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# Introduction

This paper summarizes the channel access related proposals submitted to agenda item 8.2.6 in RAN1-106-bis-e.

# 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 |
| Huawei HiSilicon | ***Proposal 4: 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 transmit beamforming gain of the potential following transmission(s) by the device.***  ***Proposal 5: 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:***     |  | | --- | |  |   •   ***GTX is the effective transmit antenna gain at the potential transmitter [dBi]***  •   ***GTX,max is the maximum supported transmit antenna gain [dBi]***  •   ***a is a scaling factor such that 0≤ a≤ 1***  ***Proposal 6: 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.***  ***Proposal 7: The value of the adjustment to ED threshold based on the sensing beam and the transmission beam is zero if the transmit antenna gain reaches***     |  | | --- | | ***which is the maximum supported transmit antenna gain.*** | |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 2: Utilize a separate EDT for each sensing beam.  Proposal 3: Support additional adjustment to Energy Detection computation/threshold to include transmit beamforming and/or sensing beam. The value of the adjustment to ED threshold based on the sensing beam and the transmission beam should be zero if pseudo-omni (near 0dBi) gain sensing beam is used. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 5: The formula of ED threshold should consider the LBT bandwidth and beamforming gain. |
| ZTE Sanechips | **Proposal 19: Considering potential mismatch between sensing beam and transmission beam, the ED threshold provided by the ETSI BRAN 302 567 can be modified to consider mismatching between sensing beam and transmission beam.**  **Proposal 20: 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.** |
| vivo | **Proposal 6: The ED threshold for CCA check should consider the impact of beamforming gain of the directional sensing beams.** |
| OPPO | Proposal 6: the EDT value should be adjusted: smaller value is applied when sensing beam is narrower. |
| OPPO | Proposal 7: the EDT value should be adjusted: smaller value is applied when the sensing beamforming gain is lower than the transmission beamforming gain. |
| CATT | **Proposal 5: Adjustment value should be considered for the baseline ED threshold.**  **Proposal 6: For adjustment value on baseline EDT, at least beamforming gain difference between the transmission beam and sensing beam should be considered.** |
| TCL Communications | **Observation 1: The threshold is adaptable for LBT in 60GHz unlicensed band. A signaling with the similar function of ul-toDL-COT-SharingED-Threshold-r16 is necessary.** |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 10: Support further adjustment on ED threshold based on the sensing and transmission beam. |
| Ericsson | Observation 4 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. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 3 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. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Proposal 6: Further adjustment of EDT based on the sensing and transmission beams is not specified.** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 6: ED threshold should depend on:** |
| Samsung | **• Whether other technology sharing the channel is absent or not on a long-term basis;** |
| Samsung | **• LBT bandwidth (which is operation channel bandwidth in regulation);** |
| Samsung | **• Beam parameters including beamforming gain and/or beam direction for transmission and/or receiving.** |
| Intel Corporation | **Proposal 2: When operating in unlicensed 60 GHz band, the ED threshold calculation shall account for the sensing beam used to perform the LBT procedure through an additional component which is added to the already agreed ED threshold formula.** |
| Intel Corporation | **Proposal 3: 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 can be further adjusted by reflecting the beam correspondence capability/requirement of UE. For pseudo-omni beam, the adjustment to ED threshold is not necessary regardless of the beam correspondence capability. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 2: Support additional adjustment to Energy Detection computation/threshold whenever the sensing beam has a lower beamforming gain than the transmission beam. |

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 |
| Huawei HiSilicon | ***Proposal 1: For operation in NR-U-60, confirm the working assumption on Pout definition in RAN1 #104bis-e in its original form or with Pout defined as the maximum of mean EIRP of each transmission burst during the COT from the node determining the EDT.***  ***Proposal 2: For defining Pout as the maximum of mean EIRP of each transmission burst during the COT from the node determining the EDT, define the ‘transmission burst’ stated in the HS EN 302 567 as a set of transmissions from the node determining EDT without any gaps, or with gaps no greater than X μs.***  -        ***FFS: Value of X*** |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 1: For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout to be at least the maximum of mean EIRP of each transmission burst during the COT at the node initiating the COT. Maximum is determined over all candidate bursts and over all directions, whereas mean is computed over burst duration.  • Burst is a set of (near-)contiguous transmissions from a gNB/UE (as defined in 37.213 section 4.0)  Observation 1. Using common Pout (common EDT) for multiple sensing beams can limit spatial reuse. |
| vivo | **Proposal 3: The transmission burst is a set of transmissions from gNB/UE from one or more transmission beams which are “covered” by a sensing beam without any gaps greater than [16us].**  **Proposal 4: For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum of mean EIRP of transmission burst for the node determining EDT during a COT.** |
| OPPO | Proposal 5: confirm the following working assumption  Working assumption:  Observation 1: the working assumption for Pout might limit the usage of the UE COT sharing.  Working assumption:  For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum EIRP of the node determining EDT during a COT. |
| Ericsson | Observation 1 According to the regulations it is sufficient to use only the initiating device’s Pout to determine EDT.  Observation 2 The argument to use both EIRPs from the initiating and responding devices to determine Pout for a node initiating a COT is insufficient as the responding device may also use a different bandwidth than the initiating device.  Proposal 1 Confirm 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.  Proposal 2 Confirm that Pout is estimated only based on the node initiating the COT even for COT sharing cases. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 5: For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as at least the maximum of mean EIRPs of the transmission bursts of the node initiating the COT during the COT.  Observation 4: Proposal 5 allows also for implementation according to RAN1#104bis working assumption. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #13: Confirm the working assumption on Pout definition in RAN1 #104bis-e without the change and it needs to consider when the determining the EDT: 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. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 1: Confirm the working assumption on Pout definition in RAN1 #104bis-e with the following updates:  • For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout to be at least the maximum of mean EIRP of each transmission burst during the COT at the node initiating the COT. |
| 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. |
| Apple | Proposal 1: Confirm the modified working assumption: For Pout in EDT determination during a COT, Pout is the maximum of the mean EIRP of each transmission burst. |

### First round discussions

On if additional adjustment to EDT is introduced:

Discussion 2.1.1-1 (closed)

Summary of positions so far:

* Support additional adjustment to ED Threshold
  + Apple, Huawei, FUTUREWEI, Spreadtrum, ZTE, vivo, OPPO, CATT, TCL, Xiaomi, Intel, InterDigital, Qualcomm, Lenovo, Mediatek, Transsion, NEC
  + Samsung (other criteria), LG (BC capability)
* Do not Support additional adjustment
  + Ericsson, Nokia,

Please provide your view if not captured above

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | As properly captured by the FL, we support an additional adjustment to the ED threshold calculation with the aim to capture the sensing beam used. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We also support additional adjustment to ED threshold |
| Xiaomi | We are open to discuss. Additional adjusting is benefical for channel access. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support additional to ED threshold to to consider mismatching between sensing beam and transmission beam. |
| vivo | We support additional EDT adjustment. Since the ED threshold is defined assuming a 0 dBi receiving antenna. When directional LBT is applied, the beamforming gain for the receiving antenna is no longer 0 dBi, and the impact of the beamforming gain of the sensing beam should be counted in when calculating the ED threshold. |
| Ericsson | We do not support adjusting the ED threshold. Any potential adjustment must not violate the EN 302 567 requirements. Reducing the EDT does not provide any gains but only is restrictive to 3GPP. This can perhaps be implementation-dependent if companies see merits in doing this instead of specifying it in 3GPP.  Sensing with an omni-directional antenna listens to interference in all the directions while sensing with a directional antenna senses interference only in a particular direction and ignores interferences from other directions, which are not guaranteed to be harmless to the coexistence considering the hidden node issues and reflection of signals. There are already merits in sensing only in a particular direction, it is unfair to compensate the EDT also, which is also why the regulations do not mandate it. |
| Apple | Support the additional adjustment. When directional sensing is used, the corresponding sensing beamforming gain is already counted as part of CCA measurement. Pout should be adjusted to avoid the double counting of beamforming gain in EDT calculation and degrade directional CCA performance. If we do not adjust the EDT, alternatively can adjust the measurement itself by removing the sensing beamforming gain. |
| LG Electronics | The ED threshold can be further adjusted by reflecting the beam correspondence capability/requirement of UE. For pseudo-omni beam, the adjustment to ED threshold is not necessary regardless of the beam correspondence capability.  The beam correspondence requirements may be different depending on whether the UE capability supports *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping* or not. A UE supporting this capability can satisfy requirements (for minimum peak EIRP and spherical coverage) without UL beam sweeping and beam management such as beam indication from gNB. On the other hand, for a UE not supporting the capability, the requirements (for minimum peak EIRP and spherical coverage) must be satisfied through the beam management procedure, and additionally, without beam management, a requirement relaxed by 3 dB must be satisfied. To be specific, the ED threshold for a UE not supporting the capability can be lower than that for a UE supporting the capability. In addition, for the UE without this capability, the ED threshold value can be adjusted depending on the presence or absence of a beam management procedure. |
| InterDigital | As captured by the FL, we support adjustment to the ED threshold to consider the beamforming gain of the sensing beam. |
| Mediatek | We are ok with additional adjustment. |
| NEC | We support the additional adjustment to the EDT to reflect the beamforming gain of sensing beam and the difference between sensing beam and transmission beam. |
| Transsion | We support additional adjustment to ED Threshold. |
| Futurewei | Our view is correctly captured in the proposal. |
| OPPO | We support additional adjustment, since the baseline ED threshold does not differentiate devices with different sensing beam. |
| Docomo | While we are open to discuss, how to define additional adjustment on EDT seems much dependent on how to define relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam. It may or may not require much amount of discussion, which is unfortunately almost impossible given that only two e-meetings remain for Rel-17 completion. We’d like to understand what is the plan to define such additional adjustment in proponents’ mind. |
| Nokia, NSB | Our view is correctly captured: we see no need for further adjustment of EDT.  As the regulation does not call for such adjustment, and since we have not observed benefits of further modifying the EDT (or LBT in the first place) we see no justification for deviating from what the regulations require.  Secondly, it is currently unclear how the EDT would be adjusted. It is not reasonable to accept a blanket statement on adjusting the EDT, while the exact modification is unclear. E.g. what is assumed to be the reference point for EDT, before or after antenna combining? |
| CATT | We support additional adjustment to ED Threshold. |
| TCL | We are ok with additional adjustment. That would reflect the dynamics of wireless environment. |
| Samsung | We support further adjustment of the ED threshold to consider at least the following aspects:   * Whether other technology sharing the channel is absent or not on a long-term basis; * Beam parameters including beamforming gain and/or beam direction for transmission and/or receiving |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support EDT adjustment.  The devices with higher conducted transmit power but lower antenna gain will have larger impact area than the devices with lower conducted transmit power but higher antenna gain. The device with higher antenna gain should be thus encouraged due to less interference in un-targeted directions. However, the current EDT only reflects the impact from RF output power (EIRP) which cannot differentiate devices with different antenna gain but the same EIRP. Therefore, we propose that the agreed baseline EDT formula should be 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. |

On WA confirmation:

Discussion 2.1.1-2 (closed)

Summary of positions so far:

* Confirm Working Assumption after Modification as follows :

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

* + FUTUREWEI (with clarifications), Qualcomm, Nokia, Lenovo, vivo, Ericsson, Apple, Oppo
* Confirm Working Assumption as it is
  + Huawei, Ericsson, LGE, Charter, Apple, Intel, Xiaomi, ZTE, Mediatek, Transsion, NEC, Futurewei, TCL, Samsung, CATT,

Please provide your view if not captured above

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We prefer to support the working assumption as is, and we have added above our preference. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine to confirm the WA after modification |
| Xiaomi | Confirm Working Assumption as it is |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the working assumption as it is and add our position in above FL proposal. |
| Vivo | Seems our views were not correctly captured. We corrected our position, we prefer the modified working assumption. |
| Ericsson | We can support both the options. Regulations states “mean EIRPs of transmission bursts”. We have acknowledged that a COT may have multiple transmission bursts or beams with varying EIRPs so maximum of mean EIRPs is acceptable. |
| Apple | We can support both options. |
| LG Electronics | We are prefer to confirm Working assumption as it is.  In addition, it needs to consider when the determining the EDT: 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. |
| Mediatek | Confirm working assumption as it is. |
| NEC | We prefer to confirm working assumption as it is. |
| Transsion | We prefer to confirm the working assumption as it is. |
| Futurewei | We support the modified working assumption with following clarifications.   * Maximum is determined over all candidate bursts and over all directions, whereas mean is computed over burst duration. * Burst is a set of (near-)contiguous transmissions from a gNB/UE (as defined in 37.213 section 4.0)   The original working assumption is also acceptable to us in case no consensus can be achieved |
| OPPO | We are fine with the working assumption after modification, but we would like to add an FFS:  FFS: whether the value of maximum of mean EIRP can be provided by network to UE when UE initiating the COT. |
| Nokia, NSB | We hope to confirm the WA after the modifications above. This formulation reflects accurately the regulations, while allowing for also a more conservative interpretation (as in the previous WA). |
| CATT | Confirm Working Assumption as it is. |
| TCL | We prefer the working assumption as it is. |
| Samsung | We prefer to confirm the working assumption as it is. |
| Charter Communications | We prefer the WA as is. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Unless there is a strong majority to Modify the WA, we prefer to agree on WA as is.  If there is a strong majority to modify the WA, our following two concerns need to be clarified first:   * Considering the difficulty of predicting/calculating the mean output power with dynamic scheduling, especially for multiple transmission bursts within a 5 ms COT, we think that adopting the “maximum of mean EIRP of each transmission burst” (as in the modified WA) may not be a practical approach. This is because it requires the gNB to know all scheduling decisions for up to 320 slots at 960 kHz before acquiring the COT. It was suggested during RAN1 106 however that the modified WA would be implemented as a transmit power restriction by gNB such that the mean EIRP for each transmission burst would not exceed a pre-selected maximum value. If it is the case, such a restriction should be part of the modified WA.   The term ‘transmission burst’ should be clearly defined in NRU-60. |

### Second round discussions

From discussion 2.1.1-1, there is strong support to introduce additional EDT adjustment (19 companies support vs 2 companies not support). The following discussion is trying to further clarify the details

Discussion 2.1.2-1

On additional adjustment to EDT if introduced, at least at UE side, the following alternatives on how to adjust the EDT can be considered

* Scenario 1. For UE indicates a capability for beam correspondence with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping ={1} and when the same TX beam is used for sensing, no additional EDT adjustment is introduced
  + Support:
* Scenario 2: For other cases (other than scenario 1) where sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam and has lower beamforming gain, the EDT is adjusted ~~higher~~ lower/tighter by the difference between the antenna gains of the sensing beam and transmission beam
  + Note: This is to make sure the same jammer at the transmission beam direction can be detected with the lower gain sensing beam
  + Support:
* Scenario 3: If UE uses omni beam for sensing, no additional EDT adjustment is introduced. If UE is using a directional beam for sensing (with positive antenna gain, so the UE will see higher energy level compared with omni sensing beam), either EDT is adjusted higher/looser by the antenna gain or the measurement energy is adjusted lower by the antenna gain before measured energy is compared with EDT
  + Support:
* Other scenarios?
* Note: This does not rule out extra backoff (conservative) EDT being applied as UE implementation

Please provide your view:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Ericsson | We support the principle in scenario 1, but it is not clear how this will be ensured. Do you propose to have a separate test to verify this behaviour in RAN4?  We do not support scenario 2. The jammer at the transmission beam direction can already be detected with a lower sensing gain because the test in regulations apply EDT before the antenna gain. Do we think that the UEs can estimate the difference in the sensing beam and transmission beam gain dynamically while sensing to transmit?  Moderator: Not sure I understand your comment on regulation apply EDT before antenna gain. Let’s say EDT is -47dBm by regulation, and UE uses an antenna gain of 10dB and measure -40dBm. Will this UE declare LBT pass (deduct antenna gain from measurement) or fail (use -40dBm directly)? On the other hand, if the UE uses omni antenna pattern to sense and measures -50dBm, will the UE declare LBT pass (directly use -50dBm) or fail (adjust -50dBm by 10dB antenna gain)? |
| Intel | We believe that Scenario 1 and 2 may not be sufficient, and we prefer to have additional adjustment for scenario 1 as well: the current proposal implies that no adjustment is needed for the case when TX and sensing beam are the same, but in our view no adjustment is needed when beamforming gain is 0dB (a.k.a, quasi omni-directional LBT), while in other cases an adjustment is needed.  Moderator: Say EDT is -47dBm. If the UE senses with omni beam and measures -50dBm, I assume your preference is to declare LBT pass. If the UE is using 10dB antenna pattern to sense, and measures -40dBm instead, your preference is declare LBT pass (relax the EDT up by 10dB or adjust the measurement down by 10dB) or fail? |
| TCL | We support both scenarios. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the above two cases. |
| NEC | We support Scenario 1 and 2. |
| OPPO | We support Scenario 1 and 2. |
| Ericsson 2 | Response to Moderator:   Thank you for raising this important question that may clear some doubts regarding this procedure. What is important to note is the reference point. Where is this -40 dBm measured at? Is it before the antenna or after the antenna? If we assume here that it is before the antenna, it means the 10 dB antenna gain will be applied after the signal passes through the antenna and the UE will note the energy measured as -30 dBm thereby failing LBT. An omni-directional antenna will have the same behaviour, but the energy measured internally will still be -40 dBm (assuming 0 dBi for the omni antenna) and will still fail the LBT.  Sensing with an omni-directional antenna listens to interference in all the directions (friendly) while sensing with a directional antenna senses interference only in a particular direction and ignores interferences from other directions, which are not guaranteed to be harmless to the coexistence considering the hidden node issues and reflection of signals. We do not think it is reasonable to compensate the EDT as well. Moreover, it will be difficult to find a suitable compensation value since the UEs may not be able to dynamically calculate the difference in sensing and transmission gain and the test in ETSI will likely use omni sensing for calibrating the interference measurement.  Moderator: Thanks for the explanation. I am not sure a node will have capability to measure energy “before” the antenna. For any measurement, it has to be done “after” the antenna. In my example, the -40dBm is measured after the antenna, so the signal reached at the antenna over the air is at -50dBm. Are you proposing we should use the energy before the antenna to compare with EDT? The gNB/UE does not directly measure it. So the energy can only be derived from the measurement after antenna, deducting the antenna gain. This also implies the gNB/UE needs to know the exact antenna gain as well.  On the other hand, this is a good point to reach common understanding. Let me start a discussion point to collect views in Discussion 2.1.2-3 |
| Samsung | We share similar view as Intel. The reference/baseline should be omni-directional sensing, and further beam forming gain should further contribute to the EDT.  Moderator: Added scenario 3. I assume this is what you have in mind? |
| Intel | To moderator: Many thanks for the reply and question: Our view is that the ED threshold for directional LBT should be more stringent – we definitely want to comply with the ETSI BRAN and utilize at minimum the ED threshold mandate by regulation. With that said, in your example the adjustment will be X dB down, where X can be further discussed and should be proportional to the beamforming gain, and X=0 for 0dB beamforming gain, so that when quasi omni-directional LBT is used then the minimum ED threshold mandated by ETSI BRAN is used.  Moderator: Sorry I had a typo in scenario 2. It should be “lower/tighter” instead of “higher”. Can you check the current scenario 2 and 3 again? My concern is, if we use X=0 for omni, and if a narrower beam is used for sensing, the UE will measure higher energy (assuming the energy comes from the direction of the sensing beam). In this case, we need to relax the EDT to let the LBT pass. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | While we are in principle in agreement with EDT adjustment, we think the solutions provided scenario 1 and scenario 2 are problematic:   * For scenario 1, we think that even if the sensing beam is the same as the TX beam, the EDT should not be the same for a wide TX beam and a narrow Tx beam as these two Tx beams have different interference footprints.   Moderator: Even though this is a good observation, I feel we should not optimize too much   * For scenario 2, if the covering sensing beam is 0dBi for instance, this solution seems to imply that the EDT will be lower (more conservative) for more directional transmissions which is counter intuitive (EDT-> EDT + (G\_sense – G\_tx)) since more directional Tx beams should not be penalized but incentivized. If this is our misunderstanding and scenario 2 means that (EDT-> EDT + (G\_tx – G\_sense)) then the adjustment would always be a positive term and EDT may exceed the regulatory threshold. That is exactly why we suggest (EDT-> EDT + (G\_tx – G\_tx\_max) which is always a negative term but still incentivize the more directional beams.   Moderator: My intention is first case (EDT-> EDT + (G\_sense – G\_tx)). I don’t think we need to consider it as penalizing narrow transmission beam. Instead we provide more incentive for narrower sensing beam to be used.  We don’t think that Scenario 3 (omni directional) should be supported altogether |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with Scenario 1. However, for Scenario 2, beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping capability should be reflected as we commented in Section 2.9.2 Directional LBT. There are two types of UE where one is satisfying BC with beam sweeping and the other is satisfying BC without beam sweeping. It means that a UE with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping = {0} should satisfy the beam correspondence requirements by the UL beam management procedure.   1. UE#1 with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping = {1} 2. UE#2 with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping = {0} after UL beam management procedure 3. UE#3 with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping = {0} before UL beam management procedure   UE#1 and UE#2 should satisfy the beam correspondence requirements while UE#3 needs to satisfy relaxed beam correspondence requirements, according to RAN4 specification. Therefore, special handling for UE#3 is needed, we can consider ED threshold adjustment (e.g., 3 dB penalty for UE#3).  For Scenario 3 (i.e., pseudo-omni beam), the adjustment to ED threshold is not necessary regardless of the beam correspondence capability. |
| Futurewei | We see the benefits of further relaxing EDT for finer directional transmission and it can be useful optimization.  In our opinion scenario 1&2 defines a consistent and valid approach.  Our concern is whether it is more conservative than required. Scenario 3 is also a consistent approach.  Consider the case with directional transmission such that Pout captures TX beamforming gain. Here under scenario-3 the EDT for omni and directional sensing would be (E, E + G\_sense), respectively, for the given directional transmission, where E includes TX beamforming gain via Pout and G\_sense in the sensing gain in the direction of transmission. If this EDT pair with omni and directional sensing meets regulation, then Scenario 3 is also valid and consistent. This would imply that scenario 1&2 are more conservative than required.  This is because in Scenario-1&2 the corresponding EDT for omni and directional sensing would be (E-G\_sense, E), respectively.  So if there is another technology operating on the band using Scenario-3, there can be a disadvantage to NR B52 using Scenario-1&2. We are open to further discuss validity of Scenario-3. |
| Ericsson 3 | Response to Moderator: thank you for the further explanations.  Regarding Scenario 2, we have the following clarifying questions –   * Lower/tighter compared to which EDT, EDT-> EDT + (G\_sense – G\_tx)? * If EDT-> EDT + (G\_sense – G\_tx) is followed, Scenario 2 will force omni-LBT to use a lower EDT (since sensing beam has lower BF gain than transmission beam) than the regulations. This is a disadvantage for devices that perform omni/quasi-omni/wider beam sensing that are friendly and aggregate interference in all directions, as opposed to devices that do sensing only in a certain direction and gets higher EDT even though the regulations do not support it. Furthermore, this seems to contradict with Scenario 3 “*If UE uses omni beam for sensing, no additional EDT adjustment is introduced*” |
| InterDigital | We support Scenario 1.  The design principles behind adjusting EDT based on the sensing beam should consider the following:   * Using a narrow sensing beam should not be penalized when compared to using a wider sensing beam. * Omni-directional LBT considers interference in all directions and effectively diminishes the contribution of detrimental interference and intensifies the contribution of harmless interference.   Based on the above, and the fact that directional LBT is better at detecting interference that is actually detrimental to the transmission (or to fair co-existence), we believe that the EDT of directional LBT should be loosened/increased compared to omni-directional LBT.  We support Scenario 3. |
| Intel | Many thanks for accommodating our concern.  We support scenario 2 and 3. |
| DOCOMO | We support Scenario 1. Scenario 2 could be considered as well, while it seems ok to leave it upto implementation. We do not support Scenario 3 as EDT seems to be capturing Tx beam gain already. |

From the discussion 2.1.1-2, there is majority to support confirming the WA as is (15 companies vs 8 companies), consider the difference is not large between the two version, for the sake of progress, Moderator would recommend to confirm the WA as is.

Proposal 2.1.2-2

Confirm the following WA as is:

Working assumption:

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

Please provide your view:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal in principle but needs clarification on how the node determine the maximum EIRP. A clarification question, is the maximum EIRP , EIRP of the intended transmissions in the COT ? If yes, we can change the proposal to –  Proposal 2.1.2-2  Confirm the following WA as is:  Working assumption:  For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum EIRP of the intended transmissions by ~~of~~ the node determining EDT during a COT.  FFS: How the node determines maximum EIRP of intended transmissions in a COT  Moderator: I am fine with the change. I feel the proposed change is clarification, not modification. But I will let other companies comment more. |
| Intel | We support the proposal. |
| Apple | We support using max EIRP. But the sentence reads like the max EIRP of the node, instead it should be max EIRP of the bursts within the COT.  For Pout in EDT determination, define Pout as the maximum EIRP of the transmission bursts ~~node determining EDT~~ during a COT. |
| TCL | We support the proposal. It makes sense to have this maximum value. |
| Nokia, NSB | As we have commented before, the working assumption is unfortunate in a sense that it is more stringent than what the regulations mandate. This will unnecessarily put NR in a disadvantageous position compared to other technologies. Furthermore, operation according to the WA is anyhow possible for a node. That said, we do not wish to prolong the discussion further. |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We can agree to Ericsson’s proposed clarification. Can they elaborate what determination of max EIRP they have in mind for the FFS?  Apple’s version requires defining “transmission burst”. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We tend to use “the maximum of mean EIRP of each transmission burst” since “Pout is the mean EIRP for a transmission burst ” is adopted in EN 302 567 v2.2.1, copied as follows:  4.2.2.1 Definition  The RF output power is the mean Equivalent Isotropically Radiated Power (EIRP) for the  equipment during a transmission burst. |
| NEC | We support the proposal. |
| Ericsson 2 | Our clarification on the proposal was intended to make progress on this topic. We also think that this working assumption will make it stringent than what the regulations mandate but since companies want to keep this WA, we thought we could clarify what it means.  Regarding estimating maximum EIRP we do not have a preference, but we think that gNBs can estimate it based on their intended transmissions’ maximum transmit power appropriated with the beamforming gain. We are open to discussing solutions to determine the EIRP. As we mentioned before, we can support both the options and also support Futurewei’s proposal on burst and determining max of mean EIRPs. |
| vivo | We agree with the modification from Ericsson. |
| Samsung | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal |
| OPPO | We can support Ericsson’s proposed clarification. Can they further clarify what the intended transmissions they have in mind? |
| Futurewei | We understood Ericsson suggestion of max EIRP determination at the initiating node to be: the maximum product of its transmit power times the beamforming gain, with the maximum being over all transmit beams the initiator intends to use during the COT. If this correct understanding, we are open to discuss it. |
| Ericsson 3 | **Response to OPPO:** “the intended transmissions” are the transmissions intended by the initiating device within the COT. This is to clarify that Pout can be the dynamic, configured value and not the maximum capable TRP.  **Response to Futurewei:** We had the same intention as you have correctly pointed out. However, we would like to point out that this is indeed conservative in terms of EDT as Nokia mentioned. Additionally, it is worthy to note that a node cannot exactly estimate its EIRP in each deployment, however it may be aware of its TX power and estimate the antenna gain. There is some estimation loss which is very difficult to account for as we have pointed during the discussions for EDT adjustment to sensing beamforming gain. |
| Apple 2 | **Response to Futurewei on burst.**  As quoted by ZTE, current Pout definition in EN 302 567 is “during a transmission burst.”  In current 37.213, the DL burst, UL burst, and discovery burst are defined. Since discovery burst is also used in short control signaling discussion, with slight modification to “no gap”, it is reasonable to define DL/UL burst similarly. |
| DOCOMO | We are ok to confirm the WA as it is. Ok with Ericsson’s update. |

Discussion 2.1.2-3

It seems that we don’t have common understanding on which measured energy is used to compare with EDT, even before we consider if additional EDT adjustment is needed. There are two views below. Please provide your understanding

* View 1. The energy at gNB/UE is measured after antenna and antenna gain is included in the energy measurement. The energy measurement is directly compared with EDT
  + Support: Qualcomm
* View 2. The energy at gNB/UE is measured before antenna and does not include antenna gain. To come up with this measurement, the gNB/UE need to deduct the antenna gain from the energy measured. After deduction, the energy is compared with EDT.
  + Support:

Please provide your support above and additional comments below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Qualcomm | We believe view 1 is reasonable. For view 2, the result will be, no matter how large the antenna gain is, the same LBT pass or fail decision will be made as it does not depend on antenna pattern. But if a node transmits further away (with larger EIRP), it will impact victims further away and should backoff more on ED. View 1 is align with the philosophy of adjusting EDT inversely with Pout. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our view is that, currently, and if RAN1 does not make any decision regarding adjustment of the measured energy, the energy is measured and compared with EDT according to View 1. However, this needs to be corrected and we suggest that RAN1 make an agreement that gNB/UE needs to deduct the UE/gNB sensing beamforming gain from the measured energy before comparing with EDT. |
| OPPO | View 1 is our understanding. Pout in the baseline threshold includes beamforming gain, so it’s not reasonable to use energy measured before antenna gain when comparing with EDT including antenna gain. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | we have similar view with OPPO. For high frequency band, we think beamforming gain have been included in the parameter Pout, so it is a natural way that the energy used to compare with EDT should be measured after antenna. Thus, we support View 1. |
| Futurewei | We have a slight preference for View-2 since it aligns with scenario-3 (assuming its validity).  Regarding FL’s useful comment on view 2: this ties with the validity of Scenario-3. If omni sensing for any directional transmission (as long as Pout captures TX beamforming gain) is valid, then View 1 is making the node satisfy a stricter requirement than is needed. Did we catch your comment correctly? |
| Ericsson | **Response to Moderator:** Thanks for initiating this fruitful discussion. A node’s Pout EIRP is already included in the EDT calculation. We are discussing to add the impact of sensing beamforming gain to the determination of EIRP. We agree with your previous comment response in 2.1.2-1 that any form of adjustment requires the node to perform some approximation to estimate the antenna gain. This is applicable even for adjustment of the EDT threshold. However, this does not justify the reason to lower or increase EDT due to sensing BF gain. Reasons are as follows, as we mentioned before:  Directional sensing already gets the benefit of sensing only in a particular and narrow direction, ignoring interferences from other directions.  It is not clear how to determine the compensation value of the sensing beamforming gain to pass the ETSI test considering that ETSI test will likely use quasi-omni sensing. As shown in the figure from EN 302 567, the oscilloscope/spectrum analyser is tuned towards the UUTs transmission and CD transmission i.e., sensing BF gain is not exactly 0dBi (due to physical antenna pattern). Therefore, it could occur that the oscilloscope stipulates that LBT should be a failure but the UUT may pass the LBT due to its internal EDT adjustment based on sensing beamforming gain. Therefore, we cannot agree to jeopardise NR devices failing the regulation test. |
| Apple | The receiver antenna gain is not clearly defined in EN 302 567.  Unlike the 5GHz band regulation, where the receiver gain is clearly defined,  “The ED Threshold Level (TL), at the input of the receiver, shall be proportional to the maximum transmit power (PH) according to the formula which assumes a 0 dBi receive antenna and PH to be specified in dBm e.i.r.p.  For PH <= 13 dBm: TL = -75 dBm/MHz  For13dBm<PH<23dBm: TL=-85dBm/MHz+(23dBm-PH)  For PH 23 dBm: TL = -85 dBm/MHz”  As quoted from Ericsson on test procedure, the oscilloscope/ spectrum analyser is tuned towards the UUTs transmission and the company device transmission. Even though oscilloscope antenna might not be exactly 0dBi, it is certainly not UUT’s antenna gain which is shown in view 1.  Prefer view 2. Open to further clarify with regulation body on the definition. |
| DOCOMO | We support View 1. |

