective of this portion of the proposal is. |
| Samsung | Yes for the main bullet | Same comment as before. Not sure the sub-bullet whether the resource can overlap in time only when soft resources are configured at the child IAB-DU. |
| LG Electronics | Yes |  |

**FL Proposal 2.3.4: The Rel-16 semi-static and dynamic resource allocation mechanisms are the starting point for supporting Rel-17 multiplexing cases.**

* **FFS Applicability for different IAB-DU resource types (i.e. Soft/Hard/NA)**
* **FFS Cell-specific/semi-static signals and channels at the IAB-DU and/or IAB-MT**

**Discussion: Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.3.4?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | No, better to be more constructive | We think the main bullet make sense only with original subbullets, which means we will enhance based on the existing resource type H/NA/S. For the subbullet we could add other alternatives for discussion     * At least resources used for simultaneous IAB-DU and IAB-MT PDSCH and/or PUSCH transmission and reception (depending on the supported multiplexing case) can overlap in time when soft/Hard resources are configured at the child IAB-DU.   Current main bullet only say we will use semi-static and dynamic resource configuration, it would not so constructive. |
| CEWiT | Yes | None |
| Fujitsu | Yes | None |
| Ericsson | Yes | We prefer current formulation before vivo’s proposal above. |
| Huawei | Mostly | On the first FFS bullet, we are still not sure why NA resources are included for simultaneous operation. This basically contradicts with the definition of NA resources and may imply that the IAB DU may deviate from the configuration from CU. |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | Yes |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | None |
| Intel | Yes | None |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| LG Electronics | Yes |  |

# Resource allocation for dual-connectivity scenarios (i.e. IAB-MT with concurrent BH links with two parent nodes)

## Definition of Dual Connectivity Scenarios (High priority):

From the eIAB WID:

* Specification of enhancements to the resource multiplexing between child and parent links of an IAB node, including:
  + Support of simultaneous operation (transmission and/or reception) of IAB-node’s child and parent links (i.e., MT Tx/DU Tx, MT Tx/DU Rx, MT Rx/DU Tx, MT Rx/DU Rx)
  + **Support for dual-connectivity scenarios defined by RAN2/RAN3 in the context of topology redundancy for improved robustness and load balancing.**

**Summary of input contributions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Huawei (R1-2005260)** | ***Proposal 5****: RAN1 needs to clarify the dual connectivity scenario for Rel-17 IAB.* |
| **Nokia (R1-2005535)** | **Observation 3.1. Clarification is needed for IAB-MT DC resource configurations and SDM/FDM operation.** |
| **Qualcomm (R1-2006825)** | **Proposal 3:**  **Rel-17 includes enhancements for efficient IAB-DU resource coordination across links to the multiple parents sharing the same time / frequency resources.** |
| **Ericsson (R1-2006903)** | Proposal 8 RAN1 should discuss whether IAB NR-DC operation using one single carrier (IAB Intra-Carrier NR-DC operation) is in the scope of the Rel-17 IAB WID, or should be considered in a wider scope than IAB. |

Topological redundancy with two parent nodes is already supported in Rel-16. From 38.300: “For IAB-nodes operating in SA-mode, NR DC is used to enable route redundancy in the BH by allowing the IAB-MT to have concurrent BH links with two parent nodes.” From a RAN1 perspective, the key question is whether the parent links share the same time/frequency resources (as well as FR1 vs. FR2 support) as this drives the required level of coordination and impacts resource allocation.

