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# Introduction

This contribution provides a summary of the discussion in RAN1#105-e for the following email discussion:

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

* 1st check point: May 24
* 2nd check point: May 27

# Simultaneous Operation of Access and Backhaul Links

**From the eIAB WID:**

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

**Summary of input contributions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon (R1-2104246)** | ***Proposal 1:*** *To facilitate simultaneous operation of different multiplexing cases, the following restrictions on the transmission or reception of IAB-MT should be aware by the parent node** *Multiplexing case A (Simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Tx): Case#6 timing, Enhanced power control scheme, Tx/Rx beam of IAB-MT*
* *Multiplexing case B (Simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Rx): DMRS antenna ports, Tx/Rx beam of IAB-MT*
* *Multiplexing case C (Simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Tx): DMRS antenna ports, Tx/Rx beam of IAB-MT*
* *Multiplexing case D (Simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Rx): Enhanced power control scheme, DMRS antenna ports, Tx/Rx beam of IAB-MT*

***Proposal 2:*** *For simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Tx, the parent node can indicate a set of preferred or undesirable DU beams for IAB node to guarantee the performance of UL transmission of IAB-MT.* * *FFS measurement mechanisms at the parent node.*

***Proposal 3:*** *For simultaneous MT-Rx/DU-Rx, the IAB node can report a set of preferred beams at the MT for interference avoidance.****Proposal 4:*** *To facilitate the co-existence of TDM and FDM slots and backward compatibility, a two-step H/S/NA configuration is supported in Rel-17** *Step 1: Configure time domain H/S/NA for each slot in one period by reusing Rel-16 mechanism*
* *Step 2: Configure frequency domain H/S/NA for a subset of the slots within one period, which overrides the time domain H/S/NA configuration in the slots*

***Proposal 5:*** *Reuse Rel-16 DCI format 2\_5 to indicate the availability of frequency domain soft resources.****Proposal 6:*** *To increase the resources for simultaneous operation, the specification should allow the collision between tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated-IAB-MT and cell-specific signals/channels. In the slots with the collision, the IAB node should ignore tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated-IAB-MT. The list of cell-specific signals/channels includes:** *SS/PBCH block*
* *CORESET for Type0-PDCCH CSS set*
* *PRACH*

***Proposal 7:*** *Donor CU can provide two sets of resource configurations to each DU cell: a basic resource configuration for access UEs and one additional resource configuration for child IAB node MTs, and the DU cell should maintain two sets of DU resource configurations simultaneously.* |
| **Vivo (R1-2104382)** | **Proposal 1: IAB MT reports parent node the supported timing mode, interference information, desired DL/UL power and desired DL/UL beam to assist parent node to indicate the applicability of a given multiplexing case.** * FFS the form of the reported information, including whether to reuse legacy parameter to reflect some of the reported information.
* FFS whether some of the information is indicated from parent node to IAB node, and the IAB node decides the applicability of a given multiplexing case accordingly.

**Proposal 2: Support both semi-static and dynamic adaptation of an IAB-node’s multiplexing operation on a given set of time/frequency resources.****Proposal 3: Support to indicate the allowance of a given multiplexing case on a given set of time/frequency resources by parent node/CU.****Proposal 4: Support IAB node to report the expected operation (e.g., simultaneous operation or TDM operation) on a given set of time/frequency resources to parent node/CU.** **Proposal 5: Support separate configuration of time and frequency resource types.****Proposal 6: The availability indication of the frequency resource should be applied to H/S resource in the time domain.** Proposal 7: Support separate indication of time and frequency resources availability in DCI format 2\_5, where different fields in DCI format 2\_5 are used for time and frequency resource availability indication.Proposal 8: For the BH link between parent DU and IAB MT, enhance the associated DL/UL beam management as following.* CRI report is per multiplexing case.
* UL beam training is per multiplexing case.

Proposal 9: If multiple timing modes are configured in TDMed manner for an IAB node, additional guard symbol types should be defined for new transition cases, e.g., * The transition between Case 1 timing mode and Case 6 timing mode;
* The transition between Case 1 timing mode and Case 7 timing mode；
* The transition between Case 6 timing mode and Case 7 timing mode.
 |
| **Qualcomm (R1-2104691)** | **Proposal 2.1:****Support joint TDM and FDM semi-static DU resource configurations, where a list of H/S/NA time-domain patterns are configured per RB set.*** **Each RB set can be configured as (starting PRB, number of consecutive PRBs).**
* **If an RB set overlaps with any of SSB, Type0-PDCCH, periodic CSI-RS, PRACH, or SR at a symbol, this RB set at this symbol shall be treated as “Hard”.**

**Proposal 2.2:****Support joint TDM and FDM indication for soft resource availability, wherein DCI2\_5 format is kept unchanged and RRC configured table for availability combinations can be extended to allow for indication of availability in frequency-domain in granularity of RB set.****Proposal 2.3:****Update resourceAvailability mapping table defined in TS38.213 so that the indication of availability can be applied over soft resources in frequency-domain for DL or UL or Flexible symbols.** * **E.g. replacing “soft DL/UL/Flexible symbols” with “soft resources in DL/UL/Flexible symbols”.**

**Proposal 3.1:** **Support dynamic indication by the IAB-node to its parent-node (via MAC-CE) to indicate whether the semi-static capability for enhanced multiplexing is applicable at the time.****Proposal 3.2:** **Support indication of conditions required to realize the enhanced multiplexing capability by the IAB-node to donor CU (via F1-AP) and/or parent node (via MAC-CE), such as*** **Required timing mode,**
* **DL RX/UL TX power constraints,**
* **Required number of guard tones for FDM.**
* **Required number of guard symbols for adaptation of enhanced multiplexing operation.**
* **A set of applicable beam directions (SSBs/TRPs) or child nodes.**

**Proposal 3.3:** **Extend the Rel-16 DU resource management to spatial-domain by indicating DU resource type (Hard/Soft/NA) per SSB area or per TRP or per child node by donor CU to an IAB-node DU.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips (R1-2104877)** | [*Proposal 1:* H/S/NA in frequency-domain should be configured per RB set, the frequency domain granularity of an RB set is configured as N PRBs.](#_Toc4076)[*Proposal 2:* For a given symbol/slot of an IAB DU cell, IAB node can be provided with either time-domain H/S/NA configuration or frequency-domain H/S/NA configuration.](#_Toc6940)[*Proposal 3:* The IAB node is aware of the H/S/NA resource configuration in frequency-domain of its child IAB DU.](#_Toc7762)[*Proposal 4:* Rel-17 IAB can reuse Rel-16 availability combination table or configure new availability combination table(s) to support availability indication of soft resources at RB set level.](#_Toc19338)[*Proposal 5:* Support the use of independent availability combination index field in DCI format 2\_5 to indicate availability of soft resources at RB set level.](#_Toc28614)[*Proposal 6:* Extension of H/S/NA resource indication to the spatial domain is not supported.](#_Toc19990)[*Proposal 7:* To enable simultaneous operation at the IAB node, dynamic indication of beams which will be used by parent backhaul link (e.g. parent node DU Tx beam, IAB-MT Tx beam) can be supported, signaling similar as DCI format 2\_0/2\_5 could be a starting point for such indication:](#_Toc9738)[• FFS: how to define/configure beam availability combination](#_Toc2485)[• FFS: time domain granularity of beam availability indication](#_Toc3985) |
| **Intel (R1-2104924)** | **Proposal 1:** TDM and FDM operation should be orthogonal to each other (i.e., TDM only or FDM only at a time interval). Time-domain H/S/NA and frequency-domain H/S/NA will not be simultaneously applied (no matter they are configured or not). **Proposal 2:** As TDM and FDM operations are independent, separate TDM and FDM semi-static DU resource configurations are preferred. **Proposal 3:** For DU soft resource availability indication, support separate frequency-domain availability indication from time-domain indication, with the following options. * Option 1: different RRC configured availability combination table interpretation
* Option 2: different RNTI
* Option 3: different field of DCI format 2\_5
* Option 4: different DCI format

**Proposal 4:** Semi-static spatial-domain resource configuration with beam-based granularity or panel-based granularity are not preferred. **Proposal 5:** There can be several options for beam management enhancements considered for Rel-17 IAB. * Option 1: parent DU can transmit dynamic beam restriction to inform an IAB-MT which beam(s) not to use
* Option 2: early PDSCH/PUSCH beam indication for an IAB-MT (e.g., enhanced K0/K2 configuration for IAB)
* Option 3: explicit dynamic beam indication from the parent DU to both the IAB-MT and the IAB-DU

**Proposal 8:** Add reference SCSs for soft resource availability indication configuration in the RRC IE *AvailabilityCombinationPerCell*. * For unpaired spectrum operation, a reference SCS configuration $µ\_{AI}$ is provided by *subcarrierSpacing-AI* and, when a supplementary UL carrier is configured for the serving cell, a reference SCS configuration $µ\_{AI,SUL}$ is provided by *subcarrierSpacing2-AI* for the supplementary UL carrier.
* For paired spectrum operation, a reference SCS configuration $µ\_{AI,DL}$ for a DL BWP is provided by *subcarrierSpacing-AI* and a reference SCS configuration $µ\_{AI,UL}$ is provided for an UL BWP by *subcarrierSpacing2-AI*.

**Proposal 9:** For DCI format 2\_5 operation in paired spectrum with a reference SCS configuration $µ\_{AI,DL}$ provided for the reference DL BWP of the serving cell and a reference SCS configuration $µ\_{AI,UL}$ provided for the reference UL BWP of the serving cell: * If $µ\_{AI,DL}\geq µ\_{AI,UL}$: for each $2^{(µ\_{AI,DL}-µ\_{AI,UL})}+1$ values provided by *resourceAvailability*, the first $2^{(µ\_{AI,DL}-µ\_{AI,UL})}$ values for the combination of availability indication values are applicable to the reference DL BWP and the next value is applicable to the reference UL BWP.
* If $µ\_{AI,DL}<µ\_{AI,UL}$: for each $2^{(µ\_{AI,UL}-µ\_{AI,DL})}+1$ values provided by *resourceAvailability*, the first value for the combination of availability indication values are applicable to the reference DL BWP and the next $2^{(µ\_{AI,DL}-µ\_{AI,UL})}$ values are applicable to the reference UL BWP.
 |
| **Apple (R1-2105124)** | **Proposal 1**: For simultaneous operation, either parent IAB-DU or IAB-DU can initiate and control the flow.**Proposal 2**: The entity with higher data priority will control the flow by initiating the scheduling on high priority link and/or indicating the desired parameters to the other link**Proposal 3**: For the case of parent IAB-DU indicating IAB node about the receiving beams/panels for Lp,DL and LA,UL / Lc,UL links, the indication can be dynamic and/or semi-static:* Dynamic e.g. through TCI index in DCI for scheduling PDSCH Lp,DL
* Semi-static, e.g. through MAC-CE/RRC to IAB-MT or through F1 interface to IAB-DU

**Proposal 4**: For the case of IAB indicating desired reception beams/panels on Lp,DL and LA,UL / Lc,UL links, the indication to parent IAB-DU can be dynamic and/or semi-static:* Dynamic e.g. through UCI transmission from IAB-MT to parent DU
* Semi-static, e.g. through MAC-CE from IAB-MT or through F1 interface from IAB-DU
* Alternatively, IAB-MT performs SR or initiates PRACH to indicate desired receiving beam on Lp,DL

**Proposal 5**: To achieve a simultaneous reception within an IAB node, i.e. DU-Rx & MT-Rx, a two-step indication is deployed* Step1: Parent IAB-DU indicates initial beam/panel, K0, SLIV, etc, and a grace time for IAB node in which IAB-MT can indicate its desired parameters like beam/panel, K0, SLIV, etc
* Step2: IAB indicates its desired parameters (beam/panel, K0, SLIV, Tx power, etc), for example, on PUCCH indicated by DL DCI from parent IAB-DU

**Proposal 6**: To utilize SDM resource multiplexing, support PDSCH allocation for IAB-MT with crossing the slot border.  |
| **ETRI (R1-2105226)** | **Proposal 1: Introduce an assist information on the supported duplexing mode (FDM and/or SDM) for simultaneous operations.****Proposal 2: Introduce an assist information to indicate support of (DL and/or UL) power control for simultaneous operations.****Proposal 3: Support DU resource configuration in the frequency domain with the frequency-domain granularity of N PRBs. Support N = 1, 2, and 4, at least. Other values for N are FFS.****Proposal 4: Enhance DCI format 2\_5 to enable frequency domain resource availability indication.*** **Alt.1: Extend of the mapping between values of resourceAvailability elements and types of soft symbol availability to frequency domain resource availability.**
* **Alt.2: Introduce a new RNTI to indicate frequency domain resource availability.**

