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# 1 Introduction

This document relates to this offline discussion:

 **[POST116bis-e][515][RA Part] CP open issues (Ericsson)**

Scope:

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

- Updated CR 38.331 for information and review

NOTE: NO contributions on these critical open issues are expected

Deadline:

- Open issues list Jan. 28th

- Company inputs 23:59 UTC Feb. 14th

This document captures a list of remaining open issues for TS 38.331 for RIP.

Note: The draft running CR attempts to capture agreements and a baseline framework for continued updates as a result of when RACH specific agreements are made in WI-specific discussions (e.g. RedCap, CE, Slicing etc).

The following delegates participated in the discussion:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact Name, Email |
| Ericsson | Henrik.enbuske@ericsson.com |
| LGE | Hanseul.hong@lge.com |
| Huawei | dawid.koziol@huawei.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 2 Open issue list to current running CR

Below is a list of open issues which does not fit under WI-specific Open Issues and are RIP specific.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OI Number** | **Slogan** | **Open issue description** | **Criticality** | **Remark** |
| **01** | **FFS if we remove the FeatureCombination from RACH common config and only keep 2)** | 1. If the indication in *RACH-ConfigCommon* allows to associate an additional whole RACH resource to a specific feature combination. This feature combination may then be considered the default one associated to all ROs of an additional RACH configuration,
 | Should be addressed early | Construct with or without will work but overall structure needs changes and thus this benefits from early decision🡪 Current version of the running CR has this top level removed. Compare with previous version for changes |
| **02** | **WI Specific parameters** | * Signaling and parameters to be implemented from WI-specific discussions
 | Noncritical | Expected to be added as part of output from WI-specific agreements/progress.Currently only place holder is captured which needs WI input. |
| **03** | **Mapping between 2-step RA preambles and PUSCH resources for MsgA** | * It is unclear if the legacy mapping mechanism between 2-step preambles to MsgA PUSCH resources can be used as it is.
 | Should be addressed | RAN2 needs to make sure the mapping is clear. To be handled in CR/ASN.1 design |
| **04** | **L1 parameters**  | * Remaining, yet to be implemented after WI Specific discussions
 | TBD |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **05** | **FFS if CE indication is configured, then the RACH partition is only applicable to the RACH procedure where CE is required. Otherwise, if CE indication is not configured, then the RACH partition is applicable to the RACH procedure where CE is not required. (if CE is considered as part of feature combination)** | * COND construct or similar - to be confirmed
 | TBD |  |
| **06** | **Maximum number of additional RACH configurations** | * Define constraints in multiplicity (6.4)
 | Noncritical | maxAdditionalRACH-r17 INTEGER ::= TBD -- Maximum number of additional RACH configurationsComment: Depends on the number of SliceGroups from Slicing WI |
| **07** | **Multiple bit use for Slicing.**  | * To determine if one or multiple bits use for Slicing.
 | TBD | To be defined once we have the meaning and use of multiple bits from Slicing WISlicing WI should define how many slices there might be in total. Then the indication may just reflect this number. Up to Slicing WI to define the mapping between slice ID and PLMN or priority or other. Update: Currently implemented in updated running CR v00 as a slice specific IE “SliceGroupList” that can be populated independently in Slicing WI discussions with e.g. as currently exemplified with a list of SliceGroupID etc.Editor’s note added to capture that the details are to be defined in Slicing WI |
| **08** | **Use of extension marker or spare fields** | * For extensibility in future releases
 | TBD | To be discussed together with the CR/ASN.1 design.**Rapporteur Initial comment:** Defining speres need decision on how many spares to add in this release and thus the limitation and overhead that number brings.By using the extension marker, only in future this would give additional overhead, however, legacy UEs will not be able to read anything after the extension mark (‘…’) and may incorrectly use a RACH partition that may come with additional future limitations. |
| **09** | **Mapping relationship of SSB and RO, and the mapping relationship of SSB and preamble** | * In Current running CR, featureCombinationPreambles-r17 IE reuses the mapping relationship of SSB and RO, and the mapping relationship of SSB and preamble
* Whether the legacy mapping between RO and SSB, and the mapping between preamble and SSB should be used for R17 should be discussed
 | TBD | To be discussed as part of the CR/ASN.1 discussion.The current CR handles this mapping as in legacy. Some companies are proposing to do this differently, but it is not clear what benefit this renders into. Invite motivation for discussion.From Rapporteurs p.o.v the SSB mapping is done like this in legacy for a reason. In case many ROs are mapped to 1 SSB at a certain time only 1 SSB is used in all frequencies to ensure that analogue beamforming can be used. We can of course be more flexible with many ROs to 1 SSB mapping, but it seems we are then rediscussing an already established solution. |

Please provide input below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company, Issue Number | Comments  | Rapporteur comment |
| LGE | The extensible format of the feature indication (i.e., FeatureComination IE) should be discussed as an open issue (e.g. whether to use extension marker ',,,‘ or introduce a spare field for future releases), considering that Rel-17 UEs would not be able to interprete the extension fields defined in future releases.  | Added as open issue |
| Huawei 001 | Regarding to „Multiple bit use for Slicing.” – there is already an agreement made in Slicing WI, so there is no need to wait with implementing this:* In a cell, there may be multiple slice-specific RACH configurations.
* One or more of the slice groups are linked to a slice-specific RACH configuration.
* There may be slice groups that are not linked to a slice-specific RACH configuration (they use the common RACH configuration).
* All slices of a slice group use the slice-specific RACH configuration of the slice group.

