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# Introduction

RAN1#104-e is the second meeting that discusses the AI 8.12.3 on Basic functions for broadcast/multicast for RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE UEs. The information of the email thread on this topic and the check points on the discussion provided by RAN1 Chairman is shown below:

[104-e-NR-MBS-03] Email discussion/approval on basic functions for broadcast/multicast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with checkpoints for agreements on Jan-28, Feb-02, Feb-05 – David (BBC)

A summary of the analysis and key issues identified from the technical inputs to this meeting to AI 8.12.3 can be found in R1-2101721 ([Inbox](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Inbox/R1-2101721.zip)).

Section 2 includes an initial proposal of High Priority issues for discussion at RAN1#104-e. Section 3 includes an initial proposal on Medium Priority issues for discussion at RAN1#104-e. Each Issue includes Initial FL proposals where companies are welcomed to provide their inputs.

Please use the “Navigation Pane” of Word to quickly find the proposals and the different rounds of discussions in this document.

Section 4 will include any agreements reached from the discussions.

# Discussion on High Priority Issues

## Issue 1: MBS Common Frequency Resource: relation to the Initial BWP

### **1st FL proposals for Issue 1**

**Proposal 1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the defined/configured common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH contains the initial BWP and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.

**Proposal 2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the initial BWP contains the defined/configured common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | Fine with proposal 1 and proposal 2. |
| ZTE | We support proposal 1 from the perspective of providing sufficient capacity for multicast transmission.  Regarding Proposal 2, we didn’t see a strong need to support a common frequency resource smaller than initial BWP. Could the proponents clarify the necessity. |
| LG | We are fine with Proposal 1. We also wonder if we have a strong need for Proposal 2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK with Proposal 1 and Proposal 2. We think whether the initial DL BWP contains the common frequency resource or vice versa is dependent on gNB configuration. |
| CATT | Support proposal 1, and also OK with proposal 2.  Either for proposal 1 or proposal 2, the common frequency resource for IDLE/INACTIVE UEs are configured by network based on different scenarios/QoS requirements. When HD video services are transmitted, large common frequency resource for broadcast is needed. When the band requirement is narrow, a small common frequency resource can be confined within the initial BWP. Even a smaller common frequency resource is configured within the initial BWP, a UE has to support initial BWP anyway. So from our understanding, either proposal 1 or 2 is up to gNB configuration. |
| Apple | We are ok with proposal 1. We are not clear the motivation of proposal 2. |
| NOKIA | Agree with the above two proposals by FL |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok with proposal 1 but not clear why proposal 2 is needed. |
| OPPO | We think some clarifications are firstly needed for the followings:   * The meaning of “contain” is not unclear to us. Does this mean the configuration signalling of one contains the configuration of the other? Or is it meant to say overlapping in frequency (PRBs / subcarriers)? I tend to think the intention is the latter one. * In proposal 2, the SCS and CP of the initial BWP and the common frequency resource do not need to be the same as in proposal 1?   We are wondering, does it matter if we have an agreement that one of them “contains” the other one. It can always be up to network configuration that the two always overlap in frequency PRB so that there is no / minimal switching delay between the two. And if they are overlapping, should they be always fully overlap or partially, due to RF BW retuning? |
| Sony | We are OK with proposal 1. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1&2 are contradicting each other if they both need to apply at the same time. We think they could be merged in such a way that either the CFR contains the Initial BWP or the Initial BWP contains the CFR. |
| Qualcomm | Similar concern on Proposal 2. It may complicate the UE behaviour in IDLE/INACTIVE mode. We suggest merging the two proposals and changing the wording as:  **Proposal 1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be configured to contain the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.  **-FFS:** the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be configured to be within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. |
| vivo | Agree with proposal 1 and proposal 2 in principle. As agree with Ericsson’s comment, re-wording may be needed. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for the comments so far.  @Nokia, Lenovo, CATT: there seems to be stronger support to agree at this point only to the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be configured to contain the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP, while leaving FFS the case that the CFR is contained within the Initial BWP. Would this be acceptable?  @ OPPO: You are right, the intention with the word “contain” is that the common frequency resource and the Initial BWP overlap in frequency.  @Ericsson: would the wording proposed by Qualcomm be more consistent? |
| Intel | Wording from Qualcomm is preferable since the original proposals contradict each other. On the use of the CFR being smaller than the initial BWP is not clear. If a smaller BW is desired, that can be handled using FDRA rather than configuration of the CFR itself. Therefore, we don’t think the FFS is necessary pending further clarifications from proponents. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | @Moderator: it is fine with us. |
| Samsung | Agree with E/// in that the two proposals contradict each other. What needs to be decided is whether the CFR can be larger than the initial BWP (no issue with the CFR being same/within the initial BWP – proposal 2 is a gNB configuration). |
| Spreadtrum | Support in general, and agree with Ericsson’s comment. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Our comments (TD Tech &Chengdu TD Tech):**  Before discussing the relation of the common frequency resource to the Initial BWP, we need to determine the bandwidth of the common frequency resource for MBS. With the bandwidth of the common frequency resource, we can further discuss the relation of it to the initial BWP.  We think proposals 1 and 2 give two possible relations of the common frequency resource to the initial BWP.  The bandwidth of the common frequency resource can be determined based on the bandwidth requirement of the MBS in the cell.  If the bandwidth of the common frequency resource can be provided by the initial BWP, proposal 2 can be supported to configure the common frequency resource within the initial BWP.  If the bandwidth of the common frequency resource can be NOT provided by the initial BWP, proposal 1 can be supported to make the common frequency resource [F1, F2] for MBS contain the initial BWP, where [0, F] is used to indicate the frequency range of the carrier, F is the bandwidth of the carrier, 0<=F1/F2<=F and [F1, F2] can just satisfy the MBS bandwidth requirement.  **If (F2-F1)>Fmin, the following questions need to be discussed, where Fmin indicates the RF channel bandwidth of the UE with the lowest RF channel bandwidth capacity among all defined UE classes. For example, Fmin=100MHz, the carrier bandwidth is 400MHZ, and the MBS bandwidth requirement in the cell is 150MHz.**   1. **Does (F2-F1)> Fmin exist?** 2. **If (F2-F1)>Fmin exists, how to solve such question?**   **Based on the above discussion, we suggest proposals 1 and 2 can be combined as below. We hope the questions in yellow can be further discussed.**  **Proposal 1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the defined/configured common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be contained by the initial DL BWP or contains the initial BWP with the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. |
| CATT | @ Moderator: We are OK with it. |
| MTK | We are fine with proposal 2. E///’s comments can be acceptable. |
| NOKIA | @Moderator: To help better progress of the discussion, we are fine to leave FFS the case that the CFR is contained within the initial BWP. |
| Convida | We are ok with proposal 1 and proposal 2. |
| Ericsson | Regarding Proposal 1/2:  In legacy NR, a UE receives everything within an active BWP. As the common frequency resource (CFR) is defined for RRC Connected, it is correspondingly always contained within a BWP: In 2A the CFR is the MBS BWP and in 2B the CFR is within the unicast BWP.  Our understanding is consequently that reception for Idle/Inactive is also always done within a BWP, either a configured BWP (which with 2A may be an MBS BWP) or the initial BWP. Proposal 1 (original and QC update) is therefore not OK since reception is then not done within a BWP.  We propose instead:  **Proposal 1x**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is always configured within a BWP (or is identical with this in case of MBS BWP). This may be a configured BWP or the initial BWP.  The configured BWP needs to contain the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. With no configured BWP, the CFR may be configured within the Initial BWP.  Note: The frequency window of the UE would match the configured BWP. Without BWP switching, the UE can then also receive the initial BWP and any configured frequency resource within the configured BWP. As a special case the configured BWP and the initial BWP are the same. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for the useful discussion.  Based on the comments there is a strong support that the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can have a larger frequency range than the range of the initial BWP and the CFR also contains (overlaps in frequency) with the Initial BWP.  There has also been a discussion around the usefulness of **Proposal 2**. Since the configuration of a CFR within the Initial BWP may be up to the gNB implementation. **I think it would be helpful if companies can disagree if this is not a correct understanding.**  I think the latest comments from Ericsson are also useful and I think may bring us closer to a consensus. In my understanding we would like to enable the following options for reception of group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for idle/inactive UEs:   * the active BWP for idle/inactive UEs can be:   + initial BWP (as per agreement in RAN1#103e)   + a configured BWP (that name as MBS BWP is still under discussion)     - the MBS BWP contains the initial BWP (completely overlaps in frequency with the initial BWP) and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP * the configured common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be   + the active BWP   + a frequency region within the initial BWP (this may be FFS)   **Is this a common understanding?**    Therefore, the moderator proposes the following revision to Proposal 1 (**Proposal 1-rev1**) using Ericsson’s wording as baseline with some editing and also including FFS to accommodate Qualcomm’s concern.  **Proposal 1-rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is always configured within a BWP:   * The BWP may be a configured BWP, in which case the CFR is identical to the BWP.   + The configured BWP needs to contain (and can be larger) than the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + Note: The frequency window of the UE would match the configured BWP. Without BWP switching, the UE can then also receive the initial BWP and any configured frequency resource within the configured BWP. * The BWP may be the initial BWP. In this case, the CFR is the initial BWP.   + FFS CFR can also be configured within the initial BWP. |

### **2nd round FL proposals for Issue 1**

**Proposal 1-rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is always configured within a BWP:

* The BWP may be a configured BWP, in which case the CFR is identical to the BWP.
  + The configured BWP needs to contain (and can be larger) than the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
  + Note: The frequency window of the UE would match the configured BWP. Without BWP switching, the UE can then also receive the initial BWP and any configured frequency resource within the configured BWP.
* The BWP may be the initial BWP. In this case, the CFR is the initial BWP.
  + FFS CFR can also be configured within the initial BWP.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | We support the updated proposal.  Based on our understanding, the configuration of a CFR within the Initial BWP is up to the gNB implementation. Besides, if we are going to configure a common frequency resource larger than the initial BWP, the only way is to make it as an MBS BWP. Otherwise, the UE behaviours of allowing UE to receive outside the active BWP is not clear to us. |
| LG | We are generally fine with the updated proposal. We can also consider the following small update:   * *The configured BWP needs to contain (and can be larger~~)~~ than) the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.* |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK with this proposal. |
| NOKIA | We fully agree with Ericsson’s earlier comment. And please find NOKIA’s re-wording proposal accordingly:  **Proposal 1-rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is always configured within a BWP:   * The BWP may be a configured BWP, in which case the CFR is identical to the BWP.   + The configured BWP needs to contain ~~(and can be larger) than~~ the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + Note: The frequency window of the UE would match the configured BWP. Without BWP switching, the UE can then also receive the initial BWP and any configured frequency resource within the configured BWP. * The BWP may be the initial BWP. In this case, the CFR ~~is~~ can be identical to the initial BWP as agreed default case.   + ~~FFS:~~ CFR can also be configured within the initial BWP.   Regarding the benefit and usefulness of the case “initial BWP contains the CFR or CFR configured within the initial BWP”, as we have stated in our Tdoc R1-2100512, 5G NR may need to support diverse broadcast services, some of the broadcast services may require in-frequent large payload to be transmitted, and some others may require frequent small broadcast payload to be transmitted. Therefore, different broadcast services can be configured with different DRX pattern in-time, as well as it can be configured with different CFR applied in-frequency, where the frequent monitoring of small payload broadcast services can be performed with CFR of even narrower bandwidth than initial BWP and that could provide even better power saving purpose for the frequent monitoring and reception idle/inactive UE.  @Moderator: Based on the earlier feedback from each company. We see quite some companies (CMCC, Lenovo, CATT, NOKIA, MTK, Convida, as well as Ericsson) support the case of “CFR can be configured within the initial BWP”. Therefore, we proposal to delete the FFS as shown in above re-wording proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are OK with this proposal. |
| OPPO | The revised proposal 1 looks reasonable and we are fine with it. One small update suggestion along the line of moderator’s comment:  The configured BWP needs to contain (and can be larger) than the initial BWP (overlap in frequency) and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. |
| CATT | The direction of this proposal is reasonable, but further clarification is needed.   * If the CFR is a MBS specific BWP, a UE may have to be configured/containing two independent but overlapped BWPs (initial BWP and MBS BWP in IDLE). How to avoid BWP switching here is not clear. The current issue is similar with the discussion in RRC\_CONNECTED UEs of Option 2A for MBS specific BWP. If the design are similar, then there should be no BWP switching observed for connected UEs and IDLE UEs. However, the switching issue is still uncertain. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We firstly want to clarify the real meaning by “initial BWP”. Since SIB1 can configure an initial downlink BWP which can be large up to the bandwidth of the carrier, which if is the initial BWP we are talking about, how could the CFR be larger than this initial BWP?  So when we say contain or larger than initial BWP, for which we actually mean the bandwidth of CORESET0 spanning the initial BWP.  In addition, last meeting has agreed initial BWP as the fault CFR, why is the second bullet needed?  Therefore, I would suggest the proposal goes like:  **Proposal 1-rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs,   * UE can be configured with a larger initial BWP than CORESET0 in SIB1 as the CFR for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH. * CORESET0 spanning initial BWP if a larger initial BWP is not configured in SIB1 is used for the CFR for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH. * FFS whether the CFR can be configured within the CORESET0 spanning initial BWP. |
| Ericsson | We think that a CFR configured within a BWP may be equal to or smaller than the BWP, at least for a configured BWP. In Option 2B the CFR is not a BWP so cannot be identical to the configured BWP but may share the same frequency range. We propose thus the following reformulation:  **(E/// Updated) Proposal 1-rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is always configured within a BWP:   * The BWP may be an RRC configured BWP, in which case the CFR may have the same size or be smaller than the configured BWP   + The RRC configured BWP needs to contain (and can be larger) than the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + Note: The frequency window of the UE would match the configured BWP. Without BWP switching, the UE can then also receive the initial BWP and any configured frequency resource within the configured BWP. * The BWP may be the initial BWP. In this case, the CFR can be configured to have the same size as the initial BWP.   + FFS CFR can be smaller than the initial BWP. |
| Samsung | E///’s modification is okay. |
| Qualcomm | FL’s proposal looks better. We don’t see the reason to add ‘or smaller’ here.  For IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast, the CFR configuration will be indicated by SIB. What else can be transmitted in the BWP larger than CFR? It just increases the power consumption to camp on a larger BWP. We can focus on broadcast first.  **Proposal 1-rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is always configured within a BWP:   * The BWP may be a configured BWP, in which case the CFR is identical to the BWP.   + The configured BWP needs to contain (and can be larger) than the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + Note: The frequency window of the UE would match the configured BWP. Without BWP switching, the UE can then also receive the initial BWP and any configured frequency resource within the configured BWP. * The BWP may be the initial BWP. In this case, the CFR is the initial BWP.   + FFS CFR can also be configured within the initial BWP. |
| Moderator | Thank you for the useful comments.  @ Nokia, thank you for the changes. I have included (part of) your modifications to the new revised Proposal 1 including the removal of the FFS.  @OPPO: thanks for the comment and this has been included in the new version of the proposal.  @CATT, I think your concerns about BWP switching are addressed by the Note in the proposal saying “*The frequency window of the UE would match the configured BWP. Without BWP switching, the UE can then also receive the initial BWP and any configured frequency resource within the configured BWP*.”  @Huawei/HiSilicon: In my understanding, during initial access, a UE would first have an initial BWP where the frequency range would be the same as the one of CORESET0, since the initial BWP has not been configured yet. Once SIB1 has been decoded, an initial BWP with a larger frequency range than that of CORESET0 can be configured, and there you are right that the configured frequency range could span the entire carrier bandwidth. Hence, I think it is convenient that we remove the term (larger than) to be more precise as you propose. I think the changes proposed by Nokia cover this concern by removing (and can be larger than).  Regarding including the different options for configuring initial BWP, I think that as per our agreement in RAN1#103e  (*Agreements: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, define/configure common frequency resource(s) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH. - the UE may assume the initial BWP as the default common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, if a specific common frequency resource is not configured*), the behaviour whether the initial BWP has the frequency range of CORESET0 or larger as per SIB1 configuration is already captured in the agreement.  Regarding why are we including the case of the initial BWP although it has already been agreed at RAN1#103e, I think it keeps the proposal cleared while allowing to introduce the concept of having a CFR smaller than the initial BWP as proposed by various companies.  @Ericcson: I am not sure about using the wording “*The BWP may be an RRC configured BWP*” since in my understanding depending on the configuration the initial BWP can be considered as a RRC-configured BWP (as per Annex B.2 in TS 38.331). I have included some of your wording about the size of the CFR that it is clearer. I have focused the discussion for broadcast reception. Hopefully that would be acceptable for the shake of progress.  @Qualcomm: I have focused the discussion for broadcast as per your proposal and removed the references to a smaller CFR than the configured BWP. However, as mentioned by Nokia, there are various companies that would like to be able to configure a CFR within the initial BWP. I have therefore removed the FFS. Would this be acceptable?  Based on the above **I propose the following revision to Proposal1-rev1**:  **Proposal 1-rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is always configured within a BWP:   * The BWP may be a configured BWP (different than the initial BWP), in which case the CFR has the same size as the BWP.   + The configured BWP needs to contain the initial BWP (overlaps in frequency) and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + Note: The frequency window of the UE would match the configured BWP. Without BWP switching, the UE can then also receive the initial BWP and any configured frequency resource within the configured BWP. * The BWP may be the initial BWP. In this case, the CFR has the same size as the initial BWP.   + CFR can be smaller than the initial BWP. |

