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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:

[107-e-NR-MBS-03] Email discussion/approval on basic functions for broadcast/multicast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with checkpoints for agreements on November 15 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#107-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#107-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

## [UPDATE] Issue 1: PDCCH: Design of DCI format for MCCH and MTCH channels

### **Background**

The following agreements at RAN1#105-e and RAN1#106-e on RRC idle/inactive UEs 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. |

The following agreements at RAN1#106bis-e on RRC connected UEs are relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For FDRA determination of the first DCI format for GC-PDCCH, Option 2 is supported.   * + Option 2:     - is given by       * the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and       * the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.     - For resource indication value (*RIV*) of downlink resource allocation type 1, the similar scheme as for the case that the DCI size for DCI format 1\_0 in USS is derived from the size of DCI format 1\_0 in CSS but applied to an active BWP is used.       * If the size of CFR (i.e. ) is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where K is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies ;otherwise,   Agreement:  For GC-PDSCH scheduled with the first DCI format for multicast, RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR. |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2110779, Huawei]
  + *Discuss:* Besides, the field for MCCH change notification has been reflected in the CR of TR38.212.
  + *Discus*: DCI format 1\_0 scrambled by G-RNTI can be used for multicast scheduling and broadcast scheduling. However, the fields needed for multicast are not useful for broadcast, e.g., HARQ process number, New data indicator. VRB-to-PRB mapping can increase the frequency diversity gain for resource allocation type1, so that it can be included in the DCI format. TB scaling field is used for increasing robustness for the transmission of paging message or random access response, which does not seem useful for MTCH.
  + Proposal 5: For DCI format 1\_0 scrambled by MCCH-RNTI/G-RNTI for MCCH/MTCH, at least the following field can be included in addition to those fields have been agreed:
    - VRB-to-PRB mapping
* In [R1-2110897, TD Tech]
  + *Discuss*: Because the interleaved VRB-to-PRB mapping will bring the SNR gain in UE, we suggest to add the field VRB-to-PRB in the DCI format for MCCH/MTCH.
  + Proposal 14: The following field is included in the DCI format for MCCH/MTCH:
    - VRB-to-PRB mapping
* In [R1-2110912, ZTE]
  + Discuss: Regarding TDRA, VRB-to-PRB mapping, MCS and RV field, they are the same as the legacy UE behaviour.  
    Regarding MCCH change notification, as agreed in RAN1#106b-e meeting, it should be included in the DCI scheduling MCCH. In order to share the same DCI fields design for DCI scheduling MCCH and DCI scheduling MTCH of broadcast, we can directly include MCCH change notification in the DCI format.  
    Regarding the bit size of FDRA, it is proposed to have the same handling as what we agreed in last meeting for the first DCI format for multicast. Also, if FDRA is determined by the CFR, it may end up with different FDRA bit sizes for MCCH scheduling and MTCH scheduling since the CFR size may be different for MCCH and MTCH. Thus, to have a unified solution, it is preferred to use the same mechanism for MCCH and MTCH of broadcast.
  + Proposal 7: The following information is transmitted by means of the DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by MCCH-RNTI/G-RNTI for broadcast:
    - Frequency domain resource assignment – bits
      *  is the size of CORESET 0
      * If the size of CFR (i.e. ) is larger than the size of CORESET0, the resource indication value (RIV) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where K is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies ;otherwise,
    - Time domain resource assignment – 4 bits
    - VRB-to-PRB mapping – 1 bit
    - Modulation and coding scheme – 5 bits
    - Redundancy version – 2 bits
    - MCCH change notification – 2 bits if the CRC of the DCI format 1\_0 is scrambled by MCCH-RNTI. Otherwise, this bit field is reserved.
    - Reserved bits – 14 bits
* In [R1- 2111041, vivo]
  + *Discuss*: Regarding the DCI field for broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE, besides FDRA, TDRA, MCS, and RV, HARQ process number and new data indicator should also be included as slot-level repetition for MTCH has been already supported.
  + *Discuss*: For UE in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE, as no unicast and groupcast transmission is expected, HARQ processes defined for unicast and groupcast can be used for combing broadcast PDSCH repetition. And it is possible to leave it to RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UE implementation to select one HPN without any indication in DCI. 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. This is because network has no information about the HPN selected by UE for broadcast PDSCH combination and may indicate the same one for the subsequent unicast and multicast transmission.
  + Proposal 4: HARQ process number and new data indicator should be included in the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH.
* In [R1-2111137, Nokia]
  + Proposal-14: Confirm DCI format 1\_0 is sufficient for broadcast reception for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.
    - FFS: If DCI format other than format 1\_0 is agreed, further discuss the resource allocation type applied for Rel17 broadcast for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.
  + Proposal-15: If DCI format 1\_0 is the only DCI format to be supported, the VRB-to-PRB mapping can be fixed with interleaved, and this field is not needed.
  + 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 to assist UE RV combining.
  + 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).
* In [R1-2111232, CATT]
  + *Discuss*: It has been agreed that for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, DCI format 1\_0 is used as baseline for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH, so a fixed 1 bit VRB-to-PRB mapping field should be included in in DCI format for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state. It implies that only the interleaved VRB-to-PRB mapping is supported for the group-common DCI.  
