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# Introduction

This document is to kick off the following email discussion:

* [Post112-e][069][MBS] Delivery mode 2 (MediaTek)

      Scope: Progress on solutions CP focus: MCCH or not for PTM configuration. PTM configuration change notification.

      Intended outcome: Report with agreeable proposals / identified open issues

      Deadline: Long

During last RAN2 meeting (RAN#112e), there were discussions on delivery modes for NR MBS. The delivery mode 2 is for “low” QoS requirement, where the UE can also receive data in INACTIVE/IDLE. The delivery mode 2 was assumed by RAN2 for broadcast sessions at last RAN2 meeting and it is FFS for its applicability for multicast sessions.

Agreements

=>For Rel-17, R2 specifies two modes:

 1: One delivery mode for high QoS (reliability, latency) requirement, to be available in CONNECTED (possibly the UE can switch to other states when there is no data reception TBD)

 2: One delivery mode for “low” QoS requirement, where the UE can also receive data in INACTIVE/IDLE (details TBD).

 R2 assumes (for R17) that delivery mode 1 is used only for multicast sessions.

 R2 assumes that delivery mode 2 is used for broadcast sessions.

 The applicability of delivery mode 2 to multicast sessions is FFS.

As one of the post-meeting discussions for RAN#111e, [906], MBS Idle mode support was initially discussed, and the following conclusion was made during the online discussion based on the email summary (R2-2008796).

Agreements

=>UE receives the MBS configuration (for broadcast/delivery mode 2) by BCCH and/or MCCH (TBD), and this can be received in Idle / Inactive mode. Connected mode FFS (dep on UE cap and where service is provided etc). A notification mechanism is used to announce the change of MBS Control information.

According to abovementioned background, this email discussion aims to discuss the detailed CP aspects of delivery mode 2.

# Clarification of Delivery mode 2

## 2.1 Applicability of Delivery mode 2 on RRC states

According to the agreements made during last RAN2 e-meeting (i.e. RAN2#112e), there is no clear statement with regard to the RRC states for the applicability of Delivery mode 2. Rapporteur thinks it is helpful to clarify it before any discussion on other issues. Rapporteur assumes that NR MBS delivery mode 2 supports both idle/inactive UEs and connected mode UEs based on the agreements so far.

### **Question 1**

Do you agree that both idle/inactive UEs and connected mode UEs can receive MBS services transmitted by NR MBS delivery mode 2?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | We assume NR MBS delivery mode 2 can provide the same/similar support as LTE SC-PTM does. Meanwhile since NR MBS delivery mode 2 supports the UE reception for low QoS MBS service, connected mode UEs should not be excluded for such reception.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | As mentioned by Mediatek, two delivery modes are targeted at different use cases and UEs in RRC Connected should be able to receive all kinds of services. Therefore, UEs in RRC Connected should be able to receive MBS service provided with delivery mode 2 in the same way as in LTE SC-PTM. FFS whether this is subject to UE capability, which should be discussed at a later stage. |
| QC | Yes for Broadcast only. | We think Multicast is mainly useful for high reliability QoS and there is no need to support low reliability QoS services using Multicast. Broadcast can be used to support low reliability services and in all RRC states. In IDLE/INACTIVE state, it is not possible to support high reliability and Multicast can be limited to RRC\_CONNECTED state for high reliability services. Note that LTE SC-PTM supports only Broadcast services. |
| OPPO | Yes  | RAN2 agreements in RAN2#112e: 2: One delivery mode for “low” QoS requirement, where the UE can also receive data in INACTIVE/IDLE (details TBD).RAN1 agreements in RAN1#103e:**Agreements:** From physical layer perspective, for broadcast reception, the same group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH can be received by both RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs and RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.Based on the agreements from RAN1 and RAN2, it is reasonable delivery mode 2 is supported for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE/CONNECTED mode UE. |
| CATT | Yes | For a specific MBS services with low QoS requirement, it should be delivered by delivery mode 2 in idle/inactive mode and connected mode.1. A UE receiving MBS in idle/inactive mode with delivery mode 2 may need to enter connected mode for unicast reception.To secure the service continuity, the MBS services should be able to continued when UE transitions to connected mode.2. A specific MBS services should has same QoS requirement in idle/inactive mode or connected mode, therefore a MBS service which is delivered with delivery mode 2 in idle/inactive should also be delivered with delivery mode 2 after UE transitions to connected mode. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We think it is already intended in the agreement “*where the UE can* ***also*** *receive data in INACTIVE/IDLE*”. We think it’s inefficient if the UE needs to transition to IDLE/INACTIVE, just only for receiving MBS service via the delivery mode 2.  |
| ZTE | Yes | Agree with OPPO and Kyocera that reception of delivery mode 2 in all RRC status is already agreed in RAN2.Moreover, we assume delivery mode 2 is a mechanism more of SC-PTM like.We see no reason not to support delivery mode 2 mode being applied to all UE RRC status, considering SC-PTM reception is not limited to RRC\_IDLE UEs only but open to all RRC status.If there are concerns on the simultaneous reception between signaling reception (broadcast or dedicated) / unicast data, AND the MBS data, there are already mechanism (i.e., Interest Indication) to help network figure this issue out. |
| LGE | Yes | If not, the UE will lose the MBS session upon establishing RRC connection. |
| Nokia | Yes | Broadcast service should be receivable in IDLE/INACTIVE states. And naturally CONNECTED mode UE may be able to receive as well if UE is capable of receiving broadcast in connected mode. Capability is then dependant on various aspects such as BWP allocation from NW, UE receiver structure etc… |
| Ericsson | Partically | RAN2 should not introduce new terminology, i.e. use delivery mode 1 and 2, but use multicast and broadcast sessions, as used by other WGs (SA2, RAN3, …) to avoid confusion and mismatch.Concerning delivery mode 2 RAN2 agreed:**R2 assumes that delivery mode 2 is used for broadcast sessions.** **The applicability of delivery mode 2 to multicast sessions is FFS.**It is not so clear how to answer the questions when it is not clear what delivery mode 2 means:* Reception of MBS (broadcast or multicast) in idle/inactive, or
* Reception of Broadcast session, or
* Something else

We agree that broadcast session can be received in idle/inactive, but reception of broadcast session in connected needs further discussion. For example in connected mode the UE may be on a dedicated BWP that does not overlap with the initial BWP where the broadcast sessions is configured, and thus not be able to receive the broadcast session. We think that the argument of broadcast service continuity does not hold, i.e. this is more a question whether the UE should be able to receive both unicast and broadcast simultaneously. When the UE prioritizes the broadcast reception, then service continuity for broadcast reception would be guaranteed.We think that multicast should be supported in connected mode, but also in inactive/idle mode during congestion period. When there is a high number of public safety users in connected mode, the system should not break, and deny service to public safety users, but continue to support multicast received in idle/inactive with reduced QoS.  |
| vivo | Yes | For IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, the answer is definitely Yes as per the achieved agreement above.For CONNECTED UEs, our answer is Yes as well. The latest RAN2 agreement says that delivery mode 2 is used for broadcast sessions. Combining with the WID which clearly indicates that broadcast is supported for UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED state, we think it is natural and complexity-friendly to allow CONNECTED UE to receive data from the broadcast session via the delivery mode 2.  |
| Futurewei | Yes | The delivery mode 2 should be only driven by the low QoS requirement of the MBS service where idle/inactive UE MBS reception is allowed. Group of UEs under such a service should be allowed in connected or inactive/idle mode. Most common scenario is mixed connected and idle/inactive UEs in the MBS group. The delivery method should not be affected by the MBS group size. |
| Intel | Yes | The agreement for delivery mode 2 is that “UE can also receive data in INACTIVE/IDLE (details TBD)”, and the wording “also” (which is related to delivery mode 1, which is for RRC\_CONNECTED only) already implies that RRC\_CONNECTED UEs can receiver delivery mode 2. Wording aside, given that broadcast sessions are carried in delivery mode 2, we think UEs in all RRC modes can receive delivery mode 2. |
| Sharp | Yes | It was already agreed in RAN2 that mode 2 delivery would be able to be received in IDLE/INACTIVE as well as CONNECTED. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | Similar as LTE SC-PTM, both idle/inactive UEs and connected mode UEs can receive MBS services transmitted by NR MBS delivery mode 2. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | For MBS services with low QoS requirement, there is no reason to exlcude the UE in connected mode for service reception. |
| NEC | Yes | Agree with above views. But in addition, multicast can also support IDLE/INACTIVE UE.  |
| Sony | Yes | In our understanding, delivery mode 2 is like LTE SC-PTM. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | The same principle as the LTE SC-PTM shoud be kept. |
| CMCC | Yes | As it was agreed in last meeting that “UE can **also** receive data in INACTIVE/IDLE (details TBD)”, it implies that delivery mode 2 could be used in RRC\_Conneted. Besides, based on the current discussion, delivery moded 2 is like LTE SC-PTM, which could be used in RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_IDLE. |
| Apple | Yes | RAN2 has agreed to support delivery mode 2 for both IDLE/INACTIVE and CONNECTED mode. |
| Samsung | Yes | Mode 2 is used for broadcast. Connected UE should be able to receive the data. |

**Rapporteur summary-1: According to the feedback provided, clear majority of the companies (21/22) agreed that both idle/inactive UEs and connected mode UEs can receive MBS services transmitted by NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

**Proposal-1: Both idle/inactive UEs and connected mode UEs can receive MBS services transmitted by NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

## 2.2 Delivery mode 2 characteristics

As concluded during last RAN2 e-meeting, delivery mode 2 supports the transmission of MBS services with lower QoS requirement. In this case, delivery mode 2 means PTM reception only, i.e. there is no PTP-PTM switch nor PTP assistance to improve PTM quality. Delivery mode 2 may support a huge number of users (i.e. UE in idle/inactive state). To enable delivery mode 2 reception, the UE does not need to take session join and/or authentication at NAS layer. In summary, the UE receiving MBS services transmitted by delivery mode 2 is not required to interact with the network before its MBS service reception (i.e. pure broadcast delivery).

### **Question 2**

Do you agree that the UE receiving MBS services transmitted by delivery mode 2 is not required to interact with the network before its MBS service reception?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | Since NR MBS delivery mode 2 supports the Idle/Inactive mode UE reception, it is not realistic to require the UEs to interact with the network before service reception.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | From 3GPP perspective, there is no such requirement. There may be some subscription mechanism at application layer, but this is out of scope of 3GPP. |
| QC | Yes for Broadcast | Broadcast services can be received by all UEs in Broadcast service area and can be received in all RRC states. For receiving Broadcast services , UEs are not required to join Broadcast session and NW does not keep UE context for delivering Broadcast services. |
| QC | Yes  | LTE SC-PTM can be baseline. We also cannot see the necessary to make RRC state transition for the reception of MBS configuration for delivery mode 2. |
| CATT | Yes, but | The answer is Yes from RAN perspective.From RAN perspective, UE does not need to interact with the network before MBS service reception, as we have agreed that “UE receives the MBS configuration (for broadcast/delivery mode 2) by BCCH and/or MCCH”.However, from SA2 perspective, Even there is no join procedure for broadcast but join procedure is needed for multicast. For now it is better not to limit the applicability of delivery mode 2 to broadcast only, as RAN2 has agreed that“The applicability of delivery mode 2 to multicast sessions is FFS.”In addition to above, we do not see the need for RAN2 to conclude whether there is interaction with the network on CN level before MBS service reception. |
| Kyocera | Yes | It was agreed that “*R2 assumes that delivery mode 2 is used for broadcast sessions.*” So, we think RAN2 can just follow the definition of *Broadcast communication service* that SA2 specified, e.g., “*all UEs in the broadcast coverage area are authorized to receive the data*” and “*For the broadcast communication service, the content provider and network may not be aware whether the authorized UEs are actually receiving the data being delivered.*” In TR 23.757.  |
| ZTE | Yes for Broadcast, no for Multicast | Don't understand why there are extra and non-official assumption in the summary part in this section:"To enable delivery mode 2 reception, the UE does not need to take session join and/or authentication at NAS layer. In summary, the UE receiving MBS services transmitted by delivery mode 2 is not required to interact with the network before its MBS service reception (i.e. pure broadcast delivery)."As far as we know, there is no such conclusion/assumption in RAN2.For Broadcast session, interaction might not be needed in 3GPP level (application level might still be need, e.g., to get USD through application level interaction).For Multicast session, if Multicast can be delivered in mode 2 (which is still FFS but we are supportive as in Q3), such interaction is needed: - NAS level is at least needed for UE to apply for such Multicast session/service. Therefore UE has to be in RRC\_CONNECTED beforehand, and then UE can be released to RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE depending on RAN2 design choices.- Air interface level. The UE/network interaction is needed to configure UE to continue Multicast service data reception in non RRC\_CONNECTED status, detail FFS. |
| LGE | Yes for Broadcast, but No for multicast session | The applicability of delivery mode 2 to multicast sessions is FFS. My understanding is ‘low QoS’ can be required for some multicast session, and UE can receive such a multicast session in IDLE/INACTIVE after completing required NAS procedure in RRC\_CONNECTED.  |
| Nokia | Yes | IDLE/INACTIVE state reception should not require message exchange between NW and UE (one way messages from NW to UE needed naturally) |
| Ericsson | Partially | To receive broadcast service in idle mode, the UE is not required to go to connected mode first from a RAN perspective. Whether there would be any need to receive security keys from the higher layers to decrypt the broadcast data is outside RAN scope. To receive broadcast service in inactive mode the UE would need to connected mode first to be able to enter inactive mode. To receive multicast service the UE needs to go to connected mode first (e.g. to join the multicast session, but also to receive the multicast data).  |
| vivo | Yes for broadcast； No for multicast | For broadcast sessions, the interaction between NW and UE is obviously not needed since the session join procedure is not necessary and the SC-PTM mode can be used as the baseline for NR MBS. However, we cannot currently exclude that delivery mode 2 is also applicable to multicast sessions based on the agreement (i.e. The applicability of delivery mode 2 to multicast sessions is FFS). As a result, we cannot exclude that interaction between NW and UE is not required before data reception via delivery mode 2.  |
| Futurewei | Yes | No UE feedback should be required. But the network is able to conduct the reconfiguration via BCCH or paging. |
| Intel | Yes for broadcast, no for multicast | Our preference is that delivery mode 2 can be also used for multicast session. Our understanding is that the UE may perform session join for multicast sessions, as in SA2 TR 23.757. The UE can then go to RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE to receive MBS data. |
| Sharp | Yes at least for broadcast | For broadcast, SC-PTM can be baseline.For multicast, we think RAN2 needs to discuss what kind of multicast session with low QoS requirement could be delivered by mode 2 first, then decide interact with the NW before receiving it. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes for broadcast, No for multicast (See Q3) | We agree that only PTM mode is used in the delivery mode 2. However, if the delivery mode 2 is also applicable for multicast, then interaction with the network is needed, e.g. for MBS session join/leave. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes for broadcast； No for multicast | For broadcast sessions, the interaction between NW and UE is not needed. For multicast sessions, the interact may be needed and needs further discussion. |
| NEC | Yes  | We should not exclude the possible of multicast service in RRC\_IDLE. At least we don’t have to do anything more to enable it.  |
| Sony | Yes | For broadcast sessions where there is no requirement to join the session |
| Xiao | Partially Yes | The UE may need to get the encryption key from the CN given that the LTE SC-PTM also allows the higher layer encryption. |
| CMCC | Yes for broadcast session, No for multicast session | For broadcast session, interaction between UE and network may be not necessary for 3GPP level.For multicast session, the interaction could not be avoided, since UE has to perform join procedure at least.And the applicability of delivery mode 2 to multicast sessions is FFS. It’s too early to make the decision. |
| Apple | Yes | For the broadcast session, UE donot need to have the interaction with NW for the service reception. For the multicast session, UE may have the interaction with CN when UE is in CONNECTED mode before entering INACTIVE state. |
| Samsung | Yes | SC-PTM can be a baseline as much as possible, unless there is additional complexity. |