### **3rd round FL proposals for Issue 1**

**Proposal 1-rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is always configured within a BWP:

* The BWP may be a configured BWP (different than the initial BWP), in which case the CFR has the same size as the BWP.
  + The configured BWP needs to contain the initial BWP (overlaps in frequency) and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
  + Note: The frequency window of the UE would match the configured BWP. Without BWP switching, the UE can then also receive the initial BWP and any configured frequency resource within the configured BWP.
* The BWP may be the initial BWP. In this case, the CFR has the same size as the initial BWP.
  + CFR can be smaller than the initial BWP.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| NOKIA | We are fine with the FL’s new proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK with the new proposal. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Proposal 1-rev2**: we agree with this proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are not ok with this proposal at this moment.  As FL pointed out, the initial BWP in the last meeting agreement could be CORESET0 or larger as per SIB1 and it would be used for CFR if a specific CFR is not configured.  Then when a specific CFR is configured and when we talk the relation between the specific CFR and initial BWP, we should make it clear which case (CORESET0 or larger than CORESET0 as per SIB1) we are saying. For the case of initial BWP larger than COREST0, since it can span the entire CC, it does not make sense to specific one additional CFR and it is nature to have the CFR confined within the initial BWP per SIB1. For the case of initial BWP as CORESET0, CFR may probably be larger than it (btw: it is the case we actually talking about by our tdoc and proposal), FFS CFR can be within the initial BWP as CORESET0.  As to the proposal, it should be like this:  **Proposal 1-rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH if configured can be:   * with the same size as the initial BWP, in which case the CFR has the frequency resources identical to the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP, * with smaller size than the initial BWP per SIB1, in which case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP per SIB1 and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. * FFS: whether can be with smaller size than the initial BWP spanned by CORESET0.   Regarding this FFS, we are fine to have CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP spanned by CORESET0 though it might not be the primary case to us. |
| Apple | The last bullet and its sub-bullet seems contradictory.   * The BWP may be the initial BWP. In this case, the CFR has the same size as the initial BWP.   + CFR can be smaller than the initial BWP.   If UE already supports to be scheduled within initial BWP, why CFR is configured smaller than initial BWP. |
| ZTE | We support this proposal in principle.  We share similar views with Apple regarding the last bullet.  Regarding Huawei’s concern on the CORESET#0 or initial BWP configured by SIB1, if we check the following RAN2 spec, UE always consider CORESET#0 as the initial BWP until it finishes reception of RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment. Thus, from our perspective, the current proposal is OK. And the most common case is to configure a common frequency resource larger than the CORESET#0 or larger than the initial BWP under IDLE/INACTIVE.  ***initialDownlinkBWP***  The initial downlink BWP configuration for a PCell. The network configures the *locationAndBandwidth* so that the initial downlink BWP contains the entire CORESET#0 of this serving cell in the frequency domain. The UE applies the *locationAndBandwidth* upon reception of this field (e.g. to determine the frequency position of signals described in relation to this *locationAndBandwidth*) but it keeps CORESET#0 until after reception of *RRCSetup*/*RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. |
| vivo | For the proposal, when a BWP different than the initial BWP is configured, how does a UE to receive multicast and SIB/paging simultaneously on two [active] DL BWPs? UE has to monitor PDCCHs in two active DL BWPs simultaneously or UE can be monitor PDCCH for multicast and PDCCHs for SIB/paging in TMD manner? |
| CATT | For the second sub-bullet of “The BWP may be the initial BWP. In this case, the CFR has the same size as the initial BWP”.  We have following agreements that: (parts of the agreements in RAN1#103-e)   * the UE may assume the initial BWP as the default common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, if a specific common frequency resource is not configured. * CORESET0 is used by default if the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is the initial BWP and the CORESET is not configured.   When CFR has the same size as the initial BWP, a UE has two independent BWPs with the same size, or UE has one BWP (i.e. initial BWP)?   * When CFR is not configured, UE applies initial BWP and CORESET0 by detault for reception of common PDSCH/PDCCH. * When CFR is configured as an independent BWP but has the same size with initial BWP, it means that UE has two BWPs. Correspondingly, a CORESET is also configured associated with the CFR within “the BWP”. Why gNB has to configure a CFR on initial BWP with the same size rather than do not configure CFR? As agreed, if CFR is not configured, initial BWP is always used. There is no necessary to configure the CFR based on the agreement and analysis when the sizes are the same. |
| Qualcomm | We support the Proposal in general. The second sublet can be deleted to avoid confusion. Anyway, we have agreed that CFR can be initial BWP by default. |
| Moderator | Thank you for all the discussion here and by email.  @Huawei: below I provide a quick recap of the discussion so far and I proposed a modified proposal based on your wording that aims to capture the different options proposed by companies, including the requested clarification of the relation of the CFR with the initial BWP (whether spanned by CORESET0 or larger by SIB1).  @Apple: thanks for the comment, I think you are right. The revised proposal has been changed to incorporate all the proposed options with support and the contradiction has been removed.  @vivo: this was clarified by Ericsson in previous discussions as follows. Since the discussion is proposing that a configured BWP would contain the initial BWP in the frequency domain and would have the same SCS and CP, the frequency window of the UE would match the configured BWP and without BWP switching, the UE can then also receive the initial BWP and any configured frequency resource within the configured BWP. Regarding the PDCCH monitoring I think this is in the scope of Issue 4 (if configured BWP for MBS is finally supported).  @CATT: the proposal has been revised below to accommodate the different options proposed. Hopefully now is clearer. Regarding your question “When CFR has the same size as the initial BWP, a UE has two independent BWPs with the same size, or UE has one BWP (i.e. initial BWP)?” what it was meant, in that case, the UE has one BWP that is the initial BWP. What other companies are proposing when defining a BWP, different to the initial BWP, is in the case where the defined BWP is larger than the initial BWP, contains it and has the same SCS and CP. Hope this clarifies.  As a quick recap on the email discussion Huawei raises the following point:” According to the following snapshot from 331, for legacy Rel15/Rel16/Rel17(non-MBS UEs) with initial BWP configured in SIB1 larger than CORESET0, CORESET0 is still be used until after entering RRC\_CONNECTED states. Therefore, to us, configuring a larger initial BWP might be sufficient. ” The moderator interprets that the point is that if an initial BWP via SIB1 is configured, with a frequency range potentially spanning the entire carrier, other UEs that do not receive MBS services in the configured initial BWP via SIB1, can still use the frequency resources spanning CORESET0 to receive for OSI/paging.  On the email discussion the moderator made the following question/comment:  “My understanding from the discussion so far is that we would like to cover the following cases:   1. CFR size is equal than initial BWP with frequency range as defined per coreset0 (agreed in RAN1#103e) 2. CFR size is equal than initial BWP with frequency range defined by SIB1 (agreed in RAN1#103e) 3. CFR is larger than the initial BWP when the frequency range of the initial BWP is smaller than the carrier Bandwidth. This would need a configured BWP. 4. FFS: CFR size smaller than the initial BWP with frequency range as defined per coreset0 5. FFS: CFR size smaller than the initial BWP with frequency range defined by SIB1”   The moderator also shared the following question:  “One follow up question, please. In my understanding, the motivation to have option C (CFR is larger than the initial BWP when the frequency range of the initial BWP is smaller than the carrier Bandwidth. This would need a configured BWP.) in my email below is as follows. Since the initial BWP is used by all idle/inactive UEs in the cell, configuring a large initial BWP to accommodate the rate needed to transmit the MBS services would have an impact on idle/inacte UEs in the cell that do not receive such MBS services but only need the initial BWP for system information. In this case, it may be desirable that a BWP is configured (different to the initial BWP) that can be larger than the initial BWP (when the initial BWP freq. range is smaller than carrier bandwidth) only for idle/inactive UEs receiving the MBS service. My understanding is that companies have proposed such a case and that’s why it is introduced.”  Nokia also commented on the same topic by email clarifying the motivation as follows:  “To our understanding, the CORESET#0 has rather limited frequency bandwidth with the size of either 24, 48, or 96 PRBs depending on the SS/PBCH block and CORESET multiplexing pattern configuration as well as sub-carrier space configuration. We agree that it can be used for OSI/Paging payload transmissions. But practically it may not always have enough capacity to carry larger OSI/Paging payload. If the capacity demanding transmission is required for OSI/Paging, the larger bandwidth with initial BWP can be configured and utilized for legacy Rel15/Rel16/Rel17(non-MBS) UEs to be camped and monitored for OSI/Paging information. In this case, the legacy Rel15/Rel16/Rel17(non-MBS) UEs may not be limited only in the CORESET#0 region, and they have to follow the bandwidth of initial BWP configured via SIB1. And in this case, the large bandwidth configuration for initial BWP with additional bandwidth added on top for MBS services may not be benefit for legacy Rel15/Rel16/Rel17(non-MBS) UEs from power saving perspective.”  Based on all the discussion so far the moderator proposes to present the different options that have been discussed (and that have been shown to have support from companies from previous email discussions) in the proposal. Taking Huawei’s new proposal wording as baseline, I have **revised Proposal 1-rev2** as below. Although some of the cases below may be already implicitly agreed by previous agreements in RAN1#103e, it is helpful to list them to have a complete picture of the relationship of the CFR with the initial BWP.  **Proposal 1-rev3**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH if configured can be:   1. with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same the same frequency resources as CORESET0. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources identical to the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. 2. with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same the same frequency resources as CORESET0. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. 3. with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources identical to the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. 4. with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. 5. for the case where the BWP may be a configured BWP (different than the initial BWP where the frequency resources of this initial BWP are configured smaller than the full carrier bandwidth), with the same size as the configured BWP. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources identical to the configured BWP. The configured BWP needs to contain the initial BWP in frequency domain and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. |