## LBT Bandwidth FFS Items

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * For LBT for single carrier transmission, gNB/UE performs LBT over the channel bandwidth (or BWP bandwidth) (Alt SC.1. in earlier agreements) * For LBT for multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA, gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each channel bandwidth separately (Alt CA.1. in earlier agreements)   + FFS: Additional support of performing single LBT over all CCs (Alt CA.2. in earlier agreements)   more than one alternative for at least multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA is not precluded. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Key Proposals/Observations/Positions |
| Huawei HiSilicon | *Proposal 10: For a multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA in NR-U-60, in addition to the agreed Alt CA.1, support performing a single LBT over all CCs, i.e., Alt CA.2.* |
| ZTE Sanechips | Observation 1: It is worth emphasizing that the OCB should be satisfied for each transmitter such as gNB or UE.  Proposal 1: 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 give a clear guidance on how to deal with the issue on the onomino bandwidth, e.g., introduce the definition of nominal bandwidth.  Proposal 2: 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.  Proposal 3: from the perspective of the probability of channel access and the waste of resources, it is not recommended that single LBT over all CCs (Alt CA.2. in earlier agreements) is supported for Rel-17 above 52.6GHz. |
| vivo | Proposal 5: The LBT bandwidth should be used as the operating channel bandwidth for EDT evaluation. |
| OPPO | Proposal 1: Alt SC.1 should be further clarified about the channel bandwidth and BWP bandwidth for LBT from gNB and UE perspective respectively.  Proposal 2: Do not support Alt CA.2 additionally. |
| CATT | Proposal 4: If performing single LBT over all CCs is supported, the EDT should be computed based on the smallest channel bandwidth among the all CCs. |
| CAICT | Proposal 1: For LBT for multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA, single LBT over all CCs (Alt CA.2) should be supported. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 7: Alt CA.2 is also supported for multiple carrier transmission.  Proposal 8: For multiple carrier transmission, how to perform LBT is left to gNB/UE implementation. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2: For LBT bandwidth, RAN1 shall further clarify: |
| Samsung | • For LBT for single carrier transmission, gNB/UE performs LBT over the channel bandwidth (or BWP bandwidth) (Alt SC.1. in earlier agreements). |
| MediaTek Inc. | Proposal 1: RAN 1 should discuss the relation between sensing result and permissible transmission of each LBT bandwidth for DL and UL transmissions before finalizing the LBT bandwidth for 60 GHz. |
| MediaTek Inc. | Proposal 2: If UL in 60 GHz can only begin the transmission when all LBT bandwidth has “idle” sensing results as in sub-6 NR-U, CA. 2 can be supported. |
| NTT DOCOMO INC. | Proposal 1:Deprioritize the discussion on whether to support performing single LBT over all CCs in case of multi-carrier transmission in intra-CA |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 12: The Operating Channel BW used in the EDT formula is equivalent to the LBT BW. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #1: The bandwidth of multiple CCs up to 2 GHz (or 2.16 GHz) can be supported considering the coexistence with incumbent system in addition to the carrier bandwidth (or BWP bandwidth) which is already agreed upon. |
| 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. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 3: For LBT for multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA, the support for single LBT over all CC is not required. |
| Charter Communications | Proposal 2: For multi-carrier LBT, do not additionally support Alt CA.2, i.e., performing single LBT over all CCs. |
|  |  |

### First round discussions

Discussion 2.2.1-1 (closed)

On if further introduce single LBT over multiple CCs under CA, the summary of positions so far:

* Additional support of performing single LBT over all CCs (Alt CA.2. in earlier agreements)
  + Huawei, CATT ( use right EDT), Nokia (implementation), Mediatek (for UL), Futurewei, InterDigital,
* Additional support of bandwidth of multiple CCs up to 2 GHz (or 2.16 GHz)
  + LGE
* Do not support single LBT over all CCs
  + ZTE, OPPO, Qualcomm, Charter, Intel, Lenovo, Xiaomi, vivo, Transsion, Apple, WILUS, TCL
* Other: Deprioritize (Docomo, Samsung)

Please provide your view if not captured above

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We do not see any strong technical reason to support a single LBT over all CCs. In this matter, we have added our preference above. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We don’t prefer to support single LBT over all CCs |
| Xiaomi | Do not support single LBT over all CCs.  From our understanding, single LBT over all CCs will increase failure possibility thus not preferred. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | There is no see the necessity of supporting single LBT over all CCs.  Besides, we have another question on how to define and understand nominal bandwidth. The definition of nominal bandwidth has been discussed in the previous meetings, but there is no a basic and clear consensus. So we would like to ask other companies’ views on how to deal with this remaining issue. |
| Vivo | We don’t support Alt CA 2 since it will dramatically reduce the transmission flexibility in unlicensed band. We added our position to the above summary. |
| Ericsson | We do not have a strong opinion here however it is worthy to note that performing single LBT over all CCs is allowed by regulations. If there are benefits in doing it, it should not be prohibited. |
| Apple | Do not support Alt CA2. |
| LG Electronics | We added our precise position in the above.  Considering the coexistence with the incumbent system (e.g., WiGig) operating in the same band, the maximum LBT bandwidth may need to be up to 2 GHz (or 2.16 GHz). Therefore, in addition to the carrier bandwidth (or BWP bandwidth), the bandwidth of multiple CCs up to 2GHz (or 2.16 GHz) can be supported based on whether other technology sharing the channel is absent or not. |
| InterDigital | The benefits of supporting different LBT BW granularity were more prominent when considering sub-BWP granularity. Nevertheless, given that a UE needs to support multiple LBT BWs for different BWP sizes, there is no reason not to support LBT over multiple CCs. |
| Mediatek | We think single LBT over all CCs can be supported at least for UL, which is consistent as multi-channel channel access in sub-6 NR-U. |
| Transsion | We do not support to introduce Alt CA 2 to the spec. |
| Futurewei | We support Alt CA2 as it can be beneficial in low-load scenarios. We added our support. |
| OPPO | We do not support single LBT over all CCs, which may block some potential transmission when only part of all CCs are occupied.  Besides, for Alt SC.1, we suggest to further clarify the channel bandwidth and BWP bandwidth for LBT from gNB and UE perspective respectively. For example, the gNB performs LBT on the channel bandwidth and UE performs LBT on the active BWP. Moreover, if a UE perform LBT on the active BWP, it should be clarified that it is UL BWP or DL BWP. |
| Docomo | As captured, we do not think it is an essential issue. Resolving this after other essential ones (only if needed) seems sufficient. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are ok with a single LBT for multiple carriers. However, this may also be left for implementation. |
| WILUS | We do not support single LBT over all CCs. |
| CATT | We think performing a single LBT for multiple carriers can be left for gNB implementation. |
| TCL | We do not support one LBT over all CCs. In the higher frequencies, it makes the problem intricate. |
| Samsung | We believe the discussion for Alt CA2 can be deprioritized, since we already have feasible solution right now.  Moreover, we have some clarification question on the agreement from last meeting. In Alt SC1, there is a bracket “(or BWP bandwidth)”, and is it allowed to perform LBT over the BWP bandwidth only and transmit? If this is allowed, does it violate the conclusion we made in the last meeting?  Conclusion:  There is no consensus in RAN1 to support the functionality of accessing a carrier if there is interference in part of the carrier in frequency. |
| Charter Communications | We do not see the need or benefit for a single LBT over all CCs. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support having the option of supporting single LBT over all CCs (Alt CA.2.).  Alt CA.2. facilitates, for instance, performing only one LBT for the whole transmission BW instead of multiple parallel LBTs. This in fact would significantly reduce the computational complexity and energy consumption of the LBT in low density deployments.  In Alt CA.2., a single LBT BW can span the total aggregated bandwidth of DL CA or UL CA. For instance, if a carrier BW of 400 MHz is used, and the transmissions are scheduled over 5 contiguous intra-band carriers, the LBT BW could span 2 GHz instead of performing 5 parallel LBT procedures with 400 MHz BW each. Note also that the minimum LBT BW of a coexisting 802.11ad/ay network is 2.16 GHz. Supporting Alt CA.2 for NR would facilitate a fair coexistence with 802.11ad/ay network.  To companies that are concerned with the possibility that single LBT over all CCs may increase failure possibility, we would like to mention that CA.2 is only an option in addition to CA.1 (performing multiple LBT, one for each channel bandwidth separately) and should be used in low density scenarios in which the chance of LBT failure is minimal. As discussed above, in such scenarios, CA2 can substantially reduce the LBT process complexity. |

### Second Round Discussion

Proposed conclusion 2.2.2-1

There is no consensus to support explicitly introducing in the spec using single LBT covering multiple CCs under CA.

* Note: This does not rule out gNB/UE implementation to perform single LBT to cover multiple CCs. However, the EDT needs to be selected such that if interference on one of the CCs exceeds the CC EDT, the LBT is declared as failed

Please provide your view:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We are Ok with the conclusion |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with Proposed conclusion 2.2.1-2. However, as commented above, the bandwidth of multiple CCs up to 2GHz (or 2.16 GHz) can be supported considering the incumbent system (e.g., WiGig) based on whether other technology sharing the channel is absent or not. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We can accept the conclusion for the sake of progress. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the conclusion |
| vivo | Support the proposed conclusion. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are OK with the conclusion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine to accept this conclusion |
| DOCOMO | Agree with the conclusion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| OPPO | We are OK with the conclusion. |
| Ericsson | We are ok with the conclusion. |
| Apple | OK with the conclusion |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| TCL | If this mechanism means a kind of double check, we support it. |
| CATT | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| Futurewei | OK to accept. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the conclusion, but our comments in the previous round is not addressed by moderator yet, so copied below:  Moreover, we have some clarification question on the agreement from last meeting. In Alt SC1, there is a bracket “(or BWP bandwidth)”, and is it allowed to perform LBT over the BWP bandwidth only and transmit? If this is allowed, does it violate the conclusion we made in the last meeting? Also, for CA case, the sensing per carrier is according to channel bandwidth, then how to understand the mismatch between SC case and CA case, i.e., does it allow to sense only on BWP bandwidth for CA case?  Conclusion:  There is no consensus in RAN1 to support the functionality of accessing a carrier if there is interference in part of the carrier in frequency.  Moderator: The bracket in the previous agreement is to unify the notation between RAN1 and RAN4. In RAN1 we distinguish BWP bandwidth and channel bandwidth, but in RAN4, they are the same thing. In other words, I believe RAN1’s BWP bandwidth is RAN4’s channel bandwidth.  Then from RAN1 perspective, my interpretation is to sense in the active BWP bandwidth. However, it also does not preclude a more conservative implementation where the sensing bandwidth is wider.  Actually this leads to another discussion on what if the UL BWP is wider than DL BWP. Then sense in DL BWP only make not be good, at least when the gNB needs to share the COT with UE. In this case the gNB may need to sense at UL BWP bandwidth. This is a little complicated, but may not be very urgent to make a decision. Let’s keep that in mind and fix it later. |

## Sensing Structures FFS Items

Agreement:

For energy measurement in 8us deferral period, at least a single measurement within 8us is performed, and the measurement duration is selected from one of the following alternatives:

* 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 and is within the 5 us observation slot.
* Alt 3: At least a contiguous duration of X+Y us where the Y us part of the measurement is done at the end of the first 3 us and X is the same as the minimum measurement duration in a 5 us observation slot and is at the beginning of the 5 us duration.

Agreement:

For energy measurement in 8us deferral period, Alt 2 is supported while Alt 1 and Alt 3 can be considered as gNB/UE implementation (Alt. 1/2/3 are defined as per previous agreement)

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 |
| Huawei HiSilicon | *Proposal 8: Confirm the following WA reached in RAN1 #104bis-e:* |
| Huawei HiSilicon | *“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.”* |
| Huawei HiSilicon | *Proposal 9: For operation in NR-U-60, when LBT is used, the measurement duration X us within the 5us observation is implementation specific.* |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 6: The duration of the measurement should be 3us for 5us observation slot. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Observation 9: For deferral period and 5us observation slot, the minimum duration of energy measurement can be configured as 3us. |
| OPPO | Proposal 3: the location of the 5us observation slot within the 8us deferral period can be left for implementation. |
| OPPO | Proposal 4: a minimum measurement duration of 2us can be considered. |
| OPPO | 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. |
| Ericsson | Observation 19 8us deferral period in IEEE 802.11ad and IEEE 802.11ay consists of the 5us observation slot at the end of the 8us period  Proposal 24 For energy measurement in 8 µs deferral period, 5us observation slot is located at the end of the 8us deferral period similar to IEEE 802.11ad/ay.  Proposal 25 The minimum measurement duration X within a 5 µs observation slot can be left for implementation with the maximum value as 3µs  Proposal 26 Confirm the working assumption that the location of the energy measurement in 5us can be left for implementation. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 4: Minimum requirement for sensing for both 5us and 8us slots should be 1us irrespective of bandwidth. |
| Intel | Proposal 1: Within a 5us or 8us observation window, a device must perform a measurement of the medium for at least 2us. |

### First round discussions

Discussion 2.3.1-1 (closed)

On sensing structure for 5us observation slot, summary of positions so far:

* The minimum measurement duration X within a 5 µs observation slot
  + Implementation: Ericsson, Apple, LGE, Transsion, WILUS, Samsung, DCM, Nokia, Charter
  + Other :1 us (Qualcomm, CATT), 2us (OPPO, Intel), 3us (ZTE, Spreadtrum, Lenovo), MTK
* Location of the X us measurement within a 5 us observation slot:
  + Implementation: Ericsson, Oppo, Huawei, Lenovo, Apple, LGE, Transsion, Futurewei, WILUS,TCL. Samsung, DCM, Nokia, CATT, Charter

Please provide your view if not captured above

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We strongly prefer to set a reasonable lower bound for the measurement window in order to ensure a device would perform a proper sensing of the media. In this matter, we would prefer to align it with that of IEEE 11ac/ay (i.e., 2 us). |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine to specify the minimum duration X within a 5us observation slot and prefer 3us  We are fine to keep the location X as implementation |
| ZTE, Sanechip | We prefer to set the minimum measurement duration X as 3us. |
| Ericsson | Regarding the minimum measurement duration X and location of the measurement duration, we prefer to leave it to implementation. IEEE 802.11ad/ay also specifies it as implementation-dependent, as shown in the table from 802.11-2020 here. |
| Apple | Same view as Ericsson.  Both duration and location are up to implementation, following the same update in 802.11ad 2020. |
| LG Electronics | We prefer to keep the same design with WiGig (802.11ad/ay) as possible and our preference is to leave as implementation for both the minimum measurement duration and location of observation slot. |
| Mediatek | We prefer to specify minimum energy measurement duration. Although 802.11 ad/ay does not require minimum duration for energy measurement, there are still CCA requirement, which is excerpted as follows |
| Transsion | We share same view as Ericsson, both the duration and location can be left to implementation. |
| Futurewei | We prefer to leave location of measurement to implementation. |
| OPPO | We agree with Intel. Furthermore, X=2us also follows NRU R16 principle.  Besides, for Alt 2 in the agreement, the location of the 5us observation slot within the 8us deferral period should also be discussed. |
| Docomo | Open to discuss, while sympathize with Ericsson point. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are ok to leave both the duration and the location of the measurement for implementation, or for RAN4 to decide along with a possible test case. |
| WILUS | We prefer to leave as implantation for both duration and location. |
| CATT | We prefer to define the minimum measurement duration X within a 5us observation slot as 1us.  We support the location of the X us measurement within a 5 us observation slot depends on UE implementation. |
| TCL | We consider the location of measurement window within 5us an implementation issue. |
| Samsung | Since there is no specific requirement in the regulation, the minimum duration and location of sensing should be left as implementation. |
| Charter Communications | Same view as Ericsson. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As a few other companies have mentioned, we prefer to follow a similar approach as 802.11ad/ay and leave duration of the measurement to implementation.  We also don’t see any compelling reason to change the WA on the location of measurement and prefer to confirm the WA that the location is left for implementation. |

### Second Round Discussion

Proposal 2.3.2-1

Confirm the WA with the following updates: 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.

Moderator note: The discussion on the duration of X is still open.

Please provide your view:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We are OK with confirming the above working assumption, and to continue discussion related to the length of the measurement window. |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We support Proposal 2.3.1-2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | One comment: whether the duration of energy measurement will be discussed separately.  If yes, we are fine with the current updated proposal. |
| OPPO | We support the proposal, and agree with Intel to continue discussing the minimum measurement duration. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal. |
| TCL | We support the proposal. |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |

Discussion 2.3.2-2

On the minimum measurement duration X within a 5 µs observation slot, if this is left for implementation, can the following becomes a valid implementation:

* The node picks a duration of single sample and declare CCA pass for the observation slot if the sample energy exceeds threshold
  + The sample energy measured has large variation and may lead to false LBT pass
* The node will try multiple locations in the observation slot and declare CCA pass for the observation slot if the lowest energy sample is lower than EDT
  + This is not allowed by regulation, but the location is implementation, seems to be hard to design a test to stop the node from doing it.

Please provide your view:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Ericsson | For the first bullet point, if the node picks a duration of a single sample and if the operation increases the false positives, this node will fail the regulation test. For the second bullet point, we beg to differ. Regulations only mandate that the observation slot be 5us, how it determines CCA pass/fail within the 5us is not within the scope of regulations. The implementation should only ensure that the devices are able to pass the test in the regulation.  Moderator: If everything is implementation, I am not even sure if it is not allowed for a node to use one setting to pass regulation test and another setting for normal usage |
| Intel | As mentioned, minimum measurement duration is necessary to be defined to prevent the issues highlighted by the FL. |
| Apple | Duration can be left for implementation, same as updated 802.11-2020 specification. To address the accuracy issue, similar approach can be used as 802.11ad specification as well. Quote from 802.11-2020 as reference below.  25.4.6.2.2 CCA  The start of a CMMG control mode transmission at a receive level greater than the minimum sensitivity for CMMG control mode (–78 dBm) shall cause CCA to indicate busy with a probability > 90% within 3 μs. |
| TCL | We think the view from intel is necessary. |
| Nokia, | We agree with Apple, similar approach as with .1ad seems sufficient. |
| Futurewei | We share Apple’s view |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with Intel’s opinion, specific measurement duration is necessary to be defined and can refer to 802.11ad/ay. |
| OPPO | We agree with Intel and support to specify minimum measurement duration. |
| Ericsson 2 | Response to Moderator:  Thank you for the response. We understand the intention behind the question, but it is worthy to note that even if we specify a minimum measurement duration there is no test to verify if devices implement the set value, neither in 3GPP nor in the ETSI regulations. It is only assumed that the devices shall adhere to these set values.  Moderator: Even if it is hard to define a test to check, with in minimum value defined, the right and wrong is defined. It is like the speed limit on highway. Even if there is no police around, the drivers are abide by law to follow the speed limit. If there is no speed limit defined in the beginning, the drivers can do whatever they want.  Response to Apple: The 90% within 3us corresponds to preamble detection and not energy detection. In 11ad specs, the aCCAtime is defined as <3us (i.e., maximum value for the measurement duration is 3us and not minimum value) but in 802.11-2020 it was changed to “Implementation-dependent”. In addition, the accuracy of Energy detection at least according to EN 302 567 is 90% (10% for short control signalling transmissions are allowed) and does not seem to have any tolerance. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Share similar view as Apple. |
| LG Electronics | We share the same view with Apple. |
| Ericsson 3 | Response to Moderator:  We fully agree with your response comment and can support that a minimum measurement duration value should be set. However, it should not be disadvantageous for NR devices and we are penalizing ourselves by choosing the maximum value from 802.11ad/ay (3us) as the minimum value for NR. |

## COT Sharing

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  On COT sharing from an initiating device transmission to responding device transmission, support both of the following two alternatives   * Alt 1: No maximum gap defined between the initiating device transmission and responding device transmission. A responding device transmission can occur without LBT with any gap within the maximum COT duration * Alt 3: Define a maximum gap Y, such that a responding device transmission can occur without LBT only if the transmission starts within Y from the end of the initiating device transmission. If the responding device transmission starts after Y from the end of the initiating device transmission, a Cat 2 LBT is needed before the responding device transmission.   + The Cat 2 LBT uses the same sensing structure as the 8 us initial deferral period as in eCCA   + Further downselect between the following options:     - Option 1: Y=8 us (motivated by need to operate in all regions)     - Option 2: Y=a multiple number of OFDM symbols     - Option 3: gNB determines Y (for example, according to local regulation)   + Cat. 2 LBT is a UE capability * The usage of the two alternatives is a gNB choice and depends at least on local regulations. * Note: Alt. 3 is motivated by the regulations in Japan but use of Cat. 3 LBT is also an option for operation in Japan and Cat. 2 LBT is not restricted for use only in Japan.   Note: Maximum gap allowed without Cat 2 LBT between two initiating device transmissions is to be separately discussed  Note: Other use cases of Cat 2 LBT will be separately discussed |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Key Proposals/Observations/Positions |
| Huawei HiSilicon | ***Proposal 18: For COT sharing without LBT in NR-U-60, support Option 2 for defining the maximum gap Y within which a transmission from a responding device occurs without LBT (Y=a multiple number of OFDM symbols).*** |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 5: Define a maximum gap Y, such that a later transmission from an initiating node can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within Y from the end of the earlier transmission from the initiating node or a responding node. If the later transmission starts after Y from the end of the earlier transmission, a one-shot LBT is needed to share the COT: |
| FUTUREWEI | • FFS: Specific value of Y. |
| OPPO | Proposal 10: for maximum gap Y, Option 1, i.e., Y=8us should be supported. |
| NEC | **Proposal 3: On COT sharing from an initiating device transmission to responding device transmission, the value of a maximum gap Y (if supported) should be defined as a multiple number of OFDM symbols depending on supported SCS.**  **Proposal 4: On COT sharing between two initiating device transmissions, 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, a Cat 2 LBT is needed to share the COT.**  **Proposal 5: Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation should be introduced for resuming transmission by the initiating device within the COT after a gap Y.** |
| TCL Communications | Proposal 3: The overhead reduction should be studied when configuring the ED Thresholds for uplink-to-downlink COT sharing. |
| CAICT | **Proposal 2: the selection of the maximum gap Y could be either 8us or a multiple number of OFDM symbols with SCS 120kHz.** |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Observation 14: In case of Alt. 3 for COT sharing, there is need for a wide range of time gap Y values to facilitate efficient scheduling while fulfilling local regulations having a wide range in requirements.  Proposal 18: Support Option 3 for maximum gap Y in Alt. 3. There is no need to signal the value Y to the UEs. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 3: For the gap duration Y in COT sharing, support Y as the duration of Cat 2 LBT, e.g. 8 us.** |
| Intel Corporation | **Proposal 5: Y is defined as:**  **§ 1 OFDM symbol for 120 KHz SCS,**  **§ 4 OFDM symbols for 480 KHz SCS,**  **§ 8 OFDM symbols for 960 KHz SCS.**  **Proposal 6: If an initiating device is capable to perform Cat-2 LBT, and if the initiating device performs an additional burst within the initiated COT which may be separated with any prior burst of at least a minimum gap Y, then under Alt-3 a Cat 2 LBT is needed before the initiating device transmission.** |
| NTT DOCOMO INC. | **Proposal 2: For the down-selection on Y value on Cat-2 LBT, support Option 1** |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | ***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:***  ***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*** |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #3: Regarding the options for the maximum gap Y, Option 3 (gNB determines Y (for example, according to local regulation)) can be supported and the CP extension indication may need to be discussed depending on the value of Y. |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 5: For COT sharing consider 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. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 5: For Alt-3 for COT sharing, gNB determines the value of Y and is transparent to UE. |

### First round discussions

Discussion 2.4.1-1

On the gap Y for Cat 2 LBT when COT Sharing is applied, the summary of positions so far:

* Option 1: Y=8 us (motivated by need to operate in all regions)
  + CAICT, Samsung, DCM, ZTE, OPPO, TCL, Charter
* Option 2: Y=a multiple number of OFDM symbols
  + Huawei, NEC, CAICT, ZTE, Futurewei, Apple, InterDigital, Transsion, CATT
  + Intel (SCS based 1,4 8 symbols for 120,480,960KHz)
* Option 3: gNB determines Y (for example, according to local regulation) and is transparent to UE
  + Nokia, LG, Qualcomm, Apple (cell specific RRC with 0 symbols as an option), Lenovo, Ericsson, Transsion, WILUS, DCM, Nokia, Sony

Please provide your view if not captured above

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We support option 2, which we believe would exemplify the implementation, and allow the CCA to be always aligned with the ODFM symbol boundary. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Option 3 |
| Xiaomi | Support Option 2. Option 3 will increase the configuration overhead unnecessary.  Moderator: The intention is the Y chosen by gNB is transparent to UE. Clarified in red above |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Option1. |
| Ericsson | We support option 3. |
| Apple | Support option 3, and option 2.  Use cell specific RRC configuration to indicate Y value, which can be configured as multiple of OFDM symbols depending on SCS. When Y is not configured, no CAT-2 LBT is needed if the transmission is within shared COT, regardless the gap length.  Question on the modulator update: gNB determines Y and is transparent to UE. How UE determine when to perform CAT-2 LBT in this case? |
| LG Electronics | We support Option 3 and the CP extension indication may need to be discussed depending on the value of Y.  Meanwhile, since Cat-2 LBT is a UE capability unlike NR-U, it may be necessary to define a UE behaviour for LBT type indication when the Cat-2 LBT capability of the UE is unknown because it is before the capability report, such as the initial access. If ChannelAccess-CPext field is 2 bits in DCI format 0\_0 and 1\_0 even in NR operation on 52.6 GHz, the LBT type indication is required when gNB schedules the Msg3 PUSCH or triggers the PUCCH for Msg4/MsgB by the fallback DCI.  I have a question on the moderator’s update: Could you clarify the meaning of transparent to UE? |
| InterDigital | We support Option 2. The gap Y should be determined between two transmissions on the same beam or beam-pair. |
| Transsion | We support Option 2 and Option 3.  One question for option 3, if the value of Y is transparent to UE, then how does the UE determine whether it needs to perform Cat 2 LBT for the configured UL transmission that occurs within the COT? |
| Futurewei | We corrected our captured position. We support option 2 with Y being specified as number of symbols. Option 3 with Y being configured as number of symbols is also acceptable to us but we are not clear about the meaning of “transparent to UE” |
| OPPO | We support Option 1, also we add our preference. |
| Docomo | The reason why we propose option 1 is it seems to be able to follow the existing structure in BRAN, which we assumed may be argued by companies. We are ok with Option 3 also.  Furthermore, we have similar question to LGE: what is the meaning of transparent? Does this intend to say “Y is configurable by gNB, and just to follow the configuration from UE perspective”? We would like to understand how such configurable values could be transparent from UE side. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Option 3. |
| WILUS | We support Option 3. |
| CATT | We support Option 2. |
| TCL | We prefer Option 1. That would alleviate the signalling impacts. |
| Sony | We support Option 3. |
| Samsung | We support Option 1 for simplicity. Since this the minimum gap, gNB can always implement with larger value of Y. |
| Charter Communications | We are fine with Option 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Option 2.  We do not prefer Option 1 with further requires discussion regarding CP extension.  For Option 3, we don’t understand how Y can be transparent to UE (as mentioned by multiple companies already). We also prefer Y to be specified if Alt 2 is used to avoid configuration. |

### Second Round Discussion

Proposed conclusion 2.4.2-1

On the gap Y for Cat 2 LBT when COT Sharing is applied, no matter which option is chosen out of options 1/2/3, the UE does not need to know the value for Y, as the UE will follow DCI to determine if Cat 2 LBT is performed

Moderator note: Please note this does not change or replace the discussion in 2.4.1-1