**Proposal 5: Consider specification supports on handling of cell-specific or semi-static signals/channels when the signals/channels are associated with the non-preferred DU beams.****Proposal 6: Consider specification supports to report non-preferred MT beams for simultaneous operations.****Proposal 7: RAN1 to study concurrent support of “Rel-16 simultaneous TCI/spatial relation update” and “Rel-17 simultaneous DU/MT operations”.****Proposal 8: Clarify that there is no impact on IAB-MT behavior due to conflicts between cell-specific signals/channels and other resource configurations of the IAB-MT, when the IAB node supports SDM between DU and MT resources at least.****Proposal 9: Study BD/CCE limits enhancement to allocate more BD/CCE budgets for the cells with simultaneous operations**. |
| **Samsung (R1-2105331)** | *Proposal 1: N RBGs can be supported as a minimum resource size.**Proposal 2: Guard band can be generated by each IAB node or parent IAB node.**Proposal 3: The following H/S/NA resource types are supported for FDM**- H type for frequency resource: the IAB DU can assume it can use the frequency resource regardless of the MT’s configuration on the frequency resource**- S type for frequency resource: the IAB DU can assume it can use the frequency resource without an impact on the MT’s configuration on the frequency resource**- NA type for frequency resource: the IAB DU cannot assume it can use the frequency resource**Proposal 4: The existing beam management framework can be reused for SDM.**Proposal 5: Availability and non-availability for beams can be indicated by using H/NA resource types.**Proposal 6: Both semi-static and dynamic adaptation for IAB node's multiplexing operations are supported.* |
| **LG (R1-2105493)** | ***Proposal 1: The multiplexing operation of an IAB node can be determined implicitly based on semi-static D/U/F resource type of MT and DU at least.******Proposal 2: Discuss how to align the understanding on the multiplexing operation of an IAB node in DU flexible resource with its parent node.******Proposal 3: In a DU cell perspective, one or multiple group(s) of consecutive PRBs can be defined where a PRB group corresponds to a Hard, Soft, or NA resource type for frequency domain multiplexing.******Proposal 4: Frequency domain H/S/NA attributes can be configured independently for DL and UL.******Proposal 5: Frequency domain H/S/NA configuration does not applied when the IAB-node is operated in TDM.******Proposal 6: The mapping table between values of resourceAvailability elements and types of frequency domain soft resource availability is specified independently from the table for time domain soft resource defined in Rel-16.******Proposal 7: It is supported that IAB node reports information on beam pair(s) capable of simultaneous operation between DU and MT (i.e., simultaneous Tx-Tx, simultaneous Rx-Rx, simultaneous Tx-Rx, simultaneous Rx-Tx) to its parent DU*** |
| **Nokia (R1-2105617)** | ***Proposal 2.1: The minimum resource size for configuring the frequency domain granularity is a multiple of RBGs.******Proposal 2.2: The H/S/NA configuration is signaled separately for each frequency domain partition.**** ***The number of separate frequency domain partitions for a given BWP should be limited***
* ***The frequency domain granularity and number of frequency domain partitions should be considered jointly to balance flexibility with network overhead.***

***Proposal 2.3: DCI 2-5 format is kept, and definition of an availability combination is enhanced to frequency domain.******Observation 2.1: If adopted for SDM operation, IAB node behavior for H/S/NA resources would require new specification.******Proposal 2.4: For SDM Rx operation (DU Rx and MT Rx), support the IAB node indicating towards the parent node about the changes of active beams used for MT reception by introducing signaling (e.g., MAC-CE) to report the desired beams (e.g., a sub-set of TCI states from the activated TCI states of PDCCH/PDSCH) for the IAB-MT to support SDM operation.*** * ***FFS: Can a similar mechanism be used to solve the power imbalance issue at the IAB node in FDM operation where desired beams are indicated by the IAB MT.***

***Proposal 2.5: For FDM/SDM operation, allowed direction of the transmission for the IAB DU in F-S resources may be further controlled by the parent node by using a dynamic indication.***  |
| **AT&T (R1-2105662)** | **Proposal 1: Specify support for mechanisms to enable non-TDM (half-duplex and full-duplex) cell-specific configurations (e.g. STC/SMTC, RACH, system information, periodic CSI-RS etc.) of the IAB-MT in resources which are not used for access UE transmissions, including overlapping hard and soft configured IAB-DU resources.****Proposal 2: Support dynamic indication of multiplexing capability and guard symbols for a subset of time/frequency resources of given backhaul link via enhancements to DCI Format 2\_5 and MAC-based signaling of guard symbols between an IAB node and its parent node.** **Proposal 3: Consider mechanisms to associate a given H/S/NA resource at the IAB-DU with different QCL assumptions of a co-located IAB-MT using the existing beam-management framework and potential extensions to support panel-level granularity.****Proposal 4: Support the extension of the semi-static DU resource type indication to frequency-domain resources within a carrier (in addition to existing Rel-16 per-carrier granularity) for H/S/NA resource types with the following:*** **Symbol-level time-domain granularity**
* **RBG-level frequency-domain granularity**
* **Separate indications for time/frequency resources in case of semi-static DU resource type indications and DCI\_Format 2\_5 soft resource availability indications**
 |
| **NTT DOCOMO (R1-2105716)** | **Proposal 1: Semi-static configuration of H/S/NA resource type in frequency domain is per RB set per slot per D/U/F resource type.****Proposal 2: Consider following options for extension of H/S/NA resource type to frequency domain.*** **Option1: Separate configurations of H/S/NA in time domain and H/S/NA in frequency domain are provided. For a symbol, both H/S/NA in time domain and H/S/NA in frequency domain can be configured.**
* **Option2: Joint configuration of H/S/NA in time domain and H/S/NA in frequency domain is provided. The configuration of H/S/NA resource type is for each time-frequency resource. Rel-16 H/S/NA in time domain is not configured.**

**Proposal 3: Dynamic indication of soft resource availability in frequency domain is per RB set per slot per D/U/F resource type.** **Proposal 4: DCI format 2\_5 framework can be reused, and *ResourceAvailability* can be enhanced to indicate availability per RB set per slot per D/U/F resource type.****Proposal 5: Consider following options of enhancement on MT beam reporting.*** **Option1: Based on legacy MT beam reporting framework, for each MT beam, whether the MT beam can be used for simultaneous MT/DU operation is additionally reported.**
* **Option2: Based on legacy MT beam reporting framework, best MT beams from the MT beams which can be used for simultaneous MT/DU operation are reported.**

**Proposal 6: DU beam management is handled by DU implementation.** **Proposal 7: If case#6 timing mode is required for simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Tx, simultaneous MT-Tx/DU-Tx can be performed only if case#6 UL Tx timing is indicated by parent node; otherwise, simultaneous Tx cannot be performed.****Proposal 8: On a DU flexible symbol, parent node can configure/indicate IAB node MT Tx/Rx, and IAB node DU will Tx/Rx on the symbol based on MT transmission/reception direction and its multiplexing capability.****Proposal 9: Whether different value range of the number of guard symbols is needed for the new timing modes needs to be studied.****Proposal 10: Further study whether to support dynamic switching among different timing modes and the potential enhancement on multiple indications of guard symbols for different timing modes, if supported.** |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (R1-2105763)** | Proposal 1: Support configuration of N PRBs/RBGs as granularity of H/S/NA indications in the frequency domain.Proposal 2: Specify rules for determining H/S/NA resource types for time-frequency resources based on separate configurations in time and frequency domains.Proposal 3: Support frequency-domain H/S/NA indication for one or several slots as a tradeoff between fully separate and fully joint indications and, furthermore, to facilitate coexistence with TDM-only mode.Proposal 4: Support conditional availability indication as a balance between existing best-effort non-TDM and TDM-only availability indication.Proposal 5: To facilitate simultaneous operations and interference management, support dynamic indication for restricting/using beams and their associated antenna panels (in upstream and/or downstream directions) for specific time-frequency resources.Proposal 6: Discuss supporting upstream indications (i.e., following an availability indication principle) in addition to indication of usage or restriction of a beam/panel.Proposal 7: Support signaling IAB node capabilities for timing alignment and multi-panel and baseband characteristics.Proposal 8: Support dynamic signalling for communicating operation constraints such as beam, power, interference, and timing alignment constraints along with information of time, frequency, and spatial resources. |
| **Ericsson (R1-2105840)** | [Proposal 1 RAN1 consider the following alternatives for the maximum payload size of DCI format 2\_5:](#_Toc71663614)[a. the current maximum payload size should remain 128 bits](#_Toc71663615)[b. the current maximum payload size should be extended to 140 bits which can only be used for AI indices.](#_Toc71663616)[c. Improving the DCI format 2\_5 in another way.](#_Toc71663617)[Proposal 2 If Alt. c in Proposal 1 is agreed, we propose the following enhancements to DCI format 2\_5:](#_Toc71663618)[a. introduce additional indexing bits to payload of DCI format 2\_5 to increase the number of configurable IAB-DU cells in DCI format 2\_5, and](#_Toc71663619)[b. introduce a mapping between the additional indexing in the DCI 2\_5 and, e.g., the position indication in AvailabilityCombinationsPerCell IE.](#_Toc71663620)[Proposal 3 Discuss whether any change to DCI format 2\_5 related signaling and configuration should also apply to Rel-16 specification.](#_Toc71663621) |
| **Ericsson (R1-2105852)** | [Proposal 1 The frequency-domain H/S/NA is indicated per IAB-RBG, the size of which contains integer multiples N of the RBG size configured for access UE frequency-domain resource allocation. FFS: The value of N](#_Toc71663387)[Proposal 2 If a resource is configured as Hard, the IAB-DU can transmit, receive, or either transmit or receive according to its configuration only if it does not impact the IAB-MT’s actual ability to operate in any other resource according to the configuration of that resource.](#_Toc71663388)[FFS: How to address the Soft Indicated Available IAB-DU resources.](#_Toc71663389)[Proposal 3 Time-domain H/S/NA configuration is always provided to the IAB-node even if ”TDM not required” is indicated to the IAB-donor-CU.](#_Toc71663390)[Proposal 4 Support separate TDM and FDM configurations in an IAB-node.](#_Toc71663391)[Proposal 5 Support operation in either TDM or FDM modes on a per-slot basis.](#_Toc71663392)[Proposal 6 An IAB-node which has indicated “TDM not required” to the IAB-donor-CU is at least provided with an additional frequency-domain H/S/NA configuration.](#_Toc71663393)[Proposal 7 A parent node can be made aware of all IAB-DU resource configurations, including both time-domain and frequency-domain H/S/NA configurations.](#_Toc71663394)[Proposal 8 Rel-17 enhancement on DCI format 2\_5 should consider extension of the maximum payload size of DCI format 2\_5 to increase the number of IAB-DU cells that can be provided with availability information for Soft resources.](#_Toc71663395)[Proposal 9 Desired/Provided Guard Symbols are signalled in multiple groups that covers all relevant switching combinations among Case #1, Case #6 and Case #7 timing alignment.](#_Toc71663396)[Proposal 10 Resources for SDM are available in FDM (and TDM for IAB nodes that do not require TDM) Soft resources through implicit indication.](#_Toc71663397)[Proposal 11 In SDM Case A, simultaneous transmission, the parent IAB node dynamically signals a list of restricted SSB beams that may affect the reception of the serving beam of the IAB-MT if used by the IAB-DU.](#_Toc71663398)[Proposal 12 Explicit availability indication overrides SDM beam restrictions in Soft resources.](#_Toc71663399)[Proposal 13 The parent IAB-node is dynamically provided with changes of the IAB-node’s multiplexing-capability.](#_Toc71663400)[Proposal 14 Whether or not to switch to FDM/SDM should be based on the ACK/NACK response from the parent IAB-node.](#_Toc71663401)[Proposal 15 A Fallback to TDM does not need an ACK response from the parent IAB-node.](#_Toc71663402)[Proposal 16 Dedicated transmission directions in terms of DL/UL for cell-specific signals/channels should be maintained when configuring simultaneous operation at an IAB-node.](#_Toc71663403)[Proposal 17 For an IAB-MT,](#_Toc71663404)[a. an indicated transmission overrides a configured SSB reception,](#_Toc71663405)[b. an indicated reception overrides a configured PRACH transmission, and](#_Toc71663406)[c. an indicated transmission overrides a configured SIB reception.](#_Toc71663407)[Proposal 18 To determine the availability of the per-cell IAB-DU soft resource by explicit indication, the IAB-node should take into consideration all received DCI format 2\_5 from the dual parent IAB-nodes via co-located IAB-MT carriers associated to the same IAB-DU cell.](#_Toc71663408)[Proposal 19 It is assumed that the per-cell IAB-DU Soft resource is Not Available if it is neither explicitly indicated as Available, nor implicitly determined as Available by the IAB-DU with respect to at least one parent IAB node.](#_Toc71663409) |