    Regarding HARQ process number (HPN) and New data indicator (NDI), to improve the reliability of UE in the edge of cell, blind retransmission should be applied. So, HPN and NDI fields should be included for the soft-combination.
  + Proposal 10: MCCH change notification, HARQ process number, new data indicator and VRB-to-PRB mapping (1 bit) fields can be included in the DCI format.
* In [R1-2111305, OPPO]
  + Proposal 9: 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.
  + Proposal 10: The size of FDRA field in DCI for scheduling GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH can be determined by the configuration of CFR used for broadcast MBS services transmission, i.e. CORESET#0 or SIB1 configured initial BWP.
* In [R1-2111518, Intel]
  + *Discuss*: UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode can be configured to monitor for DCI format 1\_0 which can be used to schedule MBS PDSCH. Based on the subsequent agreement that the CFR is assumed to have the same size of the CORESET#0 or initial BWP, the FDRA field in the for the DCI 1\_0 will be dimensioned with respect to the CORESET#0 or initial BWP. This is assuming that Case E as proposed above is agreed. Otherwise special handling for Case E may be required.
  + Proposal 5: The FDRA field of DCI 1\_0 is based on the starting PRB index and size of CORESET#0 or initial BWP.
* In [R1-2111551, Xiaomi]
  + Discuss: Regarding VRB-to-PRB mapping information field, we think it’s better to keep it in the DCI considering there are sufficient room for such 1 bit information. It can provide more flexibility for scheduling especially considering multiplexing between MBS PDSCH and SIB PDSCH is necessary in some cases. Furthermore, notification of MCCH configuration changes should be included in the DCI scheduling GC-PDSCH. All the other fields should be reserved.
  + 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 [R1-2111629, CMCC]
  + *Discuss*: 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, 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.
  + Proposal 5. HARQ process number and New data indicator are not needed in the DCI format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH.
  + Proposal 6. 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 [R1-2112130, NTT DOCOMO]
  + Observation 1: 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 4: For GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH, RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR.
  + Proposal 5: Include VRB-to-PRB mapping field in the DCI format scheduling MCCH/MTCH.
* In [R1-2112163, Lenovo]
  + *Discuss*: Consequently, the number of bits required for FDRA indicator is based on the bandwidth of CORESET 0 or SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP. Since RAN1 has already agreed that the group-common DCI format has same payload size as DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI and monitored in CSS, and the FDRA field of DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI and monitored in CSS is also given by the bandwidth of CORESET 0 or SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP, it is quite easy to align both DCI payload size.
  + Proposal 4: The number of bits for FDRA in the group-common DCI is determined based on the CFR in Case A and Case C with single RB granularity.
  + Proposal 5: RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR and the granularity of resource allocation only supports single RB.
  + Proposal 6: The number of bits in TDRA field in the group-common DCI format is determined by the number of entries in the time domain resource allocation table configured for MBS.
  + *Discuss*: Regarding VRB-to-PRB mapping, this field can be also configurable for group-common PDSCH transmission. The size is 0 bit if only resource allocation type 0 is configured or if interleaved VRB-to-PRB mapping is not configured for group-common PDSCH transmission, or 1 bit otherwise, only applicable to resource allocation type 1.
  + Proposal 7: VRB-to-PRB mapping in the group-common DCI format is 0 or 1 bit dependent on RRC configuration.
  + Proposal 8: For HARQ combining, 5 bits MCS, 1 bit NDI, 2 bits RV and 4 bits HARQ process number are included in the group-common DCI format.
  + Proposal 9: DAI/TPC/PRI/HARQ-timing indicator in the group-common DCI are removed.
  + Proposal 10: New field is introduced for indicating MCCH change notification.
  + Proposal 11: Support fields and sizes in Table 1 for the first DCI format.
  + Proposal 12: 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.
  + *Discuss*: Considering coverage is critic to broadcast transmission, the 2nd DCI format is not supported for RRC Idle/Inactive UEs.
  + Proposal 13: The second group-common DCI format is not supported for RRC Idle/Inactive UEs for broadcast reception.
* In [R1-2112314, MediaTek]
  + *Discuss*: Regarding the “HARQ process number” field, we think there is no clear motivation to add this. Even though the slot level repetition is supported for MTCH, the similar mechanism for SIB combining can be reused and it does not need to add a new “HARQ process number” field for broadcast reception. In addition, if more HARQ process are introduced for MBS broadcast services, it is not friendly to UE’s power saving and needs more device hardware affect, which is against the current WID description as copied following: *Restrictions and assumptions in MBS WID: In order to facilitate implementation and deployment of the feature, the overall implementation impact should be limited, and the UE complexity should be minimized (e.g. device hardware impact should be avoided)*.
  + Proposal 7: “HARQ process number” field is not supported for MBS broadcast DCI.
* In [R1-2112348, Ericsson]
  + Observation 14: Multicast and broadcast can share the same DCI formats, with broadcast specific and multicast-specific fields made optional.
  + Observation 15: A broadcast DCI format limited to be based on legacy DCI format 1\_0 would limit the potential of NR broadcast, by not allowing for cross-polar (two layer) MIMO or frequency diversity supported by Resource allocation Type 0.
  + Proposal 20: Support a first DCI format for broadcast, which is the same as the first DCI format for multicast, with broadcast specific and multicast-specific fields made optional.
  + Proposal 21: Support a second DCI format for broadcast, which is the same as the second DCI format for multicast, with broadcast specific and multicast-specific fields made optional.