### **4th round FL proposals for Issue 1**

**Proposal 1-rev3**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH if configured can be:

1. with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same the same frequency resources as CORESET0. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources identical to the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
2. with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same the same frequency resources as CORESET0. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
3. with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources identical to the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
4. with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
5. for the case where the BWP may be a configured BWP (different than the initial BWP where the frequency resources of this initial BWP are configured smaller than the full carrier bandwidth), with the same size as the configured BWP. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources identical to the configured BWP. The configured BWP needs to contain the initial BWP in frequency domain and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Intel | Having followed the discussion closely so far, we have a few comments on this updated proposal. Firstly, we assume that the Options listed are Alternatives and not all are needed.  For Options B and D, we do not see the need to have CFR smaller than the initial BWP size. In both cases, of BW as large as the BWP size is not needed, it can be handled by appropriate frequency allocation based on the configured CFR spanning the initial BWP. Therefore options B and D can be removed.  The issue happens when the required BW for MBS reception needs to be wider than the initial BWP corresponding to CORESET#0. In this case, we need Options C and E.  On Option C, when configured by SIB1, it would mean that the initial BWP of legacy non-MBS capable UEs are also increased/changed unless this configuration is somehow targeted to MBS UEs only. Since the gNB does not know which IDLE UEs are MBS only, SIB1 will therefore update initial BWP of all UEs. CORESET#0 can still be used by UEs to receive common control OSI/paging etc., but increasing the size of the initial BWP of legacy UEs when they reach connected mode is not ideal.  From this perspective, Option E seems a little easier i.e., a dedicated MBS SIB can configure the BWP for MBS capable UEs where this BWP contains the CORESET#0 and initial BWP. Note that this option should be triggered only if the required BW for MBS reception is wider than the initial BWP or CORESET#0. The UEs can still receive the common control and OSI/paging on CORESET#0 or initial BWP from SIB1. However, it needs to be specified if the UE assumes that the MBS BWP in this case becomes the initial active BWP when this UE transitions to connected mode. Otherwise, the UE would need to assume that the smaller CORESET#0 or initial BWP is the BWP#0 on reaching connected mode. Another issue is when configured with this BWP, where the UE expects to receive the MBS PDCCH i.e., is it CORESET#0 or not. These points can be added as FFS for Option E for this meeting.  In summary, we think Option A and E are sufficient and further details can be discussed based on these two options. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We should note what we have agreed in the last meeting is that CFR is optionally and additionally configured and by default initial BWP is used otherwise. FL has also clarified that the agreement includes the cases of initial BWP with the bandwidth of CORESET0 and the one configured within SIB1 meaning larger than CORESET0.  Regarding the proposal 1-rev3, the main bullet talks about the bandwidth of the CFR when it is to be configured. Therefore, case A and case C should be at least supported because default initial BWP can be used there is no reason to restrict the CFR resource cannot have the same size.  As commented earlier, case B we could be fine though may not be the primary case.  Case D, it is also ok and preferred over case E. The reason is when Rel-17 MBS UE after entering RRC\_connected state can receive broadcast in the initial BWP instead of switching to a larger CFR with bandwidth than initial BWP so that NW can schedule broadcast and unicast or even multicast on the SIB1 configured initial BWP.  Case E, if the point of case E is a specific BWP which contains the initial BWP per SIB1, as explained above, it may lead to Rel-17 MBS UE after entering RRC\_connected state switches the BWP for receiving broadcast and unicast/multicast.  All in all, we are ok with cases A, B, C, and D except case E.  Suggestion to FL:   1. typo in cases A and B, two “the same” 2. can highlight which cases are supported impliedly per last meeting agreement, and which cases we need more discussion. 3. Can clarify whether the intention is for down-selections and if yes which options are for down-selection. |
| Samsung | For a UE to receive MBS, it will anyway receive SIB1 and other SIB’s for MBS reception. So Case C can be used if the UE is not configured with other MBS BWP.  And after configured with MBS BWP having the same SCS and CP with initial BWP indicated by SIB1, the UE can use the MBS BWP to receive MBS-specific PDCCH/PDSCH and also SIB’s, since the initial BWP is contained in the MBS BWP. |
| CMCC | Case A and Case C has been supported in last RAN1#103-e meeting, we don’t need to discuss them again.  Case B and Case D, we support them.  For Case E, we are striving define the functionalities of CFR for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs first, and not discuss it is a MBS region or a MBS specific BWP. As the comment, we also thin the BWP switching time may be a issue need to be considered. Therefore, we suggest we can agree Case B and D first, and further discuss Case E after some process of AI 8.12.1 about the functionalities definition and the final down-selection of option 2A/2B. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK with case A and Case C and don’t think either Case B or Case D is a typical configuration. Furthermore, in either Case B or Case D, the FDRA bits in the DCI is according to the initial BWP which does not lead to any performance gain.  For Case E, we share same concern with CMCC. |
| ZTE | Similar view as Intel.  Regarding Case C, we prefer to remove it due to the following reasons:   * We were involved in the Rel-15 discussion of initial BWP configured by SIB1. During that discussion, companies clarified that, the main motivation of configuring an initial BWP by SIB1 is to configure **only one** DL BWP (i.e., the initial BWP) in the network. In this case, network can reuse most of the LTE implementation design since there is no BWP adaptation, etc. Considering this, **Case C** may not be a good idea because if network wants to additionally support MBS service, network has to update the whole BWP configurations for unicast UE as well. * Initial BWP configured by SIB1 is not mandatory configured. If the network doesn’t configure initial BWP by SIB1 and network wants to additionally support MBS, then network has to configure it, which will also impact the unicast UEs. * Case C may imply that network has to use the same PDCCH/PDSCH configuration for non-MBS UE/scheduling and MBS UE/scheduling, which is too restrictive from network perspective.   Regarding Case B, we didn’t see the need to have such a case. Besides, we can always configure a common frequency resource smaller than CORESET#0 by implementation.  Case C can be implemented by implementation from our view.  Overall, we support Case A and Case E. Other cases can be FFS from our perspective. |
| Apple | Sorry to say, for us this proposal is just interpreting what we agreed in last meeting.  **Agreements:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, define/configure common frequency resource(s) for group-  common PDCCH/PDSCH.  • the UE may assume the initial BWP as the default common frequency resource for group-common  PDCCH/PDSCH, if a specific common frequency resource is not  It makes little sense the Common frequency resource (CFR) is smaller than or equal to initial BWP (including CORESET#0 or configured), because the default CFR is initial BWP. Only required CFR is larger than initial BWP, then new MBS BWP could be configured.  In this sense, we only agree with case E. |
| NOKIA | We would like to keep the “old” proposal structure of Proposal-rev**2**, which is more clear to us.  Simply, the A/B/C/D is under the below 2ndt-subbullet point, and E is under the below 1st-subbullet point.  **Proposal 1-rev~~2~~**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is always configured within a BWP:   * The BWP may be a configured BWP (different than the initial BWP), in which case the CFR has the same size as the BWP.   + The configured BWP needs to contain the initial BWP (overlaps in frequency) and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + Note: It is assumed that the frequency resource of initial BWP is larger than CORESET0, but it does not span (or smaller than) the entire CC.   + Note: The frequency window of the UE would match the configured BWP. Without BWP switching, the UE can then also receive the initial BWP and any configured frequency resource within the configured BWP. * The BWP may be the initial BWP.   + the CFR can be smaller than the initial BWP, and the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP per SIB1 and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.     - FFS: Frequency resource size of CFR, i.e. whether it can be smaller/larger size than the CORESET0   NOTE: In this case, the frequency resource of initial BWP can be configured identically to CORESET0, or it can be configured larger and contains the CORESET0 but it does not span the entire CC. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with Case A, Case C and Case E. For Case B and Case D, we do not see the clear necessity from performance and implementation simplicity perspective is CFR smaller than initial BWP is configured. |
| vivo | Similar view as CMCC. Case A and Case C are covered by our agreements in the last meeting. For Case B and Case D, we are fine to support it.  For Case E, we have concern to discuss it as an MBS specific BWP, we prefer to adopt unified solution for CFR for UE in RRC-CONNECTED or RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state. |
| MTK | Supporting case A and case C has been agreed in last RAN1 meeting.  We support the case B and case D.  For case E, we also have concern about the BWP switching delay as CMCC commented if it define an MBS specific BWP. |
| LG | We wonder if we really need to support Case B and D. We are fine with the other cases.  But, we also prefer to keep the previous **Proposal 1-rev2**. |
| Moderator | Thank you for all the comments.  @Intel: the options listed are alternatives (since we have only agreed to one configured/defined CFR so far where multiple are for FSS) so I have clarified this below.  Regarding your comments about Options B and D, I think that given the discussion there is no consensus on this configuration of the CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, hence, that’s why it is included. However, if there is no consensus on whether this needs to be explicitly mentioned, I would propose to leave it as FFS is this would be a better position.  Your analysis of the motivation for Options C&E is as per my understanding the motivation to introduce option E. It seems that some companies do not see the usefulness of this option, specially around BWP switching even if the configured BWP would contain the initial BWP in the frequency domain. If there are strong concerns on option E, I would propose to put it as FFS to give the opportunity to come back at the next meetings with more analysis.  I have also included your comment on initial BWP assumptions when transitioning to connected as potential item for study while I would propose to leave your comment on PDCCH monitoring to the discussion on Issue 4.  @Huawei, HiSilicon: I have included your suggestions to clarify the proposal – thanks. In particular, the typos, which cases are impliedly agreed as per RAN1#103e. I have also clarified that only one option could be configured/defined (as per agreement at this meeting) while placed (temporarily) in FFS some of the options due to comments of companies. Please let me know if this is still not clear.  Regarding your comment (and from other companies) on Option E, my proposal would be to leave it as FFS to leave companies the opportunity to come back at next meeting since there is interest in this option.  @Samsung: Thanks for comments. Since there are still companies with concerns with this option, while interest from other companies I would propose to leave it as FFS.  @CMCC: I think you are right regarding options A and C. I have included a clarifying note on this. If there is strong view to remove them we could do it, but also given the discussion it may be adequate to keep them in the list to have a wide view of the options discussed so far as well as accommodating comments form other companies on this. Regarding you comment on option E, I have propose to put it as FFS that hopefully accommodates your comments.  @Lenovo: Thanks for comments, as discussed with Intel, regarding your comments about Options B and D, I think that given the discussion there is no consensus on this configuration of the CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, hence, that’s why it is included. However, if there is no consensus on whether this needs to be explicitly mentioned, I would propose to leave it as FFS is this would be a better position.  @ZTE: thanks for comments. Regarding your comments on Option C, my understanding is that this case is already supported as per agreement in RAN1#103e (*agreement*: *For RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, define/configure common frequency resource(s) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH: - the UE may assume the initial BWP as the default common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, if a specific common frequency resource is not configured.*). Regarding comments on Case B, as per mentioned to Intel and Lenovo, I think that given the discussion there is no consensus on this configuration of the CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, hence, that’s why it is included. However, if there is no consensus on whether this needs to be explicitly mentioned, I would propose to leave it as FFS is this would be a better position. Regarding option E, since there concerns from various companies, I would propose to leave it as FFS.  @Apple: Thanks for comments, I have added clarifying notes on the options A&C that would reflect the agreements at RAN1#103e. I think that given the comments from companies, e.g. Huawei and ZTE, it would be adequate to leave them to give a clear picture of the options considered/discussed. However, I agree that if we reach a common view, we could remove them. Regarding your further comments on options B, D, it is my understanding that given the discussion there is no consensus on this configuration of the CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, hence, that’s why it is included. However, if there is no consensus on whether this needs to be explicitly mentioned, I would propose to leave it as FFS is this would be a better position. Regarding case E, there various companies that have concerns with this option due to potential BWP switching issues or the need of option E at all. I would also propose to leave it as FFS if this is more agreeable by companies.  @Nokia, LG: thank you for the suggestion. I think I am finding helpful the current structure since it seems that companies can discuss each of the options in turn, I can the identify common views and disagreements. If there is no strong view on this, I would propose to keep the discussion with the current structure. I have also added further clarifications in case this is clearer now. @LG, regarding whether to include cases B and D, if there strong views on this I would propose to leave as FFS as well.  @Spreadtrum: thanks for comments, as discussed with other companies given the discussion there is no consensus on this configuration of the CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, hence, that’s why it is included. However, if there is no consensus on whether this needs to be explicitly mentioned, I would propose to leave it as FFS is this would be a better position.  @vivo, MTK: thank you, I have added clarifying notes on which options were agreed at RAN1#103e and I would also propose to put option E as FFS given your and other companies’ comments.  Based on the comments above I would propose the following changes to the Proposal 1-rev3 in case this would be agreeable.  **Proposal 1-rev3[under revision]**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, if configured/defined, can be one of the options below. [Note: the configuration/definition of multiple CFRs is FFS.]   1. with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources identical to the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. [This is as per agreement in RAN1#103e.] 2. with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. 3. with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources identical to the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. [This is as per agreement in RAN1#103e.] 4. with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. 5. FFS: for the case where the BWP may be a configured BWP (different than the initial BWP where the frequency resources of this initial BWP are configured smaller than the full carrier bandwidth), with the same size as the configured BWP. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources identical to the configured BWP. The configured BWP needs to contain the initial BWP in frequency domain and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. Other aspects to study are:  * details on UE assumptions on initial BWP if transitioning to RRC\_CONNECTED state. |
| CATT | Thanks moderator for the great effort on the discussion.  However, the above proposal 1-rev3 is not the normal way to form a way forward as a proposal for potential agreement.   * I totally understand the intention for adding option A and C to the proposal is for clear reference, but we do not have to agree something that have been agreed before. Furthermore, even Option A and Option C were agreed in the previous meeting, the agreements are using different wording that may have different meaning from the above descriptions. Therefore, we cannot simply say that Option A and Option C are agreements in RAN1#103-e. They might be having similar meaning, but they are not agreed unless we copy the agreements here in this proposal. * The agreements in RAN1#103-e said that “if a specific CFR is NOT configured”. However, the above proposal with main bullet said that “if configured/defined” which is controversial with the agreements in RAN1#103-e. The above proposal has the meaning that “configured/defined and with the same size with initial BWP”, and from my perspective it is not the same mechanism with “if not configured/defined and use initial BWP for broadcast reception”.   *We have following agreements that: (parts of the agreements in RAN1#103-e) sorry for copy them again.*   * *the UE may assume the initial BWP as the default common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, if a specific common frequency resource is not configured.* * *CORESET0 is used by default if the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is the initial BWP and the CORESET is not configured.*   Previous proposal 1-rev2 can be applied for the starting point with clear initiation even there are still some details need to be further clarified and discussed. |

## Issue 2: Number of MBS Common Frequency Resources

### **1st FL proposal for Issue 2**

**Proposal 3**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, one common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be defined/configured.