**ISSUE 2.1: FREQUENCY DOMAIN MULTIPLEXING RESOURCE GRANULARITY**

**Agreement**

For frequency domain multiplexing, H/S/NA configurations for an IAB-node are provided separately in addition to the Rel-16 H/S/NA

**Agreement**

DCI Format 2\_5 is reused to support soft resource availability indications for frequency-domain resources

* FFS: If additional enhancements are necessary

**Proposal 2.1.3:**

**If an IAB node is configured with a frequency-domain H/S/NA configuration:**

**Alt. 1 Either the Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration or frequency domain configuration is applied**

* **FFS: Whether configurations are switched with per-slot, per-resource type within a slot, or per-symbol granularity**

**Alt. 2 The Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration and frequency domain configuration are jointly applied**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.1.3 and preference on Alt. 1/2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **ETRI** | **Support Alt.2.****Regarding the Alt.1, does it mean that the frequency domain configuration will override the Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration under a given condition? Or does it meant that there would be a new configuration and/or indication mechanism to select one among the two?** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support Alt.1.****In our understanding, with alt.1, whether Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration or frequency domain configuration is applied is determined by given condition. No new configuration/indication is needed to select one among the two.****One example is, adaptation of IAB node’s multiplexing operation is supported in last meeting, on a symbol where simultaneous MT and DU operation is supported, FDM configuration is applied, on a symbol where simultaneous MT and DU operation is not supported, Rel-16 H/S/NA is applied.** |
| **CEWiT** | **Support Alt 1.****IAB node apply either time domain or frequency domain H/S/NA at a time based on the mode of operation, i.e., TDM or FDM. E.g., in TDM a slot configured as H implies IAB-DU can Tx/Rx in that slot using the entire cell, whereas in FDM certain RBG configured as H implies IAB-DU can Tx/Rx in that RBG for a time duration. We suggest adding one more FFS for the main bullet** **FFS: The time duration for which an RBG is configured as H/S/NA for IAB-DU****Switching between time domain and frequency domain configuration depends on the frequency at which mux capability of IAB node changes.**  |
| **Ericsson** | **Support Alt. 1.****Our view of Alt. 1 is that two configurations exist, one for TDM and one for FDM. Both TDM and for FDM, configurations could further be related to, e.g., resource type (UL/DL/F) or configured individually per slot. The IAB node is then configured to use either one or the other. For fall-back TDM is useful also for slots where FDM is configured.****We have serious doubts regarding how Alt. 2 will work considering that, per definition, TDM does not allow FDM, hence, a mix would no longer be TDM operation. For example, a Hard TDM configuration in a slot allows the DU to use the full spectrum and does not allow any further restrictions. Furthermore, complexity will increase with a joint time-frequency configuration.** |
| **Intel** | **Support Alt. 1.** |
| **Nokia** | **Not fully clear on what is implied with each alternative. Our understanding of Alt. 1 is that a given e.g. slot is configured either with Rel-16 TDD config, or with a new Rel-17 FDM config. It is not clear how Alt. 2 could work since it doesn’t seem possible for a slot to be configured for both TDM and FDM.**  |
| **Qualcomm** | **Support Alt.2.****In our view, Alt2 is more general than Alt1., since Alt1 can be implemented as a special case of Alt2 via proper configuration in joint time-frequency grid. In the contribution, we have provided an example of signaling enhancements to achieve Alt2, i.e. extending “*gNB-DU cell resource configuration* IE” such that the “*HSNA slot configuration list*” is over a number of RB Sets instead of existing dimension of 0 or 1, where each item within the list provides HSNA slot configuration over a number of slots per RB Set. If TDM is used at a slot, same resource type of “H/S/NA” is indicated for all RB sets at this slot; if FDM is used at a slot, different resource types of “H/S/NA” are indicated for different RB sets at this slot.** **The signaling overhead scales with the number of RB sets. In our view, a small number of RB sets, e.g. at most [4], should be sufficient to achieve a desired resource pattern in time/frequency domain, and each RB set can be configured with different number of RBs.**  |
| **Samsung** | **Our preference is Alt.1. When an IAB node is provided with both Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration and frequency domain H/S/NA configuration, whether either the Rel-16 resource configuration or the Rel-17 resource configuration is applied can be based on the details about how to perform the adaptation of multiplexing operation between TDM and FDM.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | We prefer to add Alt 3 here since it is not clear for Alt 1 as ETRI mentioned.**If an IAB node is configured with both the Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration and frequency domain configuration on a given resource:** **Alt. 1 Either the Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration or frequency domain configuration is applied** * **FFS: Whether configurations are switched with per-slot, per-resource type within a slot, or per-symbol granularity**

**Alt. 2 The Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration and frequency domain configuration are jointly applied** **Alt. 3 Only the frequency domain configuration is applied** * **FFS: Whether frequency domain configuration is configured per-slot, per-resource type within a slot, or per-symbol granularity**
 |
| **Vivo** | **Alt. 2****If our understanding is correct, Rel-16 H/S/NA has two purpose 1)TDM operation of DU/MT, 2)enable hard resource splitting of different IAB node for interference management purpose. To achieve the 2nd purpose, Rel-16 NA resource should not be overridden frequently by frequency H/S. So, frequency H/S/NA is applied only on time H/S resources.** |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Supporting Alt. 2Alt-1 does not seem to provide sufficient flexibility for coexistence with Rel-16 TDM-only, fallback to TDM if enhanced multiplexing is not applicable at a moment, etc. With Alt-1 every slot/symbol is essentially assigned an exclusive TDM/FDM attribute.Alt-2 provides more flexibility in that regard as it does not assign an exclusive TDM/FDM attribute to a slot/symbol. This is in line with our understanding of the scope of enhanced multiplexing: it is not supposed to limit or override TDM operation, but rather complement it. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Support Alt. 1****Our understanding is that Alt.1 implies that for each slot either the Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration or the Rel-17 H/S/NA configuration for FDM. It is not quite clear how the IAB node can apply two configurations jointly within one slot. In addition, the parent node and IAB node should have same understanding about the DU configuration. If the IAB node can apply the two configurations jointly, the parent node cannot know the behavior of IAB node accurately, which will result in resource collision between MT and DU.** |
| **Apple** | **Support Alt2, We share same view as QC and MotM** |
| **LG Electronics** | Support Alt 1. |

**Proposal 2.1.4:**

**The minimum resource size for configuring the frequency domain granularity is a multiple of N:**

* **Alt 1. RBGs**
* **Alt 2. RBs**
* **FFS value of N**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.1.4 and preference on Alt. 1/2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **ETRI** | **Slightly prefer Alt.2.****We think N = {4, 8, 16} RBs are a common set across the two alternatives and therefore could be agreed first.** |
| **CEWiT** | **Support Alt1** |
| **Ericsson** | **Support Alt. 1.****RBGs is the unit that is used for scheduling UEs, including the MT, i.e., the MT is scheduled on a RBG grid. The DU should not be allocated resources that deviate from that grid that is used for scheduling the MT, since any deviation from that will imply less efficient resource utilization or increased signaling overhead.****It was argued that RBGs are a UE specific configuration. That is true but the MT still only receives one RBG configuration and the configuration would naturally relate to that per the above argumentation.****One problem with using RBs is presented in ETRI’s comment – there is no one size fits all size for N considering differences in numerology and BW among different carriers. In this case, 16 is for example far too small, from a practical point of view, in a 400 MHz carrier including hundreds of RBs. RBGs already include this scaling and is for that reason a more efficient configuration.** |
| **Intel** | **Support Alt. 1 or Alt. 2 (as RB set).**  |
| **Nokia** | **Support Alt.1**  |
| **Qualcomm** | **We don’t have a strong preference on Alt1. Or Alt2.** **In our opinion, a small number of RB sets, e.g. at most 4, should be sufficient to achieve a desired resource pattern in time/frequency domain, and each RB set can be configured with different number of RBs.**  |
| **Samsung** | **Our preference is Alt.1 considering signaling overhead in RB level.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | We support Alt 2, as we pointed during GTW, the ‘RBG’ is not clear for a IAB DU, especially for the case that IAB DU and IAB MT use different SCSs. For the main bullet, it is a little confusing, it says ‘the granularity’ is a multiple(M) of ‘N RBs/RBGs’, i.e., the granularity is M\*N RBs/RBGs, we prefer to update is as:**The resource set for configuring the frequency domain H/S/NA is a multiple of N:*** **Alt 1. RBGs**
* **Alt 2. RBs**
* **FFS value of N**
 |
| **vivo** | **Alt. 2****We think frequency H/S/NA is applied per RB sets. The RB set can be multiple PRBs configured by high layer signaling overhead is not a concern. The frequency H/S/NA is used to achieve FDM between DU and MT, MT BWP is configured in PRB granularity, so DU operation BW should be in PRB granularity as well.** |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | No strong preference between the alternatives.We agree with the modification suggested by ZTE. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **We fail to see the fundamental difference between the two options. The two options are equivalent for specific values of N. Meanwhile, RBG is defined from UE/IAB-MT point of view and it has a dependency on size of BWP. Alt.2 is more general definition. Alt.2 is preferred from this perspective.** |
| **Apple** | We slightly prefer Alt2 |
| **LG Electronics** | We don’t have strong preference between the two alternatives.But, we slightly prefer Alt.2. |

**Proposal 2.1.4’:**

**The minimum resource size for configuring the frequency domain granularity is a set of N RBs:**

* **Candidate values for N: {4, 8, 16, other values TBD}**
* **FFS: Scaling or configuration of N based on system BW or size of IAB-MT BWP**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.1.4’?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **Moderator (AT&T)** | **Given the majority slightly prefer Alt. 2 this is proposed as a compromise, where flexibility of a set of RBs is used for the granularity, but it is further considered how to appropriately select or scale the value considering different possible backhaul BW allocations (esp. in FR2) and minimize signaling overhead** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support the proposal.** |
| **ETRI** | **Support the proposal.** |
| **Ericsson** | The intention of defining H/S/NA frequency resources is to coordinate between DU and collocated MT. That means that the configured DU resources should be aligned with the configured MT resource grid which is done in RBGs according to the MT’s BWP size and RBG configuration. Any deviation, either upwards or downwards, will result in fractional resources for the MT that cannot be used for scheduling if, e.g., overlapping Hard DU resources are configured. In order to have a meaningful efficient resource configuration between the MT and DU, the DU would always need to be configured in multiples of, and aligned with, MT RBGs. This can of course be configured in PRBs but a meaningful configuration would always be equivalent to configuring in RBGs.Nevertheless, for the sake of progress, **we can agree to the proposal on the condition that the values that are indicated are at least the #PRBs that are corresponding to the MT’s #PRBs of an RBG.** |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal but agree with Ericsson that RBG is a more natural fit for resource designation given how resources are allocated. |
| **Intel** | Support the proposal. |
| **Samsung** | OK with the proposal. |
| **Qualcomm** | We support this proposal |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Support the proposal.And we support N is configurable, and it is up to CU implementation how to set N. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Fine with the proposal. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Support the proposal. Regarding the possible resource fragmentation between the MT and DU, we don’t not see an issue since the number of RBs in a certain RBG can be smaller than the size of the RBG.  |
| **vivo** | Support the proposal |

**ISSUE 2.2: SPATIAL DOMAIN MULTIPLEXING RESOURCE GRANULARITY**

**Proposal 2.2.1**

**In case of simultaneous MT/DU operation, the parent node can dynamically indicate to the child node a set of preferred and/or undesirable beams at the IAB-DU of the child node and the child node can dynamically report to the parent node a set of preferred and/or undesirable beams of the IAB-MT of the child node.**