**Rapporteur summary-2: According to the feedback provided, all companies agreed that the UE receiving Broadcast sessions transmitted by delivery mode 2 is not required to interact with the network before its MBS service reception. Meanwhile, a number of companies replied that the answer is linked to the discussion on Question 3. Some companies aussmed that the UE needed to interact with the network before its reception of Mulitcast sessions transmitted by delivery mode 2 (depending on the discussion on Question 3).**

**Proposal-2a: the UE receiving Broadcast sessions transmitted by delivery mode 2 is not required to interact with the network before its MBS service reception.**

**Proposal-2b: RAN2 discuss if the UE receiving Multicast sessions transmitted by delivery mode 2 is required to interact with the network before its service reception (if Multicast sessions can also be transmitted by delivery mode 2).**

## 2.3 Delivery mode 2 for multicast/broadcast session

According to the online discussion of RAN2#112e, RAN2 assumes that delivery mode 2 is used for broadcast sessions. The applicability of delivery mode 2 to multicast sessions is not decided yet.

It should be helpful to decouple the concept of multicast/broadcast session from delivery mode. As such, the multicast sessions may be transmitted by delivery mode 1 or delivery mode 2, depending on the application-layer requirement for MBS service. Consequently, the multicast session that does not require high quality reception (lower QoS requirement) could be provided in the broadcast manner (i.e. delivery mode 2). This should be confirmed by RAN2.

### **Question 3**

Do you agree that delivery mode 2 can also support the transmission of multicast sessions?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | However, as discussed at Question 2, NR MBS delivery mode 2 does not require UE interaction with the network (e.g. Idle/Inactive mode). Then the session join procedure for low QoS multicast session may be not supported in this case, which may need be coordinated with SA2.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | SA2 defines two different types of MBS session: multicast session and broadcast session. For multicast session. As the rapporteur described in section 2.2, for multicast sessions the UEs need to interact with Core Network to join the session. Hence delivery mode 2 is not appropriate for providing multicast sessions. If an MBS service does not require high QoS, then it can use broadcast session and delivery mode 2. (This does not prevent the service provider to introduce some service subscription/join mechanism at application layer as we mentioned above). |
| QC | No | Same view as Huawei. For services requiring low reliability, broadcast mode can be used and which mode to be used for a given service is decided by 5GC NFs based on interaction with Content Provider and QoS requirements. |
| OPPO | No  | We share the same view as Huawei. |
| CATT | Yes | Multicast session can be used to delivery services with high QoS requirement and services with low QoS requirement. Therefore multicast session for delivering services with low QoS requirement should be delivered by delivery mode 2, considering the limited capacity of NG-RAN to accommodate the large amount of connected UEs.We think the key characteristic of a multicast session is the need of joining group but not the high QoS requirement. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We think there is no critical reason to exclude the multicast sessions from the delivery mode 2. We think it’s up to gNB implementation which delivery mode to be used for an MBS session, just like the decision of PTP/PTM.  |
| ZTE | Yes | 1. in real production environment, Multicast (e.g., IP multicast) is mostly used in service discovery (e.g., mDNS, Bonjour) or bulk content delivery (e.g., video content delivery). some of them are indeed Multicast services while they ask for no more than "best effort" delivery.2. and more importantly, we RAN2 shall not have such preconception or make choices for the application layer, there is no such thing that, "Multicast is always of higher reliability" as we have clearly clarified in 1.3. from 3GPP RAN perspective, it is always good to have a solution with good scalability, i.e., to allow a Multicast service delivery especially when the reception UE number is high. No one can really know how many UEs are having the same Multicast service in the same cell, or how congested the network is. In such case, we need to have a solution with scalability, and delivery mode 2 is the optimal one.to conclude, we shall allow such flexibility and scalability, i.e., to have Multicast session to be delivered in mode 2. |
| LGE | Yes | My understanding is ‘low QoS’ can be required for some multicast session, and UE can receive such a multicast session in IDLE/INACTIVE after completing required NAS procedure in RRC\_CONNECTED. |
| Nokia | No | We share the view with Huawei rs  |
| Ericsson | Depends on what you mean with delivery mode 2 | The preferred state for multicast reception, with high QoS, is connected mode. But during congestion period, when the required number of public safety users cannot be supported in connected mode, a tradeoff has to be made, i.e. continue of multicast reception with a reduced QoS in idle/inactive to avoid denial of service.  |
| vivo | Yes | In our understanding, the multicast mechanism defined by SA2 is used for UE authentication/authorization. It is supposed to be independent of QoS requirements (e.g. the data from the multicast session can be lower QoS requirement). Therefore, from the UE power saving perspective, we think it would be helpful to allow IDLE/INACTIVE UE to multicast service of lower QoS requirement. Moreover, the WID also explicitly requires that multicast for UEs in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states shall be supported.  |
| Futurewei | Depends | In general, as long as the QoS requirement (low) allows, the network can enable the delivery mode 2. This should include low QoS multicast services to be extended to the idle/inactive UEs.For the MBS applications requiring registration first, the UEs should be in connected mode to perform registration first. RAN2 can have further discussion on whether to allow UEs to get into idle/inactive for power saving if the QoS requirement for the service is low. The delivery mode 2 support both connected and idle/inactive. There are flexibility to handle different scenarios. |
| Intel | Yes | We think there can be multicast sessions which do not have high QoS requirements, and such multicast sessions can be handled by delivery mode 2. |
| Sharp | Yes | We think if QoS requirement for a multicast session is almost as low as best effort, the delivery method for the multicast session can be categorized as mode 2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | We are skeptical on the statements from Huawei. In SA2 TR 23.757 v1.2.0, broadcast session is only used for broadcast communication service.**Broadcast communication service:** A communication service in which the same service and the same specific content data are provided simultaneously to all UEs in a geographical area (i.e., all UEs in the broadcast coverage area are authorized to receive the data).**Broadcast session:** A session to deliver the broadcast communication service. A broadcast session is characterised by the content to send and the geographical area where to distribute it.**Multicast communication service:** A communication service in which the same service and the same specific content data are provided simultaneously to a dedicated set of UEs (i.e., not all UEs in the multicast coverage are authorized to receive the data).**Multicast session:** A session to deliver the multicast communication service. A multicast session is characterised by the content to send, by the list of UEs that may receive the service and optionally by a multicast area where to distribute it.Our understanding is the multicast session may also have low QoS requirement, which depends on the multicast service characteristics. For the multicast session with low QoS requirement, it is not necessary to always keep the UE in RRC\_CONNECTED.  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | We think SA2 has no conclusion that the multicast session only consist of the high QoS services.  |
| NEC | Yes  | There is no compelling association of multicast service and the UE RRC mode. in the description of what multicast service is, it doesn’t mention the QoS level for multicast service.  |
| Sony | No | Agree with Huawei and in addition, it may end up supporting if PTM in multicast and delivery mode 2 end up with the same design as a consequence. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Whether to use the delivery mode 2 can be up to the RAN decision. In some certain deployment scenarios (e.g. the indurstrial deployment with good radio quality and low-mobility UEs), the delivery mode 2 could be applicable to all MBS services. |
| CMCC | Yes  | In our understanding, the two delivery modes are defined from RAN perspective, decoupled with CN concepts, like multicast session and broadcast session, only classified by QoS requirements. And we could not exclude the case that multicast sessions carry data with low QoS requirements. |
| Apple | Yes | For the all the MBS services with low QoS requirement, including multicast services, RAN can decide to apply the deliver mode 2 for the data transmsion.  |
| Samsung | No | If multicast in mode 2 brings additional complexity, it would be better to limit to only broadcast. Whether and how much additional complexity on procedures and standardization should be discussed.  |

**Rapporteur summary-3: According to the feedback provided, majority companies (14/22) agreed that delivery mode 2 can also support the transmission of multicast sessions. Some companies 6/22 assumed delivery mode 2 only support the transmission of broadcast sessions.**

**Proposal-3: RAN2 discuss if delivery mode 2 can also support the transmission of multicast sessions.**

# Transmission of PTM configuration

## 3.1 PTM configuration transmitted by MCCH

The MBS PTM configuration can be configured via two-step based approach or one step based approach (as depicted by Figure 1) for delivery mode 2.

In LTE SC-PTM, the configuration is provided by two steps, i.e., SIB20 and SC-MCCH. SIB20 provides the SC-MCCH scheduling information; and SC-MCCH provides the SC-MTCH scheduling information. The SC-MCCH is scheduled by SC-RNTI at PDCCH and the SC-MTCH scheduled by G-RNTI at PDCCH. The two-step configuration offers the benefit that the PTM configuration scheduling is independent from SIB scheduling.

However, as discussed within email discussion [Post-111e][906], PTM configuration can also be provided by one step approach, i.e. at SIB. Some companies think that with this approach, the UEs can easily know what MBS services are provided by simply reading the MBS control information SIB without the need to monitoring MCCH.

RAN2 needs to decide the way for the transmission of PTM configuration for delivery mode 2 according to the discussion above.



*Figure 1: MBS configuration alternatives*

### **Question 4**

Do you agree that the two-step based approach (i.e. BCCH and MCCH) as adopted by LTE SC-PTM is reused for the transmission of PTM configuration for NR MBS delivery mode 2?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | Two-step configuration approach as adopted by LTE SC-PTM has the benefit of latency control and there is no impact to legacy UEs.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | As indicated by Mediatek, this approach has an advantage of more flexibility for scheduling updates (e.g. there is no limitation to update the scheduling only according to BCCH modification period) and allows to avoid impact on legacy UEs. |
| QC | Yes for Broadcast | MCCH allows to differentiate unicast SIBs from Broadcast. MCCH modification period can be much shorter than BCCH modification period. LTE SIB15 equivalent can be used to specify list of MBS services in a given freq/cell to assist service continuity during idle cell reselection procedure. |
| OPPO | Yes  | LTE SC-PTM is baseline. |
| CATT | Yes | Agree with MTK and Huawei on the the benefit of latency control and avoiding impact to legacy UEs. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We think the two-step configuration is the baseline, but we still prefer optionally to have the one-step configuration. It’s up to NW implementation or deployment policy which configuration method is used.  |
| ZTE | Yes | Agree with MTK. The control plane latency introduced by SIB itself is unacceptable. Also, MCCH-like solution offers more flexibility. |
| LGE | Yes | The two-step based approach has an advantage of more flexibility for scheduling updates, e.g. shorter MCCH modification period than BCCH. |
| Nokia | Yes  | two step approach is likely easiest solution but Q4 indicates as adopted by LTE SC-PTM cannot naturally be copy pasted to NR due to different radio. Especially BWP concept in NR can cause issues e.g. if MTCH UE is interested is not overlapping with initial BWP. This has not been solved in RAN1 or RAN2 yet and we cannot make decision on this one yet regarding MCCH channel. It could be that MCCH channel needs to be different for different UEs due to above mentioned aspects and possibly considering services with different QoS requirements. |
| Ericsson | No | Re-using existing BCCH/SI is less complex and less expensive to deploy MBS service, then use/introduction of MCCH. We do not agree that there is necessarily an impact on legacy UEs when system information is used to configure broadcast PTM, i.e. by introducing a new bit in Paging DCI to indicate MBS change the impact on legacy UEs can be avoided. The main power consumption is to wake-up and monitor the PO, not to process the received Paging PDCCH.We agree that in case system information is re-used that the SI modification period is re-used as well. But which MBS broadcast requirements cannot be fulfilled when SI modification period is re-used? Furthermore there will be a UE power saving penalty in case shorter latencies are configured on MCCH, i.e. the UE would have to monitor the MCCH more frequently to enable a shorter response latency.  |
| vivo | Yes | Generally, we think the scheduling info for MTCH changes far more frequently than that of MCCH. Thus, to reduce the impact of paging alarm to legacy UEs, we should reuse the SC-PTM solution for NR MBS, rather than the one-step based solution mentioned above.  |
| Futurewei | No | Prefer the one step approach which will reduce the signaling overhead and save UE power by eliminating the monitoring of MCCH. The UEs can easily know the MBS provided in the serving cell.Given the low QoS requirement of the MBS targeted by delivery mode 2, the scheduling configuration updated rate can be more relaxed – the normal periodicity of SIB would be good enough. Since this is the first-time supporting MBS in NR R17, we do not have backward compatibility issue with MBS and do not have to follow the LTE approach. Consider the goal in MBS WI of keeping maximum commonality between RRC\_CONNECTED state and RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state, it is preferable not to introduce MCCH for idle UEs and simply following the NR architecture supporting MBS idle UEs by SIB. In NR, SIB is also used by connected UEs. |
| Intel | Yes | As analyzed in our contribution R2-2008991, one-step approach has significant drawbacks compared with two-step approach: the latency to change MBS configuration in one-step approach is significantly larger than that of two-step approach, one-step approach might have significant impacts to power saving of UEs not receiving MBS service. Therefore we prefer two-step approach for MBS configuration in delivery mode 2. |
| Sharp | Yes | Agree with MTK |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes or No | We are fine to use LTE SC-PTM as baseline. But we are also fine to have one step based solution. The details need further discussion. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Agree with MTK and Huawei. |
| NEC | Yes  | SC-PTM can be the baseline.  |
| Sony | Yes | Agree with MTK and SC-PTM is the baseline |
| Xiaomi | Yes | For the delivery mode 2, the network needs to provide the configurations of lots MBS services (i.e. TMGI(s)) to the UE. The SI with the limited size of about 3k bits may not be able to contain all configurations. |
| CMCC | Yes | Agree with MTK and Huawei |
| Apple | Yes | Agree with MTK and Huawei.  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |

**Rapporteur summary-4: According to the feedback provided, clear majority companies (20/22) agreed that the two-step based approach (i.e. BCCH and MCCH) as adopted by LTE SC-PTM can be reused for the transmission of PTM configuration for NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

**Proposal-4: The two-step based approach (i.e. BCCH and MCCH) as adopted by LTE SC-PTM is reused for the transmission of PTM configuration for NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

## 3.2 Reception of PTM Configuration for connected UEs

This section assumes NR MBS delivery mode 2 supports both idle/inactive UEs and connected mode UEs, which depends on the confirmation of Question 1.