* FFS: whether to define/configure more than one common frequency resources
* FFS: if more than one common frequency resource are configured, either the common frequency resource can be fully confined within the initial BWP and other configured common frequency resources, or the common frequency resource can be configured to contain the entire initial BWP and other common frequency resources**.**

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | We are not sure about the motivation of configuring multiple common frequency resources, because the multiple broadcast services are common for all Idle/inactive UEs in the cell, gNB can configure a proper bandwidth of one common frequency resource to transmit multiple group-common PDCCHs/PDSCHs. |
| ZTE | We are ok with the main bullet.  For IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, it seems not necessary to support more than one common frequency resource. But for connected UEs, it can be further studied. |
| LG | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We think at most one common frequency resource for IDLE/Inactive UEs for receiving multicast. So we propose to add “at most” in the main bullet and delete the two sub-bullets. |
| CATT | Only support the main bullet.  For the two FFS sub-bullets, the motivation and benefit is not clear to configure more than one common frequency resources. Furthermore, if needed, a larger common frequency resource instead of multiple common frequency resources can be configured for UEs. |
| Apple | We are ok with the main bullet. |
| NOKIA | Agree with FL’s proposal.  Besides, we could like to add the third bullet point in below:   * FFS: if more than one common frequency resources (CFR) are configured, mechanism on support of multiple CFRs, i.e. CFR switching, changing indication, etc. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t see the need for multiple common frequency resources for IDLE/INACTIVE UE. |
| OPPO | Since all common frequency resources (if multiple) need to overlap with the initial BWP, likely they will have the same SCS and CP length. As such, we don’t see the value of having more than one CFR to carry more than one service. |
| Ericsson |  |
| Qualcomm | Some examples for more than MBS CFR:   * UEs may have different bandwidth capabilities, such as RedCap UEs. In this sense, if at most one MBS CFR is allowed, it may be too limited. * The MBS CFR for control and data could be different. The UEs can camp on a smaller MBS CFR to monitor the control and go to a wider MBS CFR to receive the data for power saving. |
| vivo | Support the main bullet. For the FFS part, we are not clear with the motivations but are open to keep it as FFS. |
| Intel | OK with the main bullet and only the first FFS. The second seems dependent on discussion in Issue 1. We also do not think multiple MBS CFR is required. Corner cases for RedCap UEs supporting MBS are not enough justify the complexity of all UEs specially when only low QoS broadcast reception only is allowed. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Our comments (TD Tech &Chengdu TD Tech):**  We agree with proposal 3.  But we think the number of the MBS common frequency resources is related to the MBS bandwidth requirement in the cell. Specifically the FFS items are related to the MBS bandwidth requirement in the cell.  If the bandwidth is small, the MBS common frequency resource is within the initial BWP. One common frequency resource is OK.  If the MBS bandwidth provided by the frequency range [F1, F2] with F2-F1<=Fmin is not enough to satisfy the MBS bandwidth requirement, one or several extra common frequency resources outside [F1, F2] shall be configured. |
| MTK | Support the main bullet. It’s no clear motivation to support multiple common frequency resource. |
| Convida | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Moderator | Thank you for the discussion.  I think there is strong support to the main bullet of Proposal 3 (For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, one common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be defined/configured.)  However, whether to support more than one CFR there is no consensus and the opinion is quite divided. There are at least 7 companies that are fine with the proposal and the FFS on multiple CFRs. Since whether to define/configure more than one CFRs is an FFS and there are multiple companies that are interested in this feature, the moderator would propose to leave the FFS to give the opportunity for companies to defend their position at next meetings. I would remove the second FFS to leave the more than one CFR more general. Therefore, the moderator proposes the following **revision to Proposal 3**.  **Proposal 3-rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, one common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be defined/configured.   * FFS: whether to define/configure more than one common frequency resources |

### **2nd round FL proposals for Issue 2**

**Proposal 3-rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, one common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be defined/configured.

* FFS: whether to define/configure more than one common frequency resources

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | We support the updated proposal. |
| LG | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK with this proposal. |
| NOKIA | Fine with us |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| OPPO | We are fine for now to keep FFS for more than one CFR. |
| CATT | Only support the main bullet. |
| Ericsson | We agree |
| Samsung | Support |
| Moderator | **Proposal 3-rev1** has been agreed at the GTW on 28th January 2021. The discussion of this Issue is therefore closed. Thank you for the discussion.  Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, one common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be defined/configured.   * FFS: whether to define/configure more than one common frequency resources |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Proposal 3-rev1: we agree with this proposal** |

## Issue 3: Configuration/Definition of MBS Common Frequency Resources

### **1st FL proposals for Issue 3**

**Proposal 4**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for the case that the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is larger than the Initial BWP (if supported), define a MBS specific BWP.

* FFS: details on start PRB, length PRB and reuse of SILV indication mechanisms.

**Proposal 5**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for the case that the Initial BWP contains the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH (if supported), configure a MBS frequency resource within the Initial BWP.

* FFS: details on start PRB, length PRB and reuse of SILV indication mechanisms.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | Not support proposal 4 and 5.  We think a general definition for common frequency resource is enough, regardless the common frequency resource is larger or smaller than initial BWP, e.g.,  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, configure a MBS frequency resource larger than (if supported) or within (if supported) the Initial BWP  ~~for the case that the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is larger than the Initial BWP (if supported), define a MBS specific BWP.~~   * FFS: details on start PRB, length PRB and reuse of SILV indication mechanisms.   In addition, whether adopt option 2A (MBS specific BWP) or option 2B (MBS resource region) for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues are still under discussion in AI 8.12.1, we can defer this issue after the process of RRC\_CONNECTED Ues. |
| ZTE | We agree with proposal 4. And the same method for BWP configuration can be reused for configuring MBS specific BWP. |
| LG | We are fine with Proposal 4. MBS specific BWP can be configured by SIB (or MCCH). |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK to delay this discussion after we have agreement on the relationship between initial DL BWP and common frequency resource. |
| CATT | Not support proposal 4.  For proposal 5, it can be supported and up to gNB configuration. |
| Apple | we can discuss these proposals after MBS BWP or common frequency region is determined for RRC\_CONNECTED UE. |
| NOKIA | Agree with the FL’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Whether call it MBS specific BWP can wait and see the progress in AI 8.12.1. We primarily think about the case that common frequency resource if configured contains the initial BWP. |
| OPPO | As commented for proposal 1 and 2, they should be clarified first, because both proposal 4 and 5 look like they are dealing with RRC configuration signalling. Furthermore, if both proposals are adopted, it seems like we have two different configuration mechanisms for the CFR. |
| Ericsson | We agree with P4&5 |
| Qualcomm | We support Proposal 4 and leave Proposal 5 FFS (due to similar concern for Proposal 2). |
| vivo | Not support the proposal 4. CMCC’s update is fine to us. |
| Moderator | Thank you for the comments.  @CMCC: thank you for the wording but I think the proposed wording would only reiterate the following agreement at RAN1#103-e: Agreements: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, define/configure common frequency resource(s) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.  @Huawei/HiSilicon: thank you for comment. I would like to ask a question for clarification (thanks!). If the common frequency resource is larger than the initial BWP, would the only option be to use a dedicated BPW since it would not be possible to confiture a frequency resource with respect to the initial BWP?  @ OPPO: You are right, the intention with the word “contain” is that the common frequency resource and the Initial BWP overlap in frequency. |
| Intel | A common MBS frequency region configuration can be defined in lieu of an initial BWP with only the configurations necessary for reception of the MBS data which can address the concern of MBS frequency region being wider than initial BWP. The configuration of the frequency region can be enabled through SIB. Additionally, the design agreed for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs in 8.12.1 can be re-used here with necessary modifications w.r.t to initial BWP. This would ensure common design between idle and connected UEs. |
| Samsung | Proposals 4 and 5 need to be considered together with Proposals 1 and 2.  Support proposal 5 (gNB configuration), FFS for proposal 4. |
| Spreadtrum | Support proposal 4, and agree with CMCC that a general configuration for common frequency resource should be defined. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Our comments (TD Tech &Chengdu TD Tech):**  The configuration/definition of the MBS common frequency resources is related to the MBS bandwidth. As we suggested for issue 1, the relation of the common frequency resource to the initial BWP has three cases and correspondingly there are three configurations. Proposals 4 and 5 provide two configurations.  We think these two proposals can be combined as below.  **Proposal 4**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for the case that the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH contains the Initial BWP (if supported) or within the initial BWP (if supported), define a MBS specific BWP where the MBS specific BWP is not a real BWP if this MBS BWP is within the initial BWP.   * FFS: details on start PRB, length PRB and reuse of SILV indication mechanisms.   **The third configuration for (F2-F1)>Fmin needs to be discussed.**  **We suggest the third configuration is done as below.**  **If (F2-F1)>Fmin (such case exists and needs to be solved), configure one common frequency resource [F3, F4] with F4-F3<=Fmin and containing the initial BWP, and then configure one or several common frequency resources outside [F3, F4] to support the MBS. The total valid bandwidth of all the common frequency resources is equal to the bandwidth requirement of the MBS.**  **Each common frequency resource outside [F3, F4] acts as the initial BWP, which means that RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UE can receive the MBS on the common frequency with no influence on camping on the cell ( Each common frequency resource outside [F3, F4] provides the same SI and paging information just as the initial BWP).** |
| MTK | Support proposal 5, NOT support proposal 4. |
| Convida | For proposal 4, we support the main bullet. For the sub-bullet, we suggest to reword it as ‘FFS the configuration details’ since using the start PRB, length PRB is one potential solution on configuring the MBS specific BWP, other solutions should not be precluded and should be also studied and considered.  For proposal 5, we are OK the main bullet. Regarding the sub-bullet, same comment for proposal 4 applies to proposal 5. Other solutions should not be precluded and should be also considered. |
| Ericsson | We have the following comment on the CMCC’s change proposal of Proposal 4:  In line with our comment about BWPs (P1/2), we think it is not possible to have the common frequency resource larger than the initial BWP, unless the CFR is contained within another larger BWP.  The principle must be that reception always occurs within a BWP. The CFR may be part of this BWP. |
| Moderator | Thank you for the discussion.  The discussion on this Issue 3 is related with the discussion on Issue 1, but I think it would be good to continue the discussion to check that we build a common understanding of the issues.  Regarding whether a common definition for CFR can be used regardless of whether the CFR is larger or smaller than the initial BWP: it has been clarified that if the CFR is larger than the initial BWP we cannot rely on the frequency resource of the initial BWP to define it. **Therefore, the only option would be to configure a BWP**, which would have a larger frequency domain resource allocation. **Could we please confirm this is a common understanding by the different companies?**  The motivation to have Proposals 4 (or modified version) is to be clear that in the case of CFR larger than initial BWP, we need to rely on defining a BWP and we cannot rely on configuring a frequency region with reference to the initial BWP .  The motivation to have Proposal 5 (or a modified version) is to force that if the CFR is smaller than the initial BWP, a dedicated BWP is not defined but instead a frequency region within the initial BWP is used, since seems to be more efficient use of the BWP configuration.  This probably needs more discussion, but I propose the following **revisions to Proposal 4 and Proposal 5** to check the opinions of the group while trying to accommodate concerns raised above. I would also be helpful if companies can provide their opinions on the questions and arguments above.  **Proposal 4-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for the case that the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is larger than the Initial BWP (if supported), a dedicated BWP is configured.   * FFS: configuration details.   **Proposal 5-rev1**:Study forRRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for the case that the Initial BWP contains the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH (if supported), the common frequency resource can be configured as a frequency resource within the Initial BWP. |
| Ericsson | As stated elsewhere, Proposals 4&5 need in general to be harmonized with Proposal 1.  We agree with **Proposal 4-rev1**  Regarding **Proposal 5-rev1** we also agree but wish to point out that there is an overlap between Proposal 1-rev1 and Proposal 5-rev1, which both cover the aspect of configuring the CFR as a subset of the Initial BWP. |

### **2nd round FL proposals for Issue 3**

**Proposal 4-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for the case that the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is larger than the Initial BWP (if supported), a dedicated BWP is configured.

* FFS: configuration details.

**Proposal 5-rev1**:Study forRRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for the case that the Initial BWP contains the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH (if supported), the common frequency resource can be configured as a frequency resource within the Initial BWP.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | We support the updated FL proposal 4-rev1 and proposal 5-rev1.  In our view, if the CFR is larger than the initial BWP we cannot rely on the frequency resource of the initial BWP to define it. Therefore, the only option would be to configure a BWP, which would have a larger frequency domain resource allocation. |
| LG | We are generally fine with the updated proposals. We could further clarify that the BWP dedicated to MBS, not UE, as follows:  ***Proposal 4-rev1****:**For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for the case that the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is larger than the Initial BWP (if supported), a MBS dedicated BWP is configured.* |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Generally, we are OK with **Proposal 4-rev1 and Proposal 5-rev1**.  A small modification from our side is added to **Proposal 4-rev1:**  **Proposal 4-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for the case that the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is larger than the Initial BWP (if supported), a dedicated BWP which contains the common frequency resource is configured.   * FFS: configuration details. |
| NOKIA | Agree with the FL’s proposal |
| Spreadtrum | We are generally fine with the updated proposals. Since Proposal 4-rev1 is to configure a dedicated MBS BWP, while Proposal 5-rev1 is to configure a common frequency resource within initial BWP, we think a similar *FFS(e.g. FFS: configuration details*.) should be added to Proposal 5-rev1 |
| OPPO | We are also generally fine with the revisions. Again, the suggestion is to clarify the word “contains” means overlap in frequency. |
| CATT | We still have concerns to configure MBS specific BWP for IDLE UEs.  Proposal 4 can be further discussed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not ok with proposal 4-rev1, same comment as to issue 1. We think the initial BWP needs to be clarified, and at this moment I don’t think a dedicated BWP for broadcast.  Since proposal 5-rev1 main bullet says study for, should be ok in general, however, similar comment to issue 1 which should be solved at first. |
| Samsung | Since Issue 1/2 are already discussed/agreed, then we don’t need to discuss Proposals 4/5. |
| Ericsson | (copied here by moderator from table above.)  As stated elsewhere, Proposals 4&5 need in general to be harmonized with Proposal 1.  We agree with **Proposal 4-rev1**  Regarding **Proposal 5-rev1** we also agree but wish to point out that there is an overlap between Proposal 1-rev1 and Proposal 5-rev1, which both cover the aspect of configuring the CFR as a subset of the Initial BWP. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for comments.  @LG, thanks for proposal, your wording has been included.  @Lenovo: thank you for wording which has been included.  @ Spreadtrum: thank you for comments that have been incorporated.  @CATT: to align with discussion at Issue 1 I have also included the term broadcast reception.  @ Huawei, HiSilicon: As per discussion in Issue 1, I have removed the term larger to address your comments.  @Samsung: thank you for comments. I think while Issue 1 focuses on the relation with the Initial BWP, specially in the frequency domain, the goal of this issue is to focus on configuration and definition details.  @Ericsson: I think you are right that there is an overlap with Issue 1. We could remove it if there are strong views.  Based on the above, I propose the following **revisions to Proposal 4-rev1 and Proposal 5-rev1**.  **Proposal 4-rev2**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, for the case that the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH contains the Initial BWP (if supported) [where “contains” refers to overlap in frequency], a MBS dedicated BWP which the CFR is configured.   * FFS: configuration details.   **Proposal 5-rev2**:Study forRRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for the case that the Initial BWP contains the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH (if supported), the common frequency resource can be configured as a frequency resource within the Initial BWP.   * FFS: configuration details. |

### **3rd round FL proposals for Issue 3**

**Proposal 4-rev2**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, for the case that the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH contains the Initial BWP (if supported) [where “contains” refers to overlap in frequency], a MBS dedicated BWP which the CFR is configured.

* FFS: configuration details.

**Proposal 5-rev2**:Study forRRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for the case that the Initial BWP contains the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH (if supported), the common frequency resource can be configured as a frequency resource within the Initial BWP.