Please provide your view:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | Agree with the conclusion above |
| LG Electronics | We haven’t heard the explanation of how Y can be transparent to UE. For both Option 1 and Option 3, the CP extension indication may need to be discussed.  Moderator: As in Rel.16 NR-U, UE does not know when the DL transmission ends, so cannot be actively involved in determine what kind of LBT is used. It will follow the DCI indication. Even for CP extension in Rel.16 NR-U, UE is just following DCI |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We are OK with the proposed conclusion but the value of Y still needs to be specified in 37.213 |
| Xiaomi | We agree that the UE will follow DCI to determine if Cat 2 LBT is performed. and UE does not need to know Y.  but we’d like to better understand, if Y is not specified, that means gNB can let UE do COT sharing without gap restriction? anyway ,we can also agree on this, just for clarification.  Moderator: The value of Y is still being discussed. For option 3 in 2.4.1-1, the intention is gNB knows the Y from local regulation (can vary market by market) and will make a decision to use Cat 1 LBT or Cat 2 LBT depends on that. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the conclusion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with the conclusion |
| DOCOMO | Support the conclusion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| OPPO | We are OK with the conclusion, but Y still needs to be specified. |
| Ericsson | We are ok with the conclusion. |
| Intel | @FL: Just to follow up on LG’s question. Would this mean that we are not mandating for some of the options (1 and 3 to be specific) that CAT-2 will be imposed to terminate at the OFDM symbol boundary of the first symbol of the start of an UL burst? If this is the case, then we still support this proposal.  Moderator: So far we haven’t discussed any CP extension design yet, and by default, it is not introduced. In that case, the UE UL transmission will start from OFDM symbol boundary (of the UL timeline). Note that this is different from DL OFDM symbol boundary due to TA offset (7us). In that case, I am actually not sure what Option 2 in discussion 2.4.1-1 means. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the conclusion. |
| Apple | We do not support the proposal.  The proposal assume DCI always indicate CAT-2 LBT within the COT, which is DCI overhead, and has not been explicitly discussed. We think Y value can be signalled to the UE (in case of option 3), if Y is not configured, no LBT is needed as default. This applies to region governed by EN 302 567 as discussed before. The benefit is in this case, only 1 bit CCA indication is needed in DCI, indicating inside COT/outside COT, saving 1 bit DCI overhead for CAT-2.  Moderator: I believe it is quite clear from Rel.16 NR-U discussion that there is no reliable way for UE to know when gNB transmission ends in the previous DL transmission, so there is no way for UE to know how long the gap is before the scheduled UL transmission. Please reconsider. |
| InterDigital | We agree with the conclusion |
| TCL | Agree with the conclusion. |
| CATT | We agree with the conclusion |
| NEC | We agree with the conclusion, |
| Samsung | We agree with the conclusion with the assumption that the CAT2 LBT is indicated in the DCI (so far no such discussion or agreement yet).  Moderator: Right we should have that agreement too. Let’s do it later, assuming it will not be a difficult discussion. |
| LG Electronics | We disagree with the conclusion. The CP extension design should be further discussed depending on the value of Y if it’s not guaranteed that the CP extension does not need it. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal with the understanding that Y will be specified. We agree with Samsung that a proposal for CAT2 LBT indication in DCI has to be opened and agreed. |
| Apple 2 | **Response to modulator, also related CAT2 LBT signaling in DCI.**  We have Alt 1 and Alt 2 in the main COT sharing discussion where Alt 1 does not require LBT for COT sharing. Alt 2 is mainly for local regulation where it requires. We also agreed that usage of the two alternatives is a gNB choice and depends at least on local regulations.  We believe CAT 2 bit in DCI is only needed if gNB signal CAT 2 is required in COT sharing, otherwise no CAT 2 bit in DCI is needed. Note that majority of regions do not require CAT 2 for COT sharing, therefore no CAT 2 bit in DCI should be the default and only enabled when gNB signal it.  We are proposing if Y is not configured, then no CAT 2 is used for COT sharing (i.e., Alt 1), and no CAT-2 bit in DCI. Other signaling methods to enable Alt 2 can be further discussed. |

## 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 |
| Huawei HiSilicon | *Proposal 19: The following use cases of CAT2 LBT related to COT initiation should be prioritized in the discussion due to the low complexity and overhead of CAT2 LBT compared to eCCA:*  -         *Starting transmission on a secondary channel in Type B multi-channel access, if supported*  -        *Energy measurement and reporting of Rx-assistance information by the receiver in Rx-assisted LBT, if supported* |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 6: 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 switching to new beam during the COT should be specified if the time duration from the initial LBT sensing for that beam exceeds a threshold. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 7: Cat 2 LBT should be supported for 60GHz unlicensed band operation. |
|  | Proposal 8: Cat 2 LBT may be used in case of directional LBT. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Proposal 11: Cat 2 LBT can be considered in the following use cases:  l 1) Resuming transmission/beam switching situation;  l 2) Type B multi-channel access procedure;  l 3) Rx-assisted LBT when COT is initiated by transmitter.  Proposal 12: For the maximum gap Y, similar rule as specified in LTE-LAA can be reused, such as Option1 that “Y=8 us (motivated by need to operate in all regions)” that is at least equal to the duration of Cat2 LBT. |
| NEC | Proposal 6: Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation should be introduced for channel sensing of receiver assistance measurements.  Proposal 7: Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation should be introduced for Type B multi-channel access. |
| CATT | Proposal 2: Cat 2 LBT should be introduced for 60GHz NR-U.  Proposal 10: Performing Cat 2 LBT before beam switching within the COT could be supported, and it can be decided by gNB.  Proposal 3: Cat2 LBT could be used for more use cases. |
| Ericsson | Observation 16 It is worthy to note that, use of CAT3 LBT is also an option for operation in Japan and CAT2 LBT is a UE capability feature  Observation 17 Cat2 LBT is not specified in HS EN 302 567  Observation 18 Simulation studies show that there is no gain using Ca2 LBT compared to no LBT for the proposed used cases.  Proposal 22 Do not support Cat2 LBT for any of the use cases in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. It is not precluded to do CAT2 LBT in addition to CAT3 LBT requirements. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Observation 3: For initiating device resuming transmission after a long transmission gap, Cat-2 LBT performance cannot be compared against Cat-3 LBT as long as Cat-3 LBT design remains open.  Proposal 4: Do not support Cat-2 LBT in beam switching or in multi-channel LBT.  Observation 8: Cat-2 LBT at every gNB beam switch would cause significant increase in overhead and is not even possible between the SSBs in the agreed SSB time locations.  Observation 10: Simulation results do not show any gain from introduction of additional Cat-2 LBT at gNB beam switch during COT. |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 4: When a UE is capable to perform Cat-2 LBT, whether to operate with or without Cat-2 LBT would be dynamically indicated by the gNB via scheduling DCIs.  Proposal 7: In addition to support CAT-2 LBT for COT-sharing procedure, the gNB may configure the UE to use CAT-2 LBT for RX-assisted LBT  Proposal 9: Do not support, Cat-2 LBT for multi-beam switching and multi-beam TDM COT. |
| NTT DOCOMO INC. | Proposal 3: Use of Cat-2 LBT should be considered for the transmission of a certain signal/channel, for which LBT is not needed in a region (e.g., BRAN with short control signalling), while LBT is always needed in another region (e.g., Japan). |
| Sony | Proposal 4: Introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60 GHz unlicensed band operation |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 14: A UE determines whether to use Cat 2 LBT based on the gap duration Y between the upcoming transmission and a preceding transmission on the same beam. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 6: Introduce Cat 2 LBT for the use case of Multi-Beam LBT. |
| WILUS Inc. | ü Proposal 2: We support Alt-2 to introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation. |

### First round discussions

Discussion 2.5.1-1

Support potential CAT2 LBT use cases:

* 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)
  + ZTE, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, NEC, Transsion, Futurewei, Apple, OPPO, WILUS, TCL, Sony, Samsung, InterDigital
* 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)
  + FUTUREWEI, Spreadtrum, , CATT, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, ZTE, vivo, LG, NEC, WILUS, TCL, Sony, Samsung (could be applicable to certain area up to regulation), InterDigital
  + No: Intel, Nokia
* Rx-Assistance:  Cat 2 LBT may be used for sensing at the receiver as a responding device for Rx-Assistance measurements and associated signalling
  + Huawei, ZTE, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, vivo, LG, NEC, Futurewei, OPPO, WILUS, TCL, Samsung
* Multi-channel Type B access if supported
  + Huawei, ZTE. NEC, vivo, WILUS, Samsung
  + No: Intel Nokia
* For a certain transmission, which can be treated as Short Control Signaling in BRAN, in a region where Short Control Signaling is NOT defined but LBT is mandatory
  + Docomo
* In general
  + CAICT
* No
  + Ericsson, Nokia (no for beam switch, multichannel,), Charter

Please provide your view if not captured above

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We support Cat-2 for two specific use cases:   * Resume transmission after Y gap. This is motivated by Japanese regulatory requirements, which is mandated by ARIB, and whose text is very generic and does not define any concept of initiating or responding device, but rather distinguishes a device from a transmitter to a receiver.  |  | | --- | | * **Interference mitigation function** * Sending and receiving identification signals * (Enforcement Article 6-2) * (Facilities Article 9-4) * Shall automatically transmit or receive identification codes. * Carrier Sense * (Facilities Article 49-20) * If the transmission power of the transmitter exceeds 10 mW, provide a carrier sense that will operate at beginning of the transmission. |   In this matter, our understanding is that carrier sensing would be needed at the beginning of every transmission, unless the transmissions are back-to-back. Notice that we have updated the list of supporting companies for this use case.   * Receiver assisted LBT: Cat2 LBT is preferred to support scheme 2 for the RX assistance given that by using Cat4 at the receiver the LBT overhead may limit and overcome the benefits from using a receiver assisted mechanism. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Added our preference for each of the above use cases |
| Xiaomi | We think it is more nature to discuss how Cat 2 LBT is used in diverse scenarios when the related scenario is detailed discussed and Cat 2 LBT is needed. The current proposal/agreement give a misleading impression that the related scenarios/schemes are already supported. For example, we haven’t decided how to do receiver assisted LBT, so it’s quite early to say “Cat 2 LBT may be used for sensing at the receiver as a responding device for Rx-Assistance measurements and associated signalling”. |
| ZTE, Sanechip | In addition to the position captured in the above FL proposal, we also support Cat 2 LBT for multi-beam LBT case. |
| vivo | We support Cat 2 LBT for Receiver assisted LBT, beam switching and type B multi-channel access. Our positions are added to the summary. |
| Ericsson | We do not see the benefits in performing CAT2 LBT in any of the use cases listed above. |
| Apple | Resume transmission after gap. Can be considered when local regulation requires LBT before any transmission.  Multi-beam: do not see the benefit in this use case.  Rx-assisted: need to determine Rx-assisted scheme 2 is supported first.  Multi-channel type B: need to decide whether multi-channel type B is supported first. |
| LG Electronics | Since it was agreed to support the Cat-2 LBT for COT sharing use case, Cat-2 LBT can be also supported for the use cases of Multi-Beam LBT and Rx-Assistance depending on the local regulation. For multi-channel Type B, it can be supported if it is allowed in the regulation. Regarding Resume transmission after a gap Y, it may need to discuss because it is not supported before. |
| InterDigital | We added our preference above. |
| NEC | In addition to the view captured above, our preferences about other use cases are provided in red. |
| Transsion | If required by local regulation, COT sharing can be the use case for Cat 2 LBT. For other use cases, whether to adopt Cat 2 LBT can be discussed jointly with the alternatives for these cases. |
| Futurewei | We added our support to some of use cases that was not captured. |
| OPPO | We support Cat-2 for use cases including resume transmission after a gap Y and Rx-Assistance, also we add our preference. Besides, we also think that the potential Cat 2 LBT use cases depend on the discussion in other sections, so we are a little confused about the intention of this discussion. |
| Docomo | We added our preference above. We think in BRAN, the application of short control signaling rule is very good from operation perspective, while it is unfortunately always applicable depending on regions where LBT is required. For example, even for SSB transmission, Japan regulation makes it mandatory to perform LBT beforehand (for each SSB, actually). We believe that the use of cat-2 for such transmissions could be useful. We are also open to discuss the other use cases. |
| Nokia, NSB | We see no benefit in using Cat2 LBT in the use cases above. However, if and when indication of Cat2 LBT can be included into DCI, many of the use cases can be satisfied in a transparent manner, based on gNB scheduling. |
| WILUS | We added our preference above. |
| CATT | We suggest discussing the benefit of using Cat 2 in each use cases separately. |
| TCL | We have added our views in above items. |
| Sony | We added our preference above. |
| Samsung | We added our positions on the use cases, and we assume the first bullet is already agreed. |
| Charter Communications | We don’t see the need for Cat 2 LBT when Cat 3 LBT is already specified and can meet all of these requirements. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We support both LBT-based Rx-assistance (Scheme 2-1) and Multi-channel Type B and we think it is necessary to support CAT2 for both schemes.  We believe if LBT-based Rx-assistance is agreed (any of scheme 2-1, 2-2, 3 in Rx Assistance discussion), supporting CAT2 LBT at the receiver side is very beneficial. Otherwise, the only choice for sensing at the responding device would be eCCA which may result in unnecessarily increasing the Rx-assistance procedure latency.  We think that if Multi-channel Type B is agreed, CAT2 (and not eCCA) needs to be performed on secondary channels. The advantage of Multi-channel access Type B to Multi-channel access Type A regarding the LBT process complexity reduction relies on using CAT2 LBT on secondary channels instead of performing independent eCCA LBT on all channels (as in Type A). |

## Rx Assistance

Agreement:

For receiver to provide assistance in channel access, channel sensing and reporting need to be performed. The following schemes can be further considered. Target down-selection by RAN1 #106bis-e

* Scheme 1: L1-RSSI based receiver assistance
  + Resource used for RSSI measurement
    - Alt 1: RSSI measurement is based on the time/frequency resources configured for ZP-CSI-RS
      * FFS: any enhancement needed for ZP-CSI-RS for this purpose (e.g., ZP-CSI-RS over all REs in BWP over one or more symbols).
    - Alt 2: Energy measurement on operating BW over indicated or specified number of symbols or time interval
  + L1-RSSI is reported in an AP-CSI report
  + L1-RSSI trigger in UL grant
    - FFS if L1-RSSI trigger can also be carried in DL grant
  + Timeline for L1-RSSI reporting is at least equal to AP-CSI reporting and RAN1 strives to tighten the timeline
    - Note: If L1-RSSI reporting timeline cannot be tighter than AP-CSI reporting timeline, this scheme is not needed
  + FFS: How to indicate the measurement beam for L1-RSSI
  + FFS: What is included in the L1-RSSI report, such as the value of RSSI measurement, comparison outcome with Energy Detection threshold, etc
* Scheme 2: CCA or eCCA based receiver assistance with existing phy channel/signals
  + Scheme 2-1: gNB schedules/triggers UL PUCCH/SRS transmission with the DL assignment DCI and indicates CCA or eCCA in the DCI. UE performs CCA or eCCA for the scheduled/triggered UL transmission and if LBT passes, transmits the Receiver-assistance information (implicitly or explicitly) in the PUCCH (or SRS in the case of 1-bit Rx-assistance) to indicate the LBT outcome. gNB detects the scheduled UL transmission to tell if UE passes the CCA or eCCA. After detecting the Receiver-assistance information, the downlink data transmission happens.
    - FFS if the downlink data transmission can be granted with the same DL DCI that schedules/triggers the first UL PUCCH/SRS transmission, in which case, the CCA or eCCA is performed for at least the first UL PUCCH/SRS transmission
  + Scheme 2-2: gNB schedules/triggers UL transmission PUSCH with the UL assignment DCI and indicates CCA or eCCA in the DCI. UE performs CCA or eCCA for the scheduled/triggered UL transmission and if LBT passes, transmits the Receiver-assistance information (implicitly or explicitly) in the PUSCH to indicate the LBT outcome. gNB detects the scheduled UL transmission to tell if UE passes the CCA or eCCA. After detecting the Receiver-assistance information, the downlink data transmission happens.
* Scheme 3: CCA or eCCA based receiver assistance with new RTS/CTS type transmission
  + New RTS/CTS-like signaling introduced.
  + gNB sends RTS-like signaling to UE. UE performs CCA or eCCA 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 CCA or eCCA. After detecting the CTS-like signal, the data transmission happens
* Scheme 4: Legacy L3-RSSI with potential enhancements
  + FFS potential enhancements, e.g., supporting gNB indicating the beam used for UE RSSI measurement, supporting gNB indicating new reference SCS and measurement bandwidths
* Note: The schemes listed above are not mutually exclusive and should be discussed separately.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Key Proposals/Observations/Positions |
| Huawei HiSilicon | *Observation 4: 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 5: 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.*  *Proposal 20: For a receiver UE to provide assistance information in channel access in the DL scenario, support Scheme 2-1 with the downlink data transmission being scheduled by the same DL DCI that schedules/triggers the first UL PUCCH/SRS transmission.*  *Proposal 21: For a receiver-assistance in channel access in the UL scenario, discuss supporting a scheme corresponding to Scheme 2-1 for the case in which the scheduling offset K2 is too long for the LBT performed by gNB before the UL grant to represent the interference at gNB during the reception of the scheduled PUSCH(s).*  *Proposal 22: For a receiver UE to provide assistance information in channel access in the DL scenario, support introducing a new field in DCI format 1\_1 scrambled with C-RNTI, CS-RNTI or MCS-C-RNTI, to schedule/trigger PUCCH/A-SRS resource before the start of the scheduled PDSCH(s)*  -           *PUCCH: A 3-bit field ‘ChannelAccess-PUCCH resource indicator’ is introduced and the existing mechanism for indicating PUCCH resource can be reused*  o    *UCI Payload size is configurable between 1 bit (CTS only) or 7 bits (energy measurement report such as L1-RSSI)*  -           *A-SRS: 2-bit ‘Channel access indicator’ indicates the SRS trigger mode for reusing existing ‘SRS Request’ field to trigger a single aperiodic SRS resource set for receiver-assisted channel access, or trigger aperiodic SRS resource set(s) for legacy MIMO/positioning purposes, or both.*  O    *The UE can be configured with one or more aperiodic SRS resource set(s) in SRS-Config (Currently supported). For the configured aperiodic SRS resource sets, an optional RRC parameter (e.g., ‘SRS-ChannelAccess’) is configured to indicate that the SRS resource set is for receiver assistance report for channel access only.*  *Proposal 23: For a receiver UE to provide assistance information in channel access in the DL scenario, support configuring/indicating a time offset of a small value range to the UE for transmitting the scheduled/triggered PUCCH/A-SRS resource with respect to the beginning of the scheduled PDSCH(s)*  -           *PUCCH: Add a new field of a configurable bitwidth (0, 1 or 2 bits) in the DCI format 1\_1 to indicate the slot level offset from the indicated PUCCH resource to the start of the scheduled PDSCH(s), e.g., ‘ChannelAccess-PUCCH-to-PDSCH timing indicator’.*  -           *A-SRS: Higher layer parameters startPosition and slotOffset and can be reused such that slotOffset for an aperiodic SRS resource (set) triggered for providing receiver assistance in channel access is reinterpreted as the number of slots from the actual transmission of the triggered aperiodic SRS resource (set) to the start of the scheduled PDSCH(s).*  *Proposal 24: For a receiver UE to provide assistance information in channel access in the DL scenario, support configuring a higher layer parameter providing the LBT type for the UE to access the channel and transmit the scheduled/triggered PUCCH/A-SRS*  -           *This can be provided using common or dedicated signaling.*  *Proposal 25: For a receiver UE to provide assistance information in channel access in the DL scenario, the following procedures are applied:*  *1)      A UE that has received a DCI format 1\_1 scheduling/triggering PUCCH/A-SRS resource before the start of the scheduled PDSCH(s) transmits the triggered A-SRS or the scheduled PUCCH, including the detected energy level if configured, only if it has accessed the channel according to the UE-side LBT performed prior to the indicated time resource for transmitting the scheduled/triggered PUCCH/A-SRS.*  *2)      A gNB that has transmitted a DCI format 1\_1 to a UE scheduling/triggering PUCCH/A-SRS resource before the start of the scheduled PDSCH(s) may transmit the scheduled PDSCH(s) and any subsequent DL control/data only if it has received the scheduled/triggered PUCCH/A-SRS from that UE, the transmission of the scheduled PDSCH(s) is dropped otherwise.* |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 8: Further discuss scheme 1 and scheme 2 for receiver assistance |
| 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. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Proposal 13: For receiver assisted channel access and interference management,  l Scheme 2 can be considered for CCA/eCCA based receiver assistance and propose to use the same DL DCI iffered to trigger/schedule UL transmission and DL data transmission considering complexity.  L Scheme 4 can be considered either as a supplementary method to CCA/eCCA based receiver assistance or when Scheme 2 is not iffered. |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 1: For receiver to provide assistance in channel access, further consider only Scheme 1 and Scheme 2.  Proposal 2: For Scheme 1 for receiver to provide assistance in channel access, to reduce latency and signaling overhead, support triggering AP-CSI report directly by the DCI with DL grant.  Proposal 3: For Scheme 2 for receiver to provide assistance in channel access, support Scheme 2-1 for lower latency and signaling overhead |
| OPPO | Proposal 16: For RX assisted LBT, Scheme 2 should be supported. |
| CATT | Proposal 11: For receiver assistance based on L1-RSSI measurement, Alt 2 (energy measurement on operating BW over specified number of symbols) is preferred.  *Proposal 12: For receiver assistance based on L1-RSSI measurement, L1-RSSI can be triggered by DL grant.*  *Proposal 13: For receiver assistance based on L1-RSSI measurement, the L1-RSSI report can be 1 bit which is the outcome of the value of RSSI measurement and Energy Detection threshold.*  *Proposal 14: For receiver assistance based on L1-RSSI measurement, it is recommended to add the QCL source information for the L1-RSSI measurement.* |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 6: No support of Scheme 2/3 as receiver assisted channel access for their complexing process increasing transmission delay. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 7: Support Scheme 4 as receiver assisted channel access, since Scheme 4 has little specification impact and has a concise process. |
| Ericsson | Observation 13 Receiver assisted LBT does not show consistent performance improvement as compared to no LBT operation.  Observation 14 Receiver assisted LBT involves RTS/CTS-like handshaking in every data transfer procedure, which significantly increases data transfer latency, reduces spectrum efficiency and system capacity.  Observation 15 The standardization and implementation technical complexity and cost for receiver assisted LBT should not be under-estimated.  Proposal 14 Do not support receiver assisted LBT.  Proposal 15 Support receiver interference measurement that is based on the existing RSSI and CSI reporting mechanisms with minimal enhancement when it is necessary.  Proposal 16 The current RSSI and CO measurement in Rel-16 should be enhanced to support NR unlicensed operation in FR2-2 in Rel-17. The enhancement at least includes extension of reference SCS and indication of channel bandwidth for RSSI measurement. The iffered details of the RRC configuration for RSSI and CO measurement should be decided by RAN2.   |  | | --- | | Proposal 17 For RSSI and CO measurement in FR2-2, UE can assume the configured RSSI measurement resources are QCL-ed with Type-D to one of the latest received PDSCH and the latest monitored CORESET. |   Proposal 18 The following enhancements on the current CSI iffered can be considered to better support receiver assistance information reporting, if time allows:  Proposal 19 Explicit feedback approach requires similar spec changes as Scheme 1 …Scheme 2-2 can be considered if the UL transmission step (i.e., CCA at the receiver) can be de-coupled from the data transmission procedure and if the implicit feedback approach is adopted.     |  | | --- | | Proposal 20 Do not support Scheme 2-1 in receiver-assistance schemes. |   Proposal 21 Do not support Scheme 3 in receiver-assistance schemes. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 24: Employ existing RSSI measurements as the receiver assistance. |
| Observation 15: The network can operate scheme 2 in a fully standards transparent manner. There is no need to define further mechanisms to support scheme 2. |
| Proposal 25: Deprioritize discussions on new mechanisms for receiver assistance until more essential parts of the channel access solution have been agreed. |
| Observation 16: Any Rx assistance scheme should be configurable per UE, so that it could be used only with Ues frequently detecting high interference. |
| Samsung | Proposal 11: For RX-assistant LBT, support:  • Scheme 2 with DCI for triggering and UCI for reporting the assistant information;  • Scheme 4 with supporting new SCS and measurement bandwidth for 60 GHz unlicensed band.  Proposal 12: Support RSSI measurement outside the active BWP and in non-serving cell. |
| MediaTek Inc. | Proposal 5: For receiver-assisted LBT, scheme 2 can be supported. If down selection between schemes 2-1 and 2-2 is needed, support scheme 2-2. |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 18: For receiver-assisted LBT procedure both scheme 1 and 2 could be supported, where both scheme 1 and 2 could be used up to UE’s capability. |
| NTT DOCOMO INC. | Proposal 5: For Rx assistance, support Scheme 4 (Legacy RSSI measurement and reporting with possible enhancements) and/or Scheme 1 (AP-CSI report with possible enhancements):  l Scheme 4 with enhancements to consider new SCSs, measurement bandwidth, and possibly beam-related aspects should be a starting point at least for the support of long-term Rx-assistance  l Scheme 1 should also be considered if the need of short-term Rx-assistance is observed |
| Sony | *Proposal 9: Receiver assisted LBT should be supported in 60 GHz unlicensed operation.*  *Proposal 10: L1-RSSI based receiver assistance and L3-RSSI with potential enhancements should be introduced in Rel-17* |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | *Proposal 23: 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, following schemes should be supported: • Scheme 1: L1-RSSI based receiver assistance o Resource used for RSSI measurement § Alt 2: Energy measurement on operating BW over indicated or specified number of symbols or time interval o L1-RSSI is reported in an AP-CSI report o L1-RSSI trigger in UL grant § FFS if L1-RSSI trigger can also be carried in DL grant o Timeline for L1-RSSI reporting is at least equal to AP-CSI iffered and RAN1 strives to tighten the timeline § Note: If L1-RSSI reporting timeline cannot be tighter than AP-CSI reporting timeline, this scheme is not needed o FFS: How to indicate the measurement beam for L1-RSSI o FFS: What is included in the L1-RSSI report, such as the value of RSSI measurement, comparison outcome with Energy Detection iffered, etc • Scheme 3: CCA or eCCA based receiver assistance with new RTS/CTS type transmission o New RTS/CTS-like signaling introduced.  o gNB sends RTS-like signaling to UE. UE performs CCA or eCCA 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 CCA or eCCA. After detecting the CTS-like signal, the data transmission happens*  *Proposal 26: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, for scheme 3, following should be supported:*  *• Short transmission using control channels (such as with 1-bit) or reference signals for before the actual transmission could be supported* |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | 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: |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 2: Receiver assistance should be considered for both omni-directional and directional LBT.  Proposal 4: Support Scheme 1 L1-RSSI reporting, where the UE is configured with periodic resources on which to measure L1-RSSI and can be aperiodically triggered to report L1-RSSI.  Proposal 5: L1-RSSI includes one or more values associated to one or more BWs or beams.  Proposal 6: L1-RSSI includes a comparison to an energy detection threshold.  Proposal 7: L3-RSSI is enhanced to support reporting for multiple beams and measurement BWs. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #4: Rx assistance Scheme 1 is not needed because L1-RSSI reporting timeline cannot be tighter than AP-CSI reporting timeline, according to the agreement made in RAN1#106 that for 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, only value(s) for CSI computation delay requirement 2 are to be defined.  Proposal #5: For the receiver to provide assistance, the feedback mechanisms already supported by the current specification such as implicit method in Scheme 2 (appearance of the scheduled PUCCH/SRS/PUSCH) can be considered but it is not preferred to introduce the additional or new mechanism (such as added explicit payload bit in PUSCH/PUCCH or introduction of new RTS/CTS-like iffered in Scheme 3). |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 10: Receiver assisted LBT and channel access should be supported in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.  Proposal 12: 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. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 7: Among Rx-Assistance schemes, prioritize and adopt L1-RSSI enhancements to AP-CSI framework.  Proposal 8: L1-RSSI enhancements to AP-CSI framework should be considered independently of Rel 17 IIOT/URLLC AP-CSI enhancements.  Proposal 9: Consider the use of RSSI compared to a configurable threshold as part of the L1-RSSI report.  Proposal 10: Consider use of UL grant DCI for trigger of Beam Specific L1-RSSI measurement and reporting for enhanced AP-CSI in PUSCH.  Proposal 11: L1-RSSI trigger should also be carried in DL grant. Consider use of PUCCH for sending Beam Specific L1-RSSI measurement and reporting for enhanced AP-CSI.  Proposal 12: Use Rel. 16 AP-CSI timelines as baseline for enhanced AP-CSI reporting with L1-RSSI and study further possible tightening of the timelines. Use worst case UE capability for BeamReportTiming for 120KHz SCS, namely 56 OFDM symbols, as a guideline for setting the minimum requirement for L1-RSSI reporting timeline.  Proposal 13: Beam Specific L1-RSSI measurement and reporting should be supported.  Proposal 14: Consider the design of timeline, triggering and beam indication mechanisms of L1-RSSI to be analogous to CSI-RS based L1-RSRP reporting in AP-CSI.  Proposal 4: For receiver to provide assistance in channel access, specify support for both Scheme 1 (L1-RSSI) and Scheme 4 (L3-RSSI). |

### First round discussion

Summary of positions so far:

* Scheme 1: Spreadtrum , ~~ZTE,~~ Fujitsu Intel (capability), Docomo (second pref) ,CATT, Lenovo, InterDigital, Qualcomm, Apple, Charter Communications
* Scheme 2: Huawei, Futurewei, Vivo, Fujitsu (2-1), OPPO, , Samsung, MediaTek(2-2), Intel (capability), Sony, LG (oppose 1/3), Apple, ZTE, Sanechips
* Scheme 3: Lenovo?
* Scheme 4: Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, (oppose 2/3), Ericsson (no to 2-1,3), Nokia, Samsung, Docomo, Sony, Lenovo, Convida, Apple, ZTE, Sanechips, LG, Interdigital, Charter Communications

For L1-RSSI, the following details are collected from supporting companies.

