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# Introduction

This contribution summarizes discussions on initial access aspects of NR extension up to 71 GHz. The discussion of the initial access aspects has been approved for email discussion until April 20, 2021.

* [104b-e-NR-52-71GHz-01] Email discussion/approval on initial access aspects with checkpoints for agreements on Apr-15, Apr-20 – Daewon (Intel)

# Summary of issues

## 2.1 SSB Aspects

### 2.1.1 Supported Numerology

* From [1] Huawei, HiSilicon:
	+ SCSs other than 120 kHz are not supported for SSB.
	+ Reuse SSB pattern case D for 120 kHz SCS for both operations with and without shared spectrum channel access.
* From [2] OPPO:
	+ For above 52.6GHz, adopt single numerology for initial access, where the numerology candidates are 120kHz, 480kHz and 960kHz.
	+ For above 52.6GHz, 240kHz SSB SCS is not supported.
* From [3] Spreadtrum:
	+ SSB with 480/960kHz SCS can be supported for connected mode UE.
* From [4] vivo:
	+ Support SCS 120KHz, 480KHz and 960KHz for initial DL BWP in NR operation from 52.6-71GHz.
	+ Support the following SCS pairs for SSB and initial DL BWP in NR operation from 52.6-71GHz：(120K, 120K) + (960K, 480K) + (960K, 960K)
	+ The design of SSB and PRACH should be consistent for initial access and non-initial access.
* From [5] Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell:
	+ Support of 480kHz and 960kHz kHz SCS for the SSB transmission in NR bands ranging between 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
	+ Support of 480kHz and 960kHz kHz SCS SSB transmission in NR bands ranging between 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz at least for “non-intial access” scenarios, covering both CONNECTED mode and IDLE/Inactive mode. Consider support for “intial access” (initial cell selection) case as well if UE complexity can be mitigated.
	+ Support 240 kHz SCS for the SSB transmission in NR bands ranging between 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
* From [6] CATT:
	+ Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS for non-initial access cases
	+ Further study is needed before RAN1 conclude to support 480 kHz and 960 kHz for initial access.
* From [7] MediaTek:
	+ The SCS of SSB and initial BWP should be both 120 kHz to prevent the timing error from mixed numerology in idle mode.
* From [8] Fujitsu:
	+ In addition to 120kHz, support 480 kHz and 960 kHz for SSB for initial access and other cases.
* From [9] Futurewei:
	+ Support only 120kHz SCS for initial channel access dedicated SSB (i.e. SSB with MIB that indicates that the CORESET for Type0-PDCCH CSS set is present). Support adding higher SCS (480 kHz and 960 kHz) for non-initial access SSBs.
* From [10] Ericsson:
	+ For cases other than initial access (e.g. for an SCell / PSCell), support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for SS/PBCH block.
	+ Like for FR2 in Rel-15/16, for initial access (PCell), support the following SCS combination in an initial BWP: 240 kHz SCS for SS/PBCH block + 120 kHz SCS for initial access related signals/channels.
* From [11] Xiaomi:
	+ At least for SSB after initial access, 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS should be supported.
	+ Beyond 120k Hz SCS，at least one of 240/480/960 kHz SCSs can be configured for cell defined SSB.
* From [12] Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:
	+ For supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel. 17, support the same numerology of data channel for SSB including 480kHz and 960kHz for both initial access and non-initial access cases.
* From [13] Intel:
	+ Support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for SSB and initial BWP.
	+ Support Type0-PDCCH configuration indication in MIB of SSB for all supported SSB SCS.
* From [14] Apple:
	+ If additional SCS is supported for initial access, only consider 480kHz SCS.
* From [15] Qualcomm:
	+ For the SSB for NR operation in the frequency between 52.6GHz and 71GHz:
		- Use SCS = 120 kHz and 240 kHz for SA mode (initial access)
		- Use SCS = 120 kHz, 240 kHz, 480 kHz, and 960 kHz for NSA mode (non-initial access where timing and frequency are known)
* From [16] Samsung:
	+ Support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for SS/PBCH block in both initial access and non-initial access cases.
* From [17] Sony:
	+ 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for SSB should be supported for NR above 52.6 GHz.
* From [18] LGE:
	+ Support 240 kHz SCS for SS/PBCH block in frequency range from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
	+ For SS/PBCH block with 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS, the following three alternatives can be taken into account and Alt 3 is preferred considering no specification impact and CSI-RS as an alternative of SS/PBCH block in most use cases.
		- Alt 1: Support SS/PBCH block with 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS for all cases, if supported, reuse one of legacy SS/PBCH block patterns (e.g., SS/PBCH block Case D)
		- Alt 2: Support SS/PBCH block with 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS for cases other than initial access, if supported, reuse one of legacy SS/PBCH block patterns (e.g., SS/PBCH block Case D)
		- Alt 3: Do not support SS/PBCH block with 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS for any case
* From [19] Convida Wireless:
	+ The support of SSB and SSB burst design for higher SCS like 480 KHz and above should be considered for NR operation from 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* From [20] AT&T:
	+ Specify one additional SCS (either 480kHz or 960kHz) for initial access related signals and channels in the initial BWP.
	+ The same subcarrier spacings are specified for initial access related signals and channels in the initial BWP and cases other than initial access.
* From [21] Interdigital:
	+ Further study necessity of SSBs and initial access related signals/channels for additional SCSs in Rel-17.
* From [22] Sharp:
	+ Support 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz at least for SSB of non-initial access case.
* From [23] ZTE, Sanechip:
	+ The following options can be considered for determining SCSs of SSB and other initial access signals/channels in initial BWP, wherein Option 1 is preferred.
		- Option 1: both SSB and other initial access signals/channels support SCS (120kHz, 480kHz, 960kHz)
		- Option 2: SSB supports SCS (120kHz, 240kHz); Other initial access signals/channels support SCS (120kHz)
	+ Regardless of SSB SCSs 480/960 kHz are supported only in non-initial access case or in both initial and non-initial access cases, the SSB design should not impact on supporting ANR function and CGI reporting.
* From [25] NTT Docomo:
	+ For SSB SCS, in addition to 120 kHz:
		- 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS should be supported for initial access case.
		- 480 and 960 kHz SCS should be supported for non-initial access cases.
		- The support of 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS for SSB can be optional as well as for the other signals/channels.
	+ For SCS used for CORESET#0 PDCCH and SIB1 PDSCH, in addition to 120 kHz:
		- Both 480 and 960 kHz SCS should be supported.

**Summary of Discussions**

* Various views on which SCS should be supported for SSB (in addition to 120 kHz)
	+ No other SCS:
		- Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek, Futurewei
	+ 240 kHz:
		- LGE, Qualcomm (in addition to 480/960kHz), ZTE(2nd preference), Sanechip (2nd preference)
	+ 480kHz:
		- Apple, Convida
	+ Either 480kHz or 960kHz:
		- AT&T, Sharp, NTT Docomo (for initial access)
	+ Both 480 kHz/960kHz:
		- OPPO, Spreadtrum (connected mode), vivo, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, CATT (non-initial access), Fujitsu, Ericsson (non-initial access), Xiaomi, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Qualcomm (non-initial access), Samsung, Sony, [Convida?], Sharp, ZTE, Sanechip, NTT Docomo (non-initial access)
* It was last RAN1 meeting to conclude on this issue, therefore moderator suggest to try to conclude on this issue first during the first week of RAN1 meeting. There are several other issues that are dependent on this decision.

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

In the Tuesday GTW session, the following was agreed.

Agreement:

* For the case where SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access) and SSB does not configure Type-0 PDCCH, support 480 kHz and 960 kHz numerologies for the SSB
	+ Note: Strive to minimize specification impact due to the new SCS for SSB

Based on the discussions during GTW, RAN1 should try to conclude on the rest of the cases that is not covered by the agreement in the GTW session during this meeting. As such, moderator asks companies to comment on the following:

* Whether or not following case(s) are supported:
	+ Case A) For non-initial access case, a SSB with 480 kHz and 960kHz SCS and Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ Case B) Support SSB with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ Case C) Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS for initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 240Hz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia | We would prefer to support also Case A. We understand that companies do not prefer to support Case B due to complexity concerns. We would also prefer support Case C in addition. |
| OPPO | We support Case A and Case B. And we don’t support Case C. |
| Samsung | We support Case A and Case B. If there are companies having strong demand to support Case C for the same implementation as FR2, we are open to it. Also to clarify, if 240 kHz SCS is supported for initial access case, it should also be supported for non-initial access case (it’s strange that we support any numerology for initial access case only).For the SSB SCS issue with Case A, we have some further comments and clarifications: For the case that UE is explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB and the UE is required to read MIB to determine the configuration of CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH in Rel-15/16 (e.g. ANR purpose), we think there could be three alternative solutions for 52.6 to 71 GHz based on current status, and would like to ask clarification from other companies on which alternative is their thinking: * Alt 1: Don’t support 480 kHz or 960 kHz SCS SSB for this case, and only support 120 kHz SCS SSB for this case;
* Alt 2: Support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS SSB for this case, and the configuration of CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH is provided by the MIB of the corresponding SSB;
* Alt 3: Support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS SSB for this case, and the configuration of CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH is provided in an alternative method other than the SSB.

Our understanding and comments of the alternatives are: * We cannot accept Alt 1, since this case is a subset of non-initial access case, and the system still cannot implement in a single numerology if we support Alt 1. For example, considering a LAA scenario, where the SCell is operated on the 60 GHz unlicensed band (which we believe is a very typical scenario in real implementation for 60 GHz unlicensed band), without supporting Alt 2 or Alt 3, the SCell still cannot be implemented in a single numerology of 480 kHz or 960 kHz, since the ANR use case is essentially required for an unlicensed band. Also, we want to point out ANR is just one special use case under measurement (just one type of report), and we didn’t see it’s reasonable that a SSB can be operated with all the other functionalities but only not for ANR purpose. Lastly, Alt 1 may have RAN2 spec impact (e.g. at least adding some restriction on the configuration of SSB SCS when the report type is for ANR, and there could be more up to RAN2 like whether a UE needs to handle the case that it completes a regular RRM procedure but cannot proceed with ANR for such SSB).
* Alt 2 is our preference, and we didn’t see any issue with it actually (e.g. same as Rel-15/16). If Alt 2 is supported, at least RAN1 spec impact is expected (e.g. CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB), and if Case B is supported, this spec impact is needed anyway (no extra work to support Alt 2 if Case B is supported).
* We are open to discuss Alt 3 if the proposed alternative method is valid. If Alt 3 is supported, at least RAN2 spec impact is expected (e.g. the procedure for ANR doesn’t require reading MIB to acquire the configuration of CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH), and whether RAN1 spec impact is needed depends on the detail of the alternative method.

So we would like to clarify with companies not supporting 480 and 960 kHz SSB for Case A, which of Alt 1 and Alt 3 is their thinking, and if possible, we can try to exclude Alt 1.  |
| Intel | We support Case A and Case B, and we do not prefer Case C.Case B is important for truly providing the single numerology operation, i.e., the same SCS for data, for control and for initial access. Case A is needed to provide ANR and CGI reporting. Here one scenario of our interest is on premises deployments in unlicensed spectrum where the ANR and CGI reporting could be an invaluable source of information for network optimization, e.g., using machine-learning or other AI-based techniques.As for the concerns on support of these cases, we don’t really understand them since 480kHz and 960kHz are optional features to support. Support of these features will not cause issues to vendors and operators that do not need to support them. However, the cases are critical to enable support for specific deployments (managed networks) and enable robust network operations in unlicensed bands, which are key differentiator compared to existing NR. |
| Qualcomm | We support cases A and C. We are not very supportive for case B due to higher UE complexity for initial search. Also, since 480/960 kHz for control/data are optional, not very clear on how to optionally support 480/960 kHz for SSB for initial access. |
| Charter Communications | We support case A and case B. There is nothing preventing a gNB from transmitting both 120 kHz SCS and 480 kHz SCS SSBs in a TDM manner to accommodate both UEs with and without capability of the optional SCSs (if desired to do so). Furthermore, a NPN operating at 480 kHz SCS can utilize case B without being concerned about compatibility for UEs that do not support 480 kHz SCS. The addition of 240 kHz SCS SSB does not provide any performance advantage and only increases the initial access PSS/SSS blind detection complexity (assuming Case B is supported). |
| Futurewei | We can support case C to move forward, and we are open to discuss whether A is necessary or not for ANR purposes. We do not support case B. We have a similar opinion with other companies that UE complexity is not justified for adding the optional 480/960 kHz SCS for the initial access. |
| InterDigital | We support Case A and Case B. We are open to support Case C. |
| LG Electronics | Our first preference is to support only Case C which is already supported for FR2.For ANR support of 480/960 kHz SCS SSB, we don’t see the strong motivation since 480/960 kHz SCS is optional (so we cannot assume all neighbor cells are operated with 480/960 kHz SCS). If it can be guaranteed that all neighbor cells are operated with 480 or 960 kHz SCS (same as the serving cell), then the main use case would be for private or managed network. In such deployment scenarios, PCI collision must not be an issue. We strongly disagree with supporting Case A just for the purpose of ANR. |
| CATT | We support Case A and Case C. Beside complexity issue case B may also have coverage issue. |
| Ericsson | We support Case C to have commonality with the FR2 initial access framework, both from a specifications and implementation point of view. As pointed out by Samsung, when supporting 240 kHz for initial access use case, it should also be supported for the non-initial access use case to allow same SSB numerology across all serving cells. We agree, it would be strange to support any SSB numerology that would be valid for initial access case only. Therefore, we think Case C should be reformulated as follows to be consistent with FR2* + Case C) Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS for both initial access and non-initial access case. For initial access, it is assumed the SSB with 240Hz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.

Regarding Case A, we don't see a strong need to support it given that we are not a supporter of Case B. There doesn't seem to be a compelling need for ANR for SCells only. We also observe that the mechanism introduced in Rel-16 NR-U to configure an off-sync raster SSB will not work for this band since the single-sync raster point per channel cannot be guaranteed. For Rel-15 ANR (on sync-raster SSB), if a critical need in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band is identified, it can be further discussed how to provide a CORESET0/Type-0 PDCCH configuration by dedicated signaling (this is generally known for cells of the same operator by the overlaid O&M system). This would correspond to Samsung's Alt-3. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Case A and Case B. Case A is beneficial for supporting ANR function and CGI reporting in non-initial access case. For Case B, larger SCS 480/960 kHz has a higher tolerance on frequency offset and it can bring benefit to single numerology operation. Thus we think SSB SCS 480/960 kHz should be supported in both non-initial access and initial access cases. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We do not support any of the cases.We believe that the agreement we reached in the last GTW meeting satisfies the main concerns related synchronization accuracy and RRM measurement in operations with 480/960 kHz SCSs. Case A results in an additional specification work at least for 1) CORESET#0 design including number of supported RBs and symbols for 480(960) kHz; 2) Supported {SSB, CORESET#0} multiplexing patterns and CORESET#0 RB offsets for 480(960) kHz; 3) Search Space design for each CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern for 480(960) kHz without tangible benefits.Case B results in even more specification work than Case A as the support for 480/960 kHz SSB for initial access would require the design of synch raster and also, most likely, entails the support of 480/960 kHz PRACH in initial access for both shared and non-shared spectrum. Additionally, Case B results in additional blind search complexity during initial access and may result in fragmentation (two set of networks one support 120 kHz only and the other supports 960 kHz only) which neither is acceptable for us. We have explained these issues and other issues relevant to the support of 480/960 kHz SSB for initial access in details in R1-2102327. Regarding the ANR use case, we have the following comments/questions that would like to have clarifications about before discussing whether or how ANR should be supported:1. We find ANR an optimization issue without which the network is functional (certainly RRM can work without ANR. CGI-InfoNR is a late addition to MeasResults). Please note that, based on proponents’ arguments so far, a main motivation of using 480/960 kHz SSB SCS is for private networks in controlled environments such as data centers. For such applications and other vertical industries in controlled environments, we wonder how useful and necessary the ANR application is.
2. To our understanding, with the current agreements (support 120 kHz SSB for all cases and 480/960 kHz SSB when explicit frequency/SCS is provided and CORESET#0 is not configured), all required information from a neighboring network can be provided by the UE to the serving network: UE can read SIB1 associated with 120 kHz SSB of the neighboring network and provide relevant neighbor network information to the serving network. UE can also detect 480/960 kHz SSB of the neighboring network and report “noSIB1” in the CGI-Report:

C:\Users\K00903651\AppData\Roaming\eSpace_Desktop\UserData\k00903651\imagefiles\E13D0259-96B6-492B-8ECA-F1CB648C1788.pngNote that as “noSIB1” includes the four bit “pdcch-ConfigSIB1”, depending on the value of “pdcch-ConfigSIB1”, the serving network would also be able to know the location of the first SSB with CORESET#0 from the neighboring network.1. With the current agreement regarding 480/960 kHz SSBs (support 480/960 kHz SSB when explicit frequency/SCS is provided and CORESET#0 is not configured), 480/960 kHz SSBs will be associated only to Scells and a UE from another network cannot directly camp on and connect to them. So, in view of this and, further, the highly direction transmissions in B52 GHz spectrum, we would like to know what is exactly the possible danger of PCI collision?
2. Again, using current mechanisms, UE can report the presence of a 480/960 kHz SSB SCS of a neighbor network on a specific location on frequency domain and further can report that this SSB does not configure SIB1 (cannot be used for camping or PCell configuration). This information would be enough for the serving network that, if it deems necessary, moves away its configured cells from the detected location of the 480/960 kHz SSB SCS of a neighbor network to avoid possible inter-network interference. We don’t see what would be the problem with such a mechanism and why we need to additionally support Case A or Case B above?
 |
| AT&T | We support Case A and Case B. If no further progress can be made, RAN1 should at least agree that the agreement above from RAN1 #104bis-e is mandatory for UEs supporting 480 and or 960 kHz, i.e., SSB and PDSCH for 480 and 960 kHz are not separate capabilities. That at least partially addresses the concerns of companies supporting 480 and 960 kHz SSB also for initial access. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Case A. We would like to support RRM measurement for all use cases while supporting the operation with single numerology. For example, we don’t think it would be good to have the operation with different numerologies to achieve RRM measurement for ANR purpose ONLY. By having such restrictions in 52.6 – 71 GHz, larger SCSs may not be useful in practical. We support Case B, but we are also ok with having a bit more restrictions, e.g., only either 480 or 960 kHz SCS is supported for SSB for initial access case to reduce the number of blind detection hypotheses at UE. We are fine with Case C as the second preference. In case that Case B) is not supported at all, Case C) should be supported. In this case, just reusing FR2 has the very same issue as supporting only 120 kHz SCS. Supporting multiplexing between SSB with 240 kHz and CORESET#0 PDCCH with 480/960 kHz needs to be considered, which in our understanding requires the same (or even larger) amount of specification effort as Case B).  |
| Mediatek | Support case A and open to discuss case C. For case B, we do not see strong need and it will cause high complexity for initial cell search. |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer to support Case A and Case B. |
| vivo | We support Case A and Case B.The design target of B52.6GHz system is to make the Rel-15/16 function work. We don’t know why we remove ANR function as we already support 480/960KHz SSB for non-initial access case. So Case A should be supported.For Case B, we don’t understand the concern on UE complexity if 480K/960K SCS is optional. Corresponding to Qualcomm’s question on how to optionally support 480/960K SCS for initial access, for private network, the personal operator such as factory, home or office could use the equipment which implement 480K/960K SSB SCS. If spec doesn’t support 480K/960K SSB SCS, at least two BWP with different SCS (one is 120KHz initial BWP and another is 960K operation BWP) in peak data rate case, which will introduce more complexity and overhead especially for private network case. The support of optional 480K/960K in spec will provide more choices to the market. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Case A and Case B to provide the single numerology operation |
| Xiaomi | We support cases A and Case C, open for Case B |
| Spreadtrum | We support Case A. CGI reporting is an important use case for NR-U, and led to a design of “off-raster” SSB in R16. CGI reporting is beneficial to the multi-operator network for R16 NR-U and above 52/6GHz equally in our view. |
| Sharp | We support case A if the specification impact issue can be addressed. |
| WILUS | We support Case A and Case B for single numerology operation for data, control, and initial access, and we do not prefer Case C. |
| Sony | We support at least Case A. Case B is 1st preference. Case C is 2nd preference if Case B is not accepted for all. |
| Fujitsu | We support Case A and Case B. |
| Apple  | We are open to consider Case A assuming it is operated based on UE capability report of 480kHz and 960kHz SCS support. We do NOT support Case B with 960kHz due to the associated UE complexity. For Case C), we can support on condition that Case B) is NOT supported. However, if Case B with 480kHz is used for initial access, we do not support Case C). The main reason is that if both Case C and Case B with 480kHz SCS are supported for initial access, total 3 SCS needs to be hypothetically detected for cell search. We would like to keep it up to 2 as in current FR2.  |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

The following is a summary of 1st round discussion by the moderator.

Based on feedback so far, its seems among case A, B, and C, case A has the most support (25 yes/3 no), followed by case B (16 yes/7 no), and case C (8 yes/2 conditional yes/5 no), respectively.

* Case A) For non-initial access case, a SSB with 480 kHz and 960kHz SCS and Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ Support (25): Nokia, NSB, OPPO, Samsung, Intel, Samsung, Charter, Interdigital, CATT, ZTE, Sanechips, AT&T, NTT Docomo, MediaTek, Convida, vivo, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, Sharp, WILUS, Sony, Fujitsu, Apple
		- Main reasons: supporting ANR and CGI reporting, better timing estimation
	+ Do not Support (3): Huawei, HiSilicon, Ericsson (support other means of indicating Type0-PDCCH)
		- Main concern: additional specification work
		- Main reasons: system would be operational with 120kHz SSB, ‘no-SIB1’ report in CGI is sufficient for ANR, PCI collision not an issue in 60GHz
	+ Samsung asked clarification question:
		- For companies that do not support Case A, does this mean Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB is only supported for 120kHz SCS SSB? Or whether Type0-PDCCH configuration is conveyed for 480/960kHz SCS SSB by alternative means (other than MIB).
* Case B) Support SSB with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ Support (16): OPPO, Samsung, Intel, Charter, Interdigital, ZTE, Sanechips, AT&T, NTT Docomo, Convida, vivo, Lenovo, Motorola Mobilityc, WILUS, Sony (1st preference between B/C), Fujitsu
		- Main reasons: enablement of single numerology operation, better timing estimation, more complexity without this (from supporting dual BWP one with 120kHz and 480/960kHz)
	+ Do not support (9): Futurewei, Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Apple, [CATT], LGE
		- Main concerns: added (cell search) complexity for the UE, additional specification work
* Case C) Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS for both initial access and non-initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 240Hz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ Support (10): Nokia, NSB, Futurewei, CATT, Ericsson, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo (2nd preference if case B cannot be supported), Xiaomi, Sony (2nd preference between B/C), Apple (only if case B is not supported)
		- Main reasons: commonality with FR2 framework
	+ Do not support (5): OPPO, Intel, Huawei, HiSilicon, WILUS
* Suggestion from AT&T: UEs supporting 480 and or 960 kHz, i.e., SSB and PDSCH for 480 and 960 kHz are not separate capabilities

#### **2nd Round Discussion – Part 1:**

Moderator asks companies to further comment on issues that is missing from the 1st round discussion summary. Keep in mind, the summary did not try to capture every little detail about the main concerns or main reasons for support. Moderator just summarized what seemed to be the most outstanding concerns and reasons in short text. With this said, if there is something else that companies wanted to add/fix, please provide further feedback, including any corrections of companies views from the summary.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Spreadtrum | The main concern on Case B is cell search complexity for the UE. But, perhaps, there could be some solutions to mitigate, e.g. very sparse SS raster(s) in a channel, UE optional capability… We can further discuss Case B. |
| LG Electronics | Our view is missing. We support only Case C which should be the natural choice since 240 kHz SSB and {240 kHz SSB, 120 kHz CORESET#0} are already supported for FR2. |
| Samsung | Regarding the searching complexity issue of Case B and Case C for initial cell search, we have some further comments to add, based on RAN4 progress on the minimum channel bandwidth. According to our analysis of the sync raster in the contribution, the sync raster interval for 240 kHz SCS is much smaller than 480 kHz and 960 kHz, in both types of channelizations (Type 1 for Rel-15 licensed and Type 2 for Rel-16 unlicensed). It’s further observed that the number of sync raster entries to search for 240 kHz SCS is even higher than the summation of those for 480 kHz and 960 kHz. In this sense, we don’t think the searching complexity is an issue for Case B, but actually Case C is the bottleneck.  |
| Samsung2  | We’d like to provide some further comments on the case “SSB location and SCS provided by network, and SSB provides CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration”, to respond to other companies’ comments. This case is not only restricted to ANR (of course we believe that’s already an important case to support, especially for unlicensed band), and also includes cell reselection, wherein the SCS and SSB location are provided by SIBx, but no explicit configuration of CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH. A UE needs to read the MIB of the targeted cell to acquire the configuration of CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH. We didn’t see a reasonable system allowing UE to perform neighboring cell measurement using 480/960 kHz, but cannot use it for cell reselection.  |
| vivo | Regarding the searching complexity, in addition to Samsung’s comment on sync raster, 480/960KHz SCS SSB will have less complexity in terms of coarse frequency offset estimation. For a given offset value (e.g. -600K~600K Hz for 60GHz center frequency), the needed number of branches are given below:* SCS120: searcher range 28k, steps = 1200k/56k≈22
* SCS240: searcher range 56k, steps = 1200k/112k ≈11
* SCS480: searcher range 112k, steps = 1200k/224k ≈6
* SCS960: searcher range 224k, steps = 1200k/448k ≈3

It is clearly observed 480/960KHz SSB require less number of branches for cell search in each sync raster. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with Samsung and vivo that larger SCS such as 480/960kHz can bring benefit to cell search complexity issue, that would be one of the reasons that Case B is supported. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal and modifications suggested by Samsung.  |
| Intel | We don’t fully agree with the concern regarding complexity increase in Case B.Actually, our intention was an opposite to complexity increase, in particular, enabling simple devices which operate relying on single numerology in private networks in unlicensed bands.Supporting Case C would cause even more problems, as SSB SCS, CORESET SCS, and data SCS could be now all different causing even more complexity both at gNB and UE, while increasing cell search complexity (if this is indeed a problem).In our view the support of Case B opens even more diverse market opportunities with different types of devices. There could be low-end devices with only single numerology operation intended for private networks in unlicensed bands. There could be mid-end devices with mixed numerology operation which are intended for public networks where PCells always provide initial access using SCS 120 kHz and where SCells with wider bandwidth and SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz may be used to boost data rates. And there could be high-end devices with mixed numerology operation which are even able to roam between public networks in licensed bands with initial access using, e.g., SCS 120 kHz and private networks in unlicensed bands with initial access using, e.g., SCS 480 kHz / 960 kHz.From Intel perspective, enabling Case B at least for managed network use cases (e.g., in enterprise or industrial settings and mainly in unlicensed bands) is quite critical as only this option provides truly single numerology which can be leveraged to simplify network operation and device implementation at the same time. In fact, we believe this is probably the most meaningful use case among all use cases envisioned for 60GHz band.One thing we noticed from opponents, that are against the support of 480/960kHz initial access, is that all of their comments are around how they think the feature is not needed since the system could be operated in a different way. However, no single opposing company provided a technical problem of supporting the 480/960kHz initial access as an optional feature. The only argument is that they don’t think it is needed and there is some work in specification needed. However, this is not a technical concern. It is more about organizational work plan concern for RAN1. Of course, companies are entitled to these opinions and there could be something that could guide decision making process in some situations. But we think in this case, it is less relevant as there are 16+ companies who support one specific optional feature (and we are not going to discuss multiple optional features that each company is suggesting).On the other hand, proponents of supporting 480/960kHz initial access clearly expressed technical concerns of only supporting 120kHz for initial access, as it forces gNB to work with mixed numerology, which by the way has never been enforced in existing NR specification. Existing NR specification always allowed gNB to operate the network with single numerology. Given that wideband operation is clearly an important use case for 60GHz band, transmission using SCS 480kHz or 960kHz is likely an important use case as well. And for this case supporting only SCS 120kHz for initial access forces specific implementation to be used, where both gNB and UE will need to deal with multiple BWPs with different SCS.All the so-called alternative methods to support these cases are to simply put something technically inferior compared to pure network operating with a single numerology framework. Companies provided alternative work around methods, but none of them would provide better functionality than what is given by the option to operate with a single numerology. Given that there is overwhelming number of companies who believe there is value in single numerology operation, we fail to understand what the real technical problem is for supporting this case as an optional feature.If the discussion was about a mandatory feature, we could somewhat sympathize, but in this case we are discussing an optional feature, and there seems to be 16+ some companies which believe in the value of the optional feature and this number clearly shows the strong level of interest of this feature in 3GPP community.Therefore, we would like to understand from the opponents of Case B, how supporting this optional feature will negatively impact their business or implementation, other than what we have heard so far (that it requires more standards work and think the network can be operated differently). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We had a quick look at the companies’ views and there seems to be a mistake in the list of opposing/supporting companies in 1st Round Discussion Summary: CATT mentioned that they are not supportive of Case B but we could not see their name in list of companies that “do not support” Case B. So, including LGE (see above), there are 9 (and not 7) companies that do not support Case B.   |
| LG Electronics | Please add LG Electronics as opponent for Case A, and as proponent for Case C, as we stated above. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion – Part 2:**

Based on the comments received, pretty good majority of the companies seems to support case A and/or B, and there is some support for supporting C, and some additional companies willing to discuss further about case C. Case A does have wide support and smaller number of companies with concerns. Since in both case A and B, the common aspect is Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB support by SSB with 480/960kHz. If agreements on this is made, further discussion on SSB design can be discussed further along with whether 480/960kHz SSB would be applicable for non-initial access only vs initial & non-initial access.

Moderator suggest also provide comments on the following proposal (in addition to further comments continuing from 1st round discussion):

* SSB with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS to support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ FFS: whether SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz will be applicable for only non-initial access, or initial access.
* FFS: Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS
	+ If SSB with 240kHz SCS is supported, it will be supported for both initial access and non-initial access.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| Nokia | We would be OK with the proposal,and would also support 240kHz SSB (for initial access). |
| LG Electronics | We disagree with the proposal.480/960 kHz SCS is an optional feature so initial access based on 480/960 kHz SCS is not necessitated.For non-initial access, we don’t see a critical issue for PCI collision as we state before. Thus, ANR support cannot justify the necessity of cell-defining 480/960 kHz SCS SSB.For 240 kHz SCS SSB, supporting it should be the natural choice since 240 kHz SSB and {240 kHz SSB, 120 kHz CORESET#0} are already supported for FR2. |
| Samsung | We support the proposal. Some wording suggestion: * SSB with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS to support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ FFS: whether SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz will be applicable for only non-initial access, or for both initial access and non-initial access.
* FFS: Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS
	+ If SSB with 240kHz SCS is supported, it will be supported for both initial access and non-initial access.
 |
| Qualcomm | For 480/960 kHz SCS for initial access, we still believe that supporting it may cause UE complexity issues. In addition, regarding the single numerology argument, the important part is to have the same numerology for the non-SSB channels/signals. For example, if SSB is 120 kHz while CORESET0 uses 480/960 kHz, then it may qualify as same numerology deployment if other data/control use 480/960 kHz. Having 120 kHz SSB and 120 kHz CORESET0 with 480/960 kHz data/control may be the case for a different numerology deployment. For the 240 kHz part, we believe it should be supported for the following reasons:* It is supported for FR2, hence makes sense to support it for 60 GHz
* 480/960 kHz are optional SCSs, and Ues/NWs that do not support it, may need to have a faster SSB sweeping time (e.g., for IoT) and hence 240 kHz may be useful
 |
| Interdigital | We support the proposal suggested by Samsung. |
| Futurewei | We do not support first bullet. We support the second bullet. |
| DOCOMO | We support the 1st bullet and FFS in the sub-bullet. To perform ANR while operating with 480/960 kHz SCS, any UE cannot be operated with single numerology, i.e. it needs to monitor SSB with 120 kHz SCS and read the following CORESET#0 PDCCH in every period if the 1st bullet is not supported. We would think it is quite inefficient. For the FFS, we are open to discuss further on the applicability of SSB with 480/960 kHz SCS to initial access case. Our view is at least either 480 or 960 kHz SCS should be supported for initial access case also. For the 2nd main bullet, although we are open to discuss further, we do not see a good motivation to support SSB with 240 kHz SCS when the 1st bullet is agreed. However, if the 1st bullet is not acceptable for RAN1, 240 kHz SCS should be supported instead.  |
| OPPO | For the first bullet, we support the modifications suggested by Samsung. |
| Vivo | We support the proposal suggested by Samsung.Corresponding to Qualcomm’s comment on “it may cause UE complexity issues”, please see the comments on part 1, we don’t think UE complexity of cell search with 960KHz SSB is increased;Corresponding to Qualcomm’s comment on supporting 480K/960K Coreset#0 with 120K SSB, we agree that it relieve the concern a bit on the need of two BWPs in some use cases. However, we think this result in more issues (e.g. timing, k\_offset indication, ultiplexing) than supporting (960K, 960K) directly.Corresponding to LG and Qualcomm’s comment on how to optionally support 480/960K SCS for initial access, the personal operator such as factory, home or office could use the equipment which implement 480K/960K SSB SCS for private network. If spec doesn’t support 480K/960K SSB SCS, at least two BWP with different SCS (one is 120KHz initial BWP and another is 960K operation BWP) in peak data rate case, which will introduce more complexity and overhead especially for private network case. The support of optional 480K/960K in spec will provide more choices to the market.For the 1st bullet, we fully agree with Samsung that SSB in non-initial access case won’t work for ANR and cell reselection if indication of Type 0 PDCCH in MIB is not supported. |
| Mediatek | We do not see strong need for 480/960 kHz SCS for SSB in initial access. Besides, we also have concern on initial cell search complexity. |
| Ericsson | We support the 2nd bullet, but not the first.On the 2nd bullet we share the same view as LGE and Qualcomm.Regarding the 1st bullet, we do not see ANR as a strong driver; however, if it can be demonstrated as essential, there are other (simple) means to provide CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH configuration by dedicated signaling to allow the UE to read SIB1 and report ECGI. We discussed such approaches already in Rel-16 NR-U, and they are relevant here as well. Moreover, the O&M system can be leveraged by a Gnb to obtain knowledge of network configuration of neighbor cells of the same operator, e.g., SSB and CORESET0 location. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the proposal with Samsung’s modification. We support SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz to be applicable for both non-initial access and initial access cases. |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal and fine with the modification by Samsung. And suggest the sub-bullet of the second bullet as a note rather than a proposal. |
| AT&T | We support the proposal with the modifications from Samsung  |
| Intel | We support the proposal suggested by Samsung. |
| Samsung2 | Although we believe moderator’s proposal is the most technically solid proposal, we can try to accommodate the comments from companies for against the configuration of CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH in MIB (for the sake of spec impact), and leave two alternatives to down-select in the next meeting. We hope this is a compromised proposal that can get the support from most companies, and it could be some way forward. Also, with this proposal, the case for non-initial access can be closed (and the supporting of new SCS for SSB is consistent for all functionalities in non-initial access case), and we can focus more on initial access case. Proposal: For the case where SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access) and CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration is provided by the SSB in Rel-15/16, support 480 kHz and 960 kHz numerologies for the SSB, and CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration is provided by: * Alt 1: the SSB
* Alt 2: dedicated signalling
 |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the changes from Samsung. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support the proposal.Further, we have the following comments:1. To support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB for non-initial access use cases (corresponding to Case A), as mentioned earlier, specification work is the concern and we do not see the benefit of configuring CORESET#0 with 480/960 kHz SSB so the UE from a neighboring network would be able to report to content of associated SIB1 in CGI-Report back to the host network. CGI-Report works fine by reporting “noSIB1”. Note also that ANR support is an optimization issue and is a late entry to Rel-15 and is even of a less importance in B52 as the chance of PCI collision is smaller due to the use of narrow beams. Also, it is questionable for us the real need for reporting content of SIB1 associated with 480/960 kHz SSBs when these SSBs can only be used for Scells. Moreover, UE can always report the presence of a 480/960 SSB of a neighbor network without reading its associated SIB1 if the intention is to optimize network and to avoid configuring cells on the same frequency locations between two neighboring networks if it is a concern in unlicensed band. In any case, if the proponent companies can justify us about the need for reporting SIB1 content, we are open to discuss how the necessary information can be reported without having to support Case A. Ericsson’s proposal can be one option.
2. To support SSB with Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB for initial access use cases (corresponding to Case B), other than added (cell search) complexity and substantial specification work, we are still not clear of the intention of some of the proponent companies. It seems that at least some of the companies support 480(960) kHz SSB for initial access to have UEs/networks that ONLY support 480 (or 960 kHz) to “optimize/simplify” the transceiver design. This, in our view, is not aligned with WID, and further, results in fragmentation: We will end up having two tiers of UEs/Networks. The UEs/networks of Type X that entirely run on 480(960)kHz and do not support 120 kHz and the UEs/networks of Type Y that run on 120kHz and cannot connect to/support Type X Networks/UEs. This is an entirely unacceptable scenario for us. Please note that the danger of fragmentation did not exist before in FR1 and FR2 although in both cases multi-numerology was supported: In FR1, the natural choice was supporting 15 kHz because of legacy LTE and EN-DC. 30kHz was mainly supported for the purpose of URLLC. In FR2, the only real choice is 120 kHz in Rel15/16 as it is the only numerology that supports both SSB and Data. If we support 480(960) kHz SSB for initial access for above 52.6 GHz, we are essentially opening the door to have two parallel competing NR networks (one running on 120 kHz and the other running on 960 kHz) which is not acceptable for us.
3. We are not sure we agree with the opening statement in **2nd Round Discussion – Part 2:** *“Based on the comments received, pretty good majority of the companies seems to support case A and/or B, and there is some support for supporting C”.* To our understanding, 9 companies do not support Case B. So, we do not see how Case B has a pretty good majority. In fact, the number of companies that are not Supporting Case B is higher than the number of companies are not supporting Case C.
4. We think that it would have been possible to formulate the proposal in a way that it would better represent the discussions during the last few meetings and companies views in this meeting. There has been a lot of discussions and strong opinions as to whether 480(960) kHz should not be supported at all (this part of the discussion was settled in this meeting), only be supported for non-initial access, or should also be supported for initial access in the last few meetings. If we agree on the main bullet of feature lead proposal but cannot reach a consensus on the FFS part (as often happens in 3GPP), we end up having this agreement:

 “SSB with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS to support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB” without having any further constraint. This would inadvertently mean that 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB can be used for all cases (initial access and non-initial access) since we have not reached a consensus about the FFS part. We do not think this would be a fair and a representative outcome of all the debates we had during the last few meetings.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the first bullet of the proposal and the editing from Samsung. Also open to the second bullet. |
| Moderator | There are some comments towards the moderator from Huawei, so let me try to respond to some **non-technical comments**.(3) I don’t know what Huawei thinks the definition of “majority” mean. To my understanding “majority” literal definition is “a number or percentage equaling more than half of a total” 16 companies support, 9 who do not results in is 64% majority. In moderator’s previous count (which might have had missing views), it was 70% majority. Therefore, given than anything above 50% is defined as majority, moderator assumed over 64% can be considered “pretty good” majority. I find this comment to be quite degrading comment towards the moderator, and make it sound like moderator has tried to manipulate the views somehow.With this said, if Huawei has concerns on moderator’s use of adjective to explain the landscape of the company views, moderator will try his best to avoid using them.(4) If Huawei thinks moderator did not effectively come up the best formulation that could have progressed RAN1, then I apologize. I am yet just another technical engineer that works for Intel, so I may have some unrealized internal bias thinking that stopped allowing me to come up with a really good proposal that would satisfy all companies. I thought I tried my best to be neutral on the subject and what I thought seems to be most commonality.While I understand Huawei has strong opinions about support of 480/960kHz, at least to my understanding there were equally strong opinion about support of 480/960kHz. Furthermore, there was (at least to moderator’s opinion) significantly more number of companies wanted support for 480/960kHz. So while I acknowledge the formulation of the discussion from me (moderator) might not have kept all companies happy, I assumed companies had ample chance to voice their opinions and to also suggest better formulation that would allow all companies to be happy. Companies who have better formulation are certainly welcomed to provide some suggestion in the comment section. I don’t think I ever straight out rejected an explicit well formulated proposal from company in any of the discussions that I’ve been moderating so far. So I don’t particularly understand why Huawei believes they can not provide alterative proposals or suggestions to modify the proposal.If Huawei has suggestions for a better comprise, please provide so. I believe I mentioned this in other sections (although I did not explicitly mention it in this section) that “Please continue to provide inputs on changes and concerns on the proposal, including any alternative/compromise proposal(s).” |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We thank our Moderator for his comments. We certainly did not mean to question the integrity of the moderator. If we made that impression, we do apologize. **Regarding comment 3:** What we say is that Case B has the support/opposition of 16/9 while Case C has the support/opposition ratio of 10/5. So, the ratio for Case C is higher. As such, we are not sure we can say Case A and Case B have higher support than Case C and base the proposal on Case A and B while leaving Case C into FFS.**Regarding Comment 4:** What we are saying is that companies have been discussing the support for 480/960 kHz SSB of initial access and non-initial access for a few meetings already. The usages and challenges for either case is different and the level of support for them is also different. In our opinion, lumping both cases into one agreement and then leave the main subject of discussion (initial vs. non-initial access) only to an FFS that may never be resolved, would not be representative of the discussions so far. Please note that, at least based on the agreement in the last meeting, we have to finalize the discussion of SSB numerologies by then end of this meeting. So, unless we want to revert the agreement in the last meeting, what is the point of FFS? And if this FFS is not resolved, it would simply, and as we said before, inadvertently, mean that SSB would be supported for both initial access and non-initial access. As for the suggestion for alternative proposal, we do not see any need for it. We actually have the proposals Case A, Case B, and Case C from the first round of discussions and we can try to agree on none, 1 or two of them.  |
| Intel 2 | We wanted to address the optionality and complexity aspect of the CaseA/B.From our understand, unlike what Huawei has explained in their comments in (2), NR certified UE would not be able to get certification without supporting “mandatory features” for the band the UE claims to support. This implies, that it is not possible to have a UE that “only” supports 480/960kHz without supporting 120kHz. So we don’t think there is this fragmentation of one type of device and another type of device.This is no different from long list of optional features that is supported in current NR specification.One thing to note about complexity is not just about difficulty in implementation something, at least in our opinion includes difficulty operating the device in specific modes and associated power consumption and processing needed.From this perspective, requiring the UE work in a mode of operation that requires two or more BWPs all with different SCS is far more complex than UE working in a mode of operation that requires 1 SCS. Note that we are not stating the UE working in single numerology mode does not need to implement mix cases, we are simply point out that processing complexity and operation complexity for this mode of operation is far easier for the UE to handle.Looking from the network perspective, as we have mentioned, there has never been a precedence where for a given channel BW, a gNB was forced work with mixed numerologies in FR1 and FR2. This is not to say, mix numerology does not have any benefits or should not be supported, but all of FR1 and FR2 deployments so far provided the flexibility at the gNB to operate in such manner.However, suddenly for 60GHz, this particular operation has been taken away for channel BWs larger than 1GHz. While UE may need to work alone with 1 gNB at the time, gNB on the other hand needs to service multiple UEs (and in some cases hundreds of UEs) at the time. Providing complexity reduction mechanisms and options for gNB is as important as reducing complexity at the UE, if not more.For the UE perspective, from our perspective, adding additional SCS for SSB for initial access for “optional” SCS, doesn’t necessarily increase complexity. As the SSB search could be done somewhat sequentially with potentially longer cell search time. Since 480/960kHz are not mandatory SCS, unlike what was supported in FR1 (15/30) or FR2(120/240), UE could potentially de-prioritize the search operation without have any impact to NR requirements or operations (note NR does not have any requirements for initial cell search).Lastly, as we mentioned multiple times for company who believe this combination of SCS for SSB is not useful, NR specification will not force them to implement, as it has been agreed to be optional. So we fail to understand why company who clear do not have any plan to support the optional SCS for SSB has concerns about cell search complexity. Especially more so when they could de-prioritize the search aspects for the optional SSB SCS. |
| CATT | We are fine with the second bullet. |
| LG Electronics | We still think Case C should be the starting point if we need more SCS for initial access.It seems quite undesirable for RAN1 to put great efforts on optional features even though system is not broken in case such optional features are not introduced.One approach could be to allow only one of 480 and 960 kHz SCSs for initial access, considering specification impact and UE complexity. |
| Samsung | We believe the SSB SCS issue is indeed a tough issue for moderating, and thanks to Daewon and all’s effort on the discussion and compromise. Since it’s close to the quiet period, and also not far from the end of the meeting, we should think of a way forward based on each other’s best compromise. We tried to list all the possible proposals for this issue (in a brief manner, and we can polish the wording later), and try to choose one. I didn’t list the one with supporting Case A/B and none of Case A/B/C, since obviously these two cannot work based on the comments so far.To Huawei: Since Huawei has the most concerns for all of the cases, is there any or more of the following proposals that you can live with?  If so, maybe we can pick it as the starting point to discuss to save time. Proposal 1: * Support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access case with CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided by MIB
* Support one of 480 or 960 kHz SCS for initial access case
* Support 240 kHz SCS for both initial access case and non-initial access case

Proposal 2: * Support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access case with CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided by MIB or dedicated signal to be down-selected
* Support one of 480 or 960 kHz SCS for initial access case
* Support 240 kHz SCS for both initial access case and non-initial access case

Proposal 3: * Support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access case with CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided by MIB
* Don’t support 480 or 960 kHz SCS for initial access case
* Support 240 kHz SCS for both initial access case and non-initial access case

Proposal 4: * Support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access case with CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided by MIB or dedicated signal to be down-selected
* Don’t support 480 or 960 kHz SCS for initial access case
* Support 240 kHz SCS for both initial access case and non-initial access case

Proposal 5: * Support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access case with CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided by MIB
* Don’t support 480 or 960 kHz SCS for initial access case
* Don’t support 240 kHz SCS for both initial access case and non-initial access case

Proposal 6: * Support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access case with CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided by MIB or dedicated signal to be down-selected
* Don’t support 480 or 960 kHz SCS for initial access case
* Don’t support 240 kHz SCS for both initial access case and non-initial access case
 |
| Huawei | Please note that Huawei is not the only company that does not support Case A or Case B. In fact there are three companies (Huawei, Ericsson, and LG) that do not support either of the cases A or B and multiple more who do not support Case B. To Samsung: We do appreciate your effort, however, 4 out of 6 suggestions are based on at least support of one of Case A or Case B. The other two also in fact support Case A but with the addition of “or dedicated signal to be down-selected” which is not very clear for us. We are not sure what “CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided dedicated signal” would mean. Does it mean there is actually a CORESET#0 and SIB1 configured somewhere and dedicated signaling configure it to the UE? Does it mean that the content that would be in SIB1 and required for purposes such as ANR, would instead be configured to the UE using dedicated signaling since there is actually no SIB1 associated with the SSB? If it is the case, what is the difference between such a dedicated signaling and the current servingcellconfigcommon? What are the purposes of such dedicated signaling? If it is ANR, how a UE from a neighboring network can have access to such information that is provided to the UE only through dedicated signaling? Finally, please also note that as we discussed before, we have a few concerns regarding ANR application (these concerns were provided in our view in FL summary but we did not get any particular reply). We can develop alternative approaches to support ANR if deemed necessary without configuring CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH. If I am not mistaken, Ericsson has already provided an example solution during the discussions. We would like to mention that, Huawei and other companies have been vocal about their preferences, but at the same time, we have been flexible in agreeing to support 480/960 kHz SSB without CORESET#0 to alleviate the concern of companies regarding RRM measurement and synchronization accuracy. Huawei has been supporting only 120 kHz SSB during the discussions and if you happen to have read our t-doc, we have provided our detailed reasons to justify our preference; yet we have compromised to agree on supporting 480/960 kHz SSB without CORESET#0. If the onus is on us to further compromise, we at least need to be completely convinced from the technical perspective. |
| Samsung | To Huawei: First, to clarify I’m not referring to Case A and Case B only, and we are referring to the whole issue. At least Ericsson and LG have provided their clear support for Case C, but not Huawei. That’s why I say Huawei has the most concerns on the cases, which is a statement not biased to any case. For the “dedicated signal”, I copied directly from Ericsson’s comment. If you have anything unclear in need of clarification, please refer to Ericsson’s comment. The intention to add such part is exactly a compromise for companies having concerns with MIB based approach (although personally I don’t agree there is any issue). We understand Huawei’s preference and concerns, and of course we read your paper in detail. Every company indeed did their own effort on justifying their preference and concerns, and every company also indeed tries to make compromise and progress. None of the proposals I listed is our preference, obviously, and at least we are trying to compromise to proposals we don’t prefer, e.g. 240 kHz SCS, dedicated signal, only supporting one SCS from 480/960 kHz for initial access. To this end, we indeed try to compromise and make progress for the best of the whole industry. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

Based on feedback so far, its seems among case A, B, and C, case A has the most support (25 yes/4 no), followed by case B (16 yes/8 no), and case C (8 yes/3 conditional yes/5 no), respectively.

* **Case A) For non-initial access case, a SSB with 480 kHz and 960kHz SCS and Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.**
	+ Support (25): Nokia, NSB, OPPO, Samsung, Intel, Samsung, Charter, Interdigital, CATT, ZTE, Sanechips, AT&T, NTT Docomo, MediaTek, Convida, vivo, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, Sharp, WILUS, Sony, Fujitsu, Apple
		- Main reasons: supporting ANR and CGI reporting, better timing estimation
	+ Do not Support (4): Huawei, HiSilicon, Ericsson (support other means of indicating Type0-PDCCH), LGE
		- Main concern: additional specification work
		- Main reasons: system would be operational with 120kHz SSB, ‘no-SIB1’ report in CGI is sufficient for ANR, PCI collision not an issue in 60GHz
	+ Samsung asked clarification question:
		- For companies that do not support Case A, does this mean Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB is only supported for 120kHz SCS SSB? Or whether Type0-PDCCH configuration is conveyed for 480/960kHz SCS SSB by alternative means (other than MIB).
* **Case B) Support SSB with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.**
	+ Support (16): OPPO, Samsung, Intel, Charter, Interdigital, ZTE, Sanechips, AT&T, NTT Docomo, Convida, vivo, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, WILUS, Sony (1st preference between B/C), Fujitsu
		- Main reasons: enablement of single numerology operation, better timing estimation, more complexity without this (from supporting dual BWP one with 120kHz and 480/960kHz)
	+ Do not support (8): Futurewei, Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Apple, [CATT]
		- Main concerns: added (cell search) complexity for the UE, additional specification work
* **Case C) Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS for both initial access and non-initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 240Hz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.**
	+ Support (8 / 11 as 2nd preference): Nokia, NSB, Futurewei, CATT, Ericsson, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo (2nd preference if case B cannot be supported), Xiaomi, Sony (2nd preference between B/C), Apple (only if case B is not supported), LGE
		- Main reasons: commonality with FR2 framework
	+ Do not support (5): OPPO, Intel, Huawei, HiSilicon, WILUS
* Suggestion from AT&T: UEs supporting 480 and or 960 kHz, i.e., SSB and PDSCH for 480 and 960 kHz are not separate capabilities
	+ Companies have not provided explicit feedback for this proposal.

The following are list of potential proposal alternatives that was suggested by the companies that could be selected for agreement

###### **Proposal 1.1-1)**

* For non-initial access case, a SSB with 480 kHz and 960kHz SCS and Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* Support SSB with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS for both initial access and non-initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 240Hz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.

###### **Proposal 1.1-2)**

– supported by Samsung,ZTE, Sanechips, Xiaomi, AT&T, Intel, vivo, OPPO, NTT Docomo, Interdigital, Spreadtum, Nokia, Convida, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility

– not support by Ericsson, LGE, Huawei, HiSilicon, Qualcomm

* SSB with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS to support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ FFS: whether SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz will be applicable for both initial and non-initial access
* FFS: Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS
	+ If SSB with 240kHz SCS is supported, it will be supported for both initial access and non-initial access.

###### **Proposal 1.1-3)**

– from Qualcomm

* Support SSB 240kHz SCS for both initial access and non-initial access scenarios
* Support configuration of 480kHz and 960kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for SSB with 120kHz and 240kHz SCS

###### **Proposal 1.1-4)**

– supported by Futurewei, CATT

* FFS: Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS
	+ If SSB with 240kHz SCS is supported, it will be supported for both initial access and non-initial access.

###### **Proposal 1.1-5)**

– another comprise alternative from Samsung

* For the case where SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access) and CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration is provided by the SSB in Rel-15/16, support 480 kHz and 960 kHz numerologies for the SSB, and CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration is provided by:
	+ Alt 1: the SSB
	+ Alt 2: dedicated signalling

###### **Proposal 1.1-6)**

* Support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access case with CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided by MIB
* Support one of 480 or 960 kHz SCS for initial access case
* Support 240 kHz SCS for both initial access case and non-initial access case

###### **Proposal 1.1-7)**

* Support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access case with CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided by MIB or dedicated signal to be down-selected
* Support one of 480 or 960 kHz SCS for initial access case
* Support 240 kHz SCS for both initial access case and non-initial access case

###### **Proposal 1.1-8)**

* Support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access case with CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided by MIB
* Don’t support 480 or 960 kHz SCS for initial access case
* Support 240 kHz SCS for both initial access case and non-initial access case

###### **Proposal 1.1-9)**

* Support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access case with CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided by MIB or dedicated signal to be down-selected
* Don’t support 480 or 960 kHz SCS for initial access case
* Support 240 kHz SCS for both initial access case and non-initial access case

###### **Proposal 1.1-10)**

* Support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access case with CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided by MIB
* Don’t support 480 or 960 kHz SCS for initial access case
* Don’t support 240 kHz SCS for both initial access case and non-initial access case

###### **Proposal 1.1-11)**

* Support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access case with CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided by MIB or dedicated signal to be down-selected
* Don’t support 480 or 960 kHz SCS for initial access case
* Don’t support 240 kHz SCS for both initial access case and non-initial access case

###### **Proposal 1.1-12)**

* Don’t support 480 or 960 kHz SCS for initial access case.
	+ Don’t support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access case with CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided by MIB or dedicated signal.
* Don’t support 240 kHz SCS for both initial access case and non-initial access case

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Companies have provided many alternatives that could be considered during the 2nd round of discussions. Moderator has selected some below that could be used for further discussions. The proposal 1.1-1 and 1.1-2 seems to contain all components under debate that companies can reference and further comment on (regardless of support for the proposal or not). Moderator has added Proposal 1.1-13 that might be considered as some compromise.

###### **Proposal 1.1-1)**

* For non-initial access case, a SSB with 480 kHz and 960kHz SCS and Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* Support SSB with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS for both initial access and non-initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 240Hz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.

###### **Proposal 1.1-2)**

* SSB with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS to support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ FFS: whether SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz will be applicable for both initial and non-initial access
* FFS: Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS
	+ If SSB with 240kHz SCS is supported, it will be supported for both initial access and non-initial access.

###### **Proposal 1.1-13)**

– potential compromise (added by moderator)

* Support SSB with 960 kHz SCS for both initial and non-initial access case. SSB with 960kHz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* ~~SSB with 480kHz will not be supported for initial access case, and it will not support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.~~

Companies are asked to review the potential alternative proposals 1.1-1 to 1.1-13 and provide input. Also, for companies that have suggestions to edit/modify any of the alternative proposals, please provide further comments.

Given the short amount time left for the discussion and decision, I would argue companies to try to make constructive feedback on how we can move forward.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We are ok either of Proposal 1.1-1, Proposal 1.1-2, or Proposal 1.1-13. Among these proposals, Proposal 1.1-1 is most preferred, due to the full flexibility it can provide to operators and vendors for implementation, and we hope that can be a good compromise among all components interested in the implementation. One suggestion on the wording: replacing “Type0-PDCCH configuration” to “CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration” for a better clarification. One clarification, for Proposal 1.1-13, what’s the proposal for 240 kHz SCS? Is it same as 1.1.-1 or 1.1-2?  |
| LG Electronics | We can accept the spirit of Proposal 1.1-13 in that one of 480 and 960 kHz SCSs is newly introduced for this frequency range, as a compromise, but only under the condition that 240 kHz SCS SSB is mandated for UE supporting NR above 52.6 GHz. With this regard, we would suggest the following by modifying Proposal 1.1-13.**Proposal 1.1-13) – potential compromise (added by moderator)*** Support SSB with 960 kHz SCS for both initial and non-initial access case. SSB with 960 kHz SCS will support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* SSB with 480kHz will not be supported for initial access case, and it will not support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS for both initial access and non-initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 240Hz SCS will support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ Note that SSB with 240 kHz SCS is mandatorily supported to UEs supporting a band in the range of 52.6 GHz-71 GHz
 |
| DOCOMO | We prefer Proposal 1.1-2). The issue we see when we do not support either 480 or 960 kHz SCS for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB provided in SSB with 480 or 960 kHz SCS for ANR use case would be, in such case, UE is mandated to monitor 120 kHz SCS to support ANR. We believe NW should have a choice to realize single numerology operation even it is optional. Also, we are not sure a controlled environment is the only deployment in 52.6 – 71 GHz although it may be indeed one of the potential one. ANR would be quite beneficial, e.g. when large number of gNBs is assumed to be deployed. For initial access, we are ok with having either 480 or 960 kHz SCS only considering SSB BD overhead. Regarding the reuse of 240 kHz SCS SSB as in FR2, our understanding is that both 240 kHz SCS for SSB and 480/960 kHz SCS SSB have each pros and cons technically. We are also unsure if there is so significant difference on SSB BD overhead at UE between SSB with 240 kHz SCS and the one with 480 or 960 kHz SCS. Thus we prefer to have either 480 or 960 kHz SCS for SSB for initial access. If companies believe it would be better to reuse 240 kHz SCS (although not supported for control/data at all in 52.6 – 71 GHz) for SSB as in FR2 is beneficial, we can live with supporting 120 and 240 kHz SCS for SSB for initial access.  |
| Qualcomm | For the same reasons discussed above, we support Proposal 1.1-8. If we had to compromise among 1.1-1, 1.1-2 and 1.1-13, we can consider 1.1-2.  |
| Apple  | We do NOT support 960kHz SCS for initial access. We are open consider 240kHz SCS (Proposal 1.1-9) or 480kHz SCS for initial access, but not both.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We believe that the agreement that we made last week on supporting 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSBs when SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access) and SSB does not configure Type-0 PDCCH, addresses major concerns of synchronization accuracy and RRM on Scells that were being discussed in that last few meetings. As we discussed earlier, we do not see any technical reason to further support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSBs for other cases. Other than 3 proposals 1.1-3, 1.1-4, and 1.1-12, We can categorize the other 10 proposals into two category:1. **For initial access**, support SSB with 480 kHz and/or 960kHz SCS
	1. 1.1-1, 1.1-2, 1.1-6, 1.1-7, 1.1-13
2. **For non-initial access**, support SSB with 480 kHz and/or 960kHz SCS and Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB or using dedicated signaling:
	1. 1.1-1, 1.1-2, 1.1-5, 1.1-6, 1.1-7, 1.1-8, 1.1-9, 1.1-10, 1.1-11,
	2. **Note:** Proposals in this category are typically to provide support ANR on scells associated with 480 kHz and/or 960kHz SSBs.

Note that some of the proposals belong to both categories (1.1-1, 1.1-2, 1.1-6, and 1.1-7). Further, we would like to point out that, as we discussed before, in our view, Proposal 1.1-2 effectively would support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for both initial access and non-initial access as the support for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS SSB in the main bullet is without any restriction and a possible restriction on the use case is only mentioned in a FFS sub-bullet. Therefore, if 3GPP cannot agree on the FFS sub-bullet (which is often the case, and, in this particular case, is even more likely, since we are supposed to finalize the SSB SCS discussion by the end of RAN1 104b-e meeting as per the earlier agreement in RAN1 104-e), agreement on 1.1-2 effectively would mean agreement on supporting 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS SSB for both initial access and non-initial access use cases. As discussed in earlier rounds, we still have serious technical issues with the proposals in both above categories where we have brief overview on them in the following lines:1. Concerns regarding proposals in Category 1 (**For initial access**, support SSB with 480 kHz and/or 960kHz SCS): As discussed earlier, the concerns include 1)
	* **substantial specification impact** including A) SSB pattern design for 480(960) kHz in non-shared spectrum; B) PRACH design, including supported PRACH sequence lengths, RA-RNTI calculation, PRACH formats, frequency resource design, and RACH occasions configuration tables for 480(960) kHz in non-shared spectrum; C) Discussion and design of SSB pattern and RACH occasion configuration for shared spectrum after (or in parallel to) the discussions in A. and B; D) CORESET#0 design including number of supported RBs and symbols for 480(960) kHz; F) Supported {SSB, CORESET#0} multiplexing patterns and CORESET#0 RB offsets for 480(960) kHz; E) Search Space design for each CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern for 480(960) kHz.
	* **Blind search complexity** as has been already exhaustively discussed.
	* **Possibility of fragmentation:** If we support 480(960)kHz SSB for intial access, we will end up having two tiers of UE/Networks. The networks of Type I that only support 480(960)kHz and UEs that only support 120 kHz cannot connect to them and the networks of Type II that only support 120kHz. This is an entirely unacceptable scenario for us. We thank Intel for sharing their views that the support for 480(960) kHz SSB will be optional so it can’t create a fragmentation issue. However, we disagree: The “optional” and “mandatory” features are only defined at the UE side and not the network side. There is no such a thing as a mandatory support for 120 kHz SSB SCS at the network side if 480/960 kHz SSB SCS for initial access is supported. Please note that we never had such a problem in NR so far. In FR2, it just makes sense that network support 120 kHz SSB since it 120 kHz the only numerology that support both SSB and data. In FR1, it just makes sense that the network support 15 kHz SSB because of pre-exiting LTE and EN-DC deployments. However, B52 is a clean slate and we cannot agree with such a danger of fragmentation.
2. Concerns regarding proposals in Category 2 (**For non-initial access**, support SSB with 480 kHz and/or 960kHz SCS and Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB or using dedicated signaling): These proposals are provided to support ANR for scells that are associated with 480(960) kHz SSBs. However ,as we discussed in earlier rounds, we have major technical questions and concerns to support configuring (or indicating) Type0-PDCCH only for the sake of ANR support. Due to the following:
	1. We find ANR an optimization issue without which the network is functional (certainly RRM can work without ANR. CGI-InfoNR is a late addition to MeasResults). Further, SSBs that do not configure CORESET0 have already been supported from Rel-15. When it comes to CGI report and ANR, we do not see any difference between SSBs without CORESET#0 in Rel-15/16 and SSBs without CORESET#0 in above 52.6 GHz.
	2. Please note that, based on proponents’ arguments so far, a main motivation of using 480/960 kHz SSB SCS is for private networks in controlled environments such as data centers where the presence of two colliding networks seem not possible. For such applications and other vertical industries in controlled environments, we wonder how useful and necessary the ANR application is.
	3. To our understanding, with the current agreements (support 120 kHz SSB for all cases and 480/960 kHz SSB when explicit frequency/SCS is provided and CORESET#0 is not configured), all required information from a neighboring network can be provided by the UE to the serving network: UE can read SIB1 associated with 120 kHz SSB of the neighboring network and provide relevant neighbor network information to the serving network. UE can also detect 480/960 kHz SSB of the neighboring network and report “noSIB1” in the CGI-Report. Note that as “noSIB1” includes the four bit “pdcch-ConfigSIB1”, depending on the value of “pdcch-ConfigSIB1”, the serving network would also be able to know the location of the first SSB with CORESET#0 from the neighboring network.
	4. With the current agreement regarding 480/960 kHz SSBs (support 480/960 kHz SSB when explicit frequency/SCS is provided and CORESET#0 is not configured), 480/960 kHz SSBs will be associated only to Scells and a UE from another network cannot directly camp on and connect to them. So, in view of this and, further, the highly directional transmissions in above 52.6 GHz spectrum, we would like to know what is exactly the possible danger of PCI collision?
	5. Again, using current mechanisms, UE can report the presence of a 480/960 kHz SSB SCS, along with its PCID on a specific location on frequency domain and further can report that this SSB does not configure SIB1 (cannot be used for camping or PCell configuration). This information would be enough for the serving network that, if it deems necessary, moves away its configured cells from the detected location of the 480/960 kHz SSB SCS of a neighbor network to avoid possible inter-network interference. Due to the high directionality of beams in above 52.6 GHz, we find it extremely unlikely that two cells belonging to two co-existing networks have 1) the same PCID and; 2) transmit SSB with the same numerology of 480 (960) kHz; 3) and the said SSBs are on the same NR ARFCN; 4) and both cells are discoverable by the same UE, so there is a real chance of cell collision.

Given all above discussions, we still have serious concerns regarding the support of 480 (960) kHz SSB for any cases/scenarios other than what we have already agreed. As such, we can only support 1.1-12 at this time. We would like to mention that, however, we can further discuss whether to support ANR for scells associated with SSBs with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS that do not configure Type-0 PDCCH and, if deemed necessary, discuss how. |
| Ericsson | Our first preference is 1.1-9 (we understand that this is not one of the ones pre-filtered by the moderator), and further we think that CORESET0/Type0-PDDCH can be provided by alternative means (dedicated signaling). As we mentioned before, such an approach was discussed in Rel-16. We think that the discussions on designing CORESET0/Type0-PDDCH configuration signaling will be long, and risk completion of the WI. We can accept the general direction of Proposal 1.1.-2, with the following modifications:* 240 kHz is agreed (not FFS) for both initial access (using FR2 design of CORESET0/Type0-PDDCH configuration) and non-initial access. We support the above Note written by LGE on mandatory support. Furthermore, the FR2 CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configurations from FR2 should be reused to avoid specification effort.
* In the first bullet, we do not support agreeing to MIB signaling of Type0-PDCCH potentially only for ANR. The ANR use case needs to be a separate discussion, and is not the primary driver for signaling design. The order of decisions that needs to be taken are:
	+ First: Whether or not initial access is supported for 480 and/or 960
	+ Second:
		- If initial access is agreed, then and then clearly MIB signaling is needed, and ANR will follow naturally.
		- If initial access is not agreed, then whether/how to support the ANR case can be discussed separately. One option is dedicated signaling. We discussed similar approaches already in Rel-16 NR-U.

For initial access, our preferences for supported SSB SCSs are* First preference:
	+ 120 and 240 kHz
* If a single larger SCS is agreed, then our preference is the following since 480 kHz is the more robust option:
	+ 120, 240, and 480 kHz
 |
| vivo | Our preference is Proposal 1.1-1 and Proposal 1.1-13. We are also OK with Proposal 1.1-2Regarding Huawei’s concern on supporting 480/960KHz SSB for initial access, please find our comments below:**substantial specification impact:** In your list case, A, B and C is already needed to be specified according to current agreement. For D, E and F, some FR2 existing pattern could be reused, e.g. multiplexing pattern for (960K, 960K) could be directly reused from that for (120K, 120K). We don’t think it is difficult challenge considering that we have 4 meetings left.**Blind search complexity:** As already discussed in **2nd Round Discussion – Part 1** on sync raster and coarse frequency syncronization, cell search complexity for 480K and 960K is not larger than that for 120K. Please provide valid technical concern for the blind**Possibility of fragmentation:** I don’t think a smart network vendor for wide coverage will implement 480K/960K SSB when they are optional UE capability. So the mentioned fragment issue doesn’t exist at all.Again, if spec doesn’t support 480K/960K SSB SCS, at least two BWP with different SCS (one is 120KHz initial BWP and another is 960K operation BWP) in peak data rate case, which will introduce more complexity and overhead especially for private network case. The support of optional 480K/960K in spec will provide more choices to the market especially on the managed/private network.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Our first preference is Proposal 1.1-2. We are also OK to Proposal 1.1-1 as it has most flexibility.  |
| Intel | Our preference is the support either 1.1-1 or 1.1-2.While we understand the moderator’s effort for a compromise in 1.1-3, we still don’t understand the technical problem for supporting an optional 480/960kHz SCS SSB for initial access to enable single numerology operation.In fact, the main implementation difficulty for supporting 480/960kHz SCS SSB actually stems from detecting 480/960kHz SCS SSB, using this for time/frequency synchronization for other channels, and performing measurement using 480/960kHz SCS SSB. In all cases, the feature needed to be implemented for initial and non-initial access is completely identical. The only technical difference is the support of CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH. However, support of PDCCH decoding is something the UE needs to support anyway (if the UE supports 480 and/or 960kHz for data/control channels. Therefore, there is absolutely no additional complexity the UE need to work on.From our understanding from UE side, supporting initial access or non-initial access is leveraging the same functionalities and implementation. UE supporting non-initial access, still needs to implement SSB detection with 480/960kHz, it still needs to implement time/frequency tracking with 480/960kHz, it needs to support PDCCH reception using 480/960kHz (for both CSS and USS), it will need to support RRM measurements using 480/960kHz SSB. The SSB searching on the SSB raster, is nothing but performing SSB detection for multiple frequencies. However, UEs supporting non-initial access would need to support SSB detection for any arbitrary frequency anyway. So what are the implementation complexity claimed to exist between initial and non-initial access that is stated as the main reason for opposition?The only non-technical draw back for supporting initial access and non-initial access is that RAN1 specification will need to support Type0-PDCCH configuration for 480/960kHz. However, given that there is no substitute for enabling single numerology operation, we believe this is something reasonable to consider.We’ve asked this question before, but we would like to ask again, for the opponents for supporting 480/960kHz for initial and non-initial access,1) what is the technical feature that need to be additionally implemented at the UE to support initial access on top of non-initial access?2) what is the technical problem for supporting single numerology operation and how is this (single numerology operation) technically inferior for all potential implementation for the gNB (other than there are other ways to operate the system) and why should this operation at the gNB be completely precluded when this has been supported in existing NR? Note this case is completely different from the 60kHz optional SCS support in FR1, as gNB had the possibility to choose 15 or 30kHz SCS for any supported BW by 60kHz in FR1. In our case, 120kHz simply cannot support anything larger than 400MHz and there is no substitute for supporting single numerology operation. |
| Nokia | Firstly few, brief comments. Regarding proposal 1.1-9, providing the CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration via dedicated signaling, would require defining the configuration options thus the two options seem bit counter intuitive as to us these would seem to be more or less identical from specification and UE implementation perspective. Hence, we would think that that in the case that CORESET#/Type0-PDCCH is not supported for 480/960kHz SSB, method (if need agreed) for ANR will be discussed separately. On the specification impact raised by Huawei, it seems that most of the companies are OK to support 480kHz and 960kHz RACH at least for the ‘non-initial access’ case (however we end defining it), thus it would seem that formats, sequence lengths etc. would need to specified in any case. Correspondingly, we have agreed to support 480kHz and 960kHz SSBs, thus patterns would need be defined (covering shared and non-shared). Hence additional aspects would in our understanding relate to SS-raster (complexity and specification), if initial access is supported, and CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH, if supported. In addition, as a side note, in my understanding non-cell-defining SSB (i.e. wo CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB) can also be configured as PSCell.Our preference would be 1.1-1, but as noted, this seems bit difficult agree. Thus we could consider also option 1.1-8. |
| Futurewei | We cannot support 480/960 kHz for the SSB in the initial access. We could compromise on and discuss the other possibilities such as using 240 kHz for the initial access, using 480/960 for the non-initial access, how CORESET0/Type0-PDDCH can be provided by alternative means or have a separate discussion on ANR i.e. prefer 1.1.-4 but could consider compromising to any of 1.1.12, 1.1.9, 1.1.8 if the majority supports it.  |
| Mediatek | Our preference is 1.1-9 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with proposal Alt 1.1-1 and 1.1-2. Our preference, however, is 1.1-1 for full system flexibility. |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

Added the proposal from LGE as 1.1-14. Added the proposal from Apple as 1.1-15.

###### **Proposal 1.1-14)**

* Support SSB with 960 kHz SCS for both initial and non-initial access case. SSB with 960kHz SCS will support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* SSB with 480kHz will not be supported for initial access case, and it will not support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS for both initial access and non-initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 240Hz SCS will support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ Note that SSB with 240 kHz SCS is mandatorily supported to UEs supporting a band in the range of 52.6 GHz-71 GHz

###### **Proposal 1.1-15)**

* Support SSB with 480 kHz SCS for both initial and non-initial access case. SSB with 480kHz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.

The following is a summary of comments received:

* Samsung: 1.1-1 (1st preference), can accept 1.1-2, 1.1-3
* LG: can accept 1.1-14
* Docomo: 1.1-2 (2nd preference)
* Qualcomm: 1.1-8 (1st preference), can accept 1.1-1, 1.1-2, 1.1-13
* Apple: ok with either 1.1-15 or 1.1-9 (but not both)
* Huawei: 1.1-12
* Ericsson: 1.1-9 (1st preference), can accept 1.1-2
* Vivo: 1.1-1, 1.1-13, can accept 1.1-2
* ZTE, Sanechips: 1.1-2 (1st preference), can accept 1.1-1
* Intel: 1.1-1 or 1.1-2.
* Nokia: 1.1-1 (1st preference), can accept 1.1-8
* Futurewei: 1.1-4 (1st preference), can accept 1.1-12, 1.1-9, 1.1-8
* MediaTek: 1.1-9
* Lenovo, Motorola Mobility: 1.1-1 (1st preference), 1.1-2

The following is a summary of preferences on Case A, B, C.

* **Case A) For non-initial access case, a SSB with 480 kHz and 960kHz SCS and Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.**
	+ Support (25): Nokia, NSB, OPPO, Samsung, Intel, Charter, Interdigital, CATT, ZTE, Sanechips, AT&T, NTT Docomo, MediaTek, Convida, vivo, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, Sharp, WILUS, Sony, Fujitsu, Apple
		- Main reasons: supporting ANR and CGI reporting, better timing estimation
	+ Do not Support (4): Huawei, HiSilicon, Ericsson (support other means of indicating Type0-PDCCH), LGE
		- Main concern: additional specification work
		- Main reasons: system would be operational with 120kHz SSB, ‘no-SIB1’ report in CGI is sufficient for ANR, PCI collision not an issue in 60GHz
* **Case B) Support SSB with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.**
	+ Support (16): OPPO, Samsung, Intel, Charter, Interdigital, ZTE, Sanechips, AT&T, NTT Docomo, Convida, vivo, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, WILUS, Sony (1st preference between B/C), Fujitsu
		- Main reasons: enablement of single numerology operation, better timing estimation, more complexity without this (from supporting dual BWP one with 120kHz and 480/960kHz)
	+ Do not support (8): Futurewei, Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Apple, [CATT]
		- Main concerns: added (cell search) complexity for the UE, additional specification work
* **Case C) Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS for both initial access and non-initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 240Hz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.**
	+ Support (8 / 11 as 2nd preference): Nokia, NSB, Futurewei, CATT, Ericsson, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo (2nd preference if case B cannot be supported), Xiaomi, Sony (2nd preference between B/C), Apple (only if case B is not supported), LGE
		- Main reasons: commonality with FR2 framework
	+ Do not support (5): OPPO, Intel, Huawei, HiSilicon, WILUS

#### **4th Round Discussion:**

Chairman has suggested one alternative for consideration. The main consideration for the proposal 1.1-16 from the chairman was that the first release for a new band determines the basic functionality that may be leveraged for any future releases and additional use cases that may come up. Therefore, limiting what may be supported for initial access may have consequences on what could be done in the future.

From moderator’s understanding, the two proposals that may satisfy Chairman suggestion for consideration are Proposal 1.1-16 (chairman’s original suggestion for compromise) and proposal 1.1-3.

###### **Proposal 1.1-16)**

Proposal for a working assumption:

* Support SSB with 240/480/960 kHz for initial and non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in UE complexity under a limit of [X].

###### **Proposal 1.1-3)**

* Support SSB 240kHz SCS for both initial access and non-initial access scenarios
* Support configuration of 480kHz and 960kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for SSB with 120kHz and 240kHz SCS

As chairman guidance, companies are asked to provide inputs on the Proposal 1.1-16 and any other potential proposal (even very creative ones) that they think could allow broader support and agreement in RAN1. The discussion does not necessarily need to be limited to proposal 1.1-16.

###### **Proposal 1.1-17)**

Proposal for a working assumption:

* Support SSB with 240/480/960 kHz for initial and non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in the total number of synchronization raster entries per band no larger than the maximum total number of synchronization raster entries per band. If the assumption cannot be satisfied, it’s up to RAN4 to decide which of 240/480/960 kHz SCS are supported for initial access of such band.
* Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS for SSB are UE capabilities:
	+ UE is not expected to support 480 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
	+ UE is not expected to support 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
* Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN4.

###### **Proposal 1.1-18)**

Proposal for a working assumption:

* Support SSB with 240/480/960 kHz for initial and non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ [Additional items to reduce workload:]
		- [SSB time domain candidate resource pattern (within a slot or pair of slots) for 480 and 960kHz SSB are identical]
		- [CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB is only supported for same SCS between SSB and CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH]
		- [any others?]
* It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in the total number of synchronization raster entries per band no larger than the maximum total number of synchronization raster entries per band. If the assumption cannot be satisfied, it’s up to RAN4 to decide which of 240/480/960 kHz SCS are supported for initial access of such band.
* Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS for SSB are UE capabilities:
	+ UE is not expected to support 480 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
	+ UE is not expected to support 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
* Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN4.

