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# Introduction

During TSG RAN #86, 3GPP approved a Release-17 Work Item (WI) to introduce support for Multicast and Broadcast Services in NR (NR MBS) [1]. The NR MBS WI includes the following objective:

|  |
| --- |
| * Specify RAN basic functions for broadcast/multicast for UEs in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states [RAN2, RAN1]:   + 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].   Note: the possibility of receiving Point to Multipoint transmissions by UEs in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states, without the need for those UEs to get the configuration of the PTM bearer carrying the Broadcast/Multicast service while in RRC CONNECTED state beforehand, is subject to verification of service subscription and authorization assumptions during the WI. |

The agreements for AI 8.12.3 on Basic functions for broadcast/multicast for RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE UEs in previous RAN1 and RAN Plenary meetings are listed in the Annex A of this document.

As announced by the Chair, the email discussion details with check points for agreements are as follows:

[106bis-e-NR-MBS-03] Email discussion/approval on basic functions for broadcast/multicast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with checkpoints for agreements on October 14 and 19 – David (BBC)

In this document, the Feature Lead (FL) presents a list of open Issues to enable reception of Point to Multipoint transmissions by UEs in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states based on the technical documents (tdocs) submitted to RAN1#106bis-e. Each of the Issues has the following subsections: background, Tdoc analysis, FL assessment and a set of proposals that are updated based on rounds of discussion between companies. The final section of this document also contains the agreements reached at RAN1#106bis-e.

The reader can use the “Navigation Pane” utility of Word to quickly find the Issues and the rounds of discussion for the set of Proposals for this meeting.

# Issues

## [ACTIVE] Issue 1: Cases D&E down-selection for CFR of MCCH/MTCH

### **Background**

During RAN2#113bis-e meeting, RAN2 discussed further aspects of MCCH scheduling with RAN1 impacts. Here, we reproduce relevant RAN2 agreements relevant to the discussion on the CFR:

|  |
| --- |
| * **Request RAN1 to discuss the details of the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception.** * **UE in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE should be able to monitor/read both MCCH channel and SI/Paging without BWP switch. It is up to RAN1 to decide how this is ensured.** |

RAN2 in [R1-2104165] requests RAN1 to investigate and provide feedback, considering agreements made by RAN2 as indicated in the LS where the following request is relevant for the discussion on CFR:

|  |
| --- |
| * Details of the allowed transmission bandwidth/BWP configurations for MCCH transmission. |

RAN2 discussed further the aspects related to MCCH design and made the following agreements during RAN2#114 meeting relevant to the discussion on CFR for MCCH/MTCH:

|  |
| --- |
| * MBS specific SIB is defined to carry MCCH configuration. * Postpone the discussion on whether dedicated MCCH configuration is required until RAN1 makes progress on BWP/CFR for MCCH. * We support single MCCH (in this release) |

The following agreements for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs at RAN1#103-e, RAN1#104-e, RAN1#105-e, RAN1#106-e and RAN#93-e are relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| 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. * FFS: the relation of the common frequency resource(s) (if configured) and initial BWP. * FFS: whether to configure one/more common frequency resources * FFS: configuration and definition details of the common frequency resource   Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, further study the following cases of a configured/defined specific common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, and identify which case(s) will be supported:   * [Case E] the case where a CFR is defined based on a configured BWP.   + In particular, study the following:     - whether a configured BWP for MBS is needed or not.     - whether BWP switching is needed or not.   + In this study, the configured BWP has the following properties:     - The configured BWP is different than the initial BWP where the frequency resources of this initial BWP are configured smaller than the full carrier bandwidth.     - The CFR has the frequency resources identical to the configured BWP.     - The configured BWP needs to fully contain the initial BWP in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + Note: The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth * the case where the initial BWP fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain.   + In this study the following sub-cases are considered:     - [Case B] A CFR 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.     - [Case D] A CFR 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.   + In particular, study the following:     - Whether the considered two options with a CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP are needed or not for MBS. * the case where the initial BWP has same size as the CFR in the frequency domain.   + In this study the following two sub-cases are considered:     - [Case A] A CFR 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 same frequency resources and same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.     - [Case C] A CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the same frequency resources and same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + In particular, study the following:     - Whether the considered two options with a CFR with the same size as the initial BWP are needed or not for MBS.   Agreement:  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case A), to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.   * Note: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.   Agreement:  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case A), to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   * Note: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.   Conclusion:  There is no specification support in Rel-17 for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with configured/defined CFRs for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case B).  Agreement (Updated proposal from RAN1#106e):  For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.   * Support Case-C * Support at least one of Case D and Case E.   + Down-selection to be made at RAN1#106b-e * Note: Case C, D and E are defined in previous agreements |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2108725, Huawei]
  + *Discuss*: We should note that case E if supported should be termed as initial BWP as well from RAN2 perspective, which can minimize the specification impact. According to the current specification, SIB1 configured initial BWP is used only when UE enters RRC\_CONNECTED state, on which UE can receive SIB/paging and unicast without BWP switching. Likewise, the initial BWP for case E can be used for broadcast and SIB/paging and unicast without BWP switching. However, if RAN1 could not achieve consensus on the naming of case E, it could be up to RAN2.
  + Proposal 4: Case E seems more motivated than case D by MTCH requiring a larger bandwidth size than the size of SIB configured initial BWP.
    - If case E is supported, it is up to RAN2 how to name case E for minimizing the specification impact.
* In [R1-2108806, Futurewei]
  + Proposal 1: For Idle/Inactive UEs broadcast reception, the common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is fully contained within the initial BWP and is configured by SIB. Furthermore, the frequency resources for the CFR does not need to be equal to CORESET0 (Case D).
  + *Discuss*: From a network operation flexibility point of view, support of both Case D and E would be preferred. However, Case E would result in a CFR that is not bounded in any way since it is entirely based on a configured BWP. In a SFN operation, having a bound on the frequency region for the reception of broadcast for UE in idle/inactive states would ensure accessibility and uniformity of services.
* In [R1-2108853, ZTE]
  + *Discuss*: Case D and Case E can be described as following. Technically speaking, both Case D and Case E as well as Case C require UE to activate a BWP larger than CORESET#0 in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE states. The spec impacts and implementation impacts for these parts are almost the same.
  + *Discuss:* For avoiding BWP switching between reception of unicast and broadcast, once UE enters RRC\_CONNECTED state, for Case D, UE can still use SIB-1 configured initial BWP as the activated BWP or activate another BWP larger than CFR. For Case E, UE can still use BWP X as the activated BWP or activate another BWP as long as it is larger than the CFR. The only difference between Case D and Case E is just the different size of CFR*.*
  + Proposal 1: For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state, support both Case D and Case E.
* In [R1-2108928, Spreadtrum]
  + *Discuss:* In NR Rel-15/Rel-16, only small data, or even no traffice data is allowed to be transmitted in idle state. High traffic volume is always transmitted in connected state. One reason is that it is higher efficiency and reliablity in connected state. The necesarity of introducing CFR with large bandwidth.e g., case E in idle state, is not clear to us.
  + Proposal 2: For CFR configuration for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, Case E is not supported.
* In [R1- 2109003, vivo]
  + *Discuss*: Case E is beneficial as it provides flexibility for the network to configure CFR independent of SIB-1 configured initial downlink BWP, so that proper size of CFR can be freely configured to facilitate MBS services well.
  + Appendix lists issues raised by companies on Case E.
  + Proposal 1: For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state:
    - Support Case-C
    - Support Case D and Case E.
    - Note: Case C, D and E are defined in previous agreements.
* In [R1-2109069, OPPO]
  + *Discuss:* For Case C, the CFR is the same as initial DL BWP configured by SIB1, and it has the least impact to current mechanism and cost efficient. Since the CFR has the same size of initial DL BWP, there is no BWP switching when UEs transfer from IDLE to CONN state, which guarantees no interruption of MBS services reception. Same bandwidth size between CFR and initial DL BWP can also have flexibility, because initial DL BWP can be configured with wide range of frequency sizes up to 100MHz*.*
  + Proposal 1: For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state, Case D is selected.
  + Proposal 2: For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state, Case E is not supported.
* In [R1-2109196, CATT]
  + *Discuss*: However, Case C will affect legacy UE due to initial BWP with increased bandwidth. Case E can solve the issue.
  + Proposal 1: Support Case D and E for gNB scheduling flexibility.
* In [R1-2109305, CMCC]
  + *Discuss*: First, Case E requires RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UE maintaining two separate BWPs.
  + Proposal 1. For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, Case D can be supported as configured/defined specific CFR for MTCH/MCCH.
* In [R1-2109318, Nokia]
  + Proposal-1: Support of both CFR Case D and Case E.
  + Observation-1: In Rel17 MBS, there is no intention to change or modify the CORESET#0 as the initial BWP of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.
  + Observation-2: For Rel17 MBS, it is understood that there will be a new configured CFR/BWP for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs for MBS reception.
  + Observation-3: An indication can be carried in the *RRCSetupRequest* and *RRCResumeRequest* that informs and allows the network to configure the UEs’ dedicated BWP to confine the Case E/D CFR correctly.
* In [R1-2109388, Xiaomi]
  + Proposal 1: For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state, support case D.
  + *Discuss*: One concern on case C is that the larger initial DL BWP increase the power consumption for legacy UE. We don’t think this argument is reasonable as nothing new is introduced for the legacy UE in terms of initial DL BWP. Power saving is never the factor needs to be taken into account when gNB configure initial DL BWP. Furthermore, there is already sufficient mechanisms aiming at reducing power consumption, for both IDLE and CONNECTED state. Power saving is certainly out of the scope for Rel-17 MBS WI*.*
  + *Discuss:* If a larger MBS-specific BWP is configured for MBS UE, additional BWP switching is required when it transfers to RRC CONNECTED state as it is larger than the initial DL BWP.
  + Proposal 2: For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state, do not support case E.
  + Proposal 3: The SIB-1 configured initial BWP for legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED state is applied as initial BWP for Rel-17 MBS capable UEs.
* In [R1-2109517, Samsung]
  + *Discuss*: Depending on which case is supported, the details should be further discussed. When Case D is supported, the separate BWP for MBS is not needed.
  + *Discuss*: When only Case E is supported, the signaling for frequency resource configuration within the initial BWP is not needed since all the cases support CFR having the same size as the BWP, which is either the initial BWP or the configured BWP.
* In [R1-2109540, Lenovo]
  + Observation 1: The motivation to support Case E is not justified.
  + Observation 2: Those UEs with small bandwidth capabilities can’t be supported in Case E.
  + Observation 3: Frequent BWP switching happens in Case E.
  + Observation 4: Significant standard impact is caused in Case E.
  + Proposal 1: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, for CFR configuration for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, Case E is not supported.
* In [R1-2109569, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 3: CFR can be configured with any size as long as it covers CORESET#0.
* In [R1-2109635, Intel]
  + Proposal 1: Case D can be implemented under Case C using appropriate FDRA since the resources required for broadcast reception under Case D are already included in Case C. Additional support for Case D is not required.
  + Observation 1: For Case E when the configured BWP is wider than legacy SIB1 configured initial BWP, when the UE transitions to CONNECTED mode, the CFR will be outside the initial active BWP, requiring the switching of the UE to a wider BWP (containing CFR) for continuous broadcast reception.
  + *Discuss*: On the other hand, if we define the “configured BWP” as another SIB-x configured initial BWP only for MBS UEs which supersedes the legacy initial BWP configuration, then the issue of CFR outside of initial active BWP for UEs transitioning to CONNECTED mode does not exist.
  + *Discuss*: The main difference here is that the configured BWP is now a new wider initial BWP for the MBS UEs while the legacy UEs still use the legacy initial BWP.
  + Proposal 2: Case E can be supported where the “configured BWP” is defined as a SIB-x configured wider initial BWP for MBS capable UEs which supersedes the legacy SIB1 configured initial BWP.
* In [R1-2109703, DOCOMO]
  + *Discuss*: A problem with transitioning from RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE to RRC\_CONNECTED state was raised at the last RAN1 meeting. The problem is that a UE receiving broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state may not be able to continue receiving the broadcast services after transitioning to RRC\_CONNECTED state since the initial BWP applied after receiving Msg4 cannot include the CFR for broadcast in Case E. However, if gNB indicates a BWP that contains the CFR for broadcast as the first active downlink BWP, the UE will be able to continue receiving broadcast services without interruption. Also, broadcast services do not require high QoS, so interrupted reception may not be a problem.
  + Proposal 1: For a CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH for broadcast, support both Case D and E.
* In [R1-2109769, TD Tech]
  + Proposal 1: A CFR for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can be larger than the initial DL BWP and has the same numerology as the initial DL BWP.
* In [R1-2109985, LGE]
  + Observation 1: If the CFR is associated with the initial DL BWP for a connected UE, the CFR can be also used by idle/inactive UEs.
  + Proposal 1: From idle/inactive UE perspective, one CFR is associated to the initial DL BWP of UE’s serving cell for REL-17.
  + Proposal 2: For Rel-17, the CFR associated to the initial DL BWP cannot be configured with a different numerology than that of the initial DL BWP.
  + Observation 2: Limiting to broadcast transmission within the initial DL BWP would lead to low broadcast capacity in CFR and potentially cause overload in initial DL BWP.
  + Proposal 3: For idle/inactive UEs receiving broadcast, CFR associated to initial DL BWP can be configured with a wider bandwidth than the initial DL BWP or a bandwidth equal to or smaller than the initial DL BWP.
    - If configured as a wider bandwidth, the initial DL BWP should be confined within the MBS specific BWP.
* In [R1-2110058, Apple]
  + *Discuss*: If the configured CFR is different from initial BWP or CORESET#0 in frequency domain, and the CFR size is larger than SIB1 configured initial DL BWP, then a BWP for MBS should be configured. The benefit of Case E is it provide the configuration flexibility to the network to provide high data rate MBS service, and there is no impacts to legacy UE and Rel.17 non-MSB UE.
  + Proposal 2: For MBS UE in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE mode, the Case E is supported for broadcast reception.
* In [R1-2110120, Convida]
  + *Discuss*: Although using case C, the gNB can achieve a wider CFR for RRC idle/inactive UEs by configuring a wider SIB1 configured initial BWP. However, since the SIB1 configured initial BWP is defined for the UE in RRC connected state, such solution will have negative impacts to the RRC connected UEs.
  + Proposal 1: Support Case E for the CFR design for the RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.
  + Proposal 2: For case E, the size of the MBS BWP can be
    - wider than the CORESET #0 but narrower than the SIB1 configured initial BWP
    - same as the SIB1 configured initial BWP
    - wider than the SIB1 configured BWP
  + Proposal 3: In addition to case E, case D can also be supported.
* In [R1-2110212, Qualcomm]
  + *Discuss*: There is some discussion on different interpretations of initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED UEs when initial BWP is configured in SIB larger than CORESET#0. For legacy UEs, “it keeps CORESET#0 until after reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*”, which means RRC\_CONNECTED UEs may assume initial BWP for paging while RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs still camp on CORESET#0.
  + *Discuss*: For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, the CORESET#0 is still the “initial BWP to receive SIB/paging” but the broadcast CFR with bandwidth size of “SIB-indicated initial BWP” larger than CORESET#0 can be regarded as a new BWP, differentiated from the “initial BWP to receive SIB/paging”.
  + *Discus*: It would be too restricted to limit the CFR for broadcast no larger than SIB1-configured DL BWP, especially considering the video broadcast services requires high data rate. If the CFR has the size larger than CORESET#0, i.e., Case C, Case D and E, a common configuration method can be used to configure CFR by configuring a CFR/BWP via SIB signalling or MCCH.
  + Proposal 1: For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state,
    - Support both Case E and Case D.
    - Different PDSCH/PDCCH parameters can be configured in the CFR for MCCH and the CFR for MTCH.
* In [R1-2110251, Google]
  + *Discuss*: From our perspective, because there is only one meeting left before RAN1 freeze. The group may not have sufficient time to complete the issue. Thus, we propose to adopt a solution with minimal UE behaver changes.
  + Proposal 2: Support to adopt Case-D for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.
* In [R1-2110357, Ericsson]
  + *Discuss*: When the UE receives broadcast in RRC INACTIVE/IDLE according to any of Cases C, D and E, the broadcast transmission will – by definition - exceed the CORESET#0 initial BWP. This means that broadcast will then need to be transmitted in a wider BWP (BWP-1). From a frequency resource perspective, The CFR then needs to be contained within BWP-1.
  + *Discuss*: With Case C, the BWP may naturally be identical in size to the SIB1-configured initial BWP but would not be the initial BWP for UEs in RRC INACTIVE/IDLE, since the CORESET#0 initial BWP is still used for all UEs in RRC INACTIVE/IDLE to receive System Information and paging and also for Random Access. In addition, the SIB1 initial BWP may only, according to legacy, be used by UEs in RRC Connected.
  + *Discuss*: With Case D, the CFR is contained within the frequency range of SIB1-configured initial BWP. As mentioned, with legacy this BWP only applies to RRC CONNECTED UEs, so the BWP (BWP-1) used for case D is still to be defined.
  + *Discuss*: It can also be noted that when SIB1 does not configure the initial BWP, so that the CORESET#0 initial BWP is used also for UEs in RRC CONNECTED, it is only with Case E that broadcast, wider than CORESET#0 can be supported.
  + Proposal 1: For UEs in RRC INACTIVE/IDLE, broadcast can be received according to Case E.
    - Note: CFRs according to Case C and D can be supported by Case E.
  + Proposal 2: With Case E, the CFR is associated with a BWP and spans the same bandwidth. The BWP and CFR for broadcast are configured in a new SIBx. The PDCCH, PDSCH, SPS configurations for this BWP are used by the CFR.
  + Proposal 3: When the UE state is changed from RRC INACTIVE/IDLE to RRC CONNECTED, the UE formally releases the BWP-1 used to receive Case E broadcast in RRC INACTIVE/IDLE. The UE however keeps the CFR, which is inherited by all configured BWPs in RRC CONNECTED, provided the CFR is contained within the respective BWP.
  + Proposal 4: When the frequency range and numerology of the BWP to receive broadcast does not change with a change of RRC state, the UE is expected to receive the broadcast data without disruption.

### **FL Assessment**

The Common Frequency Resources (CFR) for MBS has been discussed extensively during the past meetings and multiple inputs to this meeting have also addressed this topic. In this Issue we focus on the down-selection between the Case D and Case E.

1. ***On Support for Case D & Case E***

* *Support of Case D*
  + [Futurewei, Spreadtrum, OPPO, CMCC, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Google]
* *Support of Case E*
  + [Huawei, Intel, Apple] \*note, different implementations are proposed for some contributions.
* *Support of Case D and E*
  + [ZTE, vivo, CATT, Nokia, Mediatek, DOCOMO, TD Tech, LGE, Convida, Qualcomm, Ericsson]

As per previous meetings, there are different views on the cases to be supported.

1. ***Legacy behaviour of Rel-17 UEs supporting NR MBS***

At RAN1#106-e, there were multiple discussions around the legacy behaviour of Rel-17 UEs supporting NR MBS in RRC idle/inactive UE states. There was consensus then that the legacy behaviour, where SIB/Paging transmissions for RRC idle/inactive UEs are transmitted in the initial BWP with frequency resources defined by CORESET#0, should not change. Some contributions to this meeting have highlighted this issue again [Nokia, Ericsson, Qualcomm].

Since there are discussions on different potential implementations of Case E below, where one alternative is to define new initial BWP only for MBS UEs, to clarify that legacy behaviour is not changed a proposal is put forward to stablish this principle.

1. ***Motivation of Case D and Case E***

* *Flexibility on network configuration*

The main motivation for the support of cases D and E is network flexibility for the configuration of CFRs on top of case C as presented in [ZTE, Futurewei, vivo, CATT, Nokia, Apple, Qualcomm, Ericsson]. However, [OPPO, Lenovo, Xiaomi] discuss that Case C already provides flexibility on the configuration of the bandwidth that can span up to the carrier bandwidth.

* *Impact on legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 RRC connected UEs with SIB-1 configured initial BWP*

Another aspect brought up in multiple contributions on the benefit of supporting case E in addition to case C is the following. Since changing the frequency resources of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP to accommodate different bitrates under Case-C directly changes the frequency resources of legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs with SIB-1 configured initial BWP in RRC connected, Case-E allows to independently configure a CFR with larger frequency resources than the frequency resources of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP if needed.

This aspect is something worth getting a common understanding between companies, so there will be a question in the section of proposals below to collect companies’ views.

1. ***BWP switching for Case D and Case E with RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE states***

There have been discussions, in past meetings and highlighted in [Lenovo], on whether for RRC idle/inactive UEs with configured/defined CFRs with Case D and E would require BWP switching to receive the SIB/Paging transmitted signals in CORESET#0. As discussed in [Huawei, Ericsson] since both Case D and Case E contain the frequency resources of CORESET#0 (and share SCS and CP) the UE can receive both MBS broadcast transmissions and SIB/Paging transmissions without BWP switching. This is similar to legacy behaviour in NR where RRC connected UEs are expected to monitor System Information and paging in the Initial BWP in parallel with receiving unicast data, provided the Initial BWP is fully contained within the active BWP.

1. ***BWP switching for Case D when UE state changes from RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE to RRC\_CONNECTED***

In previous meetings, the aspect on potential BWP switching when UEs change from RRC idle/inactive states to RRC connected state have mainly been with respect to Case E. For this meeting [ZTE, OPPO] specifically discuss BWP switching aspects for Case D. In particular [OPPO] presents that Case D may also have BWP switching issues when transitioning RRC states. If the UE in RRC connected state uses either the SIB-1 configured BWP as active BWP or activates another BWP with larger CFR than the resources of Case D, there can be service interruption since frequency range needs to be changed.

This aspect is something worth getting a common understanding between companies, so there will be a question in the section of proposals below to collect companies’ views.

1. ***BWP switching for Case E when UE state changes from RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE to RRC\_CONNECTED***

As discussed above, most contributions to this meeting have discussed BWP switching aspects for Case E during the transmission of RRC states, as well as discussed in previous meetings. Below we discuss different scenarios depending on the active BWP of UEs in RRC connected state.

* *Scenario when UE in RRC connected state uses the SIB-1 configured BWP as active BWP*
  1. This scenario has been discussed in previous meetings, and recollected in [vivo], when the default BWP is the SIB-1 configured initial BWP. In this case there would be service loss since the CFR is of larger size than the frequency resources of the active BWP. However, it is argued in [vivo] that this situation can be avoided by network configuration where the network configures a default BWP that contains the CFR.
* *Scenario when UE in RRC connected state activates a BWP with the same frequency resources as the CFR*
  1. Here, since there is no frequency range change (nor change of SCS or CP), the UE does not need to retune and can continue receiving the service without interruption.
* *Scenario when UE in RRC connected state activates a BWP with the larger frequency resources than the CFR*
  1. Here, since the frequency range needs to change the UE needs to retune to adapt to the new (larger) frequency range which may cause service interruption.

These aspects are worth getting a common understanding between companies, so there will be questions in the section of proposals below to collect companies’ views.

1. ***On Signalling configuration of the CFR***

At the past meeting there were detailed discussion signalling of the CFR where three alternatives were discussed as follows:

* **Alt 1**: The SIB-1 configured initial BWP for legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED state is also applied as initial BWP for Rel-17 MBS capable UEs.
* **Alt 2**: Rel-17 MBS capable UEs are configured with a new MBS-specific initial BWP that is different to legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 initial BWP.
* **Alt 3**: Rel-17 MBS UEs use a configured BWP other than initial BWP.
* FFS: it is up to RAN2 whether the configuration of Alt 2 and Alt 3 is in SIB1, SIB-x, MBS-specific SIB, or MCCH for MTCH.

For the implementation of Case E, Alt2 and Alt 3 were discussed as potential candidates. However, there were different views on the benefits and drawbacks of each alternative. Multiple contributions to this meeting have discussed this issue. For Alt 2 where a new MBS specific initial BWP is configured, concerns were raised on whether this approach would change the legacy behaviour of the initial BWP for RRC idle/inactive UEs and whether the network would need to deal with UEs operating with two different initial BWPs. However, it has also been proposed e.g., [Huawei] that the signalling of the specific implementation of Case E could be up to RAN2. Therefore, to understand whether this is an approach that is adequate, the FL will put a question on this to collect companies’ views.

In the section below before directly discussing the down-selection of Case D&E, the FL makes a set of questions to frame the discussion and to try to build a common understanding. Based on the discussion in the initial rounds, further proposals will be included to conclude on the down-selection of cases for CFR for RRC idle/inactive UEs.

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

**Proposal (conclusion) 2.1-1:** For broadcast reception, Rel-17 RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs receive SIB/paging transmission in frequency resources defined by CORESET#0.

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above:**

1. **do you support proposals 2.1-1 for conclusion? (This proposal tries to clarify that the legacy behaviour for RRC idle/inactive UEs receiving system information in frequency resources defined by CORESET#0 is not changed.) Please provide reasons and views in general if you do not agree.**
2. **Do you agree with the following motivation for Case E? Please provide reasons if you do not agree.**
   1. **Since changing the frequency resources of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP to accommodate different bitrates under Case-C directly changes the frequency resources of legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs with SIB-1 configured initial BWP in RRC connected, Case-E allows to independently configure a CFR with larger frequency resources than the frequency resources of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP if needed.**
3. **Do you agree with the following statements regarding potential service interruption/loss/continuity during the transition from RRC idle/inactive to RRC connected UE states? Please provide reasons if you do not agree:**
   1. **For Case D, if the UE in RRC connected state uses either the SIB-1 configured BWP as active BWP or activates another BWP with larger CFR than the resources of Case D, there can be service interruption since frequency range needs to be changed.**
   2. **For Case E, if UE in RRC connected state uses the SIB-1 configured BWP as active BWP there is service loss since the CFR is of larger size than the frequency resources of the active BWP.**
   3. **For Case E, if the UE in RRC connected state activates a BWP with the same frequency resources as the CFR there is no frequency range change, therefore there is service continuity.**
   4. **For Case E, if the UE in RRC connected state activates a BWP with the larger frequency resources than the CFR there can be service interruption since frequency range needs to be changed.**
4. **Do you think the details on the signalling on the implementation of case D and/or Case E should be up to RAN2?**
   1. **details on signalling on implementation mean e.g., whether Case E is based on a configured BWP or whether Case E is named as “initial BWP”.**