Discussion: 2.6.1-1: (closed)

L1-RSSI based receiver assistance is introduced with the following design components

* Resource used for RSSI measurement
  + Alt 1: RSSI measurement is based on the time/frequency resources configured for ZP-CSI-RS
    - FFS: any enhancement needed for ZP-CSI-RS for this purpose (e.g., ZP-CSI-RS over all Res in BWP over one or more symbols).
    - Qualcomm, Ericsson, Futurewei (1st choice), Fujitsu, DCM,
  + Alt 2: Energy measurement on operating BW over indicated or specified number of symbols or time interval
    - Intel, Lenovo, Apple, InterDigital, Futurewei (2nd choice), Nokia, CATT, Sony,Charter
* L1-RSSI is reported in an AP-CSI report
* L1-RSSI trigger in UL grant
  + FFS if L1-RSSI trigger can also be carried in DL grant
* Timeline for L1-RSSI reporting is at least equal to AP-CSI reporting of L1-RSRP
* Reuse the same mechanism for L1-RSRP beam determination for L1-RSSI
* On the content of L1-RSSI report, down-select one or more of the following alternatives
  + Alt 1. L1-RSSI provides the (quantized) value of RSSI measurement
    - Qualcomm, Ericsson, Apple, Futurewei, DCM, Nokia. Sony, Charter
  + Alt 2. L1-RSSI provides the comparison outcome with a preconfigured Energy Detection threshold
    - Qualcomm, Intel, Lenovo, Ericsson, InterDigital, Futurewei, Fujitsu, DCM, CATT
* Support: Intel, Lenovo, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Apple, InterDigital, Futurewei, Fujitsu, TCL, DCM, Nokia, CATT, Sony, Charter
* Not support: ZTE, vivo, LGE, Samsung, Huawei/HiSilicon

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We prefer Alt2 for both the discussion related to time-domain resource used for RSSI measurements as well as the discussion related to the actual content of the L1-RSSI report. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In principle we are fine with the listed design components for L1-RSSI based receiver ifferedi.  For resource used for RSSI measurement, we prefer Alt 2.  On the content of L1-RSSI report, we prefer Alt 2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Considering that L1-RSSI measurement has not been supported in the existing specs and it is very similar to CCA/eCCA based receiver assistance and some additional standardization works are needed, we don’t particularly prefer this method.  Besides, our view is not correctly captured in the above listed summary. So we updated our position for candidate several schemes. |
| Vivo | If the intention is to list components of scheme 1 (if introduced), we suggest to make it clear.  If L1-RSSI based receiver assistance is introduced, consider the following design components  We don’t support scheme 1. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal in principle.  For Resource used for RSSI measurement:  We prefer Alt 1.  For the content of L1-RSSI report, both options could be ok. Alt-1 provides RSSI measurement value with more UCI bits. Alt-2 only gives a binary value but only requires one UCI bit. The down-selection between the alternatives also depends on how L1-RSSI is reported in the uplink. If L1-RSSI is reported on PUSCH, then a complete L1-RSSI measurement result is preferred. On the other hand, if L1-RSSI is reported on PUCCH, a single bit L1-RSSI report is more beneficial. |
| Apple | On resource, support Alt 2.  On content, support Alt 1, (quantized) value of RSSI measurement |
| LG Electronics | |  | | --- | | Agreement:  For NR operation with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, only value(s) for CSI computation delay requirement 2 are to be defined.  FFS: The specific values |   From the above agreement related to CSI computation delay in RAN1#106-e meeting, it was already agreed that only requirement 2 is supported for 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS. Therefore, Scheme 1 is not needed because L1-RSSI reporting timeline cannot be tighter than AP-CSI reporting timeline.  Moderator: The proposal above is to reuse L1-RSRP timeline, which is tighter than CSI timeline  To Moderator: We commented based on the previous arrangement's Note. According to this note, if the L1-RSSI timeline cannot be tighter than AP-CSI timeline, Scheme 1 is not required.  Note: If L1-RSSI reporting timeline cannot be tighter than AP-CSI reporting timeline, this scheme is not needed |
| InterDigital | For resource used we have a slight preference for Alt.2  For the content of L1-RSSI, we prefer Alt. 2. |
| Futurewei | We generally support the proposal. For resource we see merits of both alternatives and have a slight preference for Alt 1. Similarly, for content we see merits of both options in that Alt.1 provides finer information while Alt 2 is beneficial to obtain a resource availability map with a low overhead. |
| Fujitsu | We are generally fine with the proposal.  Regarding the resource, we prefer Alt 1.  Regarding the content, we slightly prefer Alt 2. |
| Docomo | As for Resource used for RSSI measurement, we prefer Alt 1.  On the content of L1 RSSI report, it seems Ericsson has a point. Whether to support reporting on PUCCH should be considered together. If PUSCH only is available as in Rel-16 A-CSI framework, then Alt 1 is preferred. |
| Nokia, NSB | L1-RSSI can be useful in acquiring up to date info about the interference on a channel. To achieve this goal, it is best to:   * Have the measurement resource defined as full symbols Alt 2, and * The contents of the measurement are quantized RSSI, (Alt 1), as with L3 RSSI. Note UL LBT prior to a UL transmission as such already serves the purpose of Alt 2, so no further reporting is needed. |
| CATT | We support the scheme1.  For the resource used for RSSI measurement, we prefer Alt 2.  For the content of L1-RSSI report, we prefer Alt 2, which causes less signalling overhead. |
| TCL | We perfer Alt2. That is more flexible with DCI controlling. |
| Sony | We support scheme 1.  For resource used for RSSI measurement, we support Alt 2.  For the content of L1-RSSI, we support Alt 1. Alt 2 could be subset of alt 1. |
| Samsung | Our concern is L1-RSSI measurement may need lot of discussion on the metric, procedure, and possibly RAN4’s work, and essentially there is no technical difference from CCA/eCCA. We are wondering what’s the technical benefit Scheme 1 can further provide comparing to Scheme 2.  Moderator: L1-RSSI can provide more information than CCA/eCCA. The L1-RSSI feedback can help even if UE passes LBT (interference lower than threshold). Also, we haven’t agree on CCA/eCCA scheme yet. |
| Charter Communications | On resource, support Alt 2.  On content, support Alt 1, (quantized) value of RSSI measurement |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support Scheme 1.  Scheme 1 as proposed already requires some enhancements that are in common with Scheme 2. In our view, it does not make sense to incur the standardization effort and spec impact of introducing such enhancements and yet end up with the Rx-assistance information that is decoupled from the scheduling of DL data reception and not representative of the UE’s anticipated interference at the time of DL data reception. With bursty and directional transmissions, interference measurements that are decoupled from the DL data reception may not be of any benefit to combat the hidden node problem.  Moreover, as a result of decoupling the Rx-side interference measurements from DL data reception, the overall dynamic overhead is increased in the cell compared to Scheme 2-1 (with same DL assignment scheduling/triggering the UL transmission). This is due to the fact that the gNB would need to keep triggering the L1-RSSI measurement and reporting for all candidate UEs such that the interference information can be available to assist the gNB in deciding which UE(s) should be scheduled with DL data reception.  Furthermore, even if the L1-RSSI timeline can be tightened to be at least equal to the AP-CSI reporting of L1-RSRP, the current timelines for reporting AP-CSI on PUSCH are rather long and would constitute the bottle neck for Scheme 1 anyway.  Also, given that AP-CSI reporting on PUCCH is not a legacy mechanism supported in Rel-15/16, there is no advantage for supporting Scheme 1 over Scheme 2-1 in terms of standardization effort and specification impact in Rel-17.  Finally, in contrast to Schemes 2/3, performance evaluations of the proposed Scheme 1 have never been provided/discussed in the SI phase during which the multiple companies views supported Rx-assisted LBT as beneficial channel access mechanism to combat the hidden node issue in Rel-17. |

For scheme 2 with CCA or eCCA based receiver assistance with existing phy channel/signals with following schemes

* Scheme 2-1: gNB schedules/triggers UL PUCCH/SRS transmission with the DL assignment DCI and indicates CCA or eCCA in the DCI. UE performs CCA or eCCA for the scheduled/triggered UL transmission and if LBT passes, transmits the Receiver-assistance information (implicitly or explicitly) in the PUCCH (or SRS in the case of 1-bit Rx-assistance) to indicate the LBT outcome. gNB detects the scheduled UL transmission to tell if UE passes the CCA or eCCA. After detecting the Receiver-assistance information, the downlink data transmission happens.
  + FFS if the downlink data transmission can be granted with the same DL DCI that schedules/triggers the first UL PUCCH/SRS transmission, in which case, the CCA or eCCA is performed for at least the first UL PUCCH/SRS transmission
* Scheme 2-2: gNB schedules/triggers UL transmission PUSCH with the UL assignment DCI and indicates CCA or eCCA in the DCI. UE performs CCA or eCCA for the scheduled/triggered UL transmission and if LBT passes, transmits the Receiver-assistance information (implicitly or explicitly) in the PUSCH to indicate the LBT outcome. gNB detects the scheduled UL transmission to tell if UE passes the CCA or eCCA. After detecting the Receiver-assistance information, the downlink data transmission happens.

Discussion: 2.6.1-2: (closed)

Do you agree with the following observation:

* For scheme 2-1, if DL data transmission is not granted with the same DL DCI that schedules/triggers the first UL PUCCH/SRS transmission, and if we don’t enforce the behavior that the gNB should not transmit if PUCCH/SRS is not detected, the scheme has ~~no~~ limited spec impact and can be left for implementation
  + The spec impact is limited to supporting DCI triggering UL PUCCH/SRS transmission without a PDSCH
* For scheme 2-2, if we don’t enforce the behavior that the gNB should not transmit if the PUSCH is not detected, the scheme has no spec impact and can be left for implementation

Support the observation: Intel, ZTE, Qualcomm, Ericsson (scheme 2-2 only), Apple (scheme 2-2 only), LGE, MTK, Transsion, Futurewei (2-2 only), Fujitsu, DCM, Nokia, CATT (2-2 only), TCL, Sony, Samsung, Charter

Do not support the observation: Oppo, Huawei/HiSilicon

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We agree with the FL’s observation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with the FL’s observation, but there is a question on how to handle or whether to limit the position of DCI to scheduling DL data transmission and if DCI to scheduling DL data transmission occurs before or after first UL PUCCH/SRS transmission, whether to need a LBT for DL DCI transmission.  Moderator: For this observation, I am assuming DL grant is transmitted after the UL PUCCH/SRS is detected. If another LBT is needed for the DL grant/DL data transmission is a separate discussion. |
| Vivo | From our point of view, the receiver assisted information is used to assist DL transmissions to address hidden node problem. Therefore, gNB should only transmit after it receives the assistant information. The observation from FL is not the intention of Scheme 2 and we don’t agree. |
| Ericsson | We agree with the FL’s observation for Scheme 2-2. For Scheme 2-1, a DL DCI is used to trigger PUCCH/SRS transmission. There is still some specification impact by using DL DCI to trigger PUCCH/SRS. In the current specs, a DL DCI is used to schedule PDSCH. It is NOT specified how UE should handle a DL DCI that doesn’t schedule a PDSCH.  Moderator: Good point. See the change above |
| Apple | For scheme 2-1, we need to define DL DCI to trigger PUCCH/SRS without PDSCH.  For scheme 2-2, agree.  Moderator: Good point. See the change above |
| LG Electronics | We agree with the observations. |
| Mediatek | We agree with the observation. However, when network operates in receiver-assisted LBT mode, the behaviour of gNB when assistance information is not received should be specified (considering DL scenario), because this situation can imply hidden node problem at UE side. |
| Transsion | We agree with the observations. |
| Futurewei | We agree with the observations on scheme 2-2 |
| Fujitsu | We agree with the FL’s observation. |
| OPPO | We do not support scheme 2-1/2-2 is left to implementation. The observation deviates from the motivation of introducing Rx assistance, and cannot address the hidden node problem.  Moderator: The thinking is, if the UE failed LBT (means it is heavily jammed), there is motivation for gNB not to serve DL to the UE at this moment. In this observation, we are trusting the gNB to do the right thing. |
| Docomo | Agree with the observation. |
| Nokia, NSB | We agree with the observations. In our view, there is nothing more that needs to be specified. |
| CATT | May need more discussion/clarification.   1. For scheme 2-1, if DL data transmission is not granted with the same DL DCI that schedules the first UL PUCCH, one issue is that the UE doesn’t know the time resource of UL PUCCH transmission. In additional, the DL DCI that schedules/triggers the UL PUCCH/SPS transmission requires to schedule PDSCH transmission at the same time according to the current spec. Therefore, we can’t agree with the FL’s observation for scheme 2-1. 2. For scheme 2-2, doesn’t it mean the UE may not know this UL assignment DCI is used for scheduling the transmission of the Receiver-assistance information? If the answer is yes, we can agree with the FL’s observation. |
| TCL | We agree with these observations too. |
| Sony | We agree with the observation |
| Samsung | We agree with no spec impact on the procedure wise, but there could be spec impact on the indication of CCA/eCCA in DCI, and UE’s feedback in uplink transmission. |
| Charter Communications | We agree with the FL’s updated observation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | * For scheme 2-1, we only support the solution where the DL data transmission is granted with the same DL DCI that schedules/triggers the first UL PUCCH/SRS transmission, and gNB does not transmit the DL data if PUCCH/SRS is not detected.   Nevertheless, we do not agree that the spec impact is limited “to supporting DCI triggering UL PUCCH/SRS transmission without a PDSCH” “if DL data transmission is not granted with the same DL DCI that schedules/triggers the first UL PUCCH/SRS transmission”. We also do not understand the intention of “~~no~~ limited spec impact and can be left for implementation” ; does it mean that the spec impact in the added sub-bullet is to be left to implementation?   * + We note that even in the case assumed in this discussion point, reporting the measured energy during LBT in scheduled PUCCH, is still a spec impact.   + Also, how UE would know that it should perform LBT upon receiving DCI scheduling A-SRS/PUCCH? This would also have a spec impact in our view.   + Similarly, in case of conditional triggering of A-SRS (as an implicit reporting of LBT success), how would the UE understand whether or not the triggered aperiodic SRS resource set(s) are for the legacy purposes of a MIMO usage or positioning? Moreover, how can gNB trigger a single A-SRS resource for the purpose of Rx-assisted channel access?   For scheme 2-2, we do not support that variant of Scheme 2. In fact, there is no connection between the PUSCH transmission scheduled by an UL grant and the desired outcome described in that scheme, i.e., “the downlink data transmission happens” which is supposed to be the target DL transmission scheduled by a DL assignment. Unless the intention of Scheme 2-2 is to send an additional UL grant whenever a target DL transmission is scheduled in accordance with the Rx-assistance channel access, we do not understand which PUSCH detection would be used to decide whether or not the DL data should be transmitted. |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with the observation |

Discussion: 2.6.1-3: (closed)

Do you support to explicitly introduce in the spec that

* In Scheme 2-1, the gNB should not ~~transmit~~ perform DL ~~data~~ transmission if PUCCH/SRS is not detected
* In Scheme 2-2, the gNB should not ~~transmit~~ perform DL ~~data~~ transmission if PUSCH is not detected

Support to explicitly introduce the restriction: Intel, ZTE, vivo, Mediatek, Transsion, Oppo, TCL, Samsung, HW

Not support: Ericsson, LGE, Fujitsu, TCL, DCM, Nokia, CATT, Sony, Charter

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We support to explicit indicate the conditional transmission upon detection of either PUCCH/SRS or PUSCH for scheme 2-1 and scheme 2-2, respectively. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with the FL’s suggestion. |
| Vivo | Support the intention. DL data could be interpreted as PDSCH only. We prefer a rewording.   * In Scheme 2-1, the gNB should not ~~transmit~~ perform DL ~~data~~ transmission if PUCCH/SRS is not detected * In Scheme 2-2, the gNB should not ~~transmit~~ perform DL ~~data~~ transmission if PUSCH is not detected   Moderator: Agree |
| Ericsson | We cannot support Scheme 2-1 and 2-2 if the data transmission is coupled with the Rx-assistance. |
| LG Electronics | We do not support explicitly introduce both scheme 2-1 and scheme 2.2 in the spec. The implicit method (e.g., the appearance of the scheduled PUCCH/SRS/PUSCH) can be considered without specification impact. |
| Mediatek | We agree with the FL’s suggestion |
| Transsion | We agree with the FL’s suggestion. |
| Fujitsu | We do not support the explicit restriction for gNB. It should be up to gNB implementation. |
| OPPO | We support explicitly introduce the condition when the gNB can transmit DL in the spec. Otherwise, the DL transmission may be irrelevant with UE assistance information, which deviates from the motivation of introducing Rx assistance. |
| Docomo | We do not support either Scheme 2-1 or 2-2. |
| Nokia, NSB | We do not support either scheme. The overall use of Rx assistance should be based on network decision. Also, as the Rx assistance can be provided to gNB without any spec impact, there is no need to determine explicit rules how gNB utilizes the Rx assistance. Further, such strict rule would require more complete and complex contemplation – what if gNB fails to detect single PUCCH/SRS/PUSCH due to simple detection error, or due to UE missing DCI? How many PUCCH/SRS/PUSCH should be used for Rx assistance? If several, what if some of them are not detected and some are? |
| CATT | We have concern on the explicitly introduce both scheme 2-1 and scheme 2.2 in the spec. If gNB doesn’t receive PUCCH/SRS or PUSCH, there may be two cases as following.  Case 1: The result of the CCA is failure, the UE can’t transmit PUCCH/SPS or PUSCH;  Case 2: The result of the CCA is successful, and the UE can transmit PUCCH/SPS or the PUSCH. While, the PUCCH/SPS or the PUSCH isn't detected by the gNB.  Both of the two cases may cause the gNB not to transmit DL data. |
| TCL | We think it is necessary to explicitly introduce an indication. |
| Sony | We do not support either scheme. These schemes would enforce to stop DL transmission when PDCCH or PUCCH/SRS/PUSCH is mis-detected. |
| Samsung | We support the proposal. The language here may not be like regular RAN1 spec wording, but can fit 37.213 if needed. |
| Charter Communications | Same view as Ericsson. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support to explicitly introduce in the spec that “the gNB should not ~~transmit~~ perform DL ~~data~~ transmission if PUCCH/SRS is not detected”  As we explained in the previous discussion point (2.6.1-3), we do not see the need for supporting Scheme 2-2 |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with the FL’s suggestion. We support to explicitly introduce in the spec that in Scheme 2-1, the gNB should not perform DL transmission if PUCCH/SRS is not detected. In Scheme 2-2, the gNB should not perform D transmission if PUSCH is not detected. |

Discussion: 2.6.1-4: (closed)

Do you support the following:

* For Scheme 2-1, the same DCI schedules the DL data also triggers the PUCCH/SRS transmission

Support: ZTE, Apple, Futurewei, Fujitsu, TCL, Oppo, Samsung, HW, Convida

Not support: Intel, vivo, Ericsson, LGE, Transsion, Nokia, Qualcomm, Charter

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | The DL data could be scheduled through a separate DCI. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We tend to support the same DCI schedules the DL data also triggers the PUCCH/SRS transmission. |
| Vivo | No, we prefer to use separate DCI for DL data. |
| Ericsson | We do not support this proposal. |
| Apple | Support this proposal. This saves DL scheduling overhead. Also less spec impact.  Otherwise, we need to define a new DL DCI format to trigger PUCCH/SRS without PDSCH. |
| LG Electronics | We share same view with Intel. |
| Transsion | We do not support this proposal. |
| Futurewei | We support this proposal |
| Fujitsu | We support the proposal. |
| OPPO | We slightly prefer to support the same DCI schedules the DL data also triggers the PUCCH/SRS transmission. |
| Nokia, NSB | We do not support further spec changes for this purpose. Naturally DL DCI can schedule PUCCH or SRS, and if the flexibility is not enough, a separate DCI can be used. That said, it is questionable what sort of gains this scheme would provide, if any, given the latency and overhead associated with such transmission. |
| TCL | We support this proposal. That would make the transmission more flexible. It can save some time for delay sensitive data. |
| Samsung | Same DCI is just one option, and we support another DCI as well. |
| Charter Communications | We do not support this proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support this proposal.  It can be observed that among the four schemes described in the Rx-assistance agreement in RAN1 106-e, only Schemes 2-1 and 3 are coupled with the scheduled DL data reception and can thus provide Rx-assistance information that is representative of the experienced interference immediately prior to the data reception. However, Scheme 3 requires introducing new phy channels/signals to implement the RTS/CTS-like handshake between the transmitter and the intended receiver which entails immense standardization effort and specification impact. Whereas the same goal of Scheme 3 is achieved by reusing the existing phy channels/signals as in Scheme 2-1. That is, when the target transmission is DL and UE is the receiver, the PDCCH carrying the DL scheduling DCI resembles an RTS that triggers the LBT at the intended receiver UE and the UL transmission of PUCCH (as CTS/receiver-assistance information) or A-SRS (as channel idle indication CTS only).  Detailed advantages of Scheme 2-1 in comparison with Scheme 1 is explained in our discussion point in discussion point 2.6.1-1  As for Scheme 4, the following issues can be observed in comparison to Scheme 2-1:   * Legacy RSSI is periodic measurement and thus not representative of the experienced interference immediately prior to data reception. Moreover, the output of such measurements is determined based on moving average L3 filtering rather than the instantaneous interference measurement. * Legacy RSSI requires resources dedicated for measurements and the resources used by each of the M UEs in the cell to report the measurements in UL channels. This also incurs complexity at each UE to conduct and report the measurements periodically regardless of the gNB’s intent to schedule PDSCH, as well as the complexity at gNB to continuously process these reports. * Legacy RSSI is less efficient in terms of resource overhead and complexity at both UE and gNB, especially at high load, compared to only 1 or 2 UEs reporting Rx-assistance info upon passing LBT * Configuring shorter periodicities for measurements and reporting of legacy RSSI further emphasizes the overhead and complexity savings of the Receiver-side LBT. |
| Convida Wireless | We support that for Scheme 2-1 the same DCI schedules the DL data also triggers the PUCCH/SRS transmission. |

For scheme 3, seems that we don’t have consensus to support it.

Proposed conclusion 2.6.1-5

There is no consensus to support CCA or eCCA based receiver assistance with new RTS/CTS type transmission

Support the conclusion: Intel, Xiaomi, ZTE, vivo, Ericsson, Apple, LGE, InterDigital, Mediatek, Transsion, Futurewei, Fujitsu, Charter Communications, Oppo, DCM, Nokia, CATT, TCL, Sony, Samsung, HW, Convida

Please provide your view below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We are Ok with the proposed conclusion. |
| Xiaomi | We are Ok with the proposed conclusion |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are Ok with the proposed conclusion |
| vivo | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| Ericsson | We support the conclusion in 2.6.1-5 |
| Apple | OK with the proposed conclusion. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with conclusion 2.6.1-5. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposed conclusion. |
| Mediatek | We support the proposed conlcusion |
| Transsion | We support this proposed conclusion. |
| Futurewei | We support this conclusion |
| Fujitsu | We support the conclusion. |
| OPPO | We are OK with the proposed conclusion. |
| Docomo | Support the conclusion |
| Nokia, NSB | We support this conclusion |
| CATT | We support this conclusion |
| TCL | We are fine with this conclusion. |
| Sony | We support the conclusion |
| Samsung | We are Ok with the proposed conclusion, and maybe further clarify “in Rel-17”. |
| Charter Communications | We support this conclusion |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the conclusion. |

On scheme 4 (L3-RSSI based RX assistance)

Discussion: 2.6.1-6: (closed)

Please provide your views on Legacy L3-RSSI with potential enhancements

* Do you support introducing gNB indication of the beam used for UE RSSI measurement and how?
  + Support: Xiaomi, ZTE, Ericsson, Fujitsu, TCL
  + Alt 1: gNB indicates beam when configures the L3-RSSI measurement
    - Xiaomi, Apple (?). InterDigital, DCM, Sony
  + Alt 2: (Leverage CLI design) Use the QCL type-D of the latest received PDSCH and the latest monitored CORESET
    - Ericsson, Apple, DCM
  + Other alternatives?
* Do you support introducing gNB indication of new reference SCS and measurement bandwidths and how
  + Support: Ericsson (Extending Rel.16 design to FR2-2), Apple, LGE, Fujitsu, DCM, Nokia, Sony, Samsung

Not support: Intel

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We actually do not see any benefit in supporting this scheme, since the reporting of the channel occupancy status may be infrequent enough that the effective channel occupancy status at a given time would not be well captured. In this matter, the use of the channel occupancy status report may be counter-productive and actually may end up degrading the overall system performance. |
| Xiaomi | Yes, we support to introduce gNB indication of the beam used for UE RSSI measurement. This could be done by high layer configuration. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support introducing gNB indication of the beam used for UE RSSI measurement and specific related indication method can be further discussed and determined. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal.  Regarding gNB indicating the reference SCS and bandwidth:  The current RSSI and CO measurement in Rel-16 should be enhanced to support NR unlicensed operation in FR2-2 in Rel-17. RSSI and channel occupancy measurements are performed within RMTC which is configured for the UE via RRC using RMTC-config-r16. The enhancement at least includes extension of reference SCS and indication of channel bandwidth for RSSI measurement. The signalling details of the RRC configuration for RSSI and CO measurement should be decided by RAN2.  Regarding gNB indicating the beam:  Another open issue for supporting RSSI and CO measurement in FR2-2 is how UE should setup its spatial reception parameter (i.e., receive beam) for the measurement. For this problem, the CLI-RSSI measurement defined in the current specs can be used as a guide, due to its similarity with RSSI and CO measurement. In TS 38.133, the spatial reception parameter configuration for CLI-RSSI measurement is specified as follows:  For performing CLI measurement in FR2, UE can assume the configured CLI measurement resources are QCL-ed with TypeD to one of the latest received PDSCH and the latest monitored CORESET.  Following the same principle, when performing RSSI and CO measurement in FR2-2, the UE can assume the configured RSSI measurement resources are QCL-ed with Type-D to one of the latest received PDSCH and the latest monitored CORESET. |
| Apple | Support this proposal. RMTC-Config can be enhanced for different SCS and channel BW. For gNB indicating the RSSI measurement beam, gNB can indicate whether omni-RSSI is preferred or directional RSSI is preferred. When directional RSSI is configured, UE measure using the Rx beam QCL type-D with PDCCH/PDSCH.  For use case of L3-RSSI, omni-RSSI and channel occupancy can assist the gNB to perform channel or BWP selection. Directional RSSI can measure whether there is high interference in the receiving direction and allow the gNB to selectively enable or disable LBT operation in iffer where LBT is not mandated, or enable/disable L1-RSSI or CCA/eCCA based receiver assisted information feedback. |
| LG Electronics | The legacy L3-RSSI can be supported with possible enhancement (e.g., L3-RSSI with supporting new SCS) to relieve the hidden node problem. Reference SCS for measurement and measurement duration can be defined for new SCS (i.e., 120/480/960kHz). For example, the reference SCS is defined only for 120kHz and the measurement durations can be maintained 1/14/28/42/70 symbols. In this case, even if it is 480 kHz SCS BWP, the measurement durations are defined based on 120 kHz SCS. If reference SCS is 120 kHz and duration is 1, RSSI measurement may be performed for 4 symbols based on 480 kHz SCS. |
| InterDigital | We support gNB indication of the beam used for UE RSSI measurement. The indication can be via higher layer signaling. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Docomo | We agree that RMTC-cofig can be enhanced to include new reference SCS and new bandwidths.  For spatial configuration to be used for measurement, one possibility is to reuse CLI, as pointed out by Ericsson. If more configurability is deemed necessary (which we tend to think beneficial), RRC-level spatial configuration can be considered. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine to add support for further reference SCSs and BWs. Beam indication will still require some further clarifications. |
| TCL | We are fine to this indication. |
| Sony | We support the proposal. The gNB indication of the beam used for UE RSSI measurement could be signaled by higher layer. |
| Samsung | We support the second bullet, and the new SCS and bandwidth can be configured in the RRC parameter as in the legacy way. We also want to clarify that the RSSI measurement is supported for unlicensed band only in FR2-2.  For the first bullet, we are open to the discussion, but also wondering whether there is a simple way to support it. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are open to such enhancements as long-term channel occupancy measurement for, eg, channel section. But such L3-RSSI enhancements cannot be used as “Receiver-assistance”. |

### Second Round Discussion

Proposed conclusion 2.6.2-1:

For scheme 2-1 and 2-2 in earlier agreement, there is no consensus to introduce explicitly in the spec that

* In Scheme 2-1, the gNB should not perform DL transmission if PUCCH/SRS is not detected
* In Scheme 2-2, the gNB should not perform DL transmission if PUSCH is not detected

It is to the interest of gNB that the DL transmission is not performed given the CCA/eCCA fails at UE side, thus the good practice for gNB is not to perform the DL transmission. But this is left to gNB implementation

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We do not support this conclusion, and we would really hate to end up with a design where no receiver-assisted functionalities would be supported. |
| Futurewei | We prefer to hold off making this conclusion |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with Proposed conclusion 2.6.1-7. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We can accept the conclusion for the sake of progress |
| vivo | We think the intention of the Rx-assisted LBT is to use the assistant information to decide whether to perform the DL transmission or not. It should not be up to gNB implementation.  Moderator: The point is to reduce spec work, consider introducing spec mandate may not be easy when there are multiple beams (say gNB knows a UE0 failed LBT in one beam, can gNB try another beam for DL transmission, where the beams can partially overlap). Even if we don’t enforce the gNB behavior, a properly implemented gNB should do the right thing given the information. Please also note that if we introduce RX assistance, the usage of it is also gNB implementation. If gNB uses the mechanism described in 2-1 and 2-2, there is no reason for gNB not to do the right thing. |
| Mediatek | We are ok with this conclusion |
| Nokia, NSB | We are OK with the conclusion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine to support the conclusion |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| OPPO | We do not support this conclusion. If whether or not performing DL transmission is left to gNB implementation for Rx-assisted LBT, the behaviour on the UE side will be not clear. For example, when the UE received a DCI scheduling PDSCH but failed LBT, the UE cannot determine whether or not the DL transmission happens. In this case, the UE has to receive the possible DL transmission and send HARQ-ACK feedback. If the gNB decided not to perform DL transmission, the UE power for detection and feedback goes to waste. Therefore, the DL transmission condition of the Rx-assisted LBT should be explicitly introduced in the spec.  Moderator: For the case the DL transmission after PUCCH/SRS is transmitted with a different DL grant (Proposal 2.6.2-3), this will not be an issue. |
| Ericsson | We are ok with the conclusion. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the conclusion. |
| Apple | OK with the conclusion |
| TCL | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the conclusion |
| CATT | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| OPPO2 | Based on the above explanation, the interaction between gNB and UE is more like a Rx-assisted procedure in COT sharing scenario, rather than Rx-assisted LBT. If our understanding is right, the issues on COT sharing (Section 2.4.2) should be handled firstly. We observe that the UL transmission may happen within the gap. In this case, there is no motivation to perform LBT on the UE side. |
| vivo | Thanks FL for the clarification. We are OK with the conclusion for the sake of progress. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the conclusion. |

Proposed conclusion 2.6.2-2:

* For scheme 2-2 in earlier agreement, if we don’t enforce the behavior that the gNB should not transmit if the PUSCH is not detected, the scheme has no spec impact and can be left for implementation

