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# Introduction

This paper summarizes the channel access related proposals submitted to agenda item 8.2.6 in RAN1-105e.

# Summary of contributions

The section summarises key proposals and observations from submitted contributions. Discussion points arising from each group of topics are captured separately in subsections.

## ED Threshold computation FFS Items

Agreement:

The baseline ED threshold can be computed as

Where Pout is RF output power (EIRP) and Pmax is the RF output power limit, Pout≤Pmax.

* FFS: Further adjustment on ED threshold based on the sensing beam and the transmission beam (further adjustment should not violate EDT requirements as per regulations)
* FFS: If Pout is max output EIRP of the device or instantaneous output EIRP
* FFS definition of Operating Channel BW
* FFS: Whether ED threshold for NR-U and NR-U coexistence scenarios (eg, at regulation level) can be appropriately relaxed compared with the threshold of coexistence between NR-U and Wi-Fi.
* FFS: EDT when the COT has time varying transmission beams and varying EIRP

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| AT&T | Proposal 2:  • The ED threshold can be adjusted based on the sensing beam and the transmission beam within any requirements per regulations o FFS: ED threshold when the COT has time varying transmission beams and varying EIRP |
| CATT | Proposal 9: Adjustment value should be considered for the baseline ED threshold.  Proposal 10: For adjustment value on baseline EDT, at least beamforming gain difference between the transmission beam and sensing beam should be considered. |
| Ericsson | Observation 1 ED threshold defined in EN 302 567 v2.2.0 is a function of the transmission’s EIRP Pout, which includes the transmission beamforming gain. It does not include the sensing beamforming gain.  Proposal 2 Further adjustment on ED threshold based on the transmission and sensing beamforming gains could be up to implementation while not violating EDT requirements as per regulations. |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 4: Consider the use of composite transmit angular power profile (APP) of an intended set of transmit beams to design sensing beam that “covers” that intended set. • Prominent directions of intended transmission, i.e., those for which composite transmit APP is with a fraction of the peak APP, should have relatively large sensing gain.  **• For EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum EIRP over that intended set of transmit beams. • Appropriate EDT incorporates shortfall (if any) in the sensing gain over prominent directions.**  • Enable augmented sensing to avoid blind spots without excessive exposed nodes. |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Proposal 3: For operation in NR-U-60, the agreed baseline EDT formula should be adjusted such that, for a given RF output power (EIRP), the EDT proportionally increases with the effective beamforming gain of the potential following transmission(s) by the device.  Proposal 4: For operation in NR-U-60, when LBT is used, adopt the following formula to capture the potential adjustment to the baseline EDT formula based on the transmit beamforming gain: EDT=-80 dBm+10\*〖log〗\_10⁡(Pmax/Pout)+10\*〖log〗\_10⁡(BW [MHz])+(1-a)(G\_TX -G\_(TX,max)) GTX is the effective transmit antenna gain at the potential transmitter [dBi] GTX,max is the maximum effective transmit antenna gain considered for the deployment [dBi] a is a scaling factor such that 0≤ a≤ 1  Proposal 5: For operation in NR-U-60, when LBT is used, the sensing beamforming gain of the LBT beam is deducted from the detected energy level before comparing it to the EDT. |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 4: When operating in unlicensed 60 GHz band, the ED threshold calculation shall account for the sensing beam used to perform the LBT procedure.  Proposal 5: In case the network is able to assess the absence of any other incumbent technology, the ED threshold value that a device may use during the LBT procedure is up to the gNB and may be configured via higher layer signaling. |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 11: Adapt EDT to account for beamforming gain of the sensing beam. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #14: The ED threshold provided by the ETSI 302 567 can be enhanced considering the following points: l The size of LBT bandwidth l Transmit power of beam(s) in the COT l The beam correspondence capability/requirement of UE. |
| NEC | Proposal 1: The energy detection threshold adaptation for beam based channel access procedure should take into account the antenna gain and mapping between transmission beam(s) and sensing beam(s). |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 8: Further adjustment of EDT based on the sensing and transmission beams is not specified. |
| OPPO | Proposal 6: the EDT value should be adjusted: smaller value is applied when sensing beam is narrower. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 2: The ED based comparison rule for medium busy should reflect the directionality of sensing beam and transmission beam. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 5: The formula of ED threshold should consider the LBT bandwidth and beamforming gain. |
| vivo | Proposal 8: The ED threshold for CCA check should take into account the impact of beamforming gain of the directional sensing beams. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Proposal 18: Considering mismatch between LBT sensing beam and transmission beam, the ED threshold provided by the ETSI BRAN 302 567 can be modified to consider mismatching between LBT sensing beam and transmission beam.  Proposal 19: For NR-U and NR-U coexistence scenarios, its ED threshold can be considered to be appropriately relaxed compared with the threshold of coexistence between NR-U and Wi-Fi. |

Working assumption:

* For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum EIRP of the node determining EDT during a COT.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Charter Communications | Proposal 1: Confirm the working assumption for the EDT definition: Pout is defined as the maximum EIRP of the node determining EDT during a COT. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1 Confirm the working assumption that Pout corresponds to the maximum of the mean output power EIRPs of the transmissions or transmission bursts in a COT that may contain varying transmission beams and EIRPs. |
| FUTUREWEI | Observation 1. The working assumption is only well justified when a single LBT sensing is carried out by a node using one sensing beam for all transmit beams intended to be used in the COT.  For EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum EIRP over that intended set of transmit beams. |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Proposal 1: For operation in NR-U-60, confirm the working assumptions on the definition of Pout in the previously agreed baseline EDT formula. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 7: For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as at least the maximum of beam-specific mean EIRPs of the node determining EDT during a COT.  Proposal 10: CG PUSCH configuration and operation is investigated in light of EDT dependency on Pout. |
|  |  |
| vivo | Proposal 6: The maximum output EIRP of the beams or transmission bursts within a COT is used to calculate the EDT. |

### First Round Discussion

13 Companies (AT&T, CATT, Huawei, Intel, Interdigital, LG, NEC, Qualcomm, OPPO, Spreadtrum, Vivo, ZTE, Futurewei) are proposing to modify Energy Detection based computation to include transmit beamforming and sensing beam. 2 companies (Nokia and Ericsson) are against this.

Discussion 2.1.1-1 (closed)

On further adjustment on ED threshold based on the sensing beam and the transmission beam (further adjustment should not violate EDT requirements as per regulations), please provide your view for the following

* Alt A: Support additional adjustment to Energy Detection computation/threshold to include transmit beamforming and/or sensing beam ~~relationship~~
  + FFS how to adjust
  + Support: ZTE, Intel, vivo, Apple, Futurewei, NEC, InterDigital, Huawei, Samsung, AT&T, Oppo, Spreadtrum, CATT, LG
* Alt B: No additional adjustment to Energy Detection computation introduced (Energy measurement directly compared with baseline EDT agreed no matter which transmit beamform(s) and sensing beam(s) are used
  + Support: Nokia, Charter, Ericsson,

Moderator conclusion: There is majority support for Alt A, but not likely we can converge.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt B. We do not see a benefit is defining more strict EDT definitions than what the ETSI harmonized standard requires.  Directivity of transmissions is considered in ETSI EN 303 722, and the new work item EN 303 753. In these cases, LBT is not required at all, provided that certain conditions for e.g. antenna gain are fulfilled.  On the contrary ETSI EN 302 567 does not acknowledge any relationship between the beamwidth and the EDT. Since EDT cannot be increased above the value given by the formula 4.2.5.3 in 302567, consideration of the beamwidth in EDT calculation could only result in reduced EDT for wider beams. Therefore, for a device operation according to EN 302 567, EDT should not be impacted by antenna gain. |
| Charter Communications | Alt B. We do not see a need to penalize device EDT settings based on antenna array capabilities. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We suggest postponing this discussion until we make some progress on defining relationship between sensing and transmission beams (section 2.9) |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Alt A, especially for the case that the sensing beam is inconsistent with the transmission beam. In order to accurately evaluate the actual interference in the transmission beam, it is recommended to consider introduction an additional factor in current ED threshold formula to reflect the difference of transmission beam and reception beam. |
| Intel | We support Alt. A. As it has been highlighted during the SI, when a low ED threshold is used, LBT performed with more directional beams may overperform LBT performed using a wider beam given that the level of protection offered by the later gets increased, which may help sufficiently mitigate the hidden node issue bringing this in par with that of LBT performed with more directional beams while still offering better spatial reuse than that. In this matter, it may be beneficial within the ED threshold calculation to also account more specifically for the measurement beam used so that to exploit the advantage described above. |
| vivo | Support Alt A with the following wording update as below.  Alt A: Support additional adjustment to Energy Detection computation to include transmit beamforming and sensing beam ~~relationship~~  Since Pout is RF output power (EIRP), the beamforming gain of the transmission beam has already been included in the EDT equation. For additional adjustment, only the impact of the beamforming gain of the directional sensing beams should be considered. |
| Apple | Support Alt A. Transmission beamforming gain is already included in the EDT calculation. Sensing beamforming gain and transmission beamforming gain should be compensated based on regulation requirement. |
| Futurewei | We support Alt-A. Gain of the sensing beam (based on its relation with respect to transmit beams) should be accounted for in the EDT computation. |
| NEC | We support Alt A. The difference between sensing beam(s) and transmission beam should be considered in EDT calculation when directional LBT is performed. |
| Ericsson | Alt B is preferred.  Transmission beam’s beamforming gain is already included in the Output power EIRP Pout for the EDT calculation. We are not against modifying the ED threshold based on sensing beam, however, it should not violate the EDT value. Specifically, it should not increase the EDT value above the value estimated according to the regulations. A device doing that will be in violation of the ETSI regulations. On that regard, we do not see any benefit in defining anything more than the ETSI BRAN regulations, as they allow reducing EDT value anyway. |
| InterDigital | We support Alt. A. This is especially required for cases when a single sensing beam is used to initiate a COT for multiple transmission beams. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Alt A with a slight modification on what is proposed by vivo  Alt A: Support additional adjustment to Energy Detection computation/threshold to include transmit beamforming and sensing beam ~~relationship~~  This is due to the fact that the current EDT only reflects the impact from RF output power (EIRP) which cannot differentiate devices with different antenna gains (and thus different interference footprints) but the same EIRP.  We therefore propose that the agreed baseline EDT formula is further adjusted by a term that is proportional to the effective beamforming gain of the subsequent transmission(s) such that if two antenna arrays have the same RF output power (EIRP), the antenna array with the higher beamforming gain also has a higher EDT). To ensure that the further adjusted EDT does not exceed the regulatory level, an offset value can be introduced, e.g., the maximum effective transmit antenna gain considered for the deployment as in the following proposed formula  In addition, changing the beamforming gain of the sensing antenna pattern could dramatically change the detected energy level and thus the LBT result for the same interference instance. Knowing that the received power is typically measured at the interface between the equipment and the antenna assembly, we propose that the sensing beamforming gain of the LBT beam is simply deducted from the detected energy level before comparing it to the EDT. |
| Samsung | Alt A. Better to list the details of Alt A for better understanding. |
| AT&T | We support Alt. A |
| OPPO | Support Alt A with the following modifications.   * Alt A: Support additional adjustment to Energy Detection computation to include transmit beamforming and/or sensing beam ~~relationship~~   In our view, the sensing beam may be wider or narrower depending on the implementation, and the sensed energy may be lower or higher correspondingly. Using a fixed EDT value for these different cases is unfair for co-existence. So the EDT value should be adjusted at least according to the sensing beam. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Alt. A  Given that it can have different transmission power for different RATs operating on the 60GHz unlicensed band, in order to guarantee fairly coexistence among these RATs, the formula of ED threshold should consider beamforming gain. |
| CATT | Alt A is preferred.  Because the energy detection of sensing beams with different beamforming gain is different for the same interference, the LBT result of transmission beam with different sensing beams is unpredictable. Therefore, the additional adjustment to EDT computation should be specified to reasonably compensate beamforming gain difference between transmission beam and sensing beam. |
| LG | We support Alt A.  The ED threshold can be further adjusted by reflecting the relationship between the sensing beam and transmission beam and it may be closely related to the beam correspondence between Tx/Rx beams. The relationship can be determined based on the beam correspondence capability/requirement of UE. For example, the lower (i.e., more sensitive) ED threshold can be applied to the UE satisfying the relaxed requirement for the beam correspondence capability/requirement. |

Multiple companies have proposed to clarify the working assumption of Pout as the maximum EIRP of the node determining EDT during a COT.

Proposal 2.1.1-2 (closed)

Confirm the working assumption

* Original version: For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum EIRP of the node determining EDT during a COT.
  + FFS: For COT sharing case, if the maximum EIRP of the responding device needs to be considered for EDT determination
  + Support: Lenovo, Intel (no need for FFS), vivo (no need for FFS), Apple, NEC, Ericsson, Convida, Huawei (no need for FFS), Samsung, Oppo, WILUS, Spreadtrum, LG
* Nokia version: For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as at least the maximum of beam-specific mean EIRPs of the node determining EDT during a COT.
  + Support: Nokia, Charter, ZTE
* ZTE version: For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum of mean EIRP of transmission bursts for the node determining EDT during a COT.
  + Support: ZTE
* Futurewei version: For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum EIRP among intended set of transmit beams of the node determining EDT during a COT.
  + Support: Futurewei
* CATT version: For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum of mean EIRPs of the node determining EDT during the transmission bursts in a COT.
  + Support: CATT

Moderator comment: Continue discussion in the 2nd round.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | While we acknowledge that calculation the mean EIRP may be more complex than max EIRP, we want to stress that EN 302 567 allows for use of mean EIRP. We do not see a need to define more stringent EDT definition than what ETSI allows for, and therefor propose the following modification.   * For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as at least the maximum of beam-specific mean EIRPs of the node determining EDT during a COT.   Note that this definition still allows a device to calculate the Pout according to max EIPR as in the working assumption (i.e. more conservatively), but does not unnecessarily penalize other devices that can calculate the mean EIRP as well. |
| Charter Communications | Open to Nokia’s definition |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support to confirm the working assumption |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The definition of Pout in EN 302 567 is the mean Equivalent Isotropically Radiated Power(EIRP) for the equipment during a transmission burst. While we reached WA that “For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum EIRP of the node determining EDT during a COT”. In order to better match the definition of Pout in EN 302 567 and WA as reached in 3GPP, we think WA should be modified as below:  For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum of mean EIRP of transmission bursts for the node determining EDT during a COT.  Further, considered beam feature, we also agree the modification from Nokia.  However, for the responding device, the same rule should be also applied. |
| Intel | We are OK with the proposal and to confirm the previous working assumption. As for the FFS, we do not see the technical reason to include the EIRP of the responding device within the calculation. |
| vivo | We support to confirm the WA. For COT sharing case, it is not necessary to take into account the maximum EIRP of the responding device. |
| Apple | Support to confirm the WA. |
| Futurewei | We believe the proposal is well justified only when a single LBT sensing is performed to acquire COT. To accommodate multiple sensing (each for different intended beam(s)) prior to acquiring the channel, the working assumption needs to be clarified as:  • For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum EIRP among intended set of transmit beams of the node determining EDT during a COT.  Here the intended set of beams can vary with the LBT sensing (for instance when per-beam LBT sensing is considered the intended set would be the transmit beam under consideration). |
| NEC | We support to confirm the working assupmtion. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal to confirm the working assumption that Pout corresponds to the maximum of the mean output power EIRPs of the transmissions or transmission bursts in a COT that may contain varying transmission beams and EIRPs. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok to confirm the working assumption. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the main point of the proposal. However, we do not think the FFS point is necessary. This is because the LBT sensing performed by the initiating device is not intended to sense in the opposite link/beam direction(s) from the responding device(s) sharing the COT.  Moreover, subclause 4.2.2.1 of the HS EN 302 567 only considers the EIRP of the equipment during a transmission burst before which the equipment is required to perform the CCA check according to subclause 4.2.5.3. It is noted though that transmissions from a responding equipment within the initiated COT are allowed by the same subclause yet without any impact on the determination of the Pout EIRP used in the calculation of the EDT.  Regarding Nokia’s proposed modification, we think that some clarification is needed. Is the intention that the initiating device predicts/calculates multiple mean EIRP values each corresponding to a beam then finds the maximum of these mean EIRPs rather than a single mean EIRP value over the transmission burst as required in HS EN 302 567? If so, we think it contradicts the motivation that lead to the WA which is simple/practical Pout calculation though more conservative. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Support to confirm the WA. |
| WILUS | We support the proposal to confirm the working assumption. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | According to the definition of Pout in EN 302.567, the Pout is the mean equivalent isotropically radiated power (EIRP) for the equipment during a transmission burst. Given that a COT may include multiple transmission bursts, the Pout in EDT determination for a COT can be defined as the maximum EIRP of mean EIRPs of the node determining EDT during a transmission burst within a COT. We propose the following:   * *For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum of mean EIRPs of the node determining EDT during the transmission bursts in a COT.*   For the COT sharing case, the maximum EIRP of the responding device should be limited to no more than the maximum EIRP of the node determining EDT |
| LG | We are generally fine with the proposal but additional FFS points may be required for the following situations: If multiple UL transmissions are scheduled within a COT, the transmissions with an EIRP larger than the max EIRP used for the initial EDT calculation may be suddenly scheduled in the middle of the COT. Therefore, it is necessary to take this into account when calculating the EDT based on max EIRP. |

### Second Round Discussion

Proposal 2.1.2-1

Confirm the working assumption on Pout definition in RAN1 #104bis-e with the following updates:

* For Pout in EDT determination ~~at the node initiating the COT~~, define Pout to be at least the maximum of mean EIRP of each transmission burst during the COT at the node initiating the COT.

Moderator comments:

* There is no consensus to add the FFS in proposal 2.1.1-1 but there are companies prefer to keep the COT sharing case Pout discussion open. So I added “at least” above to capture
  + The node can always pick a larger Pout to be conservative as implementation
  + Keep the discussion open if larger Pout can be considered for the COT sharing case if COT sharing node is using a larger EIRP than the COT initiating node
* Do we allow overlapping COT will be a separate discussion in the next proposal

Support: Apple, Lenovo, vivo, CATT, ZTE , Spreadtrum, Samsung, Intel, Ericsson, MTK, Nokia

Not support: HW

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Apple | Support the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree to keep open on the case that if larger Pout can be considered for the COT sharing case if COT sharing node is using a larger EIRP than the COT initiating node. But in our understanding, regardless of the initiating node or the responding node, the same definition of Pout should be at least applied. So we tend to modify the above updated WA are as follows:   * For Pout in EDT determination ~~at the node initiating the COT~~, define Pout to be at least the maximum of mean EIRP of each transmission burst during the COT.   Based on the above modification, “at least” to be add in WA can reflect the meaning that larger Pout can be considered for the COT sharing case. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are ok with Proposal 2.1.2-1 |
| Intel | We are generally OK with the proposal, and to calculate Pout as at least the maximum of mean EIRP of each transmission burst, if the bursts are those of the initiating device. As the proposal reads it seems that the within the Pout both initiating and responding EIRP are considered. Therefore, we would suggest to modify the proposal as follows:  For Pout in EDT determination ~~at the node initiating the COT~~, define Pout to be at least the maximum of mean EIRP of each transmission burst during the COT at the node initiating the COT. |
| Ericsson | We support this proposal to make progress, but we do not see any issue with the original proposal.  The comments raised in the call are not problematic in our opinion. In 5 GHz case, the Max Tx power of the initiating device is used to determine the EDT. Even in 5/6 GHz, the responding device can be a gNB and transmit at a higher power than the UE. Consequently, there is a MCOT limitation in addition to the maximum EIRP limitation. Considering the directional nature of transmissions and the low interference in these bands, we do not see any issues. In the 60 GHz case, depending on the initiating device’s EIRP, the baseline EDT is set. If the responding device tries to transmit with higher power for long, there is an MCOT limitation to curb such abuse. Also, dependent on the EDT used (higher or lower), the range of sensing is affected too. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support Proposal 2.1.2-1.  We support the WA in its original form in RAN1 104bis-e:  Working assumption:  For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum EIRP of the node determining EDT during a COT.  As discussed in GTW meeting last week, we don’t think that gNB can actually know the mean EIRP of each of its transmission bursts during COT when performing eCCA prior to COT. So, how gNB can calculate “the maximum of mean EIRP of each transmission burst” to use it in EDT formula? COT can be up to 5 ms which is 320 slots in 960 kHz. For gNB to know the “mean EIRP of each transmission burst” during COT requires gNB to know all its scheduling decisions for up to 320 slots before passing eCCA and acquiring COT. We do not think that gNB would have such a knowledge in any practical scenario. |
| Futurewei | We believe “at-least” allows provisioning for a larger value to accommodate the scenario in which the responding device has a larger EIRP. We are OK with this proposal for the case when a single sensing is used at the initiating node to acquire the COT. To clarify, we suggest:  “For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout to be at least the maximum among mean EIRPs of all transmission bursts that are transmitted by the initiating node during the COT”. |
| LG | We do not support the current updated proposal but support the working assumption as is in previous meeting. It seems that the definition of transmission burst should be clarified first. In my understanding, the transmission power for a burst is not varied during the transmission in LAA and NR-U. If it is correct understanding and aligning with the working assumption in the previous meeting, the proposal should be modified as follow:   * For Pout in EDT determination at the node initiating the COT, define Pout to be at least one of the maximum of mean EIRP of each transmission burst among the transmission burst(s) transmitted during the COT.   Moreover, we think that an additional FFS point should be captured for handling the following case: If the multiple UL transmissions are scheduled in a COT acquired by a UE and a new transmission with an EIRP larger than the max EIRP used for the initial EDT calculation may be suddenly scheduled in the middle of the COT to the UE. Further discussion is necessary to address this case and need to define the UE behavior. For example, the UE may perform the LBT using the EDT based on the EIRP of the new transmission to acquire a new COT for that transmission. Therefore, the following FFS points can be added to a third sub-bullet:  Keep the discussion open if the transmission with a larger Pout than the original Pout can be scheduled in the middle of the COT |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | We have one question on the updated WA: does the current description of WA consider a case that COT sharing node (the responding node ) can use a larger EIRP than the COT initiating node?  If yes, it means Pout used in EDT determination should be defined as “ **the maximum of mean EIRP of all transmission bursts during the COT at the node initiating the COT.**” that include transmission burst of initiating node and responding node, while not “ the maximum of mean EIRP of each transmission burst during the COT at the node initiating the COT.”. if this understanding is right, updated WA should be modified to make the meaning more clear, as below:   * For Pout in EDT determination ~~at the node initiating the COT~~, define Pout to be at least the maximum of mean EIRP of ~~each~~ all transmission bursts during the COT at the node initiating the COT.   For this, we have a further issue that we are not sure whether the node initiating COT can know the mean EIRP of each transmission burst for the responding node.  If No, we think it is more appropriate to remove “at least” from the updated WA to clarify current wording just applied for the initiating node and open to the responding node.  Proposed modification are as below:   * For Pout in EDT determination ~~at the node initiating the COT~~, define Pout to be ~~at least~~ the maximum of mean EIRP of each transmission burst of the node initiating the COT during the COT ~~at the node initiating the COT~~. |
| Moderator | Comparing the current proposal and the original WA from 104bis-e, if for each transmission burst, the EIRP is maintained to be the same, then there is no difference between “maximum EIRP” and “maximum of mean EIRP”. Only when there is EIRP variation within a transmission burst, the “maximum EIRP” is potentially higher than “maximum of mean EIPR”. I see the new proposal as a relaxation to the 104bis-e version. However, in most cases, there is no difference. If we cannot agree on the relaxation, we should respect the WA before.  For the COT sharing case, I see conflicting views, and I remember there is objection to add FFS during the online session. That is why I added “at least” to keep the discussion open. I believe the companies with concerns on COT sharing are considering a case that the COT sharing node (say a gNB when shared a UE COT) is always using higher EIRP for transmission. In this case, I do agree that COT sharing with lower Pout is problematic.  To ZTE2. The intention is to leave it open how to capture the COT sharing node higher EIRP. Thus the “at least”. |
| Mediatek | We question the utility of adding additional transmission beams mid-COT as this will undoubtedly backoff the power of the ongoing beam so as not to violate the EIRP. It is further unclear how a device wanting to start a new transmission beam will pass LBT when its own ongoing transmissions will be contributing to the energy it will see. But nonetheless agree with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips3 | Thanks Moderator for the clarification further and response.  We support the current updated WA. |
| Futurewei | We thank the moderator for this clarification. Our original understanding was that the EIRP variation within a burst would be ensured to be small (we interpreted a burst as a near-contiguous set of transmissions using common transmit power and transmit beamforming etc.).  As we now understand the definition of burst is quite fluid and does not prevent arbitrary variation of EIRP within a burst. In this case an initiator can always interpret the entire COT as comprising of one burst and then use the mean value. This would always give it an advantage (in terms of acquiring channel due to lower Pout) but we believe this is a situation that was sought to be prevented (example in Fig.1 of Ericsson R1-2104463).  The original WA prevents the above situation. We are open to the modification if the concern we raised is addressed. |

Proposal 2.1.2-2

Please provide your view if a node can initiate two (or more) (partially) overlapping COT in two different beams

* Support: Lenovo, vivo, CATT, ZTE, Spreadtrum, Samsung, Intel, Futurewei, MTK
* Not support: Apple, Ericsson, Huawei, Nokia, NSB

Moderator: This effectively is a question if the COT is defined per initiating node, or per initiating node per beam.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Apple | Not support. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| vivo | support |
| CATT | Support |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Samsung | We support a node can initiate two (or more) (partially) overlapping COT in two different beams. |
| Intel | Support, if overlapping is intended as a device is able to initiate two independent COTs over two different beams, which may occur in time over an overlapping period |
| Ericsson | We do not support this proposal. There is no motivation to complicate the specifications. Also, this would violate the regulations. Regulations only allow a single COT of 5 ms for a single initiating device that may grant this transmission opportunity to multiple responding devices. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support  We are not sure about the necessity and use case of such proposal. We have already had a lot of discussions about COT with TDM and SDM beams during the last few meetings and made some progress for those cases. Why supporting “two (or more) (partially) overlapping COT in two different beams” is required, while essentially a single COT supporting SDM and TDM beams can have the same functionality? |
| Futurewei | As we understand as per FL’s classification a single COT can be acquired via using multiple sensing beams prior to acquisition, but then all the sensed energies must be compared with thresholds computed using the same Pout.  We believe this proposal allows for using beam specific Pout. Without this proposal there can be inconsistency if we jointly view proposal 2.1.1-1 (adjusting EDT based on sensing beam and transmit beam) and proposals in Section 2.7 on Multi-beam COT pertaining to when Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT.  We support this proposal. There are of course restrictions that will need to be considered: such as the total time span of overlapping COTs should also respect maximum duration limits. |
| LG | We think that the overlapping COT should be further clarified. If it means that the COT acquired by performing LBT using the adjacent two different beams, it should be supported for MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission. It is related to Alt B (The per-beam LBT for different beams is performed simultaneously in parallel, assuming the node has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams) in Section 2.7 Multi-Beam COT. |
| Mediatek | Support, provided these beams are aimed at two different devices, but unclear if this violates occupancy times which are defined per device, not per beam. |
| Nokia, NSB | No Support. It is not clear what benefits this approach would ring, if any. At the same time, it seems to be not in line with the regulation, and also results in added overhead and complexity. |

## LBT Bandwidth FFS Items

Agreement:

For LBT for single carrier transmission, consider the following alternatives

* Alt SC.1. gNB/UE performs LBT over the channel bandwidth (or BWP bandwidth)
* Alt SC.2. gNB/UE performs LBT over the transmission bandwidth (from the lowest RB to the highest RB used for the transmission)
* Alt SC.3. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth

For LBT for multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA, consider the following alternatives

* Alt CA.1. gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each channel bandwidth separately
* Alt CA.2. gNB/UE performs single LBT over all CCs
* Alt CA.3. gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each CC over the transmission bandwidth (from the lowest RB in to the highest RB used for the transmission in the CC)
* Alt CA.4. gNB/UE performs LBT over the transmission bandwidth over all CCs (from the lowest RB in the lowest CC to the highest RB in the highest CC used for the transmission)
* Alt CA.5. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth in each CC

Note: supporting more than one alternative for at least multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA is not precluded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Apple | Proposal 1: LBT bandwidth is channel bandwidth for single carrier.  Proposal 2: For multi-carrier, gNB/UE perform multiple LBT, one for each channel bandwidth separately. |
| CAICT | Proposal 1: For LBT for single carrier transmission, Alt SC.1 should be supported.  Proposal 2: For LBT for multi-carrier transmission, Alt CA.1 and Alt CA.2 should be supported. |
| CATT | Proposal 8: For LBT bandwidth, Alt SC.1 and Alt CA.1 should be supported. |
| Charter Communications | Proposal 2: For single-carrier LBT, support Alt SC.3 with a pre-defined unit of LBT bandwidth. FFS if the unit is dependent on SCS, for e.g., 100 MHz for 120 kHz and 400 MHz for 480/960 kHz.  Proposal 3: For multi-carrier LBT, support Alt CA.5. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth in each CC. |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 14: To down-select the options of LBT BW with single carrier and multi-carrier operation for supporting NR form 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, co-existence of single carrier and multi-carrier operation within a same channel BW should be studied. |
| Ericsson | Observation 2 In EN 302 567, the nominal channel bandwidth and at least one transmission mode with occupied channel BW 70% of NBW is defined for spurious out-of-band emissions and not for LBT purposes.  Observation 3 The relationship between the LBT bandwidth and the channel bandwidth is not specified in EN 302 567 for the sake of technology-neutrality and flexibility.  Observation 4 Operating channel BW defined in EN 302 567 is the LBT BW in RAN1 which is already defined in 37.213 as a “channel”  Observation 5 Alt SC3/CA5 poses an artificial restriction to insert guard bands at the end of the LBT units  Observation 6 For SC3, LBT failure for a node within a LBT unit is complex and not discussed.  Observation 7 Definitions in EN 302 567 and TS 37.213 at least covers Alt SC1.  Proposal 3 Support Alt SC1/Alt CA1 for LBT in single carrier and multi-carrier operation. Other options are not precluded by implementation.  Proposal 4 Support Alt1 in the agreement that allows only Type A multi-channel access from 37.213. |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 1: In LBT for single carrier transmission gNB/UE performs LBT over the channel bandwidth (or BWP bandwidth)  *Proposal 2: In LBT for multi carrier transmission gNB/UE support: • gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each channel bandwidth separately, • gNB/UE performs single LBT over all CCs.* |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Proposal 2: For operation in NR-U-60, the term ‘Operating Channel Bandwidth’ in the agreed baseline EDT formula is defined as the ‘LBT Bandwidth’ or the ‘bandwidth on which a channel access procedure is performed in shared spectrum’.  Proposal 9: For a single-carrier transmission in NR-U-60, support performing a single LBT over the channel/BWP bandwidth, i.e. Alt SC.1.  Proposal 10: For a multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA in NR-U-60, support both performing a single LBT over all CCs, and performing multiple LBTs, one for each channel bandwidth separately, i.e., Alt CA.2 and Alt CA.1, respectively. |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 6: In single carrier transmission, a gNB/UE performs LBT over the channel bandwidth.  Proposal 7: For carrier aggregation, a gNB/UE performs multiple LBTs and one over each channel bandwidth. |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 12: The Operating Channel BW used in the EDT formula is equivalent to the LBT BW.  Proposal 13: For single-carrier transmission, support Alt SC.3.  Proposal 14: For multi-carrier transmission, support Alt CA.5.  Proposal 15: Support a set of LBT BWs and LBT is performed in each CC on one or more adjacent LBT BWs that covers at least the transmission BW. |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | Proposal 1: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, for LBT based channel access mechanism, there is no need to specify the nominal bandwidth in 3GPP and it is up to devices’ implementation on how to meet the OCB requirements.  Proposal 2: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, for LBT based channel access mechanism: - For single carrier transmission defining a unit of LBT bandwidth where gNB/UE estric LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth - For multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA, support defining a unit of LBT bandwidth where gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth in each CC  - Defined LBT bandwidth value is fixed for both cases |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #3: Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 9: The operating channel bandwidth in EDT determination equals to the LBT bandwidth.  Proposal 11: All the LBT bandwidth options in the agreements from RAN1#104bis-e shall be supported without further down-selection for both single and multiple carrier transmission.  Proposal 12: How to perform LBT is left to implementation as long as the LBT bandwidth used covers the transmission bandwidth for NR-U on 60GHz band. |
| NTT DOCOMO INC. | Proposal 1: l For LBT for single carrier transmission and multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA, support either of the following: Ø Alt.A: Adopt Alt SC.1 (gNB/UE performs LBT over the channel bandwidth (or BWP bandwidth)) for single carrier transmission and Alt CA.1 (gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each channel bandwidth separately) for multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA Ø Alt.B: Adopt Alt SC.3 (Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth) for single carrier transmission and Alt CA.5 (Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth in each CC) for multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA ² Minimum CBW can be considered as the unit of LBT bandwidth |
| OPPO | Proposal 1: support both Alt SC.1 and Alt SC. 3.  Proposal 2: support both Alt CA.1 and Alt CA.5. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 8: Support enhanced RSSI reporting for Rx-Assistance, enhancements include at least L1-RSSI measurement, and AP-CSI based L1-RSSI reporting  Proposal 9: For single carrier LBT, support both Alt SC.1 and Alt SC.3 as implementation choices, as long as the aggregated LBT bandwidth covers the transmission bandwidth. FFS how to indicate the aggregated LBT bandwidth from the COT initiating node to the COT sharing node.  Proposal 10: For multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA, support Alt-CA.1, Alt-CA-2, and Alt CA.5 as implementation choices, as long as the aggregated LBT bandwidth covers the transmission bandwidth.  Proposal 11: Consider specifying the maximum number of LBT-Bandwidth units a UE can sense as a UE capability. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2: For LBT bandwidth, support Alt SC.1 + CA.1 + CA.2 as the first preference, and SC.3 + CA.5 as the second preference.  Proposal 6: ED threshold should depend on: • Whether other technology sharing the channel is absent or not on a long-term basis; • LBT bandwidth (which is operation channel bandwidth in regulation); • Beam parameters including beamforming gain and/or beam direction for transmission and/or receiving. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 1: Regarding LBT bandwidth, at least Alt SC.1 and Alt CA.1 should be supported. • For single carrier transmission, at least gNB/UE should perform LBT over the channel bandwidth (or BWP bandwidth) • For multi-carrier transmission, at least gNB/UE should perform multiple LBT, one for each channel bandwidth separately |
| vivo | Proposal 1: Both Alt SC.1 and Alt SC. 3 are supported for single carrier transmission, gNB performs multi-channel LBT in all the LBT units to be transmitted in, and the UE performs wideband LBT over the active BWP or over all the LBT units to be transmitted in.  Proposal 2: Both Alt CA.1 and Alt CA. 5 are supported for multi-carrier transmission, gNB performs multi-channel LBT in all the LBT units to be transmitted in, and the UE performs wideband LBT over the active BWP or over all the LBT units to be transmitted in in each carrier.  Proposal 7: The LBT bandwidth should be used as the operating channel bandwidth for EDT evaluation. |
| WILUS Inc. | Proposal 1: We support  o Alt SC.3 for LBT on single carrier transmission. o At least Alt CA.1 or Alt CA.5 for LBT on multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1: Support Alt SC.3 for LBT for single carrier transmission, and Alt CA.5 for multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Proposal 1: Support Alt SC.3 that “Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth” and Alt CA.5 that “Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth in each CC”, considering channel access probability and spectrum utilization and friendly and fair coexistence between the same systems or different systems.  Proposal 2: If Alt SC.3 and Alt CA.5 are supported, it is recommended that the unit of LBT bandwidth is defined as the minimum channel bandwidth.  Proposal 3: If Alt SC.3 and Alt CA.5 are supported, it is not necessary to separately define LBT bandwidth for single carrier and multi-carrier cases, just a LBT bandwidth unit needs to be defined.  Proposal 4: Considering Alt SC.1 and Alt CA.1 are the special cases of Alt SC.3 and CA.5 respectively, Alt SC.1 and Alt CA.1 can be also supported only if the channel bandwidth is configured as the minimum channel bandwidth that is regarded as the unit of LBT bandwidth.  Observation 1: It is worth emphasizing that the OCB should be satisfied for each transmitter such as gNB or UE.  Proposal 5: In order to avoid ambiguity about the understanding of nominal bandwidth and resolve the problem of unclear the conclusion for the OCB requirement, it is necessary to introduce a clear the definition of nominal bandwidth.  Proposal 6: The nominal bandwidth can be defined as follows: • Nominal bandwidths for the purpose of OCB requirements at the UE are the channel BWs for transmission supported by the UE from the set of channel BWs (carrier BWs) to be defined in 38.101. • Nominal bandwidths for the purpose of OCB requirements at the gNB are the channel BWs for transmission supported by the gNB from the set of channel BWs (carrier BWs) to be defined in 38.104. |

### First Round Discussion

For LBT for single carrier transmission, the following positions have been reached.