###### **Proposal 1.1-19)**

* Support only one additional SCS (either 480kHz or 960kHz) for SSB for both initial and non-initial access case. SSB with the additional SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ Down-select between 480 kHz or 960 kHz
* Support only the same numerology between SSB and CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH (if CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH is signaled in MIB)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We support Proposal 1.1-16 in principle, and we believe this is the best direction we could achieve to compromise the implementation requirement from each side. Regarding the initial search complexity concern, we suggest the following modification, and we believe it’s reasonable to support multiple SCS if the number of sync raster entries can be smaller than FR2, which is 344. We are open to adding “dedicated signalling” as a candidate approach to provide CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration for further down-select (anyway this is an urgent task), if this can be a way forward. Technically we believe configuration in MIB is good enough. Proposal for a working assumption (updated by Samsung):* Support SSB with 240/480/960 kHz for initial and non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in the total number of synchronization raster entries per band no larger than the maximum total number of synchronization raster entries per band. If the assumption cannot be satisfied, it’s up to RAN4 to decide which of 240/480/960 kHz SCS are supported for initial access of such band.
* Send an LS to RAN4.

We object Proposal 1.1-3 since it didn’t provide any benefit. We didn’t the logic that supporting mixed numerology with indication by MIB can achieve the target of implementing SSB alone in a sub-band. Supporting such mixed numerology is challenging in k\_SSB indication as well.  |
| Qualcomm | We support proposal 1.1-3.We believe searching for 4 different possible SSB SCS for initial search involves unacceptable initial access delay and complexity. The complexity includes larger memory requires for storing the samples for the search and higher number of timing hypothesis to test. For FR2 and 52.6-71GHz band, due to beamforming nature of both TX and RX, search for SSB is slower than FR1 in the beginning, and adding more SCS hypothesis will make user experience even worse. Reducing number of raster points will help the search time, but even with 120KHz and 240KHz, we are proposing to reduce the number of raster points to help.Additionally, it is not clear to us if we support 480/960 for initial search but 480/960 SCS is UE optional. What will happen if gNB deploys 480/960 SSB but UE does not support it. Is it the common understanding that the UE will simply not able to access the network?For single SCS deployment comment we brought up in the meeting, I am not sure I understand Samsung’s comment above. Repeat what I mentioned in the meeting, if we have 120/240 SSB but pointing to a 480/960 initial DL BWP, in our view, this is already single SCS operation. The UE will only use 480/960 for reception of control and data. For SSB, the UE is handling that with a separate receiver branch anyway. So there is no UE side SCS switching. From gNB point of view, the SSB will be 120/240, and everything else is 480/960. As long as gNB does not FDM SSB with other signals/channels, this is simple TDM multiplexing of two waveforms, and SSB can be pre-generated. |
| Samsung2 | To Qualcomm: Our point is, your intended scenario can be already achieved by configuring a BWP with 480/960 kHz in RMSI, and multiplexing PDCCH/PDSCH of RMSI with SSB using the same numerology of 120 kHz. I believe this implementation is even better since the PDCCH/PDSCH of RMSI can occupied the frequency domain and time domain gaps between SSBs. In this sense, configuring PDCCH/PDSCH of RMSI using 480/960 kHz in MIB is not that essential, especially considering it will cost 1 bit further from MIB. For the UE capability issue, we forget to mention it in the updated proposal. Please find our updated wording to Proposal 1.1-16. Hopefully it could address the concern on initial search complexity (e.g. a UE doesn’t need to search that much if it didn’t support such capability). Proposal for a working assumption (updated by Samsung2):* Support SSB with 240/480/960 kHz for initial and non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in the total number of synchronization raster entries per band no larger than the maximum total number of synchronization raster entries per band. If the assumption cannot be satisfied, it’s up to RAN4 to decide which of 240/480/960 kHz SCS are supported for initial access of such band.
* Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS for SSB are UE capabilities:
	+ 480 kHz SCS for SSB and 480 kHz SCS for data/control channels are not separate UE capabilities.
	+ 960 kHz SCS for SSB and 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels are not separate UE capabilities.
* Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN4.
 |
| Qualcomm2 | To Samsung and allThanks for the explanation in Samsung2 comment.On the RSMI based BWP configuration, what you described is certainly possible. This is also the same view from HW during the meeting. However, in that case, the gNB still needs to deploy a mixed SCS scenario with RMSI in 120/240 and normal data/control in 480/960. From UE perspective, this is totally fine and better as you mentioned. This requires a little bit more work on the gNB side though.For the UE capability, thanks for the explanation. We agree if 480/960 SSB for initial access is supported, it should be optional. However, we are not sure if the same capability should control data/control SCS and SSB initial access SCS. Given an implementation, it is possible that a SCS can be supported for data and control but not for initial search. It might be safer to use different UE capabilities to control them. |
| AT&T | We feel it is crucial that from a deployment perspective RAN1 agrees on either Proposal 1.1-3 or Proposal 1.1-16. It is not acceptable to leave the agreement from last week as is. ANR in LAA/NSA deployments has been supported since Rel. 10 incl. NR since Rel. 15. In Rel. 16 this very group undertook a dedicated effort to restore ANR functionality for NR-U. ANR is a very important feature that needs to be supported irrespective of the PCell. This is based on deployment needs. Our preference is Proposal 1.1-16 ideally with the modifications by Samsung. Proposal 1.1-3 is the minimum we have to achieve this week. Not making further agreements on CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for 480kHz and 960kHz is not acceptable. 3GPP cannot take away features that operators rely on when new bands are introduced.  |
| Intel | We support chairman’s Proposal 1.1-16 and we don’t support Proposal 1.1-3.As we understood, the main reason to support only SSB 240kHz SCS for both initial access and non-initial access scenarios is to reduce specification impact and possibly alleviate timing mismatch issue between SSB and data/control when the latter has SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz. However, if we stick to reducing the specification impact and, therefore, rely only on the existing patterns for multiplexing of SSB and CORESET#0 during initial access, we will end up with SCS 120 kHz for CORESET#0. If we, at the same time, have SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for the rest of data/control transmissions, there are three different numerologies: SSB SCS 240 kHz, CORESET#0 SCS 120 kHz and SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for data/control. This is what we don’t prefer. To avoid this kind of situations, additional specification work is needed anyway to define mux patterns for SSB SCS 240 kHz and CORESET#0 SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz. Therefore, amount of specification effort is even greater in our opinion.For us, more natural way is to accept some specification efforts for SSB SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz used for initial access and benefit from single numerology operation (e.g., avoiding potential timing misalignment between SSB and data/control). However, as a compromise, we can accept SSB SCS 240 kHz for initial access if optional SSB SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for initial access is also agreed. Some companies assume SSB SCS 240 kHz to be mandatory for NR above 52.6 kHz as it is in FR2. This brings an increase in cell search complexity comparing to supporting only one mandatory SSB SCS (i.e., 120 kHz). In order to make up for the increased complexity, we need possibility to operate in a simpler mode using single numerology. That’s why we need optional support of SSB SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for initial access.We also disagree with market fragmentation issue expressed by some companies. Currently in FR1 in some licensed bands there may be two types of networks deployed operating with different SCS (i.e., 15 kHz and 30 kHz) even though initially the primarily purpose to support 15 kHz SSB was coexistence with LTE. We don’t think that situation is totally different from NR above 52.6 GHz where some private networks in unlicensed bands can be run using SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz. With this said, if RAN1 accepts Chairman’s compromise, and if the UE needs to support all the SCS for SSB, such market fragmentation, even though we don’t necessarily concur, will not occur.We think what Chairman pointed out should be weighed in. Initial access aspects is something that cannot be really updated and enhanced in future releases. More constraints we impose for initial access for the fear of some specification work, could very well lead to lost in opportunity for supporting specific use cases and deployment scenarios. This is exactly the reason additional SCS for SSB was agreed for some bands during Rel-15, even though every company in RAN1 previously agreed that only 1 should be supported for complexity reasons. Once determined for Rel-15, it will be something that can never be changed in the future. The same logic applies here for beyond 52.6GHz.While Chairman’s compromise isn’t something we originally preferred, RAN1 should try to make progress in this meeting by accepting it as working assumption. |
| Samsung3 | Thanks to Qualcomm for the further comments. The intention to introduce restriction on UE capability between SSB and data/control is to reduce initial search complexity. The sentence can be reformulated to address Qualcomm’s concern, and leave whether same or different UE capability to the end of the WI for discussion. Proposal for a working assumption (updated by Samsung3):* Support SSB with 240/480/960 kHz for initial and non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in the total number of synchronization raster entries per band no larger than the maximum total number of synchronization raster entries per band. If the assumption cannot be satisfied, it’s up to RAN4 to decide which of 240/480/960 kHz SCS are supported for initial access of such band.
* Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS for SSB are UE capabilities:
	+ UE is not expected to support 480 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
	+ UE is not expected to support 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
* Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN4.
 |
| Apple  | We support Proposal 1.1-3. We object Proposal 1.1-16. 1) We would like to note that the keeping ‘480/960’kHz SCS as optional feature is the condition that the current WID can be approved in plenary with these SCSs. The discussion here is almost repeating what happened in plenary. Support SSB with 480/960kHz SCS essentially mandates them for UE implementation, which clearly violates the ‘Note’ in the WID description and lost the meaning of ‘optional’. We can compromise to support 480kHz SCS and pay the ‘price’ to acknowledge the request from some operators. However, support ‘240/480/960’kHz is something that goes too far from what we can compromise. 2) Second, SSB SCSs should be justified by the target use case and the ‘price’, i.e., UE complexity and cost. In previously discussions, although companies hold different position, clear justifications are still provided for 240kHz vs. 480/960kHz SCS. For example, 120kHz SCS seems to be important for outdoor scenario. While 240kHz SCS is competing with 480/960kHz SCS for small cell or indoor scenarios where coverage is less concerned. We fail to see any rationale to support ‘240+480+960kHz’ as it caused complexity/cost with duplicated standard/implementation/testing efforts. 3) Third, we do not think it is proper way to handle this issue based on some ‘assumed’ RAN4 design. If RAN4 channelization design is the key decision-maker factor, why we do not ask RAN4 to handle this issue and make decision correspondingly? 4) Regarding cell search complexity, we understand that there is debating between 240 vs. 480/960kHz complexity. On the other hand, it is clear that the complexity will be increased comparing ‘240/480/960’ vs. 240 or vs. 480/960. We realize there is some channelization design proposed in RAN1 on this regard, which has to be first agreed by RAN4 before we can use it for relevant design analysis. Moreover, we acknowledged that the complexity is not only cell searching but also includes many other aspects, e.g., sampling/buffering and increased number of timing hypothesis to test. etc.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Interdigital | We support Proposal 1.1-16 and object Proposal 1.1-3. |
| Ericsson | We can live with Proposal 1.1-16, even though it has never been our first preference. If this is agreed, then we think that the only new (SSB,CORESET0) SCS combinations that need to be specified are (480,480), and (960,960). The existing combinations (120,120) and (240,120) can be reused.However, the maximum UE search complexity of 344 proposed by Samsung is too low a threshold to overturn support of 240/480/960. The number 344 corresponds to the SSB search complexity for only one of the FR2 bands (band n259). For any UE that supports more than one FR2 band, the search complexity can be roughly double this value. In fact, in a previous meeting Samsung suggested that a search complexity around 600 could be acceptable from a UE perspective. This is still ½ of the complexity for a UE that supports all 4 FR2 bands. In our contribution, we have analyzed the SSB search complexity for supporting 120 + 240 kHz SSB assuming RAN4 adopts a fixed channelization design for the 57 – 71 GHz unlicensed band. We find that the required search complexity for 120 + 240 assuming 100 MHz minimum bandwidth is on the order of 370 (assuming that not all sync raster points for Pattern 1 can be reused for Pattern 3). Assuming 480 and 960 are also supported, the number of additional sync raster points assuming 400 MHz minimum bandwidth for those SCSs would be 14 GHz / 400 MHz \* 2 = 70. Allowing for a slight increase to support both Pattern 1 and Pattern 3, this could increase to maybe, 120 or so. So we think that the total complexity to support all 4 SCSs is roughly 500 instead of 344. This is still less than a UE that would support two FR2 bands.If 1.1-16 is not agreeable, then we do not support Proposal 1.1-3, and instead prefer Proposal 1.1-9 since that proposal can support the ANR use case with minimum specification effort. With Proposal 1.1.9, the only new (SSB,CORESET0) SCS combinations that would need to be specified to support ANR are (480,480) and (960,960). Neither would need to be specified if dedicated signaling is agreed.In contrast, Propoosal 1.1-3 seems to require specifying (120,480), (240,480),(120,960),(240,960) in addition to (480,480), (960,960), hence we think that the specification effort will be excessive. |
| Futurewei | We appreciate chair and FL’s efforts to conclude this discussion, but we cannot support the Proposal 1.1-16. It would add unnecessary complexity and burden for the initial access while providing very little or no market value.Proposal 1.1-3 as Ericsson noticed seems to require many additional SCS combinations.We prefer having initial access with 120/240 kHz SSB and CORESET#0 (only existing combinations). The necessity of 480/960 kHz for the initial access (SSB/CORESET#0) may be further discussed and if necessary, added in Rel 18. If majority support 1.1-9 we could compromise to it. |
| Verizon | From an operator’s perspective, our preference is Proposal 1.1-16, at least in principle. We understand the concerns of specification effort and product complixity (by today’s standard), but at the same time, feel that a more streamlined numerlogy and options fitting different deployment scenarios (e.g, smallcells) are also quite important for the future.We agree with ATT that ANR is a feature required by the deployment and we shall figure out a solution to maintain. Not able to support it is not acceptable. |
| DOCOMO | We share AT&T’s view from a deployment perspective RAN1 should agree on either Proposal 1.1-3 or Proposal 1.1-16. Our preference is Proposal 1.1-16, and we are fine with Samsung3’s update. With this alternative, we are ok with specifying the new (SSB, CORESET#0) SCS combinations of (480, 480) and (960, 960) only. If Proposal 1.1-16 is not acceptable, we believe RAN1 needs to support Proposal 1.1-3. Otherwise there is only an inefficient approach to utilize larger SCSs.  |
| LG Electronics | We object to Proposal 1.1-3. From our understanding, it does not provide any solution to resolve ANR issue. If 480/960 kHz SCS SSB is transmitted on off-sync raster, UE cannot obtain the information on CGI since it doesn’t provide CORESET#0/type0-PDCCH configuration. So, with Proposal 1.1-3, how does ANR function? Please let us know if we missed something.For Proposal 1.1-16, we are still not agreeable. Our first preference is to introduce 240 kHz SCS SSB for initial access and for non-initial access, as mandatory feature. In addition, as a compromise, we can accept one of 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB for initial access, as an optional feature. |
| Qualcomm3 | In FR1, other than a few exceptions, we only support one initial search SCS per band. If I remembered right, for FR2, in RAN1, we also agreed to pick one initial search SCS per band. It was later decided in RAN4 that both 120 and 240KHz are mandated in FR2. So far, in both FR1 and FR2, we have up to two initial search SCS. The need to support 4 initial search SCS for 52.6-71GHz band is excessive for us. We also don’t see a strong need for the high SCS SSBs, given Proposal 1.1-3 can achieve all the goals.Complexity-wise, we share the same view as Apple that the searcher complexity is not simply depends on the number of raster points. The buffer size for searcher is a critical matter. 960KHz SSB requires 4 times the buffer size as 240KHz SSB.Proposal 1.1-9 is acceptable to us as it is already achievable in FR2. Proposal 1.1-3 is trying to address concerns from operators or gNB vendors if a single SCS deployment is preferred. If the spec impact is a concern, we can further introduce some restrictions to reduce the spec impact* We can reduce the number of subcarrier spacing combinations. For example we can limit to (120,480) and (240,960), and drop (120,960) and (240, 480). This may reduce the spec effort by half.
* Additionally we can limit the SSB and Coreset #0 to pattern 1 only, to avoid any mixed numerology OFDM symbols, which might be difficult to transmit.
* For (480,480) and (960,960) case, since it is for ANR purpose, the RSMI may not need to be large, and we don’t need to optimize it. Might be enough to reuse as baseline the FR2 (120,120) multiplexing pattern with a simple 4x scaling.

To LG. For proposal 1.1-3, we do propose to support (480,480) and (960,960) for SCell. ANR can be supported with that. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support 1.1-16. As we discussed before, we cannot agree to support 480 (960) kHz SSB for cases other than what we have already agreed to (support 480/960 kHz SSB when SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE and SSB does not configure Type-0 PDCCH) due to the initial search complexity, the danger of fragmentation, and standardization effort (please note that we only have 4 e-meetings left three of which are 7 days meetings and all of them only 1 or 2 TUs allocated to above 52.6 GHz). Current agreement guarantees a good synch accuracy, RRM measurement on the same numerology as the active BWP, and single numerology operation at the UE side (no need to change the active BWP after initial access). As for the concerns of some companies regarding ANR support, we have provided our views in details in the third round. In particular, we do not find this feature essential for sCells and we do not see why it is necessary to configure CORESET#0 for 480 (960) kHz SSB only to support ANR. Still, as we pointed out during last GTW meeting, we are open to discuss whether and how to support ANR for sCells within the bounds of current agreements, that is, for 480 (960) kHz SSBs whose location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE and do not configure Type-0 PDCCH. Regarding 1.1-3:As a compromise and in view of the fact that multiple companies are supporting 240 kHz SSB while it seems that no company is strongly against it and to conclude the discussion regarding supported SSB SCS, we could support the first bullet of 1.1-3. We prefer to discuss CORESET#0 numerology for 240 kHz SCS as FFS. As discussed, we have concerns regarding the specification impact of introducing 480/960 kHz CORESET#0 numerologies. Further, we have concerns that if a UE only supports 120/240 kHz and 240 kHz SSB configures a 960 kHz CORESET#0, UE would not be able to read SIB1 and UE would not be able to even receive UE capability signaling.  |
| LG Electronics2 | To QualcommThanks for the clarification on Proposal 1.1-3). Nevertheless, based on my reading of Proposal 1.1-3), it seems to support 480/960 kHz CORESET#0/type0-PDCCH configuration with 120/240 kHz SSB, not with 480/960 kHz SSB.We have a similar concern with Huawei on Proposal 1.1-3). If we support 120 kHz SSB & 480/960 kHz CORESET#0, UE incapable of 480/960 kHz will not access the cell even though the cell with 120 kHz SSB is detected, which leads to huge increase for initial access procedure. |
| vivo | Among Proposal 1.1-16 and Proposal 1.1-3, our first preference is Proposal 1.1-16.Regarding buffering problem of 480/960K SSB mentioned by QC, we think there will be several ways to relieve the problem, e.g. reduce the default initial access period, or perform pipeline based buffering and processing of the samples. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Proposal 1.1-16, and object Proposal 1.1-3.We can accept Proposal 1.1-16 since the additional complexity is quite limited as mentioned by Samsung and Ericsson. Besides, the multiplexing pattern for SSB and CORESET#0 can be reused to reduce the spec effort.For Proposal 1.1-3, it results in large amount of spec effort to specify the multiplexing patterns for SCS combination (120, 480), (120, 960), (240, 480) and (240, 960), which is not acceptable. |
| Apple  | In addition to Proposal 1.1-3, we can compromise to support Proposal 1.1-9.  |
| CATT | Considering the tradeoff between implementation complexity and specification effort, our first preference is 1.1-9. We can also compromise to 1.1-16 . |
| Nokia | We would support Proposal 1.1-16. We think that it would possible to achieve reasonable compromise on the UE complexity (accounting the number of search fingers) through limiting the number of frequency raster points. In terms of UE complexity there of course exist another dimension that could be considered to alleviate the complexity. The buffer size is affected by the SS period length due to timing ambiguity, which is 20ms for the existing bands. Thus, if RAN4 is not able to conclude/reach sufficiently low number of SS raster points, one option (though least favored of mine) would to restrict the UE assumption of SS periodicity in initial cell selection phase from 20ms to 10ms.A note regarding 1.1-3, that e.g. configuration of 480kHz and 960kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for 120kHz SSB implies similar UE capability as 1.1.-16 restrictions in terms of access to the cell as SSB with 480KHz/960kHz.  |
| Moderator | Intermediate update moved below Intel’s comments. |
| Intel | We support Proposal 1.1-17.We see some companies support SSB SCS 240 kHz as ONLY additional numerology for initial and non-initial access cases. They motivate it by smaller complexity. However, as we commented, SSB SCS 240 kHz will be paired with CORESET#0 SCS 120 kHz, and likely be paired with 3rd SCS of a BWP which is either 480 kHz or 960 kHz. This feature, which requires 3 different SCS, brings very little value but adds a ton of complexity for both UE and gNB. Let us also recall that SSB SCS 240 kHz would imply an increased number of mux pattern combinations {SSB SCS, CORESET#0 SCS}, e.g., {120 kHz, 120 kHz}, {120 kHz, 480 kHz}, {120 kHz, 960 kHz}, {240 kHz, 120 kHz}, {240 kHz, 480 kHz}, {240 kHz, 960 kHz}. Therefore, proposal 1.1-13 or just the first bullet of 1.1-13 is not acceptable for us.Regarding implementation details for initial and non-initial access cases, we see the key difference in the number of GSCN search attempts only. Our understanding is that the amount of memory needed for, e.g., buffering is similar for both initial and non-initial access (and not smaller in case of non-initial access). The reason for the same memory constraint is because the placement of SSB for Scell with respect to Pcell is not limited by NR specification. In particular, even if Pcell and Scell are time frame synchronized within 3us, servingCellConfig RRC IE does not include any info about timing of the SSB: For example, an SSB of Pcell may be located in the first half of a frame whereas the SSB of Scell may be located in the second half of the same frame.For Proposal 1.1-9, while this leaves ANR for open, it does not solve on how single numerology operation would be enabled for single wideband carriers, and introduces 240 kHz which we believe cause more problems than it solves.If Proposal 1.1-17 or 1.1-16 cannot be agreed, to address some companies’ concerns regarding complexity issue and, at the same time, enable the option of single numerology operation, let as suggest the following modified version of Proposal 1.1-13:* Support only one additional SCS (either 480kHz or 960kHz) for SSB for both initial and non-initial access case. SSB with the additional SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ Down-select between 480 kHz or 960 kHz
* Support only the same numerology between SSB and CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH (if CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH is signaled in MIB)

We hope that this would be a compromise as it is only one SSB SCS for both initial and non-initial access in addition to SSB SCS 120 kHz. And at the same time, it is still optional. |
| Moderator | Intermediate update moved below MediaTek’s comments. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We prefer proposal 1.1-16 |
| LG Electronics | We are OK with Moderator’s proposal 1.1-19 if 240 kHz SSB is supported as well. |
| Mediatek | We are ok with Proposal 1.1-9 |
| DOCOMO | We are also ok with Proposal 1.1-9 and 1.1-17, as well as 1.1-3 and 1.1-16.  |
| Moderator | From moderator’s understanding none of 1.1-3, 1.1-9, or 1.1-16 is what companies originally preferred. We are discussing non-favored compromises that company maybe able to accept for sake of progress.-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------Below, ok does not mean these companies prefer, but just note that they can accept for the sake of progress. Below is just an intermediate check of the current status.Proposal 1.1-3* Ok: Apple, Qualcomm, AT&T, Docomo
* Not ok: Samsung, Intel, Interdigital, Ericsson, Futurewei, LGE, ZTE, Sanechips,

Proposal 1.1-9* Ok: Apple, Ericsson, Futurewei, Qualcomm, CATT, MediaTek, Docomo
* Not ok: [Huawei?], Intel

Proposal 1.1-13* Ok: Samsung, [LGE?],
* Not ok: [Huawei?]

Proposal 1.1-14 (added 240kHz to 1.1-13)* Ok: LGE
* Not ok:

Proposal 1.1-16 (Chairman’s compromise proposal)* Ok: Samsung, AT&T, Intel, Interdigital, Ericsson, Verizon, Docomo, vivo, ZTE, Sanechips, CATT, Nokia, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Docomo
* Not ok: Qualcomm, Apple, Futurewei, LGE

Proposal 1.1-17 (from Samsung)* Ok: Samsung, Intel, Docomo
* Not ok:

Proposal 1.1-19 (from Intel)* Ok: Intel, LGE(ok only if 240kHz can be supported),
* Not ok:

------------------------------------------------------------Among the different proposals 1.1-17 I think tries to further narrow down the work and impact that could be imposed to companies, and right be good compromise, if 1.1-16 does not work. If it helps, we can consider further down scoping of the potential work for 1.1-17. I’ve added some examples in Proposal 1.1-18. Please note some example items list in 1.1-18 are some creative examples on how we can try to minimize additional workload (as I notice this is one of the key issues for several companies). Please read them as examples, and feel free to comment/suggest further.Added Proposal 1.1-19 from Intel. |

#### **4th Round Discussion Summary:**

Moderator summarizes views and proposals from companies. Ok describe below does not mean these companies prefer, but just note that a company can accept the proposal for the sake of progress.

Proposal 1.1-3

* Ok: Apple, Qualcomm, AT&T, Docomo
* Not ok: Samsung, Intel, Interdigital, Ericsson, Futurewei, LGE, ZTE, Sanechips, Intel

Proposal 1.1-9

* Ok: Apple, Ericsson, Futurewei, Qualcomm, CATT, MediaTek, Docomo
* Not ok: [Huawei?], Intel

Proposal 1.1-13

* Ok: Samsung, [LGE?],
* Not ok: [Huawei?]

Proposal 1.1-14 (added 240kHz to 1.1-13)

* Ok: LGE
* Not ok:

Proposal 1.1-16 (Chairman’s compromise proposal)

* Ok: Samsung, AT&T, Intel, Interdigital, Ericsson, Verizon, Docomo, vivo, ZTE, Sanechips, CATT, Nokia, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Docomo
* Not ok: Qualcomm, Apple, Futurewei, LGE

Proposal 1.1-17 (from Samsung)

* Ok: Samsung, Intel, Docomo
* Not ok:

Proposal 1.1-19 (from Intel)

* Ok: Intel, LGE(ok only if 240kHz can be supported),
* Not ok:

From the feedback, its pretty clear proposal 1.1-3 is something that could not be supported. Also while proposal 1.1-16 does have significant number of supporters, but also have at least 4 companies who have concerns. Among the options, moderator suggest reviewing Proposal 1.1-9, 1.1-13, 1.1-14, 1.1-16, 1.1-17, and 1.1-19 and discuss further with a proposal that might have good chance for approval.

### 2.1.2 DRS Related Aspects (including potential use of Short Signal Exemption for SSB)

* From [1] Huawei, HiSilicon:
	+ Support discovery burst and discovery burst transmission window for operations in shared spectrum in 52.6GHz to 71GHz. Discovery burst includes SSB, CORESET#0, PDSCH carrying RMSI and non-zero power CSI-RS.
	+ Use the following method to implicitly indicate that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode Ues:
		- If DBTW length is equal to or smaller than the time duration from the beginning of the half frame to the end of the slot containing the candidate SSB index N\_SSB^QCL-1, DBTW is disabled.
		- If DBTW length is larger than the time duration from the beginning of the half frame to the end of the slot containing the candidate SSB index N\_SSB^QCL -1, DBTW is enabled.
	+ Three bits are used to indicate in shared spectrum in 52.6GHz to 71GHz: One bit from subCarrierSpacingCommon in MIB, One bit from ssb-SubcarrierOffset in MIB, and one bit from searchSpaceZero in pdcch-ConfigSIB1 in MIB.
	+ DBTW with values {0.5ms, 1ms, 2ms, 2.5ms, 3ms, 4ms, 5ms} is supported in shared spectrum in 52.6GHz to 71GHz and is configured in ServingCellConfigCommonSIB.
* From [2] OPPO:
	+ For above 52.6GH unlicensed spectrum, the DBTW within which additional SSB candidate positions may be configured is supported.
	+ Reuse NRU mechanism to determine QCL relationship between SSB candidate indexes.
	+ DB is not supported.
* From [3] Spreadtrum:
	+ If Cat-2 LBT is supported, DB can be supported.
	+ DBTW can be supported.
* From [4] vivo:
	+ Type0-PDCCH, SIB1 and CSI-RS should be included in DB other than SSB for NR operation from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
	+ Support DBTW in un-licensed band from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, no matter which SSB SCS.
	+ The following methods could be considered to determine whether there is DBTW:
		- Alt. 1: Frequency band (licensed or un-licensed);
		- Alt. 2: The indicator in PBCH;
		- Alt. 3: The design of SSB sequence (PSS, SSS and DMRS).
	+ The following methods could be considered to indicate the value of Q:
		- Alt. 1: Specify the value of Q for each SCS;
		- Alt. 2: Utilize the bits in PBCH;
	+ With the increase value of Q and the introduction of DBTW, the ssbPositionsInBurst in SIB1 should be clarified.
* From [5] Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell
	+ Support operation with and without DBTW for initial access.
	+ Apply Short Control Signal exemption (SCSe) at least for SSB.
	+ Consider SCSe limitation in DBTW procedure to enable fair transmission opportunities for all SSBs.
	+ If DBTW assumption can be changed, it should be available to the UE starting from initial cell selection.
* From [6] CATT:
	+ For NR operation in unlicensed spectrum in 52.6-71 GHz, the discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) shall be supported for 120 KHz SSB when Gnb configures more than 56 SSBs transmission.
	+ DBTW is not needed for SSB with 480KHz/960KHz SCS since the duty cycle is less than 6% over 100 ms observation window of the short control signaling transmissions constraint.
	+ More than 64 SSB transmission opportunities shall be defined within a 5ms SSB burst set to support up to 64 beams for SSB beam sweeping in case of occasional LBT failure. The additional bit(s) for the extension of SSB candidate index need to be further study.
	+ How to perform DBTW shall be further studied if the actual number of SSB transmissions is more than 56 with the potential extension to have maximum number of candidate SSB position up to 80.
* From [7] MediaTek:
	+ Candidate positions of SSB should not be increased if additional bits are required.
* From [9] Futurewei:
	+ Support DBTW for 60 GHz unlicensed spectrum. The DBTW may be disabled or enabled by the Gnb.
	+ Signaling to Ues to indicate that DBTW is enabled and disabled should be supported.
	+ Use the NR-U DBTW design as basis for DBWT in 60 GHz design.
	+ Consider using CSI-RS presence in the discovery burst for possible ways to do beam refinement during the initial channel access.
* From [10] Ericsson:
	+ Reuse the definition of the Rel-16 discovery burst (DB) also for the 52.6-71 GHz frequency range.
* From [11] Xiaomi:
	+ Discovery burst transmission window should be supported similarly as in Rel\_16.
* From [12] Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:
	+ For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, potential enhancements related to periodic transmission of DRS such as SSB/PBCH/CORESET#0 are needed including:
		- performing directional LBT prior to the transmission of SSB according to the ssb-PositionsInBurst
		- directional LBT on multiple beams at the same time at the beginning of the DRS window
		- Cat 2 LBT (depending on the gap) before actual transmission
* From [13] Intel:
	+ At least for SSB SCS 120 kHz, support SS burst as DRS (discovery burst):
	+ Increase the number of candidate SSB indices up to 80, i.e., ;
	+ For QCL relationship indication across SSBs, reuse Rel-16 NR-U mechanism by introducing parameter
		- FFS: or ;
	+ No changes to MIB payload size. Further discuss and consider reinterpreting bits from some bit fields within MIB to extend candidate SSB index and information.
* From [14] Apple:
	+ If DBTW is introduced for above 52.6GHz frequency band, support enabling/disabling the DBTW by scrambling CRC bits of PBCH payload.
	+ If DBTW is introduced, for above 52.6GHz frequency band, consider re-purposing the 1-bit ‘subCarrierSpacingCommon’ and 1-bit MSB of controlResourceSetZero to signal the Q value.
* From [15] Qualcomm:
	+ for an unlicensed band that requires LBT, do not support discovery burst (DB) or discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) for SSB
	+ consider ways to have 2 bits (1 extra bit compared to FR2) to indicate the common SCS in the SSB structure or contents in case more than 2 values for the common SCS are allowed
* From [16] Samsung:
	+ Support discovery burst transmission window for 60 GHz unlicensed band.
		- The content of discover burst at least include the same components as Rel-16 NR-U;
		- The indication of Q can be in MIB for a best effort, and if not possible, in SIB1;
		- The indication of DBTW disabling can be joint coded with the indication of Q;
		- Current PBCH payload can support timing indication of up to 128 candidate SS/PBCH block candidate locations;
		- For initial access, different synchronization raster entries are applied for licensed and unlicensed operations; for non-initial access, support an explicit indication of licensed or licensed operation when configuring a cell.
* From [17] Sony:
	+ Discovery burst and discovery burst transmission window should be supported at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS.
	+ Up to 80 candidate SSB position should be supported for 120 kHz SSB SCS.
		- Lower value of QCL relations (e.g. 1, 2, 4) is not necessary to introduce for 60 GHz unlicensed operation.
		- When {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS equal to {120, 120} kHz, reserved state could be utilized for indication of candidate SSB indices and QCL relation.
		- If 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS is supported for initial access case, subCarrierSpacingCommon could be utilized for indication of candidate SSB indices and QCL relation.
* From [18] LGE:
	+ Consider the following methods to indicate enabled/disabled DBTW for idle and/or connected mode Ues.
		- Separate two sets of GSCN values where one set corresponds to the case of disabled DBTW while the other set corresponds to the case of enabled DBTW
		- Signalling via system information (e.g., measObject)
		- UE-specific RRC signaling (e.g., for Scell addition)
	+ Consider all or some of the following bits to indicate candidate values.
		- subCarrierSpacingCommon
		- LSB of ssb-SubcarrierOffset
		- dmrs-TypeA-Position
	+ Discuss how to signal actually transmitted SSBs via ssb-PositionsInBurst when less than 64 can be indicated in MIB.
* From [19] Convida Wireless:
	+ Increasing the number of SSB candidate positions to above 64 to increase transmission opportunities to cope with LBT failure should be considered.
* From [21] Interdigital:
	+ Enhance the initial access operation to support Discovery Burst (DB) and Discovery Burst Transmission Window (DBTW) in unlicensed spectrum operations that require LBT in beyond 52.6GHz spectrum.
	+ Support the enhancements on the reference tables in indication of the Q parameter for up to 64 SSB beams in initial access operations for unlicensed spectrum in beyond 52.6GHz, e.g., subsamples of the Q parameter.
* From [23] ZTE, Sanechip:
	+ Discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) should be supported for 120 kHz SSB SCS and other SSB SCSs if they are agreed to be supported.
	+ A discovery burst (DB) in Rel-17 NR above 52.6 GHz includes at least an SSB and may also include RMSI-CORESET, RMSI-PDSCH and/or NZP CSI-RS.
	+ In order to reduce the impact of standardization caused by indicating candidate SSB indices, the maximum number of candidate SSB defined in the half-frame can be limited to 128 or kept unchanged (maintain 64) for 240/480/960 kHz SSB SCS.
	+ For LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands, it is not necessary to enable/disable the DBTW by explicit signaling. The impacts on LBT exempt operation brought by DBTW can be eliminated by configuration implementation.
* From [24] NEC:
	+ DBTW should be supported at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS in mmWave unlicensed band that requires LBT.
	+ Discovery burst (DB) in mmWave operation should include CORESET#0 for PDCCH scheduling PDSCH with SIB1, PDSCH carrying SIB1 and/or non-zero power CSI-RS at least.
	+ The indication of Q value in NR-U should be reused to indicate DBTW enabling/disabling and Q value jointly at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS.
	+ Additional discovery burst transmission window in the adjacent frame could be considered as a method of cycling SSB transmission.
	+ With concurrent spatial multiplexing DBTWs, all SSBs could be transmitted in a cycling transmission fashion.
	+ The long term sensing could be considered as an approach to mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW.
	+ The application of DBTW for SSB transmission could be indicated per SSB/beam.
* From [26] WILUS:
	+ It seems beneficial to introduce discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) by defining candidate SSB positions within the DBTW.
	+ To maintain commonality and minimum of specification impacts for NR operation in both licensed band and an unlicensed band of 60GHz, we propose not to change the first symbol indexes for candidate SS/PBCH blocks as defined in FR2 and not to change SSB pattern with 120kHz SCS within a slot.
	+ It should be further considered that the additional candidate SS/PBCH block locations within a DBTW can be set to the closest slot locations after LBT failure at candidate SS/PBCH blocks locations as defined in FR2.

**Summary of Discussions**

* Discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) for SSB
	+ Do not support DB or DBTW
		- CATT (for 480/960kHz), Qualcomm
	+ Support DB or DBW
		- Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, CATT (only for 120kHz SSB), Ericsson, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Intel, Apple, Samsung, Sony, LGE, Interdigital, ZTE(120kHz), Sanechip (120kHz), NEC (at least for 120kHz), WILUS
* Configuration of DB/DBTW
	+ Enable configuration: OPPO, Huawei HiSilicon, Futurewei, Samsung, LGE
		- Method of configuration: implicit, explicit

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Companies are asked to revise and update the company preferences, now that RAN1 has agreed to support 480kHz and 960kHz SCS SSB for non-initial access cases with Type0-PDCCH not configured in MIB.