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | That would be our same understanding |
| Futurewei | Agree with this conclusion |
| LG Electronics | Support Proposed conclusion 2.6.1-8. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We can accept the conclusion for the sake of progress |
| vivo | The proposed conclusion is not Rx-assisted LBT. The Rx-assisted LBT is only applicable to UEs which is triggered to transmit PUSCH with specific length and LBT type. For other UEs, the DL reception has nothing to do with the PUSCH transmission, i.e., the DL transmission is decoupled from PUSCH detection.  Moderator: Can you explain more? I am not sure I understand the comment. |
| Mediatek | We have a few questions regarding the details of receiver-assisted LBT considering DL scenario 1. How to let UE know the network is operating in receiver-assisted LBT ? Currently, we only agree to use RRC signalling to differentiate LBT and No LBT mode. Once a UE is indicated it’s in LBT mode, it’s possible to be omni/directional/receiver-assisted LBT. So how UE knows which LBT mode is operating? If UE does not know it’s in receiver-assisted LBT mode, assistance information in PUCCH/SRS can be transmitted without implementing any LBT, e.g., in COT sharing case. So a mechanism to trigger energy measurement for receiver-assisted LBT at UE side is necessary in our view. 2. It needs to be explicitly decided whether PUCCH or SRS to transmit assistance information. If SRS is adopted, then the only impact needs to be specified is to ensure LBT is implemented before SRS transmission. On the other hand, if PUCCH is used for assistance information transmission, then how to indicate assistance information needs to be discussed, e.g., which format. If these questions can be addressed without introducing any spec impact, then we are fine with the conclusion 2.6.2-2  Moderator: In my view, RX assistant LBT is not a mode, but an operation. Under LBT mode, the gNB can request RX assistant for some transmission and can choose not to request RX assistance for other transmissions. The gNB RX assistance request is essentially transparent to UE. In both scheme 2-1 and 2-2, the UE will simply follow the LBT type as indicated in DCI (which we already have), and gNB will make the decision. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are OK with the conclusion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine to accept the conclusion |
| DOCOMO | Agree with the proposed conclusion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| OPPO | We agree with MediaTek. At least the UE should be indicated to perform LBT when it is in Rx-assisted LBT mode, which has spec impact.  Moderator: Please see the reply to MTK |
| Ericsson | We are ok with the conclusion. |
| Apple | OK with the conclusion |
| InterDigital | We agree with the conclusion. |
| TCL | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| Mediatek | Thanks Moderator for clarifying our question. We are fine with the conclusion. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the conclusion |
| CATT | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| vivo | We are OK with the conclusion for the sake of progress |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| Mediatek | As we mentioned earlier, we are fine with the conclusion. However, the case that UL transmission lies in the gNB initiated COT needs to be addressed, i.e, based on current mechanism, it’s possible that UE transmits its UL data without implementing LBT since the UE shares the COT with a gNB. To tackle this situation, we need to explicitly let UE know it’s in receiver-assisted LBT and therefore it will implement energy measurement before UL transmission. |

Proposed conclusion 2.6.2-3:

* For Scheme 2-1 in earlier agreement, there is no consensus to support the same DCI triggers the PUCCH/SRS transmission also schedules the DL transmission after the PUCCH/SRS transmission

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We support this conclusion |
| LG Electronics | We support Proposed conclusion 2.6.1-9. |
|  | We can accept the conclusion for the sake of progress |
| vivo | Support Proposed conclusion |
| Nokia, NSB | We are basically OK with the intention of the conclusion. However, a DL assignment can obviously schedule a PUCCH transmission for HARQ-ACK or SRS. Maybe the point is to say that this functionality is not further enhanced specifically for the purpose of RX assistance?  Moderator: Please check the updated language. |
| DOCOMO | We think Nokia has a valid point. We also believe that this conclusion intends to say no further enhancements for this functionality to support RX assistance. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Share the same view with Nokia and DOCOMO. |
| OPPO | Question to the Moderator: Could you clarify the intention of the conclusion? If the intention is to preclude the same DCI schedules the DL data also triggers the PUCCH/SRS transmission, we do not support the conclusion. For scheme 1, the resource used for RSSI measurement and the content of RSSI report also cannot reach consensus.  Moderator: The scheme 2-1 has two flavors. Flavor 1 is, a DCI triggers PUCCH/SRS, the UE senses the channel and transmit PUCCH/SRS. The gNB detects PUCCH/SRS to determine if UE passes LBT. If pass, the gNB will schedule another DCI to grant DL data. The flavor 2 is, the gNB sends a DCI trigger PUCCH/SRS AND PDSCH, but the PDSCH is after the PUCCH/SRS. The UE will detect the DCI and sends PUCCH/SRS if LBT passes. gNB will detect PUCCH/SRS to see if UE passes LBT. If determines UE passed LBT (PUCCH/SRS detected), the gNB will proceed with PDSCH transmission. This conclusion is trying to say flavor 2 is not supported. However, from the discussion in 2.6.2-4, it seems to me there is no consensus to support flavor 1 as well. |
| Ericsson | We are ok with the conclusion. |
| Apple | OK with the conclusion |
| TCL | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the conclusion |
| CATT | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | According to the moderator’s reply to OPPO, we think this proposal is to preclude flavor2, but flavor 1 can be still supported regardless of the final outcome of conclusion 2.6.2-4. For us, although flavor 1 has some spec impact but impact is very small compared with the scheme corresponding to supporting L1-RSSI measurement, so we think and there is no see strongly reason not to support flavor 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | At the risk of being a bit pedantic, we would like to mention that the modified language is still not entirely accurate as DCI 1\_1 can trigger A-SRS before or after of scheduled PDSCH in Rel15/16. Maybe we can make it accurate if we further modify:  For Scheme 2-1 in earlier agreement, there is no consensus to support the same DCI triggers the PUCCH/SRS transmission for Rx-assistance purposes also schedules the DL transmission after the PUCCH/SRS transmission |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the conclusion |

Proposed conclusion 2.6.2-4:

* For scheme 2-1 in earlier agreement, if DL data transmission is not granted with the same DL DCI that schedules/triggers the first UL PUCCH/SRS transmission, and if we don’t enforce the behavior that the gNB should not transmit if PUCCH/SRS is not detected, the scheme has ~~limited~~ spec impact ~~and can be left for implementation~~
  + The spec impact at least includes ~~is limited to~~ supporting DCI triggering UL PUCCH/SRS transmission without a PDSCH
* Moderator note: This conclusion is not trying to agree on supporting scheme 2-1, but is trying to identify if there is spec impact and if it is worth doing. From the comments received so far, we do have spec impact and there is no strong support to introduce the mechanism

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | That would be our same understanding |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the conclusion but we don’t think this version of 2-1 justifies spec change. |
| LG Electronics | We support Proposed conclusion 2.6.1-10. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If in Scheme 2-1 scheduling PUCCH/SRS for Rx-assistance in the same DCI as PDSCH is not agreeable (UL Receiver assistance is not tied to PDSCH), we are not interested in developing above alternative where PUCCH/SRS and PDSCH are scheduled in two different DCIs. In any case, we do not agree that the spec impact is limited “if DL data transmission is not granted with the same DL DCI that schedules/triggers the first UL PUCCH/SRS transmission”:   * Even in the case assumed in this proposed conclusion, reporting the measured energy during LBT in scheduled PUCCH, is still a spec impact. * Also, how UE would know that it should perform LBT upon receiving DCI scheduling A-SRS/PUCCH? This would also have a spec impact in our view. * Similarly, in case of conditional triggering of A-SRS (as an implicit reporting of LBT success), how would the UE understand whether or not the triggered aperiodic SRS resource set(s) are for the legacy purposes of a MIMO usage or positioning? Moreover, how can gNB trigger a single A-SRS resource for the purpose of Rx-assisted channel access? Solution to all these questions has specification impact. |
| vivo | The main bullet is not Rx-assisted LBT. However, we agree with the impact in the sub-bullet which describes the potential spec changes needed for scheme 2-1. |
| Mediatek | If PUCCH is adopted to transmit assistance information, how to transmit assistance information, e.g., which format also needs to be discussed in our view. |
| Nokia, NSB | Ok with the conclusion. We do not think this justifies a spec change. |
| DOCOMO | We share Nokia’s point. Ok with the conclusion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If this conclusion is supported, it is not clear to us how the functionality of CCA based receiver assistance is achieved.  Moderator: If we can agree on 2.6.2-2, scheme 2-2 can support CCA/eCCA based RX assistance without spec change. |
| OPPO | We do not support the proposal. The UE should be indicated to perform LBT when it is in Rx-assisted LBT mode, which also has spec impact.  Moderator: We already have LBT type indication field in DCI. Anyway, I updated the proposal language |
| Ericsson | We are ok with the conclusion. |
| Apple | OK with the conclusion |
| TCL | We are fine with the conclusion |
| Xiaomi | OK with the conclusion, but we have the same understanding as Futurewei that we don’t think this version of 2-1 justifies spec change. |
| CATT | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the conclusion. |

Proposal: 2.6.2-5:

Support extending Rel.16 L3-RSSI to unlicensed operation in FR2-2

* Introduce RRC configuration for reference SCS and measurement bandwidth
  + Extend the reference SCS/CP field (ref-SCS-CP-r16) in *RMTC-Config*
    - FFS value range: [120, 480 and 960 kHz SCSs]
  + Introduce parameter in *RMTC-Config* to indicate the measurement bandwidth
    - FFS: Value range for measurement bandwidth
* For the QCL Type-D of L3-RSSI measurement, down-select one or both of the following alternatives
  + Alt 1: gNB configures the beam when configures the L3-RSSI measurement
  + Alt 2: Use the QCL type-D of the latest received PDSCH and the latest monitored CORESET

Moderator note: We don’t need to call this RX assistance. This is a straight-forward extension of FR1 unlicensed mechanism to FR2-2 unlicensed

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We are open to support this as long this would not be claimed as a receiver-assisted procedure, for the reasons explained in our prior response, and either scheme 2-1 or scheme 2-2 are explicitly supported as well. Without those schemes, this enhancement would not have any use. |
| Futurewei | We support this proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We support Proposal 2.6.1-11 and Alt 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer to put “reference SCS” as FFS since configuration a new reference SCS may result in reducing the absolute time for RSSI measurement and its accuracy. We suggest:  Proposal: 2.6.1-11:  Support extending Rel.16 L3-RSSI to unlicensed operation in FR2-2   * Introduce RRC configuration for ~~reference SCS and~~ measurement bandwidth * FFS: Introduce RRC configuration for reference SCS * For the QCL Type-D of L3-RSSI measurement, down-select one or both of the following alternatives   + Alt 1: gNB configures the beam when configures the L3-RSSI measurement   + Alt 2: Use the QCL type-D of the latest received PDSCH and the latest monitored CORESET   Moderator: For the reference SCS suggestion, I think this can be considered as a discussion on what value the reference SCS can be. |
| Xiaomi | Agree in general, and support Alt 1. |
| vivo | We share the view from Intel and we’re open to this along with Rx-Assisted scheme 2-1 or 2-2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Ok with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the proposal and prefer Alt1. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal and prefer Alt 2.  To Moderator: We really appreciate the efforts in manoeuvring these tricky discussions. We do not see a need to introduce RRC configuration for this scheme. RSSI and Channel Occupancy (CO) measurement was introduced in Rel-16 for NR-U. RSSI and channel occupancy measurements are performed within RMTC which is configured for the UE via RRC, measured as the linear average of the total received observed per configured duration and channel bandwidth. To support RSSI and CO measurement in the spectrum beyond 52.6 GHz, the reference SCS/CP field (ref-SCS-CP-r16) in *RMTC-Config* needs to be extended to include 120, 480 and 960 kHz SCSs and introduce a new field for the measurement bandwidth.    Proposal: 2.6.2-5:  Support extending Rel.16 L3-RSSI to unlicensed operation in FR2-2   * Extend the reference SCS/CP field (ref-SCS-CP-r16) in *RMTC-Config* to include 120, 480 and 960 kHz SCSs * Introduce a new field in RMTC-Config to include ~~RRC configuration for reference SCS and~~ measurement bandwidth * For the QCL Type-D of L3-RSSI measurement, down-select one or both of the following alternatives   + Alt 1: gNB configures the beam when configures the L3-RSSI measurement   + Alt 2: Use the QCL type-D of the latest received PDSCH and the latest monitored CORESET   Moderator: Modified a little to leave the value range open to accommodate HW’s comment  Response: Thank you for the modifications and we support the proposal with the modifications |
| Apple | Support this proposal |
| TCL | We do not support this proposal. |
| CATT | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We can agree with the proposal with following modification:  Proposal: 2.6.2-5 (modified):  Support extending Rel.16 L3-RSSI to unlicensed operation in FR2-2   * ~~Introduce RRC configuration for reference SCS and measurement bandwidth~~ * FFS: Extend the reference SCS/CP field (ref-SCS-CP-r16) in *RMTC-Config*   + FFS value range: [120, 480 and 960 kHz SCSs] * Introduce parameter in *RMTC-Config* to indicate the measurement bandwidth   + FFS: Value range for measurement bandwidth * For the QCL Type-D of L3-RSSI measurement, down-select one or both of the following alternatives   + Alt 1: gNB configures the beam when configures the L3-RSSI measurement   + Alt 2: Use the QCL type-D of the latest received PDSCH and the latest monitored CORESET |
| LG Electronics | We are generally fine with the proposal. As we commented before, reference SCS for measurement and measurement duration can be defined for new SCS (i.e., 120/480/960kHz). For example, the reference SCS is defined only for 120kHz and the measurement durations can be maintained 1/14/28/42/70 symbols. In this case, even if it is 480 kHz SCS BWP, the measurement durations are defined based on 120 kHz SCS. If reference SCS is 120 kHz and duration is 1, RSSI measurement may be performed for 4 symbols based on 480 kHz SCS. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal and support Alt.1. For scheduling flexibility, the measurement report should not be restricted by a previous transmission. |
|  |  |

From discussion 2.6.1-1, there are strong support to introduce L1-RSSI mechanism (14 companies vs 5 companies). Consider there is strong support to introduce some level of receiver assistant schemes, the Moderator would like to recommend to support.

Proposal: 2.6.2-6

Support L1-RSSI for FR2-2 unlicensed operation

* The design uses L1-RSRP introduced in Rel.16 as baseline
  + FFS: L1-RSSI is reported in an AP-CSI report (L1-RSRP design)
  + FFS: L1-RSSI trigger in UL grant with existing AP-CSI triggering mechanism (L1-RSRP design)
    - FFS if L1-RSSI trigger can also be carried in DL grant
  + FFS: Timeline for L1-RSSI reporting is ~~at least~~ equal to AP-CSI reporting of L1-RSRP for 120KHz
    - Note: The L1-RSRP timeline is defined in Table 5.4-2 in 38.214
  + FFS: Reuse the same mechanism for L1-RSRP beam determination for L1-RSSI
* For resource used for RSSI measurement, down-select between the following two alternatives:
  + Alt 1: RSSI measurement is based on the time/frequency resources configured for ZP-CSI-RS or CSI-RS for IMR
    - FFS: any enhancement needed for CSI-RS for this purpose (e.g., CSI-RS over all Res in BWP over one or more symbols).
    - Qualcomm, Ericsson, Futurewei (1st choice), Fujitsu, DCM,
  + Alt 2: Energy measurement on operating BW over indicated or specified number of symbols or time interval
    - Intel, Lenovo, Apple, InterDigital, Futurewei (2nd choice), Nokia, CATT, Sony,Charter, ZTE
  + Note: L1-RSRP is using NZP-CSI-RS
* On the content of L1-RSSI report, down-select one or more of the following alternatives
  + Alt 1. L1-RSSI provides the (quantized) value of RSSI measurement
    - Qualcomm, Ericsson, Apple, Futurewei, DCM, Nokia. Sony, Charter
  + Alt 2. L1-RSSI provides the comparison outcome with a preconfigured Energy Detection threshold
    - Qualcomm, Intel, Lenovo, Ericsson, InterDigital, Futurewei, Fujitsu, DCM, CATT, ZTE
* Do not support: ZTE (not first choice), vivo, Samsung, OPPO, LG

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Ericsson | We are ok with the proposal |
| Intel | We are generally OK to support this proposal. However, as mentioned we only see benefits into this scheme if the timeline for L1-RSSI reporting is tightened, as per the note in prior agreement. Therefore, we would prefer if this could be supported only if the UE has the capability to support tighter processing time to deliver the channel occupancy status to the gNB. Therefore we would prefer to remove the 5th bullet, and indicate that this procedure is only used for UE’s supporting tighter processing time.  Moderator: The proposal is to align the timeline to L1-RSRP timeline, which is defined as Z3 column of Table 5.4-2 in 38.214 |
| Apple | OK with the proposal.  We think some AP-CSI aspect for L1-RSSI is missing. Propose to add it   * FFS: L1-RSSI can reuse the L1-RSRP priority rule (i.e., k=0) * FFS: L1-RSSI measurement take one CSI processing unit. * FFS: L1-RSSI measurement duration is >= 5us. |
| TCL | We are OK with the proposal |
| CATT | We are ok with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | In principle, we don’t particularly support this proposal since it is similar to scheme2. if scheme2 is supported, we can live with introducing L1-RSSI.  For resource used for RSSI measurement, we slightly prefer Alt2.  For the content of L1-RSSI report, we tend to support Alt2. |
| vivo | We do not support the proposal. Scheme 2-1 or scheme 2-2 can provide better processing timeline. |
| Samsung | We don’t support the proposal. The gain of Scheme 1 over Scheme 2 is still not clear. If Scheme 2 can be supported without specification impact, then why do we need Scheme 1 to achieve similar purpose? Also, there are still many FFS in Scheme 1, so it’s not clear of the design details. We are ok with further discussion on the details of Scheme 1, as we did for Scheme 2, and evaluate whether it’s needed or not after the design is more clear.  Moderator: From the discussion earlier, I see only scheme 2-2 can be supported w/o spec change, and very likely we don’t have consensus to support scheme 2-1. From what I see, scheme 1 has at least the benefit of better control on the report (resolution, threshold etc). We can certainly discuss more and please feel free to point out what other details are needed. Please note that the proposal is to reuse as much from L1-RSRP design as possible, so some of the details can be leveraged there. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have similar concerns as Samsung. To be flexible, we could consider supporting some enhancement on L1-RSSI based on Energy measurement (Alt 2). In our view, Alt 1 has little justification. We can accept the following to be further discussed and potentially agreed in RAN1 107b:  Proposal: 2.6.2-6 (modified)  Support L1-RSSI for FR2-2 unlicensed operation   * The design uses L1-RSRP introduced in Rel.16 as baseline * For resource used for RSSI measurement, support ~~down-select between the following two alternatives:~~   + ~~Alt 1: RSSI measurement is based on the time/frequency resources configured for ZP-CSI-RS or CSI-RS for IMR~~     - ~~FFS: any enhancement needed for CSI-RS for this purpose (e.g., CSI-RS over all Res in BWP over one or more symbols).~~     - ~~Qualcomm, Ericsson, Futurewei (1~~~~st~~ ~~choice), Fujitsu, DCM,~~   + ~~Alt 2:~~ Energy measurement on operating BW over indicated or specified number of symbols or time interval     - Intel, Lenovo, Apple, InterDigital, Futurewei (2nd choice), Nokia, CATT, Sony,Charter, ZTE   + ~~As a reference, L1-RSRP is using NZP-CSI-RS~~ * FFS: L1-RSSI is reported in an AP-CSI report, ~~just like L1-RSRP~~ * FFS: L1-RSSI trigger in UL grant with existing AP-CSI triggering mechanism, just like L1-RSRP   + FFS if L1-RSSI trigger can also be carried in DL grant * FFS: Timeline for L1-RSSI reporting is ~~at least~~ equal to AP-CSI reporting of L1-RSRP for 120KHz   + Note: The L1-RSRP timeline is defined in Table 5.4-2 in 38.214 * FFS: Reuse the same mechanism for L1-RSRP beam determination for L1-RSSI * On the content of L1-RSSI report, down-select one or more of the following alternatives   + Alt 1. L1-RSSI provides the (quantized) value of RSSI measurement     - Qualcomm, Ericsson, Apple, Futurewei, DCM, Nokia. Sony, Charter   + Alt 2. L1-RSSI provides the comparison outcome with a preconfigured Energy Detection threshold   Moderator: For resource used, given different preferences, we can leave the down-selection to the future. For the FFS items, I am open to change them to FFS. The FFS are just current L1-RSRP design though. |
| OPPO | We share similar view as Samsung, also we add our position to the above proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We disagree with the proposal.   |  | | --- | | Agreement:  For NR operation with 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS, only value(s) for CSI computation delay requirement 2 are to be defined.  FFS: The specific values |   From the above agreement related to CSI computation delay in RAN1#106-e meeting, it was already agreed that only requirement 2 is supported for 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS. Therefore, Scheme 1 is not needed because L1-RSSI reporting timeline cannot be tighter than AP-CSI reporting timeline. We commented based on the Note in previous agreement in RAN1#106e. According to this note, if the L1-RSSI timeline cannot be tighter than AP-CSI timeline, Scheme 1 is not required.  Note: If L1-RSSI reporting timeline cannot be tighter than AP-CSI reporting timeline, this scheme is not needed |
| Intel | Given that the intention is not to tighter the timeline, we share same concern as other companies regarding this proposal. This scheme would only be advantageous if the timeline can be tighter. If this is not possible, then we wonder what the technical benefits of this scheme are compared to scheme 2. |

Summary: 2.6.2-7

For the topics discussed in 2.6.2, here is a summary

* For scheme 1, the latest discussion in sin 2.6.2-6. There is majority to support introducing L1-RSSI feature, but there are 5 companies objecting (ZTE, vivo, LGE, Samsung, Huawei/HiSilicon, Oppo)
* For Scheme 2-1, gNB triggers the UE to transmit PUCCH/SRS with CCA/eCCA as RX assistance, we don’t have consensus to support
  + We don’t have consensus to support single DCI trigger PUCCH/SRS with CCA/eCCA and PDSCH after the PUCCH/SRS transmission
  + We don’t have consensus to support introducing DCI to trigger PUCCH/SRS with CCA/eCCA without PDSCH as well
* For Scheme 2-2 (gNB triggered PUSCH based RX assistance), we don’t have consensus to introduce in the spec the restriction that the gNB should abandon the DL transmission if PUSCH is not detected
  + On the other hand, gNB triggers PUSCH with CCA/eCCA is already supported in the spec
* For Scheme 3 (new RTS/CTS type signaling based RX assistance), there is consensus we don’t support
* For Scheme 4 (enhancements to L3-RSSI), we have majority to support, but there are objections from TCL

## 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 |
| Huawei HiSilicon | *Proposal 12: To define the sensing beam for LBT where at least the sensing beam(s) “covers” the transmission beam(s), support both Alt 1 and Alt 2 each for an appropriate use case as follows:*  -        *Alt 2: One-to-one correspondence between LBT beam(s) and transmit beam(s), e.g., independent per-beam LBTs*  -        *Alt 1: One-to-many correspondence between LBT beam and transmit beams and using quasi-omni-directional LBT beam*  *Proposal 13: For initiating a COT with SDM or TDM of different beams using a single LBT beam that “covers” all the subsequent DL transmission beams, gNB selects a spatial sensing filter that minimizes the resulting [3]dB sensing beamwidth which at least contains all beam peak directions of the subsequent DL transmission beams within the COT (Alt-1E).*  *Proposal 14: For initiating a COT with SDM or TDM of different beams, support multiple independent per-beam LBTs, i.e. Alt 2.*  *Proposal 15: When gNB performs multiple independent per-beam LBTs, the spatial domain sensing filter for an LBT beam is the same as the spatial domain filter used for the corresponding transmission beam.*  *Proposal 16: 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.*  *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 (Agree to FL Proposals 2.7.1-2 and 2.7.1-4 from RAN1#105-e).*  -        *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.*  -        *If the node is incapable of sensing simultaneously in different beams, a single LBT beam covering the multiplexed transmission beams should be used.* |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 9: 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 10: 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 11: 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 12: 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. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Proposal 8: Considering transmission opportunity and utilization of resource, Alt2 that “multiple per-beam LBT that cover multiple transmission beams used in COT” should be considered for the transmission with multiple beams in spatial iffer multiplexing if directional LBT is supported.  Proposal 9: 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 for the transmission with multiple beams in spatial domain multiplexing if Alt 2 is supported.  Proposal 10: 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 |
| vivo | Proposal 7: A node can initiate two (or more) (partially) overlapping COTs in two (or more) different beams.  Proposal 8: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, both Alt 1 and Alt 2 are supported.  Proposal 9: For a COT with TDM transmission, both Alt 1 and Alt 3 are iffered.  Proposal 10: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, both Alt A-1 and Alt B are supported.  Proposal 11: Alt A-1 and Alt-B are supported for the transmission within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching. |
| OPPO | Proposal 11: 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. |
| OPPO | *Proposal 12: introduce Cat 2 LBT into the independent per-beam LBT sensing procedure.* |
| NEC | Proposal 8: For a COT with SDM transmission, when independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed and the node does not has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams, at least the following LBT operations should be supported:  Ÿ The node performs eCCA of the different beams simultaneous, round robin between different beams.  Proposal 9: 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 and the node does not has the capability to simultaneously sense in different beams , 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. |
| CATT | Proposal 7：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 8: If supporting Alt A-1 or Alt A-2, the ‘blocking issue’ (failure of previous beam LBT causes subsequent beams unable to perform LBT) should be addressed.  Proposal 9: Alt A-3 of which node performs eCCA round robin between different beams should be supported to increase the multi-beam LBT efficiency. |
| CAICT | Proposal 4: Both single LBT sensing with wide beam and independent per-beam LBT sensing should be supported for COT with MU-MIMO transmission. Alt. B for per-beam LBT should be supported. |
|  | Proposal 5: For LBT within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, Alt 1 and 3 should be supported. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2: COT should be per sensing beam based. If a sensing beam can “cover” several transmission beams, the transmission beams will share the same COT.  Proposal 8: Multi-beam transmission for semi-static configured channels, such as CG-PUSCH should be studied to fully take advantage of spatial diversity. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 12 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.  Proposal 13 RAN1 needs to decide on whether and how to specify directional LBT for single sensing beam case before further discussing multiple sensing beams. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 14: COT initiating LBT with multiple independent per-beam LBT sensing should be ifferedized while completing the design for baseline channel access procedures.  Proposal 15: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) or within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, support both Alt 1 and Alt 2.  Proposal 16: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, support Alt B.  Observation 11: It is important to maintain flexibility of gNB implementation for multi-beam COT  Observation 12: Alt A-1 should be modified as: The node completes one eCCA on one beam, and directly moves 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).  Observation 13: Alt A-3 should be 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  Proposal 17: For a COT with TDM transmission, support the modified Alt A-1 and Alt A-3:  • Alt A-1: The node completes one eCCA on one beam, and directly moves 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).  • Alt A-3: 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.   O the last CCAs shall indicate vacant channel on all beams that are part of the COT |
| 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. |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 10: 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 11: 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.  Proposal: 12: An initiating device is able to initiate multiple overlapping COT over different beams.  Proposal 13: 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 14: 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. |
| Sony | Proposal 6: 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.  Proposal 7: 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 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) should be supported. |
| Sony | *Observation 4: If per-beam LBT sensing is introduced, per beam COT indication may be needed.* |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | Proposal 8: 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 9: 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 10: 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 11: 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*   * *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*  *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 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 13: 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* |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 13: A node that has initiated a first COT and wishing to transmit on a new transmission beam not applicable to the first COT, performs LBT on a sensing beam covering at least the new transmission beam and if possible, initiates a new COT and terminates the first COT. |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 15: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, support at least independent per-beam LBT sensing (Alt 2) and support simultaneous round robin eCCA between different beams (Alt A-3). |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 16: For a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, support at least independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT with additional requirement on CAT 2 LBT before beam switch (Alt 3) and support Alt A-2 or A-3. |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 17: Support of Alt B for SDM or TDM of beams can be considered for some Ues. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #6: 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. |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 6: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, support both iffere 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 7: 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 8: 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 9: 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. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 15: For SDM transmission, support both (Alt1) single LBT sensing with wide beam covers all beams used in the COT and (Alt 2) independent per beam sensing.  Proposal 16: For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission if independent per beam LBT is supported, and if the node has the capability to perform simultaneous sensing in different beams, simultaneous per-beam LBT for different beams is supported.  Proposal 17: Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, if independent per beam LBT is supported, and if the node has the capability to perform simultaneous sensing in different beams, simultaneous per-beam LBT for different beams is supported.  Proposal 18: 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), select, Alt A-2, namely, 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.  Proposal 19: Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, downselect to the following LBT operations  Alt A: Support both Alt-1 and Alt-2, where Alt-1 and Alt -2 are part of earlier agreement as follows:  • 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 |
| 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. |
| Panasonic | Proposal 1: Agree on Proposal 2.7.1-1 in Feature Lead Summary [1] i.e.  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  Proposal 2: Agree on Proposal 2.7.1-2 in Feature Lead Summary [1] i.e.  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.  Proposal 3: Agree on Proposal 2.7.1-3 in Feature Lead Summary [1], and further select Alt 3 by recognizing that it is a valid use case for Cat-2 LBT i.e.  Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, at least support Alt 1  • Alt 3 is additionally supported  Proposal 4: Agree on Proposal 2.7.1-4 in Feature Lead Summary [1] i.e.  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 iffered beams is supported.  Proposal 5: Support A-1 and A-3 in the discussion point 2.7.1-5 in Feature Lead Summary [2] of RAN1#105e. It means to support following.  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 are supported:  •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-3: The node performs eCCA of the different beams simultaneous, round robin between different beams |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### First round discussion (on hold)

For this topic, it will be more efficient to discuss after we agree on how to validate sensing beam for a given transmission beam. The moderator proposes to put the discussion on hold

### Second round discussion (not started yet)

This set of discussion may need to be delayed after we allow wider sensing beam for narrow transmission beam.

Proposal 2.7.1-1 (on hold)

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

Summary of Positions:

* Support both Alt 1 and Alt 2: Samsung, CATT, FUTUREWEI, CAICT, Qualcomm, Intel, Huawei/HiSilicon (Alt1 as a fallback mechanism), ITRI, Spreadtrum, TCL
* Decide single beam sensing first, deprioritize independent per beam sensing: Ericsson, Nokia

Proposal 2.7.1-2 (on hold)

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.