**FL note: based on the discussion from these questions further proposals will be included for discussion and agreement.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Intel | a. Proposed conclusion is legacy behaviour and should not be required. It’s natural to receive SIB/paging within CORESET#0.  b. Case E as a definition of CFR larger than SIB1 configured initial BWP (shared with legacy UEs) is OK. Implementation of Case E could be that CFR == initial BWP ONLY for MBS UEs configured by MBS SIB which is not shared with other legacy UEs. This avoids the issues of service continuity and the need to switch to a different BWP during transition to connected mode. Therefore, while motivation is ok implementation should be carefully considered.  c. No issue if UE uses SIB-1 configured initial BWP and CFR = initial BWP supported under Case C with FDRA. Case D is not required.  d. No it should be settled in RAN1. If we choose to use MBS specific SIB, this can be left up to RAN2. |
| Samsung | a. Support proposal 2.1-1 for conclusion.  b. Legacy UEs only need to monitor CORESET#0. Measurements are infrequent/none depending on the state and do not depend much on the BW. Overall, the difference between Case E and what is possible based on Rel-16 means is unclear.  c. Agree with the assessment – it is not different than legacy behaviour based on a SIB1 configured BWP.  d. RAN2 can discuss signalling details after RAN1 concludes cases to be supported. |
| NOKIA/NSB | a) Support  d) Agree  c) NOT agree  i. For Case D, with UE in RRC connected state, the Case D CFR will be configured by network gNB to be confined within either the SIB1 configured BWP or an UE active BWP, and the frequency range change impact is the same as legacy.  ii. For Case E, with UE in RRC connected state, the Case E CFR will be configured by network gNB to be confined within a (wider) UE active BWP, and there is no service loss.  iii. For Case E, with UE in RRC connected state, for the case of no frequency range change, the service continuity is the same as above two sub-bullet points.  iv. For Case E, with UE in RRC connected state, the configuration of a UE active BWP (larger than CFR) is happened during the RRC transition period, i.e. via *RRCSetupRequest* and *RRCResumeRequest*, thus the UE service continuity is the same as legacy behavior.  d) Before pushing/leaving the issues to RAN2, RAN1 should agree or at least have the common understanding when LS to RAN2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | a) Support  b) We don’t support Case E. Legacy UEs in Idle/Inactive mode only monitors PDCCHs in CORESET#0 instead of SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP. It is worth noting that Case E is the optimization of Case C which is not essential for timely completion of Rel-17 MBS. In addition, for Case E, we have below comments:  (1) Unclear motivation  This use case is quite unclear especially the bandwidth as SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP can’t satisfy the requirements of such MBS service. Checking TS38.331, there is no bandwidth limitation to the initial DL BWP configured by SIB1. Furthermore, which kind of MBS service needs high data rate is unknown to RAN1 and there is no LS from SA1 to give such information.  On the other hand, the proponent companies of Case E should also show the delay budget of the given MBS which requires very high data rate and low latency. If the latency requirement is not that low, definitely, the CFR with same bandwidth as SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP can be used.  In addition, this CFR configuration is targeted for idle mode or inactive mode UEs. In the worst case that CFR in Case C with same bandwidth as the SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP can’t provide enough frequency resource, the reasonable way for the UEs is to enter the connected mode and be configured with a dedicated larger BWP.  (2) Unsupportive for UEs with small bandwidth  (3) BWP switching  In Case E, an MBS-specific BWP with larger bandwidth than SIB-1 configured BWP is configured. The CFR with larger bandwidth than SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP should be definitely coupled with a BWP according to current NR framework. It is impossible that the CFR is totally independent from any BWP and can be used for transmission and reception. In Case E, the MBS-specific BWP is required. For a UE in idle mode or inactive mode, it shall receive the SIB and paging in CORESET 0 defined initial DL BWP. Since Case E is configured with larger bandwidth than CORESET 0, the UE has to perform BWP switching frequently to receive SIB/paging and MBS.  Furthermore, when the UE enters connected mode from idle/inactive mode, BWP switching delay is unavoidable because in Case E the MBS-specific BWP is configured with larger bandwidth than SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP. One example is shown in Figure 1. Before a dedicated BWP covering the MBS-specific BWP is configured for the UE, even in the connected mode, the UE has to perform BWP switching between the SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP and the MBS-specific BWP. Until the completion of the configuration of the dedicated BWP, the UE can’t stop BWP switching.    Figure 1: Case E  (4) Standard impact  In Case E, introduction of MBS-specific BWP with larger bandwidth than SIB-1 configured BWP leads to significant standard impact and UE complexity. In legacy BWP framework, UE assumes the SIB-1 configured BWP as the first active BWP when UE enters connected mode. In that sense, when UE enters connected mode, it should use the SIB-1 configured BWP instead of the MBS-specific BWP so that it may miss the MBS transmission in the MBS-specific BWP.  If proponent companies of Case E intend to configure the first active BWP exactly same as the MBS-specific BWP, according to current BWP framework, the first active BWP is configured via dedicated RRC signaling. Hence, this is not a reasonable way. Even though such operation is allowed in standard for support Case E in Rel-17 MBS, how can gNB know an idle/inactive mode UE needs to be configured with an MBS-specific BWP with larger bandwidth than SIB-1 configured BWP as the first active BWP for the UE? It is impossible.  In addition, when a UE in connected mode and BWP inactivity timer expires, according to current BWP framework, the UE shall fallback to the default BWP and the default BWP is SIB-1 configured BWP if not configured. Since the MBS-specific BWP is configured with larger bandwidth than SIB-1 configured BWP, UE may miss the MBS transmission during the fallback procedure.  c) i. agree;  ii. agree;  iii. the motivation is not clear. Seems the proposal talks about connected mode UE behaviors.  iv. agree.  d) this proposal can be discussed after the conclusion of whether Case D or E is supported. |
| ZTE | a) Support  b) Agree.  c) For i., yes, there will be service interruption. But this kind of service interruption is common to all cases (Case A/Case C/Case D/Case E) as long as the BWP (or CFR) is changed during the transition from RRC idle/inactive to RRC connected UE states;  For ii, this issue is common for all cases (Case A/Case C/Case D/Case E) if network configures a BWP smaller than the CFR. But I don’t believe network will configure such problematic configuration.  For iii, agree.  For iv, yes, there will be service interruption. But this kind of service interruption is common to all cases (Case A/Case C/Case D/Case E) as long as the BWP (or CFR) is changed during the transition from RRC idle/inactive to RRC connected UE states;  d) We prefer to handle these issues in RAN1. At least RAN1 should decide which cases are to be supported.  Some quick response to Lenovo’s previous comment.  (1) Unclear motivation  ZTE: The main motivation of Case E is clarified by FL, i.e., to avoid impacting the legacy UE using SIB-1 initial BWP and increase the network configuration/implementation flexibility.  (2) Unsupportive for UEs with small bandwidth  ZTE: No such issue. Network will ensure that CFR is within the carrier bandwidth.  (3) BWP switching  ZTE: No such issue as already clarified by many companies since last RAN1 meeting. UE can of course receive unicast/Paging/SIB under this so-called “MBS-specific BWP” in your figure. It is just a normal BWP instead of a MBS-specific BWP.  (4) Standard impact  ZTE: The framework of Case C/Case D/Case E are almost the same. Regarding how to differentiate UEs receiving broadcast or not, we can leverage the existing MBS interest report. |
| Spreadtrum | * + - * 1. Yes         2. No.   Firstly, we have not seen the use cases with high data rate needed to be delivered in idle/inactive state. The motivation of enlarging the legacy initial BWP configured by SIB1 is not clear to us.  Secondly, even if the frequency resources of legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs with SIB-1 configured initial BWP is enlarged due to MBS, actually it will not result in real harm for legacy UE by gNB implementation. The SIB1 configured initial BWP is valid in RRC connected only when no first active BWP is configured and no default BWP is configured. However, it can be avoided by gNB implementation, i.e., gNB can configure the first active BWP and default BWP for UEs if case C is adopted by gNB.   * + - * 1. i: Yes   ii:Yes  iii: No, if the SCS/CP is different, the interruption is also needed. But if the SCS/CP is same, Yes.  iv:Yes  No. It can be discussed later when we have more consensus. |
|  |  |
| OPPO | 1. The intention of this conclusion is agreeable, and the principle described in this conclusion is what it is in Rel-15/16 for broadcast reception. If there is nothing new in addition to current mechanism, we do not need to explicitly agree with something already been agreed. By supporting MBS services in Rel-17 with broadcast reception for UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE, the same mechanism/procedure is kept, which is the intention to have such a conclusion.   **Proposal (conclusion) 2.1-1:** For broadcast reception when supporting MBS services, Rel-17 RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs receive SIB/paging transmission in frequency resources defined by CORESET#0.   1. Case E introduces larger bandwidth than initial DL BWP configured by SIB1 and larger than CORESET#0. Case E not only allow to independently configure a CFR with larger frequency resources than that of initial BWP, but also have to be configured associated with an independent BWP (other than initial BWP) which has the same/larger bandwidth than this CFR. 2. Please see the following comments. 3. For case D, Yes, the continuity of receiving broadcast will also be interrupted when UE transits from RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE to RRC\_CONN state when the CFR (used in RRC\_IDLE) is smaller than the initial BWP (used in RRC\_CONN) configured by SIB1. It is considered as a BWP switching since the bandwidth is changed. 4. Yes. 5. More clarification is needed. The BWP mentioned in this sub-bullet is configured by SIB1 or RRC signalling? If this BWP is different from initial BWP configured by SIB1, and this BWP is used instead of SIB1 configured initial BWP as the activated BWP, it is too restricted that there should always be configured a BWP with the same size and frequency resources with CFR to make sure the broadcast reception continuity. 6. Yes. 7. RAN2 can further determine the signalling details based on RAN1’s agreement on the design of CFR and the relationship between CFR and CORESET#0/initial BWP configured by SIB1. |
| NTT DOCOMO | a) Support  b) Agree  c) We agree with ZTE. There can be service interruption in all Cases.  d) Signalling details can be up to RAN2. |
| Xiaomi | a) We are supportive to proposal 2.1-1. It is indeed the same behaviour as Rel-15/Rel-16 UE which should be maintained. We don’t think there is any other reasonable way for Rel-17 MBS UE of receiving SIB/paging. It is straightforward and obvious. On the other hand, it is no harm to figure it out explicitly to avoid any potential ambiguity.  b) DO NOT agree. We don’t understand why case C change the frequency resources of legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs. Nothing new is introduced for legacy UEs because of case C. For legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs, the initial DL BWP is configured by SIB1 and can be up to 275 RBs. From the first version of specification, how many RBs is included by initial DL BWP is fully depends on gNB. Zero impacts for the legacy UEs. Zero new requirements is introduced by case E. We already support case C and flexibility is already provided, we don’t see the motivation to support case E.  c) agree with the assessment.  d) similar views as Samsung. We should firstly conclude which case is supported. We are not OK with the current wording that assuming case E is already supported. |
| LG | a) We are fine with proposals 2.1-1 for conclusion.  b) We agree  d) The details on the signalling on the implementation of case D and/or Case E could be up to RAN2. |
| CMCC | a) Support  b) We don’t support Case E. One issue we want to highlight is that BWP switching for Case E when UE state changes from RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE to RRC\_CONNECTED as the following potential active BWP configuration approaches in FL assessment which is also related to question c).   * *Scenario when UE in RRC connected state uses the SIB-1 configured BWP as active BWP* * *Scenario when UE in RRC connected state activates a BWP with the same frequency resources as the CFR* * *Scenario when UE in RRC connected state activates a BWP with the larger frequency resources than the CFR*   In FL assessment, three active BWP configuration scenarios are proposed, but one big question is how the gNB sets the UE active BWP and what is the prior information for gNB setting the active BWP with the same as or larger frequency resources than the CFR. Some companies proposed gNB can get the prior information through MBS interest indication in last RAN1 meeting, but as the 38.331 running CR by RAN2 in the following, a MBS capable UE in RRC\_CONNECTED **may** initiate the MBS interests indication, which means whether UE reports MBS interests indication to gNB is up to UE’s implementation but not a mandatory feature.   |  | | --- | | 5.x.4 MBS Interest Indication5.x.4.2 Initiation An MBS capable UE in RRC\_CONNECTED may initiate the procedure in several cases including upon successful connection establishment, upon entering or leaving the broadcast service area, upon MBS broadcast session start or stop, upon change of interest, upon change of priority between MBS broadcast reception and unicast reception, upon change to a PCell broadcasting *SIBx1*. |   For example, one UE receives broadcast service but does not report MBS interests indication which causes gNB thinking the initial DL BWP configured by SIB1 is enough for this UE and will not configure another active BWP to cover the CFR frequency resources.  Thus, we think the BWP switching for Case E when UE state changes from RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE to RRC\_CONNECTED can not be resolved by any methods.  c)  i, don’t agree, the SIB-1 configured initial BWP is the first active BWP for RRC\_CONNECTED UE, which there is no data interruption.  ii. agree.  iii. don’t agree, as the comment for question b), we don’t think gNB can configure a active BWP cover the CFR frequency resources of case E if UE does not report MBS interest indication  iv. don’t agree, similar to iii, we don’t think gNB can configure a active BWP cover the CFR frequency resources of case E if UE does not report MBS interest indication  d) Make the design of Case D/E first in RAN1. |
| CATT | a. Support proposals 2.1-1 for conclusion.  b. Agree.  c. Generally agree.  d. RAN1 should have c a common understanding before leave the issue to RAN2. |
| vivo | 1. ok for clarification 2. support 3. not agree, details below 4. there is no interruption, the behaviour is similar to legacy UEs during the transition from RRC idle/inactive to RRC connected states 5. active BWP containing CFR can be configured in this case and there will be no service loss 6. For Case E, if the UE in RRC connected state activates a BWP with frequency resources containing CFR, there is service continuity. 7. there is no interruption, the behaviour is similar to legacy UEs during the transition from RRC idle/inactive to RRC connected states 8. common understanding can be achieved in RAN1 at first. |
| MediaTek | a. support the intention and OPPO’s modification version is better for us.  b. Support. Actually, we think the CFR discussion can be decoupled with SIB-1 configured initial BWP as discussed in our contribution R1-2109569.  c. Don’t agree.  The interruption and loss issue as listed can be avoided by gNB implementation.  d. Need further detailed discussion in RAN1. |
| Apple | a) support  b) agree  c) if relationship between the CFR and active BWP is one contains another. According to understanding, there is no retuning time in this case. Thus no service interruption will be introduced. We can send the LS to RAN4 to check these issue further.  d) RAN1 need to make agreement first, then the signalling details are left to RAN2. |
| Ericsson | * 1. Yes   2. We agree but wish to clarify that Case E also covers Case C and D CFRs.   3. i) We agree but wish to comment that with Case D there are two possible strategies for UE frequency window. It can either be adapted to the CFR or to the SIB1 initial BWP. If it is adapted to the CFR there is a power saving gain for the UE in RRC Inactive/Idle, but there is a service interruption in connection with moving to RRC Connected. If adapted to the SIB1 initial BWP, there is no power saving but transition to RRC Connected without service interruption is possible.   ii) We agree, but the gNB can avoid this case by configuring a large enough active BWP. Similar to multicast, the broadcast CFR should always be contained in the active BWP, if broadcast reception is to be supported in parallel.  iii) We agree. Before the active BWP has been RRC configured the UE will, for a very short time, use the SIB1 configured initial BWP for RRC messages. For the mentioned case the broadcast CFR/BWP contains the SIB1 initial BWP. We think it is then reasonable to assume that the UE simply keeps its Case E CFR/BWP frequency window and receive both RRC messages via SIB1 initial BWP and broadcast via the broadcast CFR/BWP in that case. When the RRC configuration is completed, the broadcast CFR will be a CFR on the active BWP, similar to multicast.  iv) We agree. We wish however to point out that such service interruption is likely to be very short and not to occur very frequently.  We think the details of the signaling can be left to RAN2, but RAN1 needs to agree on the conceptual framework of BWPs and CFRs, including the question about which BWP is used to receive broadcast in RRC Inactive/Idle. With legacy, only the CORESET#0 initial BWP exists in RRC Inactive/Idle. So the BWP needs to be defined for all cases C, D and E. For Cases C/D, we think the BWP to be used in RRC Inactive/Idle is not the initial BWP (which should remain to be the CORESET”0 initial BWP) but another BWP, which has the same frequency range as that of SIB1-configured initial BWP, but logically is another BWP than this, since SIB1-configured initial BWP only exists in RRC Connected. |
| Qualcomm | a. Yes  b. Yes  c: see comment on BWP switching  d: naming issue and detailed configuration can be left to RAN3, but better to achieve consensus in RAN1 first on fundamental UE behaviour.  Reply to Lenovo’s comment:  (1) Unclear motivation  Clear motivation has been discussed in SA4. 5G Media Streaming will be supported in 5G MBS according to our SA4 Rel-17 work item 5MBUSA (TR 26.802). The typical streaming/broadcast video/audio/VR bitrates have been discussed in SA4 and specified in TR 26.925. For example, HD A/V streaming ~12Mbps, UHD ~80Mbps and 360 VR: ~80 Mbps. One stream is already very high and if you put a few programs together (e.g., 5 or 10 of them), the bit rate will be increased even more.  The SIB1-configured initial BWP is used for legacy UE without MBS, which does not consider the new requirement of 5G MBS. To bound CFR always same as SIB1-configured initial BWP is not preferred. It is unreasonable to configure very large SIB1-configured initial BWP for UEs who only requires SIB/paging and basic unicast RRC configuration.  (2) Unsupportive for UEs with small bandwidth  Thanks for bringing this up. That is one reason for network to consider different CFRs for different types of UEs, e.g., RedCap and non-RedCap UE with different service reception. You may want to watch HD videos on your smart phone, but not on your smart watch. The network can configure different CFRs. It does not make sense to limit the gNB scheduling by only configuring the CFR no larger than SIB1-configured initial BWP. From UE point of view, it is not mandatory for UEs to monitor all the CFRs and receive all the broadcast services. The UE can choose to monitor only one CFR for MTCH, which is up to UE implementation.  (3) BWP switching and (4) Spec impact  For the new Rel-17 MBS UEs, we are discussing the UE behaviour. The first active BWP is to be defined. We don’t understand the Lenovo’s logic here “when UE enters connected mode, it should use the SIB-1 configured BWP instead of the MBS-specific BWP so that it may miss the MBS transmission in the MBS-specific BWP.”.  We think Case E/D/C has similar spec impact, where IDLE/INACTIVE UEs receive broadcast services in the CFR larger than CORESET0. After joining the CONNECTED mode, the UE keep staying on the larger BWP between CFR and SIB1-configired initial BWP. There is no retuning, no BWP switching and no service interruption.  Regarding CMCC’s comment  Our understanding is that network does not know the broadcast service interests (as you said, it is optional for better network configuration) when configuring CFRs. But the network is aware of MBS UE/non-MBS UE when registration/accessing network, similar as RedCap/non-RedCap UE, which can be used for network to configure first active BWP. |
| Moderator | Thanks all for the comments. There is different understanding for some of the statements regarding potential service interruption/loss/continuity during the transition from RRC idle/inactive to RRC connected UE states. It will be good to get better common understanding. Some comments and questions per company. **Pease check and comment**.  @ Intel: thanks for comments. One question, for the statements listed in c) do you agree with the assessment? it would be good to understand to check company understanding.  @Nokia, vivo, Mediatek, Apple: thanks for comments. Regarding c)   1. I am not sure I completely understand. The issue I am trying to highlight is that because the frequency range of case D is smaller than the frequency range of the BWP that will become active at RRC connected, the UE will need to physically change the frequency range, which would require some time. This physical change may cause an interruption in the service. 2. I understand that this case may only happen if the gNB would not provide a proper configuration. 3. agree 4. same as i), my understanding is that the UE will need to physically change the frequency range which may cause interruption. Whether it causes interruption or not would depend on the time it takes to change the frequency range.   @Lenovo: thanks for detail comments.Regarding your comment: “For a UE in idle mode or inactive mode, it shall receive the SIB and paging in CORESET 0 defined initial DL BWP. Since Case E is configured with larger bandwidth than CORESET 0, the UE has to perform BWP switching frequently to receive SIB/paging and MBS*.*”  As per discussion in the FL summary on *a) BWP switching for Case D and Case E with RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE states*: “As discussed in [Huawei, Ericsson] since both Case D and Case E contain the frequency resources of CORESET#0 (and share SCS and CP) the UE can receive both MBS broadcast transmissions and SIB/Paging transmissions without BWP switching. This is similar to legacy behaviour in NR where RRC connected UEs are expected to monitor System Information and paging in the Initial BWP in parallel with receiving unicast data, provided the Initial BWP is fully contained within the active BWP.” Do you agree?  Regarding your comment to **c) iii**. (“*the motivation is not clear. Seems the proposal talks about connected mode UE behaviors*”) this statement is trying to describe the situation as follows: a UE in RRC idle/inactive is configured with Case E (where frequency range of CFR is larger than SIB-1 conf initial BWP). Then the UE transits to connected state where the active BWP in the connected state has a CFR region with a frequency rage that coincides with the frequency range of the CFR used in idle/inactive. The argument is therefore there is no interruption since the UE does not need to physically change the frequency range. (Although I see per your figure in your comment that you do not agree and that you argue that the UE needs to pass through the SIB-1 conf initial BWP first. **However**, can you please check whether you agree with the comment from Ericsson above on this? reproduced here for convenience (“We agree. Before the active BWP has been RRC configured the UE will, for a very short time, use the SIB1 configured initial BWP for RRC messages. For the mentioned case the broadcast CFR/BWP contains the SIB1 initial BWP. We think it is then reasonable to assume that the UE simply keeps its Case E CFR/BWP frequency window and receive both RRC messages via SIB1 initial BWP and broadcast via the broadcast CFR/BWP in that case. When the RRC configuration is completed, the broadcast CFR will be a CFR on the active BWP, similar to multicast”)  @Spreadtrum: thanks for comments. Regarding your comment on high bit rates needed, some contributions have explained that there could be services that transmit e.g., video with high bit rate.  @OPPO: thanks for the clarification, which I think it makes the proposal clearer. I think we should include your clarification.  Regarding your question on c) iii. whether the BWP for RRC connected UEs is activated by RRC signaling of SIB1, I am not sure. could you explain the implications of each alternative? I have provided more clarifying comments on this statement in my reply to Lenovo, if you can check that as well, please – thanks!  @Xiaomi: regarding your comment on b). Let me provide more comments. As I understand the situation companies are trying to put is as follows: let’s say that a gNB has configured the SIB-1 configured initial BWP as 50 MHz for Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs in RRC connected. However, now the gNB would like start a service for idle/inactive UEs that requires 100MHz bandwidth with case C. The gNB would change the frequency range of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP to accommodate the requirements of the broadcast service for idle/inactive UEs. However, that change of frequency range for the SIB-1 configured initial BWP, would also be applied by the Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs in connected state that are not receiving the MBS broadcast service. What do you think?  @CMCC: thanks for the comment. Regarding your detailed comments on b). I am not sure I see the issue you are presenting. Let me elaborate and please let me know if you agree. Let’s say that a UE is configured with Case E where the frequency resources of the CFR are larger than the frequency resources of the SIB-1 conf initial BWP. The gNB does know that idle/inactive UEs are configured with Case E and its frequency range. When the UE transits to connected, it already knows the frequency resources of the CFR of idle/inactive UEs since it is the gNB who configures it. I do not understand why the UE would need to report any information about the configuration in idle/inactive UE state. Could you please clarify?  Regarding c) i. Since the frequency resources of the CFR with case D are different to the frequency resources of the SIB-1 conf initial BWP there will be a physical change of the frequency range, which will take some time. the argument is that it may cause some interruption due to the time it takes the UE to change physically the frequency range. What do you think?  @Ericsson: thanks for detailed comments. I think one important point to clarify between companies is whether there is a common understanding on c).iii. Your comment discusses the issue raised in Lenovo’s figure. Let’s check companies comments.  @Qualcomm: thanks for detailed comments. The discussion on potential interruption is only during the transition from idle to connected. I agree that once in connected if the active BWP containing the SIB-1 conf initial BWP and also containing the CFR does not require BWP switching. |
| Lenovo 2 | Reply to Qualcomm:  (1) Unclear motivation  Thanks for sharing SA4 progress. I wonder such high data rate is supported for CONNECTED Mode UEs only or for both Idle/Inactive UEs and connected UEs?  [QC2] If you pay attention to the title ‘5.1 Typical streaming/**broadcast** video and audio bitrates’ and ‘5.2 Typical streaming/**broadcast** 360 VR bitrates’, it clearly mentions ‘broadcast’, which we think it is not limited to CONN UEs only.  (2) Unsupportive for UEs with small bandwidth  Since network can’t know the bandwidth capabilities and types of the receiving UEs, do you assume the network configure multiple CFRs for multiple possible bandwidth capabilities and UE types?  [QC2] NR has been developed to consider multiple vertical applications with different UE types and service requirement. We think it is possible for network to configure different BWs/CFRs for variant types of UEs. But it does not mean UE needs to report UE capability to gNB in IDLE/INACTIVE mode. Variant ways for network to know some level of UE types/capabilities, e.g., when registration or when CONN mode before.  (4) Spec impact  The legacy UE behavior is when UE enters connected mode, it should use the SIB-1 configured BWP as active BWP. For Case E, if Qualcomm intend to change the definition of first active BWP, that is spec impact and may need to be discussed in RAN2. Furthermore, according to legacy BWP framework, the first active BWP is configured via dedicated RRC signaling. If first active BWP is configured for idle/inactive UE, spec impact on broadcast signaling for configuration is inevitable, which may also need RAN2 work.  [QC2] Of course, RAN2 needs to do some work. This is what we are discussing. We are not intending to change any definition: CORESET0 is for SIB/paging, SIB-1 configured initial BWP for legacy CONN UEs. The Case E/C/D with CFR size larger than CORESET0 has same spec impact, i.e., the IDLE/INACTIVE MBS UEs monitor a BWP/CFR larger than CORESET0 for broadcast transmission but no impact on SIB1/paging in CORESET0. When joining to CONN mode, UEs can keep monitor the BWP, which is the larger one between BWP/CFR and SIB1-configured initial BWP, for broadcast reception.  Additional spec impact as mentioned in our contribution is listed below:  In Case E, how can gNB know an idle/inactive mode UE needs to be configured with an MBS-specific BWP with larger bandwidth than SIB-1 configured BWP as the first active BWP for the UE?  In addition, when a UE in connected mode and BWP inactivity timer expires, according to current BWP framework, the UE shall fallback to the default BWP and the default BWP is SIB-1 configured BWP if not configured. Since the MBS-specific BWP is configured with larger bandwidth than SIB-1 configured BWP, UE may miss the MBS transmission during the fallback procedure. Do you intend to change the fallback behavior of UE?  [QC2] Again, no intention to change any fallback behavior. However, the default BWP is not fixed as SIB1-configured BWP. Even for legacy UEs, default BWP is configurable. What is the problem for MBS UEs to have a default BWP to be configured as BWP/CFR for broadcast reception? |
| Xiaomi2 | Thanks FL’s reply. Echo from our side:  We understand the ‘purpose’ and the example provided by FL. There is no problem for legacy UEs to support 100 MHz, right? For legacy UE, what the initial DL BWP exactly looks like totally depends on gNB’s decision. If gNB configures a 100 MHz initial DL BWP, legacy UE should respect this configuration. I don’t see anything broken. People keep arguing that gNB has to do this or cannot do that. I can also raise a question that how can a gNB know what is the proper configuration for initial DL BWP for legacy UE? Indeed, it is fully depends on operator’s interests when we discuss the initial DL BWP in Rel-15. The SIB1-configured initial DL BWP is introduced for supporting a unified BWP for all the UE from operator’s perspective.  The point is, if there is really an issue for legacy UE to support a larger initial DL BWP, case E is of course should be supported. However, I am sorry to say there is no issue for legacy UE not supporting case E as nothing is broken.  We even try to understand or compromise to case E from performance point of view or flexibility point of view. But the performance can be guarantee by either Case A(with a larger CORESET#0) or Case D(with a larger initial DL BWP) even considering the HD vedio. Enough or even redundant flexibility has already been achieved with the combination of case A, case C and case D.  I would like to remind that the objective included in WID for IDLE/INACTIVE enhancement is to support basic functionality for IDLE/INACTIVE UE MBS. With case A/C/D, what’s the problem for supporting basic functionality? Case E is at most an optimization and definitely not essential, let alone there are many technical concerns from companies. |
| NOKIA/NSB | @FL, please find our further reply in blow:  Regarding:  “   1. *I am not sure I completely understand. The issue I am trying to highlight is that because the frequency range of case D is smaller than the frequency range of the BWP that will become active at RRC connected, the UE will need to physically change the frequency range, which would require some time. This physical change may cause an interruption in the service.* 2. *same as i), my understanding is that the UE will need to physically change the frequency range which may cause interruption. Whether it causes interruption or not would depend on the time it takes to change the frequency range.*   “  Our point is that, this is not the specifical issue for Case D/E as raised here. Similarly, as agreed Case A with CORESET#0 as broadcast CFR for idle/inactive UEs, if UE in RRC connected state uses a wider active BWP, i.e. with SIB-1 configured BWP, the same transition behaviour as here described in i) and iv). |
| vivo 2 | Regarding c iii, we agree that in case E UE can keep RF bandwidth to the CFR between transition from RRC IDLE/INACTIVE and RRC CONNECTED states before first active BWP is configured by RRC signalling. Please also note that both RRC signalling and broadcast services can be received with CFR containing SIB-1 configured initial downlink BWP.  As for the broadcast service interruption for UEs changing frequency resources, we understand that it is common for case A, C, D, E if the first active BWP is larger than the CFR configured in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE. |
| OPPO 2 | @FL, Thank you very much for the kindly reply.  Regarding c) iii, the scenario described in this sub-bullet can be displayed as following figure, if my understanding is correct based on your explanation to Lenovo on it. From the perspective of CFR frequency resources and range, there is no change when UE transits from RRC\_IDLE to RRC\_CONN. But from the perspective of UE, a BWP (e.g. BWP-2) can be optionally configured by RRC signalling and BWP-2 is different from SIB1 configured initial BWP. When UE get into RRC\_CONN state, UE have to switch from the CFR to BWP-2, for which CFR for RRC\_IDLE and BWP-2 have different frequency range. To make sure the continuity of broadcast reception, some UEs have to configured by RRC signalling with a BWP containing a CFR equal to the CFR in RRC\_IDLE. This would be restricted. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | 1. **YES**    1. **We think the description of Case-E need updating as below:**   **Case-E allows to independently configure a CFR with larger frequency resources than the frequency resources of the initial DL BWP where the initial DL BWP is equal to CORESET 0 or the SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP.**   * 1. **YES**   **But we think there exist two kinds of CFR**   * **CFR is equal to initial DL BWP where the initial DL BWP is equal to CORESET 0 or the SIB1 configured initial DL BWP.** * **CFR is larger than the initial DL BWP**   **There’s no need to define CASE D which is smaller than the initial DL BWP.**   * 1. **YES**   2. **YES**   3. **YES**  1. **It’s better to give a suggestion for configuring CASE E to RAN2.** |
| CMCC | @FL, thanks for the reply. Please find our elaboration.  It is up to UE’s implementation to receive broadcast service or not, that is to say, even for a MBS-capable UE it can not receive the broadcast services at all. From gNB’s perspective, it doesn’t know whether there is IDLE/INACTIVE UE to receive the broadcast service. Thus, for a MBS-capable UE, if it doesn’t want to receive the broadcast service, it will not receive or ignore the SIB used to configure MCCH(including the configuration of case E), and only takes CORESET#0 as the frequency resource. It is not correct to say “*When the UE transits to connected, it already knows the frequency resources of the CFR of idle/inactive UEs since it is the gNB who configures it.* ”. The truth is that gNB doesn’t know whether a IDLE/INATCIVE UE’ s actual working frequency resource.  @Qualcomm, thanks for the reply. The MBS case is different from RedCap case, which the maximum BW is restricted by 20MHz for all RedCap UEs and if gNB wants to serve RedCap UEs, it must configure an active BWP not larger than 20MHz. But for MBS UE, as I said above, whether to receive the broadcast service is up to UE’s implementation. Your solution is always configuring the first active BWP to cover the CFR frequency resources of Case E, but it makes no sense and causes power consumption for a MBS-capable UE which not receive broadcast service because the frequency range of SIB1 configured initial DL BWP as the first active BWP is enough .  [QC2] Fully agree that “whether to receive the broadcast service is up to UE’s implementation”. Actually, we don’t think broadcast service continuity should be an issue to discuss. But we try to explain if the UEs monitor the BWP/CFR for broadcast in IDLE/INACTIVE state, there will be no service interruption if UE keep monitor the same BWP/CFR for broadcast reception. And now you care about the power consumption for MBS-capable UEs. But if we does not support Case E, it means SIB1-configured initial BWP for non-MBS UEs has to be always large enough, which is unfair for non-MBS UEs’ power consumption. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Regarding the below query from Lenovo and other companies, please refer to our RAN2 Tdoc R2-2107981 for detail discussions in Observation 1-3 and Proposal-2.  “*In Case E, how can gNB know an idle/inactive mode UE needs to be configured with an MBS-specific BWP with larger bandwidth than SIB-1 configured BWP as the first active BWP for the UE?*”  In short, to solve this issue, an indication can be carried in the *RRCSetupRequest* and *RRCResumeRequest* that informs and allows the network to configure the UEs’ dedicated BWP to confine the Case E/D CFR correctly from the beginning.  So our point is that this issue can be solved based on RAN2 discussions. |
| ZTE | Just to reply to some heat discussion above.  Regarding “Unsupportive for UEs with small bandwidth”, @Lenovo, if follow your logic, Rel-15 system doesn’t work since network doesn’t know UE’s bandwidth capability in IDLE, then how can network configure the bandwidth for Rel-15 UEs in IDLE for both DL and UL. We have already clarified this issue, the Case E CFR/BWP bandwidth has to be the values that can be accepted by UEs. For example, some bands require 100MHz as the mandatory BW.  Regarding “how to differentiate UEs receiving MBS or not”, @Lenovo, @CMCC, based on our understanding, broadcast interest reporting can address this issue. If UE wants to have a larger bandwidth part to receive broadcast (if the network is currently applying Case E), it needs to report its interested programs. Furthermore, the issue is the also common to Case C and Case D. The first active BWP can be configured by network. It is not mandatory to be the same as initial DL BWP. For Case C and Case D, how can network know which UE needs a first active BWP the same as SIB-1 initial BWP (Case C) and which UE needs a first active BWP that should at least larger than the its CFR that is > CORESET#0 and < SIB-1 initial BWP (Case D). I don’t understand why companies keep arguing this is an issue only for Case E but not for Case C and Case D.  Regarding the default BWP, @Lenovo, the default BWP can be configured by network appropriately. This is totally an implementation issue. Not sure why you claim this as specification impact. |
| Lenovo 3 | @Moderator:   1. Regarding your first question, the answer is Yes. 2. Regarding your second question, there will be BWP switching issue since the first active BWP can’t cover the CFR in case E due to gNB can’t know whether the idle mode UE needs to a larger size CFR than SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP. To inform gNB a lager size CFR is needed, then the idle mode UE should enter connected mode. In that sense, why can’t it stay at connected mode to get high data rate service? Why should it fallback to idle mode?   @Nokia:  Regarding your comment “*In short, to solve this issue, an indication can be carried in the RRCSetupRequest and RRCResumeRequest that informs and allows the network to configure the UEs’ dedicated BWP to confine the Case E/D CFR correctly from the beginning.”*, if I understand it correctly, it implies UE should enter RRC connected mode then inform the network to configure the dedicated BWP to confine the Case E/D CFR. Seemingly, it is behaviour of connected mode UEs. However, we are talking about the CFR configuration for idle/inactive mode UEs. For idle mode UE, it is impossible for the UE to do that.  @ZTE:  I don’t fully understand your question of “*how can network configure the bandwidth for Rel-15 UEs in IDLE for both DL and UL*?”. Actually, my understanding is the bandwidth for Rel-15 idle mode UE can not configured by network.  [ZTE response2] Network of course can configure bandwidth for IDLE UE, the UL bandwidth is configured by SIB-1. Network can also choose some of the candidate bandwidths for DL for CORESET#0 and for the SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP, but not all. RAN1 has previously discussed this issue.  In addition, your comment of “*Regarding “how to differentiate UEs receiving MBS or not”, @Lenovo, @CMCC, based on our understanding, broadcast interest reporting can address this issue. If UE wants to have a larger bandwidth part to receive broadcast (if the network is currently applying Case E), it needs to report its interested programs.”* is confusing. How can idle UE report the interest indication to network? Should it enter connected mode firstly? If yes, why cann’t it stay at connected mode to get high data rate service? Why should it fallback to idle mode?  [ZTE response2] UE can report its MBS interests once it enters RRC\_CONNECTED. It seems you twisted the question. In IDLE state, network can configure Case E and network doesn’t need to know which UE receives MBS or not. If one UE needs receive unicast, this UE needs to enter RRC\_CONNECTED. In this case, network needs to know whether UE receives broadcast or now. That’s why in this case we need MBS interest report.  Besides, could you reply to my previous comment “*Furthermore, the issue is the also common to Case C and Case D . .. I don’t understand why companies keep arguing this is an issue only for Case E but not for Case C and Case D*”? Thanks.  Regarding default BWP, it is not pure implementation issue. It is relevant to network configuration. When timer expires, the connected mode UE fallback to default BWP which is lower than CFR in Case E, then it may miss the MBS transmission.  [ZTE response2] This issue has been clarified by lots of companies. I don’t think network will do such a silly configuration. |
| MediaTek | Regarding the interruption/loss issue in c), we think these issues can be avoided by NW implementation and it is not the reason to extend the discussion of CFR for broadcast reception, e.g., gNB can ensure the CFR for broadcast is equal to the first active BWP when UE changes from RRC\_IDLE/INACTVIE state to RRC\_CONNECTED state. Besides, the issue is common to case C/D/E if gNB doesn’t configure the proper CFR or first active BWP. I am confused why do we need to get stuck into the discussion about c)?  For the CFR configuration for MBS broadcast, it should minimize the impact to legacy UE’s capability. Since SIB-1 configured initial BWP is common to all UEs within the same serving cell and the SIB-1 configured initial BWP will impact the legacy UE’s capability as described following:   |  | | --- | | The NW has the possibility to configure a UE specific channel bandwidth as well as UE specific BWPs. But to be able to do that, the UE must at least support a channel bandwdith which is ...   * equal to or smaller than the carrier bandwidth indicated in SIB1 and * equal to or larger than the bandwidth of the initial BWP. |   If the bandwidth of initial BWP is changed due to introducing the MBS services, it also will affect the legacy UEs’s capability. Therefore, we suggest to the discussion for the CFR should be decoupled with SIB-1 configured initial BWP. |
| Ericsson | For the case c:iii (broadcast CFR have the same size as active BWP but SIB1 initial BWP is smaller) it seems clear that there is no *technical difficulty* for the UE to keep the frequency window constant at the transition from RRC Inactive/Idle to RRC Connected. The question is how to formalize this.  We do not think that a new type of initial BWP should be specified for broadcast UEs in RRC Connected (replacing the SIB1-connfigured initial BWP), since with also legacy UEs in the cell two different initial BWPs would then need to be used in parallel, which is not desirable. It is better to keep the legacy framework for initial BWP as it is, but with additional requirements for broadcast UEs that enter RRC Connected.  We suggest that the UE is expected to continue to use its configured broadcast CFR/BWP until RRC configuration of BWPs is finalized. After this, the UE applies one of the RRC configured BWPs as the active BWP and the broadcast CFR is then a CFR on that active BWP, similar to multicast CFR. If the active BWP has the same frequency resources as the broadcast CFR seamless broadcast reception should be possible during the transition.  This means that for the UE, the broadcast BWP exists in parallel with the SIB1 initial BWP during the short phase where the UE is in RRC Connected but still not with RRC configured BWPs. During this short phase, the UE is expected to receive both the broadcast CFR/BWP and data transmitted on the SIB1-configured initial BWP. This data would typically be limited to RRC signaling.  Regarding the question of how the gNB could *know* which active BWP to use for the UE to enable seamless transition, this is of course no issue when there is only a single broadcast CFR/BWP used, which is likely to be a typical case. If the UE has previously been in RRC Connected, it can have provided an expression of interest for the broadcast service, which makes the gNB aware of this.  To solve the more general case, when there are multiple broadcast CFRs/BWPs, the problem of letting the gNB know which broadcast CFR the UE is currently receiving could be solved as part of RRC procedures and be specified by RAN2.  There are also potential interruption scenarios with all the broadcast cases A, C, D, E when the active BWP needs to be wider than the BWP/CFR used for broadcast. Finally, it is wort commenting that for many services a very short interruption is not an issue. |
| NOKIA/NSB 4 | @Lenovo:  Regarding your reply “*if I understand it correctly, it implies UE should enter RRC connected mode then inform the network to configure the dedicated BWP to confine the Case E/D CFR. Seemingly, it is behaviour of connected mode UEs. However, we are talking about the CFR configuration for idle/inactive mode UEs. For idle mode UE, it is impossible for the UE to do that.*”  It is the UE in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state sending the indication via *RRCSetupRequest* and *RRCResumeRequest*, and please note that the UE enters RRC\_CONNECTED state only after it performed cell group configuration and bearer configuration received in *RRCSetup*.  So the thing that we want to point out here is that, the query regarding “*how can gNB know an idle/inactive mode UE needs to be configured with an MBS-specific BWP with larger bandwidth than SIB-1 configured BWP as the first active BWP for the UE*” can be solved, and it is not the key issue that Case E/D cannot be supported. The spec impact added on top is also minor that can be discussed further by RAN2. |
| vivo 4 | @ Xiaomi  We understand that the CFR to be configured here serves for R17 broadcast services and we don’t expect it impacts legacy UE, which will cause poor backward compatibility.  We agree that network/operator can configure CFR and initial downlink BWP based its rule.  However, we don’t see the benefit to mix two parts with different targets together (one targets for UE in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, the other one only be valid for UE in RRC CONNECTED), as a solution derived by taking union set of two components will definitely have impacts on each individual component.  Case E provides the flexibility to configure them separately. And by going through the replies from companies, no critical issues are observed to support case E over supporting A/C/D.  @OPPO  It doesn’t have to be restricted to the size of CFR. We believe short interruption of broadcast services is not a serious issue deserving our effort.  Actually, interruption of broadcast services also happens in case A/C/D when the frequency range of first active BWP is larger than that of CFR, since first active BWP is configurable. |
| ZTE | Add our response (tagged with [ZTE response2]) to Lenovo 3 above. |
| Ericsson | We will comment directly on the reflector and in a later version |
| Futurewei | a - Support  b – The question as framed is not about the motivation of Case E but rather the impact/effects is Case E is supported. The motivation for Case E is still open for debate.  c – It is true in general in our view.  d – We don’t think pushing it to RAN2 to decide is the right to do now. Functionality is up to RAN1 and the signalling details after the functionality has been agreed is up to RAN2. In our case, we are still very much debating the functionality. |
| Ericsson2 | Regarding the CFR cases (A, C, D, E), the aspect of seamless transition has been raised for UEs receiving broadcast and going from RRC Inactive/Idle to RRC Connected.  There have been two types of questions:   1. Whether there is a service interruption due to a change of bandwidth 2. How the gNB could know the CFR of the broadcast the UE is currently receiving when configuring the active BWP, so that the BW is the same and seamless transition is ensured   The reason for the questions is that there could possibly be differences between the Cases, and this could be used in the selection of cases to be agreed (Case D only, Case E only or Case D and Case E).  Regarding the first question, the following applies for the cases C/D/E:  Case C: With Case C, the same CFR/BWP, based on SIB1-configured initial BWP, is used all the time, so no issue with service interruption, provided the active BWP is the same as the SIB-configured initial BWP.  This is however not always the case, e.g. if a narrowband broadcast is transmitted. With Case C, it may then be natural to use a SIB1-configured initial BWP that matches the narrow service BW, to allow for power saving. However, when entering RRC Connected the BW needs to be changed to the wider active BWP, potentially covering 100 MHz, so service interruption will then occur with Case C .  Case D: With Case D, there will always be a service interruption since the UE will need to change its frequency window from the (smaller) CFR to the (wider) SIB1-configured BWP when going to RRC Connected. Theoretically, the UE could use the wider frequency window of SIB1-configured BWP also when receiving the more narrowband broadcast. With this the transition to SIB1-configured initial BWP in RRC Connected could be seamless, but with this the whole point of using Case D would be lost, since it is then no more possible to have the power saving gain of the lower bandwidth of the CFR. If the frequency window is anyway kept the same as the SIB1-configured initial BWP all the time, then there is no difference from Case C. Case D would be like Case C with data being scheduled within a sub-portion, which is of no gain.  Case E (when BWP is larger than SIB1): If the network configures an active BWP with the same size as the Case E CFR/BWP, the UE could keep this CFR/BWP size all the time and experience no service interruption when going to RRC Connected. There is a very short period (few hundred ms?) after RRC connection establishment, when the SIB1-configured initial BWP becomes valid to use, and before the UE has an RRC configured active BWP. During that period the UE logically receives RRC signaling data on the smaller SIB1-configured initial BWP. But there is no reason for the UE to make a real BWP switch from the Case E CFR/BWP, so there is no need for service interruption.  Regarding the second question:  The question assumes that there can be different CFRs/BWPs being broadcast in the same cell.  For service continuity it is the BW of MTCH that matters. Currently there is no RAN1 agreement to have more than one CFR for MTCH and many companies are against having more than this. It is therefore questionable whether the standard will allow more than one CFR for MTCH to be transmitted in a cell.  Furthermore, with Case C it is not even *possible* to have more than one CFR, since Case C is defined by the cell-specific (same for all UEs in the cell) SIB1-configured initial BWP. With Case C therefore all UEs use the same (single) CFR.  With Case D, there will anyway always be a service interruption (see above), so it is not so important to analyze Case D in this respect.  With Case E there is nothing that would prevent the support of multiple CFRs/BWPs for MTCH, since Case E does not rely on the SIB1-configured initial BWP. The standard could therefore possibly allow the configuration of multiple CFRs/BWPs for Case E CFRs/BWPs.  With this, there would indeed be some uncertainty for the network to know which CFR/BWP is used by the UE. However, this should not be seen as a drawback of Case E, but rather a feature, compared to Case C.  If this is supported by the standard it is still possible to support just one Case E CFR/BWP in a given implementation. With this there is no issue of service interruption.  As mentioned by others, even with multiple CFRs/BVWPs, there can be solutions how to inform the network about which BW is used, so transition can be seamless also in such cases.  As is clear from the argumentation above, Case E does not imply any issues with respect to service continuity more than Case C and certainly less than Case D when a single CFR/BWP is used.  From Ericsson, we do not see the need to support more then one CFR for MTCH and with that there is no difference between Case C and E with respect to service continuity – the network will know which CFR/BWP is used, since this is the only one.  If multiple CFRs/BWPs are anyway supported with Case E (and perhaps with Case D) the seamless transition can either be solved or, in any case, Case E is not worse than Case D.  And with Case C is it is not even possible to have multiple CFRs/BWPs! |
| Moderator | Thanks for all the comments and discussion and responding to my earlier comments.  Before providing a summary of the discussion and a way forward I would like to highlight that our goal is to select between the following three possible outcomes: Case D (only), Case E (only), or Case D and Case E.  **Discussion on potential service interruptions due to frequency range change**  There has been discussion about potential interruption due to a frequency range change when a UE changes from RRC idle/inactive state to RRC connected state. It is clear that there is frequency range change when the active BWP in RRC connected state has a frequency range that is larger than the frequency range of the CFR used during RRC idle/inactive state. We had initially been discussing this aspect for cases under down-selection (Case D&E). However, this potential service interruption could also happen for other cases such as Case A and Case C. Therefore, whether there is frequency range change or not is less relevant to conclude on the down-selection of Case D and E. Hence, it has been suggesting by multiple companies it is better move on the discussion on the configuration of active BWP in RRC connected to receive MBS broadcast CFR.  **Discussion on the configuration of active BWP in RRC\_CONNECTED state to receive MBS broadcast CFR**  This discussion has been triggered by the following question: *To configure the active BWP in RRC\_CONNECTED UE state, how does a gNB know the frequency range of the configured CFR used by the RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE*?  In what follows, I am assuming that there is only one possible bandwidth configuration of CFR.  The issue is that even for MBS capably UEs, the UE may or may not be receiving the broadcast service being transmitted in the cell by the gNB. Then, when the gNB needs to configure the active BWP, it does not know whether the UE (transitioning from idle/inactive to connected) whether it was receiving or not the MBS broadcast service. The solution proposed by companies is that the UE during the connection process can inform the gNB that is receiving the MBS broadcast service and therefore the gNB can know the adequate frequency range to configure the active BWP.  Based on the discussion, I understand that it seems that this notification from the UE to the gNB to inform whether it is receiving the broadcast service would be needed for both cases under discussion, i.e., Case D and Case E. Next, I detail a possible sequence of steps for each case based on the explanations form companies.  For case D, a simplified sequence would be as follows:   1. UE in RRC idle/inactive receiving broadcast service in Case D CFR. 2. UE wants to change to RRC connected state (e.g., also wants unicast). 3. UE changes (increases) the frequency range to that of SIB-1 conf initial BWP and UE receives SIB-1 conf initial BWP 4. After gNB has been notified that this UE is receiving the broadcast service, gNB activates a BWP that has a frequency range with the same size as Case D (frequency range is made smaller)   For case E, a simplified sequence would be as follows:   1. UE in RRC idle/inactive receiving broadcast service in Case E CFR. 2. UE wants to change to RRC connected state (e.g., also wants unicast). 3. UE does not need to change the frequency range and can receive the SIB-1 conf initial BWP. 4. After gNB has been notified that this UE is receiving the broadcast service, gNB activates a BWP that has a frequency range with the same size as Case E     Based on this discussion, for both Case D and Case E the configuration seems (apparently) similar. I would welcome your inputs to check whether this analysis is correct or not, – thank you.  Since we need to start discussing the final down-selection, the following proposal for your consideration is put for discussion. This is based on the discussion above. Regarding support, I do not think there an outcome (Case D (only), Case E (only), or Case D and Case E) that has consensus at this stage. Regarding the initial proposal 2.1-1, it does not seem for the moment that is worth discussing at this time. |