Please also clarify whether **support of DB of DBTW** is **specific to specific SSB SCS.**

* Discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) for SSB
	+ Do not support DB or DBTW
		- *CATT (for 480/960kHz), Qualcomm*
	+ Support DB or DBW
		- *Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, CATT (only for 120kHz SSB), Ericsson, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Intel, Apple, Samsung, Sony, LGE, Interdigital, ZTE(120kHz), Sanechip (120kHz), NEC (at least for 120kHz), WILUS*
* Configuration of DB/DBTW
	+ Enable configuration of DB/DBTW (either using implicit or explicit methods):
		- *OPPO, Huawei HiSilicon, Futurewei, Samsung, LGE*
	+ Do not enable configuration of DB/DBTW (always support):
		- *??*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia | As indicated in our paper we see that there would be need to support DBTW. We think that DBTW is needed at least for 120kHz sub-carrier spacing. Assuming that ‘configuration of DB/DBTW’ refers to informing the UE whether the DBTW is used/assumed, we think that different approaches may apply in different cases. I.e. if UE is configured a specific cell in CONNECTED mode (e.g. measurement configuration), explicit signaling would be appropriate, but different method may be needed e.g. for initial cell search case. We think that we need further discussion how the DBTW is supported in terms of SSB candidate locations. The NR-U based mechanism does to seem to be able to provide additional candidate locations in even/fair manner to all SSBs, if we assume large number of SSBs (with 120kHz sub-carrier spacing).  |
| Samsung | We support DBTW at least for 120 kHz SCS, and actually we didn’t see why it cannot be used for 480 kHz and 960 kHz if it’s already supported 120 kHz. In our contribution, we have performed a detailed analysis on the feasibility of support DBTW, regarding the concern on the payload size of PBCH. Regarding the indication of enabling/disabling, implicit indication can be used for initial access case (e.g. band number and synchronization raster locations) and explicit indication can be used for non-initial access case (e.g. RRC parameter).  |
| Intel | We support DB/DBTW at least for SCS 120 kHz and at least based on SS burst transmission with this SCS and FFS for SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz. We also think that DB/DBTW could be always supported. |
| Qualcomm | Considering the high beam directivity for 60 GHz range compared to FR1, LBT failure rates may be low. Hence, supporting DBTW may add to the specification and UE complexity, e.g.:* Signaling the Q factor may be challenging (without changing the PBCH payload and DMRS sequence, per the agreement)
* Enabling/disabling DBTW depending on licensed/unlicensed bands

It would be beneficial to clarify what DB/DBTW support means. Is this only about Q, or there are more? For 480/960 kHz, the SSB sweeping is fast, and even if Q is introduced, it will not help much (the interference correlation in time will be high within the SSB sweeping).For 120 kHz, beam directivity will reduce the benefit of Q, in addition to power consumption penalty.Hence, we are not supportive of DBTW.  |
| Charter Communications | While LBT failure is expected to be much lower at 60 GHz and Cat-3 LBT makes it even likelier to successfully start a CO without skipping multiple SSBs, the R16 DBTW framework should simplify defining a similar feature in R17.Hence, we support DB/DBTW. |
| Futurewei | We are supportive to DB/DBTW and Gnb controlling it enable/disable it as it sees necessary. |
| InterDigital | We support DBTW for 120kHz and 480kHz SCS. Since the gaps are shorter than 16us in 960kHz SCS, it seems that DBTW may not be necessary. As for the indication of the licensed/unlicensed or disabled/enabled DBTW, we propose to use implicit and explicit methods. For the implicit, different sync raster ranges can be used to identify the mode of operation. As for the explicit identification, we propose using an explicit index configured by pdcch-ConfigSIB1 included in MIB. Also, reinterpreting the unused bits in MIB can be used for the explicit identification of the mode of operation, e.g., the unused bits in the controlResourceSetZero and/or searchSpaceZero in pdcch-ConfigSIB1 included in MIB. |
| LG Electronics | Prefer to support DBTW for 480/960 kHz SCS SSB as well. If MIB does not suffice to express increased number of candidate SSB indices, we can keep 64 candidate SSB indices but allow Q less than 64. |
| CATT | We support DBTW for 120 kHz SCS. For SSB with SCS 480 KHz/ 960KHz, the duty cycle is less than 6% if up to 64 SSBs are transmitted. Therefore, DBTW is not needed for SSB of 480KHz/960KHz. |
| Ericsson | Similar view as Qualcomm; the need for DBTW when LBT failure rate is so rare is highly questionable. Even for NR-U in 5/6 GHz it was an optimization. Furthermore, our expectation is that discovery burst will be classified as short control signaling, meaning DBTW is further demotivated. This needs to be concluded before any decision on DBTW.As in the agreement from last meeting, there are also quite a few unknowns that would need to be addressed before knowing if DBTW is feasible. The chief unknown is the following:* + How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL relation without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size

For 52.6 – 71 GHz band, all bits of k\_SSB are needed in general (need to signal 0 .. 11) unless RAN4 comes up with a very specific channel design that would avoid odd values of k\_SSB. If Case C is supported, need to indicate SSB numerology (120/240 kHz), so can’t steal a bit from ssbSubcarrierSpacingCommon. Also, it is not clear how many values of Q are needed. So, where will the bits come from? Does Q need to be signaled in SIB1 instead? How can DBTW be turned off before the UE reads SIB1? Does this require additional bits in MIB? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think DB and DBTW should be supported at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS. For other SSB SCSs, DB and DBTW can also be considered if they are agreed to be supported in the discussion of section 2.1.1. Enabling/Disabling DBTW can be achieved by configuration implementation, i.e. by a implicit method. |
| NEC | We support DB and DBTW at least for 120 kHz SCS and be open to the discussion for 480/960 kHz SCS. With regarding to the DB/DBTW configuration or indication, we think both implicit and explicit methods could be furtherly investigated considering the indication of Q value and candidate SSB index. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We support both DB and DBTW. DB definition can follow that of Rel-16 NR-U. Details design of DBTW can be discussed in next meeting. |
| NTT DOCOMO | For DB, we are fine with supporting it. SSB with 120 kHz SCS and 20 ms periodicity cannot be treated as Short Control Signalling, which means LBT is required to initiate SSB transmissions in some cases. In Rel-16 NR-U, cat-2 LBT can be applied for DRS in certain cases. Similar can be considered in 52.6 – 71 GHz in case that LBT is required for SSB transmissions, where multiplexing some signals/channels with SSB would be beneficial. For DBTW, we have already made an agreement at the last meeting, saying that PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2, duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms and number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2. With these restrictions, we are not sure if it is possible to support the same mechanism as in Rel-16 NR-U with reasonable amount of enhancements.  |
| Mediatek | Considering the much lower probability of LBT collision, we don’t think DBTW needs to be supported. |
| Convida Wireless | We support DB and DBTW. The enabling of DB/DBTW can be further considered. |
| Vivo | The introduction of DB and DBTW is due to the characteristics of unlicensed band, that is, increasing the transmission opportunities of signals and channels. Thus, For NR operation from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, due to the existence of licensed band and unlicensed band, the DB and DBTW should be supported no matter which SSB SCS.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support DB and DBTW at least for 120kHz SCS.  |
| Xiaomi | We support both DB and DBTW. |
| Spreadtrum | DB and DBTW can be supported, even if LBT exempt (short control signaling) is supported. They can be coexistence in the spec. Disabling/enabling DB and DBTW can be supported by SIB1, as DBTW length is also configured in SIB1 in NR-U. |
| Sharp | We support DB and DBTW at least for 120kHz SCS. |
| WILUS | We support DB/DBTW at least for SCS 120 kHz and we are open to support DB/DBTW for 480/960 kHz SCS SSB. If DBTW is supported at least for 120kHz SSB SCS, how to define the candidate SSB positions and how to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL relationship can be further discussed. |
| Sony | We support DBTW at least for 120 kHz SCS since the condition of short control ignaling cannot be met for SSB transmission with 120 kHz SCS. Whether DBTW for SSB with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS is supported or not should be discussed later since short control ignaling for SSB transmission has not been agreed yet.We support to enable/disable configuration of DB/DBTW for the environment where LBT is not mandated. |
| Apple  | Our view is that LBT failure rate is rare in a heavy-beam form system. The short control signaling can further reduce the possibility, if applicable. Nevertheless, we are open to discuss this issue.  |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

This is a quick reminder of the agreement from last RAN1 meeting:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:* For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to support discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS
	+ If DB supported
		- FFS: What signals/channels are included in DB other than SS/PBCH block
	+ If DBTW is supported
		- Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode Ues
			* FFS: how to support Ues performing initial access that do not have any prior information on DBTW.
		- PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
		- Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
		- Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
	+ The following points are additionally FFS:
		- How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL relation without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size
		- Details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
		- Whether or not to support DBTW for SSB SCS(s) other than 120 kHz if other SSB SCS(s) are supported
 |

The following is a summary of 1st round discussion by the moderator.

* Discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) for SSB
	+ Do not support DB or DBTW
		- Qualcomm, Ericsson, MediaTek
			* Main concerns: signaling needed to support DB/DBTW in MIB not clear, added UE complexity, in case LBT failure rate is low there is no need for DB/DBTW
	+ Support DB or DBW at least for 120kHz
		- Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Samsung, Intel, Charter, Futurewei, Interdigital (also for 480kHz), LG Electronics, ZTE, Sanechip, NEC, Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT, NTT Docomo, Convida, vivo, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Spreadtrum, Sharp, WILUS, Sony, Xiaomi
			* Main reasons: LBT for SSB
	+ Support DB or DBTW for all SCS
		- Samsung, LG Electronics
			* Main reasons: if DB/DBTW can be supported for 120kHz, no reason to not support it for other SCS.

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

Given that we agreed to study whether and how to support DB and DBTW, moderator suggests focusing on the whether and how components of DB and DBTW. The following seems to have the greatest support. Therefore, moderator suggest continuing discussion based on the following proposal.

Please continue to provide inputs on changes and concerns on the proposal, including any alternative/compromise proposal(s).

* Support discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for SSB with 120 kHz SCS
	+ PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
	+ Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
	+ Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
	+ FFS: applicability of DB/DBTW design for 120kHz to SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS
	+ FFS: details of how to inform Ues of the configuration of DB/DBTW, including enable/disable mechanics (if needed)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Spreadtrum | Disabling/enabling DBTW should be supported, if DBTW is supported, according to the RAN1#104e agreement:* If DBTW is supported
	+ Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode Ues
		- FFS: how to support Ues performing initial access that do not have any prior information on DBTW.
	+ PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
	+ Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
	+ Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
 |
| Nokia | We would be OK to support discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for SSB with 120 kHz SCS. Depending on the regulatory requirements, if short control signal exemption cannot be applied, supporting DB/DBTW also for other sub-carrier spacing could be considered.  |
| LG Electronics | Generally fine. It seems that a verb (e.g., support?) is needed for the main bullet.In addition, the discussion on DB should be taken under channel access agenda. |
| Samsung | We are a little bit confused of the main bullet. Is it trying to say “Support” at the beginning of the sentence, or the intention is to further study? We’ll provide further comments after this is clarified.  |
| Moderator | Sorry to the confusion. Added “support” in the beginning.As for discussing DB in channel access or not. Don’t have a strong preference, but given that this is not currently on Jing’s discussion agenda, I think we can discuss this initial access in this meeting. |
| Qualcomm | We think it is early to have such a proposal as it is not clear how details/feasibility on how to indicate the Q given the restrictions in the proposal. Mostly to indicate this, further restrictions need to be added on other items (e.g., subCarrierSpacingCommon, ssb-SubcarrierOffset, searchSpaceZero​, etc…) to free up bits to include the Q, and the impact of which is not clear.Hence, we recommend to try to resolve these issues first before attempting to have an agreement. |
| Interdigital | We support the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | The 1st, 2nd and 3rd sub-bullets are the ones which RAN1 agreed at the last e-meeting, so it should be considered as is.For the 4th bullet, there is actually a regulation in Japan that requires sensing before transmission without exceptions (i.e. Short Control Signalling is not defined). Therefore, DB and DBTW should be supported regardless of SCS. For the 5th bullet, we think it would be sufficient to reuse the existing framework supported in Rel-16 NR-U.  |
| Samsung2 | Thanks to moderator for the clarification. We support the updated proposal (with typo fixed).  |
| OPPO | We can accept the proposal, though we don’t think DB is necessary. |
| Vivo | We support the proposal. |
| Mediatek | We share similar view with Qualcomm. More details and feasibilities need to be discussed first. |
| Ericsson | We share a similar view with Qualcomm.We do not agree to support DBTW until feasibility is established. Signaling of Q is key, and so far it has not been demonstrated how to do this with the bits we have. Furthermore, it has not been established how to enable/disable DBTW in MIB which likely requires explicit signaling (otherwise the UE would not know that DBTW is enabled until after reading SIB1).Given these unknowns, we are okay to study the “how” parts of the proposal, and if feasibility is established without increasing the PBCH payload, then we can come back to the “whether” part of the proposal. |
| WILUS | We support the updated proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Generally Ok with the proposal, maybe with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS could be modified to with other SCS agreed, since the additional SCS is still FFS |
| Intel | We support the proposal with the latest correction from moderator. |
| NEC | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are supportive of the proposal and we think that DB and DBTW should be supported for all numerologies (120/480/960).Regarding Ericsson and Qualcomm preference to discuss Q indication or DBTW enable/disable before supporting DBTW, we would like to mention that:1. We find it a bit unusual in 3GPP to first agree on the detail design of a feature before generally agreeing to support that feature based on the need for and the application of that feature. The workflow is typically the other way around. For instance, we have already agreed on SSB for 480/960 kHz (without configuring CORESET#0) while the detail SSB pattern design is hardly even discussed.
2. In our view, other than the sliding window application to deal with LBT failure as in Rel-16, one additional use case of DB/DBTW is for short control signaling exemption: All signals/channels in DB may use exemption if DB (or DBTW) meet the 10% in 100 ms restriction.

The definition of DB needs to be clarified as per the Agreement in RAN1 104-e where we agreed the following* “If DB supported
	+ FFS: What signals/channels are included in DB other than SS/PBCH block”

We can follow the same definition as in NR-U. So, we suggest the following modification:* Support discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for SSB with 120 kHz SCS
	+ Definition of DB is the same as in Rel-16 37.213
	+ PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
	+ Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
	+ Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
	+ FFS: applicability of DB/DBTW design for 120kHz to SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS
	+ FFS: details of how to inform Ues of the configuration of DB/DBTW, including enable/disable mechanics (if needed)
 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal. |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

While several companies suggest to (at least) support DB/DBTW for SSB with 120kHz. Two companies commented details of the signaling for Q and SSB candidate positions needs to be discussed before agreeing to the proposal. The concern was on the feasibility of the signaling support for DB/DBTW.

One possible way to make progress is to make working assumption on the support, and the make the WA into agreement contingent on signaling.

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Continue discussions based on the following proposal. Please feel free to suggest edits/changes or even other alternatives for agreement.

###### **Proposal 1.2-1)**

* Working assumption) Support discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for SSB with 120 kHz SCS
	+ Definition of DB is the same as in Rel-16 37.213
	+ PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
		- Revisit working assumption if signaling for DB/DBTW is determined to be infeasible.
	+ Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
	+ Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
	+ FFS: applicability of DB/DBTW design for 120kHz to SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS
	+ Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode Ues
		- FFS: how to support Ues performing initial access that do not have any prior information on DBTW.
		- FFS: details of how to inform UEs of the configuration of DB/DBTW, including enable/disable mechanics

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposed working assumption.  |
| LG Electronics | In general we are OK. But we suggest to promote the bullet “Revisit working assumption if ~~” to the upper level, as DBTW can be signaled by MIB or SIB (i.e., not limited to MIB signaling).**Proposal 1.2-1)*** Working assumption) Support discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for SSB with 120 kHz SCS
	+ Definition of DB is the same as in Rel-16 37.213
	+ PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
	+ Revisit working assumption if signaling for DBTW is determined to be infeasible.
	+ Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
	+ Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
	+ FFS: applicability of DB/DBTW design for 120kHz to SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS
	+ Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode Ues
		- FFS: how to support Ues performing initial access that do not have any prior information on DBTW.
		- FFS: details of how to inform UEs of the configuration of DB/DBTW, including enable/disable mechanics
 |
| DOCOMO | We are ok with the proposed WA. Fine with LGE’s suggested change.  |
| Qualcomm | We still have concern about this as we do not believe that LBT is needed due to beam directivity and given the complexity (additional signaling), we prefer to at least study it further before making it a working assumption.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We can support the working assumption |
| Ericsson | We can live with a working assumption as long as we reuse wording from the previous agreement from RAN1#104-e. Furthermore, the need to revisit the working assumption should be contingent on what agreed last meeting. Different companies may have different interpretations on what "infeasible" means.Hence, we would be willing to accept the following:* Working assumption) Support discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for SSB with 120 kHz SCS with the following requirements
	+ Definition of DB is the same as in Rel-16 37.213
	+ PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
		- ~~Revisit working assumption if signaling for DB/DBTW is determined to be infeasible.~~
	+ Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
	+ Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
	+ FFS: applicability of DB/DBTW design for 120kHz to SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS
	+ Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode Ues
		- FFS: how to support Ues performing initial access that do not have any prior information on DBTW.
		- FFS: details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
		- FFS: details of how to inform UEs of the configuration of ~~DB/~~DBTW, ~~including enable/disable mechanics~~
	+ Revisit working assumption if the above requirements cannot be met
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with LG’s modification.  |
| Intel | Ok with WA and ok with LGE’s suggested change. |
| Nokia | In general, we would be fine with the proposed working assumption, with a minor clarification. I assume that the DB definition in 37.213 refers to the content of DB is terms of signals/channels given in Section 4.0 (at least did not find any other):- A *discovery burst* refers to a DL transmission burst including a set of signal(s) and/or channel(s) confined within a window and associated with a duty cycle. The *discovery burst* can be any of the following:- [omitted]- Transmission(s) initiated by a gNB that includes at least an SS/PBCH block consisting of a primary synchronization signal (PSS), secondary synchronization signal (SSS), physical broadcast channel (PBCH) with associated demodulation reference signal (DM-RS) and may also include CORESET for PDCCH scheduling PDSCH with SIB1, and PDSCH carrying SIB1 and/or non-zero power CSI reference signals (CSI-RS).Hence, we would propose to add the section to the reference as follows:* Working assumption) Support discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for SSB with 120 kHz SCS with the following requirements
	+ Definition of DB is the same as in Rel-16 37.213 Section 4.0
	+ PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
		- ~~Revisit working assumption if signaling for DB/DBTW is determined to be infeasible.~~
	+ Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
	+ Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
	+ FFS: applicability of DB/DBTW design for 120kHz to SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS
	+ Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode Ues
		- FFS: how to support Ues performing initial access that do not have any prior information on DBTW.
		- FFS: details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
		- FFS: details of how to inform UEs of the configuration of ~~DB/~~DBTW, ~~including enable/disable mechanics~~
	+ Revisit working assumption if the above requirements cannot be met
 |
| Futurewei | We are ok with Nokia’s formulation. |
| Mediatek | We’re fine with LG’s suggestion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposed working assumption |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

Added proposal 1.2-2 based on comments received. Moderator suggest further discussion based on proposal 1.2-2.

###### **Proposal 1.2-2)**

* Working assumption) Support discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for SSB with 120 kHz SCS with the following requirements
	+ Definition of DB is the same as in Rel-16 37.213 Section 4.0
	+ PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
	+ Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
	+ Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
	+ FFS: applicability of DB/DBTW design for 120kHz to SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS
	+ Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
		- FFS: how to support UEs performing initial access that do not have any prior information on DBTW.
		- FFS: details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
		- FFS: details of how to inform UEs of the configuration of DBTW
	+ Revisit working assumption if the above requirements cannot be met

DB definition in 36.213 Section 4

|  |
| --- |
| A *discovery burst* refers to a DL transmission burst including a set of signal(s) and/or channel(s) confined within a window and associated with a duty cycle. The *discovery burst* can be any of the following:*- [omitted]*- Transmission(s) initiated by a gNB that includes at least an SS/PBCH block consisting of a primary synchronization signal (PSS), secondary synchronization signal (SSS), physical broadcast channel (PBCH) with associated demodulation reference signal (DM-RS) and may also include CORESET for PDCCH scheduling PDSCH with SIB1, and PDSCH carrying SIB1 and/or non-zero power CSI reference signals (CSI-RS). |

#### **4th Round Discussion:**

Moderator asks whether proposal 1.2-2 is acceptable for companies. If the proposal is stable, moderator will note as stable to Chairman for email approval.

Updated proposal based on comments from LGE is provided in 1.2-3

###### **Proposal 1.2-3)**

* For operation with shared spectrum channel access of NR 52.6 – 71 GHz, support discovery burst (DB) and define the DB same as in Rel-16 37.213 Section 4.0
* Working assumption) Support ~~discovery burst (DB) and~~ discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for SSB with 120 kHz SCS with the following requirements
	+ ~~Definition of DB is the same as in Rel-16 37.213 Section 4.0~~
	+ PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
	+ Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
	+ Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
	+ FFS: applicability of ~~DB/~~DBTW design for 120kHz to SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS
	+ Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
		- FFS: how to support UEs performing initial access that do not have any prior information on DBTW.
		- FFS: details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
		- FFS: details of how to inform UEs of the configuration of DBTW
	+ Revisit working assumption if the above requirements cannot be met

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal.  |
| Qualcomm | We still think the proposal should be FFS (rather than working assumption) until the issues are resolved. Hence we don’t agree to this proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal 1.2-2 |
| Interdigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Ericsson | We support the definition of DB, and we think that should be separated out from the working assumption and made into an agreement. We think that the last sentence should be clarified as follows since it is the design details of DBTW (not DB) that are still unknown and may face signaling issues.* + Revisit working assumption if the above requirements on DBTW cannot be met

We still agree with Qualcomm that DBTW is not needed at all, and even for NR-U in 5/6 GHz it was an optimization. However, as stated above, we can live the working assumption. We do have a concern that this will suck up a lot of meeting time from more important items. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We are ok with the proposal. Ericsson’s update is also fine.  |
| LG Electronics | We share the view with Ericsson in that the definition of DB can be separated and agreed, i.e., not for working assumption. With this regard, we suggest following modification:* For operation with shared spectrum channel access of NR 52.6 – 71 GHz, support discovery burst (DB) and define the DB same as in Rel-16 37.213 Section 4.0
* Working assumption) Support discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for SSB with 120 kHz SCS with the following requirements
	+ PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
	+ Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
	+ Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
	+ FFS: applicability of DBTW design for 120kHz to SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS
	+ Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
		- FFS: how to support UEs performing initial access that do not have any prior information on DBTW.
		- FFS: details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
		- FFS: details of how to inform UEs of the configuration of DBTW
	+ Revisit working assumption if the above requirements cannot be met
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the working assumption |
| vivo | We are OK with the update and fine to have separate agreement on DB |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| CATT | Ok with this proposal |
| NEC | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia | We are OK with the proposal for DB as suggested by Ericsson and LGE, and also with the working assumption. |
| Moderator | Noted that Qualcomm still has objections to the proposal. Let’s get further comments from other companies.To gather further inputs, moderator has added proposal 1.2-3 based on comments from LGE.Continue to provide inputs. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the updated proposal 1.2-3 |
| LG Electronics | Thanks for reflecting our comments. We support Proposal 1.2-3. |
| Mediatek | We are ok with the proposal |

#### **4th Round Discussion Summary:**

Moderator suggest further check to see if Proposal 1.2-3 is acceptable.

### 2.1.3 SSB Resource Pattern

* From [2] OPPO:
	+ Wait for RAN4 response before further discuss beam switching gap issue.
* From [3] Spreadtrum:
	+ The legacy pattern for SSB with 120kHz SCS, i.e. Case D, can be considered.
	+ The new pattern for SSB with 120kHz SCS, e.g. Case A/C for SSB with 15/30kHz SCS, can be also considered.
	+ If the symbol gap between SSB positions is agreed to be supported, the SSB pattern of Case A/C for SSB with 15/30kHz SCS can be considered.
* From [4] vivo:
	+ Support to reuse case D as the baseline for designing the SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz time domain pattern.
	+ The following alternatives could be considered to solve beam switching problem for contiguous candidate SSBs:
		- Alt. 1: New SSB pattern introducing gaps between contiguous candidate SSBs;
		- Alt. 2: The same QCL assumptions for contiguous candidate SSBs;
		- Alt. 3: Hopping transmission for contiguous candidate SSBs.
* From [5] Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell:
	+ Keep the SS/PBCH block design unchanged for all sub-carrier spacings.
	+ One-shot LBT within COT is not required before Gnb beam switch between SSBs.
* From [10] Ericsson:
	+ Use the FR2 Case D pattern for time domain pattern for SSB transmissions with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS.
* From [12] Lenvo, Motorola Mobility
	+ For supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted for SSB, then to allow the beam switching between contiguous SSBs, a gap (for example a symbol gap or post prefix) should be supported before beam switching
* From [13] Intel:
	+ Consider SSB pattern in a slot with 3 SSB containing slots followed by 1 non-SSB carrying slot for 480 kHz and 6 SSB carrying slots followed by 2 non-SSB carrying slots for 960kHz, to accommodate Rx-Tx switching gap.
	+ Consider 480 kHz and 960kHz SCS based SSB positions in a slot with SSB symbols 2, 3, 4, 5 and 9, 10, 11, 12 in a slot.
		- Note: symbols numbers are enumerated from 0.
* From [14] Apple:
	+ Support to introduce a unified SSB Pattern for 480kHz SCS and 960kHz SCS (if supported):
		- The first symbol of candidate SSB have indexes {2,9,16,23} within each SSB burst.
		- Reserve 2 slots for DL/UL and UL/DL switching to allow for fast UL transmission between two SSB bursts.
* From [15] Qualcomm:
	+ for the SSB for NR operation in the frequency between 52.6GHz and 71GHz and SCS = 480 kHz and 960 kHz, consider defining an SSB pattern consisting of multiple “SSB slots” where SSB symbols for one or more beams are contained in the “SSB slot”
		- A beam switching gap of 1 symbol is inserted between SSBs within the “SSB slot”
		- Additional control symbols may be defined in the SSB slots with beam switching gaps between control and SSB symbols of different beams
		- Additional “gap slots” may be inserted between “SSB slots” to account for URLLC and UL traffic
		- Consider the option of aligning the higher SCS SSBs with the corresponding beams for the lower SCS SSB
* From [16] Samsung:
	+ Support new SS/PBCH block patterns for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCSs.
		- At least one symbol should be reserved between neighboring SS/PBCH block for beam sweeping delay.
		- Symbols should be reserved for CORESET and HARQ with same SCS as SS/PBCH block.
		- SS/PBCH block candidate locations in a slot for Case A can be reused.
* From [23] ZTE, Sanechip:
	+ For designing SSB patterns with different SCSs for NR operation above 52.6 GHz, it is proposed to reuse the existing design (i.e. Case A/C, Case B/D and Case E) as much as possible, and take different impacts in single/mixed numerology operation into account.
	+ The following options can be considered for supporting beam switching for SSB with SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz if the CPs can not used to support beam switching and other functions simultaneously.
		- Option 1: In a half-frame, any two candidate SSBs are discontinuous in the time domain
			* Option 1-1: SSB pattern with SCS 480/960 kHz can adopt the existing pattern of Case A and Case C in one or two slots defined in Rel-15 NR
			* Option 1-2: SSB pattern with SCS 480/960 kHz should be re-designed to reserve at least one symbol between any two candidate SSBs, e.g. only defining one candidate SSB per slot, or shift the existing SSB by one or more symbols
		- Option 2: Multiple adjacent candidate SSBs are defined to have a same SSB index or QCL assumption
* From [25] NTT Docomo:
	+ When new SCSs are supported for SSB, the two alternatives below can be considered for SSB mapping in time domain:
		- Two SSBs per slot, with guard period of at least 1 symbol between the SSBs
		- One SSB per slot
* From [26] WILUS:
	+ At least one symbol gap in time domain between SS/PBCH blocks with different SSB indices should be considered for higher subcarrier spacing (e.g., 960kHz) by taking a beam switching gap into account due to a RF interruption time of Tx/Rx beams and/or LBT gap in unlicensed spectrum.

**Summary of Discussions**

* For the not yet specified SSB SCS (i.e. 480 and 960 kHz), several companies provided proposals on which OFDM symbols and slots the SSB should be mapped on.
* For 120 kHz SSB SCS, few companies suggested to update the SSB pattern (OFDM symbols and slots SSB is defined for).
* Suggest discussing first supported SSB numerology.

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Moderator would like to receive comments on SSB resource pattern aspects, based on latest RAN1 agreement on support of SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS (at least) for non-initial access without Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB.

More specifically, please provide further feedback on the following:

* Whether any change is needed to SSB resource pattern (symbol positions, and slots positions in time domain) for 120kHz SCS.
* SSB resource pattern for 480kHz.
* SSB resource pattern for 960kHz.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia | Prior going to detailed pattern designs, it would be good to try to agree some baselines (as was done in Rel-15):* Do we need to provide gap for LBT for each SSB/group of SSBs? The need and type of LBT may depend on agreements on Channel Access side.
* Do we preserve symbols for e.g. PDCCH in the slots where SSBs are, and if yes how these symbols should be located?
	+ Relates also to LBT gap and the number of SSBs per slot (e.g. 2)
* Do we want to provide ‘gaps’ for (UL) data transmission and if yes, how frequently?
	+ The frequency of “UL gaps” would relate mostly to 480kHz and 960kHz sub-carrier spacings accounting also the RX-TX switching time (pending on RAN4 feedback). With 120kHz sub-carrier spacings the total time of 5ms restricts the distribution/total duration of “UL gaps”
* Do we need beam switching gap?
	+ Like discussed in last meeting, the need for beam switching gap (for 480kHz and/or 960kHz) would need to be confirmed by RAN4. Based on our understanding this would not be needed, but we are OK to wait RAN4 feedback on this.
 |
| OPPO | For 120kHz SCS, we don’t see the need to change the legacy SSB pattern.For 480kHz/960kHz SCS, a new SSB pattern design may be discussed if the beam switching gap is identified necessary after we receive response from RAN4.  |
| Samsung | For 120 kHz SCS, we didn’t a strong need to modify legacy SSB pattern. For 480 kHz/960 kHz SCS, a new SSB pattern is surely needed (based on the agreement from Tuesday GTW), and existing cases can be utilized as a reference for the design. Although we are still waiting for RAN4 to feedback the beam sweeping gap, there are existing patterns already reserving symbols between neighboring SSBs, so we can reuse Case A or Case C for the SSB locations within a slot regardless of RAN4 feedback on the beam sweeping gap.  |
| Intel | For SCS 120 kHz, reuse existing SSB pattern from FR2.For SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz, reuse SSB pattern for 120 kHz and additionally introduce an SSB pattern with a time gap between two consecutive SSBs to accommodate beam switching time. |
| Qualcomm | For 120 kHz SCS, there is no strong need to change the current Rel-16 FR2 design. For 480/960 kHz SCS, we share the same view as Nokia where before getting into details of the design, certain aspects need to be clarified. These include: * Do we need beam switching gaps (may be wait for RAN4 feedback on timing)
* Do we need URLLC and UL traffic and how many (may be wait for RAN4 feedback on timing for UL/DL switching)
* Do we need to multiplex CORESET0/SIB1 PDSCH in the slot having the SSB

Do we need to “nest” the SSB pattern within a 120 kHz pattern to avoid beam direction blockage in certain cases (e.g., CA) |
| Charter Communications | Agree with Qualcomm and Nokia |
| Futurewei | Same as other companies. Reuse current FR2 design for 120kHz SCS, wait for RAN4 decisions, and SCS decision for initial access. |
| InterDigital | For 120kHz SCS, we prefer to use the legacy SSB pattern, i.e. Case D.For 480 kHz/960kHz, SSB patterns can be used that are based on the legacy SSB patterns as reference. |
| LG Electronics | No change for 120 kHz SCS SSB.For 480/960 kHz SCS SSB, SS/PBCH block Case D (defined for 120 kHz SCS) can be reused, considering the description in TR 38.808 that no explicit switching gap is needed between successive SSB blocks. However, we can wait for RAN4’s response to RAN1’s LS. |
| CATT | For 120kHz SCS, we don’t see the need to change the legacy SSB pattern.For 480kHz/960kHz SCS, we may need to wait to hear from RAN4 on whether the beam switching gap is necessary before we make decision about the new SSB pattern |
| Ericsson | Our first preference is to reuse the Case D pattern from FR2 if possible.We also acknowledge that feedback from RAN4 is still needed on the issue of beam switching gap and Tx/Rx, Rx/Tx switching times, so it is difficult to make progress on the precise time domain pattern. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For SSB 120kHz SCS, Case D can be reused.For SSB 480/960kHz SCS, although RAN4 in the approved TP R4-2103260 thinks both CPs of SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz are feasible for beam switching, but their analysis may be only from beam switching point of view. RAN1 can continue to wait for reply LS and clarifications from RAN4. If CP is enough for beam switching and other functions, Case D can be as a baseline. Otherwise, Case A/C or a new pattern/transmission-mechanism for SSB 480/960kHz SCS can be considered. In addition, we also agree to reserve some slots/symbols between SSBs for UL traffic transmission. |
| NEC | For 120kHz SCS, we prefer to reuse the legacy Case D SSB pattern for FR2.For 480kHz/960kHz SCS, a new SSB pattern may be discussed based on the details from RAN4 feedback about beam sweeping gap. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We don’t see the need for any change in SSB pattern design for 120 kHz. Please note that we still support DBTW for 120 kHz SSB: 120 kHz SSB burst can slide within the 5 ms DBTW if Q<64 (e.g., Q=32)For the design regarding 480/960 kHz SSB, we agree that is better to follow a step-by-step approach. Agreeing on the answers to Nokia’s questions would be a good start.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | We do not see the significant necessity to make changes on SSB resource pattern for 120 kHz SCS. For SSB with 480 and 960 kHz SCS, at least guard period to ensure the required time for beam switching should be considered between SSBs as CP length is shortened.  |
| Mediatek | Agree with Qualcomm and Nokia |
| vivo | For 120KHz SCS, no change to legacy Case D pattern.For 480/960KHz SCS, use legacy Case D pattern as baseline and possible change considering beam switching gap. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Our preference is to reuse the SSB pattern design for 120kHz from Rel16 FR2. For 480/960kHz, wait for RAN4 feedback regarding introducing a symbol gab for beam switching TDD switching (at least for 960kHz) which might lead to a different time domain pattern. |
| Xiaomi | For 480kHz/960kHz SCS, FFS after response from RAN4. |
| Spreadtrum | For 120kHz SCS, legacy pattern can be reused.For 480/960kHz SCS, the pattern may depend on some questions like those proposed by Nokia and Qualcomm. As well, legacy pattern can be candidate. |
| Sharp | 120kHz SCS: reuse FR2 case D in general. |
| WILUS | For 120kHz SCS SSB, we don’t see the need to change the legacy SSB pattern in FR2.For 480kHz/960kHz SCS SSB, a new SSB pattern should be discussed based on the details from RAN4 feedback about beam switching gap. |
| Sony | For 120 kHz SCS, legacy SSB pattern could be reused.For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS, we can wait for RAN4’s response. |
| Apple  | For 120kHz SCS, reuse the legacy pattern. For 480kHz and 960kHz SCS, we share same view with Qualcomm and suggest reaching consensus on design requirement first, if possible. This would make discussions on exact pattern much easier.  |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

The following is a summary of 1st round discussion by the moderator.

All companies stated that for 120kHz SSB, legacy SSB pattern can be re-used. Also given that most companies are also suggesting to support DB/DBTW, it would be good to clarify whether the slots positions, i.e. values of n, within a half-frame is also re-used or not.

For 120kHz SSB:

* No strong need to modify legacy SSB pattern
	+ OPPO, Samsung, Intel, Qualcomm, Charter, Futurewei, Interdigital, Apple, Sony, WILUS, Sharp, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, vivo, NTT Docomo, Huawei, HiSilicon, NEC, ZTE, Sanechip, CATT, LGE

For 480/960kHz SSB:

* Several companies suggested to work with trying to narrow down design principles first.

#### **2nd Round Discussion – Part 1:**

Given that most companies are also suggesting to support DB/DBTW, it would be good to clarify whether the slots positions, i.e. values of n, within a half-frame is also re-used or not when stating re-use of 120kHz SSB pattern from FR2. Moderator asks companies to provide input/comment on the following:

For SSB with 120kHz SCS, re-use of 120kHz SSB pattern from FR2 for NR above 52.6 GHz means the following:

* Case D – 120 kHz SCS: the first symbols of the candidate SS/PBCH blocks have indexes {4, 8,16, 20} + 28×n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame.
* For carrier frequencies within 52.6 GHz to 71GHz, 𝑛 = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia | While re-use would be simplest, we think that in order to enable DB/DBTW with larger number of SSB, introducing additional candidate locations for SSBs is needed. Current SSB time location pattern in the 5ms window leaves certain slots among the 40 slots unused, namely slot indexes {8,9,18,19,28,29,38,39}. Additional SSB candidate locations could be introduced to these.In principle the symbol level locations could be kept unchanged, but it is not clear if we need to have different symbol locations in different slots i.e. {4…7} and {8…11} versus {2…5}and {6…9}. Also the applicability of symbol level pattern has some dependency of the Channel Access (8.2.6) decisions. |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | We support the same SSB pattern for 120 kHz, which includes the starting symbol index in slot and slot index in half frame. In this sense, we support moderator’s proposal.  |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal |
| Interdigital | We support the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | Support the interpretation of “reuse of 120 kHz SSB pattern from FR2” above.  |
| OPPO | We support the proposal. |
| Vivo | We support the proposal |
| Ericsson | Is the intention to agree that Case D is supported for 120 kHz, or just to clarify what “re-use” means?We support the proposal in either case. |
| WILUS | We support the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the proposal. |
| Intel | We agree with Nokia’s arguments that more candidate SSB positions may be needed within 5 ms if DB/DBTW is agreed for SS burst with SCS 120 kHz.Therefore, we suggest adding in the 2nd main bullet:* For carrier frequencies within 52.6 GHz to 71GHz, support at least 𝑛 = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18.
	+ Other values of *n* (if any) are FFS
 |
| NEC | We support re-use of 120kHz SSB pattern from FR2 as a basis, and share the similar view as Nokia and Intel about introducing additional SSB candidates in the gap slots of existing 120kHz SSB pattern. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal. |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion – Part 2:**

As suggested by companies, moderator would like to get further input on the following issues:

For SSB with 480/960kHz SCS:

* Gap for LBT for each SSB within a slot needed?
* Gap for LBT for group of SSBs (between slots) needed?
* Gap for beam switching between SSB needed?
* Gap for beam switching between SSB (and potential PDCCH) needed?
* Preserving symbol(s) for PDCCH within the slots that contain SSB needed?
	+ If Yes, where are these symbols located.
* Support multiplexing of CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH
* Preserving symbol(s) for uplink and/or ULRRC data transmission within the slots that contain SSB needed?

Please note that for some questions, RAN1 may need to wait for RAN4 response. In case, companies already have some input, please provide them. If companies think we need to wait for RAN4 input, please state so as well. Moderator thinks having more information will be beneficial for further discussions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia | Firstly note that there is also some dependency also in the Channel Access (8.2.6) discussion and pending decisions. Hence, it may not be yet possible to conclude the design of SSB pattern. After that being said, if based on RAN4 feedback no beam switching gap between SSBs is needed, and if LBT for different SSBs can be done simultaneously/consecutively we don’t see need to have gap between each SSB. If, for example beam switching gap is needed based on RAN4 feedback, we would then prefer to bundle SSB and corresponding Type0-PDCCH occasion to consecutive symbols to minimize the number of beams switches. Thus, we would prefer to enable multiplexing Type0-PDCCH and SSB in the same slot, but the location of these would depend on the RAN4 feedback.Option to preserve symbols for UL transmission in same slots with SSBs would depend on the need of the afore discussed gaps i.e. beam switching. Currently, assuming that we can have slots without SSBs sufficiently frequently e.g. ~<0.5ms, we don’t see a strong need to have UL symbols in the SSB slot.  |
| LG Electronics | LBT gap: should be discussed under channel access agendaBeam switching gap: can postpone until RAN4 respond to RAN1 LSCORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH: should be first agreed to support cell-defining 480/960 kHz SCS SSBPreserving DL/UL symbols: we do not see the strong need, but if we reuse legacy SSB pattern, then it’s up to Gnb where DL/UL symbols can be used. |
| Samsung | The gap for LBT purpose and beam sweeping purpose may need input or coordination with other agenda or WG, so can be delayed for discussion. The symbols reserved for PDCCH should surely be considered. In Rel-15 FR2, at least the first two symbols and symbol #7 are all possibly used as PDCCH, according to Table 13-12 in TS 38.213, and at least those symbols should be reserved (there can be more to accommodate 2-symbol PDCCH as an optimization). In this sense, gap between two SSBs in a slot is also needed, regardless of the purpose for LBT and/or beam switching.  |
| Qualcomm | Gaps for LBT:* Need to wait for channel access AI agreement

Gap for beam switching:* We think it is necessary, but would wait for RAN4 recommendation

Preserving symbol(s) for PDCCH within the slots that contain SSB needed:* We are open to consider such a design option
* These can be located in the beginning of the slots containing SSB

Support multiplexing of CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH * We are open to consider such a design option (e.g., to minimize the beam switching gaps overhead if beam switching gaps are used)

Preserving symbol(s) for uplink and/or ULRRC data transmission within the slots that contain SSB needed?* Yes, but need to wait for RAN4 reply for UL/DL switching delay
 |
| Interdigital | We support multiplexing of CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH along with the corresponding SS/PBCH blocks to reduce the need for the beam switching. The multiplexing is also beneficial in unlicensed spectrums to ensure channel occupancy to avoid gaps and consequently to prevent frequent LBT procedures.  |
| Futurewei | Gap for beam switching may be necessary based RAN4 values. We suggest waiting for RAN4 decision. For the LBT gap, we prefer to decide on the DB and the short control signaling LBT exempt. For Support multiplexing of CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH , our preference is that there is no CORESET#0 for 480/960 kHz SCS. We should wait for that decisions first.In conclusion, this discussion can be postponed. |
| DOCOMO | For the 3rd and 4th bullet, we are ok to wait for RAN4 response. For the 5th bullet, we agree it should be considered for CORESET#0 PDCCH resources as it can reduce beam switching overhead, whose benefit could be significant assuming 64 SSB beams. It can also accommodate the support of guard periods between SSBs motivated by the 4 subbullets above. We are open to discuss on the exact location of PDCCH symbols. We support the 6th bullet, as we mentioned in 2.1.1We are open to discuss on the 7th bullet.  |
| OPPO | We agree this discussion can be postponed. |
| Vivo | Gaps for LBT:* Delay the discussion until the agreement from channel access AI

Gap for beam switching:* Better to wait for RAN4 recommendation.