* **At least SSB-level beam granularity should be supported (FFS support of additional granularity)**
* **FFS: Additional semi-static signaling (e.g. beams linked with specific H/S/NA resources)**
* **FFS: Applicability to specific multiplexing cases or specific time-frequency resources**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.2.1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **ETRI** | **Support in principle.*** **We think semi-static signaling should be agreed first, since we don’t think such preference will be changed dynamically in IAB scenarios. Hence, we suggest to delete (or to have a bracket, at least) “dynamically” in the main bullet. For the same reason, the second sub-bullet is not needed, we think.**
* **Regarding the beam granularity, we think the existing configurations, i.e. QCL-TypeD, TCI configuration, spatial relation Info, are more than enough and therefore should be the baseline. Further down-selection among them could be further studied.**
 |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support child node report to parent node a set of preferred and/or undesirable beams of IAB-MT.****Regarding parent node indicate to child node a set of preferred and/or undesirable beams at the IAB-DU, we think following need to be discussed and clarified.*** **In our understanding, different sets of preferred and/or undesirable beams at IAB-DU is needed for different MT beams because of different interference condition. So whether the indication of sets of preferred and/or undesirable beams at IAB-DU is per MT beam?**
* **And for which set of MT beams, preferred and/or undesirable beams at DU is indicated, e.g. for each SSB of MT serving cell?**
* **And considering MT beam and DU beam is defined per serving cell, whether the indication is for each MT beam in each MT serving cell and whether a set of DU beams in each DU cell should be indicated?**
 |
| **CEWiT**  | **Support proposal 2.2.1** |
| **Ericsson** | **We support the parent node indicating but not the child node indicating.****Furthermore, we think that we can already now agree to use a set of restricted beams. These are beams that the parent DU will receive sufficiently well for them to interfere with the parent DU. There is no guarantee that the parent DU receives all beams from the IAB-node, hence, the preferred set cannot be guaranteed to be complete.****We think the dynamic indication is needed since this is a coordination that is only concerning the parent node and the IAB node and does not need to include the CU. This is related to physical layer resources and interference. Although we do not expect this to change very often, a dynamic update, in case of beam loss or channel changes, is sensible.** **We don’t see a need for the child node indicating anything to the parent node since it is the IAB-DU that will need to adjust to the MT in case of simultaneous operation and not the other way around.** |
| **Intel** | **We support the parent node indicating, but not the child node indicating. Parent node indicating is kind of giving H/NA spatial resources to the IAB-DU dynamically.**  |
| **Nokia** | **Support the proposal.** |
| **Qualcomm** | **We share similar view as ETRI that semi-static signaling shall be considered first, and this proposal can also be closely related to the proposal for per-child backhaul link resource configuration.****In our view, a typical scenario can be that an IAB-node may be able to support simultaneous MT/DU operation over a subset of child IAB-nodes (directions). So it is important for the IAB-node to report this information to donor CU, so that donor CU can make proper per-child backhaul link resource configuration, e.g. for a parent DU’s hard resource, a subset of child backhaul links of an IAB-node can be indicated with “Hard” while remaining child backhaul links of an IAB-node can be indicated with “NA” based on the IAB-node’s reported capability information associated with different child backhaul links.** **This information can also be useful for parent node, so that the parent node can make proper decision on availability indication.**  |
| **Samsung** | **One clarification question. In our understanding, the existing specifications provide beam configurations/activation/triggering mechanisms by using TCI states corresponding to beams. We are wondering how the main bullet and also the first sub-bullet are associated with the existing beam mechanisms.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Agree with the parent indication part, we think it is also beneficial to support the following,**The parent node can dynamically indicate to the child node a set of preferred and/or undesirable beams at the IAB-MT of the child node.** |
| **vivo** | **We share view as DCM, ‘Child node indicating’ is supported.****One of the purpose beam management is interference mitigation. For simultaneous DU RX/MT TX or for simultaneous RX/RX, child MT can report MT TX/RX beams incurring less interference to DU reception, the reported beam for those Rel-17 multiplexing case may be sub-set of reported beams for Rel-16 TDM case. For the above Rel-17 multiplexing cases, how parent IAB node can indicate the UL beam of child DU, which seems not feasible.** **‘Parent node indicating’ may be applied only for simultaneous TX/TX, which is used to mitigate CLI from child node to parent node, the interference scenario is the same as legacy NW, why we need specific enhancement in IAB session. We hope companies can clarify a little bit.****Another purpose of the beam related discussion is to decide the beam sharing between DU and MT in case of simultaneous TX/TX and simultaneous RX/RX. ‘parent node indicating’ does not work for this purpose.** |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | We **support the indication by the parent node**, as it is in line with the previous discussions. But we **do not support the reporting by the child node** yet as the method and its intent are not fully clear.We suggest splitting this proposal into two proposals:* The first proposal would be on dynamic indication by the parent node to the child node, which is supposedly followed by a mandatory behavior at the child node.
* The second proposal would be on reporting preferred and/or undesirable beams, which may be followed by an optional/implementation-based behavior at the parent node.

These two are different types of signaling and behavior, hence they deserve separate discussions.Re: the first bullet item, SSB-level beam is fine in principle, but what would be the spec impact? Is SSB-level a well-defined concept for the spec? |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **We are supportive of the main-bullet.****Our understanding is that the indication from parent node to the child node is mainly targeting simultaneous Tx case while the indication from child node to the parent node is mainly targeting simultaneous Rx case.****We think more discussions are needed for the first sub-bullet, especially for restriction indication from parent node. The IAB-DU may use a beam different from SSB beams for PDSCH transmission. Therefore, the child node may not be able to apply the restrictions correctly.** |
| **Apple** | We support the intention with the modification of “at least semi-static indication from parent to child” and “at least dynamic indication from child to parent” is supported. The intention goes to the assumption that Parent-child link is semi-static with no mobility, but child-parent since may involve access UE at DU, includes dynamic indications. |
| **LG Electronics** | We suggest to discuss whether semi-static level beam-level coordination between IAB-node is required for supporting simultaneous operation.  |

**Possible Agreement (for comeback)**

In case of simultaneous MT/DU operation,

* the parent node can dynamically indicate to the child node a set of restricted beams at the IAB-DU of the child node
* the child node can dynamically report to the parent node a set of recommended or restricted beams of the IAB-MT of the child node
* At least existing beam management reporting is supported
* FFS: Applicability to specific multiplexing cases or specific time-frequency resources
* FFS: Additional semi-static signaling

**Discussion: Views on possible agreement from GTW?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **Moderator (AT&T)** | **For the first two bullets, to promote progress, proponents may want to highlight what is the expected impact beyond what is already supported with existing beam management reporting and whether there is any required link between the two main bullets** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **We support the proposal.****In our understanding, the 1st bullet is beneficial for interference between MT-Tx/DU-Tx, since parent node can measure the interference. The spec. impact may include that parent node need to be aware of configuration of DU’s SSB Tx and/or CSI-RS Tx. And new signaling from parent node to child node may be needed to indicate which DU beams cannot be used for DU Tx simultaneous with MT Tx.****In our understanding, the 2nd bullet is beneficial for following two cases, and spec impact my include child-MT may need to report separate sets of preferred MT beams for simultaneous operation and non-simultaneous operation.*** **Case#1: Interference between MT-Rx/DU-Rx, MT-Rx/DU-Tx, MT-Tx/DU-Rx. The preferred MT beam for simultaneous operation taking interference into account may be different from the preferred MT beams for non-simultaneous operation**
* **Case#2: Considering multiple panels at IAB node, if there is simultaneous operation, two panels are used for MT and DU respectively, e.g. only panel#1 can be used for MT, while if there is no simultaneous operation, both panel#1 and panel#2 can be used for MT. The preferred MT beam for simultaneous operation and non-simultaneous operation can be different.**
 |
| **ETRI** | **Support the proposal.****As discussed in the GTW, the current specifications do not support indication or report of “restricted beams” at all, which can be beneficial to have a single set of indication/report (based on the legacy beam managements) on the preferred beams for all simultaneous operation modes. Otherwise, the network needs to configure/indicate multiple sets of measurements and reports to obtain the beam information per simultaneous operation mode, which will cause significant signaling and reporting overhead to enable the simultaneous operations. For this issue, there is no differentiation between the first and second bullet.** |
| **Ericsson** | We share NTT Docomo’s problem description of the first bullet and think this is necessary for SDM simultaneous operation since, **without parent signaling of restricted beams, the IAB node will not know what DU beams will interfere with the parent backhaul link operation**.We are not as convinced regarding the second bullet. Our view has been that the MT beam should always be prioritized to the DU beams and there already exist a framework for a UE selecting the preferred beam towards the parent DU. Nevertheless, **any beam decision should be made by the parent IAB node** and we would like to change the 2nd bullet to better reflect that:* the child node can dynamically report to the parent node a set of **advantageous** or **disadvantageous** beams of the IAB-MT of the child node

If so, we can **agree to the proposal.** |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal. In light of Ericsson’s concern another alternative might be to change “restricted beams” to “preferred beam restrictions”. |
| **Intel** | We support the first bullet and have similar concern regarding the second bullet as Ericsson. But we can agree on Ericsson or Nokia’s updated version.  |
| **Samsung** | Support the proposal in principle.In our understanding, “restricted beam” in the first sub-bullet can be utilized to restrict beam(s) for IAB DU transmission which can interfere with parent DU UL reception. In the second sub-bullet, “recommended beam” can be utilized to recommend beam(s) for IAB MT reception. So, we understand at least “recommended beam” can be based on the existing beam management and “restricted beam” is based on further discussion maybe in other agenda, for example, how to measure interferences, how to report necessary information to parent.Regarding “restricted beam” in the second sub-bullet, we are wondering what it is for, for example, is it to restrict beam(s) for IAB MT transmission in order to not interfere with IAB DU DL reception? |
| **Qualcomm** | We support this proposal.One minor comment on 3rd bullet point, “at least existing beam management reporting is supported”. We are not sure whether this bullet point is strictly needed, because by default the existing beam management reporting should be supported by default (i.e. there is no IAB-specific exclusion). |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Agree in principle.And share similar view as Samsung that it is better to have some clarification on the direction of ‘restricted beam’ and ‘recommended beam’.For child node MT reporting, from our point of view, this is just an assistance info to help parent DU to determine proper beams at the child MT, i.e., the used beam of IAB MT at a given resource should be controlled/indicated by the parent DU. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | We **do not support the proposal**.Our main concern is with the first bullet item as it seems to address interference management (DU-DU interference with Case A multiplexing), which is being discussed in 8.10.2. According to our understanding, the issue at hand in 8.10.1 with respect to beam management and SDM is enhancements to resource multiplexing that deal with duplexing capabilities, number of antenna panels, self-interference, etc. that are relevant to simultaneous operation between upstream and downstream links (the solid green links in the figure below) at the IAB node. Measurement and management of various interference cases (e.g., the dashed red links in the figure below) should be discussed under interference management in 8.10.2.Our proposal is thus as follows:1) For enabling SDM and enhancing beam management, down-select from the following alternatives:* Alt. 1: Dynamic indication of beams and/or panels for upstream link of the IAB node (i.e., beams/panels for IAB-MT)
* Alt. 2: Dynamic indication of beams and/or panels for downstream link of the IAB node (i.e., beams/panels for IAB-DU)

In our view, Alt. 1 is the preferred option because:* it addresses the issue that we should address in 8.10.1 (unlike Alt. 2 that is related to 8.10.2);
* it could lead to a less complex and more straight-forward spec;
* it seems overall the more natural option as the parent node controls “spatial resources” of its own link directly.