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

**Proposal 2.1-2**: For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.

* Support Case D and Case E.
* Note: details on the signalling on the implementation of case D and Case E are up to RAN2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| OPPO | We cannot support both cases together. If one case has to be selected, it would be case D but not E.  The commonality is analysed and explained by companies, however, case C and case E are still two different design on the CFR in RRC\_IDLE and have different impact on UEs while transition from IDLE to CONN. For case C, the CFR in RRC\_IDLE is configured by considering both SIB1 config initial BWP and broadcast reception. But for case E, the CFR in RRC\_IDLE is configured by only considering broadcast reception, and besides, another larger size BWP rather than SIB1 config initial BWP by RRC should be configured to make sure the issues introduced by this case to be solved without impact on the agreed design in RRC-CONN. So the activated BWP in CONN is trying to accommodate broadcast reception while unicast reception may only supposed to be configured with a narrow band frequency. Furthermore, since there is already agreed case A and case C, supporting extra case, considered as optimization, by introducing additional issues that need effort to be solved is not acceptable at this stage. |
| Xiaomi | Same position as OPPO.  After back and forth discussion, more and more companies admit that case E is an optimization. If so, why case E should be supported? The argument for case E is listed below:   1. Avoid to introduce impacts on legacy UEs.   It is not true. No new requirements are introduced for legacy UEs without case E. For a specific band, legacy UE needs to support the maximum number of the band. The initial DL BWP is totally up to gNB implementation. gNB has no idea on the UE capability when it configures initial DL BWP. On the other hand, case E will impacts the legacy UE. As gNB doesn’t know which UE supports MBS, i.e. which UEs are configured with a MBS-BWP larger than initial DL BWP, it has to configure a large first active BWP for all the UEs in order to guarantee the service continuity. This is definitely not expected for legacy UEs.  Furthermore, case E introduces more issues on how to select the initial DL BWP when UE transit into RRC CONNECTED. For MBS UE, there are actually two initial DL BWP, i.e. SIB1-configured initial DL BWP and MBS-specific initial DL BWP. It is not clear how MBS UE should make a decision. Some companies propose that MBS UE enters MBS-specific BWP and legacy UE enters SIB1-configured initial DL BWP. It is different from the current mechanism and needs further discussion. On the other hand, gNB has to maintain two initial DL BWP, which will complicate scheduling.   1. Supporting high data rate   It can already be supported by case A or case C.   1. Power saving   Not true. For UE in IDLE/INACTIVE state, there is no issue as it is totally same as Rel-15/16 behaviour. I would like mention that legacy UE can only receive data within the frequency range equalling to CORESET#0 before it enters CONNECTED mode. During CONNECTED mode, there are plenty tools to improve the power consumption, e.g. WUS, dormancy, BWP switching. I don’t see any point on power saving.  Beside the above technical argument, I don’t understand why power saving is one of the reasoning behind case E. It is clearly out of scope of Rel-17 MBS WI.   1. Flexibility   Not true. Flexibility can already be achieved by case A/C/D.   1. Case E is a basic functionality   Not correct. If MBS doesn’t work without case E, we would be very happy to agree with this argue. However, the truth is that MBS works very well with case A/C/D for IDLE/INACTIVE UE. I am wondering why some companies insist case E is a basic functionality.  Case E is a parallel solutions with case A/case C/case D. It definitely needs more standard effort. Considering the above analyses, we don’t support case E. |
| Spreadtrum | Not support case E. Fine with case D.  Thanks all of you for the constructive discussions on CFR for idle/inactive state. Share our views below:  **The motivation of case E:**  After going through all the discussions, the motivations of case E proposed by proponents of case E includes the following. Our understanding also added inline.   1. Target the use case of high data rate, e.g, HD A/V streaming ~12Mbps, UHD ~80Mbps and 360 VR: ~80 Mbps  * However, if we see the WID, you will find the target use cases for Rel-17 is Objective A. We are still not clear about which use cases with high data rate must be delivered in idle state.  1. Avoid the congestion between multiple broadcast transmission and SIB/paging/unicast RRC within the SIB1-configured initial BWP  * We think it is not issue. When gNB configures the initial BWP by SIB1, actually it will consider it.  1. Avoid to cause the impact on legacy UE  * Although we think there is no MBS use case with high data rate shall be delivered in idle, but for the discussion on the motivation, we can assume the requirement exist. * People are afraid that legacy UE not supporting MBS will be affected if case E is not supported and case C is configured. For this issue, we have different understanding, if there are wrong, please correct us, thanks!   + In Rel-15, the SIB1 configured initial can be up to 272RBs, and no UE capability. It means **all Rel-15 UEs must be ready** to support initial BWP with larger bandwidth, even up to carrier bandwidth.   + Due to incapable of the differentiation of UE receiving broadcast or not, gNB may configure first active BWP with larger or smaller than or equal to the initial BWP, or not configure. Even so, there would be no behaviour change brought for legacy UEs.     - We are open to discuss this issue, and open to the solution, e.g.,Msg3 carrying MBS interest indication proposed by NOKIA,LG.   + As some companies claim that maybe more power would be costed for legacy UEs due to the enlarged bandwidth to support MBS, we think it belongs to power saving field. For optimizing power cost for legacy UE, many candidate solutions can be considered, e.g., MSG3 carrying MBS interest indication claimed as some company(By this way, gNB would configure first active BWP and default BWP for legacy UEs, then SIB1 configured initial BWP would not be valid), supporting case E where legacy UE only think SIB1 configured initial BWP is initial BWP not BWP configured by case E. With what we have said, the event may not happen, for the reason that the configuration is up to gNB implementation, and broadcast service is not always on.   + In addition, we don’t think case E can solve the power cost issue of legacy UE not supporting MBS. This is because gNB doesn’t distinguish UEs. It may still configure unicast BWP larger or smaller or equal to the BWP configured by case E. In this point, there is no essential difference between case C and case E.   + Thus, in our understanding, we have already case C, and case E is not necessary.   **The spec work of case E and case C:**  Regarding the service interruption, yes, we think it is common for case C and case E.  Regarding the differentiation of UE receiving broadcast or not, yes, it is common for all cases.  But, after all, new BWP is introduced by case E while no for case C. Consequently there will be more spec work for case E, e.g., whether/how to use the BWP configured by case E in RRC connected state.  **Given the above, in our understanding,**   * **In Rel-17 MBS, there seems no requirements to support high date rate in idle state.** * **Even if assuming the requirement exists, case C already can satisfy, and there is no behaviour change for legacy UEs for case C.** * **Case E seems to be one optimization, and is unnecessary when we have already case C.** |
| Ericsson | Support. If only one of Case D and E is to be selected, we prefer Case E.  With the adoption of Cases C, D and E it is quite clear which **CFRs** can be used for broadcast to UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, which is arbitrary CFRs larger than (and containing) the CORESET#0 initial BWP. This provides maximum flexibility, which is very useful.  RAN1 however needs to clarify which **BWP** is used to receive broadcast for UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE. System Information and paging will continue to be transmitted to all UEs (legacy and broadcast) using the CORESET#0 initial BWP. UEs receiving broadcast via Case C, D or E will, in addition, need to receive the broadcast on a wider BWP, which is then not the initial BWP, since there can presumably be only one initial BWP per UE, which also needs to be common for all UEs in the cell due to the broadcast nature of System Information and paging. The BWP for broadcast therefore needs to be configured separately from the CORESET#0 initial BWP for all cases C, D and E.  For Case E, it is entirely clear which BWP is used since with Case E a configured BWP, independent of both CORESET#0 initial BWP and SIB1-configured initial BWP, is used. It is therefore clear that with Case E there is no impact on the initial BWP used in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE.  However, for Case C and D, RAN1 has still not decided which BWP should be used to receive broadcast for UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE.  Case C & D currently just define the **CFR** (used by UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE) to have a relation to the SIB1-configured initial BWP (used by UEs in RRC CONNECTED). It should be noted that the SIB1-configured initial BWP is currently only applicable for UEs in RRC CONNECTED. What is missing is to define the BWP to be used in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE.  Since there is already an initial BWP (CORESET#0) in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, it is not obvious to extend the SIB1-configured BWP to apply also for UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE. That would mean that there are simultaneously two different initial BWPs for UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, which seems illogical and breaks the current initial BWP framework.  To avoid this entire issue, for Case C, the simplest thing would be to use the Case E framework also for Case C, so that the BWP used by UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE would also be considered to be a *configured BWP*, which “happens to” (as a special case) have the same frequency resources as the SIB1-configured initial BWP.  Likewise, for Case D, the Case E framework could be used to create a BWP/CFR that is exactly according to the definition of Case D (which does not say which BWP is used – only defines the relation of the CFR to the SIB1-configured initial BWP for Connected UEs).  With this, the Case D CFR would still be contained within the *frequency resources* of SIB1 configured initial BWP, but the BWP used by UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE would not have this SIB1 size but would have the same size as the CFR.  This means that a unified solution could be specified, covering cases C, D and E, where the CFR and BWP used by UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE *always* have the same size, which may be anything larger than CORESET#0 initial BWP.  With the functionality of Case E in place, it is difficult to see any gain of supporting Case D with a BWP that is *larger* than the CFR, since the whole purpose of Case D is that the UE will anyway adapt its frequency window to match the CFR.  The conclusion is therefore that the broadcast CFR and BWP can always have the same frequency resources for UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE. We propose to add this as a separate proposal or amend the Proposal 2.1-2 above with this.  It is therefore not the case that Case E is an “optimization”. It is rather so that Case E provides the general unified solution, which covers Case C and D as special cases in a consistent way.  Case D/E could instead be viewed as unmotivated limitations of a more natural general solution that would make broadcast transmission independent of what happens to be the SIB1-configured initial BWP, for which there may be special reasons, unrelated to broadcast.  We do not see any additional difficulties by adopting such an approach. This would provide maximum flexibility and could also be used in the way Case C and D proponents argue.  The aspect of service interruption is either no issue, if the active BWP is the same as the broadcast BWP, or is a common issue to all Cases A, C, D and E, when the frequency resources of the broadcast CFR need to be different from those of the active BWP.  We see no difference either between the cases for the possible need to signal to the network that the UE is receiving broadcast.  Regarding impact on initial BWP for UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE: it is only by configuring an *independent* BWP for broadcast that one can avoid impact on legacy initial BWP operation. In this way, a Case E-based solution (with Case C and D as special cases) is the simplest and safest way forward.  Signaling of the frequency resources for CFR/BWP can be up to RAN2, but basically the new SIBx for broadcast could provide an optional field with *LocationAndBandwidth* of the CFR/BWP. When not used, the default CFR/BWP has the same frequency resources as the SIB1 initial BWP configuration, and if SIB1 does not configure the initial BWP, the CORESET#0 is used (as earlier agreed). But this is not for RAN1 to decide on. |
| ZTE | Support the FL proposal. If only one case is to be selected, we prefer Case E.  All the arguments have been raised and discussed thoroughly, more and more companies believe that Case C, Case D and Case E can be supported by the same framework.  Also, Case E is an important and basic feature for the network. Otherwise, all the UEs not receiving broadcast will be impacted.  If CORESET#0=20MHz, SIB-1 initial BWP=40MHz, carrier bandwidth=100MHz, Case E allows network to configure the whole bandwidth for UE for broadcast but not impacting UEs not receiving broadcast, allowing UE to receiving broadcast in the whole bandwidth without impacting other UEs is of course a **basic** function. |
| Apple | We support Case E.  Supporting case D doesn’t provide more benefits. if the SIB1 configured initial DL BWP is small, the case D doesn’t make sense and could provide higher throughput. If initial DL BWP is configured with larger bandwidth, the legacy UE and non-MBS UE would be impacted, e.g., power consumption, resource utilization efficiency etc. In this scenario, the network can configure Case C instead of Case D. Thus, the Case D is not preferred.  For Case E, it avoids the configured larger initial BWP, there are no impacts to legacy UE. It provides the better quality of broadcast service. We can’t say the case E is not basic case considering the whole network operating efficiency. |
| Qualcomm | Similar as Ericsson/Apple/ZTE, we also prefer Case E if only one of Case D and E is to be selected.  It seems the common understanding at least for IDLE/INACTIVE MBS UEs, all the Case C/D/E have similar spec impact, where a CFR/BWP larger than CORESET0 is configured for broadcast, while UEs keep receiving SIB/paging in CORESET0.  Now the main concern is for UEs moving from IDLE/INACTIVE to CONN mode, e.g., OPPO’s comment: “for case E, the CFR in RRC\_IDLE is configured by only considering broadcast reception, and besides, another larger size BWP rather than SIB1 config initial BWP by RRC should be configured to make sure the issues introduced by this case to be solved without impact on the agreed design in RRC-CONN.”  We think for Case C/E, the UE just keep using the same CFR/BWP from broadcast. The only difference is just freq range of Case C is same as that of SIB1-configred BWP. No extra RRC signaling is needed. Before RRC connection is established, the UE can monitor the CFR/BWP for broadcast, up to UE implementation, with no need to consider specific service continuity needed. After RRC connection is established, the network can configure first active BWP **same** or **different** than this CFR/BWP by RRC signalling, e.g., considering the multicast/broadcast interest, which is up to network decision. In CONN state, it is supported by legacy procedure, and no impact on the design in RRC-CONN.  Regarding Xiaomi’s comments:   1. Avoid to introduce impacts on legacy UEs.   The logic is not correct. Case E is a CFR/BWP for broadcast, no impact on legacy non-MBS UEs. Isolating it from SIB1-configured initial BWP is to avoid the impact on legacy UEs. It is not a correct assumption that the first active BWP via RRC signaling is for all UEs. Supporting broadcast by only using A/C will share the broadcast transmission with other legacy non-MBS transmission, which impacts legacy UEs.   1. Power saving   The argument for your listed power saving feature is out of the discussion point. We are not talking about Rel16/17 power saving features, which we believe can be applied for non-MBS UE and MBS UEs but it is a separate issue. The Case E is more for reducing the impact on the power consumption of legacy non-MBS UEs. The Case C by extending the BW of the SIB1-configured initial BWP due to broadcast is not preferred.   1. Flexibility   It is not flexible and not reasonable to make the broadcast transmission in a CFR with size only same as SIB1-configured initial BWP.   1. Case E is a basic functionality   We agree with Ericsson that  It is therefore not the case that Case E is an “optimization”. It is rather so that Case E provides the general unified solution, which covers Case C and D as special cases in a consistent way. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for the discussion. Based on discussions a summary of my understanding on an important source of disagreement is copied below.  ------------------------**email from FL summarising the discussion**-----------  First of all, thank you for this exchange of ideas that is helping build a common understanding. In this email I try to provide my understanding of the situation and some guidance to focus the **discussion on Down-selection of Case D&E**.  **Goal of the group:**  I would like to point out that **our objective is to select between these possible outcomes: Case D (only), Case E (only) or Case D and E**.  Therefore, I think the discussions on the motivation of Case D or Case E are not contributing towards our joint goal.  **Main source of Disagreement:**  It seems there is common understanding that potential service interruption due to frequency range change could happen for all cases A, C, D and E. Then, as discussed in the FL summary, I think we can focus on another aspects that helps us on our **goal**.  Based on the discussion below, I think the **main source of disagreement is** **on the topic** on how the gNB can differentiate whether UEs are receiving the broadcast service or not. This is in the context of when the UE is in idle/inactive UE state and transits to RRC connected (e.g., because it wants also unicast) and the gNB needs to configure an active BWP for the UE in RRC connected state.  As presented by companies, the gNB does not know whether the UE while in idle/inactive states was receiving or not the broadcast service. Therefore, it does not have the necessary information to configure the frequency range of the active BWP if it is expected that the UE can continue receiving the broadcast service in RRC connected state. To solve this, i.e., proving the gNB with the information that the UE was receiving the broadcast service, technical solutions are being proposed, e.g., UE sends the information that it is receiving the broadcast service to the gNB. They **key technical aspect for disagreement is** that some companies think that this technical solutions (on proving the gNB with the information that the UE is receiving the broadcast service) only apply to Case E, while other companies think that this technical solutions apply to both Case D and Case E. (Companies that think that this technical solutions are required for Case D and Case E also think these are required for Case A and C, however, as before I think we should focus on our down-selection **goal**.)  From the discussion up to know, my current understanding is the following:  **technical solutions to provide the gNB with the information that the UE is receiving the broadcast service so the gNB can configure an adequate active BWP apply to both Case D and Case E**.   * The reason for why I think technical solutions apply to Case D are as follows: during the reception of the broadcast service during idle/inactive UE state, the UE is using Case D. Then the UE wants to transit to RRC connected state. The UE would need to change the frequency range to that of the initial BWP SIB1 configured. I understand that during the transition the UE can receive RRC information for necessary configuration, however, the gNB it does not know it was receiving a broadcast service during idle/inactive state. The gNB could configure an active BWP with a frequency range that is smaller than the frequency range used to receive the broadcast service with Case D. Hence, the service would be lost. (This specific topic has been discussed and raised by CMCC, vivo, ZTE, Xiaomi and possible others but I do not think we have got clear exchanges on whether we agree or not). * For case E, I think there is common understanding that the technical solutions to provide the gNB with the information that the UE is receiving the broadcast service so the gNB can configure an adequate active BWP apply for Case E.   From this perspective, I understand it therefore makes sense to support both Case D and Case E.  Please note that all this analysis is my understanding based on discussions but I would of course welcome your counter arguments and whether you agree or disagree with me – thank you.  ------------------------**end email from FL summarising the discussion**--------------------  There has been also discussion about the motivation of Case E with argumentation that it is not a basic feature and therefore it is an optimisation over existing agreed cases such as Case C. Whether Case E is an optimisation or whether it can be considered a basic component, it has mixed views as well. Although, the motivation does play a role in the discussion, I also think it will be easier to try to build a common understanding on the technical aspects we have been discussing while compering the different Cases.  I would welcome comments on my email copied above with the summary of the discussions so far to check whether my understanding is correct or not on **Main source of Disagreement**. Thank you! |
| ZTE | We agree with Moderator’s summary on the Main source of Disagreement. Based on our understanding, both technical aspects mentioned by moderator are common to Case D and Case E. |
| vivo | We support case E.  Regarding the comments ‘technical solutions to provide the gNB with the information that the UE is receiving the broadcast service so the gNB can configure an adequate active BWP apply to both Case D and Case E.’ from FL, we agree with it.  This is because in case D, we cannot make the restriction that SIB1-configured initial downlink BWP is the first active BWP automatically, instead, *firstActiveDownlinkBWP* can be configured by network, and it is up to network to determine the size and location of it. If information that the UE is receiving the broadcast service is not available to gNB, it has no idea to configure BWPs containing frequency resources of CFR. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with OPPO/Xiaomi/Spreadtrum/CMCC.  We don’t support the moderator summary on main source of disagreement.  Case E is an optimization with aim to provide high date rate for idle mode UEs where Case C can’t provide high enough data rate to meet requirements. The example provided by proponent of Case E is to support AR/VR.  It is obvious that Case E is not a basic function on top of Case A and Case C. So Case E should be deprioritized in Rel-17 and we are open to support it in Rel-18 for MBS enhancement.  We’d like to emphasize that defining more fancy solutions based on unjustified use cases/motivations are not way/style in 3GPP.  We **strongly suggest** discussing the use case and motivation as well as whether Case E is basic function or optimization firstly before any technical issues.  For time being, there is only one meeting left before completion of Rel-17. As guided by Chairman, *“to first focus on getting agreements in place for at least one mechanism,  even if it is simple and basic, to make the functionality wor* “, we should focus on simple and basic solution.  For the technical concerns, please kindly check our comments in the first round. It is good to see the raised issue on “how gNB can know an idle/inactive mode UE needs to be configured with an MBS-specific BWP with larger bandwidth than SIB-1 configured BWP as the first active BWP for the UE?” leads to hot discussion here. However, I can’t evaluate how much effort needs to be spent in RAN2 to solve this issue. Even though I am not pretty sure about whether there is new issue brought out in next meeting.  For sake of progress, we are OK to Case D only as it brings less issue than Case E. |
| Spreadtrum | **Don’t agree with FL’s opinion about the discussion of the motivation of case D and case E.**  Since we already have agreed case A and case C, which already can ensure to support MBS in idle/inactive state. If we want to introduce new cases, e.g., case D and case E, the motivation is very important. Otherwise, it does not make sense, and like Lenovo points out that *defining more fancy solutions based on unjustified use cases/motivations are not way/style in 3GPP.*  After email discussion over last meeting and last week, it seems there is no consensus. Thus, maybe we could try to discuss point by point to achieve the consensus step by step. In our understanding, the motivation shall be the first step.  **Not fully agree with FL’s opinion about the Main source of Disagreement**  In our understanding, technical solutions to provide the gNB with the information that the UE is receiving the broadcast service so the gNB can configure an adequate active BWP, **definitely apply to all cases: case A, case C, case D, and case E**. So that gNB can configure one adequate active BWP for each UE.  **But we don’t understand why with the above assumption, it makes sense to support both Case D and Case E. We disagree with this claim.**  In our view, with the above the assumption that the technical solutions to provide the gNB with the information that the UE is receiving the broadcast service so the gNB can configure an adequate active BWP exists, **case E is not needed since we already have case C**. The reasons as below:   1. If the motivation is to support high date rate as claimed by the proponent of case E (although we think the use case is not clear for Rel-17 MBS), case C also can realize the motivation, for the reason that the SIB1 configured initial BWP can be up to 272RBs. 2. If the motivation is to avoid to power waste on legacy UEs, case C also can realize the motivation. For case C, gNB could configure unicast BWP and default BWP for UEs not supporting MBS when entering into RRC connected state, to make the SIB1 configured initial BWP invalid.   **Regarding the selection of case D and case E**  If we must select one of case D and case E, based on the above the analysis, we could **support case D**, for the relatively less spec work. We are also fine with **not support both case D and case E**. |
| CMCC | We support only Case D.  We don’t support the moderator summary on main source of disagreement.  As the comment in email reflector, gNB doesn’t need to configure another BWP for Case D, UE just needs to follow legacy behaviour, which take SIB1-configured initial DL BWP as the first active BWP and this BWP has already covers the CFR for broadcast, even for UE dose not send MBS interest indictaion, there is no service lost and spec impact.  But for Case E, the key point is the SIB1-configured initial DL BWP is smaller than CFR and gNB MUST configure an active BWP to cover the frequency resources of CFR by gNB DOESN’T know which UEs receive the broadcast service since the MBS interest indication is an optional feature. Either all UE take Case E MBS BWP as the first active BWP (this is additional spec impact to define new first active BWP) or UE will not receive broadcast service if not report MBS interest indication (this will not guarantee all UEs’ broadcast reception). We cannot accept these two drawbacks. |
| NOKIA/NSB | We prefer both Case E and Case D.  The Case E is more preferred over Case D if down-selection between the two cases.  For Case E, it is a more general case which covers both Case C and Case D, or the Case C and Case D is simply a subset of Case E. Practically, the support of all 3 cases may allow the network to flexibly configure the size of CFR for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs to monitor and to receive MBS services, depending on MBS traffic payload size. Moreover, the difference among the CFR Case D, Case E, as well as previously agreed Case C, is just the matter of configured value of CFR size. And a common signaling design approach could simply be applied to accommodate all 3 cases.  Regarding the “interruption” issue as discussed, it happened for all cases, including the agreed Case A and Case C, thus it is not a specific issue for Case E and Case D.  From standardization perspective, we see the same standardization impact for all CFR cases. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | We support Case E. We agree with FL that UE needs to inform gNB of its receiving an MBS session with broadcast mode.  We think it’s better to configure an CFR of Case E type, where an CFR of Case E type can be equal to CORESET 0, the SIB1 configured initial DL BWP or larger than the initial DL BWP. In other word, from our side, we agree with Ericsson/Apple/ZTE/QC to support one CFR of CASE E type. CASE C and CASE D can be regarded as a special CFR of CASE E type.  But for a specific MBS session with broadcast mode, we think CORESET 0/SIB1 configured initial DL BWP/ CFR larger than the initial DL BWP can be indicated to UE if the specific MBS session is scheduled within CORESET 0/SIB1 configured initial DL BWP/ CFR to save the power consumption of UE. In other word, from gNB side, only one CFR of CASE E type is configured to carry all MBS sessions with broadcast mode. From UE side, the CFR for receiving an MBS session, can be one of following three types:   * CORESET 0 * SIB1 configured initial DL BWP * CFR larger than the initial DL BWP   If the CFR for receiving an MBS session can be one above three types, it’s better to schedule the broadcast sessions within CORESET0/SIB1 configured initial DL BWP to make RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs receiving an broadcast session work on CORESET0/SIB1 configured initial DL BWP as far as possible.  The multicast sessions with broadcast mode can be scheduled within the frequency resource outside the initial DL BWP and within the CFR because UE needs to keep in RRC\_CONNECTED to receive a multicast session.  If the CFR for receiving an MBS session can be one of three types, it’s better to:   1. Configure the CORESETs/CSSs for MCCH and MTCH within CORESET0/SIB configured initial DL BWP   Schedule MCCH within the initial DL BWP. |
| LG | If only one case is to be selected, we prefer Case E. But, we are fine to support both Case E and Case D for compromise. |
| MediaTek | We are confused with why does it need to consider the service continuity issue for broadcast reception when UE transit from RRC IDLE/INACTIVE to RRC CONNECTED state. If gNB can configure a proper CFR or active BWP, the services loss or services interruption issue can be avoided. If gNB doesn’t ensure that, the services loss or services interruption will exist, which is also common for legacy behaviour when UE transit from RRC IDLE/INACTIVE to RRC CONNECTED state. When UE enter into RRC CONNECTED mode, the UE will report the MII information for interest broadcast services and it is up to network implementation to guarantee the broadcast CFR is within the bandwidth of the active BWP as we discussed in AI 8.12.1.  If only case C is supported, we think it is against the agreement achieved in RAN#93-e meeting as copied following.   |  | | --- | | Agreement:  For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state:   * Support Case-C * Support at least one of Case D and Case E. Down-selection to be made at RAN1#106b-e   Note: Case C, D and E are defined in previous agreements. |   Besides, when only case C is supported, if larger broadcast services are delivered, it may need to configure larger SIB-1 configured initial BWP. However, from our perspective, if larger SIB-1 configured initial BWP is configured due to introducing the broadcast services, it will impact the legacy UE’s capability as we commented earlier. We recopied it as described following:   |  | | --- | | The NW has the possibility to configure a UE specific channel bandwidth as well as UE specific BWPs. But to be able to do that, the UE must at least support a channel bandwdith which is ...   * equal to or smaller than the carrier bandwidth indicated in SIB1 and * equal to or larger than the bandwidth of the initial BWP. |   Therefore, we suggest to the discussion for the CFR should be decoupled with SIB-1 configured initial BWP, and case E can be as a solution |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok with the proposal.  The use case for case E has been discussed in both RAN1 and RAN plenary meeting. What RAN1 should proceed is with RAN plenary meeting agreement to at least support one of case D and case E instead of reverting all the discussion to the very beginning since the both sides cannot be convinced by each other regarding the sticking points. From this sense, we think this proposal from FL could be a good compromise to move forward. |
| CATT | Prefer support both Case D and Case E.  We share the same view with MTK that the configured larger bandwidth of initial BWP due to broadcast services will impact the legacy UE‘s behaviours. Thus, Case E is a solution to eliminate the impact. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We agree with FL’s summary. We prefer both Case D and Case E. But if we have to choose one, we prefer Case D to Case E. |
| Xiaomi | We don’t agree with FL’s summary and fully agree with the opinion from Lenovo/Spreadstrum/CMCC. It can be seen not only the UE vendor but also the operator has serious concerns.  Some response echoing QC:   1. Avoid to introduce impacts on legacy UEs.   It does. The same question is also raised by Lenovo. How can gNB knows which UE is a MBS UE when it configures first active DL BWP? It cannot. Consequently, gNB has to configure larger BWP for each UE in order to maintain the service continuity. Hope this clarifies.   1. Power saving.   I confirm what I am talking about is power saving for legacy UE. The same question, why do we need consider the power saving issue for legacy UE? The explanation is focus on legacy UE. It is definitely out of scope. It certainly not a reason for supporting case E.   1. Flexibility   You mentioned “It is not flexible and not reasonable to make the broadcast transmission in a CFR with size only same as SIB1-configured initial BWP.” It is not true as case A and case D can configure a smaller CFR compared to SIB1-configured initial BWP. It is not true not supporting case E will make the broadcast transmission in a CFR with size only same as SIB1-configured initial BWP.   1. Case E is a basic functionality   My reading of a basic functionality is that the feature does not work without it. However, MBS works well without supporting case E. |

## [DEPRIO] Issue 2: Number of MBS CFRs for MTCH

### **Background**

The following agreement for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs at RAN1#103-e, RAN1#104-e and RAN1#106-e are relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| 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. * FFS: the relation of the common frequency resource(s) (if configured) and initial BWP. * FFS: whether to configure one/more common frequency resources * FFS: configuration and definition details of the common frequency resource   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   Agreement:  Only one CFR can be configured for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.  Agreement:  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   * FFS: use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH |

The following agreement for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs at RAN1#105-e is relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  One CFR is supported per dedicated unicast BWP for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED Ues.   * FFS: Whether more than one CFR is supported per dedicated unicast BWP * FFS: Whether multicast can be supported or not in a dedicated unicast BWP when no CFR is configured for that BWP |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2108853, ZTE]
  + Observation 1: Regarding CFR,
    - It is beneficial for power saving by supporting more than one CFR.
    - It is beneficial for MBS service expansion by supporting more than one CFR.
    - It is particularly important for redcap UE to support multiple CFRs, which means that more MBS services can be received.
  + Proposal 2: More than one CFR is supported for MTCH for UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states.
* In [R1- 2109003, vivo]
  + *Discuss*: Among multiple MBS services, some RRC IDLE/INACTIVE UEs may be interested in only a subset of services while some other UEs are interested in another subset of services, thus, transmitting all MBS services in one CFR for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE UEs is not friendly to power saving purpose.
  + Proposal 2: For UEs in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE, more than one common frequency resource can be defined/configured.
* In [R1-2109069, OPPO]
  + *Discuss*: According to the use cases and deployment scenarios for MBS services in this release, only one CFR configured for MTCH is enough. Configuring more than one CFR for MTCH may introduce design complexity and need extra indication scheme, which may not be a real requirement for UEs in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state.
  + Proposal 4: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, only one CFR is configured for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH
* In [R1-2109305, CMCC]
  + *Discuss*: In addition, as we have agreed three cases of CFR, i.e., Case A, Case C and Case D, how to switch between them need to be studied because DCI format 1\_0 cannot be used for BWP switching. Therefore, supporting only one CFR for MTCH is enough for UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.
  + Proposal 2. Only one CFR can be configured for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.
* In [R1-2109318, Nokia]
  + *Discuss*: However, considering that the traffic data size of different MBS services could be varying a lot, and depending on the MBS services applied, the MTCH CFR can be also configured differently for different MBS services. For instance as shown in CFR Case C-2 of Figure-2, the same MCCH CFR can be configured for both MBS services, but the CFR of MTCH-1 is configured to be associated with CORESET#0 and the CFR of MTCH-2 is configured to be associated with the larger CFR that is identical to initial BWP.
  + Proposal-3: There can be multiple MTCH CFRs configured corresponding to difference MBS service types applied.
* In [R1-2109388, Xiaomi]
  + Proposal 5: Only one CFR can be configured for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.
* In [R1-2109569, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 4: Not support more than one CFR for UE supporting MBS in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states.
* In [R1-2109635, Intel]
  + Proposal 3: Only one common frequency resource may be configured for MBS reception for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE mode UEs for both MCCH and MTCH.
* In [R1-2109703, DOCOMO]
  + *Discuss*: Even when there are multiple broadcast services, a single CFR can transmit multiple MBS services. If CFRs are separated for each service, a UE receiving multiple broadcast services needs to receive multiple CFRs, it would complicate UE processing.
  + Proposal 2: Support at most one CFR for MTCH for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.
* In [R1-2109769, TD Tech]
  + Proposal 2a: More than one CFRs can be configured. At most one CFR is the initial DL BWP. Each other CFR is larger than the initial DL BWP.
* In [R1-2109985, LGE]
  + *Discuss*: RAN1 agreed that one CFR is supported per dedicated unicast BWP for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs. We think that this agreement can be also applied to broadcast of idle/inactive UEs. Thus, from idle/inactive UE perspective, one CFR is associated to the initial DL BWP of UE’s serving cell for REL-17.
  + Proposal 1: From idle/inactive UE perspective, one CFR is associated to the initial DL BWP of UE’s serving cell for REL-17.
* In [R1-2110357, Ericsson]
  + *Discuss*: Even with a single CFR, most part of the power saving is expected to come from the time domain DRX and change notification mechanism, which allows the UE to receive MCCH change notification using a very small percentage of all slots, once the cyclic MCCH as such as has been captured.   
    Using a single CFR therefore seems to provide enough opportunities for power saving and would also relieve the UE from receiving two CFRs in parallel.
  + Proposal 5: Only a common CFR for both MCCH and MTCH is supported in Rel-17.

### **FL Assessment**

As per Background discussion, RAN1 has agreed that only one CFR can be configured to carry MCCH. Contributions to this meeting discussing this issue support either only one CFR or they support multiple CFRs for RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE UEs. However, some of the contributions do not discuss whether this is explicitly for MTCH. Given the previous RAN1 agreement, the FL will focus this discussion on the number of CFRs for MTCH only.

From the tdocs submitted to this meeting, while [ZTE, vivo, Nokia, TD Tech] support multiple CFR, [OPPO, CMCC, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Intel, DOCOMO, LG, Ericsson] only support one CFR.

Arguments in favour to configure multiple CFRs address aspects on power saving [ZTE, vivo], service expansion [ZTE], or support of redcap UEs [ZTE]. Regarding power saving [Ericsson] discusses that even with a single CFR most of the power saving can be expected from time domain DRX rather on the bandwidth of the CFR. [OPPO CMCC, DOCOMO] discuss that multiple CFRs can have additional complexity due to switching between CFRs for UEs receiving multiple services. [LGE] also discusses that an only one CFR has alignment with agreements on multicast.

Given the discussion above and the stronger support for configuring only one CFR for MTCH, the starting point of the proposal is to support only one CFR for MTCH in this release.

We note that the discussion on whether MCCH and MTCH could have different bandwidth configurations is addressed in Issue 3 in this summary. Even if we would agree that only one CFR can be configured for MTCH, it would still be possible, if agreed and pending discussion in Issue 3, that MCCH and MTCH could be configured with different bandwidth configurations.

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

**Proposal 2.2-1**: Only one CFR can be configured for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above, do you support proposal above? Please provide reasons and views in general. Please provide any alternate proposals in case you don’t support the proposal.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Intel | OK |
| Samsung | Agree |
| NOKIA/NSB | We support multiple CFRs  By considering that the traffic data size of different broadcast services could be varying a lot, and depending on the MBS services applied, the MTCH CFR can be also configured differently for different MBS services. And we see the potential benefit from power saving perspective, where the CFR bandwidth can be varying in time depends on traffic payload size of broadcast services, e.g. smaller CFR width when broadcast traffic data is small. And the larger CFR width is only applied when larger broadcast services is needed. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree. |
| ZTE | Similar view as Nokia, we also see some benefits of supporting multiple CFRs.  If companies couldn’t converge to support multiple CFRs in Rel-17, we hope companies can consider it in Rel-18 MBS WI. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| OPPO | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| Xiaomi | Agree.  Regarding the motivation raised by Nokia, a single CFR is sufficient for supporting different MBS services, where the single CFR should accommodate different MBS services. For the power saving issue, it is out of scope and we don’t think it deserves further discussion. If power saving is really a problem proved by simulation, we are OK to discussed it only if the WID include power saving issue.  Furthermore, we don’t know how to switch CFR. Is it the similar mechanism as BWP switching? If so, the CFR is actually BWP which is not align with the agreement achieved for CONNECTED UEs that CFR is not a BWP. If not, it is not clear on how to indicate the target CFR. All in all, there would be many standard efforts to support this optimization, which is not preferred at such a late stage. |
| LG | OK |
| CMCC | Agree. |
| CATT | Support |
| vivo | We support multiple CFRs.  Among multiple MBS services, some RRC IDLE/INACTIVE UEs may be interested in only a subset of services while some other UEs are interested in another subset of services, thus, transmitting all MBS services in one CFR for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE UEs is not friendly to power saving purpose. |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok |
| Apple | Just want to clarify our understanding on this proposal.  In last RAN1 meeting, the following agreements were reached. If Proposal 2.2-1 is agreeable, then it could be the case one CFR for MCCH and another CFR for MTCH. But it seems contradict with agreements made in RAN plenary, i.e., one configured/defined CFR for both MCCH and MTCH.  So considering the last meeting agreements, we are not sure this proposal is really needed.   * Agreement   Only one CFR can be configured for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.  Agreement (Updated proposal from RAN1#106e):  For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.   * Support Case-C * Support at least one of Case D and Case E.   + Down-selection to be made at RAN1#106b-e   Note: Case C, D and E are defined in previous agreements |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Qualcomm | From network point of view, one or multiple CFRs can be configured for MTCH, especially considering different broadcast services for different types of UEs, e.g., RedCap and non-RedCap UEs with MBS.  From UE point of view, UE can choose only one CFR for MTCH, up to UE implementation. |
| Moderator | One comment from my side is that we have been discussing this aspect for multiple meetings and although there are companies interested in allowing multiple CFRs, companies that do not support this have not changed their position. **I would like to invite supporting companies of multiple CFR if they could provide additional comments to address the concerns provided so far**.  @Apple: thanks for the careful checking of the proposals.  My understanding of the proposals agreed by plenary is that: - a configured/defined configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH supports case C (plus potential support of Case D&E) and  - a configured/defined configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH supports case C (plus potential support of Case D&E).  Whether MCCH and MTCH have the same bandwidth configuration is discussed in Issue 3. |
| NOKIA/NSB | @Xiaomi: The supporting of multiple MTCH CFRs may provide extra power saving benefits depends on broadcast traffic payload, especially at UE side, and the discussions relate to on how to support MBS CFR for idle/inactive UE, which is in scope of the WID description.  For Rel17 MBS, to help move forward of the discussions, if the majority view is to support single CFR for both MCCH and MTCH as the easy starting point, we are OK to further discuss the multiple MTCH CFRs in future release. |
| Vivo 2 | For the CFR switching issue pointed out by some companies, we understand there are two potential solutions:   1. CFR switching can be performed based on UE implementation, e.g., UE can determine some proper time within service reception gap to switch to a larger CFR when it has new interested services and switch to a small CFR when it loses interest in some services. This can be transparent to Gnb and has no spec impact. 2. As stated by Qualcomm, multiple CFRs can be configured by network and UE picks up one among them and no switching issue involved. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Ok |
| NOKIA/NSB 2 | We want to point out here that, with only one MTCH CFR supported and catering for all broadcast services in a cell, the larger CFR with Case E is even more important and even more necessary to be supported. |
| Moderator | Although some companies are interested in supporting multiple CFR for MTCH, most companies do not support it. We have discussed this issue at multiple meetings and companies have not changed their point of view. Given the stage of this meeting and of the release the FL proposes to deprioritise the discussion of this issue. |

## [ACTIVE] Issue 3: Parameters and configuration of the CFR for MCCH/MTCH

### **Background**

The following agreements for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs at RAN1#103-e and RAN1#106-e are relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| 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. * FFS: the relation of the common frequency resource(s) (if configured) and initial BWP. * FFS: whether to configure one/more common frequency resources * FFS: configuration and definition details of the common frequency resource   Agreement:  From RAN1 perspective, the CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, includes at least the following configurations:   * One set of parameters configured for PDSCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDSCH * One set of parameters configured for PDCCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH * FFS: whether some parameters configured for PDSCH/PDCCH are optional/needed for the supported cases of CFR. * FFS: If necessary, depending on the cases supported, starting PRB and the number of PRBs   + The reference for starting PRB is Point A. (Following the same approach to determine reference for starting PRB as that defined in AI8.12.1.)   Agreement:  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   * FFS: use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH |

### **Tdoc analysis**

***On parameters of the CFR***

* In [R1-2108725, Huawei]
  + Discuss: For UE receiving unicast, *RateMatchPattern* can be configured per UE per BWP in PDSCH-Config for UE to rate match PDSCH around. The resources indicated by the rate match patterns are occupied for other purpose, e.g., CSI-RS/TRS configured to other UEs, so that such resources have to be rate matched around for UEs that will have PDSCH to be transmitted on because otherwise PDSCH and CSI-RS/TRS will interfere each other.  
    The motivation of configuring *RateMatchPattern* for UE receiving broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states also holds.
  + Proposal 5: *RateMatchPattern* can be configured together with the CFR configured for broadcast reception for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.
* In [R1-2109196, CATT]
  + *On default configs*:
    - Proposal 2: Some parameters configured for PDSCH for broadcast reception can be optional. When some parameters in PDSCH for broadcast reception are not configured, the corresponding parameters in PDSCH configuration of the initial BWP can be the default configuration.
    - Proposal 3: Some parameters configured for PDCCH for broadcast reception can be optional. When some parameters in PDCCH for broadcast reception are not configured, the corresponding parameters in PDCCH configuration of the initial BWP can be the default configuration.
  + *On reference for staring PRBs*
    - Proposal 4: The *locationAndBandwidth* parameter for PDSCH/PDCCH can be optional for Case C.
    - Proposal 5: For Case D (if supported) and Case E (if supported), the starting PRB is referenced to Point A. The current RIV mechanism can be applied for indicating the starting PRB and the length of PRB of CFR.
* In [R1-2109569, MediaTek]
  + *Discuss*: From our perspective, as long as the parameter for broadcast is the same with legacy unicast parameter in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE states, this parameter for broadcast can be not configured, and the UE can reuse the legacy unicast parameter in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE states for broadcast reception.
  + Proposal 6: The parameter configured for GC-PDSCH/GC-PDCCH can be optional if the unicast has the same value with that of broadcast.
* In [R1-2109318, Nokia]
  + Proposal-7: To align the outcome agreement with RRC\_CONNECTED, the Point A as reference point of starting PRB for CFR configuration of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.
* In [R1-2109769, TD Tech]
  + Proposal 3: If no CFR for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs is configured, the CFR is by default the initial DL BWP.
  + Proposal 4: If a CFR for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs is configured by a new IE associated with the initial DL BWP, the CORESET/search spaces for GC-PDCCH carrying MCCH/MTCH can be configured as below, where the new IE can indicate the CFR is the initial DL BWP.
    - If a CORESETs/search space not configured by *initialDownlinkBWP* is shared by MCCH and MBS sessions, configure the CORESETs/search space on the MCCH specific SIB with the type of the CORESET/search space set as “Shared”.
    - If a CORESETs/search space not configured by *initialDownlinkBWP* is only used by MCCH, configure the CORESETs/search space on the MCCH specific SIB with the type of the CORESET/search space set as “NOT Shared”.
    - If a CORESETs/search space not configured by *initialDownlinkBWP* is only used by MBS sessions, configure it with the new IE on MCCH.
    - If at least one CORESET/search space configured by *initialDownlinkBWP* is used by MCCH, a CORESET/search space ID list is provided on the MCCH specific SIB to indicate which CORESETs/search spaces by *initialDownlinkBWP* are used by MCCH. For each CORESET/search space in the CORESET/search space ID list, if it’s shared by MBS sessions, its type is set as “Shared’. Otherwise its type is set as “NOT Shared”.
    - If at least one CORESET/search space configured by *initialDownlinkBWP* is used by MBS sessions but not used by MCCH, a CORESET/search space ID list is provided with the new IE on MCCH to indicate which CORESETs/search spaces by *initialDownlinkBWP* are used by MBS sessions.
* In [R1- 2110258, Asustek]
  + Proposal 1: The current SLIV indication mechanism can be reused to indicate the starting PRB and the number of PRBs of the CFR.
  + Proposal 2: Only the basic parameters in the current PDSCH-Config are necessary for broadcast reception for RRC\_IDLE/ INACTIVE UEs, e.g. pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList, resourceAllocation, and rbg-Size, to simplify the implementation.
* In [R1-2110357, Ericsson]
  + Proposal 6: To define the broadcast BWP/CFR frequency resources, reuse the legacy definition of BWP frequency resources for unicast using the combination of Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and locationAndBandwidth to indicate the exact location of the BWP/CFR with respect to the carrier starting RB.