* Alt SC.1. gNB/UE performs LBT over the channel bandwidth (or BWP bandwidth)
  + Apple, CAICT, CATT, Ericsson, FUTUREWEI, Huawei, Intel, Nokia, DOCOMO, OPPO, Qualcomm, Samsung (1st Preference), Spreadtrum, vivo
* Alt SC.3. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth
  + Charter, InterDigital, Lenovo, LG, DOCOMO, OPPO, Qualcomm (unit sizes left to implementation), Samsung (2nd Preference), vivo, WILUS, Xiaomi, ZTE

For LBT for multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA, the following positions have been reached.

* Alt CA.1. gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each channel bandwidth separately
  + Apple, CAICT , CATT, Ericsson, FUTUREWEI, Huawei, Intel, OPPO, Samsung (1st Preference) , Spreadtrum, vivo, WILUS
* Alt CA.2. gNB/UE performs single LBT over all CCs
  + CAICT, FUTUREWEI, Huawei, Samsung (1st Preference)
* Alt CA.5. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth in each CC
  + Charter, InterDigital, Lenovo, DOCOMO, OPPO , Qualcomm (unit sizes left to implementation), Samsung (2nd Preference) , vivo, WILUS, Xiaomi, ZTE

Proposal 2.2.1-1 (closed)

For LBT for single carrier transmissions, support both Alt SC.1 and Alt SC.3, and leave the choice to gNB/UE implementation.

* FFS if and how gNB indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to UE
* FFS if and how UE indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to gNB

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We support at least Alt SC.1. Alt SC.3 is also ok in principle, but we would like to first see what options for LBT bandwidth are considered.  For the choice of LBT bandwidth, we are not yet sure if leaving the choice of the LBT BW for UE is a reasonable approach. As the baseline, the network should have means for controlling UE’s LBT BW. |
| Charter Communications | OK with the compromise proposal, but hesitant to leave the LBT bandwidth open to implementation. Also a question for Alt SC. 1, if there is interference that is non-contiguous in frequency domain, what is the chunk granularity that gNB/UE assumes is available for transmission? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Although we support Alt SC. 1 but are ok with proposal to support both. However, the choice should be only up to the network, and not UE |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Although we prefer to support Alt SC.3, but considering Alt SC.1 can be considered as a special case of Alt SC.3 only if the channel bandwidth is configured as the minimum channel bandwidth that is regarded as the unit of LBT bandwidth, we can also accept Alt SC.1. specifically, how to support one of these two methods for gNB/UE, we can discuss it further. |
| Intel | We are not OK to leave up to gNB/UE’s implementation to decide which definition of the LBT BW to use, and we would rather prefer to down-select one of the alternatives. While the group has introduced a factor within the ED threshold to account for the BW, the resulting values that could be calculated may differ based on the LBT BW definition that is used even when the channel/transmission BW may be the same. This would induce co-existence issues, that the group was trying to mitigate by introducing the dependency from the BW. Also, we do not see the need to introduce additional signalling and overhead to indicate the definition of the LBT BW used.  Among the two options, while both are technically valid, our preference is for Alt. SC.1, which is the simplest solution. As for Alt. SC.3, we lack to understand why we may need to overcomplicate the design, and what is the technical motivation to introduce a specific LBT BW unit. This was well motivated for sub-6 GHz band, since the ETSI BRAN imposes a 20 MHZ LBT BW, but for above 52.6 GHz no estriction are mandated. |
| Vivo | Support to have both Alt SC.1 and Alt SC.3.  For Alt SC.3, the LBT unit can be configured via RRC signalling. For UE, Alt SC.1 or wideband LBT over all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) should be applied since multi-channel LBT over multiple LBT units will not bring benefit. Ues are only allowed to transmit when all the LBT units are idle. For gNB, the LBT bandwidth is up to implementation and there is no need to indicate to UE. |
| Apple | Do not support the proposal. It is not clear how alt SC3 works when LBT unit size is left for UE and gNB implementation. In NR-U, the size is 20MHz defined by regulation. |
| Futurewei | We support Alt SC1 but have concerns with Alt SC3. We echo Intel’s views on potential coexistence issues especially arising from UE specific LBT bandwidth assumptions and need for additional signalling. |
| Ericsson | We support Alt SC1.  Alt SC3 in our opinion poses an artificial restriction on the LBT Bandwidth. Unlike 5/6 GHz, there is no fixed nominal channel BW nor channel raster defined in the EN 302 567. It is not clear to us how Alt SC3 and corresponding CA5 can be supported when the channels may not be aligned. It also poses another issue in determining guard bands for these channels that may be nested, which is complex. In addition, the behavior of the node when the LBT in a LBT BW unit fails is also not clear nor discussed. For example, if 100 MHz is defined as the LBT BW unit, for a Single Carrier of 1.6 GHz channel bandwidth, firstly there are a total of 16 logical LBT results. Secondly, the behavior of the node when LBT fails in some of these LBT units are not discussed nor specified in ETSI TC BRAN.  We also agree that gNB needs to control or indicate the UE’s LBT BW. This, for instance, could be the active BWP bandwidth that is configured. |
| InterDigital | We are ok with the compromise solution, as long as Alt SC3 is supported. Always performing LBT on the entire channel BW is not an effective way of acquiring the unlicensed channel. Different Ues may support different sets of units of LBT BWs and this should be indicated to the network. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | First, please note that the agreement mentioned at the top of Section 2.2 is not the latest one achieved in RAN1#104bis-e  Second, we support Alt SC1  We share the same views with Intel that it should not be left to gNB/UE’s implementation to decide which definition of the LBT BW to use, and also that introducing an LBT BW unit is not justified and would only complicate the design, especially if different unit sizes need to be defined to avoid excessive LBT complexity and energy consumption for wider carriers/BWP.  As vivo also mentioned, Alt SC3 is not beneficial at all for UL since the transmission would not be allowed unless all LBT is successful on all the LBT BW units. This an issue for wideband UL in Rel-16 NR-U that we could not avoid due the 20 MHz LBT BW imposed by ETSI BRAN in the sub 6GHz bands. |
| Samsung | For both Alt SC1 and SC3, one key point is to choose the LBT bandwidth cover the transmission bandwidth. Based on this understanding, one clarification question, is there any further discussion on the details of Alt SC.3, e.g. the size of the unit? If everything is up to implementation, then it’s like the choice of LBT BW itself is up to implementation (as long as transmission bandwidth is covered), and seems no need to define Alt SC.1 and Alt SC.3. |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |
| WILUS | Although we support Alt SC. 3 but are ok with proposal to support both. |
| LG | We support the proposal 2.2.1-1.  The unit of LBT bandwidth for a UE can be configured by the gNB and the size of LBT bandwidth can be adjusted to manage the channel access probability and the spectral efficiency considering the bandwidth capability of UE and the interference level of the cell.  On the proposal structure, the main bullet (leave to gNB/UE implementation) is not matched with the sub-bullet (regarding on the indication of LBT bandwidth). Therefore, we suggest the following simple modification on the Proposal 2.2.1-1:  Proposal 2.2.1-1  For LBT for single carrier transmissions, support both Alt SC.1 and Alt SC.3.   * FFS if and how gNB indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to UE   FFS if and how UE indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to gNB |

Proposal 2.2.1-2 (closed)

For LBT for multi-carrier transmissions in intra-band CA, support Alt CA.1, Alt CA.2, and Alt CA.5, and leave the choice to gNB/UE implementation.

* FFS if and how gNB indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to UE
* FFS if and how UE indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to gNB

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We are in principle ok with supporting all alternatives, but for Alt 5, more discussion on the possible BW options would be needed before agreeing.  Similarly as in the single carrier case, as a starting point the network should be able control the LBT BW that the UE uses. |
| Charter Communications | OK with the compromise proposal with the same caveat as the single carrier case. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Although we support Alt CA. 5 but are ok with proposal to support all three. However, the choice should be only up to the network, and not UE |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If proposal 2.2.1-1 is agreed, then it is a nature way that proposal 2.2.1-2 should be also supported. But eventually it depends on the result of proposal 2.2.1-1 discussion. |
| Intel | Please see comments above. |
| Vivo | We only support Alt CA.1 and Alt CA.5.  The application of Alt CA.2 should be FFS since the over protection will reduce the performance of CA. For example, is it feasible/desirable to perform a single LBT covering say 5 CC each with around 2 GHz channel bandwidth? |
| Apple | Do not support this proposal. It is not clear how alt CA5 works when LBT unit size is left for UE and gNB implementation. In NR-U, the size is 20MHz defined by regulation. |
| Futurewei | We support Alt CA.1 and Alt CA.2 but have concerns on Alt CA.5 similar to those raised above. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal, to leave it to gNB implementation in principle. However, we still cannot support SC3/CA5 among those options. If SC3 is agreed, CA5 is redundant as it only extrapolates the single carrier case. In a broader sense, Alt CA5 = Alt SC3 + Alt CA1. That said, the issues regarding Alt SC3 and CA5 and corresponding guard bands (explained above) will still be an issue if we were to specify this in the RAN1 specification. |
| InterDigital | Similar comment as for Proposal 2.2.1-1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Alt CA.1 and Alt CA.2 .  Similar to our comments for the SC case, we are not supportive of leaving it to gNB/UE’s implementation to decide which definition of the LBT BW to use. In addition, introducing an LBT BW unit is more concerning in the CA case in terms complexity/energy consumption, especially if a small LBT BW unit needs to be used to suit different channel/CC BWs that are aggregated. |
| Samsung | Similar comment as single carrier case. |
| OPPO | We only support Alt CA.1 and Alt CA.5. |
| WILUS | Although we support Alt CA.1 or Alt CA. 5 but are ok with proposal to support all three. |
| LG | We support Alt CA.5 and find with the Proposal 2.2.1-2.  Unlike NR-U, the LBT bandwidth of 60GHz may have a structure in which multiple BWPs/CCs are confined within only a single LBT bandwidth. In other words, one BWP/CC smaller than a LBT bandwidth does not overlap with multiple LBT bandwidths. When the unit LBT bandwidth is defined, it is no need to distinguish between single-carrier LBT and multi-carrier transmission LBT. Moreover, the operating channel bandwidth of the baseline ED threshold formula can also be calculated by replacing with the unit LBT bandwidth.  On the proposal structure, the main bullet (leave to gNB/UE implementation) is not matched with the sub-bullet (regarding on the indication of LBT bandwidth). Therefore, we suggest the following simple modification on the Proposal 2.2.1-1:  Proposal 2.2.1-1  For LBT for single carrier transmissions, support both Alt SC.1 and Alt SC.3.   * FFS if and how gNB indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to UE   FFS if and how UE indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to gNB |

### Second Round Discussion

Proposal 2.2.2-1 (closed)

For LBT for single carrier transmissions, support both Alt SC.1 and Alt SC.3~~, and leave the choice to gNB/UE implementation.~~

* For Alt SC.3, the LBT bandwidth is chosen from a set of bandwidth values (FFS the set of values)
* FFS if and how gNB indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to UE
* FFS if and how UE indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to gNB

Support: Spreadtrum, LG, Convida, vivo, Qualcomm, ZTE,

Alt SC.1 only: CATT, Apple, Intel, Ericsson, HW, FW,

Alt SC.1 with Alt SC.3 with fixed bandwidth: DCM, Lenovo, Samsung,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine to support both Alt SC.1 and Alt SC.3. |
| CATT | We support Alt SC.1.  Alt SC.3 is not clear for us. There are some points that need to be clarified.   * How to define LBT unit? * Whether gNB/UE performs LBT on the LBT units that will not be transmitted in the channel bandwidth. * Assuming the channel bandwidth consists of several LBT units, when the LBT results of parts of LBT units are failed, whether the gNB/UE can be allowed to transmit on another parts of LBT units where the LBT results are successful. |
| LG | We suggest the modification to the first bullet as follow:   * For Alt SC.3, the LBT bandwidth is chosen from a set of bandwidth values (FFS the set of values) |
| DOCOMO | We prefer to have a fixed bandwidth as a LBT unit for Alt SC.3, rather than multiple values in a set. Otherwise we do not see the motivation to support SC3. |
| Convida Wireless | Both Alt SC1 and Alt SC3 can be supported. From UE perspective, Alt SC1 is sufficient and channel BW can be equal to multiple integers of LBT BW. On the other hand, it may be up to gNB implementation to perform single-LBT or multi-LBT for better channel utilization when CA and SC are sharing a same channel BW. For example, the LBT BW can be defined as the minimum channel BW (e.g., 400 MHz). |
| vivo | As we mentioned in the first round, we prefer that the LBT unit is configured via RRC signalling if LBT unit is from a set of values. |
| Qualcomm | For Alt SC.3, we think a single value for LBT bandwidth is not possible given the channel bandwidth we need to cover. For 100MHz carrier bandwidth, the LBT bandwidth should not exceed 100MHz. But if we use the same 100MHz for 2GHz bandwidth, we will need to do 20 separate LBT measurements, which cannot be supported by hardward. |
| Apple | Support SC.1. FFS SC.3. Many unknown questions remain, and overall design implication is unclear for SC.3. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For Alt SC. 3, we think that the unit of LBT bandwidth is fixed value. Then the LBT can be done on multiples of LBT bandwidth unit. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support this compromise solution. And we think LBT is always performed on the entire channel bandwidth, which is not an effective and reasonable way to obtain channel. Instead, the introduction of unit of LBT bandwidth can just make up for the weakness of performing LBT on the whole channel bandwidth.  Further,for the first bullet, we prefer to have a fixed unit of LBT bandwidth for a specific channel bandwidth, which is from the set of bandwidth specified in RAN4, while not to have a variable value for unit of LBT bandwidth for a specific channel bandwidth. If so, then it may make the issue more complicated. |
| Samsung | For Alt SC.3, we believe the key issue is whether the LBT unit is fixed as single value or from a set of values, and added bullet didn’t resolve that issue. We prefer a single fixed LBT unit to easy the implementation, and the value should be relatively large. If a carrier is smaller than the unit, then the node can always implement Alt SC.1 as an alternative way. |
| Intel | We prefer Alt. SC.1 only.  Once again we are not OK to support multiple options and to leave up to gNB/UE’s implementation to decide which definition of the LBT BW to use. While the group has introduced a factor within the ED threshold to account for the BW, the resulting values that could be calculated may differ based on the LBT BW definition that is used even when the channel/transmission BW may be the same. This would induce co-existence issues, that the group was trying to mitigate by introducing the dependency from the BW. Also, we do not see the need to introduce additional signalling and overhead to indicate the definition of the LBT BW used. |
| Ericsson | We support Alt SC1/CA1 as the baseline.  We need more clarifications for Alt SC3 and CA5.  1. Does the LBT BW unit vary for different sub-carrier spacing?   1. How will the LBT failure on few LBT units be dealt with in the spec? 2. There is also the issue of specifying of the guard bands between these subbands within a carrier. Or the proponents support this mode only to perform LBT over the units?   We cannot proceed further with this proposal without getting a clear picture on the above questions.  Therefore, we support Alt SC1/CA1 as the baseline, while not precluding other options which can be left to gNB/UE implementation on a case by case basis. For UE, we can discuss using the active BWP bandwidth as the LBT BW as indicated in the SC1 option. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As discussed in the first round, we support SC.1.  We can accept to keep SC.3 as FFS although we have a couple of main concerns about SC. 3:   1. If multiple LBT BW units are introduced and it is left to gNB which one to choose, then how co-existing issue is addressed? 2. Also, we are still not justified how the complexity of running N parallel eCCA processes on N BW units each having a BW of, say, B compared to running only 1 eCCA process on the whole BW of B\*N would justify any of its potential (which are arguable) advantages. |
| Futurewei | We support SC1. Option SC3 can be FFS. For option SC3 we see that just defining one LBT bandwidth unit may not work in all scenarios (can lead to excessive LBT sensing operations) but defining as configurable from a set of units also has its issues (coexistence issues arising from differing LBT bandwidth assumptions pointed by Intel as well) . We believe it is better to discuss in detail before agreeing to support this option. |
| LG2 | On the proposal structure, the main bullet (leave to gNB/UE implementation) is not matched with the sub-bullet (regarding on the indication of LBT bandwidth). Therefore, we suggest the following simple modification on the Proposal 2.2.1-1:  Proposal 2.2.1-1  For LBT for single carrier transmissions, support both Alt SC.1 and Alt SC.3, ~~and leave the choice to gNB/UE implementation.~~   * FFS if and how gNB indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to UE   FFS if and how UE indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to gNB |

Proposal 2.2.2-2 (closed)

For LBT for multi-carrier transmissions in intra-band CA, support Alt CA.1, Alt CA.2, and Alt CA.5~~, and leave the choice to gNB/UE implementation.~~

* For Alt CA.5, the LBT bandwidth is chosen from a set of bandwidth values (FFS the set of values)
* FFS if and how gNB indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to UE
* FFS if and how UE indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to gNB

Alt CA.1 + Alt CA.5: Spreadtrum, DCM, vivo, ZTE

Alt CA.1: CATT, Apple, Intel, Ericsson,

Alt CA.1 + Alt CA.5 with fixed bandwidth: Lenovo,

Alt CA.1+Alt CA.2: HW, FW

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Spreadtrum | We cannot support Alt CA.2 |
| CATT | We support Alt CA.1. We are not clear how Alt CA.5 works and share some views as comments in Proposal 2.2.1-1. |
| LG | We think that if Alt SC.3 is adopted, there no differences between the single carrier and the multi-carrier transmission. |
| DOCOMO | Whether to support/perform CA1 and/or CA5 should depend on the choice for SC. CA2 would be over protection, so not preferred in our view. |
| vivo | Alt CA.2 should be FFS.  We prefer LBT unit is configured via RRC signalling if LBT unit is from a set of values. |
| Apple | Support Alt CA1. FFS Alt CA2 and Alt CA5. It is not clear how Alt CA5 works and overall design implication of Alt CA5. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Similar to Alt SC.3, For Alt CA. 5, we think that the unit of LBT bandwidth is fixed value. Then the LBT can be done on multiples of LBT bandwidth unit. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The similar reason have been provided in the first round. That is to say, If proposal 2.2.2-1 is agreed, then it is a nature way that proposal 2.2.2-2 should be also supported. But we are not sure whether CA.2 should be supported for multi-carrier case. |
| Intel | Support Alt CA.1 with the same motivations as above. |
| Ericsson | We support Alt SC1/CA1 as the baseline.  We need more clarifications for Alt SC3 and CA5.  Firstly, we think CA5 is redundant to SC3.  Alt CA5 = Alt SC3 + multi-carrier (Alt CA1).  1. Does the LBT BW unit vary for different sub-carrier spacing?   1. How will the LBT failure on few LBT units be dealt with in the spec? 2. There is also the issue of specifying of the guard bands between these subbands within a carrier. Or the proponents support this mode only to perform LBT over the units?   We cannot proceed further with this proposal without getting a clear picture on the above questions.  Therefore, we support Alt SC1/CA1 as the baseline, while not precluding other options which can be left to gNB/UE implementation on a case by case basis. For UE, we can discuss using the active BWP bandwidth as the LBT BW as indicated in the SC1 option. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support CA.1 and CA.2 and have serious concerns about CA.5  For CA.2, we think it is important to have the option of performing single LBT over all CCs to reduce the eCCA complexity procedure associated with performing N parallel eCCAs of N CCs especially in low to moderate traffic where the chance of LBT failure is low. For companies that are against CA.2, please note that we do not believe that CA.2 should be the only mode or default mode of supporting LBT over multiple CCs and that is why we also support CA.1 as well.  For CA. 5, our concerns are similar to SC. 3:   1. If multiple LBT BW units are introduced and it is left to gNB which one to choose, then how co-existing issue is addressed? 2. Also, we are still not justified how the complexity of running N parallel eCCA processes on N BW units each having a BW of, say, B compared to running only 1 eCCA process on the whole BW of B\*N would justify any of its potential (which are arguable) advantages.   As a way forward, maybe companies can at least agree on CA.1 which seems to be least controversial and leave CA.2 and CA. 5 as FFS?  **Proposal:**  For LBT for multi-carrier transmissions in intra-band CA, support at least Alt CA.1.   * FFS: Support of Alt CA.2, and Alt CA.5~~, and leave the choice to gNB/UE implementation.~~   + If Alt CA.5 is agreed, ~~For Alt CA.5,~~ the LBT bandwidth is chosen from a set of bandwidth values (FFS the set of values) * FFS if and how gNB indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to UE * FFS if and how UE indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to gNB |
| Futurewei | We support CA.1 and CA.2. Similar to our comment above CA.5 can be FFS. |
| LG2 | On the proposal structure, the main bullet (leave to gNB/UE implementation) is not matched with the sub-bullet (regarding on the indication of LBT bandwidth). Therefore, we suggest the following simple modification on the Proposal 2.2.2-2:  Proposal 2.2.2-2  For LBT for multi-carrier transmissions in intra-band CA, support Alt CA.1, Alt CA.2, and Alt CA.5, ~~and leave the choice to gNB/UE implementation.~~   * For Alt CA.5, the LBT bandwidth is chosen from a set of bandwidth values (FFS the set of values) * FFS if and how gNB indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to UE * FFS if and how UE indicates the LBT bandwidth adopted to gNB |

### Third Round Discussion

From the previous round of discussions, it is obvious we are not converging. I believe Alt SC.1 and Alt CA.1 are alternatives all companies want, but there are different preference for everything else.

For Alt SC.3 and Alt CA.5, the additional functionality supported on top of Alt SC.1 and Alt CA.1 is the node can access “part” of the channel, instead of all or nothing within the channel. Maybe better to pose the question in the following proposal.

Proposal 2.2.3-1

For single carrier transmission or multi-carrier transmission, should we support the functionality to access a carrier if there is interference in part of the carrier?

Support: DCM, Lenovo, ZTE

Not support: Apple, MTK, CATT

Need to discuss more: Nokia, Samsung

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| DOCOMO | Yes, it should be supported. It would not be efficient that the whole bandwidth cannot be used if interference is detected at only partial bandwidth. Not occupied bandiwdth should be available even if it is only a part of intended bandwidth (not equal to LBT bandwidth). |
| Apple | Since channel BW or BWP bandwidth can be flexible configured by gNB, we see limited benefit of defining another level of granularity for LBT within BWP BW. At the same time, we see implementation complexity increase to support flexible multiple LBT simultaneously with such tight 5us sensing slot definition. |
| Mediatek | We do not support this functionality since we do not see obvious benefit and we have similar concern on implementation complexity. |
| Nokia, NSB | We may consider this further after the baseline has been agreed |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes, this should be supported as it provides more flexibility to partially use a carrier |
| CATT | We don’t support this functionality. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes, such functionality should be supported since the introduction of unit of LBT bandwidth will be beneficial to degrade waste of resource and improve the opportunities of accessing channel, which can make up for the weakness of performing LBT on the whole channel bandwidth. So, we don’t think it is a good way to first agree Alt SC.1 and Alt CA.1 before Alt SC.3 and Alt CA.5 haven’t been agreed. |
| Samsung | The answer to this question may be tied to the decision on which LBT BW is adopted. |
| vivo | Yes, with this feature, gNB or UE can perform LBT only on the bandwidth with scheduled resources, the interference on the part of channel where no data is scheduled will not affect the channel access. Alt SC 1 or Alt CA 1 is a little bit over protection if the transmission is not spreading over the whole channel. And for DL transmission, same as in NR-U, if part of the channel is occupied, gNB can still use the other part of the channel for DL transmission. |
| Ericsson | It is not clear to us how this would be specified nor the motivation to do this. We already have flexibility in configuring BWP to the UEs. If the interference in certain part of the carrier is ascertained, there needs to be guard bands to ensure that the newly planned transmission doesn’t cause interference with the ongoing transmission, which forms the crux of doing LBT. Specifying guard bands for various LBT units and channel bandwidth sizes is not trivial and will require a large specification effort in RAN1. We do not see the need to overcomplicate the specification. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not see a strong justification. It is also not easy to specify it for UL. |
| Convida Wireless | In general, this functionality may be discussed further. When the portion of (subband) interference that exceeds a threshold in a wideband, this could cause the fragmentation in a wideband which could potentially degrade the channel access opportunities. From UE perspective, Alt SC1 (or a BWP) may be sufficient. On the other hand, it may be up to gNB implementation to perform single-LBT or multi-LBT for better channel utilization when CA and SC are sharing a same channel BW. |

For Alt CA.2, on top of Alt CA.1, the additional limitation is if we allow the node to access the carriers if “all” carriers pass LBT.

Proposal 2.2.3-2

For multi-carrier transmission, should we support the functionality to access a carrier if all carriers in the CA pass the LBT?

Moderator comment: Essentially this is a relaxation for initiating node multi-carrier LBT on top of Alt CA.1

Support: Samsung

Not support: DCM, Apple, MTK, Lenovo, CATT, ZTE,

Need discussion: Nokia (after we have the baseline)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| DOCOMO | We do not see so strong necessity, while ok to support it if companies desire to support. |
| Apple | Do not see a need if Alt CA.1 is already supported. |
| Mediatek | We do not see strong need for this if we support Alt CA 1. |
| Nokia, NSB | We may consider this further after the baseline has been agreed |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We don’t see the need to support this |
| CATT | The benefit of supporting this functionality is not clear, we don’t support it. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | No see a strong need for Alt CA.2. |
| Samsung | We are ok to support Alt CA.2, and up to implementation to choose from Alt CA1 and 2. |
| vivo | The motivation of such additional limitation is not clear to us if Alt SC 1 is supported. |
| Ericsson | We are neutral about this proposal but agree with Nokia that we establish a baseline first. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are supportive of this as a complementary feature to the baseline CA.1 (per carrier LBT). In low/medium traffic where the change of LBT failure is low, it is much more efficient to have a single LBT process over all carriers instead of N parallel processes for each carrier |
|  |  |

## Sensing Structures FFS Items

Agreement:

For energy measurement in 8us deferral period, down-select from the following:

* Alt 1. Two energy measurements are required
* Alt 2. One measurement is required
* Alt 3. Extend the 8us to 10us and perform two measurements, one in each 5us segment

For energy measurement in 5us observation slot, perform single measurement

* FFS minimum duration of the measurement
* FFS location of the measurement

Working assumption:

* For energy measurement in 5us observation slot, when performing single measurement, the location of the measurement within the 5us is left for implementation, i.e., anywhere within the 5us.FFS location of the measurement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Apple | Proposal 10: Only one sensing is required in 8us initial sensing period. It is up to implementation to perform two sensing, or longer sensing time for better accuracy. |
| CAICT | Proposal 3: One measurement for energy measurement in 8us deferral period is proposed.  Proposal 4: the minimum duration of one measurement in 5us observation slot equals the length of one symbol length for 480kHz. |
| CATT | Proposal 3: The minimum duration of deferral period is 8us.  Proposal 4: One energy measurement is required for 8us deferral period. |
| Ericsson | Observation 27 IEEE 802.11ad and IEEE 802.11ay do not perform two energy measurements in the 8 µs deferral period  Observation 28 ETSI HS does not require two energy measurements in 8 µs deferral period.  Observation 29 No simulation studies to suggest that two energy measurements are needed in an 8us deferral period for good coexistence.  Proposal 18 For energy measurement in 8 µs deferral period, Alt2 is preferred.  Proposal 19 The minimum duration of energy measurement within 5 µs can be left for implementation.  Proposal 20 Confirm the working assumption that for the location of the energy measurement in 5us,it can be left for implementation. |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Proposal 6: Confirm the following WA reached in RAN1 #104bis-e: “For energy measurement in 5us observation slot, when performing single measurement, the location of the measurement within the 5us is left for implementation, i.e., anywhere within the 5us.”  Proposal 7: For operation in NR-U-60, when LBT is used, the measurement duration X us within the 5us observation is implementation specific.  Proposal 8: For operation in NR-U-60, when LBT is used, support one energy measurement in the 8us deferral period. Td consists of a Tf duration immediately followed by a 5us slot duration, and Tf=3us does not include any measurement duration. |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 1: Alt-1 is supported and the 8us observation period is divided into two slots of 3 and 5us, respectively. For the energy measurement in the 3us observation slot, the location of the measurement is left up to implementation. |
| OPPO | Proposal 3: two energy measurements are required during a 8us deferral period.  Proposal 4: a minimum measurement duration of 2us can be considered.  Proposal 5: confirm the following working assumption  Working assumption: For energy measurement in 5us observation slot, when performing single measurement, the location of the measurement within the 5us is left for implementation, i.e., anywhere within the 5us. |
| Samsung | Proposal 3: For sensing structure, confirm the working assumption from RAN1#104b-e, and support single energy measurement within the 8 us deferral period. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 6: Two energy measurements are required for 8us deferral period.  Proposal 7: The duration of the measurement should be 3us for 5us observation slot. |
| WILUS Inc. | Proposal 2: We propose to support Alt-2 that one measurement is required for energy measurement in 8us deferral period.  Option 1: For the sensing structure within 8us deferral period, the regulation does not specify anything which is left to the implementation at the device. Regardless of one or two energy measurements are required, it seems reasonable to be left to the implementation aspects.   Option 2: Similar to define performing one energy measurement for 16us Cat-2 LBT in Rel-16 NR-U considering to actually miss the channel busy within a 16us, the 8us deferral period includes an observation slot that occurs within the last 5us of 8us deferral period. The channel is considered to be idle within the duration of the 8us deferral period if the channel is sensed to be idle for a total of at least (5us or 4us) with at least 3us of sensing occurring in the sensing slot. Option 3: Similar to define performing one energy measurement for 16us Cat-2 LBT in Rel-16 NR-U considering to actually miss the channel busy within a 16us, the channel is considered to be idle within the duration of the 8us deferral period if the channel is sensed to be idle for a total of at least 5us with at least 3us of sensing occurring in the deferral period. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Observation 12: Deferral period can be composed of 3us observation slot and one or more consecutive 5us observation slot.  Observation 13: Energy measurement is performed in 3us observation slot and one or more consecutive 5us observation slot(s), respectively.  Observation 14: For deferral period and 5us observation slot, the length of energy measurement can be further discussed.  Observation 11: Consider the minimum value of deferral period as 8us in CCA check procedure of EN 302 567 and specific deferral period value is related to the channel access priority class (p). |

### First Round Discussion

Summary: Current support for sensing structure discussion items appears as follows.