### **FL Assessment**

This issue was discussed at the last meeting without reaching a conclusion.

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

* *FDRA*

[OPPO, Intel, Xiaomi, CMCC, Lenovo] propose that the size of the FDRA field is determined by the size of the CFR. This aspect of the size of the FDRA was already discussed based on a proposal at the last meeting. However, it was discussed to wait until the conclusion of a related discussion in AI 8.12.1. However, as per the background section, an agreement has already been reached for AI 8.12.1. Another concern brought was whether there could be a mismatch between the CFR received by idle/inactive UEs and connected UEs. However, this has not been discussed in any of the submitted tdocs and it is also FL’s understanding that the FDRA parameters in connected state also depends on the CFR which would align both RRC states. **Proposal 2.1-1** is put forward for discussion.

[Intel, NTT DOCOMO, Lenovo] propose that the starting PRB index is based on the CFR, rather than CORESET#0 as per existing numbering rule legacy with DCI format 1\_0 in CSS. **Proposal 2.1-2** is therefore put for discussion that also aligns with an agreement in AI 8.12.1.

[CMCC, Lenovo] propose that the resource allocation for broadcast is a single RB providing increased scheduling flexibility. However, [ZTE] proposes to have the same handling to what has been agreed for multicast in AI 8.12.1 to have a unified solution, which allows to have RB granularity larger than one. Although not many companies have discussed the resource allocation granularity for broadcast, the starting point for discussion is single RB resource allocation as per **Proposal 2.1-3**.

* *HARQ Process Number (HPN)*

[Huawei, Nokia, CMCC, MediaTek] discuss that HPN is not necessary for broadcast reception. However, [vivo, CATT, Lenovo] propose to include HPN. [vivo] discusses that it is necessary, based on the support of PDSCH repetition for broadcast reception. Although, this parameter may not be needed solely on the operation of RRC idle/inactive UEs, since broadcast can also be received in RRC connected UEs, these two parameters are needed to avoid collisions between HARQ processes used for unicast/multicast and broadcast.