***On different configurations between MCCH and MTCH, including bandwidth***

* In [R1-2108725, Huawei]
  + *Discuss*: For example, the CFR, CORESET, SS for MCCH and MTCH can be different and the configuration for MTCH can come from MCCH. MTCH may require larger frequency resources than MCCH, so the CFR for MTCH can be configured in MCCH.
  + *Discuss*: When CFR for at least MTCH can be configured with the same size as SIB1 configured initial BWP, the CORESET for MTCH scheduling can be configured to be larger than the bandwidth of CORESET#0. Hence, the CORESET for MTCH scheduling can be configured in MCCH which could be part of configuration of CFR but can be up to RAN2 for signaling design. Search space for MTCH may have different monitoring periodicity, so the search space for MTCH can be configured in MCCH.
  + Proposal 8: The CFR, CORESET, and search space for MCCH and MTCH can be configured separately.
    - The CFR, CORESET, and search space for MTCH scheduling can be included in MCCH.
* In [R1-2109196, CATT]
  + *Discuss*: However, the benefit is not clear with multiple MBS CFR configurations and different bandwidth configuration for MCCH and MTCH. Using different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH implies that two CFR configurations are needed for carrying MCCH and MTCH. Per our understanding, these two CFRs may be active simultaneously and will bring more discussion and additional specification efforts. Instead, a wider CFR for MCCH and MTCH is more feasible and beneficial when wide band is required for MBS reception.
  + Proposal 6: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH are not supported.
* In [R1-2109569, MediaTek]
  + *Discuss*: However, some companies argued that different CFR should be configured for MCCH and MTCH due to different requirements for these two logical channels. From our understanding, it will need two CFRs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE states, if different CFR are configured for MCCH and MTCH and UE needs to monitor the two CFRs simultaneously, which will make the UE processing more complexity and is not desirable. Therefore, unified CFR is preferred for MCCH and MTCH reception.
  + Proposal 1: The unified CFR is defined/configured for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.
* In [R1-2109635, Intel]
  + *Discuss*: In the last meeting it was agreed that only one CFR configuration is allowed for MCCH and that MCCH/MTCH can use the same bandwidth. Additionally, MCCH and MTCH can use the same single CFR configuration. The two channels need not have different CFR configurations where MTCH CFR is configured in MCCH since the gains from such involved design is not clear.
  + Proposal 3: Only one common frequency resource may be configured for MBS reception for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE mode UEs for both MCCH and MTCH.
* In [R1-2109318, Nokia]
  + *Discuss*: Practically the traffic payload size for MCCH and MTCH can be different a lot, where the control configuration payload carried via MCCH can be much smaller than the MBS traffic data payload carried via MTCH. Thus, the CFR for MCCH and MTCH can be also configured differently and controlled by network Gnb based on traffic needs.
  + Proposal-2: CFR for MCCH and MTCH can be configured to be differently.
* In [R1-2110212, Qualcomm]
  + *Discuss*: Considering different types of information carried in MCCH and MTCH, separate CFR can be configured with different pdsch-config, and/or pdcch-config even in the same frequency range.   
    - For MTCH, besides Case A/C, it is also possible to configure broadcast CFR larger than initial BWP (Case E) for flexible scheduling to avoid congestion by SI/paging/broadcast traffic in same band.  
    - For MCCH, the CFR can be configured with the frequency size to be same as that of that of MTCH (Case A/C/E) but the parameters for GC-PDSCH/PDCCH may be separate from MTCH.
  + Proposal 1: For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state,
    - Support both Case E and Case D.
    - Different PDSCH/PDCCH parameters can be configured in the CFR for MCCH and the CFR for MTCH.
  + *Discuss*: For GC-PDSCH transmission of broadcast MCCH/MTCH, the configuration can be separately considered, i.e., pdsch-config in corresponding CFR for MCCH/MTCH:  
    -For sake of simplicity, GC-PDSCH for MCCH can assume QPSK and single layer, similar as SIB/paging.  
    -GC-PDSCH configuration for broadcast MTCH can be more flexible, configured by MCCH.  
    -Semi-static and dynamic repetitions can be configured for broadcast MCCH/MTCH to improve the link budget.
  + Proposal 4: GC-PDSCH for broadcast MCCH can use QPSK and single layer. GC-PDSCH for broadcast MTCH can be configured by MCCH to use flexible MCS.
* In [R1-2108853, ZTE]
  + *Discuss*: MCCH only transmits some control information for MBS. However, MTCH needs to transmit MBS traffic, which may require large bandwidth. Considering the different requirements of MCCH and MTCH, it is worthwhile for network to have the flexibility of configuring different CFRs for MCCH and MTCH.  
    Further, if more than one CFR is supported for MTCH for transmitting different MBS traffics or to accommodate UEs with different bandwidth capabilities, this naturally supports the different CFR configuration for MTCH.
  + Proposal 3: Network supports configuring different CFRs for MCCH and MTCH.
* In [R1-2109069, OPPO]
  + *Discuss*: Even for some cases that the requirements of bandwidth are different between MCCH and MTCH, the CFR for MTCH reception should have to fully contain the CFR for MCCH in order to guarantee the GC-PDSCH reception. At present, a uniformed size design and CFR configuration is a simple way for both MCCH and MTCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH is configured by SIB.
  + Proposal 3: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configuration by SIB for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.
* In [R1-2109388, Xiaomi]
  + Proposal 4: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configuration for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.
* In [R1-2110357, Ericsson]
  + *Discuss*: Even with a single CFR, most part of the power saving is expected to come from the time domain DRX and change notification mechanism, which allows the UE to receive MCCH change notification using a very small percentage of all slots, once the cyclic MCCH as such as has been captured.   
    Using a single CFR therefore seems to provide enough opportunities for power saving and would also relieve the UE from receiving two CFRs in parallel.
  + Proposal 5: Only a common CFR for both MCCH and MTCH is supported in Rel-17.

***On MBS-SIB configuration of MCCH / MTCH***

* In [R1-2109569, MediaTek]
  + *Discuss*: If one CFR is used for MCCH and MTCH, how to configure the CFR for MCCH and MTCH needs to be further discussed. From our perspective, RAN2 has defined a new MBS specific SIB (e.g., SBIx) for broadcast services configuration. Therefore, the unified CFR information for MCCH and MTCH can be configured via MBS specific SIB (e.g., SIBx).
  + Proposal 2: The unified CFR for MCCH and MTCH can be configured via MBS specific SIB (e.g., SIB-x).
* In [R1-2109318, Nokia]
  + Proposal-5: For broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the following way of CFR configuration is preferred:
    - the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH is configured by SIBx.
    - the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH is configured by MCCH.

### **FL Assessment**

This Issue is divided in three sub-topics: i) on parameters that are part of the configuration of the CFR, ii) on whether MCCH and MTCH can be configured differently (including the bandwidth parameter), and iii) on whether a SIB (or new MBS SIB) configures both MCCH and MTCH, or whether SIB configures MCCH and MCCH configures MTCH.

***i) On parameters of the CFR***

[CATT, MediaTek, TD Tech] propose that the PDCCH / PDSCH parameters that are not configured can take as default the values of the PDCCH / PDSCH parameters for unicast (i.e., parameters of the initial BWP). However, it is not completely clear to the FL with the descriptions in the tdocs, if the companies refer to the initial BWP of idle/inactive UEs (determined by CORESET#0) or the SIB1 configured initial BWP for connected UEs. Also, the RAN1 agreement at RAN1#103-e (cf. Background) states that 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.

[CATT, Nokia, Ericsson] propose that the existing mechanisms to define the BWP frequency resources with reference to Point A. [Ericsson] further details to use the reuse the legacy definition of BWP frequency resources for unicast using the combination of Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and *locationAndBandwidth* to indicate the exact location of the BWP/CFR with respect to the carrier starting RB.

While [Huawei] proposes that the CFR for broadcast reception includes the configuration of *RateMatchPattern* parameter, [AsusTek] proposes that only basic parameters for PDSCH-config are included for broadcast reception.

The previous RAN1 meeting started the discussion on the configuration of the CFR and the tdocs to this meeting start providing further details for discussion which are included as proposals below.

***ii) On different configurations between MCCH and MTCH, including bandwidth***

Here, two aspects can be considered. First, whether the bandwidth configuration of the MCCH and MTCH can be the different, and secondly whether (besides the bandwidth configuration) other parameters, e.g., SS, CORESET, configuration of PDSCH/PDCCH, can be different between MCCH and MTCH.

On the bandwidth configuration of MCCH and MTCH, [Huawei, Nokia, ZTE] propose that MCCH and MTCH can have different bandwidths mainly motivated by both logical channels having different data requitements. However, [CATT, MediaTek, Intel, OPPO, Xiaomi, Ericsson] only support that MCCH and MTCH have the same bandwidth configuration. In particular [CATT] argue that different bandwidths for MCCH and MTCH may increase specification impact, [MediaTek] argue that monitoring two CFRs would increase processing complexity and regarding power saving [Ericsson] discusses that even with a single CFR most of the power saving can be expected from time domain DRX rather on the bandwidth of the CFR.

Therefore, the FL will put forward a proposal for the same bandwidth configuration for MCCH and MTCH given the discussion above and the stronger support for this approach.

On whether (besides bandwidth) MCCH and MTCH can have different configurations: [Huawei, Nokia, Qualcomm, ZTE] propose that MCCH and MTCH can have different configurations mainly motivated by different requirements of the logical channels, i.e., MCCH carrying control information and MTCH carrying mainly service data information. [Qualcomm] provides more detail for the transmission of GC-PDSCH where MCCH could be configured with QPSK and single layer (like SIB/paging) while MTCH could be more flexible and configured by MCCH (flexible MCS). On the other hand [MediaTek, Intel] propose that a unified CFR is configured for MCCH and MTCH where [MediaTek] argue that monitoring two CFRs would increase processing complexity.

Here, there is apparently stronger support and less concerns that MCCH and MTCH can have different configurations (besides bandwidth). Also based on the technical discussion above the FL will put forward a proposal to support different configurations for MCCH and MTCH.

***iii) On MBS-SIB configuration of MCCH / MTCH***

Here, two contributions discuss how to configure MCCH and MTCH. [MediaTek] proposes that a MBS specific SIB configures both MCCH and MTCH (since a unified CFR configuration is also proposed) while [Nokia] proposes that the MBS specific SIB can configure MCCH while MTCH can be configured by MCCH (since different configurations for MCCH and MTCH are also proposed). This subtopic is also related to the one above. Given that the starting point for the discussion in this meeting is allowing different configurations (besides bandwidth) for MCCH and MTCH, the FL puts forward a proposal to accommodate the configuration of MTCH by MCCH.

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

**Proposal 2.3-1**: The PDCCH/PDSCH parameters for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH, which are not configured, use as default the value of the PDCCH/PDSCH parameters for the configuration of the Rel-15/Rel-16 initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.

**Proposal 2.3-2:** For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the starting PRB and the number of PRBs of the CFR reuse the legacy definition of BWP frequency resources for unicast using the combination of Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and *locationAndBandwidth*.

**Proposal 2.3-3:** The CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs includes the configuration of *RateMatchPattern*.

**Proposal 2.3-4:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can only use the same bandwidth configuration for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

**Proposal 2.3-5:** for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, different PDSCH/PDCCH parameters can be configured in the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

**Proposal 2.3-6:** for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs:

* GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH can be configured by SIBx
* GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH can be configured by MCCH

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above, do you support proposals above? Please provide reasons and views in general. Please provide any alternate proposals in case you don’t support the proposals.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Intel | Proposal 2.3-2 should be discussed after Cases D/E discussion is concluded.  Proposal 2.3-5: Do not think it is clear why this is needed. Also without details, cannot agree to such statements.  Proposal 2.3-6: Better to mention explicitly what is configured |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.3-1: Support.  Proposal 2.3-2: Can conclude first whether to support Case D or Case E.  Proposal 2.3-3: Assuming that CFR will include parameters from *PDSCH-ConfigCommon* with optional configuration, what is the purpose of the proposal. What happens to other parameters without an explicit agreement?  Proposal 2.3-4: Support.  Proposal 2.3-5: Given proposal 2.3-6, proposal 2.3-5 is unnecessary as the configurations are separate. There is no agreement for separate CFRs for the MCCH and the MTCH.  Proposal 2.3-6: Support. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Proposal 2.3-2: Agree  Proposal 2.3-3: Do no see the justification why we need it?  Proposal 2.3-4: Not sure we could fully understand the proposal, does it mean the same CFR between MCCH and MTCH?  Proposal 2.3-5: Again, does it mean different PDSCH/PDCCH parameters between MCCH and MTCH?  Proposal 2.3-6: Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.3-1: OK  Proposal 2.3-2: For Case C, such indication is not needed. So it can be discussed after the conclusion of support Case D or E is made  Proposal 2.3-3: it can reuse legacy UE behavior.  Proposal 2.3-4: OK  Proposal 2.3-5: Can you elaborate what PDSCH/PDCCH parameters mean?  Proposal 2.3-6: Why not use SIBx for configuring MTCH? Such two-step configuration needs justification. |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.3-1: Generally fine. But if there is anything related to the bandwidth of CFR, it is better to wait the outcome of Case D/Case E first.  Proposal 2.3-2: OK  Proposal 2.3-3: OK  Proposal 2.3-4: I guess there is a typo “MTCH”🡪 “MCCH”. We don’t understand why we need to have such configuration. If companies have concern on the potential switching between CFR for MCCH and CFR for MTCH, maybe we can update the proposal with a sub-bullet as following.  **Proposal 2.3-4:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can ~~only~~ use ~~the same~~ different bandwidth configuration for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying M~~T~~CCH.  The CFR of MTCH fully contains the CFR of MCCH.  Proposal 2.3-5: Fine. One typo there “MTCH”🡪 “MCCH”.  Proposal 2.3-6: OK |
| OPPO | **Proposal 2.3-1**: OK  **Proposal 2.3-2:** It can be discussed after determination of case D/E.  **Proposal 2.3-4:** If the intention of this proposal is “MCCH and MTCH are using the same CFR”, the proposal can be updated with simple wording.  **Proposal 2.3-5 and 2.3-6:** Not support. MCCH and MTCH can be configured with the same configurations including parameters, as well as configuration procedures. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.3-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.3-2**: Support  **Proposal 2.3-3**: The motivation is not clear to us.  **Proposal 2.3-4, Proposal 2.3-5**: Support in principle. There seems to be a typo.  The CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MC~~T~~CH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.  **Proposal 2.3-6**: Support |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 2.3-1**: support.  **Proposal 2.3-2:** agree.  **Proposal 2.3-3:** Justification is appreciated. From our perspective, it is Gnb’s decision on whether to configure RMR within the CFR for IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.  **Proposal 2.3-4:** support.  **Proposal 2.3-5:** No. it seems this proposal assuming separate CFRs for MCCH and MTCH, which is not OK for us.  **Proposal 2.3-6:** OK |
| LG | **Proposal 2.3-1**: We are generally fine with this proposal. This proposal could be concluded after Cases D/E discussion.  **Proposal 2.3-2:** OK  **Proposal 2.3-5:** We think that for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, different PDSCH/PDCCH parameters can be configured in the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.  **Proposal 2.3-6:** OK |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.3-1: Support.  Proposal 2.3-2: Same view as Lenovo.  Proposal 2.3-3: Don’t know the motivation, in addition DCI format 1\_0 can not be used to dynamically indicate the rate matching pattern.  Proposal 2.3-4: Support. Typo about second “MTCH”  Proposal 2.3-5: Similar view as Samsung.  Proposal 2.3-6: Support. |
| CATT | Proposal 2.3-1: OK  Proposal 2.3-2: Similar views with Lenovo, Case C does not needed such indication. So the proposal can be updated as below:  **Proposal 2.3-2:** For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for Case D (if supported) /Case E (if supported), the starting PRB and the number of PRBs of the CFR reuse the legacy definition of BWP frequency resources for unicast using the combination of Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and *locationAndBandwidth*.  Proposal 2.3-3: OK  Proposal 2.3-4/Proposal 2.3-5: Does these two proposals mean different CFR will be supported for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCC? If so, we are not OK with these two proposals.  Proposal 2.3-6: OK |
| vivo | Proposal 2.3-1: support  Proposal 2.3-2: support  Proposal 2.3-3: does it work for indicating RRC IDLE UEs the information of CSI-RS/TRS configured to RRC-CONNECTED UEs?  Proposal 2.3-4: for MTCH and MCCH?  Proposal 2.3-4: same as 2.3-4  Proposal 2.3-6: Clarified details of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH to be configured will be helpful |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.3-1**: Support.  **Proposal 2.3-2**: Share the similar view with CATT. For case C, it is not necessary to reconfigure the starting PRB and the number of PRBs of the CFR due to CFR=SIB1 configured initial BWP. It is needed for case D and E.  **Proposal 2.3-3**: The motivation is not clear as CMCC commented.  **Proposal 2.3-4**: I guess the FL’s purpose is to configure the same CFR for MCCH and MTCH. If my understanding is right, we support the proposal with corresponding typo modificaition.  **Proposal 2.3-5**: Not support. One CFR for MCCH and MTCH is sufficient.  **Proposal 2.3-6**: From my understanding, RAN2 is also discussing the detailed parameter information for SIBx and MCCH. From RAN1 discussion perspective, the detailed parameter information related to RAN1 needs to be clarified. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support all the proposals assuming 2.3.4 has the typo as ZTE pointed out.  For proposal 2.3-3 including the configuration of *RateMatchPattern*, the resources indicated by the rate match patterns are occupied for other purpose, e.g., CSI-RS/TRS configured to other UEs, so that such resources have to be rate matched around for UEs that will have PDSCH to be transmitted on because otherwise PDSCH and CSI-RS/TRS will interfere each other. |
| Apple | **Proposal 2.3-1:** this proposal seems too broad, we have no clue the exact standard impacts.  **Proposal 2.3-2:** ok  **Proposal 2.3-3:** for the CFR definition, it includes One PDSCH-config for MBS, One PDCCH-config for MBS, SPS-config(s) for MBS. Is the parameter *RateMatchPattern* not covered by these configuration?  **Proposal 2.3-4:** not sure this proposal is really needed, considering the following agreement.  Agreement (Updated proposal from RAN1#106e):  For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.   * Support Case-C * Support at least one of Case D and Case E.   + Down-selection to be made at RAN1#106b-e * Note: Case C, D and E are defined in previous agreements   **Proposal 2.3-5:** don’t support. Different PDSCH/PDCCH parameters are configured for CFR for MTCH and MCCH, it means two separated CFRs for MTCH and MCCH respectively. Don’t see the strong motivation to support this case.  **Proposal 2.3-6**: the proposal needs to clarify further, the GC-PDSCH can be configured with CORSET and search space. The PDSCH is scheduled and not configured. |
| Ericsson | P2.3-1: Support  P2.3.2: Support  P2.3-3: Support  P2.3-4: We assume there is a typo with “MTCH” duplicated, so that the Proposal should read:  **Proposal 2.3-4:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can only use the same bandwidth configuration for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying M~~TC~~CH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.  With that assumption we support the Proposal.  P.2.3-5: Not support. We need to first identify for what purpose there may be different configurations.  The DRX cycle need to be different for MCCH and MTCH, but that is up to RAN2 to specify. We could send an LS to RAN2 and ask whether anything needs to be done on RAN1 level to enable this functionality. |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 2.3-4:** prefer to delete ‘only’ and revise the typo.  Support other proposals (with typo corrected)  For MCCH, the PDSCH/PDCCH parameters can be similar as SIB, e.g., QPSK, CORESET0, SS0; while, for MTCH, the PDSCH/PDCCH parameters can be more flexible for high data rate, e.g., flexible MCS, SS for different type of services with single-cell or multi-cell SFN transmission. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Proposal 2.3-1**: OK  **Proposal 2.3-2: OK**  **Proposal 2.3-3: OK**  **Proposal 2.3-4: We suggest** the CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH is equal to the initial DL BWP to make UE receive MCCH without affecting the SI/paging reception. If UE is interested in one MBS session after acquiring MCCH, it can work the CFR for MTCH if the CFR for MTCH is larger than the CFR for MCCH.  But the CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH can be equal to the initial DL BWP or larger than the initial DL BWP.  **Proposal 2.3-5:** YES. Firstly, MCCH and MTCH can have different or same configurations for PDCCH/PDSCH. For example, MCCH and MTCH can share the same CORESETs/CSSs.  **Proposal 2.3-6:** YES.  But if MCCH and MTCH have some same configuration (CORESETs/CSSs), there’s no need to send the same configuration on both the MCCH specific SIB and MCCH.  For example, a CORESET/CSS is shared by MCCH and MTCH, the configuration for the CORESET/CSS is sent on the MCCH specific SIB and a flag within the configuration for the CORESET/CSS is used to indicate that the CORESET/CSSS is also applied for MTCH. |
| Moderator | Thanks all for input.  **Regarding Proposal 2.3-1:**   * **Support** [Samsung, Lenovo, OPPO, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, CMCC, CATT, vivo, MediaTek, Huawei, Ericsson, Qualcomm, TD Tech] * **Do not support** [Apple] * **Wait for Issue 1 on bandwidth CFR** [ZTE, LG]   @ZTE, LG: I do not know when we are going to conclude on the discussion of down-selection of Case D&E so we may not agree this proposal (or modifications) in this meeting if we have to wait to conclude on Issue 1. I have added a FFS to try to accommodate your comments.  @Apple: this proposal is building from the following proposal:  “Agreement: From RAN1 perspective, the CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, includes at least the following configurations:   * One set of parameters configured for PDSCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDSCH * One set of parameters configured for PDCCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH * FFS: whether some parameters configured for PDSCH/PDCCH are optional/needed for the supported cases of CFR. * FFS: If necessary, depending on the cases supported, starting PRB and the number of PRBs   + The reference for starting PRB is Point A. (Following the same approach to determine reference for starting PRB as that defined in AI8.12.1.)”   The CFR will have PDCCH / PDSCH config parameters. Those parameters that are not configured would take as default value the vales that are used to configure the initial BWP of idle/inactive UEs. Does this clarify?  **Regarding Proposal 2.3-2:**   * **Support** [Nokia, ZTE, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, LG, CATT?, vivo, MediaTek?, Huawei, Apple, Ericson, Qualcomm, TD Tech] * **Do not support** [] * **Wait for Issue 1 on bandwidth CFR** [Intel, Samsung, Lenovo, OPPO, CMCC]   @Intel, Samsung, Lenovo, OPPO, CMCC: I do not know when we are going to conclude on the discussion of down-selection of Case D&E so we may not agree this proposal (or modifications) in this meeting if we have to wait to conclude on Issue 1. I have added some modifications as per CATT suggestions that clarify this would be for the cases of D and/or E (which at least one of them will be supported as per RAN agreement).  **Regarding Proposal 2.3-3:**  @Huawei: There have been comments from Samsung, Apple, Lenovo, Xiaomi about whether this parameter would be included already in the *PDSCH-configCommon*, so there are questions whether this proposal would be needed. I wanted to seek your thoughts – thank you.  @vivo, Nokia, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, CMCC, MediatTek: please check clarification from Huawei and comment if there are more comments.  **Regarding Proposal 2.3-4:**  **Apologies all** for the typo, one of the MTCH should have been a MCCH. This has created confusion so I will correct the typo and check for more comments – thanks.  @ZTE: As per the FL assessment there have been multiple contributions arguing against different bandwidth configurations with their corresponding analysis (please see FL assessment section).  @Apple: thanks for the careful checking of the proposals.  My understanding of the proposals agreed by plenary is that: - a configured/defined configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH supports case C (plus potential support of Case D&E) and  - a configured/defined configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH supports case C (plus potential support of Case D&E).  Furthermore, we also had this agreement:  *Agreement:*  *For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.*   * *FFS: use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH*   This proposal tries to conclude on the FFS.  @Qualcomm: please comment to Apple. This proposal is trying to conclude on the FFS from previous meeting based on contributions to this meeting,  **Regarding Proposal 2.3-5 & related 2.3-6:**  **Apologies all** **again** for the typo on Proposal 2.3-5, one of the MTCH should have been a MCCH. This has created confusion so I will correct the typo and check for more comments – thanks.  Please also check the clarifications from why this is needed as follows   * Qualcomm “*For MCCH, the PDSCH/PDCCH parameters can be similar as SIB, e.g., QPSK, CORESET0, SS0; while, for MTCH, the PDSCH/PDCCH parameters can be more flexible for high data rate, e.g., flexible MCS, SS for different type of services with single-cell or multi-cell SFN transmission*.” * LG: “*We think that for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, different PDSCH/PDCCH parameters can be configured in the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH*” |

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

**Proposal 2.3-1rev1**: The PDCCH/PDSCH parameters for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH, which are not configured, use as default the value of the PDCCH/PDSCH parameters for the configuration of the Rel-15/Rel-16 initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.

* FFS: default value for the configuration of the frequency range of the CFR.

**Proposal 2.3-2rev1:** For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for case D (if supported) and Case E (if supported) the starting PRB and the number of PRBs of the CFR reuse the legacy definition of BWP frequency resources for unicast using the combination of Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and *locationAndBandwidth*.

**Proposal 2.3-3[unchanged - waiting for clarifications]:** The CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs includes the configuration of *RateMatchPattern*.

**Proposal 2.3-4rev1:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can only use the same bandwidth configuration for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

**Proposal 2.3-5rev1:** for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, different PDSCH/PDCCH parameters can be configured in the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

**Proposal 2.3-6 [unchanged]:** for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs:

* GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH can be configured by SIBx
* GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH can be configured by MCCH

**Please provide your answers in the table below. do you support proposals above? Please provide reasons and views in general. Please provide any alternate proposals in case you don’t support the proposals.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.3-1rev1**: Support.  **Proposal 2.3-2rev1**: Even if only Case E is supported, should those parameters be configured? All PRBs in the BWP can be considered as the CFR.  **Proposal 2.3-3**: It is still not unclear what happens to other parameters without an explicit agreement.  **Proposal 2.3-4rev1**: Support.  **Proposal 2.3-5rev1**: We still think given proposal 2.3-6, proposal 2.3-5 is unnecessary as the configurations are separate. There is no agreement for separate CFRs for the MCCH and the MTCH.  **Proposal 2.3-6**: Support. |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 2.3-1rev1**: Support without the FFS point. We don’t see the point of the FFS. If it is agreed that CFR for broadcast is not configured, the default frequency range can only be CORESET#0 or initial DL BWP(if CORESET#0 is not configured).  **Proposal 2.3-2rev1**: We don’t see the necessity of newly added wording. Look into the newly added condition, i.e. ‘for case D (if supported) and Case E (if supported)’, the exactly same mechanism is applied to both. Then why do we need this?  **Proposal 2.3-3**: Agree with Samsung.  **Proposal 2.3-4rev1**: Support.  **Proposal 2.3-5rev1**: No. The same parameters are sufficient for both MCCH and MTCH. Regarding the clarification from Qualcomm, the same parameter can also realize QPSK for MCCH, which is determined by the entry index of MCS table. For the other parameters, we don’t see what the problem is if the PDCCH scheduling MCCH is transmitted in a search space other than SS#0.  **Proposal 2.3-6**: Support. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.3-1rev1**: Support.  **Proposal 2.3-2rev1**: Agree with Xiaomi. We think this proposal is quite straightforward which can be easily agreed after the conclusion of CFR configuration.  **Proposal 2.3-3**: Agree with Samsung.  **Proposal 2.3-4rev1**: Support.  **Proposal 2.3-5rev1**: We support same parameters for MCCH and MTCH.  **Proposal 2.3-6**: I think we don’t need to exclude the possibility of using SIBx for configuring MTCH. Can we add that in the sub-bullet?   * GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH can be configured by SIBx or MCCH |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.3-1rev1**: Support.  **Proposal 2.3-2rev1:** Support.  **Proposal 2.3-4rev1:** Support.  **Proposal 2.3-5rev1:** Not Support. We share the similar view with Samsng, Xiaomi, and Lenovo that one common CFR for MCCH and MTCH is enough.  **Proposal 2.3-6:** Need more clarification.  From my understanding, RAN2 is also discussing the detailed configuration parameter information for SIBx and MCCH. From RAN1 discussion perspective, the detailed parameter information related to RAN1 needs to be clarified. E.g., the CFR information for MCCH and MTCH can be configured within SIBx. |
|  |  |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.3-2rev1: It would be better to make decision on this issue after CFR determination. Even to make progress, the pre-condition on case D/E is not suggested to be added in the agreement before it is confirmed.  Proposal 2.3-3: Similar view with Samsung.  Proposal 2.3-4rev1: support.  Proposal 2.3-5rev1: Not support. Similar view with Samsung/Xiaomi/Lenovo/MTK that one common CFR for MCCH and MTCH is the basic function that need to be supported.  Proposal 2.3-6rev1: The baseline for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH configuration is that both MCCH and MTCH can be configured by SIBx, which should be supported first. This proposal is one step further beyond the basic one. |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.3-3: Agree with Samsung.  Proposal 2.3-4rev1: support.  Proposal 2.3-5rev1: We also support one common CFR for MCCH/MTCH, but one thing is the meaning of “one common CFR” among companies, does it mean all the parameters, e.g., PDSCH-config are same for MCCH/MTCH, or mean only the frequency range of CFR is same for MCCH and MTCH, but other parameters, e.g., PDSCH-config can be different? Considering we have Proposal 2.3-4rev1, does Proposal 2.3-5rev1 means the later interpretation?  Proposal 2.3-6rev1: Similar view as MTK, and as the comment in proposal 2.3-5, does it allow to configure CFR for MCCH in SIBx, and configure a same BW of CFR for MTCH in MCCH but with different PDSCH-config? |
| CATT | Proposal 2.3-2rev1: The intention of adding the ‘for case D (if supported) and Case E (if supported)’ is to distinguish Case C does not need this configuration parameters. However, if companies have the common understanding that this proposal is only for the bandwidth of CFR equals to that of initial BWP, we are OK with it. On the other hands, we also think adding the ‘for case D (if supported) and Case E (if supported)’ dose not harm anything.  Proposal 2.3-3: OK  Proposal 2.3-4rev1:OK  Proposal 2.3-5rev1: Not support. Similar view with above companies that one CFR for MCCH and MTCH is supported.  Proposal 2.3-6rev1: OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.3-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.3-2rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.3-3**: Support  **Proposal 2.3-4rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.3-6**: Support |
| ZTE | **Proposal 2.3-2rev1:** Maybe it is better to wait a little bit for the outcome of Case D/Case E discussion.  **Proposal 2.3-3:** From our perspective, some RateMatchPattern may be needed, which is similar to what we have for unicast PDSCH. Otherwise network may have to schedule broadcast PDSCH to avoid all the potential unavailable resource.  **Proposal 2.3-4rev1 and Proposal 2.3-5rev1:** When looking at these two proposals together, it effectively means different CFR can be configured for MCCH and MTCH. If that is the case, we would propose to just allow to configure different CFR size for MCCH and MTCH under the condition that **CFR for MTCH fully contains the CFR for MCCH**. This should address most of concerns from companies,  **Proposal 2.3-6:** Support. |
| Moderator | A revised version of **Proposal 2.3-1rev1** was agreed at GTW on 14 October.  Agreement:  The PDCCH/PDSCH parameters for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH, which are not configured, use as default the value of the PDCCH/PDSCH parameters for the configuration of the Rel-15/Rel-16 initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for the comments. Given the limited time left for the meeting and the comments above, propose the following.  **Proposal 2.3-2rev1** delay discussion to conclude issue on CFR.  **Proposal 2.3-3** delay the discussion it does not seem we can get consensus easily.  **Proposal 2.3-4**: I think most companies agree that the same bw configuration should be used for MTCH and MCCH. However, ZTE would prefer to have different bw confs. We can delay this discussion given we have already agreed that MCCH and MTCH can have same bw configurations.  **Proposal 2.3-5**: does not have consensus and it seems difficult to get it with the time left.  **Proposal 2.3-6:** has good support, although MediaTek/CMCC requires more clarification. My understanding is that it would be possible to have different PDSCH-configs, however, given the agreements so far the bandwidth configuration has to be the same for MCCH and MTCH since we have not agreed that they can be different. I will include the comment from Lenovo as well to see if we can get agreement on this proposal by focusing the discussion. |

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

**Proposal 2.3-6rev1:** for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs:

* GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH can be configured by SIBx
* GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH can be configured by SIBx or MCCH

**Please provide your answers in the table below. do you support proposal above? Please provide reasons and views in general. Please provide any alternate proposals in case you don’t support the proposal.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | We are ok with this proposal. |
| vivo | We are generally ok with the updates, but prefer to make clear the parameters to be configured by SIBx or MCCH first. |
| CMCC | Ok |
| NOKIA/NSB | We see the including of “SIBx” in the 2nd sub-bullet point is unnecessary. To our understanding, the two step ways of configurations as LTE had reached consensus in RAN2. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | * **Proposal 2.3-4rev1:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can only use the same bandwidth configuration for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   **we think it’s better to support different CFRs for MCCH and MTCH.**  **Reasons:**   1. **MCCH is just a logical channel to carry the MTCH configuration. It only uses some of frequency resource. Therefore, it can be configured within the initial DL BWP to make UE know which MBS sessions are provided by gNB without working on a CFR for MTCH which may be larger than the initial DL BWP if CASE E is supported.** 2. **If the same CFR is used for MCCH and MTCH, UE not interested in any MBS session has to work on the CFR of CASE E type to receive MCCH if CESE E is supported and the same CFR is larger than the initial DL BWP.**   **Proposal 2.3-5rev1:** OK  **Proposal 2.3-6 OK** |
| LG | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Regarding proposal 2.3-3,**  **One comment from Samsung was echoed by other companies are what happens to other parameters without an explicit agreement.**  **My response is that if no explicit agreement, the parameters for unicast perhaps can be applicable including the default value or the “per UE, cell, TRP, BWP,…”. However, we do see some parameters that could be different from for unicst with the above regards. For example, the *RateMatchPattern* for broadcast/multicast would be per G-RNTI instead of per BWP.**  Regarding proposal **2.3-6rev1,** I can understand the intention. However, I am not really getting what we are going to do with the proposal agreed, assuming PDCCH-Config/PDSCH-Config for MCCH or MTCH can be configured by SIBx or SIBx/MCCH? |
| CATT | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |

## [DEPRIO] Issue 4: PDCCH: Details of Common Search Space design for MCCH/MTCH channels

### **Background**

The following agreement for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs at RAN1#103-e, RAN2#104-e, RAN1#105-e and RAN1#106-e are relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| 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.   Agreement:  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 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.   Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH.  Agreement:  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the same CSS type for MCCH and MTCH.   * FFS support of different CSS types for MCCH and MTCH channels for broadcast reception.   Conclusion:  For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, there is no specification support in Rel-17 of different CSS types for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH.  Agreement:  Study whether the Type-x CSS supported for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED can be reused as baseline for broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH. |

The following agreements for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs at RAN1#105-e and RAN1#106-e are also relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For CSS of group-common PDCCH of PTM scheme 1 for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED state, Alt 2 is supported:   * Alt 2: support a Type-x CSS   + The monitoring priority of Type-x CSS is determined based on the search space set indexes of the Type-x CSS set and USS sets, regardless of which DCI format of group-common PDCCH is configured in the Type-x CSS. * FFS: Whether the Type-x CSS is a Type-3 CSS   Conclusion:  The specification impact of having a new Type-x CSS for GC-PDCCH in RRC\_CONNECTED state can be studied and discussed further. |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2108725, Huawei]
  + Discuss: Search space #0 can be used. Since the other CORESET than CORESET#0 can be configured, additional common search space for MTCH scheduling specifically can be configured. Note that RAN1#105 meeting has agreed both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH.
  + Proposal 7: For MTCH scheduling, both searchSpace#0 and Type-x CSS can be configured for GC-PDCCH scheduling MTCH.
* In [R1-2108928, Spreadtrum]
  + *Discuss*: In current specification, CSS Type3 when applied for scheduling is only applicable for primary cell. For some MBS services, e.g., video streaming, for the sake of load balance, they could be carried on Scell. Thus, in our opinion, one new CSS type, e.g., Type4 could be defined for Rel-17 MBS, which could be used for both Pcell and Scell.
  + Proposal 6: A new CSS type can be introduced for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with group-common PDCCH receiving.
* In [R1- 2109003, vivo]
  + *Discuss*: As no additional requirement is observed for CSS for RRC idle/inactive UEs over that for RRC connected UEs in MBS, the same type of CSS, i.e., type-x CSS can be used.
  + Proposal 8: The same type of CSS supported for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED can be reused for broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH.
* In [R1-2109069, OPPO]
  + *Discuss*: The Type-x CSS is a new type CSS which is introduced for monitor priority procedure. SearchSpace#0 and CSS other than SearchSpace#0 are agreed to be configured for GC-PDCCH. A new Type-x of CSS may introduce more flexible monitoring occasions, but it may not be feasible for RRC\_IDLE state. Existing CSS, e.g. Type-3, can be reused as a baseline with different search space sets equation initialization. The design of search space in RRC\_CONNECTED state should consider about the monitoring priority of CSS and USS to make sure the monitoring procedures do not beyond UEs’ capability. In RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, UE does not monitor USS which should be ignored.
  + Proposal 5: One of the existing CSS types can be selected and reused for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_CONNECTED UEs for broadcast reception.
  + Proposal 6: The Type-x CSS for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED is not reused for broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH.
* In [R1-2109305, CMCC]
  + *Discuss*: We also think the new Type-x CSS should be used for MCCH/MTCH of broadcast service and there are several reasons as the following.  
    The first is that RRC\_CONNECTED UEs can both receive broadcast service and multicast service, and it is no sense to define different CSS types and different PDCCH monitoring priority rules between broadcast and multicast.  
    The second is that new Type-x CSS for MTCH can reduce unnecessary BD/CCE counting for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs…
  + Proposal 3. For CSS of GC-PDCCH for broadcast, the same CSS type as multicast is supported, i.e., Type-x CSS.
* In [R1-2109318, Nokia]
  + *On SS#0 and SS other than SS#0 for MTCH*
    - *Discuss*: One issue that need to be addressed is whether additional SS can be configured for MTCH specifically in addition to the SS#0 and SS for MCCH. To our view, depends on the MBS services, the MTCH traffic may need to be monitored with different periodicity than OSI/Paging messages and MCCH traffic. Thus, it is supported to have additional SS configuration(s) for MTCH in addition to SS#0 and SS for MCCH.
    - Proposal-12: It is supported to have additional SS configuration(s) for MTCH in addition to SS#0 and SS for MCCH.
  + *On reusing Type-x CSS from multicast*
    - *Discuss*: In legacy, the Type0/0A/1/2-PDCCH can be applied to RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs associated with the CSS of CORESET#0. For the operation of MBS services, there is a need to define a new Type-y CSS that is associated with at least G-RNTI (MTCH) or GS-RNTI (MCCH), and this newly defined Type-y CSS can be monitored by RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs in the CORESET#0 as well as in the CORESET of (Case C/D/E) CFR if configured.  
      Currently, in AI-8.12.1 with RRC\_CONNECTED mode UE discussion, following agreement has been made, and a so-called Type-x CSS has been agreed to be supported. From the signalling configuration perspective, it is understood that the Type-x CSS can be configured via UE dedicated *SearchSpace* configuration in PDCCH-Config with *searchSpaceType*=common. But for Type-y CSS, the corresponding *SearchSpace* configuration is carried differently either via SIB or MCCH. Therefore, from signalling configuration perspective, the Type-x CSS defined in RRC\_CONNECTED cannot be directly reused, and there may need to define a new Type-y CSS specifically for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE with MBS operation.
    - Proposal-13: From signalling configuration perspective, the Type-x CSS defined in RRC\_CONNECTED cannot be directly reused, and there may need to define a new Type-y CSS specifically for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE with MBS operation.
* In [R1-2109517, Samsung]
  + *Discuss*: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs it can only be a CSS and, unlike RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, there is no additional impact on scheduling or specifications as there are no USS sets.
  + *Discuss*: The suggested motivation for a new CSS is to avoid the default collision among PDCCH candidates that always start from CCE index 0. Therefore, whether or not there is any modification, is not applicable to that configuration of CSS sets (can remain as for Type-3 CSS sets with UE-common/SIB1 RRC instead of UE-specific RRC) but to the search space set equation where an initialization may not always be Y\_(p,-1)=0. Such collision avoidance (also with PDCCH candidates for non-Type-3 CSS in case of CORESET#0) is necessary and should also apply for multicast for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs (with respect to PDCCH monitoring, broadcast is only a particular realization of multicast and it has been agreed that the same GC-PDCCH can be received by both RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs and RRC\_CONNECTED UEs). The mechanism to avoid the collisions can be further discussed.
  + Observation 1: Configuration of SS sets for GC-PDCCH can be as for Type-3 PDCCH CSS sets in Rel-16 (via UE-common, instead of UE-specific, RRC signaling).
  + Proposal 1. Support avoidance of permanent collisions for PDCCH candidates of search space sets for GC-PDCCH for broadcast and multicast.
* In [R1-2109540, Lenovo]
  + On the other hand, if the specific common frequency resource is configured within the initial DL BWP, a common CORESET other than CORESET 0 can be configured within the specific common frequency resource for RRC IDLE/RRC INACTIVE UEs to detect the group-common DCI. Correspondingly, an associated common search space is configured for the common CORESET, which can reuse current CSS type.
  + Proposal 10: A CSS is configured for RRC IDLE/RRC INACTIVE UEs by reusing existing CSS type.
* In [R1-2109569, MediaTek]
  + *Discuss*: Therefore, we prefer the same CSS type can be used for all three RRC states for broadcast transmission.
  + Proposal 7: The CSS type defined in AI 8.12.1 (e.g., a new Type-x CSS) for MBS group scheduling can be used for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH.
* In [R1-2109635, Intel]
  + *Discuss*: Alternately it can be monitored in a new PDCCH CSS set e.g., *searchSpaceBroadcast* which is configured by the MBS specific *PDCCH-ConfigBroadcast*. The CSS set can be a Type-x CSS set similar to the case for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs
  + Proposal 7: The PDCCH scheduling the MCCH can also be monitored in a Type-x CSS set configured by the MBS specific *PDCCH-ConfigBroadcast.*
* In [R1-2109703, DOCOMO]
  + *Discuss*: For commonality of configurations, it is better to use the same CSS types for multicast and broadcast. By adding RNTIs for MCCH/MTCH as RNTI types monitored in type-x CSS, type-x CSS can be reused for broadcast. We don’t see any technical problems with reusing type-x CSS for broadcast.
  + Proposal 3: For CSS for broadcast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, reuse the Type-x CSS for multicast.
* In [R1-2109985, LGE]
  + Proposal 6: For MTCH, support CSS type of which the monitoring priority for group-common PDCCH is determined based on the search space set indexes for MTCHs. The CSS for MTCHs can be optionally configured by MCCH.
* In [R1-2110120, Convida]
  + *Discuss*: Also, similar to RRC connected state, a new CSS type should be defined for monitoring the group-common PDCCH, e.g., the CSS for MBS may not always be prioritized in PDCCH overbooking.
  + Proposal 5: A new CSS type should be defined for monitoring the group-common PDCCH.
* In [R1-2110212, Qualcomm]
  + *Discuss*: We think there is no specific issue identified to reuse the design for multicast RRC\_CONNECTED UEs. The Type-x CSS for GC-PDCCH can be used as the SS of MCCH/MTCH.
  + Proposal 2: Support Type-x CSS for the SS of MCCH/MTCH.
* In [R1-2110357, Ericsson]
  + Proposal 20: The CSS type for broadcast should be the same as the CSS type for multicast.