For energy measurement in (minimum) 8us deferral period, continue down-selection between the following alternatives:

* Alt 1. Two energy measurements are required
  + Intel, OPPO, spreadtrum,
* Alt 2. One measurement is required
  + Apple, CAICT, CATT, Ericsson, Huawei, Samsung,
* Alt 3. Extend the 8us to 10us and perform two measurements, one in each 5us segment
  + ZTE
* Implementation
  + WILUS

For energy measurement in 8us observation slot, with minimum duration of the measurement

* + 2us (OPPO), 3us (ZTE)

Proposal 2.3.1-1

For energy measurement in 8us deferral period, continue down-selection between the following alternatives

* Alt 1. Two energy measurements are required, with one measurement in the first 3us and one measurement in the last 5us
  + Support: Lenovo, ZTE, Intel, Oppo, Spreadtrum
* Alt 2. One measurement is required
  + FFS where the measurement is located
  + Support: Nokia, Charter, Apple, Futurewei, Ericsson, Huawei, Samsung, WILUS, CATT, LG

Note: By implementation, it is possible to support longer than 8us deferral period (Intend to cover Alt 3 as implementation choice for either Alt 1 or Alt 2)

Moderator comment: This proposal seems to be stable. Another discussion is started in 2.3.2 to see if we can go further.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We are ok with Alt 2. |
| Charter Communications | Fine with Alt 2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We prefer Alt 1 to have two energy measurements |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Alt 1 considering such sensing structure is also used in LTE-LAA and NR-U and it is different with that of Wi-Fi, so I am not sure why we have to keep sensing structure in 52.6GHz the same as in 802.11ad/ay. |
| Intel | We are OK with the proposal 2.3.1-1, and we prefer Alt. 1. Also as for the duration of the measurement, we could impose a minimum of 2 us (to resemble IEEE), and leave up to implementation the actual duration. |
| Apple | Alt 2. This is what required by regulation and implemented by 802.11ad. For devices want to improve accuracy with longer sensing time, device can always perform longer sensing. |
| Futurewei | We support Alt 2. |
| Ericsson | Alt 2 is preferred.  The regulation does not mandate two energy measurements nor is it mentioned in the specifications of competing technology 802.11ad/ay. Furthermore, it is difficult to perform sensing within a 3us period. The measuring duration would anyway be shorter as it needs to include processing delays. We do not see the purpose of doing this.  Response to ZTE: The sensing structure in LTE-LAA and NRU was motivated by 802.11 specifications, specifically 802.11ax performing sensing within a 25us duration (which corresponds to 8us here). Furthermore, the corresponding regulation also mentioned sensing within 25us. There is no evidence to suggest that 802.11ad/ay specification nor implementation performs two energy measurements in an 8us period, nor does EN 302 567 mandates it. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are Ok with proposal in principle and we prefer Alt 2.  Note that, unlike what is mentioned in the box at the top of Section 2.3, WA made in RAN1 104bis-e does not have a FFS part:  Working assumption:   * For energy measurement in 5us observation slot, when performing single measurement, the location of the measurement within the 5us is left for implementation, i.e., anywhere within the 5us.~~FFS location of the measurement~~ |
| Samsung | We are ok with Alt 2 for simplicity. Supporting Alt 2 didn’t prevent Alt 1 as an implementation, if there is benefit figured out for Alt 1. |
| OPPO | Support Alt 1. |
| WILUS | We support Alt 2. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal and we prefer Alt 1. |
| CATT | Alt 2 is preferred. And we support deferral period can be longer than 8us by implementation.  There is only one energy measurement within 8us deferral period in 802.11ad specification. The motivation for adding an additional energy measurement within 8us deferral period for 60GHz NR-U is not clear. We think performing one energy measurement within 8us deferral period is sufficient for 60 GHz NR-U.  According to the CCA check definition, the device will observe the channel for a minimum of 8us. Considering the fairness between different systems, the deferral period for 60 GHz NR-U shall consistent with EN 302.567. In our view, 8us shall be defined as the minimum duration of deferral period. |
| LG | Alt 2 is preferred. |

### Second Round Discussion

In proposal 2.3.1-1, we still have two alternatives on defining the sensing structure for the 8us initial deferral period. There is more companies supporting Alt 2, but a few companies supporting Alt 1. The concern from companies prefer Alt 1 seems to be if a single measurement is enforced in 8us, and if the random counter is picked as 0, then the entire eCCA process only measures the channel once, and it is possible to fall in the gap of a WiFi transmission (up to 3us). The next discussion is trying to see if we can reach a compromise by

* Enforcing one measurement in 8us
* For the random counter, instead of a minimum of 0, increase the minimum to 1, so that the shortest eCCA will be a 8us plus 5us
* During eCCA process, when ED fails in an observation state, the count down restarts with another 8us initial deferral period and a counter at least 1, so that after the interference is gone, the COT can be initiated with at least two measurements

Discussion 2.3.2-1 (closed)

Please provide your view in the following potential compromise on 8us initial deferral period sensing structure:

* One measurement in 8us in initial deferral period
* In the eCCA procedure
  + The random counter is selected from 1 (instead of 0) to at least 3
  + When ED fails in an observation state during eCCA, the count-down resumes with counter set to at least 1, after another 8us initial deferral period after the interference is detected to be gone

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Apple | Support one measure in 8us.  To address the concern raised, i.e, ensure 8us CCA does not fall into the 3us SIFS time, we can add the 8us CCA is at least cover the same 5us slot CCA time. No need to force minimum number to be 1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Although our preference is Alt 1, but we are fine to agree to Apple’s suggestion |
| CATT | Support one measurement in 8us in initial deferral period. But we don’t support increasing the minimum of the random counter from 0 to 1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Our 1st preference is two measurements in 8us. But if concern raised by supporting Alt 1’s companies can be properly addressed, we can also compromise to one measurement in 8us. But the current proposed method to modify the minimum of the random back-off counter from 0 to 1 is unacceptable to us. |
| Spreadtrum | Our preference is Alt 1, but we can accept Apple’s suggestion as a compromise for the sake of the progress. |
| Samsung | We support single measurement duration.  We don’t agree with the proposal on eCCA. It will cause degradation of NR system comparing to other RATs, since we are using a more restricted eCCA procedure. As long as the procedure satisfies regulation, we didn’t see an issue with fairness. If one worries about collision using single sensing period, it’s always possible to sense longer or multiple times by implementation to avoid that. |
| Intel | Support Alt.2 and to perform two measurements, given that a single measurement may lead in many cases to false detection. We are also not OK to elongate the eCCA, and impose that the counter would be at least 1, since this would be quite detrimental in increasing the overhead. |
| Moderator | To Apple: Can you elaborate what you mean “the 8us CCA is at least cover the same 5us slot CCA time”? |
| Ericsson | Agree with one measurement in 8us. 802.11ad/ay also does only one measurement.   We do not agree to the second bullet point in 2.3.2-1. We do not understand the problem. The first deferral period was chosen as 8us (3us+ observation slot 5us), in order to ensure that the eCCA process does not start just at the start of a SIFS gap (3us) and cause collisions. In fact, this is the expected behaviour and there is no problem to be solved here.  Even if we agree to increase the random counter to start from 1. How will this be tested? There is no way to guarantee that devices would implement this, posing the question what is the motivation to do this? |
| OPPO | We share the same view as Intel. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support one measurement in the 8us deferral period.  Our understanding is that this 8 us deferral period will be specified as the minimum require duration set by regulations but longer sensing is of course not precluded by implementation.    We do not support modifying the minimum of the back-off counter to 1 instead of 0 as this would only deprioritize NR-U-60 with respect to any other coexisting RAT that adheres to the ‘adaptivity’ requirements in the HS EN 302 567. Similar to the impact of mp parameter for prioritization of a CAPC in Rel-16 NR-U.  If Apple’s proposal means that the one measurement duration within the 8 us deferral period is at least equal to the measurement duration within a 5us observation slot, we can support it. |
| Futurewei | As we understand starting random counter from 1 can add a fixed overhead and have unintended consequence (especially in cases where multiple eCCA are done). That said, we are open to considering further details on addressing this concern with a single energy measurement. We don’t fully understand Apple’s suggestion, and it is unclear whether longer sensing implementation alone cannot address those (as pointed by Samsung). |

### Third Round Discussion

Seems that there is not enough support to lower bound the counter to 1. To resolve the conflict, please see if the following proposal works.

Proposal 2.3.3-1

For energy measurement in 8us deferral period, performs single measurement within 8us, the measurement duration is

* Alt 1: At least 3+X us (FFS X, such as X=1).
* Alt 2: At least X us, where X is the same as the minimum measurement duration in a 5 us observation slot

Moderator comment: Not sure if this is what Apple is proposing. The intention here is to have a single measurement (the majority view), but makes sure the measurement will not fall in a 3us gap in WiFi.

Moderator comment 2: From what Apple clarified below, seems this proposal is different from what Apple is proposing. The Apple proposal is actually single X us measurement, same X as 5us observation slot, but by implementation, the node can measure longer. There is no enforcement to make sure the measurement does not fall in WiFi gap.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Apple | Clarify our previous comment: the location of measurement within the 8us deferral duration at least include the measurement location used in 5us slot. The simplest solution will be just reusing the same 5us sensing structure, same as 11ad design. Implementation can determine to sensing longer time in addition to the sensing location within the 5us slot. |
| Mediatek | Ok with the proposal along with Apple’s update |
| Nokia, NSB | We are ok with the proposal as well as the modification by Apple |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are okay with the proposal and suggested update by Apple |
| CATT | We are ok with Apple’s update. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We want to further confirm one question: what is the time domain structure of 8us deferral period? Is it composed of a 3us time window(duration) and a 5us time window? Or just a 8us time window?  If one energy measurement is supported, we need to clarify that this one energy measurement is performed in 5us time window or 8us time window corresponding to deferral period.  If it is the latter, we think it is similar to two energy measurement due to additional Xus is introduced. So I don’t know why I have to support one energy measurement, not two energy measurement. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | We do not support the proposal.  8us deferral period already contains a 5us observation slot which can be reused for sensing as Apple suggests above. However, we further do not see the need to change the duration/location of measurement for the 5us observation slot within this 8us. We agree with Apple that implementation can decide to sense longer if they wish to do so.   To the proponents of the proposal, what are the odds that the eCCA for the intended transmission falls exactly within the 3us SIFS gap of a 802.11ad/ay transmission, or somehow falls exactly so that it misses the sensing part? Are there any studies to show that this is detrimental to coexistence? We think this is a corner case we don’t need to worry about. |

## COT Sharing

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  On maximum gap within a COT to allow COT sharing without LBT, down-select from   * Alt 1. No maximum gap defined. A later transmission can share the COT without LBT with any gap within the maximum COT duration * Alt 2. Define a maximum gap X, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within X from the end of the earlier transmission   + FFS: Value for X * Alt 3. Define a maximum gap Y, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within Y from the end of the earlier transmission. If the later transmission starts after Y from the end of the earlier transmission, an one-shot LBT is needed to share the COT   + FFS: Value for Y   + FFS:  How to define the one-shot LBT * FFS location of the measurement |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Apple | Proposal 11: Regulation does not define max gap duration in COT sharing without LBT. Since any gap is counted into 5ms COT, no gap limitation needs to be specified. |
| CAICT | Proposal 5: Alt.3 should be supported for COT sharing.  Proposal 6：When the later transmission starts after the defined maximum gap from the end of the earlier transmission, whether a one-short LBT needs to be performed can be decided by gNB. |
| Ericsson | Observation 26 ETSI BRAN regulations do not specify a minimum or maximum gap in the 60 GHz HS.  Proposal 16 Support Alt 1 for gaps in COT sharing. |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 6: Define a maximum gap Y, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within Y from the end of the earlier transmission. If the later transmission starts after Y from the end of the earlier transmission, a one-shot LBT is needed to share the COT: • Where Y (for all SCS) may be the time duration of 3 symbols (@120 kHz SCS  • Where One-shot LBT duration (for all SCS): the time duration of 1 symbol @ 120kHz SCS |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Proposal 18: For COT sharing without LBT in NR-U-60, no maximum gap is defined and a later transmission from a responding device can share the COT without LBT irrespective to the gap duration within the MCOT. Any gap duration should be counted in the COT duration |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 16: When COT sharing, a UE determines what LBT to use based on the gap duration between the upcoming transmission and a previous transmission on the same beam. |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | Proposal 16: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, define a maximum gap Y, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within Y from the end of the earlier transmission. If the later transmission starts after Y from the end of the earlier transmission, one-shot LBT is needed to share the COT  Proposal 17: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, COT sharing between the initiating device and responding device should be supported with at least Cat 2 LBT: - If the responding device is capable of beam correspondence and it is expected to use only any of the Rx beam(s) as Tx beam(s) for its transmission that have been used to receive at least one of the transmissions from the initiating device within the same COT - If the responding device determines at least one suitable beam on which it is allowed to transmit within the same COT, where the suitable beam can be determined as follows: o UE can be configured with a mapping table for determining suitable transmit beams for UL transmissions based on the receive beam(s) which the UE used to receive the prior DL transmissions in the same COT  Proposal 18: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, multiple COT sharing indicators and their corresponding association to different beams can be signaled in a group common DCI and the association of COT sharing indicator to transmission is semi-statically signaled. |
| NEC | Proposal 3: A maximum gap Y should be defined, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within Y from the end of the earlier transmission. If the later transmission starts after Y from the end of the earlier transmission, an one-shot LBT is needed to share the COT. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 26: On maximum gap within a COT to allow COT sharing without LBT, we support Alt. 1.  Proposal 27: In case of Alt.2 or Alt.3 for COT sharing without LBT, the maximum time gap X is at least longer that PDSCH processing time and PUSCH preparation time. |
| OPPO | Proposal 11: Define a maximum gap Y, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within Y from the end of the earlier transmission. If the later transmission starts after Y from the end of the earlier transmission, an one-shot LBT is needed to share the COT. The value of Y is 8us or 13us. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 8: Regarding COT sharing, NO maximum gap is needed. |
| vivo | Proposal 3: No maximum gap is defined for COT sharing. A later transmission can share the COT without LBT with any gap within the maximum COT duration. |
| WILUS Inc. | Proposal 3: We support Alt-1 since it seems no need to define a maximum gap for COT sharing within the maximum COT duration from the ETSI regulation perspectives. |

### First Round Discussion

On maximum gap within a COT to allow COT sharing without LBT, the following positions are collected.

* Alt 1. No maximum gap defined. A later transmission can share the COT without LBT with any gap within the maximum COT duration
  + Apple, Ericsson, Huawei, Nokia, Spreadtrum, vivo, WILUS
* Alt 2. Define a maximum gap X, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within X from the end of the earlier transmission
* Alt 3. Define a maximum gap Y, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within Y from the end of the earlier transmission. If the later transmission starts after Y from the end of the earlier transmission, a one-shot LBT is needed to share the COT
  + CAICT, FUTUREWEI, Lenovo, OPPO, InterDigital?

Discussion 2.4.1-1 (closed)

On maximum gap within a COT to allow COT sharing without LBT, please provide your view on the following alternatives

* Alt 1. No maximum gap defined. A later transmission can share the COT without LBT with any gap within the maximum COT duration
  + Support: Apple, Ericsson, Huawei, Nokia, Spreadtrum, vivo, WILUS, Charter, Intel, Ericsson, Spreadtrum, CATT
* Alt 2. Define a maximum gap X, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within X from the end of the earlier transmission
* Alt 3. Define a maximum gap Y, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within Y from the end of the earlier transmission. If the later transmission starts after Y from the end of the earlier transmission, an one-shot LBT is needed to share the COT
  + Support: CAICT, FUTUREWEI, Lenovo, OPPO, InterDigital, Nokia, ZTE, Intel, NEC, Samsung, Oppo, CATT, LG, DCM

Moderator comment: Alt 1 and Alt 3 seems to be stable. We can down-select to two and start from there for further down-selection. The additional down-selection will depend on if Cat 2 LBT is introduced or not.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We are ok with either Alt 1 or Alt 2. |
| Charter Communications | Support Alt 1 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Alt 3. If no maximum gap is defined, and channel can be accessed without LBT within the maximum COT duration, there is a possibility that channel can become occupied. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Alt 3 and think one-shot LBT is necessary before the later transmission to prevent the bursty interference, which is not only conducive to prevent interference to the equipment that is already transmitting, but also to avoid interference and influence from other equipment. |
| Intel | Our view is that both Alt.1 and Alt.3 can be supported. One-shot LBT, if introduced, should be used in a configurable manner up to gNB. When the one-shot LBT is not used, Alt.1 is used, which is consistent with the minimum requirements mandated by the ETSI BRAN. However, when one-shot LBT is configured, Alt-3 is used, and the concept of maximum gap could be used to discern the case when no-LBT or one-shot LBT is used. |
| vivo | Alt-1 is supported. According to the ETSI BRAN regulation, no maximum gap is specified. Therefore, we prefer not to impose additional constrains. |
| Apple | We support alternative 1 per regulation requirement. We do not see how Y can be determined. If we use 802.11ad as reference for Y value, the same way as LAA/NR-Uusing 802.11a, Y is 3us which is way to small. |
| Futurewei | We support Alt-3. The max COT duration is quite large and without ability to configure a one shot LBT after a max gap, there can be multiple co-existence issues. One-shot LBT is a useful way to avoid interference and being interfered by transmissions that might have begun in the interim. |
| NEC | We support Alt 3. The maximum gap is necessary for fair channel occupancy without leading to unintentional interference from other nodes. With an additional LBT, later transmission still can share the COT. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 is preferred. |
| InterDigital | We support Alt.3. Furthermore, the gap should be determined between two transmissions that share the same LBT parameters (e.g. on the same beam). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our preference is Alt 1.  COT sharing for transmission(s) by a responding device as specified in the HS EN 302 567 does not require additional LBT within the COT. Furthermore, no requirement on a max gap between transmissions within the COT has been stated. We thus do not see the need to restrict the scheduling within the COT by applying restrictions on the gap between transmissions.  Since the feasibility of Alt 3 depends on the outcome of discussion point 2.5 as to whether or not Cat 2 LBT is supported on not and for which uses cases, we propose that least Alt 2 can be eliminated for the sake of progress on this discussion point.  Furthermore, we propose that any gap duration should be counted in the COT duration. |
| Samsung | We support Alt 3, to be the same as Rel-16 NR-U. |
| OPPO | Support Alt 3. |
| WILUS | We support Alt 1. It is not necessary to define a maximum gap for COT sharing within the maximum COT duration per the ETSI regulation |
| Spreadtrum | Our preference is Alt 1. So far the ETSI HS EN 302 567 does not mandate any maximum gap for COT sharing. Additional restriction beyond the regulation in ETSI HS EN 302 567 should not be introduced to 60GHz band. |
| CATT | We support both Alt 1 and Alt 3. Whether to apply Alt 1 or Alt 3 for COT sharing can be decided by gNB configuration. |
| LG | We support Alt 3.  Even if the EN 302 567 does not explicitly define the gap allowed for COT sharing, it is beneficial to introduce the maximum gap and the Cat-2 LBT for efficient COT sharing to support NR above 52.6GHz. |
| DOCOMO | In subband C1 in ETSI BRAN, there is indeed no requirement to perform LBT at responding device. However, in some other regions (e.g. Japan), just “to operate sensing before initiating transmission(s)” is required. In this case, we believe Alt 3 should be supported. We are ok with supporting Alt 3 with dependency on region/regulatory. |

### Second Round Discussion

Proposal 2.4.2-1:

On maximum gap within a COT to allow COT sharing without LBT, down-select or support both of the following two alternatives

* Alt 1. No maximum gap defined. A later transmission can share the COT without LBT with any gap within the maximum COT duration
  + Support: Apple, Ericsson, Huawei, Nokia, Spreadtrum, vivo, WILUS, Charter, Intel, Ericsson, Spreadtrum, CATT, MTK, Nokia
* Alt 3. Define a maximum gap Y, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within Y from the end of the earlier transmission. If the later transmission starts after Y from the end of the earlier transmission, an one-shot LBT is needed to share the COT
  + Support: CAICT, FUTUREWEI, Lenovo, OPPO, InterDigital, ~~Nokia~~, ZTE, Intel, NEC, Samsung, Oppo, CATT, LG, DCM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Apple | Support Alt.1  For alt.2, maybe supporting companies can submit what Y value can be for further discussion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support Alt 1  We don’t understand what the concern is with introducing some gap Y to allow COT without LBT. |
| vivo | Support Alt 1. We prefer not to impose additional restrictions other than regulation on COT sharing. |
| CATT | Support both Alt 1 and Alt 3, and it can be decided by gNB configuration.  We think Alt 1 and Alt 3 can be used for different use cases.   * When the interference within the network is low, performing a one-short LBT before the later transmission when the maximum gap is satisfied introduces unnecessary measurement complexity. Thus, Alt 1 can be applied in the case where the interference within the network is low. * When the interference within the network is severe, performing a one-short LBT before the later transmission when the maximum gap is satisfied can avoid the channel is occupied by other transmission node. Alt 3 can be applied in the case where the interference within the network is severe.   Whether to apply Alt 1 or Alt 3 for COT sharing can be decided by gNB. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We have similar view with CATT. For COT sharing node, whether one-shot LBT or No LBT is needed can depend on the gNB. For example, if NO LBT is used for the COT sharing, then the gNB need to ensure the gap between DL/UL and UL/DL to be no larger than the maximum gap Y. otherwise, if the gap between DL/UL and UL/DL is larger than the maximum gap Y, then it is inevitable that one-shot LBT will be needed to avoid some unnecessary interference. |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt 1.  We believe that Additional restriction beyond the regulation in ETSI HS EN 302 567 should not be introduced on COT sharing. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are OK to down-select Alt-2. However, in our perspective both Alt1 and Alt.3 can be supported. One-shot LBT, if introduced, should be used in a configurable manner up to gNB. When the one-shot LBT is not used, Alt.1 is used, which is consistent with the minimum requirements mandated by the ETSI BRAN. However, when one-shot LBT is configured, Alt-3 is used, and the concept of maximum gap could be used to discern the case when no-LBT or one-shot LBT is used. So, we would propose to modify the proposal as follows:  Proposal 2.4.2-1:  On maximum gap within a COT to allow COT sharing without LBT, decide whether to down-select ~~to the following~~ one among the two alternatives or support both: |
| Ericsson | We support Alt 1. |
| OPPO | Agree with proposal and we support Alt.3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with the proposal. We prefer FL version. |
| Futurewei | We believe Alt-3 should be supported. Our suggested value was Y to be 3 symbols @120kHz.  We are fine with the modification by the FL and OK with the proposal. |
| LG | Support Alt 3.  Even if the regulatory requirements does not explicitly define the gap allowed for COT sharing, it is beneficial to introduce the maximum gap and the Cat-2 LBT for efficient COT sharing and fair coexistence with incumbent system in 60GHz. |
| DOCOMO | As no restriction is defined in ETSI BRAN, we are ok with supporting Alt 1. On the other hand, in our understanding, there is no reason to preclude the assumption that 60 GHz device can be deployed in another region based on the corresponding regulation(s) in the region. Japan regulation does not allow such no-LBT transmission for a responding device. It does not specify LBT with back-off, either. The only thing required is “sensing” to initiate any transmission. So in our understanding, at least in a certain region, Alt 3 needs to be supported. |
| Mediatek | In the absence of any gap definition in the regulation, we should assume no gap is allowed except when short enough to successfully transmit **only** an ACK/NACK. Hence, we support Alt 1. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Alt 1, but **not** Alt 3. Alt 3 would increase both gNB and UE complexity, while the benefits are unclear. |

## Cat 2 LBT

Agreement:

For Cat 2 LBT, down-select from the following alternatives

* Alt 1: Do not introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation
* Alt 2: Introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation

Agreement:

If Cat 2 LBT is introduced, the following use cases can be further studied:

* Resume transmission after a gap Y:  Cat 2 LBT may be used to resume transmission by the initiating device within the COT after a gap Y (FFS the value of Y)
* COT sharing: Cat 2 LBT may be used before transmission by a responding node sharing a COT
* Multi-Beam LBT:  Cat 2 LBT may be used before switching to a new transmission beam (not used in earlier part of the COT) in a COT with TDM beams, or resume a previously used transmission beam after a gap Z (FFS the value of Z)
* Rx-Assistance:  Cat 2 LBT may be used for sensing at the receiver as a responding device for Rx-Assistance measurements and associated signalling

Other use cases not precluded.

FFS if Cat 2 LBT is mandated for each use case or not.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Apple | Proposal 12: No CAT-2 LBT needs to be defined for COT sharing. |
| AT&T | Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT with additional requirement on Cat 2 LBT before beam switch  The per-beam LBT for different beams is performed one after another in time domain. The node completes one eCCA on one beam, and directly move on to the eCCA on the other beam, with no transmission in the middle |
| CAICT | Proposal 6: Cat2 LBT should be supported.  Proposal 5: Cat 2 LBT should be introduced for 60GHz NR-U.  Proposal 14: Performing Cat 2 LBT before beam switching within the COT could be supported, and it can be decided by gNB. |
| Charter Communications | Proposal 6: Do not introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation. |
| Ericsson | Observation 23 CAT2 LBT is not specified in HS EN 302 567  Observation 24 Simulations study show that there is no consistent gain using CAT2 LBT compared to no LBT for COT sharing.  Observation 25 It is not precluded to do CAT2 LBT in addition to the CAT3 LBT requirements. There is no motivation to specify it in the 3GPP RAN1 standard.  Proposal 15 Do not support CAT2 LBT for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 5: Introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation.  Proposal 7: When independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT, an additional requirement on Cat 2 LBT before beam switch during the COT should be specified. |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Proposal 19: Support introducing CAT2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation (Alt 2 in the agreement made in RAN1#104-e).  Support only use cases related to COT initiation, i.e., starting transmission on a secondary channel in Type B multi-channel access, and energy measurement and reporting of Rx-assistance information by the receiver in Rx-assisted LBT. |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 10: Cat-2 LBT is introduced for 60 GHz unlicensed band operation. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #8: Type 2 (e.g., 2A/2B/2C) channel access procedure can be introduced for the use cases such as COT sharing, multi-beam LBT, and Rx-Assistance and the maximum gap Y between the transmissions within the COT can be defined for above 52.6 GHz. |
| NEC | Proposal 3: A maximum gap Y should be defined, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within Y from the end of the earlier transmission. If the later transmission starts after Y from the end of the earlier transmission, an one-shot LBT is needed to share the COT.  Proposal 4: Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation should be introduced. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 3: Decide on Cat-2 LBT support separately for gNB and UE.  Proposal 4: Decide on Cat-2 LBT support together with the specific Cat-2 LBT use case.  Proposal 5: Do not support Cat-2 LBT at the UE side.  Proposal 6: Do not support Cat-2 LBT at the gNB side unless required for SSB transmission.  Proposal 16: One-shot LBT within COT is not required before gNB beam switch between SSBs  Observation 4: Use of LBT provides mostly loss of median throughput compared to no-LBT mode  Observation 5: Use of LBT reduces throughput for cell edge Ues  Observation 6: Simulation results do not show any gain from introduction of additional Cat-2 LBT at gNB beam switch during COT. |
| NTT DOCOMO INC. | Proposal 2: Cat 2 LBT, i.e., LBT with fixed sensing duration, should be introduced for 60 GHz unlicensed band operation, at least to support COT sharing. l Other use cases can be studied further |
| OPPO | Proposal 12: introduce Cat-2 LBT with a sensing duration of 13us, which further consists of an 8us duration followed by a 5us sensing slot. |
| Panasonic | Proposal 4: For a COT with TDM of beams, support both Alt-1 and Alt-2 in the previous agreement at the start of COT. Whether or not additional Cat 2 LBT is required before beam switching within the COT depends on the gap of no transmission of the next beam direction. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 7: Consider defining Cat 2 LBT as a sensing/measurement. Consider the use of such Cat 2 LBT sensing as an optional/configured and triggered component of LBT procedures  Proposal 14: Support Alt 2 for Multi-Channel LBT. For Type B multi-channel access, introduce Cat 2 LBT for non-primary channels. |
| Samsung | Proposal 4: Support the following types of channel access procedures for 60 GHz unlicensed band: • Type 1 channel access procedure without CWS adaptation; • Type 2 channel access procedure with zero and positive fixed sensing duration. |
| Sony | Proposal 7: Directional LBT should be supported in 60 GHz unlicensed operation. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 9: Cat 2 LBT should be supported for 60GHz unlicensed band operation.  Proposal 10: Cat 2 LBT may be used in case of Receiver-Assistance. |
| vivo | Proposal 4: The Cat 2 LBT can be used before switching to a new beam in a COT with TDM beams, before response with assistant information at the receiver, and in the Type B multi-channel access scheme. |
| WILUS Inc. | Proposal 5: We support Alt-2 to introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Observation 10: Current CCA check procedure in EN 302 567 can be regarded as “Cat 4” rather than “Cat3”.  Proposal 17: Cat 2/one-shot LBT should be considered to be introduced in above 52.6GHz for the following cases: • COT sharing • FBE mode • Multi-channel access procedure • Rx-assisted LBT • Resume transmission/beam switching |

### First Round Discussion

Discussion 2.5.1-0 (closed)

Summary: Current support for CAT 2 LBT FFS item appears as follows.

For Cat 2 LBT,

* Alt 1: Do not introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation
  + Apple, Charter, Ericsson, Nokia, MTK
* Alt 2: Introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation
  + AT&T, CAICT, FUTUREWEI, Huawei, Intel, LGE, NEC, NEC, NTT, OPPO, Qualcomm, Samsung, Spreadtrum, vivo, WILUS, ZTE, Lenovo, InterDigital, Convida, AT&T, Oppo, WILUS, LG, DCM

Moderator comment: My attempted compromise in discussion 2.5.1-1 and 2.5.1-2 obviously is not acceptable by most companies. So we are back to the beginning. There are many other discussion points rely on if Cat 2 LBT is introduced, and we cannot discuss this forever. Propose to set a deadline for a decision. Additional discussion in 2.5.2.

Seems that there is relative majority on introducing Cat 2 LBT, though there is strong objections from multiple companies as well. I would like to see if we can reach some compromise.