As discussed in the previous section, the PTM configuration for the MBS sessions supported by delivery mode 2 can be acquired on BCCH and/or MCCH. There may be no ambiguity for idle/inactive UEs. However it would be needed to clarify if the same principle also applies to connected mode UEs.

There are two alternatives according to the contributions submitted to RAN2#112e. At first alternative, the UEs in connected mode acquires the PTM MBS configuration from broadcast (BCCH and/or MCCH). At second alternative, the UEs in connected mode receives the MBS configuration via dedicated signaling. Note that LTE SC-PTM adopts the first alternative.

### **Question 5**

Select the alternative for connected UEs to receive the PTM Configuration for MBS services for NR MBS delivery mode 2?

Alt-1: Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism (i.e. receive the PTM configuration via broadcast)

Alt-2: Receive the PTM Configuration for MBS services via dedicated signaling

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Selected Alt(s) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Alt-1 | We prefer a unified solution for both Idle/Inactive UEs and confectioned mode UEs for the transmission of PTM Configuration.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt-1 | We should not multiply different configuration options unnecessarily, i.e. for delivery mode 1 the configuration is provided via dedicated signalling and for delivery mode 2 it is always provided via broadcast signalling. The UEs is RRC Connected are currently capable of receiving SIB information and MBS enabled UEs will also need to be capable of receiving PTM transmission, so it is unclear why they should require to receive a dedicated MBS configuration for delivery mode 2. In case the PTM configuration is not broadcast within the UE’s active BWP, a container with the broadcast PTM configuration can be sent to the UE via dedicated signaling, like what has been done for SIBs. |
| QC | Alt-1 for Broadcast only | Note that this is not applicable for Multicast services. Multicast services supported in RRC\_CONNCTED state only can receive the MRB configuration using dedicated RRC signaling. |
| OPPO | Alt-1 | We prefer to use a unified solution for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE/CONNECTED mode UE. |
| CATT | Both Alt-1 and Alt-2 | Agree with Huawei, the SIB approach could be reused.UE in connected mode could 1.Acquire PTM configuration via broadcast signaling. 2. Or a container with the broadcast PTM configuration in dedicated signaling is also possible since the BCCH/MCCH may not transmitted on the dedicated BWP of UE. |
| Kyocera | Both Alt-1 and Alt-2 | We think Alt-1 allows the unified solution with IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, as MediaTek pointed out. On the other hand, Alt-2 may be aligned with handover, if HO command may provide the target cell’s MBS configuration, i.e., Proposal 7 in the email discussion [Post111-e][905][MBS] ([R2-2010385](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_112-e/Docs/R2-2010385.zip)). So, we’re wondering if both alternatives should be assumed so far.  |
| ZTE | for Broadcast, Alt-1 as the baseline.for Multicast, FFS. | for Broadcast, the LTE solution or Alt-1 offers a good starting point for delivery mode 2.for Multicast, the concept of PTM configuration is not clear yet. if delivery mode 2 can be applied to Multicast as well, considering UE who has applied for Multicast services will have to be in RRC\_CONNECTED status beforehand, we are not so sure if it is a good idea to have all the "PTM config" delivered to UE through broadcast signaling and if it is necessary to fully align with SC-PTM solution. |
| LGE | Alt-1 | Unless we finds the need for different configuration depending on RRC state for the same MBS session, we don’t need to spend our effort to define separate solution for RRC\_CONNECTED. |
| Nokia | Alt-1 but possibly in addition alt-2? | Is Alt-1 is trying to say that same information delivery mechanism is used for IDLE/INACTIVE and CONNECTED mode UE? But as noted on Q4 we cannot possibly copy-paste LTE solution. With Alt-1 we would limit active BWP to always overlap MCCH BWP. With Alt-2 there would not be this limitation but would this also require NW to send updated MCCH in dedicated signaling?  |
| Ericsson | Alt-1 for broadcast if broadcast in connected is supportedAlt-2 for multicast in case multicast in idle/inactive is supported.  | When on the initial BWP in connected mode, the UE can receive the PTM configuration for broadcaast via BCCH/SI, similar as on idle/inactive. The UE always receives the PTM configuration for multicast via dedicated signalling in connected, and during congestion the UE can continue to receive the dedicated PTM configuration to receive multicast in idle/inactive. |
| vivo | Alt-1 and Alt-2 | To allow CONNECTED UE to receive MBS data via delivery mode 2 on PCell, we think the LTE SC-PTM mode can be reused.For the other potential extended case (e.g. MBS data reception via delivery mode 2 on SpCell, which is TBD), we think Alt-2 is preferred for UE simplicity.  |
| Futurewei | Alt-1 | Agree with the rapporteur, we would like to have common solution for all connect and idle/inactive UEs. The MBS configuration from the network is already broadcast to all the UEs which meets the service requirement. Unicast configuration to the connected UEs is duplicated effort and over kill. |
| Intel | Alt-1 | We prefer a single unified solution for both IDLE/INACTIVE and CONNECTED UEs regarding MBS configuration for delivery mode 2. |
| Sharp | Alt-1 | For mode 2 delivery, PTM configuration should be able to be received without transition to CONNECTED mode. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Both Alt.1 and Alt.2.  | For broadcast, alt.1 can be used which is similar with SC-PTM.For multicast, alt.2 should be used at least for the connected UEs. For example, the dedicated configuration can be provided n the dedicated active BWP. |
| Spreadtrum | Alt-1 | We prefer an unified solution for UEs in idle/inactive and UEs in connected. |
| NEC | Alt-1 | The configuration can be provided in SIB for both IDLE/INACTIVE and CONNECTED. |
| Sony | Alt-1 | We are not sure of the benefit of alt-2 if UE is not required to join a session for delivery mode 2. |
| Xiaomi | Alt-1 | Alt-1 as the LTE SC-PTM should be considered as the baseline. Alt-2 could be considered if the proponents can provide sufficient benefits/ use cases.  |
| CMCC | Alt-1&Alt-2 | Alt-1 is necessary for Idle and inactive UEs， but for Connected UEs，both broadcast way and dedicated signalling are possible ways for PTM configuration. |
| Apple | Alt-1 and Alt-2 | UE should be able to receive the PTM configuration via the common channel, but if CONNECTED UE is not able to receive the common channel in the currently activated BWP, NW should be able to provide the UE interested PTM configuration via dedicated signaling.  |
| Samsung | Alt-1 | In case that the dedicated signaling is needed, mode 1 will be better to use. |

**Rapporteur summary-5: According to the feedback provided, all companies agreed that Alt-1 can be supported for connected UEs to receive the PTM Configuration for MBS services for NR MBS delivery mode 2, i.e. LTE SC-PTM mechanism can be reused. There were some companies (8/22) that indicated the possibility to consider both broadcast and dedicated signaling based reception for PTM Configuration for delivery mode 2. Three replies (among the 8/22) suggested to take broadcast based manner for broadcast service and to take dedicated signaling based manner for multicast service.**

**Proposal-5a: Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism for the connected UEs to receive the PTM configuration for NR MBS delivery mode 2, i.e. broadcast based manner.**

**Proposal-5b: RAN2 further discuss if dedicated signaling based reception for PTM configuration is allowed for NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

## 3.3 Area specific MBS SIB and PTM configuration

As discussed in many contributions submitted to RAN2#112e, the MBS SIB and MCCH configuration may be area specific. If the MBS SIB and PTM configuration are area specific, the UE may not need to read the MBS SIB after cell reselection and then may help to ensure better service continuity. On the other hand, according to the view within the contributions, some company thinks that PTM configuration (e.g. in MCCH) should be cell specific as different cell may deliver different MBS services.

### **Question 6**

Do you agree that MBS SIB can be area specific for NR?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | MBS SIB as a regular SIB can be area specific. We think MBS SIB can cell specific. Then the area specific MBS SIB can be set as optional.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | This is as for any other SIB, so no extra work for this Is required for MBS. |
| QC | Yes | Same view as MediaTek. |
| OPPO | Yes  | We share the same view as MediaTek. |
| CATT | Yes | Agree with MTK and Huawei. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We think the “area” is up to NW implementation or deployment policy, i.e., one cell or multiple cells. So, we think it’s optionally supported.  |
| ZTE | Yes but | Partly agree with MTK. We already have the concept of validity area of SIB, therefore we see no reason it can not be applied to a SIB that is designed for MBS.However not all SIB shall be or can be area specific. We have concerns if we do need such a RAN level concept of Broadcast/Multicast area that is visible to UE. There will be other related issues, e.g., if there is common PTM config throughout the cells in such area, and how it will affect UE behaviour. RAN level concept of Broadcast/Multicast area shall be the issue we need to talk about, and this shall be FFS. |
| LGE | Yes | MBS SIB can be area specific as other SIBs. |
| Nokia | No | Specification support area specific SIBs but what is use case to support are specific SIB for MBMS? MCCH/MTCH are cell specific channels then why would one have MBMS SIB that is area specific? So before deciding on this we wneed to consider what are contents of SIB and if actually parameters in the SIB would be even possible to have area wide validity. And secondly we would recommend rapporteur to add a question regarding whether we would have MBMS specific new SIB or is the MBMS information included in existing SIB. For us new MBMS specific SIB is OK but this has not been discussed. |
| Ericsson | Maybe | Perhaps we should decide later on this when we know more about the PTM configuration details, and then we can judge better if the PTM configuration can be the same (or not) in neighbouring cells. In any case, this should be optional.  |
| vivo | Yes | Even though the MBS might be supposed to be deployed per cell basis, we think the NW operator can make the MBS SIB (e.g. configuration for MCCH) common within a specific area by the implementation.  |
| Futurewei | Yes | With one step SIB only approach, area specific MBS SIB can be designed similar to other SIBs which can be transmitted at per cell basis in the service area. The UEs need not to decode the SIB again in the service area if the MBS SIB is not changed. |
| Intel | To be discussed later | MBS SIB contains information regarding MCCH configuration. Therefore whether SIB can be area specific depends on details on MCCH design, e.g. there is only one MCCH as in LTE SC-PTM, or multiple MCCHs as in proposals from some contributions. Hence whether to have area specific SIB can be only decided once MCCH structure is agreed. |
| Sharp | Yes | Agree with MTK. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | See Comments | The MBS SIB could be area-specific if multiple cells have same MCCH configuration. However, if we have MCCH enhancement as Multiple MCCHs within one cell in section 3.5 then “per area MBS SIB” seems less useful. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Same view as MediaTek. |
| NEC | Yes  | For some service, it is only valid in the specific area.  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | No sure | The SIB would contain the scheduling information of the MCCH message, which shoud be decided by each gNB independently. Maybe this needs to be confirmed by RAN3 as well. |
| CMCC | Yes  | It could be area-specific as other SIB. |
| Apple | Yes | Same view as MTK. MBS SIB is same as other legacy SIBs which can be configured as area specific SIB.  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |

**Rapporteur summary-6: According to the feedback provided, majority companies (16/22) agreed that MBS SIB, as a regular SIB, can be optionally area specific. However some replies indicated that whether MBS SIB could be area specific should be dependent on the design of MCCH.**