Furthermore, Alt. 1 has more support based on our understanding of the company proposals: R1-2104877, R1-2104924, R1-2105124, R1-2105716, R1-2105763, etc.Note: A unified solution addressing the issues in 8.10.1 and 8.10.2 does not have to be precluded at this point.2) Discuss the second bullet item in a different proposal as it seems to be on a signaling with a different purpose. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **We support the proposal.** We agree with DCM’s analysis on the scenarios. For the detailed wording, we suggest changing “recommended” to “preferred” and keep the “restricted” to align with the first bullet. For the third bullet, it is not clear how it is linked to the first two bullets since our understanding is that the intention of the first two bullets is to introduce some different beam management mechanisms which are not currently supported. |
| **vivo** | For 1st bullet, the legacy DU-to-DU CLI mitigation mechanism can already address the child DU to parent DU interference, which is not urgent for optimization. The scenario addressed by the 2nd bullet is more specific in IAB scenario, which should be prioritized in IAB discussion. However, if the majority prefer optimization as in 1st bullet, we can accept 1st and 2nd bullet together.For 2nd bullet, it is possible for MT to recommend beams for parent DU, so we cannot fully understand Ericsson’s concern. The wording ‘recommended beams’/ ‘preferred beams’ should be kept as it is. If Nokia’s wording can address Ericsson’s concern, we can accept Nokia’s wording. |

**Updated Possible Agreement (for comeback)**

In case of simultaneous MT/DU operation,

* the parent node can dynamically indicate to the child node a set of restricted beams at the IAB-DU of the child node
	+ - FFS: the parent node can dynamically indicate to the child node a set of recommended beams at the IAB-DU of the child node
* the child node can dynamically report to the parent node a set of recommended beams, not preferred beams, or both recommended and not preferred beams of the IAB-MT of the child node
* FFS: Applicability to specific multiplexing cases or specific time-frequency resources
* FFS: Additional semi-static signaling
* FFS: Per-panel granularity in addition to per-beam granularity
* Note: This does not preclude any enhancements for either DU or MT-based CLI measurement and reports

**Discussion: Views on the updated possible agreement?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **Moderator (AT&T)** | **The above update attempts to address the major concerns received during the GTW. Apologies, if I missed some, please let me know if that is the case.****@Apple: Added FFS to the first bullet to leave open the option for parity between the parent node and child node reporting** **@Lenovo/MotM: Added per-panel granularity as an option. However, downselection between the first and second bullets is not likely to be agreeable as was mentioned during the GTW, this already represents multiple compromises from various sets of companies. In addition, although related due to the fundamental issues, CLI measurement/reporting is not required for this agreement – it is a potential enabler to allow a parent or child to improve its beam selection/recommendations due to multiple factors including the multiplexing mode capability and resource allocation considerations (e.g. scheduling of other backhaul links at the parent) – not just for interference management. So in 8.10.1 we do not say how the parent or child is making the recommendations/restrictions, just enabling the signaling to do it. In my understanding agreeing to this proposal does not preclude any enhancements for either DU or MT-based CLI measurement and reports and I am happy to include a note to that effect.**  |
| **NTT Docomo** | **We support the proposal.****But have a question to clarify our understanding on the first bullet with the newly added FFS. We see two interpretation. Our understanding is the first.****First is, if the proposal is agreed, parent indicating restricted beam is supported, and in addition to that we further study whether parent node can indicate recommended beam.****Second is, if the proposal is agreed, the situation of first bullet is the same as second bullet that is we may support parent node only indicating restricted beam, or only indicating recommended beam, or both.** |
| **OPPO** | **We raised this question in GTW: the 2nd bullet has ambiguous meanings in our view. It seems a sub-bullet is needed for clarification, as following*** the child node can dynamically report to the parent node a set of recommended beams, not preferred beams, or both recommended and not preferred beams of the IAB-MT of the child node
	+ FFS whether the specification supports all these report combinations.

**We are also ok if the group steps further by deciding the FFS in this meeting.** |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **We support the proposal.** **DCM and OPPO have similar comments on the need of supporting all possible indications/reporting combinations. At current stage, we think it will be difficult to decide without a careful analysis between different alternatives.** In case of simultaneous MT/DU operation, * the parent node can dynamically indicate to the child node a set of restricted beams or recommended beams at the IAB-DU of the child node
	+ - FFS: Whether the specification supports all indication combinations.
		- ~~the parent node can dynamically indicate to the child node a set of recommended beams at the IAB-DU of the child node~~
* the child node can dynamically report to the parent node a set of recommended beams, not preferred beams, or both recommended and not preferred beams of the IAB-MT of the child node
	+ - FFS: Whether the specification supports all reporting combinations.
* FFS: Applicability to specific multiplexing cases or specific time-frequency resources
* FFS: Additional semi-static signaling
* FFS: Per-panel granularity in addition to per-beam granularity
* Note: This does not preclude any enhancements for either DU or MT-based CLI measurement and reports
 |
| **Samsung** | **We support the proposal and share a similar view with HW. One more editorial comment for the first sub-bullet on top of HW’s update:**In case of simultaneous MT/DU operation, * the parent node can dynamically indicate to the child node a set of restricted beams, ~~or~~ recommended beams or both recommended and restricted beams at the IAB-DU of the child node
	+ - FFS: Whether the specification supports all indication combinations.
		- ~~the parent node can dynamically indicate to the child node a set of recommended beams at the IAB-DU of the child node~~
* the child node can dynamically report to the parent node a set of recommended beams, not preferred beams, or both recommended and not preferred beams of the IAB-MT of the child node
	+ - FFS: Whether the specification supports all reporting combinations.
* FFS: Applicability to specific multiplexing cases or specific time-frequency resources
* FFS: Additional semi-static signaling
* FFS: Per-panel granularity in addition to per-beam granularity
* Note: This does not preclude any enhancements for either DU or MT-based CLI measurement and reports
 |
| **Ericsson** | **We support the proposal** but not the additions regarding bullet 1 as proposed by some companies. We are fine with the proposed changes to bullet 2 as proposed by Oppo.With respect to whether the parent node should signal restricted or recommended beams, we do not see how recommended beams will work for one reason: **the parent node cannot signal what it doesn’t know** as the ideal recommended beam would not even be detected by the parent node. It is highly unlikely that the parent node will detect all IAB-DU beams, and hence it cannot signal whether they are preferred or not and would as a result lead to an incomplete set of preferred beams. Restricted beams, on the other hand, per definition deals solely with beams that the parent DU is able to detect. See figure below for illustration of what we mean where orange beams are restricted and green/blue beams would be preferred.We can agree to the FFS in bullet 1 for the sake of progress but in all honesty, we don’t think signaling preferred beams is a viable alternative. |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal as drafted but agree with revision from Oppo. We agree with Ericsson that signaling for preferred and recommended beams don’t seem well motivated but are willing to hear further discussion for the sake of progress. A preferred child DU beam should be any beam that doesn’t interfere with parent operation. It is unclear what the benefit of specifying signaling for recommended beams will be if there is no explicit behavior that is determined by the signaling. Using a beam restriction gives the operator enough flexibility to determine how much control parent node has by controlling the number of beams that are/aren’t restricted. |
| **Intel** | We are okay with the proposal and also fine with Samsung’s revision. |
| **Apple** | Thanks FL, for addressing the questions. We are fine with the intention but maybe my concern on the first bullet is misunderstood. In our understanding, IAB-MT may recommend some preferred/non-desired beams to be used by its parent (as 2nd bullet says), since all information for making such decision is available at IAB node (in a joint work between IAB-MT and IAB-DU within an IAB node). But for the first bullet, it is not clear to us how the parent IAB-DU can indicate restricted beams (or desired beams) to be used at IAB-DU of child. Required information to make such indication at IAB-DU of parent is not available. In any case, the signaling procedure and how the flow works can be added to the proposal, as FFS at this point.  |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Based on further discussion in the emails, it is clear that other companies also agree that the matter of correlation between DU beam and MT beams needs attention in this signaling. Since the remaining time is very limited, we propose the following additional FFS point with minimal change to the current proposal:In case of simultaneous MT/DU operation, * the parent node can dynamically indicate to the child node a set of restricted beams at the IAB-DU of the child node
	+ FFS: the parent node can dynamically indicate to the child node a set of recommended beams at the IAB-DU of the child node
* the child node can dynamically report to the parent node a set of recommended beams, not preferred beams, or both recommended and not preferred beams of the IAB-MT of the child node
* FFS: Applicability to specific multiplexing cases or specific time-frequency resources
* FFS: Additional semi-static signaling
* FFS: Per-panel granularity in addition to per-beam granularity
* FFS: Relationship with child IAB-MT beam indication
* Note: This does not preclude any enhancements for either DU or MT-based CLI measurement and reports
 |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | We support the proposal, we are also OK to the new added FFS from Lenovo/Motm, to make the FFS clearly, it is better to clarify the direction of the indication, i.e., FFS: Relationship with child IAB-MT beam indication from the parent node. |
| **Vivo** | We support the proposal with OPPO’s change on the 2nd bullet.  |

**ISSUE 2.3: MULTIPLEXING CAPABILITY INDICATION ENHANCEMENTS**

**Proposal 2.3.0.** **The parent IAB-node is dynamically provided with changes of the IAB-node’s multiplexing-capability.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.3.0?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **ETRI** | **We don’t clearly understand the motivation for dynamic update of multiplexing capability.****We think the other aspects including the contents of the multiplexing capability, frequency domain granularity of the capability information, etc., should be discussed first. Otherwise, the required time-domain sensitivity for this multiplexing capability signaling cannot be assessed well. For instance, we may clarify the following point first; whether to assume the same multiplexing-capability for Rel-16 and Rel-17 or not.** |
| **CEWiT** | **Support proposal 2.3.0****We suggest adding the following** **FFS: Minimum duration for which IAB node stay in a multiplexing capability** |
| **Ericsson** | **We support this proposal.** |
| **Intel** | **We support this proposal.** |
| **Nokia** | **Agree with ETRI that is unclear why multiplexing capability would need to be indicated dynamically.** |
| **Qualcomm** | **We support this proposal.** |
| **Samsung** | **OK with the FL proposal.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | **Share similar view as ETRI.** |
| **Vivo** | **Support the proposal**  |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | The proposal is fine, but this discussion could alternatively emerge from discussions in 8.10.2 with more specific purpose and direction for next steps.Unless the proposal here is specific to, e.g., multiplexing capability related to FDM/SDM constraints, in which case it is worth an explicit mention. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **We think the proposal can be covered by the proposal 2.3.1** |
| **Apple** | Support the proposal |
| **LG Electronics** | It is not clear to understand the reason why multiplexing capability of IAB-node is indicated dynamically. |

**Proposal 2.3.1. Indication between a child node to a parent node and/or donor CU of at least the following conditions to facilitate adaptation between multiplexing operation modes is supported:**

* **Required guard band for FDM (FFS granularity)**
* **Required number of guard symbols**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 2.3.1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **ETRI** | **Support the proposal.** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support the main bullet and second sub-bullet.****For guard band, we think IAB node’s behavior on guard band need be discussed first. For example, if the behavior is as IAB node MT will not Tx/Rx in the guard band, then we agree that the required guard band need to be reported. While if the behavior is as IAB node DU will not Tx/Rx in the guard band, then we think the report of required guard band is not necessary, since the required guard band can be determined by DU based on its interference condition and up to DU implementation.** |
| **CEWiT** | **Support the main bullet and second sub-bullet****Regarding guard band for FDM, we share similar view with Docomo** |
| **Ericsson** | **We support providing the number of guard symbols but not guard bands.****The guard band will depend on, e.g., the transmit power relation between the DU and MT, hence there is no single guard band to be signaled. Instead, we propose that the DU should handle any guard band within its own Hard or Soft-IA resource. In that case, signaling is not needed.** |
| **Intel** | **We think more discussion are needed.** **Regarding the guard symbols, Rel-16 IAB supports 8 MT/DU transition guard symbols indication through MAC CE between an IAB node and its parent node. We are not sure what will be added in this proposal (based on Rel-16 guard symbols). Also, guard symbols with different multiplexing modes are on-going discussion in 8.10.2 (switching among Case#1/Case#6/Case#7). So, we think we need more details/clarifications on this sub-bullet.** **Regarding the guard band, we also think more details are needed. For example, in Hard frequency-domain resource, whether we need to define specific rules to make the hard resource all available to the IAB-DU or need to allow guard bands inside the hard resource. Those rules will have impact on whether indication between an IAB node and its parent is needed.**  |
| **Nokia**  | **Agree with Docomo and Ericsson that guard band should be determined by DU and does not need to be indicated.** |
| **Qualcomm** | **Support the main bullet and second sub-bullet****Regarding guard band for FDM, we don’t have strong preference and we acknowledge comments made by Docomo and Ericsson.**  |
| **Samsung** | **Share similar view with QC.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | **It is not necessary/urgent to do such optimization.** **The guard band can be left to IAB node DU implementation(e.g., IAB DU can reserve guard tones according to how IAB-MT’s resources are configured/scheduled).****The guard symbols defined in Rel-16 can be reused.** |
| **Vivo** | **Support the proposal.****For 1st bullet, the guard band can be determined by IAB node implementation. However, CU needs to know the implemented guard band, which is used to assist CU to configured FDM resource to IAB DU.** **The 2nd bullet needs some clarification, are we going to report additional guard symbol compared with Rel-16 guard symbols?**  |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | **Support** |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Support the proposal.** **Regarding the required guard band, it is true that it will depends on who is handling this, i.e. the parent node or the IAB node. Our views is that there will be both use cases. As an example, some of the cell-specific signals/channels at the IAB DU will be treated as Hard resources. In this case, it is preferred that the IAB node can report the required guard band to its parent node so that the parent node does not impact the Tx/Rx of these signals/channels.** **In addition, we prefer to add more conditions, e.g. required timing mode, required power control parameters, and preferred TCI.** |
| **Apple** | Prefer to have further discussion on the direction of indication (from parent to node or vice versa), as it impacts the indication as well (as DCM mentioned)  |
| **LG Electronics** | **It is not clear to understand a necessary of indication of guard band / guard symbol between a child node to a parent node.** |

