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# Introduction

In this contribution, we summarize all issues submitted on physical layer changes and aspects for supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz for RAN1 #102-e meeting. Section 2 and 3 contain summary of email discussions that took place during RAN1 #102-e.

# Summary of Views on Numerology and Bandwidth

The following is a summary of views on bandwidth, subcarrier spacing (SCS), FFT sizes, CP length, and other related issues to numerology.

Table 1. Summary of views on bandwidth, subcarrier spacing (SCS), FFT size, CP length, and related issues to numerology

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **Bandwidth** | **SCS (for BWP)** | **FFT** | **CP** | **Notes** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | ≤ 800 MHz (for 240 kHz)≤ 1.6 GHz (for 480 kHz)[≤ 2.1 GHz (for 960 kHz)] | 240 kHz,480 kHz, [960 kHz] | Max 4096 | NCP: 240,480, [960] kHz | 960kHz could be further investigated and with 480kHz, we can also meet the occupied at least 70% of 2.16GHz channel BW requirement for unlicensed operation |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 400 MHz (for 120 kHz)800 MHz (for 240 kHz)larger BW using CA | 120, 240 kHz | Max 4096 | NCP:120, 240 kHz | SSB SCS:120,240 kHz for licensed240 kHz for unlicensed |
| Futurewei | 400 MHz | 480 kHz | Max 4096 |  | Larger BW achieved using CA |
| vivo |  | 120 kHz, 960 kHz |  | NCP: 120, 960 kHz |  |
| Fujitsu |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sony | 2.16 GHz (unlicensed)400 MHz (licensed) | 240 or 480 or 960 kHz | 4096 (960 kHz)8192 (480 kHz)16384 (240 kHz) |  | CA is acceptable to achieve 2.16GHz bandwidth.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 400 x N MHz2.16 GHz | ≤ 960 kHz | Max 4096 | NCP: ≤ 960 kHz | SSB SCS:120 kHz, 240 kHz |
| MediaTek |  |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 1 GHz | 240 kHz | Max 4096 | NCP: 240 kHz |  |
| Xiaomi |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEC | > 1 GHz | 240 kHz, 480 and 960KHz |  |  |  |
| TCL | ≤ 2.16 GHz |  |  |  |  |
| Mitsubishi  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intel  | Select candidates from rangeMin 400 MHzMax 2.16 GHz | 480, 960 kHz |  | NCP:480, 960 kHz | ECP might be needed depending on MIMO TAE |
| Ericsson | ≤ 1.6 GHz  | ≤ 480 kHz | Max 4096 | NCP only | SSB SCS: 120/240 kHz |
| OPPO |  | 960 kHz |  |  |  |
| Samsung | 400 MHz2.1~~.~~6 GHz | 960 kHz (2.16 GHz)120 kHz (400 MHz) | Max 4096 | 120 kHz (NCP)960 kHz (NCP and/or ECP) |  |
| CMCC | ≤ 1.6 GHz | ≤ 480 kHz | Max 4096 |  |  |
| Spreadtrum  | 400 MHz2.16 GHz | 120 kHz (400 MHz)≤960 kHz (2.16 GHz) | Max 4096 |  |  |
| LG Electronics | 800 MHz (240kHz) 1.6 MHz and/or 800 MHz (480kHz) | 240, 480 kHz | Max 4096 | ECP: 480, 960 kHz (if supported) | SSB SCS: 120kHz, 240 kHz  |
| InterDigital | 400 x N MHz2.16 GHz | 480, 960 kHz | Max 4096Min 512 | NCP: 480, 960 kHz  | SSB SCS: 120kHz, 240 kHz |
| Apple | 400 x N MHz | ≤ 480 kHz | Max 4096 | NCP | SSB SCS:120,240 kHz |
| Convida Wireless |  |  |  |  |  |
| Charter Communications | ≤ 400 MHz (120kHz)≤ 2.16 GHz (960 kHz) | 480 kHz960 kHz (FFS) | Max 4096 | NCP | SSB SCS: 120 kHz, 240 kHz |
| NTT DOCOMO | Max: > 400 MHzMin: > 50 MHz | > 120 kHz | Max 4096 | ECP: 960kHz (if supported) |  |
| Qualcomm | ≤ 400 MHz (120kHz)≤ 2.16 GHz (960 kHz) | 120 kHz960 kHz | Max 4096 | NCP | SSB SCS: 120kHz, 960kHz |
| CAICT |  | 240 kHz 480 kHz (FFS) |  |  |  |
| WILUS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 400 x N MHz (N=1,2,3), 2.16 GHz | 120kHz960 kHz1920 kHz (only for OFDM) | Max 4096 | ECP: consider only for SCS >960 kHz | At least 120kHz and 240kHz |

Summary of views provided for each issue are provide below.

Supported Bandwidth

* Several companies provided a relationship between supported bandwidth and subcarrier spacing, which mostly stems from maximum FFT size limitations.
* Almost all companies (with 1 exception) provided supported bandwidths in the range between 400 MHz to 2.16 GHz for a cell.
* RAN1 discuss further on the suggested supported bandwidth and its relationship with supported subcarrier spacing.

Supported SCS (for BWP)

* There are some diverse views from the companies on the supported subcarrier spacing.
* Almost all companies (with 1 exception) provided supported subcarrier spacing in the range between 120 kHz to 960 kHz.
* RAN1 discuss further on the suggested supported bandwidth and its relationship with supported subcarrier spacing.

FFT size limitations

* All companies agree FFT size limitation of 4096 should apply to NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.

CP size

* All companies agree for subcarrier spacing below 240 kHz, Normal CP (NCP) should apply.
* While many companies states NCP even up to 960 kHz should be ok, there are some companies who considers extended CP (ECP) for 480 and 960 kHz.
* RAN1 discuss further on the supported CP lengths for subcarriers 480 kHz and larger (if supported).

Based on the summary, moderator proposed to agree to the following conclusion:

**(Proposal 2) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* For NR system operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,
	+ NR should be designed with maximum FFT size of 4096;
	+ candidate supported system bandwidth(s) for a cell is between 400 MHz and 2160 MHz;
	+ If subcarrier spacing 240 kHz or below are supported, NR should use normal CP length only.

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | Based on today’s online discussion on system parameters, one important question has not been asked. I hope we are not planning to re-design the baseline principle of NR here. Therefore, we would like to update the conclusion as following**Moderator Suggested Conclusion:*** For NR system operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,
	+ NR should be designed with maximum FFT size of 4096 and maximum of 275RBs per carrier;
	+ candidate supported system bandwidth(s) for a cell is between 400 MHz and 2160 MHz;
	+ If subcarrier spacing 240 kHz or below are supported, NR should use normal CP length only.
 |
| InterDigital | Support Nokia’s update. |
| Samsung | Understand the intention of Nokia’s update, but the exact number of RB should be determined in RAN4.  |
| Ericsson | * This proposal will preclude configuring a whole range of carrier bandwidths already supported for FR2 in Rel-15/16. For example, it would not allow one to configure a 100 MHz carrier with 120 kHz SCS.
	+ Suggest rewording to "candidate supported *maximum* carrier bandwidths between 400 MHz and 2160 MHz"
* Agree to Nokia's limitation of 275 PRBs.
 |
| MediaTek | Agree with Ericsson’s comments regarding carrier bandwidth limitation. System bandwidth smaller than 400MHz should be allowed. |
| LG Electronics | Support updates from Nokia and Ericsson |
| Futurewei | Support Nokia and Ericsson changes to the Moderator Conclusion. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal. We are also fine with Nokia’s update. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Moderator Conclusion with the changes from Nokia and Ericsson. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We support Nokia’s update and in addition, suggest further updated to the third bullet in moderator’s proposal. Based on evaluations, we think extended CP is not beneficial even for 480 kHz (in terms of throughput/spectral efficiency).* + If subcarrier spacing ~~240~~ 480 kHz or below are supported, NR should use normal CP length only.
 |
| Apple | Support moderator’s proposal with Nokia and Ericsson’s updates. |
| CATT | We support moderator’s proposal with “maximum” carrier BW between 400 and 2160 MHz. We don’t see the need to limit the maximum number of RBs to 275 per carrier |
| Intel | We support the moderator’s proposal and update from Nokia. We think NR in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz should operate at least larger than or equal to 400MHz system bandwidth in order to differentiate with FR2, given the huge amount of spectrum available in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. The minimum system bandwidth should be at least 400MHz.  |
| vivo | Support moderator’s proposal and also fine with Nokia’s update. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support updates from Nokia and Ericsson |
| Xiaomi | Agree with moderator’s proposal and Ericsson’s update.  |

**(Proposal 2 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* For NR system operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,
	+ NR should be designed with maximum FFT size of 4096;
	+ candidate supported maximum system bandwidth(s) for a cell is between 400 MHz and 2160 MHz;
	+ If subcarrier spacing 240 kHz or below are supported, NR should use normal CP length only.

RAN1 Agreement from #102-e:

* For NR system operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,
	+ NR should be designed with maximum FFT size of 4096 and maximum of 275RBs per carrier;
	+ Candidate supported maximum carrier bandwidth(s) for a cell is between 400 MHz and 2160 MHz;
	+ If subcarrier spacing 240 kHz or below are supported, NR in 52.6 to 71 GHz is expected to use normal CP length only (does not have any implications on whether ECP is supported for the higher subcarrier spacings, if supported).

# Summary of [102-e-NR-52-71-Waveform-Changes]

## 3.1 General Comments on SI

These are collection of comments on the SI or framework of licensed or unlicensed operation.

* From [5]:
	+ To support operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, a common framework should be shared for licensed and unlicensed operation for less standardization workload and specification burden.
	+ To figure out the required changes to NR using existing NR waveform, discussion on unlicensed operation can be prioritized.
	+ Based on the outcome, licensed operation can be supported by simply removing some unnecessary functionalities or adding essential functionalities if any.
	+ If it is possible that a spectrum is for unlicensed operation in a region but for licensed operation in another region, mechanism to allow UE to differentiate two types of operation should be considered at the beginning.
* From [17]:
	+ The study item shall support both licensed and unlicensed operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, and unlicensed band between 57 GHz and 71 GHz (i.e., 60 GHz unlicensed band) should be prioritized.
* From [30]:
	+ 60 GHz unlicensed band should be prioritized for this SI study.
	+ Short range high data rate D2D deployment scenario should be studied for above 52.6 GHz band.
	+ Higher priority should be given for CA case, where above 52.6 GHz is only used for SCell for throughput boosting.
* From [2]:
	+ Proposal 2: The design of FR2 should be reused if the numerologies of 120/240 kHz SCSs are adopted. RAN1 should strive to have a common design between licensed band and unlicensed band.

**Discussion:**

Companies are suggesting having some agreement/conclusion on the focus and scope of the SI, especially regarding on licensed and unlicensed operation. Given that the already approved WI in RP-193229 approves work for both licensed and unlicensed, avoiding working on licensed and unlicensed operation might not be possible. However, moderator thinks we can still have some discussion on whether unlicensed operation should be prioritized or not.

Please comment further on the following:

* [The study item shall support both licensed and unlicensed operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz] – *moderator note: may not need to agree or conclude given that WI approved (RP-193229) work for both licensed and unlicensed.*
* Unlicensed band operation should be prioritized for this SI study.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | We suggest to follow guidance given by the SID (without any prioritization between licensed and unlicensed band operation). We propose to maximize commonality between two scenarios (SCS, BW, etc.) Co-existence methods for unlicensed operation should continue to be studied as per agenda item 8.2.2 |
| InterDigital | The study item shall support both licensed and unlicensed operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support to follow the original guidance from SID, i.e. to consider both licensed and unlicensed operation.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support to follow the guidance of SID(without any prioritization between licensed and unlicensed band operation). In additional, it’s better to construct a common framework among the licensed and unlicensed operation, and reuse Rel-15/16 design and procedure as much as possible. Under this framework, we could study the difference between licensed and unlicensed operation for different scenarios. |
| NEC | We think the study should focus on both licensed and unlicensed operation. |
| LG Electronics | We support to follow the guidance from the SID. |
| Apple | The study should follow the guidance from the SID and consider both licensed and unlicensed operation without any prioritization. AI 8.2.2 can focus on unlicensed access. |
| Futurewei | The study should follow the guidance from SID. The specifics of channel unlicensed access should be considered in 8.2.2. Use the same design solutions as much as possible in both scenarios. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not agree with a prioritization between licensed and unlicensed operation, and suggest not spending time on discussing this. Requirements for licensed band operation are important. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal. The prioritization may not be explicitly captured in the TR, but naturally addressed in the SI, since for many issues, we have a clear use case of unlicensed band.  |
| Vivo | Although we see many evaluations are done for unlicensed bands, we don’t think an agreement on priority of bands should be made as long as we are following the SID. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t think any prioritization between licensed and unlicensed operations is necessary. As we have learned from Rel-16 NR-U, licensed and unlicensed operations largely share common designs. Also, since we have already gone through the Rel-16 NR-U design and have general ideas on the issues associated with licensed and unlicensed operations, it would not require as much effort as in Rel-15 and Rel-16, to work on the licensed and unlicensed designs simultaneously. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | In our view, we don’t see a strong reason to prioritize this SI to only unlicensed. And as the moderator pointed out, the approved WI objective considers both licensed as well as unlicensed case, so we think that both modes should be equally prioritized. FR 52.6GHz to 71GHz is essential for both modes of operation |
| Sony | RAN1 should strive for common design between unlicensed band and licensed band. As for progress, unlicensed band operation can be prioritized for this SI. |
| Convida Wireless | Both licensed and unlicensed operations should be supported. |
| Xiaomi | Both licensed and unlicensed operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz should be supported. And unlicensed band operation should be prioritized for this SI study. |
| Intel | The work load expected to complete licensed operation on top of unlicensed is expected to be about the same. Therefore, SI can continue to work on both licensed and unlicensed operation without any prioritization. |
| Spreadtrum | We support to follow the guidance from the SID. Both licensed and unlicensed operation should be supported. |

Good number of companies expressed opinion that unlicensed operation does not necessarily need to be prioritized for the SI. Based on suggestions from companies, moderator has updated the conclusion as follows.

**(Proposal 3-1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* RAN1 continues study and specification effort for both licensed and unlicensed operation for supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz SI.

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | We think it is important design principle to agree on “RAN1 strives for maximum commonality for the system design for licensed and unlicensed operation for NR from 52.6GHz to 71GHz” This should be added to the above conclusion.  |
| InterDigital | Support Nokia’s proposal |
| Ericsson  | * Support moderator’s proposal
* Agree to Nokia’s addition about commonality between licensed/unlicensed.
 |
| MediaTek | We agree with Nokia’s comment |
| Futurewei | Support Nokia’s proposal with the following addition: “RAN1 strives for maximum commonality for the system design for licensed and unlicensed operation for NR from 52.6GHz to 71GHz, *and for maximum re-use of the existing NR design*” |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Nokia’s proposal with Futurewei’s addition.  |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s proposal and are also fine with Nokia’s proposal |
| Apple | Support Moderator’s proposal with updates from Nokia and FutureWei. |
| CATT | We support Nokia and Futurewei’s modification.  |
| Intel | We support moderator’s proposal and Nokia’s addition.  |
| vivo | We support moderator’s proposal and Nokia’s addition.  |
| Convida Wireless | We support Moderator’s proposal. We are also fine with Nokia’s update. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Nokia and Futurewei |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the moderator’s proposal with Nokia’s update. |
| Xiaomi | Support Nokia’s proposal |

**(Proposal 3-1 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* RAN1 continues study and specification effort for both licensed and unlicensed operation for supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz SI.
	+ RAN1 strives for maximum commonality for the system design for licensed and unlicensed operation for NR from 52.6GHz to 71GHz, and for maximum re-use of the existing NR design

Further comments and discussions after 8/24 UTC 05:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s updated conclusion |
| Ericsson | Support moderator's updated conclusion |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposed conclusion. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposed conclusion.  |
| Samsung | We support the proposed conclusion.  |
| Futurewei | We support the proposed conclusion. |
| Apple | We support the proposed conclusion |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with the updated conclusion from moderator. |
| CATT | We agree with Moderator’s updated conclusion |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the moderator’s updated conclusion |

Further comments and discussions after 8/25 UTC 03:00

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

## 3.2 General Comments on Numerology Study

The following are observations/proposals related to numerology study from the submitted contribution.

* From [5]:
	+ In order to achieve higher efficiency from signaling overhead and resource utilization perspective, wider channel BW beyond 400 MHz should be supported.
	+ Furthermore, Lager SCS than 120 kHz can be introduced to have small FFT size in case of wider channel BW and robustness to phase noise at the higher frequency
	+ The CP can be scaled following the SCS in the same way as NCP in Rel-15.
	+ The tradeoff between performance and cost should be taken into account in the discussion on how wide channel BW and SCS would be supported in the range from 52.6GHz to 71GHz.
* From [9]:
	+ The physical channel/signals with the potential impacts by the introducing of higher SCS for data and control channels are as follows,
		- (1) Type0-PDCCH SCS indication in MIB
		- (2) PRACH preamble
		- (3) UE processing capability and the required processing time for higher SCS
* From [15]:
	+ For selection of suitable SCS for the 52.6 – 71 GHz frequency range, it is important to perform link level evaluations with 90th percentile RMS delay spreads that are representative of a suitable range of deployment scenarios with different site densities, e.g., up to several tens of ns.
	+ Sufficient margin must also be left for other sources of time synchronization error.
* From [19]:
	+ Study the impact of channel bandwidth and numerology to physical signal/channel, e.g. the time line, SS/PBCH block, PT-RS and PDCCH monitoring capability
* From [20]:
	+ Study further on potential impacts (and relevant handling) due to the shortening of OFDM symbol duration and CP length by adopting larger SCS value.
	+ Whether/how to handle impact to cell coverage and/or beam switching time (e.g. by employing the extended CP and/or grouping multiple OFDM symbols as a unit)
* From [21]:
	+ Study multiples of 400 MHz up to 2 GHz is considered for above 52.6 GHz.
	+ Study potential coexistence issue with other RAT in the spectrum of 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
* From [22]:
	+ Down-select SCS based on the phase noise reduction requirements of transmission at < 71 GHz, the bandwidth requirements and the cyclic prefix required to mitigate the effect of the beam formed delay spread.
* From [23]:
	+ To support various wide bands and use cases for NR operation from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, a wide range of numerologies with the carrier aggregation need to be studied, also considering the LBT bandwidth (or the RB set) for co-existing issues, UE capability, processing time and power consumption.
* From [25]:
	+ The changes added to the current NR should be minimized.
	+ In this sense, only one or two SCSs are sufficient for 52.6 – 71 GHz band in our view
* From [29]:
	+ In addition to channel BW and link performance aspects, RAN1 should consider also implementation complexity associated with high SCSs when selecting the supported SCSs for above 52.6 GHz.
	+ Extend the numerology scaling framework defined in NR Rel-15 to higher numerologies with an appropriate range of integer values for μ.
	+ Maintain the maximum number of RBs supported by NR specification also for NR scenario above 52.6 GHz.

**Discussion:**

The general comments span multiple aspects such as factors that should be taken into account as part of the numerology discussion, to system components that get impacted from numerology, bandwidths that should be supported, and the baseline and design commonality with existing NR system. While it might be difficult to get everything down, there could be some benefits to agree on some general principles or general groundwork of the study, so that such description could be captured into the TR.