Preserving symbol(s) for PDCCH within the slots that contain SSB needed:* Open to discuss after RAN4’s response is back

Support multiplexing of CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH * Need more clarification on the meaning. Does it mean FDM multiplexing of SSB and CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH

Preserving symbol(s) for uplink and/or ULRRC data transmission within the slots that contain SSB needed?In our view, if needed for the use case, ssbPositionInBurst could disable some SSB transmission for the UL/DL switching. |
| Mediatek | We agree to wait for further information. |
| Ericsson | Gap for LBT for each SSB within a slot needed?* Wait for agreements in Channel Access AI

Gap for LBT for group of SSBs (between slots) needed?* Wait for agreements in Channel Access AI

Gap for beam switching between SSB needed?* We think “no,” but need to wait for feedback from RAN4

Gap for beam switching between SSB (and potential PDCCH) needed?* We don’t think this is needed

Preserving symbol(s) for PDCCH within the slots that contain SSB needed?* Yes

If Yes, where are these symbols located.* Similar as Case D pattern

Support multiplexing of CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH * Yes, as in FR2

Preserving symbol(s) for uplink and/or ULRRC data transmission within the slots that contain SSB needed?* No – UL/DL switching times will be too large to make this useful
 |
| WILUS | For the 1st/2nd bullet related LBT, it should be discussed under channel access agenda.For 3rd/4th bullet related beam switching, we need to wait for feedback from RAN4 even though we think one symbol gap is needed for beam switching at least for the case of 960kHz case in 3rd bullet. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Gap for LBT: * Wait for the progress from A.I. 8.2.6 channel access.

Gap for beam switching: * Wait for RAN4’s reply LS.

Preserving symbols for PDCCH: * It can be considered when design SSB pattern.

Multiplexing of CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH: * It depends on the conclusion in 2.1.1 although we support SSB with 480/960kHz SCS multiplexing with CORESET#0.

Preserving symbol(s) for uplink and/or ULRRC data transmission:* We agree to reserve some slots/symbols between SSBs for above purposes, but their use depends on the implementation.
 |
| Xiaomi | Share with the similar view to postpone the discussion |
| Intel | Gap for LBT for each SSB within a slot needed?* Not explicitly. We think if LBT gaps are needed, they could be handled by additional SSB candidate positions (likely in FR1 NR-U).

Gap for LBT for group of SSBs (between slots) needed?* Similar to question 1, not explicitly. We think if LBT gaps are needed, they could be handled by additional SSB candidate positions (likely in FR1 NR-U).

Gap for beam switching between SSB needed?* Potentially. Of course this may depend on RAN4 feedback. If RAN1 design with 1 symbol gap, we think this design should be robust to whatever RAN4 may feedback, as we do not expect beam switching gap to be larger than 1 960kHz symbol even in the worst case.

Gap for beam switching between SSB (and potential PDCCH) needed?* Potentially. Of course this may depend on RAN4 feedback.

Preserving symbol(s) for PDCCH within the slots that contain SSB needed?* Yes, some symbols should be reserved from SSB so that PDCCH transmission in the same slot can be supported.
* To enable Type0-PDCCH CORESET, we may need to provide two sets of CORESET symbols (one for each SSB) within the slot.

If Yes, where are these symbols located.* We suggest first 1~3 symbols and additional 1~3 symbols right before the second SSB within the slot.

Support multiplexing of CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH * Yes, we support.

Preserving symbol(s) for uplink and/or URLLC data transmission within the slots that contain SSB needed?Not needed, as the slot duration are only a fraction of slot for 120kHz. We don’t see s need to support this in a slot SSB is contained. Uplink and URLLC could be scheduled in other slots that does not contain SSB. |
| Convida Wireless | LBT gap could be discussed in channel access mechanism. The discussion could be deferred to later. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | * Gap for LBT for each SSB within a slot needed?
	+ No. We prefer to have LBT only at the beginning of DB (or SSB burst)
* Gap for LBT for group of SSBs (between slots) needed?
	+ No. We prefer to have LBT only at the beginning of DB (or SSB burst)
* Gap for beam switching between SSB needed?
	+ Yes. We can wait for RAN4 LS reply though.
* Gap for beam switching between SSB (and potential PDCCH) needed?
	+ If the PDCCH is not a Type0-PDCCH, we can discuss the need.
* Preserving symbol(s) for PDCCH within the slots that contain SSB needed?
	+ If the PDCCH is not a Type0-PDCCH, we can discuss the need.
* Support multiplexing of CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH.
	+ No. We don’t not think 480/960 kHz SSB should configure CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH.
* Preserving symbol(s) for uplink and/or ULRRC data transmission within the slots that contain SSB needed?
	+ Yes. preserve symbols/slots for URLLC and regular UL traffic.
 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | * The need of a gap for LBT for each SSB within a slot or for group of SSBs depends on the agreements in 8.2.6
* Beam switching gaps between SSB depends on the feedback from RAN4
* We are fine with considering gap for beam switching between SSB (and potential PDCCH)
* We support preserving symbol(s) for PDCCH within the slots that contain SSB
* Support multiplexing of CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH
 |
| CATT | Gaps for LBT/ Gap for beam switching/Preserving symbol(s) for PDCCH within the slots that contain SSB needed: The discussion can be delayedSupport multiplexing of CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH * We are ok for this option

Preserving symbol(s) for uplink and/or ULRRC data transmission within the slots that contain SSB needed? * No need for this .
 |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

Previous several companies suggested “re-using” 120kHz SSB resource pattern D. Companies seem to be in alignment of that re-use here refers to

* 120 kHz SCS: the first symbols of the candidate SS/PBCH blocks have indexes {4, 8,16, 20} + 28×n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame, where 𝑛 = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18.

Few companies mentioned if DB/DBTW were to be supported then additional values of n may need to be supported as well.

As for discussion on the SSB resource pattern for 480kHz and 960kHz, the following is a summary of discussions so far.

* Gap for LBT for each SSB within a slot needed? Gap for beam switching between SSB needed? Gap for LBT for group of SSBs (between slots) needed? Gap for beam switching between SSB (and potential PDCCH) needed?
	+ Need to wait for response from RAN4: Nokia, Qualcomm, Futurewei, vivo, Ericsson, WILUS, Huawei, HiSilicon, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
	+ Need to wait for channel access agreement on LBT for SSB: Qualcomm, Futurewei, vivo, Ericsson, ZTE, Sanechips, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
	+ Gap may need required regardless of LBT and/or beam switching: Samsung
	+ Gap for Beam switching necessary: Qualcomm, Intel, Huawei, HiSilicon
	+ Gap for LBT not necessary: Intel, Huawei, HiSilicon
* Preserving symbol(s) for PDCCH within the slots that contain SSB needed?
	+ Yes: Samsung, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Intel, NTT Docomo, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
		- Positioned in the beginning of the slot: Qualcomm
		- Similar as Type D SSB pattern: Ericsson
		- Positioned in the first 1~3 symbols of the beginning of the slot, and 1~3 symbol prior to the 2nd SSB of the slot: Intel
		- Position FFS: NTT Docomo
	+ Can be considered: ZTE, Sanechips, CATT
* Support multiplexing of CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH
	+ Supportive: Qualcomm, Interdigital, Ericsson, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
	+ Not supportive: Huawei, HiSilicon
* Preserving symbol(s) for uplink and/or ULRRC data transmission within the slots that contain SSB needed?
	+ Yes: Qualcomm (need further feedback from RAN4), ZTE, Sanechips, Huawei, HiSilicon
	+ No need: LGE, Nokia (if we can have slots without SSBs sufficiently frequently e.g. ~<0.5ms), vivo (ssbPositionInBurst could disable some SSB transmission for the UL/DL switching), Ericsson, Intel, CATT

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Based on 2nd round discussion, discussion on the SSB resource pattern for 480kHz and 960 kHz require input from channel access agenda and RAN4 to progress further.

For the 120kHz case, companies seem to in alignment on how this should be supported. Suggest to further discuss on “FFS: additional n values” proposed by few companies.

###### **Proposal 1.3-1)**

For SSB with 120kHz SCS for NR 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,

* 120 kHz SCS: the first symbols of the candidate SS/PBCH blocks have indexes {4, 8,16, 20} + 28×n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame.
* For carrier frequencies within 52.6 GHz to 71GHz, support at least 𝑛 = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18.
	+ Other values of *n* (if any) are FFS

###### **Proposal 1.3-2)**

For SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS for NR 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,

* Study further on the need for potential gap for LBT and/or beam switching and (if needed) the details of how the gap for LBT and/or beams witching can be considered for the SSB (time domain) resource pattern.
* Study further on multiplexing of SSB and CORESET#0, including whether or not such multiplexing should be supported
* Study further on preserving symbol(s) for uplink and/or ULRRC data transmission within the slots that contain SSB, including whether or not such consideration is needed

Companies are asked to provide further comments on proposal 1.3-1 and 1.3-2. Please feel free to suggest edits/changes or even other alternatives for agreement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | One of the aspects discussed in the last round is not captured in this proposal, which didn’t see negative view from the summary, so suggest the following change: For SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS for NR 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,* Study further on the need for potential gap for LBT and/or beam switching and (if needed) the details of how the gap for LBT and/or beams witching can be considered for the SSB (time domain) resource pattern.
* Study further on preserving symbol(s) for PDCCH within the slots that contain SSB.
* Study further on multiplexing of SSB and CORESET#0, including whether or not such multiplexing should be supported
* Study further on preserving symbol(s) for uplink and/or ULRRC data transmission within the slots that contain SSB, including whether or not such consideration is needed
 |
| LG Electronics | For proposal 1-3-1), one clarification question for FFS on other values of n* Is the purpose of allowing more n values to introduce more than 64 candidate SSB indexes if DBTW is introduced?

For proposal 1-3-2), we fail to see a need to agree on it since we already made an agreement in the last meeting, as follows. Therefore, we prefer to defer the relevant discussion until RAN4 reply to RAN1’s LS.Agreement:For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)* Study further on reserving symbol gap between SSB positions with different SSB index (and possibly between SSB position and other signal/channels)
	+ FFS: whether symbol gap is needed for only 960 kHz or both 480 and 960 kHz.
* Study further on reserving gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern accounting possibility for reserving UL transmission occasions in the SSB pattern
* Study should account for inputs from RAN4
 |
| DOCOMO | Support both proposal 1.3-1 with Samsung’s suggested change and 1.3-2 |
| Qualcomm | We support proposal 1.3-1 without “*Other values of n (if any) are FFS*” but can agree with the current text (if needed) for progress.We also support 1.3-2 including Samsung’s suggested change. |
| Apple  | We are ok with proposal 1.3-1 and modification from Samsung. We also ok with proposal 1.3-2.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support 1.3.1.We cannot support the second bullet of 1.3-2. This bullet is related to issue 2.1.1 which we would like to finalize in this meeting. We can support the modified proposal 1.3-2 as follows: Modified Proposal 1.3-2:For SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS for NR 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,* Study further on the need for potential gap for LBT and/or beam switching and (if needed) the details of how the gap for LBT and/or beams witching can be considered for the SSB (time domain) resource pattern.
* ~~Study further on multiplexing of SSB and CORESET#0, including whether or not such multiplexing should be supported~~
* Study further on preserving symbol(s) for uplink and/or ULRRC data transmission within the slots that contain SSB, including whether or not such consideration is needed
 |
| Ericsson | On Proposal 1.3-1, we object to additional values of n for 120 kHz SCS. We do not want a change to the initial access design for 120 kHz SSB since it will unnecessarily cause a change to implementations.On Proposal 1.3-2, we agree with LGE; this is not needed due to the agreement from RAN1#104-e. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Proposal 1.3.1. We are open to Proposal 1.3.2 though its research depends on the conclusions of some other topics. |
| Intel | Support 1.3-1. If the concern from companies is that we don’t have a formal agreement on DB/DBTW or LBT of SSB aspects, then we are also ok add to the FFS, “support of additional n values are subject to support of DB/DBTW for 120kHz SSB”.Ok with Samsung’s suggested change for 1.3-2 |
| Nokia | We would be fine with the proposal 1.3-1, we see that the DBTW design should also cover the case that larger number of beams are used.On proposal 1.3-2, we are in principle fine to study these aspects further, but as raised by LGE, there may not be need to do a new agreement to achieve this. I.e. we are OK to further consider option for having symbols preserved for PDCCH is the slot containing SSB(s) (which is missing from the earlier agreement).  |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal 1.3.-1 and agree with LGE that 1.3.-2 is not needed due to previous agreement. We are open for further discussions on possible changes of 1.3-2 . |
| Mediatek | Ok with proposals 1.3-1 and 1.3-2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Proposal 1.3-1, we are also open to Proposal 1.3-2 and ok with the related Samsung’s addition |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

Added proposal 1.1-3 based on comments from Intel, and updated proposal 1.3-2 based on comments from Huawei and Samsung in 1.3-4. Ericsson explicitly mentioned that they do not agree with additional n values in Proposal 1.1-2.

Some companies mentioned that proposal 1.3-4 may not be needed.

###### **Proposal 1.3-3)**

For SSB with 120kHz SCS for NR 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,

* 120 kHz SCS: the first symbols of the candidate SS/PBCH blocks have indexes {4, 8,16, 20} + 28×n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame.
* For carrier frequencies within 52.6 GHz to 71GHz, support at least 𝑛 = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18.
	+ Other values of *n* (if any) are FFS, and support of additional n values are subject to support of DBTW for 120kHz SSB

###### **Proposal 1.3-4)**

For SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS for NR 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,

* Study further on the need for potential gap for LBT and/or beam switching and (if needed) the details of how the gap for LBT and/or beams witching can be considered for the SSB (time domain) resource pattern.
* Study further on preserving symbol(s) for PDCCH within the slots that contain SSB.
* ~~Study further on multiplexing of SSB and CORESET#0, including whether or not such multiplexing should be supported~~
* Study further on preserving symbol(s) for uplink and/or ULRRC data transmission within the slots that contain SSB, including whether or not such consideration is needed

#### **4th Round Discussion:**

Moderator suggest to provide further inputs on Proposal 1.3-3 and 1.3-4.

Added Proposal 1.3-5 based on comments from Ericsson.

###### **Proposal 1.3-5)**

For SSB with 120kHz SCS for NR 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,

* 120 kHz SCS: the first symbols of the candidate SS/PBCH blocks have indexes {4, 8,16, 20} + 28×n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame.
* For carrier frequencies within 52.6 GHz to 71GHz, ~~support at least~~ 𝑛 = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18.
	+ ~~Other values of~~ *~~n~~* ~~(if any) are FFS, and support of additional n values are subject to support of DBTW for 120kHz SSB~~

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposals, but preferring to add back the deleted bullet for Proposal 1.3-4 if there is agreement on supporting CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB.  |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with the proposals although prefer not to have “Other values of *n* (if any) are FFS, and support of additional n values are subject to support of DBTW for 120kHz SSB” |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposals 1.3-3 and 1.3-4 |
| Interdigital | We are fine with the proposals. |
| Ericsson | Regarding Proposal 1.3-3, we are still not fine with changing the time domain SSB pattern for 120 kHz from the perspective of common implementation for FR2 and 52.6 – 71 GHz frequency rangesFor SSB with 120kHz SCS for NR 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,* 120 kHz SCS: the first symbols of the candidate SS/PBCH blocks have indexes {4, 8,16, 20} + 28×n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame.
* ~~For carrier frequencies within 52.6 GHz to 71GHz,~~ support ~~at least~~ 𝑛 = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18.
	+ ~~Other values of~~ *~~n~~* ~~(if any) are FFS, and support of additional n values are subject to support of DBTW for 120kHz SSB~~

Regarding Proposal 1.3-4, we still don't understand why this proposal is made – it is covered already by an existing agreement.Furthermore, we disagree with including LBT gap. For 480/960 kHz SCS, seem to agree that the discovery burst is short and will fall within the 10% out of 100 ms rule for short control signaling. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposals. |
| DOCOMO | Support both the proposals.  |
| LG Electronics | For Proposal 1.3-3, we share the view with Qualcomm and Ericsson. We prefer to keep the same design as in Rel-15.For Proposal 1.3.-4, as we commented earlier, what is the main point of Proposal 1.3-4 different from the previous agreement? Still, we don’t see the necessity to have it, in addition to the previous agreement. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with proposal 1.3-3 and 1.3-4 |
| vivo | We are OK with current proposals |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with Proposals 1.3-3 and 1.3-4 |
| CATT | We support the proposals. |
| NEC | We are fine with proposals 1.3-3 and 1.3-4. |
| Nokia | We are OK with proposal 1.3-3, and as commented earlier, if we are seriously considering to support DBTW, then we need to also consider case with larger number of beams, hence option of having additional SSB candidate positions.For proposal 1.3-4 we are in principle agreement, but as raised earlier it is not very clear what are the necessary additional aspects, we need on top of last meetings agreement. |
| Moderator | If Proposal 1.3-4 is controversial, most likely we will skip this meeting due to time constraints.For Proposal 1.3-3, if we are keeping everything the same, Just a quick question to companies (for moderator’s sake of better understanding), if RAN1 agrees to supporting DBTW and LBT for SSB (I understanding this is not yet agreed), and we also keep n values identical to previously. How is LBT dealt with for SSB? 𝑛 = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, would result in exactly 64 SSB candidate positions, so for gNB sending 64 beams, there is no other candidate leverage for LBT.For companies who think LBT is not needed altogether for SSB, I think I understand the logic. I wasn’t sure about the other companies.Is it correct understanding companies who prefer only supporting 𝑛 = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, that you do not wish to support LBT for SSB? Or is there something moderator is missing.Anyway, added Proposal 1.3-5 based on Ericsson, LGE, and Qualcomm comments.Please provide further feedback. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the new proposal 1.3-5 |
| LG Electronics | Our logic is that if gNB sends 64 beams, then only one candidate SSB index per SSB beam can be defined. On the other hand, if gNB sends less than 64 beams, e.g., 32 beams, then two candidate SSB indices can correspond to a SSB beam. In this case, gNB has multiple opportunities for a SSB beam. |

#### **4th Round Discussion Summary:**

Moderator suggest checking either Proposal 1.3-5 or 1.3-3 is acceptable.

### 2.1.4 CORESET#0 Configuration

* From [1] Huawei, HiSilicon:
	+ Support only {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS equal to {120, 120} kHz in 52.6GHz to 71GHz spectrum.
	+ CORESET#0 with 96 PRB can be configured to make full use of allowed transmit power at least for operations in shared spectrum
	+ Support the following CORESET#0 RB offsets values for {SSB, CORESET#0} SCS={120, 120} kHz:
		- 24 RB and 48 RB CORESET#0: the same as supported values in Table 13-8 of 38.213
		- 96 RB CORESET#0: 0, 38, 76 RBs for multiplexing pattern 1 and -20 (-21) RBs when k\_SSB=0 (k\_SSB>0) for multiplexing pattern 3.
* From [4] vivo:
	+ The following SSB-Coreset 0 multiplexing patterns are supported for each SCS pair:
		- (120K, 120K): Pattern 1, Pattern 3
		- (960K, 960K): Pattern 1, Pattern 3
		- (960K, 480K): Pattern 1, Pattern 2
	+ To save more bits, the CORESET design of un-licensed band operation from 52.6GHz to 71GHz can re-use the design criterion in NR-U, which is occupy as much bandwidth as possible in the frequency domain.
* From [5] Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell:
	+ Consider supporting at least SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern 1 for {480, 480} case. Pending on the UE minimum BW capability, consider also SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern 3.
	+ Consider supporting at least SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern 1 for {960, 960} case.
	+ Consider supporting pattern 1 and pattern 2 for {240,120} case.
	+ For CORESET#0 with 120kHz sub-carrier spacing, consider supporting N\_{RB}^{CORESET}={96} in addition to N\_{RB}^{CORESET}={24, 48}.
	+ For SSB and CORESET#0 with 480kHz sub-carrier spacing, support following options:
		- For multiplexing pattern1 N\_{symb}^{CORESET}={[1],2, 3}
		- For multiplexing pattern3 N\_{symb}^{CORESET}={1, 2}
	+ For CORESET#0 with 480kHz sub-carrier spacing, support N\_RB^CORESET={24, 48}.
	+ For SSB and CORESET#0 with 960kHz sub-carrier spacing, support for multiplexing pattern 1 N\_{symb}^{CORESET}={2, 3}.
	+ For CORESET#0 with 960kHz sub-carrier spacing, support N\_RB^CORESET={24}.
	+ For SSB with 240kHz sub-carrier spacing and CORESET#0 with 120kHz sub-carrier spacing, support following options:
		- N\_symb^CORESET={1, 2}
		- N\_RB^CORESET={24, 48}
* From [6] CATT:
	+ While 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS are introduced, the 1bit indication in MIB provides the information of Type0-PDCCH SCS along with the detected SSB SCS in a given band in 52.7 -71 GHz ,
	+ Proposal 8: Patterns 2 and 3 of SSB and CORESET for Type0-PDCCH can multiplex with periodic CSI-RS/paging PDCCH&PDSCH in frequency.
* From [9] Futurewei:
	+ Support SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern 1 (different slots), and pattern 3 (same slots).
* From [10] Ericsson:
	+ For the case when {SS/PBCH block, PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz, Table 13.8 in 38.213 can be used for operation in 57 – 71 GHz.
	+ For the case when {SS/PBCH, PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz, Table 13-10 in 38.13 can be used for operation in 57 – 71 GHz.
* From [11] Xiaomi:
	+ SSB and CORESET0 multiplexing cconfiguration tables need update to support additional SCS for NR from 52.6GHz to 71 GHz.
* From [13] Intel:
	+ Support Type0-PDCCH configuration indication in MIB of SSB for all supported SSB SCS.
	+ Consider only SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern 1 for 480 and 960 kHz SCS.
	+ Consider only same SCS for SSB and CORESET#0 (configured by MIB) for 480 and 960 kHz SCS.
	+ Type0-PDCCH CSS may utilize symbols {0,1} and {7,8} that correspond to SSB in the first half and second half of the slot.
* From [15] Qualcomm:
	+ Consider the following SSB and CORESET0 SCS combinations:
		- SSB SCS = 120 kHz, CORESET0 SCS = 120, 480, 960 kHz
		- SSB SCS = 240 kHz, CORESET0 SCS = 120, 480, 960 kHz
		- SSB SCS = 480/960 kHz, CORESET0 SCS = SSB SCS
	+ NR Rel-16 SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 1 design may be reused with possibly some changes to the table (e.g., the need for < 2.5 ms options for the start of the CORESET0 wrt frame boundary) which depends on the outcome of the SSB pattern design
	+ SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 2:
		- For the 240 kHz + 120 kHz combination: reuse the same design as in NR Rel-16
		- For the 120 kHz + 480/960 kHz combination: the CORESET0 symbols may be placed in the gap symbols between the SSBs (similar to the existing NR Rel-16 design)
	+ NR Rel-16 SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 3 design may be reused for the valid combinations of 120 + 120 kHz, 480 + 480 kHz, and 960 + 960 kHz
	+ consider introducing an SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern for higher SCS SSB (480 and 960 kHz), where a time domain fixed location for the CORESET0 and SIB1 is considered
	+ consider introducing an SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern for higher SCS SSB (480 and 960 kHz), where TDM grouping of the SSB and the corresponding CORESET0/SIB1 is considered
* From [16] Samsung:
	+ For COREST#0,
		- if synchronization raster interval is larger than FR2, additional CORESET#0 RB offsets are needed for 120 kHz SS/PBCH block SCS;
		- if 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SS/PBCH block SCS is supported, at least CORESET#0 configuration table with same SCS as SS/PBCH block should be supported;
		- if there are reserved configurations, both multiplexing Pattern 2 and Pattern 3 can be supported in a CORESET#0 configuration table;
		- if CORESET#0 bandwidth can be increased, 96 RB can be added to the CORESET#0 configuration table for 120 kHz SS/PBCH block SCS.
* From [21] Interdigital:
	+ Introduce the enhancements on SS/PBCH block transmission patterns to deliberately include the CORESET#0 and sib1 along with the corresponding SS/PBCH block to ensure the channel occupancy as much as possible, in the initial access operations for unlicensed spectrum in beyond 52.6GHz.
* From [23] ZTE, Sanechip:
	+ The following multiplexing patterns for three approved SCS combinations of SSB and Type0-PDCCH can be considered for Rel-17 NR above 52.6 GHz. Other SCS combinations could be precluded.
		- (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (120 kHz, 120 kHz), Multiplexing patterns: 1, 3
		- (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (480 kHz, 480 kHz), Multiplexing patterns: 1, 3
		- (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (960 kHz, 960 kHz), Multiplexing patterns: 1, 3
* From [25] NTT Docomo:
	+ When new SCS(s) is supported for SSB and a single numerology is used for both SSB and CORESET#0/SIB1, at least TDM between SSB and CORESET#0/SIB1 can be supported.
	+ In case of TDM between SSB and CORESET#0 PDCCH/SIB1 PDSCH, support different structure(s) of TDM than the ones supported in Rel-15/-16 NR.
		- E.g., a group of SSB/CORESET#0 PDCCH/SIB1 PDSCH, which are associated with the same QCL, is allocated within a slot
	+ When lower SCS is used for SSB compared with that used for CORESET#0/SIB1, FDM between SSB and SIB1 PDSCH such as in pattern 2 can be considered.
* From [26] WILUS:
	+ Regarding the multiplexing between SSB and CORESET#0/RMSI-PDSCH, after agreeing new SCSs for SSB above all, it should be decided which combinations and multiplexing patterns are supported for NR operation from 52.6GHz to 71GHz.
	+ We propose that SS/PBCH block and CORESET#0/RMSI can be multiplexed in TDM/FDM within a slot considering multi-beam operation and it can be closely located without the gap between SSB and CORESET#0/RMSI for not allowing any in-between channel access operation in the unlicensed band.

**Summary of Discussions**

* Supported SCS for Type0-PDCCH/CORESET#0 indicated by MIB
	+ With 120kHz SSB:
		- 120kHz SCS for Type0-PDCCH: Intel, ZTE, Sanechip, Huawei, vivo, Ericsson
		- 120kHz, 480kHz, 960kHz SCS for Type0-PDCCH: Qualcomm
	+ With 240kHz SSB (if agreed):
		- 120kHz SCS for Type0-PDCCH:
		- 120kHz, 480kHz, 960kHz SCS for Type0-PDCCH: Qualcomm
	+ With 480 kHz SSB (if agreed):
		- 480kHz SCS for Type0-PDCCH: Qualcomm, Intel, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Samsung, ZTE, Sanechip
	+ With 960 kHz SSB (if agreed):
		- 960kHz SCS for Type0-PDCCH: Qualcomm, Intel, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Samsung, ZTE, Sanechip
		- 480kHz and 960 kHz SCS for Type0-PDCCH: vivo
* For the specific {SSB, Type0-PDCCH} SCS pair, supported CORESET#0 PRB size, and supported SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern
	+ Further discussion needed based on supported SCS pair(s).

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Given that discussion on whether Type0-PDCCH configuration will be supported for SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS is under discussion and discussion on whether 240kHz will be supported is also under discussion, moderator suggest to first focus on Type0-PDCCH configuration for SSB with 120kHz SCS.

Please provide inputs on the following:

* For SSB with 120kHz,
	+ SCS for CORESET#0
		- Alt 1) Only support 120kHz Type0-PDCCH (current specification)
		- Alt 2) support 120kHz, 480kHz, and 960kHz Type0-PDCCH
	+ Any changes to Type0-PDCCH configuration (other than Offset RB)
		- Alt 1) support all existing combinations of SSB/COREST multiplexing pattern, and number of RB and symbols for CORESET.
			* {mux pattern 1, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
			* {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* {mux pattern 3, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* {mux pattern 3, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- Alt 2) other options {companies to provide details}
		- Alt 3) …

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia | In context of CORESET with 120kHz sub-carrier spacings, we would propose to support ={96} in addition to ={24, 48}.  |
| Samsung | For 120 kHz SCS SSB, we didn’t see a strong need to support 480 kHz or 960 kHz CORESET#0 SCS, so we support Alt 1 for the SCS of CORESET#0. For the CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration, we believe 96 RB CORESET BW should be supported in addition to existing configurations in FR2, since the carrier bandwidth for 52.6 to 71 GHz is much larger than FR2 in Rel-15. Also, Pattern 2 can also be considered if there is reserved row in the configuration table, to allow more flexibility on allocating the CORESET#0. One clarification to the second sub-bullet, the context should be for 120 kHz as the SCS of CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH (i.e., Alt 1 of the first sub-bullet).  |
| Intel | For SCS 120 kHz for CORESET#0, we support Alt 1, i.e., only 120 kHz Type0-PDCCH (current specification). The support of other SSB/CORESET SCS pair such as {120, 480} or {120, 960} kHz, while could be interesting, may pose issues when the UE is trying to obtain accurate timing for reception and detection. Further time/frequency synchronization for 480/960kHz SCS will need to be aided by potential use of TRS and other signal/channels, and this means configuring the TRS and other signal/channel along with a new DL BWP with 480/960kHz SCS after initial access. For Type0-PDCCH, we support only configurations with mux pattern 1. The use of beams at Gnb and lack of resource available make it quite difficult to multiplex PDCCH and PDSCH of SIB1 and SSB using mux pattern 3. Therefore, we don’t quite see the need for supporting such cases. However, if companies which to support the cases for flexibility and efficient signal packing purposes, we would be ok to support the other cases.  |
| Qualcomm | For SSB with 120kHz, we support Alt 2 for the SCS for CORESET#0 (i.e., support 120kHz, 480kHz, and 960kHz Type0-PDCCH).* This may be useful in some cases where single SCS operation (other than SSB) is needed

For the Type0-PDCCH configuration: we support Alt 1* As a special case of mux pattern 1, consider introducing an SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern for higher SCS Type0-PDCCH (480 and 960 kHz), where a time domain fixed location for the CORESET0 and SIB1 is considered. The CORESET0 and SIB1 PDSCH are inserted in the gap slots of the 120 kHz SSB pattern. The advantages of this design may include: After acquiring SSB, if the RSSI of the SSB is good enough and the UE decides not to detect any other SSBs, the UE may sleep until the corresponding CORESET0/SIB1, thus achieve some power saving. Also, a smaller delay between SSB and CORESET0/SIB1 (within the same frame).

For mux pattern 3 (FDM), it may involve mixed numerology at the transmitter |
| Charter Communications | We prefer to first settle the SSB numerology discussion for remaining non-initial access/initial access. If 480 kHz/960 kHz SSB is supported for initial access, then only support 120kHz Type0-PDCCH (current specification). |
| Futurewei | We support Alt-1, we do not see the need Type0-PDCCH for higher SCS. We are open to discuss it after the initial SCS is decided. |
| InterDigital | For the 120kHz SCS, we support Alt1 in the context of supporting the single numerology.As for the CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration and allocations in time, we propose to use a (pre)configured configuration to ensure the occupancy of the channel as much as possible to avoid frequent need to LBT in unlicensed spectrums for all supported SCS frequencies. As such, the CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH would be located either preceding or following the corresponding SSB to be transmitted with the same beam direction and to further reduce the beam switching occasions. |
| LG Electronics | For SCS for CORESET#0, prefer Alt 1 (i.e., current specification)For Type0-PDCCH configuration, prefer Alt 1, but open to discuss other number of RBs (e.g., 96 RBs) |
| CATT | For 120 kHz SCS SSB, we don’t see evident benefit to support 480 kHz or 960 kHz CORESET#0 SCS. At the same time we see some implementation issues (timing etc)so we support Alt 1 for the SCS of CORESET#0. For the Type0-PDCCH configuration we also support ALT1 since this configuration simplify implementation |
| Ericsson | We support Alt-1 in both cases.On the SCS, we think from a coverage perspective, 120 kHz CORESET0 should be used for 120 kHz SSB.On the CORESET0 configuration, we don’t see a need for any changes. We analyzed this quite extensively in our contribution considering different potential outcomes from RAN4, and even the current SSB-CORESET0 offsets are sufficient too. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For 120kHz SSB SCS, Alt-1 is preferred.In principle, we think multiplexing between SSB and CORESET#0 with SCS combination {120kHz, 120kHz} should reuse the existing pattern/configuration as much as possible. But considering achieved transmission power and OCB requirements, a larger number of PRBs of CORESET#0 (e.g. 96 PRBs) can also be discussed. |
| NEC  | For SSB with 120kHz SCS, we support Alt 1 for the SCS for CORESET#0. For the Type0-PDCCH configuration, we prefer Alt 1 in general, and be open to the discussion in detail. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | For operation in a shared spectrum, both maximum transmission power limit and power spectrum density limit should be observed and to make full use of the transmit power. As such, in addition to what is already supported, we support 96 RB CORESET#0 for {SSB, CORESET#0} SCS={120, 120} kHz. Both Mux1 and Mux3 patterns can be supported for 96 RB CORESET#0.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | For SCS for CORESET#0, our view is to have a middle ground between Alt 1 and Alt 2, i.e., Alt 3) support 120 kHz and 480 or 960 kHz SCS Type0-PDCCH, considering the overhead to be required for Type0-PDCCH SCS indication. For Type0-PDCCH configuration other than Offset RB, it would not be clear to us if all the existing combinations of SSB/CORESET multiplexing patterns are necessary. For instance, if minimum channel bandwidth supported in 52.6 – 71 GHz is somehow larger, mux pattern with CORESET with smaller number of PRBs would not be necessary. As minimum channel bandwidth is fully up to RAN4 now, we believe Type0-PDCCH configuration should be discussed after RAN4’s decision even for 120 kHz SCS.  |
| Vivo | For the 120K SSB SCS, Alt. 1 is preferred since it is not beneficial but brings some issues like number of k\_offset bits if 480/960K SCS SSB is supported for initial access case. Otherwise, we are open to discuss Alt. 2.On the Coreset#0 configurations, we are open to discuss the supported number of RBs. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Alt1 for SSB with 120kHz (CORESET#0 with 120kHz SCS). Regarding Type0-PDCCH configuration for multiplexing patterns, we prefer Alt1.  |
| Spreadtrum | For SCS of CORESET0, we support Alt-1. But if both 120kHz CORESET0 and 480/960kHz CORESET0 (for CGI reporting) are supported, it seems large overhead. Is it possible that only 480/960kHz CORESET exists and 120kHz SSB indicates the location of 480/960kHz SSB (current spec support the non-cell-defining SSB indicates the location of the cell-defining SSB)? |
| Sharp | SCS for CORESET 0: we prefer Alt 1. |
| WILUS | For SCS 120 kHz for CORESET#0, we support Alt 1.For the Type0-PDCCH configuration, we support Alt 1 but are open to discuss other cases. |
| Sony | For SCS for CORESET#0, we support alt 1 if SSB with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS is supported for initial access case.For Type0-PDCCH configuration, we prefer alt 1. All existing combination could be used. |
| Apple  | For SSB with 120kHz SCS, Alt.1 for SCS for CORESET #0. On the CORESET0 configuration, we prefer Alt.1.  |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

The following is a summary of 1st round discussion by the moderator.

* For SSB with 120kHz,
	+ SCS for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH
		- Alt 1) Only support 120kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH (current specification)
			* Supported by: Samsung, Intel, Charter (if 480/960kHz is only supported for non-initial access), Futurewei, Interdigital, LG Electronics, CATT, Ericsson, ZTE, Sanechips, NEC, vivo, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Spreadtrum, Sharp, WILUS, Sony, Apple
		- Alt 2) support 120kHz, 480kHz, and 960kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH
			* Supported by: Qualcomm
		- Alt 3) Support 120kHz and either of 480kHz or 960kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH
			* Supported by NTT Docomo
	+ Any changes to Type0-PDCCH configuration (other than Offset RB)
		- Alt 1) support all existing combinations of SSB/COREST multiplexing pattern, and number of RB and symbols for CORESET.
			* {mux pattern 1, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
			* {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* {mux pattern 3, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* {mux pattern 3, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* Supported by Qualcomm, LGE (open to support another configuration), CATT, Ericsson, Huawei, HiSilicon, Sony, WILUS, Apple
		- Alt 2) support ={24, 48, 96}.
			* Supported by Samsung, Nokia, Huawei, HiSilicon (support mux 1 & 3 for 96 RB case)
		- Alt 3) support mux pattern 1 only
			* Supported by Intel
		- Alt 4) the CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH would be located either preceding or following the corresponding SSB
			* Supported by Interdigital

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

There seems to be good amount of support for only support 120/120kHz SSB/CORESET#0 combination. Also several companies commented on supporting existing combinations, but few companies also mentioned support of 96PRB cases as well. Based on discussion, moderator put together a tentative proposal. Please provide further comments on the proposal.