### **FL Assessment**

This Issues is divided in two subtopics: i) the configuration of searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 for MTCH, and ii) the discussion on reusing the Type-x CSS for multicast reception in RRC connected UE state for MCCH/MTCH broadcast reception.

***On searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 for MTCH***

[Huawei, Nokia] propose that for MTCH both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for GC-PDCCH scheduling MTCH noting that this configuration of search spaces was already agreed for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH.

Since there are not so far opposing views from the inputs to the meeting, a proposal is put forward to agree both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 for MTCH.

***On*** ***reusing Type-x CSS for multicast reception in RRC connected UE state for MCCH/MTCH broadcast reception***

The issue on Type-x CSS was discussed at RAN1#106-e without reaching an agreement. There is also a related discussion on AI 8.12.1.

[vivo, CMCC, MediaTek, Intel, DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Ericsson] propose to reuse the same type of CSS supported for multicast in RRC connected state. [vivo] highlights that there are no additional requirements for broadcast compared to multicast. [CMCC] discusses that i) for UEs in RRC connected receiving both multicast and broadcast, using the same CSS Type with same priority rules for monitoring is more adequate, and ii) that a new Type-x CSS for MTCH can reduce unnecessary BD/CCE counting for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs that can also receive broadcast MBS.

[Spreadtrum, Convida] proposes a new CSS Type for broadcast reception. [Spreadtrum] proposes to transmit MBS broadcast services in Scell, which would need new Type (Type-4) CSS.

On the other hand [OPPO, Samsung, Lenovo] propose to reuse existing CSS Types for broadcast reception with RRC idle/inactive UEs, where [OPPO, Samsung] propose using different initialisation for the search space sets equation.

As per the request of the agreement at the lats RAN1 meeting, [Nokia] discusses whether Type-x CSS used for multicast in RRC connected UE state can be reused for broadcast reception in RRC idle/inactive UE states. [Nokia] describes that from the signalling configuration point of view, the Type-x CSS can be configured via UE dedicated *SearchSpace* configuration in *PDCCH-Config* with *searchSpaceType*=common but for broadcast reception the corresponding *SearchSpace* configuration is carried via SIB/MCCH. Therefore, the Type-x CSS defined for multicast reception in RRC\_CONNECTED cannot be directly reused which requires defining a new Type-y CSS for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception.

As per previous meetings, there is strong support on reusing the Type-x CSS for multicast reception in RRC connected UE state for broadcast reception in RRC idle/inactive UE states. However, there still no consensus and there are some companies that do prefer to reuse existing CSS Types. More discussion is needed, specially taking into account that there is a related discussion at AI 8.12.1. Regarding the agreed study on whether the multicast solution on Type-x CSS could be reused for broadcast reception in RRC idle/inactive UEs, one company has found an issue that it is worth discussing with the entire group. Reaching a conclusion first on whether there are in fact any issues on reusing the Type-x CSS from multicast can help reach an agreement on the type of CSS used for broadcast reception. For this subtopic the FL requests feedback on the issue found by Nokia and other potential issues, if any, to conclude on the study agreed on the previous meeting.

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

**Proposal 2.4-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for GC-PDCCH scheduling MTCH.

**Proposal (conclusion) 2.4-2**: the Type-x CSS defined in RRC\_CONNECTED UE state for multicast reception cannot be directly reused for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs for the following reason:

* Type-x CSS it is configured via UE dedicated *SearchSpace* configuration in *PDCCH-Config* with *searchSpaceType*=common but for broadcast reception the corresponding *SearchSpace* configuration is carried via SIB/MCCH.

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above:**

1. **do you support proposals 2.4-1?**
2. **do you agree with the issue found in proposal 2.4-2? Please provide reasons and views in general if you do not agree.**
3. **Do you think there are any other issues, if any, for reusing the Type-x CSS supported for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED as baseline for broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Intel | Proposal 2.4-1: OK  Proposal 2.4-2: Not sure why this is an issue. This configuration can be provided via SIB/MCCH |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.4-1: Support  Proposal 2.4-2: Agree. |
| NOKIA/NSB | e)Proposal 2.4-1: Support  f)Proposal 2.4-2: Agree,  g) And depends also on how the corresponding discussion goes in 8.12.1 about Type-x CSS. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.4-1: Support  Proposal 2.4-2: Agree. |
| ZTE | e) we support Proposal 2.4-1;  f) Not sure why the sub-bullet of Proposal 2.4-2 is an issue, maybe some more clarification is needed.  g) We suggest to wait for the outcome in AI8.12.1 first so that we can have a consistent solution for UE. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2.4-1: Support  Proposal 2.4-2: Agree. |
| NTT DOCOMO | e) Support  f) We are not sure this is a problem. We think Type-x CSS configuration can be included in SIB/MCCH. |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 2.4-1**: Support.  **Proposal (conclusion) 2.4-2**: Same question as Intel. |
| CMCC | e) support Proposal 2.4-1;  f) we think the definition of type of CSS and configuration signalling are two independent issues, e.g., the Type\_x CSS is configured by SIB/MCCH for IDLE UE and by RRC signalling for CONNCTED UE. |
| CATT | e. support proposals 2.4-1  f. Agree with the issue found in proposal 2.4-2 |
| vivo | Proposal 2.4-1: Support  Proposal 2.4-2: we can wait for progress on the type of CSS to be used in RRC\_CONNECTED UE |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.4-1**: support  **Proposal 2.4-2**: We don’t think this is an issue. ZTE/vivo’s suggestion is fine for us. |
| Apple | **Proposal 2.4-1:** ok.  **Proposal 2.4-2:** agree to wait for the progress in AI 8.12.1 |
| Ericsson | P2.4-1: Support  P2.4-2: Not support. The fact that the signaling method differs does not imply that the corresponding Information Elements need to be different. In principle the IE of PDCCH config in RRC could be copied into SIB. |
| Qualcomm | Similar view as Intel/ZTE/CMCC, there will be no issue to broadcast Type-x CSS in SIB/MCCH. |
| Moderator | Thanks for inputs.  Proposal 2.4-1 is **supported by all companies**.  Regarding question f) on Proposal (conclusion) 2.4-2. The intention of this proposal is to promote debate since there are multiple companies that would like to reuse the solution from the multicast discussion, while other companies see concerns. I would like to ask companies (e.g., **Nokia, Lenovo, Samsung, Spreadtrum, CATT**) that agree with the issue in Proposal 2.4-1 to clarify why this is an issue if as other companies say the configurations could be transmitted in SIB/MCCH. Thank you! |
| NOKIA/NSB | Please find our view in below:   * The signalling method for Type-x CSS is different for the idle/inactive UEs from the connected UEs, and to our understanding, that is the highlighted issue in the sub-bullet of Proposal (conclusion) 2.4-2. And that was the intention that we agreed this proposal. * We agree that Type-x CSS for idle/inactive UEs can be via SIB or MCCH. We don’t see the intension of **Proposal (conclusion) 2.4-2** is to say that “Type-x CSS for idle/inactive UEs can NOT be via SIB or MCCH”, at least that is not our expectations.   Furthermore, we could like to wait until the progress of corresponding Type-x CSS discussion in AI 8.12.1, and after we have detailed/clarified Type-x CSS defined in AI 8.12.1, we may further discuss the Type-x CSS here in idle/inactive on whether it can be reused or not. |
| Spreadtrum | Regarding proposal 2.4-2, we could not agree more that Type-x CSS for idle/inactive UE can be transmitted by SIB/MCCH, and the parameters for Type-x CSS for idle/inactive state and the parameters for Type-x CSS connected state can be configured to be the same by Gnb . The reasons why we agree proposal 2.4-2 in 1st round are below:   * The signalling to configure Type-x CSS for idle state/inactive state UE and connected UEs are different. The former is via SIB/MCCH while the latter is via UE-specific RRC signalling. * For a UE, typically it firstly enters in idle state, then transfers into RRC connected state. Thus, we can’t say reuse the Type-x CSS of connected state for idle state. |
| CATT | The reason why we agree proposal 2.4-2 in 1st round is similar with Spreadtrum. We suggest defer this proposal until more progress from AI 8.12.1. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Proposal 2.4-1**:YES  **Proposal (conclusion) 2.4-2**: YES |
| Samsung | We have the same view as Nokia above. We also see Type-x CSS for IDLE/INACTIVE UEs can be done via SIB/MCCH. |
| Moderator | **Proposal 2.4-1** was agreed at the GTW on 14 October.  Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for GC-PDCCH scheduling MTCH. |
| Moderator | Thank you for the discussion. I think given the stage of the meeting, that this question depens on progress on other AI I do not think is worth continuing the discussion on this issue. I hope it has been useful for next steps in the discussion. The discussion of this proposal is therefore depriortised. |

## [ACTIVE] Issue 5: PDCCH: RNTI and DCI design for carrying MCCH change notification

### **Background**

RAN2 discussed the details of broadcast session delivery and the following agreements were made during RAN2#113-e meeting:

|  |
| --- |
| * **Assume that MCCH change notification mechanism is used to notify the changes of MCCH configuration due to session start for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS (other cases FFS, if any).** |

During RAN2#113bis-e meeting, RAN2 discussed further aspects of MCCH scheduling and MCCH change notification leading to the following agreements with RAN1 impacts:

|  |
| --- |
| * **The modification period is defined for NR MCCH and NR MCCH contents are only allowed to be modified at each modification period boundary.** * **The updated MCCH message should be sent in the same MCCH modification period where the change notification is sent.** * **It is up to RAN1 to decide about the RNTI and DCI format used for MCCH change notifications.** * **RAN2 will discuss and down-select from the following two options for the UE to get aware of session stop/modification:**   + **Reading MCCH once per each MCCH modification period when receiving an ongoing broadcast session**   + **DCI used for MCCH notification indicates the change of an ongoing broadcast session** |

At RAN1#105-e, RAN2 requests RAN1 [R1-2104165] to investigate and provide feedback, considering agreements made by RAN2 as indicated in the LS (cf. Annex B) where the following request is relevant for the discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| * Details of the RNTI and DCI design for carrying MCCH change notifications.   + NOTE: RAN2 is still discussing some aspects that may have an impact on this issue, e.g. whether or not to support multiple MCCH or whether or not a notification about the modification/stop of an ongoing session is needed, as indicated above. RAN2 will update RAN1 as soon as further agreements are made on these items. |

RAN2 discussed further the aspects related to MCCH design and made the following agreements during RAN2#114-e meeting:

|  |
| --- |
| * Indication of an MCCH change due to modification of an ongoing session‘s configuration (including session stop) is provided with an explicit notification from the network (provided that RAN1 confirms a separate bit for this purpose can be accommodated in the MCCH change notification DCI, in addition to a bit for session start notification). FFS on whether this notification can be reused for modification of other information carried by MCCH, if any. * FFS whether the possibility of UE missing an MCCH change notification needs to be addressed or can be left to UE implementation. * At least in case RAN1 decides to utilize RNTI other than MCCH-RNTI for MCCH change notification, MCCH change notification is sent in the first MCCH monitoring occasion of each MCCH repetition period. |

RAN2 discussed further the aspects related to MCCH design and made the following agreements during RAN2#115-e meeting:

|  |
| --- |
| * **RAN2 waits for RAN1’s final decision on which RNTI/DCI (i.e. Alt1 and/or Alt 2 as identified by RAN1) for MCCH change notification to be adopted.** * **Do not specify any mechanism to address the possibility of UE missing an MCCH change notification and it is left to UE implementation.** * It is up to network implementation (e.g. paging repetitions) for addressing scenario of potential notification loss for UEs. |

RAN1 discussed aspects related to RNTI and DCI design for carrying MCCH change notifications and made the following agreements during RAN1#105-e and RAN1#106-e meetings:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, DCI format 1\_0 is used as baseline for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH.   * FFS details of FDRA.   Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, study the following alternatives for MCCH change notification indication due to session start:   * Alt 1: Define a dedicated RNTI to scramble the CRC of a DCI indicating a MCCH change notification; * Alt 2: Use of a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification;   Other solutions are not precluded and it is also not precluded whether to support both Alt1 and Alt2.  Conclusion:  It is up to RAN2 to decide the specific contents of the MCCH change notification, e.g, whether notification only informs about session start, whether or not notification also informs about session modification/stop or whether or not the notification informs about any other information.  Agreement:  Study and reach an agreement by RAN1#106b-e on whether Alt1 and Alt2 for MCCH change notification indication can accommodate at least 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop). |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2108725, Huawei]
  + *Discuss*: For MBSFN and SC-PTM, DCI format 1C scrambled by a dedicated RNTI (M-RNTI and SC-N-RNTI for MBSFN and SC-PTM, respectively) are used for notifying the start of the session. All other bits in DCI format 1C are reserved for DCI size alignment.   
    The change notified by a specific DCI which is not used for scheduling means UE needs to monitor one more DCI format in addition to the one for scheduling MCCH/MTCH, which is not necessarily needed.
  + *Discuss*: Instead, using a field in the DCI scheduling MCCH to notify the MCCH change can reduce the possibility of UE missing an MCCH change notification, because the DCI scheduling MCCH will be transmitted from network whenever MCCH is transmitted.
  + Proposal 11: A specific DCI scrambled by a dedicated RNTI is not necessary and not sufficient for notifying the session start and the modification of an ongoing session (including session stop).
  + *Discuss*: In RAN2#115 meeting, it was agreed that do not specify any mechanism to address the possibility of UE missing an MCCH change notification and it is left to UE implementation and it is up to network implementation (e.g. paging repetitions) for addressing scenario of potential notification loss for UEs.
  + Proposal 12: Using a field in DCI scheduling MCCH to notify the session start and the modification of an ongoing session, i.e., Alt2.
    - Send LS to RAN2 with the mechanism RAN1 agreed.
* In [R1-2108853, ZTE]
  + *Discuss*: As DCI format 1\_0 in CSS, such as, DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with P-RNTI/SI-RNTI should also be monitored by legacy UEs, the size of DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with P-RNTI/SI-RNTI cannot be changed. This requires that size of DCI format GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH should be smaller than size of DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with P-RNTI/SI-RNTI.
  + *Discuss*: DCI size will add at least 2 bit under Alt.2, which may cause size of DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with SC-RNTI/G-RNTI to be greater than size of DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with P-RNTI/SI-RNTI. As a result, DCI size alignment cannot be executed. In addition, Alt.2 may also lead to a lower reliability.
  + Proposal 4: Define a dedicated RNTI to scramble the CRC of a DCI indicating a MCCH change notification (Alt.1).
* In [R1-2108928, Spreadtrum]
  + Proposal 3: Support MCCH change notification indication includes the status of each MBS session.
  + Proposal 4: For MCCH change notification indication, the combination of Alt1 and Alt 2 can be considered.
  + Proposal 5: More than 2 bits can be accommodated in the MCCH change notification indication.
* In [R1-2109069, OPPO]
  + Proposal 8: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, define a dedicated RNTI to scramble the CRC of a DCI indicating a MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2109196, CATT]
  + *Discuss*: In Alt 1, a DCI format scrambled by a dedicated RNTI (e.g. SC-N-RNTI) is used for notifying. All other bits in DCI format are reserved for DCI size alignment. However, large number of bits will be padded during DCI size alignment. In Alt 2, at least 2 bit can be accommodated for the MCCH change notification due to the HARQ-ACK feedback may be supported for IDEL/INACTIVE UEs. We believe that companies have a consensus that the HARQ-ACK feedback is not supported for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, so the HARQ-ACK related fields such as DAI (2 bits), TPC command for scheduled PUCCH (2 bits), PRI (3 bits) and K1 (3 bits) can be applied for notifying the start of the session and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop). Thus, we prefer Alt2.
  + Proposal 10: For MCCH change notification indication, Alt2 (a field in DCI scheduling MCCH) can be used to notify the session start and the modification of an ongoing session.
* In [R1-2109305, CMCC]
  + Discuss: But as the analysis above and the example in Table 1, the reserved bits in DCI format for MCCH is much larger than 2 bits and is enough to be used as MCCH change notification and can also provide forward compatibility. Therefore, Alt 2 can be supported which is a simple and sufficient way without defining a new RNTI for MCCH change notification.
  + Proposal 4. The DCI format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH also includes the following fields for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state:
    - MCCH change notification (only for MCCH)
    - VRB-to-PRB mapping
* In [R1-2109318, Nokia]
  + *Discuss*: MCCH change notification field (if supported and only for MCCH): To answer the RAN2 LS on whether there can be a separate bit for MCCH change modification accommodated in the MCCH change notification DCI, in addition to a bit for session start notification. We see it is feasible to accommodate such an additional bit in the DCI. But it ups to RAN2 to decide whether it is beneficial to introduce such an additional bit.
* In [R1-2109388, Xiaomi]
  + *Discuss*: Generally speaking, MCCH carries the configuration information of MBS transmission which is broadcast to all the MBS capable UEs. The situation is quite similar to SIB1 and OSI transmission, which is scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI. In order to have a clear picture on the DCI content, we provide the information fields in DCI format 1\_0 scheduling SIB1 or OSI in table 1. It can be observed there are 15 reserved bits can be further exploited even the exact same information fields are needed for MBS MCCH scheduling.
  + *Discuss*: From our understanding, the scheduling information included in DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI are sufficient for MCCH scheduling. In the other words, there are 16 bits can be further exploited for MCCH change notification indication, i.e. 1 bit system information indicator and 15 reserved bits. They are sufficient to the at least 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes.
  + Observation: There are abundant bits to accommodate the at least 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes in the DCI format 1\_0 scheduling PDSCH carrying MCCH.
  + *Discuss*: One concern on alternative 2 is that power consumption goes up as UE needs to monitor PDCCH in every MO configured for MTCH scheduling. Indeed, UE always needs to monitor PDCCH scheduling MTCH per network configuration. It is the principle of PDCCH design since Rel-15. We don’t see any additional power consumption introduced by alt 2. On the other hand, alternative 1 needs additional PDCCH monitoring which is dedicated only for notification of MCCH configuration changes on top of MTCH scheduling.
  + Proposal 7: For MCCH change notification indication, use a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2109517, Samsung]
  + Proposal 4. Use of a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2109569, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 8: MBS DCI format 1\_0 used for MCCH and MTCH reception is reused for NR MBS MCCH change notification.
  + Proposal 9: A new RNTI (e.g., MCCH-N-RNTI) can be used for MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2109635, Intel]
  + Proposal 6: For MCCH change notification, a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH can be used without a dedicated RNTI
* In [R1-2109703, DOCOMO]
  + *Discuss*: The total number of bits of the required DCI fields will be less than 37 bits, even if all the fields that are FFS are included. Thus, an MCCH change notification can be included in a DCI format scheduling MCCH. We don’t see clear motivation to define a dedicated RNTI to transfer only 2 bits of information.
  + Observation 1: A DCI format scheduling MCCH can accommodate an MCCH change notification.
  + Proposal 4: For MCCH change notification for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, support Alt 2.
* In [R1-2109769, TD Tech]
  + Proposal 7: Wait for the final requirement for the idle bits from RAN2 for the MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2110058, Apple]
  + *Discuss*: For the discussed solutions, Alt 1 would require a new RNTI and new DCI format, the field of this DCI need to be defined, more standard works are expected. For Alt2, if only 2bits are required to indicate all MBS sessions start and sessions stop, it is reasonable to introduce a new field in the first DCI format. Currently, it was agreed 1bit Identifier for DCI format field is not needed. In addition, 2bits TPC command for scheduled PUCCH field seems not needed for MBS broadcast service, as no PUCCH feedback is supported for broadcast. Thus, introducing 2bit MCCH change notification field doesn’t impact the first DCI format size.
  + Proposal 3: New field is introduced in first DCI format for GC-PDCCH to indicate MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2110212, Qualcomm]
  + Proposal 3: Support Alt1: Define a dedicated RNTI (e.g., MCCH-N-RNTI) to scramble the CRC of a DCI indicating MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2110251, Google]
  + Observation 1: In LTE SC-PTM, for UE other than BL UEs, UEs in CE or NB-IoT UEs, a very compact DCI format 1C is applied to SC-MCCH change notification to secure the reception reliability. In order to achieve a similar reliability as in LTE SC-PTM, delivering of MBS MCCH change notification should have higher reliability than the MBS MCCH information.
  + Observation 2: In LTE SC-PTM, for BL UEs, UEs in CE or NB-IoT UEs, DCI format 6-2 with CRC scrambled by SC-RNTI is applied for SC-MCCH change notification and SC-MCCH information delivery. Where the transmission reliability is further enhanced by PDCCH repetition.
  + *Discuss*: The size of NR DCI format 1\_0 is about doubled to LTE DCI formats 1C and 6-2. However, the size of CCE in NR is also doubled to CCE defined in LTE. Thus, if the notification is sent in the same CCE aggregation level, it can be expected that Alt-2 can provide similar performance to the non-BL/CE/NB-IoT UE in LTE. Further, NR supports aggregation level up to 16 CCEs (Max CCE aggregation level in LTE is 8), it can provide the reliability comparable with 2 repetitions of MCCH notification in LTE. According to the observation, we think Alt-2 is sufficient to Embb UE.
  + Observation 3: Considering the larger size of CCE and the higher supported aggregation level in NR, sending MCCH notification by using DCI format 1\_0 can achieve the reliability that is comparable to LTE DCI format 6-2 with 2 repetitions.
  + Proposal 1: Support Alt-2, use of a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification.
* In [R1- 2110258, AsusTek]
  + Proposal 3: For MCCH change notification indication, only Alt 2 is supported.
* In [R1-2110357, Ericsson]
  + *Discuss*: With Alt1, a dedicated RNTI is transmitted only when there is a change to be signaled and the nature of the change is signaled in the DCI of the related PDCCH. To increase robustness, this message could be repeated over several modification periods, with identical content. To distinguish between a real change and a repetition, relative signaling via bit toggling relative to earlier change notifications would be preferable to absolute signaling of the change, i.e. it is the change of bits not the bit value itself that carries the information of change.
  + *Discuss*: With Alt2, the two change notification bits are carried in the DCI of the MCCH PDCCH. As in Alt1, the change notification bits could be toggled when there is a change. With Alt2, the change notification bits will be available in every MCCH DCI, so the signaling can be extremely robust.  
    With measures to increase robustness, as above, both Alt1/Alt2 approaches would be reasonable.
  + Proposal: Further study if, and to what extent,
    - robustness could be increased in Alt1 and Alt2 via repetition and bit toggling.
    - the additional two DCI bits in Alt2 will cause an increased overhead, considering DCI size alignment with unicast/multicast.

### **FL Assessment**

***On Alt 1: dedicated RNTI to scramble the CRC of a DCI indicating a MCCH change notification***

* *Proponents of Alt 1*
  + [ZTE, Spreadtrum, OPPO, MediaTek, Qualcomm].
* *Drawbacks of Alt 1*
  + [Huawei, Xiaomi] discusses that Alt 1 requires the monitoring of an additional DCI format, which increase complexity and [Apple] discusses that more standardisation work is needed for Alt 1.
* *Robustness of Alt1*
  + [Ericsson] discusses that to increase robustness, this message could be repeated over several modification periods, with identical content. Propose to study robustness aspects via repetition and bit toggling.
* *Can Alt 1 accommodate at least 2 bits for the MCCH change notification?* 
  + [CATT] describes that besides the bits used for notification (2 in this case) the rest of bits are reserved for DCI size alignment. Therefore, it is understood that Alt 1 could also accommodate 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop).

***On Alt 2: Use of a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification***

* *Proponents of Alt 2*
  + [Huawei, Spreadtrum, CATT, CMCC, Xiaomi, Samsung, Intel, DOCOMO, Apple, Google, AsusTek]
* *Drawbacks of Alt 2*
  + [ZTE] discusses that since the DCI size will add at least 2 bits, it may cause that the DCI 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with GC-RNTI is of larger size that the DCI 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with P/SI-RNTI where size alignment cannot be executed.
* *Robustness of Alt2*
  + [Huawei, Ericsson] discusses that Alt 2 can be very robust since the notification is transmitted whenever the MCCH is transmitted.
  + [Google] presents that although the DCI format 1\_0 in NR is double the size of DCI formats 1C and 6-2 in LTE, since NR has larger size of CCE and higher supported aggregation level, sending MCCH notification by using DCI format 1\_0 can achieve a reliability that is comparable to the reliability of LTE DCI format 6-2 with 2 repetitions.
  + [Ericsson] study robustness aspects via repetition and bit toggling.
* *Can Alt 2 accommodate at least 2 bits for the MCCH change notification?* 
  + [CATT, CMCC, Nokia, Xiaomi, DOCOMO, Apple] provide analysis of the number of total bits required for the DCI 1\_0 format scheduling PDSCH carrying a MCCH and they show there is sufficient space to accommodate the 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop).

There is stronger support for Alt 2. Regarding the question whether Alt1 and Alt2 for MCCH change notification indication can accommodate at least 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop), based on the analysis it seems both alternatives can accommodate at last 2 bits and therefore, RAN1 could inform RAN2 on these finding. Regarding down-selection between Alt1 and Alt 2, the situation is not very different to previous meetings. It is worth reaching a common understanding of the drawbacks for each alternative to then try to make a selection taking into account the very late stage of the standardisation in rel-17. The FL therefore puts forward some proposals for discussion and some additional questions on the FL assessment on this section to build a common understanding. Based on the discussion on initial rounds additional proposals can be discussed to try to reach a conclusion on this Issue.

### **1st round FL proposals for Issue 5**

**Proposal (conclusion) 2.5-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, Alt 1 can accommodate at least 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop).

**Proposal (conclusion) 2.5-2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, Alt 2 can accommodate at least 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop).

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above:**

1. **do you agree the conclusions in proposals 2.5-1 and 2.5-2? Please provide reasons and views in general if you do not agree.**
2. **Do you agree with the drawbacks of Alt 1 and Alt 2 listed in the FL assessment above? Please provide reasons and views in general if you do not agree.**
3. **Do you agree with the robustness comments in Alt 1 and Alt 2 listed in the FL assessment above? Please provide reasons and views in general if you do not agree.**

**FL note: based on the discussion from these questions additional proposals can be included for agreement (e.g., down-selection between Alt 1 & Alt 2) including potential LS to RAN2.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Intel | Alt. 2 seems majority view and preferable. It can support 2 bits and is more robust. |
| Samsung | Agree with the conclusions.  At least 2 bits can be used in Alt 2 for the notification of MCCH configuration changes. Alt 1 requires more CRC checking with more RNTI values. |
| NOKIA/NSB | a) Agree  b) Agree, both Alts could work and decision up to RAN2  c) Agree, both Alts could work and decision up to RAN2 |
| ZTE | a) Agree  b) Our main concern for Alt.2 is that there may not be enough bits for change notification, which may be up to the ongoing discussion of DCI fields for first DCI format, especially if we need to align the DCI fields between broadcast and multicast.  c) Agree  Since the comparison between Alt.1 and Alt.2 also require some RAN2 design, e.g., whether repetition is possible for these PDCCHs, maybe we can also leave it to RAN2 to decide the final alternative. |
| NTT DOCOMO | a) Agree  b) We agree on the drawbacks of Alt 1, but not on those of Alt 2. In Alt 2, Even if a MCCH change notification is added to the DCI format scheduling MCCH, the total number of bits in the DCI fields can be less than the size of DCI 1\_0 in CSS.  c) Agree |
| Xiaomi | Agree with Intel and Samsung. Considering there is clear majority support on alt 2, only alt 2 should be recommended from RAN1 perspective.  We don’t agree with the drawbacks identified for alt 2 as the reserved bits is sufficient for MCCH notification. The payload size wouldn’t be increased because of notification indication. |
| CMCC | a) Agree  b) Agree  c) Agree  Since both alt 1 and alt 2 can work, we suggest take the majority view, i.e., alt 2. |
| CATT | a) Agree the conclusions in proposals 2.5-1 and 2.5-2  b) We do not agree with the drawbacks of Alt2 that listed in the FL assessment above. The We believe that companies have a consensus that the HARQ-ACK feedback is not supported for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, so the HARQ-ACK related fields such as DAI (2 bits), TPC command for scheduled PUCCH (2 bits), PRI (3 bits) and K1 (3 bits) can be applied for notifying the start of the session and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop). Thus, per our understanding, the size alignment can be executed as normal. |
| Vivo | Agree with two conclusions above. |
| MediaTek | b) Don’t agree the drawbacks of Alt 1 listed in the FL assessment above. Alt 1 will not introduce a new DCI format for MCCH change notification, just reuse DCI 1\_0 with a new dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Prefer to make the decision of supporting Alt2 in RAN1. |
| Apple | Agree with the conclusions. |
| Ericsson | * + 1. We agree     2. The only potential drawback with Alt2 is the increased DCI size, but we agree with other companies that this is not a real drawback due spare capacity in DCI 1\_0 and DCI alignment.     3. We agree. With repetitions and bit toggling there is no robustness issue. |
| Qualcomm | Alt2 will introduce new fields in DCI 1\_0, especially this field has 2+ bits at least. It will jeopardize the PDCCH for MCCH change notification as well as for MCCH itself, which requires more repetition and larger AL for compensation. Compressed DCI is always preferred for IDLE/INACTIVE UEs with less power consumption and high reliability.  Alt1 does not require additional complexity. CRC check with different RNTIs is not an issue, already supported since LTE MBMS.   * + 1. Another key difference is that no matter whether there is change or not, the added field based on Alt1 has to be always there; but for Alt2, the PDCCH for MCCH change notification with dedicated RNTI is only to be sent when needed. |
| Moderator | Thanks for discussion.  From the replies I understand that **Proposal 2.5-1 and 2.5-2 are agreeable.** Therefore, both alternatives could accommodate the 2 bits for the MCCH change notification**.**  There have been comments on taking majority view or leaving the final selection up to RAN2. Before, I would like to have another exchange of views given that proponents of Alt1 have provided some clarifications on the potential added complexity (Qualcomm, MediaTek).  **Could proponents of Alt 2**, check whether they agree with the clarifications by Qualcomm and MediaTek? |
| Xiaomi2 | @ MTK, alternative 1 will consume additional RNTI value and need additional PDCCH monitoring.  @ Qualcomm, I think we are discussing NR technology here. The mechanism adopted in LTE of course is a good reference but it is not the reason to specify something for NR system because LTE did. Regarding your comments：‘but for Alt2, the PDCCH for MCCH change notification with dedicated RNTI is only to be sent when needed’ I don’t think so. The basic idea to support alt 2 is to repurpose the reserved bits in DCI format 1\_0, the content of DCI format does not change across slots. |
| CATT | Compare with Alt2, we still think Alt1 brings more complexity due to new DCI format introducing. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Don’t agree with QC and MTK,  DCI size cannot be compressed because it will need to be size aligned with others.  The total number of RNTI within a slot need to be limited and especially when we are introducing more G-RNTIs for multiple multicast and multiple broadcast, using a single MCCH-RNTI would be preferred in the direction of controlling the increase of the number of RNTIs introduced.  DCI 1\_0 for broadcast will anyway have some fields not to be used due to no HARQ-ACK, using one field is no problem especially considering it will needs to be size aligned with others eventually anyway.  Strongly suggest RAN1 makes the decision in this meeting instead of deferring it to RAN2 because RAN1 only has one meeting left to finalize RAN1 functionality. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | 1. **Yes. But we think proposal 2.5-2 can be updated as below.**   **Proposal (conclusion) 2.5-2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, Alt 2 can accommodate at least 2 bits (generally more than 10 idle bits ) for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop).   1. **Yes** 2. **Yes** |
| ZTE2 | Another benefits of Alt.1 is that Alt.1 has more reserved bits, which can be reserved for future enhancements if needed. |
| MediaTek | Firstly, regarding the drawbacks of Alt1 as copied below, we don’t think it is correct, especially for the wording of “an additional DCI format”. From our understanding, the DCI format 1\_0 as we agreed in R1#105-e (Agreement: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, DCI format 1\_0 is used as baseline for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH.) can be reused for MCCH change notification no matter which Alt is used. So, there is no an addition DCI format for Alt 1.   * *Drawbacks of Alt 1*   + [Huawei, Xiaomi] discusses that Alt 1 requires the monitoring of an additional DCI format, which increase complexity and [Apple] discusses that more standardisation work is needed for Alt 1.   Secondly, regarding the additional PDCCH monitoring as mentioned by Xiaomi, we think the PDCCH monitoring is the same for Alt 1 and Alt2 because MCCH change notification exist in some specific occasion. Thus, the additional PDCCH monitoring for Alt 1 is not fair.  Thirdly, regarding the RNTI issue, maybe it need to be jointly considered with the DCI field bits. From our understanding, there some values are reserved in TS 38.321 (e.g., FFF3–FFFD), only one dedicated is used for MCCH change notification, it is ok from spec perspective. From the slot scheduling perspective, the dedicated occasion is used for MCCH change notification. So, it will not exist other RNTI (e.g., G-RNTI,MCCH-RNTI) in the notification occasion. Besides, RAN2 is discussing whether more than 2 bits is needed for other change notification purpose. If more bits are introduced, the bits will be not enough for Alt 2. So, comparing the RNTI and DCI field bits potential issue, Alt 1 is better and has more reserved bits for further enhancement as ZTE commented. |
| Ericsson | In our understanding, the first DCI format needs to be aligned with DCI 1\_0 and for broadcast there are unused bit fields. There should therefore be enough bit capacity to allow the 2 bits in the DCI without requiring an increased DCI size. There is no advantage of having a smaller DCI size than 1\_0, taking the alignment into account, so Alt2 allows the 2 bits to be added “for free”.  With this, Alt2 is actually leaner than Alt1, since Alt1 will come as an additional transmission, when it needs to be transmitted, whereas Alt2 does not ned any overhead in practice (considering the alignment). Since the DCI with Alt2 is anyway repeatedly transmitted, scheduling the MCCH, there is an inherent repetition which allows for increased robustness, provided bit toggling is used to indicate a change. |
| Qualcomm2 | Regarding DCI size/format, it will be same as MCCH PDCCH with DCI format 0. However, the valid bits instead of counting the padding bits is the key for the link performance.  So, if always adding a field for MCCH change notification in the MCCH DCI will degrade the MCCH detection as well as MCCH change notification itself. |
| Moderator | Thank you for the discussion at the GTW and the continued contributions to the summary.  Based on the clarifications provided by MediaTek, Qualcomm and ZTE, it has been clarified that for Alt 1 also uses DCI 1\_0 format, hence, Alt1 it does not introduce a new DCI format it just would use a new dedicated RNTI. It has also been pointed out that Alt 1 has more reserved bits that could be used for future extensions. There has been discussion about i) potential performance comparison between Alt 1 vs Alt 2 and ii) RNTI monitoring for Alt 1. There is no consensus about which alternative would perform better. However, it is worth pointing out that there is consensus that both alternatives would work.  Based on the discussion above between companies and in the GTW on 14 October I have the following observations:   * As per GTW discussion, there is common understanding that both Alt 1 & Alt 2 can accommodate at least 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop). * There has been debate on the pros/cons of each alternative in terms of potential additional complexity and/or performance. There is no consensus on which alternative would perform better. * However, there is common understanding that both Alt 1 & Alt 2 work. * Some companies have suggested leaving the decision up to RAN2 which alternative to support. However, we only have one meeting left in RAN1 to complete REL-17 and RAN1 may not have time to finish details of other Issues or potential follow up work from RAN2 decision. * There is stronger support for Alt 2 although some companies prefer Alt 1. There is no consensus.   I think we need to come to a conclusion and move forward to completing the work for this feature in RAN1. We need to compromise for the benefit of progress.  Given the above, the FL recommendation is to support Alt 2 and send an LS to RAN2. |

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

**Proposal 2.5-3**: Alt 2 is supported for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for the notification of MCCH configuration changes.