* FFS: configuration details.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | We are generally fine with the updated proposal. I guess that you may want to complete Proposal 4-rev2 as follows:  **Proposal 4-rev2**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, for the case that the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH contains the Initial BWP (if supported) [where “contains” refers to overlap in frequency], a MBS dedicated BWP which the CFR is configured can be configured. |
| NOKIA | We are fine with the FL’s new proposal, and with minor update in below:  **Proposal 5-rev2**:Study forRRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, for the case that the Initial BWP contains the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH (if supported), the common frequency resource can be configured as a frequency resource within the Initial BWP.   * FFS: configuration details. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are generally fine with the updated proposal. Maybe one word is missing in Proposal 4-rev2:  **Proposal 4-rev2**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, for the case that the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH contains the Initial BWP (if supported) [where “contains” refers to overlap in frequency], a MBS dedicated BWP which contains the CFR is configured.   * FFS: configuration details. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **We agree with these two proposals. But proposal 4-rev2 can be updated as below.**  **Proposal 4-rev2**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, for the case that the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH contains the Initial BWP (if supported) [where “contains” refers to overlap in frequency], a MBS dedicated BWP for the CFR is configured.   * FFS: configuration details.   **Proposal 5-rev2**:Study forRRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for the case that the Initial BWP contains the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH (if supported), the common frequency resource can be configured as a frequency resource within the Initial BWP.   * FFS: configuration details. |
| CMCC | Can moderator clarify the relationship between these two proposals and **Proposal 1-rev2?** We think the **Proposal 1-rev2** has covered **Proposal 4-rev2** and **Proposal 5-rev2.**  **In Proposal 4-rev2**: “a MBS dedicated BWP for the CFR is configured” is equivalent to configured BWP (different than the initial BWP) in **Proposal 1-rev2.**  In addition, if we agree “CFR can be smaller than the initial BWP” in **Proposal 1-rev2,** we don’t need **Proposal 5-rev2.**  **Proposal 1-rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is always configured within a BWP:   1. The BWP may be a configured BWP (different than the initial BWP), in which case the CFR has the same size as the BWP.    * The configured BWP needs to contain the initial BWP (overlaps in frequency) and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.    * Note: The frequency window of the UE would match the configured BWP. Without BWP switching, the UE can then also receive the initial BWP and any configured frequency resource within the configured BWP. 2. The BWP may be the initial BWP. In this case, the CFR has the same size as the initial BWP.    * CFR can be smaller than the initial BWP. |
| Apple | For proposal 4-rev2, this proposal indicates there are two configurations, one is MBS BWP configuration, and another is CFR configuration within MBS BWP. This BWP is already MBS specific, why it need additional CFR configuration, MBS broadcast service just scheduling in MBS dedicated BWP is enough.  For Proposal 5-rev2, restructuring it for better understanding.  **Proposal 5-rev2**:forRRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, study the case that the Initial BWP contains the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH (if supported), the common frequency resource can be configured as a frequency resource within the Initial BWP.   * FFS: configuration details.   **Proposal 1-rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is always configured within a BWP:   1. …. 2. The BWP may be the initial BWP. In this case, the CFR has the same size as the initial BWP.    * CFR can be smaller than the initial BWP.   The same thing is proposed twice in Proposal 1 and Proposal 5. Proposal 5-rev2 is for study, i.e., FFS, so Proposal 5-rev2 is not really necessary. |
| ZTE | Support the two proposals. For proposal 4, as commented by Lenovo, a word is missing in it. |
| vivo | Can moderator clarify the relationship between these two proposals and **Proposal 1-rev2?** We also think the **Proposal 1-rev2** has covered **Proposal 4-rev2** and **Proposal 5-rev2.** |
| Moderator | Thank you all for taking the time to provide your inputs.  @LG, Nokia, Lenovo, TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech, ZTE: thanks for providing word revisions. Since the evolving discussion in Issue 1 may overlap with this Issue, I would propose (as multiple companies are proposing) that we try to progress on Issue 1. I think it will be difficult to reach agreement based on the comments from companies if we do not solve Issue 1 first.  @CMCC, vivo: I think you are right that due to the evolving discussion in Issue 1 there is starting to be overlap between the two Issues. As proposed by some companies, we can try to move the discussion forward with Issue 1 and once that discussion is more mature we can come back to this one.  @Apple: thanks for the comments. The intention of Proposal 4-rev2 was to define a CFR that has the same frequency resources as the BWP. It was not the intention that if a BWP is configured the CFR can be configured within BWP. However, as mentioned to other companies, I think that given to the evolving discussion in Issue 1, we can try to first make progress in Issue 1 and then come back to this issue since as you highlighted there is starting to be overlap between the two issues.  Therefore, based on the discussion above, the moderator does not update the Proposals of Issue 3 in this round of discussion. |

## Issue 4: CORESET configuration for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH

### **1st FL proposals for Issue 4**

**Proposal 6**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, network can configure the common CORESET configured by RRC signalling *commonControlResourceSet* for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH if the common frequency resource is the initial BWP and a CORESET is not configured.

**Proposal 7**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, multiple CORESETs can be configured for the defined/configured common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.

* the same configured CORESET can be used to schedule MBS control information reception, broadcast, multicast and unicast.
* multiple CORESETs can be configured to independently schedule different MBS services and/or channels for control and traffic.
* FFS: definition of new RRC parameters to configure CORESET in a common frequency resource larger than Initial BWP (if supported).

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | Not support.  We are not sure the motivation to support multiple CORESETs to differentiate multiple MBS services and/or channels for control and traffic.  In addition, whether to support more than one CORESETs in addition to CORESET 0 is an optional capability of UE. For all IDLE/INACTIVE UEs in the cell, gNB can only configure one additional CORESET in addition to CORESET 0. Therefore, we think we can modify the proposal like this:  **Proposal 7**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, at most one ~~multiple~~ CORESET~~s~~ can be configured for the defined/configured common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH in addition to CORESET 0.   * the same configured CORESET can be used to schedule MBS control information reception, broadcast, multicast and unicast. * ~~multiple CORESETs can be configured to independently schedule different MBS services and/or channels for control and traffic.~~ * FFS: definition of new RRC parameters to configure CORESET in a common frequency resource larger than Initial BWP (if supported). |
| ZTE | Support both proposal 6 and proposal 7. |
| LG | We are fine with Proposal 6 and 7. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 6: generally fine with us.  Proposal 7: The motivation is not clear to us. We think one CORESET is enough for idle/inactive UEs. |
| CATT | Not supporting neither proposal 6 nor proposal 7.  We share the similar views form CMCC.  For Proposal 6, it has been agreed in last meeting that the CORESET0 is used by default if the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is the initial BWP and the CORESET is not configured.  For proposal 7, the motivation and benefit to configure multiple CORESETs is unclear. One common frequency with one CORESET (if configured) is enough for MBS services |
| Apple | We are ok with proposal 6. |
| NOKIA | We are fine with Proposal 6 and Proposal 7 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If the common resource is initial BWP, it is nature to use COREST0. In addition, one more CORESET can be configured, the configured CORESET can be used for scheduling broadcast, but sure why used for multicast and unicast? |
| OPPO | Not sure if proposal 6 is needed. And we share the same view as CMCC on proposal 7. |
| Ericsson | We agree with P6&7 |
| Qualcomm | Similar concerns as Huawei |
| vivo | Not support.  We have no discussions on whether support multiple MBS services for UE in idle/inactive state which should be discuss first. |
| Intel | Proposal 6: Not sure if this is needed. If initial BWP is used and CORESET is not configured, CORESET#0 is the default.  Proposal 7: Do not support current wording  Not clear why multiple CORESETs are required for scheduling MBS for RRC\_IDLE UEs where only low QoS mode delivery is supported. Multicast and Unicast need not be mentioned in this context. Additionally, have we agreed that RRC\_IDLE UEs can receive multiple MBS services? |
| Samsung | OK for proposal 7 (minus unicast). No need for proposal 6. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with Proposal 6 and 7. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Our comments (TD Tech &Chengdu TD Tech):**  **We think the proposals 6 and 7 can be combined as below.**  **Proposal 6**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, multiple CORESETs can be configured for the defined/configured common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.   * the configured CORESETs can be used to carry the PDCCH for the MBS control information and the PDCCH for the unicast service. * FFS: detailed signalling for configuring CORESET(s) in a common frequency resource. |
| MTK | We have the similar view with CATT. |
| Convida | We are OK with proposal 6 and 7. |
| Moderator | Thank you for your contributions.  There is no consensus on whether more than one coreset can be configured so more discussion is needed. I think at this moment the biggest disagreement is on whether multiple coresets can be configured. I would be convenient to discuss this aspect.  While there are multiple companies that agree with defining multiple coresets, there are also companies that do not support it mainly for two reasons. First, they do not see a clear motivation and secondly it is argued that the configuration of multiple coresets is up to UE capability. However, from R1-2100189, it is clarified that *the number of CORESETs per BWP is limited to 5 (including common and UE-specific CORESETs) in Rel-16*. Then the questions, based on this understanding, whether companies would like to have the flexibility to use some of the total configurable coresets for the group-common PDCCH in idle/inactive UEs. **Could companies check this is a correct understanding?**  Regarding Proposal 6, the views are quite divided. One option would be to leave it as study for companies to come back at next meetings with more discussion.  This probably needs more discussion, but I propose the following **revisions to Proposal 6 and Proposal 7** to check the opinions of the group while trying to accommodate concerns raised above. I would also be helpful if companies can provide their opinions on the questions and arguments above.  **Proposal 6-rev1**:Study for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, whether network can configure the common CORESET configured by RRC signalling *commonControlResourceSet* for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH if the common frequency resource is the initial BWP and a CORESET is not configured.  **Proposal 7-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, multiple CORESETs can be configured for the defined/configured common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.   * FFS: the same configured CORESET can be used to schedule MBS control information reception, broadcast, multicast. * FFS: multiple CORESETs can be configured to independently schedule different MBS services and/or channels for control and traffic. * FFS: definition of new RRC parameters to configure CORESET in a common frequency resource larger than Initial BWP (if supported). |

### **2nd round FL proposals for Issue 4**

**Proposal 6-rev1**:Study for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, whether network can configure the common CORESET configured by RRC signalling *commonControlResourceSet* for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH if the common frequency resource is the initial BWP and a CORESET is not configured.

**Proposal 7-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, multiple CORESETs can be configured for the defined/configured common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.

* FFS: the same configured CORESET can be used to schedule MBS control information reception, broadcast, multicast.
* FFS: multiple CORESETs can be configured to independently schedule different MBS services and/or channels for control and traffic.
* FFS: definition of new RRC parameters to configure CORESET in a common frequency resource larger than Initial BWP (if supported).

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | Although we prefer the previous Proposal 6, we are ok with the updated proposal 6-rev1 and proposal 7-rev1. |
| LG | We are fine with the updated proposals. |
| NOKIA | To our view, the CORESET configuration may relate to the MBS CFR discussion in Issue 1, and therefore we have the following revising proposal:  For the case that the Initial BWP as default CFR, (as agreed from last RAN1-103-e meeting)   * For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, an additional CORESET configured via legacy *commonControlResourceSet* can be also utilized for the defined/configured common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH in addition to CORESET 0.   + - the configured CORESET can be used to schedule MBS control information reception of broadcast (FFS: for multicast and unicast).   For the case that the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is larger than the Initial BWP (if supported), i.e. MBS BWP,   * Either to configure a single CORESET, or to configure more than one CORESETs where with some CORESET(s) corresponding to the overlapped region with initial BWP   For the case that the Initial BWP contains the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH (if supported)   * FFS: whether to introduce a new narrower CORESET for narrower CFR specifically |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the updated proposals. |
| OPPO | We are fine to study proposal 6-rev1 further. For proposal 7-rev1, to us it is not about UE capability issue but rather the purpose. A UE is capable of up to 5 CORSETs does not mean it needs to use to its full capability. |
| Ericsson | We agree with Proposal 6-rev1 and Proposal 7-rev1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are not ok with proposal 7-rev1, because multiple CORESETS needs clarification whether one of them is CORESET0 regardless the initial BWP is a larger or CORESET0 bandwidth and how many multiple means.  1st FFS I guess people are thinking about the CORESETS that are used for scheduling IDLE/Inactive UEs for broadcast and connected UE for multicast. I would say it is up to NW configuration. If NW would like to do it, then do it. What we should discuss or the discussion we should focus on is what spec is needed for scheduling IDLE/INACTIVE UEs. From this point, I don’t think we need this FFS.  Again, similar comment to initial BWP in the 3rd FFS. |
| Samsung | No need to have Proposal 6-rev1.  Okay for Proposal 7-rev1. |
| Qualcomm | Ok |
| Moderator | Thank you for comments.  @Nokia: thank you for directly proposing changes to the proposal. I agree the wording should be aligned to Issue 1 discussion to with your wording as baseline I have done some edits for alignment. I have also removed some FFS to try to keep the proposal simpler in case this is more acceptable for companies.  @OPPO: since various companies where fine with the proposals and/or supportive multiple coresets I have kept this possibility in the revised version.  @ Huawei, HiSilicon: Hopefully the wording of the revised version addresses your concerns (or at least goes in the right direction). For the case where the BWP is the initial BWP it has been clarified that it is in addition to CORESET0 (this is an FFS). I have tried to remove some FFS as per your suggestion since they do not seem they were clear enough.  @Samsung: thanks for comments, Proposal 6-rev1 has been merged with the new revision below as an FFS to accommodate views from other companies that would like to explore this.  Based on the above Proposal 6-rev1 and Proposal 7-rev1 are revised and merged into a single proposal as below.  **Proposal 7-rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception with group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, for the case where the BWP may be a configured BWP (different than the initial BWP) multiple CORESETs (within the maximum number of CORESETs per BWP in Rel-16) can be configured.   * FFS: for the case where the BWP may be the initial BWP, the configuration of an additional CORESET via legacy *commonControlResourceSet* in addition to CORESET0. |

### **3rd round FL proposals for Issue 4**

**Proposal 7-rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception with group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, for the case where the BWP may be a configured BWP (different than the initial BWP) multiple CORESETs (within the maximum number of CORESETs per BWP in Rel-16) can be configured.