Please comment further on the following (including if you already have some suggestions for a TP with general description about the numerology study):

* Agree to add a paragraph(s) in the TR regarding:
	+ potential issues for consideration as part of the numerology selection and study,
	+ (if needed) general framework description (e.g. using 2μ ×15 subcarrier spacing to select candidates)
* The exact text could be worked on further if above is agreeable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Agree, the current text covers the main points. One could add implementation complexity and coexistence as further aspects raised in many Tdocs. |
| InterDigital | Agree with Moderator’s proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Moderator’s proposal.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips  | We support Moderator’s proposal. The following general description could be considered:In order to reduce the complexity of the design, the numerology of Rel-17 NR above 52.6 GHz can be scaled by an integral multiple of current numerology supported by Rel-15/16 NR (e.g. using Δf = 2μ × 15 kHz (FFS: μ can be set as 3, 4, 5, 6 or others). The selection of numerology provided in FFS for Rel-17 NR above 52.6 GHz needs to consider the impacts of frequency band, bandwidth, overhead, multi-path delay, phase noise and other RF impairments.- Larger SCS(s) may be needed to support larger bandwidth and handle phase noise.- Short CP may be not enough to cover delay spread, beam switching time and potential timing errors. In addition, extended CP may not be needed.- Keep the same maximum FFT size 4096 as in Rel-15/16 NR can avoid higher PAPR and reduce implementation complexity |
| NEC | Agree with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s proposal. |
| Apple | Agree with the moderator’s proposal. The list of potential issues should be exhaustive and include both technical (e.g. performance in the presence of phase noise and advanced signal processing techniques) and non-technical (e.g. change of maximum BW and sampling rate in 38.211 ) |
| Futurewei | Agree with proposal. The list of criteria should include reuse of the existing NR design where is possible (maintain the maximum FFT size), reduced complexity (add only one additional SCS if necessary that can operate in multiple scenarios), consider specifics of 60GHz band (such as PN, high propagation loss, delay spread), consider spectrum regulations (OCB requirements, PSD and ERP limits) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We view this as a part of a larger discussion that we need to have on the skeleton of the TR 38.808. The TR skeleton needs to be discussed and agreed in RAN1 and the discussion needs to include how the simulation results are captured in the TR (for instance, should the TR have a section dedicated to the simulation results and the corresponding observations or the simulation results relevant to each section will be presented in the same section). In any case, there needs to be a dedicated (sub-)section in the TR (e.g., a subsection of 4.1.1 in the current skeleton) that discusses “potential issues for consideration regarding numerology selection” (similar to the first suggested sub-bullet) due to the importance of the selected numerology and its impact on other PHY layer designs. This subsection should also include the relevant observations drawn from companies’ simulation results. For example, as in many Tdocs, observations on the robustness of the various numerologies to phase noise with various receiver assumptions should be discussed and captured in the TR. Same thing for the impact on the coverage, the robustness to timing alignment errors, etc.We do not see any immediate need for the second bullet as the existing candidates for the numerology are limited and all companies agree on the value of 2^mu \* 15. |
| Samsung | We agree with the proposal.  |
| Vivo | As we discussed in our contribution, we support to list aspects for consideration for the numerology study.Regarding whether and where to capture exact text into TR, we think this could be decided later in the next meeting as the list of aspects may be updated then. Having a list of aspects for consideration even as a conclusion should help us in our future work. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | In our view, at least following high level description could be considered for TR:For supporting NR operation in both licensed and unlicensed band in the frequency range from 52.6GHz to 71GHz, additional numerologies beyond that supported currently in NR are studied. Existing framework for numerology scaling is considered i.e. 2μ ×15 subcarrier spacing to select the candidates. For SSB transmissions, it is investigated if µ>4 (240 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts on the SSB design. For data and control channel transmissions, it is investigated if µ>3 (120 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts on aspects including processing timelines, scheduling enhancements, beam-management and reference signal design. For investigating the need for higher numerologies, one of the key aspects that is studied is the phase noise impact. Based on the evaluations, following aspects have been identified:* Large SCS, at least 480kHz would be needed
* Normal CP is sufficient at least for SCS up to 480kHz
 |
| Sony | Agree to add current text in the TR with respect to potential issues of scaled numerology, i.e. 2μ ×15 SCS. |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with the Moderator’s proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with the Moderator’s proposal.. |
| Intel | Agree with moderator proposal. Lenvo/Motorola Mobility suggested text seems to be a good starting point. We suggest to remove the “base on the evaluation …” for now so that we can conclude on the observed aspects from evaluation together with actual evaluations. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with Moderator’s proposal. |
| Charter Communications | Agree with Moderator’s proposal. |

Text proposal from Lenovo/Motorola Mobility seems to be a good start. Moderator also agrees with Huawei’s comment that the TR should capture information provided by the companies for each identified issue with proper sub-sections. The text could be used as a prelude to the sub-sections that contain useful information and could be some value in capturing a general text description.

**(Proposal 3-2) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Instruct rapporteur to create dedicated (sub-)section for set of identified issues for physical layer NR design.
* Agree to following text proposal as introduction to the (sub-)sections for discussing identified issues for physical layer.
	+ For supporting NR operation in both licensed and unlicensed band in the frequency range from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, additional numerologies beyond that supported currently in NR are studied. Existing framework for numerology scaling is considered i.e. 2μ ×15 subcarrier spacing to select the candidates. For SSB transmissions, it is investigated if µ>4 (240 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts on the SSB design. For data and control channel transmissions, it is investigated if µ>3 (120 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts on aspects including processing timelines, scheduling enhancements, beam-management and reference signal design. For investigating the need for higher numerologies, one of the key aspects that is studied is the phase noise impact.

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | **Moderator Suggested Conclusion:*** Instruct rapporteur to create dedicated (sub-)section for set of identified issues for physical layer NR design.
* Agree to following text proposal as introduction to the (sub-)sections for discussing identified issues for physical layer.
	+ For supporting NR operation in both licensed and unlicensed band in the frequency range from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, additional numerologies beyond that supported currently in NR are studied. Existing framework for numerology scaling is considered i.e. 2μ ×15 subcarrier spacing to select the candidates. For SSB transmissions, it is investigated if µ>4 (240 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts on the SSB design. For data and control channel transmissions, it is investigated if µ>3 (120 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts on aspects including processing timelines, scheduling enhancements, beam-management and reference signal design. For investigating the need for higher numerologies, one of the key aspects that is studied is the phase noise impact.

We think that in highlighted items, “PDCCH monitoring capability” should be listed  |
| InterDigital | We are fine with Nokia’s update. |
| Ericsson | Support moderator’s conclusion with the following update to the wording:For supporting NR operation in both licensed and unlicensed band in the frequency range from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, additional numerologies beyond that supported currently in NR are studied. Existing framework for numerology scaling is considered i.e. 2μ ×15 subcarrier spacing to select the candidates. For SSB transmissions, it is investigated whether or not ~~if~~ µ>4 (240 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts on the SSB design. For data and control channel transmissions, it is investigated if µ>3 (120 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts, if any, on aspects including processing timelines, PDCCH monitoring capability (BD/CCE), scheduling enhancements, beam-management, reference signal design. For investigating the need for higher numerologies, one of the key aspects that is studied is the phase noise impact.  |
| MediaTek | Agree with Nokia’s proposal |
| Futurewei | Agree with Ericsson updates. |
| Qualcomm | Since some detailed aspects of data and control channels are included, it would be better to add similar level of details for SSB. * … For SSB transmissions, it is investigated if µ>4 (240 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts on the ~~SSB design~~ aspects including SSB pattern, multiplexing of other signal/channels, and transmission window.
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree with Ericsson updates |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with moderator’s proposal and are fine with Ericsson’s update as well. |
| Apple | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal and Ericsson’s updates. We should add HARQ processing to the list. |
| CATT | Agree with Ericsson’s update |
| Intel | We are fine with Nokia’s update.  |
| Vivo | Generally fine with moderator’s proposal. However, how to handle existing numerology especially for FR2 is not clear to us since it only mentions “additional numerologies beyond that supported currently in NR are studied”. To handle the existing numerologies, there are the following 2 options:Option 1: all FR2 numerologies will be extended to 52.6-71GHz;Option 2: Part of FR2 numerologies will be supported in 52.6-71GHz.Current proposal seems to imply Option 1 but this should be also discussed and agreed if our understanding is correct.If going for Option 2, down selection of existing numerologies also needs to be studied. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with Nokia’s update. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Nokia and Qualcomm. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are generally ok with the moderator’s proposal and other companies’ suggested update. We propose further updates (on top of other proposed changes) below:For supporting NR operation in both licensed and unlicensed band in the frequency range from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, FR2 numerologies and additional numerologies beyond that supported currently in NR are studied. Existing framework for numerology scaling is considered i.e. 2μ ×15 subcarrier spacing to select the candidates. For SSB transmissions, it is investigated whether or not ~~if~~ µ>4 (larger than 240 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts on the ~~SSB design~~ aspects including SSB pattern, multiplexing of other signal/channels, and transmission window. For data and control channel transmissions, it is investigated if µ>3 (larger than 120 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts, if any, on aspects including processing timelines, PDCCH monitoring capability (BD/CCE), scheduling enhancements, beam-management, reference signal design. For investigating the need for higher numerologies, some of the key aspects that are studied are the impact due to phase noise, delay spread, TAE, analog beam switching delay, and impact to coverage.  |
| Xiaomi | Agree with Nokia’s proposal. |

**(Proposal 3-2 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Instruct rapporteur to create dedicated (sub-)section for set of identified issues for physical layer NR design.
* Agree to following text proposal as introduction to the (sub-)sections for discussing identified issues for physical layer.
	+ For supporting NR operation in both licensed and unlicensed band in the frequency range from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, FR2 numerologies and additional numerologies beyond that supported currently in NR are studied. Existing framework for numerology scaling is considered i.e. 2μ ×15 subcarrier spacing to select the candidates. For SSB transmissions, it is investigated whether or not ~~if~~ µ>4 (larger than 240 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts on the ~~SSB design~~ aspects including SSB pattern, multiplexing of other signal/channels, and transmission window. For data and control channel transmissions, it is investigated if µ>3 (larger than 120 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts, if any, on aspects including processing timelines, PDCCH monitoring capability (BD/CCE), scheduling enhancements, beam-management, reference signal design. For investigating the need for higher numerologies, some of the key aspects that are studied are the impact due to phase noise, delay spread, TAE, analog beam switching delay, and impact to coverage.

Further comments and discussions after 8/24 UTC 05:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We support the updated conclusion with some minor edits highlighted in yellow:* Instruct rapporteur to create dedicated (sub-)section for set of identified issues for physical layer NR design.
* Agree to following text proposal as introduction to the (sub-)sections for discussing identified issues for physical layer.
	+ For supporting NR operation in both licensed and unlicensed band in the frequency range from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, FR2 numerologies and additional numerologies beyond that supported currently in NR are studied. Existing framework for numerology scaling is considered i.e. 2μ ×15 subcarrier spacing to select the candidates. For SSB transmissions, it is investigated whether or not ~~if~~ µ>4 (larger than 240 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts, if any, on the ~~SSB design~~ aspects including at least the SSB pattern, multiplexing of other signal/channels, and transmission window. For data and control channel transmissions, it is investigated if µ>3 (larger than 120 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts, if any, on aspects including at least the processing timelines, PDCCH monitoring capability (BD/CCE), scheduling enhancements, beam-management, reference signal design. For investigating the need for higher numerologies, some of the key aspects that are studied are the impact due to phase noise, delay spread, TAE, analog beam switching delay, and impact to coverage.
 |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the Lenovo edits.If the intention is to list criteria for selection of SCS, then spectral efficiency and peak data-rates should be added as well, please see TP below* + For investigating the need for higher numerologies, some of the key aspects that are studied are the impact due to phase noise, delay spread, TAE, analog beam switching delay, impact to coverage, spectral efficiency and peak data rates.
 |
| Ericsson | Support conclusion with Lenovo’s additions plus the following addition.…the ~~SSB design~~ aspects including at least the SSB pattern, multiplexing of other signal/channels, and transmission window, if supported.Regarding TAE, please see our comment in Section 3.4.3 in response to the moderator updated proposal. We think it should be discussed in RAN1 about sending an LS to RAN4 requesting feedback on how the timing detection error Te is expected to scale with higher sub-carrier spacings. Our understanding from Rel-15 is that values lower than 3\*64\*Tc were tough to achieve, and it is important for RAN1 to understand if there are some fundamental limits that we need to take into account. |
| Qualcomm | We support the conclusion with Ericsson’s update. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the conclusion with Ericsson’s update.  |
| Samsung | We are OK the updated text by Lenovo, Nokia, and Ericsson.  |
| Futurewei | We support the proposed conclusion with the proposed updates from Lenovo, and Ericsson. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposed conclusion including the edits from Lenovo, Nokia and Ericsson |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with Lenovo’s updates to include “at least” in the moderator’s updated conclusion. In addition, we are ok with Nokia’s updates. |
| CATT | We support the conclusion with Ericsson’s update |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the conclusion with Ericsson’s and Nokia’s updates, and in addition we suggest completing the list with “relative delay in intra-cell/inter-cell multi-TRP operations”.In summary:* Instruct rapporteur to create dedicated (sub-)section for set of identified issues for physical layer NR design.
* Agree to following text proposal as introduction to the (sub-)sections for discussing identified issues for physical layer.
	+ For supporting NR operation in both licensed and unlicensed band in the frequency range from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, FR2 numerologies and additional numerologies beyond that supported currently in NR are studied. Existing framework for numerology scaling is considered i.e. 2μ ×15 subcarrier spacing to select the candidates. For SSB transmissions, it is investigated whether or not ~~if~~ µ>4 (larger than 240 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts, if any, on the ~~SSB design~~ aspects including at least the SSB pattern, multiplexing of other signal/channels, and transmission window, if supported. For data and control channel transmissions, it is investigated if µ>3 (larger than 120 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts, if any, on aspects including at least the processing timelines, PDCCH monitoring capability (BD/CCE), scheduling enhancements, beam-management, reference signal design. For investigating the need for higher numerologies, some of the key aspects that are studied are the impact due to phase noise, delay spread, TAE, analog beam switching delay, ~~and~~ impact to coverage, relative delay in intra-cell/inter-cell multi-TRP operations, spectral efficiency and peak data rates.
 |

**(Proposal 3-2 rev2) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Instruct rapporteur to create dedicated (sub-)section for set of identified issues for physical layer NR design.
* Agree to following text proposal as introduction to the (sub-)sections for discussing identified issues for physical layer.
	+ For supporting NR operation in both licensed and unlicensed band in the frequency range from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, FR2 numerologies and additional numerologies beyond that supported currently in NR are studied. Existing framework for numerology scaling is considered i.e. 2μ ×15 subcarrier spacing to select the candidates. For SSB transmissions, it is investigated whether or not µ>4 (larger than 240 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts, if any, on the aspects including at least SSB pattern, multiplexing of other signal/channels, and transmission window, if supported. For data and control channel transmissions, it is investigated if µ>3 (larger than 120 kHz) is needed and corresponding impacts, if any, on aspects including at least processing timelines, PDCCH monitoring capability (BD/CCE), scheduling enhancements, beam-management, reference signal design. For investigating the need for higher numerologies, some of the key aspects that are studied are the impact due to phase noise, delay spread, TAE, analog beam switching delay, and impact to coverage, spectral efficiency and peak data rates, relative delay in intra-cell/inter-cell multi-TRP operations, spectral efficiency and peak data rates.

Further comments and discussions after 8/25 UTC 03:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Moderator’s proposal. |

## 3.3 SSB pattern and SSB/CORESET multiplexing

The following are observations/proposals related to SSB pattern and SSB/CORESET multiplexing aspect from the submitted contribution.

* From [2]:
	+ Multiplexing patterns 2 and 3 for SSB and CORESET for Type0-PDCCH better facilitate meeting the OCB requirement in NR-U-60.
* From [7]:
	+ SSB pattern could be re-designed whether higher SCS is supported or not. Transmission opportunities, timing and QCI of Rel-17 SSB should be considered.
* From [12]:
	+ Introduce groups of SCS in FR2 and all control/data communication will use the SCS from one such group.
	+ It is proposed to investigate how to transmit the indication about additional SS/PBCH candidate positions which can become available with existing FR2 numerologies or future new numerologies.
	+ It is proposed to investigate efficient transmission of MSI including the multiplexing patterns for both licensed and shared carriers.
* From [14]:
	+ When a large subcarrier spacing is defined, SSB pattern and multiplexing of SSB and CORESET0/RMSI need to be updated to accommodate beam switching time.
* From [15]:
	+ Do not design for SS/PBCH block sliding within a transmission window for >52.6 GHz operation.
	+ For NR operations in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band, consider only 120 and 240 kHz SCS for SS/PBCH blocks, as already supported in Rel-15/16.
	+ Consider reusing the SS/PBCH / CORSET0 multiplexing patterns as much as possible.
	+ If minor, targeted, enhancements to particular pattern(s) are beneficial, these can be considered.
		- SS/PBCH / CORESET0 multiplexing patterns 2 and 3 are restricted to very small RMSI payloads due to the small number (2) of available OFDM symbols for RMSI PDSCH.
		- SS/PBCH / CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 1, especially with non-zero offset O for the Type0-PDCCH monitoring occasions, is much less restrictive in terms of allowable RMSI payload due to the fact that SS/PBCH and RMSI PDCCH/PDSCH are time division multiplexed.
	+ Consider enhancements to SS/PBCH / CORESET0 multiplexing Pattern 1 as follows:
		- (1) Allow (240 kHz, 240 kHz) SCS,
		- (2) Support 6 symbol SLIV in Default Table A starting at OFDM symbols 2 and 8.
* From [17]:
	+ RAN1 shall study the SS/PBCH block pattern for the new numerology, taking into account the beam switching time between neighboring SS/PBCH blocks.
* From [20]:
	+ Consider the enhancements for the SSB transmission to provide more opportunities in FR-X unlicensed band.
	+ Study further how to multiplex SSB and corresponding CORESET#0 in case of using new numerologies such as 240/480 kHz SCSs for the DL signal/channels other than SSB.
* From [25]:
	+ Whether to introduce gap symbol(s) for beam switching time should be discussed not only for SSB but also for any signal/channels with beam switching in case that higher SCS such as 960 kHz is supported.
	+ For SSB and CORESET multiplexing, following aspects should be discussed:
		- Which SCS(s) is supported for SSB and which combination(s) of SCS between SSB and CORESET#0 is supported;
		- Whether only single numerology is supported as in Rel-16 NR-U or not;
		- Whether the number of supported SCSs for SSB should be minimized.
	+ Which multiplexing pattern between SSB and CORESET#0 is supported for each combination of SCS between SSB and CORESET#0:
		- What are minimum channel bandwidth, minimum required CORESET#0 bandwidth and minimum required bandwidth for RMSI PDSCH;
		- Whether beam sweeping overhead should be minimized by FDM between SSB and CORESET#0 and/or RMSI PDSCH
* From [27]:
	+ SSB design should be enhanced to match unlicensed band requirements.
* From [28]:
	+ SSB pattern in a slot should be further investigated for higher subcarrier spacing (e.g. candidate subcarrier spacings of 480kHz, 960kHz, or 1920kHz) taking into account a beam switching gap due to a RF interruption time of Tx/Rx beams and/or LBT gap in unlicensed spectrum.
	+ It should be further studied so that SS/PBCH block and CORESET#0/RMSI can be multiplexed in TDM/FDM within a slot considering multi-beam operation. And it may need to be designed so that it can be closely located without the gap between SSB and CORESET#0/RMSI for the operation of the unlicensed band in terms of channel access.
* From [29]:
	+ If SSB design is needed for 960 kHz SCS, design new SSB mapping pattern that allows beam switching gap of 100 ns and/or possible LBT gap between consecutive SSBs.
	+ Existing FR2 SSB and Type0-PDCCH multiplexing patterns are a good starting point for above 52.6 GHz operation.
	+ If SSB design is needed for 960 kHz SCS, changes would be needed to SSB and RMSI multiplexing patterns, and more specifically on the CORESET Type0-PDCCH time domain allocation to take into potentially required beam switching and/or LBT gap.
* From [31]:
	+ Study the window duration/timing granularity to search a SSB set.

**Discussion:**

From the discussions, there seems to be many consideration aspects for SSB and CORESET#0 design. Moderator thinks it would be good to narrow down list of issues (or if possible, agree on some principles or issues). We may try to capture the potential issues or guiding principles into the TR once stabilized.

Please comment further on the following:

* Consider the following aspects for SSB and CORESET#0 design for a given SCS
	+ Whether re-use of existing SSB and/or SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern is possible (assuming the SSB SCS and/or COREST SCS is something that is already supported in existing NR)
	+ Beam switching gap for signal(s)/channel(s)
	+ Time granularity of placement of SSB
	+ Multiplexing of system information (e.g. RMSI, SIB1) with SSB
	+ Multiplexing of PDCCH (for system information, and possible others) with SSB
	+ Number of transmission opportunities within a transmission window (such as DRS window)
	+ Supported multiplexing pattern type (either 0, 1, or 2) for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing.