Summary of Positions as of RAN1-105e:

* Stable with wide support except Ericsson

Proposal 2.7.1-3 (on hold)

Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, at least support Alt 1

* FFS: If Alt 2 or Alt 3 are additionally supported. The decision can be made after we decide if Cat 2 LBT is introduced

Proposal 2.7.1-4 (on hold)

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.

## 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 | *View* |
| Huawei HiSilicon | *Proposal 11: For multi-channel access in NR-U-60, support both Type A and Type B procedures.* |
| Vivo | Proposal 1: 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. |
| vivo | Proposal 2: Both Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access can be supported. |
| CAICT | Proposal 6: Support both Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access. |
| Ericsson | Observation 5 ETSI regulation for 60 GHz bands do not support Type B multi-channel access. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 4 Support Alt1 in the agreement that allows only Type A multi-channel access from 37.213. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 5 Do not support Type B multi-channel access for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 9: Only Type A multi-channel access procedure (i.e. Alt.1 defined in RAN1#104-e meeting) shall be supported in NR-U on 60GHz band. |
| MediaTek Inc. | Proposal 4: Support only type A multi-channel channel access scheme. |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 8: Do not support, type B channel access mode for multi-carrier operation. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 20: Adopt Alt-1 for multi-channel access, i.e., support Type A multi-channel access only. |
| WILUS Inc. | ü Proposal 3: 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 on support of Cat-2 LBT including the definition of Cat-2 LBT. |

### First Round Discussion

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

Summary of Positions based on contribution proposals:

* Alt1: Support Type A multi-channel channel access only
  + Ericsson, Nokia, Qualcomm, Intel, DCM, CATT, Apple, Mediatek, Transsion, Charter
* Alt2: Support both Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access.
  + CAICT, WILUS (reconcile as a use-case of Cat 2 LBT), Huawei/HiSilicon, vivo, Lenovo, LG, ZTE, vivo, Samsung, Convida, NEC, TCL

Proposal 2.8.1-1:

Please provide your view below on Alt 1 or Alt 2 if not captured above:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We support Alt.1, since applying CAT-2 LBT to initiate a COT for a specific CC or CCS may be against the adaptivity mechanism defined by the ETSI BRAN for this band. |
| Xiaomi | Currently we are a little confused, compared to previous agreements “For LBT for multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA, gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each channel bandwidth separately (Alt CA.1. in earlier agreements)” , what is the application scenario for this multi-channel channel access? And what does “channel” mean in “multi-channel”? does the channel means something as “LBT bandwidth”? but we don’t have such definition as LBT bandwidth in 60GHz, if I remember correctly.  Please correct me if I am wrong. Thanks.  Moderator: Previous agreement is how LBT covers the CCs in frequency domain, and we agreed to do one LBT per CC. Now this discussion is more on time domain, i.e., what kind of LBT is performed, CCA or eCCA. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think this issue can be discussed after the use case of Cat 2 LBT is determined. |
| Vivo | We support Alt 2. Cat 2 can be used for Type B multi-channel access |
| Ericsson | We support Alt 1 as correctly captured by the FL. Type B channel access is not allowed by the regulations. |
| Apple | Alt 1 |
| LG Electronics | It seems necessary to first discuss whether Type B multi-channel access is allowed in regulation. |
| Mediatek | We support Alt 1. Type B does not comply with the regulation. |
| NEC | We support Alt 2 by introducing Cat 2 LBT. |
| Transsion | We support Alt 1. |
| Docomo | Alt 1 |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Alt 1. |
| WILUS | We support Alt 2. |
| CATT | Alt.1 |
| TCL | We support Alt. 2. |
| Charter Communications | We support Alt. 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Alt 2.  Type B multi-channel access procedure can be more efficient and simpler to implement than Type A multi-channel access procedure. This is due to the fact that only one eCCA is performed on the ‘primary’ channel using one backoff counter whereas a short one-shot CAT2 LBT is used on all remaining channels as ‘secondary’ channels. Therefore, having both options of supporting Type A and Type B would be beneficial.  Also, Type B is much easier for implementation since it does not suffer from the problem of eCCA in Channel 1 being finished earlier or later than eCCA in a neighbouring Channel 2 which may necessitate some alignment/coordination among eCCAs in different channels.  Our understanding is that 802.11 ad/ay already uses a similar mechanism as in Type B where, secondary channel BWs are integer multiple of the primary channel BW. Therefore, we don’t see why 3GPP should not support such a mechanism. |
| Ericsson 2 | We support Alt 1.  Type B channel access in 5/6 GHz relies on a specific channel bonding scheme with 20 MHz as the nominal channel BW. In the 60 GHz, regime there is no such definition nor a channel bonding scheme. Even if we can agree on such channelization, performing CAT2 LBT to access the secondary channel violates the ETSI BRAN regulations. |
| Xiaomi | Thanks for Moderator’s explanation, we have a clear understanding now. We support Alt 1. |

## Directional LBT

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  3GPP specification consider defining at least the relative relationship between all applicable sensing beam(s) and the transmission beam(s) to define sensing beam for LBT, where at least sensing beam(s) “covers” the transmission beam(s), considering following alternatives. Target down-selection by RAN1 #106bis-e   * Alt 1: Specify necessary requirement/test procedure to guarantee sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam   + Some methods to define “cover” have been discussed in RAN1 (may further down select the list) and are considered as acceptable from RAN1 perspective     - Alt-1A: the angle included in the [3] dB beamwidth of the transmission beam is ncluding in the [X, FFS] dB beamwidth of the sensing beam.     - Alt-1B: the sensing beam gain measured along the direction of peak transmission direction is at least X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain     - Alt-1C: The sensing beam gain is measured in one or more directions where the transmission beam EIRP is within A [FFS] dB of the peak EIRP. The sensing beam gain measured along the chosen directions is at least X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain in those directions.     - Alt-1D: The sensing beam gain is measured in one or more directions where the transmission beam EIRP is within A [FFS] dB of the peak EIRP and the sensing beam gain measured along the chosen directions is at least X [FFS] dB of the peak sensing beam gain     - Alt-1E: Sensing beam has the minimum [3] dB beamwidth which at least contains all beam peak directions of transmission beams.   + Sending LS to RAN4 and inform them the above and request them to make the final choice     - RAN4 choice may not be limited by the list above, but if different method is selected, RAN1 would like to have an opportunity to check as well * Alt 2. Extending the beam correspondence framework and QCL/TCI/SpatialRelationInfo framework to define “cover” and to indicate sensing beam(s) associated with a transmission beam(s)   + On gNB side sensing beam selection for a DL transmission beam,     - Option 1: The selection of eligible sensing beam for a transmission beam is left for gNB implementation       * No testing or enforcement introduced in 3GPP spec for this option     - Option 2: Beam correspondence at gNB side is assumed. Supporting one or more of the following behaviors       * A1. For a gNB transmission beam corresponding to TCI state A for a certain UE, the gNB can use the same beam for sensing       * A2. If TCI B is used as QCL source (Type D) for TCI A for a certain UE, then gNB transmission beam corresponding to TCI B can be used as the sensing beam for transmission with TCI A.       * A3. If TCI C is NOT used as QCL source (Type D) for TCI A for any UE, then gNB cannot use the transmission beam corresponds to TCI C as the sensing beam for transmission with TCI A.       * FFS: How and if to support sensing with a beam without corresponding RS sent? For example, how to use quasi-Omni beam for sensing if there is no SSB transmitted with quasi-omni beam   + On UE side sensing beam selection for a UL transmission beam     - Beam correspondence is assumed at UE       * FFS: What if beam correspondence is not supported at UE.     - Supporting one or more of the following behaviors       * If the UE is indicated to transmit with a beam corresponding to a certain SRI, the UE can use the same beam for sensing       * Assuming Rel.17 unified TCI framework, if the UE is indicated to transmit with a beam corresponding to a certain unified TCI, the UE can use the reception beam corresponding to the TCI for sensing       * FFS: How and if to support a wider sensing beam (such as pseudo-omni beam, which is supported in WiFi) to be used for a narrower transmission beam under QCL/TCI framework         + Option 0: Not supported         + Option 1: UE implementation.   No testing or enforcement introduced in 3GPP spec for this option   * + - * + Option 2: gNB indication.   FFS details.   * + FFS: How and if to support multiple sensing beams to be used for a transmission beam under QCL/TCI framework * Note: Supporting both alternatives or a combination of the two alternatives is not precluded |

Summary of positions so far:

* Alt 1: Huawei, FUTUREWEI, ZTE( No Beam Correspondence), Vivo, Xiaomi, Ericsson , Nokia, Intel, (gNB), Interdigital, Qualcomm (mixed)
* Alt 2: Spreadturm, ZTE ( Beam Correspondence), OPPO, NEC, TCL, Samsung, Intel (UE), DOCOMO, Lenovo, LGE, Convida, Qualcomm (mixed) ,Charter, InterDigital, ITRI. TCL
* ITRI : Do not allow mismatched sensing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Key Proposals/Observations/Positions |
| Huawei HiSilicon | ***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.*** |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 4: Consider cover relation based on Alt-1. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 1: The directional LBT should be supported in 60GHz unlicensed band.  Proposal 2: The relationship between all the LBT beams and the transmission beam should be defined and at least LBT beam “covers” the transmission beam.  Proposal 3: The beam correspondence framework or QCL/TCI framework can be extended to define “cover”. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Proposal 7: If directional LBT is supported, it is necessary to further define the relationship between sensing/receiving beam(s) and transmission beam(s) and at least one of the following methods can be considered :  l If Alt1 is supported, it is recommended that RAN1 can further discuss all potential candidate alternatives and try to down-select in order to reduce RAN4’s workload.  L If Alt2 is supported,  - For gNB side, Option 1 that “The selection of eligible sensing beam for a transmission beam is left for gNB implementation” can be considered in order to provide more flexibility to gNB.  - For UE side,  ü if beam correspondence is supported, SpatialRelationInfo or Rel-17 unified TCI framework can be used for defining the relationship between transmission beam and sensing/receiving beam. Wherein, which method will be used depends on UE capability.  Ü If beam correspondence is not supported, Alt 1 can be considered for determining the relationship between transmission beam and sensing/receiving beam. |
| Vivo | **Proposal 3: The transmission burst is a set of transmissions from gNB/UE from one or more transmission beams which are “covered” by a sensing beam without any gaps greater than [16us].**  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 [X] dB beam width of the sensing beam.  Proposal 13: Adopt the modified scheme 2. |
| OPPO | Proposal 7: consider using QCL/TCI framework to define ‘cover’. |
| NEC | **Proposal 1: The energy detection threshold adaptation for beam based channel access procedure should take into account the beamforming gain and mapping between transmission beam(s) and sensing beam(s).**  **Proposal 2: Conditioned on directional LBT introduced with details in spec, extending the beam correspondence framework and QCL/TCI framework should be supported to define “cover” and to indicate sensing beam(s) associated with a transmission beam(s).** |
| TCL Communications | **Proposal 1: To have a unified frame framework with existing QCL/TCI and reduce the standardization work, we support Alt.2 to decide the relative relationship between all applicable sensing beam(s) and the transmission beam(s).**  Proposal 2: The relative relationship of the sensing beam(s) and the transmission beam(s) on the gNB side is provided to UE to configure ED threshold(s) for uplink-to-downlink COT sharing. |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 3: Both Omni-directional LBT and directional LBT should be supported.**  **Proposal 4: Support Alt 1 is to define the relationship between sensing beam(s) and the transmission beam(s).** |
| Ericsson | Observation 3 Reference point regarding which RSSI value (before or after antenna beamforming gain) is compared with the EDT to determine channel idle/busy needs to be clarified  Observation 8 Common understanding in ETSI and IEEE 802.11ad and IEEE 802.11ay specs are omni-directional LBT or quasi-omnidirectional LBT  Observation 9 Simulation studies in general indicate no significant gain from using directional LBT.  Observation 10 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 11 Notion of “beams” for sensing/LBT is non-existent in 37.213.  Observation 12 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 9 Support omni-directional LBT or quasi-omni-directional LBT as the baseline LBT procedure for 60 GHz band.  Proposal 10 Do not support Alt.2 on extending the beam correspondence framework and/or QCL/TCI framework to define “cover”.  Proposal 11 For the relationship between sensing and transmission beams, support Alt1 and send an LS to RAN4 to specify the necessary test/requirements |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Observation 7: Generic requirements for relative relationship between LBT sensing beam(s) and transmission beam(s) should be done in RAN4, not in RAN1.  Proposal 13: Alt 1 from RAN1#106-e is agreed for defining the relative relationship between applicable LBT sensing beam(s) and the transmission beam(s). |
| Samsung | **Proposal 8:**  **• Support extending the beam correspondence framework and/or QCL/TCI framework to define “cover” (Alt 2), option.2;**  **• Support option 2 gNB indication in the sense of broad sensing beam can be implicitly indicated by reusing the set of DL RS signals which are used as QCL-D sources for the covered UL narrow transmission beams.** |
| Intel Corporation | **Proposal 19: Take Alt 2, “extending the beam correspondence framework and QCL, TCI, SpatialRelationInfo framework to define “cover” and to indicate sensing beam(s) associated with a transmission beam(s)” as baseline for further discussion and standards development.**  **Proposal 20: Support option 1, “The selection of eligible sensing beam for a transmission beam is left for gNB implementation”, for gNB side of alternative 2.**   |  | | --- | | **Proposal 21: Beam correspondence mandatory capability signaling is set to 1 for all supported unlicensed bands in FR2-2.** |   **Proposal 22: Support option 1, up to UE implementation on how to support wide sensing beaming using QCL/TCI framework, for UE side of alternative 2.**  **Proposal 23: RAN1 should extend the QCI or Spatial Relation Info framework to define and indicate the sensing beam associated with a transmission beam.** |
| NTT DOCOMO INC. | **Proposal 4: Support Alt 2 for the definition of relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam** |
| Sony | |  | | --- | | Proposal 5: Directional LBT should be supported in 60 GHz unlicensed operation. | |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | ***Proposal 1: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, Alt 2 should be supported as: • Alt 2. Extending the beam correspondence framework and QCL/TCI/SpatialRelationInfo framework to define “cover” and to indicate sensing beam(s) associated with a transmission beam(s) o On gNB side sensing beam selection for a DL transmission beam,  § Option 1: The selection of eligible sensing beam for a transmission beam is left for gNB implementation • No testing or enforcement introduced in 3GPP spec for this option  § Option 2: Beam correspondence at gNB side is assumed. Supporting one or more of the following behaviors • A1. For a gNB transmission beam corresponding to TCI state A for a certain UE, the gNB can use the same beam for sensing  • A2. If TCI B is used as QCL source (Type D) for TCI A for a certain UE, then gNB transmission beam corresponding to TCI B can be used as the sensing beam for transmission with TCI A.  • A3. If TCI C is NOT used as QCL source (Type D) for TCI A for any UE, then gNB cannot use the transmission beam corresponds to TCI C as the sensing beam for transmission with TCI A.  • FFS: How and if to support sensing with a beam without corresponding RS sent? For example, how to use quasi-Omni beam for sensing if there is no SSB transmitted with quasi-omni beam o On UE side sensing beam selection for a UL transmission beam § Beam correspondence is assumed at UE • FFS: What if beam correspondence is not supported at UE. § Supporting one or more of the following behaviors • If the UE is indicated to transmit with a beam corresponding to a certain SRI, the UE can use the same beam for sensing • Assuming Rel.17 unified TCI framework, if the UE is indicated to transmit with a beam corresponding to a certain unified TCI, the UE can use the reception beam corresponding to the TCI for sensing • FFS: How and if to support a wider sensing beam (such as pseudo-omni beam, which is supported in WiFi) to be used for a narrower transmission beam under QCL/TCI framework o Option 0: Not supported o Option 1: UE implementation.  § No testing or enforcement introduced in 3GPP spec for this option  o Option 2: gNB indication.  § FFS details. o FFS: How and if to support a multiple sensing beams to be used for a transmission beam under QCL/TCI framework*** |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | ***Proposal 2: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, Alt 2 should be supported for both UE side and gNB side.***  ***Proposal 3: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, with Alt 2, all the listed behaviors for UE side sensing beam selection should be supported.***  ***Proposal 4: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, with Alt 2, UE reporting can be enhanced such that UE can report sensing beams corresponding to the UL transmission beams (or activated TCI states or SRI for UL transmission)***  ***gNB can then indicate sensing beams to UE corresponding to the indicate UL transmission beam***  ***Proposal 5: 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 6: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, the relationship between the sensing and transmission beams can be configured based on the TCI framework 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 7: 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***  ***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*** |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 1: Support sensing beam determination using Alt.1 (at least for multiple associated transmission beams) and Alt.2 (for single associated transmission beam). |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 3: Directional receiver assistance is supported. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #8: 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 #9: 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 #10: For the directional LBT, support Alt 2 that extends the beam correspondence framework and QCL/TCI/SpatialRelationInfo framework to define “cover” and to indicate sensing beam(s) associated with a transmission beam(s).  Proposal #11: On gNB side sensing beam selection for a DL transmission beam, support Option 1 (the selection of eligible sensing beam for a transmission beam is left for gNB implementation).  Proposal #12: For the FFS point regarding how and if to support a wider sensing beam (such as pseudo-omni beam, which is supported in WiFi) to be used for a narrower transmission beam under QCL/TCI framework, Option 2 should be supported.  Proposal #18: To reduce the probability of collision, the contention window adjustment (CWS) procedure similar to Rel-16 NR-U can be adopted, and it is also necessary to discuss the relationship of the CWS and back-off counter values between wide beam LBT and independent per-beam LBT for multi-beam COT. |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 3: If beam correspondence is assumed, sensing beam may be determined from transmission beam corresponding to a certain TCI state for frequency range of 52.6GHz to 71GHz. |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 4: If beam correspondence is not assumed, sensing beam may be determined from a certain dB beamwidth for frequency range of 52.6GHz to 71GHz. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 21: If Alt 1 is chosen, Support Alt -1-D namely the sensing beam gain is measured in one or more directions where the transmission beam EIRP is within A [FFS] dB of the peak EIRP and the sensing beam gain measured along the chosen directions is at least X [FFS] dB of the peak sensing beam gain.  Proposal 22: Alt-1-D Alternative formulation: The sensing beam gain is measured in one or more directions where the transmission beam EIRP is within A [FFS] dB of the peak EIRP and the sensing beam gain measured along the chosen directions is at least X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain in those directions.  Proposal 23: If Alt -2 is chosen, adopt gNB behaviors A1 and A2 for sensing at gNB.  Proposal 24: If Alt -2 is chosen, and UE has beam correspondence and if the UE is indicated to transmit with a beam corresponding to a certain SRI, the UE can use the same beam for sensing.  Proposal 25: If Alt -2 is chosen, and UE has beam correspondence, assuming Rel.17 unified TCI framework, if the UE is indicated to transmit with a beam corresponding to a certain unified TCI, the UE can use the reception beam corresponding to the TCI for sensing.  Proposal 26: Adopt Alt 2 behaviors in the known-beam situations i.e. cases where sensing beam and transmission beams can be connected by TCI/QCL/beam correspondence relationship for the UE, and the behaviors A1, A2 hold for gNB in Alt -2 . In other situations specify requirement/test procedure to guarantee sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam, via RAN4. |
| ITRI | Proposal 1: In order to avoid resource wastage and hidden node problem, the LBT beam should be the same as the transmission beam. |
| Charter Communications | Proposal 3: Support Alt. 2 for sensing beam framework. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### First Round Discussion

Please provide your views below on the compromise option.

Discussion 2.9.1-1: (closed)

If beam correspondence at gNB side is assumed. Support the following two behaviors on gNB side

* A1. For a gNB transmission beam corresponding to TCI state A for a certain UE, the gNB can use the same beam for sensing
* A2. If TCI B is used as QCL source (Type D) for TCI A for a certain UE, then gNB transmission beam corresponding to TCI B can be used as the sensing beam for transmission with TCI A.

Support: Lenovo (A2), InterDigital, HW,

Not support (leave for gNB implementation): Intel, Xiaomi, ZTE, Ericsson, Apple, LGE, NEC, Transsion, Futurewei, TCL, Oppo, DCM, Nokia, CATT, Sony

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | For gNB, our view is that the relationship between the sensing and transmit beam could be left up to implementation and there is no need to define any behaviour. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support A2 |
| Xiaomi | Agree with Intel that DL behaviour is left to gNB implementation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For gNB side, we tend to leave the selection of eligible sensing beam for a transmission beam for the implementation from the flexibility point of view. |
| Ericsson | For gNBs, there is no beam correspondence requirement, nor will it be tested. Therefore, in our view, beam correspondence at gNB side should not be assumed for the purpose of directional LBT. |
| Apple | gNB sensing beam is up to gNB implementation. |
| LG Electronics | We share the same view with Intel. The selection of eligible sensing beam for a transmission beam can be left for gNB implementation |
| InterDigital | We support the two behaviors. |
| NEC | We share the similar view with Intel to leave for gNB implementation. |
| Transsion | We share the similar view with Intel and Ericsson. gNB sensing beam should be left to gNB implementation. |
| Futurewei | We share Ericsson’s views. |
| OPPO | The gNB sensing beam can be left to gNB implementation. |
| Docomo | We share Intel’s view. |
| Nokia, NSB | We agree with Intel, Ericsson, and others that the gNB sensing beam can be left for implementation / RAN4 as covered by discussion under 2.9.1-3. |
| CATT | We share same view as Intel and others. The selection of eligible sensing beam for a transmission beam could be left for gNB implementation. |
| TCL | We donot support these proposals. |
| Sony | We do not support. We share the similar view with Intel. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the behaviors for gNB.  We think that the fact that beam correspondence at the gNB has not been defined in Rel-15/16 does not justify to leave the choice of LBT beam at the gNB entirely to the gNB implementation. Otherwise, gNB can always direct its beam towards a direction that knows is without any interference (based on some apriori information) and acquire the channel.  If agreeing on the support of beam correspondence at the gNB side is not possible, then we prefer to define LBT beam at the gNB based on Alt1 (our preference: Alt 1-E) for both cases that one LBT beam corresponds (or covers) one Tx beam (one-to-one mapping) and the case that one LBT beam corresponds (or covers) multiple Tx beams (one-to-multiple mapping). |

Discussion 2.9.1-2: (closed)

When UE has beam correspondence, support the following behaviors

* If the UE is indicated to transmit with a beam corresponding to a certain SRI, the UE can use the same beam for sensing
* Assuming Rel.17 unified TCI framework, if the UE is indicated to transmit with a beam corresponding to a certain unified TCI, the UE can use the reception beam corresponding to the TCI for sensing
* Note: This discussion is focused on single transmission beam. After we have better understanding for this case, we can further discuss how to extend to multiple beam case
* Note: This discussion is focused on the case of using the same beam for transmission and sensing. Using wider sensing beam for transmission is discussed in 2.9.1-3

Support: Intel, Lenovo, Xiaomi, ITRI, vivo, Apple, LGE, InterDigital, NEC, Transsion, TCL, Oppo, DCM, Nokia (need confirmation from RAN4), CATT, Sony, Samsung, HW, Convida

Not support: Ericsson,

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We support the above behaviour. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are generally fine with the listed behaviours.  However, we think that additional behaviour to indicate multiple sensing beams corresponding to a single transmission beam should also be considered for increased possibility of LBT success.  Also, we suggest discussing the behaviour/details when UE has not beam correspondence. In our contribution [R1-2109902], we provide details on them |
| Xiaomi | Support in principle. But I think an important case is missed in the Proposal, that is how to egula a sensing beam that is wider than the transmission beam. And we are open to discuss this issue.  Moderator: The sensing beam wider than transmission beam is to be covered by Discussion 2.9.1-3 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | It is necessary to clarify which cases the above listed method are applied in, e.g., one-to-one, one-to-many and many-to-one “covers” relationship between sensing beam and transmission.  Moderator: Intend to discuss single beam first |
| vivo | We support this behaviour. |
| Ericsson | We do not support this behaviour. The current beam correspondence testing requirement in RAN4 is very loose. Moreover, beam correspondence test in 3GPP is to compare two UL transmissions beams (to make sure that the UL transmission beam derived based on the corresponding DL transmission beam is good enough compared to the UL transmission beam derived based on beam sweeping). Thus, it could result in scenarios that sensing beam based on beam correspondence requirement is not well aligned or sufficiently “cover” the transmission beam. Therefore, it is not guaranteed that a device using directional LBT based on beam correspondence framework could pass the ETSI egulator test. Omni LBT or quasi-omni LBT would be a safer option on this aspect. |
| Apple | Support this behaviour. |
| LG Electronics | We can support the above behaviours. Regarding support a wider sensing beam (such as pseudo-omni beam, which is supported in WiFi) to be used for a narrower transmission beam under QCL/TCI framework, Option 2 (i.e., gNB indication) should be supported. To be specific, for an indication of sensing beam for PUSCH (including CG-PUSCH) and PUCCH, the information about the sensing beam can be jointly encoded or separately indicated together with SRI or TCI indication for the transmission beam in the DCI (activation DCI for CG-PUSCH). For a sensing beam for SRS, the sensing beam can be configured to each SRS resource set/group or each SRS resource together with the configuration of QCL assumption for SRS resource.  Moderator: My problem with gNB indication of a wider beam is, as far as I know, gNB has no information on the relative width of UE side beams. Seems to me it is hard for gNB to pick a wider sensing beam. |
| InterDigital | We support the above behaviors. |
| NEC | We support the above behavior. |
| Transsion | We support the above behaviors. |
| ITRI | We support the above behaviors. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (2) | As mentioned earlier, the above behavior is valid for the case when beam correspondence is assumed at the UE.  WE also need to consider when beam correspondence cannot be assumed.  And also, we agree with LG’s view on supporting gNB indication for indicating wider sensing beams a swell. |
| OPPO | We support the above behaviors. |
| Docomo | We support the behavior above. |
| Nokia, NSB | While the high-level approach seems acceptable, RAN4 should have the final say on this. It is presently unclear if test validating the operation as above are feasible. Therefore, before agreeing to this, this option should be included into the RAN4 LS discussed below. |
| CATT | We support the behavior above. |
| ITRI | We support the above behaviors. |
| Sony | We support the above behaivors. |
| Samsung | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the listed behaviors.  Our understanding is that Beam Correspondence is Mandatory in FR2. However, depending on the value of *beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping*={0,1}, this beam correspondence may or may not need to be achieved using beam sweeping. |
| Convida Wireless | We support the above behaviours. |

Discussion 2.9.1-3: (closed)

For situations not covered by Discussion 2.9.1-1 and 2.9.1-2, Specify necessary requirement/test procedure to guarantee sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam

* Some methods to define “cover” have been discussed in RAN1 (may further down select the list) and are considered as acceptable from RAN1 perspective
  + Alt-1A: the angle included in the [3] dB beamwidth of the transmission beam is included in the [X, FFS] dB beamwidth of the sensing beam.
  + Alt-1B: the sensing beam gain measured along the direction of peak transmission direction is at least X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain
  + Alt-1C: The sensing beam gain is measured in one or more directions where the transmission beam EIRP is within A [FFS] dB of the peak EIRP. The sensing beam gain measured along the chosen directions is at least X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain in those directions.
  + Alt-1D: The sensing beam gain is measured in one or more directions where the transmission beam EIRP is within A [FFS] dB of the peak EIRP and the sensing beam gain measured along the chosen directions is at least X [FFS] dB of the peak sensing beam gain
  + Alt-1E: Sensing beam has the minimum [3] dB beamwidth which at least contains all beam peak directions of transmission beams.
* Sending LS to RAN4 and inform them the above and request them to make the final choice
  + RAN4 choice may not be limited by the list above, but if different method is selected, RAN1 would like to have an opportunity to check as well
* Note: Please provide your view for this discussion on gNB side and UE side separately

Support: Lenovo, Xiaomi, ZTE, vivo (Alt-1A), Ericsson, Apple, InterDigital, Transsion, Futurewei (gNB, UE w/o BC), TCL, Nokia, CATT, TCL, Sony, HW

Not support: Intel, LGE, DCM (BC mandatory at UE)

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We do not see any purpose for discussion 2-9.1-3, since we believe that one-to-many mapping between the sensing and transmit beam is only applicable to gNB, and in this case it is preferable to leave the whole procedure up to gNB’s implementation.  Moderator: How about UE side? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine to send LS to RAN4 |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support this proposal, it is helpful to handle the case that Beam correspondence is not supported. |
| Vivo | We support in principle and prefer Alt 1A. |
| Ericsson | We support this proposal in principle and agree to send LS to RAN 4. |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal |
| LG Electronics | The relative relationship between all applicable sensing beams and the transmission beam can be defined in RAN1 by using the beam correspondence and the QCL/TCI framework in RAN1 without RAN4 involvement. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal |
| Transsion | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We support this proposal in all cases for gNB, and at-least for UEs that do not support tight beam correspondence (i.e., do not support beam correspondence without UL beam sweeping).  Further, to emphasize that this proposal applies to one-to-many scenario as well, we would like to include original line in the agreement:  “3GPP specification consider defining at least the relative relationship between all applicable sensing beam(s) and the transmission beam(s) to define sensing beam for LBT, where at least sensing beam(s) “covers” the transmission beam(s).” |
| Docomo | For gNB, as we prefer to leave it up to implementation, we do not see the need of this proposal.  For UE side, as we understand that beam correspondence is mandatory UE feature, we do not see the need of this proposal either. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support this proposal, assuming that Discussion 2-9.1-1/2 is also taken into account. |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |
| TCL | We support the proposal.  For gNB side, we prefer the values of X is decided by gNB, since it has a view of the cell. The UE is under the control of gNB on these values. |
| Sony | We support the proposal |
| Samsung | Thanks for the FL’s proposals for discussion. We realized many companies (e.g., LG, Lenovo, DOCOMO, NEC,TCL, Samsung) are also proposing the Alt.2 on defining the “covering” relation between one sensing beam and multiple transmission beams which is NOT captured in the FL’s current proposals for discussion. Therefore, we suggest to add a proposal on this aspect. Also, in fact, this aspect has already been captured in the agreement of RAN1-106e, we think it should be kept in the FL’s proposals for discussions in this meeting.  For example, the following proposal reusing part of last meeting’s agreement can be considered:  =================================================================  When UE has beam correspondence, support the following behaviours:  If UE side selects the sensing beam for “covering” multiple UL transmission beams, how and if to support a wider sensing beam to be used for a narrower transmission beam under QCL/TCI framework   * + - * + Option 0: Not supported         + Option 1: UE implementation.   No testing or enforcement introduced in 3GPP spec for this option   * + - * + Option 2: gNB indication.   FFS details  Moderator: The intention is to discuss single TX beam first. If we have agreement, I believe it can be easily extended to multiple TX beams |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal but we prefer to down-select among alternatives Alt-1A to Alt1-E (our preference is Alt1-E which seems to be the simplest) before sending an LS to RAN4.  In our view, Alt1 is applicable when one LBT used to acquire the channel access for multiple Tx beams and, in principle, is applicable for both gNB and UE. |
| Intel | @FL Our understanding is that one-to-many mapping is only applicable if multi-TRP is supported. Given that there are many other details involved, at this point we feel that support of this could be placed on hold. |

Seems that the proposal in 2.9.1-1 does not receive enough support.