**Agreement**

**The parent IAB-node is dynamically provided with conditions/parameters to facilitate adaptation between multiplexing operation modes:**

* **FFS: Required number of guard symbols for switching of multiplexing mode (FFS: per timing mode or per multiplexing mode) for IAB-DU**
* **FFS: Signalling procedure**
* **FFS: Required guard band for FDM**
* **FFS: other conditions, e.g. required timing mode, required power control parameters, and preferred TCI.**

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

**From the eIAB WID:**

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

**Summary of input contributions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon (R1-2104246)** | ***Proposal 8:*** *For inter-carrier intra-band DC, simultaneous Rx/Tx is not supported in Rel-17 for IAB.****Proposal 9:*** *In case of inter-carrier intra-band DC, the IAB-DU may use a soft symbol if the IAB-MT detects both DCI format 2\_5 with an AI index field value indicating the soft symbol as available.****Proposal 10:*** *To avoid inefficient resource partitioning between IAB-MT and IAB-DU in case of DC, resource coordination between the two parent nodes is supported so that more resources can be released to the IAB-DU.* |
| **Vivo (R1-2104382)** | **Proposal 10: RAN1 supports both intra-carrier DC and inter-carrier DC.** **Proposal 11: To handle link direction conflict between MCG and SCG, Rel-16 CA TDD conflict resolution framework is extended to DC scenario as following.** * **Reuse the prioritization rules in case of UL/DL conflict.**
* **Reuse scheduling restriction/resource indication restriction between CCs based on semi-static TDD configurations on the CCs.**

Proposal 12: RAN1 to handle the following aspects regarding DU resource type indication conflict. * **Clarify IAB DU/MT behavior when receiving different dynamic resource type indication (e.g., DCI format 2\_5) from MCG and SCG.**
* **Report soft resource availability from child node to parent node(s).**
 |
| **Qualcomm (R1-2104691)** | **Proposal 4.1:****To extend CA TDD confliction resolution rules to synchronous intra-band NR-DC operation, the following spec changes shall be considered:*** **In TS38.331, flag “*directionalCollisionHandling*” shall be extended from CA to NR-DC.**
* **In TS38.213, the conditions for applying TDD confliction resolution rules shall be updated to be applicable for both CA and NR-DC.**
	+ **E.g. update “indicates support of capability for half-duplex operation in CA with unpaired spectrum” as “indicates support of capability for half-duplex operation in CA or NR-DC with unpaired spectrum”.**
* **In TS38.213, redefine the CA TDD confliction resolution rules that are not applicable for NR-DC with independent MAC schedulers.**
	+ **E.g. the rule of “*the UE* *does not expect to detect a first DCI format scheduling a transmission or reception on a symbol on a first cell and a second DCI format scheduling a reception or transmission on the symbol on a second cell, respectively*” shall be redefined.**

**Proposal 4.2:****To support TDD configuration coordination between parent nodes, extend “*intended TDD DL UL config*” IE to include IAB-specific TDD patterns.*** **FFS: define a new UE-specific signaling message to coordinate TDD configuration between parent nodes for the dual-connected UE/MT only.**

**Observation 4.3:****The coordination of H/S/NA configurations for a dual-connected IAB-node between donors depends on RAN3 decision on IAB management framework under inter-donor topology adaptation.****Observation 4.4:****In FR2 or higher band, due to analog beam constraint, a dual-connected UE/MT may not have the capability to simultaneously receive from two parent nodes and/or simultaneously transmit to two parent nodes, and the impact to support multiple-parent in IAB needs to be investigated.****Observation 4.5:****For single-parent case with a single MAC scheduler at the parent DU, if IAB-MT is configured with DCI 2\_5 from multiple serving cells, the received multiple DCI 2\_5s are expected to be consistent with each other.****Observation 4.6:****For multi-parent case with separate MAC schedulers at two parent DUs, the usage of a soft resource at an IAB-DU cell shall depend on explicit and/or implicit control of both parent DUs.****Proposal 4.3:****For an IAB-node with dual-parents, an IAB-DU cell can use a soft resource if*** **Explicit indications of availability are received from both parents.**
* **Or explicit indication of availability is received from 1st parent, and implicit determination is made on 2nd parent so that**
	+ **Either IAB-MT will not do TX/RX with 2nd parent**
	+ **Or the IAB-DU cell’s use of the soft resource will not impact the IAB-MT’s TX or RX with 2nd parent.**
* **Or implicit determination is made on both parent nodes so that**
	+ **Either IAB-MT will not do TX/RX with both parent nodes**
	+ **Or the IAB-DU cell’s use of the soft resource will not impact the IAB-MT’s TX or RX with both parent nodes.**
	+ **Or IAB-MT will not do TX/RX with one parent node, and the IAB-DU cell’s use of the soft resource will not impact IAB-MT’s TX or RX with the other parent node.**
 |
| **R1-2104877 (ZTE, Sanechips)** | [*Proposal 8:* To minimize the transmission direction conflict at the IAB MT side, the TDD configuration from different parent nodes are assumed not conflicted for intra-band inter-carrier DC.](#_Toc20757)[*Proposal 9:* In DC operation, IAB MT is not expected to be configured and/or indicated different transmission directions between the reference cell in MCG and the reference cell in SCG](#_Toc8755)[*Proposal 10:* Just one resource availability indication either from MCG or from SCG is expected for an IAB-DU soft symbol of an IAB DU cell.](#_Toc265)[*Proposal 11:* From RAN1 perspective, both intra-donor and inter-donor multi-parent scenarios can be supported within a common framework.](#_Toc29802) |
| **Intel (R1-2104924)** | **Proposal 6:** For scheduling collision between two parent DUs due to DCI format 2\_5 indication: * Same carrier(s) indication is preferred for inter-carrier DC.
* Same indication from both parents is preferred for intra-carrier DC (if supported).

**Proposal 7:** For the semi-static DU resource configurations, additionally support per-backhaul link (e.g. per child IAB-MT link) configuration.  |
| **ETRI (R1-2105226)** | **Proposal 10: Clarify the target scenarios for intra-band inter-carrier DC to support dual parents among the following options**.* **Case #1: The IAB-MT has two parent DUs through intra-band inter-carrier DC while the IAB-DU establishes a single set of cells to the MT of child node within a single band (i.e. without configuring DC for the child node).**
* **Case #2: The IAB-MT has two parent DUs through intra-band inter-carrier DC and the IAB-DU also configures DC to the MT of child node.**

**Proposal 11: If Case #2 in proposal 7 is the target scenario, then adopt the TP in Table 9.****Proposal 12: Consider to handle intra-carrier DC in the future releases*** **Joint operation of “mTRP” + “Rel-16 TEI on half duplex CA” can be a good starting point for dual parent IAB via intra-carrier DC**
 |
| **Samsung (R1-2105331)** | *Proposal 7: Consider the reference cell concept from Rel-16 CA when there are configuration and scheduling collisions between MCG and SCG.**Proposal 8: Consider per-backhaul link signaling between IAB MT and different parent IABs in Table 1.* |
| **LG (R1-2105493)** | ***Proposal 8: The coordination of TDD configuration of MT between two parent DUs can be assumed for both of intra-donor and inter-donor DC scenarios.******Proposal 9: In case of DL/UL collision between two parent links, the priority rule should be defined in MT perspective.*** ***Proposal 10: It is necessary to support a MT which cannot perform simultaneous Tx/Tx and Rx/Rx for two parent links.*** ***Proposal 11: Availability determination rule when a MT monitors DCI format 2\_5 for a DU cell from multiple carrier frequencies needs to be defined. Discuss further following alternatives to determine for availability determination rule.**** ***Alt 1. The soft resource is determined as available, if at least one parent node indicates that the DU soft resource is available. Otherwise, it is determined that the soft resource is not indicated as available.***
* ***Alt 2. The soft resource is determined as available, if both parent nodes indicate that the DU soft resource is available. Otherwise, it is determined that the soft resource is not indicated as available.***
 |
| **Nokia (R1-2105617)** | ***Proposal 3.1: In intra-donor inter-band inter-carrier DC scenario, if the IAB MT does not support simultaneous Tx and Rx on different carriers, it does not expect to receive conflicting DCI 2\_0 from different parents.*** * ***Note: This must be handled by the CU and the parent nodes.***

***Proposal 3.2: In inter-donor inter-band inter-carrier DC scenario, if the IAB MT does not support simultaneous Tx and Rx on different carriers, it must apply conflict resolution rules when it receives indications/configurations of conflicting DCI 2\_0 and/or semi static TDD configurations from different parents.*** * ***FFS: required resolution rules***

***Proposal 3.3: In inter-carrier DC, the indication of availability of soft resources via DCI format 2-5 from a parent node is only valid for the IAB-DU cell(s) which uses the same carrier(s) in the backhaul link for the same parent.*** ***Proposal 3.4: Support per-child-link resource configurations for an IAB-DU in the case of dual connectivity.*** ***Proposal 3.5: IAB-MT shall support both single DCI-based and multi-DCI-based multi-TRP transmission schemes.*** ***Proposal 3.6: For multi-DCI based multi-TRP reception supported IAB node, the explicit indication of a soft resource is determined based on indications received from both TRPs, and a soft resource is available only when DCI 2-5 indications allowing the use of the soft resource are received from both TRPs.***  |
| **AT&T (R1-2105662)** | **Proposal 5: Per-backhaul link resource configurations and multiplexing capability indications independent of the per-IAB-DU configuration and multiplexing capability indication are supported in Rel-17. Coordination signaling to exchange the per-link resource configurations and multiplexing capability indications between up to two parent IAB-nodes/donors should be additionally supported in Rel-17.** |
| **NTT DOCOMO (R1-2105716)** | **Proposal 11: For TDM resource multiplexing in DC scenario, following methods can be considered:*** **Option1: DU H/S/NA resource types are configured per DU serving cell with reusing Rel-16 mechanism of DU H/S/NA resource configuration. DU can Tx/Rx on a symbol configured as hard, or a symbol configured as soft and explicitly/implicitly indicated as available by both parent nodes.**
* **Option2: DU H/S/NA resource types are configured per DU serving cell and per parent node. DU can Tx/Rx on a symbol configured as hard for both parent nodes, or a symbol configured as hard for one parent node while configured and explicitly/implicitly indicated as soft-IA by the other parent node, or a symbol configured and explicitly/implicitly indicated as soft-IA by both parent nodes.**
 |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (R1-2105763)** | Proposal 9: Support signaling from an IAB node in the DC mode to its parent node for informing the parent node of the status of availability of soft resources. Further discuss specification of mechanisms to handle availability indication collisions by two parent nodes in the DC mode.Proposal 10: Support extension of CA TDD collision handling for DL-UL conflict resolution. - Support inter-donor signaling for inter-parent coordination - Include scenarios of resource conflicts due to timing misalignment |
| **Ericsson (R1-2105852)** | [Proposal 20 For inter-carrier DC, the IAB-donor-CU can be made aware of the IAB-MT’s capability regarding simultaneous transmission and reception on multiple serving cells in a frequency band, configured by the two parent nodes.](#_Toc71663410)[Proposal 21 If an IAB-MT is not capable of simultaneous transmission and reception on any pair of the multiple serving cells in the frequency band configured for two parent nodes, the IAB-MT can assume all serving cells configured for the two parent nodes have aligned UL/DL directions.](#_Toc71663411)[Proposal 22 In intra-donor-DC and inter-donor-DC operations, a parent-node can be made aware of the DU resource configuration of the other peer parent node that connects to the same IAB-node.](#_Toc71663412) |

**ISSUE 3.1: ENHANCEMENTS FOR DC SUPPORT**

**Proposal 3.1.1:**

**In case of intra-band inter-carrier dual connectivity for both inter-donor and intra-donor scenarios the following enhancements are supported:**