* FFS: for the case where the BWP may be the initial BWP, the configuration of an additional CORESET via legacy *commonControlResourceSet* in addition to CORESET0.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| NOKIA | Below case seems not being considered by the new Proposal 7-rev2:  For the case that the Initial BWP contains the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH (if supported)   * FFS: whether to introduce a new narrower CORESET for narrower CFR specifically   (Note: this new narrower CORESET may in addition to CORESET#0 and CORESET configured via legacy *commonControlResourceSet* within the initial BWP) |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Proposal 7-rev2**: we agree with this proposal. |
| CMCC | We still have concern about configure multiple CORESETs. Before discuss this proposal, we should first discuss the maximum number of CORESETs UE can be configured for **TWO** active BWPs. In Rel-15, the mandatory UE’s capability is supporting **TWO** CORESETs per BWP and **THREE** CORESETs is an optional UE’s capability. In Rel-16, maximum **FIVE** CORESETS is also an optional UE’s capability. To be highlight, these UE’s capabilities are only considering one active BWP.  However, considering the case in current proposal, “the BWP may be a configured BWP (different than the initial BWP)”, UE is configured **TWO** active BWPs, and UE has been configured CORESET 0 and *commonControlResourceSet* in initial BWP. Which the maximum number of CORESTS totally in TWO BWPs should we keep, it is **THREE** or **FIVE？**  In addition, the motivation of configuring multiple CORESETs are still unclear.   * If the motivation of configuring multiple CORESETs is differentiate different TCI states, but for IDLE/INATCVE UEs, beam sweeping is needed for GC-PDCCHs, form this perspective, all CORESETs are beam sweeping and the beam sweeping pattern are also the same, the motivation of configuring different TCI states for different CORESETs are not necessary. * If the motivation is scheduling different MBS services, we say the current search space configuration can realize it but has no relationship with CORESET, because multiple search spaces can be associated with the same CORESET. * If the motivation is considering the capacity of CORESET, one CORESET with the bandwidth equals with configured BWP is also enough.   Form these aspects, we only accept one CORESET for GC-PDCCH in addition to CORESET 0 and *commonControlResourceSet.* |
| Apple | Per my understanding, the maximum CORESETs per BWP is three. The proposal could be updated as below.  **Proposal 7-rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception with group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, if MBS dedicated BWP is configured (different than the initial BWP), up to 3 CORESETs can be configured on MBS dedicated BWP.   * FFS: for the case where the BWP may be the initial BWP, the configuration of an additional CORESET via legacy *commonControlResourceSet* in addition to CORESET0. |
| ZTE | We support this proposal. |
| vivo | Whether the multiple CORESETs include CORESET0 or not? We are not clear with the motivation to configure multiple CORESETs in addition to CORESET0. |
| Qualcomm | Fine with the proposal. |
| Moderator | Thank you for the comments.  @Nokia: thanks for the proposal that has been included.  @CMCC: thanks for the detailed comments. I think it is good point that how many CORESETS can be configured has not been addressed so I have revised the proposal to try to address this concern with the following FFS (*FFS: maximum number of configured CORESETs per configured BWP*).  As per your comments “we only accept one CORESET for GC-PDCCH in addition to CORESET 0 and *commonControlResourceSet*” I think the current wording would include the option you propose while allowing discussion at next meetings on the specific maximum number of CORESETS to configure per BWP. Please let me know otherwise.  Regarding the motivation for multiple CORESETS, this was proposed by 2 tdocs (Nokia, Qualcomm) but companies proposing this may be better placed to provide more elaborate comments.  @Apple: thank you for the proposal. To accommodate CMCC points I have revised the proposal as below while leaving the maximum number of configured CORESETS for FFS.  Based on the discussion above I **revise Proposal 7-rev2** as follows:  **Proposal 7-rev3**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception with group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, for the case where the BWP may be a configured BWP, different than the initial BWP, [if supported] multiple CORESETs (including CORESET0) can be configured.   * FFS: maximum number of configured CORESETs per configured BWP * FFS: for the case where the BWP may be the initial BWP, the configuration of an additional CORESET via legacy *commonControlResourceSet* in addition to CORESET0. * FFS: whether to introduce a new narrower CORESET for narrower common frequency resource specifically |

### **4th round FL proposals for Issue 4**

**Proposal 7-rev3**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception with group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, for the case where the BWP may be a configured BWP, different than the initial BWP, [if supported] multiple CORESETs (including CORESET0) can be configured.

* FFS: maximum number of configured CORESETs per configured BWP
* FFS: for the case where the BWP may be the initial BWP, the configuration of an additional CORESET via legacy *commonControlResourceSet* in addition to CORESET0.
* FFS: whether to introduce a new narrower CORESET for narrower common frequency resource specifically

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Intel | We would prefer to agree to one CORESET being configured in addition to CORESET#0 and keep other options FFS i.e., we can use the following wording:  **Proposal 7-rev3**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception with group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, for the case where the BWP may be a configured BWP, different than the initial BWP, [if supported] N CORESETs (~~including~~ in addition to CORESET0) can be configured per BWP.   * N = 1   + - FFS: N>1 and the maximum value of N. ~~maximum number of configured CORESETs per configured BWP~~ * FFS: for the case where the BWP may be the initial BWP, the configuration of an additional CORESET via legacy *commonControlResourceSet* in addition to CORESET0. * FFS: whether to introduce a new narrower CORESET for narrower common frequency resource specifically |
| Samsung | Support with FL proposal. But we could do with one CORESET in addition to CORESET#0 and further discuss. |
| CMCC | Agree with Intel’s version, we can agree N=1 first and keep N>1 as FFS. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with Intel’s version, we can agree N=1 first and keep N>1 as FFS. |
| ZTE | Support FL proposal. |
| NOKIA | We are not OK with the new proposal.  The CORESET configuration relates to the MBS CFR discussion in Issue 1. Based on our understanding from Issue-1 so far, the reception for Idle/Inactive is always done within a BWP, either a configured BWP or the initial BWP.  And for the new Proposal-rev3, the main bullet ONLY covers “for the case where the BWP may be a configured BWP, different than the initial BWP, [if supported]”, meaning that for the case where the BWP is the initial BWP is not covered in the main bullet of Proposal-rev3.  Also thanks to add the 3rd-sub-bullet regarding “whether to introduce a new narrower CORESET for narrower common frequency resource specifically” based on our 3rd-round proposal. But it should not be considered under the current main bullet proposal with “a configured BWP”, instead it should be a sub-bullet under the “initial BWP”, and targeting for the case that the Initial BWP contains the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH (if supported) |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with Intel’s version, we can agree N=1 first and keep N>1 as FFS. |
| vivo | Agree with Intel’s version, we can agree N=1 first and keep N>1 as FFS. |
| LG | We are also fine with Intel’s version. |
|  |  |

## Issue 5: Search Space (SS) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH

### **1st FL proposal for Issue 5**

**Proposal 8**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, a new CSS type is defined for group-common PDCCH.

* FFS: monitoring priority with respect to existing CSS and USS.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | Support. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. |
| LG | We are fine with this proposal. |
| CATT | OK with this proposal.  We think either defines a new CSS for MBS or reuses the current CSS type is OK, as long as the priority of the MBS SS can be adjusted according to the MBS services. |
| Apple | We are ok with this proposal. |
| NOKIA | Agree with FL’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Thinking about the case that 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, it is better to discuss it later after seeing progress in AI 8.12.1 |
| OPPO | OK |
| Ericsson | We think it must first be clarified why a new CSS type is needed. |
| Qualcomm | Ok with the proposal |
| vivo | Support the main bullet. One question for the sub-bullet, since there is no overbooking for UE in idle/inactive state, could clarify what’s the motivation to discuss the monitoring priority issue? |
| Intel | The outcome from 8.12.1 on this issue can be re-used. While a distinct RNTI may be assumed for IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, a new search space set distinct from the search space set for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs supporting MBS is not required. |
| Samsung | No need for a new CSS-type. It would also be good to define what “new” CSS-type is. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with the proposal. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **We agree with proposal 8.** |
| MTK | As Intel commented, we can reuse the AI 8.12.1’s discussion outcome. |
| Convida | OK with the proposal |
| Moderator | Thank you for comments.  There is strong support for Proposal 8, but there are some companies that require more clarification.  Regarding motivation to define a new CSS the following text from R1-2101065 is useful: “*CSS is agreed to be used for group-common PDCCH for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs. Because RRC\_CONNECTED UEs can receive the same group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH for broadcast service with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the same CSS is used for all three RRC states.*  *As the discussion in our contribution [2], PDCCH overbooking rule should be considered in the discussion of CSS types for broadcast group-common PDCCH. For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, only CSS can be monitored, and gNB can guarantee the monitored CSS PDCCHs not beyond the BD/CCEs limit. For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, all configured CSS PDCCHs are counted into the monitored BD/CCEs and the left BD/CCEs capability are used for USS in Rel-15/16. However, it’s up to UE to receive Rel-17 broadcast services or not, that is UE may not receive some configured broadcast service CSS PDCCHs. If current CSS type is reused for broadcast group-common PDCCH and the same PDCCH overbooking rule is re-used for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, the non-monitored BD/CCEs are occupied by these non-received broadcast group-common PDCCHs, which causing the reduction of USS scheduling opportunity.*  *Therefore, a new CSS type can be defined for broadcast group-common PDCCH, which can be monitored both by RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs and RRC\_CONNECTED UEs. The monitoring priority of new type broadcast CSS is lower than legacy CSS and the non-monitored broadcast CSS group-common PDCCHs are not counted into the monitored BD/CCEs for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.* ”  There are also comments regarding reusing the solutions being discussed at RRC\_CONNECTED. I have therefore **modified Proposal 8** including an FFS to try to accommodate this.  **Proposal 8-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, a new CSS type is defined for group-common PDCCH.   * FFS: monitoring priority with respect to existing CSS and USS. * FFS: alignment and/or reuse with solutions supported for RRC\_CONNECTED |

### **2nd round FL proposals for Issue 5**

**Proposal 8-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, a new CSS type is defined for group-common PDCCH.

* FFS: monitoring priority with respect to existing CSS and USS.
* FFS: alignment and/or reuse with solutions supported for RRC\_CONNECTED

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | Support the proposal. |
| LG | We are fine with this updated proposal. |
| NOKIA | Agree with FL’s proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| OPPO | We are fine as well. |
| CATT | OK with the proposals. |
| Ericsson | We agree with a new CSS type for broadcast.  Regarding multicast, we suggest keeping CSS type (existing and/or new) FFS, pending RAN2 decisions. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | From UEs in IDLE/INACTIVE, why should the monitoring priority with respect to USS be discussed in the 1st FFS because UE in IDLE/INACTIVE only monitors CSS anyway. |
| Samsung | As already expressed, No need for a new CSS-type. It would also be good to define what “new” CSS-type is. It's not clear what "New" CSS-type is.  The operation needs to first be defined and then it can be determined whether the CSS is “new” or “old”. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Ericsson to add ‘for broadcast’ here.  **Proposal 8-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast, a new CSS type is defined for group-common PDCCH.   * FFS: monitoring priority with respect to existing CSS and USS. * FFS: alignment and/or reuse with solutions supported for RRC\_CONNECTED |
| Moderator | Thank you all for comments.  @Ericsson and Qualcomm: your proposal has been added, I have added broadcast reception instead of only broadcast.  @Huawei: the 1st FFS has been removed as per your comment.  @ Samsung: as per my understanding of the motivation to introduce a different CSS to the existing CSS in Rel-16 is to have a more flexible scheduling compared with reusing existing CSS where the CCE index calculation is always zero. I have modified the proposal to try address your comment so it is clearer what new CSS means (or at least the difference with the existing CSS in Rel16). Please do let me know if this acceptable.  **Proposal 8-rev2**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, a new CSS type, with potentially different CCE index calculation to existing Rel-16 CSS, is defined for group-common PDCCH.   * FFS: alignment and/or reuse with solutions supported for RRC\_CONNECTED |

### **3rd round FL proposals for Issue 5**

**Proposal 8-rev2**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, a new CSS type, with potentially different CCE index calculation to existing Rel-16 CSS, is defined for group-common PDCCH.

* FFS: alignment and/or reuse with solutions supported for RRC\_CONNECTED

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | We are fine with this updated proposal. |
| NOKIA | We are fine with the FL’s new proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | We agree with the proposal. |
| CMCC | Don’t agree, the new CSS type doesn’t mean different CCE index calculation to existing Rel-16 CSS, we never discuss the hash function in previous proposal, the new proposal is different from the previous one.  We accept Qualcomm’s version:  **Proposal 8-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast, a new CSS type is defined for group-common PDCCH.   * FFS: monitoring priority with respect to existing CSS and USS. * FFS: alignment and/or reuse with solutions supported for RRC\_CONNECTED |
| ZTE | We are generally fine with the proposal. But we think the word “potentially” is not clear whether “different CCE index calculation” is agreed or not. Thus, we would prefer to make it as an FFS.  **Proposal 8-rev2**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, a new CSS type~~, with potentially different CCE index calculation to existing Rel-16 CSS,~~ is defined for group-common PDCCH.   * FFS: alignment and/or reuse with solutions supported for RRC\_CONNECTED * FFS: whether different CCE index calculation to existing Rel-16 CSS is needed |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Moderator | Thanks for your further inputs.  @CMCC: I have reused ZTE’s comments, so hopefully your concern is addressed. I removed one of the FFS as per Huawei’s comments from previous rounds.  @ZTE: thanks for wording that has been included.  @Samsung: I am not sure whether the discussion and the current changes address your concern, please do let us know whether this is acceptable.  Using ZTE’s wording, I propose the following revision to **Proposal 8-rev2**:  **Proposal 8-rev3**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, a new CSS type is defined for group-common PDCCH.   * FFS: alignment and/or reuse with solutions supported for RRC\_CONNECTED * FFS: whether different CCE index calculation to existing Rel-16 CSS is needed |

### **4th round FL proposals for Issue 5**

**Proposal 8-rev3**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, a new CSS type is defined for group-common PDCCH.

* FFS: alignment and/or reuse with solutions supported for RRC\_CONNECTED
* FFS: whether different CCE index calculation to existing Rel-16 CSS is needed

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | Can we remove “new”? We can discuss first the operation/behaviour of a UE and then discuss whether it is “new” or “old”. |
| CMCC | Agree.  @Samsung, we have CSS as agreement in RAN1#103-e as the following, if we remove “new”, it has no difference form this one. The motivation of Proposal 8-rev3 is discussing whether the CSS for GC-PDCCH is a current CSS type or new CSS type.  Agreements**:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, CSS is supported for group-common PDCCH.   * FFS: reuse current CSS type, define a new CSS type, etc. * FFS other details. |
| ZTE | We support the FL proposal. |
| NOKIA | We are fine with the FL’s new proposal |
| Spreadtrum | We support the FL proposal. |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal. |
| LG | We are fine with this updated proposal. |

## Issue 6: Beam Sweeping for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH

### **1st FL proposal for Issue 6**

**Proposal 9**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the UE may assume that group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with SSB if configured.