Please comment on whether you think above is something useful to capture. If companies have some different suggestion regarding SSB and CORESET design aspects, please provide comments. Also, if there are (sub-)bullet that is missing or needs correction, please comment as well.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Bullets regarding beam switching gap and time granularity could be amended by “, if new SCS is supported”.Regarding transmission opportunities within a transmission window, clarification would be needed about the dependency on the used channel access mechanism (mode). Otherwise the list seems ok.  |
| InterDigital | In our view, the list needs to be updated as follows:* Study Whether re-use of existing SSB and/or SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern is possible (assuming the SSB SCS and/or COREST SCS is something that is already supported in existing NR)
* If re-use of some or all of existing SSB and/or SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern is not possible, consider the following aspects for SSB and CORESET#0 design for a given SCS
	+ Beam switching gap for signal(s)/channel(s)
	+ Time granularity of placement of SSB
	+ Multiplexing of system information (e.g. RMSI, SIB1) with SSB
	+ Multiplexing of PDCCH (for system information, and possible others) with SSB
	+ Number of transmission opportunities within a transmission window (such as DRS window)
	+ Supported multiplexing pattern type (either 0, 1, or 2) for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing.
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are okay with InterDigital’s proposal to prioritize the discussion the reuse of the existing SSB and/or SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern. |
| ZTE | The following adjustment could be considered:* Consider the following aspects for SSB and CORESET#0 design for a given SCS
	+ Whether re-use of existing SSB pattern~~and/or SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern~~ is possible (assuming the SSB SCS ~~and/or CORESET SCS~~ is something that is already supported in existing NR)
		- Beam switching gap for signal(s)/channel(s) if new SCS is supported
		- Time granularity of placement of SSB
		- Number of transmission opportunities within a transmission window (such as DRS window)
	+ Whether re-use of SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern is possible (assuming the CORESET SCS is something that is already supported in existing NR)
		- Supported multiplexing pattern type (either 0, 1, or 2) for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing.
		- Multiplexing of PDCCH (for system information, and possible others) with SSB
		- Multiplexing of other signals/channels~~system information~~ (e.g. RMSI, ~~SIB1~~, paging, CSI-RS) with SSB
	+ ~~Multiplexing of PDCCH (for system information, and possible others) with SSB~~
	+ ~~Number of transmission opportunities within a transmission window (such as DRS window)~~
	+ ~~Supported multiplexing pattern type (either 0, 1, or 2) for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing.~~
 |
| NEC | We are OK with the proposal. BTW, we think the SCS and bandwidth should be decided first to facilitate SSB discussion. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with InterDigital’s structure in that legacy SSB/CORESET design is prioritized. |
| Apple | Agree with the prioritization of the legacy SSB/CORESET design. Clarify whether any changes are needed in the case that there is no change in the SSB/CORESET#0 numerology. In the case of no SSB numerology change, e.g. beam switching gap, may not need to be changed. |
| Futurewei | Agree with the list with the emphasize that the change of the legacy design only if necessary.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We believe that, due to its importance, the discussion regarding SSB pattern design can be benefit from more structure. We find that SSB and CORESET for Type0-PDCCH multiplexing schemes would be a second step decision. We suggest the following discussions:1) Whether or not different SSB patterns should be supported for licensed and unlicensed bands.2) List of considerations for SSB pattern design in licensed band.Note: Can include the discussion on whether or not FR2 SSB patterns for 120 kHz and 240 kHz are reusable if 120 kHz or 240 kHz SCS for SSB are used for data/control.3) List of considerations for SSB pattern design in unlicensed band if different from 2.4) Consideration for multiplexing SSB and CORESET for Type0-PDCCH.Note: Include the discussion on whether (a subset of) current 3 MUX patterns in FR2 are reusable or new patterns are required. |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal in general. Here are some further comments for consideration:* The main bullet: “for a given SCS” is not clear, since there can be different SCS for SSB and CORESET#0 (at least we didn’t discuss this point yet), so suggest to remove
* First, Fourth and Seventh subbullets are all talking about multiplexing of SSB and CORESET#0, so they can merged (also some wording are not correct)
* Third bullet: not quite sure of the meaning of “time granularity of placement of SSB”. Does it intend to say “SSB pattern in time domain”?

Here is some suggested wording for revision: * Consider the following aspects for SSB and CORESET#0 design ~~for a given SCS~~
	+ ~~Whether re-use of existing SSB and/or SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern is possible (assuming the SSB SCS and/or COREST SCS is something that is already supported in existing NR)~~
	+ Multiplexing pattern of SSB and its associated CORESET#0, including e.g. whether existing patterns are sufficient or modification/enhancement is needed
	+ Beam switching gap for signal(s)/channel(s)
	+ ~~Time granularity of placement of SSB~~ SSB pattern in time domain
	+ ~~Multiplexing of system information (e.g. RMSI, SIB1) with SSB~~
	+ Multiplexing of PDCCH (for system information, and possible others) with SSB
	+ Number of SSB transmission opportunities within a transmission window (such as DRS window)
	+ ~~Supported multiplexing pattern type (either 0, 1, or 2) for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing.~~
 |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We share a similar view with InterDigital: the discussion may be split into two parts. 1) Re-using existing SSB SCS(s) and/or SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, 2) introducing new SSB SCS(s) that are not supported in Rel-15/16 NR and/or the associated design aspects (i.e., sub-bullets in the proposal). The study on the new SSB SCS(s) doesn’t need to be conditional to the case that “re-use of some or all of existing SSB and/or SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern is not possible”. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We think the listed bullets capture all the key aspects and agree to capture them |
| Convida Wireless | Our view is that the reuse of SSB SCS and pattern could be one part for discussions. In addition, new SSB SCS and patterns for larger SCS could be another part for discussions and should also be considered. These include number of transmission opportunities within a transmission window (such as DRS window), beam switching gap for signal(s)/channel(s), etc. |
| Xiaomi | The main bullet is suggested to be modified as: “Consider the following aspects for SSB and/or CORESET#0 design for a given new SCS |
| Intel | Generally supportive of moderator proposal. Agree with Interdigital and Qualcomm, some structure would help. |
| Spreadtrum | Support InterDigital’s proposal of prioritizing the legacy SSB/CORESET#0 design. |

Based on suggestions from companies, moderator has updated the conclusion as follows.

**(Proposal 3-3) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Study whether or not different SSB patterns should be supported for licensed and unlicensed bands.
* For each licensed and unlicensed band, study whether re-use of existing SSB pattern with currently supported SSB SCS is possible. If re-use is not possible, consider the following aspects for SSB
	+ Beam switching gap for signal(s)/channel(s)
	+ SSB pattern in time domain
	+ Number of SSB transmission opportunities within a transmission window (such as DRS window)
* For each licensed and unlicensed band, Study whether re-use of existing SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern with currently supported SCS for SSB and CORESET is possible. If re-use is not possible, consider the following aspects for SSB and CORESET#0 design
	+ Supported multiplexing pattern type(s) (type 0, 1, and/or 2) for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing.
	+ Multiplexing of PDCCH (for system information, and possible others) with SSB
	+ Multiplexing of other signal/channels (e.g. RMSI, paging, CSI-RS) with SSB

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | The wording “reuse… is possible” is a little bit confusing. Not sure reusing with a performance degradation is counted as “possible” or not. Also, there is some wording change suggestion for the multiplexing part (it’s Pattern ½/3 in the spec)* Supported multiplexing pattern(s) ~~type(s)~~ (~~type~~ ~~0, 1, and/or 2~~ Pattern 1, 2, and/or 3) for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing.
 |
| Ericsson | It is unlikely that increasing the number of SSB transmission opportunities within a transmission window is needed for 60 GHz operation. Hence, the starting point should not be “the number of SSB opportunities …” but rather“whether or not it is needed to define a transmission window (such as DRS window)” |
| MediaTek | We think the second and third sub-bullets under the second bullet are bit overlapping, unless the point of second sub-bullet is meant to cover Type0-PDCCH design which we think can be a separate bullet itself to be more generic. And RAR seems to be missing from the list of examples in the third bullet. For the second bullet, we propose to modify as following. * + ~~Multiplexing of PDCCH (for system information, and possible others) with SSB~~
	+ Multiplexing of other signal/channels (e.g. RMSI, paging, RAR, CSI-RS) with SSB

For completeness, we suggest to add a third bullet to study Type0-PDCCH search spaces set configuration as follow:* For each licensed and unlicensed band, study whether re-use of existing Type0-PDCCH search space set configuration is possible.
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | For the 2nd bullet, we share Samsung’s view that “reuse… is possible” is a bit confusing. Another unclear point to us is, would this bullet intend to discuss SSB pattern with currently supported SSB SCS (i.e. 120 and 240 kHz) only? How do we discuss SSB pattern for higher SCS for SSB is supported? Is this going to be covered in the next section? Maybe we can remove “with currently supported SSB SCS” for simplicity, as follows:* For each licensed and unlicensed band, study whether re-use of existing SSB pattern ~~with currently supported SSB SCS~~ is possible. If re-use is not possible, consider the following aspects for SSB
	+ Beam switching gap for signal(s)/channel(s)
	+ SSB pattern in time domain
	+ Number of SSB transmission opportunities within a transmission window (such as DRS window)
 |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We also agree with Samsung’s suggested update |
| Apple | Want to clarify the first bullet in light of the discussion on maximizing commonality between licensed and unlicensed design. |
| CATT | We agree with Samsung’s modification of moderator’s proposal.  |
| Intel | We support moderator’s proposal with the update from Ericsson |
| vivo | We share a similar view with DOCOMO on the currently supported SSB SCS. Based on our understanding, SSB numerology should be determined first and then discuss the listed issue here. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with NTT DOCOMO’s modified proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  “Number of SSB transmission opportunities within a transmission window” also needs to be considered if reuse is possible . |
| Xiaomi | Support Samsung and Docomo’s modification. In addition, the first bullet seems difficult to answer before the second bullet is clear, so it could be the sub-bullet of the 2nd bullet. |

**(Proposal 3-3 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Study whether or not different SSB patterns should be supported for licensed and unlicensed bands.
* For each licensed and unlicensed band, study whether re-use of existing SSB pattern is possible. If re-use is not possible, consider the following aspects for SSB
	+ Beam switching gap for signal(s)/channel(s)
	+ SSB pattern in time domain
	+ Whether or not it is needed to define a transmission window (such as DRS window), and if needed, number of SSB transmission opportunities within a transmission window
* For each licensed and unlicensed band, Study whether re-use of existing SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern for SSB and CORESET is possible. If re-use is not possible, consider the following aspects for SSB and CORESET#0 design
	+ Supported multiplexing pattern type(s) (Pattern 1, 2, and/or 3) for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing.
	+ Multiplexing of other signal/channels (e.g. RMSI, paging, CSI-RS) with SSB
	+ For each licensed and unlicensed band, study whether re-use of existing Type0-PDCCH search space set configuration is possible

Further comments and discussions after 8/24 UTC 05:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s updated conclusion |
| Nokia,NSB | We are fine with the proposal. However, we think that before we study changes to SSB structures, it should be clear whether new SSB SCS is supported or not. |
| Ericsson | Generally fine with moderator’s updated conclusionUnder the 2nd main bullet, the first two sub-bullets refer to the same thing, so one could be made a sub-bullet of the other. |
| Qualcomm | In our understanding, third sub-bullet of the second main bullet, which is newly added per MediaTek’s suggestion, should be the third main bullet. However, considering the relevance between the topics, we think the third sub-bullet can be kept under the second main bullet, with some clean-up of redundant text:* For each licensed and unlicensed band, Study whether re-use of existing SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern for SSB and CORESET is possible. If re-use is not possible, consider the following aspects for SSB and CORESET#0 design
	+ Supported multiplexing pattern type(s) (Pattern 1, 2, and/or 3) for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing.
	+ Multiplexing of other signal/channels (e.g. RMSI, paging, CSI-RS) with SSB
	+ ~~For each licensed and unlicensed band, study whether re-use of existing~~ Configuration of Type0-PDCCH search space set ~~configuration is possible~~
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support moderator’s updated conclusion itself. We share Nokia’s view that whether new SSB SCS is supported or not, which will be discussed under 3.4 in our understanding.  |
| Samsung | As commented in the previous round, the wording “reuse is possible” is confusing to us. If the study figures out reuse may cause performance degradation, e.g. long time of synchronization, whether it’s called “reuse is possible”. Hence, we suggest to replace all the wording “if reuse is possible” to “if issues are identified for reuse”.  |
| Futurewei | We support the updated conclusion with Qualcomm changes. |
| Apple | Support conclusion with Qualcomm’s changes. For that sub-bullet, fix typo* For each licensed and unlicensed band, ~~S~~study
 |
| Convida Wireless | We support moderator’s updated conclusion. We are also fine with Qualcomm’s updates to remove “whether reuse of existing configuration …”. |
| CATT | We support moderator’s updated proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are generally fine with the updated proposal but the third bullet and its sub-bullets are a bit confusing. First, we think that CORESET in the third bullet should be changed to CORESET#0 as our understanding is that the discussion in this section was focused on SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns.Second, the third bullet suggests to consider some aspects if reuse of SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns is not supported, yet the first sub-bullet discusses the supported current multiplexing patterns of SSB and CORESET#0.Third, the second and third sub-bullets of the third bullet can be discussed irrespective to whether or not current SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns are supported. Therefore, they can be independent bullets of their own.In summary, we propose the following update:  Study whether or not different SSB patterns should be supported for licensed and unlicensed bands.  For each licensed and unlicensed band, study whether re-use of existing SSB pattern is possible. If re-use is not possible, consider the following aspects for SSB  Beam switching gap for signal(s)/channel(s)  SSB pattern in time domain  Whether or not it is needed to define a transmission window (such as DRS window), and if needed, number of SSB transmission opportunities within a transmission window~~~~For each licensed and unlicensed band, Study whether re-use of all or some of the existing SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns for SSB and CORESET#0 is possible and whether new multiplexing patterns for SSB and CORESET#0 need to be designed. ~~If re-use is not possible, consider the following aspects for SSB and CORESET#0 design~~~~  Supported multiplexing pattern type(s) (Pattern 1, 2, and/or 3) for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing.~~  For each licensed and unlicensed band, Study Multiplexing of other signal/channels (e.g. RMSI, paging, CSI-RS) with SSB  For each licensed and unlicensed band, study whether re-use of existing Type0-PDCCH search space set configuration is possible |

**(Proposal 3-3 rev2) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Study whether or not different SSB patterns should be supported for licensed and unlicensed bands.
* For each licensed and unlicensed band, if issues are identified for reuse of existing SSB, consider at least the following aspects for SSB
	+ Beam switching gap for signal(s)/channel(s)
	+ SSB pattern in time domain
	+ Whether or not it is needed to define a transmission window (such as DRS window), and if needed, number of SSB transmission opportunities within a transmission window
* For each licensed and unlicensed band, if issues are identified for reuse of all or some of the existing SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern, consider at least the following aspects for SSB and CORESET#0 design
	+ Supported multiplexing pattern type(s) (Pattern 1, 2, and/or 3) for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing.
	+ For each licensed and unlicensed band, study multiplexing of other signal/channels (e.g. RMSI, paging, CSI-RS) with SSB
	+ Configuration of Type0-PDCCH search space set configuration is possible

Further comments and discussions after 8/25 UTC 03:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are generally fine the updated proposal except the following minor modification on the third main bullet:* For each licensed and unlicensed band, if issues are identified for reuse of all or some of the existing SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern, consider at least the following aspects for SSB ~~and~~ , CORESET#0 and and other signals/channels design
	+ Supported multiplexing pattern type(s) (Pattern 1, 2, and/or 3) for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing.
	+ For each licensed and unlicensed band, study multiplexing of other signal/channels (e.g. RMSI, paging, CSI-RS) with SSB
	+ Configuration of Type0-PDCCH search space set ~~configuration is possible~~
 |
| Samsung | We support the revision from ZTE. |

## 3.4 SSB numerology

The following are observations/proposals specifically related to SSB numerology from the submitted contribution.

### 3.4.1 General aspects on SSB numerology

* From [4]:
	+ SSB numerology would better to be determined after BWP numerology is selected and supported (SSB, corset 0) numerology pairs need to be determined as well by considering koffset indication and SSB-Coreset 0 multiplexing pattern.
* From [15]:
	+ There are several sources of frequency errors, e.g. inter-gNB frequency accuracy, UE initial frequency accuracy, UE frequency drift and Doppler shift, all which scales with the carrier frequency.
	+ Thus, to keep the ratio ∆f/SCS similar at different carrier frequencies, the SCS needs to scale accordingly.
	+ From a frequency error perspective, an SSB SCS of either 240 kHz or 480 kHz seems reasonable for a 60 GHz carrier frequency.
	+ A higher UL SCS puts tighter requirements on UE UL timing accuracy.
	+ To avoid further tightening the UE requirement on UL timing error in relation to 1/SCSSSB compared to current specifications, the UL SCS should not be more than twice that of the SSB SCS.
	+ This motivates selection of UL SCS to be no greater than 480 kHz assuming the maximum SSB SCS of 240 kHz in the spec today.
	+ Extended CP need not be considered for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* From [16]:
	+ consider reusing FR2 SCS for initial access phase
* From [29]:
	+ Regarding SSB numerologies:
		- Support existing SSB numerologies and
		- study further need for new numerologies for SSB and Type0-PDCCH design.
* From [2]:
	+ Observation 6: SSB with 120 kHz or 240 kHz SCS in FR2 is suitable for licensed band and SSB with 240 kHz SCS is suitable for NR-U-60

### 3.4.2 Cell Search Complexity

* From [4]:
	+ frequency domain offset estimation during SSB detection. With increasing of the center frequency, the absolute value for frequency domain offset is increased if assuming the same ratio (e.g. 10ppm).
	+ The following aspects should be studied for SSB design: (1) Frequency domain offset estimation; (2) Amount of buffering SSB samples; (3) Beam switching for contiguous candidate SSBs.

### 3.4.3 Discussion

From the discussions, there seems to be some additional/different aspects to consider for SSB subcarrier spacing, which may or may not be same as other data channels.

Please comment further on the following:

* Consider the following aspects for determination of supported SSB subcarrier spacing
	+ Detection performance of SSB (including PSS, SSS, PBCH DMRS, and PBCH)
	+ Consideration of multiplexing with regular data subcarrier spacing (i.e. BWP subcarrier spacing)
	+ Initial cell search complexity from relative increase of frequency errors (e.g. carrier frequency offset, Doppler shift, etc)
	+ Timing detection accuracy and its relation to uplink transmission accuracy
	+ Signaling design for supporting different subcarrier spacing for SSB and CORESET#0 (if supported)

Please comment on whether you think above is something useful to capture. If companies have some different suggestion regarding SSB numerology, please provide comments. Also, if there are (sub-)bullet that is missing or needs correction, please comment as well.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Agree |
| InterDigital | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree. |
| NEC | We are OK with the proposal. BTW, we think the SCS and bandwidth should be decided first to facilitate SSB discussion. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. Agree with NEC that the numerology should be decided first. |
| Futurewei | Agree |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We suggest adding the following bullets:• SSB coverage requirement• Multi-TRP delay considerations |
| Samsung | The last subbullet can be moved to 3.3 since it’s not a determining aspect for SSB numerology, but SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing.  |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal.As we discussed in [4], we support to decide SSB numerology separately and after BWP numerology.  |
| Qualcomm | A sub-bullet can be added:Consideration of SSB-based RRM/RLM and beam management when the SSB SCS is significantly different from that of the active BWP (e.g., switching gap, scheduling constraint, etc.) |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Agree with the moderator’s proposal |
| Sony | Agree |
| Xiaomi | Agree with the Moderator’s proposal |
| Intel | Agree with proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with the moderator’s proposal |
| Charter Communications | Agree with the proposal. |

Based on suggestions from companies, moderator has updated the conclusion as follows.

**(Proposal 3-4) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* RAN1 consider the following aspects for determination of supported SSB subcarrier spacing
	+ Detection performance of SSB (including PSS, SSS, PBCH DMRS, and PBCH)
	+ Consideration of multiplexing with regular data subcarrier spacing (i.e. BWP subcarrier spacing)
	+ Initial cell search complexity from relative increase of frequency errors (e.g. carrier frequency offset, Doppler shift, etc)
	+ Timing detection accuracy and its relation to uplink transmission accuracy
	+ Signaling design for supporting different subcarrier spacing for SSB and CORESET#0 (if supported)
	+ SSB coverage requirement
	+ Multi-TRP delay considerations
	+ Consideration of SSB-based RRM/RLM and beam management when the SSB SCS is significantly different from that of the active BWP (e.g., switching gap, scheduling constraint, etc.)