This discussion is related to the progress on PDSCH repetition. However, companies have already discussed different options for the operation of HARQ process at the UE. Based on the discussion from [vivo], it seems this parameter is needed for the case when HARQ processes are shared between unicast/multicast and broadcast in RRC connected state. To promote discussion, the starting point is that HPN field is not included as per **Proposal 2.1-4** (for conclusion) to collect companies’ views.

* *New Data Indicator (NDI)*

[Huawei, CMCC] discuss that NDI is not necessary for broadcast reception. However, [vivo, CATT, Lenovo] propose that NDI is necessary. [vivo] argues its introduction based on the support of PDSCH repetition for broadcast reception. Although, this parameter may not be needed solely on the operation of RRC idle/inactive UEs, since broadcast can also be received in RRC connected UEs, these two parameters are needed to avoid collisions between HARQ processes used for unicast/multicast and broadcast. [Nokia] also supports the introduction of NDI field to assist the UE RV combining. Although there is no clear position to include this field the starting point for the discussion is to include this field as per **Proposal 2.1-5** to collect company views.

* *VRB-to-PRB mapping*

[Huawei, TD Tech, ZTE, Xiaomi, NTT DOCOMO] support to include this field where the main argument to included it is the increased diversity gain that can be achieved, which is especially useful for broadcast reception without knowledge at the gNB of the UEs’ channel frequency responses. [Nokia, CATT], proposes to fix this parameter to interleaved, where [Nokia] further argues that this field could therefore be saved. On the other hand, [Xiaomi] argues that is adequate to keep the field due to cases when MBS PDSCH and SIB PDSCH need to be multiplexed. [Lenovo] proposes that whether this field is included depends on RRC configuration and only for type 1 resource allocation. Given the different alternatives have been proposed for this field, **Question 2.1-6** below discusses the 3 options in the table to collect companies’ views.

* *TB scaling field*

[Huawei] discusses that this field does not seem useful for MTCH. [Nokia] proposes a discussion on the potential inclusion of this field that could provide increased robustness for broadcast reception. However, most companies have included this field explicitly when listing the possible fields that are can be included in the DCI. Therefore, the starting point for the discussion is that TB scaling field is not included and **Proposal 2.1-7 (for conclusion)** is put forward to collect companies’ views.

* *MCCH change notification and TRS related fields*

The MCCH change notification was agreed at the last meeting as Working Assumption and has been included in the Draft CR of TS 38.212. The inclusion of TRS related fields depends on whether the respective functionality is supported pending the discussion other Issues in this summary.

***On first and second DCI format for broadcast and unified solution with multicast***

[Ericsson] proposes that in order to have an unified solution between multicast and broadcast, both can share the same DCI formats where broadcast-specific and multicast-specific-files are made optional. Building on this, they also propose to use a second DCI format for broadcast, which is the same as the second DCI for multicast where broadcast-specific and multicast-specific-files are made optional. Having a second DCI for broadcast would allow cross-polar MIMO and/or frequency diversity by resource allocation Type 0. On the other hand, [Lenovo] proposes that a second DCI format for broadcast is not supported arguing that a second DCI would not meet stringent coverage requirements required for broadcast reception.

Given that not many companies have discussed this aspect but has been first introduced in this meeting (for the second DCI aspect), Question 2.1-8 is included to collect companies’ views.

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

#### Proposal 2.1-1

For GC-PDSCH scheduled with DCI format 1\_0 for broadcast reception, the size of the FDRA field depends on the size of the CFR.

#### Proposal 2.1-2

For GC-PDSCH scheduled with DCI format 1\_0 for broadcast reception, RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR.

#### Proposal 2.1-3

For GC-PDSCH scheduled with DCI format 1\_0 for broadcast reception, the resource allocation granularity is single RB.

#### Proposal 2.1-4

**(for conclusion)**

for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH does not include the field HARQ Process Number.

#### Proposal 2.1-5

for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH includes the field New Data Indicator.