* For SSB with 120kHz, only support 120kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration by MIB
	+ support all existing combinations of SSB/CORESET multiplexing pattern, and number of RB and symbols for CORESET.
		- {mux pattern 1, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 3, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 3, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
	+ In addition to above, also support
		- {mux pattern 1, 96 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 96 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 3, 96 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
	+ FFS: CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH CSS location in time domain changes to account for LBT operations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Spreadtrum | Suggest agreeing the existing combinations first. Companies can further check new combinations. |
| Nokia | We are OK with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are OK with the proposal. Just one typo in the first sub-bullet: SSB/CORESETAlso, we may need more details regarding the FFS for a better understanding of the intention (we are ok to include it there). What’s the meaning of “changes” in the context? Is it a change to the configuration table or a dynamic change due to LBT?  |
| Moderator | Fixed typo above. |
| Qualcomm | If SSB is 120 kHz while CORESET0 uses 480/960 kHz, then it may qualify as same numerology deployment if other data/control use 480/960 kHzHaving 120 kHz SSB and 120 kHz CORESET0 with 480/960 kHz data/control may be the case for a different numerology deployment, which will complicate the deployment and the implementation. Hence, we prefer to have the 480/960 kHz for CORESET0 option for SSB 120 kHz |
| Interdigital | We support the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | RAN4 has agreed than 100 MHz is the minimum CBW for 120 kHz SCS operation. We do not see any motivation to support the mux patterns with smaller PRBs for CORESET even though it is supported in FR2. 24 PRBs CORESET for both mux pattern 1 and 3 has no motivation other than FR2 reuse. 48 PRBs for mux pattern 3 may be too large, but slightly smaller PRBs enables CORESET and SSB to use the given bandwidth more efficiently. Thus we propose the following:* + - ~~{mux pattern 1, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}~~
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 3, ~~24~~[42] PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- ~~{mux pattern 3, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}~~

For the suggested additional patterns, we are fine to support them considering larger BW.  |
| OPPO | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Vivo | We think this should be decided when SSB SCS for initial access is settled. |
| Ericsson | We don’t see a need to preclude any of the existing combinationsWe do not support 96 RB CORESET0, as this has not been discussed sufficiently. Is it required for balanced coverage of SSB and PDCCH? It is not clear that adding 96 RBs will increase coverage. Also, the minimum bandwidth is 100 MHz, so in a coverage challenged scenario, 96 RBs will not help. |
| WILUS | We are OK with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Ok with the proposal |
| Intel | We agree with DOCOMO’s updates. We don’t think there is a strong need to support the 50MHz CORESET sizes given that minimum BW is 100MHz for 120kHz.Also while we can accept the proposal with updates from DOCOMO, our preference is not to support mux pattern 3, as the value of corresponding cases with mux pattern 3 seems to be minimal. These cases basically limit resources that could be used for SIB1 (and other CSS based transmissions). With this said, if companies think that this is useful, we are ok accepting the proposals. |
| NEC | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

In general, companies seem to agree to support the existing Type0-PDCCH configuration for {120kHz, 120kHz} SCS combination for SSB and CORESET#0. There were some comments on support of 50MHz BW cases given that RAN4 has concluded 100MHz is the minimum BW for 120kHz. Some companies asked to support larger RB sizes for CORESET#0 that were not previously supported in FR2.

As a reference, RAN4 has decided to support 100MHz as the minimum BW for 120kHz SCS case, and 400 MHz as the minimum BW for 480kHz and 960kHz case.

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Based on discussions, moderator has formulated proposal 1.4-1.

###### **Proposal 1.4-1)**

* For SSB with 120kHz, only support 120kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration by MIB
	+ support following combinations of SSB/CORESET multiplexing pattern, and number of RB and symbols for CORESET.
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
	+ FFS on whether to support the following case:
		- {mux pattern 1, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- Note: this combination is currently supported in NR FR2
	+ Support either following option 1 or 2 and FFS which option to support:
		- Option 1) supported in NR FR2 currently
			* {mux pattern 3, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* {mux pattern 3, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- Option 2) modification to better match with 100MHz channel BW
			* {mux pattern 3, [42] PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
	+ FFS on support of the following cases:
		- {mux pattern 1, 96 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 96 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 3, 96 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
	+ FFS: CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH CSS location in time domain changes to account for LBT operations

Please continue to provide comments/input on proposal 1.4-1. Please feel free to suggest edits/changes or even other alternatives for agreement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal (although there are too many FFS…) |
| LG Electronics | We support only the main bullet.For CORESET configuration, combinations supported in FR2 need to be the starting point and consensus should be made if we try to remove/replace some of combinations supported in FR2. |
| DOCOMO | We would like to echo QC’s comment at the previous round. If both 480/960 kHz SCS are supported for SSB for initial access (which we assume is difficult to support considering companies’ views), we support only 120 kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for SSB with 120 kHz SCS. If both 480/960 kHz SCS are NOT supported for SSB for initial access, we prefer to have at least one of larger SCSs for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configured by MIB in SSB with 120 kHz SCS as it enforces less flexibility to trigger the operation with larger SCSs.  |
| Qualcomm | As commented before, to achieve single numerology deployment, 480/960 kHz may be needed for CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH when SSB is 120 kHz. So the current proposal text “*For SSB with 120kHz, only support 120kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration by MIB*” is not agreeable to us. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We already had the following agreement in RAN1 104-e:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement:**For CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:* Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS equal to {120, 120} kHz
	+ Support at least SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of RBs for CORESET#0, number of symbols (duration of CORESET#0) that are supported in Rel-15/16 for {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS = {120, 120} kHz.
		- FFS: Supporting additional values
	+ FFS: Supported values for SSB to CORESET#0 offset RBs
	+ FFS: initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS (480/960 kHz)

[…] |

 As such, we cannot agree to put some of the combinations that are supported in Rel-15/16 as “FFS” or “Option” since this would be a reversal of the agreement in RAN1 104-e without, in our opinion, a completing reason. We can further study 96 PRB CORESET#0 if it is not already agreeable by other companies. We are open to further discuss [42] PRB CORESET#0. We propose the following alternative:**Proposal:** * For SSB with 120kHz, only support 120kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration by MIB.
* Other than the SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of RBs for CORESET#0, number of symbols (duration of CORESET#0) for {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS = {120, 120} kHz that are supported in Rel-15/16 and agreed in RAN1 104-e, further study the support of
	+ {mux pattern 1, 96 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
	+ {mux pattern 1, 96 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
	+ {mux pattern 3, 96 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
	+ {mux pattern 3, [42] PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
 |
| Ericsson | We have a strong concern with this proposal of eliminating Rel-15 functionality. Our view is that we support at least the Rel-15 options, and then there can be further discussion if anything extra is needed. From an implementation perspective, we have a strong desire to keep the Rel-15 initial access framework for 120 kHz (and 240 kHz too). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For SCS combination {120kHz, 120kHz}, the Rel-15 NR configuration should be reused as much as possible. We do not see sufficient reasons to change some bullets about the Rel-15 NR configuration from support to FFS. |
| Intel | We are Ok with 1.4-1. |
| Nokia | As raised by Huawei, we have made an agreement to support the Rel-15/16 configurations as a baseline for {120,120}, thus we would not prefer to re-open this discussion for all aspects. After that being said, for multiplexing pattern 3, based on the agreements made by RAN4 we can further consider whether to support [42] RB instead of 48RB, or both. As noted, we would be interested to consider in addition 96RB option for {120,120} case, at least for multiplexing pattern 1. For {240,120} case, if agreed to be supported, we think that multiplexing pattern 1 at least should be considered.If, we don’t support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration with 480kHz/960kHz SSBs, we are OK to consider supporting {120,480} and {120,960} and/or {240,480} and {240,960} combinations in addition. |
| Futurewei | We have similar opinions with Nokia and other companies: {120,120} is already agreed as the baseline. We do not support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration with 480kHz/960kHz SSBs. The other combinations can be discussed after the SSB numerology for initial access discussion. |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

From moderator’s understanding the reasons we are discussing the supported parameter set for 120kHz, even though we agreed on support of such existing parameters (as Huawei) mentioned, is because of the updated information on minimum BW from RAN4.

Moderator has reformulated proposal 1.4-1 to 1.4-2. Basically 1.4-2 would be a small update of the existing RAN1 agreement, where we clarify the FFS of additional values, and add new FFS given the new information on minimum channel BW from RAN4.

###### **Proposal 1.4-2)**

* For SSB with 120kHz, only support 120kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration by MIB
	+ support following combinations of SSB/CORESET multiplexing pattern, and number of RB and symbols for CORESET.
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* FFS: on whether to remove support for 24 PRB
		- {mux pattern 3, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* FFS: on whether to remove support for 24 PRB
		- {mux pattern 3, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* FFS: on whether 48 PRB CORESET can be updated to [42] PRB
	+ FFS on support of the following cases:
		- {mux pattern 1, 96 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 96 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 3, 96 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}

The following is the previous RAN1 agreement (for reference).

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement:**For CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:* Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS equal to {120, 120} kHz
	+ Support at least SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of RBs for CORESET#0, number of symbols (duration of CORESET#0) that are supported in Rel-15/16 for {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS = {120, 120} kHz.
		- FFS: Supporting additional values
	+ FFS: Supported values for SSB to CORESET#0 offset RBs
	+ FFS: initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS (480/960 kHz)
 |

#### **4th Round Discussion:**

Companies are asked to provide further comments on Proposal 1.4-2.

Added Proposal 1.4-3 based on further comments from companies.

###### **Proposal 1.4-3)**

* For SSB with 120kHz, ~~only~~ support 120kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration by MIB
	+ support following combinations of SSB/CORESET multiplexing pattern, and number of RB and symbols for CORESET.
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* FFS: on whether to remove support for 24 PRB
		- {mux pattern 3, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* FFS: on whether to remove support for 24 PRB
		- {mux pattern 3, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* FFS: on whether 48 PRB CORESET can be updated to [42] PRB
	+ FFS on support of the following cases:
		- {mux pattern 1, 96 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 96 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 3, 96 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
	+ FFS on other case of {SSB, CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH} SCS combination other than {120, 120} kHz
	+ FFS: CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH CSS location in time domain changes to account for LBT operations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We are ok with proposal.  |
| Qualcomm | As commented before, to achieve single numerology deployment, 480/960 kHz may be needed for CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH when SSB is 120 kHz. So the current proposal text “*For SSB with 120kHz, only support 120kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration by MIB*” **is not agreeable to us.**We would like to have the 480/960 kHz as an option at least as an FFS.Suggested proposal:* For SSB with 120kHz, ~~only~~ support 120kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration by MIB
	+ support following combinations of SSB/CORESET multiplexing pattern, and number of RB and symbols for CORESET.
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* FFS: on whether to remove support for 24 PRB
		- {mux pattern 3, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* FFS: on whether to remove support for 24 PRB
		- {mux pattern 3, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* FFS: on whether 48 PRB CORESET can be updated to [42] PRB
	+ FFS on support of the following cases:
		- {mux pattern 1, 96 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 96 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 3, 96 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
* For SSB with 120 kHz and 240 kHz (if supported), support 480 kHz and 960 kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration by MIB
 |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal 1.4-2 |
| Interdigital | To consider the channel occupancy through including the CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH along with the SS/PBCH blocks and to avoid the LBT operations, we urge to again add the FFS that was already provided in Proposal 1.4-1:* + FFS: CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH CSS location in time domain changes to account for LBT operations
 |
| Ericsson | We are not fine with the last bullet that Qualcomm has suggested. This is jumping the gun before we have finalized agreements on what SSB SCSs are supported for which purposes. Again, we have strong concerns with this proposal. As commented by a number of companies, we do not want to change what is supported in Rel-15. If additional configurations are supported on top, we are open to further discussion, but not removing Rel-15 functionality. Also, we point out that the RAN4 decision on minimum bandwidth does not mean that certain rows of the configuration tables should be removed. In Rel-15 where the minimum bandwidth is 50 MHz, not all rows in the configuration tables are relevant. The gNB does not use those rows if it configures a channel where the configuration is not appropriate. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal and we are OK with Qualcomm addition 480/960 kHz as an FFS. |
| DOCOMO | We think it should be discussed after finalizing SSB SCS discussion. On the FFSs to remove the existing mux pattern, we would like to keep them although we understand that some companies have a concern on it. This is indeed Rel-15 functionality, but we are not sure why it is a problem that a functionality in Rel-15 where 52.6 – 71 GHz is not supported is so needed in 52.6 – 71 GHz. Our understanding is that the mux pattern with 24 PRB CORESET is indeed necessary in FR2 since min. CBW is 50 MHz, which means only 32 PRBs are available in some cases. But now, in 52.6 – 71 GHz with 120 kHz SCS, at least 66 PRBs are available. In this case, it is questionable to us why the mux pattern with 24 PRBs should be kept.  |
| LG Electronics | We are supportive of only the main bullet.Previously, we clearly agreed to support at least SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of RBs for CORESET#0, number of symbols (duration of CORESET#0) that are supported in Rel-15/16 for {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS = {120, 120} kHz.* {mux pattern 1, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}: Even though min. CH BW is increased to 100 MHz, 24 PRBs can be used for CORESET#0
* {mux pattern 3, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}: Even though min. CH BW is increased to 100 MHz, 24 PRBs can be used for CORESET#0
* {mux pattern 3, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}: This was defined from Rel-15 where min. CH BW = 50 MHz. What is the problem if we keep this value also for NR 52.6 – 71 GHz?

If we make a consensus to need additional combination to configure CORESET#0, we can simply add that combination to the current table for CORESET#0 configuration. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with proposal 1.4-2 |
| vivo | We are OK with the proposal and put Qualcomm’s additional bullet as FFS. We think it depends on the decision of SSB SCS for initial access. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are generally fine with Proposal 1.4-2 but it would be better if the FFS part are removed. We cannot accept Qualcomm’s modification, we see no benefit to support the SCS combination (120, 480), (120, 960) for SSB and CORESET#0. |
| CATT | We are OK with proposal and also fine with QC’s modification |
| Nokia | Firstly we are OK with the proposal in principle, accounting QCM proposal to remove the ‘only’ from the first bullet. With that change, option to further consider CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH options of 480kHz and 960kHz with 120kHz SSB is open, and not necessary to add as FFS bullet. Secondly, while we understand DOCOMO’s point to consider 24RB for multiplexing pattern 1, and can consider it, we don’t see why same would need to be considered for multiplexing pattern 3. Thus would like to have clarification or further consider the bullet. |
| Moderator | Looks like companies seem to want slightly different things. I assumed by putting FFS on some while keep the rest the same, it would be ok.I’ve put proposal 1.4-3 and added FFS on aspect other companies mentioned. I would urge companies to be bit more open minded about the FFS, as in some cases it could very well be the other way around (i.e. wanting to add FSS but is met with opposition).I also understand companies are more than welcomed to provide input even if the FFS is not there. From the moderator’s perspective, the FFS simply serves as some guideline for discussion but doesn’t not necessarily preclude other essential aspects.With this said, please do provide further comments. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the new proposal 1.4-3  |
| LG Electronics | Even though we still have a concern on (120,480) or (120,960), we can accept proposal 1.4-3 for the sake of progress. |

#### **4th Round Discussion Summary:**

Moderator suggest checking wether 1.4-3 is acceptable.

### 2.1.5 Various other aspects on SSB Design

* From [3] Spreadtrum:
	+ The SSB-based TRS/CSI-RS validation can be considered to be supported.
* From [4] vivo:
	+ For initial cell search in 52.6-71GHz, a UE may assume that half frames with SSB occur with smaller period than FR2 (e.g. 5ms), or lower RAN4 requirement for the cell search time.
* From [9] Futurewei
	+ The UE LBT channel access operation in 60 GHz unlicensed spectrum may be disabled by the Gnb when LBT operation is not mandated by the spectrum regulations.
* From [10] Ericsson:
	+ Consistent with EN 302 567, when operating in LBT mode a node can access the channel without LBT for control signal/channel transmissions, the total duration of which shall not exceed 10ms within an observation period of 100ms. The following signals/channels shall be classified as Short control signaling transmissions:
		- a. Discovery burst (as defined in Rel-16)
		- b. msg1 and msg3 for the 4 step RACH and MsgA for the 2-step RACH
		- c. FFS: Other control transmissions not multiplexed with user data (subject to Gnb configuration)
* From [13] Intel:
	+ While SSB may be considered as a candidate for short control signal exemption, RAN1 specification shall support operations of SSB transmission with LBT (at the Gnb) and discovery burst (DS) at least for 120 kHz SSB.
		- For SSB with larger SCS, consider further supporting operations of SSB transmission with LBT (at the Gnb) for commonality with 120 kHz SSB.
	+ Send LS to RAN4 asking them to clarify sync raster and channel raster relationship for NR extension from 52.6 GHz up to 71 GHz.
* From [15] Qualcomm:
	+ For initial access, in cases where the SSB SCS is smaller than other channels SCS (e.g., PDCCH/PDSCH), consider WB DMRS or cell-specific TRS for further timing error corrections
		- For cell-specific TRS, consider studying the FD density needed
* From [19] Convida Wireless:
	+ SSB coverage enhancement should be studied for higher SCS if it is supported.

**Summary of Discussions**

* Companies have provided discussion on considerations for SSB design. The discussion includes, support of 5 msec SSB periodicity as default value, LBT operation control, application of short signal exemption for DB, TRS availability for time error correction, and SSB coverage enhancements.
* Suggest discussing these issues further.

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Please provide suggestions on proposal(s) companies would like to discuss on SSB that is not covered by other discussions. Once the proposals are provided, moderator will copy the proposal and present in the discussion document to further request input/feedback from companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia | As noted in our paper, assuming that short control signal exemption is applied at least for SSB, we would need to discuss how to handle the case when only sub-set of SSBs can be transmitted under short control exemption. |
| Samsung | All these topics could be treated later after the major issues are resolved. Should have a better understanding of their necessity by then.  |
| Intel | SSB coverage enhancements are out of the scope of the WID. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Samsung’s comment about deferring these until the major issues are resolved |
| Charter Communications | Support SCSe for SSBs. |
| Futurewei | Support short control LBT exempt for various steps of the initial access. We could leave the discussion for later. |
| CATT | These proposals could be discussed at later stage. Some of the enhancement may not be necessary in this release. |
| Ericsson | We think the SCS exemption for discovery burst (DB) is important, but that is being treated in the Channel Access AI.SSB coverage enhancement is out of scope for this WI. The WID contains the following note:* + - Note: coverage enhancement for SSB is not pursued.

We think there is enough to do in this WI without considering additional RS/RS configurations for improved timing.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | These issues are in low priority and can be discussed later. |
| Vivo | These issues could be discussed when the major issue is solved. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Share the same view as other companies. These issues can be discussed later. |
| Xiaomi | These proposals could be FFS. |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

The following is a summary of 1st round discussion by the moderator.

* Several companies mentioned what we need to discuss short control signal exemption applicability to SSB.
* One companies mentioned RAN1 should discuss how to handle when only sub-set of SSBs can be transmitted under short control exemption.

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

For other issues mentioned in the 1st round summary, the majority of company suggest to discuss once further details of SSB design is progressed. As for the issue commented by Nokia, companies asked to provide input on hoe to handle when only sub-set of SSBs can be transmitted under short control exemption.

* Alt 1) Specification to support a sub-set of all transmitted of SSBs to be transmitted without LBT under short control exemption, and sub-set of all transmitted of SSB to be transmitted with LBT.
	+ If supported, please provide further input on how this case will be handled.
* Alt 2) Specification to only support all transmitted SSB to be transmitted without LBT under short control signal exemption or all transmitted SSB to be transmitted with LBT, i.e. no partial sub-set SSBs not performing LBT due to short control signal exemption rules.
* Alt 3) other alternative {company to provide detail}

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia | We would prefer Alt 1). It would be preferable that network can dynamically determine/choose which SSBs are transmitted with short control exemption to allow equal opportunity for different SSBs to be transmitted. As with higher number of beams, with 120khz SSB, there will be limited number of additional candidate locations for SSBs with DBTW, it maybe be necessary to ‘rotate’ SSBs to be sent under short control exemption.  |
| LG Electronics | It can be up to Gnb’s implementation. |
| Samsung | In Rel-16 NR-U, there was a similar discussion on whether all the transmission of SSB have to be initialized by single LBT and the conclusion was it’s up to implementation, i.e., the Gnb has the freedom to divide a SSB burst into multiple sub-bursts and perform LBT for each of them (applying the LBT type accordingly). Then we believe same principle can be applied here: it should be allowed to use only part of the SSBs as short control signal and perform LBT for the remaining SSBs up to Gnb’s implementation, and no specification work is needed.  |
| Qualcomm | Another hybrid approach (between Alt 1 and Alt 2) can be considered: Do an LBT before the SSBs transmission, if LBT passes then transmit all SSB (up to 64), if LBT fails, then only transmit the number of SSBs that are allowed. The transmitted SSBs may be rotated (per Nokia’s comment). |
| Futurewei | We prefer the LBT decision for each SSB (set) to be left to the implementation.  |
| OPPO | We prefer to leave it for Gnb implementation. |
| Vivo | We think it could up to implementation which meets the channel access requirement. |
| Ericsson | We prefer to leave to Gnb implementation. LBT failure is rare to start with; we do not need to optimize, and certainly we do not need to specify. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We don’t think any specification is needed, and it’s up to the Gnb’s implementation. |
| Intel | We are ok with either Alt 1 or Alt 2 as long as the understanding is that no specification effort will be needed. Basically, we would like to avoid enforcing complicated behavior sets for gNB and UE to support partial SSB subset LBT exemption cases. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Alt. 2. In fact, we think that short control signaling should be applicable to the whole DB and not only SSB within the DB: Either the whole DB is exempted or there should be a LBT before DB (without partial exemption).We think that supporting partial exemption or leaving it to gNB implementation can render LBT completely irrelevant in all scenarios: Any SSB burst (regardless of SCS or periodicity) can be chopped into sub-sets so each subset satisfies the 10% out of 100 ms restriction rule and use the exemption to be transmitted without LBT. We think that the intention of introducing short control signaling was not to completely work around LBT based on gNB implementation.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We prefer to leave it to implementation. |
| CATT | This can be left to implementation. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

The following is a summary of company views on handling of which SSBs to be applicable for transmission with or without LBT under short control exemption rules.

* Alt 1) Specification to support a sub-set of all transmitted of SSBs to be transmitted without LBT under short control exemption, and sub-set of all transmitted of SSB to be transmitted with LBT.
	+ Supported by Nokia, NSB
* Alt 2) Specification to only support all transmitted SSB to be transmitted without LBT under short control signal exemption or all transmitted SSB to be transmitted with LBT, i.e. no partial sub-set SSBs not performing LBT due to short control signal exemption rules.
	+ Supported by Huawei, HiSilicon
* Alt 3) Perform an LBT before the SSBs transmission, if LBT passes then transmit all SSB (up to 64), if LBT fails, then only transmit the number of SSBs that are allowed. The transmitted SSBs may be rotated in each transmission burst.
	+ Supported by Qualcomm
* Alt 4) Leave the specific behaviors on which SSB to be transmitted with/without LBT under short control exemption up the gNB implementation.
	+ Supported by LGE, Samsung, Futurewei, OPPO, vivo, Ericsson, ZTE, Sanechip, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, CATT

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Based on the discussion, moderator has formulated proposal 1.5-1, that seem to have majority support, and proposal 1.5-2 that leave the issue for further discussion.

###### **Proposal 1.5-1)**

* Leave the specific behaviors on which SSB to be transmitted with/without LBT under short control exemption up the gNB implementation.

###### **Proposal 1.5-2)**

* Further study on how to handle transmission of SSB, when potentially only a sub-set of SSB can be qualified to be transmitted under short control exemption.
	+ Some example behaviors for discussion and consideration are:
		- Specification to support a sub-set of all transmitted of SSBs to be transmitted without LBT under short control exemption, and sub-set of all transmitted of SSB to be transmitted with LBT.
		- Specification to only support all transmitted SSB to be transmitted without LBT under short control signal exemption or all transmitted SSB to be transmitted with LBT, i.e. no partial sub-set SSBs not performing LBT due to short control signal exemption rules.
		- Perform an LBT before the SSBs transmission, if LBT passes then transmit all SSB (up to 64), if LBT fails, then only transmit the number of SSBs that are allowed. The transmitted SSBs may be rotated in each transmission burst.

Please continue to provide comments/input on proposal 1.5-1 and 1.5-2. Please feel free to suggest edits/changes or even other alternatives for agreement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We support Proposal 1.5-1, with the reason explained in the previous round.  |
| LG Electronics | We support Proposal 1.5-1, and if further discussion is necessary, it should be discussed under channel access agenda item. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t have a strong view here. In some sense, the methods in proposal 1.5-2 can be also achieved by gNB implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are supportive of proposal 1.5-2. We also would like to have some clarifications from the proponents of Proposal 1.5-1: What happens if the SSB burst occupies 18% (and not up to 10%) out of every 100 ms? Since the specific behavior of using short control signaling is up to gNB, what stops gNB from dividing the SSB burst to the first half and the second half so both of them only occupy 9% out of every 100ms and meet the short control signaling restriction in which case gNB can transmit both halves (all SSB burst) without any LBT? |
| Ericsson | We strongly support Proposal 1.5-1. The gNB must satisfy any applicable regulations, and there is no need to specify how to do this. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Proposal 1.5-1. |
| Intel | We prefer Proposal 1.5-1. |
| Nokia | We would support proposal 1.5-2, while the discussion may fall more under the Channel Access agenda item. This also relates for the applicable additional candidate SSB locations in DBTW, and hence there would be some need to clarify the UE expectation. |
| Futurewei | We prefer Proposal 1.5-1 with FFS additional clarifications on gNB signaling the controls to UE for short signaling enablement if any. We are open to discuss 1.5-2 but we think that there will be too many options to consider and cover. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Proposal 1.5-1. |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

Several companies preferred 1.5-1. At least two companies commented this the handling of the cases where transmission of SSB exceeding the short control exemption needs further discussion.

Based on the comments, moderator has added the up to gNB implementation option to proposal 1.5-2 to 1.5-3.

###### **Proposal 1.5-3)**

* Further study on how to handle transmission of SSB, when potentially only a sub-set of SSB can be qualified to be transmitted under short control exemption.
	+ Some example behaviors for discussion and consideration are:
		- Specification to support a sub-set of all transmitted ~~of~~ SSBs to be transmitted without LBT under short control exemption, and sub-set of all transmitted of SSB to be transmitted with LBT.
		- Specification to only support all transmitted SSB to be transmitted without LBT under short control signal exemption or all transmitted SSB to be transmitted with LBT, i.e. no partial sub-set SSBs not performing LBT due to short control signal exemption rules.
		- Perform an LBT before the SSBs transmission, if LBT passes then transmit all SSB (up to 64), if LBT fails, then only transmit the number of SSBs that are allowed. The transmitted SSBs may be rotated in each transmission burst.
		- Leave the specific behaviors on which SSB to be transmitted with/without LBT under short control exemption up the gNB implementation

#### **4th Round Discussion:**

Companies are asked to provide further comments on Proposal 1.5-3.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal to further study.  |
| Qualcomm | The proposal is fine with us |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal 1.5-3 |
| Interdigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Ericsson | We do not agree that this needs discussion in this AI. In the 3rd round discussion, it seems to me a majority of companies prefer Proposal 1.5-1 where it is left to gNB implementation. Further one company supporting 1.5-2 says that any discussion should be in the Channel Access AI.We do not need Proposal 1.5-3, and prefer to remove it. |
| Futurewei | We would prefer to leave it for the implementation , therefore we prefer to remove all the sub-bullets and leave only main bullet.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Generally OK with Proposal 1.5-3. Some editorial changes seem to be needed:* Specification to support a sub-set of all transmitted ~~of~~ SSBs to be transmitted without LBT under short control exemption, and sub-set of all transmitted ~~of~~ SSB to be transmitted with LBT.
 |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia | We are OK with the proposal. In my understanding Channel Access has agreed to support short control exemption (at least) to SSB.  |
| LG Electronics | Same view with Ericsson. This agenda seems to be not the right place to discuss channel access aspects for SSB. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal. |

#### **4th Round Discussion Summary:**

Given the concerns from companies and most promising proposal is to study, moderator suggest to skip this proposal for RAN1 #104-bis-e.

## 2.2 PRACH Aspects

### 2.2.1 Supported PRACH Numerology

* From [1] Huawei, HiSilicon:
	+ For PRACH and Msg3 in initial UL BWP, only 120 kHz should be used in 52.6GHz to 71GHz spectrum.
* From [4] vivo:
	+ Support 120KHz, 480KHz and 960KHz as candidate SCS of initial UL BWP.
	+ The design of SSB and PRACH should be consistent for initial access and non-initial access.
* From [5] Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell:
	+ Support 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS for PRACH in non-initial access use cases.
	+ Support 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS for PRACH in initial access use case when UE’s SSB search complexity can be mitigated.
* From [8] Fujitsu:
	+ In addition to 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139, 571 and 1151, support at least 480kHz and 960kHz for PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for initial access and other cases.
* From [10] Ericsson:
	+ Proposal 8 For cases other than initial access (e.g. for a Scell or PSCell), if SS/PBCH block with 480 and 960 kHz SCS is supported, support PRACH with the same SCS as the UL BWP.
* From [13] Intel:
	+ Support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for PRACH in NR extension up to 71 GHz.
* From [14] Apple:
	+ If 480kHz and 960kHz SCS are used for PRACH transmission, support L=139 only.
* From [15] Qualcomm:
	+ consider only using PRACH sequence length = 139 for SCS = 480 kHz and 960 kHz
* From [16] Samsung:
	+ Support short PRACH format for all PRACH sequence lengths and all SCSs , and don’t support long PRACH format.
* From [18] LGE:
	+ If 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS PRACH is supported, support only the sequence length L=139 for the cases other than initial access (e.g., for Scell).
* From [21] Interditigal:
	+ Further study necessity of PRACH for additional SCSs in Rel-17.
* From [22] Sharp:
	+ Support 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS for PRACH.
* From [23] ZTE, Sanechip:
	+ Support additional SCSs (480kHz and/or 960kHz) for PRACH and SSB if single subcarrier spacing is supported.

**Summary of Discussions**

* Companies provided proposals on supported SCS for PRACH.
	+ Support only 120kHz
		- Huawei, HiSilicon
	+ Support 120, 480, 960 kHz
		- vivo, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Fujitsu, Ericsson, Intel, Qualcomm, Apple, ZTE, Sanechip
* Some companies mentioned the SCS selection for PRACH should be aligned with SCS selection for SSB.

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Companies are asked to revise and update the company preferences, now that RAN1 has agreed to support 480kHz and 960kHz SCS SSB for non-initial access cases with Type0-PDCCH not configured in MIB.

* Support only 120kHz
	+ *Huawei, HiSilicon*
* Support 120, 480, 960 kHz
	+ *vivo, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Fujitsu, Ericsson, Intel, Qualcomm, Apple, ZTE, Sanechip*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| LG | We added the related proposal in our contribution to above and since the 480 and 960 kHz SCS SSB has agreed only for non-initial access cases, 480 and 960 kHz SCS PRACH can be supported only for the cases other than initial access (e.g., for Scell). |
| Nokia | For non-initial access use cases we propose support following (in addition to the 120kHz): * + Support 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.

We don’t see strong need to support L=571 and 1151 with 480kHz or 960kHz sub-carrier spacing.Noting also that initial versus non-initial is not very well defined from RACH perspective, as in all cases, the UE is basically transmitting RACH. In our understanding at least following scenarios would be covered:* RRC Connection Re-establishment after radio link failure (RRC\_CONNECTED)
* Handover (RRC\_CONNECTED)
* UL data arrival when the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED state, with non-synchronized UL
* DL data arrival when the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED state, with non-synchronized UL
* UL data arrival when the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED state and no SR resources
* The UE sends a scheduling request in response to UL data arrival but fails to receive an UL grant from the network (RRC\_CONNECTED)
* Transition from RRC\_INACTIVE state to RRC\_CONNECTED state
* Establishing time alignment when adding Scell (RRC\_CONNECTED)
* Request of Other SI (RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE)
* Beam failure recovery (RRC\_CONNECTED)
 |
| OPPO | We support 120, 480, 960 kHz SCS for PRACH |
| Intel | For the sake of truly supporting the single numerology operation, our preference is SCS 120 kHz, 480 kHz, 960 kHz for PRACH (for both initial access and non-initial access cases). |
| Qualcomm | We support 120, 480, 960 kHz SCS for PRACH |
| Charter Communications | We support 120, 480, 960 kHz SCS for PRACH |
| Futurewei | We support 120kHz for PRACH and 480, 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access PRACH as mentioned by LGE. |
| InterDigital | We support 120kHz, 480kHz, and 960kHz SCS to support single numerology operation. |
| CATT | We support 120, 480, 960 kHz SCS for PRACH |
| Ericsson | For non-initial access, we support 480 and 960 kHz SCS PRACH (in addition to 120 kHz). This is useful to be able to configure PRACH with the same SCS as the UL BWP. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support 120, 480, 960 kHz SCS for PRACH |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We consider the support for 480, 960 kHz SCS for PRACH only for non-initial access purposes. For initial access purposes where RACH is configured in ServingCellConfigCommon -> UplinkConfigCommon, only 120 kHz RACH is supported to avoid using more than one SCS during initial access. |
| Samsung  | We support 120, 480, 960 kHz SCS for PRACHSeems our proposal in the tdoc is missing, so please help capturing it in the summary. **Proposal 5: Support short PRACH format for all PRACH sequence lengths and all SCSs , and don’t support long PRACH format.** |
| NTT DOCOMO | 480 and 960 kHz SCS should be supported for PRACH to align with SSB SCS. The supported use cases should be revisited after completing the discussion on SSB SCS |
| Convida Wireless | We support 120, 480, 960 kHz SCS for PRACH. |
| Vivo | We support 120, 480, 960KHz SCS for PRACH |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support 480/960kHz in addition to 120kHz for PRACH |
| Sharp | We support 120, 480, 960 kHz SCS for PRACH. |
| Sony | We support 120, 480, 960 kHz SCS for PRACH |
| Fujitsu | We support 120, 480, 960 kHz SCS for PRACH. |
| Apple  | For non-initial access case, we support 120, 480, 960 kHz SCS for PRACH |
| Moderator | Added Samsung proposal to the summary |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

The following is a summary of 1st round discussion by the moderator.

* All companies mentioned support for 480kHz and 960kHz.
* LG, Nokia, Futurewei, Huawei/HiSilicon mentioned support for 480kHz and 960kHz SCS PRACH should be for non-initial access.
* Intel mentioned support for 480kHz and 960kHz SCS PRACH should be for non-initial access and initial access cases.

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

Moderator suggest further discussion based on the following proposal:

* For non-initial access case, support PRACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS (in addition to 120kHz SCS).
	+ Non-initial access case includes (but may not be limited to):
		- RRC Connection Re-establishment after radio link failure (RRC\_CONNECTED)
		- Handover (RRC\_CONNECTED)
		- UL data arrival when the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED state, with non-synchronized UL
		- DL data arrival when the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED state, with non-synchronized UL
		- UL data arrival when the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED state and no SR resources
		- The UE sends a scheduling request in response to UL data arrival but fails to receive an UL grant from the network (RRC\_CONNECTED)
		- Transition from RRC\_INACTIVE state to RRC\_CONNECTED state
		- Establishing time alignment when adding Scell (RRC\_CONNECTED)
		- Request of Other SI (RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE)
		- Beam failure recovery (RRC\_CONNECTED)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| Nokia | Firstly to clarify that if we support Type0-PDCCH for 480kHz and 960kHz SSB, we would also support enabling use of 480kHz and 960kHz for RACH in initial access. Our earlier comment referred to the agreement that had been made. As noted above, in RACH terms the split between these two cases is not large.Hence, we think that afore mentioned cases should be (at least) supported, even if Type0-PDCCH is not provide in 480kHz and 960kHz SSB. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal |
| Interdigital | We Support the proposal. |
| Futurewei | Agree with Nokia, the cases above can be supported if they do not require Type0-PDCCH for 480kHz and 960kHz SSB. |
| LG | We support the proposal. For Nokia’s comments, it can be discussed after whether to support Type0-PDCCH for 480/960kHz is determined. |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal.  |
| Samsung | We are not ok with the proposal, and we suggest a re-check of the company position on this issue. We didn’t explicitly show our supporting is for non-initial access, since we believe it should be supported in general (not sure whether some other companies sharing same understanding). Unlike SSB case, the supporting of SCS (and sequence length as well in the next topic) for PRACH may not need to (or even impossible to) distinguish initial access and non-initial access, since anyway it’s indicated by network. The first indication of such information is RMSI, which is already “non-initial access” in the context of SSB discussion, so we are wondering what’s the meaning of “initial access” for PRACH. For example, if system information can be considered as initial access, but it can also be provided by RRC (e.g. in handover) as non-initial access, then are we treating differently for the same information?  |
| OPPO | We support the proposal. |
| Vivo | Agree with Samsung and we support 480K/960K SCS PRACH in general. Could the companies supporting 480K/960K PRACH only for non-initial access case provide the technical concern on supporting 480K/960K PRACH for initial access? In our understanding, the transmission and detection complexity for initial access and non-initial access is the same. |
| Ericsson | We agree at least to:* For non-initial access case, support PRACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS (in addition to 120kHz SCS).

However, detailed checking of each of the listed scenarios is needed. Suggest to put an FFS on the list of cases. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We share same view with Samsung and vivo, we support 480/960kHz SCS for PRACH for both initial access and non-initial access. There is no need to distinguish PRACH for initial access or non-initial access. |
| Fujitsu | We share the views with Samsung, vivo and ZTE that 480K/960K SCS should be supported in general. |
| Intel | We support the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We can agree with the main bullet without the sub-bullet part listing the “non-initial access” cases. We have two reasons for removing the suggested sub-bullet by feature lead: 1) Most of these applications are RAN2 procedures and RAN2 is better positioned to discuss exactly for what procedure the 480/960 kHz RACH is supported; 2) Each of these applications/procedure should be more thoroughly studied before we can commit to them. However, we think that it would be a good practice to try to clarify what support of PRACH for non-initial access case mean. PRACH can be configured in both *ServingCellConfigCommon* (for non-initial access use cases) and *ServingCellConfigCommonSIB* (In SIB1 for initial access use cases). Also, since we have not agreed yet to support configuring CORESET#0 with 480(960) kHzSSB, configuring 480/960 kHz RACH in *ServingCellConfigCommonSIB* is not justifiable either. Therefore, we suggest to add a note after the main bullet clarifying this issue:* For non-initial access case, support PRACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS (in addition to 120kHz SCS).
	+ Note: RACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS is configured only in *ServingCellConfigCommon*.
	+ ~~Non-initial access case includes (but may not be limited to):~~
		- ~~RRC Connection Re-establishment after radio link failure (RRC\_CONNECTED)~~
		- ~~Handover (RRC\_CONNECTED)~~
		- ~~UL data arrival when the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED state, with non-synchronized UL~~
		- ~~DL data arrival when the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED state, with non-synchronized UL~~
		- ~~UL data arrival when the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED state and no SR resources~~
		- ~~The UE sends a scheduling request in response to UL data arrival but fails to receive an UL grant from the network (RRC\_CONNECTED)~~
		- ~~Transition from RRC\_INACTIVE state to RRC\_CONNECTED state~~
		- ~~Establishing time alignment when adding Scell (RRC\_CONNECTED)~~
		- ~~Request of Other SI (RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE)~~
		- ~~Beam failure recovery (RRC\_CONNECTED)~~

 As for vivo’s question regarding “Could the companies supporting 480K/960K PRACH only for non-initial access case provide the technical concern on supporting 480K/960K PRACH for initial access?”, we think that it is better to avoid change of numerology during initial access (before RRC configuration) . Therefore, if only SSB and CORESET#0 of 120 kHz are used during initial access, it makes sense to only use 120 kHz msg1 and msg3 as well during initial access.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal. |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

The following is the summary of the 2nd round of discussions.