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | Additional aspects were added in the first round, therefore we would like to highlight that also TRS are available in Idle and Connected mode to aid synchronization and timing estimation.**Moderator Suggested Conclusion:*** RAN1 consider the following aspects for determination of supported SSB subcarrier spacing
	+ Detection performance of SSB (including PSS, SSS, PBCH DMRS, and PBCH)
	+ Consideration of multiplexing with regular data subcarrier spacing (i.e. BWP subcarrier spacing)
	+ Initial cell search complexity from relative increase of frequency errors (e.g. carrier frequency offset, Doppler shift, etc)
	+ Usage of TRS in connected mode and idle mode (if )
	+ Timing detection accuracy and its relation to uplink transmission accuracy
	+ Signaling design for supporting different subcarrier spacing for SSB and CORESET#0 (if supported)
	+ SSB coverage requirement
	+ Multi-TRP delay considerations
	+ Consideration of SSB-based RRM/RLM and beam management when the SSB SCS is significantly different from that of the active BWP (e.g., switching gap, scheduling constraint, etc.)
	+ Utilization of TRS in connected mode (R16) and idle mode (to be specified in R17 Power saving AI)
 |
| InterDigital | We propose following update based on Nokia’s proposal:**Moderator Suggested Conclusion:*** RAN1 consider the following aspects for determination of supported SSB subcarrier spacing
	+ Detection performance of SSB (including PSS, SSS, PBCH DMRS, and PBCH)
	+ Consideration of multiplexing with regular data subcarrier spacing (i.e. BWP subcarrier spacing)
	+ Initial cell search complexity from relative increase of frequency errors (e.g. carrier frequency offset, Doppler shift, etc)
	+ ~~Usage of TRS in connected mode and idle mode (if )~~
	+ Timing detection accuracy and its relation to uplink transmission accuracy
	+ Signaling design for supporting different subcarrier spacing for SSB and CORESET#0 (if supported)
	+ SSB coverage requirement
	+ Multi-TRP delay considerations
	+ Consideration of SSB-based RRM/RLM and beam management when the SSB SCS is significantly different from that of the active BWP (e.g., switching gap, scheduling constraint, etc.)
	+ Utilization of TRS in connected mode (R16) and idle mode (if specified in R17 Power saving AI)
 |
| Ericsson | Regarding the following bullet:* “ Timing detection accuracy and its relation to uplink transmission accuracy”

This is a vital aspect for RAN1 to take into account, since the absolute timing error Te as a fraction of the uplink CP duration will determine what SCS values are feasible. If Te is too large a fraction of the CP, then there is no margin for delay spread or any other sources of time alignment errors.Hence, we propose sending an LS to RAN4 to ask what timing errors are expected for each candidate numerology. The following Te values are currently specified in 38.133 Section 7.1.2 for FR1 and FR2. RAN4 will need to specify values for the 60 GHz band.Table 7.1.2-1: Te Timing Error Limit

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Frequency Range | SCS of SSB signals (kHz) | SCS of uplink signals (kHz) | Te |
| 1 | 15 | 15 | 12\*64\*Tc |
| 30 | 10\*64\*Tc |
| 60 | 10\*64\*Tc |
| 30 | 15 | 8\*64\*Tc |
| 30 | 8\*64\*Tc |
| 60 | 7\*64\*Tc |
| 2 | 120 | 60 | 3.5\*64\*Tc |
| 120 | 3.5\*64\*Tc |
| 240 | 60 | 3\*64\*Tc |
| 120 | 3\*64\*Tc |
| Note 1: Tc is the basic timing unit defined in TS 38.211 [6] |

 |
| Qualcomm | We support the original proposal. In our view, the availability of TRS, in Nokia’s comment, is not quite relevant to the SSB subcarrier spacing, and is an optional feature that the UE cannot always rely on. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We share QC’s view.  |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s proposal |
| Apple | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal. |
| CATT | We support moderator’s proposal and agree with Qualcomm’s view on TRS, which is in discussion in Rel-17 UE power saving enhancement and irrelevant to this feature.  |
| Intel | We are fine with moderator’s proposal with Nokia’s update.  |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The bullets of “Detection performance of SSB” and “SSB coverage requirement” can be combined. In other respects, we support the original proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with the current proposal by moderator. |

**(Proposal 3-4 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* RAN1 consider the following aspects for determination of supported SSB subcarrier spacing
	+ Detection performance of SSB (including PSS, SSS, PBCH DMRS, and PBCH) and SSB coverage requirement
	+ Consideration of multiplexing with regular data subcarrier spacing (i.e. BWP subcarrier spacing)
	+ Initial cell search complexity from relative increase of frequency errors (e.g. carrier frequency offset, Doppler shift, etc)
	+ Timing detection accuracy and its relation to uplink transmission accuracy
	+ Signaling design for supporting different subcarrier spacing for SSB and CORESET#0 (if supported)
	+ Multi-TRP delay considerations
	+ Consideration of SSB-based RRM/RLM and beam management when the SSB SCS is significantly different from that of the active BWP (e.g., switching gap, scheduling constraint, etc.)

Further comments and discussions after 8/24 UTC 05:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s updated conclusion |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the conclusion |
| Ericsson | Generally fine with the conclusion. Regarding the 4th sub-bullet, however, we still think that that it should be discussed in RAN1 about sending an LS to RAN4 requesting feedback on how the timing detection error Te is expected to scale with higher sub-carrier spacings. Our understanding from Rel-15 is that values lower than 3\*64\*Tc were tough to achieve, and it is important for RAN1 to understand if there are some fundamental limits that we need to take into account. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposed conclusion. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are supportive of updated conclusion. We are ok to discuss about sending an LS to RAN4 requesting feedback on how the timing detection error Te is expected to scale with higher SCS, as mentioned by Ericsson.  |
| Samsung | We are supportive of the proposed conclusion.  |
| Nokia, NSB | I suppose companies are welcome to submit contributions to RAN4, and if RAN4 sees issue then will send LS to RAN1.  |
| Futurewei | We support the updated conclusion and agree with Nokia that RAN4 will investigate these issues anyways and, if necessary, will send RAN1 a LS.  |
| Apple | Fine with conclusion.  |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with moderator’s updated conclusion. |
| CATT |  We are OK with moderator’s updated conclusion |

**(Proposal 3-4 rev2) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* RAN1 at least consider the following aspects for determination of supported SSB subcarrier spacing
	+ Detection performance of SSB (including PSS, SSS, PBCH DMRS, and PBCH) and SSB coverage requirement
	+ Consideration of multiplexing with regular data subcarrier spacing (i.e. BWP subcarrier spacing)
	+ Initial cell search complexity from relative increase of frequency errors (e.g. carrier frequency offset, Doppler shift, etc)
	+ Timing detection accuracy and its relation to uplink transmission accuracy
	+ Signaling design for supporting different subcarrier spacing for SSB and CORESET#0 (if supported)
	+ Multi-TRP delay considerations
	+ Consideration of SSB-based RRM/RLM and beam management when the SSB SCS is significantly different from that of the active BWP (e.g., switching gap, scheduling constraint, etc.)

Moderator Notes on the LS:

* In general, moderator suggests refraining from sending LS to provide RAN4 of RAN1 agreements or conclusions. If the LS is to provide some information for reference in the future, RAN4 is more than welcomed to read the RAN1 chairman notes and meeting report. I think we can avoid the logistics in showing RAN4, RAN1 agreements via LS.
* On the LS proposed, I think the goal is to ask RAN4 to specify timing requirement for uplink, which is already under RAN4 domain, may be LS might not be needed for this. It seems bit odd for RAN1 to ask RAN4 to their job.
* If the intent to ask for RAN4 feedback on specific requirements that may impact SCS selection, I think we can draft something bit more generic so that we don’t sent another LS at a later time. We can also list some examples (like timing requirement) that we think that could be relevant.
	+ A minor note, moderator just worries about timeline to get the reply LS from RAN4. From moderator’s understanding RAN4 is conducting their own study on potential supportable subcarrier spacing, and they will consider this from RAN4 perspective (including any RAN4 requirements). If so, RAN1 can try to make agreement the best it can and have RAN4 confirm or not confirm the subcarriers spacings. This was at least how Rel-15 subcarrier spacing was specified in RAN1 and RAN4.

Further comments and discussions after 8/25 UTC 03:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Moderator’s proposal. |

## 3.5 PRACH

The following are observations/proposals specifically related to PRACH design from the submitted contribution.

* From [2]:
	+ For unlicensed band, new ZC lengths should be considered (for OCB).
	+ Observation 8: 60 kHz SCS can support a coverage close to the maximum expected coverage for the backhauling use cases while increasing the SCS of preamble will reduce the coverage and the maximum cell radius
* From [4]:
	+ Format 0-3 with special SCS is not supported and the candidate PRACH numerologies for format A, B and C are the same as the candidate BWP numerologies. Both coverage and capacity should be studied for PRACH design with new defined numerology.
* From [14]:
	+ When a large subcarrier spacing is defined, PRACH configuration related aspects need to be investigated.
* From [17]:
	+ RAN1 shall study the scaling/reuse of current PRACH SCS with some enhancement including the non-consecutive RO configuration.
* From [25]:
	+ For PRACH sequence, short PRACH sequence supported in Rel-15 NR should be a baseline
* From [29]:
	+ Introducing longer sequence lengths for short time domain PRACH preambles, e.g. the ones supported in Rel-16 NR-U (571 and 1151), would allow transmitting device to achieve 40 dBm EIRP maximum in CEPT scenarios c1 and c2.

**Discussion:**

There were several discussions, on PRACH especially on its length and supported coverages.

Please comment further on the following:

* Consider the following aspects for PRACH design
	+ Sequence lengths (possibly other than what is supported in Rel-15 and 16 NR) for 60 GHz unlicensed operation
	+ RACH RO configurations with new SCS (if new SCS is supported)

Please comment on whether you think above is something useful to capture. If companies have some different suggestion regarding PRACH design aspects, please provide comments. Also, if there are (sub-)bullet that is missing or needs correction, please comment as well.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Agree |
| InterDigital | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree. |
| NEC | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s proposal. |
| Apple | Agree |
| Futurewei | Agree |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are not sure if the proposal is to focus on detailed design aspects or requirements, but we think that we should consider PRACH coverage requirement in the PRACH design. |
| Samsung | Add one more subbullet: LBT gap between Ros.  |
| Vivo | Not sure why it explicitly lists “(possibly other than what is supported in Rel-15 and 16 NR)” in the 1st sub-bullet. Whether it’s the same or different from what is supported in Rel-16, the impact on coverage and capacity should be studied.We suggest to a rewording of the 1st sub-bullet:* + Sequence lengths and impact on PRACH coverage and capacity for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz
 |
| Qualcomm | On the second sub-bullet, the text in the parentheses may also apply for the first sub-bullet, i.e., the study on the new sequence should also be dependent on whether new SCS(s) is supported. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Agree with the moderator’s proposal |
| Xiaomi | Agree with the Moderator’s proposal |
| Intel | Agree with proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with the moderator’s proposal |

Based on suggestions from companies, moderator has updated the conclusion as follows.

**(Proposal 3-5) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects for PRACH design of NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz
	+ PRACH coverage requirements
	+ applicable PRACH Sequence length(s) and subcarrier spacing(s) for PRACH, including any impact on PRACH coverage and capacity from the applicable sequence length(s).
	+ RACH RO configurations with new SCS (if new SCS is supported)

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | We assume “complexity, specification effort” is baseline aspect, and this is common understanding, if so, no need to add 😊 |
| Ericsson  | Support moderator proposal |
| MediaTek | We support moderator’s proposal |
| Futurewei | Support Moderator Conclusion |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support moderator’s conclusion. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s proposal |
| Apple  | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| CATT | We support moderator’s proposal |
| Intel | We support moderator’s proposal. |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| Xiaomi | We support moderator’s proposal. |

Further comments and discussions after 8/24 UTC 05:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson  | Still support moderator proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | We also still support moderator proposal.  |
| Samsung | Seems our first round comment is not addressed. We propose to add another bullet, which was also agreed to be captured in the last meeting: LBT gap between Ros |

**(Proposal 3-5 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the at least following aspects for PRACH design of NR operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz
	+ PRACH coverage requirements
	+ applicable PRACH Sequence length(s) and subcarrier spacing(s) for PRACH, including any impact on PRACH coverage and capacity from the applicable sequence length(s).
	+ RACH RO configurations with new SCS (if new SCS is supported)
	+ LBT gap between RACH occasions (RO)

Further comments and discussions after 8/25 UTC 03:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the original proposal provided by Moderator. For the 4th sub-bullet, this issue has been discussed in Rel-16 NRU without consensus, we are not sure what is the motivation to bring it to above 52.6GHz.  |
| Samsung | To address ZTE’s comments, we believe the LBT gap between RO is an essential part to make RACH works well in unlicensed band. It’s true that the proposal was discussed but not supported in Rel-16, but the reasons are various (mainly due to lack of time for discussion in our view). Now for above 52.6 GHz, the issue can be more severe since one LBT procedure (or even one CCA slot) may span multiple ROs, if a higher SCS is supported, then the gNB should have better control of the RO configuration to increase the chance for passing LBT. That’s the motivation to bring it back to above 52.6 GHz, and the bullet should be kept.  |

## 3.6 PT-RS

The following are observations/proposals specifically related to PT-RS design and phase noise compensation from the submitted contribution.

* From [1]:
	+ For supporting NR operation between 52.6GHz and 71GHz in Rel. 17, no PT-RS configuration should also be supported, depending up on the MCS range, if higher subcarrier spacing values are agreed to be supported.
* From [2]:
	+ Block PTRS enables low complexity ICI compensation for smaller SCSs such as 120 kHz and 240 kHz and helps the smaller SCS to perform even better than a larger SCS such as 960 kHz.
* From [4]:
	+ DM-RS/PT-RS enhancement should be studied to solve the problem brought by RF impairment such as phase noise, I-Q imbalance and PA non-linear work range.
* From [8]:
	+ Methods to eliminate ICI induced by phase noise should be studied for NR operation in the 60 GHz band.
* From [13]:
	+ Investigate PT-RS patterns allowing for ICI compensation for CP-OFDM. Support block-based PTRS patterns for OFDM waveform. Support density extension of current Rel.15 PTRS for DFTsOFDM waveform.
* From [16]:
	+ further study the need for PTRS enhancement for smaller SCS than 960KHz
* From [17]:
	+ RAN1 shall study the enhancement to reference signals (e.g. PT-RS) for the new carrier frequency range, taking into consideration of the impact from the new numerology.
* From [22]:
	+ RAN1 to study the need to update Rel-15 PTRS for both OFDM and DFT-S-OFDM to account increased CPE/ICI at higher frequencies.
* From [23]:
	+ The spectral efficiency (include guard band, PT-RS overhead, etc.) for large number of carrier aggregation should be studied for NR operation from 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* From [25]:
	+ How to allocate resource for RS (e.g. DMRS, PTRS) in frequency domain needs to be considered for higher SCS if introduced
* From [29]:
	+ Consider block-PTRS for CP-OFDM. Consider defining new PTRS configurations for DFT-s-OFDM.
* From [15], [32]:
	+ Phase noise induced performance issues for the OFDM waveform in the 52.6 – 71 GHz frequency range can be effectively addressed with the Rel-15 PTRS structure and simple ICI compensation algorithms. Performance with SCS of 480 kHz with simple ICI compensation is on par or better than the performance with 960 kHz with CPE compensation only.

**Discussion:**

PT-RS is very integral to the phase noise compensation and overall performance for NR operating in the 60 GHz band. Several companies has brought information on new potential method to process with PT-RS for inter-carrier interference (ICI) other than common phase error (CPE) compensation, or new PT-RS design that potentially help with ICI from phase noise. Other several companies has commented about density and configurations based on existing PT-RS design.

Please comment further on the following:

* Consider the following aspects of PT-RS design for a given SCS
	+ CPE and ICI compensation performance of existing PT-RS design
	+ Study of need of any modification/changes to existing PT-RS design
	+ Potential modification to the PT-RS pattern or configuration to aid performance improvement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM waveforms.
	+ Potential methods to aid ICI compensation at the receiver

Please comment on whether you think above is something useful to capture. If companies have some different suggestion regarding PT-RS design aspects, please provide comments. Also, if there are (sub-)bullet that is missing or needs correction, please comment as well.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Agree |
| InterDigital | We propose following updates:* Consider the following aspects of PT-RS design for a given SCS
	+ CPE and ICI compensation performance of existing PT-RS design
	+ Study of need of any modification/changes to existing PT-RS design
	+ Potential modification to the PT-RS pattern or configuration to aid performance improvement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM waveforms (if needed)
	+ Potential methods to aid ICI compensation at the receiver (if needed)
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Moderator’s proposal, also okay with InterDigital’s update |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We basically agree with moderator’s proposal. The following modification for the 2nd sub-bullet could be considered:* + Study of need of any modification/changes to existing PT-RS design if larger SCS (e.g. 960kHz) is supported
 |
| NEC | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| LG Electronics | Support InterDigital’s update. |
| Apple | Agree |
| Futurewei | Agree |
| Mitsubishi | Agree with the Moderator’s proposal. Do not agree with ZTE’s update, PTRS enhancement is shown by simulation results to be bring important performance enhancements especially at SCS lower than 960kHz, I don’t see the need of such a condition.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree that it is useful to capture these considerations for the next steps of the study. We also do not agree with the proposed modification from ZTE and agree with the reason given by Mitsubishi. |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal.  |
| Vivo | We prefer a general description of “Phase noise compensation” instead of “CPE and ICI” in the 1st sub-bullet as CPE and ICI may not be always used together.We propose the following updates on top of InterDigital’s update:* Consider the following aspects of PT-RS design for a given SCS
	+ Phase noise compensation performance of existing PT-RS design
	+ Study whether there is a need of any modification/changes to existing PT-RS design
	+ Potential modification to the PT-RS pattern or configuration to aid performance improvement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM waveforms (if needed).
	+ Potential methods to aid phase noise compensation at the receiver (if needed).
 |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the proposal. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Agree with the moderator’s proposal |
| Xiaomi | Agree with the proposal |
| Intel | Generally supportive of the moderator proposal. Agree with vivo, the need for separation of phase noise compensation into CPE and ICI might not be needed. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with the moderator’s proposal |
| Charter Communications | Agree, but we think we should first focus on CPE and ICI compensation performance of existing PT-RS design |

Based on suggestions from companies, moderator has updated the conclusion as follows.

**(Proposal 3-6) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects of PT-RS design for a given SCS
	+ Phase noise compensation performance of existing PT-RS design
	+ Study of need of any modification/changes to existing PT-RS design
	+ Potential modification to the PT-RS pattern or configuration to aid performance improvement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM waveforms (if needed)
	+ Potential methods to aid ICI compensation at the receiver (if needed)

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| InterDigital | We are fine with Moderator’s proposal |
| Ericsson | Support moderator proposal except we think that the last 2 bullets can be made as sub-bullets of bullet 2 since they are redundantPlease note that we added the proposal from our papers [15], [32] above since it was missed in the initial summary. |
| MediaTek | We agree with moderator’s proposal |
| Futurewei | OK with proposed Conclusion |
| Qualcomm | We have same view as Ericsson. For better organization of aspects, we think the third and fourth sub-bullets can be under the second sub-bullet. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support moderator’s conclusion. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with moderator’s proposal |
| Apple | Agree with moderator’s propsal |
| CATT | We agree with the view from Ericsson.  |
| Intel | We support moderator’s proposal. |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Ericsson and Qualcomm |
| Xiaomi | Agree with Moderator’s proposal |

**(Proposal 3-6 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects of PT-RS design for a given SCS
	+ Phase noise compensation performance of existing PT-RS design
	+ Study of need of any modification/changes to existing PT-RS design
		- Potential modification to the PT-RS pattern or configuration to aid performance improvement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM waveforms (if needed)
		- Potential methods to aid ICI compensation at the receiver (if needed)

Further comments and discussions after 8/24 UTC 05:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s updated conclusion |
| Ericsson | Support moderator’s updated conclusion |
| Qualcomm | We support the suggested conclusion. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the suggested conclusion.  |
| Samsung | We support the proposed conclusion.  |
| Futurewei | Support moderator’s updated conclusion |
| Apple | Support moderator’s conclusion |
| CATT | We support moderator’s updated conclusion |

**(Proposal 3-6 rev2) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider at least the following aspects of PT-RS design for a given SCS
	+ Phase noise compensation performance of existing PT-RS design
	+ Study of need of any modification/changes to existing PT-RS design
		- Potential modification to the PT-RS pattern or configuration to aid performance improvement for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM waveforms (if needed)
		- Potential methods to aid ICI compensation at the receiver (if needed)

Further comments and discussions after 8/25 UTC 03:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Moderator’s proposal. |

## 3.7 DM-RS

The following are observations/proposals specifically related to DM-RS design from the submitted contribution.