**Proposal-6: The MBS SIB, as a regular SIB, can be optionally area specific.**

### **Question 7**

Do you agree that the PTM configuration (e.g. in MCCH) can be area specific for NR MBS delivery mode 2?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | PTM configuration (e.g. in MCCH) can both area specific and cell specific. It may be a network implementation issue.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | MCCH contains scheduling configuration which is performed by each cell independently depending on the load situation, available resources etc. and may change rather dynamically. We think it will be very hard, if not impossible, for the network to configure areas with the same MCCH configuration.  |
| QC | Yes | Same view as MediaTek. It upto configuration whether to use cell specific or area based. |
| OPPO | Yes  | We share the same view as MediaTek.We also see the benefit of reduction for interruption of the MBS service during cell reselection if the MCCH is area specific. |
| CATT | Maybe | This may be feasible within a DU.But area-specific MBS configuration among different NG-RAN nodes need further discussed. The MBS control information contained in the MCCH is hard to align between NG-RAN nodes. Such as the following,1. Ongoing MBS services on each cell may be different.2. G-RNTI of a specific MBS service are allocated by each cells independently. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We think it’s also up to NW implementation or deployment policy as same in Q7, so we think this is also optionally supported.  |
| ZTE | FFS | Depending on if the area specific PTM config is visible to UE and others, this brings spec impacts in different level (RAN2/3, considering the network level interaction among gNBs) and can be an FFS for now. Our suggestion is firstly to figure out what PTM config is, and how it is delivered in a single cell (as in SC-PTM), then we come back to this issue if TU in current release allows. |
| LGE |  | No strong view, but if multiple MCCHs are allowed, it may not be simple. |
| Nokia | No | It seems quite difficult to share same MCCH between neighbouring cellsas we do not have SFN operation in NR. Thus in our view it seems best to assume MCCH is not similar between cells.Also what would be benefit of having area specific MCCH from UE point of view as UE needs regularly update MCCH? |
| Ericsson | Maybe | See Q6 |
| vivo | Yes | Agree with MediaTek. This is up to NW implementation. |
| Futurewei | Yes | For one-step SIB only approach, it is in the MBS configuration SIB. |
| Intel | No | In typical cases, MCCH can be cell specific regarding ongoing MBS sessions. Therefore area specific MCCH is not needed. |
| Sharp | No strong view |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No | The content of MCCH should be cell specific since different cells have different ongoing MBS Sessions probably.  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | It is up to the network implementation. |
| NEC | Yes  | Same to Q6. |
| Sony | Yes | It may be area specific if network is able to coordinate MCCH config across cells. |
| Xiaomi | No sure | The MCCH message would contain the scheduling information of the MTCH traffics, which shoud be decided by each gNB independently. Maybe this needs to be confirmed by RAN3 as well. |
| CMCC | Yes | It is benefit for service continuity and we don’t think it could introduce too much workload, since it is similar to area specific SIB from technical point. |
| Apple | Yes | It can be applicable in the CU-DU split network architecture.  |
| Samsung | Yes, but | It can be cell specific by NW implementation. Before this,it would be better to focus on specific funcationality, e.g. service continuity. |

**Rapporteur summary-7: According to the feedback provided, more than half companies (12/22) agreed that MCCH can be area specific, which is a network implementation and some of the rest companies (6/22) have no strong view or are not sure. The left companies (4/22) assumed that MCCH should be cell specific.**

**Proposal-7: RAN2 further discuss if MCCH should be cell specific or area specific for PTM configuration of NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

## 3.4 On-demand MCCH transmission/PTM configuration

As discussed in many contributions submitted to RAN2#112e, MCCH for NR MBS can be provided in on-demand mode following the similar principle of On-demand SI transmission as supported by NR Rel-15/Rel-16. For delay tolerant services, On-demand MCCH transmission may be able to optimize the resource consumption for MCCH signalling. On the other hand, it may be not friendly to delay sensitive services. In addition, On-demand MCCH transmission require the UE-Network interaction before the MBS service reception. In order to allow some flexibility, NR MCCH can be transmitted either by using Broadcast mode or on-demand following network configuration.

### **Question 8**

Select the alternative to support MCCH transmission/PTM configuration:

Alt-1: Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism (i.e. Broadcast mode based MCCH transmission)

Alt-2: NR MCCH/PTM configuration can be transmitted either by using Broadcast mode or on-demand following network configuration

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred Alt(s) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Alt-1 | We think that On-demand MCCH transmission is not friendly to UEs in Idle/Inactive mode. It may be over-specified.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt-1 | We find such mechanism unnecessary. For broadcast sessions, we can rely on proper service delivery planning by higher layers / OAM. |
| QC | Alt-2 | It is upto NW to configure either on-demand or broadcast MCCH depending on service requirements. If area based MCCH is configured, when idle UEs are moving from one cell to another cell, there is no need to request on-demand MCCH as long as UE is within that configured area. Alt2 allows flexibility for NW resource optimization in addition to meeting delay requirements of different services. |
| OPPO | Alt-1 | We worried about the impact on the MBS service interruption during cell reselection if on-demand mechanism is introduced for MCCH and also for MBS BCCH. |
| CATT | Alt-1 | We do not see the benefit of on demand MCCH.MCCH is used to inform the start/stop of MBS services, Reachability to all the interested UE is important. So it should be in broadcast mode. |
| Kyocera | Alt-2 | We think Alt-1 is subset of Alt-2. So, we think Alt-2 is more flexible and it’s up to NW implementation which mode is used for MCCH transmission.  |
| ZTE | Alt-1 as baseline. | For Broadcast, MCCH was designed for UE in all RRC status, and for lower CP latency. Marginal enhancement is expected for Broadcast session.However the legacy design brought up issues as well, e.g., overhead apparently which does not really fit into NR's lean design. Some improvements can be adopted for Multicast considering UE will be in RRC\_CONNECTED beforehand, to reduce the overhead. |
| LGE | Alt-2 | MCCH is accessible in IDLE/INACTIVE and gNB doesn’t know whether there is an UE which wants to receive it. In this respect, MCCH is very similar to BCCH, and applying the same approach, i.e. on-demand transmission, would be beneficial. |
| Nokia | Alt-1 | We share view with Huawei |
| Ericsson | Alt-1 as baseline | There is only benefit of on demand SI when there are no UEs in the broadcast service area interested in the broadcast service. For on-demand SI the UE would also have to interact with the NW, i.e. this seems to contradict question 2. |
| vivo | Alt-2 | Alt-2 provides more flexibility for NW operation. With this, on-demand SIB and MCCH could be considered if signaling overhead really matters.  |
| Futurewei | Alt-2 for SIB-only | With one step SIB only approach, simply follow the existing on demand SIB approach assuming there are mixed active and idle/inactive UEs in service. The demand is from an active UE. |
| Intel | Alt-1 | On-demand MCCH increases latency especially in consideration of service continuity. Therefore we prefer not to consider it. |
| Sharp | Alt-1 | Agree with MTK |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt-1 | On-demand MBS SIB and MCCH increases delay of MBS service acquisition. On-demand MBS SIB and MCCH need more discussion.  |
| Spreadtrum | Alt-2 | Alt2 provides flexibility for network to configure the NR MCCH/PTM configuration. |
| NEC | Alt-1 | Alt-1 is the baseline, on-demand SIB may cause extra delay.  |
| Sony | Alt-2 | Alt-2 provide more flexibility. As an alternative, We are also ok as SIB20 like SIB can be on-demand just like other SIBs and network broadcast of MCCH may be linked to on-demand for SIB20 and upto network implementation |
| Xiaomi | Alt-1 | We think that Alt-1 can be considered as the baseline. We are open to the discussion of the Alt-2 once we got sufficient time in RAN2. |
| CMCC | Alt-2  | Alt-2 provides more flexibility for network operation and could reduce signaling overhead. |
| Apple | Alt-1 | Alt-1 is the baseline. For Alt-2, the benefit should be justified first.  |
| Samsung | Alt-1 | SC-PTM can be a baseline. We think Alt-2 is an optimization |

**Rapporteur summary-8: According to the feedback provided, a slight majority companies (14/22) prefer to reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism (i.e. Broadcast mode based MCCH transmission) or reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism as the baseline. The rest companies (8/22) select Alt2 (i.e.** **NR MCCH/PTM configuration can be transmitted either by using Broadcast mode or on-demand following network configuration).**

**Proposal-8: Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism (i.e. Broadcast mode based MCCH transmission) as the baseline for NR MBS delivery mode 2 and FFS for on-demand based MCCH transmission.**

## 3.5 Multiple MCCHs within one cell

This discussion of this section assumes MCCH is adopted for PTM configuration transmission.

Legacy MCCH uses a fixed modification period and repetition period and one MCCH may not cater for different characteristics of use cases for NR MBS. One possibility would be to consider whether the configuration channel should be separated for different use cases. For example, one MCCH provides the delay sensitive services frequently while another MCCH provides the delay tolerant services sparsely.

In LTE SC-PTM, there was the restriction that one cell has only one SC-MCCH. However, NR MBS can remove such a restriction, considering a larger number of use cases are assumed than LTE. If the multiple MCCHs are allowed in a cell, each MCCH can have different scheduling configuration, such as the repetition period, which can be optimized for certain services.

In this case, the PTM configuration can be transmitted by multiple MCCHs within one cell and the UE can only receive the MCCH configuration about the services that he is interested in.

### **Question 9**

Do you agree that the PTM configuration can be transmitted by multiple MCCHs within one cell for NR MBS delivery mode 2?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | PTM configuration transmitted by multiple MCCHs is a simple way to support multiple type of MBS services by one cell.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We already specify two delivery modes and delivery mode 1 is the one to be used for high-reliability / low latency services. It is unnecessary to optimize delivery mode 2 for such use cases. |
| QC | Yes | Allowing multiple MCCH allows NW to configure different MCCH modification periods for different service groups based on delay requirements as an optional configuration. It allows NW to configure broadcast MCCH and area based MCCH configuration depending on services supported by different MCCH. |
| OPPO | No  | We cannot see the strong benefit and necessary to do this, maybe we can discuss it online. |
| CATT | - | This enhancement need further evaluated.On one hand, we see some disadvantage on the single SC-MCCH approach of SC-PTM. UE only interested in one/several of the large amount MBS services supported by the cell. When any of the MBS services changes, UE in idle/inactive mode will need to receive the updated SC-MCCH control information blindly and to find out whether the interested MBS service has changed. This may result in the increase of UE power consumption.On the other hand, Multiple MCCHs may also increase the overhead and complexity of NG-RAN.And UE may need to monitor multiple MCCHs, which will result in the increase of power consumption. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We think the multiple MCCHs could support various types of MBS services efficiently.  |
| ZTE | No | We see the rationale to satisfy diverse needs which is not provided in legacy system. however, we don't think the solution of multiple MCCH is necessary:- The per cell SC-MCCH offers a single entrance for UE in the cell to receive the cell specific PTM config. Otherwise, how to differentiate among the multiple MCCHs will be a big issue. Extra overhead and spec impacts (separate MCCH related scheduling info, RNTI associated with the MCCH, modification notification and its associated RNTI) seem inevitable.- For MBSFN, there are multiple MCCH as each is per MBSFN area, but for SC-PTM, SC-MCCH is per cell. Single cell PTM rather than multiple cell PTM is our baseline and where we can start from. |
| LGE |  | No strong view. If it is justified that the differences in allowed maximum delay in Uu interface can be very large from MBS session to MBS session, it would be beneficial in terms of radio resource management. |
| Nokia | Yes | This depends on use cases we need to support and if UE receiving MTCH is always able to receive BWP of “the MCCH”and BCCH, If UE is capable then there is no need for multiple MCCH. And secondly the point raised by QC about different service requirements may pose different requirements for e.g. MCCH periodicity.  |
| Ericsson | No | Similar view as HW, i.e. we have broadcast and multicast session for service differentiation already, and do not see the need to provide further service differentiation for broadcast session.  |
| vivo | Yes | Multiple MCCHs mechanisms should be supported to achieve a better tradeoff between power saving and service requirements.  |
| Futurewei | No | In LTE, MCCH can support multiple MBMS services with different requirement. It can support multiple MTCH each corresponding to one MBMS service. MCCH can configure each MTCH with specific scheduling configurations. It is not clear why in NR multiple MCCHs are needed. With one-step SIB- only approach, multiple MBS services can also be configured in the MBS SIB. |
| Intel | No | Although there might be some benefits from multiple MCCHs e.g. flexible configuration for different type of services , there are also potential drawbacks e.g. more power consumption for UEs monitoring multiple MCCHs. In addition, there are increased complexity and more discussion is needed on multiple MCCH design, e.g. how UE can know which subset of MCCHs to monitor, MCCH notification, and DRX for multiple MCCH monitoring. Given the slow pace of Rel-17 NR MBS discussion, we prefer to reuse LTE SC-PTM design of single MCCH. |
| Sharp | No | As mode 2 delivery is for "low QoS" MBS session, we think multiple MCCHs to cover different use cases would not be necessary. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No | The delivery mode 2 is used for the service with low QoS requirement. It should be delay tolerant. The optimization is not necessary. The UE may need to monitor PDCCH for multiple MCCHs which cause more power consumption. RAN1 should be involved e.g. how the UE to identify the different MCCHs in PDCCH. |
| Spreadtrum | No | We think there is no need to introduce multiple MCCHs for the service differentiation as we have introduced delivery mode1 and delivery mode 2. |
| Sony | No | Agree with Huawei |
| Xiaomi | No | We understand that multiple MCCHs may provide better service differentiation, but this could also cause extra signaling overheads.  |
| CMCC | Maybe | We see the benefit of multiple MCCHs like different MCCH periodicity to fit diverse MBS service requirements, and also it helps to UE power saving in some sense. But this could cause extra specification workload，we need further evaluation. |
| Apple | No | Delivery mode 2 is for the service transmission with low QoS requirement. So it seems no need to differenciate the service any more.  |
| Samsung | No | Agree with Huawei |

**Rapporteur summary-9: According to the feedback provided, a number of companies prefer to study the support of multiple MCCH based PTM configuration (including 5 clear supporters and 3 companies that did not show their position explicitly). Meanwhile the rest companies (13/21) prefer to not support multiple MCCH based PTM configuration.**

**Proposal-9: RAN2 further discuss if multiple MCCH based PTM configuration can be supported for NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

# Change notification for PTM configuration

## 4.1 Purpose of PTM change notification mechanism

It should be noted that the legacy change notification mechanism for MBMS (including eMTC/NB-IoT SC-PTM) was designed to notify the changes of (SC-)MCCH due to session start and the changes of (SC-)MCCH due to other purpose (e.g. modification of the transmission cycle, counting request for a service, etc.).

There is a view that from upper layer perspective, the broadcast session does not require session joining procedure for the UE before MBS service reception. If this is the case, NR delivery mode 2 may need not to support to notify the changes of PTM configuration (e.g. carried by MCCH) due to session start provided that only broadcast session is supported by NR delivery mode 2. This discussion may depend on the reply for Question 3 in section 2.3.

Meanwhile, rapporteur understanding is that NR delivery mode 2 need to support to notify the changes of PTM configuration due to other purposes (e.g. modification of the transmission cycle for a service).

RAN2 needs to confirm the above understandings.