* **Reusing the Rel-16 CA TDD prioritization rules in case of UL/DL conflict across CGs**
* **Reusing scheduling restriction/resource indication restriction between CCs based on semi-static TDD configurations on the CCs.**
* **Coordinating TDD configurations for the parent nodes by introducing IAB-MT specific TDD configurations**
	+ **If the IAB MT does not support simultaneous Tx and Rx on different carriers, it can assume that that TDD configuration and any DCI Format 2\_0 indications from different parent nodes should not conflict**
* **Support for exchanging H/S/NA configurations between parent nodes/donors**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 3.1.1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **Ericsson** | **We can agree to the first and fourth bullets but would like clarifications on the two middle bullets. For example, or bullet 3, we think it is not only DCI 2\_0 that is of interest.** |
| **Intel** | **We have similar concern on bullet 3 as Ericsson.**  |
| **Nokia** | **We have concern with bullet 3 and specifically the sub-bullet, since it may be overly restrictive on network operation to ensure that even in inter-donor scenarios there will be no conflict.**  |
| **Qualcomm** | **We support the proposal in principle, and have some comments on bullet 3.** **Though bullet 3 imposes a restriction of non-conflicting DCI2\_0 from different parent nodes, as long as there are flexible symbols indicated in DCI2\_0 from both parent nodes, it is possible that one parent may make a dynamic scheduling of DL TX while another parent may make a dynamic scheduling of UL TX over the IAB-MT. The existing CA rule on restriction of conflicting DL/UL scheduling from both parent nodes may not be applicable for NRDC case because two parent nodes cannot coordinate in the level of dynamic scheduling. So in our opinion, restriction on non-conflicting DCI2\_0 will not be sufficient to avoid conflicting DL/UL dynamic scheduling from both parent nodes.** **Besides requiring non-conflicting TDD configuration and DCI2\_0 from different parent nodes, the following two options can be considered:*** **Option1: If IAB-MT does not support simultaneous TX and RX on different carriers, it can be assume that DCI2\_0 should not have flexible symbols.**
* **Option2: It is allowed to have flexible symbols in DCI2\_0, and conflict resolution rule shall be defined for the case with conflicting DL/UL dynamic scheduling made by parent nodes.**

**E.g. Redefine the CA rule of “*the UE* *does not expect to detect a first DCI format scheduling a transmission or reception on a symbol on a first cell and a second DCI format scheduling a reception or transmission on the symbol on a second cell, respectively*” to a new rule for NRDC, e.g. either TX or RX shall be cancelled at IAB-MT in this case.**  |
| **Samsung** | **Support the FL’s proposal in principle but share other companies’ views about some restrictions** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | **Agree in principle.** |
| **Vivo** | **For 1st bullet, why the conflict resolution is applied only to CGs, it can be applied between CG and DG.****For the 4th bullet, we had following agreement in 104b ‘Coordinating TDD configurations for the parent nodes (for both intra-donor and inter-donor operation) and coordinating H/S/NA configurations for the child node between donors (at least for inter-donor operation)’. ‘coordinating’ includes the meaning of ‘exchange’, is my understanding correct. I mean there may be overlapping part between 4th bullet and previous agreement.** |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Support bullet items 1, 2, 4Bullet item 3 is not sufficiently justified and as companies have mentioned, the sub-bullet is too restrictive. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **For the first bullet, it is not completely clear to us whether it is feasible to reuse all the Rel-16 CA TDD prioritization rules. Note that there are a lot of different rules defined in current specification, e.g. semi-static TDD configurations, dynamic scheduling conflictions, etc.****For the third bullet, it is not clear to us what the MT-specific TDD configuration is by giving that we already have MT TDD configuration in Rel-16 IAB.** **For the fourth bullet, the motivation of the exchanging is not clear, and more clarifications are needed.** |
| **LG Electronics** | Suggest to modify as following: (1st and 2nd sub-bullet are not the enhancement features.)**In case of intra-band inter-carrier dual connectivity for both inter-donor and intra-donor scenarios the followings ~~enhancements~~ are supported:*** **Reusing the Rel-16 CA TDD prioritization rules in case of UL/DL conflict across CGs**
* **Reusing scheduling restriction/resource indication restriction between CCs based on semi-static TDD configurations on the CCs.**
* **Coordinating TDD configurations for the parent nodes by introducing IAB-MT specific TDD configurations**
	+ **If the IAB MT does not support simultaneous Tx and Rx on different carriers, it can assume that that TDD configuration and any DCI Format 2\_0 indications from different parent nodes should not conflict**
* **~~Support for e~~Exchanging H/S/NA configurations between parent nodes/donors**

It is not unclear whether 3rd sub-bullet is required. |

**Proposal 3.1.1’:**

**In case of intra-band inter-carrier dual connectivity for both inter-donor and intra-donor scenarios the following are supported:**

* **Reusing the Rel-16 CA TDD prioritization rules in case of UL/DL conflict**
	+ **FFS: Whether all prioritization rules apply in case of NR-DC**
* **Reusing scheduling restriction/resource indication restriction between CCs based on semi-static TDD configurations on the CCs.**
* **Coordinating the IAB-MT’s TDD configurations and DCI Format 2\_0 usage to avoid scheduling/configuration conflicts (including usage of flexible symbols) from different parent nodes in case the child IAB-MT does not support simultaneous TX and RX on different carriers**
* **Exchanging H/S/NA configurations between parent nodes/donors**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 3.1.1’?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **Moderator (AT&T)** | **To clarify the second and third bullets are intended to focus on the need for coordination and/or rules to avoid configuration or scheduling conflicts across carriers and parent nodes. Since coordination is different for TDD CA and NR-DC due to latency considerations some updates may be necessary.** |
| **Ericsson** | We are still not confident about the meaning and implications of the second subbullet.DCI format 2\_0 is not included in Rel-16 CA whereas other DCI formats are. For that reason, we would like to modify the 3rd bullet to the following:**Coordinating the IAB-MT’s TDD configurations and at least DCI Format 2\_0 usage to avoid scheduling/configuration conflicts (including usage of flexible symbols) from different parent nodes in case the child IAB-MT does not support simultaneous TX and RX on different carriers** |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal. Would support Ericsson’s proposed revision as well. |
| **Intel** | Support the proposal in general. Would support Ericsson’s proposed revision as well. |
| **Samsung** | Support the FL’s proposal and also fine with Ericsson’s update. |
| **Qualcomm** | We support this proposal. OK with suggestion from Ericsson.One minor comment on 1st bullet point. We think the following modification on 1st bullet point may be more clear and provide additional details for the FFS aspects. Being a FFS item this is not critical to incorporate if an agreement can be easily made without it.**“Reusing the Rel-16 CA TDD prioritization rules in case of UL/DL confliction if applicable for NR-DC.*** **FFS: Determining the set of CA TDD prioritization rules that are applicable in case of NR-DC.**

**FFS: Redefining the set of CA TDD prioritization rules that are not applicable in case of NR-DC due to latency consideration. ”** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | For the 3rd sub-bullet, we still doubt the feasibility of the coordination on dynamic scheduling b/w parents(including DCI 2-0 and other formats), more study is needed. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Support the proposal. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | For the first bullet, we agree with QC that some further modifications are beneficial. * **Reusing the Rel-16 CA TDD prioritization rules in case of UL/DL conflict when applicable**
	+ **FFS: Whether all prioritization rules apply in case of NR-DC**
	+ **FFS: Need of new prioritization rules in case of NR-DC**

On second bullet, we don’t understand the intention and are not sure whether it has already been covered by the first bullet.On the third bullet, the implications on the “DCI format 2\_0 usage” needs to be clarified. Our understanding that DCI format 2\_0 can be configured separately for set of serving cells in each CG. In case of intra-band inter-carrier DC, if the UE does not support the simultaneous Tx/Rx, it is not clear how coordination for DCI format 2\_0 between the two parent nodes is possible since DCI format 2\_0 are sent independently.* **Coordinating the IAB-MT’s TDD configurations ~~and DCI Format 2\_0 usage~~ to avoid scheduling/configuration conflicts (including usage of flexible symbols) from different parent**
 |
| **vivo** | For the TDD coordination in 3rd bullet, we think it is feasible to exchange intended TDD between parents and donors. We also wonder how DCI 2-0 is coordinated, do you means report of DCI 2-0 of one parent to the other parent?. As summary, we would like to FFS coordination of DCI 2-0. |

**ISSUE 3.2: MULTI-PARENT SOFT RESOURCE AVAILABILITY INDICATION**

**Proposal 3.2.1: The indication of availability of soft resources via DCI format 2-5 from a parent node is only valid for the child IAB-DU cell(s) which operate on the same carrier(s) in the backhaul link towards that parent node.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 3.2.1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **ETRI** | **We have a clarification question for the meaning of (s) in this proposal. Is it to capture that the AI is only valid within the same cell group? (If so, we prefer to clarify this explicitly.)** |
| **CEWiT** | **Support proposal** |
| **Ericsson** | **We do not support the proposal.****Restricting a DCI to only be valid on a single carrier, there is no way to indicate adjacent channel restrictions due to adjacent channel interference. This is obvious if DU and MT is operating on adjacent carriers.****Operation “on the same carrier” does not necessarily reflect spectrum relations. For example, an MT’s BWP could differ from the DU’s carrier.** |
| **Intel** | **We support the proposal.** **In response to Ericsson’s comments, if an IAB-MT and a co-located IAB-DU are on different carrier, the IAB-DU does not need the explicit DCI format 2\_5 indication for soft resources. The IAB-DU can implicitly decide whether the soft resource on different carrier(s) can be used or not depending on the IAB-node’s multiplexing capability.**  |
| **Nokia** | **Support the proposal.**  |
| **Qualcomm** | **We do not support the proposal.** **We agree with Ericsson’s comment that restriction of “same carrier indication” is too limiting. We propose to extend the existing rules to multi-parent case, so that explicit indication and implicit determination for a soft resource can be made from both parent nodes.**  |
| **Samsung** | **One clarification question. In last RAN1 meeting, it was discussed a case when IAB-MT have multiple CCs which are same or different frequency with the IAB-DU cell and then CR for Rel-16 was agreed. If the FL proposal is saying just the same carrier(s) between MT and DU, we are wondering how to address another IAB-DU cell(s) not belong to the backhaul link toward any parent nodes in the similar perspective as the discussion in the Rel-16 CR.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | If DCI format 2-5 from a parent node is only valid for part of the child IAB-DU cell(s), we propose to that parent node only send AI indication on these child IAB-DU cell(s).**The indication of availability of soft resources via DCI format 2-5 from a parent node is only ~~valid~~ indicated for the child IAB-DU cell(s) which operate on the same carrier(s) in the backhaul link towards that parent node.** |
| **Vivo** | **We do not support the proposal, cell index associated with an availability indication is configured in RRC. We do not needs such restriction.** |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Agree with comments from Ericsson and Qualcomm. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **No. We understand the intention but don’t think this restriction is really necessary.**  |
| **LG Electronics** | We have similar view with Ericsson and Qualcomm. |

**Proposal 3.2.2: If an IAB-MT receives DCI 2\_5 from multiple serving cells (including multiple parent nodes) corresponding to the same set of IAB-DU cell(s), the availability indications from the multiple DCI 2\_5s are not expected to conflict with each other.**

* **FFS: need for updated rules for implicit determination of availability in case of multiple serving cells/parents for an IAB node.**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 3.2.2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **Moderator (AT&T)** | **Based on some comments, this proposal is expanded to consider both multi-carrier and multi-parent scenarios under a common framework. Some companies raised issues about the impact on implicit determination for those scenarios – that issue is FFS.** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Do not support.****In case of multiple parent nodes, since the scheduling of two parent nodes are independent, it is hard to expect no conflict between parent nodes.****In our understanding, the existing rule of DU resource availability determination can be easily extended to multiple parent case as: DU can Tx/Rx on a soft symbol,*** **if explicitly indicated as available by both parent nodes,**
* **or explicitly indicated as available by one parent node, and implicitly determined as available from another parent node.**
* **or implicitly determined as available by both parent node.**
 |
| **Ericsson** | **We do not support this proposal.**Dynamic indication cannot be expected to be aligned between arbitrary parent nodes, not even if these belong to the same CU.We would like to point out that our proposal regarding the availability of soft resource, while attempting to mimic Rel-16 as much as possible, also includes the dual parent case:**It is assumed that the per-cell IAB-DU Soft resource is Not Available if it is neither explicitly indicated as Available, nor implicitly determined as Available by the IAB-DU with respect to at least one parent IAB node.** |
| **Nokia** | Do not support proposal.The original proposal seemed to be focused on mitigating conflicts for inter-carrier DC scenarios, but the new proposal seems overly broad and requiring no conflicts between parents even in inter-donor scenarios places too strong a restriction on network operation.  |
| **Intel** | Do not support proposal.This proposal is implicitly expecting parent nodes’ coordination regarding dynamic DCI format 2\_5 to make them not conflicting with each other. We don’t think parent coordination can work in a timely manner for dynamic DCI format 2\_5 indication.   |
| **Samsung** | Do not support the proposal. We doubt whether required coordination is possible to avoid the conflict each other. |
| **Qualcomm** | We think the main proposal as formulated is not needed. Since DCI 2\_5 can only indicate resource availability and cannot indicate resource unavailability, there is really no conflict possible between separate DCI 2\_5’s received from multiple serving cells for a given DU resource. We think the FFS point is however needed. |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | For the main bullet, we think ‘not expected to conflict with each other’ has the same meaning of ‘expected to be the same’, is it right?In our understanding, the so called ‘conflict’ can be the following two cases:* Case 1: For a given IAB DU cell, DCI 2\_5 from multiple parents are received for this IAB-DU cell with different Ais.
* Case 2: Intra-band inter-IAB DU cell collision, e.g., DCI 2\_5 from parent 1 for IAB DU cell A has different availability indication with DCI 2\_5 from parent 2 for IAB DU cell B.