* send an LS to RAN2 with the mechanism agreed in RAN1

**Please provide your comments in the table below.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Moderator | At the GTW on 15 October the following working assumption was agreed.  Working assumption:  Alt 2 (from previous agreement) is supported for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for the notification of MCCH configuration changes.   * Send an LS to RAN2 with the mechanism agreed in RAN1 |

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

**Please provide your comments in the table below on the following:**

1. **Do you agree that both alternatives work for the considered purpose of MCCH change notification?**
2. **As per the DRAT LS provided in drafts/8.12.3/Phase1/LS, please provide your comments or revisions in the table below.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Moderator | From the discussion at the GTW and the advice from the vice-chair, it is advised that the discussion focuses on whether the alternatives would work or not at this state of the discussion rather on which Alternative performs better.  Also, the FL has prepared an DRAFT LS in the drafts/8.12.3/Phase1/LS for your consideration and review.  Comments to both follow up discussion on the Alt 1 & Alt 2 (to work towards confirming the WA) and comments to the DRAFT LS can be provided here. |
| ZTE | Yes, both alternatives can work from our perspective. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Both Alts can work, and no need for further down selection discussion in RAN1, it ups to RAN2 decision |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Both alts can work.  We think there’s no need to send an LS to RAN2 just to inform RAN2 of a working assumption made in RAN1. As we suggested in the GTW, how many idle bits are required for MCCH change notification has no decision in RAN2. We think the RAN1 working assumption shall not affect the RAN2 discussion on   1. Whether or not to use more bits to indicate which MBS types/groups have the configuration updated. 2. Whether or not the neighbour cell list update is indicated in MCCH change notification 3. If the neighbour cell list update is needed, how to indicate the update is in the discussion with two possible methods: one is to reuse one of the two bits while the other is to use a new bit.   Therefore, it’s not suitable time to send an LS to RAN2. |
| MediaTek | We don’t support to send an LS to RAN2 because it is only a working assumption. From my understanding, WA is just a baseline direction for further discussion and can be reverted. If my understanding is right, maybe it need more discussion in RNA1.  For the Alt 2, our previous proposal is that it can accommodate at least 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop). Maybe some companies only consider 2 bits are enough, if more bits are needed, whether it can work, it needs to be further discussed. At least, we need to wait the DCI field is clear if we support Alt 2.  In contrast, Alt 1 can provide more reserved bits and can offer more flexibility if RAN2 needs more change notification bits.  Considering meeting progress, we can support to send an LS to RAN2 and revert the WA and inform RAN2 that the following two Alts with some modification for Alt 2 can work, and it’s up to RAN2’s decision to choose which Alt.   |  | | --- | | **Proposal (conclusion) 2.5-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, Alt 1 can accommodate at least 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop).  **Proposal (conclusion) 2.5-2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, Alt 2 can accommodate at least 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop). | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It was a WA which in RAN1 is interpreted as confirmed if no fundamental issue discovered that the mechanism does not work.  I guess nobody argues it does not work fundamentally. We can either confirm this WA in this meeting or next meeting (assuming companies need more time for check), either case as vice-chair clarified should not be the obstacle to send the LS to RAN2.  The draft LS reply looks fine. |
| CATT | Per our understanding, both alternatives are workable. |
| NTT DOCOMO | a) Agree  In RAN2#115e, there seemed to be no discussion about whether to include additional information in an MCCH change notification, and it was agreed that RAN2 will wait for RAN1’s decision. RAN2 is waiting for a reply from RAN1 so we will need to send an LS.   |  | | --- | | * RAN2 waits for RAN1’s final decision on which RNTI/DCI (i.e. Alt1 and/or Alt 2 as identified by RAN1) for MCCH change notification to be adopted. | |

## [ACTIVE] Issue 6: PDCCH: Design of DCI format for MCCH and MTCH channels

### **Background**

The following agreements at RAN1#105-e and RAN1#106-e are relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, DCI format 1\_0 is used as baseline for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH.   * FFS details of FDRA.   Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, study the following alternatives for MCCH change notification indication due to session start:   * Alt 1: Define a dedicated RNTI to scramble the CRC of a DCI indicating a MCCH change notification; * Alt 2: Use of a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification;   Other solutions are not precluded and it is also not precluded whether to support both Alt1 and Alt2.  Conclusion:  It is up to RAN2 to decide the specific contents of the MCCH change notification, e.g, whether notification only informs about session start, whether or not notification also informs about session modification/stop or whether or not the notification informs about any other information.  Agreement:  Study and reach an agreement by RAN1#106b-e on whether Alt1 and Alt2 for MCCH change notification indication can accommodate at least 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop).  Agreement:  The DCI format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH at least includes the following fields for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state:   * FDRA field * TDRA field * Modulation and coding scheme * Redundancy version * FFS:   + MCCH change notification (if supported and only for MCCH),   + RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR and support of resource allocation with granularity of single or multiple RBs.   + HARQ process number and New data indicator   + VRB-to-PRB mapping   + other fields if needed.   Agreement:  For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the DCI size of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH is aligned with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI in the CSS. |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2108928, Spreadtrum]
  + Proposal 1: If a specific CFR has been configured for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, the FDRA field should be based on the size of the CFR, otherwise, the FDRA field should be determined by the size of the CORESET0 or the SIB1 configured initial BWP.
* In [R1- 2109003, vivo]
  + *Discuss*: However, broadcast PDSCH with repetition can be also received by RRC\_CONNECTED UE, if HPN and NDI is not indicated in DCI and RRC\_CONNECTED UE randomly chooses a free HPN for combination, then it will cause chaos for further unicast and multicast reception.
  + Proposal 9: If PDSCH repetition for broadcast is supported, HARQ process number and new data indicator should be included in DCI 1-0 with the CRC scrambled by G-RNTI, MCCH-RNTI, and any other RNTIs further agreed for broadcast.
* In [R1-2109069, OPPO]
  + *Discuss*: Since the GC-PDCCH can be used for broadcast scheduling which can also be received by RRC\_CONN UEs, the DCI format may need to be aligned among UEs with different connection states.
  + Proposal 7: The DCI format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH additionally includes the following fields for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state:
    - Modulation and coding scheme
    - Reserve bits.
* In [R1-2109196, CATT]
  + Proposal 11: At least MCCH change notification, HARQ process number, new data indicator and VRB-to-PRB mapping fields can be included in the DCI format.
* In [R1-2109540, Lenovo]
  + Proposal 2: The number of bits for FDRA in the group-common DCI is determined based on the bandwidth of CORESET 0 in Case A or SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP in Case C.
  + Proposal 3: RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR and the granularity of resource allocation only supports single RB.
  + Proposal 4: The number of bits in TDRA field in the first DCI format is determined by the number of entries in the time domain resource allocation list configured for MBS.
  + Proposal 5: VRB-to-PRB mapping in the first DCI format is 0 or 1 bit dependent on RRC configuration.
  + Proposal 6: 5 bits MCS, 1 bit NDI, 2 bits RV and 4 bits HARQ process number are included in the first DCI format.
  + Proposal 7: NO DAI/TPC/PRI/HARQ-timing indicator in the group-common DCI.
  + Proposal 8: Support fields and sizes in Table 1 for the first DCI format.
  + Proposal 9: Zero bits are appended to the group-common DCI format in case its size prior to padding is smaller than the size of DCI format 1-0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI and monitored in CSS.
* In [R1-2109305, CMCC]
  + *Discuss*: Furthermore, the HARQ process number and New data indicator are not needed for HARQ-ACK feedback.  
    As for blind retransmission soft buffer combination, dedicated HARQ process is defined for system information in NR and similar mechanism can be used for broadcast service. In addition, as different G-RNTI are used to differentiate broadcast services, which means the HARQ buffer has one to one mapping with G-RNTI, and it is up to UE’s implementation to buffer different services in different HARQ buffer without the necessary to be indicated the HARQ process number in the DCI.
  + *Discuss*: But as the analysis above and the example in Table 1, the reserved bits in DCI format for MCCH is much larger than 2 bits and is enough to be used as MCCH change notification and can also provide forward compatibility. Therefore, Alt 2 can be supported which is a simple and sufficient way without defining a new RNTI for MCCH change notification.
  + Proposal 4. The DCI format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH also includes the following fields for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state:
    - MCCH change notification (only for MCCH)
    - VRB-to-PRB mapping
  + Proposal 5. The FDRA field bit length in DCI format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH is related to CFR size but not CORESET#0 size and the resource allocation granularity is single RB.
* In [R1-2109318, Nokia]
  + Observation-6: Support of DCI format 1\_0 only seems to be sufficient for broadcast reception for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.
  + Proposal-14: Discuss the resource allocation type applied for Rel17 broadcast for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.
  + Proposal-15: Discuss whether the VRB-to-PRB mapping field should be included in the DCI, or it should be fixed in the specification depends on the resource allocation type applied.
  + Proposal-16: Considering of TB scaling field be included in the DCI.
  + Proposal-17: It is beneficial to support of HARQ combining for broadcast with slightly increase UE complexity, where a single additional dedicated HARQ process seems to be sufficient for all broadcast services associated with different G-RNTIs. And there is no need of including HARQ process number in the DCI field.
  + Proposal-18: It is beneficial to support NDI in the DCI field for broadcast.
  + Proposal-19: Further discuss other fields to be included in the DCI, i.e. MCCH change notification field (if supported for MCCH), and TRS related field (if supported for MTCH).
  + Observation-7: It is feasible to accommodate such an additional bit in the DCI. But it ups to RAN2 to decide whether it is beneficial to introduce such an additional bit.
* In [R1-2109388, Xiaomi]
  + Proposal 12: DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI is used to schedule a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, including the following information fields:
    - FDRA field
    - TDRA field
    - VRB-to-PRB mapping
    - Modulation and coding scheme
    - Redundancy version
    - MCCH configuration change notification
    - Reserved bits
  + Proposal 13: The FDRA should be determined by CORESET#0 or initial DL BWP if CORESET#0 is not configured.
* In [R1-2109635, Intel]
  + Proposal 5: The FDRA field of DCI 1\_0 is based on the starting PRB index and size of the CORESET#0 or the initial BWP.
* In [R1-2109703, DOCOMO]
  + Observation 2: If the existing RB numbering rule for PDSCH scheduled with DCI format 1\_0 in CSS is reused for PDSCH scheduled with the DCI format scheduling MCCH/MTCH, there may be RBs that cannot be allocated GC-PDSCH.
  + Proposal 5: For GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH, RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR.
  + Proposal 6: Include VRB-to-PRB mapping field in the DCI format scheduling MCCH/MTCH.
* In [R1-2109769, TD Tech]
  + Proposal 16: The following fields are included in the DCI format:
    - VRB-to-PRB mapping (for both MCCH and MTCH)
    - Downlink assignment index (only for MTCH)
* In [R1-2110357, Ericsson]
  + *Discuss*: For the FDRA field in the DCI 1\_0 for broadcast (i.e. scrambled with G-RNTI):
    - The FDRA field size is given by the CFR size, i.e. one of the following
    - the size of coreset#0
    - the size of the configured BWP.
  + Proposal 18: The broadcast DCI format is the same as multicast, with broadcast specific and multicast-specific fields made optional.

### **FL Assessment**

***On FDRA of DCI format 1\_0 for MCCH / MTCH***

[Spreadtrum, CMCC, Xiaomi, Intel, Lenovo, DOCOMO, Ericsson] propose that the FDRA field size is given by the size of the configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH / MTCH for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state. [Nokia] also discusses that supporting of Type\_1 only with DCI format 1\_0 is sufficient.

Although Issue 1 still discusses the final down-selection for Case D&E, since Case C for the CFR is already supported there is agreement that the FDRA should accommodate cases other than a CFR with the same frequency resources as those of CORESET#0. Therefore, a proposal is put forward to agree this.

***On DCI format 1\_0 fields for MCCH / MTCH***

* *HARQ Process Number (HPN) and New Data Indicator (NDI)*

[vivo, CATT, Lenovo] propose that HARQ Process Number (HPN) and New Data Indicator (NDI) are included as fields in the DCI. [vivo] discusses that these two fields are required for reception of broadcast by RRC connected UEs. However, [CMCC, Nokia] discuss that these parameters may not be needed even for blind retransmission. Their preferred approach is dedicated HARQ process as defined for system information with an increase on UE complexity. While [CMCC] presents that both HPN and NDI are not needed, [Nokia] presents that NDI is beneficial to be included.

For these parameters, there are different views on whether the two parameters need to be included or not. The FL will include these parameters to collect more comments from more companies.

* *VRB-to-PRB mapping*

[CATT, CMCC, Nokia, Lenovo, DOCOMO, TD Tech] proposes/discuss to include VRB-to-PRB mapping as filed in the DCI. There have been discussions in previous meetings on whether this parameter should also be fixed to interleaved and therefore it could be saved. The FL will include this parameter to collect comments from more companies.

* *TB scaling field*

[Nokia] proposes to discuss the inclusion of the TB scaling field that can be beneficial to provide increased robustness for the transmission. This parameter has not been discussed in previous meetings so is also included in the proposals for discussion.

* *MCCH change notification and TRS related fields*

The inclusion of these parameters depends on whether their respective functionalities are supported pending the discussion other Issues in this summary. However, these are included as well in the proposals to collect comments from companies.

### **1st round FL proposals for Issue 6**

**Proposal 2.6-1**: the size of the FDRA field within the DCI of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH depends on the size of the configured/defined CFR for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.

**Proposal 2.6-2**: The DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH also includes the following fields for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state:

* HARQ Process Number
* New Data Indicator
* VRB-to-PRB mapping
* TB scaling field
* MCCH change notification (if supported and only for MCCH)
* TRS related fields (if supported)

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above:**

1. **do you agree with the proposal 2.6-1? Please provide reasons and views in general if you do not agree.**
2. **do you agree with including the fields in proposal 2.6-2? Please provide reasons and views in general if you do not agree.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Intel | OK with Proposal 2.6-1 |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.6-1: Support  Proposal 2.6-2: Do not agree. HARQ process number, NDI, VRB-to-PRB mapping indicator are not needed for broadcast. |
| NOKIA/NSB | a)Agree  b) Not fully agree, regarding “HARQ process number” and “TRS field”, we need to discuss first on how the HARQ process is handled with DM2, and whether the TRS is supported or not. Thus, we prefer to exclude these two fields for the moment. The rest of fields are fine for us. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 2.6-1: Support  2.6-2: We are Ok with the fields except TB scaling field. |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.6-1: This proposal has correlation with the ongoing discussion of DCI fields of the first DCI format and the corresponding discussion under AI8.12.1. We suggest to postpone the discussion for now. Otherwise, it may end up different mechanisms for IDLE/INACTIVE state and CONNECTED state.  Proposal 2.6-2: One general issue is whether we need to have the same DCI fields for multicast and broadcast. If yes, then we may need to check the progress in AI 8.12.1. If not, then we can discuss this proposal separately from AI 8.12.1.  Some more clarification is needed for HARQ Process Number, New Data Indicator, TB scaling field and TRS related fields (if supported). Do we intend to support HARQ feedback for broadcast? |
| Spreadtrum | 2.6-1: Support  2.6-2: partially agree. ‘TRS field’ is not clear to us. Even if TRS is supported for MBS, it is periodic. The configuration or triggering of Periodic TRS is not by DCI. |
| OPPO | **Proposal 2.6-1:** One question for clarification. If the FDRA field in DCI is depending on the CFR in RRC\_IDLE, then UE in RRC-CONN (receiving broadcast) state may have different CFR which is confined within a dedicated BWP.  **Proposal 2.6-2:** Some fields listed in the proposal need more discussion, e.g. HARQ-ACK is not supported for broadcast. Besides, GC-DCI for RRC-DLE and GC-DCI for RRC-CONN with the same format should have the same fields or not? |
| NTT DOCOMO | a) Agree  b) We don’t think ‘HARQ Process Number’ and ‘New Data Indicator’ are necessary. We think slot-level repetition is sufficient to improve the reliability of broadcast PDSCH. |
| Xiaomi | a) Agree  b) we don’t think the following information fields are necessary   * HARQ Process Number * New Data Indicator * TB scaling field |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.6-1: support  Proposal 2.6-2: Not support, at least some fields proposed in RAN1 meeting for the first time. E.g., TB scaling, TRS related should have more discussion. |
| CATT | a. OK with the proposal 2.6-1  b. Agree with including the fields in proposal 2.6-2 |
| vivo | Proposal 2.6-1: Support  Proposal 2.6-2: delete the following two before agreed:   * MCCH change notification (if supported and only for MCCH) * TRS related fields (if supported) |
| Apple | Proposal 2.6-1: support  Proposal 2.6-2: We agree with field VRB-to-PRB mapping, other fields need more discussion. |
| Ericsson | P2.6-1: Support  P2.6-2: Support. We think however that the DCI 1\_0 format for multicast and broadcast should be common and configured, as appropriate, for multicast and/or broadcast. |
| Qualcomm | P2.6-1: Support  P2.6-2: So we suggest for now   * FFS: HARQ Process Number * FFS: New Data Indicator   FFS: TB scaling field |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above:**   1. **YES** 2. **YES** |
| Moderator | Thanks all for input.  **Regarding Proposal 2.6-1**  **All:** OPPO and ZTE discuss the relationship with AI 8.12.1. In particular it would be good to get feedback on the following issue raised: “*One question for clarification. If the FDRA field in DCI is depending on the CFR in RRC\_IDLE, then UE in RRC-CONN (receiving broadcast) state may have different CFR which is confined within a dedicated BWP*”.  **Regarding Proposal 2.6-2**  Based on the comments, it seems the only parameters that has most support is VRB-to-PRB mapping. There is also a question from ZTE that it will be good to get common understanding on whether the there is the need to have the same DCI fields for multicast and broadcast. I have a question below to collect company comments. |

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

**Proposal 2.6-1[unchanged – waiting feedback]**: the size of the FDRA field within the DCI of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH depends on the size of the configured/defined CFR for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.

**Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: The DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH also includes the following fields for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state:

* ~~HARQ Process Number~~
* ~~New Data Indicator~~
* VRB-to-PRB mapping
* ~~TB scaling field~~
* ~~MCCH change notification (if supported and only for MCCH)~~
* ~~TRS related fields (if supported)~~

**Please provide your answers in the table below on the below questions:**

1. **Regarding the discussion on Proposal 2.6-1:  
   Do you think that if the FDRA field in DCI depends on the CFR in RRC\_IDLE, then UE in RRC-CONN (receiving broadcast) state may have different CFR which is confined within a dedicated BWP?**
2. **Regarding the discussion on Proposal 2.6-2.  
   Do you think the DCI fields should be the same for multicast and broadcast?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.6-1**: support  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: Not clear on the motivation of VRB-to-PRB mapping for broadcast, which is the scenarios for many users to receive the same things. |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 2.6-1**: agree with ZTE and OPPO  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: support. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.6-1**: Support.  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: support. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.6-1:** Agree with ZTE/OPPO’s view. We can delay the discussion and wait the conclusion of FDRA determination discussion for first DCI format in AI8.12.1, then discuss the FDRA determination for broadcast for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs. |
| OPPO | **Proposal 2.6-1:** To answer the question a), Yes, the CFRs may be different for RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_CONN state.  **Proposal 2.6-2:** OK. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.6-1:** Support  Question a), we also discuss CONNECTED mode UE behaviour to receive broadcast in AI 8.12.1, from our point of view, the CFR for broadcast should be same for IDLE/IANCTIVE and CONNECTED UEs,  **Proposal 2.6-2:** Support  Question b), Yes |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.6-1**: agree with ZTE and OPPO  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: Not OK. The HARQ Process Number and New Data Indicator should be included for soft-combine when gNB implement blind retransmission. We do not think the DCI fields can be the same for multicast and broadcast. Seams that for broadcast, for IDLE/INACTIVE UE, the HARQ-ACK related parameters such as DAI (2 bits), PRI (3 bits) and K1 (3 bits) may not be needed. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.6-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: Support  b) No. Multicast and broadcast require different functions, so not all fields need to be the same. |
| Ericsson | Answers to questions:   * Question a) Yes, the FDRA field in the DCI for broadcast will need to depend on the CFR exactly like the CFR for multicast does. Since UEs in RRC CONNECTED receive exactly the same broadcast (including DCI) as UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE they will need to have the same CFR for broadcast. The broadcast reception is independent of RRC state. * Question b) the same DCI format should be used for multicast and broadcast. This DCI format could have common mandatory (and optional) fields for both multicast and broadcast and in addition there are optional fields that only apply for multicast but not broadcast (relating e.g. to HARQ feedback) and possibly fields that are specific to broadcast. With this common format a pure multicast DCI could be used, removing all broadcast-specific fields or a pure broadcast DCI could be used, removing all multicast-specific fields, or a common multicast/broadcast transmission DCI could be used, targeting both multicast and broadcast UEs with the same PDCCH/PDSCH. |
| Apple | Proposal 2.6-1: support.  a) Yes, UE in RRC\_CONN could receive the broadcast service in different CFR.  Proposal 2.6-2: support  b) yes, the Size of DCI and fields of DCI are the same for multicast and broadcast. |
| Moderator | Thank you for the discussion.  Given the comments (which are supported further in this round) on the correlation with the ongoing discussion on DCI field under 8.12.1 and the potential mismatch that can occur between idle/inactive and connected (which may receive broadcast confined in dedicated BWP) the discussion on **Proposal 2.6-1** is thereforepostponed.  Regarding the question on DCI fields should be the same for multicast and broadcast, not all companies have replied to the question. There are different views on whether these are the same or different. One company clarifies that the same DCI format should be used for multicast and broadcast. The DCI would have common and optional fields, where the optional fields would be applied to either multicast or broadcast.  It seems that including the VRB-to-PRB mapping is widely supported except by comments provided by Samsung that requires more motivation. As per tdocs submitted to this meeting, the motivation from proponents is that VRB-to-PRB mapping can provide additional diversity that can improve the performance. With this clarification, I will check whether the proposal is agreeable. CATT does not agree with removing the parameters but I think agreeing to VRB-to-PRB is the closest we can get to consensus. Please note that including other parameters is not excluded with this proposal. I do not think given the remainder time in the meeting that we can agree other parameters at this stage. (The only difference is that I have removed a grammatical error) |

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

**Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: The DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH also includes the following field for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state:

* VRB-to-PRB mapping

**Based on the discussion from FL above, do you agree with the proposal 2.6-1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | Ok with the above proposal. |
| CMCC | Ok |
| NOKIA/NSB | Fine |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Ok. We think there’s no need to have the same fields for both multicast mode and broadcast mode unless the related fields are necessary for both modes. |
| CATT | At this stage, the VRB-to-PRB field is agreeable in our position. To help move forward, we are OK to further discuss HPN and NDI fields. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |

## [DEPRIO] Issue 7: PDCCH: CORESET for MCCH and MTCH channels

### **Background**

The following agreements for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs at RAN1#103-e, RAN1#105-e are relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, a CORESET can be configured within the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH. 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.  FFS: configuration details of the CORESET for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.  Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the CORESET index can be the same for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH.  Agreement:  For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily (in the minimum capability) supported for Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs, i.e., 2 CORESETs.   * If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 or where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can be configured with the following options:   + CORESET#0 (default option if CFR is the initial BWP and CORESET is not configured); or   + CORESET configured by *commonControlResourceSet;* or   + CORESET#0 and CORESET configured by *commonControlResourceSet*. |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2108725, Huawei]
  + Proposal 6: When the CFR for MCCH/MTCH is configured with the same size as SIB1 configured initial BWP, in addition to CORESET#0, the other CORESET larger than CORESET#0 can be configured.
* In [R1-2109318, Nokia]
  + Proposal-10: Support different/separate CORESET can be utilized for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH.
  + Observation-5: For CFR Case C as agreed to be supported, the agreements that have been agreed for CFR Case A can be applied directly.
  + Proposal-11: For CFR Case D and Case E, the corresponding CFR\_CORESET can be configured by network Gnb, and CORESET#0 is applied as default if CFR\_CORESET is not configured.
* In [R1-2109388, Xiaomi]
  + Proposal 6: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the same CORESET is used for MCCH and MTCH in the same CFR.
* In [R1-2110120, Convida]
  + Proposal 4: One or more CORESETs can be configured for group-common PDCCH within an MBS specific BWP for UEs in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE states.
* In [R1-2110357, Ericsson]
  + Proposal 17: For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily (in the minimum capability) supported for Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs, i.e., 2 CORESETs.
    - If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can be configured with the following options:
      * CORESET#0 (default option if CFR is the initial BWP and CORESET is not configured); or
      * CORESET configured by commonControlResourceSet; or
      * CORESET#0 and CORESET configured by commonControlResourceSet.

### **FL Assessment**

1. ***On configuring in addition to CORESET#0, other CORESET larger than CORESET#0***

[Huawei, Convida] propose configuring in addition to CORESET#0, other CORESET larger than CORESET#0 when the CFR has the same frequency resources as the frequency resources of the initial BWP SIB1 configured. However, is FL understanding that this is already possible based on the agreement at previous meetings (see below) [**is this is a misunderstanding, please do share your views in the discussion section below**].

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily (in the minimum capability) supported for Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs, i.e., 2 CORESETs.   * If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 or where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can be configured with the following options:   + CORESET#0 (default option if CFR is the initial BWP and CORESET is not configured); or   + CORESET configured by *commonControlResourceSet;* or   + CORESET#0 and CORESET configured by *commonControlResourceSet*. |

1. ***On separate configurations of GC-PDCCH can done for MCCH and MTCH***

[Nokia] propose that separate configurations of GC-PDCCH can done for MCCH and MTCH. However, [Xiaomi] proposes that the same CORESET is used for MCCH and MTCH. Although this issue was discussed at the last meeting, there was not much time for discussion. Therefore, the FL puts forward a proposal to collect company comments.

1. ***On clarifications on agreement on maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily (in the minimum capability)*** ***supported***

Finally, [Ericsson] proposes to reformulate one of the agreements on maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily (in the minimum capability) supported. However, it is the understanding of the FL that with the latest agreement on CFR (including Case C), the agreement on maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily (in the minimum capability) supported is consistent.

The FL puts forward a proposal addressing the aspects above.

### **1st round FL proposals for Issue 7**

**Proposal 2.7-2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the CORESET of GC-PDCCH for MCCH and MTCH can be separately configured in corresponding CFR: CORESET for MCCH can be configured by SIB and CORESET for MTCH can be configured by MCCH.

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above:**

1. **do you agree with the proposal 2.7-1? Please provide reasons and views in general if you do not agree.**
2. **Please provide your views in case you do not agree with the FL understanding: i) on configuring in addition to CORESET#0, other CORESET larger than CORESET#0 and ii) on clarifications on agreement on maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily (in the minimum capability) supported.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Intel | We have not agreed to support distinct CFRs for MCCH and MTCH. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.7-2: Need to first conclude whether or not to support separate CFRs. We do not see such need given that a UE will be receiving in CORESETs and the rest is up to Gnb scheduling. |
| NOKIA/NSB | a) Do I miss the Proposal 2.7-1 somewhere?  If it is Proposal 2.7-2 above, it is fine for us. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We don’t support this proposal. |
| ZTE | Ok with Proposal 2.7-2 above. |
| Spreadtrum | The issue depends on **Proposal 2.3-4/ Proposal 2.3-5**. It can be discussed later. |
| OPPO | MCCH and MTCH should have the same CFR including the corresponding configurations and parameters. Therefore, this proposal is not supported. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.7-2**: Support |
| Xiaomi | Regarding proposal 2.7-2, we share the same views with Samsung. Furthermore, we don’t see the necessity to configure separate CORESETs for MCCH and MTCH. CORESET can be used for different search spaces. The motivation of configuring separate CORESETs for MCCH and MTCH is not clear to us. |
| LG | **Proposal 2.7-2**: OK |
| CMCC | Similar view as Intel and Samsung. |
| CATT | Not support. |
| Vivo | Proposal 2.7-2: can be discussed after concluding on issue 2 |
| MediaTek | Not support. We can discuss whether support different CFR for MCCH and MTCH firstly. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Support.** |
| Apple | Not support. |
| Ericsson | In the question, “proposal 2.7-1” is mentioned but there is only “Proposal 2.7-2”, so we assume this is a typo and only Proposal 2.7-2 exists. Our answer below refers to this:  P2.7-2: Support. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | 1. **We agree with proposal 2.7-1 partly. If a CORESET/CSS is shared by MCCH and MTCH, there’s no need to configure it on both an MCCH specific SIB and MCCH. On the MCCH specific SIB, it’s configured with a flag=TRUE to show it’s also applied for MTCH. Therefore, proposal 2.7-1 need an note as below.**   **Proposal 2.7-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the CORESET of GC-PDCCH for MCCH and MTCH can be separately configured in corresponding CFR: CORESET for MCCH can be configured by SIB and CORESET for MTCH can be configured by MCCH.  **Note: If a CORESET of GC-PDCCH is shared by MCCH and MTCH, it’s only configured on an MCCH specific SIB with a flag=TRUE indicating it’s also applied to MTCH. There’s no need to reconfigure it on MCCH. Such processing can’t affect the MTCH reception. Because UE needs to read the MCCH specific SIB firstly before acquiring MCCH. After acquiring MCCH, UE can receive each interested MBS session.** |
| Moderator | Thank you for the discussion. Apologies for the typo the number of the proposal above should have been **Proposal 2.7-1.** However, it seems it was clear given the comments.  There has been opposition from some companies to the proposal. This proposal would additional flexibility but given the state of discussion on other issues, the opposition from companies it is therefore to deprioritise the discussion of this issue. |

## [CLOSED] Issue 8: PDSCH repetition/HARQ combining

### **Background**

The following agreements at RAN1#102-e, RAN1#103-e, RAN1#104-e UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED state are relevant for the discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements: For RRC\_CONNECTED Ues, at least support slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH.   * FFS: whether enhancement is needed   Agreements:  For slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH of RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, for indicating the repetition number, further down-select among:   * Opt 1: by DCI * Opt 2: by RRC * Opt 3: by RRC+DCI * FFS: Opt 4: by MAC-CE * FFS: Opt 5: by RRC+MAC-CE * FFS details for each option. * FFS further enhancements for configuration of slot-level repetition   Agreement:  For slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs receiving multicast,   * (Config A) UE can be optionally configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor*. * (Config B) UE can be optionally configured with TDRA table with *repetitionNumber* as part of the TDRA table. * If UE is configured with Config B, UE does not expect to be configured with Config A for the same group-common PDSCH.   Conclusion:  The maximum number of HARQ processes per cell, currently supported for unicast, is kept unchanged for UE to support multicast reception.   * How to allocate HARQ processes between unicast and multicast is up to Gnb. |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2108853, ZTE]
  + Proposal 6: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, consecutive slot-level PDSCH repetition with repetition number configured by higher layer (e.g., via SIB) is supported for MBS.
* In [R1-2109318, Nokia]
  + Proposal-9: For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support slot-level repetition for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH.
* In [R1-2109388, Xiaomi]
  + Proposal 8: For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support slot-level repetition for GC- PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH.
* In [R1-2109635, Intel]
  + Proposal 11: Slot level repetition can be supported for RRC\_IDLE UEs with the repetition configured as part of the TDRA table via SIB and indicated dynamically through DCI
* In [R1-2109703, DOCOMO]
  + Proposal 11: pdsch-AggregationFactor and repetitionNumber can be configured for group-common PDSCH for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.
* In [R1-2109769, TD Tech]
  + Proposal 10: Support the slot-level repetition for MCCH/MTCH.
  + Proposal 11: The repetition times for MCCH is configured on an MCCH specific SIB.
  + Proposal 12: The repetition times for MTCH is configured on MCCH as a part of the configuration information of the related MBS session.
* In [R1-2109985, LGE]
  + Proposal 11: For slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs receiving broadcast,
    - (Config A) UE can be optionally configured with pdsch-AggregationFactor.
    - (Config B) UE can be optionally configured with TDRA table with repetitionNumber as part of the TDRA table.
    - If UE is configured with Config B, UE does not expect to be configured with Config A for the same group-common PDSCH.
* In [R1-2110120, Convida]
  + Proposal 7: Support PDSCH repetition and PDCCH repetition for MBS for the RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.
* In [R1-2110212, Qualcomm]
  + Proposal 5: Support semi-static and dynamic repetition configuration for broadcast MCCH/MTCH.
  + Proposal 6: At least for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, support HARQ combining using the available HARQ process(es) of unicast/multicast.

### **FL Assessment**

This issue was also discussed for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs at RAN1#106-e without reaching an agreement.

[ZTE, Nokia, Xiaomi, Intel, DOCOMO, TD Tech, LGE, Convida, Qualcomm] propose/discuss the support of slot-level repetition for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC Idle/inactive state.

As per previous meetings multiple companies propose slot-level repetition for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC idle/inactive state, a feature already supported for multicast reception for RRC connected UEs.

The FL puts forward a proposal to also include the support for broadcast reception with idle/inactive states taking as starting point the latest revision at RAN1#106-e (including a comment from LGE that discussed that it would only be applicable to MTCH).

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

**Proposal 2.8-1**: For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support slot-level repetition for MTCH.

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above:**

1. **do you agree with the proposal 2.8-1? Please provide reasons and views in general if you do not agree.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Intel | OK |
| Samsung | Support |
| NOKIA/NSB | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | OK |
| ZTE | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| OPPO | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| LG | OK |
| CMCC | OK |
| CATT | OK |
| vivo | Support |
| Apple | OK |
| Ericsson | We agree. This functionality exists for multicast and is easy to carry over to broadcast.  For the same reason, we also propose to support repetitions using the HARQ mechanism, using multiple different RVs exactly like multicast but without HARQ feedback. These transmissions could have the same degree of time separation as HARQ transmissions for unicast/multicast and would provide increased time diversity. |
| Qualcomm | Ok.  Furthermore, we can add at least Config A is supported. FFS Config B.   * + - (Config A) UE can be optionally configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor* per *pdsch-Config-Broadcast* in a CFR for broadcast   (Config B) UE can be optionally configured with TDRA table with *repetitionNumber* as part of the TDRA table in *PDSCH-Config-Broadcast* in a CFR for broadcast. |
| Moderator | Thanks all for comments. There is wide support for this. I will update the proposal including the additions from qualcomm to check companies’ views. |

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

**Proposal 2.8-1rev1**: For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support slot-level repetition for MTCH.

* At least Config A is supported: UE can be optionally configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor* per *pdsch-Config-Broadcast* in a CFR for broadcast.
* FFS support of Config B: UE can be optionally configured with TDRA table with *repetitionNumber* as part of the TDRA table in *PDSCH-Config-Broadcast* in a CFR for broadcast.

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Do you agree with the proposal 2.8-1rev1? Please provide reasons and views in general if you do not agree.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| LG | We do not agree with this proposal.  We think that the following proposal for multicast in AI 8.12.2 can be also applied to broadcast. ***Proposal 6.1-1 (H)*** *If configured, the pdsch-AggregationFactor for multicast is configured per G-RNTI.* |
| Xiaomi | We are OK with the proposal. But as pointed out by LG, the commonality between IDLE/INACTIVE state and CONNECTED state should be pursued. Considering the similar issue is still under discussion in another AI, maybe we can postpone the discussion here. |
| OPPO | Comment for clarification: if the following understanding is correct based on the proposal 2.8-1rev1.   1. Slot-level repetition is “Optionally” supported but not mandatory support. 2. When slot-level repetition is configured, Config. A is proposed as the default configuration. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To LG,  *Proposal 6.1-1* itself is for multicast essentially and literally.  If the mechanisms is agreeable, it could be fine to have a separate proposal for broadcast. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | OK |
| CMCC | OK in principle, the issue proposed by OPPO is valuable to discuss, because there is no capability report in IDLE/INATCIVE mode. From our understanding, if a UE doesn’t support Slot-level repetition, it can ignore the *pdsch-AggregationFactor* configuration and only receive the first PDSCH. |
| ZTE | Ok with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Moderator | Thanks for input.  The original proposal had very good support and the FFS has created concerns. PDSCH repetition has been discussed in multiple meetings and has always had good support but never been agreed due to limited time for discussion or companies preferring to delay until further progress on AI 8.12.3. If this functionality it to be included for broadcast reception, we need to agree it otherwise there will be no time to include it. I propose to revert back to the original proposal to agree that the functionality will be included while leaving other details for separate discussion. Of course additional discussion is welcome. |

### **3rd round FL proposals for Issue 8**

**Proposal 2.8-1**: For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support slot-level repetition for MTCH.

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Do you agree with the proposal 2.8-1rev1? Please provide reasons and views in general if you do not agree.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| MediaTek | Support |
| OPPO | We are OK with this proposal, but there is one question should be considered that whether there are many issues related to this proposal that needs to be discussed and solved, since only one meeting is left, and further enhancement in addition to the basic design will consume more time and effort. |
| CMCC | OK |
| Moderator | Thanks OPPO for comments. Given you are also OK with this proposal, and the wide support on previous rounds, I am going to put it for email approval. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| LG | **Proposal 2.8-1**: OK |
| ZTE | Support.  @OPPO, we don’t think there are any remaining issue for this proposal other than configuration of repetition number. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Moderator | The following proposal was agreed by email at first check point. Therefore the discussion of this issue at this meeting is closed.  Agreement:  For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support slot-level repetition for MTCH. |

## [DEPRIO]Issue 9: PDSCH: Semi Persistent Scheduling

### **Background**

The following agreements for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs made at RAN1#103-e, RAN1#104-e, RAN1#104b-e and RAN1#105-e are relevant for this discussion.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements: Support SPS group-common PDSCH for MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs   * FFS: use group-common PDCCH or UE-specific PDCCH for SPS group-common PDSCH activation/deactivation * FFS: whether to support more than one SPS group-common PDSCH configuration per UE * FFS: whether and how uplink feedback could be configured * FFS: retransmission of SPS group-common PDSCH   Agreement:  For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, more than one SPS group-common PDSCH configuration for MBS can be configured per UE subject to UE capability   * The total number of SPS configurations supported by a UE currently defined for unicast is not increased due to additionally supporting MBS. * FFS: How to allocate the total SPS configurations between MBS and unicast.     Agreement:  For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support HARQ-ACK feedback for SPS group-common PDSCH for MBS   * FFS: The retransmission scheme(s) * FFS: The HARQ-ACK details for SPS PDSCH and activation/deactivation, which can be discussed in AI 8.12.2   Agreement:  The retransmission scheme for a given SPS group-common PDSCH can be either PTM scheme 1 or PTP.   * FFS: Whether PTM scheme 1 retransmission and PTP retransmission can be used simultaneously for different UEs in the same MBS group   Agreement:  Define G-CS-RNTI at least for SPS group-common PDSCH and activation/deactivation of SPS group-common PDSCH, different from CS-RNTI for unicast SPS PDSCH.   * G-CS-RNTI is used for PTM scheme 1 based dynamic retransmission of SPS group-common PDSCH * FFS: Whether CS-RNTI can be used for PTP retransmission of SPS group-common PDSCH. * FFS: Number of G-CS-RNTI.   Agreement:  For RRC\_CONNECTED UE supporting MBS, support up to 8 configured SPS configurations in a BWP of a serving cell for unicast and MBS in total.   * It is up to gNB implementation to configure the SPS configuration indexes for unicast and MBS, respectively.   Agreement:  Confirm the working assumption:  For activation/deactivation of SPS group-common PDSCH for MBS in RRC\_CONNECTED state,   * At least group-common PDCCH is supported   + FFS: Whether and how to address the missed activation and deactivation * FFS: Whether UE-specific PDCCH is supported for activation/deactivation   Agreement:  If a SPS-config for MBS is configured in CFR, one G-CS-RNTI is associated with the SPS-config.   * FFS: Multiple G-CS-RNTIs associated with one SPS-config |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2108853, ZTE]
  + Proposal 7: Support SPS group-common PDSCH for MBS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.
* In [R1- 2109003, vivo]
  + Proposal 11: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, at least for broadcast reception, SPS PDSCH with DCI activation/deactivation is not supported.
    - FFS: SPS PDSCH without DCI activation/deactivation.
* In [R1-2109318, Nokia]
  + Observation-4: SPS with DCI activation is not sensible for broadcast reception for RRC\_ IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.
  + Proposal-8: Discuss on support of SPS without DCI activation for broadcast.
* In [R1-2109388, Xiaomi]
  + Proposal 10: For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support SPS GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH.
* In [R1-2109703, DOCOMO]
  + Proposal 12: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, support SPS group-common PDSCH without activation/deactivation commands.
* In [R1-2110357, Ericsson]
  + Proposal 15: For SPS broadcast to UEs in RRC-Idle/Inactive, we propose configuration and activation/deactivation is carried by the MCCH.
  + Proposal 16: For SPS to UEs in RRC-Idle/Inactive, the slot offset and other parameters carried by the PDDCH for activation and release of SPS is included in the SPS-Config IE and this IE is carried in MCCH.

### **FL Assessment**

[ZTE, vivo, Nokia, Xiaomi, DOCOMO, Ericsson] propose/discuss the use of SPS GC-PDSCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC idle/inactive state for MTCH. Most companies highlight that SPS with DCI activation/deactivation is not feasible for broadcast reception with RRC idle/inactive UEs, so it is generally proposed to discuss solutions without DCI activation/deactivation. Ericsson proposes that configuration to receive the SPS GC-PDSCH is included in an IE carried by MCCH including activation/deactivation.

This issue was discussed at RAN1#106-e although there was not much time for discussion. To allow for more time for discussion a proposal is put forward below to collect company comments.