Baed on the agreements it is clear that we need to have a possibility to configure RACH partition per slice group. | Implemented in updated running CR , see Rapporteur comment to OI #07 |
| Huawei 002 | Regarding **Mapping between 2-step RA preambles and PUSCH resources for MsgA**In the running CR, for separated preamble case, the MsgA PUSCH config for R17 still use the shared resource with legacy R16, however, this may not be suitable, i.e., the PUSCH payload for SDT and non-SDT is different. For separated RO case, the MsgA PUSCH config is per RACH configuration, however, in our understanding, each RACH configurtion corresponds to at least one RACH partition, and each RACH partition maps to one feature/feature combination. Considering that, e.g. each slice group may have different type of service which may lead to different PUSCH payload, so the MsgA PUSCH config should be per feature/feature combination. We agree this has to be addressed. | Open Issue #03 created |
| Huawei 003 | According to the current running CR, featureCombinationPreambles-r17 IE reuses the mapping relationship of SSB and RO, and the mapping relationship of SSB and preamble, i.e., the parameter ssb-perRACH-OccasionAndCB-PreamblesPerSSB. However, whether the legacy mapping between RO and SSB, and the mapping between preamble and SSB should be used for R17 should be discussed. We think that the mapping between SSB and preamble should be R17 feature/feature combination specific. | **Rapporteur Initial comment**: Apart from company view, an Open Issue #09 is captured for discussion. |
| OPPO | OI#1:We think the same IE within FeatureCombinationPreambles-r17 can already do the same job, so it can be removedOI#3:For shared Rel16 RO case, we think additional PUSCH resource for MsgA is needed because legacy PUSCH resource units are only for CBRA of legacy UE while any RACH partition introduced in Rel17 is taken as reserved preambles for legacy UE.OI#5:We think CE can be taken as a feature hence FFS can be removed.Oi#7:Yes we need wait input from Slicing WID, but common session can decide whether we need define RACH partition per slicing group or for all groups with additional rule. We prefer RACH partition per slicing group to make progress.OI#8:the issue itself is not very clear about extension of what. If it is for new feature in future, we think it is necessary to keep forward compatibilityOI#9:From running CR, RACH partition for one specific feature combination may consist of two part: 4-step RACH resource in *rach-ConfigCommon-r16/r17* and 2-step RACH resource in *rach-ConfigCommonTwoStepRA-r16/r17*. If there is no ROs defined within rach-ConfigCommonTwoStepRA-r16 or rach-ConfigCommonTwoStepRA-r17, it measn only 4-step RACH resource for RACH partition will be configured i.e. featureCombinationPreambles-r17 will not be there. Is it correct understanding? |  |

# 3. Other General Open Issues

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OI No** | **Slogan** | **Open issue description** | **Criticality** | **Remark** |
| **10** | **Priority rules between RACH partitions are configurable** | RAN2 agreement:3. If only a subset of features have a matching RACH partition, and the triggered RACH doesn’t fit with any of the configured RACH partitions then the UE behaviour will be specified. Details are TBD4. Priority rules are configurable (e.g. can be configured in SI) | Essential | Overall mechanism need to be implemented. **For agreement 3**, Rapporteur thinks this should be only present in case of some (odd) NW implementation and suggest a simple solution. For example, one solution is to consider that no partition is available, i.e the cell is barred for RACH corresponding to that (subset)feature/feature-comb. However, needs to be discussed.**For agreement 4:** See sub-item below w.r.t the definition of priority. Depends on the general direction above. |
| **11** | **Priority definition** | Whether the priority rule is defined for each feature or each partition. | Essential | Decision needed before implementation.**Rapporteur initial comment.** For some features, like RedCap it is essential to have the feature (indication) prioritized rather than selecting an access mechanism (feature) such as SDT without an RC indication. Needs discussion |
|  |  | UE behavior if decided:1. no priority is configured,
2. if specified for equal priority,
3. or alternatively relative priority is always explicitly given.
 | Essential | Rapporteur suggests that it is left for UE implementation for cases 1,2 if 3 is not decided.  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Please provide input below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company, Issue number | Comments | Rapporteur comment |
| LGE | In RAN2#116bis, it is agreed that the priority rules between the RACH partitions are configurable:3. If only a subset of features have a matching RACH partition, and the triggered RACH doesn’t fit with any of the configured RACH partitions then the UE behaviour will be specified. Details are TBD4. Priority rules are configurable (e.g. can be configured in SI)Regarding the configuration the details should be discussed as an open issue including:* Whether the priority rule is defined for each feature or each partition. Depending on the decision, the priority rule for following case would be different
	+ The RA is for F1+F2+F3. The network configures one partition is for F1 (with high priority) and another partition for F2+F3 (each of feature has low priority).
* On which level of ASN1 signaling the priority is configured.

After that, the configuration of priorty rule should be handled in RRC CR.  | Agree on issue; additions to open issues added.  |
| OPPO | OI#10/11:We think priority should be defined per feature instead of per RACH partition considering RACH partition will increase more quickly than features themselves. Once priority i.e. a priority value is configured for one feature, then the relative priority is also clear i.e. the lower value, the higher priority. Then RACH partition will be prioritized over another one if at least one feature is of higher priority. |  |
|  |  |  |

# 4. Summary and Conclusion with Proposals

Based on the discussion in phase 2 consider the above open issues and comments a new document will provide the proposed conclusion.