### **Question 10**

Do you agree that the PTM change notification mechanism can be used to notify the changes of PTM configuration (e.g. carried by MCCH) due to session start for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | It is not clear to us why LTE SC-PTM support notification of the session start but delivery mode 2 of NR MBS need not. Meanwhile we think that this can be coordinated with SA2.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | gNBs should send session start notification when the broadcast session establishment request is received from the CN. |
| QC | Yes but | PTM configuration is carried by MCCH. we think the question is whether MCCH change notification mechanism can be used to alert Broadcast UEs to acquire MCCH based on MCCH modification period. With this understanding, MCCH change notification can be used to alert change of Broadcast service(s) (i.e addition/removal), broadcast session start/stop, PTM configuration change etc. |
| OPPO | Yes but | The MCCH change notification mechanism can be reused also in NR. But if it be can used to notify the session status, we should confirm it with SA2. |
| CATT | Yes | The session start can be informed to UE with change notification mechanism. SC-PTM mechanism should be the baseline. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We think it’s same with LTE SC-PTM. We assume the notification should be sent whenever the PTM configuration (e.g., MCCH contents) would be changed, regardless of the cases, i.e., start, modify or stop of MBS sessions (or PTM transmissions). With the notification we think it has the same benefit with LTE SC-PTM, i.e., the UE can skip decoding the MCCHs that do not need to be monitored.  |
| ZTE | Yes | at least for Broadcast session start as legacy did. |
| LGE | Yes | RAN2 already made following agreements:* UE receives the MBS configuration (for broadcast/delivery mode 2) by BCCH and/or MCCH (TBD), and this can be received in Idle / Inactive mode. A notification mechanism is used to announce the change of MBS Control information.

We don’t need to revisit this issue. |
| Nokia | Yes | Some sort of change notification method is needed but regarding session start/stop update is not up to RAN2. The term “PTM change notification” is not clear. MCCH change notification shall indicate changes to the content of MCCH message. How actually realize this needs to be studied e.g. how DCI formats are used.  |
| Ericsson | No | We do not see a need for the gNB to notify the UE that that the broadcast session is about to start, i.e. the UE that is interested to a broadcast session can check in system information (or MCCH) whether the broadcast session the UE is interested to receive is active or not. In case the NW should notify the UEs about the start, then the NW would also be required to continue notification while the session is active to notify UEs that enter the cell while the session is active. To enable a hybrid solution that only notifies when the session starts does not make sense to us.  |
| vivo | Yes | The LTE SC-MCCH information change notification should be reused for NR MBS to notify the session start. Otherwise, how can a UE with no ongoing MBS service efficiently know when to monitor the SC-MCCH without blind detection on whether data is transmitted?  |
| Futurewei | Yes | With SIB-only approach, we can use the MBS SIB specific change notification to only trigger the MBS UEs to read MBS SIB for changes. Maybe use modified (e.g. SIB1) conventional SIB start/change mechanism. |
| Intel | Yes | Our understanding is that session start is also needed for broadcast session, just as in LTE. |
| Sharp | Yes | SC-PTM approach would be simple. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | As in legacy, the MCCH change notification mechanism is used to announce changes of MCCH due to either Session Start. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | The LTE SC-MCCH change notification mechanism can be reused. |
| NEC | Yes  | We can re-use SC-PTM change notification as the baseline.  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | From our perspective, change notification method is needed to indicate the session start. But for the specific change notification design, we share the view from Nokia, the specific signaling needs to be studied e.g., how DCI formats are used. |
| Apple | Yes | LTE SC-PTM change notifiaiton mechanism can be taken as the baseline.  |
| Samsung | Yes | We prefere SC-PTM as initial baseline, but some details can be further discussed. |

**Rapporteur summary-10: According to the feedback provided, the majority companies (21/22) agreed that PTM change notification mechanism can be used to notify the changes of PTM configuration (e.g. carried by MCCH) due to session start for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS. One company did not see the need.**

**Proposal-10: PTM change notification mechanism can be used to notify the changes of PTM configuration (e.g. carried by MCCH) due to session start for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS.**

### **Question 11**

Do you agree that the PTM change notification mechanism can be used to notify the changes of PTM configuration (e.g. carried by MCCH) due to other purpose (e.g. modification of the transmission cycle for a service) for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | Same as legacy approach.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We prefer to use the same approach as in LTE SC-PTM, i.e. notifications are only sent for new session indication. For ongoing MBS sessions, the UE should read MCCH once per MCCH modification period to check whether any configuration updates were done.  |
| QC | Yes | See Q10 response. |
| OPPO | Yes? | We are not sure if it is same as Huawei said? We are not sure if the transmission cycle for a service exists in SC-PTM? |
| CATT | ? | Same understanding on the SC-PTM mechanism as Huawei. Change notification mechanism in SC-PTM is only used to inform the session start.Then the question is what is the problem if we stick to SC-PTM approach? Or what is the benefit if we extend the usage of the change notification mechanism? |
| Kyocera | Yes | We think it’s same with LTE SC-PTM.  |
| ZTE | Yes | legacy can be baseline. |
| LGE | No | Same as legacy mechanism in LTE.  |
| Nokia | No | MCCH change notification shall indicate any change in the content of MCCH message and a UE interested to receive or receiving MBS broadcast shall acquire the MCCH message.  |
| Ericsson | Yes | In case the PTM configuration is changed, without notifying the UE, this would interrupt the broadcast reception. We assume PTM configuration changes are infrequent, and that they could be notified to the UE via normal SI change notification.  |
| vivo | Yes | The LTE MBMS mechanism for NB-IoT/MTC can be reused for NR since it is good for UE power saving. |
| Futurewei | Yes but | Also for SIB-only approach without BCCH. The basic assumption is: with low QoS requirement, frequent scheduling configuration change is not needed. The existing NR SI change notification mechanism can be slightly modified to MBS SI change only notification. |
| Intel | Yes | Same as LTE SC-PTM. |
| Sharp | Yes | Same approach with SC-PTM is preferable. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | See Q10 response. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Same as LTE SC-PTM. |
| Sony | No | Agree with Huawei |
| Xiaomi | Yes | It seems that companies are having different understandings on the use cases of the MCCH change notification. Maybe we could say that the LTE MCCH change notification is used as the baseline. |
| CMCC |  | See Q10 response. |
| Apple |  | See Q10 response.  |
| Samsung | No | See Q10 |

**Rapporteur summary-11: According to the feedback provided, the majority companies (13/22) agreed that PTM change notification mechanism can be used to notify the changes of PTM configuration (e.g. carried by MCCH) due to other purpose (e.g. modification of the transmission cycle for a service) for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS. However some companies (5/22) commented that it was not LTE SC-PTM approach during the reply. It would be better to take online discussion for the issue.**

**Proposal-11: RAN2 to discuss if PTM change notification mechanism can be used to notify the changes of PTM configuration (e.g. carried by MCCH) due to other purpose (e.g. modification of the transmission cycle for a service) for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS.**

## 4.2 Baseline of PTM change notification mechanism

The discussion of PTM change notification should be connected with the decision whether two-step approach (BCCH +MCCH) or one-step approach (BCCH only) is adopted for PTM configuration transmission, as discussed within section 3.1. However, this discussion in this section assumes that MCCH logical channel is adopted for the transmission PTM configuration as LTE SC-PTM.

It should be noted that the initial discussion for change notification for MBS was taken during email discussion [Post-111e][906] for Idle/Inactive mode UEs. According to that email discussion summary and the contributions submitted to RAN2#112e, rapporteur understanding is that the companies want to have a baseline for change notification before any specific enhancement discussion.

**Baseline: Use the legacy LTE SC-PTM change notification mechanism**

In LTE SC-PTM, the change notification of the MBMS control information is sent in the first subframe in a Repetition Period where the SC-MCCH can be scheduled. The notification is sent using the DCI format 1C with SC-N-RNTI. When the UE receives the notification, it will acquire the updated SC-MCCH.

RAN2 needs to confirm this baseline for PTM change notification mechanism for NR MBS delivery mode 2.

### **Question 12**

Do you agree to use the legacy LTE SC-PTM change notification mechanism as the baseline for PTM change notification for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | Same as legacy approach.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We think there is no reason to deviate from the legacy mechanism, either the one used for non-NB-IOT/MTC UEs (based on SC-N-RNTI) or the one used for NB-IOT/MTC UEs (based on SC-RNTI).  |
| QC | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes  |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes | We think it’s straight forward as the baseline.  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | We think the SI change notification can be used (to notify PTM configuration change). This is less complex and less costly. |
| vivo | Yes | No specific technical issue is found.  |
| Futurewei | No | We have similar view as Ericsson.  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes  | Same as Q11.  |
| Sony | Yes | We agree with Huawei that a further down selection between NB-IoT/MTC and parent SC-PTM approach is required at a later stage. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| CMCC | No | Firstly, we prefer to adopt the two-step based approach for acquiring MBS PTM configuration, that is, SIB20-like provides the SC-MCCH scheduling information; and SC-MCCH provides the SC-MTCH scheduling information, where the SC-MCCH is scheduled by SC-RNTI at PDCCH (not SI-RNTI at PDCCH), and the SC-MTCH scheduled by G-RNTI at PDCCH. Hence, the PTM configuration scheduling is independent from SIB scheduling. And we need a kind of PTM change notification signaling, not paging message. However, considering the efficiency and singling overhead, we tend to prefer some enhancement in the PTM change notification. For example, adopting the short message mechanism for paging message into the change notification of the MBMS control information. Specifically, design a new DCI format for PTM change notification which is similar as that used in Short Message for paging to indicate the whether the MBMS control information is change,  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |

**Rapporteur summary-12: According to the feedback provided, the majority companies (19/22) prefer to take LTE SC-PTM approach as baseline for PTM change notification for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS.**

**Proposal-12: Take LTE SC-PTM approach as baseline for PTM change notification for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS.**

## 4.3 Group based PTM change notification

This section continue the discussion from previous section.

The legacy LTE SC-PTM change notification mechanism is a simple solution. However, as commented by some companies during the email discussion Post111-e(906), the SC-PTM change notification mechanism may lead the UE to monitor both MCCH and PCCH and to wake up and receive the updated MCCH control information for some MBS services which are not his interests and then may be not friendly to UE power consumption for the cases where PTM configuration changes too often.

According to the email discussion (Post111-e-906) summary [1] and the contributions submitted to RAN2#112e, rapporteur summarizes the following alternatives to handle the issue.

**Alternative 1: Multiple MCCHs to notify PTM configuration change**

The network groups some of MBS services together to form a MBS service group to share the same MCCH modification cycle and repetition cycle. For example, the frequently changed MBS services can be organized together into one service group and their PTM configuration and change notification shares one MCCH. As discussed in section 3.5, multiple MCCHs are used in this case.

If the MBS services could be grouped above, the PTM change notification can be only notified to the involved UEs which have interests. UE may refrain from frequent wake-up for MCCH check if he wants to only follow less frequently changed MBS services (e.g. IoT services).

**Alternative 2: Group based paging to notify PTM configuration change**

The spirit of this design is to merge the monitoring of PTM configuration change notification into the legacy paging monitoring to save UE power. The bits within the Short Message field of the legacy DCI format for paging or new DCI format can be used to indicate whether the NR MBS control information is changed. The field (e.g. short message) can further indicate which MBS service group’s MBMS control information are changed. The UE reads the paging and then reads the updated MCCH channel if needed.

This design also assume that the MBS services could be grouped. This design implies that the UE that is interested in the MBS services can be automatically grouped and then UE group based paging applies. It should be noted that UE group based paging is being discussed within Rel-17 power saving WI.

The benefit of this alternative is that the change notification is only notified to the involved UEs which have interests [28]. However the discussion of the DCI format may need coordination with RAN1. RAN2 also needs to discuss how to group the UEs to enable group based paging for different MBS service groups.

There may be pros and cons for the abovementioned alternatives. And there may be additional alternatives for the enhancement of baseline PTM change notification mechanism.

RAN2 can discuss which alternative should be adopted if an enhancement based on the baseline PTM change notification mechanism is considered.

### **Question 13**

Which alternative should be adopted if an enhancement based on the baseline PTM change notification mechanism is considered?

Alt-1: Multiple MCCHs to notify PTM configuration change

Alt-2: Group based paging to notify PTM configuration change

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred Alt(s) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Alt-1 | It should be noted that NR MBS delivery mode 2 may support both Idle/Inactive UEs and connected UEs. Requiring the connected UEs to monitor Paging channel is an additional burden for the UEs. In addition, grouping info in Paging DCI may lead to legacy UEs to receive the Paging DCI indicating MBS change if PO is not arranged correctly. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Neither | It is too soon to discuss such optimizations considering that we have not agreed on the baseline mechanism yet. |
| QC | Alt1 for Broadcast MCCH change notification but | Group paging is more appropriate for alerting Multicast UEs (assuming Multicast config is provided via RRC dedicated signaling) and MCCH change notification is appropriate for alerting Broadcast UEs to update MCCH changes. Even if there is single MCCH used, MCCH change notification can be used and no need to tie it to multiple MCCH case only. |
| OPPO | None  | We share the same view with Huawei. |
| CATT | Alt-2 | We understand the method that notifying PTM configuration change in group can be used in SC-MCCH based change notification mechanism or paging mechanism. The question is what is the principle/granularity to group the MBS services, |
| Kyocera | Alt-1 and Alt-2 | We share Huawei’s view. We think it’s too early to discuss Q13, so both alternatives (and other possible options, if any) can be considered later.  |
| ZTE | Neither | too early to discuss. |
| LGE | Neither | Same view as HW. |
| Nokia | None | Let’s try to set basline first |
| Ericsson | Paging | PS: we have the feeling that questions about notification methods are repeated.We think that re-use of paging for notification (if needed) is simpler and less complex. We are not sure whether group paging should be based on group RNTI, and based on a single bit in Paging DCI (e.g. MBS change), after which the UE check SI to see what exactly has been changed.  |
| vivo | Alt-1 | Alt-1 is preferred if multiple MCCHs are supported. Moreover, a parallel discussion on the group-based paging/WUS mechanism should be avoided.  |
| Futurewei | Alt-2 modified for SIB only approach | For one-step SIB only approach, reuse the BCCH to configure the notification period, position and occasions of MBS notification in PCCH for SIB content change per MBS service. The MBS UEs including idle ones continue to monitor the notification occasions, when there is MBS SIB content change, the network sends the notification to the MBS UEs. The notification indicates which MBS service configuration is changed. Only the UEs in that service will go ahead to read the MBS SIB. New tag of MBS SIB maybe added to SIB1. |
| Intel | None | In Alt-2, the minimum paging cycle of 320 ms might not support the latency requirement of certain services, therefore Alt-2 should not be considered. As in our reply to Question 9, we prefer not to consider multiple MCCH approach. |
| Sharp |  | Agree with HW. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | None  | We share the same view with Huawei. |
| Spreadtrum | None  | Share the same view with Huawei. |
| NEC | NONE | Too early to discuss.  |
| Sony | Neither | Too early to discuss |
| Xiaomi | None | Too early to discuss |
| CMCC | Alt 2-variant | What we preferred is group-based PTM notification message, rather than group-based paging to notify PTM configuration change. |
| Apple | None | Too early to discuss |
| Samsung | None |  |

**Rapporteur summary-13: According to the feedback provided, the slight majority companies (13/22) think that it is too early to discuss the enhancement for PTM change notification (i.e. Group based PTM change notification). Meanwhile there are some interests in discussing both Alt1 (Mulitple MCCHs based) and Alt2 (Group paging based) or its variants for PTM change notification for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS.**

**Proposal-13: Mark the enhancement for PTM change notification as an open issue for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS.**

# Counting and Interesting indication

In LTE eMBMS/SC-PTM, there are two different types of methods specified to collect UE’s receiving/interested services, i.e., MBMS Counting and MBMS Interest Indication (MII). RAN2 should discuss if the related mechanism can apply to delivery mode 2 of NR MBS.