* UE monitoring occasions are associated with a subset of the total SSB indexes in a timing window.
  + FFS: definition details of timing window such as periodicity and offset
  + FFS: association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions.
* for broadcast reception, full beam sweeping is supported.
* FFS: (re)use of RRC\_CONNECTED beam configuration for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs states.
* FFS: group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with TRS if configured.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | As RAN2 agreement, IDLE/INACTIVE UE only support broadcast sessions, can moderator clarify whether the first sub-bullet is also used for broadcast reception or only for multicast reception?   * 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. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal.  Regarding the first bullet, does “a subset of the total SSB indexes” refer to a subset of the SSB total index or a subset of the total transmitted SSBs? Our understanding is “a subset of the total transmitted SSBs”. Maybe we can clarify it. |
| LG | We are generally fine with this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are generally fine with this proposal. |
| CATT | OK with the main bullet of Proposal 9.  All the sub-bullets need further clarifications and discussions. |
| NOKIA | Could the FL clarify a bit about the below bullet point, what is the intention here?   * FFS: (re)use of RRC\_CONNECTED beam configuration for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs states. |
| OPPO | We share the same view as CATT. |
| Sony | We are OK with the main bullet of the proposal 9. |
| Ericsson | We cannot agree to this Proposal now, since we think there are several issues to discuss first.  For beam sweeping of multicast it must be ensured that Idle/Inactive UEs have the same monitoring occasions as connected UEs, to allow reception of the same transmission.  We also question the use of beam sweeping for broadcast.  Also the assumed QCL between SSB and PDCCH/PDSCH needs further discussion. |
| Qualcomm | Since multicast for IDLE/INACTIVE is FFS in RAN2, we should focus on broadcast beam sweeping for RAN1 discussion. |
| vivo | Agree with QC’s view. |
| Moderator | Thank you for comments and discussion.  @CMCC, the first sub-bullet (“UE monitoring occasions are associated with…”) was intended for broadcast transmissions. This could be clarified in a new wording.  @ZTE: in my understanding what has been proposed in the tdocs is that in a window the gNB would perform a full beam sweeping where each SSB index is associated with one spatial direction. A UE does not need to monitor all SSB indexes (i.e. directions) but only needs to monitor a subset of the SSB indexes, which would save power. Is this correct? please provide a better wording if you think adequate.  @Nokia: this FFS is to accommodate tdoc inputs from Ericsson and Sony where the beam management procedures that allow UEs to negotiate beam assignment with the gNB would still be available for reception even when the UE is transition from connected to idle/inactive. |
| Intel | This proposal needs further discussion. We can be ok with the main bullet, but the sub-bullets need further discussion. This issue can be discussed after other details are finalized. |
| Samsung | The proposal should be further discussed. It is unclear what new UE behaviour is proposed. The following statement from the WID should also be kept in mind  *Restrictions and assumptions:*  *FR2: we assume that there are no issues to provide Multicast / Broadcast transmissions in FR2. If any enhancements is needed it should be treated with lower priority compared to the minimum set of objectives above.* |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Our comments (TD Tech &Chengdu TD Tech):** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, only full beam sweeping can be used because gNB doesn’t know which UE is receiving the MBS. Therefore, proposal 9 can be updated as below. **Proposal 9**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the UE may assume that full beam sweeping is used for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.   * FFS：detailed full beam sweeping   + FFS: periodicity, offset, duration of the full beam sweeping   FFS: the relation between the monitoring occasions and the beams for group common PDSCH/PDCCH. |
| NOKIA | @Moderator: Many thanks for the clarification, we share the same above view as CATT and QC. |
| Convida | We share the same view as CATT and OPPO. |
| Moderator | Thank you for comments.  The first bullet seems to have wide support from various companies, but the sub-bullets need more discussion. Multiple companies have mentioned that more discussion is needed. It would be helpful to provide more specific comments so we can discuss in more detail specific aspects – thank you!  I also think that given the current RAN2 agreements that confirm that idle/inactive UEs support broadcast reception where multicast reception is FFS, I propose that **we focus on broadcast reception** as raised by various companies in this round of discussion.  Based on the comments and discussion above, I propose a **slight revision to proposal 9** with additional wording from TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech. However, we need more discussion, please share your ideas on what aspects you think we should find consensus.  **Proposal 9-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the UE may assume that group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with SSB if configured.   * UE monitoring occasions are associated with a subset of the total SSB indexes in a timing window.   + FFS: definition details of timing window such as periodicity and offset   + FFS: association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions. * FFS: the UE may assume full beam sweeping * FFS: (re)use of RRC\_CONNECTED beam configuration for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs states. * FFS: group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with TRS if configured. |
| Ericsson | We cannot agree to this Proposal now, since we think there are several issues to discuss first.  It should be possible to configure one operation mode of IDLE/INACTIVE broadcast reception so that the same PDCCH/PDSCH can be received as by UEs in RRC-Connected. The monitoring occasions in this mode follow DRX configuration for RRC connected UEs.  In addition to such operation mode, we agree to an operation mode for IDLE/INACTIVE broadcast reception where monitoring occasions are defined differently from the DRX configuration for RRC-Connected UEs. For such additional mode, the FL proposal could be agreeable.  For beam sweeping of multicast it must be ensured that Idle/Inactive UEs have the same monitoring occasions as connected UEs, to allow reception of the same transmission. |

### **2nd round FL proposals for Issue 6**

**Proposal 9-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the UE may assume that group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with SSB if configured.

* UE monitoring occasions are associated with a subset of the total SSB indexes in a timing window.
  + FFS: definition details of timing window such as periodicity and offset
  + FFS: association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions.
* FFS: the UE may assume full beam sweeping
* FFS: (re)use of RRC\_CONNECTED beam configuration for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs states.
* FFS: group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with TRS if configured.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | Thanks moderator for the updated proposal. We support the proposal in principle.  We understand the intention of the first bullet is to say that UE doesn’t need to monitor all the monitoring occasions within a timing window. Instead, UE may only need to monitor a subset of the MOs. Thus, we have a minor update on the first bullet. If this is the correct understanding, then we support this proposal. |
| LG | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| NOKIA | For simplicity, we prefer to limit the discussion scope regarding beam sweeping for RRC\_Idle/Inactive state UEs. Therefore we have the following revising proposal:  **Proposal 9-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the UE may assume that group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with SSB if configured.   * UE monitoring occasions are associated with a subset of the total SSB indexes in a timing window.   + FFS: definition details of timing window such as periodicity and offset   + FFS: association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions. * ~~FFS: the UE may assume full beam sweeping~~ For broadcast reception, full beam sweeping is supported. * ~~FFS: (re)use of RRC\_CONNECTED beam configuration for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs states.~~ * ~~FFS: group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with TRS if configured.~~ |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| OPPO | Our preference is to agree on the main bullet only. There was also a question on the meaning of “subset of the total SSB indexes in a timing window”. And since the details of timing window is unclear, it is too earlier to agree on there will be a subset. The first subset also needs to be study further. |
| CATT | OK with the proposals. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | General ok with the main bullets.  1st FFS: Could you clarify what “full beam sweeping” means? It does not seem the term normally used in the spec.  The second FFS: I would comment the beam sweep framework for IDLE/INACTIVE can be considered to be reused for CONNECTED instead of the other way around because beam sweeping is more justified for IDLE/INACTIVE UEs. |
| Samsung | Generally fine, but in the main bullet, it is not clear what "if configure" means. It seems those behaviour is the same as SIB reception. |
| Qualcomm | Ok in principle. |
| Moderator | Thanks for further comments.  @ZTE: thanks for the comments. I have removed the term referring to the timing windows since there are other companies that think the timing window is not clear. For progress I have removed it.  @Nokia: thanks for edits to the proposal: I have included your proposal in the revised version with some further editing.  @OPPO: thanks for comment which has been taken into account.  @Huawei: thanks for comments. Regarding “full beam sweeping”, here I mean that the gNB would transmit the beams in all directions since it is not aware of the positions of the UEs. This is based on the tdocs submitted to this meeting. Also based on the tdocs, my understanding is to reuse beam sweeping operation for the transmission of system information and/or paging where a similar “full beam sweeping” is done. But actually if there is a more appropriate term, please do let me know and we can include it – thank you!  @Samsung: thanks for comment. The term “if configured” was because there are two proposals in the table whether assume QCL with SSBs or with TRS. Which one would be would be configured. Since we have removed the FFS including the TRS, I have removed the term “if configured”. regarding your comment on similar behaviour as SIB reception, I think you are right, tdocs submitted to this meeting propose to reuse beam sweeping operation of SIB transmission and/or paging.  Based on the above I do the following **revision to Proposal 9-rev1**, to check if we are converging towards something that is agreeable:  **Proposal 9-rev2**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the UE may assume that group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with SSB.   * UE monitoring occasions are associated with a subset of the total SSB indexes.   + FFS: association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions. * For broadcast reception, the UE may assume the transmitter does full beam sweeping |

### **3rd round FL proposals for Issue 6**

**Proposal 9-rev2**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the UE may assume that group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with SSB.

* UE monitoring occasions are associated with a subset of the total SSB indexes.
  + FFS: association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions.
* For broadcast reception, the UE may assume the transmitter does full beam sweeping

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | We are fine with this updated proposal. |
| NOKIA | We are fine with the FL’s new proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | We agree with the proposal. |
| CMCC | Only agree with main bullet.  The two sub-bullets seem are conflicted, if UE monitoring occasions are associated with a subset of the total SSB indexes, how can UE may assume the transmitter does full beam sweeping? Dose it means UE can monitor GC-PDCCH not in monitoring occasions or there is more than one QCL configurations for one monitoring occasion? |
| ZTE | We agree with the proposal.  @CMCC, based on our understanding, the first bullet is trying to that UE is not required to monitor all the monitoring occasions. In other words, UE only need to monitor the monitoring occasions corresponding to a sub set of the SSB indices.  Maybe we can update the proposal as below to address companies concern  **Proposal 9-rev2**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the UE may assume that group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with SSB.   * It is up to UE implementation whether UE monitors monitoring occasions corresponding to all SSB indexes or monitoring occasions corresponding to a subset of all SSB indexes.   + ~~FFS: association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions.~~ * For broadcast reception, the UE may assume the transmitter does full beam sweeping   + FFS: association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions. |
| vivo | Partially agree  We agree with the main bullet and the first sub-bullet.  For the second sub-bullet, i.e. ” For broadcast reception, the UE may assume the transmitter does full beam sweeping ”, we don’t think it is needed. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with main bullet and want to add ‘FFS: group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCl’d with TRS if configured’. The reason is that we should study whether TRS is required for MBS GC-PDSCH. SSB could be ok for SIB/paging using QPSK; but may not be sufficient for MBS data if using higher modulation than QPSK. Note that LTE MBMS and SC-PTM do support variant MCS for broadcast transmission. |
| Moderator | Thanks all for comments.  @CMCC: please see comments by ZTE.  @vivo: thanks, your comment has been incorporated.  @Qualcomm: you comment has been incorporated.  Based on comments above, I propose the **following revision to Proposal 9-rev2** reusing ZTE’s wording and vivo/QC’s input.  **Proposal 9-rev3**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the UE may assume that group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with SSB.   * It is up to UE implementation whether UE monitors monitoring occasions corresponding to all SSB indexes or monitoring occasions corresponding to a subset of all SSB indexes. * FFS: association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions. * FFS: group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCl’d with TRS if configured |

### **4th round FL proposals for Issue 6**

**Proposal 9-rev3**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the UE may assume that group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with SSB.

* It is up to UE implementation whether UE monitors monitoring occasions corresponding to all SSB indexes or monitoring occasions corresponding to a subset of all SSB indexes.
* FFS: association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions.
* FFS: group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCl’d with TRS if configured

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | Okay with proposal. |
| CMCC | Okay with proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree. |
| ZTE | Support the FL proposal. |
| NOKIA | We are generally fine with the FL’s proposal.  And we would like to have further clarification and discussion why and what is the benefit to have “FFS: group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCl’d with TRS if configured”?  To our view, “group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with SSB” is enough for Rel17 MBS |
| Spreadtrum | Support the FL proposal. |
| vivo | Fine. |
| LG | We are fine with this updated proposal. |

## Issue 7: HARQ feedback for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UE states

### **1st FL proposal for Issue 7**

**Proposal 10**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, study the potential support of HARQ feedback.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | We prefer not support HARQ feedback for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs. |
| ZTE | We support to study HARQ-ACK feedback for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs. |
| LG | We are fine with NACK only based HARQ feedback from RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs for PTM scheme 1. But, we do not support ACK/NACK based HARQ feedback from RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, regardless of whether UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED support ACK/NACK based HARQ feedback. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We don’t support HARQ-ACK feedback for idle/inactive UEs. |
| CATT | At least for Rel-17 MBS, HARQ-ACK feedback is NOT supported/discussed for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs. |
| Apple | We don’t support HARQ-ACK feedback for idle/inactive UEs. |
| NOKIA | NO, it is out of the working scope of Rel17 MBS as stated in the WID |
| OPPO | Share the same view as LG. |
| Ericsson | We disagree. It is difficult to see how e.g. Timing Advance could be maintained.  Subject to RAN2 agreement, UEs in RRC Idle/Inactive should be able to receive the same multicast transmissions as UEs in RRC Connected. This includes reception of HARQ retransmissions triggered by other UEs. This needs to be harmonized with agreed solutions for RRC Connected |
| Qualcomm | HARQ-ACK feedback for IDLE/INACTIVE UEs are not in the scope of Rel17 WID. |
| vivo | Not support. We don’t support HARQ-ACK feedback for idle/inactive UEs. |
| Intel | We can only support NACK-only HARQ feedback not ACK/NACK based HARQ feedback. The proposal should be modified to study the case of NACK-only. |
| Samsung | No need, not in scope. |
| Spreadtrum | Not support HARQ-ACK feedback for idle/inactive UEs. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Our comments (TD Tech &Chengdu TD Tech):**  We suggest to support the HARQ-ACK feedback for the MBS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with the shared PUCCH resource(s).  In detail, both the ACK/NACK feedback with the shared PUCCH resources and the NACK-ONLY feedback with the unique shared PUCCH resource can be used.  For the ACK/NACK feedback with the shared PUCCH resources, CBG (code block group) based feedback can be used, where the shared PUCCH resources consist of (2^C-1 or 2^C) PUCCH sequences and C is the number of the code groups of a TB. In each beam coverage, when UEs in the beam coverage are located far away from the cell edge, the code group based feedback has the better resource efficiency. We hope such CBG based feedback can be supported for the flexible scheduling for the retransmission. |
| MTK | Not support. |
| Moderator | Thank you for comments.  I think there is significant opposition to studying the potential support of HARQ feedback in idle/inactive UEs. Various companies have raised concerns that this would not be in the scope of the work item. Therefore, I propose that this feature is not supported in Rel-17.  Just to make clear that we are not discarding the possibility of receiving HARQ retransmissions (without any UL from idle/inactive UEs), and to align to the wording in the WI, I make the **following revision to Proposal 10**:  **Proposal 10-rev1**:RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs do not support UL feedback to improve reliability of Broadcast/Multicast services in Rel-17. |