* From [1]:
	+ For higher SCS values with both 400MHz and 2GHz bandwidth, BLER performance difference between the ideal channel estimation and real channel estimation varies for different SCS values, where, as the subcarrier spacing is increasing, the performance degradation with real channel estimation also increases which could be attributed to the performance of DM-RS configuration with different SCS values.
	+ For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, new DM-RS configurations should be studied.
* From [20]:
	+ Investigate the necessity to enhance the structure of DM-RS for data as well as control DL/UL channels.
* From [21]:
	+ Study enhanced DM-RS designs for a larger subcarrier spacing for PDSCH and PUSCH. Study channel estimation performance impact of PDCCH and PUCCH with a larger subcarrier spacing.
* From [25]:
	+ How to allocate resource for RS (e.g. DMRS, PTRS) in frequency domain needs to be considered for higher SCS if introduced. DMRS density in frequency domain may not be sufficient. DMRS ports multiplexing may not work well
* From [31]:
	+ Study enhancement of the frequency domain structure of DMRS for NR on 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.

**Discussion:**

Some companies have mentioned potential challenges with existing DM-RS, when scaled to higher subcarrier spacings.

Please comment further on the following:

* Consider the following aspects of DM-RS design for a given SCS
	+ Validate any issues for current DM-RS design supported in Rel-15/16 NR.
	+ Study any potential enhancements for DM-RS for various channels (if needed)

Please comment on whether you think above is something useful to capture. If companies have some different suggestion regarding DM-RS design aspects, please provide comments. Also, if there are (sub-)bullet that is missing or needs correction, please comment as well.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Agree.Instead of “Validate any issues for”, “Further study whether there is any issue with” could be better language |
| InterDigital | We would like to propose following updates for DM-RS as well as PT-RS* Consider the following aspects of DM-RS design for a given SCS
	+ Channel estimation performance of existing DM-RS design with existing and new SCSs
	+ Study of need of any modification/changes to existing DM-RS design
	+ Potential modification to the DM-RS pattern, configuration or indication to aid performance improvement for CP-OFDM and DFT-S OFDM waveforms (if needed)
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Moderator’s proposal, also okay with InterDigital’s update |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree. |
| NEC | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s proposal. InterDigital’s update is also ok. |
| Apple | Agree. Also fine with InterDigital’s update. |
| Futurewei | Agree |
| Mitsubishi | Agree with Interdigital’s update |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree that it is useful to capture these considerations for the next steps of the study. InterDigital’s update is also ok. |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal.  |
| Vivo | Agree with Nokia on the wording “Further study whether there is any issue with” for the 1st sub-bullet of moderator’s proposal.Also okay with InterDigital’s version with the following wording changes:* Consider the following aspects of DM-RS design for a given SCS
	+ Channel estimation performance of existing DM-RS design with existing and new SCSs
	+ Study whether there is a need of any modification/changes to existing DM-RS design
	+ Potential modification to the DM-RS pattern, configuration or indication to aid performance improvement for CP-OFDM and DFT-S OFDM waveforms (if needed)
 |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the proposal. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Agree with the moderator’s proposalIn addition, following sub-bullets to the second bullet could be added:* + Study of new DM-RS configurations

Study the need to restrict/limit the existing DM-RS configurations for different physical channels |
| Xiaomi  | Agree with the proposal. |
| Intel | Agree with proposal, and also agree with Nokia’s suggested change in their comment |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with the moderator’s proposal |

Based on suggestions from companies, moderator has updated the conclusion as follows.

**(Proposal 3-7) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects of DM-RS design for a given SCS
	+ Channel estimation performance of existing DM-RS design with existing and new SCSs
	+ Study whether there is a need of any modification/changes to existing DM-RS design
	+ Potential modification or introduction of new DM-RS pattern, configuration or indication to aid performance improvement for CP-OFDM and DFT-S OFDM waveforms (if needed)

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| InterDigital | We are fine with Moderator’s proposal |
| Ericsson | * Support moderator proposal
* Similar comment as for PTRS – the 3rd bullet can be made a sub-bullet of the 2nd bullet since it is redundant.
 |
| MediaTek | Agree with moderator’s proposal |
| Futurewei  | We are fine with Moderator’s Conclusion. For the sake of clarity suggest adding to the first sub-bullet “and new SCSs (if any)” |
| Qualcomm | The third sub-bullet can be a level-3 sub-bullet of the second sub-bullet. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support moderator’s conclusion with Futurewei’s suggestion.  |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s proposal and are also fine with Futurwei’s and Qualcomm’s suggestions. |
| Apple | Support moderator’s proposal. Agree with Futurewei and Qualcomm’s updates. |
| CATT | We agree with Ericsson’s suggestion |
| Intel | We support moderator’s proposal. |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Ericsson and Qualcomm |
| Xiaomi | Support moderator’s proposal |

**(Proposal 3-7 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects of DM-RS design for a given SCS
	+ Channel estimation performance of existing DM-RS design with existing and new SCSs (if any)
	+ Study whether there is a need of any modification/changes to existing DM-RS design
		- Potential modification or introduction of new DM-RS pattern, configuration or indication to aid performance improvement for CP-OFDM and DFT-S OFDM waveforms (if needed)

Further comments and discussions after 8/24 UTC 05:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s updated conclusion |
| Ericsson | Support moderator’s updated conclusion |
| Qualcomm | We support the updated conclusion. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the updated conclusion. |
| Samsung | We support the proposed conclusion. |
| Futurewei | We support moderator’s updated conclusion. |
| Apple | Support the updated conclusion.  |
| CATT | We support moderator’s updated conclusion |

**(Proposal 3-7 rev2) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider at least the following aspects of DM-RS design for a given SCS
	+ Channel estimation performance of existing DM-RS design with existing and new SCSs (if any)
	+ Study whether there is a need of any modification/changes to existing DM-RS design
		- Potential modification or introduction of new DM-RS pattern, configuration or indication to aid performance improvement for CP-OFDM and DFT-S OFDM waveforms (if needed)

## 3.8 Processing Timelines

The following are observations/proposals specifically related to processing timelines for various signals and channels from the submitted contributions.

### 3.8.1 Processing Timelines – General

* From [2]:
	+ If numerologies higher than 120 kHz are introduced, the processing timelines (BWP switching times, HARQ scheduling, UE processing, preparation and computation times for PDSCH, PUSCH/SRS and CSI) and PDCCH monitoring capability should be studied for the new numerologies.
* From [4]:
	+ Timeline definition, basic time unit and super long CP per half frame should be discussed for new defined numerology such as (960K, NCP).
* From [7]:
	+ If introducing new numerology, the impacts on processing time and scheduling operation should be considered.
* From [10]:
	+ For PDSCH/PUSCH processing, N1/N2 values for µ larger than 3 should be defined with consideration of different UE processing capabilities.
	+ For PDSCH to HARQ-ACK timing, the value range of k1 should be extended to facilitate SCS higher than 120kHz. UL grant to PUSCH timing, the value range of k2 should be extended to facilitate SCS higher than 120kHz.
	+ UE processing capability for PDSCH/PUSCH should be defined for SCS higher than 120kHz.
* From [11]:
	+ Determine the processing time when the new numerologies are decided. Study the range of K0, K1, K2 for the new SCS.
* From [14]:
	+ When a large subcarrier spacing is defined, processing time related aspects, including PDSCH/PUSCH processing time, CSI computation time, etc., need to be investigated.
* From [15]:
	+ UE processing timelines for SCS > 120 kHz need to be further tightened vis-à-vis those for 120 kHz SCS to enable high performance NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz.
	+ The times provisioned for UE processing grow exponentially with the numerology.
	+ Large processing latencies restrict the achievable throughputs, defeating the purpose of enabling large bandwidths with large sub-carrier spacings.
	+ RAN1 should investigate the different factors that contribute to the PDSCH processing time and consider possible latency reduction opportunities.
* From [17]:
	+ RAN1 shall study the processing timing related procedures for modification/enhancement, taking into consideration of the impact from the new numerology.
	+ Timing indication (K0/K1/K2); HARQ procedure with increased value of K0/K1/K2; PDCCH monitoring with practical PDCCH BD capability; Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling
* From [20]:
	+ It would be beneficial in terms of UE implementation complexity or power consumption to perform slot(or symbol)-group level processing instead of every slot(or symbol) processing, e.g. PDCCH monitoring and CSI processing unit availability check.
* From [21]:
	+ Study required UE processing time and switching time for larger subcarrier spacings to be introduced. Study enhanced processing time determination methods to reduce the redundant processing time.
* From [22]:
	+ RAN1 to modify the UE timing parameter values and their associated signaling.
* From [25]:
	+ For higher SCS, the appropriate configuration of k0, k1, k2 need to be discussed to meet UE minimum processing timeline.
	+ If the current candidate values don’t meet UE processing limitation, extending, limiting or shifting the range of k0, k1, k2 may be necessary

### 3.8.2 Processing Timelines – CSI Specific

* From [1]:
	+ For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, then potential enhancements should be considered on how to efficiently utilize UE’s limited processing capability to reduce latency and efficiently handle processing/preparation of CSI reports associated with multiple numerologies parallelly.
* From [10]:
	+ For CSI computation, Z1/Z2/Z3 value for µ larger than 3 should be defined with consideration of different CSI computation delay requirements.

### 3.8.3 Discussion

Please comment further on the following:

* Consider the following aspects of processing timelines for given SCS
	+ For new SCS not supported in existing NR specification, study the following aspects
		- appropriate configuration(s) of k0, k1, k2,
		- PDSCH processing time,
		- PUSCH preparation time,
		- CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3
		- [BWP switching time] – RAN4?
		- Related UE capability(ies) for processing timelines

Please comment on whether you think above is something useful to capture. If companies have some different suggestion regarding processing timeline design aspects, please provide comments. Also, if there are (sub-)bullet that is missing or needs correction, please comment as well.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Agree |
| InterDigital | At least, DCI based TCI state switching time should be added for the study. We can consider MAC CE based TCI state switching time if we discuss BWP switching time in RAN1.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | UE processing capability(ies) would need to be clarified at first in our view.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree. |
| NEC | In addition to the proposal, the “minimum guard period between two SRS resources of an SRS resource set for antenna switching” may be studied for new SCS. |
| LG Electronics | The list seems fine for us. In addition, “any potential limitation to CPU occupation configuration to help UE complexity (if needed)” could be considered as further aspects. |
| Apple | The list currently contains N1 (PDSCH processing time), and N2 (PUSCH processing time). In addition, we should add N3 (timeline for HARQ-ACK multiplexing).  |
| Futurewei | Agree |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We suggest changing “PUSCH preparation time” to “PUSCH/SRS preparation time”. HARQ scheduling timeline may also need to be considered.We think that RAN1 should also discuss design implications of impact on BWP switching time, even if exact values are the responsibility of RAN4 |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal.  |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the proposal. We may also add SFI, PI, and CI timeline, SPS/CG overriding timing, etc. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Based on our contribution and also what LGE suggested, we propose following update to the CSI processing bullet:* CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3: and CSI processing units
 |
| Xiaomi | Support the FL proposal above. And we think it would be better that the discussion of PDCCH blind decoding capability in our contribution[10] be classified to section 3.12. |
| Intel | Agree with proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with the moderator’s proposal |

Based on suggestions from companies, moderator has updated the conclusion as follows.

**(Proposal 3-8) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects of processing timelines for new SCS (if agreed) that are not currently supported,
	+ appropriate configuration(s) of k0, k1, k2,
	+ PDSCH processing time (N1),
	+ PUSCH preparation time (N2),
	+ HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3)
	+ CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3, and CSI processing units
	+ [BWP switching time] – RAN4?
	+ Related UE capability(ies) for processing timelines
	+ minimum guard period between two SRS resources of an SRS resource set for antenna switching
	+ any potential limitation to CPU occupation configuration to help UE complexity (if needed)

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | Indeed, BWP switching delay is RAN4 business. We are not against, but we would like to better understand how below statement is related to RAN1 specification* + any potential limitation to CPU occupation configuration to help UE complexity (if needed)
 |
| InterDigital | We agree with Nokia. |
| Ericsson | Agree with the proposal.Same question as Nokia |
| MediaTek | Agree with Nokia’s comments |
| LG Electronics | The intention of the bullet “any potential limitation to CPU occupation configuration to help UE complexity (if needed)” is to consider UE’s complexity to check CPU availability every symbol in case large SCS is introduced. Maybe we can modify that bullet “any potential limitation to CPU occupation ~~configuration~~ calculation to help UE complexity (if needed)” for more clarity. |
| Futurewei | We agree with Moderator Conclusion and agree that the above switching times need to be specified. We suggest moving forward and re-use of the FR2 values for the design and ask later RAN4 the validation of these values. The validation could be a lengthy process, which should not hold back our study. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support moderator’s conclusion. Still we are not sure the relation b/w RAN1 spec. and the very last bullet. Note that we are also not against.  |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | To further clarify on Nokia’s comment on CPU – we think that how the availability of CPUs on a symbol is calculated for processing, especially when multiple CSI reports associated with possibly different SCS values (including higher SCS values), might potentially need to be enhanced. This procedure would come under RAN1 specificationWe suggest following update to the last bullet on CPU and propose to make it as a sub-bullet of CSI processing bullet* + CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3, and CSI processing units
		- Any potential enhancements to CPU occupation calculation
 |
| Apple | Support moderator’s proposal. Are fine with Lenovo’s updates. |
| CATT | We agree with most of moderator’s proposal except the last bullet “any potential limitation to CPU occupation configuration to help UE complexity (if needed)”The timing control, computation and memory allocation in the CSI processing are very specific in UE architecture design in the UE implementation. We don’t see RAN1 could reach any common assumptions for investigation.  |
| Intel | We are fine with moderator’s proposal or LGE’s update on CPU occupation calculation.  |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Nokia’s comments |
| Xiaomi | Agree with Nokia’s comments |

**(Proposal 3-8 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects of processing timelines for new SCS (if agreed) that are not currently supported,
	+ appropriate configuration(s) of k0, k1, k2,
	+ PDSCH processing time (N1),
	+ PUSCH preparation time (N2),
	+ HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3)
	+ CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3, and CSI processing units
		- Any potential enhancements to CPU occupation calculation
	+ Related UE capability(ies) for processing timelines
	+ minimum guard period between two SRS resources of an SRS resource set for antenna switching

Further comments and discussions after 8/24 UTC 05:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s updated conclusion |
| Nokia, NSB | We support  |
| Ericsson | Support moderator’s updated conclusion |
| Qualcomm | We support the updated conclusion. |
| LG Electronics | Support Moderator’s proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the updated conclusion.  |
| Samsung | We support the proposed conclusion.  |
| Futurewei | We support the updated conclusion. |
| Apple | Support updated conclusion |
| Convida Wireless | We support updated conclusion by moderator. |
| CATT | We support moderator updated proposal |

**(Proposal 3-8 rev2) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider at least the following aspects of processing timelines for new SCS (if agreed) that are not currently supported,
	+ appropriate configuration(s) of k0, k1, k2,
	+ PDSCH processing time (N1),
	+ PUSCH preparation time (N2),
	+ HARQ-ACK multiplexing timeline (N3)
	+ CSI processing time, Z1, Z2, and Z3, and CSI processing units
		- Any potential enhancements to CPU occupation calculation
	+ Related UE capability(ies) for processing timelines
	+ minimum guard period between two SRS resources of an SRS resource set for antenna switching

Further comments and discussions after 8/25 UTC 03:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Moderator’s proposal. |

## 3.9 PDCCH Monitoring

The following are observations/proposals specifically related to PDCCH monitoring from the submitted contributions.

* From [1]:
	+ For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, then the PDCCH monitoring capability would be further reduced and the number of PDCCH candidates per slot would be lower.
	+ For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, then the PDCCH processing in every slot might not be scalable with increasing subcarrier spacing, due to limitations with UE processing capability.
	+ For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz with existing waveforms in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted, then enhancements to current PDCCH design including the possibility:
		- To introduce new DCI formats should be considered for reduced PDCCH monitoring and efficient scheduling for both UL and DL,
		- To limit the monitoring to specific DCI formats
* From [10]:
	+ Multiple slot-based UE processing capability for PDCCH blind decoding for should be defined for µ larger than 3.
* From [14]:
	+ When a large subcarrier spacing is defined, maximum number of BDs/CCEs for PDCCH monitoring needs to be investigated.
* From [19]:
	+ PDCCH monitoring may be an issues for the UE when using a larger subcarrier spacing.
	+ Therefore, the PDCCH monitoring capability should be studied.
* From [22]:
	+ Study mechanisms to limit the increase in PDCCH monitoring complexity with any change in the SCS
* From [29]:
	+ Increase of the minimum scheduling/ PDCCH monitoring unit to avoid excessive increase in PDCCH monitoring rate.
	+ Support Multi-PDSCH DCI for reaching peak data-rates for the cases of high SCSs.
	+ Determine BD/CCE limits based on nominal scheduling/monitoring unit such as slot of e.g. 120kHz (defined in R15)/240kHz (FFS).

**Discussion:**

Many companies have noted that based on existing specification the PDCCH monitoring support by the UE should shrink as subcarrier spacing grows. Study of the exact PDCCH monitoring support by the UE and related issues need further investigation.

Please comment further on the following:

* Consider the following aspects of PDCCH monitoring for a given SCS
	+ For new SCS not supported in Rel-15/16 NR,
		- investigate on the maximum number of BDs/CCEs for PDCCH monitoring
		- any potential limitation to PDCCH monitoring configurations (e.g. search spaces, DCI formats, etc) to help with UE processing (if needed)

Please comment on whether you think above is something useful to capture. If companies have some different suggestion regarding PDCCH onitoring aspects, please provide comments. Also, if there are (sub-)bullet that is missing or needs correction, please comment as well.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Agree. Increased minimum PDCCH monitoring unit could be explicitly mentioned as a way to reduce the PDCCH monitoring complexity:* For new SCS not supported in Rel-15/16 NR,
	+ any potential limitation to PDCCH monitoring configurations (e.g. search spaces, DCI formats, etc) to help with UE processing (if needed)
		- e.g. increased minimum PDCCH monitoring unit
 |
| InterDigital | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Moderator’s proposal which seems sufficient at this moment.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree. |
| NEC | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| LG Electronics | Support Nokia’s update. |
| Apple | Agree with Moderator’s proposal. A modification is suggested based on Nokia’s update:* any potential limitation to PDCCH monitoring configurations (e.g. search spaces, DCI formats, overbooking/dropping etc) to help with UE processing (if needed)

Agree with Nokia on the modification of the PDCCH monitoring unit which we term as a “slot group”. Essentially we are defining PDCCH monitoring limits (and monitoring occasions) over a group of slots as opposed to a slot in Rel-15 or a span (< slot) in Rel-16. |
| Futurewei | Agree. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In general we think that the TR should capture observations on the specification impact for each potential choice of numerology. So we could have observations on the impact on the maximum number of BDs/CCEs for each candidate SCS, etc. This should be a first step, rather than doing the actual design for each numerology (which should come in the WI phase if needed). |
| Samsung | OK in general. Suggest some wording change: * investigate on the maximum number of BDs/CCEs for PDCCH monitoring per time unit (e.g. slot as Rel-15, or new scheduling/monitoring unit)
 |
| vivo | Support moderator’s original wording. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the proposal. Additionally, “Related UE capability(ies) for PDCCH processing” would be captured as a sub-bullet. For example, instead of the per-slot-based PDCCH processing capability, a multi-slot-based capability may be considered. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with listed aspects and suggest additional sub-bulletPotential enhancements for CORESET, if needed |
| Xiaomi | First, we would like to add to this section our proposal in [10] “*Multiple slot-based UE processing capability for PDCCH blind decoding for should be defined for µ larger than 3.*”We support the FL proposals above. |
| Intel | Generally supportive of moderator proposal. Ok with Nokia and Apple’s modifications. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with the moderator’s proposal. OK with Nokia and Apple’s modifications. |

Based on suggestions from companies, moderator has updated the conclusion as follows.