Support PRACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS (in addition to 120kHz SCS)

* Support for non-initial access case: Spreadtrum, Qualcomm, Interdigitial, Docomo, OPPO, Ericsson, Lenovo, Motorola, Mobility, CATT
* Support the operation, and no need to differentiate initial and non-initial case: Nokia, Futurewei, Samsung, ZTE, Sanechips,

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Based on the discussion above, moderator has formulated proposal 2.1-1 and 2.1-2.

###### **Proposal 2.1-1)**

* Support PRACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS (in addition to 120kHz SCS) for at least the non-initial access case
	+ FFS on details of boundary for non-initial access and initial access case for PRACH. Some examples of non-initial access may be (which require further check):
		- RRC Connection Re-establishment after radio link failure (RRC\_CONNECTED)
		- Handover (RRC\_CONNECTED)
		- UL data arrival when the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED state, with non-synchronized UL
		- DL data arrival when the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED state, with non-synchronized UL
		- UL data arrival when the UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED state and no SR resources
		- The UE sends a scheduling request in response to UL data arrival but fails to receive an UL grant from the network (RRC\_CONNECTED)
		- Transition from RRC\_INACTIVE state to RRC\_CONNECTED state
		- Establishing time alignment when adding Scell (RRC\_CONNECTED)
		- Request of Other SI (RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE)
		- Beam failure recovery (RRC\_CONNECTED)

###### **Proposal 2.1-2)**

* For non-initial access case, support PRACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS (in addition to 120kHz SCS).
	+ Note: RACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS can be only configured in ServingCellConfigCommon RRC IE.

Please continue to provide comments/input on proposal 2.1-1 and 2.1-2. Please feel free to suggest edits/changes or even other alternatives for agreement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung  | We are not fine to differentiate non-initial access and initial access for RACH SCS. There is no point to do so.* From design history point of view, the random access procedure is always same for the so called initial access (assuming you are talking about for connection purpose) and non-initial access; although we are allow separately and newly configured RACH resource e.g., for BFR etc.
* From signaling point of view, the RACH SCS is separately configured by gNB, there is no tied to the SSB or others;
* From implementation point of view, the random access channel is specially designed and filtered. Intentionally try to allow different SCS for RACH by separating the so called initial access and non-initial access will increase the implementation burden, e.g., gNB needs to consider two different SCS reception for one operation.

And I also did not understand the point of list the trigger events for RACH, they will be many and they will be more to come, e.g., does the list consider SDT transmission? Does the list consider positioning purpose? This is not something that RAN1 need to specify. So we suggest following changes:* Support PRACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS (in addition to 120kHz SCS) ~~for at least the non-initial access case~~
	+ FFS: the details of signaling and configuration.
 |
| DOCOMO | We understand HW’s point and agree SSB SCS discussion is ongoing. But the Proposal 2.1-2 seems rather preclude the possibility to support larger SCSs for PRACH during initial access. We believe it would be premature to agree on Proposal 2.1-2. For Proposal 2.1-1, if capturing non-initial access cases should not be RAN1 work, then we are ok to remove this.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Samsung’s modified proposal. |
| LG | We support Proposal 2.1-2. As Huawei mentioned in 2nd round, we have not agreed yet to support Type0-PDCCH for 480/960 kHz. Therefore, RACH with 480/960kHz SCS should be configured only in *ServingCellConfigCommon*. |
| Qualcomm | We think the examples are too restrictive at this point. We support Samsung’s revised version:* Support PRACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS (in addition to 120kHz SCS) ~~for at least the non-initial access case~~
	+ FFS: the details of signaling and configuration.
 |
| Apple  | We support moderator proposal 2.1-2 without modification.It is our view that limiting to ‘non-initial Access’ case is useful because it at least excludes the possibility that SSB with 120kHz SCS and 480kHz/960kHz SCS is indicated for PRACH transmission for the same serving cell. This would waste UE power for earlier steps in initial access/cell search if UE does not support this optional SCS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Proposal 2.1-2. Most of examples in 2.1-1 are RAN2 procedures and RAN2 is better positioned to discuss exactly for what procedure the 480/960 kHz RACH is supported. Further, each of these applications/procedure should be more thoroughly studied before we can commit to them.  |
| Ericsson | We support the first bullet of Proposal 2.1-2. We prefer to remove the note at this point, as RAN2 can decide on the appropriate signaling details. |
| Intel | While we are ok with 2.1-2, we actually agree with Samsung.From the UE perspective, there is absolutely no functional difference between initial and non-initial access.From the gNB perspective, use of initial or non-initial is completely up to implementation.Therefore, there no technical reason that requires differentiation between initial and non-initial access for PRACH. |
| Nokia | Firstly we agree that the details of the procedures belong partly under RAN2 jurisdiction, thus we can omit the examples. These were just intended to elaborate that the functional difference between initial access and non-initial access, is not large, if existing, from RACH transmission perspective. We also think that the signaling details are under RAN2 agenda. Hence, we would be supportive the modified proposal from Samsung with minor modification:* Support PRACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS (in addition to 120kHz SCS) ~~for at least the non-initial access case~~
	+ FFS: the details of ~~signaling and~~ configuration.
 |
| Futurewei | We support moderator proposal 2.1-2 |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

Added the modification from Nokia and Samsung to proposal 2.1-1 in proposal 2.1-3.

###### **Proposal 2.1-3)**

* Support PRACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS (in addition to 120kHz SCS)
	+ FFS: the details of configuration

###### **Proposal 2.1-2)**

* For non-initial access case, support PRACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS (in addition to 120kHz SCS).
	+ Note: RACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS can be only configured in ServingCellConfigCommon RRC IE.

While several companies preferred on proposal 2.1-3. There was at least one company who preferred proposal 2.1-2. Few companies mentioned that there is no functional difference between initial and non-initial case for PRACH in the physical layer. Moderator actually agrees, the note in proposal 2.1-2 seems to be something that is in the RAN2 domain.

#### **4th Round Discussion:**

Companies are asked to provide further comments on Proposal 2.1-3 and 2.1-2.

Please note that moderator thinks the RAN1 should avoid discussing RAN2 work on the RRC signaling definition.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 2.1-3 |
| Intel | We support Proposal 2.1-3 |
| DOCOMO | Support Proposal 2.1-3.  |
| Samsung  | Support 2.1-3 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Proposal 2.1-2.  |
| Vivo | Support Proposal 2.1-3 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Proposal 2.1-3 |
| LG | We still prefer Proposal 2.1-2. |
| CATT | Support 2.1-2. |
| Nokia | We would support 2.1-3 assuming that we can reach agreement in Section 2.1.1. In relation to 2.1-2, we think that the sub-bullet relates to signaling details in RAN2 specification and RAN1 should not make any decisions relation to it. |
| Moderator | Just wanted to add, from moderator’s understanding proposal 2.1-3 does not seem to preclude proposal 2.1-2, which further limits on how RRC signaling is performed. This could very well be part of FFS.Companies are asked to provide further comments. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support Proposal 2.1-3 |

#### **4th Round Discussion Summary:**

Moderator suggest checking to see if proposal 2.1-3 is acceptable. If not add FFS aspects to address the concerns.

### 2.2.2 PRACH Sequence and Format

* From [2] OPPO:
	+ Sequence length L=571 and 1151 for PRACH when the SCS is 480kHz/960kHz are not needed.
* From [4] vivo:
	+ The PRACH sequence lengths 571 and 1151 can be supported for 480/960KHz SCS.
	+ Format 0-3 with special SCS is not supported
	+ Support 960KHz SCS for PRACH format (A, B, C) in addition to 120KHz SCS for initial access use cases.
	+ With the usage of higher SCS, the issue of preamble sequence generation needs to be considered to match the certain coverage area.
* From [5] Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell:
	+ Support L=571 and L=1151 for PRACH only with 120 kHz SCS at above 52.6 GHz.
* From [6] CATT:
	+ Consider supporting the increasing of symbols in time domain to enhance coverage and the extending of frequency domain by repeating and concatenating the RACH preamble sequence in the unlicensed spectrum.
* From [9] Futurewei:
	+ For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
	+ For non-initial access use cases,
		- if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.
* From [10] Ericsson:
	+ Specify support for all sequence lengths (139/571/1151) for 120 kHz PRACH. For 480/960 kHz PRACH, specify support for only L = 139.
* From [13] Intel:
	+ Support PRACH formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, C2 for L\_{RA}= 571 with SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz, i.e., \mu\in{5,\ 6}, in addition to the formats for L\_{RA}= 139.
	+ Optional support of PRACH formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, C2 for L\_{RA}= 1151 with SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz, i.e., \mu {5, 6}.
* From [16] Samsung:
	+ Support short PRACH format for all PRACH sequence lengths and all SCSs , and don’t support long PRACH format.
* From [18] LGE:
	+ The 120 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence lengths L=571 and L=1151 are not required for the licensed spectrum where the regulatory requirements are not defined on PSD limit.
	+ If 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS PRACH is supported, support only the sequence length L=139 for the cases other than initial access (e.g., for Scell).
* From [21] Interdigital:
	+ For 52.6 – 71 GHz, the existing PRACH sequences with the existing PRACH sequence lengths 571 and 1151 should be reused.
* From [22] Sharp:
	+ For 480kHz and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS if supported, it is not needed to introduce preamble sequence lengths of 571 and 1151.
* From [23] ZTE, Sanechip:
	+ Support sequence length 571 and 1151 for PRACH in non-initial use cases.

**Summary of Discussions**

* Supported sequence lengths
	+ For 120kHz SCS PRACH:
		- L=139, 571, 1151: OPPO, vivo, Nokia, NSB, Ericsson, Intel, Samsung, LGE, Interdigital
	+ For 480/960kHz SCS PRACH (if agreed):
		- L=139: Ericsson, LGE, Sharp
		- L=139, 571, 1151: Intel, Futurewei, Samsung, [Interdigital]~~, Sharp~~, ZTE (non-initial access), Sanechip (non-initial access)
* Supported PRACH formats:
	+ For 480/960kHz SCS PRACH (if agreed):
		- Support format A1~A3, B1 ~B4, C0, C2: Futurewei, Intel

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Agreement from RAN1 #104-e:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
* For non-initial access use cases,
	+ if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.
		- FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151
* FFS: Support of 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases, if 480 and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported for initial access
 |

Moderator suggest resolving the FFS aspects. Please provide further comments on the following proposal on PRACH sequence format.

* Whether or not the FFS can be agreed
	+ For non-initial access use cases, if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
		- support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.
	+ For initial access use cases, if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
		- support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.
			* Alt 1) L = 139
			* Alt 2) L = 139, 571, 1151

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| LG | For PRACH formats and the sequence length, we would like to clarify that the 120 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence lengths L=571 and L=1151 are not required for the licensed spectrum where the regulatory requirements are not defined on PSD limit. Besides, as mentioned in 2.2.1, since the 480 and 960 kHz SCS SSB has agreed only for non-initial access cases, 480 and 960 kHz SCS PRACH with the sequence length L=139 is only supported for the cases other than initial access (e.g., for Scell) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively. |
| Nokia | As noted above, we would be fine to confirm the first sub-bullet (non-initial access) based on the agreement made in Tuesday GTW. Second sub-bullet (initial access) could be confirmed if corresponding agreement is made in DL. |
| OPPO | As discussed in our contribution, we don’t see the motivation to support sequence length L=571, 1151 for 480 and 960 kHz PRACH since it doesn’t bring power boosting gain. We support L=139 only for 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS PRACH for both initial access case and non-initial access case.  |
| Intel | Support moderator’s suggestion.As for selection of Alt 1 or 2 for the initial access use case, our preference is Alt 2. |
| Qualcomm | For both initial and non-initial access, if 480/960 kHz is agreed to be support, we only support L = 139 (this sequence length is enough to achieve the desired BW requirement for the maximum EIRP allowed) |
| Futurewei | For higher SCS (480/960 kHz) support only short sequence L=139. |
| InterDigital | We are fine to reuse the existing PRACH sequence lengths 571 and 1151. |
| CATT | We support Alt2  |
| Ericsson | For non-initial access we support 480/960 kHz PRACH, but only for L = 139. The PRACH bandwidth for L = 571/1151 far exceeds the bandwidth required to achieve max power under the regulatory requirements. Hence, the link budget will degrade. Note that L = 571/1151 translates to 274/552 MHz for 480 kHz SCS and to 548/1105 MHz for 960 kHz – excessively large bandwidths indeed!The 2nd FFS for initial access should be deferred until discussions on SSB numerology are concluded. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support moderator’s suggestion. For initial access, we prefer Alt2. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | For non-initial access use cases, we do not support L=571, 1151 for 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS.For initial access use cases, we do not support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS as we believe all channels/signals during initial access should be on 120 kHz.  |
| Samsung | For the first sub-bullet, we support 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively. For the second sub-bullet, we support Alt 2. We didn’t see a need to distinguish initial access or non-initial access use cases for PRACH, since anyway the sequence length is configured.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | the 1st bullet can be agreed in general. For sequence length, we are not sure if the longer sequences supported in Rel-16 NR-U would be necessary for PRACH with 480/960 kHz SCS. L=139 with larger SCS can achieve sufficient absolute frequency resources. The 2nd bullet needs to be revisited after completing SSB SCS discussion for initial access case. |
| Mediatek | Support only short sequence L=139. |
| Vivo | For initial access and non-initial access use cases, we support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with all PRACH sequence length (L=139,571,1151) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s proposal for non-initial access case. For initial access case we prefer Alt2 |
| Sharp | We support only L = 139 for 480kHz and 960 kHz (same as our proposal). |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with moderator’s proposal.  |
| Apple  | If 480/960 kHz is agreed to be support, we support L = 139 |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

The following is a summary of 1st round discussion by the moderator.

* Previous agreement:
	+ For non-initial access use cases,
		- if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.
			* FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151
* Discussion on FFS:
	+ Alt 1) only support L = 139 (current agreement, no FFS)
		- Supported by (10): LGE, OPPO, Qualcomm, Futurewei, Ericsson, Huawei, HiSilicon, NTT Docomo, Sharp, MediaTek, Apple
		- Main reasons: larger PRACH BW are not needed for improving Tx power from PSD limitations
	+ Alt 2) support L = 139, 571, 1151
		- Supported by (9): Interdigital, Intel, CATT, ZTE, Sanechips, Samsung, vivo, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility,

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

There seems to be even split between Alt 1 and Alt 2. Companies support of Alt 1 mentioned that L = 571 and 1151 may not help with improving maximum transmit power in regulatory domains with maximum PSD limitation. Companies supportive of Alt 2 are asked to provide some further clarification of the motivation.

Companies are asked to provide further comments on between Alt 1 and Alt 2 above.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia | We would support Alt1. We don’t see a strong need for L=571 and 1151 with 480kHz and 960kHz. |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt1, as this sequence length is enough to achieve the desired BW requirement for the maximum EIRP allowed |
| Futurewei | Same as the other companies above, Alt 1. |
| LG | We support Alt 1 and agree with Qualcomm. |
| DOCOMO | Agree with Nokia and Qualcomm. Support Alt 1.  |
| OPPO | We support Alt1. |
| Mediatek | We support Alt1. |
| Ericsson | Support Alt-1 for the same reasons as described previously – L = 571/1151 exceeds the bandwidth required to achieve maximum transmit power according to regulations, therefore negatively impacting coverage. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Although we prefer common PRACH sequence and format design for each SCS in above 52.6GHz to achieve a relatively flexible configuration, we can compromise to Alt 1 if it’s majority’s view. |
| Fujitsu | We support Alt 1. |
| Intel | While we believe the support of L=571 and 1151 for SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz won’t be difficult in both specification effort and implementation efforts given that these lengths are supported for SCS 120kHz, for sake of progress we are ok to accept Alt 1. |
| Samsung | We didn’t see a harm to support longer sequence length to get a unified design for all SCSs. For the sake of progress, we can live with Alt.1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Alt 1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Alt 1. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

While some companies preferred to supporting L=139, 571, and 1151 for 480/960kHz PRACH, based on further discussion they are willing to compromise and only support L=139 for 480/960kHz PRACH.

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Moderator has formulated proposal 2.2-1.

###### **Proposal 2.2-1**

* Only support L = 139 for PRACH with 480kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS.
	+ Do not support L = 571 and 1151 for PRACH with 480kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS in the specifications.

Please continue to provide comments/input on proposal 2.2-1. Please feel free to suggest edits/changes or even other alternatives for agreement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | Support the Proposal 2.2-1.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are generally fine with the proposal, but the sub-bullet seems not needed. |
| LG | We support the Proposal 2.2-1. |
| Qualcomm | Support the Proposal 2.2-1. |
| Apple | Support the Proposal 2.2-1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Proposal 2.2.-1 |
| Ericsson | Support Proposal 2.2-1. |
| Nokia | Support the moderator proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal. |
| Mediatek | Support the proposal from the moderator |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal 2.2-1 |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

Proposal 2.2-1 seems stable.

###### **Proposal 2.2-1**

* Only support L = 139 for PRACH with 480kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS.
	+ Do not support L = 571 and 1151 for PRACH with 480kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS in the specifications.

#### **4th Round Discussion:**

Please only comment if you have concerns on proposal 2.2-1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
|  |  |

#### **4th Round Discussion Summary:**

Moderator suggest agree to proposal 2.2-1.

### 2.2.3 RACH Occasion Resources

* From [1] Huawei, HiSilicon:
	+ For operations with shared channel access in 52.6GHz to 71GHz spectrum, a gap symbol between consecutive ROs within the PRACH slot should be supported to avoid a LBT failure at the UE due to a PRACH transmission from another UE in the previous RO.
* From [2] OPPO:
	+ Set the reference SCS for RACH slot determination as 120kHz.
	+ RAN1 should design a unified RO configuration for both licensed and unlicensed spectrums.
	+ On top of RO configuration, a mask can be further added for unlicensed spectrum to switch off certain RO from being selected.
* From [4] vivo:
	+ Support non-consecutive RO in time domain to avoid LBT failure.
	+ With the introduction of larger SCS in 52.6-71GHz, such as 480/960kHz, how to configure time domain ROs should be considered.
	+ One approach is to reuse FR2 RO slot configuration rule but to define new reference slot and re-interpret RACH slot index for high PRACH SCS in 52.6-71GHz.
* From [5] Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell:
	+ Reuse the existing FR2 RACH configuration table and PRACH slot(s) for 480 and 960 kHz are allocated with the following principles where the reference SCS is 60 kHz:
		- If “Number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz slot” is 1, then there is one PRACH slot with 480 or 960 kHz SCS among the slots defined by the 60 kHz reference slot
		- If “Number of PRACH slots within a 120 kHz slot” is 2, then there are two PRACHs slot with 480 or 960 kHz SCS among the slots defined by the 60 kHz reference slot.
	+ If LBT gaps are needed between ROs, it would be better to define fixed LBT gap time between valid ROs that do not depend on the time domain allocation of the PRACH. In that case the LBT gap length would not depend on the used PRACH format.
* From [6] CATT:
	+ When the specification supports SCS=/480/960 KHz, 120 KHz configuration is reused for each 8/16 slots within 60 KHz slot.
* From [8] Fujitsu:
	+ Support RO configuration for non-consecutive ROs in time domain
* From [10] Ericsson:
	+ For 480/960 kHz PRACH, support PRACH configurations that allow maintaining the same PRACH processing load (operations/unit time) as for 120 kHz PRACH configurations.
	+ To fulfill Proposal 8, support configuration of PRACH occasion(s) in only 1 or 2 480/960 kHz slots within a 60 kHz reference slot.
	+ For 480/960 kHz PRACH, reuse the current PRACH configuration table in 38.211 for FR2 "as is." Specify rule for which 1 or 2 480/960 kHz slots within a 60 kHz reference slot are used depending on the value in the existing column "Number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz slot" in the current PRACH configuration table. The rule should be common for all PRACH configurations in the table.
* From [11] Xiaomi:
	+ Inconsecutive RO time domain configuration need be discussed.
* From [13] Intel:
	+ Regarding PRACH RO configurations for SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz:
	+ The numerology for reference slot counting within a system frame remains corresponding to SCS 60 kHz;
	+ The max number of starting positions for PRACH slots within a reference slot (which has SCS 60 kHz) is equal to 2;
	+ Fix the starting position(s) of PRACH slots within the reference slot by properly setting the values of parameter n\_{slot}^{RA} (TS 38.211, Section 5.3.2).
	+ Reuse PRACH RO configurations listed in Table 6.3.3.2-4 from TS 38.211.
	+ For PRACH SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz, introduce optional time gaps between consecutive RO;
	+ Modify equation defining the first OFDM symbol of PRACH RO given Section 5.3.2 from TS 38.211 as follows: , where is the gap duration (number of OFDM symbols) and for no gap.
* From [14] Apple:
	+ Maximum 4 PRACH ROs can be configured for 120kHz SCS with L=571.
	+ Maximum 2 PRACH ROs can be configured for 120kHz SCS with L=1151.
	+ Reuse the existing FR2 PRACH configuration Table to indicate the time-domain PRACH slot location.
	+ Support to keep the same PRACH capacity as Rel-16 FR2 for 480kHz and 960kHz SCS to minimize the signaling overhead.
	+ The configured PRACH slots should be distributed over the 60kHz reference slot.
* From [15] Qualcomm:
	+ a maximum of 4 and 2 FD multiplexed ROs for SCS = 120 kHz and sequence length = 571 and 1151, respectively
	+ for higher RACH SCS (480 and 960 kHz), consider including a symbol-level gap between ROs to allow for gNB beam switching delay
	+ for higher RACH SCS (480 and 960 kHz), consider including a symbol-level gap between POs to allow for gNB beam switching delay
* From [16] Samsung:
	+ Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for larger SCS cases.
	+ For RO configuration, both direction 1 (indication on which one(s) of the 8 eighty-slots or which one(s) of the eight 960 khz ROs within a 120 khz RO) and direction 2 (keep 80slots in total but redesign the RACH period and RACH duration location) can be considered.
	+ Support non-consecutive RO configuration to alleviate the RACH LBT failure.
* From [18] LGE:
	+ If the reference slot SCS is kept as 60 kHz, the PRACH slot index for 480 and 960 kHz SCS can be determined based on the selected two values of with the pre-configured rule or based on the configured/indicated value(s) of by the gNB.
	+ When LBT is used to transmit the PRACH preamble, consider to insert CCA gap between adjacent RACH occasions in time domain (e.g. X usec or Y symbol) to avoid inter-UE LBT blocking due to the propagation delay of PRACH transmitted in an earlier RO.
* From [21] Interdigital:
	+ For 52.6 – 71 GHz, supporting non-consecutive RACH occasions is not preferred.

**Summary of Discussions**

* Support of non-consecutive RO to account for LBT
	+ Needed: Samsung, LGE, Fujitsu, vivo, Huawei, HiSilicon, [Nokia, NSB]
	+ Not Needed: Interdigital, Intel, Ericsson
* Support of non-consecutive RO to account for beam switching
	+ Needed (for larger SCS): Qualcomm, Intel
	+ Not Needed: Ericsson
* RO configuration for 480/960kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ Several companies proposed to limit number of RO in a reference 60 (or 120kHz) PRACH slot. For example, 4 RO for 480kHz and 2 RO for 960kHz.

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Companies are asked to revise and update the company preferences (below).

Companies are encouraged to also clarify which PRACH SCS the non-consecutive RO (if applied) would be needed for. Based on company inputs, moderator will try to provide suggested proposal(s).

Also, companies are encourage to provide suggestions on potential proposals that could be considered for agreement (that are not covered by below) regarding PRACH RO configuration.

* Support of non-consecutive RO to account for LBT
	+ Needed: *Samsung, LGE, Fujitsu, vivo, Huawei, HiSilicon, [Nokia, NSB]*
	+ Not Needed: *Interdigital, Intel, Ericsson*
* Support of non-consecutive RO to account for beam switching
	+ Needed (for larger SCS): *Qualcomm, Intel*
	+ Not Needed: *Ericsson*
* RO configuration for 480/960kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ FFS: details of how to limit of number of 480/960 kHz PRACH RO per [60 kHz] reference PRACH slot

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| LG | The CCA gap between adjacent RACH occasions in time domain (e.g. X usec or Y symbol) is required to avoid inter-UE LBT blocking due to the propagation delay of PRACH transmitted in an earlier RO. For the non-consecutive RO gap for RACH beam switching, it would be better to defer the related discussion until RAN4 respond to RAN1’s LS that is sent in the last RAN1 meeting. |
| Nokia | We are fine to support non-consecutive RO’s if they are needed from channel access perspective. For beam switching gap, we would agree with LGE to wait for RAN4 response. We would support limiting the number of PRACH slots with 480kHz and 960kHz to 1 or 2 in 60kHz reference slot. In case of 2 slots (in reference slot), it could be preferable to distributed the PRACH slots with 480kHz and 960kHz in the 60kHz reference slot. |
| OPPO | Support non-consecutive RO to account for LBT. For 480/960kHz PRACH, we propose to use the smallest SCS supported in the range of 52.6~71GHz, i.e., 120kHz, as the reference SCS for RO configuration.  |
| Intel | Our preference is to have an option of supporting non-consecutive RO to account for beam switching in case of PRACH SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz. RO configuration could be discussed later on.As for factoring into account LBT, this decision may need to be revisited after RAN1 decides whether or not we will support LBT for PRACH (by using the short control signal exemption rule). We believe the seldom transmission nature of PRACH, make it good candidate to consider PRACH transmission without LBT. In such case, RO definition to account for LBT may not be needed.For the RO configuration for 480/960kHz SCS, our preference is to leverage existing NR RO configuration and limit 1 (or 2) 480/960kHz RO for each potential 60kHz RO position. |
| Qualcomm | We support non-consecutive ROs to account for beam switching (pending RAN4 feedback on beam switching timings). We don’t believe gaps to account for LBT are needed. In addition, if we want to leave LBT gap, the LBT gap needs to be on the order of 20us which is already close to a slot or more than a slot. Hence, there is almost no way to do that. Essentially only can configure a PRACH with single RO in time domain, which is already supported in the spec. Note that in NR-U when LBT gap at RO level was proposed, each RO is relatively long due to 15/30 kHz SCS. |
| Charter Communications | There is no support for RO LBT gaps in R16, and the concept is less well-motivated at these higher SCSs with potential SCSe for RACH or Cat-3 LBT. |
| Futurewei | For higher SCS we support non-consecutive ROs for beam switching purposes. PRACH transmission may be LBT exempt (short control signal), however if it is necessary it should be based one shot-LBT.  |
| CATT | Non-consecutive RO for beam switching should be discussed after RAN4 feedback. |
| Ericsson | Regarding gaps for beam switching, we are still awaiting feedback from RAN4 so too early to concluded.Regarding gaps for LBT, we do not support, as we think that RACH should fall under SCS exemption, so LBT not needed.Regarding RO configuration, perhaps a way forward to to first agree on a high level principle on how many ROs per 60 kHz reference slot should be supported. In FR2, if 120 kHz PRACH is configured, there can be up to 2 ROs per 60 kHz reference slot. Our preference is to maintain the same PRACH processing load at the gNB (operations/unit time) as for 120 kHz PRACH. Hence, for 480/960 kHz PRACH, we suggest the same limitation – up to two ROs per 60 kHz reference slot. It can be further discussed which two ROs can be configured, but knowing how many would be a good first step. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the purpose of LBT, it depends on whether PRACH signals can fulfill the short control signaling exemption requirements, and it is being discussed in channel access AI, we can wait for the conclusion. For the purpose of beam switching, we need to wait for the feedback from RAN4. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We support non-consecutive RO to account for LBT. If there is no gap, LBT may fail due to the PRACH transmission from another UE in a preceding RO and different propagation delays at different UEs. |
| Samsung | We support non-consecutive RO to mitigate the impact from LBT. If such non-consecutive RO configuration is supported, it can also be used for the purpose of beam sweeping gap, then there is no need to distinguish the purpose to reserve gap between ROs. For the RO configuration for 480/960 kHz SCS, we suggest to list all possible solutions based on using existing [60 or 120] kHz PRACH configuration as reference, because there are several aspects to be considered:1. Whether the smallest PRACH configuration period is still 10ms? (as there will be quite large number of slots in 10ms, so it could be discussed that whether we need to design the RO configuration in such number of slots)?2. if the smallest PRACH configuration period is still 10ms, then whether we still have RO spreads all 10ms? For example, in 960khz, limit the RO in 1.25ms of the 10ms, and we can total reuse the 120khz RO configuration. This is similar for current NR design that, in 160ms PRACH configuration period but only 10ms contains RO.3. if the solutions for RO configuration is more clear, then their impact to RA-RNTI aspects could be more clear as well.Some suggested changes to third bullet:* RO configuration for 480/960kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ FFS: details of how to configure the 480/960 kHz PRACH RO using [60 or 120 kHz] reference PRACH configuration considering at least:
		- Whether support PRACH configuration periodicity smaller than 10ms
		- Whether support PRACH duration (which actually contains ROs) within 10ms (the smallest PRACH configuration periodicity, and also the PRACH duration in current NR)
		- The impact to RA-RNTI calculation
		- Other aspects are not precluded.
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | From our perspective, the only potential motivation to support non-consecutive RO would be to account for beam switching, which is now up to LS reply from RAN4. We should wait for RAN4’s reaction. |
| Mediatek | If beam switching gap is needed, we are ok with non-consecutive. Otherwise, we do not see the need for non-consecutive RO. |
| vivo | We support non-consecutive RO in time domain to avoid LBT failure. Besides, since both PRACH processing load and access efficiency should be considered, the number of 480/960kHz PRACH RO per [60kHz] reference PRACH slot should be carefully selected. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with supporting non-consecutive RO at least to account for beam switching gaps. Details can be discussed after RAN4 feedback. An agreement on whether PRACH is transmitted with LBT or as short control signaling need to be met first before considering non-consecutive RO to account for LBT. |
| Xiaomi | We support non-consecutive RO as an enhancement at least for LBT |
| Sharp | We are open to the discussion if enhancement is necessary. |
| Sony | For non-consecutive RO to account for LBT, it should be discussed after discussion on LBT for PRACH is concluded.For non-consecutive RO to account for beam switching, we should wait for RAN4’s response. |
| Fujitsu | We support non-consecutive RO to avoid blocking between neighboring ROs due to LBT and/or to have gap for beam switching. We agree with Samsung that it is unnecessary to differentiate the purpose. |
| Apple  | Regarding the RO configuration for 480/960kHz SCS (if agreed), our view is to keep the same RO capacity as that of FR2, i.e., up to 2 ROs within a 60kHz SCS reference slot.  |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

The following is a summary of 1st round discussion by the moderator.

* Support of non-consecutive RO to account for LBT
	+ Needed: Samsung, LGE, OPPO, Fujitsu, vivo, Huawei, HiSilicon, Xiaomi, Fujitsu
	+ Not Needed: Intel, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Charter, NTT Docomo
* Support of non-consecutive RO to account for beam switching
	+ Needed (for larger SCS): Qualcomm, Intel, Futurewei, MediaTek, Fujitsu
	+ Wait for RAN4 LS to decide: Nokia, LGE, Ericsson, Sony, NTT Docomo

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

Based on feedback, although many companies provide their preferences, it is true that the need to accommodate for LBT seems to depend on short control signal exemption for PRACH, and accounting for beam switching gap required RAN4 input. Therefore, moderator suggests to continue discussion once further progress has been made on beam switching gap in RAN4 and short control signal exemption applicability for PRACH.

As Samsung commented, we could focus on clarifying the FFS aspects of the RO further. Moderator copied the suggested from Samsung. Companies are asked to provide further input on the proposal.

* RO configuration for 480/960kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ FFS: details of how to configure the 480/960 kHz PRACH RO using [60 or 120 kHz] reference PRACH configuration considering at least:
		- Whether support PRACH configuration periodicity smaller than 10ms
		- Whether support PRACH duration (which actually contains ROs) within 10ms (the smallest PRACH configuration periodicity, and also the PRACH duration in current NR)
		- The impact to RA-RNTI calculation
		- Other aspects are not precluded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia | We would prefer to keep the periodicity at 10ms. Also we would support limiting the number of PRACH slots with 480kHz and 960kHz to 1 or 2 in 60kHz reference slot. Mapping to e.g. 480kHz slot from the 60kHz slot could be defined preserving the distributed RO’s similar to Rel-15. We think that the RA-RNTI formula defined for 120 kHz SCS can be re-used by setting to assumes 480/960 kHz SCS and to assumes 120 kHz SCS. |
| Qualcomm | Regarding the number of 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within a 60 kHz reference slot, the use of longer PRACH format may be needed (e.g., for coverage). In this case, we may not be able to fit as many ROs (especially 6 ROs per RACH slot with 2-symbol PRACH format) as what we have for 120 kHz SCS. In that sense, having the flexibility on going beyond 2 can be useful.Once the number of RACH slots within a reference slot (and its SCS) is resolved, we can consider RA-RNTI extension.We prefer to keep the periodicity at 10 ms. |
| Futurewei | Prefer periodicity at 10ms, and revisit RA-RNTI formula after the SCS for initial access and the number of RACH slots are determined. |
| LG | We prefer to keep the periodicity at 10ms. However, considering the number of slots is increased in 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS compared to 120 kHz SCS, it may be necessary to increase the density of PRACH occasion than in 120 kHz in the time-domain (e.g., 4 slots out of 8 slots for 480 kHz). In this case, modifications on the current periodicity, duration, and RA-RNTI calculation may be needed. |
| DOCOMO | Slightly prefer to keep PRACH configuration periodicity as 10ms, but open to discuss all the FFSs including this. We are fine with the proposal.  |
| OPPO | We are open to discuss PRACH configuration periodicity smaller than 10ms. The potential enhancements to RA-RNTI calculation can be discussed after we have design principle for RO configuration. |
| vivo | We prefer to keep the periodicity at 10ms and further discuss how many RACH slots within a reference slot should be supported. |
| Ericsson | * Prefer to maintain as much as possible of Rel-15 PRACH configuration design:
* 10 ms
* 1 or 2 ROs within a reference 60 kHz slot
* With the above, RA-RNTI does not require modification

We propose some changes to the proposal. On the 2nd bullet in the FFS, we don't know what it means.* RO configuration for 480/960kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ FFS: details of how to configure the 480/960 kHz PRACH ROs using [60 or 120 kHz] reference ~~PRACH configuration~~slot considering at least:
		- Number of ROs per reference slot
		- Whether or not to support PRACH configuration periodicity smaller than 10ms
		- ~~Whether support PRACH duration (which actually contains ROs) within 10ms (the smallest PRACH configuration periodicity, and also the PRACH duration in current NR)~~
		- ~~The~~ Potential impact to RA-RNTI calculation
		- Other aspects are not precluded.
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer to keep the periodicity at 10ms.Regarding the number of RACH slots for 480/960kHz, we prefer to keep it the same as in FR2 when 120kHz is configured for PRACH. That means the total RO absolute time duration might be reduced(denpending on the PRACH format) but the RO density is kept unchanged. It’s not clear to us the benefit to increase the RO density for 480/960kHz, since the opportunity to access the channel is the same as in FR2. Besides, keep the RO density unchanged within 10ms periodicity might be helpful to RA-RNTI calculation, since some options rely on the current RO density in FR2. |
| Intel | We are supportive regarding the proposal in general.We are also supportive of limiting the number of PRACH slots with 480/960kHz per 60kHz reference slot. However, we want FFS on the exact number. The reason for FFS is that the potential introduction of time gaps between consecutive RO may result in larger number of RACH slots than currently defined in NR specification. |
| Samsung | We are fine to the FL proposals. But considering some company’s comments, a few changes could be added in below.Regarding the periodicity, we are open to discuss.Regarding the added “Number of ROs per reference slot” by E///, we think it should change to: which 480/960khz PRACH slot(s) per reference slot. As for example, reference slot is 120khz slot, and it is replaced by four 480khz-slot and eight 960khz-slot; so we could discuss which slots in these four 480khz-slot and eight 960khz-slot should be PRACH slots, then use 120khz PRACH configuration index, we derive the pattern of 120khz PRACH slot in 10ms, then for each 120khz PRACH slot, we derive the pattern of 480khz/960khz PRACH slot, then in each PRACH slot, we know the number of RO and location by the table naturally. Regarding the removed one by E///, and it’s intention was aligned with ZTE’s comments, to keep the RACH density (was denoted by RACH duration) per 10ms (PRACH configuration periodicity), because one direct way is that we can scale the 120khz PRACH slot pattern in 10ms down to 480khz PRACH slot pattern in 2.5ms, or down to 960khz PRACH slot pattern in 1.25ms, and there is only one such 2.5ms or 1.25ms containing PRACH in 10ms, so that the RACH density is unchanged. We only need to define which 2.5ms or 1.25ms in the 10ms are the PRACH located. So suggested change on top of E/// version* RO configuration for 480/960kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ FFS: details of how to configure the 480/960 kHz PRACH ROs using [60 or 120 kHz] reference ~~PRACH configuration~~slot considering at least:
		- Number/location of ~~ROs~~ 480/960 kHz PRACH slot per reference slot
		- Whether or not to support PRACH configuration periodicity smaller than 10ms
		- ~~Whether support PRACH duration (which actually contains ROs) within 10ms (the smallest PRACH configuration periodicity, and also the PRACH duration in current NR)~~
		- The location of 480/960khz PRACH slot pattern(in 2.5/12.5 ms respectively) scaling from reference slot pattern within 10ms~~The~~ Potential impact to RA-RNTI calculation
		- Other aspects are not precluded.
 |
| CATT | We prefer to 10ms periodicity . We are OK to further discuss how many RACH slots within a reference slot should be supported. |
| Ericsson2 | @Samsung and ZTE: Thanks for the clarification on the deleted bullet. I think I understand what the intention was. Please confirm if the following understanding is correct:ZTE suggests that for 480/960 kHz and for a given PRACH configuration, it is desirable to keep the same number of PRACH slots within a PRACH configuration period as for 120 kHz. If this is the intention, then yes, we agree. We don't see a need to increase the density since opportunities to access the channel should be the same regardless of SCS. In fact we made a similar proposal in our contribution (Proposal 10). Is this correct understanding?If this is correct understanding, then I think a more clear formulation of the bullet is needed * + - ~~Whether support PRACH duration (which actually contains ROs) within 10ms (the smallest PRACH configuration periodicity, and also the PRACH duration in current NR)~~
		- ~~The location of 480/960khz PRACH slot pattern(in 2.5/12.5 ms respectively) scaling from reference slot pattern within 10ms~~
		- FFS: For a given PRACH configuration, maintain the same PRACH density as for 120 kHz, where PRACH density is defined as the number of PRACH slots per PRACH configuration period.