## 5.1 Counting

In LTE eMBMS, counting is used to determine if there are sufficient UEs interested in receiving a service to enable the operator to decide if it is appropriate to deliver the service via MBSFN.

When the MCE entity requests the counting, MCE will send counting request to eNB. Upon reception of Counting Request from MCE, eNB will broadcast Counting Request to the UE, then the RRC\_CONNECTED UE will respond the counting response message to the network, in order to assist the network to decide the transmission method for the MBMS session. But for RRC\_IDLE UE, they are not mandated to enter RRC\_CONNECTED mode to respond the counting request.

For NR MBS delivery mode 2, even though there is no standardized support for MBSFN, the counting may still help to the network to decide the transmission method.

RAN2 needs to discuss the support of counting procedure for delivery mode 2 for both connected UEs and Idle/Inactive mode UEs.

Specific to Idle/Inactive mode UEs, some companies think that it would be possible to allow UE to respond the counting request without going to RRC connected mode if it is supported [4].

### **Question 14**

Should delivery mode 2 support counting procedure for connected mode UEs?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | Same as legacy approach.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Counting is a complicated mechanism and we do not think it is necessary to support it. For multicast sessions, the network is aware of the number of the UEs using a service while for broadcast we can rely on proper network planning and higher layers. This is how it is handled in LTE SC-PTM where AS layer counting is not supported and instead we rely on application layer to collect the information about the number of receiving UEs and determine to use broadcast or unicast transmission. |
| QC | Maybe Yes | Can be useful to determine whether to broadcast a service or not. But for Multicast services, RAN3 agreed not to support counting procedure. |
| OPPO | No  | It is already agreed in RAN3 that counting is not supported in NR MBS.  |
| CATT | Depends | It depends on whether NG-RAN supports to dynamic control on the start/stop of broadcast services delivery based on number of interested UEs. |
| Kyocera | Yes | As the rapporteur summarized, Counting Response is initiated by Counting Request, i.e., NW-triggered, while MBMS Interest Indication (MII) is UE-triggered process. Also, Counting would be used for the decision of starting the delivery mode 2, while MII would be used for service continuity by scheduling/handover of Connected UEs. So, we think Counting is still helpful for NR MBS.  |
| ZTE | No | Legacy interest indication for RRC\_CONNECTED UE can do the job of counting. |
| LGE | No | gNB stores the MBS context and would update it based on the interest indication from UE. If so, no further mechanism is needed for counting. |
| Nokia | No | This is not essential to make MBMS to work. Let’s try to first set aspects that are actually needed. Although ROM UEs are not covered by the scope of the Rel-17 WID, it is good to understand that presence of ROM UEs in the system would make counting useless. And secondly if one wants better performance then most likely one needs to fall to multicast approach providing better reliablility. |
| Ericsson | No | Not needed for multicast, and for broadcast the service is provided in the broadcast service area.  |
| vivo | No | For CONNECTED UE with data received from the broadcast session, we think the NW can acquire the corresponding info via the reported interest indication. For CONNECTED UE with data received from the multicast session, considering that the session join/leave is mandatory, we cannot see the need to introduce the counting mechanism. |
| Futurewei |  | No strong opinion. |
| Intel | No | RAN3#109-e meeting made the following agreement: "Counting procedures for multicast are not introduced in Rel-17". In addition, in RAN3#110-e meeting, following working assumption was made: “WA: Counting procedures for broadcast in Rel-17 (other than interest indication) does not seem needed at this time; to be coordinated with RAN2, SA2”. There is no need to reopen the discussion in RAN2.  |
| Sharp | Yes for broadcast service | Agree with QC. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No | No for multicast.For broadcast, counting is not an essential function. In LTE, the counting was introduced mainly for MBMS suspension and resumption function.  |
| Spreadtrum | No | Agree with Intel. |
| NEC | Yes | Without counting, how RAN makes decision of PTM/PTP? |
| Sony | Yes | If broadcast service is received in connected mode using delivery mode 2 |
| Xiaomi | Yes | This could be useful for the broadcast service. We should probably also take the on-going RAN3 counting discussion into account. |
| CMCC | No | It was agreed in RAN3 that "Counting procedures for multicast are not introduced in Rel-17", and we don’t think it’s necessary for broadcast session. |
| Apple | No | RAN3 has excluded the counting mechanism.  |
| Samsung | No | gNB can always transmit the broadcast data. |

**Rapporteur summary-14: According to the feedback provided, a number of companies (13/22) prefer not to support the counting procedure for NR MBS delivery mode 2 for connected mode UEs. However, there are also quite a number companies (7/22) see the need.**

**Proposal-14: RAN2 further discuss if delivery mode 2 support counting procedure for connected mode UEs.**

### **Question 15**

Should delivery mode 2 support counting procedure for Idle/Inactive mode UEs?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | No | It may be too complicated to require Idle/Inactive mode UEs to provide counting response.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Please see answer to question 14. |
| QC | Yes | If counting is supported for Broadcast UEs, then it has to be supported for UEs in all RRC states to provide response. |
| OPPO | No  | It is already agreed in RAN3 that counting is not supported in NR MBS. |
| CATT | Depends | Same as our answer to Q14. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We assume Counting Request can be broadcasted, while Counting Response can be reported without transitioning to Connected, e.g., by PRACH partitioning or SDT. So, we think it’s not significant burden on UEs.  |
| ZTE | No | It was not supported in legacy. We see no motivation to enhance it further in NR. |
| LGE | No | Same as legacy mechanism in LTE. |
| Nokia | No | Please see answer to question 14. |
| Ericsson | No | Not needed for multicast, and for broadcast the service is provided in the broadcast service area.  |
| vivo | Yes | If we understand correctly, the RAN3 agreement on counting is only limited to the multicast case (i.e. counting procedures for multicast are not introduced in Rel-17). Whether counting can be supported for broadcast hasn’t been discussed yet. Now, when it comes to data received from the broadcast session in IDLE/INACITVE state, the NW has no way to collect the corresponding info on the amounts of UEs. Thus, we think it is beneficial for UE to provide the assistance info to the NW.  |
| Futurewei | No |  |
| Intel | No | See Q14. |
| Sharp | Yes | The same view with Q14 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No | It is difficult to support counting for IDLE/Inactive UEs. |
| Spreadtrum | No | See Q14. |
| NEC | Yes | Same as Q14.  |
| Son y | Yes | This can be linked to on-demand request for SIB/MCCH and no special mechanism defined. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| CMCC | No | Same as Q14 |
| Apple | No |  |
| Samsung | No |  |

**Rapporteur summary-15: According to the feedback provided, a number of companies (14/22) prefer not to support the counting procedure for NR MBS delivery mode 2 for Idle/Inactive mode UEs. However, there are also quite a number companies (7/22) see the need.**

**Proposal-15: RAN2 further discuss if delivery mode 2 support counting procedure for Idle/Inactive mode UEs.**

### **Question 16**

Should delivery mode 2 support counting procedure for Idle/Inactive mode UEs without mandating the UEs to enter RRC connected mode?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | No | This may be a RAN1 discussion. However requiring Idle/Inactive mode UEs to feedback may cause problem to the UEs if the uplink coverage is not good enough.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Please see answer to question 14. |
| QC | No |  |
| OPPO | No  | It is already agreed in RAN3 that counting is not supported in NR MBS. |
| CATT | No |  |
| Kyocera | Yes | See our comment in Q15. We prefer to stick with the LTE eMBMS principle that the IDLE/INACTIVE UEs should not transition to CONN just for the purpose of sending Counting Response.  |
| ZTE | No | As in our answer to Q15. |
| LGE | No |  |
| Nokia | No | Please see answer to question 14. |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| vivo | No | Further enhancements are not considered in Rel-17. |
| Futurewei | No strong opinion | It is possibleIf counting of connected UE is supported. Consider also update the MBS counting for idle/inactive UEs through the location update or keep-alive mechanism. |
| Intel | No | See Q14. |
| Sharp | No |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No |  |
| Spreadtrum | No | See Q14. |
| NEC | No |  |
| Sony | Yes | See our response to Q15 |
| Xiaomi | Depends on the solutions | Maybe this can be discussed after we decide whether to allow IDLE/INACTIVE counting. |
| CMCC | No |  |
| Apple | No |  |
| Samsung | No | Maybe this may be discussed after we decide whether to allow IDLE/INACTIVE counting. |

**Rapporteur summary-16: According to the feedback provided, clear majority companies (18/22) prefer not to support counting procedure for Idle/Inactive mode UEs without mandating the UEs to enter RRC connected mode. This can also be revisited after we decide whether to allow Idle/Inactive UEs based counting.**

**Proposal-16: Mark the discussion of the mechanism for counting procedure for Idle/Inactive UEs based counting as an open issue for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS. To be revisited after we decide whether to allow Idle/Inactive UEs based counting.**

## 5.2 Interesting indication

In LTE eMBMS/SC-PTM, the purpose of MBMS Interest Indication procedure is to inform E-UTRAN that the UE is receiving or is interested to receive MBMS via an MRB, and if so, to inform E-UTRAN about the priority of MBMS versus unicast reception.

As can be seen, the MBMS Interest Indication procedure is different from counting procedure. Furthermore, in LTE eMBMS/SC-PTM, UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED is allowed to send the MBMSInterestIndication message at any time. It contains the information related to MBMS frequencies of interest, MBMS services of interest, MBMS priority, etc. MBMS Interest Indication (MII) procedure is mainly used for the network to ensure that the UE can continue to receive its service of interest while in connected mode.

In LTE eMBMS/SC-PTM, MII cannot collect the information from UEs in IDLE mode, even though the majority of UEs may receive the broadcast services in IDLE mode.

According to the email discussion [Post111-e][906] and company contribution submitted to RAN2#112e, some companies think that unnecessary PTM transmissions can be avoided if the cell knows the interests of UEs in IDLE/INACTIVE. However, some companies have concerns about the complexity and signalling overhead of UE interest indication from UE in idle/inactive mode.

For NR MBS delivery mode 2, there may be both connected UEs and Idle/Inactive mode UEs. So then RAN2 can separate the discussion for connected UEs and Idle/Inactive mode UEs.

### **Question 17**

Should MBS Interest Indication is supported for UEs in connected mode for delivery mode 2?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | We support this MBS Interest Indication to enable the service continuity for UE reception.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | It is needed for service continuity, e.g. to allow the source gNB to select a target cell which supports the broadcast service for the UE during handover or to configure or schedule the UE in the way allowing it to receive PTM together with unicast while it is in RRC Connected. |
| QC | Yes for broadcast only | LTE MII is intended for service continuity for UEs receiving Broadcast services while in RRC\_CONNECTED state. The same is true for NR Broadcast as well. |
| OPPO | Yes  | There is no AS context for the delivery mode 2, so interesting indication is good for connected UE when receiving delivery mode 2 MBS. |
| CATT | Yes | To secure handover with basic service continuity, NG-RAN should know which broadcast service(s) the UE in connected mode is receiving. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We think MBS Interest Indication has different purpose comparing to Counting as commented in Q14, so it’s useful for service continuity on the delivery mode 2 even if Counting is introduced.  |
| ZTE | Yes for Broadcast | Yes for Broadcast for network to better scheduling for such UE in RRC\_CONNECTED UE, e.g., simultaneous reception of both MBS and Unicast services in inter slot TDM manner.For Multicast, no (if the definition of MII is unchanged). |
| LGE | Yes | Same as legacy mechanism in LTE. |
| Nokia | yes (only delivery mode 2 serving broadcast) | If connected mode UE is not able to receive broadcast service while being configured with dedicated BWP then this is needed to inform NW how to configure BWP for the UE. Additionally we need to consider mobility scenario where MBS service of interest is provided on different frequency – UE would need to provide interest indication for NW to allow possibility for NW to handover UE to proper frequency. |
| Ericsson | No | First of all we do not see a strong need to support broadcast reception in connected mode, and when supported it should be supported it should be supported in a simple way. We think that broadcast reception in connected is more best effort and not guaranteed. What is the network supposed to do with the “interested” information from the UE, especially when there is a conflict to receive both unicast and broadcast simultaneously? We think that the NW is not required to know about broadcast reception in connected mode in a similar way as for multicast. |
| vivo | Yes | With this, the NW can know UE‘s newest MBS services interest, preference degree, and the capability of simultaneous MBS data reception. |
| Futurewei | Yes | For connected UEs it should be supported in delivery mode 2. |
| Intel | Yes | We think the interest information is useful for service continuity and appropriate configuration. |
| Sharp | Yes for broadcast | The same as legacy is preferable |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes for broadcast only |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | It is beneficial for the servie continuity. |
| NEC | Yes | It is beneficial for the servie continuity. |
| Sony | Yes | We agree that it is needed for service continuity |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| CMCC | NO  | We see its benefit of support this for service continuity, but we are wondering the actual gain of only taking Connected UE into consideration, since delivery mode 2 also serves Idle and Inactive UEs. |
| Apple | Yes | It's benefitical ffor the MBS service continuity.  |
| Samsung | No | Mode 2 is mainly for broadcast, which is best effort and low priority.  |