Discussion 2.9.1-4: (moved to 2nd round)

Please provide your view to the following alternatives for sensing beam selection on the gNB side

* Alt A. Leave to gNB implement. There is neither RAN1 requirement nor RAN4 requirement
  + Question: How does this alternative satisfy the previous agreement on “3GPP specification consider defining at least the relative relationship between all applicable sensing beam(s) and the transmission beam(s) to define sensing beam for LBT, where at least sensing beam(s) “covers” the transmission beam(s)”?
* Alt B. Alt 1 in earlier agreement (RAN4 requirement based)

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We are OK with Alt.A |
| Futurewei | Support Alt B (Alt 1 in earlier agreement) |
| LG Electronics | We support Alt A. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As a compromise, we think at least Alt B. (Alt 1 in earlier agreement) should be supported if supporting Alt 2 (beam correspondence at the gNB side) is not agreeable |
| vivo | We support alt B |

Proposal 2.9.1-5: (closed)

When UE has beam correspondence [with capability beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping ={1}], support the following behaviors

* If the UE is indicated to transmit with a beam corresponding to a certain SRI, the UE can use the same beam for sensing
* Assuming Rel.17 unified TCI framework, if the UE is indicated to transmit with a beam corresponding to a certain unified TCI, the UE can use the reception beam corresponding to the TCI for sensing

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We are Ok with the proposal |
| Futurewei | We are OK to support this in principal for UE which has capability beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping ={1}. We would prefer RAN4 confirmation on this.  Question to moderator: UE which has beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping={0} can only be relied to autonomously generate a sensing beam for an indicated TX beam that is aligned up-to a tolerance which may not be tight enough. Are such UE situations covered under Proposal 2.9.1-6? That would be our preference |
| LG Electronics | We support Proposal 2.9.1-5. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| vivo | We support the proposal |

Agreement:

* When UE indicates a capability for beam correspondence with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping ={1}, support the following behaviors
* If the UE is indicated to transmit with a beam corresponding to a certain SRI, the UE can use the same beam for sensing
* Assuming Rel.17 unified TCI framework, if the UE is indicated to transmit with a beam corresponding to a certain unified TCI, the UE can use the reception beam corresponding to the TCI for sensing
* FFS: The case when UE does not indicate a capability for beam correspondence
* Note: The UE should meet local regulatory requirements

Proposal 2.9.1-6: (closed and continue discussion in 2nd round)

On UE side, at least for single TX beam case, for situations not covered by proposal 2.9.1-5, adopt Alt 1 in earlier agreement (RAN4 requirement based) to define “cover” (repeated below for reference)

Specify necessary requirement/test procedure to guarantee sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam

* Some methods to define “cover” have been discussed in RAN1 (may further down select the list) and are considered as acceptable from RAN1 perspective
  + Alt-1A: the angle included in the [3] dB beamwidth of the transmission beam is included in the [X, FFS] dB beamwidth of the sensing beam.
  + Alt-1B: the sensing beam gain measured along the direction of peak transmission direction is at least X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain
  + Alt-1C: The sensing beam gain is measured in one or more directions where the transmission beam EIRP is within A [FFS] dB of the peak EIRP. The sensing beam gain measured along the chosen directions is at least X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain in those directions.
  + Alt-1D: The sensing beam gain is measured in one or more directions where the transmission beam EIRP is within A [FFS] dB of the peak EIRP and the sensing beam gain measured along the chosen directions is at least X [FFS] dB of the peak sensing beam gain
  + Alt-1E: Sensing beam has the minimum [3] dB beamwidth which at least contains all beam peak directions of transmission beams.
* Sending LS to RAN4 and inform them the above and request them to make the final choice
  + RAN4 choice may not be limited by the list above, but if different method is selected, RAN1 would like to have an opportunity to check as well

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | As clarified above, we do not think this is needed. Our understanding, as explained above, is that one-to-many mapping at the UE is only applicable if multi-TRP is supported, and we are not ready at this point to make this agreement, while many details in this matter have not been discussed. |
| Futurewei | Support (our preference is Alt-1C and Alt-1D) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We can support the proposal without the restriction for “(for single TX beam)”. UE may have more than one Tx beam corresponding to more than one SRI. |
| vivo | Support the proposal and prefer Alt 1A |

### Second Round Discussion

Discussion 2.9.2-1

Please provide your view to the following alternatives for sensing beam selection on the gNB side

* Alt A. Leave to gNB implement. There is neither RAN1 requirement nor RAN4 requirement
  + Question: How does this alternative satisfy the previous agreement on “3GPP specification consider defining at least the relative relationship between all applicable sensing beam(s) and the transmission beam(s) to define sensing beam for LBT, where at least sensing beam(s) “covers” the transmission beam(s)”?
* Alt B. Alt 1 in earlier agreement (RAN4 requirement based)
  + Further modify the Alt 1 in earlier agreement to clarify that, RAN4 can further decide for gNB if such test is not needed or not practical and leave it for gNB implementation

Moderator: For proponents of Alt A, please note the question above.

Moderator: From the discussion, we have small majority on the Alt B. There are many companies supporting Alt. A. However, since Alt A involves reverting one earlier agreement, the moderator would recommend to go with Alt B while add the clarification above so RAN4 can make the decision if any requirements is needed

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We are OK with Alt.A |
| Futurewei | Support Alt B (Alt 1 in earlier agreement) |
| LG Electronics | We support Alt A. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As a compromise, we think at least Alt B. (Alt 1 in earlier agreement) should be supported if supporting Alt 2 (beam correspondence at the gNB side) is not agreeable |
| vivo | We support alt B |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Alt.A. On how to meet the previous agreement, we understand we can regard it as valid only for UE side.  Moderator: You mean reinterpret the previous agreement to it only applies to UE side? |
| Ericsson | We proposed to support this entire feature (directional LBT) by leaving it to implementation for both gNBs and UEs since the beginning of this discussion. However, other companies wanted to add this requirement for all devices with the motivation to introduce relationship between sensing and transmission beams (cover question in Alt A)as there was concern that without this relationship the transmitter could sense in a direction which is different from the transmit direction resulting in coexistence issues.   Therefore, as a compromise we supported Alt 1 and wanted to involve RAN4, assuming gNBs would also need to meet this “cover” requirement. That said, in the online meeting it was agreed for UEs to use beam correspondence to achieve relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam, even though beam correspondence requirement also does not necessarily satisfy the “cover” requirement in our opinion.  If Alt A is agreed, there is no need to specify anything in RAN1 or RAN4 as correctly pointed out by the FL.  If Alt B is agreed, RAN4 needs to be involved sooner as we do not know how or where the requirements for gNB would be captured.  Therefore, for the sake of progress with limited time in this WI, **we support Alt A.** |
| InterDigital | We support Alt B. |
| TCL | We agree with InterDigital. |
| Nokia | We see that it would be good to at least check with RAN4, if they see definition of a requirement as necessary. As for the requirement itself, RAN4 may also be in the best position to decide on it, and RAN1 does not need to be very specific about the alternatives. |
| CATT | Alt A is our preferred. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | To moderator:  Yes, we tend to reinterpret the previous agreement and limit it only applied for UE side  Moderator: I believe reinterpret an earlier agreement needs a new agreement and it might be difficult to reach in RAN1. How about we modify Alt 1 and add a clarification that in RAN4, they can further decide for gNB and UE separately if such test is not needed or not practical and leave it for gNB or UE implementation? Please see the updated proposal above. |
| NEC | We support Alt B. |
| Samsung | We support Alt B. At least some RAN4 impact is expected to support such feature. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Alt B and don’t see why the additional note is required. Alt 1 already left the final decision to RAN4:   * Sending LS to RAN4 and inform them the above and request them to make the final choice   + RAN4 choice may not be limited by the list above, but if different method is selected, RAN1 would like to have an opportunity to check as well   Our understanding is that it is always up to RAN4 to decide if it is necessary to design a performance requirement test. If a test is not designed, the feature will be based on implementation anyway. RAN4 does not need RAN1 green light for not designing a requirement test. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Thanks moderator for the response.  The updated Alt B is acceptable for us. |
| Mediatek | We support Alt B. |
| Ericsson 2 | **Response to Moderator:**  We do not think that the previous agreement needs to be reverted nor a new agreement needs to be made. The previous agreement only mentions “considers defining”, so regarding gNBs we can consider not to define. Regarding UEs, we already made an agreement this meeting.  **A clarification question:** Currently there are no requirements nor notions of beams for gNB in RAN4. If Alt B is agreed, where will it get specified? How will this get embodied in the RAN1 spec? |

The following proposal is where we stopped in online discussion

Proposal 2.9.2-2

For situations where UE does not indicate a capability for beam correspondence with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping ={1}, or UE ~~chooses to~~ uses a different beam for sensing than the beam used for transmission, specify necessary requirement/test procedure to guarantee sensing beam(s) “covers” the transmission beam(s)

* Some methods to define “cover” have been discussed in RAN1 (may further down select the list) and are considered as acceptable from RAN1 perspective
  + Alt-1A: the angle included in the [3] dB beamwidth of the transmission beam is included in the [X, FFS] dB beamwidth of the sensing beam.
  + Alt-1B: the sensing beam gain measured along the direction of peak transmission direction is at least X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain
  + Alt-1C: The sensing beam gain is measured in one or more directions where the transmission beam EIRP is within A [FFS] dB of the peak EIRP. The sensing beam gain measured along the chosen directions is at least X [FFS] dB of the transmission beam gain in those directions.
  + Alt-1D: The sensing beam gain is measured in one or more directions where the transmission beam EIRP is within A [FFS] dB of the peak EIRP and the sensing beam gain measured along the chosen directions is at least X [FFS] dB of the peak sensing beam gain
  + Alt-1E: Sensing beam has the minimum [3] dB beamwidth which at least contains all beam peak directions of transmission beams.
* Sending LS to RAN4 and inform them the above and request them to make the final choice
  + RAN4 choice may not be limited by the list above, but if different method is selected, RAN1 would like to have an opportunity to check as well
* Note: This does not preclude discussion of other alternatives

Moderator: Further modify the Alt 1 in earlier agreement to clarify that, RAN4 can further decide for UE if such test is not needed or not practical and leave it for UE implementation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal from the online session. |
| LG Electronics | We have a different understanding for beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping capability. It is a mandatory feature for a UE in FR2-1, and there are two types of UE where one is satisfying BC with beam sweeping and the other is satisfying BC without beam sweeping. It means that a UE with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping = {0} should satisfy the beam correspondence requirements by the UL beam management procedure.   1. UE#1 with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping = {1} 2. UE#2 with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping = {0} after UL beam management procedure 3. UE#3 with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping = {0} before UL beam management procedure   In other words, UE#1 and UE#2 should satisfy the beam correspondence requirements while UE#3 needs to satisfy relaxed beam correspondence requirements, according to RAN4 specification. In that sense, at least UE#1 and UE#2 should be able to apply the agreement made in online discussion and further discussion is needed for how to handle UE#3. In our opinion, for UE#3, we can also apply the agreement made in online discussion but if a special handling for UE#3 is needed, we can consider ED threshold adjustment (e.g., 3 dB penalty for UE#3), without RAN4 involvement on this issue.  Moderator: I think the difference between beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping = {0} and {1} is, for {1} UEs, the same phaser coefficient for RX and TX will lead to the same antenna pattern, but for {0} UEs, the same phase coefficients for RX and TX cannot lead to the same antenna patter. Then for {0} UEs, a beam sweeping is needed to identify the UL beam that will be able to be used to transmit to pair with DL beam for reception. However, this is just for closing the link purpose. The concern is, by finding the UL beam that can be paired with DL beam for {0} UEs does not mean the DL RX beam “covers” the UL transmission beam |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We tend to agree with LG and also the proposal from Intel during the online session to explicitly agree that beam correspondence is mandatory in FR2-2. If this can be agreed then the above proposal is not needed  Moderator: The proposal is not only limited to the case with BC. This applies also to using wider beam to sense for a narrow beam transmission. So the discussion will not go away even if we mandate BC. Additionally, I don’t think we can mandate all UE to have full BC {1}. We cannot rule out the partial BC {0}. |
| DOCOMO | We are ok with agreeing that beam correspondence is mandatory (which means beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping shall always be 1 in our understanding) in FR2-2. In this case, we do not see the need of this proposal. Otherwise, we are ok with the proposal.  Moderator: Please see explanation above |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We also agree with LG, if this mandatory feature in FR2-1 can be directly reused in FR2-2, we think the current proposal will not be needed. Otherwise, the current proposal is needed and a minor change is needed as follows:  For situations where UE does not indicate a capability for beam correspondence with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping ={1}, or UE chooses to use a different beam for sensing than the beam used for transmission, specify necessary requirement/test procedure to guarantee sensing beam(s) “covers” the transmission beam(s)  The above modification is to reflect all relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam: one-to-one, many-to-one, and one-to-many. Further, It is also conducive to clearly notifying RAN1 requirements to RAN4.  Moderator: Please see the reply to LG. The “(s)” is captured |
| OPPO | We agree with LG’s view that beam correspondence is a mandatory feature in FR2. Therefore, for the UE does not indicate a capability for beam correspondence with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping ={1}, it can still apply Alt 2 for sensing beam selection. On the other hand, considering the beam correspondence may be weak now, the UE can also choose Alt 1 to determine sensing beam.  Moderator: Please see the reply to LG |
| Ericsson | We proposed to leave this entire feature (directional LBT) to implementation for both gNBs and UEs since the beginning of this discussion. However, other companies wanted to add this requirement for all devices with the motivation to introduce relationship between sensing and transmission beams (cover)as there was concern that without this relationship the transmitter could sense in a direction which is different from the transmit direction resulting in coexistence issues.  Therefore, as a compromise we supported Alt 1 and wanted to involve RAN4. However, in the online meeting it was agreed for UEs to use beam correspondence to achieve relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam, even though beam correspondence requirement does not necessarily define “cover”. We have already highlighted the issues with beam correspondence requirement being loose and rudimentary in RAN4 and the possibility that the “cover” requirement may not be met.  **As a compromise we can agree to not specify the above for UEs that do not support indicating capability of beam correspondence if we can capture in one of the agreements that UEs can also use different beams for sensing such as omni/quasi-omni sensing beam.**  This also reduces specification effort in RAN4.  Additionally, we can also support Intel’s proposal to make beam correspondence without UL Beam sweeping a mandatory feature for all devices in FR 2-2. |
| Intel | We agree with LG, and as mentioned during the GTW we believe that the beam correspondence should be mandatory in FR2-2.  Moderator: If we cannot mandate BC {1} for FR2-1, I don’t think we should mandate it for FR2-2. But I will let other companies comment as well. |
| Apple | The main bullet request RAN4 to specific related requirement. It is only up to RAN4 to choose how to specify the requirement. It should be up to RAN4 decision whether and how to specify requirement or not.  The “cover” aspect is in regulation requirement and test cases. Sometimes RAN4 may not repeat the regulation test, for example, RAN4 has no MPE requirement test for FR2, where MPE isonly tested by regulation.  It also only says “UE can choose” wider beam. Can gNB request UE to perform omni/quasi-omni sensing?  Moderator: I can change “choose” to “use”. It is still to be discussed if gNB indicates which beam to use or UE makes the decision itself. |
| TCL | We think the decision from RAN4 is more import. We shall make conclusion later after RAN4 response. |
| CATT | We generally ok with the proposal. At least, for the case where the sensing beam is not same as transmission beam, the necessary requirement/test procedure is needed. |
| Futurewei | We support this proposal. Our understanding of beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping is aligned with FL’s reply to LG. |
| vivo | We support the proposal and agree with the FL’s reply to LG. For UEs with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping = {0} , the Tx beam and Rx beam are not really “covered” by each other. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Proposal 2.9.2-2 |
| LG Electronics | Response to Moderator: Thanks for sharing your understanding.   1. UE#1 with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping = {1} 2. UE#2 with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping = {0} after UL beam management procedure 3. UE#3 with beamCorrespondenceWithoutUL-BeamSweeping = {0} before UL beam management procedure   However, we think that the beam correspondence capability should be considered from the RAN4 requirement (defined in 38.101) perspective since how UE is implanted depends on the implementation.  There's no reason to discriminate between the UE#1 with BC={1} and the UE#2 with BC={0} after the beam management procedure because the same requirement should be met to both UEs. In addition, the same principle with UE#1/2 can be applied as well to UE#3 “with BC={0} and before the beam management procedure” which should be satisfied with RAN4 requirement but with 3 dB relaxed. Therefore, the agreement made in online discussion is sufficient to all of UE#1/2/3 in our view and, if necessary, ED threshold adjustment (e.g., 3 dB penalty for UE#3) can be considered for UE#3. |
| Mediatek | Our understanding on beam correspondence is aligned with the FL’s reply to LG, and it’s possible that Tx beam and Rx beam are not the fully equivalent. Therefore we are ok with the proposal. |
| Ericsson 2 | We want progress on this topic so we can support not specifying anything more as we articulated in our previous comment or we can also support this proposal 2.9.2-2 for the UEs that do not support beam correspondence capability or UEs that use wider/different sensing beam, with the comment from Moderator (in red) included/incorporated. |

## 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   * 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 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Key Proposals/Observations/Positions |
| Huawei HiSilicon | ***Observation 2: When network allows enabling/disabling the LBT mode, coexistence issues would arise as the performance of the nodes operating with LBT mode would be adversely impacted by the nodes operating with No-LBT on the channel without a time limit .***  ***Observation 3: When No-LBT is used in regions where LBT is not mandated by regulations, the hidden node issue would still persist.***  ***Proposal 26: For operation in the 60 GHz band, in regions where LBT is not mandated, indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode per beam is not supported.***  ***Proposal 27: For operation in the 60 GHz band, in regions where LBT is not mandated, indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode using L1 signaling is not supported.***  ***Proposal 28: 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 29: For operation in the 60 GHz band, in regions where LBT is not mandated, COT should be limited when No–LBT is used.*** |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 9: For regions where LBT is not mandated, indication of UE specific per-beam LBT/no-LBT indication from the gNB is not supported.  Proposal 10: In deployments without LBT consider specification of channel vacation policies accounting for disparity among co-existing devices. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Proposal 4: No LBT can be considered to be used in the following cases:  • 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 5: 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.  Proposal 6: Conditions for No LBT fallback to LBT should be further studied, e.g., based on the interference level or correctly decoding rate.  Proposal 16: Support Per beam indication for LBT mode.  Proposal 17: Support gNB and its UE(s) having different LBT mode.  Proposal 18: Support L1 signalling for the indication of LBT mode.  **Proposal 22: If per beam is agreed for LBT mode, it is suggested to capture the feature of per beam for LBT mode in Rel-17 RRC parameters list.** |
| Vivo | Proposal 14: Per-beam based channel access mode indication is not necessary.  Proposal 15: 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. |
| OPPO | Proposal 8: support gNB and UE having different modes.  Proposal 9: support LBT mode per beam indication. |
| NEC | **Observation 1: Based on long term measurement, the channel assessment in statistic could be considered to determine or switch the operation mode.**  **Proposal 10: For regions where LBT is not mandated, the mechanism and conditions for LBT mode and no-LBT mode switching should be specified to simplify the system implement.** |
| CATT | **Proposal 1: During the initial access procedure before RRC\_CONNETED state, the LBT mode indication can be transmitted by MIB or reserved bits in DCI format 1\_0 scrambled by SI-RNTI.** |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1: How to prevent long time continuous channel occupying for Tx using No-LBT should be further studied.  Proposal 5: Conditions about whether to enable/disable receiver assisted LBT can be studied. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 27 Cell-specific system information indication of LBT ON/OFF is included in SIB1  i. Define same DCI\_1\_0 sizes for both LBT on/off (licensed and unlicensed operation) |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Observation 9: Use of LBT provides mostly loss in median throughput compared to no-LBT mode and reduces throughput for cell edge Ues  **Proposal 26: Leave any additional conditions/mechanisms/restriction/fallback modes on the no-LBT channel access mode for gNB implementation.** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1: For regions where LBT is not mandated,**  **• 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;**  **• 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 uppo 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.** |
| InterDigital Inc. | Proposal 8: The UE receives indication of the channel access mode (omni-directional, directional, receiver assistance, no LBT) from the gNB.  Proposal 9: The indication of channel access mode is received per cell and per beam.  Proposal 10: L1 signaling can be used for UE specific indication, at least for initial access. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #15: For regions where LBT is not mandated, the mechanism for switching between the no-LBT mode and LBT mode should be upports and specified at least for UL, and the channel access mode switching between no-LBT mode and LBT mode can be determined e.g., based on the consecutive decoding success or failure or interference measurement. |
| Convida Wireless | |  | | --- | | Proposal 1: Both omni-directional and directional LBT should be supported for frequency range of 52.6GHz to 71GHz. |   Proposal 2: Adaptation and indication for LBT mode, no-LBT mode and LBT sub-mode for system performance optimization should be considered. |
|  |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 27: Do not support per beam indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode. |

### First Round Discussion

Discussion 2.10.1-1 (closed)

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
* Do not support per beam indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode:

Summary of current positions:

* Support Per Beam indication: InterDigital, Lenovo (for UE), Samsung (gNB and UE), OPPO, NEC, ZTE, ITRI , TCL
* Do not support per beam indication: Huawei, Vivo, Qualcomm, FUTUREWEI, LG, Charter, Intel, DCM, Ericsson, Apple, Convida, CATT, WILUS , Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, Transsion, vivo, Nokia

Please provide your view if not already captured above

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | As correctly captured by the FL, we do not see any technical reason to support per beam indication. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are also ok to support per beam indication for gNB as well |
| Xiaomi | Do not support per beam indication |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support per beam indication to UE. |
| Vivo | 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. |
| Ericsson | We do not support per beam indication as accurately captured by the FL. |
| Apple | Do not support per beam indication |
| LG Electronics | We do not see the necessity of per beam indication. |
| InterDigital | We support per beam indication. We believe this is beneficial for multi-TRP scenarios as well as CoMP-like scenarios. |
| Transsion | We do not see the necessity to support per beam indication. |
| Docomo | Same view as LGE. |
| Nokia, NSB | We do not support per-beam indication. |
| WILUS | We do not support per-beam indication. |
| CATT | Do not support per beam indication. |
| TCL | We support per-beam indication. That reflects the wireless environment better. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support per beam indication due to the following two reasons:   * For a COT with multiplexed beams, a transmission on beam indicated with No-LBT would have to be deferred to allow for sensing by the same device before transmitting on another beam indicated with LBT mode; hindering the benefit of No-LBT * If two UEs in the same cell operate with two different channel access modes, the UE operating with LBT is consistently at a disadvantage compared to the UE operating without LBT. We thus think that further indicating the LBT/No-LBT mode in per-beam granularity would overcomplicate the signaling without a clear benefit to the system performance. |

Discussion 2.10.1-2 (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. Note this is different from the DCI field indicate the LBT type for UL transmission.

Summary of current positions:

* L1 Signaling for No-LBT mode or LBT mode should be supported: InterDigital, CATT, Apple, vivo (if there is benefit), Oppo, Lenovo, ZTE, NEC, TCL
* L1 Signaling for No-LBT mode or LBT mode should not be supported: Huawei, Intel. Charter, LG, Nokia, DCM, Ericsson, WILUS, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, Transsion, Mediatek, Samsung, DCM

Please provide your view if not already captured above

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | As captured above, we do not support L1-signalling for the matter of indicating no-LBT mode. |
| Xiaomi | L1 Signaling for No-LBT mode should not be supported |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Our position has been correctly captured in summary. But we are a little confused that No-LBT mode is used in current description, it seems to imply that L1-Signalling can only indicate No-LBT mode, while cannot indicate LBT mode for the regions where LBT is not mandated. In order to avoid ambiguity, we propose the following the updated proposal for reference.   * L1 Signaling for No-LBT mode or LBT mode should be supported * L1 Signaling for No-LBT mode or LBT mode should not be supported |
| Ericsson | We do not support L1 signalling for LBT/no LBT mode indication. |
| Apple | For region where no LBT is mandated, LBT only need to be enabled when the UE is experiencing high interference. In light loaded scenario, UE perceived throughput degrades due to the additional LBT time. Therefore we support to use L1 indication to disable/enable LBT based on interference. |
| LG Electronics | We do not see the necessity of L1 singaling but the GC-PDCCH may be used to trigger the switching between the operating modes. |
| InterDigital | We agree with ZTE’s comment. Furthermore, the L1 indication could indicate the LBT type (omni, directional, receiver-assisted) |
| Mediatek | We are open for discussing advantage of L1-signaling for No LBT indication. However, we didn’t see any. |
| Transsion | We do not see the necessity to support L1 signaling indication. |
| OPPO | Following legacy design principle, where gNB can indicate the UE to omit LBT.  Moderator: This discussion is about LBT mode on/off, instead of a LBT type for a particular transmission |
| Docomo | We are ok with reusing the existing DCI fields with different interpretation. Looking at the clarification by FL, this Discussion 2.10.1-2 does not intend such enhancement. At this moment we do not see the significant need to have L1 signalling other than the existing DCI fields. |
| Nokia, NSB | We do not support L1 signalling for LBT/no LBT mode indication. |
| WILUS | We do not support L1 signalling for LBT/no LBT mode indication. |
| CATT | We support L1 signaling for LBT/no LBT mode indication. |
| CATT | We support L1 signaling for LBT/no LBT mode indication, too. |
| Samsung | We added our position with the assumption that this is different from the DCI field indicate the LBT type for UL transmission |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are not convinced about the motivation of indicating LBT/No-LBT mode in L1 signalling and don’t support it. |

### Second Round Discussion

Proposed conclusion 2.10.2-1

There is no consensus to support per beam LBT mode or no-LBT mode UE specific gNB indication.

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We are Ok with the conclusion |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| vivo | Support the proposed conclusion. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the conclusion |
| DOCOMO | Support the conclusion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the sake of progress, we can accept the conclusion. |
| Ericsson | We support the conclusion |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the conclusion |
| Apple | Support |
| InterDigital | We believe per-beam LBT/No-LBT mode is has benefits.  Moderator: At this phase, unfortunately this is not a discussion if the feature has benefit or not anymore. It is simply we don’t have time to continue discussing and should conclude as much as possible. |
| TCL | We think per-beam LBT/No-LBT mode is has benefits. |
| CATT | Support |
| NEC | We support the conclusion. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with conclusion. |

Proposed conclusion 2.10.2-2

For regions where LBT is not mandated, there is no consensus to introduce L1 signalling 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.