**FL Survey 3.1.1: Should both inter-carrier and intra-carrier DC scenarios for IAB-MTs be considered in Rel-17?**

**Discussion:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Yes | Prioritization for intra-carrier DC scenarios can be made since it is the more limiting scenario (similar to in-band vs. out-of-band operation) |
| Huawei | Yes | The necessity of intra-band DC should be justified, e.g. why it is important in the context of IAB |
| Ericsson | Not now | Inter-carrier DC should be considered for dual-connectivity scenarios.  Before RAN1 starts IAB work on and specification of intra-carrier DC, RAN Plenary should clarify that this is within the scope of the IAB WI. |
| Nokia | Yes | Agree with AT&T, that intra-carrier DC scenarios represent the more relevant scenario for consideration. We do not think there is any special attention needed for inter-band cases. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | No, only inter-carrier DC scenario should be considered in Rel-17 IAB | IAB MT should not go beyond what normal UE can support regarding to intra-carrier DC vs inter-carrier DC. Rel-17 IAB does not seem to have that kind of time budget to step ahead of UE features regarding to normal Uu link operations. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes for inter-carrier DC | - Intra-carrier DC is totally new feature for NR IAB/UE, so that we may focus on inter-carrier DC for Rel-17 eIAB, and we may follow the NR-DC specification.  - For DC scenarios for IAB MT, resource management between MT and DU should be considered, especially if frequency band for DU (e.g. f1+f2) fully or partially overlaps with frequency bands for MT MSG (e.g. f1)/SSG (e.g. f2). |
| Samsung | Yes | Although it should be first discussed in RAN2/RAN3, we open to discuss both |
| LG Electronics |  | Before deciding the FL Survey 3.1.1, we need to clarify what is dual connectivity scenario for Rel-17 IAB, and to discuss whether intra-carrier DC scenario can be include in a scope of Rel-17 IAB. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | Agree with AT&T. |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | Yes | We agree to prioritize intra-carrier DC |
| CMCC | Yes in principle | DC was identified in the WID. But what specific scenario should be focused on needs more discussion and clarification |
| vivo | Yes | We are open to discuss either |
| CEWiT | Yes | Agree with AT&T that intra-carrier DC has more challenges and spec impact |

**FL Survey 3.1.2: Should both FR1 and FR2 bands be considered for DC scenarios in Rel-17?**

**Discussion:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Yes | FR1/FR2 can be considered for inter-carrier DC and FR2 should be prioritized over FR1 for intra-carrier scenarios due to the ability to better isolate the links between different parents |
| Huawei | Yes | Unsure how this have an impact for specification work. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Inter-carrier DC using both FR1 and FR2 should be specified. |
| Nokia | Yes | A similar view as HW, not clear what specification impact is band dependent |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Not sure whether this can be assessed by RAN1 only | DC scenarios are determined by RAN2/3, according to WID.  For the time being, RAN1 can only consider Rel-16 IAB DC scenarios. If Rel-16 IAB DC allows FR1 and FR2, RAN1 should simply follow; otherwise, the decision maybe needed in plenary. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | Although it should be first discussed in RAN2/RAN3, we open to discuss both |
| LG Electronics | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes in principle | As mentioned in 3.1.1, more clarifications are needed for the use case or using scenarios. If needed, both FR1 and FR2 could be considered. And more clarifications are needed for RAN1 impact.  This is partial overlapped with questions in section 2.1 |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |

## Key issues/requirements for Dual Connectivity Scenarios (Med priority):

**Goal:**Identify and describe key performance metrics and targets for prioritized multi-parent scenarios (e.g. reliability or system capacity improvement, etc.) as well as issues which may limit the benefits or impact feasibility.

**Summary of input contributions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Vivo (R1-2005399)** | Error: Reference source not found  **Error: Reference source not found** |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell (R1-2005535)** | **Observation 3.2. The DU configurations of the parent nodes of a DC connection need to be aligned so that the IAB-MT reception would be well defined.**  **Proposal 3.3: For IAB-MT DU scenario, RAN1 shall investigate the required coordination between parent nodes such that MT reception is well aligned.**  **Proposal 3.4. RAN1 to investigate possible differences in the RX timing of MCG and SCG links causing additional issues when SDM/FDM operation is supported.** |
| **Samsung (R1-2006165)** | ***Proposal 2: As a baseline, consider dual connectivity scenarios with two parent nodes under same IAB-donor in Rel-17.*** |
| **Qualcomm (R1-2006825)** | **Observation 4:**  **From a RAN1 perspective, the impact of multiple-parents scenarios on IAB-DU resource coordination resolves to the need to consider the additional duplexing constraint / capability of an IAB-node across the links to the multiple parents.** |
| **Ericsson (R1-2006903)** | Observation 3 IAB Inter-Carrier NR-DC is already supported with Rel-16 specification. For independent carriers, resource coordination is not needed. |

Especially for intra-carrier DC scenarios, several companies have suggested that the DC scenarios cannot be considered independently of the supported multiplexing scenarios (TDM + no-TDM Case 1-4)

**FL Survey 3.2.1: Can different DC scenarios be considered independently from the multiplexing cases? If the answer is no, which multiplexing cases (TDM + no-TDM Case 1-4) should be considered for different DC scenarios?**