Discussion 2.5.1-1 (closed)

Do you agree with the following statement: For the use case of Cat 2 LBT identified, a Cat 4 LBT can serve the purpose as well, at the cost of longer LBT time, and uncertainty of LBT time.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt 1. Since EN 302 567 does now recognize Cat 2 LBT, we do not see a reason to introduce it. We have not seen evidence that use of Cat 2 LBT would provide benefit in operation at 60 GHz.  Furthermore, before making a blanket decision on introduction of Cat2 LBT, one should consider the use cases where it would be applied, as well as which devices (gNB or UE) is concerned. It seems different proponents of Alt 2 have very different ideas of when exactly Cat 2 LBT should be used.  For discussion 2.5.1-1: the LBT scheme described in 302 567 is rather Cat3 than Cat4 , as there is no CWS adjustment. The comparison between Cat3 and Ca2 depends on the specific use case. |
| Charter Communications | Alt 1. The principles of sub-7 GHz NR-U do not apply here. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We do not see what this statement is supposed to achieve. Generally, a successful long CCA implies that the channel would have sensed as idle even for a shorter period. But it doesn't serve the purpose of having to sense the channel for only a reasonably small period.  Support Alt 2 and it is applicable to use cases of COT sharing, in case of receiver assistance, beam switching within COT with TDM |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support Alt 2 and we agree Cat4 LBT can also achieve the function of Cat2 LBT but the effect may be different since Cat4 LBT may need to cost more times to complete LBT procedure, but Cat2 LBT does not need. So we don’t think Cat 4 LBT can directly replace Cat2 LBT. |
| Intel | We are OK with the statement made by the feature lead. The issue in using Cat-4 LBT is that the overall overhead would be greatly increased, which if used for instance for COT sharing may impact quite negatively the average system performance. However, the use of CAT-2 LBT may have a smaller impact, while helping to boost the QoS of the edge users. |
| vivo | We support Alt 2.  On the argument to against introducing Cat.2 LBT, we really don’t understand the logic. A fundamental reason that we had multiple categories of LBT in unlicensed band operation (LAA/NR-U) is to serve different purpose/scenario where one category LBT may be better than another. Multiple scenarios have been identified for Cat.2 LBT in 60 GHz operation where there’s benefit to use Cat.2 LBT. Let me ask this question, what would the harm by having Cat.2 LBT? Will the system performance degrade? |
| Apple | Alt 1  When a CAT4 LBT is performed, a new COT is acquired, therefore does not fit into the concept for three use cases, resume transmission after gap, COT sharing and multi-beam COT.  For Rx assisted, UE can always measure channel is busy or not and feedback assisted information. We do not see CAT-2 LBT is needed either. |
| Futurewei | We support Alt-2. We do not agree with the statement. The timeliness of Cat-2 based reports and checks are important. |
| NEC | We support Alt 2, and be open to discuss the use cases of Cat 2 LBT at least for COT sharing. Regarding discussion 2.5.1-1, we think long and uncertain sensing duration may be not necessary for most potential use cases though a Cat 4 LBT can serve the purpose as well. |
| Ericsson | We prefer Alt 1 as CAT2 LBT is not specified in the EN 302 567. Furthermore, we did not see any significant gain in performing additional CAT2 LBT at the receiver for COT sharing.  We agree with the statement in Discussion 2.5.1-1. However, we would like to highlight that the mechanism defined in EN 302 567 v2.20 is CAT3 LBT and not CAT4 LBT. Although the “*cost of longer LBT time, and uncertainty of LBT time*” may be true, it is not highly impactful as the CWS is only 3. |
| InterDigital | We support Alt. 2 at least for beam switching within COT with TDM. |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer Alt. 2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Alt 2.  In our view, introducing CAT2 LBT is beneficial for procedures related to COT initiation rather than for transmitting within the COT. The benefits of Type B multi-channel access procedures cannot be realized without introducing CAT2 LBT to initiate a CO on a secondary channel. Furthermore, on initiating a CO using Rx-assisted LBT, CAT2 LBT can be used for energy measurement at the receiver and providing the Rx-assistance information from only the devices that pass the LBT. |
| Samsung | We support Alt 2 as in the summary. Introducing Cat 2 LBT will significantly reduce the potential spec changes, since everything using Cat 2 LBT in NR-U can basically be reused. |
| AT&T | We support Alt. 2 for the reasons mentioned by other proponents above. |
| OPPO | Support Alt 2. |
| WILUS | We support Alt 2. Also we are open to discuss 2.5.1-1 although the reason to have longer LBT time by using Cat-4 is not clear to us. |
| LG | We support Alt 2.  The several use cases of Cat-2 LBT other than COT sharing is identified to be studied during the RAN1#104-e meeting as follows: Cat-2 LBT may be used before switching to a new transmission beam in a COT with TDM beams, and Cat-2 LBT may be used for sensing at the receiver as a responding device for RX-assistance measurement and associated signalling. Even if the EN 302 567 does not explicitly define the Cat-2 LBT, it is beneficial to prevent the collisions between the transmissions and can be useful in above use cases. |
| DOCOMO | Support Alt 2. |

Discussion 2.5.1-2 (closed)

Do you agree with the following compromise:

* Alt 3: Instead of introducing Cat 2 LBT, a Cat 4 LBT with fixed counter (instead of randomly from 0 to 3) can be used for proposed use cases for Cat 2 LBT
  + The fixed counter can be 0

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | According to EN 302 567, size of the contention window shall be at least 3. Hence Alt 3 is not in line with the harmonized standard. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No, we do not agree |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Disagree Alt 3 and reason has been mentioned in discussion 2.5.1-2. Besides, at least for COT sharing or Rx-assistance case, we think that Cat 3 LBT with fixed counter cannot replace Cat2 LBT. |
| Intel | As long as the introduced LBT procedure has a short and fixed length, we would be OK with Alt.3, and to fix the counter to 0, so a minimum of 8us observation period would be performed. However, this new LBT procedure should not be used to initiate a COT, so that the rules mandates in the ETSI BRAN are not violated. |
| Vivo | As we commented, we categorize LBT types for a reason. We still prefer Cat.2 LBT. |
| Apple | Do not support Alt 3. |
| Futurewei | We agree with the statement that removing randomness and allowing for shorter length LBT can capture advantages of Cat2 LBT. |
| NEC | No, we prefer Alt 2 as mentioned in discussion 2.5.1-1. |
| Ericsson | It is not clear to us how this will be specified. If it is left to implementation or that it would be specified as a “CAT3 variant”. Regardless of whether it is called CAT2 LBT or CAT3 variant as in Alt 3, it needs to be indicated to the UE. This is unnecessary complexity in our opinion. Furthermore, Alt 3 is not compliant with EN 302 567. CAT3 LBT in EN 302 567 itself is CAT2 LBT on an average 25% of the time.  CAT3 LBT = 8+ 5x(rand(0.3)); which implies channel access occurs using 8us, 13us, 18us, or 23us with 25% of the time using 8us. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with this compromise. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not think that Cat 4 LBT, even with fixed (deterministic) counter value or 0 counter value, can be considered equivalent to Cat 2 LBT. This is due to the fact that Cat4 LBT procedure relies on persistent deferral (iCCA for a duration of Td) as long as the channel is sensed busy as opposed to one-shot CCA performed over a fixed duration in Cat 2 LBT. |
| OPPO | Do not support Alt 3. |
| WILUS | We don’t support Alt 3 which is not compliant with harmonized standard in ETSI BRAN. |
| LG | We do not support Alt-3. |
| DOCOMO | Ok with the compromise |

### Second Round Discussion

The next proposal is trying to set a deadline on the decision if Cat 2 LBT is introduced.

Proposal 2.5.2-1

RAN1 to reach agreement on if Cat 2 LBT is introduced for unlicensed operation in 52.6 ~ 71GHz band by RAN1 #106-e. The decision should be based on case-by-case study for different proposed use cases of Cat 2 LBT. Companies are encouraged to provide evaluation and justifications for the introduction. If consensus cannot be reached by then, Cat 2 LBT will not be introduced for unlicensed operation in the WI.

Support: Apple, vivo, Spreadtrum, Samsung, Ericsson, DCM, MTK, Nokia

Not support: ZTE, Intel, Oppo, HW, FW, LG

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Apple | Support the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We would like to understand what are technical concerns with introducing Cat 2 LBT |
| vivo | OK with the proposal. We still think that in some specific scenarios, Cat 2 LBT should be introduced to enhance the performance by avoiding possible interference to other nodes. |
| CATT | When RAN1 cannot reach agreement by next meeting, does it mean that performing additional one-shot LBT in some uses cases such as COT sharing, multi-beam COT, multi-channel access will not be introduced for unlicensed operation in WI as well? If so, we still think Cat 2 LBT should be introduced for 60GHz NR-U. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think whether Cat2 LBT should be introduced in 52.6 - 71GHz band need to be discussed case by case, instead generally speaking, should or should not be introduced. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | The discussion of Cat 2 LBT is closely related to many other proposals. We should fully aware of the consequence before concluding Cat LBT 2 is not introduced. |
| Intel | Do not support the proposal since there is clear majority of companies prefer to introduce Cat-2 LBT, and it is still unclear what are the technical motivations for not introducing it. |
| Moderator | We can have case by case discussion. If there is one case that we agree Cat 2 LBT is necessary, we should agree on introducing it.  The goal of the proposal is, we should not discuss the topic forever. We have 3 meeting left. This Cat 2 LBT has many impacts to other discussions so we should strive to agree on the adoption or not earlier.  From Qualcomm point of view, we do support the Cat 2 LBT introduction. However, it is not introduced, we can still use Cat 4 LBT with more resource waste. The system should still work, though not as efficient. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. We do not support introduction of CAT2 LBT.  Technically, there were only two companies with simulation results that analysed the impact of CAT2 LBT. Our simulation results showed no benefit in performing CAT2 LBT for COT sharing. The other simulations showed no benefit in using CAT2 LBT during beam switching within a COT. Furthermore, CAT2 LBT is not recognized by the ETSI regulations. The competing technology also does not implement CAT2 LBT for COT sharing and multi-beam COT. There is no motivation to specify something more than what the regulations require. |
| OPPO | We agree with Intel, there is a clear majority support of Cat-2. The supporting companies have explained multiple times the reasoning and the use case for introducing/utilizing Cat-2. We cannot accept that opposing companies just commented that there is no motivation or no technical reasons in order to prevent from making agreement. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t see the need for such a deadline. We prefer to have the case by case discussion as already pointed out by couple of companies. |
| Futurewei | We are fine to discuss Cat-2 on a case by case basis and would like to see the objections to introducing CAT-2 LBT spelled out. |
| LG | We do not support the Proposal 2.5.2-1. From Discussion 2.5.1-0 in the first round discussion, it is clear the majority of companies support the introduction of Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation. As we mentioned, even if the regulatory requirements does not explicitly define the Cat-2 LBT, it is beneficial to prevent the collisions between the transmissions and can be useful in above use cases. |
| Moderator | Yes we do have a majority view on introducing Cat 2 LBT (including us). However, we are running a consensus based system. The intention of the proposal is, if the proposing companies cannot convince the objecting companies by next meeting (which includes a summer break) there is good enough reason to introduce Cat 2 LBT, the chance of achieving the goal is not high in my opinion, and the damage with not making a decision increase. Thus I would recommend we set up a deadline to make a decision. We should treat it with high priority in the next meeting, and the proposing companies are encouraged to bring up the best argument and evaluation results to justify the introduction of Cat 2 LBT. |
| DOCOMO | Agree to set up the deadline considering some other topics depending on this decision. |
| Mediatek | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Ok to decide in the next meeting. However, as discussed earlier, the introduction should be considered case by case. |

## Rx Assistance

Agreement:

For receiver to provide assistance, channel sensing and reporting need to be performed. The following set of tools can be considered for further discussion

* Alt 1. Legacy RSSI measurement and reporting with possible enhancements
* Alt 2. AP-CSI report with possible enhancements
* Alt 3. LBT at receiver
  + Alt 3.1 eCCA
  + Alt 3.2 Cat2 LBT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| AT&T | Proposal 3:  • Receiver assistance in Rel. 17 is limited to measurement enhancements  • Message based schemes similar to RTS/CTS signalling can be addressed in a later release targeting Class B scenarios  • Hand shaking is not supported  • Transmission should be allowed before the receiver assistance is received • Receiver assistance can equally be useful, and should be allowed, for the no-LBT mode of transmissions  • Receiver assistance is a fast, low complexity feedback mechanism to convey to the transmitter the interference environment at the receiver |
| CATT | Proposal 15：The receiver assistance channel access mechanism can be designed based on the A-CSI feedback framework. |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 9: Receiver assisted LBT and channel access should be supported in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.  Proposal 10: Enhancement of resource utilization and interference mitigation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz should be considered.  Proposal 11: For receiver to provide assistance, the following can be further discussed: legacy RSSI measurement and reporting with possible enhancements, AP-CSI report with possible enhancements and LBT at receiver using eCCA or Cat2 LBT. |
| Ericsson | Observation 17 Receiver assisted LBT does not show consistent performance improvement as compared to no LBT operation.  Observation 18 Receiver assistance LBT involves RTS/CTS-like handshaking in every data transfer procedure, which significantly increases data transfer latency, reduces spectrum efficiency and system capacity.  Observation 19 The standardization and implementation technical complexity and cost for receiver assistance LBT should not be under-estimated.  Observation 20 A new L1 report quantity of L1-RSSI can be introduced for UE to report interference level to gNB.  Observation 21 Enhancement to enable aperiodic CSI reporting to be triggered by DL DCIs and to be transmitted on PUCCH as being discussed in the URLLC WI can be reused to communicate receiver assistance information to gNB.  Observation 22 Current processing delay requirement for CSI reporting in NR can be reduced for L1-RSSI reporting, to make the receiver assistance mechanisms more efficient.  Proposal 12 Do not support receiver assisted LBT (Alt-3) in Rel-17.  Proposal 13 Support Alt-1 and Alt-2 for receiver assistance mechanisms that are based on the existing RSSI or CSI reporting and decoupled from data transmission procedure.  Proposal 14 The following enhancements on the current AP-CSI reporting can be considered to better support receiver assistance information reporting: |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 2: To support that gNB determines whether to transmit a PDSCH based on UE’s assistance information, LBT at receiver (Alt 3) is preferred. |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 8: For receiver assisted LBT, support NR CSI-IM based reporting for the clear channel assessment at the receiver.  Proposal 9: For receiver assisted LBT, the receiver shall report the resource availability prior to the transmission. The RSSI measurement definition may be extended to assess the resource availability, where the resources, type of measurement (for instance Cat2 LBT) shall be provided by the transmitter. |
|  |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Observation 4：Receiver-only directional LBT saves the LBT overhead associated with the transmitter-side LBT of the receiver-assisted LBT mechanism and provides an efficient tradeoff as it aims at increasing the spatial reuse while mitigating the hidden node issue.  Proposal 20：For operation in the 60 GHz band, receiver-side LBT should be supported (Alt 3 in the agreement made in the RAN1#104-e).  Observation 7: Compared to No-LBT, substantial coverage gains are achieved using Receiver-assisted LBT/Receiver-only LBT in the indoor scenario, especially at medium and high traffic load. Even higher gains are realized when wider beams are used for directional transmissions  Observation 8: For Receiver-assisted LBT/Receiver-only LBT, if a high EDT\_Rx threshold is used, the DL cell-edge performance degrades if only CTS/idle indication is fed back when interference level is lower than the EDT\_Rx threshold. |
| Intel Corporation | Observation 2: Receiver-aided LBT is able to mitigate the issues introduced by directional LBT and offers a mean to better assess the correct level of interference at the receiver. |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 5: Receiver based directional LBT is supported.  Proposal 6: A single receiver based directional LBT process can be performed on a beam whose parameters are determined from the parameters of the Rx beam of one or more associated transmissions.  Proposal 7: Enhance legacy RSSI measurements and AP-CSI reporting to enable beam-based receiver assisted channel sensing and reporting. |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | Proposal 21: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, adopt CG retransmission collision avoidance techniques such as retransmission deferral or additional retransmission resources.  Proposal 24: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, receiver assistance should be supported for both LBT and no-LBT based channel access mechanisms to avoid potential interference at the receiver.  Proposal 25: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, enhancement to the transmitter side LBT mechanism based on failure to receive HARQ feedback scheme or timer-based scheme should be supported for LBT based channel access mechanisms to consider potential interference at the receiver.  Proposal 26: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, only class A receiver assistance should be supported where the assistance information is sent only to the transmitter.  Proposal 28: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, for receiver to provide assistance, channel sensing and reporting need to be performed and following enhancements to legacy RSSI measurements should be supported: - for long term sensing to measure interference statistics from WiFi systems or other NR operators, a new category of ZP CSI-RS should be supported where the UE is not expected to receive any channel/signal (including NZP CSI-RS for interference measurement) and only measure potential interference from WiFi nodes or other NR operators and report back corresponding measurements.  Proposal 29: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, for receiver to provide assistance, channel sensing and reporting need to be performed and eCCA should be supported as follows: - Signaling mechanism similar to RTS/CTS should be considered for receiver assistance o Short transmission using control channels (such as with 1-bit) or reference signals for before the actual transmission could be supported |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #6: For the receiver to provide assistance, support Alt 1 (i.e., legacy RSSI measurement and reporting with possible enhancements), and the introduction of directional RSSI and L1 RSSI reporting can be considered as the potential enhancements. |
| MediaTek Inc. | Proposal 3: Among candidate mechanisms to obtain assistant information from receiver in receiver-assisted LBT, at least RSSI should not be considered. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 29: Employ RSSI measurements and CSI reporting as a part of the receiver assistance.  Proposal 30: Wait for the URLLC discussion to conclude on aperiodic CSI on PUCCH feature.  Proposal 31: Any Rx assistance scheme should be configurable per UE, so that it could be used only with UEs frequently detecting high interference.  Proposal 32: For any new Rx assistance schemes, UE processing time similar to PDSCH processing time (N1) or CSI computation time (N2/Z1Z2) should be considered when providing Rx assistance.  Proposal 33: Rx assistance should not be limited to the beginning of COT only. |
| NTT DOCOMO INC. | Proposal 3: For Rx assistance, support Alt 1 (Legacy RSSI measurement and reporting with possible enhancements) and/or Alt 2 (AP-CSI report with possible enhancements): l Alt 1 with enhancements to consider beam-related aspects should be a starting point at least for the support of long-term Rx-assistance l Alt 2 should also be considered if the need of short-term Rx-assistance is observed |
| OPPO | Proposal 15: RTS-like signal can be carried in a PDCCH and CTS-like signal can be carried in a PUCCH. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Observation 5: The results for 2-operator deployment indicate that beam collisions can be severe with a significant fraction of users experiencing interference level higher than the carrier level.  Observation 6: The worst-case beams collisions, if persistent, can lead to stuck situations, that is, an extended duration of severe interference.  Observation 7: The worst-case collisions, if sporadic and unpredictable, can lead to intense bursty interference and consequent penalties.  Proposal 6: Support LBT sensing at the receiver with a conditional response from the receiver for Rx-Assistance. |
| Samsung | Proposal 11: Support dynamic RX-assistant channel access mechanism with handshake between transmitter and receiver, e.g. wherein the channel access request is based on DCI and channel access response is based on UCI in a downlink scenario.  Proposal 12: Support RSSI measurement outside the active BWP and in non-serving cell. |
| Sony  Sony | Proposal 11: Receiver assisted LBT should be supported in 60 GHz unlicensed operation.  Observation 5: For RSSI measurement and reporting with possible enhancements, L1-RSSI carried in CSI needs to be considered.  Observation 6: For AP-CSI report with possible enhancements, fast and low complexity measurement/reporting may be required.  Observation 7: For LBT at receiver, PDCCH transmission corresponds to RTS-like signal and PUCCH corresponds to CTS-like signal.  Proposal 12: For reporting receiver assistance information, CSI reporting mechanism should be a baseline. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 4: Regarding receiver assisted LBT, at least the method of Legacy RSSI measurement and reporting with possible enhancements (Alt 1) and the method of AP-CSI report with possible enhancements (Alt 2) should be supported for further study. |
| vivo | Proposal 13: LBT at receiver is supported and Cat 2 LBT can be applied.  Proposal 14: The assistant information can include the channel state information at the receiver, such as the LBT results, AP-CSI report.  Proposal 15: The transmitter request triggering UE to send assistant information should be studied.  Proposal 16: Each transmitter request monitoring occasion corresponds to a receiver feedback transmission opportunity. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 4: Conditions about whether to enable/disable receiver assisted LBT can be studied.  Proposal 5: How to design a receiver assisted LBT with a simpler flow and little spec impact should be considered.  Proposal 6: For receiver to provide assistance, the Rx side can report its detected interference level periodically to Tx. And Tx can determine whether to occupy the channel based on the interference level values previously received from Rx side. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Proposal 16: For receiver assisted channel access and interference management, l If existing L1 and L3 measurement mechanism is supported to obtain assistance information, some enhancements may need to be considered for using the measurement results timely and effectively to guide the subsequent transmission. l If LBT is supported to obtain assistance information, assistance information can be considered to be obtained within COT in addition to the beginning of COT. n If Cat2 LBT is used for receiver, then Cat4 LBT should be used for transmitter to initiate a COT. |

### First Round Discussion

For receiver to provide assistance, the following positions are collected

* Alt 1. Legacy RSSI measurement and reporting with possible enhancements
  + AT&T, Ericsson, FUTUREWEI, Lenovo, LG, Mediatek (at least), Nokia, DOCOMO, ~~Samsung~~, Sony, Spreadtrum, ~~vivo,~~ ZTE
* Alt 2. AP-CSI report with possible enhancements
  + CATT, Convida, Ericsson, Nokia, Sony, Spreadtrum, ~~vivo~~
* Alt 3. LBT at receiver (Convida, Fujitsu, Huawei, Intel, AT&T, InterDigital, OPPO, Sony, vivo, Xiaomi(study), ZTE,Samsung )
  + Alt 3.1 eCCA
  + Alt 3.2 Cat2 LBT

Proposal 2.6.1-1

As a receiver assistance technique, introduce L1-RSSI measurement to be sent as part of an enhanced AP-CSI report

* FFS: Timeline of measurement, reporting and trigger
* FFS: Measurement configuration/resource of L1-RSSI
* FFS: ZP-CSI-RS based measurement
* FFS: Beam specific RSSI measurement and reporting
* FFS: What is included in the L1-RSSI report, such as the value of RSSI measurement, comparison outcome with Energy Detection threshold, etc
* FFS: CCA/eCCA based receiver assistance
* Support: Nokia, Charter, Lenovo, ZTE, Intel, Futurewei (mostly), Ericsson, InterDigital, Fujitsu, Convida, Spreadtrum, CATT, DCM
* Not support: vivo, Huawei, LG

Moderator comments:

* This proposal is to capture the “possible enhancements” part of Alt 1 and Alt2
* This proposal does not rule out using legacy AP-CSI or legacy L3-RSSI for receiver assistance
* This proposal does not rule out separate discussion on using LBT for receiver assistance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We support specification of L1-RSSI measurement and reporting. |
| Charter Communications | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal, but would additionally suggest including a proposal on further consideration for Alt 3 that doesn’t seem to be covered by the proposal, although there is quite good support for Alt 3 as well |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with the proposal 2.6.1-1. further, we would like to confirm whether this proposal also include the triggering of AP-L1-RSSI. |
| Intel | We are generally OK with the proposal. |
| vivo | First of all, we corrected our position in the summary as we don’t support Alt 1 and Alt 2.  We have concerns about the proposal. Is the intention to confirm Alt 1 and Alt 2? If that’s the understanding, then we don’t support this proposal. We think Alt 3 should be part of Rx Assistance data as that has been evaluated and demonstrated effective gain during SI. |
| Apple | Need clarification on Alt 1 and this proposal. Is Alt-1 limit to L3-RSSI and its enhancement?  As AP-CSI enhancement, the improvement of L1-RSSI versus L1-SINR is not clear |
| Futurewei | We support RSSI enhancement and use of Cat-2 LBT sensing at receiver. We are mostly OK with this proposal. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal with a slight modification as shown in red below.  *Proposal 2.6.1-1*  *As a receiver assistance technique, introduce L1-RSSI measurement to be sent as part of an enhanced AP-CSI report*   * *FFS: Timeline of measurement, reporting and trigger* * *FFS: Measurement configuration/resource of L1-RSSI* * *FFS: ZP-CSI-RS based measurement* * *FFS: Beam specific RSSI measurement and reporting* * *FFS: What is included in the L1-RSSI report, such as the value of RSSI measurement, comparison outcome with Energy Detection threshold, etc* |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We are generally OK with the proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Alt 3 in the agreement and we cannot agree with the Proposal 2.6.1-1 for the following reasons:   * It should be noted that introducing L1-RSSI is not an enhancement of the ‘Legacy RSSI’ measurement and reporting which is a L3 measurement. Introducing L1-RSSI would require defining a new measurement quantity in L1 along with designing and specifying its measurement configuration, resources, trigger and associated timelines. * We understand that proposing that the L1-RSSI measurement be provided in AP-CSI report attempts to overcome the issues with legacy RSSI measurements, specifically, being periodically measured and reported by all UEs in the cell regardless of gNB’s intention to schedule them. However, the current AP-CSI reporting mechanism by itself needs several enhancements to resolve these issues:   + The AP CSI-RS would be triggered by each scheduling DL assignments for measurement, then followed by some processing delay before reporting CSI on PUCCH resources from the UEs candidate for scheduling UEs. Such a mechanism does not exist and would need be designed and specified in addition to introducing L1-RSSI.   + Relaying on the current AP-CSI reporting mechanism on PUSCH means that the gNB cannot trigger the AP-CSI reporting by the same scheduling DL assignments and additional DCIs (triggering UL grants) are needed for the timely feedback to be sent.   + As acknowledged by the proponents of AP-CSI, current processing delays for CSI reports in NR are rather long. * We do not see how above issues and associated specification work could be comparable to the specification work for simple ED measurement during LBT by the candidate UEs before reporting on a triggered resource by the same DL assignments from only the UEs who pass the LBT. |
| Samsung | Corrected our view in the summary.  We are wondering the essential difference between L1-RSSI measurement with short duration and LBT sensing. To support the L1-RSSI measurement enhancement, lots of spec impact is expected (e.g. so many FFS points), and a simpler way could be including LBT sensing results in CSI report. |
| AT&T | Agree with Samsung |
| OPPO | We don’t support the proposal. It is not clear to us how this L1-RSSI measurement/report is used in the LBT procedure. We prefer to discuss the procedure of the receiver assisted LBT first. If enhancement of L1-RSSI measurement is required, it can be discussed later after the procedure is clear. |
| Moderator | To clarify why I bring this proposal up. Last time the agreement has enhancement part to both Alt 1 and Alt 2. In the last email discussion, we asked the question what enhancement people have in mind. This proposal is trying to summarize what is collected. This is not trying to replace the CCA/eCCA based receiver assistance, which is still open. This is also not trying to replace the legacy AP-CSI or legacy L3-RSSI based receiver assistance, consider those are already there or at most a feature discussion to support them in this band.  Between L1-RSSI and L3-RSSI, I see the difference mainly this L1-RSSI can be faster and based on AP-CSI reporting. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We are fine with this proposal and supports introduce L1-RSSI measurement as AP-CSI enhancement. |
| LG | We don’t support the Proposal 2.6.1-1.  We do not prefer to introduce the additional or new mechanism (such as L1-RSSI measurement to be sent as part of AP-CSI report) for the receiver assisted LBT because the assistance information or feedback mechanism is already supported by the current specification. |
| DOCOMO | We support the updated proposal 2.6.1-1 above. |
| Mediatek | Our view is not accurately captured. Our proposal is listed as follows  **Proposal 3:Among candidate mechanisms to obtain assistant information from receiver in receiver-assisted LBT, at least RSSI should not be considered.**  The above proposal means that RSSI should be precluded, since the property of RSSI mechanisms that periodically configuring resource set to all UEs in a cell is not suitable for rx-assisted LBT in our view. However, we are fine with the moderator’s proposal if the L1-RSSI is just part of AP-CSI report. |

### Second Round Discussion

Proposal 2.6.2-1

Possible conclusion:

Legacy AP-CSI report (without additional enhancement) and legacy L3-RSSI measurement (without additional enhancements) can be configured for UE in 52.6-71GHz band per UE feature discussion.

Moderator notes: This conclusion is trying to say, without enhancements, AP-CSI and/or L3-RSSI can already be used to provide some level of receiver assistance. This is not trying to close the door for enhancements.