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

**Proposal 2.9-1**: Support SPS without DCI activation/deactivation for GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE states.

* configuration to receive SPS (including activation/deactivation) is included in IE *SPS-Config* carried in MCCH.

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above:**

1. **do you agree with the proposal 2.9-1? Please provide reasons and views in general if you do not agree.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | Support |
| NOKIA/NSB | a) Not fully agree, and prefer to delete the sub-bullet as below:  **Proposal 2.9-1**: Support SPS without DCI activation/deactivation for GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE states.   * ~~configuration to receive SPS (including activation/deactivation) is included in IE~~ *~~SPS-Config~~* ~~carried in MCCH.~~ |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Not clear to me. Do you propose UL CG Type-1 like SPS for MBS? |
| ZTE | We support the proposal.  @Lenovo, one of the motivation of supporting SPS for IDLE/INACTIVE UE is to support periodical broadcast service, in which case network can save PDCCH overhead. |
| OPPO | Comment for clarification on this proposal.  For SPS based on DCI activation/deactivation, only one GC-DCI is used for activation and deactivation. Besides, the reason not using DCI for activation/deactivation is because of infeasibility but not DCI overhead saving. |
| NTT DOCOMO | a) Agree |
| Xiaomi | OK |
| LG | We do not support this proposal. We prefer to have the same approach for activation of group common SPS for broadcast as well as multicast and for all RRC states. |
| CMCC | Since the SPS is also related to RAN2 work, we suggest to deprioritize this issue. |
| vivo | Ok with the main bullet, the configuration in sub-bullet needs more discussion. |
| MediaTek | Not support. Share the similar view with LG. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have not agreed to support SPS for broadcast which we think is not essential at this stage for the entire broadcast transmission functionality. |
| Apple | We don’t see the strong motivation to introduce configured grant type for MBS. |
| Ericsson | We agree |
| Qualcomm | Have concern on the SPS without activation/deactivation confirmation. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Ok |
| Moderator | There are comments from companies that do not agree on the introduction of SPS for broadcast or to deprioritise this functionality. Given the progress of discussion on other issues which have more priority and the late state of the meeting the discussion in this issue is deprioritised. |

## [ACTIVE] Issue 10: Beam Sweeping for MCCH and MTCH channels

### **Background**

The following agreement for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs at RAN1#103-e, RAN2#104-e, RAN1#105-e and RAN1#106-e are relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, beam sweeping is supported for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.   + FFS: Details for support of beam sweeping for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.   Agreement:  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   Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, RAN1 confirms the following assumptions made by RAN2   * RAN2 assumes, in case searchSpace#0 is configured for MCCH (if allowed, pending RAN1 decision), the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1. * RAN2 assumes that if common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MCCH (if allowed, pending RAN1 decision), the PDCCH monitoring occasions for MCCH message which are not overlapping with UL symbols are sequentially numbered from one in the MCCH transmission window and mapped to SSBs using the similar rule as defined for OSI in TS 38.331.   Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the same beam can be used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH for carrying MCCH or MTCH.   * UE may assume that DMRS ports of the group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MCCH is QCL’d with SSB. * UE may assume that DMRS ports of the group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB. * FFS: group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured   Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH.  Agreement:  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the same CSS type for MCCH and MTCH.   * FFS support of different CSS types for MCCH and MTCH channels for broadcast reception.   Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, if searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1.  Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with broadcast reception, if common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping of PDCCH monitoring occasions to SSBs can be configured with a rule.   * The existing rule defined for OSI in TS 38.331 is used as starting point to define the above rule. |

The following agreements form RAN2#113bis-e meeting are relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| * **The concept of MCCH transmission window, similar to the one used for LTE SC-PTM, is used for NR MCCH scheduling. The exact parameters to define the window are FFS (discussed in the following proposals).** * **The MCCH transmission window is defined by MCCH repetition period, MCCH window duration and radio frame/slot offset.** * **R2 assumes PDCCH occasions for MCCH search space are associated with SSBs in a pre-defined manner so that the UE can receive MCCH scheduling on PDCCH occasions according to its detected SSB.** * **R2 assumes, In case searchSpace#0 is configured for MCCH (if allowed, pending RAN1 decision), the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1.** * **R2 assumes that If common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MCCH (if allowed, pending RAN1 decision), the PDCCH monitoring occasions for MCCH message which are not overlapping with UL symbols are sequentially numbered from one in the MCCH transmission window and mapped to SSBs using the similar rule as defined for OSI in TS 38.331.** |

The following agreements form RAN2#115-e meeting are relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| * **If Data Inactivity timer is configured, data monitoring is applied both for unicast and MBS multicast (i.e. both PTM and PTP data) (but not MBS broadcast)** * **The Multicast Long DRX operation has to support the following parameters which are similar to the UE-specific DRX for unicast, where the last two parameters are needed if the HARQ- feedback is enabled:**   + **drx-onDurationTimerPTM**   + **drx-InactivityTimerPTM**   + **drx-LongCycleStartOffsetPTM**   + **drx-SlotOffsetPTM**   + **drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerDLPTM**   + **drx-RetransmissionTimerDLPTM** * **For NR Broadcast, the DRX pattern is configured per G-RNTI.** * **For NR Broadcast, DRX configuration includes: drx-onDurationTimerPTM, drx-SlotOffsetPTM, drx-InactivityTimerPTM, drx-CycleStartOffsetPTM.** |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2108725, Huawei]
  + Proposal 9: MTCH scheduling is associated with a window defined by the MTCH monitoring periodicity *K*\_(G-RNTI) and the offset to the starting of the periodicity *O*\_(G-RNTI):
    - the PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) in slot n\_slot in the frame SFN is given by (SFN∙N\_slot+n\_slot-O\_(G-RNTI) )mod K\_(G-RNTI)=0, where N\_slot is the number of slots in a radio frame.
  + Proposal 10: Within the MTCH scheduling window, the association between the PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSB is defined as:
    - the [x×N+K]th PDCCH monitoring occasion (s) for MTCH in the scheduling window corresponds to the Kth transmitted SSB, where x = 0, 1, ...X-1, K = 1, 2, …N, N is the number of actual transmitted SSBs determined according to ssb-PositionsInBurst in SIB1 and X is equal to CEIL(number of PDCCH monitoring occasions in G-RNTI window/N).
    - The UE assumes that, in the MTCH scheduling window, PDCCH for an MTCH scrambled by G-RNTI is transmitted in at least one PDCCH monitoring occasion corresponding to each transmitted SSB.
* In [R1-2109069, OPPO]
  + Proposal 9: Since PDCCH monitoring occasions are directly related to the SSB locations due to beam sweeping, the higher layer parameter “MCCH duration” is no longer necessary. RAN1 should inform RAN2 about this and recommend to remove this parameter if there is no other use.
  + Proposal 10: The MBS window is defined as SFN mod T = offset, where the period T and offset are configured by the network. The MBS window is used to number PDCCH occasion from 0 for MTCH scheduling.
  + Proposal 11:
    - 5a: The first PDCCH occasion of each data are configured by the network and the PDCCH occasion from configured first PDCCH occasion in ascending order can be mapped to SSB index in ascending order of their SSB indexes for corresponding data.
    - 5b: If first PDCCH occasion of each data are not configured by the network, the PDCCH occasion from 0 in ascending order can be mapped to SSB index in ascending order of their SSB indexes data by data.
* In [R1-2109196, CATT]
  + Proposal 8: In NR MBS system, both options of PDCCH MO configuration can be considered, and how to initiate these two options can be further studied.
    - Option 1: PDCCH MOs in one MBS-window length are allocated to different SSBs successively, same as the PDCCH MOs for SIBx.
    - Option 2: PDCCH MOs in one MBS-window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive MOs.
* In [R1-2109318, Nokia]
  + *Discuss*: Rel17 MBS is the very first release for NR, it is preferred to keep the robust SSB-based beam sweeping operation as SIB for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs for both MCCH and MTCH. Due to the limited working time left for Rel17 MBS, supporting of more advanced beam sweeping operation for MBS could be considered in future releases.
  + Proposal-22: It is preferred to keep the robust SSB-based beam sweeping operation as SIB for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs for both MCCH and MTCH in Rel17 MBS.
  + Observation-11: Based on the latest agreement from RAN2-115-e meeting, transmission window of MTCH is based on DRX pattern configuration, where different broadcast services can be configured and associated with different DRX pattern configuration.
  + Proposal-23: It is proposed to consider additional association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions other than the rule defined for OSI in TS 38.331.
  + Proposal-24: Consider the SSB index to PDCCH MO mapping across the MBS window can be “disabled” by network. Thus, the mapped number of mapped SSB beams can be evenly distributed among each MCCH window duration.
  + Proposal-25: Allow the network to control the number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the on-duration window.
* In [R1-2109388, Xiaomi]
  + Proposal 11: The current defined beam sweeping mechanisms are sufficient and any further optimization on beam sweeping is not supported in Rel-17.
* In [R1-2109769, TD Tech]
  + Proposal 13: For the search space other than search space 0, the mapping between POs and SSB indexes within each transmission window of MCCH is defined as:
    - The POs within each transmission window of MCCH are numbered in sequence with index 0 for the first PO.
    - The PO with index k=(N\*x+n) is associated with SSB index n, where n=0,…,N-1, N is the number of the beams used for the SSBs, x=0,…,INT[L/N]-1, and L is the number of the POs in each transmission window.
  + Proposal 14: For the search space other than search space 0, the mapping between POs and SSB indexes within each monitoring period of the search space is defined as:
    - The POs within each monitoring period are numbered in sequence with index 0 for the first PO.
    - The PO with index k=(N\*x+n) is associated with SSB index n, where n=0,…,N-1, N is the number of the beams used for the SSBs, x=0,…,INT[L1/N]-1, and L1 is the number of the POs in each monitoring period.
  + Proposal 15: If a CSS for MTCH is shared by unicast sessions, the mapping between POs and SSB indexes for MTCH within each monitoring period of the CSS can be disabled with the following configuration supported.
* In [R1-2109985, LGE]
  + *Discuss*: Unlike MCCH information and System information having periodically stable TB sizes at a cell, MTCH can serve more dynamic data traffic in size and periodicity. Thus, we prefer to have more flexibility in scheduling various broadcast MTCH transmissions, instead of fully reusing the concept of SI window for MTCH.
  + Observation 3: Different SI messages can be scheduled in different SI windows with different scheduling parameters e.g. different SI periodicities.
  + Proposal 7: Group common transmissions for different G-RNTIs with different traffic patterns can be scheduled in different transmission windows. Different transmission windows can be configured with different window lengths as well as different periodicities of transmission windows, depending on MTCH traffic characteristics.
  + Proposal 8: Group common transmissions for different G-RNTIs with similar traffic pattern can be scheduled in same transmission windows.
  + Observation 4: A certain broadcast service may be available only at a specific local area within a cell.
  + Proposal 9: For a certain broadcast service, the number of actual transmitted SSBs is used to determine PDCCH monitoring occasions within a transmission window and can be smaller than the number of SSBs determined in SIB1. Different transmission windows can be configured with different number of actual transmitted SSBs, depending on actual broadcast service area.
  + Observation 5: RAN2 agreed that MCCH contents should include information about broadcast sessions such as G-RNTI, MBS session ID as well as scheduling information for MTCH (e.g. search space, DRX).
  + Proposal 10: PDCCH monitoring occasions are determined in DRX on-durations for MTCH of a broadcast service for idle/inactive UEs.
* In [R1-2110357, Ericsson]
  + Proposal 9: It should be configurable whether beams sweeping is used in the MBS broadcast mode. The beamwidth of PDSCH carrying MTCH should be possible to adjust separately from the SSB beamwidth.
  + Proposal 10: For scheduling a PTM-PDSCH, we propose the following schemes:
    - a) PDCCH in the same beam as the PTM-PDSCH
    - b) Multiple PDCCH, one per narrower beam, each pointing to the same PTM-PDSCH in a different, potentially wider, beam.
    - c) SPS
  + Proposal 11: The beamwidth of PDSCH carrying MCCH should be possible to adjust separately from the beamwidth of PDSCH carrying MTCH.
  + Proposal 12: When beam sweeping is used for unicast and/or multicast to RRC Connected UEs, the same beams may also carry multicast and/or broadcast, addressing Inactive/Idle UEs.

### **FL Assessment**

***On transmission window & mapping of PDCCH monitoring occasions to SSBs for MTCH for CSS other than SS#0***

[Huawei, OPPO, TD Tech] propose the definition of a transmission window and the association rules between PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSBs, where [Huawei] reuses the functionality specified for OSI. [Nokia] presents that based on latest RAN2 agreements, the transmission window of MTCH is based on DRX patters, where different broadcast services can be configured and associated with different DRX pattern configuration.

The FL puts forward a proposal to agree a basic functionality reusing the methods as specified for OSI as proposed above.

***On additional association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions***

[CATT, Nokia, LG] propose additional rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions that would provide more flexibility compared to beam sweeping mechanism supported for system information and being reused for MBS broadcast reception with RRC idle/inactive UEs. The additional rules here have already been proposed in previous meetings. However, [Xiaomi] discusses that further optimisations should not be part of Rel-17 work.

The additional rules proposed above have been discussed at the previous meeting without reaching a conclusion. The FL puts forward the latest version of the proposals from RAN1#106-e meeting as starting point for this meeting (with minor revisions) to collect companies’ views.

***On separate configurations for GC-PDCCH and GC-PDSCH and between MTCH and MCCH***

[Ericsson] as per the previous meetings has multiple proposals to allow separate beam sweeping configurations between GC-PDCCH and GC-PDSCH as well as to allow for separate beam sweeping configurations between MCCH and MTCH. The proposals also include allowing the configuration of beamwidths larger for GC-PDSCH and potential association from multiple GC-PDCCH beams.

The FL puts forward the latest version of the proposals from RAN1#106-e meeting as starting point for this meeting to collect companies’ views.

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

**Proposal 2.10-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, MTCH scheduling is associated with a window defined by the MTCH monitoring periodicity and the offset to the starting of the periodicity :

* the PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) in slot in the frame is given by , where is the number of slots in a radio frame.

**Proposal 2.10-2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, within the MTCH scheduling window, the association between the PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSB is defined as:

* the [*x*×*N*+*K*]th PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) for MTCH in the scheduling window corresponds to the *K*th transmitted SSB, where *x* = 0, 1, ...*X*-1, *K* = 1, 2, …*N*, *N* is the number of actual transmitted SSBs determined according to *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in SIB1 and *X* is equal to CEIL(*number of PDCCH monitoring occasions in G-RNTI window*/*N*).
* The UE assumes that, in the MTCH scheduling window, PDCCH for an MTCH scrambled by G-RNTI is transmitted in at least one PDCCH monitoring occasion corresponding to each transmitted SSB.

**Proposal 2.10-3**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, further study to reach an agreement at RAN1#107-e the following issues of additional association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions for GC-PDCCH scheduling MTCH:

* Issues 1: mapping across transmission windows:
  + Mapping of SSB index to GC-PDCCH MO across transmission window can be disabled by network.
* Issue 2: mapping within a transmission window:
  + Issue 2.1: actual transmitted SSB smaller than number of SSBs determined in SIB1:
    - Number of actual transmitted SSBs in [*x*×*N*+*K*]th PDCCH monitoring occasions smaller than the number of SSBs determined in SIB1
    - Mapping of SSB beams without MBS transmission
  + Issue 2.2: repetition mapping within a transmission window
    - GC-PDCCH MOs in one transmission window length are allocated to different SSBs successively (e.g., based on the PDCCH MOs for SIBx) or GC-PDCCH MOs in one transmission window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive monitoring occasions.
    - Number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the transmission window duration can be controlled by network.

**Proposal 2.10-4**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, study to reach an agreement at RAN1#107-e the following for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH:

* multiple GC-PDCCH, one per narrow beam, each pointing to the same GC-PDSCH in a different potentially wider beam.
* beamwidth of GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH is adjusted separately from the beamwidth of GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH.

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above:**

1. **do you agree with the proposal 2.10-1 to 2.1-4? Please provide reasons, views in general or alternative proposals if you do not agree.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | Support 2.10-1 and 2.10-2.  Do not support 2.10-3 and 2.10-4 as they are out of scope based on the WID (no FR2 enhancements). |
| NOKIA/NSB | Proposal 2.10-1: There is already DRX (including corresponding parameters) defined by RAN2 for broadcast, why we still need the proposal 2.10-1?  We see somehow the Proposal 2.10-2 and Proposal 2.10-3 are related. And prefer to kick-out the discussion of Proposal 2.10-3 in this meeting.  Proposal 2.10-4: OK |
| ZTE | Just one clarification question for Proposal 2.10-1, is its intention to say that we will have separate window configuration for different G-RNTIs?  If yes, then we support Proposal 2.10-1 and 2.10-2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.10-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.10-2**: Support  **Proposal 2.10-3**: OK to study  **Proposal 2.10-4**: OK to study |
| Xiaomi | Support 2.10-1 and 2.10-2.  Do not support proposal 2.10-3 and 2.10-4. Agree with Samsung that they are out of scope. In Rel-17 MBS WID, it is cleared stated that we should focus on the basic functionality for broadcast/multicast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs. |
| LG | **Proposal 2.10-1**: We do not support a MTCH transmission window only specific to a single G-RNTI. We think that different MTCHs for different G-RNTIs can be scheduled based on PDCCHs in a certain MTCH transmission window, while different MTCH transmission windows (e.g. with different window lengths) can be still used to schedule different G-RNTIs. Such scheduling could depend on e.g. DRX configuration and/or a set of SSBs for a transmission window.  **Proposal 2.10-2**: We think that the MTCH transmission window is not specific to a single G-RNTI. In addition, we think that if there is no broadcast MTCH in the MTCH window, the second bullet point would not work. The proposal could be changed to:   * the [*x*×*N*+*K*]th PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) for MTCH in the scheduling window corresponds to the *K*th transmitted SSB, where *x* = 0, 1, ...*X*-1, *K* = 1, 2, …*N*, *N* is the number of actual transmitted SSBs determined in SIB or MCCH ~~according to~~ *~~ssb-PositionsInBurst~~* ~~in SIB1~~ and *X* is equal to CEIL(*number of PDCCH monitoring occasions in ~~G-RNTI~~ MTCH transmission window*/*N*). * ~~The UE assumes that, in the MTCH scheduling window, PDCCH for an MTCH scrambled by G-RNTI is transmitted in at least one PDCCH monitoring occasion corresponding to each transmitted SSB.~~   **Proposal 2.10-3**: OK |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.10-1: Similar view as Nokia, the search space and DRX configuration is enough.  Proposal 2.10-2: Support.  Proposal 2.10-3, 2.10-4: Deprioritize these two proposals. |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.10-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.10-2**: Support  **Proposal 2.10-3**: OK to study  **Proposal 2.10-4**: OK to study |
| vivo | Ok with 2.10-1 and 2.10-2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Ok with proposal 2.10-1/2.**  **The second bullet deleted by LGE actually intended for the purpose of associating SSB and MTCH scheduling occasion,**   * + - **For the purpose of associating PDCCH monitoring occasion for MTCH and SSB, the UE assumes that, in the MTCH scheduling window, PDCCH for an MTCH scrambled by G-RNTI is transmitted in at least one PDCCH monitoring occasion corresponding to each transmitted SSB.** |
| Ericsson | For Proposals 2.10-1/2/3: Not support (for now). We think the proposals need to be clarified first, primarily with respect to the meaning/definition of the “window”.  P2.10-4: Support. Considering the large potential gains (see our contribution) in spectral efficiency of receiving a wide PDSCH transmission beam over N slots compared to receiving beamformed PDSCH in only one slot, we find it important for such functionality to be supported in Rel-17. |
| CATT2 | We do not think P2.10-3 and P 2.10-4 are the FR2 issue. Per our understanding, for FR1, the association between SSB and MOs should also be discussed. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Proposal 2.10-1**:OK  **Proposal 2.10-2**: OK but the second item can be deleted.  **Proposal 2.10-3**:   * Issues 1: OK * Issue 2: mapping within a transmission window:   + Issue 2.1: We think it is an implementation problem. That is, among K consecutive MOs associated with K beams, some MOs have no GC-PDCCH transmission because no UE is located in the corresponding beam coverage area.   + Issue 2.2:   We think that GC-PDCCH MOs in one transmission window length are allocated to different SSBs successively should have a better time diversity gain.  We support GC-PDSCH repetition is supported but the same repetition times is applied for each beam.  **Proposal 2.10-4**: We think GC-PDCCH needs to be sent with all the beams to make GC-PDCCH cover the entire cell. The GC-PDSCH associated with the GC-PDCCH sent with beam “n” can use the same beam or a wider beam only if all wider beams can cover the entire cell. It’s just an implementation problem because the GC-PDSCH has its own DMRS. |
| Ericsson2 | We also think the schedule of the monitoring occasions should enable it to sweep over all beams within 32 slots, so that all PDCCHs in a sweep could in their *PDSCH-TimeDomainResourceAllocation* point to a common PDSCH, noting that that field has range 0…32. |
| Moderator | Thanks for input.  **Regarding Proposal 2.10-1**  @ZTE, Proposal 2.10-1, it is my understanding that and are parameters on G-RNTI which then would allow for different window configurations per G-RNTI. However, please see comment from Nokia and CMCC below.  However, Nokia and CMCC discuss that this proposal is not needed since RAN2 work on DRX for broadcast already covers this. **Could other companies comment on this please?**  **Regarding Proposal 2.10-2**   * **Support**: [Samsung, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, CMCC, CATT, vivo, Huawei] * **Do not support**: [LG, Ericsson. TD Tech]   The current proposal has wide support although some companies do not support its current form. I have included the comments from LG and Huawei. I have also included “at least” to not exclude the discussions on Proposals 2.10-3/4.  **Regarding Proposal 2.10-3**:   * support [Nokia, DOCOMO, LG, CATT, TD Tech] * do not support [Samsung, Xiaomi, CMCC, Ericsson]   **Regarding Proposal 2.10-4**:   * support [Nokia, DOCOMO, CATT, Ericsson, TD Tech] * do not support [Samsung, Xiaomi, CMCC]   For these two proposals, the situation is quite mixed. There are comments from companies with concerns that these are FR2 enhancements and therefore not in the scope of the WID. It would be good to understand if this in fact is a general understanding that companies think these are FR2 enhancements. Please do comment. There have not been any proposals for change so I will keep them unchanged to collect companies views. |

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

**Proposal 2.10-1[unchanged – awaiting feedback]**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, MTCH scheduling is associated with a window defined by the MTCH monitoring periodicity and the offset to the starting of the periodicity :

* the PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) in slot in the frame is given by , where is the number of slots in a radio frame.

**Proposal 2.10-2rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, at least support that within the MTCH scheduling window, the association between the PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSB is defined as:

* the [*x*×*N*+*K*]th PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) for MTCH in the scheduling window corresponds to the *K*th transmitted SSB, where *x* = 0, 1, ...*X*-1, *K* = 1, 2, …*N*, *N* is the number of actual transmitted SSBs determined according to SIB/MCCH and *X* is equal to CEIL(*number of PDCCH monitoring occasions in MTCH window*/*N*).
* For the purpose of associating PDCCH monitoring occasion for MTCH and SSB,the UE assumes that, in the MTCH scheduling window, PDCCH for an MTCH scrambled by G-RNTI is transmitted in at least one PDCCH monitoring occasion corresponding to each transmitted SSB.

**Proposal 2.10-3[unchanged – awaiting feedback]**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, further study to reach an agreement at RAN1#107-e the following issues of additional association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions for GC-PDCCH scheduling MTCH:

* Issues 1: mapping across transmission windows:
  + Mapping of SSB index to GC-PDCCH MO across transmission window can be disabled by network.
* Issue 2: mapping within a transmission window:
  + Issue 2.1: actual transmitted SSB smaller than number of SSBs determined in SIB1:
    - Number of actual transmitted SSBs in [*x*×*N*+*K*]th PDCCH monitoring occasions smaller than the number of SSBs determined in SIB1
    - Mapping of SSB beams without MBS transmission
  + Issue 2.2: repetition mapping within a transmission window
    - GC-PDCCH MOs in one transmission window length are allocated to different SSBs successively (e.g., based on the PDCCH MOs for SIBx) or GC-PDCCH MOs in one transmission window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive monitoring occasions.
    - Number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the transmission window duration can be controlled by network.

**Proposal 2.10-4[unchanged – awaiting feedback]**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, study to reach an agreement at RAN1#107-e the following for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH:

* multiple GC-PDCCH, one per narrow beam, each pointing to the same GC-PDSCH in a different potentially wider beam.
* beamwidth of GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH is adjusted separately from the beamwidth of GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH.

**Please provide your answers in the table below.:**

1. **Regarding Proposal 2.10-1, do you think RAN2 agreements on DRX configuration for NR broadcast already covers the details of the MTCH transmission window?**
2. **Do you support Proposal 2.10-2rev1? Please provide reasons and/or alternative proposals if you do not agree.**
3. **Regarding Proposals 2.10-3 and 2.10-4, do you think these are FR2 enhancements compared to basic functionality?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | Support 2.10-1 and 2.10-2rev1.  Still do not support 2.10-3 and 2.10-4 as they are out of scope based on the WID (no FR2 enhancements). There is no reason to conclude this first. |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 2.10-1:** support.  **Proposal 2.10-2 rev1:** we are not clear on the modification of **‘***N* is the number of actual transmitted SSBs determined according to SIB/MCCH**’**. The number of actual SSBs is determined by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in SIB1, why is it insufficient?  **Proposal 2.10-3:** not support. Similar views as Samsung.  **Proposal 2.10-4:** not support. Similar views as Samsung. |
| OPPO | **Proposal 2.10-3 and proposal 2.10-4:** To answer the question d): Yes. Directly understanding from the two proposals reflects additional enhancements are needed. So we share the similar view with Samsung and Xiaomi. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.10-2 rev1:** Not support, it is simple to reuse the number of actual SSBs by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* to realize full beam sweeping similar as SIB/Paging.  **Proposal 2.10-3 and proposal 2.10-4:** Not support, same view as Samsung |
| vivo | Proposal 2.10-2 rev1: Not support to include MCCH |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.10-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.10-2rev1**: Not support. We have the similar view as Xiaomi/CMCC. |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 2.10-1**: We also think that this proposal is related to DRX and proponents should clarify the relation before it can be agreed.  **Proposal 2.10-2rev1**: We also think the schedule of the monitoring occasions should enable it to sweep over all beams within 32 slots, so that all PDCCHs in a sweep could in their *PDSCH-TimeDomainResourceAllocation* point to a common PDSCH, noting that that field has range 0…32.  **Proposal 2.10-3:** Reiterating our earlier request for clarification of window definition. The equation in Proposal 2.10-1 defines an offset and a periodicity. The equation in our understanding defines a sequence of slots spaced by K\_G-RNTI. None of the parameters in the equation are explained to define a window length. Further details of this proposal cannot be understood and agreed before the window has been clarified.  **Proposal 2.10-4: S**upport. Comments have been made that this is an optimization for FR2 which is down prioritized, however we are of the opinion that the entire topic of beam sweeping is only relevant for FR2, so we don't see why proposals 2.10-1 to 2.10-3 would be of higher priority than 2.10-4. |
| Moderator | Thank you for discussion.  For **Proposal 2.10-1,** it may be better to delay the discussion until other parameters such as DRX are clarified, given the time left for discussion, the FL proposes to delay the discussion.  For **Proposal 2.10-2rev1** the changes have received opposition from some companies, so previous version had wider support. I propose to leave the clarification from Huawei and the term “at least” to not exclude other discussions. However, we are also getting to the end of the release and we should ensure we complete the discussions and move forward.  Regarding **Proposals 2.10-3/4**, there have been clarifications from Ericsson. I will leave the proposals to check what companies think about these clarifications. |

### **3rd round FL proposals for Issue 10**

**Proposal 2.10-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, at least support that within the MTCH scheduling window, the association between the PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSB is defined as:

* the [*x*×*N*+*K*]th PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) for MTCH in the scheduling window corresponds to the *K*th transmitted SSB, where *x* = 0, 1, ...*X*-1, *K* = 1, 2, …*N*, *N* is the number of actual transmitted SSBs determined according to *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in SIB1 and *X* is equal to CEIL(*number of PDCCH monitoring occasions in G-RNTI window*/*N*).
* For the purpose of associating PDCCH monitoring occasion for MTCH and SSB,the UE assumes that, in the MTCH scheduling window, PDCCH for an MTCH scrambled by G-RNTI is transmitted in at least one PDCCH monitoring occasion corresponding to each transmitted SSB.

**Proposal 2.10-3[unchanged – awaiting feedback]**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, further study to reach an agreement at RAN1#107-e the following issues of additional association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions for GC-PDCCH scheduling MTCH:

* Issues 1: mapping across transmission windows:
  + Mapping of SSB index to GC-PDCCH MO across transmission window can be disabled by network.
* Issue 2: mapping within a transmission window:
  + Issue 2.1: actual transmitted SSB smaller than number of SSBs determined in SIB1:
    - Number of actual transmitted SSBs in [*x*×*N*+*K*]th PDCCH monitoring occasions smaller than the number of SSBs determined in SIB1
    - Mapping of SSB beams without MBS transmission
  + Issue 2.2: repetition mapping within a transmission window
    - GC-PDCCH MOs in one transmission window length are allocated to different SSBs successively (e.g., based on the PDCCH MOs for SIBx) or GC-PDCCH MOs in one transmission window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive monitoring occasions.
    - Number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the transmission window duration can be controlled by network.

**Proposal 2.10-4[unchanged – awaiting feedback]**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, study to reach an agreement at RAN1#107-e the following for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH:

* multiple GC-PDCCH, one per narrow beam, each pointing to the same GC-PDSCH in a different potentially wider beam.
* beamwidth of GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH is adjusted separately from the beamwidth of GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH.

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Do you support Proposal 2.10-2rev2? Do you support Proposal 2.10-3 and/or 2.10-4 based on explanations provided in previous round?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | We are ok with Proposal 2.10-2rev2. |
| vivo | Ok with 2.10-2rev2.  Prefer to delay Proposal 2.10-3 and 2.10-4 for further information. |
| CMCC | Only support Proposal 2.10-2rev2. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Proposal 2.10-1[unchanged – awaiting feedback]: some words are missing**  **Proposal 2.10-1[unchanged – awaiting feedback]**:. For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, MTCH scheduling is associated with a window defined by the MTCH monitoring periodicity and the offset to the starting of the periodicity :   * the starting point of the window indicated by the frame number SFN and the slot number satisfies , where is the number of slots in a radio frame.   **Proposal 2.10-2rev1**: We suggest to delete the following item. We don’t see the need for the following item. With the first item, UE know how to monitor an MBS session. gNB needs to send GC-PDCCH in each beam direction. If repetition of N times is applied for an MBS session, gNB needs to send GC-PDCCH N times in each beam direction. It’s very clear. What’s meaning for adding the following item?   * For the purpose of associating PDCCH monitoring occasion for MTCH and SSB,the UE assumes that, in the MTCH scheduling window, PDCCH for an MTCH scrambled by G-RNTI is transmitted in at least one PDCCH monitoring occasion corresponding to each transmitted SS   **Proposal 2.10-3: See our view as below**   * Issues 1: Ok   + Issue 2.1: The scenario for issue 2.1 shall be given.   We think of the following scenario for issue 2.1:  a multicast session is transmitted with broadcast mode. gNB know which UEs are receiving the session. gNB also know the beams these UEs are located in. Therefore, gNB can only transmit the session in these beams. If a beam has no UE receiving the session, gNB has no need to transmit the session using the beam.   * + Issue 2.2:   We support: GC-PDCCH MOs in one transmission window length are allocated to different SSBs successively  We support repetition for GC-PDSCH.  **Proposal 2.10-4: we think how to set the beam for transmitting GC-PDSCH is an implementation problem. If the beams used for transmitting GC-PDSCH can cover the entire cell, it’s OK.** |
| LG | **Proposal 2.10-2rev2**: We think that the MTCH transmission window is not specific to a single G-RNTI. Thus, G-RNTI window could be changed to MTCH transmission window.  The first bullet point in this proposal could be changed to:   * the [*x*×*N*+*K*]th PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) for MTCH in the scheduling window corresponds to the *K*th transmitted SSB, where *x* = 0, 1, ...*X*-1, *K* = 1, 2, …*N*, *N* is the number of actual transmitted SSBs determined according to *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in SIB1 and *X* is equal to CEIL(*number of PDCCH monitoring occasions in ~~G-RNTI~~ MTCH transmission window*/*N*).   In addition, we think that this proposal is related to issue 2 in Proposal 2.10-3. Thus, we could add the following note in this proposal:   * NOTE: Additional association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions will be separately discussed.   **Proposal 2.10-3**: OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Regarding proposal 2.10-1, for progress, I would suggest revising it as follows:**  Proposal 2.10-1-rev1:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues for broadcast reception, MTCH scheduling is associated with a window defined by the MTCH monitoring periodicity *K* and the offset to the starting of the periodicity *O*:   * FFS: *K/O* is per G-RNTI or applies to all G-RNTI.   **Support proposal 2.10-2rev2.**  **For other two proposals, no need to have an agreement on it especially when it is controversial because the main bullet is FFS.** |
| CATT | Ok with 2.10-2rev2.  Support Proposal 2.10-3 and 2.10-4. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.10-2rev2**: Support |

## [ACTIVE] Issue 11: TRS as QLC source

### **Background**

The following agreement for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs at RAN1#103-e, RAN2#104-e, RAN1#105-e and RAN1#106-e are relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, beam sweeping is supported for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.   + FFS: Details for support of beam sweeping for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.   Agreement:  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   Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the same beam can be used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH for carrying MCCH or MTCH.   * UE may assume that DMRS ports of the group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MCCH is QCL’d with SSB. * UE may assume that DMRS ports of the group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB. * FFS: group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured |

The following agreement at RAN#93-e is also relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * The following aspects can be considered to be within the scope of the Rel-17 MBS WID and can be further discussed in the WGs with the aim of minimizing specification impacts:   + Configurable scrambling sequence initialization for PDCCH/PDSCH and DMRS sequence generator initialization for PDCCH/PDSCH for broadcast transmission (as supported for RRC\_CONNECTED UE).   + Configuring TRS as QCL sources for broadcast transmission (as supported for RRC\_CONNECTED UE). * Note: For broadcast transmission, the presence of TRS would be optional from a network perspective. * Note: Any SFN operation is transparent to the UE |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2108725, Huawei]
  + *Discuss*: TRS as QCL source is used for time/frequency tracking in SFN manner where SSB per cell is not workable properly.
  + *Discuss*: Considering the broadcast deployment will dominate in low frequency range, e.g., 600MHz/700MHz, periodic TRS as QCL source can be used for finer time/frequency tracking instead of beam training that is more necessary for FR2. Therefore, when periodic TRS is to be configured as QCL source, there is no need to configure SSB as the QCL source of the periodic TRS.  
    We should note that the specification impact is quite minor because there is no change to TRS itself but rather specifying the support of the TRS configuration (as supported for RRC\_CONNECTED UE) in SIB/MCCH for MTCH carrying broadcast for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE. Also, the SFN operation is transparent to UE.
  + Proposal 3: Periodic TRS can be configured as QCL source for broadcast transmission especially for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE.
* In [R1- 2109003, vivo]
  + Proposal 7: Study the following aspects to determine whether to support TRS as QCL source for broadcast transmission.
    - Indication method for QCL information of TRS, i.e., whether associated with SSB
    - Transmission manner of TRS, e.g., whether beam sweeping is supported in FR2
    - Timing acquisition, e.g., how to acquire cell timing
* In [R1-2109318, Nokia]
  + *Discuss*: However, from robustness perspective for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE with broadcast reception, the scheme based on SSB with lower modulation scheme could be a better solution in practice. For further discussion and supporting of TRS with higher modulation scheme, it is preferred having performance evaluation and justification provided from the proponents before the proceeding of detailed specification work.
  + Observation-8: Scheme based on SSB with lower modulation scheme could be a better solution in practice from robustness perspective for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE with broadcast transmission.
  + Proposal-20: For further discussion and supporting of TRS with higher modulation scheme, it is preferred having performance evaluation and justification from the proponents before the detailed specification work.
  + Observation-9: Based on the outcome of RAN#93e, there is no update of Rel17 MBS WID, meaning that there is no standardized support specifically for SFN is provided in Rel17 MBS WI. Any SFN operation should be transparent to the UE.
  + Observation-10: There is ongoing work on support of TRS for RRC\_IDLE/INATIVE UEs in Rel17 UE power saving WI. How to align the two Rel17 Wis need to be carefully considered, so as to parallel duplicated work in Rel17 on supporting of TRS for RRC\_IDLE/INATIVE UEs.
  + Proposal-21: If there is not enough time for specifying TRS for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs in Rel17 MBS, it can be further considered as a candidate in upcoming Rel18 MBS work.
* In [R1-2109389, Xiaomi]
  + *Discuss*: For physical broadcast channel, it carries the most essential information targeting to all UEs. Compared to efficiency, reliability is the ultimate goal. From this perspective, there is no motivation to support advanced modulation schemes for current physical broadcast channels. For NR Multicast and Broadcast services, diverse services with large TBS are on the table and need to be supported, e.g. V2X applications, transparent IPv4/IPv6 multicast delivery, IPTV, software delivery over wireless, group communications and IoT applications.
  + *Discuss*: In order to support higher modulation order compared to QPSK, the synchronization accuracy becomes a bottleneck for UEs in Idle/Inactive state. One straightforward mechanism is to introduce a group-specific TRS for UEs in Idle/Inactive states which support MBS traffic.
  + Proposal: Introduce group-specific TRS for MBS capable UE in order to improve the accuracy of T/F synchronization.
    - MBS UE receives the group-specific TRS only when it is in Idle/Inactive state.
* In [R1-2110212, Qualcomm]
  + *Discuss*: If broadcast is transmitted from SFNed multiple cells, GC-PDCCH/PDSCH should be QCL’d with periodic TRS with the multiple cells. The TRS can be configured in a broadcast CFR with transmission no larger than that of the CFR. Although the time delay spread is different from that of serving cell’s SSB, the TRS can be QCL-ed with SSB at least in terms of timing, doppler shift.  
    Even if the broadcast is transmission from single cell, the GC-PDSCH for MTCH may use high modulation and TRS is beneficial to link budget.
  + Proposal 7: TRS can be configured in a broadcast CFR for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.
    - UE may assume that the GC-PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured for broadcast.
    - The TRS can be QCL-ed with SSB at least in terms of timing, doppler.
* In [R1-2110357, Ericsson]
  + *Discuss*: TRS are beneficial for operation at low SINR, typically for SINR<3dB and at low bandwidth, typically <6 PRBs.  
    In a broadcast scenario SINR<3dB can easily happen for UEs close to the cell border, even with beam sweeping. Small bandwidth allocations for MBS services that do not exceed 6 PRBs are also easily conceivable, e.g. MCPTT voice service. Configuring TRS for MBS broadcast can make sense in such scenarios.
  + Proposal 13: Group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with TRS if configured.

### **FL Assessment**

* *Supporters of configuring TRS as a QLC source for broadcast reception in RRC idle/inactive UEs*
  + [Huawei, Xiaomi, Qualcomm, Ericsson]
* *More discussion is needed for the support of TRS as a QLC source for broadcast reception*
  + [vivo, Nokia].
  + [Nokia] highlights ongoing work on support of TRS for RRC\_IDLE/INATIVE UEs in Rel17 UE power saving WI and that additional results may be needed to justify the introduction of the functionality if the motivation is to enable higher order modulation schemes.
* *Use case of TRS as QLC source*
  + [Huawei, Xiaomi, Qualcomm]: improved time/frequency tracking accuracy, especially in the lower frequency ranges, e.g., 600-700 MHz for both transmissions from a single-cell or from multiple-cells (intra-DU SFN)
  + [Huawei] not for beam training at FR2.
* *Items for further study for TRS as QLC source* [vivo, Nokia]
  + Indication method for QCL information of TRS, i.e., whether associated with SSB
  + Transmission manner of TRS, e.g., whether beam sweeping is supported in FR2
  + Timing acquisition, e.g., how to acquire cell timing

Based on the above and to allow more discussion the FL puts forward the proposals below.