For case 1, it can be avoid by proper spec design, e.g., for a given IAB DU cell, only AI from one parent is expected.For case 2, further study is preferred. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Do not support the proposal. Both feasibility and applicability of full inter-parent coordination is questioned as other companies have pointed out. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Do not support the proposal.**We agree with comments from DCMTo our understanding, the proposal implies dynamic coordination between two parent nodes; thus their indication can be aligned. However, there is no ideal backhaul link between the two parent nodes in DC scenario. Therefore, we think the approach is not feasible.  |
| **Vivo** | Do not agree, since it is not possible to always guarantee non-conflicted DCI 2-5 from two parent node. It is more acceptable to have conflict resolution rules in spec. |

**Proposal 3.2.3: For an IAB-MT with multiple serving cells (including the case with two parent nodes) corresponding to the same IAB-DU cell(s), a per-cell IAB-DU resource is considered as available if:**

* **explicitly indicated (via DCI 2\_5) or implicitly determined as available with respect to all serving cells**
* **FFS: if the IAB-DU per-cell resource neither explicitly indicated as Available, nor implicitly determined as Available by the IAB-DU with respect to at least one serving cell**
	+ **Alt 1. The IAB-DU per-cell resource is assumed to be not available**
	+ **Alt 2. The IAB-DU per-cell resource is assumed to be available**
	+ **Alt 3. The IAB-DU per-cell resource is assumed to be available/not available depending on additional conditions or determinations at the child node**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 3.2.3?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **Moderator (AT&T)** | **Putting aside the feasibility of coordinated DCI Format 2\_5 from different parents, if possible this would be the expected behavior and extending implicit determination also seems non controversial. So the key question is how to handle the FFS and I am not sure if that can be resolved quickly in this meeting based on comments so far. However if companies have a clear preference for one of the sub-alternatives, please do share it now.** |
| **NTT Docomo** | **Support. Our preference is Alt.1 for the FFS.** |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Not support. On the first bullet, there will be an issues if a first IAB-DU cell is indicated available on one carrier but not indicated as available on a second IAB-DU cell on an adjacent carrier. The resources of the first IAB-DU cell may still be unavailable since the second IAB-DU cell may use the resources which lead to serve adjacent channel interference.**  |
| **Ericsson** | **We support the intention with the proposal.**We are not certain how the indication rule should be interpreted though:* **(explicitly indicated (via DCI 2\_5) or implicitly determined as available) with respect to all serving cells**
* **explicitly indicated (via DCI 2\_5) or (implicitly determined as available with respect to all serving cells)**

We think that the FL’s Alt 1 represents the first interpretation and we support that.If companies are supporting Alt. 1, a possible **reformulation of the proposal** would be as follows:**For an IAB-MT with multiple serving cells (including the case with two parent nodes) corresponding to the same IAB-DU cell(s), a per-cell IAB-DU resource is considered as available if, with respect to all serving cells, the resource is either explicitly indicated or implicitly determined as available.**Regarding Huawei’s concern about availability for multiple IAB-DU cells, in the example provided, the second IAB-DU cell is using resources and thereby preventing the first IAB-DU cell from using another set of resources. This is unrelated to IAB-MT/DU resource availability and, we think, should be avoided by design as is already the case in Rel-15. |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal and agree that Ericsson’s or a similar revision would be preferred for clarity.Regarding concern from HW, we understand the proposal to indicate availability on the per-cell IAB-DU resource to the child node, since explicit IA from either serving cell would be for the purpose of designating IAB-DU resource availability. The proposal does not address coordinating resource allocation between parent links. |
| **Intel** | Support the proposal. With Ericsson’s concern, we suggest to add a comma as below.* **explicitly indicated (via DCI 2\_5) or implicitly determined as available, with respect to all serving cells**
 |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Support |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | There is a little confusing to say ‘’multiple IAB MT serving cells’ corresponding ‘ the same IAB-DU cell(s)’, what this ‘corresponding’ means? TDM required for a [MT CC, DU cell] pair?And we prefer to update the proposal based on Ericssion’s version.**For an IAB-MT with multiple serving cells (including the case with two parent nodes) ~~corresponding to the same IAB-DU cell(s)~~, a per-cell IAB-DU resource is considered as available if, with respect to all serving cells, the resource is either explicitly indicated or implicitly determined as available.** |
| **vivo** | **We agree the proposal in principle. However, we are focusing on DC scenario, not CA. In the agreement, it is preferred only to mention DC scenario. We propose the following wording based on Ericsson’s change.****If IAB-MT serving cells for two parent nodes corresponds to the same IAB-DU cell, a per-cell IAB-DU resource is considered as available if, with respect to both parent nodes, the resource is either explicitly indicated or implicitly determined as available.** |

**ISSUE 3.3: RESOURCE COORDINATION**

**Proposal 3.3.1: Per-backhaul link (e.g. per child IAB-MT link) resource configurations are supported in addition to per-DU resource configurations**

**Discussion: Views on proposal 3.3.1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **ETRI** | **Re the “e.g.”, we think it should be “i.e.”. (Or do we have another example for this?)****We think the intention of this proposal is to define multiple frequency domain resource configurations per a given DU cell. If this is the correct understanding, we prefer to capture it directly.****Regarding the exact meaning of “per-backhaul link (i.e. per child IAB-MT link)”, does it mean “per child IAB-MT CC” or “per a set of child IAB-MT CCs (i.e. per CG of child IAB-MT)”?** |
| **CEWiT** | **Support the proposal** |
| **Ericsson** | **We likely support this proposal however, some clarification may be needed like what configurations are considered. H/S/NA?** |
| **Intel** | **We support the proposal.** |
| **Nokia** | **Support the proposal.** |
| **Qualcomm** | **We support the proposal.** |
| **Samsung** | **OK with the FL proposal.** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | **The following should be clarified for the proposal:*** **The targeted scenarios/motivation for this proposal, why it is only DC related?**
* **The contents for such configuration, only HSNA configuration, or both for HSNA and DFU configurations?**
* **The relationship with Rel-16 DU configuration and Rel-17 frequency domain HSNA configuration?**
 |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | Agree with comment from ZTE. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **We would like to have some clarifications regarding the proposal similar to ZTE.****In addition, our views is that in case this per link resource configuration is introduced, both the parent nodes and child IAB node should be aware of the information with respective to the per-backhaul link resource configurations. The reason is that both nodes would need such information to avoid scheduling collisions. In that case, the IAB node can determine the serving CG(s) in each resources, which is essential for reception.**  |

**Proposal 3.3.1’: Per-backhaul link (e.g. per child IAB-MT link) H/S/NA resource configurations are optionally supported in addition to per-DU cell resource configurations for both the time domain and frequency domain**

* **FFS: whether the per-backhaul link configuration is additionally provided to the child node**

**Discussion: Can Proposal 3.3.1’ be agreed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments**  |
| **Moderator (AT&T)** | **To clarify, this proposal is not restricted to NR-DC, it is in the section because one key use case was for multi-parent operation – however that is not the only use case. Also, it is clarified that the per-backhaul configuration is in addition to the existing per-cell time/frequency configurations, and do not need to be provided for every link.** |
| **Ericsson** | **We support the proposal.** However, this is a very general formulation and we foresee that different companies will have a different understanding of what this agreement really means. |
| **Nokia** | Support the proposal.  FFS should note and try to align with similar proposal (2.3) on interference mitigation in 8.10.2  |
| **Intel** | We support the proposal. We further agree on the moderator’s comments that this is not restricted to DC. In our proposal R1-2104924, we list three scenarios that per child IAB-MT link configuration can be beneficial: 1. One child-MT with DC
2. One child-MT with interference from adjacent link
3. One child-MT has different child-DU resource configuration
 |
| **Samsung** | Support the proposal. |
| **Qualcomm** | We support this proposal. |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Thanks the clarification on the scenarios, but it is still unclear to us which configuration(s) is applied when the Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration, frequency domain configuration and per-link configuration are all configured for a resources. And since it is an optional optimization, we prefer to discuss this after the per-DU cell resource configuration is stable. |
| **Lenovo, Motorola Mobility** | We **do not support this proposal** as benefits of H/S/NA configurations on a per-link basis are not clear. For example, it is not clear how per-link configurations may help with interference management and why other techniques based on proper configurations, enhancements being discussed in 8.10.2, etc. do not address the issue.Overall, this would be a major agreement with significant specification impact and added complexity, potentially impacting signaling and behavior related to resource management in Rel-16 as well as Rel-17 enhancements. We request that supporting companies please provide solid examples of how per-link H/S/NA provides benefits that cannot be achieved with proper per-DU configurations. A discussion on the spec impact and modifications (at least to the existing signaling and IAB node behavior) will also be helpful. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We don’t support the proposal at least in the current form.We would like to understand a bit more on the reasoning behind of this proposal, e.g. why a per IAB-MT link IAB-DU resource configuration is necessary for the use cases mentioned by the FL and also other companies. Note that in Rel-16 the H/S/NA resource configurations are defined from IAB-DU point of view and the main motivation is to enable resource multiplexing between the MT and DU. For case 2 mentioned intel, we think essentially the restrictions will be applied for the IAB-MT instead of IAB-DU. Essentially, the interference avoidance/mitigation scheme will result in a scheduler decision at the DU where it is not clear why per child-link DU resource configuration is really needed. For case 3, is the resource availability of a certain IAB-MT is different, the CU can be configure different IAB-DU H/S/NA resource configurations instead of configuring a per IAB-MT child link H/S/NA for the parent DU.For DC case, we think it may be beneficial to provide two DU configurations to the child node. Basically, each of the configuration is associated to one parent node. In this case, both the parent nodes and child node can be aware of the per-backhaul link configuration. Therefore, instead of introducing a per child-MT DU resource configuration, we think per-parent backhaul link H/S/NA resource configurations can be considered. |

# Summary

**Agreement**

For frequency domain multiplexing, H/S/NA configurations for an IAB-node are provided separately in addition to the Rel-16 H/S/NA

**Agreement**

DCI Format 2\_5 is reused to support soft resource availability indications for frequency-domain resources

* FFS: If additional enhancements are necessary

**Agreement**

**The parent IAB-node is dynamically provided with conditions/parameters to facilitate adaptation between multiplexing operation modes:**

* **FFS: Required number of guard symbols for switching of multiplexing mode (FFS: per timing mode or per multiplexing mode) for IAB-DU**
* **FFS: Signalling procedure**
* **FFS: Required guard band for FDM**
* **FFS: other conditions, e.g. required timing mode, required power control parameters, and preferred TCI.**

**Agreement**

If an IAB node is configured with a frequency-domain H/S/NA configuration down select between the following options:

* Alt. 1 Either the Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration or frequency domain configuration is applied for a given resource
	+ FFS: Whether configurations are switched with per-slot, per-resource type within a slot, or per-symbol granularity
* Alt. 2 The Rel-16 H/S/NA configuration and frequency domain configuration are jointly applied

**Agreement**

The minimum resource size for configuring the frequency domain granularity is a set of N RBs:

* Candidate values for N: {4, 8, 16, other values TBD}
* N is at least the # PRBs that are corresponding to the MT’s # PRBs of an RBG).
* FFS: Scaling or configuration of N based on system BW or size of IAB-MT BWP

**Agreement**

In case of intra-band inter-carrier dual connectivity for both inter-donor and intra-donor scenarios the following are supported:

* Reusing the Rel-16 CA TDD prioritization rules in case of UL/DL conflict when applicable
	+ FFS: Whether all prioritization rules apply in case of NR-DC
	+ FFS: Need of new prioritization rules in case of NR-DC
* Coordinating the IAB-MT’s TDD configurations to avoid conflicts from different parent nodes in case the child IAB-MT does not support simultaneous TX and RX on different carries
	+ FFS: Coordination for scheduling conflicts involving at least DCI Format 2\_0 usage (e.g. usage of flexible symbols)
* Exchanging H/S/NA configurations between parent nodes/donors