#### Question 2.1-6

for broadcast reception, which of the following options is supported for VRB-to-PRB mapping field in the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH?

* Opt-1: DCI includes the VRB-to-PRB mapping field with 1 bit according to Table 7.3.1.2.2-5 in TS 38.212
* Opt-2: VRB-to-PRB mapping is fixed to “interleaved” and no corresponding field is included in the DCI
* Opt-3: RRC signalling configures whether VRB-to-PRB mapping field in DCI is 0 bits or 1 bit according to Table 7.3.1.2.2-5 in TS 38.212

#### Proposal 2.1-7

**(for conclusion)**

for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH does not include the field TB scaling.

#### Question 2.1-8

Please provide your views on the following two bullets on the potential inclusion for broadcast reception

* Support a first DCI format for broadcast, which is the same as the first DCI format for multicast, with broadcast specific and multicast-specific fields made optional.
* Support a second DCI format for broadcast, which is the same as the second DCI format for multicast, with broadcast specific and multicast-specific fields made optional which would allow further functionality such as allow cross-polar MIMO and/or frequency diversity by resource allocation Type 0.

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

1. **do you agree with the Proposals 2.1-1, 2.1-2, 2.1-3, 2.1-4, 2.1-5 and 2.1-7? Please provide reasons and views in general.**
2. **Please provide your views on Questions 2.1-6 and 2.1-8.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 2.1-4 We prefer to support HARQ Process Number with NDI.Proposal 2.1-5 We prefer to support New Data Indicator for combining. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Proposal 2.1-1: OKProposal 2.1-2: OKProposal 2.1-3: OK, and we understood that the support of single RB granularity is the starting point for discussion.Proposal 2.1-4: Does it mean that there will be a dedicated HARQ process for broadcast reception? Meaning that there will be no sharing HARQ process with unicast/multicast reception. If it is the case, we are fine with the proposal.Proposal 2.1-5: OKQuestion 2.1-6: Prefer Opt-2Proposal 2.1-7: FineQuestion 2.1-8: For Rel17 MBS, support only DCI format 1\_0 for broadcast reception is enough, and there is no need to support the second DCI format |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.1-1, 2.1-2, 2.1-3, 2.1-4: SupportProposal 2.1-5: We don’t think NDI is necessary.Question 2.1-6: We prefer Opt-1. DCI format 1\_0 for broadcast has enough capacity to include the field, so we don’t see the need to fix to “interleaved”. Proposal 2.1-7: Support Question 2.1-8: We understand the motivation to support the second DCI format, but given the limited time, we don’t think it is necessary to support the second DCI format in Rel-17. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.1-1: OKProposal 2.1-2: OKProposal 2.1-3: OKProposal 2.1-4: Don’t support. For sake of HARQ soft combining at UE side, HARQ process number field is required to support blind HARQ retransmission. We don’t see the need to remove this field.Proposal 2.1-5: OKQuestion 2.1-6: Option 3 is supported.Proposal 2.1-7: OKQuestion 2.1-8: We think the first group-common DCI format for broadcast is sufficient. Even for the second group-common DCI format, the original motivation is to support MIMO as discussed in AI 8.12.1. However, companies can’t agree to include MCS/NDI/RV for 2nd TB. For broadcast, more important thing is to have wide coverage which requires a compact DCI payload size as DCI format 1-0 in CSS. In addition, considering the DCI blind detection for idle/inactive UEs, support the single DCI format can save UE power.Hence, we support only the first DCI format for broadcast in Rel-17. |
| Xiaomi | For Proposal 2.1-2/2.1-4/2.1-7, we are OK. For the other proposals, we don’t support and detail comments are provided as below.Proposal 2.1-1: Do not support. Our position is that the bit length of FDRA should be determined by the CORESET#0. This is the legacy mechanism, and we believe this is the only reasonable mechanism in order to align DCI payload size, for DCI format 1-0 in CSS which is used since Rel-15. On the other hand, 8.12.1 has already agreed that the FDRA bit length is determined by the CORESET#0 if configured. Proposal 2.1-3 Do not support. We should firstly achieve a consensus on proposal 2.1-1 and then come back to this proposal. Proposal 2.1-5 We don’t see the necessity to include NDI if HARQ-ACK is not supported for INACTIVE/IDLE UEs. Hence we are not ok with the proposal. Question 2.1-6 Option 1. The reason is provided in the background. With VRB-to-PRB mapping indicator, gNB has more flexibility on multiplexing PDSCHs. Question 2.1-8 First of all, we don’t see the necessity of introducing the second DCI format for broadcast.  For the first subbullet, we are not sure what ‘with broadcast specific and multicast-specific fields made optional’ means. Does it mean the bit field in the DCI format 1-0 is configurable? |