Support: Apple, Lenovo, CATT, Spreadtrum, MTK, Fujitsu, Samsung, Intel, Ericsson, Futurewei, LG,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Apple | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree that some level of receiver assistance can be provided, but we don’t want to close the door for potential enhancements, if needed |
| vivo | If this conclusion does not preclude any other possible enhancements, we are ok with it. |
| CATT | Support  However, as for L3-RSSI, it should be noted that the transient period is about 3 us, and the RSSI measurement configuration should take the transient period into the consideration for 480 kHz and 960kHz. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We want to confirm whether “without enhancement” mentioned in notes is for which of the following cases:  Case 1: current AP-CSI-RS and/or L3-RSSI specified in FR2  Case 2: AP-CSI-RS and/or L3-RSSI with new SCS(e.g., 480kHz, 960kHz ) in FR2x/FR3.  Case 3: both Case 1 and Case 2 above. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with this conclusion. |
| Mediatek | Support. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| Samsung | We are ok with this conclusion. |
| Intel | Support |
| Moderator | To ZTE: Your questions should be covered by “per UE feature discussion part”. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal in principle. Legacy measurements can already be used in 60 GHz band. Specific enhancements to these methods need further study. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not see the purpose of and the need for such a conclusion.  Any legacy measurement/report is supported in next releases unless it is explicitly excluded (which we don’t recall this has ever happened). We understand how the background discussion on Rx-assistance has led FL to propose such conclusion here, however, this conclusion, as is, does not have any relation to Channel Access discussion nor does it have any specification impact. |
| Futurewei | We are ok with this conclusion. |
| LG | We support the proposal. |
| Moderator | To HW. Yes this is quite obvious. That is why this is a conclusion. The reason I put it here is many companies consider these as some kind of receiver assistance techniques. |

Discussion 2.6.2-2 (closed)

Possible conclusion:

For receiver to provide assistance when gNB is the initiating device, Alt 3.1 (LBT at receiver with eCCA) can already be supported if gNB indicates the UE to use Cat 4 LBT for UL transmission

Moderator comment: Sorry the language of this discussion is not clear. Let me try again in discussion 2.6.3-1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Apple | For UL transmission, gNB is the receiver. PUSCH scheduling is receiver assisted in certain sense, regardless of whether UE use CAT 4 LBT or not for UL. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Again, similar comment as above, we don’t want to close the door for potential enhancements, if needed |
| vivo | Alt 3.1 can be an option, but we still think that Cat. 2 LBT or even no LBT (perform as short control signalling) is more suitable for a quick feedback with assistant information. |
| CATT | Agree with apple’s view. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Share similar views with Apple. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree. |
| Mediatek | Agree |
| Fujitsu | We agree with the view that the gNB is the receiver for UL transmission.  In addition, if consider directional LBT, when the gNB indicates the UE to use LBT for UL transmission, the sensing beam for the LBT should be corresponding to the transmission beam of the UL transmission, while for the purpose of assistance for DL transmission, the sensing beam for the LBT at receiver should be corresponding to the reception beam of DL transmission.  Considering the above, it cannot be directly concluded that Alt 3.1 (LBT at receiver with eCCA) can already be supported if gNB indicates the UE to use Cat 4 LBT for UL transmission. |
| Samsung | We don’t agree with this conclusion. The key part of “provide assistance” is missing in the argument. When gNB indicating UE to perform LBT, there is no feedback from the UE on the sensing result, and such feedback part is missing from the conclusion. So in our understanding, essentially RX assistance includes two steps: 1) gNB provides information on the configuration for the assistance information 2) UE reports the assistance information. The second part of the procedure is missing in the conclusion.  Also, even for the first step, we are not sure whether it is clear that it is already supported by existing mechanism. Because the existing channel access bit field is only for PUCCH/SRS. |
| Intel | Do not support the statement above. In our understanding, the procedure of Alt.3.1 is different, and the transmission at the initiating device (i.e., gNB) is conditional to the success of the LBT at the receiver (i.e., UE), which is not achievable through the simple signalling of the LBT by the gNB. |
| Moderator | Added “when gNB is the initiating device” in the possible conclusion to clarify a little.  Seems that we still have different understanding on what is the behavior for Alt 3.1. Please provide some details on what you have in mind for Alt 3.1.  From Qualcomm point of view, we see the transmission or not (as the result the eCCA) from the UE as the assistance information. |
| Ericsson | We do not support this proposal. We need to separate the discussions on Receiver-assistance measurements/reporting (Alt 1 and Alt2 ) and LBT at the receiver (Alt 3.1). These questions need clarifications from the proponents of Alt 3. before we agree further on this topic.  1. Does LBT at the receiver mean-  LBT to transmit CTS? Where is this triggered? Need a new DCI format? If the LBT fails, is CTS not transmitted?  2. CTS is not a signal known in 3GPP. Which resources are used to transmit CTS ? Do they require a PUCCH format for UCI?  Conventional RTS/CTS are transmitted over the full channel BW (omnidirectionally)to avoid hidden nodes. Is that the purpose here?  3. What does gNB do with the information in CTS or if CTS is not transmitted ? Is PDSCH Conditioned based on the contents of CTS?  3. OR, If eCCA/CAT2 LBT is used as a “measurement”, we need to define a new report and it is as good as a AP-CSI reporting.  From our point of view, enhancements to AP-CSI reporting mechanisms can be considered in addition to introducing new report quantity for L1- RSSI while reducing the processing latency. We do not support Alt 3. |
| OPPO | It is not clear what the conclusion means? It says that the gNB is an initiating device and also it says that the gNB indicates the UE to use CAT-4 to transmit UL. Does it mean that gNB and UE are in the same gNB COT or in separate COT. If they are in different COT, it is not clear that why UE can provide assistance info corresponding to the gNB’s transmission during the gNB COT. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support the conclusion.  Rx-assistance is the assistance the receiver provides to the transmitter to indicate whether the channel at the receiver side is clear for the signal reception. As such, at the UE side, Rx-assistance is the assistance to the gNB as to whether or not gNB should send its DL transmission. In our view, this Rx-assistance should be in the form of CTS (+interference info) after (one-shot) LBT. Other companies may prefer other forms of Rx-assistance but, in our view, the common denominator of all these schemes is that Rx-assistance is the assistance that receiving node sends to the transmitting node to help the transmitting node to decide whether its own transmission should be carried out. |
| Futurewei | We also do not support this conclusion. Our understanding is similar to Samsung in that UE reporting part seems to be missing. |
| LG | We are fine with the above possible conclusion if the Alt 3.1 can be supported using the legacy mechanism supported by Rel-15/16 specification (i.e., without additional mechanism/enhancement). |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | For updated proposal, we think that since gNB is the initiating device, and if LBT is required in this area, then it will inevitably initiate a COT. In this case, we don’t understand why gNB has to indicate a Cat4 LBT to receiver side such as UE instead of Cat 2 LBT or No LBT.  To say the least, even if the gNB indicates a Cat4 LBT to UE, it cannot also preclude a case that assistance information can be provided within COT in additional to the beginning of COT. For this case, Cat2 LBT or No LBT can be also allowed to be indicated to UE. |

### Third Round Discussion

Need some clarification on exactly what Alt 3.1 means for receiver assistant LBT. Please provide your view for the next discussion point:

Discussion 2.6.3-1

For receiver to provide assistance Alt 3.1 (eCCA based), when gNB is the initiating device (UE is providing assistance), what is your view on this scheme

* Alt 3.1A: gNB schedules or triggers UL transmission (PUCCH, PUSCH, SRS etc) with DCI and indicating Cat 4 LBT in the DCI. UE performs Cat 4 LBT for the scheduled UL transmission. gNB detects the scheduled UL transmission to tell if UE passes the Cat 4 LBT
  + Support: Nokia, CATT
* Alt 3.1B: New RTS/CTS-like signaling introduced. gNB sends RTS-like signaling to UE. UE performs Cat 4 LBT and if LBT passes, transmits CTS-like signaling to explicitly indicate the LBT outcome. gNB detects the CTS-like signaling to identify if the UE passed Cat 4 LBT. After detecting the CTS-like signal, the data transmission happens
  + Support: Apple, Lenovo, Samsung
* Anything else?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| DOCOMO | “New RTS/CTS” is a bit too jumping in our view. Maybe the key point is whether to report information from Rx side to Tx side. For UL transmission, we agree gNB’s instruction on channel access mechanism could be said as “Rx assistance”. For DL transmission, our understanding is there is no such functionality, which is a discussion point in our view. We may be able to say “whether to support such reporting from UE to gNB in advance to DL transmission”. |
| Apple | In our view, Alt 3.1A is not receiver assisted. For UL transmission with DCI indicating CAT4 LBT or no LBT is mainly to differentiate inside COT or outside COT, based on regulation requirement.  Alt 3.1B is one way of receiver assisted. For example for DL transmission, gNB send PDSCH scheduling DCI (RTS like), and UE measure the link and send ACK (CTS like). gNB continue PDSCH transmission after receiving ACK (CTS like). |
| Nokia, NSB | Our understanding is that Alt 3.1.A can anyhow be supported as a gNB scheduling choice. It is not clear if anything else is needed. We see no need for another RST/CTS-like scheme as in 3.1B |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Our understanding of Alt 3.1 is similar to Alt 3.1B. Alt 3.1A in our view is not really receiver assistance. With receiver assistance, in Alt 3.1B, RTS/CTS handshake is done before actual transmission of data. |
| CATT | Our understanding of Alt 3.1 is similar to Alt 3.1A.  Alt 3.1A can be supported without specification impact. However, new RTS/CTS-like signalling in Alt 3.1B means that a new DCI format for scheduling CTS signalling and PDSCH is required to be designed for the 60GHz NR-U. Such RTS/CTS-like mechanism is not supported in the EN 302.567. We see no need to introduce Alt 3.1B in 60GHz NR-U as well. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | In our understanding, Rx-assisted LBT can be supported but the current proposal cannot limit LBT as Cat4 LBT. Such wording seems to preclude COT sharing case. |
| Samsung | Our understanding of Alt 3.1 is similar to Alt 3.1B, but the CTS/RTS may not be new signal/channels. The request from gNB on channel sensing can be similar to the one as described in Alt 3.1A (but may not be restricted to CAT4 LBT), and the UE should provide an explicit feedback (e.g. as part of UCI) of the sensing result instead of implicitly indication by a UL transmission. |
| vivo | Firstly, we think the functionality of the assistant information should be clarified. How does the assistant information help gNB? What will gNB do when it receives the assistant information? What will gNB do if it does not receive the assistant information. From our point of view, the assistant information is to help gNB to perform DL transmission, i.e., gNB can perform DL transmission **only after** it receives the assistant information.  We don’t see how Alt 3.1 A assists the gNB. What will gNB do before receiving the UL transmissions? There is always a processing time for UE before UL transmission (e.g., k2). gNB should or should not transmit during this period? |
| Ericsson | We do not support adding Alt 3.1-B, RTS-CTS like transmission without having proper evidence to suggest that there are benefits.  Regarding Alt 3.1-A, we need more discussions on the proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | Alt 3.1A is not true receiver assisted LBT. Alt 3.1B is receiver assisted LBT and may  be considered if benefit can be justified. |

## Multi-Beam COT

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, further consider the follow alternatives (down-select or support both)   * Alt 1: Single LBT sensing at the start of the COT with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold * Alt 2: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT   Agreement:  Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, down-select one or more of the following LBT operations   * Alt 1: Single LBT sensing with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold   + FFS: Details on the definition of "cover" * Alt 2: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT * Alt 3: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT with additional requirement on Cat 2 LBT before beam switch   Agreement:   * SSB transmission with LBT is supported, at least when the conditions for contention exempt short control signalling based SSB transmission is not met   + Note the channel access for SSB with LBT may not be different from a normal COT with multiple beams   + FFS: If any difference from a multi-beam COT LBT needs to be introduced   Agreement:  For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, when independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT (Alt 2 in earlier agreement) is considered, the following alternatives are further considered   * Alt A: The per-beam LBT for different beams is performed in TDM fashion   + Alt A-1: The node completes one eCCA on one beam, and directly move on to the eCCA on the other beam, with no transmission in the middle   + Alt A-2: The node completes one eCCA on one beam, start transmission with the beam to occupy the COT, then move on to the eCCA on the other beam   + Alt A-3: The node performs eCCA of the different beams simultaneous, round robin between different beams * Alt B: The per-beam LBT for different beams is performed simultaneously in parallel, assuming the node has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams   Agreement:  Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, when independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT (Alt 2 or Alt 3 in earlier agreement) is considered, the following alternatives are further considered   * Alt A: The per-beam LBT for different beams is performed one after another in time domain   + Alt A-1: The node completes one eCCA on one beam, and directly move on to the eCCA on the other beam, with no transmission in the middle   + Alt A-2: The node completes one eCCA on one beam, start transmission with the beam to occupy the COT, then move on to the eCCA on the other beam   + Alt A-3: The node performs eCCA of the different beams simultaneous, round robin between different beams * Alt B: The per-beam LBT for different beams is performed simultaneously in parallel, assuming the node has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Apple | Proposal 6: Alt A-3 and Alt B can be used for multi-beam COT sensing. |
| AT&T | Proposal 1:  • Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT with additional requirement on Cat 2 LBT before beam switch • The per-beam LBT for different beams is performed one after another in time domain. The node completes one eCCA on one beam, and directly move on to the eCCA on the other beam, with no transmission in the middle |
| CAICT | Proposal 7: For a COT with MU-MIMO(SDM) transmission, Alt B and Alt A-3 is proposed.  Proposal 8: For COT with TDM transmission with beam switching, Alt B and Alt A-3 is proposed. |
| CATT | Proposal 11：Consider supporting both of single LBT sensing with wide beam and independent per-beam LBT sensing for all beams to be used within the COT at the start of the COT.  Proposal 12: If supporting Alt A-1 or Alt A-2, the ‘blocking issue’ (failure of forward beam LBT cause subsequent beams unable to perform LBT) should be addressed.  Proposal 13: Alt A-3 of which node performs eCCA round robin between different beams should be supported to increase the multi-beam LBT efficiency. |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 5: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, support both single LBT sensing at the start of the COT with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold and independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT performed for beams used in the COT.  Proposal 6: Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, support both single LBT sensing with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams and independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT performed for beams used in the COT. Further discuss independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT for beams used in the COT with additional requirement on Cat 2 LBT before beam switch.  Proposal 7: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, consider both per-beam LBT for different beams performed in TDM fashion and per-beam LBT for different beams performed simultaneously in parallel, assuming the node has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams.  Proposal 8: Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, consider both per-beam LBT for different beams performed in TDM fashion and per-beam LBT for different beams performed simultaneously in parallel, assuming the node has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams. |
| Ericsson | Observation 16 All alternatives agreed to be considered for a COT with TDM and SDM of beams, depends solely on how directional LBT for a single beam would be specified.  Proposal 10 If any enhancements to better enable multiple beam transmissions within a COT when LBT mode is used can be agreed now, it is to support Alt 1 in principle for TDM and SDM case where a single LBT at the beginning of the COT is performed with the definition of “cover” meaning omni-directional or quasi-omni-directional. |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 7: When independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT, an additional requirement on Cat 2 LBT before beam switch during the COT should be specified. |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Proposal 14: For initiating a COT with SDM or TDM of different beams, support multiple per-beam LBTs, i.e. Alt 2.  Proposal 15: For initiating a COT with SDM or TDM of different beams, support one LBT beam covering all transmission beams (Alt 1) as a fallback mechanism when the one-to-one correspondence between the LBT beams and transmission beams cannot be established.  Observation 1: specifying the spatial relationship between a wide LBT beam and multiple subsequent transmission beams is feasible if spatial properties similar to those defined in TS 38.104 for a transmission beam are defined for the LBT beam, including beam peak direction, beam center direction and beamwidth.  Proposal 16: For initiating a COT with SDM or TDM of different beams using a single LBT, gNB selects a spatial sensing filter that minimizes the resulting XdB sensing beamwidth which at least contains all beam peak directions of the subsequent DL transmission beams within the COT.  Proposal 17: For initiating a COT with SDM or TDM of different beams, when independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT, support performing the per-beam LBTs simultaneously in parallel (Alt B). If the node is incapable of sensing simultaneously in different beams, a single LBT beam should be used as in Alt-1. FFS: How to coordinate these parallel LBTs to align the start times of the SDMed transmissions, and how to determine the COT start time in the TDM case. |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 11: It is up to the gNB on whether to mandate or not the use of LBT before attempting any transmission from any device within an initiating device’s acquired COT.  Proposal 12: For a COT with MU-MIMO, both Alt-1 and Alt-2 are supported. As for Alt-2 both Alt-A-2 and Alt-B could be considered.  Proposal 13: For a COT with beam switching, both single LBT sensing with wide beam and independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of the COT are supported. |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 17: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, support Alt-3.  Proposal 18: For a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, support Alt A-2 or A-3.  Proposal 19: Support of Alt B for SDM or TDM of beams can be considered for some UEs. |
| ITRI | Proposal 2: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, the per-beam LBT for different beams is performed simultaneously in parallel.  Proposal 3: For a COT with TDM transmission, the per-beam LBT for different beams is performed one after another in time domain. |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | Proposal 7: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, for a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, all of the following should be supported: - Single LBT sensing at the start of the COT with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold - Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT  Proposal 8: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, all of the following should be supported: - Single LBT sensing with wide beam covering all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold, where covering implies that the coverage region of wide beam contains the coverage region of all the beams - Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT - Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT with additional requirement on Cat 2 LBT before beam switch  Proposal 9: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, for a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, the per-beam LBT for different beams is performed simultaneously in parallel, assuming the node has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams  Proposal 10: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, for a COT with TDM transmission, the per-beam LBT for different beams can be supported with both alternatives below: • Alt A: The per-beam LBT for different beams is performed one after another in time domain o Alt A-1: The node completes one eCCA on one beam, and directly move on to the eCCA on the other beam, with no transmission in the middle o Alt A-2: The node completes one eCCA on one beam, start transmission with the beam to occupy the COT, then move on to the eCCA on the other beam o Alt A-3: The node performs eCCA of the different beams simultaneous, round robin between different beams • Alt B: The per-beam LBT for different beams is performed simultaneously in parallel, assuming the node has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams  Proposal 11: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, when multiple DL/UL transmissions are scheduled on multiple beams in TDM in same COT, then LBT can be performed at the beginning of the transmissions and also in the middle of same COT, if needed, which is depending upon following gaps: - Maximum allowed gap between the first symbol of the following scheduled transmission on a given beam and the last symbol of the transmitted (same) beam - Or if there is no previous transmission on the same beam within a COT, then the maximum allowed gap between the between the first symbol of the following scheduled transmission on a given beam and the time instance when Cat 4 LBT was successful on a beam covering the transmit beam  Proposal 12: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, when multiple DL/UL transmissions are scheduled on multiple beams in TDM and if directional LBT is performed on multiple beams with Cat 4 LBT, then multiple COTs should be initiated corresponding to each of the sensing beam |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #13: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) and TDM of beams transmission, adopt Alt A-1 (the node completes one eCCA on one beam, and directly move on to the eCCA on the other beam, with no transmission in the middle) when independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT. |
| MediaTek Inc. | Proposal 2: Alt A-1 and Alt A-3 should be precluded, and both Alt A-2 and Alt B can be considered. |
| NEC | Proposal 5: For a COT with SDM transmission, when independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed, the following LBT operations should be supported: Ÿ If the node has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams, the node performs per-beam LBT for different beams simultaneously in parallel. Ÿ Otherwise, the node performs eCCA of the different beams simultaneous, round robin between different beams.  Proposal 6: Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, when independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT, the following LBT operations should be supported: • The node completes one eCCA on one beam, start transmission with the beam to occupy the COT, then move on to the eCCA on the other beam. • The node performs eCCA of the different beams simultaneous, round robin between different beams. |
|  |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 20: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, support both Alt 1 and Alt 2  Proposal 21: Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, support both Alt 1and Alt 2 for LBT operations.  Proposal 22: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, support Alt B.  Proposal 23: Alt A-1 is modified as: The node completes one eCCA on one beam, and directly move on to the eCCA on the other beam, with no transmission in the middle. After completing eCCA on all beams, a further round robin CCA check is carried out in all beams (except the last beam).  Proposal 24: Alt A-3 is modified as: The node performs eCCA of the different beams simultaneous, round robin between different beams.  • single contention window is shared by beams or each beam has a separate contention window. • the last CCAs shall indicate vacant channel on all beams that are part of the COT  Observation 7: It is important to maintain flexibility of gNB implementation for multi-beam COT  Proposal 25: For a COT with TDM transmission, support the modified Alt A-1 and Alt A-3. |
| NTT DOCOMO INC. | Proposal 4:  l For LBT initiating a COT with SDMed multiple transmissions, support a single LBT at the start of COT, covering all the SDMed beams.  l For LBT initiating a COT with TDMed multiple transmissions, support independent per-beam LBT at the start of COT (Alt A-1) or at the start of transmission with changed beam within a COT (Alt A-2). |
| OPPO | Proposal 13: For COT containing multiple beams, including MU-MIMO (SDM) and TDM of beams, Alt A-2 is not supported. Alt A-1 and Alt A-3 can be left for implementation. |
| Panasonic | Proposal 1: Support Alt A-1, A-3 and B for a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, when independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for all beams used in the COT.  Proposal 2: Support both Alt 1 (single wide beam LBT sensing) and Alt 2 (independent per-beam LBT sensing) at the start of COT with SDM of beams.  Proposal 3: Support Alt A-1, A-3 and B for a COT with TDM beam transmission, when independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for all beams used in the COT.  Proposal 4: For a COT with TDM of beams, support both Alt-1 and Alt-2 in the previous agreement at the start of COT. Whether or not additional Cat 2 LBT is required before beam switching within the COT depends on the gap of no transmission of the next beam direction. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Observation 1: To enable any form of per beam channel access on more than one beam, e.g. for a multi-beam COT, more than one separate sensing operations need to be supported.  Proposal 4: Support Alt-B where applicable for simultaneous sensing. Support Alt-A-2 for SDM and TDM COT where applicable. Proposal 5: Any LBT based Rx-Assistance procedure should be made optional/configurable on a per UE link basis. |
| Samsung | Proposal 9: Support directional channel sensing in multi-beam operation: • For multi-beam SDM scenario, both Alt 1 and Alt 2 can be supported. • For multi-beam TDM scenario, Alt 1 can be supported as baseline, and selection between Alt 2 and Alt 3 depends on whether sensing is required for switching beams within a COT.  Proposal 10: For per-beam LBT for different beams, • Support both Alt A and Alt B, and up to implementation to choose between Alt A and Alt B. • Within Alt A, support Alt A-1 as the baseline. |
| Sony | Proposal 10: Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, both Alt 1 (single LBT sensing with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold) and Alt 2 (independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT) should be supported.  Observation 4: If per-beam LBT sensing is introduced, per beam COT indication may be needed. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 11: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, single LBT sensing at the start of the COT with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold should be supported.  Proposal 12: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT should be supported, and the per-beam LBT for different beams is performed simultaneously in parallel, assuming the node has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams.  Proposal 13: Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, single LBT sensing at the start of the COT with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold should be supported.  Proposal 14: Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, when independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT: - If the transmitter has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams, the per-beam LBT for different beams is performed simultaneously in parallel - If the transmitter does not have the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams, Alt A-1 should be supported. |
| vivo | Proposal 9: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, the per-beam LBT for different beams is performed simultaneously in parallel, assuming the node has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams.  Proposal 10: Alt A-1 and Alt-B are supported for the transmission within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 7: Multi-beam transmission should be studied to fully take advantage of spatial diversity.  Proposal 8: Support independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT for a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Proposal 14: Considering LBT overhead and transmission delay, Alt B that“The per-beam LBT for different beams is performed simultaneously in parallel, assuming the node has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams” should be considered if Alt 2 is supported.  Proposal 15: Considering transmission opportunity and unnecessary interference to other device that is going to transmit transmission, Alt-3 that “Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT with additional requirement on Cat 2 LBT before beam switch” can be considered for the transmission with multiple beams in time domain multiplexing, if directional LBT is supported. l Considering LBT overhead and transmission delay, Alt B that“The per-beam LBT for different beams is performed simultaneously in parallel, assuming the node has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams” should be considered if Alt 2 or Alt 3 is supported |

### First round discussion

A large number of companies argue for support of both Alt 1 and Alt 2 for SDM Multi-Beam COT from the following agreement:

For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, further consider the follow alternatives (down-select or support both)

* Alt 1: Single LBT sensing at the start of the COT with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold
* Alt 2: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT

Proposal 2.7.1-1

For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, support both Alt 1 and Alt 2 below:

* Alt 1: Single LBT sensing at the start of the COT with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold
* Alt 2: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT
* Support: Nokia, Charter, Lenovo, ZTE, Intel, vivo, Apple, Futurewei, NEC, Huawei, ITRI, InterDigital, Convida, Samsung, AT&T, Oppo, WILUS, Spreadtrum, CATT, LG, DCM, MTK,
* Ericsson (agree on how to sense in single beam first)

Moderator comment: This proposal seems to be stable, other than Ericsson. Recommend to agree on this without waiting for the detailed definitions. No matter what final design for single beam sensing or directional LBT end up with, the discussion here should apply.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal |
| Charter Communications | Support the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with the proposal 2.7.1-1 |
| Intel | We are OK to support both Alt-1 and Alt-2 and leave up to the device capability which alternative to use. However, for Alt-2, we should leave for FFS how the procedure is done given that in prior meeting we have identified multiple alternatives or multiple views on how this could be performed (i.e., Alt A-1/2/3) |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Apple | Support the proposal |
| Futurewei | We support the proposal. |
| NEC | We support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | We support Alt 1 as the baseline mechanism with omni-directional/quasi-omnidirectional beam as the wide beam. Alt 2 need not be precluded by implementation and device capability.  However, we do not want to agree to anything on this topic without agreeing on how to do sensing for a single beam case, and how to enable directional LBT (“cover”). Sensing beam is not defined in the current TS 37.213 either. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal |
| ITRI | We support the proposal |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal |
| Convida Wireless | We support the proposal. |
| Samsung | We support the proposal.  The choice of Alt 1 and Alt 2 can be up to implementation. |
| AT&T | We support the proposal. |
| OPPO | We think both Alt 1 and Alt 2 can be left for implementation. |
| WILUS | We support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We support the proposal |
| LG | We support the Proposal 2.7.1-1. |
| DOCOMO | We support Proposal 2.7.1-1, while we think EDT determination needs to be considered especially for certain cases related to Alt 2. |
| Mediatek | We support the proposal |

Proposal 2.7.1-2

For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission if Alt 2 is supported (independent per beam LBT), and if the node has the capability to perform simultaneous sensing in different beams, simultaneous per-beam LBT for different beams is supported.

Support: Nokia, Charter, Lenovo (may not have spec impact), ZTE, Intel, vivo, Apple, Futurewei, NEC, Huawei, ITRI, InterDigigal, Convida, Samsung, AT&T, Oppo, WILUS, Spreadtrum, CATT, LG, DCM, MTK

Ericsson: Ok, but need to agree on sensing beam first

Moderator comment: This proposal seems to be stable, other than Ericsson. Recommend to agree on this without waiting for the detailed definitions. No matter what final design for single beam sensing or directional LBT end up with, the discussion here should apply.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal |
| Charter Communications | Proposal is OK but this does not need to be specified in the specs |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal, though we are not certain if the simultaneous per-beam LBT will have any specification impact. It may be sufficient to specify the support of independent per-beam sensing. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with the proposal 2.7.1-2 |
| Intel | We are also OK with this proposal. |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Apple | Support the proposal |
| Futurewei | We support the proposal. |
| NEC | We support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal, in principle but it is not clear to us what will be specified. It is best to leave it to implementation and device capability.  However, we do not want to agree to anything on this topic without agreeing on how to do sensing for a single beam case, and how to enable directional LBT (“cover”). Sensing beam is not defined in the current TS 37.213 either. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with the proposal. |
| ITRI | We support the proposal |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal |
| Convida Wireless | We support the proposal. |
| Samsung | We support the proposal. |
| AT&T | We support the proposal. |
| OPPO | We think it can be left for implementation. |
| WILUS | We support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |
| LG | We are fine with the Proposal 2.7.1-2. |
| DOCOMO | We support the Proposal 2.7.1-2. |
| Mediatek | We are ok with the proposal |

Proposal 2.7.1-3

Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, down-select to one of the following LBT operations

* Alt A: Support both Alt-1 and Alt 2
  + Support: Nokia, Intel, Apple, Huawei, LG, MTK
* Alt B: Support both Alt-1 and Alt 3
  + Support: Lenovo, ZTE, vivo, Futurewei, ITRI, InterDigital, AT&T, WILUS, Spreadtrum,
* Ericsson: Agree on directional sensing and single beam sensing first.
* Samsung: Support, and the only difference between Alt A and Alt B is if Cat 2 LBT is supported, DCM
* Oppo: Left for implementation
* CATT: Support Alt 1/2/3

Moderator comment: This proposal seems to be stable, other than Ericsson. Recommend to agree on this without waiting for the detailed definitions. No matter what final design for single beam sensing or directional LBT end up with, the discussion here should apply.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Alt A |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Alt B i.e. support Alt-1 and Alt-3   * Alt 1: Single LBT sensing with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold   + FFS: Details on the definition of "cover" * Alt 3: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT with additional requirement on Cat 2 LBT before beam switch |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support Alt B. |
| Intel | Our preference is for Alt. A. However, for Alt-2, we should leave for FFS how the procedure is done given that in prior meeting we have identified multiple alternatives or multiple views on how this could be performed (i.e., Alt A-1/2/3) |
| vivo | Alt B |
| Apple | Alt A |
| Futurewei | Alt-B |
| NEC | We support Alt B. |
| Ericsson | We support Alt 1 as the baseline mechanism with omni-directional/quasi-omnidirectional beam as the wide beam, covering all the intended TDM transmission beams. Alt 2 need not be precluded by implementation and device capability.  However, we do not want to agree to anything on this topic without agreeing on how to do sensing for a single beam case, and how to enable directional LBT (“cover”). Sensing beam is not defined in the current TS 37.213 either. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Apologies if we are being pedantic here but we think proposal needs some clarification. Regarding LBT for COT with TDM Tx beams, we have the following two agreements:  Agreement **(RAN1 104-e):**  Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, down-select one or more of the following LBT operations   * Alt 1: Single LBT sensing with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold   + FFS: Details on the definition of "cover" * Alt 2: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT * Alt 3: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT with additional requirement on Cat 2 LBT before beam switch   Agreement **(RAN1 104bis-e):**  Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, when independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT (Alt 2 or Alt 3 in earlier agreement) is considered, the following alternatives are further considered   * Alt A: The per-beam LBT for different beams is performed one after another in time domain   + Alt A-1: The node completes one eCCA on one beam, and directly move on to the eCCA on the other beam, with no transmission in the middle   + Alt A-2: The node completes one eCCA on one beam, start transmission with the beam to occupy the COT, then move on to the eCCA on the other beam   + Alt A-3: The node performs eCCA of the different beams simultaneous, round robin between different beams * Alt B: The per-beam LBT for different beams is performed simultaneously in parallel, assuming the node has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams   In proposal 2.7.1-3, there is an “Alt-1”. We are not sure this is meant to be “Alt 1” as in Agreement in RAN1 104-e or “Alt A-1” as in Agreement in RAN1 104bis-e.  In any case, we provide our views as follows:   1. If “Alt-1” in 2.7.1-3 is meant to be “Alt A-1” in RAN1 104bis-e, it is not an acceptable choice for us and we do not support neither Alt A nor alt Alt B in Proposal 2.7.1-3. If the per-beam eCCAs are performed sequentially as in Alt A-1, the first eCCA in the sequence of eCCAs is far off from the beginning of the COT, thus rendering its sensing result irrelevant. Moreover, latency and LBT overhead are maximized compared to performing these eCCAs simultaneously. 2. If “Alt-1” in 2.7.1-3 is meant to be “Alt 1” in RAN1 104-e, then we suppose Alt A in Proposal 2.7.1-3.   Moderator: The Alt-1 is Alt 1 from RAN1 104-e |
| ITRI | We support Alt B. |
| InterDigital | We support Alt. B |
| Samsung | We support the proposal.  The decision of Alt A and Alt B may depend on whether Cat 2 LBT is supported or not. |
| AT&T | Alt. B |
| OPPO | We think it can be left for implementation. |
| WILUS | We support Alt B i.e., support Alt-1 and Alt-3. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal and we support Alt B. |
| CATT | We support Alt 1, Alt 2 and Alt 3. We suggest that both Alt 2 and Alt 3 can be supported for independent per-beam LBT, whether applying Alt 2 or Alt 3 could be decided by gNB.  For Independent per-beam LBT, we think Alt 2 and Alt 3 could be applied in different use cases. For the case where the beams to be transmitted within the COT are spatially continuous, one of the beams is transmitting the data, the adjacent beams are less likely to be interfered by other nodes. It’s not necessary to perform an additional LBT. But, if the beams to be transmitted within the COT are spatially dispersive, the beam direction that is not transmitting the data may be occupied by other nodes. In this case, an additional LBT before beam switching is required for gNB.  Agreement:  Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, down-select one or more of the following LBT operations   * Alt 1: Single LBT sensing with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold   + FFS: Details on the definition of "cover" * Alt 2: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT * Alt 3: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT with additional requirement on Cat 2 LBT before beam switch |
| LG | We support the Alt A.  For Alt-3, it needs to further discussion on when additional Cat-2 LBTs are needed. The Cat-2 LBT is not always needed before beam switch but Cat-2 LBT may be needed for the large beam switching delay within a COT. |
| DOCOMO | We are generally fine with the principle to support both a single LBT sensing with wide beam to “cover” all beams (Alt 1) and independent per beam LBT (Alt 2 or Alt 3). But we think whether a CAT 2 LBT is required before beam switch needs separate discussion. |
| Mediatek | Alt A |

Proposal 2.7.1-4

Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, if Alt 2 or Alt 3 is supported (independent per beam LBT), and if the node has the capability to perform simultaneous sensing in different beams, simultaneous per-beam LBT for different beams is supported.

Support: Nokia, Charter, Lenovo, ZTE, Intel, vivo, Apple, Futurewei, NEC, Huawei, ITRI, InterDigital, Convida, Samsung,WILUS, Spreadtrum, CATT, lG, DCM, MTK

Ericsson: Agree on directional LBT and single beam sensing first.