**(Proposal 3-9) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects of PDCCH monitoring for a given SCS
	+ For new SCS not supported in Rel-15/16 NR,
		- investigate on the maximum number of BDs/CCEs for PDCCH monitoring per time unit (e.g. slot as Rel-15, or new scheduling/monitoring unit)
		- any potential limitation to PDCCH monitoring configurations (e.g. search spaces, DCI formats, overbooking/dropping, etc) to help with UE processing (if needed)
			* e.g. increased minimum PDCCH monitoring unit
		- Potential enhancements for CORESET, if needed
		- Related UE capability(ies) for PDCCH processing

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson  | Agree with the proposal  |
| Mediatek | We agree with the proposals with a suggestion to remove the parentheses of “(if needed)” at the end of the second sub-bullet. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support moderator’s conclusion. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with moderator’s proposal  |
| Apple | Support moderator’s proposal |
| CATT | We are OK with moderator’s proposal.  |
| Intel | We support the moderator’s proposal. |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with the proposal  |
| Xiaomi | We support moderator’s conclusion. |
| Apple | Support moderator’s updated conclusion |

**(Proposal 3-9 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects of PDCCH monitoring for a given SCS
	+ For new SCS not supported in Rel-15/16 NR,
		- investigate on the maximum number of BDs/CCEs for PDCCH monitoring per time unit (e.g. slot as Rel-15, or new scheduling/monitoring unit)
		- any potential limitation to PDCCH monitoring configurations (e.g. search spaces, DCI formats, overbooking/dropping, etc) to help with UE processing, if needed
			* e.g. increased minimum PDCCH monitoring unit
		- Potential enhancements for CORESET, if needed
		- Related UE capability(ies) for PDCCH processing

Further comments and discussions after 8/24 UTC 05:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s updated conclusion |
| Nokia, NSB  | We support |
| Ericsson | Support moderator’s proposal |
| Qualcomm | We support the updated proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the updated proposal |
| Samsung | We support the proposed conclusion.  |
| Futurewei | We support the updated conclusion. |
| Apple | We support the updated conclusion. |
| Convida Wireless  | We are fine with the moderator’s updated proposal.  |
| CATT |  We are OK with moderator’s updated proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are ok with the updated proposal, and for consistency with other proposals we suggest writing “new SCS (if agreed)”. We are not sure why specific examples in brackets need to be kept at this time, otherwise the list should be made more exhaustive, similar to comments made on other proposals. In summary:* Consider the following aspects of PDCCH monitoring for a given SCS
	+ For new SCS  (if agreed) not supported in Rel-15/16 NR,
		- investigate on the maximum number of BDs/CCEs for PDCCH monitoring per time unit ~~(e.g. slot as Rel-15, or new scheduling/monitoring unit)~~
		- any potential limitation to PDCCH monitoring configurations ~~(e.g. search spaces, DCI formats, overbooking/dropping, etc)~~ to help with UE processing, if needed
			* e.g. increased minimum PDCCH monitoring unit
		- Potential enhancements for CORESET, if needed
		- Related UE capability(ies) for PDCCH processing
 |

**(Proposal 3-9 rev2) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider at least the following aspects of PDCCH monitoring for a given SCS
	+ For new SCS, if agreed, that are not supported in Rel-15/16 NR,
		- investigate on the maximum number of BDs/CCEs for PDCCH monitoring per time unit (e.g. slot as Rel-15, or new scheduling/monitoring unit)
		- any potential limitation to PDCCH monitoring configurations (e.g. search spaces, DCI formats, overbooking/dropping, etc) to help with UE processing, if needed
			* e.g. increased minimum PDCCH monitoring unit
		- Potential enhancements for CORESET, if needed
		- Related UE capability(ies) for PDCCH processing

Moderator Notes:

* Some concerns on the examples listed.

Further comments and discussions after 8/25 UTC 03:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We don’t have strong preference, but if the examples in proposal 3-10 are removed, it’s better to remove the examples to keep in line with proposal 3-10. |

## 3.10 Scheduling and DCI Formats

The following are observations/proposals specifically related to DCI formats and related scheduling operations from the submitted contributions.

* From [14]:
	+ When a large subcarrier spacing is defined, multi-TTI based scheduling can be considered to relax scheduler implementation and higher layer processing burden
* From [15]:
	+ For 60GHz operation, reduce the FDRA fields size by supporting larger RBG sizes
	+ Consider a gNB initiated polling approach for UL traffic management to reduce UL data latency
	+ Consider support of scheduling multiple PDSCH using one DCI for NR operation in 52.6 to 71 GHz
* From [17]:
	+ RAN1 shall study more flexible resource allocation in both time and frequency domain for different scenarios, including slot bundling, subcarrier bundling/sub-PRB.
* From [25]:
	+ The current granularity in time/frequency domain in Rel-15/16 may be too fine, assuming less opportunity for FDM between UEs due to narrower beam width and larger number of symbols required for coverage performance.
	+ How to allocate resource for data in frequency domain needs to be considered especially for higher SCS if introduced. PDSCH/PUSCH allocated on more than 14 symbols would be beneficial.

**Discussion:**

Few companies have mentioned that some updates to time and/or frequency domain scheduling may be needed for large subcarrier spacing due to shorter slot durations. Additionally, extensive use of beams in the 60 GHz band may limit the frequency domain multiplexing possible.

Please comment further on the following:

* Consider the following aspects of scheduling for BWP with a given SCS
	+ Study of frequency domain scheduling enhancements/optimization
	+ Study of time domain scheduling enhancements

Please comment on whether you think above is something useful to capture. If companies have some different suggestion regarding scheduling aspects, please provide comments. Also, if there are (sub-)bullet that is missing or needs correction, please comment as well.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Agree. The following candidate solutions discussed in the contributions could also be mentioned:* Study of time domain scheduling enhancements, such as
	+ Increased minimum scheduling unit in time
	+ Support for multi-PDSCH DCI
 |
| InterDigital | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Moderator’s proposal which seems sufficient at this moment.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Nokia. |
| NEC | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s proposal. |
| Apple | Agree with Nokia’s update and the use of an increased minimum scheduling unit in time (e.g. a slot group).  |
| Futurewei | Agree |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In general we think that the TR should capture observations on the specification impact for each potential choice of numerology. So we could have observations on the impact on the FDRA and TDRA for each candidate SCS. This should be a first step, rather than doing the actual design for each numerology (which should come in the WI phase if needed). |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal. Some more details can be clarified: * Study of frequency domain scheduling enhancements/optimization
	+ Subcarrier bundling/sub-PRB based;
* Study of time domain scheduling enhancements
	+ Slot/TTI bundling
	+ Multi-PDSCH scheduling
 |
| vivo | OK with the intention. Prefer to add “(if needed)” as for other enhancements.* Consider the following aspects of scheduling for BWP with a given SCS
	+ Study of frequency domain scheduling enhancements/optimization (if needed)
	+ Study of time domain scheduling enhancements (if needed)
 |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the proposal. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Agree with moderator’s proposal and no further details or examples needed at this point. Maybe just a clarification that above bullets apply to both PUSCH and PDSCH |
| Xiaomi | Agree with the proposal. And we think scheduling enhancements and DCI format optimization can be discussed after the numerology design has been mostly determined, and can be suspended for now. |
| Intel | Agree with moderator proposal. We are also ok with Samsung’s structuring of the description. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with the moderator’s and Samsung’s proposal. |

Based on suggestions from companies, moderator has updated the conclusion as follows.

**(Proposal 3-10) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects of scheduling for BWP with a given SCS
	+ Study of frequency domain scheduling enhancements/optimization for PDSCH/PUSCH, if needed
		- e.g. subcarrier bundling/sub-PRB frequency domain allocations
	+ Study of time domain scheduling enhancements for PDSCH/PUSCH, if needed
		- e.g increased minimum scheduling unit in time, support for multi-PDSCH DCI and scheduling, slot/TTI bundling

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | In principle agree with the proposal. Besides, potential scheduling requests enhancement should also be added to the list.We think the examples in the sub-bullets should be removed, otherwise one would need to think of an exhaustive list. The main bullets are descriptive enough. |
| MediaTek | Agree with moderator’s proposal |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Ericsson. It would be better to remove examples at this stage. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We agree with E/// and LGE.  |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with moderator’s proposal and are also fine with Ericsson’s suggestion |
| Apple | Support moderator’s proposal. Agree with Ericsson’s updates. |
| CATT | We support Ericsson’s suggestion to remove the examples in the moderator’s proposal.  |
| Intel | We support the moderator’s proposal. It is better to list some options to facilitate the discussion/study in the SI/WI phase.  |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Ericsson to remove the examples. |
| Samsung | We support the moderator’s proposal, and it’s always good to keep detailed examples in the TR to have a clear scope on the potential issues identified. We don’t mind adding more examples, or adding wording like “not exhaust list”, but examples should be kept for consistency like other agenda.  |
| Xiaomi | Support moderator’s proposal |

**Moderator Comments:**

* Let’s see if the original conclusion is ok.
* The main bullet points both discuss issues “if needed”, and the very definition of e.g. is “for example”. I don’t believe there will be confusion that the list is going to be exhaustive list especially that it is stated for example.

**(Proposal 3-10 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects of scheduling for BWP with a given SCS
	+ Study of frequency domain scheduling enhancements/optimization for PDSCH/PUSCH, if needed
		- e.g. subcarrier bundling/sub-PRB frequency domain allocations
	+ Study of time domain scheduling enhancements for PDSCH/PUSCH, if needed
		- e.g increased minimum scheduling unit in time, support for multi-PDSCH DCI and scheduling, slot/TTI bundling

Further comments and discussions after 8/24 UTC 05:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We suggest removing the examples under both the bullets. Just keeping the following should be sufficient:* Consider the following aspects of scheduling for BWP with a given SCS
	+ Study of frequency domain scheduling enhancements/optimization for PDSCH/PUSCH, if needed
		- ~~e.g. subcarrier bundling/sub-PRB frequency domain allocations~~
	+ Study of time domain scheduling enhancements for PDSCH/PUSCH, if needed
		- ~~e.g increased minimum scheduling unit in time, support for multi-PDSCH DCI and scheduling, slot/TTI bundling~~
 |
| Nokia, NSB | We are not sure why some companies are against having examples, example aspects were contributed to this RAN1 e-meeting, so I believe it is already exhaustive list for this meeting. 😊 |
| Ericsson  | Agree with Lenovo about removing the examplesThe reason is that not all examples have been captured. For example, we think that there may be a need for enhancements of the SR mechanism for a system that relies heavily on beamforming. To remedy this we propose to remove the examples and make the following change:“consider at least the following aspects”  |
| Qualcomm | We support the conclusion with Lenovo/Motorola Mobility and Ericsson’s update. |
| LG Electronics | We also agree with Lenovo to remove examples.This is especially because “subcarrier bundling/sub-PRB frequency domain allocations” is not clear to us. Would it be related only to UL FDRA or also to DL FDRA? If it is only for UL, it can be covered in Section 3.14. Otherwise, could any proponent supporting this example clarify why it is needed for DL FDRA? |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Ericsson’s update.  |
| Samsung | We don’t understand why examples should be removed only for this particular agenda, and we require a consistent treatment of adding examples in all the agendas. If the examples here are removed, examples in all the agenda should be removed for consistency. If company has concerns on the meaning of the example, revision to the wording is suggested, and welcome for further examples as well to clarify the scope of study. * Consider the following aspects of scheduling for BWP with a given SCS
	+ Study of frequency domain scheduling enhancements/optimization for PDSCH/PUSCH, if needed
		- e.g. impact to UL scheduling if subcarrier bundling/sub-PRB frequency domain allocations are supported
	+ Study of time domain scheduling enhancements for PDSCH/PUSCH, if needed
		- e.g increased minimum scheduling unit in time, support for multi-PDSCH DCI and scheduling, slot/TTI bundling
 |
| Nokia, NSB | We are not sure how SR mechanism relates to PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, and we agree “at least ” should be added to main bullet |
| Apple | Agree with adding “at least” to the main bullet. Do not see why examples should not be listed. |
| Convida Wireless  | We support the conclusion with Lenovo/Motorola Mobility and Ericsson’s update. We also suggest to update the conclusion to “Consider at least the following aspects of scheduling for BWP with a given SCS …” since it is not sure if all the aspects have been considered. |
| CATT  | We agree with Lenova/MM to remove examples. |

**(Proposal 3-10 rev2) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider at least the following aspects of scheduling for BWP with a given SCS
	+ Study of frequency domain scheduling enhancements/optimization for PDSCH/PUSCH, if needed
		- ~~e.g. subcarrier bundling/sub-PRB frequency domain allocations~~
	+ Study of time domain scheduling enhancements for PDSCH/PUSCH, if needed
		- ~~e.g increased minimum scheduling unit in time, support for multi-PDSCH DCI and scheduling, slot/TTI bundling~~

Moderator notes:

* The examples listed above seems to be controversial

Further comments and discussions after 8/25 UTC 03:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine to remove the examples. Actually we don’t think this is a critical issue whether to remove the examples or not, we only have one concern that it’s better to have same operation on other proposals. |
| Samsung | As responded in the separate email, we have concerns on removing the examples. We understand there are some comments from companies on the wording, and so we clarified as follow. We believe all the examples (some are not from our contribution) are valid technical proposals, and thus worth for study.* Consider at least the following aspects of scheduling for BWP with a given SCS
	+ Study of frequency domain scheduling enhancements/optimization for PDSCH/PUSCH, if needed
		- e.g. potential impact to UL scheduling if sub-PRB based frequency domain resource allocation is supported
	+ Study of time domain scheduling enhancements for PDSCH/PUSCH, if needed
		- e.g. increasing the minimum time-domain scheduling unit to be larger than one symbol, supporting multi-PDSCH scheduled by one DCI, supporting one TB mapped to multiple slots (i.e., TTI bundling)
 |

## 3.11 UL specific aspects

The following are observations/proposals specifically related to uplink channel design from the submitted contributions.

### 3.11.1 PUCCH

* From [15]:
	+ PUCCH format 0/1/4 enhancements to compensate for the limited transmit power should be studied. Consider enhancements to SR (PUCCH) resource configuration and spatial relation management to reduce UL data latency
* From [26]:
	+ In addition to the design issues discussed in RAN1 #101-e, discuss the design of PUCCH to achieve higher EIRP up to maximum allowed EIRP.
* From [29]:
	+ Consider support for contiguous multi-PRB allocation for PUCCH format 0 and format 1 or use of PUCCH format 2 and format 3 for SR and before dedicated PUCCH configuration.

### 3.11.2 UL Interlace Transmission

* From [1]:
	+ For supporting NR beyond 52.6 GHz in unlicensed band in Rel. 17, study the enhancement of PRB/sub-PRB interlacing designs for NR with higher SCS, if agreed to be supported.
* From [2]:
	+ PRB based interlace resource mapping for PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS should be studied in NR-U-60.
	+ More evaluation is required before introducing PRB-based interlacing in NR-U-60.
* From [5]:
	+ Similar as NR-U in Rel-16, to maximize transmission power under regulation requirements, interlaced structure should be supported for the SCS and bandwidth of the unlicensed spectrum between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz.
* From [12]:
	+ RAN1 shall study high BW formats, up to 2.16 GHz, for NR-U PUCCH in 60 GHz band. RAN1 shall study the possibility to assign NR-U PUCCH onto partial interlaces for high BW channels.
* From [15]:
	+ PRB-based interlacing is not beneficial for SCS ≥ 120 kHz. Sub-PRB interlacing is not beneficial for SCS ≥ 960 kHz.
	+ Both PRB and sub-PRB interlacing is not beneficial for large frequency allocations.
	+ The support of UL interlace allocation is not considered for operation in >52.6 GHz spectrum
	+ To fulfil the OCB requirement specified in EN 302 567, for each of the declared channel bandwidths, the device has to support at least one mode of transmission where the transmission occupies at least 70% of the declared channel bandwidth.
	+ Existing NR design fulfills the EN 302 567 OCB requirement
* From [20]:
	+ Design wide-band PRACH and interlaced PUSCH/PUCCH considering regulatory requirements such as nominal channel BW, occupied channel BW, maximum allowed output power, and maximum power spectral density.
* From [25]:
	+ In unlicensed band, interlaced PUCCH/PUSCH would be necessary.
* From [27]:
	+ In order to meet the requirements of minimum OCB, some enhancement on interlace design with unregular RB number might be considered.
* From [29]:
	+ No interlaced transmission is defined for 60 GHz unlicenced band.

### 3.11.3 Discussion

Please comment further on the following:

* Consider the following aspects for uplink transmission
	+ Study of potential enhancements for PUCCH/PRACH transmissions to achieve higher transmit power (when transmit power spectral density limits apply)
	+ Study of potential enhancements to uplink interlace design for PUCCH/PUSCH including on whether uplink interlace needs to be supported at all for unlicensed operation in 60 GHz band.

Please comment on whether you think above is something useful to capture. If companies have some different suggestion regarding uplink transmission aspects, please provide comments. Also, if there are (sub-)bullet that is missing or needs correction, please comment as well.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Proposed text is acceptable for us. We do not see a need for supporting and re-designing interlaced UL allocation for 60 GHz band. |
| InterDigital | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree. |
| NEC | We share the same view with Nokia |
| LG Electronics | We suggest to add PUSCH also for the first bullet. |
| Apple | Agree |
| Futurewei | Agree |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We suggest adding one bullet:• Study the interlace design for SRS if PUCCH/PUSCH interlaced mapping is supported. |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal. Some wording suggestion: * + Study of potential enhancements for uplink PRB/sub-PRB-based interlace design for PUCCH/PUSCH including on whether uplink interlace needs to be supported at all for unlicensed operation in 60 GHz band.
 |
| Vivo | Our understanding is that interlaced uplink design for NR-U in 5 or 6 GHz is not automatically supported for NR in 52.6 to 71 GHz. Suggest the following rewording.* Consider the following aspects for uplink transmission
	+ Study of potential enhancements for PUCCH/PRACH transmissions to achieve higher transmit power (when transmit power spectral density limits apply) (if needed)
	+ Study whether uplink interlace needs to be supported at all for unlicensed operation in 60 GHz band and if supported, potential enhancements to uplink interlace design for PUCCH/PUSCH.
 |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the proposal. In the first sub-bullet, the PSD limit is applied for unlicensed band operation. Thus, we may add “for unlicensed operation in 60 GHz band” at the end of the first sub-bullet. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with moderator’s proposal |
| Xiaomi | Agree with the proposal. Since OCB requirement exists in EN 302 567, interlacing should be considered for UL. And it is better that we can have similar interlacing like NR-U in R16 without much change. |
| Intel | Agree with moderator proposal. Agree with LG Electronics that PUSCH could be added here as well. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with the moderator’s proposal |

Based on suggestions from companies, moderator has updated the conclusion as follows.

**(Proposal 3-11) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects for uplink transmission
	+ Study of potential enhancements for PUCCH/PRACH transmissions to achieve higher transmit power (when transmit power spectral density limits apply), if needed
	+ Study whether uplink interlace needs to be supported for unlicensed operation in 60 GHz band. If supported, study of potential enhancements to uplink PRB and/or sub-PRB based interlace design for PUCCH/PUSCH.

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | In principle OK. But it is already clear that PRB level interlacing does not bring benefits for SCS> 120KHz where a single RB is already >1MHz.  |
| MediaTek | Agree with the proposal in general, except we think in the second bullet, the sentence “If supported, study of potential enhancements to uplink PRB and/or sub-PRB based interlace design for PUCCH/PUSCH” could be listed as a sub-bullet of the second bullet. |
| LG Electronics | As we commented in the first round, PUSCH also can be added to the first bullet. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with suggested Conclusion. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are ok with suggested conclusion although we feel sympathy with Ericsson.  |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with moderator’s proposal  |
| Apple | Agree with moderator’s proposal. |
| CATT | We are Ok with the moderator’s proposal and share the view with Ericsson.  |
| Intel | We support the moderator’s proposal. We are also fine to add PUSCH in the first sub-bullet.  |
| Vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support Moderator’s proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We suggest also listing SRS along with the PUCCH and PUSCH if uplink interlace needs to be supported:* Study of potential enhancements for PUCCH/PRACH transmissions to achieve higher transmit power (when transmit power spectral density limits apply), if needed
* Study whether uplink interlace needs to be supported for unlicensed operation in 60 GHz band. If supported, study of potential enhancements to uplink PRB and/or sub-PRB based interlace design for PUCCH/PUSCH and SRS.
 |
| Xiaomi | Agree with moderator’s proposal. |

**(Proposal 3-11 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects for uplink transmission
	+ Study of potential enhancements for PUSCH/PUCCH/PRACH transmissions to achieve higher transmit power (when transmit power spectral density limits apply), if needed
	+ Study whether uplink interlace needs to be supported for unlicensed operation in 60 GHz band.
		- If supported, study of potential enhancements to uplink PRB and/or sub-PRB based interlace design for PUCCH/PUSCH/SRS.