**Rapporteur summary-17: According to the feedback provided, clear majority companies (19/22) agreed that MBS Interest Indication can be supported for UEs in connected mode for delivery mode 2. Two companies did not see the need.**

**Proposal-17: MBS Interest Indication is supported for UEs in connected mode for NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

### **Question 18**

Should MBS Interest Indication is supported for UEs in idle/inactive mode for delivery mode 2?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | No | It may be too complicated to require Idle/Inactive mode UEs to provide MBS Interest Indication for delivery mode 2.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | There is no use of MBS Interest Indication for IDLE/INACTIVE mode UEs. |
| QC | No | See Q17 response. |
| OPPO | No  |  |
| CATT | Depends | Same as our answer in Q14. |
| Kyocera | No | We assume MBS Interest Indication is mainly used for service continuity of Connected UEs, as same in LTE SC-PTM. In addition, we assume the message content is much larger than Counting, if the same information is applied as in LTE SC-PTM. So, we think it’s useless for UEs in IDLE/INACTIVE to report it without transitioning to Connected.  |
| ZTE | No | Don't see the need here. |
| LGE | No | Same as legacy mechanism in LTE. |
| Nokia | No |  |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| vivo | No | Further enhancements are not considered in Rel-17. |
| Futurewei | No | In SIB only approach, the idle UEs can easily determine which MBS services provided in the serving cell is interested. |
| Intel | No | Interest indication is not needed for UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE. It was discussed in LTE before and were not agreed due to complexity, signalling overhead / congestion etc. |
| Sharp | No |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No |  |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| NEC | No  |  |
| Sony | No |  |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| CMCC | No |  |
| Apple | No |  |
| Samsung | No |  |

**Rapporteur summary-18: According to the feedback provided, clear majority companies (21/22) agreed that MBS Interest Indication should not be supported for UEs in idle/inactive mode for delivery mode 2.**

**Proposal-18: MBS Interest Indication is not supported for UEs in idle/inactive mode for NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

## 5.3 Interaction between MBS interest indication and On-Demand SI

There is a discussion at the previous section (i.e. 3.4) on the support on-demand PTM configuration (as provided by e.g. MCCH). Then there is a proposal to correlate the procedure of MBS interest indication with on-demand request for MCCH configuration [19]. In practice, the UE can provide an MBMS interest indication as part of the process to acquire an MBS SIB or PTM configuration (e.g. carried by MCCH). Requesting MBS SIB/PTM configuration could be understood as some form of MBS interest from the UE. This can be seen as a signalling optimization to reduce latency.

### **Question 19**

Should MBS Interest Indication be merged with on demand MBS/PTM configuration request procedure for delivery mode 2?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | No | As replied at Question 8, we are not convinced for the benefit of on demand PTM configuration (e.g. in MCCH).  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | MBS Interest Indication should only be for UEs in RRC Connected while the configuration for delivery mode 2 is provided with broadcast signalling to ensure also RRC IDLE UEs can receive it. We do not see how this ca be correlated. |
| QC | No | Motivation of MII is different from on demand SIB/MCCH request. If a UE is requesting On-demand SIB/MCCH does not mean that UE is receiving a particular Broadcast service in RRC\_CONNECTED state. A UE requests on-demand SIB/MCCH to learn which broadcast services available in the cell or area then UE starts receiving Broadcast service based on user interest. If UE starts receiving some Broadcast services while in RRC\_CONNECTED state then for the purpose of service continuity UE can send MII to gNB.  |
| OPPO | No  | We think we should agree that the on-demand MCCH or MBS BCCH is supported firstly. |
| CATT | No | On demand MCCH is not preferred as we commented in Q8. |
| Kyocera | FFS | We share the intention of proposal, while we’re wondering if it depends on the purpose and message contents of NR MBS Interest Indication. So, we think it’s too early to decide this.  |
| ZTE | No |  |
| LGE | No | Anyway, too early to discuss this issue. |
| Nokia | Yes | When it comes to MBS SIB, arises the question whether the UE should provide an MBMS interest indication as part of the process to acquire an MBS SIB in order to reduce latency. After all, requesting MBS SIB should be understood as some form of MBS interest from the UE but probably in order to decide on this we need to discuss more on the contents of interest indication. |
| Ericsson | No | PS: this question overlaps with Q16? |
| vivo | No | Agree with the rapporteur that on-demand request on SIB and MCCH can be regarded as one kind of interest indication. We are wondering why we should associate the interest indication with the on-demand SIB/MCCH request.  |
| Futurewei | FFS | No strong opinion. It is an optimization. The motivation of show interest is to get MBS configured. In delivery mode 2, the configuration is through SIB. |
| Intel | No | As in our reply to Q8, we don't think on-demand MBS configuration is needed. |
| Sharp | No | We do not support on demand PTM configuration |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No | It is not clear how the mechanism works e.g. for on-demand in idle/inactive, the network may not know which UE is interested in which MBS service.  |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| NEC | NO  |  |
| Sony | Yes | We think this can be merged for the serving cell but won’t assist in service continuity and interest in neighboring cells/frequencies and details are FFS. |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| CMCC | Yes  | If on-demand MBS SIB, MCCH and UE interest indication are supported, it could be used together. UE’s request for MBS SIB and MCCH could be considered as a kind of interest indication, and vice versa. |
| Apple | No |  |
| Samsung | No |  |

**Rapporteur summary-19: According to the feedback provided, clear majority companies (16/22) did not see the need to merge the** **MBS Interest Indication with on demand MBS/PTM configuration request procedure for delivery mode 2, even though the support of on demand MBS/PTM configuration request procedure was not decided yet. Three companies see the need. The rest two companies put it FFS.**

**Proposal-19: RAN2 decide if the** **MBS Interest Indication can be merged with on demand MBS/PTM configuration request procedure for delivery mode 2 after the decision on the support of on demand MBS/PTM configuration request procedure.**

# Service continuity for Delivery mode 2

## 6.1 Need of Service continuity for Delivery mode 2

The need of service continuity for Delivery mode 2 should be discussed. On one hand, the Delivery mode 2 is used for low QoS MBS service and then the service continuity for UE reception may be not very critical. On the other hand, the current service continuity mechanism for LTE SC-PTM/eMBMS is easy to be reused by Delivery mode 2. RAN2 can confirm the understanding before any other discussion for service continuity for Delivery mode 2 in the following sections.

### **Question 20**

Do you agree that service continuity is needed for NR MBS Delivery mode 2?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | Same need as legacy approach for LTE SC-PTM/eMBMS.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Even though the service may have low QoS requirements, we should ensure that the UE is able to receive it whenever it is interested in this service. |
| QC | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes  |  |
| CATT | Yes | From user experience point of view, at least basic service continuity in mobility should be supported naturally regardless of what delivery mode is used. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We think there is no technical reason to degrade NR MBS delivery mode 2, comparing to LTE eMBMS/SC-PTM service continuity.  |
| ZTE | Yes | Legacy can be baseline. |
| LGE | Yes | Same as legacy mechanism in LTE. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Nokia | Yes | Service continuity in CONNECTED should be possible but there are scenarios when NW cannot fulfill all the unicast/broadcast requirements same time and then service continuity may not be guaranteed. But then again we could reuse reselection rules (MBMS layer prioritization) for service continuity in IDLE/INACTIVE states. |
| Ericsson | It depends on what you mean with service continuity? |  |
| vivo | Yes | A good user experience should be guaranteed as much as possible. |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes | Same motivation as LTE SC-PTM. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | Same as LTE SC-PTM  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes  |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | Service continuity should be pursued. But mode 2 is not for low QoS. We don’t need to introduce too complicated heavy solution. |

**Rapporteur summary-20: According to the feedback provided, clear majority companies (21/22) see the need to have** **service continuity for NR MBS Delivery mode 2. Many companies indicated to follow the same motivation as LTE SC-PTM.**

**Proposal-20: Service continuity is needed for NR MBS Delivery mode 2.**

## 6.2 Mechanism to transmit the information for Service continuity for Delivery mode 2

For LTE SC-PTM, the service continuity was ensured via various ways as described below:

At first, to avoid the need for the UE to read MBMS related system information and potentially SC-MCCH on neighbor frequencies, the MBMS assistance information are provided by both USD (i.e. user service description) and system information (i.e. SIB15).

Secondly, the UEs in RRC\_IDLE applies frequency based prioritization during cell reselection.

Thirdly, for each MBMS service provided using SC-PTM, E-UTRAN indicates in the SC-MCCH the list of neighbor cells providing this MBMS service so that the UE can request unicast reception of the service before changing to a cell not providing the MBMS service using SC-PTM. The UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED informs the network about its MBMS interest, and then the network does its best to ensure that the UE is able to receive MBMS and unicast services subject to the UE’s capabilities during mobility.

Specific to NR delivery mode 2, this section can focus on the discussion of first way as mentioned above. The discussion of frequency based prioritization is taken at section 6.3 and 6.4. The discussion of the third way (i.e. interest indication and MCCH information) is taken at section 5 and section 7 respectively.

RAN2 needs to decide whether NR delivery mode 2 can assume that both USD and system information can be provided for purpose of service continuity as for LTE SC-PTM. It should be noted that USD will be discussed by SA/CT WGs and the design of the content of system information may be subject to the final description of USD.

### **Question 21**

Do you agree that both USD and system information can be provided for purpose of service continuity for NR MBS Delivery mode 2 (i.e. reuse legacy approach for LTE SC-PTM)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | The content of USD may rely on the input from SA/CT WGs. Then the SIB information cannot be decided now. However the general principle of legacy approach for LTE SC-PTM/eMBMS can be reused.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We agree the general principle can be reused. |
| QC | Yes | In LTE, USD main purpose is to configure list of broadcast services and frequencies of support etc. Based on USD list, UE can search for a frequency to acquire SIB15 and UE selects its interested broadcast service. The same approach can be used for NR Broadcast as well. |
| OPPO | Yes  |  |
| CATT | Yes | Agree with MTK and Huawei that general principle in SC-PTM can be reused. |
| Kyocera | Yes | We agree with MediaTek in general. The USD is up to other WGs. The SIB should provide the information to assist the UEs on service continuity, while the details are FFS so far.  |
| ZTE | FFS | We don't know yet if the same USD and SAI concept will be adopted by SA2/SA6. It is out of RAN scope but some inter WG coordination is needed. RAN can't decide what USD includes. |
| LGE | Yes | Same as legacy mechanism in LTE. |
| Nokia | Yes but cell specific information provision need is not clear | let’s start with simple approach and just allow frequency prioritization for cell reselection based on the frequencies received in USD and not to introduce an cell specific information |
| Ericsson | Details FFS | USD is outside RAN2 scope. And the details on the assistance info in SI needs further discussion. |
| vivo | Yes from RAN2 perspective | Generally, we think USD info is necessary. |
| Futurewei | Yes | All the legacy methods can be applied to the SIB only approach including that MBS SIB supporting the serving cell and showing the neighboring services can be broadcast to entire service area to ensure the service continuity in the area. Reselection priority can be provided to the carrier frequency with MBS service. Connected UEs can also demand the service. |
| Intel | Yes | The only question relevant to RAN2 is the system information for service continuity. Decision regarding USD should be up to SA4, and our understanding is that USD is transmitted as application layer message as in LTE. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | We agree to take SC-PTM as baseline. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Same as legacy mechanism in LTE. |
| NEC | Yes  | LTE SC-PTM can be the baseline. |
| Sony | Yes | We are ok with legacy principles and USD is not in RAN2 scope. |
| Xiaomi | FFS | We are not sure whether the SAI information in the USD is still applicable for the broadcast MBS service.  |
| CMCC | Yes | We are OK to use legacy approach as baseline, but USD is out of RAN2 scope. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | We are ok with legacy principles and USD is not in RAN2 scope. |

**Rapporteur summary-21: According to the feedback provided, clear majority companies (20/22) agreed that both USD and system information can be provided for purpose of service continuity for NR MBS Delivery mode 2 (i.e. reuse legacy approach for LTE SC-PTM). Meanwhile, during the reply, many companies indicated that the general principle in SC-PTM can be reused, but the exact content within USD is out of scope of RAN2.**

**Proposal-21: In general, the mechanism to ensure service continuity of LTE SC-PTM is reused for NR MBS Delivery mode 2 (i.e. both USD and system information can be provided for purpose of service continuity).**

## 6.3 UE awareness of MBS services on cell/frequency basis for service continuity

In LTE, the MBMS service is deployed on frequency basis, and the mechanism specified to ensure UE service continuity is that, UE is made aware of which frequency is providing which MBMS services through the combination of USD and SIB15.

During the email discussion [Post-111e][906], there are diverse views on the reuse of the same mechanism as LTE SC-PTM. For example, some companies think that the MBS service information only for neighboring frequencies may not be enough and show preference to have a cell list per frequency per MBS service or a list about the services the cell/node could support (e.g. via BCCH). However this requires more configuration and maintenance of system information to provide neighbor cell info per cell. RAN2 need to discuss this issue from the perspective of delivery mode 2.

### **Question 22**

Select the alternative to support UE awareness of MBS services on cell/frequency basis for service continuity for NR MBS delivery mode 2?