Oppo: Implementation

Moderator comment: This proposal seems to be stable, other than Ericsson. Recommend to agree on this without waiting for the detailed definitions. No matter what final design for single beam sensing or directional LBT end up with, the discussion here should apply.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal |
| Charter Communications | Support the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal, though we are not certain if the simultaneous per-beam LBT will have any specification impact. It may be sufficient to specify the support of independent per-beam sensing. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with the proposal 2.7.1-4 |
| Intel | We also support this proposal. |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Apple | Support the proposal |
| Futurewei | We support this proposal |
| NEC | We support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | We do not want to agree to anything on this topic without agreeing on how to do sensing for a single beam case, and how to enable directional LBT (“cover”). Sensing beam/beams are not defined in the current TS 37.213 either. It is not clear to us what will be specified. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with the proposal. |
| ITRI | We support the proposal |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We support the proposal. |
| Samsung | We support the proposal. |
| OPPO | We think it can be left for implementation. |
| WILUS | We support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We support the proposal |
| LG | We support the Proposal 2.7.1-4. |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal |
| Mediatek | We support the proposal |

Discussion 2.7.1-5

For a gNB/UE to initiate a COT with SDM or TDM multiple beams with separate LBT per beam and the gNB/UE does not have the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams, the following alternatives have been identified:

* Alt A-1: The node completes one eCCA on one beam, and directly move on to the eCCA on the other beam, with no transmission in the middle
  + Nokia, Lenovo, vivo, Futurewei, ITRI, Samsung, Oppo, WILUS, Spreadtrum, CATT, LG, DCM
* Alt A-2: The node completes one eCCA on one beam, start transmission with the beam to occupy the COT, then move on to the eCCA on the other beam
  + Lenovo, ZTE, Intel, Qualcomm, Futurewei, NEC, InterDigital, DCM (already allowed by ETSI), MTK,
* Alt A-3: The node performs eCCA of the different beams simultaneous, round robin between different beams
  + Nokia, ZTE, Apple, NEC, ITRI, InterDigital, Oppo, WILUS, CATT
* Not support: Ericsson, Huawei,

Moderator: The view seems to be diverging on this topic. More discussion needed

Please provide your view below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Alt A-1 and Alt A-3. Alt A-2 seems more like there are separate COTs initiated for each beam. It is not clear if this case needs to be considered separately. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We prefer supporting Alt A-1 and Alt A-2. We don’t think Alt A-3 is useful considering proposal 2.7.1-4 already considers simultaneous sensing in different beams  Also, which alternative to apply when and how can be further discussed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support Alt A-2 or Alt A-3. |
| Intel | Our preference is Alt A-2. |
| vivo | Alt A-1 |
| Apple | Alt A-3. Alt A-1 perform much longer eCCA than needed. Alt A-2 is equivalent to multiple single beam COT. |
| Futurewei | Alt-1 and AltA-2 (although latter seems like multiple per-beam COT acquisitions). AltA-3 has too many undefined or vaguely defined aspects and needs further discussion. |
| NEC | We supporting Alt A-2 and Alt A-3. |
| Ericsson | We do not see the reason nor motivation to support this proposal. All the alternatives perform eCCA per TDM beam. This means, if there are 8 beams planned in a COT, the LBT overhead is 8 times more in this alternative as compared to Alt 1 (wide beam eCCA ). We need more clarifications on why this needs to be specified which not only increases the overhead, but also is unnecessary from regulatory point of view. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are not supportive of any of the alternatives Alt A-1, Alt A-2, or Alt A-3 due to the following reasons:   * Alt A-1: If the per-beam eCCAs are performed sequentially as in Alt A-1, the first eCCA in the sequence of eCCAs is far off from the beginning of the COT, thus rendering its sensing result irrelevant. Moreover, latency and LBT overhead are maximized compared to performing these eCCAs simultaneously. * Alt A-2: This alternative in fact defeats the purpose of TDM of N transmission beams in one COT as it simply splits one COT with N TDM beams to N single-beam COTs each initiated with its own eCCA while the LBT overhead is the same as that of Alt A-1. * Alt A-3: This alternative does not seem to be compliant with the regulations as for any given CCA engine/backoff counter a sensing slot cannot be skipped or blindly assumed idle based on the sensing result of another CCA engine/backoff counter.   We propose the following alternative:   * Alt A-4: The node performs one eCCA with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold as a fall back mechanism (Alt 1 in Agreement in RAN1 104-e) |
| ITRI | We support Alt A-1 and Alt A-3 |
| InterDigital | We support Alt-A3 for SDM or TDM and Alt-A2 for TDM |
| Samsung | We support Alt A-1 for simplicity.  We need a clarification for Alt A-2. Is it intended to support transmission on one beam direction, while sensing on another beam direction at the same time?  For Alt A-3, it depends on whether directional per-beam backoff counter is supported or not. If yes, then the scheme of round robin may not work.  Mod: No. Alt A-2 is trying to finish eCCA on one beam, followed by eCCA on another beam, then followed with SDM or TDM transmission on both beams. |
| OPPO | Alt A-2 is not supported. Alt A-1 and Alt A-3 can be left for implementation. |
| WILUS | We support Alt A-1 and Alt A-3. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Alt A-1 for simplicity.  Alt A-2 will cause the transmitter to transmit in one beam direction while performing eCCA in other beam direction, which may cause interference between the transmission beam and LBT beam.  Regarding Alt A-3, it is not aligned with the regulations. |
| CATT | We prefer Alt A-1 and Alt A-3.  For Alt A-3, the node performs energy detection round robin between different beams as show in the figure. The node can utilize idle time on Beam1 within 5us observation time to perform energy detection for other beams. When the CCA backoff counter for Beam 1 cuts down by 1, the node can start second round energy detection between different beams. In this way, Alt A-3 not only complies with CCA check procedure, but also improves the efficiency of the multi-beam LBT. |
| LG | We support Alt A-1.  For Alt A-2, it is equivalent to the independent single beam transmission in an each separate COT. Hence, it is not relevant to the multiplexing of multi-beam transmission. For Alt A-3, it seems that it is not aligned with the LBT procedures described in ETSI EN 302 567 regulation. For a concern on the large LBT latency, the additional single wide beam (or omnidirectional LBT) of Cat-2 LBT can be used after back-to-back eCCA is finished. |
| DOCOMO | Alt A-2 looks like something already defined in ETSI BRAN since it may be same as taking a COT in the middle of another COT, which is not precluded anywhere in our view. To support Alt A-2 itself would be fine for us.  Plus, when a transmitter is aware of the use of multiple transmission beams before having a COT, we believe Alt A-1 should be supported as Alt A-2 needs more Tx-Rx switching at the transmitter. |
| Mediatek | We support Alt A-2 and open to Alt B. We don’t support Alt A-1 and Alt A-3 since it violates the spirit of CCA that it assumes the channel remains idle even after a period of pause for sensing. |

## Multi-Channel channel access

Agreement:

Define Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access as:

* Type A: Perform independent eCCA for each channel
* Type B: Identify a primary channel and perform eCCA on the primary channel, while perform Cat 2 LBT for other channels in the last observation slot

Down-selection between

* Alt1: Support Type A multi-channel channel access only
* Alt2: Support both Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access.

Note: How eCCA is performed on each channel, and the BW of the channels over which eCCAs are performed are separately discussed

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
|  |  |
| CAICT | Proposal 9: Support both Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access. |
| Ericsson  Ericsson | Observation 8 ETSI regulation for 60 GHz bands do not support Type B multi-channel access.  Proposal 5 Do not support Type B multi-channel access for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Proposal 11: For multi-channel access in NR-U-60, support both Type A and Type B procedures, i.e., Alt2 in the agreement made in RAN1#104-e. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 13: Only Type A multi-channel access procedure (i.e. Alt.1) shall be supported in NR-U on 60GHz band. |
| vivo | Proposal 5: Both Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access can be supported. |
| WILUS Inc. | Proposal 6: At least Type A multi-channel access which performs independent clear channel assessment (CCA) for each channel should be supported. For support of the Type B multi-channel access, it should be further discussed after the decision by depending on support of Cat-2 LBT including definition of Cat-2 LBT. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### First Round Discussion

There are differing views on whether to support Type B multi-channel access. The discussion seems to focus on if Cat 2 LBT is introduced or not.

Proposal 2.8.1-1 (closed)

* Type A multi-channel channel access is supported
* If Cat 2 LBT is introduced, type B multi-channel channel access is supported

Note: Essentially this proposal bundles the type B multi-channel channel access with the adoption of Cat 2 LBT

Support: Lenovo, ZTE, vivo, Futurewei, Huawei, Convida, Samsung, Oppo, WILUS, Spreadtrum, CATT, LG

Change type B to FFS: Intel, Apple, DCM

Type A only: Nokia, Charter, Ericsson,

Moderator comment: This proposal is tightly connected with if Cat 2 LBT is introduced. We can resume discussion after we agree on that.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We see no need to Type B multi-channel LBT. Type B multi-channel channel access is not allowed by ETSI EN 302 567. Furthermore, Type B channel access assumes a specific type of channelization (channel bonding), which seems very impractical at 60 GHz unlicensed spectrum where different channel and LBT bandwidths are applied. |
| Charter Communications | Prefer to agree to Type A multi-channel access first |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We do not see that EN302 567 explicitly states that cat2 LBT is not supported. In addition, combined with Cat2 LBT required in many used cases, then, we understand that Type B multi-channel channel access should not be precluded in above 52.6GHz. |
| Intel | We are OK with the first bullet, but are not OK with the second bullet. While we support the introduction of Cat-2 LBT, we do not support type B since this violates ETSI BRAN rules, and we would prefer to keep this second bullet as an FFS. |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Apple | Agree with type A is supported. Type B is FFS. |
| Futurewei | We support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | We support Type A and do not support Type B channel access.  Even if CAT2 LBT is agreed to be introduced, there are other factors that determine the fairness in type B multi-channel access. Type B multi-channel access is a fair spectrum access mechanism and is touted to have any benefit only if all the devices sharing the spectrum have same channel BWs (and channelization with guard bands). This ensures devices choose a “random” primary channel (of same BW) and corresponding secondary channels. If there was a clash in the primary channel, they could change the primary channel. This was easy in 5/6 GHz because of the fixed 20 MHz nominal channel BW for all. In the 60 GHz, there is no fixed channel BW and channelization. The minimum supported channel BWs are different for different SCS. There is no guarantee that Type B multi-channel would be a fair spectrum access mechanism in the 60 GHz. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are supportive of Proposal 2.8.1-1.  To address Nokia’s comment, we do not see why Type B would be applicable only if channelization is conformant with channel bonding as in 802.11 ad/ay. In particular, unlike in 802.11 ad/ay, the BW of the primary channel can be flexible and the BW of the secondary channels does not need to follow multiples of 2.16 GHz in Type B defined for Rel-17. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal. |
| WILUS | We support Proposal 2.8.1-1. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We support the proposal. Type A multi-channel channel access can be support first. The motivation to introduce Type B multi-channel channel access need to be further clarified. |
| LG | We support the Proposal 2.8.1-1. |
| DOCOMO | We agree with the 1st bullet. For the 2nd bullet, as only at most 3 backoffs are required for eCCA in BRAN, the benefit to support type B can be small. Also in BRAN, since eCCA with sensing of operating channel bandwidth and backoff is anyway required to initiate a COT, type B may revert BRAN’s regulation. We prefer to study about type B a bit more. |

## Directional LBT

Proposal for convergence: Directional Sensing

3GPP specification defines the relative relationship between all applicable sensing beams and the transmission beam(s), at least sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam(s). Choose one of the following alternatives:

* Alt 1. To define “cover”, the angle included in the [3]dB beamwidth of the transmission beam(s) is included in the [3]dB beamwidth of the sensing beam
* Alt 2. Extending the beam correspondence framework and/or QCL/TCI framework to define “cover”
* Alt 3. Leave RAN4 to define cover

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Apple | Proposal 3: 3GPP specification defines relationship of all applicable sensing beams “covers” the transmission beams.  Proposal 4: Extend the TCI framework to signal the COT directivity based on sensing directivity. COT directivity can be signaled in DCI format 2-0 for gNB initiated COT, and CG-UCI for UE initiated COT.  Proposal 5: Perform directional or omni-directional LBT at the beginning of COT with the sensing beam(s) that covers all TDM beams, with no LBT before each beam switch in the middle of COT  Proposal 14: Consider using omni and directional RSSI and channel occupancy for long term sensing. |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 1: Both omni-directional LBT and directional LBT should be supported for frequency range of 52.6GHz to 71GHz.  Proposal 12: Enhancement of beam operation for unlicensed bands should be investigated to mitigate interference and optimize system performance due to hidden node for NR up to 71 GHz. |
| Ericsson | Observation 10 The effectiveness of LBT itself as medium access mechanism for co-existence in unlicensed spectrum in 60 GHz band is questionable. Therefore, any further enhancement on LBT baseline from the HS need to be justified both on the performance gain and the required complexity.  Observation 11 Common understanding in ETSI and IEEE 802.11ad and IEEE 802.11ay specs are omni-directional LBT or quasi-omnidirectional LBT  Observation 12 Simulation studies in general indicate no significant gain from using directional LBT.  Observation 13 Directional LBT is currently not precluded in the existing regulations. EN 302 567¨s tests intrinsically ensure sensing beam is in the direction of the transmission beam for devices equipped with directional antenna systems.  Observation 14 Notion of “beams” for sensing/LBT is non-existent in 37.213.  Observation 15 Alt1 and Alt3 have more RAN4 spec impact and can be considered together under a single alternative.  Proposal 8 Support omni-directional LBT or quasi-omni-directional LBT as the baseline LBT procedure for 60 GHz band.  Proposal 9 Do not support Alt.2 on extending the beam correspondence framework and/or QCL/TCI framework to define “cover”.  Proposal 11 RAN1 needs to decide on whether and how to specify directional LBT for single sensing beam case before further discussing multiple sensing beams. |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 3: For the CCA check procedure, the COT initiating device may use one or multiple spatial domains receive filters. For each transmission during the COT, there should be associated one or multiple spatial domains receive filters used in the CCA check procedure.  Proposal 4: Consider the use of composite transmit angular power profile (APP) of an intended set of transmit beams to design sensing beam that “covers” that intended set. • Prominent directions of intended transmission, i.e., those for which composite transmit APP is with a fraction of the peak APP, should have relatively large sensing gain.  • For EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum EIRP over that intended set of transmit beams. • Appropriate EDT incorporates shortfall (if any) in the sensing gain over prominent directions.  • Enable augmented sensing to avoid blind spots without excessive exposed nodes. |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Proposal 12: For operation in the 60 GHz band, specify the spatial relation between the LBT beam and the transmission beam(s).  Proposal 13: For a COT with a single transmission beam, the spatial domain sensing filter for the LBT beam at the beginning of the COT can be configured to be the same as the spatial domain filter used for the transmission during the COT.  Observation 2: (Quasi-)omni-directional simplifies the implementation but could lead to an ‘over protection’ problem and thus reduction of spatial reuse.  Observation 3: Directional LBT potentially improves the channel access probability and enhances the spatial reuse. However, when performed at the transmitter side, the hidden node problem could be more severe due to limited sensing direction. |
| Intel Corporation | Observation 1: Omni-directional LBT may act in many cases overprotectively and may prevent from fully exploiting spatial reuse under highly directional transmissions. This issue may be mitigated through directional LBT. However, directional sensing exacerbates the well-known hidden node issue, and leads to scenarios where the system could suffer from deafness.  Proposal 14: Both omni-directional and directional LBT are supported. When directional LBT is used, a receiver-aided LBT should complement its CCA procedure.  Proposal 15: RAN1 to define some relationship between the received beams used for LBT measurements, and the transmit beam to be used after LBT success. Further details of how the relationship is defined is FFS in RAN1.  Proposal 16: When directional sensing is performed, the COT should be considered to be acquired only in the transmission beams for which the LBT is performed and the LBT measurements have indicated that the channel is idle.  Proposal 17: When directional sensing is performed, and multiple concurrent COTs are acquired, these should be independently treated unless LBT measurements have overlapping beams. In this case, RAN1 should define some rules on how to handle these cases.  Proposal 18: RAN1 should further study how to efficiently allow beam-pairing due to LBT success. |
| InterDigital Inc. | Observation 1: Omni-directional LBT in unlicensed spectrum from 52.6GHz to 71GHz can under-represent interference in the direction of the associated transmission and over-represent interference in other directions.  Observation 2: Dynamic scenarios with some level of mobility increases the likelihood of transmitter-receiver pairs interfering with each other even when using narrowbeams.  Observation 3: Directional LBT provides benefits over no LBT at least for medium to high loads and especially for tail UEs, while reducing the drawbacks associated with omni-directional LBT.  Proposal 1: Directional LBT is specified in Rel-17.  Proposal 2: The relationship between the LBT beam and the transmission beam should be specified.  Proposal 3: A single directional LBT process can be performed on a beam whose parameters are determined from the parameters of the Tx beam of one or more associated transmissions.  Observation 4: In a beam-based environment, LBT (omni-directional or directional) can fail to detect hidden nodes if the interference is only in the direction of the receiving node.  Proposal 4: Receiver based LBT should be considered for both omni-directional and directional LBT.  Proposal 8: The UE receives configuration and indication of the channel access mode (omni-directional, directional, receiver assisted, no LBT) from the gNB using Alt. 2 (either cell specific or UE-specific indication) |
| ITRI | Proposal 1: In order to avoid resource wastage and hidden node problem, the LBT beam should be the same as the transmission beam. |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | Observation 1: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, LBT failure on a beam could require a beam update procedure and that results in increased latency.  Observation 4: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, when directional LBT is applied, then performing LBT only at the transmitted side may not guarantee an interference-free reception due to hidden nodes to the transmitter  Proposal 3: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, configuration and/or indication of multiple sensing beams to UE should be specified for beam-based UL transmission  Proposal 4: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, explicit mapping between sensing beam(s) and UL transmit beam should be specified based on extension of TCI framework, where the association between the sensing and transmission beams can be configured based on the TCI association between to be: - One-to-one mapping between sensing beam and transmission beam - One sensing beam to many transmission beams mapping - Many sensing beams to one transmission mapping  Proposal 5: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, following two aspects should be specified: - Definition of cover could be such that the angle included in the [3] dB beamwidth of the transmission beam(s) is included in the [3] dB beamwidth of the sensing beam(s) - Indication/configuration of association between sensing beam(s) and transmission beam(s) according to extension of TCI framework  Proposal 6: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, for UL transmissions on CG resources, time-based autonomous switching of UL Tx beam should be supported, where the switching can be based on a timer within which the UE is expected to receiver HARQ-ACK feedback  Proposal 15: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, within a COT, PDCCH monitoring is not supported in the CORESETs corresponding to other COTs (PDCCH monitoring restricted to monitoring corresponding to only one COT at a time) |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #5: The directional CCA and the receiver assisted LBT can be beneficial to increase cell coverage and spatial reuse, and whether or not the receiver assisted LBT can have an impact on specification except for indicating LBT type to responder should be first investigated.  Proposal #7: If the directional CCA procedure is introduced the followings points can be considered: l How to perform the CCA procedure for multiple-beam sweeping transmission l How to define CWS management (e.g., per-direction or across-direction management) l How to manage the back-off counter value  Proposal #9: It should be discussed how to indicate the direction of LBT (e.g., omni-directional LBT or directional LBT) and the type of LBT (e.g., Type 1 or Type 2A/2B/2C channel access procedure in NR-U) when scheduling a UL transmission inside or outside of a channel occupancy.  Proposal #10: The relationship between the LBT beam with a specific direction to acquire the COT and the transmission beam(s) allowed to transmit in that COT should be defined considering the relationship between the CCA range of the LBT beam and the interference range of the transmission beam(s).  Proposal #11: It would be beneficial for coexistence that channel occupancy acquired by directional LBT is shared only for DL and UL signals/channels having spatial QCL relationship.  Proposal #12: To define the relative relationship between all applicable sensing beams and the transmission beam in 3GPP specification, adopt Alt-2 (Extending the beam correspondence and/or QCL/TCI framework to define “cover”). |
| NEC | Proposal 2: For LBT based channel access in mmWave unlicensed band, the relationship between LBT beam and transmission beam should be defined to reduce the complexity of channel access for different nodes. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 19: Leave the relationship between gNB LBT sensing beam(s) and transmission beam(s) to the vendor-specific implementations. Vendors can use different beamforming techniques for their LBT procedures, as long as global or region and deployment specific requirements (i.e., ETSI EN 302 567) are fulfilled.  Observation 3: Generic requirements may be considered, e.g., that the beam(s) used in the LBT contain the transmission direction(s) intended to be used during the COT. However, that should be done in RAN4, not in RAN1. |
| OPPO | Proposal 7: consider using QCL/TCI framework to define ‘cover’. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Observation 2: At least some sensing in per beam channel access is necessarily directional.  Observation 3: As shown in the simulation results in the contribution, the energy level sensed by directional beam is strongly affected by the directionality/beam forming gain of the sensing beam  Observation 4: In a fair channel access procedure, for a given pre-determined transmission beam (and consequent interference footprint), it is desirable that the channel access probability should not depend on the sensing beam properties.  Proposal 1: Adopt Alt-2, i.e. extend QCL/TCI framework and/or beam correspondence framework to support mismatched directional sensing and transmission. Beam correspondence should be extended to support many -to-many relationship between transmission beams and eligible sensing beams. QCL/TCI framework could be extended to support necessary signaling if any.  Proposal 3: Use defined QCL/TCI framework to determine procedures to support independent per beam sensing and transmission of a multi-beam COT. |
| Samsung | Proposal 8: • Support extending the beam correspondence framework and/or QCL/TCI framework to define “cover” (Alt 2); • Support a new type of QCL assumption to define the sensing beam covering the transmission beam. |
| Sony | Proposal 8: For definition of the relative relationship between applicable sensing beams and the transmission beam(s), extending the beam correspondence and/or QCL/TCI framework to define and/or indicate “cover” is considered from the RAN1 perspective.  Proposal 9: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, both Alt 1 (Single LBT sensing at the start of the COT with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold) and Alt 2 (Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT) should be supported. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 2: The directional LBT should be supported in 60GHz unlicensed band.  Proposal 3: The relationship between all the LBT beams and the transmission beam should be defined and at least LBT beam “covers” the transmission beam. |
| vivo | Proposal 11: If UE capability supports beam correspondence, the receiving beam corresponding to the transmission beam is used as the sensing beam.  Proposal 12: The “cover” for sensing beam is defined as: the angle included in the [3] dB beam width of the transmission beam(s) is included in the [3] dB beam width of the sensing beam. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Proposal 12: If directional LBT is supported, it is necessary to further define the relationship between LBT sensing/receiving beam(s) and transmission beam(s): l Under the assumption of channel reciprocity between transmission beam and LBT sensing/receiving beam, LBT sensing/receiving beam and transmission beam are actually equivalent. l Without the assumption of channel reciprocity between transmission beam and LBT sensing beam, when LBT sensing beam (e.g., reception beam) is wider than the transmission beam and/or partially overlapping with each other, certain method need to be further considered, e.g., introduce an additional factor to reflect the difference of transmission beam and reception beam, or extend QCL/TCI framework to define the relationship between transmission beam and LBT sensing/receiving beam. |

### First Round Discussion

Based on the proposal for convergence a rough summary of company positions is presented below,

* Alt 1: To define “cover”, the angle included in the [3]dB beamwidth of the transmission beam(s) is included in the [3]dB beamwidth of the sensing beam
  + Huawei?, FUTUERWEI? InterDigital? ITRI, vivo, ZTE
* Alt 2: Extending the beam correspondence framework and/or QCL/TCI framework to define “cover”
  + Lenovo, LG, Samsung, Oppo, ~~vivo~~
* Alt 3 : Leave RAN4 to define cover
  + Support: Ericsson
  + Objection: Huawei, Apple, FUTUREWEI, Intel, InterDigital, NEC, Qualcomm

Before we make a decision, it might be good to have a clear understanding on what companies have in mind for the alternatives. It might be helpful to discuss how to select a sensing beam for a single transmission beam first.

Discussion 2.9.1-1 (closed)

A few possible descriptions of sensing beam ‘covering’ a transmission beams are presented below. They are intended as next level of detail designs for Alt 2 and Alt 1. Please provide your view

* Alt 1: To define “cover”, the angle included in the [3]dB beamwidth of the transmission beam(s) is included in the [3]dB beamwidth of the sensing beam
  + Vivo, Apple, Futurewei, ITRI, InterDigital (also acceptable), Convida
* Alt 2: Extending the beam correspondence framework and/or QCL/TCI framework to define “cover”
  + Alt 2-1: Introduce a new sensing beam and transmission beam correspondence relationship: “A sensing beam is considered to be corresponding to a transmission beam if the sensing beam gain measured along the direction of peak transmission direction is within X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain”
    - FFS: How to define/measure sensing beam gain and transmission beam gain.
  + Alt-2-2: Introduce a new sensing beam and transmission beam correspondence relationship: “The sensing beam gain is measured in one or more directions where the transmission beam EIRP is within A [FFS] dB of the peak transmission beam gain. The sensing beam is considered to be corresponding to the transmission beam if the sensing beam gain measured along the chosen directions is within X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain in those directions.”
    - FFS: How to define/measure sensing beam gain and transmission beam gain.
    - ZTE, Futurewei (open for discuss)
  + Alt 2-3: Extending QCL/TCI or SpatialRelationInfo (for SRS) framework for sensing: If gNB configures some UE to use TCI state B as QCL source for TCS state A, then the beam used for TCI B can be used as a sensing beam for transmission of beam for TCI A. This extension allows gNB to define the relationship between its sensing beams and transmissions.
    - Lenovo, ZTE, Intel, InterDigital, Samsung (open for others as well), Oppo, LG, DCM
  + Alt 2-4: Beam correspondence based extension: Beam correspondence framework can be extended to allow UE to select a valid sensing beam corresponding to a transmission beam.
    - Intel, Futurewei (open for discuss), InterDigital
  + Support general Alt 2: Apple, ITRI, Convida

Intel: Alt 1, Alt 2-1, and Alt 2-2 more like RAN4 discussion

Leave to RAN4: Nokia, Ericsson,

Moderator comment: The view seems to be diverging. Shall we send an LS to RAN4 to collect their view if this should be handled in RAN1 or RAN4? Will start another discussion in 2.9.2

Please provide your view, especially if you have other ways to define the “cover” in mind

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | | View |
| Nokia, NSB | | We support Alt 3: Leave RAN4 to define cover  Definition of beam correspondence for the gNB is a very complicated task, while the benefits are unclear. It is enough to leave the relationship between gNB LBT sensing beam(s) and transmission beam(s) to the vendor-specific implementations. Vendors can use different beamforming techniques for their LBT procedures, as long as global or region and deployment specific requirements (i.e., ETSI EN 302 567) are fulfilled. RAN4 is anyhow expected to define a test that verifies that a device operates according to regional regulations. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | | We support Alt 2-3. In our view, this is the most straightforward way of extending current TCI framework for indicating association between sensing and transmission beams. Furthermore, this method has the benefit of also providing complete flexibility in supporting following association types:   * One-to-one mapping between sensing beam and transmission beam * One sensing beam to many transmissions beams mapping * Many sensing beams to one transmission mapping   This can somewhat also cover the scenario when no explicit association is indicated, then one-to-one mapping can be assumed or left up to vendor-specific implementations. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | | For Alt 2-1 and Alt 2-2, we think that these two alternatives depend on the device’s capability. If capability allows, then we prefer to support Alt 2-2. otherwise, we support Alt 2-3, but for Alt 2-3, we are not sure how the gNB determines relationship between its sensing beams and transmissions relatively accurately. |
| Intel | | We prefer the Alt 2 (or Alt-2 like) approach. While Alt 1 could be acceptable, practical beams could have many sidelobes or it could be complex beam composed of multiple lobes. In such case 3dB beamwidth, while might be possible to define, could have some other side effects. With this said, we are not necessarily objecting to Alt 1.  As for Alt 2, there are other methods such as using the “spatial domain filter” description that is used in current NR specification to specify use of same beam for Rx and Tx.  One example of such framework is in SRS. “…the UE shall transmit the target  SRS resource with the same spatial domain transmission filter used for the reception of the reference SS/PBCH block,…”  Of course, RAN4 would need to further help define requirements as such, but for RAN1 defining some relationship between Rx and Tx concept is not new and this could be extended.  Alt 2-1 and 2-2 seem to be more something that should be discussed in RAN4. From RAN1 perspective, we just need to define clear description of what needs to be done, and RAN4 can work out the details on how such behaviour can be enforced and tested. Of course, RAN1 should try not to define behaviours that would be impossible to test. However, for this case RAN4 has experience with beam correspondence and should have experience with concept of applying same spatial domain filter. We believe all the discussion here is relatively in the same bucket.  So we are supportive of Alt 2-3 and Alt 2-4 approaches. |
| vivo | | We corrected our position in the summary as we don’t support Alt 2.  We only support Alt 1. The “beam correspondence” in our proposal 11 follows the current definition in the spec. We discussed the cases with beam correspondence and without beam correspondence in the contribution. We think there will be confusion if it is extended to include other cases. |
| Apple | | Alt 1 and Alt 2.  The adaptivity test case defined in EN 302.567 can be used as reference to define “cover”. The high-level description is copied below. The sensing beamwidth needs to be wider than the beamwidth of maximum EIRP transmission direction. Omni-sensing is always possible, since omni/quai-omni sensing beamwidth cover the transmission direction by default.  *“5.3.8.2 Test method*  *The principle is to establish a communication between UUT and companion device, and then check the behaviour of UUT in the presence of an interferer.*  *The UUT may be connected to a companion device during the test. When performing this test of a UUT with directional antenna (such as array antenna system capable of beam-forming), the wanted communication link (between the UUT and the companion device) and the interference signal shall be aligned to the direction corresponding to the UUT's maximum EIRP.”* |
| Futurewei | | We support Alt-1. Our preferred definition of “cover” for Alt-1 is:  The sensing beam gain is measured in one or more directions where the transmission beam EIRP of at-least one intended transmission beam is within X [FFS] dB of the maximal peak transmission beam EIRP among all intended beams. The sensing beam is considered to cover the intended set of transmission beams if the sensing beam gain measured along the chosen directions is within Y [FFS] dB of the maximal gain over all transmission beam gains in those directions.”  • FFS: How to define/measure sensing beam gain and transmission beam gain. Specific values of X and Y.  We are also open to further discuss Alt2-2 and Alt2-4. |
| Ericsson | We support Alt 3 with a spec. text defined in RAN1 specification.  We also think some of the alternatives proposed above are not equivalent as some require more RAN1 specification effort while some others, probably RAN4. Also, we need to know how exactly each of this alternative is going to be specified in RAN1 if it were to be agreed. In RAN1 # 104b-e we proposed a spec. text that modifies the existing 37.213 in a minimal fashion while enabling directional LBT and allows RAN4 to do the testing based on EN 302 567’s test clause (Refer Apple’s comment above). Therefore, we have the following modification to the proposal.  *Discussion 2.9.1-1:*  *3GPP specification defines the relative relationship between all applicable sensing beam and the transmission beam(s), at least sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam(s), considering following alternatives*   * + - *Alt 1: RAN4 (and RAN1 if needed) to specify necessary requirement/test procedure to guarantee sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam considering the following alternatives*       * *Alt1-1: To satisfy “cover”, the angle included in the [3] dB beamwidth of the transmission beam is included in the [3] dB beamwidth of the sensing beam.*       * *Alt1-2: Introduce a new sensing beam and transmission beam correspondence relationship: “A sensing beam is considered to be corresponding to a transmission beam if the sensing beam gain measured along the direction of peak transmission direction is within X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain”*   *FFS: How to define/measure sensing beam gain and transmission beam gain.*   * + - * *Alt1-3: Introduce a new sensing beam and transmission beam correspondence relationship: “The sensing beam gain is measured in one or more directions where the transmission beam EIRP is within A [FFS] dB of the peak transmission beam gain. The sensing beam is considered to be corresponding to the transmission beam if the sensing beam gain measured along the chosen directions is within X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain in those directions.”* * *FFS: How to define/measure sensing beam gain and transmission beam gain.* * *Alt1-4: Leave RAN4 to define suitable requirement/test for “cover”* * *Alt 1-5: Leave RAN4 to define suitable requirement/test for directional LBT with the following specification text in RAN1*   + *FFS: Consider the specification text update to 37.213 for the support of directional LBT in 60 GHz band. “A channel access procedure is a procedure based on sensing that evaluates the availability of a channel for performing transmissions. The basic unit for sensing is a sensing slot with a duration T\_sl=5us. The sensing slot duration T\_sl is considered to be idle if an eNB/gNB or a UE senses the channel during the sensing slot duration, and determines that the detected power in the intended transmission directions for at least X us within the sensing slot duration is less than energy detection threshold X\_"Thresh" . Otherwise, the sensing slot duration T\_sl is considered to be busy.”*     - *Alt 2. Extending the beam correspondence framework and/or QCL/TCI framework to define “cover” considering the following alternatives*       * *Alt 2-1: Extending QCL/TCI framework for sensing: If gNB configures some UE to use TCI state B as QCL source for TCI state A, then the beam used for TCI B can be used as a sensing beam for transmission of beam for TCI A. This extension allows gNB to define the relationship between its sensing beams and transmissions.*       * *Alt 2-2: Beam correspondence-based extension: Beam correspondence framework can be extended to allow UE to select a valid sensing beam corresponding to a transmission beam.*   %%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%  We also have further comments/questions regarding Alt 2:   1. First and foremost, there are no “beams” defined for sensing/LBT. How will the “sensing beam” be defined in RAN1? The beam correspondence or QCL /TCI framework needs to be modified to include some specification text in RAN1. We would like to question the proponents how they plan to do this? What will be specified in RAN1 specs if we were to agree one of the alternatives in Alt1 or Alt2? We provided the spec text for Alt 1-5 where only the highlighted text are changes/additions to the existing spec text. 2. Whatever specification we write in RAN1, it still needs RAN4 requirements and testing. 3. How to enable beam correspondence for LBT in a gNB? Currently, there are no beam correspondence requirements for gNB and it will not be tested. 4. Also, beam correspondence requirement for UEs are also not mandatory   Without understanding all of the above, we cannot support this proposal for an agreement. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | | Based on the agreements so far, the relation between the LBT beam with multiple subsequent transmission beams in a multi-beam COT does not necessarily need to be the natural extension of the relation between one LBT beam and one subsequent transmission beam in a single-beam COT. In fact, in our agreements so far, we use the word “cover” only when describing the relation between one LBT beam with multiple subsequent transmission beams but NOT when describing the relation between one LBT beam with one subsequent transmission beam  To define the relation between one LBT beam and one subsequent transmission beam, we already have tools in place in RAN1 such as QCL indication between two DL RSs and spatialRelationInfo between a DL RS and UL RS. This is similar to Alt 2-3but we prefer to also include spatialRelationInfo which relates SRS transmit beam to a DL RS Receive beam. We think that extension of spatialRelationInfo describes better the relation between a sensing beam (analogous to a Rx beam of a DL RS) and a Tx beam (analogous to the Tx beam of UL SRS) than QCL/TCI frame work which describe Rx beams used for two DL RSs. So, for one to one relation between a single LBT beam and single subsequent Tx beam, we prefer a modified Alt 2-3 as follows:   * Extend QCL/TCI or SpatialRelationInfo (for SRS) framework for sensing to define the relation between a single LBT beam and a single subsequent Tx beam   However, to define the relation between one LBT beam and multiple subsequent transmission beams, LBT beam needs to “cover” multiple transmission beams. Extending the approach used in Alt 2-3 is neither trivial nor necessary. Alternatively, we could define “cover” by defining some geometric properties of the LBT beam relative to the multiple “covered” transmission beams. One such attempt is done in Alt. 1 above. However, in fact, any omni-directional LBT beam meets the requirement in Alt. 1. In our view, the intention of defining “covering” was not to use an arbitrarily large LBT beam width. Therefore, while we are in general supportive of using geometric properties of LBT beam in relations to Tx beams to define “covering”, we think other alternatives should also be considered.  Overall, we can propose the following  **Proposal:**  To define the relation between a single LBT beam and subsequent Tx beam(s) in the COT:   * In the case of a single LBT beam corresponding to a single Tx beam, extend QCL/TCI or SpatialRelationInfo (for SRS) framework * In the case of a single LBT beam and multiple Tx beams, use geometric properties of the LBT beam relative to the multiple transmission beams. Examples include:   + The angle included in the [3]dB beamwidth of the transmission beams is included in the [3]dB beamwidth of the sensing beam (Alt 1 above)   + Sensing beam has the minimum [3]dB beamwidth which at least contains all beam peak directions of transmission beams. |
| ITRI | | We support Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| InterDigital | | We prefer Alt.2, though Alt.1 could be acceptable. Withing Alt.2, we prefer Alt.2-3 or Alt 2.4. |
| Convida Wireless | | We are fine with Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| Samsung | | We support the proposal.  Our preference is Alt 2-3, and open to the discussion for other alternatives. We generally agree with the statement of some other alternatives, but wonder whether the language is aligned with RAN1 spec. |
| OPPO | | We support Alt 2-3. In our view, it is straightforward to use QCL/TCI framework considering it has already been used to define the beam pairing between the transmitter beam and the receiver beam in legacy system. |
| Spreadtrum | | We are fine with the proposal. And our preference is Alt 2-3. |
| LG | | We support Alt 2-3.  If the directional LBT is performed to transmit a beamformed transmission, it may be desirable that all DL signals/channels (or UL signals/channels) belonging to the same TX burst have QCL relationship. Moreover, when the spatial relationship between the DL signals/channels and the UL signals/channels are associated, it is desirable that the COT acquired by directional LBT is shared between the DL signals/channels and UL signals/channels having spatial QCL relationship.  For Alt 2-4, as we mentioned in Section 2.1.1, the ED threshold can be further adjusted by reflecting the beam correspondence capability/requirement of UE. For example, the lower (i.e., more sensitive) ED threshold can be applied to the UE satisfying the relaxed requirement for the beam correspondence capability/requirement. |
| DOCOMO | | We prefer Alt 2-3. QCL/TCI framework extension seems straightforward at least for per-beam LBT. We prefer to have unified solution between per-beam and single wide-beam LBT. |

### Second Round Discussion

Discussion 2.9.2-1

Please provide your view on if we can send an LS to RAN4 asking their view if the relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam should be defined in RAN4 or RAN1?

