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**1. Overall Description:**

RAN1 has further discussed the remaining physical layer issues for CG-SDT and RA-SDT, and the following agreements have been achieved.

|  |
| --- |
| Mapping ratio and association period   * Mapping ratio of SSB to CG PUSCH is configured per CG configurations.   + FFS whether to restrict the same value for all CG configurations * For the candidate value set of SSB to CG PUSCH mapping ratio, support at least {1, 2, 4, 8, 16}   + FFS {1/8,1/4,1/2}   Multi-layer PUSCH transmission   * Multi-layer PUSCH transmission is not supported for CG-SDT.   Repetitions   * The repetitions are considered as a bundle of transmission occasions that are mapped to the same SSB(s), no additional specification rule is needed.   Validation of PUSCH occasion   * No need to define UL/DL pattern type of validation rule specific for paired spectrum at least for non-RedCap UEs.   + FFS the case for RedCap UEs * A CG PUSCH occasion is not valid if it overlaps with any valid PRACH occasion or valid MsgA PUSCH occasion.   Default SSB set   * When SSB set indication is absent, UE assumes the SSB set includes all actually transmitted SSBs configured by SIB1.   Search space and CORESET   * RAN1 confirms the working assumption in RAN2 that UE-specific search space is configured for UEs performing CG-SDT. * CORESET for UE performing RA-SDT should be a common CORESET.   L1 feedback   * From RAN1’s perspective, it’s feasible to reuse CG-DFI mechanism for CG-SDT, but no consensus on whether CG-DFI is needed.   Pathloss determination   * The pathloss for CG-SDT PUSCH power control can be determined by the measurement of selected SSB associated with the CG PUSCH.   QCL assumption   * For CG-SDT, the UE can assume the PDCCH carrying the DCI has the same DM-RS antenna port quasi co-location properties as for a SSB associated to the CG PUSCH transmission e.g. for detection of retransmission DCI in response to a CG PUSCH transmission. |
|  |

Regarding the five questions from RAN2 in LS R1-2108715, the responses from RAN1 are provided as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| Q1: For both RA-SDT and CG-SDT, RAN2 assumes that common PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT UEs) can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions. Can RAN1 confirm this?  A1:   * RAN1 confirms that common PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT UEs) can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions.   Q2: For RA-SDT and CG-SDT, for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions, does RAN1 think there is a need for any other PUCCH resources than the above and if needed, can RAN1 define these?  A2:   * RAN1 thinks there is no need for any other PUCCH resources than common PUCCH resources shared with non-SDT UEs.   Q3: Is there any other L1 configuration needed for both RA-SDT and CG-SDT to support the subsequent data transmissions from RAN1 perspective?  A3:   * From RAN1’s perspective, there is no other L1 configuration for RA-SDT and CG-SDT to support subsequent data transmission.   Q4: Do RAN1 have any concerns to support RA-SDT on the non-initial BWP?  NOTE: It has already been agreed in RAN2 that *CG-SDT resource can be configured on either initial BWP or separate SDT BWP*, if confirmed by RAN1.  A4:   * It’s RAN1’s common understanding that RA-SDT resource cannot be configured on non-initial BWP. * RAN1 cannot reach a consensus on whether to confirm RAN2 agreement that CG-SDT resource can be configured on separate SDT BWP with the concern on [necessity].   Q5: Does RAN1 think that BFD/BFR procedure is required for SDT and if needed, can RAN1 define the necessary procedure to support this?  A5:   * It’s RAN1’s common understanding that BFD/BFR procedure is not required for SDT in Rel-17.   + FFS: whether or not to support reporting the beam change to gNB. |

**2. Actions:**

**To RAN2:**

**ACTION:** RAN1 respectfully asks RAN2 to take the above information into account.

**4. Date of Next TSG-RAN WG1 Meetings:**

TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #107-e 11th Nov – 19th Nov 2021 e-meeting