Alt-1: Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism (i.e. per frequency)

Alt-2: Support cell based neighbor cell info for MBS service

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Selected Alt(s) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Alt-1 | We suggest to agree the baseline based on LTE SC-PTM, as per frequency approach is a simple solution in terms of SI configuration. And then consider Alt-2 based on further discussion if possible.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt-1 | We think the service should be provided on the same frequency in a certain area. Hence, the issue would only apply to area borders. We can think later whether it is worth introducing any optimizations for such cases, once we finalize the baseline mechanism. Please note that in our opinion it is still useful to provide the UE with the list of neighbour cells providing specific MBS services in the PTM configuration, as indicated in the answer to Q24. |
| QC | Alt1 as baseline | Same view as MediaTek. If needed, we can specify cell level info in a given frequency. |
| OPPO | Alt-1 | But it should be confirmed with SA2/1. |
| CATT | Alt1 as baseline | Firstly we can take LTE SC-PTM mechanism as baseline, then we can also work on cell based solution if there is strong need from operators on supporting cell basis deployment. |
| Kyocera | Alt-2 | We think LTE SC-PTM already provides some pieces of the neighbour cell information, although it was not perfect, i.e., *scptm-NeighbourCellList* in SC-MCCH (*SCPTMConfiguration*). So, we think it’s worth supporting Alt-2 in NR MBS, although it’s FFS whether the information is provided in SIB or MCCH.  |
| ZTE | FFS | As in Q21, inter WG coordination is needed, e.g., RAN2 and SA2/6. RAN can't decide the deployment scenarios (per cell or per frequency) and what USD includes. |
| LGE |  | Neighbor cell information is already provided in SC-MCCH, i.e. SCPTMConfiguration, in LTE.

|  |
| --- |
| ***scptm-NeighbourCellList***List of neighbour cells providing MBMS services via SC-MRB. When absent, the UE shall assume that MBMS services listed in the *SCPTMConfiguration* message are not provided via SC-MRB in any neighbour cell. |

 |
| Nokia | Alt-1 | Cell specific information may be necessary after we progress but as basline frequency specific information is good starting point as that is definitely needed. |
| Ericsson  | Alt-1 | Alt-2 may create problems, i.e. UE shall always be on the strongest cell on the frequency (which may not be the one providing broadcast service), and it is complex and costly to configure per cell assistance information in real deployments. Furthermore “per cell” assistance info does not in first instance enable service continuity, but ensuring that there is a continuous frequency layer supporting broadcast does.  |
| vivo | Alt-1 | Agree with MediaTek. |
| Futurewei | Alt-1 | Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism is good enough |
| Intel | Alt-1 | We prefer to use SC-PTM approach as baseline. |
| Sharp | Alt-1 as baseline |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt-1 as baseline |  |
| Spreadtrum | Alt-1 | SC-PTM approach is baseline. |
| NEC | Alt-1 | LTE SC-PTM is the baseline, for alt-2, the benefit can be further clarified.  |
| Sony | Alt-1 |  |
| Xiaomi | ? | LTE SC-PTM provides the MBS services information of both neighbor cells (i.e. in the SC-MCCH message) and neighbor frequencies (i.e. in the SIB15). |
| CMCC | Alt-1  | Alt-1 could be the baseline, and neighbor list information could be provided in PTM configuration as discussed in Q24. |
| Apple | Alt-1 |  |
| Samsung | Alt-1 | We are fine to have broadcast assistance for prioritization with frequency level granularity. |

**Rapporteur summary-22: According to the feedback provided, clear majority companies (18/22) agreed to support UE awareness of MBS services on frequency basis for service continuity for NR MBS delivery mode 2 (i.e. Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism). Meanwhile, some companies (among the companies that did not reply Yes) indicated that LTE SC-PTM already provides the neighbour cell information for the service, i.e., scptm-NeighbourCellList in SC-MCCH (SCPTMConfiguration). However that information was not applied in the criteria of cell reselection for LTE MBMS/SC-PTM.**

**Proposal-22: Support UE awareness of MBS services on frequency basis for service continuity for NR MBS delivery mode 2 (i.e. Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism).**

## 6.4 Frequency/cell prioritization for service continuity

In LTE, specific to the MBMS service, UE can determine whether to make the frequency which also provides current MBS service(s) a highest priority during the evaluation of cell reselection. However, if the specific MBS service is deployed on a cell basis, some interested MBS services may be only supported by a certain cell of a particular frequency. Then there may be no motivation to prioritize that frequency if the signal strength of that cell supporting the MBS services is not strong enough.

###  **Question 23**

Select the alternative to support cell/frequency prioritization during cell reselection for service continuity for NR MBS delivery mode 2?

Alt-1: Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism (i.e. per frequency)

Alt-2: Support cell based prioritization for MBS service

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Selected Alt(s) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Alt-1 | Frequency based prioritization is the simplest solution for cell reselection and should be adopted as the baseline. The impact on the rule for cell reselection based on cell based prioritization needs more discussion.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt-1 | Cell based prioritization is unacceptable from IDLE mode procedures point of view. We cannot allow the UE to camp on non-best cell on a frequency as it would impact the efficiency of the whole system. |
| QC | Alt-1 | Same view as MediaTek. |
| OPPO | Alt-1 |  |
| CATT | Alt-1 as baseline | Agree with MTK. |
| Kyocera | FFS (slightly Alt-2) | We think Alt-1 is simple, but we’re not sure if per-frequency prioritization is enough. For example, HSDN handles the priority per cell depending on UE mobility state, which may be a good reference of Alt-2. More precise control can be also considered, e.g., frequency/cell priority per MBS service. So, we think RAN2 should discuss further details on this matter.  |
| ZTE | FFS | It depends on the outcome of Q21, 22 |
| LGE | Alt-1 | Same as legacy mechanism in LTE. |
| Nokia | Alt-1 |  |
| Ericsson | Alt-1 |  |
| vivo | Alt-1 | Agree with MediaTek and Huawei. |
| Futurewei | Alt-1 | Same answer to question 22. |
| Intel | Alt-1 | We prefer to use SC-PTM approach as baseline. |
| Sharp | Alt-1 as baseline |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt-1 | The cell reselection should be on frequency basis. The cell basis cell reselection is more complicated. |
| Spreadtrum | Alt-1 | Agree with MTK. |
| NEC | Alt-1  |  |
| Sony | Alt-1 |  |
| Xiaomi | Alt-1 |  |
| CMCC | FFS | Alt-1 is a simple solution, but we think it depends on the outcome of Q21,Q22. |
| Apple | Alt-1 |  |
| Samsung | Alt-1 | We are fine to have broadcast assistance for prioritization with frequency level granularity. |

**Rapporteur summary-23: According to the feedback provided, clear majority companies (19/22) agreed to support frequency prioritization during cell reselection for service continuity for NR MBS delivery mode 2 (i.e. Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism). Meanwhile, the rest three companies prefer to put is as FFS (depending on the outcome of Q21,Q22).**

**Proposal-23: Support frequency prioritization during cell reselection for service continuity for NR MBS delivery mode 2 (i.e. Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism).**

# Content of PTM configuration

Furthermore, it should be clarified what kind of information the PTM configuration carries (e.g. by MCCH if supported). In LTE SC-PTM, the *SCPTMConfiguration* message carries information about:

* The configuration of each SC-MTCH in the current cell (including MBMS session info, G-RNTI, SC-MTCH scheduling info).
* List of neighbour cells providing MBMS services via SC-MRB.

Note that the first part of the information above for the configuration of the MBS service and the second part of the information is for the purpose of service continuity as discussed in section 6.2.

Correspondingly, for NR MBS delivery mode 2, PTM configuration can include the following information:

* The configuration of each MTCH in the current cell (including MBS session info, G-RNTI and MTCH scheduling info).
* List of neighbour cells providing MBS services via NR MBS delivery mode 2.

### **Question 24**

Do you agree that for NR MBS delivery mode 2, PTM configuration can include the following information?

* The configuration of each MTCH in the current cell (including MBS session info, G-RNTI and MTCH scheduling info).
* List of neighbour cells providing MBS services via NR MBS delivery mode 2.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | We think the high level configuration principle of PTM configuration should be kept as same as LTE SC-PTM. The details of the information elements can be discussed further.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | MTCH configuration is necessary for the UE to receive the service while the list of neighboring cells is useful to achieve service continuity. |
| QC | Yes | Same view as MediaTek. |
| OPPO | Yes  | We think yes and it is based on LTE SC-PTM. |
| CATT | Partial agree | 1. MTCH configuration is necessary.2. List of neighbour cells providing ongoing MBS services in SC-PTM is to secure service continuity for mobility from MBS cell to non MBS cell. Whether this RAN level mechanism still needed in NR should further discussed. Maybe CN level mechanism is sufficient as SA2 has concluded “It shall be possible to establish an Associated PDU session for cases, if not exists, where mobility to non-5GMBS-supporting cells happens.”  |
| Kyocera | Yes | We agree with MediaTek that the high-level concept of LTE SC-PTM can be reused, while the details will be discussed later. So, we wonder if only the generic words like “MTCH configuration” and “neighbour cell information” can be agreed at this point.  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes | Neighbor cell information is already provided in SC-MCCH, i.e. SCPTMConfiguration, in LTE.

|  |
| --- |
| ***scptm-NeighbourCellList***List of neighbour cells providing MBMS services via SC-MRB. When absent, the UE shall assume that MBMS services listed in the *SCPTMConfiguration* message are not provided via SC-MRB in any neighbour cell. |

 |
| Nokia | Yes partly | Not sure whether neighbor cell information is needed. How would that be used? |
| Ericsson | Partially | Yes, the serving cell needs to indicate the PTM/MTCH configuration info of the serving cellNo, the serving cell should not be required to list the PTM/MTCH configuration info of the neighbouring cells, which is complex/costly.  |
| vivo | Yes only for MTCH configuration | For LTE SC-PTM, the list of neighbor cells providing MBMS services is not considered for cell reselection and any other purposes. Thus, we think this information is not needed in NR MBS.  |
| Futurewei | Yes | For the one step SIB-only approach, the information of the first item and the second item can be included in the MBS SIB for service in the serving cell and the MBS SIB for listing the services in the neighboring cells respectively. |
| Intel | Yes | We agree with the high level summary regarding the content of PTM configuration. |
| Sharp | Yes | Agree with MTK. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes  | LTE SC-PTM as baseline. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes  |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | SC-PTM can be an initial baseline, but some further discussion is required, e.g. neighbor info, etc.. |

**Rapporteur summary-24: According to the feedback provided, all companies agreed that PTM configuration should include MTCH configuration as LTE SC-PTM. A majority companies(18/22) agreed that PTM configuration should include neighbour cell information as LTE SC-PTM. However, some companies (4/22) questioned the need to have neighbour cell information within PTM configuration. Rapportuer suggests to reuse the high-level concept of LTE SC-PTM service continuity for delivery mode 2, while the details can be left open.**

**Proposal-24: For NR MBS delivery mode 2, PTM configuration can include both MTCH configuration and neighbour cell information.**

# Conclusion

The following proposals are made based on the email discussion:

**Proposal-1: Both idle/inactive UEs and connected mode UEs can receive MBS services transmitted by NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

**Proposal-2a: the UE receiving Broadcast sessions transmitted by delivery mode 2 is not required to interact with the network before its MBS service reception.**

**Proposal-2b: RAN2 discuss if the UE receiving Multicast sessions transmitted by delivery mode 2 is required to interact with the network before its service reception (if Multicast sessions can also be transmitted by delivery mode 2).**

**Proposal-3: RAN2 discuss if delivery mode 2 can also support the transmission of multicast sessions.**

**Proposal-4: The two-step based approach (i.e. BCCH and MCCH) as adopted by LTE SC-PTM is reused for the transmission of PTM configuration for NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

**Proposal-5a: Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism for the connected UEs to receive the PTM configuration for NR MBS delivery mode 2, i.e. broadcast based manner.**

**Proposal-5b: RAN2 further discuss if dedicated signaling based reception for PTM configuration is allowed for NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

**Proposal-6: The MBS SIB, as a regular SIB, can be optionally area specific.**

**Proposal-7: RAN2 further discuss if MCCH should be cell specific or area specific for PTM configuration of NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

**Proposal-8: Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism (i.e. Broadcast mode based MCCH transmission) as the baseline for NR MBS delivery mode 2 and FFS for on-demand based MCCH transmission.**

**Proposal-9: RAN2 further discuss if multiple MCCH based PTM configuration can be supported for NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

**Proposal-10: PTM change notification mechanism can be used to notify the changes of PTM configuration (e.g. carried by MCCH) due to session start for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS.**

**Proposal-11: RAN2 to discuss if PTM change notification mechanism can be used to notify the changes of PTM configuration (e.g. carried by MCCH) due to other purpose (e.g. modification of the transmission cycle for a service) for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS.**

**Proposal-12: Take LTE SC-PTM approach as baseline for PTM change notification for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS.**

**Proposal-13: Mark the enhancement for PTM change notification as an open issue for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS.**

**Proposal-14: RAN2 further discuss if delivery mode 2 support counting procedure for connected mode UEs.**

**Proposal-15: RAN2 further discuss if delivery mode 2 support counting procedure for Idle/Inactive mode UEs.**

**Proposal-16: Mark the discussion of the mechanism for counting procedure for Idle/Inactive UEs based counting as an open issue for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS. To be revisited after we decide whether to allow Idle/Inactive UEs based counting.**

**Proposal-17: MBS Interest Indication is supported for UEs in connected mode for NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

**Proposal-18: MBS Interest Indication is not supported for UEs in idle/inactive mode for NR MBS delivery mode 2.**

**Proposal-19: RAN2 decide if the** **MBS Interest Indication can be merged with on demand MBS/PTM configuration request procedure for delivery mode 2 after the decision on the support of on demand MBS/PTM configuration request procedure.**

**Proposal-20: Service continuity is needed for NR MBS Delivery mode 2.**

**Proposal-21: In general, the mechanism to ensure service continuity of LTE SC-PTM is reused for NR MBS Delivery mode 2 (i.e. both USD and system information can be provided for purpose of service continuity).**

**Proposal-22: Support UE awareness of MBS services on frequency basis for service continuity for NR MBS delivery mode 2 (i.e. Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism).**

**Proposal-23: Support frequency prioritization during cell reselection for service continuity for NR MBS delivery mode 2 (i.e. Reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism).**

**Proposal-24: For NR MBS delivery mode 2, PTM configuration can include both MTCH configuration and neighbor cell information.**
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