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We are Ok with the conclusion |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| vivo | Support the proposed conclusion. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the conclusion |
| DOCOMO | Support the conclusion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the sake of progress, we can accept the conclusion. |
| Ericsson | We support the conclusion. |
| Apple | OK |
| TCL | Support |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposed conclusion. Considering that it has been agreed to indicate the LBT mode or no-LBT mode to UE, will we continue to discuss how to indicate LBT mode or no-LBT mode to UE if the proposed conclusion is supported?  Moderator: Yes we will continue discussing where the LBT mode/no LBT mode is indicated. There are already proposals from companies to indicate it in SIB1 followed by some UE specific configuration that may overwrite the indication. I feel it will be a simple discussion. |
| NEC | We support the proposed conclusion. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with conclusion. |

## 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. |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules apply to the transmission of msg1 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/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/msgA transmission from one UE perspective * FFS: Other UL signals/channels can be transmitted with Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule, such as msg3, SRS, PUCCH, PUSCH without user plain data, etc |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Key Proposals/Observations/Positions |
| Huawei HiSilicon | ***Proposal 30: In regions where LBT is mandated, only channels/signals included in the DB as defined for Rel-16 NR-U should be ignalin for contention exemption short control signaling based DL transmission.***  ***Proposal 31: In regions where LBT is mandated, contention-exempt short control signaling rules apply to the transmission of msg1 for 4 step RACH and msgA for 2-step RACH such that the 10% over any 100ms interval restriction is applicable to all available msg1/msgA resources configured in a cell (Alt 1).***  ***Proposal 32: In regions where LBT is mandated, contention-exempt short control signaling based transmission is not supported for UL signals/channels other than msg1/msgA.*** |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 7: The 10% over any 100ms interval restriction is applicable to all available msg1/msgA resources configured (not limited to the resources actually used) in a cell.  FFS Candidates for short control exempt signaling subject to enforceability of 10% limit. |
| ZTE Sanechips | Observation 2: 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 3: If channel(s)/signal(s) is not regarded as Short Control Signalling and not multiplexed with any Short Control Signalling, it is a natural way that such channel(s)/signal(s) cannot apply Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule.  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 ignaling.  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 ignaling.  Observation 5: As long as total time corresponding to all available UL resources that be used to transmit Short Control Signalling (e.g., Msg1/Msg A/potential Msg 3 ) meets 10ms limitation within a 100ms observation period, Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule can be applied.  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.  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 and LBT is performed before Short Control Signalling transmission, it is suggested that such transmission should not be counted into 10ms limitation within the 100ms observation period. |
| Vivo | Proposal 16: The contention exempt short control signaling can be extended to discovery burst with duration at most 1ms.  Proposal 17: The contention exempt short control signaling based SS/PBCH can be multiplexed with RMSI PDCCH, RMSI PDSCH and CSI-RS.  Proposal 18: The 10% over any 100ms interval restriction is applicable to the msg1/msgA transmission from one UE perspective. |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 13: PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK information belong to short control signaling.***  ***Proposal 14: msg3, SRS, and PUSCH without user plain data should not belong to short control signaling.***  ***Proposal 15: restriction for short control ignaling transmissions is applicable to all available msg1/msgA resources configured in a cell.*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 15: The 10% over any 100ms interval restriction should be applicable to all Contention Exempt Short Control Signals from cell perspective.*** |
| ***Proposal 16: In order to meet 10ms limit over 100ms, it should be supported to apply the Contention Exempt Short Signaling rules to sub-set of PRACH slots for msg1/msg3.*** |
| ***Proposal 17: For UL signal, the Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules can be applied to the PUCCH and PUSCH without user-plane data.*** |
| ***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 20 msec and the number of SSB beams is 64, the total duration of SSB transmission is more than 10ms over 100ms.*** |
| ***Proposal 19: In order to meet 10ms limit over 100ms, the Contention Exempt Short Signaling rules may be applied to sub-set of SSB beams for 120 kHz SCS when the up to 64 SSBs transmission is supported.*** |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 9: Support Alt 1, that is 10% over any 100ms interval restriction is applied to all available msg1/msgA resources configured. |
| Ericsson | Observation 6 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 ignaling transmissions exemption to Discovery Burst.  Proposal 7 Support Alt2 in which the short control ignaling transmissions requirement of 10ms over 100ms duration is applicable to control and management transmissions from a single UE perspective  Proposal 8 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 msg3 for the 4 step RACH and MsgB for the 2-step RACH |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Observation 5: 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 10: NR-U design for 60 GHz bands supports transmission of the following DL and UL control and management signals as short control ignaling 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 11: For the UL transmissions, the 10% short control signalling allowance is shared by all the Ues in the cell.  Observation 6: Short contention window of [4] observation slots facilitates flexible LBT timing for SSB transmissions.  Proposal 12: Use of short control signal contention exemption and use of LBT for SSBs is predetermined or semi-statically determined, distributing the channel access uncertainty over the SSBs. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 7: For “short control ignaling”:**  **• support at least discovery burst as part of the short control signalling;**  **• support limitation on the duty cycle to use “short control signalling”, wherein the duty cycle are defined from the perspective of a node.** |
| MediaTek Inc. | **Proposal 3: For sensing structure within a 8 us deferral period, support Alt 2.** |
| Intel Corporation | **Proposal 24: 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 25: SSB transmission with no LBT is supported at least for 960 kHz and type0-PDCCH.**  **Proposal 26: 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.**  **Proposal 27: The 10% over any observation period of 100ms is applicable to the msg1/msgA transmission from one UE perspective.**  **Observation 4: 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 28: Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules apply to the transmission of msg3 for the 4-step RACH for all ignalin SCS.**  **Proposal 29: It is up to the UE to decide and apply SSE to SRS, PUSCH without user plain data, and PUCCH, as long as when it does the 10% duty cycle over a 100ms observation period is met.**  **Proposal 30: The gNB indicates through a cell-specific RRC parameter which specific channels/signals could be qualifies as short control signaling.** |
|  |
| NTT DOCOMO INC. | **Proposal 6: Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules can be applicable irrespective of SCS**  **Proposal 7: Support Alt 2 on the interpretation of Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules, i.e., the 10% over any 100ms interval restriction is applicable to the msg1/msgA transmission from one UE perspective** |
| Sony | **Proposal 2: Contention exempt short control ignaling should be adopted for transmission of RMSI PDCCH, RMSI PDSCH, and/or CSI-RS contained in Discovery Burst.** |
| LG Electronics | Observation #1: The interpretation of regulation for 10% over any 100ms interval restitution from one UE perspective (Alt-2) is likely to cause coexistence problems with the incumbent system operating in the same band.  Proposal #16: Whether a short control signing rule is applicable or not to the configured msg1/msgA resources can be explicitly indicated by the gNB or can be implicitly determined by the UE. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 28: Support Alt 2. Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules apply to the transmission of msg1 for the 4 step RACH and msgA for the 2-step RACH for all supported SCS. The 10% over any 100ms interval restriction is applicable from the perspective of the UE in accordance with per device requirement set by regulation.  Proposal 29: SRS should be included towards contention exempt transmissions.  Proposal 30: PUCCH should be included towards contention exempt transmissions.  Proposal 31: PUSCH without user plane data, such as CSI or Ack/Knack, and msg3 should be included towards contention exempt transmissions.  Proposal 32: Under the restrictions of duty cycle for short control signaling, allow SS/PBCH, PDCCH, CSI-RS and PRS for contention exempt transmission. |

### First Round Discussion

Summary of Current Positions:

Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules apply to the transmission of msg1 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
  + Huawei, CATT, ZTE, FUTUREWEI, Nokia, OPPO, LG,
* Alt 2: The 10% over any 100ms interval restriction is applicable to the msg1/ /msgA transmission from one UE perspective
  + Vivo, Ericsson, Samsung, Qualcomm, Intel, DOCOMO, Charter, Intel, Lenovo, Nokia, WILUS
* FFS: Other UL signals/channels can be transmitted with Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule, such as msg3, SRS, PUCCH, PUSCH without user plain data, etc

Proposal 2.11.1-1:

Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules apply to the transmission of msg1 for the 4 step RACH and MsgA for the 2-step RACH for all supported SCS. Restriction for short control signalling transmissions apply (10% over any 100ms intervals). Down-select from the following alternatives

* Alt 1: The 10% over any 100ms interval restriction is applicable to all available msg1/msgA resources configured (not limited to the resources actually used) in a cell
  + Support: Oppo, HW, LG, Nokia (though regulation allows Alt 2), ZTE, Futurewei, CATT, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, Transsion, TCL
* Alt 2: The 10% over any 100ms interval restriction is applicable to the msg1/msgA transmission from one UE perspective
  + Support: vivo, Charter, Intel, Lenovo, DCM, InterDigital, Ericsson, Samsung, Convida, Apple, Nokia, Qualcomm, Mediatek, WILUS

Please provide your view if not captured

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We prefer alt-2, since this is more in line with the ETSI BRAN requirements, and given the infrequency of msg1/msgA, we do not see any coexistence issue. |
| Xiaomi | Alt 1 is preferred to give gNB more control of the wireless environment.so that interference is better controlled. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Our position has been correctly captured in above proposal. |
| Vivo | From our point of view, the regulation regarding short control signalling is for the actually transmitted signals, not the configured resources. Only when the signal is transmitted, it is considered as a short control signalling and the signal duration is counted in. If the signal is not transmitted, no transmission duration should be counted in the total short control signalling transmission time. Therefore, Alt 2 is supported for msg 1 and Msg A transmission when they are considered as short control signalling. |
| Ericsson | We support Alt 2. |
| Apple | Alt 2. |
| LG Electronics | We support Alt 1 based on the observation that the interpretation of regulation for 10% over any 100ms interval restitution from one UE perspective (Alt-2) is likely to cause coexistence problems with the incumbent system operating in the same band. |
| InterDigital | Our position is correctly captured. |
| Mediatek | We support Alt 2. |
| Transsion | We support Alt 1. |
| OPPO | Alt 1 is more beneficial to fair coexistence. |
| Docomo | We confirm that our position is correctly capture. Thanks to FL. |
| Nokia, NSB | Our position is correctly captured. |
| WILUS | We support Alt 2 and added our position above. |
| CATT | We prefer Alt 1. If the 10% over any 100ms interval restriction is counted from UE perspective, the total amount of UL signals which applies to Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule may be too large to interfere with other systems. |
| TCL | We support Al1. That is more fair with other coexisting RATs. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | First, RAN1 agreement does not exempt Msg3 as short control signaling. Therefore, “msg3” should be removed from alt 1 at the top of Section 2.11.1  We support Alt. 1. If Alt. 2 is used, then the total time resources at which at least one UE within the cell transmits msg1/ 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”. |

Discussion 2.11.1-2:

For contention exemption short control signalling based UL transmission consider the following signals and channels.

* Any transmission on PUCCH
  + Support: OPPO (HARQ A/N only), CATT , Nokia, Qualcomm, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Ericsson, Mediatek, Apple, WILUS, DCM
* SRS
  + Support: Qualcomm, Intel, Ericsson, Apple, Nokia, WILUS, TCL, DCM. CATT
  + Oppose: OPPO
* PUSCH not carrying user plane data
  + HARQ A/N on PUSCH
  + Support: CATT, Nokia, Qualcomm, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Ericsson, Apple, WILUS, DCM
    - Oppose: OPPO
  + CSI reporting on PUSCH
    - Support: CATT, Nokia , Qualcomm, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Ericsson, Apple, WILUS, DCM
    - Oppose: OPPO
  + Msg 3
    - Support: CATT, Ericsson, Nokia, Qualcomm, Intel. Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Ericsson, Apple, WILUS, TCL, DCM
    - Oppose: Oppo
* No other Contention Exempt UL transmission should be permitted: Huawei, InterDigital

Please provide your views if not captured:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | As long as 10% duty cycle is met, any control information (PUCCH, SRS, msg3, PUSCH with no user plane data) could be qualified as short control signalling. Notice that we have updated he list of supporting companies and include our preference. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Added our position above |
| Xiaomi | In principle, we agree that as long as 10% duty cycle is met, any control information (PUCCH, SRS, msg3, PUSCH with no user plane data) could be qualified as short control signalling.  But we are still inclined to give gNB more control, so that a UL transmission can only be qualified as short control signalling when gNB configure or indicate it to be. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think it is necessary to carefully evaluate which channels/signals are suitable to be seen as Contention Exempt UL transmission to avoid abuse of this rule. |
| Ericsson | We also agree that if the 10% limit is met, any control information can be transmitted using short control signalling exemption. We have updated the list of supporting companies. |
| Apple | We agree that if the 10% limit is met, any control information can be transmitted using short control signalling exemption. |
| InterDigital | Added our position above |
| Mediatek | Added our position above |
| OPPO | We should rather discuss what the criterion is to judge if a channel is qualified to be contention exemption short control signalling. According to regulation, at least PUCCH carrying Ack/Nack is clearly allowed. For the rest of the UL channels/signals, we need a clear criterion for the decision. |
| Docomo | As stated by some companies, we think that if the 10% limit is met, any control information can be transmitted as short control signaling. |
| Nokia, NSB | Added our support for also SRS. |
| WILUS | We added our preference above. |
| CATT | As long as 10% duty cycle is met, any control information can be transmitted using short control signalling exemption. |
| TCL | We added our views above. |
| Samsung | We are ok with any periodic transmission that satisfies the duty cycle should be part of the short control signaling, e.g. msg3.  Also one comment to moderator, we expect similar discussion on additional components for DL short control signaling, and we believe the discussion for DL is more essential.  Moderator: Ok. Will add a DL aspect discussion in the 2nd round. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It would be challenging for the network, if not infeasible, to ensure that the restrictions are maintained if other UL signals/channels are also allowed to be transmitted with the short control exemption rule. We therefore propose that the exemption based transmission is not supported for UL signals/channels other than msg1/msgA.  In principle, we think it is a misuse of the exemption rule to just consider each individual UE and/or individual signal/channel and say that since it does not occupy 10% of the channel, it can be exempted. With this approach, essentially, at any given time, a big portion of UEs would be using such an exemption. This is certainly against the intention of introducing such a relaxation rule. |

Discussion 2.11.1-3:

For contention exemption short control signalling based UL transmission, further introduce RRC configuration to allow gNB to control which channels can be transmitted with contention exemption.

Support: Intel, Xiaomi, ZTE, Qualcomm, Apple, Nokia, CATT, TCL, Samsung, Huawei/HiSilicon

Not support: Lenovo, vivo, Ericsson, InterDigital, Mediatek, Transsion, WILUS, TCL

Deprioritize: DCM

Please provide your views:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We support the proposal, and we believe this would be helpful to provide to the gNB urther control on which signal/channel the UE should qualify as short control signalling. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We don’t see the need for gNB to enable/disable short control signalling for channels/signals specifically |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with this proposal |
| vivo | We think it is up to UE to transmit the UL signals based on short control signalling or with LBT. When the UL signals based on short control signalling reaches the 10% limits over 100ms, UE will switch to the normal channel access mechanism. |
| Ericsson | We do not support this proposal as we do not see any benefits in doing this. |
| Apple | We see more value for gNB to indicate which RS is transmitted as short control signaling. The specification should allow the gNB to RRC configure some important DL signal/channels based on deployment, such as the RS used for RLM and/or beam management. For example, with RLM RS configured as short control signaling, UE will be able to differentiate whether a missed RS detection is due to bad link quality, or due to LBT.  All discussion here are for UL. Suggest adding discussion points related to FFS in DL signaling. |
| InterDigital | This is not needed since only msg1/MsgA should use Short Control Signaling. |
| Mediatek | We don’t support the proposal since we think that if the 10% limit is met, any control information can be transmitted using short control signalling exemption. |
| Transsion | We think this proposal is related to discussion 2.11.1-2, if no UL channels/signals except msg1/MsgA are introduced as short control signaling, then this RRC signaling is not needed. |
| Docomo | We are surely open to discuss, but given the remaining time for Rel-17 completion, it should be deprioritized as it is not essential. |
| Nokia, NSB | We see that it is useful for the network or UE to know which signals/channels are transmitted without uncertainty, and which are subject to LBT. E.g. if the amount of control signals transmitted in a cell exceed 10%, It should be possible to indicate which ones are transmitted with or without LBT. |
| WILUS | We don’t think this RRC signaling is necessary. |
| CATT | We share same with Intel and Nokia, and support the proposal. |
| TCL | We do think it is necessary for such RRC signallings. |
| Samsung | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The use of exemption at the UE side should be under the control of gNB. |

### Second Round Discussion

We have previous agreement as follows

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.

Discussion 2.11.2-1 (closed and replaced by proposal 2.11.2-3)

Please provide your view if the following signals/channels can be multiplexed with contention exemption short control signalling based SS/PBCH block transmission

* RMSI PDCCH and RMSI PDSCH
  + Support: Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DOCOMO, ZTE, Sanechips, Ericsson, TCL, Samsung
* Other broadcast PDSCH
  + Support: Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DOCOMO, Ericsson, Samsung
* PDSCH without user-plane data
  + Support: Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DOCOMO, Ericsson
* PDCCH
  + Support: Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DOCOMO, Ericsson
* CSI-RS
  + Support:: Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DOCOMO, ZTE, Sanechips, Ericsson, Samsung
* PRS
  + Support: Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DOCOMO, Ericsson
* Not support any:

Please list your support in the above list and provide additional view below if any

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support RMSI PDCCH and RMSI PDSCH, CSI-RS. We add our position in the above list. |
| Ericsson | We had a proposal for Discovery burst (which is also in the agreement above) and we did not see any objection to that. We request the moderator to consider that discussion before discussing separately the signals that can be multiplexed with SS/PBCH blocks.   1. Support extending the Short control signalling transmissions exemption to Discovery Burst.   Regarding the discussion above, we support all the above signals for short control signalling transmissions as long as 10% limit is met. |
| Intel | Our view is that is can be left up to gNB to decide and apply the short signaling exemption 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. Notice that we have added our position in the above lists. However, in this matter it should be further clarified what multiplexing may mean: e.g., same slot or contiguous slots without gaps.  Moderator: For multiplexd with SSB, I interpret it as in the same burst without gaps |
| Apple | We would like to confirm that in the main bullet, “if the following signals/channels can be multiplexed with SS/PBCH block transmission.”, here it means FDM multiplexing. If so, any non-user plane data can be FDMed together with SSB.  Moderator: I don’t think it is limited to FDM only. It can be TDM, say multiplexed in the gap between SSBs |
| Samsung | We added our position inline, but we’d more prefer to agree discovery burst as a whole. |

Discussion 2.11.2-2 (closed and replaced by proposal 2.11.2-4)

Please provide your view if contention exemption short control signalling based DL transmission is allowed when not multiplexed with SS/PBCH block transmission

* RMSI PDCCH and RMSI PDSCH
  + Support: Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DOCOMO, Ericsson, TCL, Samsung
* Other broadcast PDSCH
  + Support: Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DOCOMO, Ericsson, Samsung
* PDSCH without user-plane data
  + Support: Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DOCOMO, Ericsson
* PDCCH
  + Support: Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DOCOMO, Ericsson
* CSI-RS
  + Support: Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DOCOMO, Ericsson, Samsung
* PRS
  + Support: Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DOCOMO, Ericsson
* Not support any:

Please list your support in the above list and provide additional view below if any

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Ericsson | We support all the signals as long as 10% limit is met. |
| Intel | We do not see the need to support this and qualify any of the channels/signals listed above, and we believe that we should constrain the short control signalling for initial access only, following the principles of Rel.16. |
| Apple | We support as long as 10% limit is met.  We see benefit for gNB to indicate which RS is transmitted as short control signaling. Propose to allow the gNB to RRC configure some important DL signal/channels based on deployment, such as the RS used for RLM and/or beam management, to be transmitted as short control signaling. For example, with RLM RS configured as short control signaling, UE will be able to differentiate whether a missed RS detection is due to bad link quality, or due to LBT. |
| Samsung | In general, we support as least discovery burst as short control signalling, and its components can be separately used as short control signalling. |

Proposal 2.11.2-3

The following signals/channels can be multiplexed with SS/PBCH block transmission in the same burst without gaps and the burst can be transmitted as contention exemption short control signalling

* RMSI PDCCH and RMSI PDSCH
* Other broadcast PDSCH
* PDSCH without user-plane data
* PDCCH
* CSI-RS
* PRS

Note: Total exempted signals/channels should meet the restriction of 10% over any 100ms interval.

Moderator note: Given HW is objecting to this proposal, we need some more discussion. At least we can agree on RMSI PDSCH, RMSI PDSCH and CSI-RS first, which seems to be no objection.

Support: Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DCM, Ericsson, ZTE/Sanechips (RMSI PDCCH/PDSCH and CSI-RS only), Intel, Apple, TCL, CATT

Not support: HW

Please provide your view if not captured

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| CATT | We support the proposed conclusion. |
| vivo | We support the proposal. |
| Samsung | Just one clarification: the above signal/channel multiplexed with SSB are also exempted from performing LBT?  Moderator: Yes. It is the same burst  Current wording is strange, since signal/channel for sure should be able to multiplex with SSB, but the key is whether they are also exempt from LBT. Also, if they are also exempt from LBT, we prefer to call them part of short control signal as well to be aligned with regulation. Otherwise it looks like we introduce new signal/channel to be multiplexed with short control signal and exempt from LBT.  Moderator: Not sure how to improve the language. The intention is to agree what can be transmitted together with SSB with SCS. For other signals/channels not in the list, they can certainly be transmitted with SSB as well, but in that case, the transmission will be subject to LBT (if required) |
| Intel | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support the proposal. In our view, only signals/channels that belong to DB may be exempted.  Moderator: The list of signals/channels, though more than what are included in Rel.16 NR-U DRS, are the signals/channels that can be multiplexed in DRS with Cat2 LBT based transmission. Since we introduced exception for them in NR-U in FR1, it may not be too aggressive to introduce similar exception for them in FR2-2 |

Proposal 2.11.2-4

Contention exemption short control signalling based DL transmission of the following signals/channels is allowed even when not multiplexed with SS/PBCH block transmission

* RMSI PDCCH and RMSI PDSCH
* Other broadcast PDSCH
* PDSCH without user-plane data
* PDCCH
* CSI-RS
* PRS

Note: Total exempted signals/channels should meet the restriction of 10% over any 100ms interval.

Support: Nokia/NSB, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, DCM, Ericsson, Apple, Samsung

Not support: Intel, CATT (need more discussion), vivo (only support RMSI)

Please provide your view if not captured

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| CATT | May need more discussion. |
| vivo | We only support RMSI PDCCH and RMSI PDSCH as the short control signalling, |
| Intel | As mentioned above we do not support this proposal, and further discussion may ne needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support the proposal. In our view, only signals/channels that belong to DB may be exempted. |

## CWS and CAPC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Key Proposals/Observations/Positions |
|  |  |
| ZTE Sanechips | Proposal 14: 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. |
|  | Proposal 15: Current CCA check procedure in EN 302 567 can be regarded as “Cat 4” rather than “Cat 3”. |
| CATT | **Proposal 3: There is no need to introduce CAPC and CWS.** |
| Ericsson | Proposal 23 Do not support CAPC and CWS adjustment for NR operation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 1: Completing the design for features essential for baseline channel access operation should be prioritized.  Observation 1: We do not see a need for contention window adjustment mechanism for mitigating channel access collisions.  Proposal 2: LBT procedure uses fixed contention window size for random back-off.  Observation 2: With sufficiently short contention window size, there is no need for CAPCs  Proposal 3: Contention window size of [4] is used in the LBT procedure  Proposal 19: For dynamically scheduled UL transmissions, adopt Rel-16 DCI indication with appropriate modifications on the indicated channel access types. There is no need for an indication of CAPC or CP extension. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 4: Support Cat 3 LBT, i.e., without the need to adjustment the CW size.**  **Proposal 5: No need to define CAPC.** |
| Intel Corporation | **Proposal 16: 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 17: 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.** |
| Sony | **Proposal 3: Support fixed Contention Window.**  **• gNB’s contention windows size is left to network implementation.**  **• UE’s contention window size is configured by network.** |
| 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 #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 #17: The channel access priority classes (CAPC) can be introduced for NR above 52.6 GHz to differentiate the channel access probabilities for different channels and traffic. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 33: CWS adjustment need not be introduced for 60GHz band.  Proposal 34: CAPC need not be introduced for 60GHz band. |
| ITRI | Proposal 6: CWS adjustment mechanism could be applied per beam-based in an independent manner for 60 GHz NR-U. |
| WILUS Inc. | ü Proposal 1: We propose to introduce CAPC, CWS and CWS adjustment mechanism for 60GHz band, with Rel.16 NR-U as baseline. |
|  |  |

### First Round Discussion

Discussion 2.12.1-1 (closed)

Regarding introduction of CWS Adjustment, down select from the following alternatives

* Alt 1: Support the introduction of CWS adjustment
* Alt 2: Do not introduce CWS adjustment

Summary of positions so far:

* Alt 1: Lenovo, Motorola, ZTE, LG, Intel, ITRI (per beam) , WILUS, TCL
* Alt 2: Sony, Samsung, CATT, Nokia, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Futurewei, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, vivo, Apple, Transsion, Charter Communications, DCM

Please provide your position if not captured above

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | While this concept is not explicitly captured in the ETSI BRAN, it is neither precluded as well. Therefore, given that this procedure is well established in the specification, and allow to address different channel and traffic conditions that may impact the channel access procedure, RAN1 should consider to adopt it in the above 52.6 GHz band with the necessary modifications. |
| Xiaomi | Do not introduce CWS adjustment |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the introduction of CWS adjustment, which is beneficial in some highly congested scenarios and to friendly and fair coexistence with Wi-Fi. |
| Vivo | We see no strong motivation to introduce CWS adjustment. We added our position to the summary. |
| Ericsson | We support Alt 2. It is not precluded to do Alt 1 by implementation. |
| Apple | Alt 2. Added to supporting company list. |
| LG Electronics | To reduce the probability of collision, the contention window adjustment (CWS) procedure similar to Rel-16 NR-U can be adopted, and it is also necessary to discuss the relationship of the CWS and back-off counter values between wide beam LBT and independent per-beam LBT for multi-beam COT. |
| Transsion | We support Alt 2. |
| Docomo | Support Alt 2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Our view is captured correctly |
| WILUS | We support Alt 1 since it seems beneficial to address different channel and traffic conditions that may impact the channel access procedure such as prioritization of high priority traffic and resolution of the collision between transmissions in highly congested scenarios. |
| CATT | We support Alt 2. |
| TCL | We support Alt 1. That benefits fair coexistence. |
| Sony | We support Alt 2. |

Discussion 2.12.1-2 (closed)

Regarding introduction of Channel Access Priority Classes, down select from the following alternatives

* Alt 1: Support the introduction of CAPC
* Alt 2: Do not introduce CAPC adjustment

Summary of positions so far:

* Alt 1: Lenovo, Motorola, ZTE, LG, Intel, ITRI, WILUS, Mediatek, TCL
* Alt 2: Sony, Samsung, CATT, Nokia, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Futurewei, Xiaomi, vivo, Apple, Transsion, Charter Communications, DCM,

Please provide your position if not captured above

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | See comment above. |
| Xiaomi | Do not introduce CAPC adjustment |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the introduction of CAPC |
| vivo | We see no strong motivation to introduce CAPC. We added our position to the summary. |
| Ericsson | We support Alt 2. It is not precluded to do Alt 1 by implementation. |
| Apple | Alt 2. Added to supporting company list. |
| LG Electronics | The channel access priority classes (CAPC) can be introduced for NR above 52.6 GHz to differentiate the channel access probabilities for different channels and traffic. |
| Mediatek | We are ok with Alt 1, since it’s beneficial for traffic congestion and prioritize differed types of traffic. |
| Transsion | We support Alt 2. |
| Docomo | Support Alt2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Our view is captured correctly |
| WILUS | We support Alt 1 |
| CATT | We support Alt 2. |
| TCL | We support introducing CAPC, i.e., Alt. 1. |
| Sony | We support Alt 2. |

### Second Round Discussion

Proposed conclusion 2.12.2-1

There is no consensus to introduce CWS Adjustment for unlicensed operation in FR2-2

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Intel | We are not yet ready to conclude. In our understanding, if no conclusion is reached then Rel.16 CWS procedure is used. In this case, how would Zmin and Zmax would be defined?  Moderator: Don’t think we have agreement to use Rel.16 NR-U as baseline for FR2-2 unlicensed operation |
| Futurewei | Support this conclusion. As in ETSI BRAN a fixed CWS would be used. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| vivo | Support the proposed conclusion. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the conclusion |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We believe that although there is no explicit provision in ETSI to support CW, it does not mean that it is excluded. Further, considering coexistence with 802.11ad/ay and CW has been supported in Wi-Fi, so we think there is no reason to preclude this functionality.  Moderator: The current observation is, there is no regulation mandate, and there is no consensus to introduce CWS adjustment. |
| Ericsson | We support the conclusion. CWS adjustment can be performed by implementation. |
| Intel | @Moderator: Our understanding is that the CWS adjustment is supported in Rel.16 generally for operation in shared spectrum. So if we agree to not supporting this functionality, we will need to explicitly indicate in the spec that this will not apply for FR2-2.  Moderator: Agree this will be captured in 37.213 |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the conclusion |
| InterDigital | We support the proposed conclusion |
| TCL | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | Response to Moderator’s reply to Intel: if we explicitly indicate the functionality of CWs is not applied for FR2-2, obviously the functionality has been precluded and not supported in FR2-2, which is inconsistent with your reply to us.  Moderator: I am not sure what is inconsistent. There is no regulation mandate to support CWS adjustment, and there is no consensus to introduce it for FR2-2. So from the proposed conclusion, it will NOT be introduced for FR2-2. In 37.213, it will be clarified the CWS adjustment mechanism described there will be applied to FR1 shared spectrum access only and not applied to the newly introduced FR2-2 shared spectrum access. |
| LG Electronics | We still think that it is beneficial to introduce the CWS adjustment mechanism in 60GHz.  Moderator: This is not a discussion on if it is beneficial. This is to admit we don’t have consensus if it is beneficial or if we want to introduce it or not. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We understand that “from the proposed conclusion, it will be introduced for FR2-2.” means that whether CWs adjustment is supported is still open in FR2-2 . But if we limit CWs adjustment specified in the current TS 37.213 only to be used for FR1, in our opinion, the functionality of CWs adjustment is not already supported in FR2-2.  Moderator: Sorry I have a typo in the above response with a NOT missing. Now added with yellow highlight. |

Proposed conclusion 2.12.2-2

There is no consensus to introduce CAPC for unlicensed operation in FR2-2

Please provide your view

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Futurewei | Support this conclusion |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| vivo | Support the proposed conclusion. |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We believe that although there is no explicit provision in ETSI to support CAPC, it does not mean that it is excluded. So we do not agree the conclusion.  Moderator: The current observation is, there is no regulation mandate, and there is no consensus to introduce CAPC |
| Ericsson | We support the conclusion. CAPC can be done by implementation. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the conclusion |
| InterDigital | We support the proposed conclusion |
| TCL | We are find with the conclusion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips2 | The same concern as the commented above  Moderator: Same reply above |
| LG Elevctronics | We still think that it is beneficial to introduce the CAPC in 60GHz.  Moderator: This is not a discussion on if it is beneficial. This is to admit we don’t have consensus if it is beneficial or if we want to introduce it or not. |

## Long Term Sensing, Interference Mitigation, ATPC, Other aspects

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Key Proposals/Observations/Positions |
| ZTE Sanechips | Proposal 21: Study and evaluate the impact of LBT and the limitation of COT length on the procedure of beam failure detection. |
| Ericsson | Observation 7 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. |
| Nokia Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 20: For configured UL transmissions like scheduling request and CG-PUSCH, consider and agree on the necessary signalling indicating appropriate channel access type for the UE.  Proposal 21: CG PUSCH configuration shall include indication of whether the CG PUSCH configuration is used inside or outside of a gNB initiated COT, or both.  Proposal 22: Study the benefits of sharing the ED measurements results at gNB to the UEs.  Proposal 23: Support for Cat-3 LBT is UE capability.  Observation 17: Channel access mechanism without LBT should fulfil the requirements of EN 303 722 as well as the expected requirements of EN 303 753. |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 15: RAN1 should further study how to efficiently allow beam-pairing due to LBT success. |
| Lenovo Motorola Mobility | *Proposal 14: 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 15: 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 16: 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)*  *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*  *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 22: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, UE assistance information to indicate whether and which UL Tx beams can be used with no-LBT mode as initiating and/or responding device should be supported*  *Proposal 24: 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 27: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, long term sensing should be supported for both LBT based and no-LBT based channel access mechanism to consider potential interference.*  Observation 6: Currently, there is no mechanism is support long-term sensing including interference measurements from WiFi or other NR operators at the UE and corresponding reporting.  - 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, 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 |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #2: If ChannelAccess-CPext field is kept as 2 bits in DCI format 0\_0 and 1\_0 for FR2-2 unlicensed band same as in NR-U, it is necessary to define UE behaviour for LBT type indication before identifying the Cat-2 LBT capability of the UE, such as initial access. |
| Convida Wireless | Proposal 11: Enhancement of resource utilization and interference mitigation in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz should be considered.  Proposal 13: 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. |
| 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. |
|  |  |
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