### **2nd round FL proposals for Issue 7**

**Proposal 10-rev1**:RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs do not support UL feedback to improve reliability of Broadcast/Multicast services in Rel-17.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | We feel that it is not needed to have an agreement or conclusion to preclude something for MBS. If companies have strong concern on supporting HARQ-ACK for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the discussion can stop here but we don’t feel we need an agreements/conclusion for this. |
| LG | We think that we can postpone this decision until separate discussion on NACK only HARQ feedback becomes stable. We could simply check whether NACK only HARQ feedback can be supported by RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs without significant impact, later. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support this proposal. |
| NOKIA | Fully agree |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| OPPO | Same view as LGE. |
| CATT | Support this proposal. |
| Ericsson | We agree |
| Samsung | Agree |
| Qualcomm | Can be agreed as a conclusion |
| Moderator | Thanks for the discussion today at the GTW.  As per the discussion at the GTW, although there are multiple companies that do not support UL feedback in idle UEs, since there some companies that would like to delay this decision, I would propose that we do not spend much time in this discussion.  If companies have other vies, please share.  @Qualcomm: I did not understand what you were proposing with your comment “can be agreed as a conclusion”, do you have a way forward? thank you for the explanation. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | We think there’s no clear description on support or not support the HARQ-ACK feedback for RRC\_IDILE/RRC\_INACITVE UEs.  The first item below shows that the UL feedback can be used as a possible method to improve the reliability for multicast/broadcast.  The second item shows the maximum commonality is needed between RRC\_CONNECTED state and RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state for the configuration of PTM reception. If the UL feedback configuration can be regarded as a part of the PTM configuration, the UL feedback can be used for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs to keep the maximum commonality.  We hope the discussion on the UL feedback for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can be deferred. There’s no need to have a conclusion on the UL feedback for now.   * + Specify required changes to improve reliability of Broadcast/Multicast service, e.g. by UL feedback. The level of reliability should be based on the requirements of the application/service provided.[RAN1, RAN2]   + Specify required changes to enable the reception of Point to Multipoint transmissions by UEs in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states, with the aim of keeping maximum commonality between RRC\_CONNECTED state and RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state for the configuration of PTM reception. [RAN2, RAN1] |
| Qualcomm | @FL: Sorry for the confusion. My comment is nothing, but to make the proposal as a conclusion instead of agreement.  I don’t have good suggestion but at least the following could be common sense I hope.  Proposal 10-rev1:  **Conclusion**: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs do not support UE-specific UL feedback to improve reliability of Broadcast/Multicast services in Rel-17. |
| Moderator | @ TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech: thanks for comments. I think given the comments and the GTW discussion the outcome for this Issue is that is not discuss furthermore at this meeting and companies can come back to this Issue at next RAN1 meetings.  @Qualcomm: thanks for the comment, let’s see what other companies think. |

# Discussion on Medium Priority Issues

## Issue 8: PDSCH repetition

### **1st FL proposals for Issue 8**

**Proposal 11**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, support slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH.

* semi-static and dynamic slot-level repetition number configured by higher layer signalling.
* FFS: support of consecutive slot-level and RV-based time-interleaving for group-common PDSCH.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | We can defer this issue after the process of AI 8.12.2. |
| LG | We are generally fine with this proposal. But, We are also OK to defer this issue until RAN1 makes some progress in AI 8.12.2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree to delay this discussion. |
| CATT | Support this proposal.  Slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH can essentially enhance the reception performance |
| Apple | We agree to delay this discussion. |
| NOKIA | We would like to leave the first bullet point as FFS as shown in below:  **Proposal 11**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, support slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH.   * FFS: semi-static and dynamic slot-level repetition number configured by higher layer signalling. * FFS: support of consecutive slot-level and RV-based time-interleaving for group-common PDSCH. |
| OPPO | We also prefer to defer this discussion. |
| Ericsson | Subject to RAN2 agreement, UEs in RRC Idle/Inactive should be able to receive the same multicast transmissions as UEs in RRC Connected. This includes PDSCH repetition. This needs to be harmonized with agreed solutions for RRC Connected. |
| Qualcomm | No need to delay the main bullet. We are fine with Nokia’s suggestion. |
| vivo | We agree to delay this discussion. |
| Intel | Solution to be agreed in 8.12.1 should be used with appropriate changes to configuration. Can be delayed till after agreements in 8.12.1 |
| ZTE | We are supportive of the main bullet. Regarding the first sub-bullet, we can make it as FFS for now as we are not clear how UE can be dynamically indicated with the repetition number. |
| Samsung | Can be deprioritized. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Our comments (TD Tech &Chengdu TD Tech):**  We agree with the main branch of proposal 11.  We think the sub-branches need clarifying:   1. What does “dynamic slot-level repetition number configured by higher layer signalling”mean? Dynamic slot-level repetition number can be realized with higher layer signalling?   What does “ slot-level an RV based timeleaving” mean? |
| Qualcomm | Fine with either FL’s proposal or Nokia’s revised one.  @TD Tech: you can refer to our contribution R1-2101489 for more details of “consecutive slot-level and RV-based time-interleaving”, where we provided simulation results to show the gain of the scheme when applied to broadcast GC-PDSCH repetitions. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for comments.  @CMCC, LG, Lenovo, vivo, Apple, Samsung, OPPO, Intel: thanks for comments, there are companies that support the proposal so I would initially try to reach agreement, if possible to foster progress.  @Nokia, ZTE, Qualcomm, ZTE: Your input has been included.  @Ericsson: thanks for comments, I have included the term “broadcast reception” to clarify the scope.  @ TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech: thanks for comments, please see Qualcomm’s reply for further details on RV time-interleaving.  There are 6 companies supportive of supporting slot-level repetition. There are 8 companies that propose to delay the discussion after progress in other agenda items is done. There have also been comments on aligning design with connected UEs, but since this is already mentioned in the WI, I propose we do not make explicit mention of this, unless there are strong views otherwise. As moderator, given that there are various companies supportive of this proposal, and that this has already been agreed for connected UEs, I propose we continue trying to work towards an agreeable proposal.  Based on the above, I **propose the following revision to Proposal 11.**  **Proposal 11-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, support slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH.   * FFS: semi-static and dynamic slot-level repetition number configured by higher layer signalling. * FFS: support of consecutive slot-level and RV-based time-interleaving for group-common PDSCH. |

### **2nd round FL proposals for Issue 8**

**Proposal 11-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, support slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH.

* FFS: semi-static and dynamic slot-level repetition number configured by higher layer signalling.
* FFS: support of consecutive slot-level and RV-based time-interleaving for group-common PDSCH.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | We support the FL proposal. |

## Issue 9: PDSCH Semi Persistent Scheduling

### **1st FL proposals for Issue 9**

**Proposal 12**: Support SPS group-common PDSCH for MBS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.

* FFS: whether to support more than one SPS group-common PDSCH configuration per UE

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | Support. |
| LG | We suggest to defer this issue until RAN1 makes some progress on MBS SPS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with LG’s proposal. |
| CATT | This proposal can be deferred for discussion in this AI.  The motivation/scenarios should be first discussed, as well as the potential benefit. |
| NOKIA | Agree with FL’s proposal |
| OPPO | Agree with LG. |
| Ericsson | Subject to RAN2 agreement, UEs in RRC Idle/Inactive should be able to receive the same multicast transmissions as UEs in RRC Connected. This includes SPS repetition. This needs to be harmonized with agreed solutions for RRC Connected. |
| Qualcomm | Need further study. |
| vivo | One question is how/whether to support to activate/deactivate the SPS group-common PDSCH for MBS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs  We prefer to delay this discussion. |
| Intel | OK to support. Can defer till solution for CONNECTED mode UEs is finalized. |
| ZTE | We support this proposal. |
| Samsung | Need further study for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs. Can focus on more critical issues first. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Our comments (TD Tech &Chengdu TD Tech):**  We agree with proposal 12. |
| Moderator | Thanks all for discussion.  There are 4 companies that support the proposal. There are 5 companies that would prefer to delay this until further progress in other AI since SPS has been agreed for connected UEs. Finally, there are 3 companies that think study is needed.  Therefore, I **propose a revision of Proposal 12**.  **Proposal 12-rev1**:Study the support SPS group-common PDSCH for MBS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs. |

### **2nd round FL proposals for Issue 9**

**Proposal 12-rev1**:Study the support SPS group-common PDSCH for MBS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | We support the FL proposal. |

## Issue 10: MBS Common Frequency Resource: relation with Unicast BWP

### **1st FL proposals for Issue 10**

**Proposal 13**: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 when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE contains the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | Support. |
| LG | We are fine with this proposal. We also think that 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 depending on UE capability, when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE does not contain the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK with this proposal. |
| CATT | Support.  Another case that UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE does not contain the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs should also be considered. The corresponding scheme/solution should also be discussed. We would like to add an FFS as a sub-bullet under this proposal.  **Proposal 13**: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 when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE contains the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.   * FFS: the case when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE does not contain the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs. |
| Apple | We are OK with this proposal. |
| NOKIA | We have below re-wording proposal:  **Proposal 13**:For broadcast reception, the same common frequency resource that carrying the group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH can be received by both RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs and RRC\_CONNECTED UEs. For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, the common frequency resource can be confined within a configured dedicated BWP. |
| OPPO | I think we are fine with the intention, but same as before, the meaning of “contain” should be clarified. |
| Ericsson | We agree |
| Qualcomm | Agree |
| vivo | Ok in principle. |
| Intel | Ok |
| ZTE | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | What is the specification impact in order to agree to the proposal? It seems to be a gNB implementation issue. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Our comments (TD Tech &Chengdu TD Tech):**  We agree with the proposal. |
| Moderator | Thanks for comments.  @LG, CATT: your comment has been included as FFS.  @Samsung. thanks for comment. I think the motivation for this proposal is to narrow down the case when 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. With the further FFS added by other companies considering the case when there is no full overlap it does provide further guidance to come with more studies for a different case in next meetings.  @Nokia: thanks for propose wording. The first part of the current wording “*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..*” is the same wording as the one we agreed at RAN1#103e, so I think it may be easier to find agreement if keep that one. The second sentence, given the discussion in Issues 1 and 3, I think it may be more controversial since it seems to me that has more implications of configuration. I would propose we keep the current wording if you do not have a strong view. Please do let me know otherwise.  @OPPO: thanks for comment which has been incorporated.  @Samsung: I am not sure of the  There are 13 companies supporting directly or with the addition of an FFS with no company showing strong concerns. Hence, I propose the following revision of Proposal 13.  **Proposal 13-rev1**: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 when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE contains the common frequency resource (i.e. overlaps in frequency) of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.   * FFS: the case when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE does not contain the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs. |

### **2nd round FL proposals for Issue 10**

**Proposal 13-rev1**: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 when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE contains the common frequency resource (i.e. overlaps in frequency) of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.

* FFS: the case when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE does not contain the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | It seems that we may also need to say that the SCS and CP are the same.  **Proposal 13-rev1**: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 when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE contains the common frequency resource (i.e. overlaps in frequency) of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs and the SCS and CP are the same.   * FFS: the case when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE does not contain the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs. |

## Issue 11: Multicast reception by UEs in IDLE/INACTIVE states

### **1st FL proposals for Issue 11**

**Proposal 14**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, Multicast reception with high QoS requirement (reliability, latency) is not supported for UEs in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE states.

* FFS: multicast reception with low QoS requirement (reliability, latency) for For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, subject to final RAN2 confirmation.

Please provide your company’s views and comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | We think this issue is up to RAN2’s decision, and is not necessary to discuss in RAN1. |
| LG | We are generally fine with this proposal. But, some level of QoS requirements (but not so high requirement) could be supported for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, based on repetitions and NACK only based HARQ feedback. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with CMCC. |
| CATT | This issue can be discussed in RAN2 rather than RAN1. |
| Apple | Agree with CMCC. |
| NOKIA | Agree with FL’s proposal, and also agree with CMCC’s comment |
| OPPO | Agree with CMCC. |
| Ericsson | We disagree. The terminology of “high QoS” and “low QoS” should not be used and in any case should not be associated with multicast reception in different RRC states. Depending on network implementation, high QoS may also be achieved in Inactive/Idle.  Subject to RAN2 agreement, UEs in RRC Idle/Inactive should be able to receive the same multicast transmissions as UEs in RRC Connected. This needs to be harmonized with agreed solutions for RRC Connected. |
| Qualcomm | Fine to leave it in RAN2.  The intention is to focus the discussion of broadcast reception in RAN1 now. |
| vivo | Agree with CMCC. |
| Intel | This is up to RAN2 and need not be discussed in RAN1. |
| ZTE | Maybe it is better to leave this to RAN2. |
| Samsung | Can revisit after RAN2 progress. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Our comments (TD Tech &Chengdu TD Tech):**  We agree with the proposal. |
| Moderator | Thanks for comments.  There are 11 companies that explicitly support leave the discussion to RAN2.  Hence, the **moderator proposes that we do not discuss this aspect furthermore at this meeting**. |

1. Proposals for potential discussion on GTW on 28 January

This are potential Proposals for discussion on the GTW on the 28 January 2021 for AI 8.12.3:

**Proposal 3-rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, one common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be defined/configured.

* FFS: whether to define/configure more than one common frequency resources

**Proposal 10-rev1**:RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs do not support UL feedback to improve reliability of Broadcast/Multicast services in Rel-17.

**Proposal 8-rev1**:For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, a new CSS type is defined for group-common PDCCH.

* FFS: monitoring priority with respect to existing CSS and USS.
* FFS: alignment and/or reuse with solutions supported for RRC\_CONNECTED

# Summary

Agreements at GTW on 28 January 2021.

Agreement:

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, one common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be defined/configured.

* FFS: whether to define/configure more than one common frequency resources
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