**Discussion:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Yes | All multiplexing cases should be applicable for both inter- an intra-carrier DC scenarios. However for intra-carrier DC, the level of optimization for the no-TDM cases should be further considered vs. the potential specification impact/implementation complexity |
| Huawei | Yes | There is no need to preclude the combination of DC and simultaneous operation between parent and child links at the current stage. However it may be more important to clarify whether intra-band DC should be supported in the first place. |
| Ericsson | No | DC scenarios assuming TDM should be prioritized since TDM based operation in IAB is already specified. Simultaneously specifying both *no-TDM* and different DC scenarios based upon those no-TDM cases will be significantly more complex and inefficient and may result in an incomplete specification considering the current TU allocation for IAB. |
| Nokia | Yes | Agree with HW comment. It is too early to preclude any discussion on this. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The answer may depend on what DC scenarios are taken into account. | It seems we need to know what DC scenarios are taken into account (i.e., will be brought into Rel-17 scope) when answering this question.  If the “DC scenario” only refers to “intra-carrier DC” and “inter-carrier DC”, the chance can be such that there is no “different DC scenario” if “intra-carrier DC” fails to enter the scope.  If the DC scenarios cover more, it is better to explicitly agree the list first. |
| NTT DOCOMO |  | We prefer to consider only inter-DC scenario. |
| Samsung | Yes | All multiplexing cases should be considered for both. |
| LG Electronics |  | At least in inter-carrier DC scenario, all multiplexing cases can be applied. Furthermore, we can consider a potential specification impact when multiplexing capability of two parents is different. |
| CMCC | The answer may depend on what DC scenarios are taken into account. | And it is too early to preclude any discussion on this. |
| vivo |  | DC scenario discussion is separated from multiplexing case. The related enh. can be considered for all multiplexing cases if any. |
| CEWiT | Yes | All multiplexing cases should be considered in DC scenario. |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | Yes | [update in MotM2]  Details of DC with non-TDM can be discussed further upon progress in discussions on non-TDM for single-parent. |

Additionally it was proposed that the level of required coordination and timing alignment between the parent nodes needs to be further considered since these factors impact resource allocation in DC scenarios. As pointed out by Samsung in R1-12006165, intra-donor DC scenarios are the baseline from Rel-16 and inter-donor scenarios need to be first discussed in RAN3.

**FL Proposal 3.2.2: Further consider the required coordination (at least under the same donor CU) and timing alignment between parent nodes to support resource allocation for different DC scenarios.**

**Discussion:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 3.2.2?** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Some clarification are needed | We do not see the urgency to agree on this proposal before clarifying whether intra-band DC should be supported. In addition, the timing alignment aspects are unclear. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | This may not be necessary for all multiplexing scenarios. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | At least depends on the decision for intra-carrier DC | In addition, we think it is necessary to decide which of following path should be taken in RAN1 to handle multi-parent DC.   * Handle the DC with respect to nature of DC (i.e., loose coordination and timing alignment) * Handle the DC by adding “coordination/alignment” that could be somehow “required” by IAB performance improvement. Such coordination/alignment may not be adopted/defined for DC of UE. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| LG Electronics |  | In DC scenario, two parent DU can have different Rx timing depending on simultaneous operation. Hence, if it is clarified that intra-carrier DC scenario is included in Rel-17 IAB, we think the required coordination to support resource allocation is required. |
| vivo |  | In principle yes. However, no need to restrict same CU scenario. And current wording is not clear to us, required coordination means resource coordination between MCG and SCG? |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo |  | [update in MotM2]  The proposal is fine, but the whole discussion may be left to when we have more convergence on FL Survey 2.2.1. |

## Solutions/enhancements for Dual Connectivity Scenarios (Low priority):

**Goal:**  Summarize proposed new features and enhancements to existing Rel-16 resource allocation functionality (e.g. semi-static resource coordination, DCI Format 2\_5 enhancements, prioritization rules, guard symbols etc.) as a starting point for future discussion

**Summary of input contributions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Huawei (R1-2005260)** | ***Observation 3:*** *Inter-band DC and multi-TRP transmission in Rel-15/16 can be reused by IAB-MT without additional specification impact.* |
| **Vivo (R1-2005399)** | Error: Reference source not found |
| **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell (R1-2005535)** | **Proposal 3.1: For IAB-MT DC scenario, RAN1 shall investigate the rules of using resources when there are two MT configurations received with the configured MCG and SCG.**  **Proposal 3.2. An IAB-node should be able to determine how to schedule the child link connections being part of the child node DC connections, either MCGs or SCGs.** |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (R1-2005927)** | **Proposal 3:** Define signaling for IAB nodes in the DC mode to inform parent IAB nodes of the status of the availability of soft resources. |
| **AT&T (R1-2005951)** | **Proposal 1: Per-link IAB-DU resource configurations and signaling between multiple IAB-nodes/donors should be considered in Rel-17.** |
| **Samsung (R1-2006165)** | ***Proposal 3: Discuss whether or not separate signaling between IAB MT and different parent IABs are necessary in Rel-17.***  ***Proposal 4: Discuss how to address scheduling collision issues for child IAB between MCG and SCG.*** |