Further comments and discussions after 8/24 UTC 05:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with the moderator’s proposal |
| Ericsson | Suggest rewording the last bullet as follows, since interlacing is not supported for SRS in Rel-16, nor is sub-PRB interlacing for any signal/channelIf supported, study ~~of potential enhancements to~~ uplink PRB and/or sub-PRB based interlace design for ~~PUCCH/PUSCH/SRS~~ PUCCH, PUSCH, and/or SRS. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposed conclusion. |
| LG Electronics | Support Moderator’s proposal and also update from Ericsson |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Ericsson’s rewording.  |
| Samsung | We support the proposed conclusion.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Ericsson comment is correct. |
| Apple | We are fine with Ericsson’s update. |
| CATT | We support Ericsson’s update |

**(Proposal 3-11 rev2) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider at least the following aspects for uplink transmission
	+ Study of potential enhancements for PUSCH/PUCCH/PRACH transmissions to achieve higher transmit power (when transmit power spectral density limits apply), if needed
	+ Study whether uplink interlace needs to be supported for unlicensed operation in 60 GHz band.
		- If supported, study uplink PRB and/or sub-PRB based interlace design for PUCCH, PUSCH, and/or SRS.

Further comments and discussions after 8/25 UTC 03:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Moderator’s proposal. |

## 3.12 Multi-Carrier Operations

The following are observations/proposals specifically related to multi-carrier operations from the submitted contributions.

* From [6]:
	+ Silicon footprint for having large single FFT (using one CC) and multiple smaller FFT (using CA) could be compariable
* From [20]:
	+ Consider carrier-group based operation for NR unlicensed band in frequency range above 52.6 GHz, with consideration of multi-RAT coexistence as well as control signalling efficiency.
* From [23]:
	+ The signal overhead for scheduling large number of aggregated carriers should be studied for NR operation from 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* From [29]:
	+ Support both channel bonding and CA between 2.16 GHz channels
* From [31]:
	+ Study whether/how to utilize wide available spectrum such as more than 10 GHz bandwidth in 52.6-71GHz frequency range.

**Discussion:**

Several companies mentioned that CA could be utilized to support larger aggregate bandwidth. Companies also mentioned that control signaling efficiency and transceiver complexity for single carrier with large bandwidth versus multiple carrier with smaller bandwidth needs to be factored into account.

Please comment further on the following:

* Consider the following aspects multi-carrier operation
	+ Study of multi-carrier operation to facilitate larger aggregate bandwidths (e.g. 2.16 GHz or larger)
	+ Study of control signaling efficiency, transceiver complexity, and multi-RAT coexistence when multi-carrier operation is utilized compared to a single wideband carrier.

Please comment on whether you think above is something useful to capture. If companies have some different suggestion regarding multi-carrier operations aspects, please provide comments. Also, if there are (sub-)bullet that is missing or needs correction, please comment as well.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Agree. Carrier aggregation within a 2.16 GHz channel could also be mentioned (e.g. Nx400 MHz)* Study of multi-carrier operation to facilitate larger aggregate bandwidths (e.g. Nx400 MHz or Mx2.16 GHz)
 |
| InterDigital | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Moderator’s proposal. Since 400 MHz is also on the table, we also agree with Nokia’s update.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with Nokia’s update. |
| NEC | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| LG Electronics | Support Moderator’s proposal. |
| Apple | Agree with Nokia’s update. We think it is important that a mode where larger bandwidths can be achieved by carrier aggregation. |
| Futurewei  | Agree, with the Nx400 MHz update. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The second sub-bullet point should rather indicate what RAN1 needs to study for comparing the approach of a single large carrier vs. carrier aggregation. So all the aspects listed are equally relevant to be investigated for a single large carrier. We suggest re-wording the bullet as follows:• Study and compare single carrier vs multi-carrier operation to support larger bandwidths (e.g., 2.16 GHz or larger) in respect to coverage, CP length, TAE, beam switching time, processing timeline, multi-TRP delay requirements, control signaling efficiency, transceiver complexity.The aspect of coexistence could be a separate bullet point, but it should also be understood as a comparison between single carrier vs. CA in terms of feasibility of coexistence with other RATs.  |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal.  |
| Vivo | Prefer a more general description “on the support of large system bandwidth operation” instead of “multi-carrier”. Suggest the following update.* Consider the following aspects on the support of large system bandwidth operation
	+ Study of control signaling efficiency, transceiver complexity, and multi-RAT coexistence for multi-carrier and a single wideband carrier operation.
	+ Study of multi-carrier operation to facilitate larger aggregate bandwidths (e.g. 2.16 GHz or larger)
 |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the proposal. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with moderator’s proposal. The example in the bracket of first sub-bullet can be deleted to avoid any misunderstanding on minimum aggregated channel bandwidth.  |
| Sony | Agree. CA could be utilized to support large aggregate bandwidth such as channel of 2.16 GHz. |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with Moderator’s proposal. |
| Intel | Agree with moderator proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with the moderator’s proposal |

Based on suggestions from companies, moderator has updated the conclusion as follows.

**(Proposal 3-12) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects on the support of large system bandwidth operation
	+ Study and compare single carrier vs multi-carrier operation to support larger bandwidths, such as 2.16 GHz or larger, in respect to
		- coverage, CP length, TAE, beam switching time, processing timeline, multi-TRP delay requirements, control signaling efficiency, and transceiver complexity.
	+ Study of multi-carrier operation to facilitate larger aggregate bandwidths (e.g. N x 400 MHz or N x 2.16 GHz), if needed
	+ Study of multi-RAT coexistence when multi-carrier operation is utilized compared to a single wideband carrier.

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | We are not OK with proposal, the following should be removed * + - ~~coverage, CP length, TAE, beam switching time, processing timeline, multi-TRP delay requirements~~

“Coverage, CP length, TAE, beam switching time, processing timeline, multi-TRP delay requirements“ have nothing to do with single carrier vs multi-carrier, those are questions of SCS and discussed in other conclusions. When comparing wideband with CA, the following aspects matter given that SCS is fixed. **RRC and dynamic control signaling overhead, transceiver complexity, spectral efficiency.**  |
| InterDigital | We agree with Nokia |
| Ericsson | We don’t agree that there is a target bandwidth that should be supported – this is not been discussed yet. Hence we think that the formulation of this study point is a bit flawed.Besides, both multi-carrier operation and single wideband carrier are valid modes of operation and are supported by NR. We do not understand the need to study the benefits of each one over the other. Excluding an already NR supported feature is not in the scope. Furthermore, it is not clear what is special about multi-RAT coexistence when multi-carrier operation is utilized compared to a single wideband carrier. The same thing can be said about multi-RAT coexistence when different RATs use wideband carrier of different bandwidth.Hence, our view is that this proposal is not needed. Once the bandwidth discussion has progressed further, this can be revisited, if needed.  |
| MediaTek | Agree with Nokia’s comments. In addition, we also don’t see the need to consider multi-RAT coexistence when comparing single wideband carrier and multi-carrier operation. |
| LG Electronics | We prefer original Moderator’s proposal, since current conclusion has an impression that one of single carrier and multi-carrier operations can be adopted based on the study and comparisons.The response to Ericsson regarding the aspect of multi-RAT coexistence: Our consideration for that aspect is multiple carriers coexisting with one WiGig channel can operate at once and share LBT result or channel occupancy duration between carriers. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Nokia’s revision. Also, from the perspective of single vs multiple CC comparison study, the third sub-bullet may belong to the first sub-bullet. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Our view is there should not be any targer BW value at this moment, which should be discussed separately. We also think coexistence aspect should be discussed in 8.2.2.  |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with Nokia’s update  |
| Apple | We think that the BW issue needs to be addressed first. |
| CATT | We agree with Ericsson that this proposal is not needed and could be part of the discussion in the maximum carrier BW.  |
| Intel | We share similar view as LGE, that multi-RAT coexistence needs to be considered for study on the support larger system bandwidth.  |
| Vivo | We are okay with Nokia’s revision to remove the 2nd-level sub-bullet of the first sub-bullet.. |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with the Moderator with the following minor update* + Study of multi-carrier operation to facilitate larger aggregate bandwidths ~~(e.g. N x 400 MHz or N x 2.16 GHz), if needed~~
 |
| ZTE | We share similar view with Nokia and Qualcomm.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with Ericsson’s and Docomo’s comments. In terms of coexistence, the systems already defined for 5 GHz unlicensed operation have already demonstrated that they can coexist with different channel bandwidths. We should rather conclude that multi-carrier operation using CA should be supported by NR above 52.6 GHz. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with MTK  |

**Moderator Comments:**

* The main bullet could have been bit confusing. May be the correct formulation should be “the determination of the maximum system bandwidth” instead. I expect the following aspects are to be used to determine the target bandwidth or maximum system bandwidth. It wasn’t meant to say we won’t support CA, which I assume all companies support CA operation in 60GHz band.
* I left out the coexistence aspects separately, as it could be potentially reviewed in agenda 8.2.2.

**(Proposal 3-12 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects for the determination of maximum system bandwidth
	+ Study and compare single carrier vs multi-carrier operation to support larger bandwidths, such as 2.16 GHz or larger, in respect to
		- RRC and dynamic control signaling overhead, transceiver complexity, spectral efficiency.
	+ Study of multi-carrier operation to facilitate larger aggregate bandwidths (e.g. N x 400 MHz or N x 2.16 GHz), if needed

Further comments and discussions after 8/24 UTC 05:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with the moderator’s proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We support |
| Ericsson | Do not support the FL proposal.Several companies have pointed out that the maximum bandwidth issue should be settled first. For this reason, and the fact that single/multi-carrier operation is not the only factor that drives that decision, we prefer to rephrase the first main bullet. Furthermore, both single and multi-carrier operation are valid, specified modes in Rel-16 NR-U; we prefer that the conclusion on what to study should be written in a neutral way. Our suggestion for the conclusion is as follows:Updated Conclusion* Study the following for achieving wide bandwidth utilization
	+ Single carrier operation
	+ Multi-carrier operation
* Study can consider aspects such as control signaling overhead, transceiver complexity, spectral efficiency, etc.
 |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposed conclusion. |
| LG Electronics | We support Ericsson’s suggestion to set two operations modes fairly.Regarding multi-RAT coexistence perspective, we agree that some issues related to channel access mechanism can be discussed under AI 8.2.2. In addition to channel access related aspects, we think signaling overhead can be reduced since multiple carriers within 2 GHz BW can operate like a single wide carrier considering coexisting RAT. However, this sort of issue seems already covered by “control signaling overhead” in proposed conclusion. In that sense, we’re OK to remove the bullet corresponding to multi-RAT coexistence. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We share Ericsson’s view.  |
| Samsung | We support the proposed conclusion with a minor change: adding “at least in respect to” to the study aspects since there could be more aspect show up during the study. We didn’t see this conclusion is biased to any of the operation modes.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with Samsung’s assessment, we are fine to add “at least” |
| Futurewei | We support Ericsson’s version of the updated conclusion. |
| Apple | Support Ericsson’s version. |
| Convida Wireless  | We agree with Ericson’s proposal regarding the maximum BW should be settled/agreed first. We also agree with Samsung’ view to include “at least” to the aspect for study. |
| CATT | We support Ericsson’s update |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share Ericsson’s view, but we are still uncertain about what the conclusion is trying to achieve. If all companies assume that both single carrier and multi-carrier operation will be supported, then we just need to ensure that what we design works in both cases. Certainly there is a need to determine the maximum single carrier bandwidth that the system should be designed to support within 52.6-71 GHz. Then on top of that CA will be configurable and it will be possible to aggregate carriers of different sizes. In all likelihood we will be able to aggregate the same number of carriers as supported by the R15/R16 core specifications, or possibly more carriers. In summary, it seems the only decision that is really left to be made is on the largest single carrier bandwidth (between 400 MHz and 2160 MHz as agreed on Monday), which really depends on the study of SCS (and thus also depends on considerations of delay spread, TAE, analog beam switching delay, and impact to coverage, and multi-TRP impact). In summary, we don’t see the need for any conclusion in this section, other than both single carrier and multi-carrier operations should be supported. |

**(Proposal 3-12 rev2) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Study at least the following for achieving wide bandwidth utilization
	+ Single carrier operation
	+ Multi-carrier operation
	+ Study can consider aspects such as control signaling overhead, transceiver complexity, spectral efficiency, etc.

Further comments and discussions after 8/25 UTC 03:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The structure seems a bit strange to parallel the 3 sub-bullets. We prefer to move the 3rd sub-bullet to the main bullet. |
| Samsung | The revised proposal is unclear to us what indeed needs to be studied. rev1 is more clear in the sense of the focus of the study.  |

## 3.13 Beam related issues/aspects

The following are observations/proposals specifically related to beam operations from the submitted contributions.

### 3.13.1 Beam Switching

* From [25]:
	+ sufficient time gap for beam switching between transmissions/receptions with different beam directions may be necessary in case of high SCS.
* From [29]:
	+ Study the impacts of beam switching gap on NR physical layer design extended to higher SCSs. The following assumptions are taken when considering need for the explicit beam switching gap:
		- Max 100 ns assumed as beam switching time;
		- If the CP is longer than 100 ns, no explicit gap is needed for the beam switching

### 3.13.2 Beam Management

* From [2]:
	+ Study the use of aperiodic CSI-RS for BFR procedure in NR-U-60.
* From [17]:
	+ RAN1 shall study the beam adjustment mechanism in initial access procedure.
* From [20]:
	+ Study potential enhancements for beam management CSI-RS or SRS considering beam switching time and coverage loss for large SCS.
* From [25]:
	+ SSB beam may not be narrow enough considering large propagation loss. In order to improve the coverage performance of DL transmissions following SSB during initial access, beam refinement during initial access may be beneficial.
	+ BFR procedure enhancement needs to be considered with at least following points:
		- The number of candidate beams included in set q1;
		- The minimum time gap to apply new beam configuration after receiving BFR response from gNB; Simultaneous update of beam configuration for multiple Scells;
		- Monitoring aperiodic transmissions for beam failure detection
* From [29]:
	+ For P-TRS transmissions in the cell, it would be beneficial to have a mechanism to be able to transmit P-TRSs dropped due to LBT failure.
	+ Applied coexistence mechanism(s) should be clarified before impact on beam management and the CSI measurement and reporting framework can be fully evaluated.
	+ As the UE moves in a cell, the likelihood of blockage and beam mis-alignment increases with decreasing beamwidths used by the gNB.
	+ Connectivity and robustness improvements are being developed for FR2 in the MIMO WID under multi-beam enhancements and multi-TRP agenda items, and those improvements are also expected to be valid solutions above 52.6 GHz operation.

### 3.13.3 Discussion

Several companies mentioned aspects related to beam management and beam transition aspects.

Please comment further on the following:

* Consider the following aspects beam management
	+ Study the use of aperiodic CSI-RS for BFR
	+ study the beam adjustment mechanism in initial access procedure
	+ study of beam refinement during initial access
	+ study of a mechanism to transmission P-TRSs potentially dropped due to LBT failure
* Consider study of handling of beam switching gap for higher subcarriers spacing (if supported)

Please comment on whether you think above is something useful to capture. If companies have some different suggestion regarding beam management design aspects, please provide comments. Also, if there are (sub-)bullet that is missing or needs correction, please comment as well.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Agree of the content. Second and third sub-bullet could be combined as they seem to target the same thing, i.e. beam refinement/adjustment in initial access procedure.  |
| InterDigital | We propose following updates:* Consider the following aspects beam management
	+ Study the BFR mechanism
	+ Study the beam adjustment mechanism in initial access procedure
	+ Study of beam refinement during initial access
	+ Study of a mechanism to transmission P-TRSs potentially dropped due to LBT failure
* Consider study of handling of beam switching gap for higher subcarriers spacing (if supported)
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | We agree with InterDigitral’s update, and prefer to have wider scope for BFR in high SCS.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Nokia. |
| NEC | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| LG Electronics | Our opinion for the second and third sub-bullets is that we don’t need to restrict them only for initial access case. Enhancement for beam management can be necessary to study also after RRC connection is established. |
| Apple | Agree |
| Futurewei | Agree |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We suggest re-wording the 4th bullet point:* Study of periodic RS (e.g., P-TRSs) enhancement in beam management to cope with LBT failure.

We agree with Nokia’s comment that the second and third sub-bullet could be combined. |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal.  |
| Vivo | Support in principle. Also agree with Nokia’s comment that the second and third sub-bullet could be combined. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the proposal. For the second bullet, aspects related to UE’s beam switching capability for PDSCH and A-CSI-RS, i.e., FG 2-2 (timeDurationForQCL) and FG 2-28 (beamSwitchTiming) may be added. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We generally agree with the listed bullets, but with following update to generalize the last sub-bullet of first main bullet:study of a mechanism to transmit ~~P-TRSs~~ periodic CSI-RS that are potentially dropped due to LBT failure |
| Sony | Agree to study the beam switching gap for higher SCS, and reconsider the beam selection and beam failure procedure due to LBT failure. We also agree that beam adjustment/refinement mechanisms during initial access should be studied. |
| Intel | Generally supportive of moderator proposal. Agree with Nokia that 2nd and 3rd bullet could be merged. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with the moderator’s proposal |

Based on suggestions from companies, moderator has updated the conclusion as follows.

