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# Introduction

This document contains summary of open issues and proposed resolutions for UP aspects of Common RACH partitioning:

* [POST116bis-e][514][RA Part] UP open issues (ZTE)

Scope:

- List of critical open issues to be resolved for WI completion

- Updated CR 38.321 for information and review

NOTE: NO contributions on these critical open issues are expected

Deadline:

- Open issues list Jan. 28th

- Company inputs Feb. 15th

Proposed format for comments is as below:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Description | Criticality  (Essential / Optional / Enhancement) | Company comments/Preference  Companies can use company ID and enter comment (see example) | Proposed resolution (to be updated by Rapporteur) |
| Zxxx | XXX is missing/wrong/open etc | Essential | ZTE: We think this is not needed  XXX: We agree with YYY etc | Rapp: Will be implemented in the next revision |

# Discussion

## Procedural open issues

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Description | Criticality  (Essential / Optional / Enhancement) | Company comments/Preference | Proposed resolution (to be updated by Rapporteur) |
| Z001 | Align the parameter names between MAC and RRC specs | Essential |  | Rapp: To be done before/during next meeting (after the RRC CR is stable) |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## UP/MAC open issues

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Description | Criticality  (Essential / Optional / Enhancement) | Company comments/Preference | Proposed resolution (to be updated by Rapporteur) |
| Z002 | What is the order of carrier selection and RACH partition selection  Options:   1. Carrier selection happens before RACH partition selection 2. RACH partition selection happens before carrier selection | Essential |  |  |
| Z003 | If RACH partition selection is performed after carrier selection, how to configure separate carrier selection threshold for CE and SDT etc? (e.g. should we undo these agreements or should we design something else?) | Essential |  |  |
| Z004 | How to capture RECAP BWP selection?  Options:   * In REDCAP CR * In Common RACH CR | Essential |  |  |
| Z005 | Can the rsrp-Threshold-Msg3Rep and RSRP threshold for SSB selection for CE be configured differently in different RACH partitions? If so, how to select the correct value (before selecting the RACH partition)? | Essential |  |  |
| Z006 | How to refer to the “legacy RACH partition”? Can we use the name of some RRC IE etc? | Essential |  | Propose to finalise this after the RRC structure is finalized. |
| Z007 | Is RACH partitioning applicable in dedicated BWP (i.e. RRC\_CONNECTED)? | Essential |  |  |
| Z008 | Is RACH partitioning applicable to CFRA? | Essential |  |  |
| Z009 | Is RACH partitioning applicable when CFRA fallsback to CBRA? How does the overall procedure look like in this case? | Essential |  |  |
| Z010 | Can we assume that there is default RACH resource without feature combination in REDCAP initial BWP, which is similar as the legacy RACH resource on legacy initial BWP and can be selected if there is no available RACH partition can be selected on the REDCAP initial BWP? (otherwise we may need to specify some BWP switching procedure for this case) | Essential |  |  |
| Z011 | Do we need to handle the issue of RNTI collision? I.e. which option is preferred?  Option 1: Do nothing (i.e. leave to network implementation)  Option 2: the network should be able to (optionally) configure a specific search space for RAR/MSGB monitoring per RACH resource partition  Option 3: what else | Optional |  |  |
| Q001 | What is the rule for UE to select BWP when RACH is triggered in a dedicated BWP? E.g. UE performs RACH in the current BWP as long as it is eligible to use at least one RACH partition configured in that BWP or something else? | Essential |  |  |
| S001 | Do we need to handle the issue of RNTI collision? I.e. which option is preferred?  Option 1: Do nothing (i.e. leave to network implementation)  Option 2: A custom offset, signalled through RRC and associated to each PRACH configuration, is added in the formula for RA-RNTI and/or MSGB-RNTI. The legacy PRACH configuration it is assumed to have offset = 0.  Option 3: the network should be able to (optionally) configure a specific search space for RAR/MSGB monitoring per RACH resource partition (as was already agreed anyway for some features – e.g. SDT) | Optional |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

# Conclusion and proposals

# References

1. R2-2201664, Report for Rel-17 Small data, URLLC/IIoT and RACH partitioning
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