In fact, even better, if most companies agree that the minimum PRACH configuration period should remain as 10 ms, and that the PRACH density for a given PRACH configuration (defined as # PRACH slots per PRACH configuration period) should remain unchanged compared to 120 kHz, then maybe we can try to make such a high level agreement in addition to the above proposal.Suggested change on top of Samsung revision:* PRACH configuration for 480/960 kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ The minimum PRACH configuration period is 10 ms (as in FR2)
	+ For a given PRACH configuration, maintain the same PRACH density as for 120 kHz, where PRACH density is defined as the number of PRACH slots per PRACH configuration period.
* RO configuration for PRACH with 480/960kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ FFS: details of how to configure the 480/960 kHz PRACH ROs using [60 or 120 kHz] reference ~~PRACH configuration~~slot considering at least:
		- Number/location of ~~ROs~~ 480/960 kHz PRACH slot per reference slot
		- ~~Whether or not to support PRACH configuration periodicity smaller than 10ms~~
		- ~~Whether support PRACH duration (which actually contains ROs) within 10ms (the smallest PRACH configuration periodicity, and also the PRACH duration in current NR)~~
		- ~~The location of 480/960khz PRACH slot pattern(in 2.5/12.5 ms respectively) scaling from reference slot pattern within 10ms~~
		- ~~The~~ Potential impact to RA-RNTI calculation

Other aspects are not precluded.  |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

The following is a summary of 2nd round discussions.

On PRACH configuration periodicity:

* Keep periodicity 10msec: Nokia, NSB, Qualcomm, Futurewei, LGE, Docomo, vivo, Ericsson, ZTE, Sanechips, CATT

On number of ROs per reference slot:

* Keep the density same as 120kHz PRACH in FR2: ZTE, Sanechips, Samsung
* May need to support more than 2 per 60kHz reference slots: Qualcomm, LGE
* Support 1 or 2 per 60kHz reference slot: Ericsson
* FFS on the number: Intel

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Based on the discussions, the moderator has formulated proposal 2.3-1.

###### **Proposal 2.3-1)**

* PRACH configuration for 480/960 kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ The minimum PRACH configuration period is 10 ms (as in FR2)
	+ For a given PRACH configuration, (at least) support the same PRACH RO density as for 120 kHz, where PRACH RO density is defined as the number of PRACH slots per PRACH configuration period.
	+ For RO configuration for PRACH with 480/960kHz SCS,
		- FFS: details of how to configure the 480/960 kHz PRACH ROs using [60 or 120 kHz] reference slot considering at least:
			* number and location of 480/960 kHz PRACH slot per reference slot
			* potential impact to RA-RNTI calculation
		- FFS on whether (and how) to support larger RO density compared to RO density with 120kHz SCS PRACH in FR2

Please continue to provide comments/input on proposal 2.3-1. Please feel free to suggest edits/changes or even other alternatives for agreement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung  | To E///, although from our company view, we are open to discuss the RACH density; we see the same density as 120khz case is a reasonable configuration. so we are fine with FL’s above proposal. In addition, as we illustrated, they are several ways to derive the 480khz/960khz RO pattern even with the same RACH density requirement. There was no definition of RACH density in NR, so we understand it’s for discussion purpose, and it denotes actually the configured RACH occasion (instead of valid RO) in time domain. And one more thing to be clarified here, if we say PRACH slots per PRACH configuration period, do we assume the RO pattern within one slot is unchanged for a given preamble format? Our understanding it’s yes.Thus, we suggest following change:* PRACH configuration for 480/960 kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ The minimum PRACH configuration period is 10 ms (as in FR2)
	+ For a given PRACH configuration, (at least) support the same PRACH RO density as for 120 kHz, where PRACH RO density (for discussion purpose) is ~~defined~~ understood as the number of PRACH slots per PRACH configuration period in time domain.
		- Note: This assumes the configured 480/960 kHz RO location and number within one 480/960 kHz slot is same as that for 120khz for a given preamble format.
	+ For RO configuration for PRACH with 480/960kHz SCS,
		- FFS: details of how to configure the 480/960 kHz PRACH ROs using [60 or 120 kHz] reference slot considering at least:
			* number and location of 480/960 kHz PRACH slot per reference slot
			* The location of duration containing 480/960khz PRACH slot pattern~~(in 2.5/1.25ms, respectively) scaling from reference slot pattern~~ within 10ms
			* potential impact to RA-RNTI calculation
		- FFS on whether (and how) to support larger RO density compared to RO density with 120kHz SCS PRACH in FR2
 |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal 2.3-1.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Respond to Ericsson:Regarding the PRACH slot number, yes, our intention is to keep the same number of PRACH slots as in 120kHz. But in my mind the definition of RO density means the number of PRACH occasions per PRACH configuration period, referring to the number of PRACH slots multipled by the number of ROs in a PRACH slots. To achieve the same RO density as for 120kHz, the simplest way is to 1) keep the RO number in each PRACH slot unchanged, and 2) configure the same number of PRACH slots as for 120kHz in the PRACH configuration period. This results in a relatively sparse configuration of PRACH slots, but in each PRACH slot, the PRACH format and RO location are unchanged.In order to separately discuss the PRACH slot and RO configuration in each PRACH slot, we suggest the following modification:* PRACH configuration for 480/960 kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ The minimum PRACH configuration period is 10 ms (as in FR2)
	+ For a given PRACH configuration, (at least) support the same PRACH RO density as for 120 kHz, where PRACH RO density is defined as the number of PRACH ~~slots~~ occasions per PRACH configuration period.
		- The same number of PRACH slots as for 120kHz.
		- The same RO configuration for each PRACH slot as for 120kHz.
	+ For ~~RO~~ PRACH slot configuration for PRACH with 480/960kHz SCS,
		- FFS: details of how to configure the 480/960 kHz PRACH ~~ROs~~ slots using [60 or 120 kHz] reference slot considering at least:
			* ~~number and~~ location of 480/960 kHz PRACH slots per reference slot
			* potential impact to RA-RNTI calculation
		- FFS on whether (and how) to support larger RO density compared to RO density with 120kHz SCS PRACH in FR2
 |
| LG | We support the Proposal 2.3-1. For the FFS points on whether to support larger RO density, it is necessary to first consider whether the RO density of the current 120kHz SCS PRACH in FR2 is insufficient for 480/960kHz. |
| Qualcomm | At this point, we think that the number of ROs in a reference slot compared to that of 120 kHz is not clear (as discussed in our previous comments, we may require more ROs for 480/960 kHz), hence we prefer the following change:* PRACH configuration for 480/960 kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ The minimum PRACH configuration period is 10 ms (as in FR2)
	+ ~~For a given PRACH configuration, (at least) support the same PRACH RO density as for 120 kHz, where PRACH RO density is defined as the number of PRACH slots per PRACH configuration period.~~
	+ For RO configuration for PRACH with 480/960kHz SCS,
		- FFS: details of how to configure the 480/960 kHz PRACH ROs using [60 or 120 kHz] reference slot considering at least:
			* number and location of 480/960 kHz PRACH slot per reference slot
			* potential impact to RA-RNTI calculation
		- ~~FFS on whether (and how) to support larger RO density compared to RO density with 120kHz SCS PRACH in FR2~~
 |
| Apple  | We support the Proposal 2.3-1.  |
| Ericsson | We agree with most of the proposal.Our first preference would be to avoid increasing the RO density compared to FR2 at all, since that will lead to long discussions on extending the design of the length-256 PRACH configuration table in 38.21. Perhaps the proponents could clarify why larger density is needed? We agree with ZTE's statement that "It’s not clear to us the benefit to increase the RO density for 480/960kHz, since the opportunity to access the channel is the same as in FR2."If a clear rationale for supporting larger density can be demonstrated, then we can live with the 2nd bullet and then FFS on whether/how to support larger RO density, but that would not be our first preference. |
| Intel | Ok with changes suggested by Samsung. |
| Nokia | We are not clear either why there is a need to increase the RO density over the configuration period. Our preference would be to keep the PRACH configuration period as 10ms, and have same number of RO’s per configuration period. The exact mapping to slots can be further discussed, for example depending on the need of the LBT gaps and short control exemption applicability.  |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal 2.3-1 |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

Added proposal 2.3-2 based on comments received from Samsung and ZTE.

Added proposal 2.3-4 based on comments from Qualcomm.

###### **Proposal 2.3-2)**

* PRACH configuration for 480/960 kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ The minimum PRACH configuration period is 10 ms (as in FR2)
	+ For a given PRACH configuration, (at least) support the same PRACH RO density as for 120 kHz, where PRACH RO density (for discussion purpose) is ~~defined~~ understood as the number of PRACH occassions~~slots~~ per PRACH configuration period in time domain.
		- The same number of PRACH slots as for 120kHz.
		- The same RO configuration for each PRACH slot as for 120kHz.
		- Note: This assumes the configured 480/960 kHz RO location and number within one 480/960 kHz slot is same as that for 120khz for a given preamble format.
	+ For RO configuration for PRACH with 480/960kHz SCS,
		- FFS: details of how to configure the 480/960 kHz PRACH ROs using [60 or 120 kHz] reference slot considering at least:
			* ~~number and~~ location of 480/960 kHz PRACH slot per reference slot
			* The location of duration containing 480/960khz PRACH slot pattern~~(in 2.5/1.25ms, respectively) scaling from reference slot pattern~~ within 10ms
			* potential impact to RA-RNTI calculation
		- FFS on whether (and how) to support larger RO density compared to RO density with 120kHz SCS PRACH in FR2

###### **Proposal 2.3-3)**

* PRACH configuration for 480/960 kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ The minimum PRACH configuration period is 10 ms (as in FR2)
	+ For RO configuration for PRACH with 480/960kHz SCS,
		- FFS: details of how to configure the 480/960 kHz PRACH ROs using [60 or 120 kHz] reference slot considering at least:
			* location of 480/960 kHz PRACH slot per reference slot
			* location of duration containing 480/960khz PRACH slot pattern within 10ms
			* potential impact to RA-RNTI calculation

#### **4th Round Discussion:**

Please provide further comments on proposal 2.3-2 and 2.3-3.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | At least for this meeting, we believe it is early to conclude that the same RO density as 120 kHz is supported. We prefer to keep both same density and increased densities as an FFS (at the same level) for this meeting. The main reason is that we still don’t know if we need to have a new PRACH format with more repetitions (e.g., for coverage) which will require more ROs in configuration period.  |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal 2.3-2, but if 2.3-2 is still somehow controversial we can also accept proposal 2.3-3. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with Proposal 2.3-2, since it seems to make some progress. We can live with 2.3-2; however, it does not seem to make much progress. |
| Futurewei | We agree with Qualcomm that this discussion may wait, we are OK with the proposal 2.3.-3 and specify the details later. |
| DOCOMO | Share E///’s view.  |
| Samsung  | Shared with E///’s view, we prefer 2.3-2 since we discussed so long and progress will be larger. But we can live with 2.3-3 in case some company still has strong concerns on 2.3-2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We cannot support 2.3-2. If we use the same RO configuration for each PRACH slot as for 120kHz, it implies there will not be any gap symbol for beam switching and/or LBT which is not acceptable for us at this time. Also, the definition of PRACH RO density is still unclear for us. Is it “The total number of ROs per PRACH slot” x “number of RACH slots within a base [60/120] slot” x “total number of slots (number of slots in fifth column of Table 6.3.3.2-4 in 38.211)”/(“RACH configuration period in number of symbols”) or is it something else? And why it is necessary to keep the RO density as in Rel-15?We do not have a strong opinion regarding 2.3-3. We can agree with it. We are also OK to continue discussion on this in the next meeting without any agreement.  |
| vivo | Agree with Qualcomm and Futurewei. We are Ok with proposal 2.3-3 and leave the details open at this moment. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Proposal 2.3-2. From our perspective, Proposal 2.3-2 still leaves the door open to discuss larger RO density, and the same RO density as for FR2 should be reused.Proposal 2.3-3 is not controversial but it makes limited progress on RO configuration. |
| LG | We are fine with Proposal 2.3-2. For RO configuration for PRACH with 480/960kHz SCS, it is necessary to first investigate whether the RO density of the current 120kHz SCS PRACH in FR2 is insufficient for 480/960kHz or not. |
| CATT | We also feel it is too early to decide the density. |
| Nokia | We are in principle fine on high level with the proposal 2.3-2. However as pointed out by Huawei, this would result that there would not be any LBT gaps. To my understanding this aspect has not been yet concluded. Also when reading the proposal(s) it is not fully clear what is meant with sub-bullet “The location of duration containing” when combined with the afore sub-bullet talking about locations of 480/960kHz slot(s?) per reference slot. In my interpretation the latter bullet would not be needed if we agree the location of the slots.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support proposal 2.3-2, since it makes more progress |
| Mediatek | We are fine with Proposal 2.3-2 |

#### **4th Round Discussion Summary:**

Moderator suggest checking to see either proposal 2.3-2 or 2.3-3 is acceptable.

### 2.2.4 RA Preamble ID calculation

* From [9] vivo:
	+ For larger PRACH SCS (480KHz/960KHz), the following options can be considered for RA-RNTI calculation:
		- Alt.1: Modify the RA-RNTI formula as following and introduce some contention resolution mechanism to resolve the conflict.
			* RA-RNTI = (1+s\_id+14×t\_id+14×X×f\_id +14×X×8×ul\_carrier\_id) mod A
		- Alt.2: Reuse the current RA-RNTI formula while introducing additional indicator field to indicate the time-frequency resource together with RA-RNTI.
		- Alt.3: Depending on the RO configuration pattern, reuse the RA-RNTI formula and express the slot indexes t\_id based on a new specific subcarrier spacing.
* From [5] Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell:
	+ Reuse RA-RNTI formula defined for 120 kHz SCS also for the cases PRACH is configured with 480 or 960 kHz SCS where
		- s\_{id} assumes 480/960 kHz SCS
		- t\_{id} assumes 120 kHz SCS
* From [6] CATT:
	+ For supporting Msg1 transmission on SCS=480KHz/960KHz uplink, RA-RNTI is divided into two parts . One part of RA-RNTI is carried by DCI IE, and remaining RA-RNTI will be used to scramble the DCI as in R15/R16. Two possible options as following:
		- Option A:
		- RA-RNTI = (1 + s\_id + 14 × t\_id + 14 ×× f\_id + 14 × × 8 × ul\_carrier\_id) mod
		- inDCI\_bit = floor ((1 + s\_id + 14 × t\_id + 14 ×× f\_id + 14 × × 8 × ul\_carrier\_id) /
			* s\_id is the index of the first OFDM symbol of the PRACH occasion (0 ≤ s\_id < 14)
			* t\_id is the index of the first slot of the PRACH occasion in a system frame (0 ≤ t\_id < 640)
		- Option B:
		- RA-RNTI = 1 + s\_id + 14 ×(t\_id mod 80) + 14 × 80 × f\_id + 14 × 80 × 8 × ul\_carrier\_id
		- inDCI\_bit =
			* s\_id is the index of the first OFDM symbol of the PRACH occasion (0 ≤ s\_id < 14)
			* t\_id is the index of the first slot of the PRACH occasion in a system frame (0 ≤ t\_id < 640)
* From [8] Fujitsu:
	+ If 480kHz/960kHz PRACH SCS is supported, the following should be considered to uniquely identify a RO:
		- When calculating RA-RNTI, t\_id is determined in a way that more than one slot can have the same t\_id; and
		- DCI scheduling RAR indicates the local index among the slots having the same t\_id.
* From [9] Futurewei:
	+ If 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS is supported, use Rel-16 solution as basis for extension of RA-RNTI formula for higher SCS.
* From [13] Intel:
	+ RA-RNTI computation equation should be adjusted to avoid overflow in case of PRACH SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz;
	+ Support the following modified equation for RA-RNTI computation:
		- RA-RNTI = 1 + s\_id + 14 × t\_id / + 14 × 80 × f\_id + 14 × 80 × 8 × ul\_carrier\_id,
		- where t\_id is based on the value of specified in clause 5.3.2 of TS 38.211.
* From [14] Apple:
	+ modifying the existing calculation equation to solve the RA-RNTI overflowing problem:
* From [15] Qualcomm:
	+ for higher RACH SCS (480 and 960 kHz), consider the following options for the RA-RNTI:
		- Option A: using the following equation for the RA-RNTI calculations (\mu\_{max} is the maximum \mu for the FR used) and defining rules in case RA-RNTI conflicts with pre-allocated RNTIs or in case multiple ROs have the same RA-RNTI
			* RA-RNTI
		- Option B: reuse the same RA-RNTI equation in NR Rel-16, divide the RAR window into N segments (each segment is 80 slots using the used SCS), and signal the segment index in the DCI that schedules the MSG2/B
* From [18] LGE:
	+ To calculate RA-RNTI/MSGB-RNTI associated with the PRACH occasion for 480 and 960 kHz subcarrier spacing using the existing RA-RNTI equation, the following options can be considered:
		- Option 1: Divide the RAR window into N sub-periods (where each sub-period is 80 slots using the used SCS) + signal the sub-period index using the DCI that schedules the MSG2/MSGB.
		- Option 2: Divide the frequency index or the symbol index into M subset (if M=4, the subset index 0/1/2/3 can be configured to the frequency index {0, 1}, {2, 3}, {4, 5}, {6, 7}, respectively) + signal the subset index using the DCI that schedules the MSG2/MSGB.
		- Option 3: Maintain the density of RACH occasion same as in 120 kHz in the time-domain (e.g., 2 slots out of 8 slots for 480 kHz) and calculate the RA-RNTI based on 120 kHz SCS for 480 and 960 kHz SCS.
* From [22] Sharp:
	+ Modify the calculation of RA-RNTI to accommodate 480kHz and/or 960kHz PRACH SCS if supported.
	+ At least the following alternatives on calculation of RA-RNTI to accommodate 480kHz and/or 960kHz PRACH SCS can be discussed:
		- Alt 1: Modify the equation considering new maximum PRACH SCS and available RNTI value range.
		- Alt 2: Reuse the Rel-16 equation and the additional information is indicated by DCI bits.
		- Alt 3: Exploit sparse nature of PRACH occasion allocations in time domain.
		- Alt 4: Constraint RO allocation period/positions.
* From [23] ZTE, Sanechip:
	+ For higher PRACH SCS (480 and/or 960 kHz), consider the following options for RA-RNTI enhancements:
	+ Option 1: Change the equation of RA-RNTI calculation, without additional signalling overhead
	+ Option 2: Reuse the same RA-RNTI equation in NR Rel-16, divide the system frame into N segments (each segment is 80 slots using the used SCS), and signal the segment index that transmit the preamble in the DCI.

**Summary of Discussions**

* In case 480/960 kHz SCS is supported for PRACH, it was identified existing RA-RNTI calculation will have overflow issue. One of more of the following options were considered by companies to resolve this issue.
	+ Option 1) modification of t\_id
		- Intel, vivo (Alt 3), Nokia, Nokia, NSB, CATT (option B), Fujitsu, LGE (option 3)
		- Futurewei – Use existing formula with 160 for max t\_id
	+ Option 2) modulus of the whole RA-RNTI
		- vivo (alt 1), CATT (option A), Apple, Qualcomm (option A)
	+ Option 3) multiple RO blocks (segmented RO blocks) with indication ~~in RAR~~
		- CATT, Fujitsu, Qualcomm (option B), LGE (option 1), ZTE, Sanechip (option 2)
	+ Option 4) No change compared to Rel-15/16
		- Note: reference subcarrier spacing for mu for computing t\_id may need to be updated.

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Companies have commented that RA-RNTI calculation issue should be concluded after further progress has been made for RO configuration. Therefore, moderator suggest continuing discussion on RA-RNTI once further progress have been made for RO configuration.

With this said, if companies think we can formulate some proposal that all companies would be ok with, please suggest a proposal for discussion. Once the proposal(s) are provided, moderator will copy the proposal and present in the discussion document to further request input/feedback from companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| LG | We share the same view with Moderator. Since RA-RNTI calculation issue is closely related to the RO configuration, it is better to discuss the RO configuration first and we can continue the discussion on RA-RNTI based on the conclusion of the RO configuration. |
| Nokia | We share the same view as Moderator. |
| OPPO | We share the same view as Moderator. |
| Intel | We’re ok to wait some time for further progress in the discussion about RO. |
| Qualcomm | We share the same view as Moderator. |
| Charter Communications | OK with the moderator proposal. |
| Futurewei | We support Moderator proposal. |
| CATT | Agree that this can be discussed after RO configuration is resolved |
| Ericsson | A 4th option needs to be added to the FL proposal:* + Option 4) No change compared to Rel-15/16

The reason is that the decision on modifying RA-RNTI computation depends on Issue 2.2.3, i.e., the number of ROs per 60 kHz reference slot. If only up to 2 ROs are supported (as for 120 kHz PRACH in FR2), no modification is needed to the RA-RNTI computation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support moderator’s proposal. For option 3, we sugggest the following modification:* + Option 3) multiple RO blocks (segmented RO blocks) with indication ~~in RAR~~

Regarding Ericsson’s suggestion, we think that even with the same density of RO compared to 60kHz reference slot, we still need wo modify the RA-RNTI calculation, because t\_id is the absolute slot index, not logical RO index, we may at least revise the definition of t\_id.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Agree with the moderator. This can be discussed in later meetings when other aspects of RACH design are settled. |
| Samsung | As mentioned in above comment, it’s beneficial to combine the discussions and perform an assessment based on a whole picture.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree with the moderator’s assessment. |
| vivo | We share the same view as Moderator. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with Moderator’s view. |
| Sharp | We agree with moderator’s suggestion. |
| Sony | We share the same view as Moderator. |
| Fujitsu | Share the same view as Moderator. |
| Apple  | Share the same view as Moderator. |
| Moderator | Question/Comment to Ericsson:Moderator shared the same understanding as ZTE’ comment. TS38.321 states:“t\_id is the index of the first slot of the PRACH occasion in a system frame (0 ≤ t\_id < 80), where the subcarrier spacing to determine t\_id is based on the value of μ specified in clause 5.3.2 in TS 38.211 [8],”, where the μ specified in clause 5.3.2 in TS 38.211 corresponds to the subcarrier spacing of the PRACH (except for the case when long PRACH sequence of 839 is used). Therefore, some updates to how t\_id is based on would need update even if the RO indices are made such that it mimics 60kHz cases.Therefore, moderator assumed this would be part of option 1. With this said, added option 4 with a note. Please clarify further if this is correct or not. |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

All companies seem to agree this issue should be discussed once further progress on RO configuration has been made.

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

Please provide any further comments, if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | Fine with Option 4 + note. Thank-you. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | From our understanding, Option 4 with the note is part of Option 1 actually, but we can discuss it until RO configuration is determined. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with the first round of Discussion Summary: “this issue should be discussed once further progress on RO configuration has been made”.  |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

Companies seem to agree to discuss the details once the work on RO configuration has further progressed in RAN1. The discussion for RA-RNTI calculation has also been captured as FFS in Proposal 2.3-1.

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Please comment further on whether FFS in Proposal 2.3-1 for RA-RNTI calculation is enough or whether we should list up the options for the potential changes to further narrow down the discussions (proposal 2.4-1).

###### **Proposal 2.4-1)**

FFS on potential impact to RA-RNTI in proposal 2.3-1 is sufficient. No further conclusion needed.

###### **Proposal 2.4-2)**

Suggestion for conclusion

* RAN1 to discuss further on potential impact and changes require for RA-RNTI calculation.
	+ The following are some options discussed in RAN1 on required changes to RA-RNTI calculation (note multiple options can be considered together):
		- modification of t\_id, e.g. limiting the max value, modulous operation, scale and flooring operation
		- modulus of the whole RA-RNTI
		- multiple RO blocks (segmented RO blocks) with indication
		- No change of RA-RNTI equation compared to Rel-15/16 and update reference subcarrier spacing for µ for computing t\_id

Please continue to provide comments/input on proposal 2.4-1 and 2.4-2. Please feel free to suggest edits/changes or even other alternatives for agreement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| LG | We are okay with the proposals except for the companies name in Proposal 2.4-1 should be deleted. |
| Qualcomm | We support Proposal 2.4-1 |
| Moderator | Deleted the company names from the proposal 2.4-1. |
| Ericsson | We support Proposal 2.4-1 since we think the RO configuration design should be settled first, and then it can be better understood what potential impact this will have on RA-RNTI calculation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Proposal 2.4.1. |
| Intel | We are Ok with either 2.4-1 or 2.4-2. |
| Nokia | We are fine with moderator’s proposal 2.4-1. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal 2.4-1 or 2.4-2 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with either proposal 2.4-1 or 2.4-2 |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

Companies seem to suggest no further conclusion for RAN1 #104-bis-e or proposal 2.4-2.

###### **Proposal 2.4-2)**

Suggestion for conclusion

* RAN1 to discuss further on potential impact and changes require for RA-RNTI calculation.
	+ The following are some options discussed in RAN1 on required changes to RA-RNTI calculation (note multiple options can be considered together):
		- modification of t\_id, e.g. limiting the max value, modulous operation, scale and flooring operation
		- modulus of the whole RA-RNTI
		- multiple RO blocks (segmented RO blocks) with indication
		- No change of RA-RNTI equation compared to Rel-15/16 and update reference subcarrier spacing for µ for computing t\_id

#### **4th Round Discussion:**

Please provide further comments on proposal 2.4-2. If proposal 2.4-2 is controversial, moderator thinks we should just skip the conclusion for RAN1 #104-bis-e.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | Still prefer to wait for RO design |
| Intel | Skip conclusion. We will study this further |
| Ericsson  | Agree with Qualcomm and Intel. We can skip making a conclusion since one of the FFS points in Proposals 2.3-2 and 2.3-3 is already about RA-RNTI.  |
| Futurewei | Agree with the above companies. Slip conclusion, study further. |
| DOCOMO | Agree with QC and Intel.  |
| vivo | Agree to wait for RO design |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Prefer to slip the conclusion. |
| LG | We agree with the above companies.  |
| Nokia | We are OK to skip the conclusion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with moderator’s suggestion to skip the conclusion |

#### **4th Round Discussion Summary:**

Moderator suggest to skip conclusion on this issue for RAN1 #104-bis-e.

### 2.2.5 Other aspects on PRACH

* From [5] Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell:
	+ Support short control signal exemption (SCSe) for PRACH transmissions and consider how gNB can control use of SCSe for PRACH transmissions so that the maximum limit for the SCSe transmissions can be kept.
* From [9] Futurewei:
	+ Signaling to indicate that LBT is disabled or enabled for the RACH procedure may be provided to UE in IDLE mode via system information block or during random access procedure (for instance via RAR, or MSG 4).
	+ Signaling to indicate that LBT is disabled or enabled for the RACH procedure may be provided to UEs in CONNECTED mode via RRC.
	+ Consider selection of multiple SS/PBCH blocks at UE to perform transmissions of multiple RACH preambles (MSG1/MSG A) during initial channel access.
	+ When RACH exchange is considered as short control/management frames that can be exempt from LBT, gNB should signal to UEs if RACH exchange is LBT exempt.
* From [10] Ericsson:
	+ Consistent with EN 302 567, when operating in LBT mode a node can access the channel without LBT for control signal/channel transmissions, the total duration of which shall not exceed 10ms within an observation period of 100ms. The following signals/channels shall be classified as Short control signaling transmissions:
		- a. Discovery burst (as defined in Rel-16)
		- b. msg1 and msg3 for the 4 step RACH and MsgA for the 2-step RACH
		- c. FFS: Other control transmissions not multiplexed with user data (subject to gNB configuration)
* From [13] Intel:
	+ Consider applying short control signal exemption to PRACH transmission by the UE.

**Summary of Discussions**

* Companies have provided discussion on considerations for PRACH design. The discussion includes, application of short control signal exemption for PRACH, and enable/disable of LBT for PRACH.
* Suggest discussing these issues further.

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Please provide suggestions on proposal(s) companies would like to discuss on PRACH that is not covered by other discussions. Once the proposals are provided, moderator will copy the proposal and present in the discussion document to further request input/feedback from companies.

As for the short control signal exemption for PRACH, moderator assumed that this will be discussed under the channel access agenda item.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia | As noted, the short control exemption related behavior with RACH from UE and network perspective would need to be discussed, but this can wait until other details have been progressed. |
| Ericsson | We agree with Nokia, the short control signaling exemption is important, and this is being discussed in the Channel Access AI. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We think that also the supported SCS for Msg3 in initial UL BWP should be be discussed in this sub-AI.  |
| Samsung | We agree with moderator that whether PRACH or other RACH related channels are included in short control signal should be discussed in channel access agenda.  |
| LG | We agree with moderator and Samsung. |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

Companies provide comments on short control signal exemption applicability for PRACH and related signals. These issues are being discussed under channel access agenda. Therefore, suggest to revisit issues after channel access agenda conclude on the short control signal exemption applicability.

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

Please provide any further comments, if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Ericsson | Agree with moderator's summary |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with moderator’s summary |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

No further comments were received for other aspects for PRACH during the email discussion. Therefore, moderator assumes there are no outstanding issues for discussion at least for RAN1 #104bis-e other than issues listed in this document above.

# Suggested Agreements/Conclusions from Moderator

The following are list of suggested agreements and conclusions from the moderator. Please note that some suggested agreement and conclusion may require further discussion.

##### SCS for SSB

Should focus on one of the following proposal for approval. Moderator has listed multiple potential alternatives for approval.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Below, ok does not mean these companies prefer, but just note that they can accept for the sake of progress. Below is just an intermediate check of the current status.

Proposal 1.1-3

* Ok: Apple, Qualcomm, AT&T, Docomo
* Not ok: Samsung, Intel, Interdigital, Ericsson, Futurewei, LGE, ZTE, Sanechips,

Proposal 1.1-9

* Ok: Apple, Ericsson, Futurewei, Qualcomm, CATT, MediaTek, Docomo
* Not ok: [Huawei?], Intel

Proposal 1.1-13

* Ok: Samsung, [LGE?],
* Not ok: [Huawei?]

Proposal 1.1-14 (added 240kHz to 1.1-13)

* Ok: LGE
* Not ok:

Proposal 1.1-16 (Chairman’s compromise proposal)

* Ok: Samsung, AT&T, Intel, Interdigital, Ericsson, Verizon, Docomo, vivo, ZTE, Sanechips, CATT, Nokia, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Docomo
* Not ok: Qualcomm, Apple, Futurewei, LGE

Proposal 1.1-17 (compromise suggestion from Samsung)

* Ok: Samsung, Intel, Docomo
* Not ok:

Proposal 1.1-19 (compromise suggestion from Intel)

* Ok: Intel, LGE(ok only if 240kHz can be supported),
* Not ok:

------------------------------------------------------------

Category – no support of 480/960kHz for initial access

###### **Proposal 1.1-9)**

* Support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for non-initial access case with CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration provided by MIB or dedicated signal to be down-selected
* Don’t support 480 or 960 kHz SCS for initial access case
* Support 240 kHz SCS for both initial access case and non-initial access case

Category –support of either 480 or 960kHz for initial access

###### **Proposal 1.1-13)**

* Support SSB with 960 kHz SCS for both initial and non-initial access case. SSB with 960kHz SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.

###### **Proposal 1.1-19)**

* Support only one additional SCS (either 480kHz or 960kHz) for SSB for both initial and non-initial access case. SSB with the additional SCS will support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ Down-select between 480 kHz or 960 kHz
* Support only the same numerology between SSB and CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH (if CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH is signaled in MIB)

Category –support of 480 and 960kHz for initial access & with some restrictions

###### **Proposal 1.1-14)**

* Support SSB with 960 kHz SCS for both initial and non-initial access case. SSB with 960kHz SCS will support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* SSB with 480kHz will not be supported for initial access case, and it will not support Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* Support SSB with 240 kHz SCS for both initial access and non-initial access case (where UE is not explicitly provided with center frequency and SCS of SSB). In this case, it is assumed initial access SSB with 240Hz SCS will support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
	+ Note that SSB with 240 kHz SCS is mandatorily supported to UEs supporting a band in the range of 52.6 GHz-71 GHz

###### **Proposal 1.1-16)**

Proposal for a working assumption:

* Support SSB with 240/480/960 kHz for initial and non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in UE complexity under a limit of [X].

###### **Proposal 1.1-17)**

Proposal for a working assumption:

* Support SSB with 240/480/960 kHz for initial and non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
* It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in the total number of synchronization raster entries per band no larger than the maximum total number of synchronization raster entries per band. If the assumption cannot be satisfied, it’s up to RAN4 to decide which of 240/480/960 kHz SCS are supported for initial access of such band.
* Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS for SSB are UE capabilities:
	+ UE is not expected to support 480 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
	+ UE is not expected to support 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
* Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN4.

##### DRS

###### **Proposal 1.2-3)**

* For operation with shared spectrum channel access of NR 52.6 – 71 GHz, support discovery burst (DB) and define the DB same as in Rel-16 37.213 Section 4.0
* Working assumption) Support ~~discovery burst (DB) and~~ discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for SSB with 120 kHz SCS with the following requirements
	+ ~~Definition of DB is the same as in Rel-16 37.213 Section 4.0~~
	+ PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
	+ Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
	+ Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
	+ FFS: applicability of ~~DB/~~DBTW design for 120kHz to SSB with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS
	+ Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
		- FFS: how to support UEs performing initial access that do not have any prior information on DBTW.
		- FFS: details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
		- FFS: details of how to inform UEs of the configuration of DBTW
	+ Revisit working assumption if the above requirements cannot be met

##### SSB resource pattern

Moderator has listed 2 potential alternatives for approval.

###### **Proposal 1.3-3)**

For SSB with 120kHz SCS for NR 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,

* 120 kHz SCS: the first symbols of the candidate SS/PBCH blocks have indexes {4, 8,16, 20} + 28×n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame.
* For carrier frequencies within 52.6 GHz to 71GHz, support at least 𝑛 = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18.
	+ Other values of *n* (if any) are FFS, and support of additional n values are subject to support of DBTW for 120kHz SSB

###### **Proposal 1.3-5)**

For SSB with 120kHz SCS for NR 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,

* 120 kHz SCS: the first symbols of the candidate SS/PBCH blocks have indexes {4, 8,16, 20} + 28×n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame.
* For carrier frequencies within 52.6 GHz to 71GHz, ~~support at least~~ 𝑛 = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18.
	+ ~~Other values of~~ *~~n~~* ~~(if any) are FFS, and support of additional n values are subject to support of DBTW for 120kHz SSB~~

##### CORESET#0 configuration

###### **Proposal 1.4-3)**

* For SSB with 120kHz, ~~only~~ support 120kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration by MIB
	+ support following combinations of SSB/CORESET multiplexing pattern, and number of RB and symbols for CORESET.
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* FFS: on whether to remove support for 24 PRB
		- {mux pattern 3, 24 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* FFS: on whether to remove support for 24 PRB
		- {mux pattern 3, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
			* FFS: on whether 48 PRB CORESET can be updated to [42] PRB
	+ FFS on support of the following cases:
		- {mux pattern 1, 96 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 96 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 3, 96 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
	+ FFS on other case of {SSB, CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH} SCS combination other than {120, 120} kHz
	+ FFS: CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH CSS location in time domain changes to account for LBT operations

##### PRACH SCS

###### **Proposal 2.1-3)**

* Support PRACH with 480kHz and 960kHz SCS (in addition to 120kHz SCS)
	+ FFS: the details of configuration

##### PRACH format & sequence – stable

###### **Proposal 2.2-1)**

* Only support L = 139 for PRACH with 480kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS.
	+ Do not support L = 571 and 1151 for PRACH with 480kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS in the specifications.

##### PRACH RO configuration

Moderator has listed 2 potential alternatives for approval.

###### **Proposal 2.3-2)**

* PRACH configuration for 480/960 kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ The minimum PRACH configuration period is 10 ms (as in FR2)
	+ For a given PRACH configuration, (at least) support the same PRACH RO density as for 120 kHz, where PRACH RO density (for discussion purpose) is ~~defined~~ understood as the number of PRACH occassions~~slots~~ per PRACH configuration period in time domain.
		- The same number of PRACH slots as for 120kHz.
		- The same RO configuration for each PRACH slot as for 120kHz.
		- Note: This assumes the configured 480/960 kHz RO location and number within one 480/960 kHz slot is same as that for 120khz for a given preamble format.
	+ For RO configuration for PRACH with 480/960kHz SCS,
		- FFS: details of how to configure the 480/960 kHz PRACH ROs using [60 or 120 kHz] reference slot considering at least:
			* ~~number and~~ location of 480/960 kHz PRACH slot per reference slot
			* The location of duration containing 480/960khz PRACH slot pattern~~(in 2.5/1.25ms, respectively) scaling from reference slot pattern~~ within 10ms
			* potential impact to RA-RNTI calculation
		- FFS on whether (and how) to support larger RO density compared to RO density with 120kHz SCS PRACH in FR2

###### **Proposal 2.3-3)**

* PRACH configuration for 480/960 kHz SCS (if agreed)
	+ The minimum PRACH configuration period is 10 ms (as in FR2)
	+ For RO configuration for PRACH with 480/960kHz SCS,
		- FFS: details of how to configure the 480/960 kHz PRACH ROs using [60 or 120 kHz] reference slot considering at least:
			* location of 480/960 kHz PRACH slot per reference slot
			* location of duration containing 480/960khz PRACH slot pattern within 10ms
			* potential impact to RA-RNTI calculation

# Summary of Agreements/Conclusions in RAN1 #104bis-e

TBD

# Reference
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2. R1-2102385, “Discussion on initial access aspects,” OPPO
3. R1-2102448, “Discussion on initial access aspects for NR for 60GHz,” Spreadtrum Communications
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5. R1-2102558, “Initial access aspects,” Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell
6. R1-2102621, “Initial access aspects for up to 71GHz operation,” CATT
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12. R1-2102996, “Initial access aspects for NR from 52.6 GHz to 71GHz,” Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
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15. R1-2103157, “Initial access aspects for NR in 52.6 to 71GHz band,” Qualcomm Incorporated
16. R1-2103229, “Initial access aspects for NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,” Samsung
17. R1-2103294, “Considerations on initial access aspects for NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,” Sony
18. R1-2103339, “Initial access aspects to support NR above 52.6 GHz,” LG Electronics
19. R1-2103411, “NR Initial Access from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz,” Convida Wireless
20. R1-2103442, “Further Discussion of Initial Access Aspects,” AT&T
21. R1-2103448, “Discussions on initial access aspects,” InterDigital, Inc.
22. R1-2103472, “Initial access aspects,” Sharp
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