Support: Ericsson,

Not support (Keep the discussion in RAN1): Apple, Lenovo, vivo, Samsung, Intel, Oppo, FW, LG

RAN4 decides the minimum requirement: Apple, CATT, ZTE, Spreadtrum, Intel, Oppo

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Apple | RAN4 can define minimum requirement of directional sensing. Then RAN5 define test cases for directional CCA test case. RAN1 can continue COT directivity signalling design using TCI framework. We do not see RAN4 work and RAN1 work are exclusive. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We don’t agree with the intended question that RAN4 needs to answer on defining relationship between sensing and transmission beams.  In our view, it is clearly RAN1’s work to define methods/signalling to indicate relationship between sensing and transmission beam. This work should be continued in RAN1 using TCI framework.  In the meantime, RAN4 can rather define minimum requirement of directional sensing, as suggested by Apple |
| vivo | The relationship should be defined in RAN1, RAN1 can send LS to RAN4 if there are some unclear issues related to RAN4. |
| CATT | We agree to send LS to RAN4 to define the minimum requirement of direction sensing. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | On beam correspondence, we understand that it is related to UE capability, and specific minimum requirement should be discussed in RAN4, but once UE has no this capability, then corresponding relationship still belongs to RAN1’s work. |
| Spreadtrum | We believe that the signalling involved in indicating the relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam should be defined by RAN1.  We share the same view as Apple that a LS can be sent to RAN4 to inquire about the minimum requirement of directional sensing. |
| Samsung | In our view, this issue is not an RAN1 or RAN4 issue, but anyway needs the involvement of RAN4. Even alternative preferable of RAN1 definition, it also needs works in RAN4. In this sense, RAN1 should focus on providing solutions first, and then send the LS to RAN4 to trigger the discussion of their work. |
| Intel | We share same view as Apple. |
| Ericsson | We support this proposal. We think it is reasonable to leave it to RAN4 to define requirements to ensure that sensing beam includes the intended transmission direction. From RAN1 point of view, it’s our opinion that only bare minimum needs to be specified to not burden the specification effort as it is not precluded by the regulations even though it is not specified in the harmonized standards. For example, this “bare minimum” can be achieved with our proposal in our previous comment.  In principle, RAN4 needs to provide requirement for whatever we define in RAN1. We do not understand how QCL/TCI or SpatialRelationInfo could be used for a gNB. What is the motivation to define this relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam when gNBs will not be tested (If QCL/TCI framework or spatialrelationinfo or beam correspondence is used )? The QCL/TCI framework is used to define the relationship between two DL transmissions (i.e., between two transmission beams). How will gNB use these TCI State tables for sensing? Therefore, it is not clear how to use it to define the relationship between a sensing beam and a transmission beam (i.e., between a received beam and a transmission beam). The amount of specification effort is tremendous in our opinion.   We request the proponents to clarify what and how exactly do they plan to specify in RAN1 specs for us to consider the various proposals requested here. |
| OPPO | Agree with Apple |
| FW | We agree with vivo and believe a relationship should first be defined in RAN1 |
| LG | We share the same with Lenovo. The RAN1 should define methods/signalling to indicate relationship between sensing and transmission beam by extending QCL/TCI or SpatialRelationInfo framework. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Regarding the relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam(s) we have agreed to the following alternatives:  **Case 1) (Corresponding to Alt 1 in RAN1 104-e)** Single LBT sensing at the start of the COT with wide beam **‘cover’** all beams  **Case 2) (Corresponding to Alt 2 in RAN1 104e)** Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams  Case 1 seems to be the subject of the discussion in 2.9.1 but the subject of discussion in 2.9.2 seems to be more general(?)  In any case, defining the correspondence between one sensing beam and a Tx beam in Case 2 and the correspondence between one sensing beam and multiple Tx beams (defining LBT beam “cover” Tx beams) in Case 1 and the corresponding signalling are in RAN1 domain.  **For Case 2**, current QCL/TCI or SpatialRelationInfo can be easily used to define the correspondence (**any flavor of Alt 2 in 2.9.1-1**) in RAN1  **For Case 1**, current QCL/TCI or SpatialRelationInfo can be extended to define the correspondence (**any flavor of Alt 2 in 2.9.1-1**) or the correspondence can be defined based on the geometric relationship of the sensing beam and the transmission beams (similar to what **Alt 1 in 2.9.1-1** provides as an example) in RAN1  Then, in an LS can be sent to RAN4 to requesting provide the minimum requirement for such correspondence. In case the correspondence is defined based on the geometric relationship of the sensing beam and the transmission beam for Case 1, RAN1 may also ask RAN4 about the feasibility of such definition. |

### Third Round Discussion

Discussion 2.9.3-1

Please provide your view on if we can send an LS to RAN4 asking their view on the minimum requirement on the relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam? At the same time, RAN1 will still continue to define the relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | | View |
| Apple | | RAN4 can define minimum requirement of directional sensing. Then RAN5 define test cases for directional CCA test case. RAN1 can continue COT directivity signalling design using TCI framework. We do not see RAN4 work and RAN1 work are exclusive. |
| DOCOMO | | Basically same view as Apple. |
| Nokia, NSB | | Support sending an LS to RAN4. As we have commented earlier, in our opinion it should be sufficient that RAN4 defines the tests that verify the LBT is capturing interference from the direction of the intended transmission, without RAN1 having to specify the relation. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | | We would like to clarify that sending LS to RAN4 on minimum requirement doesn’t stop RAN1 from further discussion/agreeing on the exact signalling mechanism to indicate the association.  This could be added as note for clarification. |
| CATT | | We agree to send LS to RAN4 to define the minimum requirement on the relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | | We have same views with Apple, DOCOMO and Lenovo. |
| Samsung | | We share the same view with Apple. This discussion anyway needs the involvement of RAN4’s work, and doesn’t conflict the discussion in RAN1. |
| vivo | | It’s not our preference to send an LS to RAN4 right now. After RAN1 decide the relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam, then we can inform RAN4 and ask them to define requirements. |
| Ericsson | While we support sending an LS to RAN4 asking their view on the minimum requirement on the relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam, we tend to agree with Samsung that RAN1 should have more progress on the solutions first, and then send the LS to trigger discussions in RAN4 .  For the progress in RAN1, we propose to revise the previous proposal from the first round to split the alternatives into two main sets: 1st set with RAN4 centric alternatives: including Alt.1, Alt.3, Alt.2-1, Alt.2-2; 2nd set with RAN1 centric alternatives: Alt.2-3, Alt.2-4. From our view (and seems to be the view from some other companies), Alt.2-1 and Alt.2-2 are more relevant to RAN4 than RAN1. Therefore, it is more reasonable to consider it together with Alt.1 and Alt.3. RAN1 could aim to select one or more of the following alternatives before sending the LS to RAN4.  *Proposal:*  *3GPP specification defines the relative relationship between all applicable sensing beam and the transmission beam(s), at least sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam(s), considering following alternatives*   * + - *Alt 1: RAN4 (and RAN1 if needed) to specify necessary requirement/test procedure to guarantee sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam*       * *FFS: To satisfy “cover”, the angle included in the [3] dB beamwidth of the transmission beam is included in the [3] dB beamwidth of the sensing beam.*       * *FFS: A sensing beam is considered to be corresponding to a transmission beam if the sensing beam gain measured along the direction of peak transmission direction is within X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain*       * *FFS: The sensing beam gain is measured in one or more directions where the transmission beam EIRP is within A [FFS] dB of the peak transmission beam gain. The sensing beam is considered to be corresponding to the transmission beam if the sensing beam gain measured along the chosen directions is within X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain in those directions.* * *FFS: Leave RAN4 to define suitable requirement/test for “cover”*   + - *Alt 2. Extending the beam correspondence framework and/or QCL/TCI framework to define “cover”*       * *FFS: Extending QCL/TCI framework for sensing: If gNB configures some UE to use TCI state B as QCL source for TCI state A, then the beam used for TCI B can be used as a sensing beam for transmission of beam for TCI A. This extension allows gNB to define the relationship between its sensing beams and transmissions.*       * *FFS: Beam correspondence-based extension: Beam correspondence framework can be extended to allow UE to select a valid sensing beam corresponding to a transmission beam.*     On a higher-level principle, we agree with Nokia. We do not think that directional LBT needs to be specified in RAN1 but can be left to RAN4 (and RAN5) or just implementation. Directional LBT is not precluded by the regulations. However, some companies showed apprehensions about devices abusing if not specified in RAN1. Hence, we agreed for a compromise to specify it in RAN1 (and the proposals above), but we do not support specifying complex mechanisms that only are going to increase the specification effort for no clear requirements needed to enable directional LBT. For instance, in RAN1 we couldconsider the specification text update to 37.213 to reflect the support of directional LBT in 60 GHz band.  *“A channel access procedure is a procedure based on sensing that evaluates the availability of a channel for performing transmissions. The basic unit for sensing is a sensing slot with a duration T\_sl=5us. The sensing slot duration T\_sl is considered to be idle if an eNB/gNB or a UE senses the channel during the sensing slot duration, and determines that the detected power in the intended transmission directions for at least X us within the sensing slot duration is less than energy detection threshold X\_"Thresh" . Otherwise, the sensing slot duration T\_sl is considered to be busy.”* | | |
| Futurewei | We share the view that RAN1 should provide at least the outlines of a solution first. | | |

## No LBT

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For regions where LBT is not mandated, gNB should indicate to the UE this gNB-UE connection is operating in LBT mode or no-LBT mode. Down-select between   * Alt 1. Support cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell as part of system information or dedicated RRC signalling or both) gNB indication * Alt 2. Support both cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell as part of system information or dedicated RRC signalling or both) and UE specific (can be different for different UEs in a cell as part of UE-specific RRC configuration) gNB indication * FFS: Whether the indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode is per beam (can be different for different UEs in different beams or can be different for different beam pairs between gNB and the UE) or per cell (can be different for different cells for a UE in carrier aggregation) * FFS: Whether a gNB and its UE(s) can have different mode * FFS: Whether L1 signalling can be used for both Alt 1 and Alt 2 for gNB indication |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
|  |  |
| CATT | Proposal 1: Both Cell-specific and UE-specific gNB indication should be supported to indicate LBT or No-LBT mode to the UE.  Proposal 2: L1 signaling, such as DCI format 1\_0 scrambled by SI-RNTI/P-RNTI, could be used as Cell-specific gNB indication to indicate LBT mode or No-LBT mode to the UE. |
| Charter Communications | Proposal 5: For indication of LBT mode or no-LBT mode in regions where LBT is not mandated, support only cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell as part of system information or dedicated RRC signalling or both) gNB indication without L1 signalling. |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 2: Adaptation between LBT modes and LBT sub-modes for optimizing system performance should be considered.  Proposal 3: Both cell specific and UE specific gNB indication could be used. In UE specific gNB indication, LBT mode could be different for different UEs in a cell as part of UE-specific RRC configuration.  Proposal 4: Both L1 signalling and higher layer signaling could be considered for gNB indication of LBT mode. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 21 Support Atl.2 where both cell specific and UE specific signals could be used for indicating LBT mode.  Proposal 22 For NR operation in 52.6GHz to 71 GHz, gNB and UE(s) could have different LBT modes. |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 1: Regarding indication of LBT mode and no-LBT mode, Alt 2 should be adopted. • Alt 2. Support both cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell as part of system information or dedicated RRC signalling or both) and UE specific (can be different for different UEs in a cell as part of UE-specific RRC configuration) gNB indication. |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 10: For regions where LBT is not mandatory, a no-LBT mode can be defined and switching between LBT mode and no-LBT mode can be supported.  Proposal 11: For indication of LBT mode and no-LBT mode, cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell) indication as part of system information and dedicated RRC signaling should be supported.  • FFS: Supporting UE specific (i.e., different for different UEs in a cell) indication via dedicated RRC signaling.  Proposal 12: In deployments without LBT consider specification of channel vacation policies accounting for disparity among co-existing devices. |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Proposal 21：For operation in the 60 GHz band, in regions where LBT is not mandated, a gNB/UE can initiate a channel occupancy access using a channel access mechanism without LBT if it is used in conjunction with an interference mitigation scheme. Interference mitigation schemes such as ATPC or DFS would be implemented as specified by the region-specific regulations and do not need to be specified by 3GPP.  Proposal 22: For operation in the 60 GHz band, in regions where LBT is not mandated, support Alt 1, i.e., cell specific gNB indication common for all UEs in a cell as part of system information or dedicated RRC signalling or both. Within the same cell, all nodes, UEs and gNB, should apply the same channel access mechanism. Only higher layer signaling is supported for this gNB indication.  Proposal 23: For operation in the 60 GHz band, in regions where LBT is not mandated, the serving cell may enable Rx-side LBT using a higher layer configuration to mitigate high levels of interference experienced from hidden nodes.  Proposal 24: For operation in the 60 GHz band, in regions where LBT is not mandated, COT should be limited when no–LBT is used.  Observation 6: When No-LBT is used in regions where LBT is not mandated by regulations, the hidden node issue would still persist. |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 8: gNB indicates whether LBT or no-LBT procedure should be used via both system information and UE-specific RRC configuration.  Proposal 9: A switching mechanism between LBT and no-LBT is defined, but it is up to gNB’s control to decide when to switch. |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 9: The indication of channel access mode is received per cell and per beam. |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | Observation 5: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, long-term channel sensing could be useful for both LBT and no-LBT based channel access mechanism: - For LBT based channel access mechanism, long-term sensing at the UE could be utilized for receiver assistance LBT at the gNB - For no LBT based channel access mechanisms, long-term sensing could provide interference statistics in terms of potential interference from WiFi as well as interference from other NR operators  Proposal 22: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, switching between LBT and no-LBT based channel access mechanism should be supported for regions where LBT is not mandated.  Proposal 23: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, different implicit and/or explicit methods for switching between LBT and no-LBT mode should be considered. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #1: The channel access mechanism can be switched from LBT mode to no-LBT mode based on timer operation when receiving the information of the local regulation from the gNB (by cell specific or UE specific signaling) and satisfying certain conditions such as a low interference environment. |
| MediaTek Inc. | Proposal 1: Both cell-specific and UE-specific method should be supported for gNB to indicate UE operating in LBT or no LBT mode. |
| NEC | Proposal 7: For regions where LBT is not mandated, both cell specific and UE specific gNB indication for LBT/no-LBT mode operation should be supported. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 28: UEs without LBT functionality are supported.  Observation 8: Channel access mechanism without LBT should fulfil the expected requirements of EN 303 722 but also possibly EN 303 753.  Proposal 34: Introduce Alt2 (both cell and UE specific) for channel access mode indication.  Proposal 35: Leave any additional conditions/mechanisms/restriction/fallback modes on the no-LBT channel access mode for gNB implementation. |
| OPPO | Proposal 8: support both Alt 1 and Alt 2 for operation between LBT mode and non-LBT mode  Proposal 9: support gNB and UE having different modes.  Proposal 10: support LBT mode per beam indication. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 15: Consider the use of beam specific indication of No-LBT or LBT mode.  Proposal 16: Allow different modes for gNB and UE.  Proposal 17: It is not necessary to use L1 signaling for cell specific and UE specific gNB indication. |
| Samsung | Proposal 1: For regions where LBT is not mandated, • support both cell-specific and UE-specific indication of the operation mode (Alt 2). o the cell-specific indication is a group of mode pairs, wherein each mode pair defines the modes of gNB and UE for a particular beam; o the UE-specific indication is a mode pair. • gNB determines its operation mode up to implementation. |
| Sony | Observation 1: In EU, no-LBT mode cannot be operated at least under the ‘C1’ mode for indoor and outdoor deployment.  Observation 2: No-LBT mode works in the uncongested environment.  Observation 3: Congestion could be measured by average RSSI and channel occupancy which have already been introduced in NR-U.  Proposal 1: No-LBT mode is configured by the network based on measurement results of RSSI and channel occupancy.  Proposal 2: For indication of LBT mode/no-LBT mode, both cell specific and UE specific gNB indication should be supported. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 15: Support both cell specific and UE specific gNB indication for LBT mode or no-LBT mode. |
| vivo | Proposal 17: Both cell-specific and UE-specific indication of the channel access mode should be supported. Per-beam based channel access mode indication is not necessary.  Proposal 18: The channel access mode can be selected based on the channel occupancy time, channel access rate, transmission priority, service requirement, or feedback information from the receiver, etc. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2: Support both cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell as part of system information or dedicated RRC signalling or both) and UE specific (can be different for different UEs in a cell as part of UE-specific RRC configuration) gNB indication  Proposal 3: How to prevent long time continuous channel occupying for Tx using No-LBT should be further studied. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Observation 6: Once the transmission of DL/UL channels/signals considered as Short Control Signalling exceeds 10ms limitation, it is a nature way to switch from No LBT mode to LBT mode.  Proposal 9: No LBT can be considered to be used in the following cases: • COT sharing case only if the later transmission starts within the maximum gap Y from the end of the earlier transmission. • Specific areas such as ITU region 2 and 3. • Interference controlled environment. • The transmission beams of nodes of different operators in the same system (e.g., NR-U) have little interference with each other.  Observation 8: No LBT should be workable only if some interference elimination mechanisms are applied on top of it. If no LBT is supported, the spec impact of introducing such enhancement should be further studied and evaluated.  Proposal 11: Conditions for No LBT fallback to LBT should be further studied, e.g., based on the interference level or correctly decoding rate. |

### First Round Discussion

No LBT: For regions where LBT is not mandated, gNB should indicate to the UE this gNB-UE connection is operating in LBT mode or no-LBT mode, the following positions are reached by companies

* Alt 1. Support cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell as part of system information or dedicated RRC signalling or both) gNB indication
  + Charter, Huawei, Inter-digital, OPPO
* Alt 2. Support both cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell as part of system information or dedicated RRC signalling or both) and UE specific (can be different for different UEs in a cell as part of UE-specific RRC configuration) gNB indication
  + CATT, Convida, Ericsson, Fujitsu , (FFS for Futurewei), Intel, (LG?), MediaTek, NEC, Nokia, OPPO, Samsung, Sony, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, Vivo, ITRI
* FFS: Whether the indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode is per beam (can be different for different UEs in different beams or can be different for different beam pairs between gNB and the UE) or per cell (can be different for different cells for a UE in carrier aggregation)
  + Per Beam: Inter-digital, OPPO, Samsung, Qualcomm,
  + Against: Vivo
* FFS: Whether a gNB and its UE(s) can have different mode
  + Support: Ericsson, OPPO, Qualcomm
  + Against: Huawei
* FFS: Whether L1 signalling can be used for both Alt 1 and Alt 2 for gNB indication
  + For: Convida
  + Against: Qualcomm

For regions where LBT is not mandated, gNB should indicate to the UE this gNB-UE connection is operating in LBT mode or no-LBT mode, between the two alternative, Alt 2 seems to have stronger support

Proposal 2.10.1-1

For regions where LBT is not mandated, gNB should indicate to the UE this gNB-UE connection is operating in LBT mode or no-LBT mode

* Support both cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell as part of system information or dedicated RRC signalling or both) and UE specific (can be different for different UEs in a cell as part of UE-specific RRC configuration) gNB indication
* Support: Nokia, Charter, Lenovo, ZTE, Intel, vivo, Apple, Futurewei, NEC, Ericsson, Huawei (can accept), ITRI, InterDigital, Fujitsu, Convida, Samsung, Oppo, WILUS, Spreadtrum, CATT, LG, DCM, MTK

Moderator comment: The proposal seems to be stable

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the new proposal 2.10.1-1 |
| Charter Communications | OK with the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with proposal 2.10.1-1 |
| Intel | We support the proposal. |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Apple | Support the proposal |
| Futurewei | We are OK with this new proposal. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal in 2.10.1-1.  However, we also need to address the issue raised in Initial access. We need to elaborate what cell-specific system information from the above means.  Proposal: Cell-specific system information indication of LBT ON/OFF is included in one of the following alternatives  Alt 1: MIB  In our view, there are two options for the UE to determine the size of DCI \_1\_0 during SIB1 reading; 1) LBT on/off is signalled in MIB or 2) the UE needs to make two assumptions of the DCI size during PDCCH decoding while reading SIB1, i.e., perform 2 blind decodes. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We can accept proposal 2.10.1-1 as a compromise although we do not see why different UEs in the same cell should have different LBT modes. |
| ITRI | We support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal |
| Fujitsu | We support the proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We support the proposal. |
| Samsung | We support the proposal. |
| OPPO | We support the proposal. |
| WILUS | We support Proposal 2.10.1-1 |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We are ok with the proposal.  For the initial access, L1 signaling, such as DCI format 1\_0 scrambled by SI-RNTI/P-RNTI, could be used as Cell-specific gNB indication.  DCI format 1\_0 scrambled by SI-RNTI/P-RNTI in unlicensed band has two more additional reserved bits than that in licensed band. These additional 2 bits in DCI 1\_0 scrambled by SI-RNTI can be reused as LBT/No-LBT indication, so that the UE can obtain LBT/No-LBT mode information before reading SIB and avoid increasing the overhead of system information. It is recommended that L1 signaling such as DCI format 1\_0 scrambled by SI-RNTI/P-RNTI can be used as cell-specific indication for LBT mode/No-LBT mode. |
| LG | We are fine with the Proposal.  If the information that the local regulation allows initiating channel occupancy without LBT is delivered to the UE (either cell-specific or UE-specific) and at least one of the specific conditions are met, the channel access with LBT can be switched to the channel access mechanism without LBT. |
| DOCOMO | Ok with supporting both cell-specific and UE specific gNB indication for LBT turning on/off. |
| Mediatek | We are ok with the proposal. |

Discussion 2.10.1-2

If UE specific gNB indication on using LBT mode or no-LBT mode is adopted, please provide your view whether the indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode is per beam (can be different for different UEs in different beams or can be different for different beam pairs between gNB and the UE) or not

* Support per beam indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode: Lenovo, ZTE, NEC, ITRI, InterDigital, Samsung, Oppo
* Do not support per beam indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode: Nokia, Charter, Intel, vivo, Apple, Futurewei, Ericsson, Huawei, Fujitsu, WILUS, Spreadtrum, CATT, LG, DCM, MTK

Moderator comment: More discussion needed

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | As a starting point, cell-specific indication seems sufficient. We may further consider beam-specific indication. |
| Charter Communications | Do not support per beam indication |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, per beam indication should be applied to indicate LBT or no LBT mode. It could be different for different beam pairs between gNB and UE |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support per beam indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode |
| Intel | We do not see the need to support this indication in terms of beams, so the proposal with first bullet removed is preferred. |
| vivo | Per-beam channel access mode indication is not necessary. The beam pair link quality is changing due to UE moving or rotation. In general, TCI states are updated dynamically based on beam report, e.g. the gNB activates a set of TCI states via MAC CE or indicates TCI state by DCI. Therefore, per-beam channel mode indication by RRC will not adapt to the change of the TCI state. |
| Apple | Do not support per beam indication. UE beam is not known to network in general. |
| Futurewei | We do not support per-beam indication since its benefits over per-UE indication are unclear. |
| NEC | We support per beam indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode |
| Ericsson | WE do not see the need to specify per beam indication of LBT on/OFF. We need more clarification on how to specify this. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Do not support per beam indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode |
| ITRI | We support per beam indication |
| InterDigital | We support per beam indication. This can be beneficial for multi-TRP scenarios. |
| Fujitsu | We also think cell-specific indication seems sufficient. But we are open to further discussing beam-specific indication. Maybe the proponents can share more details. |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer to postpone this decision to later. |
| Samsung | We support the per-beam indication within a cell. |
| OPPO | Support per beam indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode. |
| WILUS | We are not clear for necessity to specify per beam indication. It seems sufficient to have cell-specific indication. |
| Spreadtrum | We don’t support per beam indication. |
| CATT | Do not support per beam indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode: |
| LG | Do not support per beam indication. |
| DOCOMO | We think whether to perform LBT should depend on at least the interference condition, which is not depending on beams in our view. Thus, we do not see the necessity to support per beam indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no LBT mode. |
| Mediatek | Per-beam indication is actually a special case or subset of UE-specific signalling to us. Unless some problems/issues can be clearly identified/pointed out that UE-specific signaling can’t solve while per-beam indication can. Otherwise, we don’t see the need for per-beam indication. |

Discussion 2.10.1-3

If UE specific gNB indication on using LBT mode or no-LBT mode is adopted, please provide your view whether the indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode is per cell (can be different for different cells for a UE in carrier aggregation),

* Support per cell indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode: Nokia, Lenovo, Intel, ZTE(?), vivo, NEC, Ericsson, InterDigital, Fujitsu, Convida, Samsung, Oppo,WILUS, Spreadtrum, CATT, LG, DCM, MTK
* Do not support per cell indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode:

Moderator comment: The proposal seems to be stable

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We support per-cell indication. In CA, different cells may in principle be operating according to different ETSI harmonized standards, e.g. depending on the type of the equipment. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Per cell indication could also be indicated |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If the same interference situation is for UEs under cell, then we support per cell indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode. Otherwise, we do not support per cell indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode. |
| Intel | We support the per cell indication, and the proposal with the second bullet removed. |
| vivo | Support per cell indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode |
| NEC | We support per cell indication in CA. |
| Ericsson | We do not understand the need for this proposal. Cell-specific indication is already included. Since LBT mode is already indicated independently per cell, no more complexity is required to indicate different LBT modes for different cells. It could be up to gNB implementation to whether to indicate the same or different LBT modes for different beams from different cells for the same UE.  Mod: There is a FFS in the previous agreement. |
| InterDigital | We support per cell indication. The different cells may use different beams with different interference profiles, thus leading to different needs for LBT. |
| Fujitsu | We support per cell indication. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with per cell indication. |
| Samsung | Yes, we support per cell indication in CA as well. |
| OPPO | Support per cell indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode. |
| WILUS | We support per cell indication. |
| Spreadtrum | We support per cell indication. |
| CATT | We support per cell indication. |
| LG | We support per cell indication. |
| DOCOMO | We support per cell indication. |
| Mediatek | We are ok with the per-cell indication. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with per cell indication |
|  |  |

Discussion 2.10.1-4

For regions where LBT is not mandated, please provide your view if gNB and UE can have different LBT or no-LBT mode

* Support a gNB and its UE(s) to have different mode: Nokia, Charter, Lenovo, ZTE, Intel, vivo, Apple, Futurewei, NEC, Ericsson, Huawei, ITRI, InterDigital, Fujitsu (fine with it), Samsung, Oppo, Spreadtrum CATT, LG, DCM, MTK
* A gNB and its UE(s) are either both in LBT mode or both in no-LBT mode:
* Discuss later: Convida

Moderator comment: The proposal seems to be stable

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes, if LBT is not mandated on a given region, enabling of LBT can be done separately for gNB and different UEs |
| Charter Communications | Don’t see a technical justification but the flexibility to implement this should be available |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | LBT can be enabled/indicated separately for gNB and UEs |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support a gNB and its UE(s) to have different mode |
| Intel | Our view is that the gNB and its UE(s) can have different mode of operation. |
| vivo | Support a gNB and its UE(s) to have different mode |
| Apple | Support gNB and UE to have different mode. This allows only gNB perform sensing. |
| Futurewei | We are open to support gNB and UE(s) to have different modes since it allows for higher flexibility. |
| NEC | Support a gNB and its UE(s) to have different mode. |
| Ericsson | Support gNbs and UEs could have different LBT modes. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This seems to have some relation with Proposal 2.10.1-1. In particular, if “a gNB and its UE(s) are either both in LBT mode or both in no-LBT mode”, then how LBT indication can be UE specific (can be different for different UEs)? So, if we support UE-specific indication in 2.10.1-1, it seems that we are implicitly supporting “a gNB and its UE(s) to have different mode” in 2.10-1-4. |
| ITRI | Support a gNB and its UE(s) to have different mode |
| InterDigital | There is no need to limit the operation to both using the same mode. Therefore we support that a gNB and its UE(s) can have different modes. |
| Fujitsu | We agree with Huawei’s comment. And for cell-specific indication, common mode for gNB and UE seems sufficient. But if the majority view is to support a gNB and its UE(s) to have different mode for the case of cell-specific indication as well, we are fine with it. |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer to postpone this decision to later. |
| Samsung | We support a gNB and UE has different modes.  To clarify the relationship between per-cell/per-beam and gNB/UE with same/different mode, we summarize the different indication methods as below for further discussion (of course there could be more to be added):  Examples for cell-specific indication:  1. Per-cell indication of a single mode applied to both gNB and UEs  2. Per-cell indication of a mode pair applied to gNB and UEs respectively  3. Per-beam indication of a group of modes , wherein is a common mode applied to gNB and UEs in beam .  4. Per-beam indication of a group of mode pairs , wherein are modes for gNB and UEs in beam respectively.  5. Per-cell indication of gNB’s mode , and per-beam indication of UE’s modes wherein is a mode applied to UEs in beam  The examples for UE-specific indication can be discussed later based on the choice of the cell-specific indication. |
| OPPO | Support a gNB and its UE(s) to have different modes. |
| Spreadtrum | We support gNB and its UE can have different mode. |
| CATT | Support a gNB and its UE(s) to have different mode: |
| LG | We support a gNB and its UE(s) to have different mode. |
| DOCOMO | we are ok with supporting a gNB and its UE(s) to have different modes. |
| Mediatek | We support gNB and its UE(s) to have different mode |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the conclusion of this discussion point, although our preference is that both gNB and UE use the same LBT/No-LBT mode, but we believe that agreeing to a proposal is not needed since the indication of the LBT mode of the gNB-UE connection is intended to the UE and the UE is not concerned with whether the gNB performs LBT or not |
|  |  |

Discussion 2.10.1-5 (closed)

For regions where LBT is not mandated, please provide your view if L1 signalling is be introduced for gNB to indicate to the UE if the operation is in LBT mode or no-LBT mode

* Support: Nokia (at least for initial access), Lenovo, ZTE (at least for initial access), vivo (if there is clear motivation or benefit), NEC, ITRI, InterDigital (at least for initial access), Convida, CATT (at least for initial access),
* Not support: Charter, Intel, Apple, Futurewei, Ericsson, Huawei, Fujitsu, Samsung (this is different from LBT field in DCI), WILUS, Spreadtrum, LG, MTK

Moderator comment: There seems to be some confusion on the original statement for discussion. I don’t think this is about the DCI field on LBT control. Instead, as Samsung commented, we are discussing if there is a need to introduce L1 based LBT mode switching. Will try again in 2.10.2 with a better formulation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | At least for initial access, the UE will need to get a L1 indication of whether or not LBT should be used. |
| Charter Communications | Do not support, higher-layer signaling can support all cases. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support L1 signalling introduction |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Share same views with Nokia. |
| Intel | We do not support L1 signalling for this purpose. |
| Vivo | If clear motivation or benefit can be seen, L1 signalling can be introduced. |
| Apple | Do not support L1 signaling for this purpose. |
| Futurewei | We have to see more convincing arguments and details for considering L1 signalling for this purpose. |
| NEC | We support L1 signalling for this purpose. |
| Ericsson | We do not see the need for this proposal when we have both cell-specific and UE-specific indication of LBT. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support. We do not see why switching between LBT and no-LBT should be so dynamic. It can be indicated semi-statically in RRC.  Regarding Nokia’s comment LBT/No-LBT mode during initial access can be implicitly or explicitly derived from MIB/SIB1. |
| ITRI | Support L1 signalling at least for initial access |
| InterDigital | We agree with Nokia and we support L1 signaling to indicate the LBT mode. |
| Fujitsu | Not support: We do not see the motivation to support L1 signalling for indicating the modes. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with L1 signaling to indicate the LBT mode. |
| Samsung | To clarify, the supporting of LBT/no-LBT mode doesn’t conflict with the indication of LBT type by DCI as supported in NR-U. In our understanding, LBT/no-LBT mode is a more static system mode, while the indication in DCI for LBT type is a dynamic one for the upcoming transmission. In this sense, we don’t think LBT mode should be indicated in L1 signalling, but the mechanism of indication LBT type/parameters in Rel-16 NRU can still be supported (with potential modification). |
| WILUS | We do not support L1 signalling for this purpose. |
| Spreadtrum | We do not see the need to indicate the LBT mode by L1 signalling. We believe that the LBT mode switch should be based a long term measurements of the interference. |
| CATT | Share same views with Nokia.  For initial access, L1 signaling, such as DCI format 1\_0 scrambled by SI-RNTI/P-RNTI, could be used as Cell-specific gNB indication, so that the UE can obtain LBT/No-LBT mode information before reading SIB. |
| LG | We don’t support the L1 signalling for indication of LBT mode. |
| Mediatek | We do not see the need for L1 signaling, it can be handled by RRC parameters like channel access mode indication in R-16. |

### Second Round Discussion

Discussion 2.10.2-1

For regions where LBT is not mandated, please provide your view if L1 signalling is be introduced for gNB to indicate to the UE if the operation is in LBT mode or no-LBT mode. Note this is different from the DCI field indicate the LBT type for UL transmission.