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

**Proposal 2.11-1**: for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, periodic TRS can be configured as QCL source for broadcast reception of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

**Proposal 2.11-2**: Study the following aspects on the configuration of TRS as QCL source for broadcast transmission.

* Indication method for QCL information of TRS, i.e., whether associated with SSB
* Transmission manner of TRS, e.g., whether beam sweeping is supported in FR2
* Timing acquisition, e.g., how to acquire cell timing

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above:**

1. **do you agree with the proposal 2.11-1? Please provide reasons, views in general if you do not agree.**
2. **do you agree with the study items listed in proposal 2.11-2? Please provide reasons, views in general or an alternative list if you do not agree.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | FR2 enhancements are out of scope. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Proposal 2.11-1: Not support  Scheme based on SSB with lower modulation scheme could be a better solution in practice from robustness perspective for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE with broadcast transmission.  For further discussion and supporting of TRS with higher modulation scheme, it is preferred having performance evaluation and justification from the proponents before the detailed specification work.  There is ongoing work on support of TRS for RRC\_IDLE/INATIVE UEs in Rel17 UE power saving WI. Please clarify on how to align the two Rel17 Wis need to be carefully considered, so as to parallel duplicated work in Rel17 on supporting of TRS for RRC\_IDLE/INATIVE UEs.  Proposal 2.11-2: Not support, the same reason why not to support as stated in above. |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.11-1: We support this proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | a) Agree  b) Agree |
| Xiaomi | Our feeling is that both proposal from FL is beneficial even essential for MBS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs. We are open to discuss this issues. |
| LG | We do not support this proposal. If TRS is supported, we prefer to have commonality with support of TRS in power saving WI as much as possible. |
| vivo | The issues listed in Proposal 2.11-2 should be discussed first before supporting TRS as QCL source for broadcast transmission. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with proposal **2.11-1.** It is not used for FR2 enhancement. Actually broadcast is mainly targeting low frequency band. TRS as QCL source aims to provide better performance than SSB.  2.11.2, the bullets can be further studied, specifically for the first two issues:  1. not need to associated with SSB, because it is for low frequency band for finer performance, beam training is not needed.  2. no need. FR2 is not the target band.  Regarding the comment about relation with the mechanism adopted in power saving. Regardless the TRS for broadcast or for power saving, the TRS essentially is the same as that for connected state, what need to be done is the configuration can be configured in SIB/MCCH. |
| Ericsson | P2.11-1: Support  P2.11-2: Support |
| Qualcomm | Support  We think TRS can be associated with SSB in terms of timing and Doppler spread, but not delay spread due to different paths of multi-cell SFN transmission. |
| Moderator | Thanks for inputs. Although there is support from some companies, there are companies with concerns. Proponents of TRS have provided clarifications, so it would be worth checking if these comments address concerns, e.g., it has been clarified that it FR2 is not the target band and that it does not need to be associated with SSB because finer performance at lower frequencies so no beam training is needed. Regarding comments on WI on Power Saving, Huawei has the TRS would be the same as for connected state.  @**Samsung, Nokia, LG, vivo**, could you please share whether your concerns have been addressed? |
| NOKIA/NSB | Please find our reply in below:   * From the proponent reply, we still don’t see how the TRS for RRC\_IDLE/INATIVE UEs can be aligned with corresponding framework in Rel17 UE power saving WI, so as to avoid parallel duplicated work in Rel17 on supporting of TRS for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.  Moreover, how to understand the TRS could be the same as for connected state? Does it assume the same TRS configuration for all the connected UEs in a cell, or there can also different TRS configurations for different UEs with respect to different BWP configurations in a cell? And if there are different TRS configurations for different UEs applied in a cell, for which TRS configurations is applied for idle/inactive UEs? * From robustness perspective, with TRS for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE for broadcast transmission, we would like to see performance evaluation and justification from the proponents provided. |
| vivo 2 | We observe that companies have different understanding on whether TRS can be associated with SSB, at least in terms of timing and Doppler spread.  We wonder what solutions in proponents’ mind to acquire timing when TRS configured as QCL source for broadcast.  Further information is quite appreciated. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The point is TRS can improve better performance than SSB which does not prevent UE from obtaining timing from SSB. |
| Moderator | Thank you for the discussion. Given the comments, we could try to agree a study that addresses the points raised by companies. It has also been discussed that it could be not just an enhancement but necessary. If the study concludes the benefits and also shows that the minor spec impact from proponents, TRS could be introduced. However, we have to be also be mindful that there is only one meeting left. I think it is worth collecting company views on whether there is consensus on doing such a study. |

### **2nd round FL proposals for Issue 11**

**Proposal 2.11-2rev1**: Study the following aspects for TRS as possible QCL source for broadcast transmission.

* Indication method for QCL information of TRS, i.e., whether associated with SSB
* Transmission manner of TRS, e.g., whether beam sweeping is supported in FR2
* Timing acquisition, e.g., how to acquire cell timing
* performance evaluation with higher order modulation for MTCH
* potential specification impact

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the discussion above, do you agree with the study in proposal 2.11-2rev1? Please provide reasons, views in general or an alternative list if you do not agree.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| vivo | Ok with the proposal and the 2nd subbullet can be deleted providing that FR2 is not the target band for MBS.  Proposal 2.11-2rev1: Study the following aspects for TRS as possible QCL source for broadcast transmission.   * Indication method for QCL information of TRS, i.e., whether associated with SSB * ~~Transmission manner of TRS, e.g., whether beam sweeping is supported in FR2~~ * Timing acquisition, e.g., how to acquire cell timing * performance evaluation with higher order modulation for MTCH * potential specification impact |
| NOKIA/NSB | It has to be noted here that the basic functionality via SSB can work well with robustness. And supporting of higher order modulation for MTCH can be considered as further optimization in future release, considering that there is very limited time left now for specifying TRS for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs in Rel17 MBS. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | ok |
| LG | Support of TRS seems not essential for this release. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. We would to see completing the basic functionalities with compelling and competitive performance for successful commercialization. |
| CATT | Considering RAN1 has only one meeting left for R17, we do not think we have enough time to discuss this topic, especially when other main issues e.g. CRF configuration, MCCH change notification, DCI design are not agreeable yet. Moreover, per our understanding, using SSB can require the QCL information as well, so supporting TRS are not necessary for R17. Thus, we prefer not discuss this topic. |

## [CLOSED] Issue 12: Scrambling sequence initialisation for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH and DMRS

### **Background**

The following agreements at RAN1#106-e for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs are relevant for this discussion.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH with the second DCI format,   * equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in the CORESET in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH; otherwise. * FFS: Values for . Choices include one or more of the following:   + Alt1: G-RNTI used for the GC-PDCCH.   + Alt2: 0   + Alt3: Other fixed values   Agreement:  For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDSCH scheduled by the second DCI format for multicast received in Type-x CSS,   * equals the higher layer parameter *dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH* if it is configured in *PDSCH-Config* in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH and the RNTI equals the G-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI; otherwise. * corresponds to the RNTI associated with the GC-PDSCH transmission (i.e., the G-RNTI used by the scheduling GC-PDCCH, or the G-CS-RNTI used by the SPS GC-PDSCH activation PDCCH)   Agreement:  For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDCCH with the second DCI format received in Type-x CSS,   * equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in the CORESET in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH; otherwise. |

The following agreement at RAN#93-e is also relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * The following aspects can be considered to be within the scope of the Rel-17 MBS WID and can be further discussed in the WGs with the aim of minimizing specification impacts:   + Configurable scrambling sequence initialization for PDCCH/PDSCH and DMRS sequence generator initialization for PDCCH/PDSCH for broadcast transmission (as supported for RRC\_CONNECTED UE).   + Configuring TRS as QCL sources for broadcast transmission (as supported for RRC\_CONNECTED UE). * Note: For broadcast transmission, the presence of TRS would be optional from a network perspective. * Note: Any SFN operation is transparent to the UE |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2108725, Huawei]
  + Proposal 1: Support a configurable ID for scrambling sequence and DMRS generator initialization for scheduling broadcast, specifically:
    - For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH with/scheduled by the first DCI format, n\_"ID" is an value configured by the higher layer parameter, respectively.
    - For initializing DMRS generator of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH with/scheduled by the first DCI format, n\_"ID" is a value configured by the higher layer parameter, respectively.
  + Proposal 2: The configurable ID for scrambling sequence and DMRS generator initialization for scheduling broadcast is per G-RNTI instead of per UE.
* In [R1- 2109003, vivo]
  + Proposal 3: For scrambling sequence initialization for GC-PDCCH using DCI format 1\_0 with the CRC scrambled by G-RNTI, MCCH-RNTI, and any other RNTIs further agreed for broadcast,
    -  can be configured by high-layer parameters, i.e., *GC-pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID-broadcast*, if not configured.
    -  can be selected as one or more of the following
      * Alt1: G-RNTI used for the GC-PDCCH
      * Alt2: 0
      * Alt3: Other fixed values
  + Proposal 4: For scrambling sequence initialization for GC-PDSCH scheduled by GC-PDCCH using DCI format 1\_0 with the CRC scrambled by G-RNTI, MCCH-RNTI, and any other RNTIs further agreed for broadcast,
    -  can be configured by high-layer parameters, i.e., *DataScramblingIdentityGC-PDSCH-broadcast,* if not configured.
    -  corresponds to the RNTI associated with the GC-PDSCH transmission.
  + Proposal 5: For DMRS sequence generator initialization for GC-PDCCH using DCI format 1\_0 with the CRC scrambled by G-RNTI, MCCH-RNTI, and any other RNTIs further agreed for broadcast,
    - can be configured by high-layer parameters, i.e., *GC-pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID-broadcast*,if not configured.
  + Proposal 6: For DMRS sequence generator initialization for GC-PDSCH scheduled by GC-PDCCH using DCI format 1\_0 with the CRC scrambled by G-RNTI, MCCH-RNTI, and any other RNTIs further agreed for broadcast,
  + can be configured by high-layer parameters, i.e., *GC-pdsch-DMRS-ScramblingID-broadcast*,if not configured.
* In [R1-2109305, CMCC]
  + Proposal 6. For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH,
    - equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.
    - is given by the G-RNTI or MCCH-RNTI for a PDCCH if the higher-layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* is configured; otherwise.
  + Proposal 7. For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH,
    - equals the higher layer parameter *dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH* if it is configured in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH and the RNTI equals the G-RNTI or MCCH-RNTI; otherwise.
    - corresponds to the RNTI associated with the GC-PDSCH transmission.
  + Proposal 8. For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH,
    - equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.
  + Proposal 9. For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH,
    - equals the higher-layer parameters *scramblingID0* if it is configured in the *DMRS-DownlinkConfig*IE in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.
* In [R1-2109318, Nokia]
  + *Discuss*: Proposal-6: Regarding the scrambling sequence initialization for PDCCH/PDSCH and DMRS sequence generator initialization for PDCCH/PDSCH for broadcast transmission, similar discussion can be discussed as for RRC\_CONNECTED UE. Any SFN related operation should be transparent to the UE, as agreed in RAN#93-e meeting.
* In [R1-2109517, Samsung]
  + Proposal 2. The Group-common PDSCH can be scrambled using  .
* In [R1-2109703, DOCOMO]
  + Proposal 7: For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH/MTCH,
    - equals the higher-layer parameter pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID if it is configured in the CORESET in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH; otherwise.
  + Proposal 8: For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH,
    - equals the higher-layer parameter scramblingID0 in the DMRS-DownlinkConfig IE for broadcast if provided ; otherwise.
  + Proposal 9: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH/MTCH,
    - equals the higher layer parameter pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID if it is configured in the CORESET in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH; otherwise.
  + Proposal 10: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH
    - equals the higher layer parameter dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH if it is configured in PDSCH-Config in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH; otherwise.

### **FL Assessment**

[Huawei, vivo, CMCC, Nokia, Samsung, DOCOMO] all propose initialisation scrambling sequences for the sequence generator of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH and the DMRS with detailed proposals reusing the discussions on AI 8.12.1 on RRC connected UEs. The FL puts forward proposals for agreement based on the proposals presented by the companies.

### **1st round FL proposals for Issue 12**

**Proposal 2.12-1**: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.
* is given by the G-RNTI or MCCH-RNTI for a PDCCH if the higher-layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* is configured; otherwise.

**Proposal 2.12-2**: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH,

* equals the higher layer parameter *dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH* if it is configured in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH and the RNTI equals the G-RNTI or MCCH-RNTI; otherwise.
* corresponds to the RNTI associated with the GC-PDSCH transmission.

**Proposal 2.12-3:** For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.

**Proposal 2.12-4:** For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH,

* equals the higher-layer parameters *scramblingID0* if it is configured in the *DMRS-DownlinkConfig*IE in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above:**

1. **do you agree with the proposals 2.12-1 to 2.12-4? Please provide reasons, views in general, or alternative proposals if you do not agree.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | Agree the above proposals. |
| NOKIA/NSB | OK |
| ZTE | OK |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.12-1**: Similar to the discussion in AI 8.12.1, nRNTI should be fixed to 0 to reduce UE processing when monitoring multiple RNTIs.  **Proposal 2.12-2**: Support  **Proposal 2.12-3**: Support  **Proposal 2.12-4**: Support |
| Xiaomi | OK |
| LG | OK |
| CMCC | Ok |
| CATT | OK |
| vivo | Generally ok |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with all the proposals. |
| Apple | Ok. |
| Ericsson | P2.12-1: Support at least for the case of a single *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID*.  Add FFS for the use of multiple *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* to cover the case withoverlapping SFNs, e.g. G-RNTI1 is transmitted in SFN1 using cells C1 and C2, whereas G-RNTI2 is transmitted in SFN2 using cells C2 and C3.  P2.12-2: Support  P2.12-3: Support  P2.12-4: Support |
| Qualcomm | Ok |
| Moderator | Thank you for discussion.  Proposals 2.12-2/4 are stable. For proposal 2.12-1, I have included the comments from DOCOMO and Ericsson. Please check |

### **2nd round FL proposals for Issue 12**

**Proposal 2.12-1rev1**: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.
* .
* FFS: the use of multiple *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* to enable SFN operation with overlapping cells

**Proposal 2.12-2[stable]**: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH,

* equals the higher layer parameter *dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH* if it is configured in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH and the RNTI equals the G-RNTI or MCCH-RNTI; otherwise.
* corresponds to the RNTI associated with the GC-PDSCH transmission.

**Proposal 2.12-3[stable]:** For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.

**Proposal 2.12-4[stable]:** For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH,

* equals the higher-layer parameters *scramblingID0* if it is configured in the *DMRS-DownlinkConfig*IE in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Please provide reasons, views in general, or alternative proposals if you do not agree.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok with the update. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.12-1rev1**: Support |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Proposal 2.12-1rev1**: we agree with the proposal. But we think for a special scenario, the special configuration can be supported to reduce the decoding effort by a RRC\_CONNECTED UE for decoding GC-PDCCH and PDCCH separately. Therefore, a new item is suggested as below.  **Proposal 2.12-1rev1**: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH,   * equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise. * . * FFS: the use of multiple *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* to enable SFN operation with overlapping cells * If a CSS is shared by GC-PDCCH scrambled with G-RNTI and PDCCH scrambled with C-RNTI, the following configuration can be enabled. * and for generating a same scrambling sequence for both GC-PDCCH and PDCCH * PDCCH scrambled with G-RNTI and PDCCH scrambled with C-RNTI use the following formula to generate a same DMRS sequence with .   The new item can make GC-PDCCH and PDCCH have a same scrambling sequence and a same DMRS sequence. Furthermore, DCI format 1-0 for GC-PDCCH and DCI format 1-0 for PDCCH are size aligned in the CSS. Therefore, for the scenario that GC-PDCCH and PDCCH have a same MO, with the special configuration enabled, a RRC\_CONNECTED UE receiving both a unicast session and a broadcast-mode MBS session can decode GC-PDCCH and PDCCH with only one decoding. If the special configuration isn’t enabled, the first two items are applied to the special scenario.  **Proposal 2.12-2**: OK  **Proposal 2.12-3:** We agree with the proposal. But we think the proposal doesn't exclude the special configuration listed in Proposal 2.12-1rev1if the special configuration is appro**ved.**  **Proposal 2.12-4:** OK |
| CMCC | OK |
| ZTE | OK |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Moderator | Thanks for comments.  @TD Tech: thanks for comments. Given the wide support I suggest that we try to agree on the proposal as it is and consider the other point as a separate discussion – thanks. |
| Samsung | OK |
| NOKIA/NSB | Regarding **Proposal 2.12-1rev1**, just for our understanding from the proponent, what could be the drawback if we do not have the FFS supported?   * FFS: the use of multiple *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* to enable SFN operation with overlapping cells |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | OK |
| Moderator | Thanks for the discussions. The first proposal has been agreed at the GTW on 14 Oct with the clarification “for broadcast”. Thanks TD Tech for the compromise!  Agreement:  For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH for broadcast,   * equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise. * .   The other proposals are also stable but I also include the clarification “for broadcast” and I will place them for potential email approval.  @TD Tech: regarding your proposal and the discussion at the GTW, some more comments:   * I am not sure whether the CSS search space could be shared, however, the configuration of parameters is proposed can be configured by the gNB for the GC-PDCCH as the agreement above. As per TS 38.211, these parameters can also be configured as per your proposal, so I would think this would all be an implantation issue. * Regarding the second item on DMRS, I think this is related to DMRS and not the scrambling sequence of the PDCCH. I also think the formula is the same one as in TR 38.211 so I was not sure of the difference. |

### **3rd round FL proposals for Issue 12**

**Proposal 2.12-2rev1**: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH for broadcast,

* equals the higher layer parameter *dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH* if it is configured in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH and the RNTI equals the G-RNTI or MCCH-RNTI; otherwise.
* corresponds to the RNTI associated with the GC-PDSCH transmission.

**Proposal 2.12-3rev1:** For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH for broadcast,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.

**Proposal 2.12-4rev1:** For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH for broadcast,

* equals the higher-layer parameters *scramblingID0* if it is configured in the *DMRS-DownlinkConfig*IE in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.

**Please provide your comments if you have concerns with approving these.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | OK |
| Ericsson | OK for all three proposals. |
| ZTE | OK |
| Moderator | The above proposals were approved by email at first check point. Therefore, the discussion in this issue is closed.  Agreement:  For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH for broadcast,   * equals the higher layer parameter *dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH* if it is configured in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH and the RNTI equals the G-RNTI or MCCH-RNTI; otherwise. * corresponds to the RNTI associated with the GC-PDSCH transmission.   Agreement:  For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH for broadcast,   * equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.   Agreement:  For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH for broadcast,   * equals the higher-layer parameters *scramblingID0* if it is configured in the *DMRS-DownlinkConfig*IE in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | OK |

## Other Issues

Here, we include other issues that have been discussed at the tdocs submitted to this meeting. However, it is not the initial plan of the FL to tread these issues in this meeting. If you have any views or recommendations do please put your comments in the table below.

### **Other Issue 1: HARQ feedback for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UE states**

* [vivo, OPPO, CMCC, Xiaomi, Samsung, Intel]

### **Other Issue 2: Broadcast services supported for both RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs**

* [CATT, MediaTek, Intel, TD Tech, Ericsson]

### **Other Issue 3: Discontinuous Reception (DRX) and Wakeup Signals (WUS)**

* [CATT]

### **Other Issue 4: PDSCH TDRA table configuration**

* [ZTE]

### **Other Issue 5: UE feedback for MBS Interest Indication for partial beam sweeping or MCS determination**

* [Nokia, Sony]

### **Other Issue 6: Support of RedCap UEs**

* [Apple, ZTE]

**Provide your comments if any in the following table.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | We want to clarify that this work intends to support the case that Rel-17 RedCap UE receives Rel-17 broadcast and/or multicast. |

# Proposals for Discussion at GTW sessions

This section will include proposals for potential discussion at the different GTW scheduled for NR MBS at RAN1#106bis-e.

## Proposals for GTW on 14 October

### **Proposal 2.4-1 (CSS)**

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for GC-PDCCH scheduling MTCH.

|  |
| --- |
| **Support** [Intel, Samsung, Nokia, Lenovo, ZTE, Spreadtrum, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, CMCC, CATT, vivo, MediaTek, Apple, Ericsson] |

### **Proposal 2.5-1 and Proposal 2.5-2 (MCCH notification)**

**Proposal (conclusion) 2.5-1**

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, Alt 1 can accommodate at least 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop).

**Proposal (conclusion) 2.5-2**:

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, Alt 2 can accommodate at least 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop).

|  |
| --- |
| **Support** [Samsung, Nokia, ZTE, DOCOMO, CMCC, CATT, vivo, Apple, Ericsson]  **Do not support** []  (Discussion on which option to select ongoing.) |

### **Proposal 2.3-1rev1 (Configuration CFR)**

The PDCCH/PDSCH parameters for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH, which are not configured, use as default the value of the PDCCH/PDSCH parameters for the configuration of the Rel-15/Rel-16 initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.

* FFS: default value for the configuration of the frequency range of the CFR.

|  |
| --- |
| * **Support** [Samsung, Lenovo, OPPO, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, CMCC, CATT, vivo, MediaTek, Huawei, Ericsson, Qualcomm, TD Tech] * **Do not support** [Apple] (*clarifications provided*) * **Wait** for Issue 1 on bandwidth CFR [ZTE, LG] (*FFS added*) |

### **Proposal 2.3-2rev1 (Configuration CFR)**

For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for case D (if supported) and Case E (if supported) the starting PRB and the number of PRBs of the CFR reuse the legacy definition of BWP frequency resources for unicast using the combination of Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and *locationAndBandwidth*.

|  |
| --- |
| * **Support** [Nokia, ZTE, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, LG, CATT, vivo, MediaTek, Huawei, Apple, Ericson, Qualcomm, TD Tech] * **Do not support** [] * **Wait for Issue 1 on bandwidth CFR** [Intel, Samsung, Lenovo, OPPO, CMCC] (*FFS added*) |

### **Proposal 2.12-1rev1 to Proposal 2.12-4 (Scrambling)**

**Proposal 2.12-1rev1:** For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.
* .
* FFS: the use of multiple *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* to enable SFN operation with overlapping cells

|  |
| --- |
| * **Support** without revisions [Samsung, Nokia, ZTE, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, LG, CMCC, CATT, vivo, Huawei, Apple, Qualcomm] * **Support with revisions** [Huawei, DOCOMO, CMCC, ZTE, Ericsson] (*comment from TD Tech*) |

**Proposal 2.12-2[stable]**: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH,

* equals the higher layer parameter *dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH* if it is configured in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH and the RNTI equals the G-RNTI or MCCH-RNTI; otherwise.
* corresponds to the RNTI associated with the GC-PDSCH transmission.

**Proposal 2.12-3[stable]:** For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.

**Proposal 2.12-4[stable]:** For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH,

* equals the higher-layer parameters *scramblingID0* if it is configured in the *DMRS-DownlinkConfig*IE in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposals 2.12-2 to 2.12-4**  **Support** [Samsung, Nokia, ZTE, Spreadtrum, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, LG, CMCC, CATT, vivo, Huawei, Apple, Ericsson, Qualcomm] |

## Proposals for GTW on 15 October

### **Proposal 2.5-3**

Alt 2 is supported for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for the notification of MCCH configuration changes.

* send an LS to RAN2 with the mechanism agreed in RAN1

### **Proposal 2.1-2**

For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.

* Support Case D and Case E.
* Note: details on the signalling on the implementation of case D and Case E are up to RAN2

# Stable Proposals

# Summary of Agreements

This section includes the agreements for RAN1#106bis-e.

Agreement:

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for GC-PDCCH scheduling MTCH.

Agreement:

The PDCCH/PDSCH parameters for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH, which are not configured, use as default the value of the PDCCH/PDSCH parameters for the configuration of the Rel-15/Rel-16 initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.

Agreement:

For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH for broadcast,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.
* .

Agreement:

For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support slot-level repetition for MTCH.

Agreement:

For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH for broadcast,

* equals the higher layer parameter *dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH* if it is configured in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH and the RNTI equals the G-RNTI or MCCH-RNTI; otherwise.
* corresponds to the RNTI associated with the GC-PDSCH transmission.

Agreement:

For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH for broadcast,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.

Agreement:

For initializing sequence generator for DMRS of GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH for broadcast,

* equals the higher-layer parameters *scramblingID0* if it is configured in the *DMRS-DownlinkConfig*IE in a CFR used for GC-PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH; otherwise.

Working assumption:

Alt 2 (from previous agreement) is supported for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for the notification of MCCH configuration changes.

* Send an LS to RAN2 with the mechanism agreed in RAN1
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# Annex A: Agreements in previous RAN1 meetings

## RAN1#103-e agreements

Agreements: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule a group-common PDSCH, where the scrambling of the group-common PDSCH is based on the same common RNTI.

* FFS details

Agreements:

* For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, beam sweeping is supported for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.
  + FFS: Details for support of beam sweeping for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.

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.
* FFS: the relation of the common frequency resource(s) (if configured) and initial BWP.
* FFS: whether to configure one/more common frequency resources
* FFS: configuration and definition details of the common frequency resource

Agreements: From physical layer perspective, for broadcast reception, the same group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH can be received by both RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs and RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.

* FFS details.

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.

Agreements: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, a CORESET can be configured within the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH. 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.

* FFS: configuration details of the CORESET for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH

## RAN1#104-e agreements

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

Agreement:

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

Agreement:

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 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.

Agreement:

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, further study the following cases of a configured/defined specific common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, and identify which case(s) will be supported:

* [Case E] the case where a CFR is defined based on a configured BWP.
  + In particular, study the following:
    - whether a configured BWP for MBS is needed or not.
    - whether BWP switching is needed or not.
  + In this study, the configured BWP has the following properties:
    - The configured BWP is different than the initial BWP where the frequency resources of this initial BWP are configured smaller than the full carrier bandwidth.
    - The CFR has the frequency resources identical to the configured BWP.
    - The configured BWP needs to fully contain the initial BWP in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
  + Note: The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth
* the case where the initial BWP fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain.
  + In this study the following sub-cases are considered:
    - [Case B] A CFR 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.
    - [Case D] A CFR 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.
  + In particular, study the following:
    - Whether the considered two options with a CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP are needed or not for MBS.
* the case where the initial BWP has same size as the CFR in the frequency domain.
  + In this study the following two sub-cases are considered:
    - [Case A] A CFR 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 same frequency resources and same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
    - [Case C] A CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the same frequency resources and same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
  + In particular, study the following:
    - Whether the considered two options with a CFR with the same size as the initial BWP are needed or not for MBS.

## RAN1#105-e agreements

Agreement:

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH.

Agreement:

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, DCI format 1\_0 is used as baseline for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH.

* FFS details of FDRA.

Agreement:

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, RAN1 confirms the following assumptions made by RAN2

* RAN2 assumes, in case searchSpace#0 is configured for MCCH (if allowed, pending RAN1 decision), the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1.
* RAN2 assumes that if common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MCCH (if allowed, pending RAN1 decision), the PDCCH monitoring occasions for MCCH message which are not overlapping with UL symbols are sequentially numbered from one in the MCCH transmission window and mapped to SSBs using the similar rule as defined for OSI in TS 38.331.

Agreement:

For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the same CSS type for MCCH and MTCH.

* FFS support of different CSS types for MCCH and MTCH channels for broadcast reception.

Agreement:

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, study the following alternatives for MCCH change notification indication due to session start:

* Alt 1: Define a dedicated RNTI to scramble the CRC of a DCI indicating a MCCH change notification;
* Alt 2: Use of a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification;

Other solutions are not precluded and it is also not precluded whether to support both Alt1 and Alt2.

Conclusion:

It is up to RAN2 to decide the specific contents of the MCCH change notification, e.g, whether notification only informs about session start, whether or not notification also informs about session modification/stop or whether or not the notification informs about any other information.

Agreement:

For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case A), to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.

* Note: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.

Agreement:

For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case A), to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

* Note: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.

Agreement:

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the CORESET index can be the same for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH.

Agreement:

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the same beam can be used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH for carrying MCCH or MTCH.

* UE may assume that DMRS ports of the group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MCCH is QCL’d with SSB.
* UE may assume that DMRS ports of the group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB.
* FFS: group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured

Agreement:

For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily (in the minimum capability) supported for Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs, i.e., 2 CORESETs.

* If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 or where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can be configured with the following options:
  + CORESET#0 (default option if CFR is the initial BWP and CORESET is not configured); or
  + CORESET configured by *commonControlResourceSet;* or
  + CORESET#0 and CORESET configured by *commonControlResourceSet*.

## RAN1#106-e agreements

Agreement:

From RAN1 perspective, the CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, includes at least the following configurations:

* One set of parameters configured for PDSCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDSCH
* One set of parameters configured for PDCCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH
* FFS: whether some parameters configured for PDSCH/PDCCH are optional/needed for the supported cases of CFR.
* FFS: If necessary, depending on the cases supported, starting PRB and the number of PRBs
  + The reference for starting PRB is Point A. (Following the same approach to determine reference for starting PRB as that defined in AI8.12.1.)

Conclusion:

There is no specification support in Rel-17 for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with configured/defined CFRs for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case B).

Agreement:

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, if searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1.

Agreement:

Study and reach an agreement by RAN1#106b-e on whether Alt1 and Alt2 for MCCH change notification indication can accommodate at least 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop).

Agreement:

The DCI format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH at least includes the following fields for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state:

* FDRA field
* TDRA field
* Modulation and coding scheme
* Redundancy version
* FFS:
  + MCCH change notification (if supported and only for MCCH),
  + RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR and support of resource allocation with granularity of single or multiple RBs.
  + HARQ process number and New data indicator
  + VRB-to-PRB mapping
  + other fields if needed.

Agreement:

Only one CFR can be configured for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.

Agreement:

For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the DCI size of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH is aligned with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI in the CSS.

Agreement:

For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

* FFS: use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH

Conclusion:

For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, there is no specification support in Rel-17 of different CSS types for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH.

Agreement:

Study whether the Type-x CSS supported for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED can be reused as baseline for broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH.

Agreement:

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with broadcast reception, if common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping of PDCCH monitoring occasions to SSBs can be configured with a rule.

* The existing rule defined for OSI in TS 38.331 is used as starting point to define the above rule.

## RAN#93-e agreements

Agreement:

* The following aspects can be considered to be within the scope of the Rel-17 MBS WID and can be further discussed in the WGs with the aim of minimizing specification impacts:
  + Configurable scrambling sequence initialization for PDCCH/PDSCH and DMRS sequence generator initialization for PDCCH/PDSCH for broadcast transmission (as supported for RRC\_CONNECTED UE).
  + Configuring TRS as QCL sources for broadcast transmission (as supported for RRC\_CONNECTED UE).
* Note: For broadcast transmission, the presence of TRS would be optional from a network perspective.
* Note: Any SFN operation is transparent to the UE

Agreement (Updated proposal from RAN1#106e):

For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.

* Support Case-C
* Support at least one of Case D and Case E.
  + Down-selection to be made at RAN1#106b-e
* Note: Case C, D and E are defined in previous agreements

# Annex B: [R1-2104165] RAN2 LS on broadcast session delivery and MCCH design

R1-2104165 submitted to RAN1#105-e reproduced here for convenience:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3GPP TSG RAN WG1 #105-e R1-2104165**  **e-Meeting, May 10th – 27th, 2021**  **3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #113bis-e R2-2104639**  **E-meeting, 12th – 20th April 2021**  **Title: LS on broadcast session delivery and MCCH design**  **Response to:**  **Release: Release 17**  **Work Item: NR\_MBS-Core**  **Source: RAN2**  **To: RAN1**  **Contact person: Dawid Koziol**  **dawid.koziol@huawei.com**    **Send any reply LS to: 3GPP Liaisons Coordinator,** [**mailto:3GPPLiaison@etsi.org**](mailto:3GPPLiaison@etsi.org)  **Attachments:** **N/A**  1 Overall description  RAN2 discussed the details of broadcast session delivery and the following agreements were made during RAN2#113-e meeting:   |  | | --- | | * **Both idle/inactive UEs and connected mode UEs can receive MBS services transmitted by NR MBS delivery mode 2 (Broadcast service as already agreed, TBD other). The ability for connected mode UEs to receive this may depend on the network provisioning of the service (e.g. which freq), UE connected mode configuration and UE capabilities.** * **The two-step based approach (i.e. BCCH and MCCH) as adopted by LTE SC-PTM is reused for the transmission of PTM configuration for NR MBS delivery mode 2.** * **Assume it is possible to reuse LTE SC-PTM mechanism for the CONNECTED UEs to receive the PTM configuration for NR MBS delivery mode 2, i.e. broadcast based manner.** * **Assume that MCCH change notification mechanism is used to notify the changes of MCCH configuration due to session start for delivery mode 2 of NR MBS (other cases FFS, if any).** |   For RAN1 to better understand the above agreements, RAN2 would like to clarify that RAN2 is working on two MBS delivery modes (DM1 and DM2), summarized as follows:   * DM1 is used for multicast session delivery and is applicable to UEs in RRC Connected state (FFS UEs in RRC Inactive, but this scenario is down-prioritized). The UE is provided with MBS configuration e.g. G-RNTI using dedicated RRC signalling when the UE is in RRC Connected state. DM1 can use both Point-to-Point and Point-to-Multipoint transmissions and can take advantage of UL UE feedback (e.g. HARQ) when the UE is in RRC Connected. * DM2 is used for broadcast session (FFS for multicast session for UEs in RRC Inactive, but this scenario is down-prioritized) delivery and is applicable to UEs in all RRC states. The UE is provided with MBS configuration using common RRC signalling in a two-step based approach, i.e. SIB will be used to provide the transmission configuration of MCCH. Based on the MCCH configuration received via SIB, UE reads MCCH, which carries transmission configuration of MTCH(s), e.g. G-RNTI. The MTCH configuration acquired from MCCH is applied by the UE for MTCH reception regardless of UE’s RRC state (for RRC\_CONNECTED state, the possibility to receive MTCH can be further subject to UE’s configuration and capabilities).   It was also agreed that RAN2 will prioritize multicast session reception in RRC Connected mode in Rel-17. If time permits multicast support for RRC Inactive can be considered later, once connected mode Multicast solution and Broadcast solution become more mature.  Furthermore, RAN2 defines two types of logical channels used at least for broadcast session delivery using DM2:   * MTCH: A point-to-multipoint downlink channel for transmitting traffic data from the network to the UE. * MCCH: A point-to-multipoint downlink channel used for transmitting MBS control information from the network to the UE, for one or several MTCH(s).   + In RAN2, some companies think it should be allowed to configure multiple MCCH(s) for different services, but other companies disagree with the need for multiple MCCH and RAN2 has not made a decision on this issue yet.   During RAN2#113bis-e meeting, RAN2 discussed further aspects of MCCH scheduling and MCCH change notification leading to the following agreements with RAN1 impacts:   |  | | --- | | * **The concept of MCCH transmission window, similar to the one used for LTE SC-PTM, is used for NR MCCH scheduling. The exact parameters to define the window are FFS (discussed in the following proposals).** * **The MCCH transmission window is defined by MCCH repetition period, MCCH window duration and radio frame/slot offset.** * **New RNTI is defined for scheduling MCCH.** * **Common search space is needed for MCCH scheduling. RAN2 should request RAN1 to discuss the details of CSS for MCCH.** * **R2 assumes PDCCH occasions for MCCH search space are associated with SSBs in a pre-defined manner so that the UE can receive MCCH scheduling on PDCCH occasions according to its detected SSB.** * **R2 assumes, In case searchSpace#0 is configured for MCCH (if allowed, pending RAN1 decision), the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1.** * **R2 assumes that If common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MCCH (if allowed, pending RAN1 decision), the PDCCH monitoring occasions for MCCH message which are not overlapping with UL symbols are sequentially numbered from one in the MCCH transmission window and mapped to SSBs using the similar rule as defined for OSI in TS 38.331.** * **Request RAN1 to discuss the details of the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception.** * **The modification period is defined for NR MCCH and NR MCCH contents are only allowed to be modified at each modification period boundary.** * **The updated MCCH message should be sent in the same MCCH modification period where the change notification is sent.** * **UE in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE should be able to monitor/read both MCCH channel and SI/Paging without BWP switch. It is up to RAN1 to decide how this is ensured.** * **It is up to RAN1 to to decide about the RNTI and DCI format used for MCCH change notifications.** * **FFS whether to support multiple MCCH, e.g. to support different service types.** * **RAN2 will discuss and down-select from the following two options for the UE to get aware of session stop/modification:**   + **Reading MCCH once per each MCCH modification period when receiving an ongoing broadcast session**   + **DCI used for MCCH notification indicates the change of an ongoing broadcast session** |   The agreements made by RAN2 require further discussions in RAN1. In particular, RAN2 would like to request RAN1 to investigate and provide feedback on the following aspects, considering the above agreements made by RAN2:   1. Details of Common Search Space design for MCCH channel, e.g. is SS#0 allowed to be configured as a search space for MCCH, is search space other than SS#0 allowed to be configured as a search space for MCCH. 2. Details of the allowed transmission bandwidth/BWP configurations for MCCH transmission. 3. Details of the RNTI and DCI design for carrying MCCH change notifications.    * NOTE: RAN2 is still discussing some aspects that may have an impact on this issue, e.g. whether or not to support multiple MCCH or whether or not a notification about the modification/stop of an ongoing session is needed, as indicated above. RAN2 will update RAN1 as soon as further agreements are made on these items.   2 Actions  **To RAN1 group:**  **ACTION:**  RAN2 respectfully asks RAN1 to take RAN2 agreements into account in their work on MBS and discuss RAN1 aspects of MCCH as requested above.  3 Dates of next RAN2 meetings  TSG-RAN2 Meeting #114-e May 19 – May 27, 2021 E-Meeting |
|  |

# Annex C: [R1-2106410] RAN2 LS on update for MCCH design

R1-2106410 submitted to RAN1#106-e reproduced here for convenience.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3GPP TSG RAN WG1 #106-e R1-2106410**  **e-Meeting, August 16th – 27th, 2021**  **3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #114-e R2-2106544**  **E-meeting, 19th – 27th May 2021**  **Title: LS on update for MCCH design**  **Response to:**  **Release: Release 17**  **Work Item: NR\_MBS-Core**  **Source: RAN2**  **To: RAN1**  **Contact person: Dawid Koziol**  **dawid.koziol@huawei.com**    **Send any reply LS to: 3GPP Liaisons Coordinator,** [**mailto:3GPPLiaison@etsi.org**](mailto:3GPPLiaison@etsi.org)  **Attachments:** **N/A**  1 Overall description  RAN2 discussed further the aspects related to MCCH design and made the following agreements during RAN2#114 meeting:   |  | | --- | | * MBS specific SIB is defined to carry MCCH configuration. * MCCH contents should include information about broadcast sessions such as G-RNTI, MBS session ID as well as scheduling information for MTCH (e.g. search space, DRX). L1 parameters that need to be included in MCCH are pending further RAN1 progress and input. * Postpone the discussion on whether dedicated MCCH configuration is required until RAN1 makes progress on BWP/CFR for MCCH. * Indication of an MCCH change due to modification of an ongoing session’s configuration (including session stop) is provided with an explicit notification from the network (provided that RAN1 confirms a separate bit for this purpose can be accommodated in the MCCH change notification DCI, in addition to a bit for session start notification). FFS on whether this notification can be reused for modification of other information carried by MCCH, if any. * FFS whether the possibility of UE missing an MCCH change notification needs to be addressed or can be left to UE implementation. * At least in case RAN1 decides to utilize RNTI other than MCCH-RNTI for MCCH change notification, MCCH change notification is sent in the first MCCH monitoring occasion of each MCCH repetition period. * We support single MCCH (in this release) * MCCH is mapped to the DL-SCH for NR MBS delivery mode 2. |   RAN2 would like RAN1 to take these agreements into account when discussing PHY layer aspects of MCCH design (in particular for RNTI and DCI design for carrying the MCCH change notifications), in addition to the agreements RAN2 informed earlier in R2-2104639.  2 Actions  **To RAN1 group:**  **ACTION:**  RAN2 respectfully asks RAN1 to take RAN2 agreements into account when discussing PHY layer aspects of MCCH.  3 Dates of next RAN2 meetings  TSG-RAN2 Meeting #115-e August 16 – August 27, 2021 Online  TSG-RAN2 Meeting #116-e November 01 – November 12, 2021 Online |