**(Proposal 3-13) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects beam management
	+ Study the BFR mechanism
	+ Study of beam switching capability for PDSCH and A-CSI-RS, i.e., FG2-2 (timeDurationForQCL) and FG 2-28 (beamSwitchTiming)
	+ Study the beam adjustment/refinement mechanism, including operations during initial access
	+ Study of periodic RS (e.g., periodic CSI-RS) enhancement in beam management to cope with LBT failure
* Consider study of handling of beam switching gap for higher subcarriers spacing, if supported

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the Moderator’s proposal |
| Ericsson | * It’s not clear what, if anything, needs to be studied in the BFR mechanism
* For the 2nd bullet, it is sufficient to say “Study of UE capabilities on beam switch timing”
* It’s not clear to us what “beam refinement” is done in initial access. This is typically done in connected mode.
* Is the intention of the 4th bullet to introduce a sliding window for TRS? This does not seem feasible given the Rel-16 discussions on validation of TRS in the first place.
 |
| MediaTek | We agree with the moderator’s proposal. In addition, we believe the coverage issue of CSI-RS and SRS for beam management should be addressed as suggested by [20]. For larger sub-carrier spacing such as 960 kHz, the symbol duration is only one 8th of that of the 120 kHz sub-carrier spacing, or equivalently 9 dB lower in energy. This issue is not captured in 3.17.2 and therefore should be captured here in beam management aspects. |
| LG Electronics | We prefer to remove “, including operations during initial access” in the third bullet. In addition, as MediaTek pointed out, we suggest to include “Study of coverage enhancement for CSI-RS and SRS for beam management”. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support moderator’s proposal. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with moderator’s proposal  |
| Apple | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal. |
| CATT | We share the concerns and questions with Ericsson. We need to have specific issue on why Rel-16 BFR needs further enhancements. Regarding beam refinement, is it for narrow beamwidth operation or dynamic adaptation of DL/UL correspondence? |
| Intel | We agree with moderator’s proposal |
| vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with the moderator’s general proposal. The coverage issue of CSI-RS and SRS raised by MediaTek and LG can be captured in 3.17.8. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We should avoid re-investigating MIMO procedures unless necessary specifically for operation above 52.6 GHz. There is a Rel-17 MIMO enhancements work item, which will already address enhancements for beam management. Those enhancements will then be available for all NR bands. The only point that may need to be considered is the UE capability of beam switch timing depending on the choice of SCS. |

**(Proposal 3-13 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the following aspects beam management
	+ Study of UE capabilities on beam switch timing
	+ Study of periodic RS (e.g., periodic CSI-RS) enhancement in beam management to cope with LBT failure
	+ Study potential enhancements for beam management in DL and UL
		- considering beam switching time, LBT failure, and potential coverage loss (if large SCS is supported)
* Consider study of handling of beam switching gap for higher subcarriers spacing, if supported

Further comments and discussions after 8/24 UTC 05:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with the moderator’s proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We support |
| Ericsson | Support some parts of the moderator’s proposal. We propose the following modifications (merging the 2nd sub-bullet into the sub-bullet of the 3rd sub-bullet). The last main bullet can be removed since it is already covered as a study aspect for SSB in Section 3.3. Moreover, multiple CSI-RS / SRS resources for beam management in a CSI-RS / SRS resource set can already be configured with configurable gaps in Rel-15/16, so it is not clear that extra gaps are needed.* Consider the following aspects beam management
	+ Study of UE capabilities on beam switch timing
	+ ~~Study of periodic RS (e.g., periodic CSI-RS) enhancement in beam management to cope with LBT failure~~
	+ Study whether or not ~~potential~~ enhancements for beam management in DL and UL are needed considering at least the following
		- ~~considering~~ beam switching time, LBT failure for beam management RS(s) (e.g., CSI-RS, SRS), and potential coverage loss (if large SCS is supported)
* ~~Consider study of handling of beam switching gap for higher subcarriers spacing, if supported~~
 |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We support Ericsson’s suggestion with the understanding that the handling of beam switching time is contained in sub-bullet under the second sub-bullet. Our understanding of the last main bullet in Moderator’s latest proposal, is that beam switching time can be absorbed even in a symbol by repeating CSI-RS/SRS within the symbol. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Ericsson’s proposal with some modification from our side in cyan, which tries to separate the aspects to be studied and corresponding motivation being considered:* Consider the following aspects beam management
	+ Study of UE capabilities on beam switch timing
	+ ~~Study of periodic RS (e.g., periodic CSI-RS) enhancement in beam management to cope with LBT failure~~
	+ Study whether or not ~~potential~~ enhancements for beam management and corresponding RS(s) in DL and UL are needed considering at least the following
		- ~~considering~~ beam switching time, LBT failure ~~for beam management RS(s) (e.g., CSI-RS, SRS)~~, and potential coverage loss (if large SCS is supported)

~~Consider study of handling of beam switching gap for higher subcarriers spacing, if supported~~ |
| Samsung | We support the proposed conclusion.  |
| Futurewei | We support the updated conclusion. |
| Apple | We support Ericsson’s update. However, we think the last bullet should remain as it is possible that there may be other issues on the beam switching gap for higher layers that do not have to do with the SSB. |
| CATT | We support Ericsson’s update.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t see why the possible enhancements in DL/UL RSs should be restricted to beam management purposes. As such, we propose the following modification based on NTT DOCOMO proposal:~~  Consider the following aspects beam management~~  Study ~~of~~ UE capabilities on beam switch timing in beam management procedure~~  Study of periodic RS (e.g., periodic CSI-RS) enhancement in beam management to cope with LBT failure~~  Study whether or not enhancements for ~~beam management and corresponding~~ RS(s) in DL and UL are needed considering at least the following aspects  ~~considering~~ beam switching time, LBT failure~~for beam management RS(s) (e.g., CSI-RS, SRS)~~, and potential coverage loss (if large SCS is supported) |

**(Proposal 3-13 rev2) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider at least the following aspects in system operations with beams
	+ Study of UE capabilities on beam switch timing in beam management procedure
	+ Study whether or not enhancements for beam management and corresponding RS(s) in DL and UL are needed considering at least the following aspects:
		- beam switching time, LBT failure, and potential coverage loss (if large SCS is supported)
	+ Consider study of handling of beam switching gap for higher subcarriers spacing, if supported

Moderator Note:

* The yellow highlighted sub-bullet was debated

Further comments and discussions after 8/25 UTC 03:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support to remove the last bullet. It has been covered in proposal 3-3. |
| Samsung | “Beam sweeping time” may not be sufficient to reflect all the potential issues for beam management since it only reflects the operation from TX end, so we suggest to add “beam alignment delay” to show the whole procedure of beam determination for both TX and RX end, since the whole procedure is more challenging if a higher SCS is supported (shorter beam sweeping time and shorter beam determination time). Meanwhile, for the beam alignment delay, our contribution analyzed the issue for initial access: the wider beam during initial access has been complained to cause relatively poor performance on broadcast PDDCH, and the lack of beam tracking in time can cause the failure of msg.3/4 thus longer access delay. This issue is already observed in FR2 (under discussion in other Rel-17 SI/WI as well), but we want to emphasize that it could be more severe for above 52.6 due to the support of higher SCS. We understand that finally the topic may not be treated in the associated WI, but in feMIMO, but it’s always good to capture the potential issue in the TR for a consistent study. For the last bullet, we are OK to keep it there since it may not exactly have the same coverage as the other bullets. We suggest the following change: * Consider at least the following aspects in system operations with beams
	+ Study of UE capabilities on beam switch timing in beam management procedure
	+ Study whether or not enhancements for beam management and corresponding RS(s) in DL and UL are needed considering at least the following aspects:
		- beam switching time, beam alignment delay (including initial access), LBT failure, and potential coverage loss (if large SCS is supported)
	+ Consider study of handling of beam switching gap for higher subcarriers spacing, if supported
 |

## 3.14 Other Issues/Aspects

The following are pool of issues that was mentioned by few companies. It should be noted that issues categorized under this section does not imply the issue is less important or otherwise. The issues were categorized under this section because each issue was discussed by only few companies.

### 3.14.1 TDD Transition Time

* From [3]:
	+ A larger fraction of a slot is used for switching between Tx and Rx with higher numerology, which is 7µs.
	+ For 240 kHz SCS, 2 symbols would be needed for transition, 4 symbols are needed for 480 kHz SCS, and 7 symbols are needed for 960 kHz SCS. This additional overhead should be accounted.

### 3.14.2 Cell Coverage

* From [2]:
	+ 60 kHz SCS (support up to 2500m), 120 kHz SCS (support up to 1250m), 240 kHz SCS (support up to 625m), 480 kHz SCS (support up to 313m), 960 kHz SCS (support up to 156m)
	+ 60 kHz SCS can support a coverage close to the maximum expected coverage for the backhauling use cases while increasing the SCS of preamble will reduce the coverage and the maximum cell radius.
* From [4]:
	+ Coverage enhancement mechanism should be studied for PDCCH design especially for high SCS.
* From [29]:
	+ Support improved PDCCH coverage for the cases of high SCS
	+ Consider coverage enhancements for channels and signals with higher SCS.

### 3.14.3 Transmission Rank

* From [29]:
	+ Consider supporting rank-2 SU-MIMO for DFT-s-OFDM.

### 3.14.4 Channelization

* From [7]:
	+ When determining supported bandwidths for NR above 52.6 GHz, RAN1 should take co-existence of IEEE 802.11ad/ay into account at least in unlicensed band.
	+ In licensed frequency band or in a controlled environment, it can be designed in a unified way with unlicensed band or independently.
	+ 400 MHz (and/or its integral multiple e.g. 800/1600 MHz) and 2.16 GHz can be served as candidates of supported bandwidths for Rel-17 NR above 52.6 GHz.
* From [29]:
	+ Support operation with CBW=2.16 GHz

### 3.14.5 MAC Buffering

* From [15]:
	+ Very larger sub-carrier spacing will induce excessive MAC buffering requirements and causes higher UE implementation costs.

### 3.14.6 HARQ Processes

* From [15]:
	+ Because of larger processing latencies, the numbers of DL and UL HARQ processes may need to be increased.
	+ Otherwise, physical layer specification and implementation changes compared to Rel-15 may be needed to sustain high data throughput.
* From [22]:
	+ RAN1 to modify the design of the HARQ feedback mechanism to accommodate timeline changes from the increased number of slots due to a possible increase in the SCS.

### 3.14.7 Additional RF Impairments

* From [4]:
	+ Perform modeling of I/Q imbalance in link level evaluation with reasonable sideband suppression value, and study potential enhancement if problem is identified.
	+ Perform PAPR evaluation for different channels/signals, and study potential PAPR reduction technique if problem is identified.

### 3.14.8 Discussion

For issues that were provided by few companies, moderator has put all of them to the other issues and aspects. Please note, this does not mean these issues are less important. Moderator has try to summarize all the mentioned aspects below.

Please comment further on the following:

* Consider the study of the following aspects
	+ System overhead impact from TDD switching time for larger subcarrier spacing
	+ Coverage enhancement mechanisms for control channels
	+ Any potential modifications to HARQ processes including number of processes that should be supported
	+ Impact from MAC buffering for larger subcarrier spacing
	+ Channelization and impact from potential alignment or misalignment with 11ad channels
	+ Support of rank 2 transmission for DFT-s-OFDM in the uplink
	+ Additional RF impairments that impact evaluations

Please comment on whether you think above is something useful to capture. If companies have some different suggestion regarding mentioned study aspects, please provide comments. Also, if there are (sub-)bullet that is missing or needs correction, please comment as well.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | * Channelization/sub-channelization and impact from potential alignment or misalignment with 11ad channels
 |
| InterDigital | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO  | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE | Agree with minor modification:* + Coverage enhancement mechanisms for control channels and SSB (if larger SCS is supported)
 |
| NEC | Support Moderator’s proposal |
| LG Electronics | Support Moderator’s proposal. |
| Apple | Agree with Moderator’s proposal. |
| Futurewei | Agree |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Capturing a list of study points in the FL summary for guiding the discussion in the study phase is fine, but this should not imply that these considerations are essential for the extension of NR above 52.6 GHz. Before any of these considerations are captured in the TR, their justification and potential benefits should first be determined based on further discussion. The list is a mixture of considerations on complexity aspects and proposals for optimization of the performance. |
| Samsung | These additional aspects are OK, but we are wondering how these are reflected in the TR.  |
| vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the proposal. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We are okay to capture the listed bullets. In addition, we propose to add following two bullets:Impact on BWP switching procedure due to new higher SCS Other aspects and impacts due to introduction of higher SCS are not precluded. |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with Moderator’s proposal. Especially, the impact of alignment or misalignment with 11ad/ay channels should be studied. We also support the Moderator’s proposal with minor modification on the second bullet as follows: * Coverage enhancement mechanisms for control channels and SSB.
 |
| Xiaomi | Our initial thoughts are,1, TDD switching time/coverage enhancement should be further studied.2, As to HARQ process number and MAC buffering impact, we think it is related to the processing timeline with higher SCS and how many PDSCHs/PUSCHs can be scheduled within the processing timeline. Let’s say, if in current FR2 with SCS 120KHz, UE capability can at best support schedule one TB in every slot, and processing one TB needs N slot, and in FR2x with SCS 480KHz, UE capability can at best support schedule one TB in every two slots, and processing one TB needs 2\*N slot. In this case HARQ process number and MAC buffering will not be impacted by higher SCS. So HARQ process number and MAC buffering impact can be discussed in combination with processing timeline and capability. |
| Intel | Agree with proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with the moderator’s proposal |

Based on suggestions from companies, moderator has updated the conclusion as follows.

**(Proposal 3-14) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the study of the following aspects, including the justification for the features and their potential benefits
	+ System overhead impact from TDD switching time for larger subcarrier spacing
	+ Coverage enhancement mechanisms for control channels and SSB, if larger SCS is supported
	+ Any potential modifications to HARQ processes including number of processes that should be supported
	+ Impact from MAC buffering for larger subcarrier spacing, if any
	+ Channelization and impact from potential alignment or misalignment with 11ad channels
	+ Support of rank 2 transmission for DFT-s-OFDM in the uplink
	+ Additional RF impairments that impact evaluations
	+ Impact on BWP switching procedure due to new higher SCS
* Other aspects and impacts due to introduction of higher SCS are not precluded.

Further comments and discussions after 8/20 UTC 12:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | Sub-channelization was missed and very relevant to n x 400MHz CA operation* + NR channelization and sub-channelization and impact from potential alignment or misalignment with 11ad channels
 |
| Ericsson | * The bullet on potential alignment or misalignment with 11ad channels is a coexistence issue and can be discussed in 8.2.2. Furthermore, channelization is a RAN4 issue.
* The bullet on rank-2 for DFT-s-OFDM is a MIMO enhancement, and it should be discussed in a MIMO SI/WI.
 |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with moderator’s proposal  |
| Apple | Are okay with the moderator’s proposal and support Nokia’s update. |
| CATT | We are not clear about the issue related to the study of “BWP switching procedure”, which includes dynamic BWP switching indication by DCI and timer. It is not clear to us how operation in 52.6 -71 GHz would have impact on the BWP switching procedure except the switching delay and interruption time. We also agree with Ericsson that rank-2 for DFT-s-OFDM should be discussed in Rel-17 MIMO enhancement WI.  |
| Intel | We agree with moderator’s proposal |
| vivo | Support moderator’s proposal |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with Moderators’ proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Ericsson and CATT that rank-2 for DFT-s-OFDM should be discussed in Rel-17 MIMO enhancement WI.  |
| Xiaomi | Agree with the moderator’s proposal and support Nokia’s update |

**Moderator Comments:**

* Remove the Rank 2 transmission for now.
* I assume the actual channelization work will be done by RAN4. However, I assume there could be RAN1 aspects or at least aspects that will be impacted by channelization (for example, coexistence, defining SSB offset, CORESET#0 offset, decoding neighbor cell SIB, etc). I’ve tried to make the text on channelization bit more generic.

**(Proposal 3-14 rev1) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the study of the following aspects, including the justification for the features and their potential benefits
	+ System overhead impact from TDD switching time for larger subcarrier spacing
	+ Coverage enhancement mechanisms for control channels and SSB, if larger SCS is supported
	+ Any potential modifications to HARQ processes including number of processes that should be supported
	+ Impact from MAC buffering for larger subcarrier spacing, if any
	+ NR channelization and sub-channelization and any potential impact from RAN1 perspective
	+ Additional RF impairments that impact evaluations
	+ Impact on BWP switching procedure due to new higher SCS
* Other aspects and impacts due to introduction of higher SCS are not precluded.

Further comments and discussions after 8/24 UTC 05:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We agree with the moderator’s proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We support |
| Ericsson | Generally fine with moderator's conclusion, but suggest the following small modifications. Regarding "justification for the features and their potential benefits," the wording "if applicable is added" since it seems that this may apply to some bullets and not others. Some bullets are just to study whether or not there is an issue. Recommend removing the bullet on RF impairments since that is being discussed in 8.2.3.**Moderator Suggested Conclusion:*** Consider the study of the following aspects, including the justification for the features and their potential benefits, if applicable
	+ System overhead impact from TDD switching time for larger subcarrier spacing
	+ Coverage enhancement mechanisms for control channels and SSB, if larger SCS is supported
	+ Any potential modifications to HARQ processes including number of processes, if supported ~~that should be supported~~
	+ Impact from MAC buffering for larger subcarrier spacing, if any
	+ NR channelization ~~and sub-channelization~~ and any potential impact from RAN1 perspective
	+ ~~Additional RF impairments that impact evaluations~~
	+ Impact on BWP switching procedure due to new higher SCS, if supported
* Other aspects and impacts due to introduction of higher SCS are not precluded.
 |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Ericsson’s modification.  |
| Samsung | We support the proposed conclusion.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Follow up: regarding rank 2 DFT-s-OFDM, it is not part of Rel-17 FeMIMO after double check. Since this is more related to the low PAPR waveform of UL, we believe it belongs to this study list. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with Ericsson’s modifications. |
| Apple | We support the proposal |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal.  |
| CATT | We prefer Ericsson’s updated proposal. |

**(Proposal 3-14 rev2) Moderator Suggested Conclusion:**

* Consider the study of at least the following aspects, including the justification for the features and their potential benefits, if applicable
	+ System overhead impact from TDD switching time for larger subcarrier spacing
	+ Coverage enhancement mechanisms for control channels and SSB, if larger SCS is supported
	+ Any potential modifications to HARQ processes including number of processes, if supported
	+ Impact from MAC buffering for larger subcarrier spacing, if any
	+ NR channelization and any potential impact from RAN1 perspective
	+ Additional RF impairments that impact evaluations
	+ Impact on BWP switching procedure due to new higher SCS, if supported
* Other aspects and impacts due to introduction of higher SCS are not precluded.

Further comments and discussions after 8/25 UTC 03:00

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Moderator’s proposal. |

# Suggested Conclusions/Agreements based on Discussions

The following is copy of agreements for reference.

RAN1 Agreement from #102-e:

* For NR system operating in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,
	+ NR should be designed with maximum FFT size of 4096 and maximum of 275RBs per carrier;
	+ Candidate supported maximum carrier bandwidth(s) for a cell is between 400 MHz and 2160 MHz;
	+ If subcarrier spacing 240 kHz or below are supported, NR in 52.6 to 71 GHz is expected to use normal CP length only (does not have any implications on whether ECP is supported for the higher subcarrier spacings, if supported).

The following are copy of suggested conclusions/agreements based on discussion in Section 3.

Moderator to update this section

# Reference

1. R1-2005239, “Discussion on potential physical layer impacts for NR beyond 52.6 GHz,” Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
2. R1-2005241, “PHY design in 52.6-71 GHz using NR waveform,” Huawei, HiSilicon
3. R1-2005280, “Considerations on phase noise for numerology selection,” FUTUREWEI
4. R1-2005371, “Discussion on requried changes to NR using existing DL/UL NR waveform,” vivo
5. R1-2005543, “Consideration on required changes to NR using existing NR waveform,” Fujitsu
6. R1-2005567, “Considerations on bandwidth and subcarrier spacing for above 52.6 GHz,” Sony
7. R1-2005607, “Discussion on the required changes to NR for above 52.6GHz,” ZTE, Sanechips
8. R1-2006989, “On required changes to NR using existing DL/UL NR waveform for operation in 60GHz band,” MediaTek Inc.
9. R1-2005699, “System Analysis of NR opration in 52.6 to 71 GHz,” CATT
10. R1-2005734, “Physical layer design for NR 52.6-71GHz,” Beijing Xiaomi Software Tech
11. R1-2005764, “Study on the required changes to NR using existing DL/UL NR waveform,” NEC
12. R1-2005766, “Required changes to NR using existing DL/UL NR waveform,” TCL Communication Ltd.
13. R1-2005787, “On phase noise compensation for NR from 52.6GHz to 71GHz,” Mitsubishi Electric RCE
14. R1-2006986, “Discussion on Required Changes to NR in 52.6 – 71 GHz,” Intel Corporation
15. R1-2005920, “On NR operations in 52.6 to 71 GHz,” Ericsson
16. R1-2006026, “discusson on DL/UL NR waveform for 52.6GHz to 71GHz,” OPPO
17. R1-2006136, “Design aspects for extending NR to up to 71 GHz,” Samsung
18. R1-2006237, “Required changes to NR using existing DL/UL NR waveform in 52.6GHz ~ 71GHz,” CMCC
19. R1-2006274, “Discussion on required changes to NR using existing NR waveform,” Spreadtrum Communications
20. R1-2006304, “Consideration on required physical layer changes to support NR above 52.6 GHz,” LG Electronics
21. R1-2006452, “Consideration on supporting above 52.6GHz in NR,” InterDigital, Inc.
22. R1-2006512, “On Required changes to NR above 52.6 GHz using the existing DL/UL NR Waveform,” Apple
23. R1-2006628, “On NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz,” Convida Wireless
24. R1-2006649, “60 GHz DL and UL waveform evaluations,” Charter Communications
25. R1-2006725, “Evaluation Methodology and Required Changes on NR from 52.6 to 71 GHz,” NTT DOCOMO, INC.
26. R1-2006797, “NR using existing DL-UL NR waveform to support operation between 52p6 GHz and 71 GHz,” Qualcomm Incorporated
27. R1-2006853, “Discussions on required changes on supporting NR from 52.6GHz to 71 GHz,” CAICT
28. R1-2006885, “Discussion on physical layer aspects for NR beyond 52.6GHz,” WILUS Inc.
29. R1-2006907, “Required changes to NR using existing DL/UL NR waveform,” Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell
30. R1-2006028, “discussion on other aspects,” OPPO
31. R1-2006727, “Potential Enhancements for NR on 52.6 to 71 GHz,” NTT DOCOMO, INC.
32. R1-2007046, " On NR operations in 52.6 to 71 GHz,” Ericsson (Update of R1-2005920)