**FL Proposal 3.3.1: Existing Inter-frequency DC and multi-TRP transmission features can be reused at the IAB-MT to support concurrent BH links to two parents without additional specification effort.**

**Discussion:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 3.3.1?** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Yes | However given an IAB-MT may have advantages over an UE in terms of larger panels, higher Tx power, etc. optimizations should be considered to improve system performance of these features. |
| Huawei | Yes | None |
| Ericsson | No | In our opinion multi-TRP is not included in the dual-connectivity scenarios defined by RAN2/RAN3. Multi-TRP requires both parent nodes to communicate and coordinate extensively and speedily with each other and such parent-parent communication and coordination is far from guaranteed in IAB. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | No | Share the view with Ericsson. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No | OK with considering features at least from the existing DC features. But, further discussion is needed regarding additional spec. effort. |
| LG Electronics |  | We need to clarify which existing features for inter-frequency DC and multi-TRP transmission can be reused to support resource multiplexing in DC scenario. |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | No | Parent nodes in DC scenarios may need to coordinate on resource availability indication, which may require MT spec enhancements |
| vivo | Yes | The inter-frequency DC feature can be starting point in IAB DC. However, some spec. impact specified to IAB node can be considered, e.g., considering power sharing between MT (MCG, SCG)and DU in case of simultaneous transmission.  Moreover, for intra-carrier DC, we may have more issue than Inter-frequency DC and multi-TRP transmission features. The proposal is applied only to inter-carrier DC case. |

**FL Proposal 3.3.2: The following categories of enhancements should be further considered to support DC scenarios (not an exhaustive list):**

* **Inter-parent DU resource coordination mechanisms and signaling**
* **Resource allocation/scheduling conflict resolution rules at the parent or child node**
* **Per-link IAB-DU resource configurations at the parent node**

**Discussion:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 3.3.2?** | **Comments** |
| AT&T | Yes | Discussion of enhancements for multiplexing cases should jointly consider operation of one or two parent links |
| Huawei | Partially | First of all, this proposal is a further step after the support of intra-band DC scenario are clarified.  Secondly, on the 1st bullet, we think the inter-parent DU coordination can be merged into the 2nd bullet, and the inter-DU signaling is not possible based on current system architecture.  For the 3rd bullet, we think it is just one possible solution for the 2nd bullet.  In general, there is no urgency to agree on this proposal. But once the clarification regarding FL Survey 3.1.1 becomes clear, we suggest further considering the following revised proposal  **FL Proposal 3.3.2: The following categories of enhancements should be further considered to support DC scenarios (not an exhaustive list):**   * **~~Inter-parent DU resource coordination mechanisms and signaling~~** * **Resource allocation/scheduling conflict resolution rules at the parent or child node** * **~~Per-link IAB-DU resource configurations at the parent node~~** |
| Ericsson |  | We would appreciate a clarification about the role of per-link DU configuration (related to a multi-child scenario) in DC considerations, if the configuration is beyond configuring NA resources.  Furthermore, unless we agree to the intra-carrier DC, we are not convinced of the usefulness of bullets 1 and 2. |
| Nokia | Yes | Resource coordination is important in DC scenarios and we agree with the FL. We think that this should be the main focus of DC related resource multiplexing. RAN1 shall also find the DC cases that are relevant, and the discussions may vary depending on different DC situations. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Depending on decision on intra-carrier DC | If intra-carrier DC is not supported in Rel-17, there is no need to discuss the first two bullets. |
| Samsung | Yes | But, which DC scenario(s) is supported in Rel-17 should be first decided. |
| LG Electronics | Yes |  |
| Motorola Mobility, Lenovo | Yes |  |
| vivo |  | We think power sharing between DU, MCG and SCG needs to be revisited, which should base on discussion of DU/MT power sharing in simultaneous TX cases. |
| CEWiT | Yes |  |

RAN1#102-e Decisions

**Agreement**

Reuse by IAB-MT of existing Inter-frequency DC is considered as a starting point to support concurrent BH links to two parents.

* FFS: Reuse of multi-TRP transmission resource allocation features (if intra-freq DC scenario is supported for IAB)
* FFS: Additional specification effort to support IAB

**For companies to further consider:**

The following categories of enhancements have been proposed to support DC scenarios (not an exhaustive list):

* Inter-parent DU resource coordination mechanisms and signaling
* Resource allocation/scheduling conflict resolution rules at the parent or child node
* Per-link IAB-DU resource configurations at the parent node