* Support: Lenovo, vivo, CATT, ZTE
* Not support: Apple, Spreadtrum, MTK, Fujitsu, Samsung, Intel, Ericsson, HW, LG

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Apple | Not support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| vivo | We are ok to support L1 signalling if clear motivation or benefit can be provided. |
| CATT | Support.  For initial access, L1 signaling, such as DCI format 1\_0 could be used as Cell-specific gNB indication, so that the UE can obtain LBT/No-LBT mode information before reading SIB and determine the correct DCI size. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support and have same views with vivo and CATT. |
| Spreadtrum | Not support. |
| Mediatek | Not support. |
| Fujitsu | Not support.  So far, we do not think it is necessary to inform UE of the LBT/No-LBT mode before reading SIB.  In addition, even if it is necessary, we prefer to include the indication in MIB, which in our understanding is not a part of the L1 signalling we are referring to in this discussion. |
| Samsung | We don’t think L1 signalling of LBT mode is needed, given the understanding that indicating LBT type in DCI is a separate issue. |
| Intel | As already highlighted in our prior comments, we do not support L1 signalling for this purpose. |
| Ericsson | We do not support the proposal. We do not see the benefit for indicating No LBT/LBT mode via L1 signalling. |
| OPPO | This can be further discussed. To us, what is not very clear is that even in region that LBT is mandatory, the gNB can already indicate UE to perform non-LBT via L1-signaling (current specification). Here for the region where LBT is not mandatory, what does it mean? Does it mean that the gNB will indicate there is no LBT in the system information or not? If it is not the case, we see no difference from the current specification. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support. We do not see why switching between LBT and no-LBT should be so dynamic. It can be indicated semi-statically in RRC. |
| LG | Not support. |
| DOCOMO | For initial access, we agree it may be beneficial to support L1 signalling, while we also think it would be unclear if it is possible by reasonable enhancements. We are not sure if it is good to conclude support or not support at this stage without further investigation. Prefer to be more careful. |
| Nokia, NSB | LBT mode signalling may be better addressed in Initial Access AI considering also signalling for DBTW. After initial access, there is no need to support L1 signalling of the LBT mode. |

## Short Control Signaling and Contention Exempt Transmission

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules can be applicable to the transmission of SS/PBCH.   + FFS: What are the other DL signals and channels that can be multiplexed with SS/PBCH transmission under Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule   + FFS: Whether this can be applied to all supported SCS or specific SCS.   + FFS: Extension to discovery burst if it is defined including signals other than SS/PBCH   + Note: Restriction for short control signalling transmissions apply (10% over any 100ms interval) * FFS: Other DL signals/channels can be transmitted with Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule, such as PDCCH, broadcast PDSCH, PDSCH without user plain data, CSI-RS, PRS, etc   Agreement:  For contention exemption short control signalling based DL transmission of SS/PBCH, further consider if the following signals/channels can be multiplexed with SS/PBCH block transmission.   * RMSI PDCCH and RMSI PDSCH * Other broadcast PDSCH * PDSCH without user-plane data * PDCCH * CSI-RS * PRS * Other signals/channels contained in Discovery Burst (i.e., exemption applies to Discovery Burst)   Note: Total exempted signals/channels should meet the restriction of 10% over any 100ms interval.  FFS: If contention exemption short control signalling based DL transmission is allowed when not multiplexed with SS/PBCH block transmission. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
|  |  |
| Apple | Proposal 7: Other DL signals and channels for control, management and beamforming RS that is FDMed together in the SSB symbol can be transmitted as short control signaling.  Proposal 8: Transmission of SSB as short control signaling can be applied to 120KHz, 240KHz, 480KHz and 960KHz SCS. It is up to gNB implementation to ensure short control signaling regulation limitation is met.  Proposal 9: For UL, at least PRACH should be considered as short control signaling. The 10% over any 100ms interval restriction is applicable to the msg1/msg3/msgA transmission from one UE perspective. |
| CATT | Proposal 16: The Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules can be applied to SS/PBCH transmission of all the supported SCS with the restriction that less than 10% duty cycle within 100ms has to be satisfied.  Proposal 17: For UL signal, the Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules can be applied to Msg1/Msg A and ACK/NACK signaling.  Proposal 18: The Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling can be applied to any signaling without user-plane data multiplexed with SS/PBCH block transmission.  Observation 1: When the periodicity of SS/PBCH block is 20msec and the number of SSB beams is 64, the total duration of SSB transmission is more than 10% within 100ms.  Proposal 19: In order to meet the rule of less than 10% duty cycle within 100ms, the Contention Exempt Short Signaling rules shall be applied to specific SSB beams for 120 kHz SCS. |
| Charter Communications | Proposal 4: The short control signalling exemptions for SS/PBCH blocks should apply at least to an entire SSB burst of any SCS that is not multiplexed with unicast control or data (subject to the duty cycle limits). |
| Ericsson | Observation 9 In HS EN 302 567, SCS transmissions have a duty cycle requirement but no limitations on the number of SCS transmissions within the observation period.  Proposal 6 Support extending the Short control signalling transmissions exemption to Discovery Burst.  Proposal 7 Consistent with EN 302 567, a node can access the channel without LBT for control signal/channel transmissions, the total duration of which shall not exceed 10 ms within an observation period of 100ms. The following signals/channels shall be classified as short control signaling transmissions: 1 msg1 and msg3 for the 4 step RACH and MsgA for the 2-step RACH 2 FFS: Other control transmissions not multiplexed with user data (subject to gNB configuration) |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Proposal 25: In regions where LBT is mandated, for contention exemption short control signalling based DL transmission of SS/PBCH, only channels/signals that can be multiplexed within the DB as defined for Rel-16 NR-U should be supported.  Proposal 26: In regions where LBT is mandated, contention-exempt short control signaling rules do not apply to the transmission of msg1/msg3 for 4 step RACH and MsgA for 2-step RACH. |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 19: It is left up to gNB to decide and apply SSE to any signals/channels which are additionally multiplexed with SS/PBCH, as long as when it does the 10% duty cycle over a 100ms observation period is met.  Proposal 20: SSB transmission with no LBT is supported at least for 960 kHz and type0-PDCCH.  Proposal 21: It is up to the gNB to decide and apply SSE to the discovery burst, as long as when it does the 10% duty cycle over a 100ms observation period is met.  Observation 3: For 120 kHz, 480kHz, and 960 kHz PRACH transmission, UE does not exceed total transmission duration of 10 msec for PRACH within a 100 msec observation period.  Proposal 22: Consider applying short control signal exemption to PRACH transmission by the UE. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #2: The contention exempt short control signalling can be supported for SS/PBCH multiplexed with non-unicast information (e.g., SIB1, CSI-RS), where the transmission(s) duration is not exceed 10ms within an observation period of 100ms. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Observation 2: EN 302 567, v2.2.0 allows for Short Control Signalling transmissions for up to 10% of time within an observation period of 100 ms.  Proposal 14: NR-U design for 60 GHz bands supports transmission of the following DL and UL control and management signals as short control signalling without LBT:  • Downlink: SS/PBCH blocks (already agreed), PDCCH, CSI-RS and other reference signals, e.g., for beam management, SIBs, Paging • Uplink: HARQ-ACK feedback on either PUCCH or PUSCH, Scheduling Request, CSI feedback, Sounding RS, e.g., for beam management, RACH related transmissions  Proposal 15: For the UL transmissions, the 10% short control signaling allowance is shared by all the UEs in the cell.  Proposal 18: Use of short control signal contention exemption and use of LBT is periodically cycled over the SSBs, evenly distributing the channel access uncertainty over the SSBs. |
| NTT DOCOMO INC. | Proposal 5: Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules can be applicable to the transmission of SS/PBCH and multiplexed signals/channels within a same transmission burst irrespective of SCS |
| OPPO | Proposal 14: PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK information and SSB burst belong to short control signaling; while the duty cycle limitation should be met. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 12: Under the restrictions of duty cycle for short control signaling, allow SS/PBCH, PDCCH, CSI-RS and PRS for contention exempt transmission  Proposal 13: Under the restrictions of duty cycle for short control signaling, allow PRACH, msg1, msg3, msgA, SRS, PUCCH and PUSCH without user plane data for contention exempt transmission |
| Samsung | Proposal 7: For “short control signalling”: • support discovery burst as part of the short control signalling; • support other periodic transmission with high priority can be part of “short control signalling”, including non-unicast information, PRACH, PDCCH, PUCCH, and RS. • support limitation on the duty cycle to use “short control signalling”, wherein the duty cycle are defined from the channel occupancy point of view. |
| Sony | Proposal 3: Contention exempt short control signalling should be adopted for transmission of RMSI PDCCH, RMSI PDSCH, and/or CSI-RS contained in Discovery Burst.  Proposal 4: Contention exempt short control signalling should be adopted for PRACH transmission. |
| vivo | Proposal 19: The contention exempt short control signaling can be extended to discovery burst with duration less than 1ms.  Proposal 20: The contention exempt short control signaling based SS/PBCH can be multiplexed with RMSI PDCCH, RMSI PDCH and CSI-RS. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Observation 7: For the case of the transmission of DL/UL channels/signals considered as Short Control Signalling is in a COT initiated by gNB or UE, it is suggested that such transmission should not be counted into 10ms limitation within the 100ms observation period.  Observation 2: On 10ms limitation of Short Control Signalling, it is recommended that “ the total time corresponding to all transmitted symbols for a channel/signal that is regarded as short control signalling can be used to evaluate whether to meet 10ms limitation” should be considered.  Observation 3: Other channel/signal is allowed to be multiplexed with a channel/signal that has been regarded as Short Control Signalling only if their total transmission time does not exceed 10ms limitation within 100ms observation period.  Observation 4:  l For 120 kHz SCS SS/PBCH, transmitted 64 SS/PBCH with 20ms SS/PBCH period exceeds 10ms limitation within a 100ms observation period required for short control signalling. l For larger SCS (e.g., 240/480/960kHz) SS/PBCH, transmitted 64 SS/PBCH with 20ms SS/PBCH period does not exceed 10ms limitation within a 100ms observation period required for short control signalling.  Observation 5: Msg1 or Msg3 or MsgA can be considered to apply Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules.  Proposal 7: SS/PBCH other than 120kHz SCS can be considered using Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules.  Proposal 8: Msg1 or Msg3 or MsgA can be considered using Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules. |

### First Round Discussion

For Short Control Signaling exemption from LBT for uplink transmissions, following positions are roughly reached by the companies

* PRACH, Msg1/MsgA
  + Apple, Ericsson, CATT, Intel, ZTE
  + Against; Huawei
* PUCCH (all)
* Msg3
  + Ericsson, ZTE
  + Against: Huawei
* Ack/Nack on PUSCH (Nokia)
* CSI reporting on PUSCH (Nokia)
* SRS (all)

Proposal 2.11.1-1:

* Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules apply to the transmission of msg1 and/or msg3 for the 4 step RACH and MsgA for the 2-step RACH for all supported SCS.
  + Note restriction for short control signalling transmissions apply (10% over any 100ms intervals)
  + Alt 1: The 10% over any 100ms interval restriction is applicable to all available msg1/msg3/msgA resources configured (not limited to the resources actually used) in a cell
  + Alt 2: The 10% over any 100ms interval restriction is applicable to the msg1/msg3/msgA transmission from one UE perspective
* FFS: Other UL signals/channels can be transmitted with Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule, such as SRS, PUCCH, PUSCH without user plain data, etc
* Support: Nokia, Charter, Lenovo (Alt 2), ZTE (Alt 1), Intel, Apple (Alt 2), Futurewei (Alt 1), Ericsson (Alt 2), Samsung, Speradtrum, CATT (Alt 2), DCM (Alt 2)
* Object: Huawei

Moderator: There is majority view to support the proposal, though there is split view for Alt 1 or Alt 2

* To HW: The proposal is not all PRACH configuration can be supported by SCS. Only those satisfy the condition in Alt 1 or Alt 2 is allowed with SCS. Does this address your concern? I feel your argument at least align with Alt 1
* To LG: Isn’t Alt 1 and Alt 2 trying to discuss if the duty cycle constraint is per cell or per UE?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal. |
| Charter Communications | Support the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal. Our understanding from the regulation is that the short control signalling exemption applies to a respective transmitter's perspective, i.e. Alt 2. Alt 1 would therefore be a tighter condition. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support proposal 2.11.1-1 and prefer to support Alt 1. and for main bullet, we understand if the total duration of Msg1 and Msg 3 exceeds to 10ms limitation, then this case cannot be seen as SCS transmission. |
| Intel | We support the proposal. |
| Apple | Support the proposal. Alt 2 should be used for 10% short control signaling overhead |
| Futurewei | We do not support Alt2 but are open to further discussing Alt1. We believe the 10% limit over any 100ms should be from a cell perspective which is a stricter constraint. However, how to ensure that this limit is respected and how to handle situations when the bound is reached, are open issues that need to considered first. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Ericsson | We support Alt2.  Alt2 is in accordance with the regulations, EN 302 567, and EN 303 753.  Short control signalling transmissions are tested per “equipment” in the ETSI regulations and not per system or cell. The requirement of 10ms over 100ms is from one UE perspective.  Furthermore, if the examples of Short control signalling transmissions (highlighted)are to be considered, RACH messages fall perfectly within the scope. RACH is used for synchronization between gNBs and UEs.   **EN 302 567 v 2.2.0:**  **4.2.6.2 Definition**  Short Control Signalling Transmissions are transmissions used by the equipment to send management and control  frames without sensing the channel for the presence of other signals.  **4.2.6.3 Limits**  The use of Short Control Signalling Transmissions shall be constrained as follows:  • within an observation period of 100 ms;  • the total duration of the equipment's Short Control Signalling Transmissions shall be less than 10 ms within  said observation period.  **Clause 5.3.8.2, step 4:**  Apart from transmission of the frames for short control signalling (such as, for example, ACK/NACK  signals, beacon frames, other time synchronization frames and frames for beamforming) no frame shall  be initiated. **EN 303 753 v 0.0.3:** 4.2.6.1 Definition *Short Control Signalling Transmissions* are transmissions used by the equipment to send management and control frames, other time synchronization frames and frames for beamforming, without minimum requirements for antenna and beamforming gain, while still conforming to the output power requirements in clause 4.2.2.2. 4.2.6.2 Limits The total duration of the equipment's *Short Control Signalling Transmissions* shall be less than 10 ms within an observation period of 100 ms. It is not required for equipment to implement *Short Control Signalling Transmissions*. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t support the proposal. Neither of Alternatives are acceptable.  As for Alt. 1 in above proposal, we think that this alternative is simply infeasible: We have already agreed in RAN1 #104e that “For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.” According to Table 6.3.3.2-4 in TS 38.211, at least one of the 256 supported PRACH configuration indexes (PRACH Config. Index = 26) corresponding to Format A1 in 120 kHz configures more than 10% of the resources for PRACH preambles: This configuration index has the periodicity of 10 ms with 10 PRACH slots in each period and 12 PRACH symbols per each PRACH slot which already amounts for (12/14) \* (10/80) = 10.7% of all time resources. How when even a single PRACH Config. Index = 26 would violate Alt. 1, Alt. 1 can be applicable?  As for Alt. 2 in above proposal, if it is left to each individual UE to use Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling for msg1 and/or msg3 for the 4 step RACH and MsgA for the 2-step RACH, then the total time resources at which at least one UE within the cell transmits msg1/msg3/MsgA can easily far exceed the 10% occupancy time for short control signaling exemption. In our view, this is a misuse of the exemption that is introduced in regulations for “short control signaling”.  Mod: The proposal is not all PRACH configuration can be supported by SCS. Only those satisfy the condition in Alt 1 or Alt 2 is allowed with SCS. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Samsung | We support the proposal.  Clarification questions.   * If with Alt 2 and other UL signal/channels are agreed to be part of short control signalling, is the total resource for all components in short control signalling counted for the 10% or each component counted separately. * If with Alt 1, the 10% is from cell perspective, is DL short control signalling also counted for the 10%?   Mod: For Alt 2, since we don’t have other UL signal/channels agreed with SCS yet, it is not a problem yet. However, my intention is everything is counted from one UE perspective. For Alt 1, the proposal is not trying to count DL and UL together. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal. |
| CATT | We share same views with Ericsson and support Alt 2. |
| LG | We don’t support the Proposal.  For the signals and channels other than SSB (e.g., PRACH), the clarifications on whether the constraints/conditions such as duty cycle are per cell or per UE (for UL only) should be preceded. |
| DOCOMO | Support Proposal 2.11.1-1 with Alt 2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | To moderator:  Thanks for your comment regarding our view. Alt2 is not an acceptable alternative for us. Still, we believe that Alt 1 is an infeasible choice. Alt 1 says “The 10% over any 100ms interval restriction is applicable to all available msg1/msg3/msgA resources configured in a cell”. We have provided our answer above if Alt1 means that the total PRACH configuration resources should be less 10%. If Alt 1 means that network only allows 10 ms worth of msg1/msg3/msgA resources out of every 100 ms to be transmitted without LBT, then the question is how network can actually apply this restriction in the network considering the fact that RACH transmissions can be from initial access UEs/using CBRA?  As a sidenote:  According to 302.567  “Short Control Signalling Transmissions are transmissions used by the equipment to send management and control  frames without sensing the channel for the presence of other signals.”  “Apart from transmission of the frames for short control signalling (such as, for example, ACK/NACK  signals, beacon frames, other time synchronization frames and frames for beamforming) no frame shall  be initiated.”  We doubt that above definition/examples at least cover msg3/msgA. |
| LG2 | We support the Alt-2 in the Proposal 2.11.1-1. |
| Moderator | To HW. Can you check if the above change (in red) is good for you? For msg3/msgA, I believe the supporting companies are considering these as control frames. The 2nd sentence you quoted from 302.567 is more like examples, as is stated. |
| Mediatek | Support Alt 2. |

### Second Round Discussion

There is no second round discussion for this topic. HW and LG, please check the Moderator comments in 2.11.1-1

## CWS and CAPC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| CATT | Proposal 7: No need to introduce CAPC and CWS. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 17 Do not support CAPC and CWS adjustment for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 2: For operation unlicensed 60 GHz band, when LBT is used within the COT, the principle of the type 1 channel access procedure defined for the sub-6 GHz band should be reused, and the channel access parameters should be modified in accordance with numerologies provided by the ETSI BRAN Harmonized Standard.  Proposal 3: The procedure specified in NR-U related to the CWS adjustment should be considered for operation in unlicensed 60 GHz band. RAN1 should further discuss and identify the values Zmin and Zmax. |
| ITRI | Proposal 6: CWS adjustment mechanism could be applied per beam-based in an independent manner for 60 GHz NR-U. |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | Proposal 19: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, CWS adjustment should be applied for each beam in an independent manner depending upon the corresponding CAPC (when Cat 4 LBT is done for each beam and COT is initiated for each of the beams), where the CWS adjustment for a transmit beam (TCI state) of a data channel can be based on the ACK/NACK feedback for the corresponding data channel with the same transmit beam (TCI state) |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #4: Introduce channel access priority class and the contention window adjustment mechanisms when LBT is used in NR above 52.6 GHz, similar to Rel-16 NR-U. |
| MediaTek Inc. | Proposal 4: For channel access mechanism, at least channel access priority class should be considered to prioritize different traffic. |
|  | Proposal 5: Current CAPC table can be a starting point for 52.6 – 71 GHz. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Observation 1: We do not see a need for contention window adjustment mechanism for mitigating channel access collisions.  Proposal 1: LBT procedure uses fixed contention window size for random back-off. The size of the fixed contention window is FFS.  Proposal 2: At most two CAPCs are supported.  Proposal 17: High CAPC with short contention window of [3] CCAs is supported for SSB transmission.  Observation 9: NR for 60 GHz band shall be able to fulfil the EN 303 722 requirements for spectrum sharing based on automatic transmit power control and/or automatic link adaptation. Needed specification changes, if any, are to be considered along with EN 303 722 progress. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 18: CWS adjustment need not be introduced for 60GHz band.  Proposal 19: CAPC need not be introduced for 60GHz band. |
| Samsung | Proposal 5: No need to define CAPC for 60 GHz unlicensed band. |
| Sony | Proposal 5: Support fixed Contention Window. • gNB’s contention windows size is left to network implementation. • UE’s contention window size is configured by network.  Proposal 6: Introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60 GHz unlicensed band operation |
| WILUS Inc. | Proposal 4: We propose to introduce CAPC, CWS and CWS adjustment mechanism for 60GHz band, with Rel.16 NR-U as baseline. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Proposal 10: Similar restriction as defined in Type 2C channel access procedure in TS 37.213 can also introduced in above 52.6GHz NR-U frequency band but the length of a transmission can be relaxed.  Observation 9: CWs adjustment can be considered to be introduced, which is beneficial in some highly congested scenarios and to friendly and fair coexistence with Wi-Fi. |

### First Round Discussion

Discussion 2.12.1-1

On if CWS adjustment is introduced, the following positions are collected.

* Support the introduction of CWS adjustment
  + ZTE, WILUS, Lenovo (per beam), ITRI, Intel, Huawei, ITRI (per beam), WILUS, LG
* Do not introduce CWS adjustment
  + SONY, Qualcomm, Ericsson, CATT, Nokia, NSB, vivo, Charter, Apple, Samsung, Oppo, Spreadtrum, CATT, MTK

Please provide additional views if any

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | Do not support CWS adjustment. ETSI 302 567 does not recognize CWS adjustment, and there is no clear reason why RAN1 should deviate from that. |
| Charter Communications | Do not support CWS adjustment, it is meaningless for Cat-3 LBT |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We prefer CWS adjustment per beam basis |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support the introduction of CWS adjustment and its introduction is beneficial in some highly congested scenarios and to friendly and fair coexistence with Wi-Fi due to it had been introduced in 802.11ad/ay. |
| Intel | We think that the notion of CWS adjustment should be also introduced here, and the principles/framework used for sub-6 GHz band NR-U could be used as a baseline. |
| vivo | Do not introduce CWS adjustment. Added our position to the summary. |
| Apple | Do not introduce CWS adjustment |
| Futurewei | Do not introduce CWS adjustment |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Ericsson | We do not support introduction of CWS adjustment. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support introduction of CWS adjustment |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ITRI | We prefer CWS adjustment per beam basis |
| Samsung | We didn’t see a need to support CWS adjustment. |
| OPPO | Do not introduce CWS adjustment |
| WILUS | We support introduction of CWS adjustment |
| Spreadtrum | We do not see the need to introduce CWS adjustment. |
| CATT | Do not introduce CWS adjustment |
| LG | We support the introduction of CAPC.  Because the purpose of CAPC and CWS adjustment are to prioritize high priority traffic and resolve the collision between the transmissions, the introduction of CAPC and CWS adjustment mechanism can be beneficial in highly congested scenario. Moreover, considering the fair coexistence with the incumbent system (e.g., WiGig) operating in the above 52.6GHz, it is necessary to consider the introduction of CAPC and CWS adjustment procedure. The procedures specified for the CAPC and CWS adjustment mechanism in Rel-16 NR-U can be reused as baseline for operation in the 60 GHz band. |
| Mediatek | We don’t see strong need to support CWS, but we are open to discuss the benefit it can bring. |

Discussion 2.12.1-2

On if CAPC is introduced, the following positions are collected.

* Support the introduction of CAPC
  + ZTE, WILUS, Lenovo (per beam), ITRI, Intel (reduced set), Nokia (at most 2 classes if max CWS >3), MediaTek, Huawei, InterDigital, WILUS, LG, MTK
* Do not introduce CAPC
  + Samsung, Qualcomm, Ericsson, CATT, vivo, Charter, Apple, Futurewei, Oppo, Spreadtrum, CATT

Please provide additional views if any

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | This depends on the maximum CWS that is supported. We think that CWS = 3 is useful at least for SSBs (if short control signaling cannot be used), and other control signals. If the CWS is always =3, a single CAPC is sufficient; otherwise we may consider two CAPCs (and max CWSs), one (>3) for data, and another one for control signals. |
| Charter Communications | Do not introduce CAPC. The objective should be to serve traffic of all classes as quickly as possible given the transient nature of the link. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We prefer CAPC adjustment per beam basis |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support the introduction of CAPC to consider the requirement of different traffic type. |
| Intel | We support the introduction of a reduced set of CAPC compared to sub-6 GHz band NR-U. |
| vivo | Do not introduce CAPC. Added our position to the summary. |
| Apple | Do not introduce CAPC |
| Futurewei | We do not support introduction of CAPC |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Ericsson | We do not see the need to introduce CAPC. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support introduction of CAPC |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| InterDigital | We support the introduction of CAPC to support different traffic types. |
| Samsung | CAPC can be based on implementation and no explicit definition is needed. |
| OPPO | Do not introduce CAPC |
| WILUS | We support the introduction of CAPC to support different traffic types. |
| Spreadtrum | We do not see the need to introduce CAPC. |
| CATT | Do not introduce CAPC. |
| LG | We support the introduction of CAPC.  Because the purpose of CAPC and CWS adjustment are to prioritize high priority traffic and resolve the collision between the transmissions, the introduction of CAPC and CWS adjustment mechanism can be beneficial in highly congested scenario. Moreover, considering the fair coexistence with the incumbent system (e.g., WiGig) operating in the above 52.6GHz, it is necessary to consider the introduction of CAPC and CWS adjustment procedure. The procedures specified for the CAPC and CWS adjustment mechanism in Rel-16 NR-U can be reused as baseline for operation in the 60 GHz band. |
| Mediatek | We support the introduction of the CAPC since we believe it can be beneficial in highly congested scenario. |

### Second Round Discussion

## Long Term Sensing, Interference Mitigation, ATPC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Apple | Proposal 14: Consider using omni and directional RSSI and channel occupancy for long term sensing. |
| AT&T |  |
| CAICT |  |
| CATT |  |
| Charter Comm. |  |
| Convida Wireless |  |
| Ericsson |  |
| Fujitsu |  |
| FUTUREWEI |  |
| Huawei HiSilicon |  |
| Intel Corporation |  |
| InterDigital Inc. |  |
| ITRI |  |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | Observation 5: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, long-term channel sensing could be useful for both LBT and no-LBT based channel access mechanism: - For LBT based channel access mechanism, long-term sensing at the UE could be utilized for receiver assistance LBT at the gNB - For no LBT based channel access mechanisms, long-term sensing could provide interference statistics in terms of potential interference from WiFi as well as interference from other NR operators  Observation 2: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, in order to adopt ATPC as potential channel access mechanism, receiver feedback such as long-term sensing would be needed  Proposal 20: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, ATPC could be adopted as one of the channel access mechanism, at least for regions where LBT is mandated by regulatory requirements |
| LG Electronics |  |
| MediaTek Inc. |  |
| NEC |  |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell |  |
| NTT DOCOMO INC. |  |
| OPPO |  |
| Panasonic |  |
| Qualcomm |  |
| Samsung |  |
| Sony |  |
| Spreadtrum Comm. |  |
| vivo |  |
| WILUS Inc. |  |
| Xiaomi |  |
| ZTE Sanechips |  |

## Other

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 10: The UE can select a channel access mechanism as a function of measurements (e.g. RSRP) or prior LBT performance. |
| ITRI | Proposal 4: PDCCH monitoring enhancement for M-TRP operation should be supported for 60 GHz NR-U.  Proposal 5: Configuring multiple SRIs for a CG transmission should be supported for 60 GHz NR-U. |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | Observation 3: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, depending on the configuration, a collision on CG resources can cause systematic collisions between corresponding subsequent retransmissions causing transmission failure of affected packets.  Proposal 13: If a UE is going to transmit a set of consecutive PUSCH transmissions including both dynamically scheduled PUSCH transmissions and CG-PUSCH transmissions, the UE can select the latest indicated UL Tx beam to transmit the consecutive UL transmissions.  Proposal 14: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, then following potential enhancements related to periodic transmissions of RS such as P-TRS should be specified to deal with LBT failure: - Termination of periodic RS transmission on beams where consecutive LBT failures are encountered - Dynamic switching of the QCL assumption (beams) for periodic RS transmission where consecutive LBT failures are encountered, where: o Multiple QCL assumptions (multiple beams) can be configured to the RS resource and beam switch can be triggered once the continuous number of LBT failures reach a certain threshold value  Proposal 30: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, potential enhancements related to periodic transmission of DRS such as SSB/PBCH/CORESET#0 are needed including: - performing directional LBT prior to the transmission of SSB according to the ssb-PositionsInBurst - directional LBT on multiple beams at the same time at the beginning of the DRS window - Cat 2 LBT (depending on the gap) before actual transmission |
| ZTE Sanechips | Proposal 20: Study and evaluate the impact of LBT and the limitation of COT length on the procedure of beam failure detection. |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 13: Increasing the number of SSB candidate positions to above 64 to increase transmission opportunities to cope with LBT failure should be considered. |
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