| CATT | Proposal 2.1-1: OKProposal 2.1-2: SupportProposal 2.1-3: OKProposal 2.1-4: Not support. The HPN field should be included for blind retransmission soft buffer combination. And we believe that the dedicated HARQ process mechanism cannot be reused for broadcast. It has been agreed that multiple G-RNTI can be supported for UE. And each G-RNTI needs a dedicated HARQ process for the combination. In this way, the number of needed dedicated HARQ process may exceed than 16 with larger number of G-RNTI configured. This is not expected. Thus, the HPN field should be included in DCI format for broadcast.Proposal 2.1-5: Support.Proposal 2.1-6: Not support. It has been agreed that for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, DCI format 1\_0 is used as baseline for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH. Similarly with the DCI format 1\_0, a fixed 1 bit VRB-to-PRB mapping field should be included in in DCI format for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state. |
| OPPO | **Proposal 2.1-2:** OK.  **Proposal 2.1-4:** OK. HARQ-ACK feedback is not supported in R-17 MBS, and this field seems not necessary.  **Proposal 2.1-5:** If HARQ field in DCI is not included in the DCI, then NDI field is not needed. Unless this field is reserved/interpreted for other indication.  **Proposal 2.1-7:** OK. Question 2.1-8: One DCI format is sufficient to schedule broadcast MBS services, which is the first DCI format. Whether/how to define the broadcast-specific and multicast-specific field in the DCI format should be further discussed. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.1-1~5: Support Q 2.1-6) Option 1.Q 2.1-8) It is not clear the motivation of this question. We don’t need the second format in Rel-17. |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.1-1: FDRA field size has agreed to be based on CORESET#0/initial DL BWP instead of CFR for multicast scheduling with DCI format 1\_0. Then for broadcast, it would be better if we can have consistent solution with multicast. Also, there are discussions on whether to share the same DCI fields between multicast and broadcast, if this is agreed, then the reserved bits for FDRA may not be sufficient if FDRA is based on CFR.  Thus, we would propose to use the same approach as agreed in multicast for broadcast. Proposal 2.1-2: OKProposal 2.1-3: This proposal is related to Proposal 2.1-1. We propose to discuss Proposal 2.1-1 first and then come back to this proposal later.Proposal 2.1-4: OK with this proposal. However, we should make it clear whether this means soft-combining is not supported for broadcast or a dedicated HARQ process is used for broadcast and thus HARQ process ID is not needed.Proposal 2.1-5: We this depends whether multiple different TBs can be transmitted in the MCCH/MTCH window. If only one TB can be transmitted in each MCCH/MTCH window, then this NDI is not needed. If multiple different TBs can be transmitted in the same MCCH/MTCH window, then the NDI is needed to differentiate initial transmission and retransmission.Question 2.1-6: Opt-1, which is the same behaviour with the existing SIB scheduling.Proposal 2.1-7: Support. The TB scaling field is mainly used for small TB. Thus, it is not needed for MBS scheduling since the MBS TB can be large. Question 2.1-8: **We think the first DCI format is sufficient. We are ok to share the same DCI fields between multicast and broadcast, where some fields are specific to broadcast (reserved for multicast) and some other fields are specific to multicast (reserved for broadcast).** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| vivo | Proposal 2.1-4 we think HARQ Process Number field is necessary to support PDSCH repetition for MTCH, so that dynamic sharing of HARQ processes between broadcast and groupcast/unicast is possible.Question 2.1-6We prefer option 1.Question 2.1-8 We support first DCI format only for broadcast. We are ok with other proposals |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2.1-1: Support.Proposal 2.1-2: Support. The similar behaviour as we agreed for multicast can be reused for broadcast reception since the CFR is limited.Proposal 2.1-3: Support.Proposal 2.1-4: Support. Introducing the extra HARQ process for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state is not friendly from UE power saving perspective. For HARQ combining buffer, the similar behaviour for SIB can be reused, which is totally up to UE implementation.Proposal 2.1-5: Not support. Since the HARQ process number field is not used, why does DCI for broadcast need to introduce this field.Proposal 2.1-6: Opt 1 is preferred.Proposal 2.1-7: Support.Proposal 2.1-8: Not support. The motivation is not clear for introducing more DCI format for broadcast reception. For Rel-17 MBS broadcast reception, DCI format 1\_0 is sufficient. |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.1-1~5: Support  Question 2.1-6: Opt-1  Proposal 2.1-7: Support Question 2.1-8: We don’t support the second DCI format for broadcast |
| Ericsson | Proposal 2.1-1: OKProposal 2.1-2: OKProposal 2.1-3: OKProposal 2.1-4: Not support. We prefer to support HARQ Process Number with NDI for broadcast, like it is supported for multicast. This is also enabled by having a common DCI format for multicast and broadcast.Proposal 2.1-5: Support. But the NDI field should be used in combination with the HARQ process number field. HPIDs are shared between unicast/multicast and broadcast. The gNB ensures by implementation that there are no collisions.Proposal 2.1-6: At least Option 3 is OK.Proposal 2.1-7: Support Proposal 2.1-8: Support. This provides maximum harmonization between multicast and broadcast and simplifies specification impact. With this, Broadcast also can also use advanced functions such as cross-polar MIMO, Type0 resource allocation and potentially HARQ combining. |
| Apple | Proposal 2.1-1/-2/-3: okProposal 2.1-7: ok Question 2.1-8: support first DCI format is enough for broadcast service. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 2.1-1, Proposal 2.1-2, Proposal 2.1-3, Proposal 2.1-4 and Proposal 2.1-7 okProposal 2.1-5 no need to include NDI. we don’t prefer to define dedicated HARQ process(es) for broadcast. It can be up to UE implementation for soft-combining for broadcast MCCH/MTCH.Question 2.1-6 prefer Opt-1Question 2.1-8 This question is dependent whether DCI format 1\_0 can support some functionality of DCI format 1\_1. For example, RAN1 agreed broadcast MTCH can support slot-level repetition. However, based on the current 38.214 CR, the pdschAggregationFactor and repetitionNumber in TDRA can only be applied to DCI format 1\_1 for unicast/multicast. |
| Intel | Proposal 2.1-1, 2.1-2: OK **Proposal 2.1-3:** Why should we not support RBG based scheduling and only limit to single RB?  **Proposal 2.1-4, 2.1-5:** Either both HPN and NDI are supported or neither are supported. Question 2.1-8: We don’t see any need to support 2nd DCI format in multicast. In DCI 1\_1, some field lengths are configurable based on RRC and such functionality is not available in IDLE/INACTIVE mode and we do not see the need to discuss alternative approaches at this late stage. DCI 1\_0 is enough to support broadcast. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 2.1-1: size needs to be aligned with 1\_0/C-RNTI in CSS, so depends on the size of CORSET#0/initial BWP is the only way. 2.1-3, depends on 2.1-1, if FDRA field is determined by CORESET0/initial BWP, then granularity will depends on the size of CFR for broadcast.  2.1-5: both HPID and NDI are not needed.  2.1-6: opt-1 is better. 2.1-8, support first DCI would be sufficient for this release. |
| Moderator | Thank you for the comments. Proposal 2.1-1: Multiple companies were supporting of the above formulation of the proposal. However, [Xiaomi, ZTE, Huawei] do not support this and would like to align the procedure for broadcast to the procedure agreed for multicast. To hear company comments on this alternative Proposal 2.1-1is revised as below which reuses the procedure agreed for multicast. Proposal 2.1-2 This proposal is stable with wide support and is **proposed for email approval**. Proposal 2.1-3 This proposal is related to the discussion on Proposal 2.1-1, therefore this proposal is leave **unchanged to wait for comments** on Proposal 2.1-1rev1 Proposal 2.1-4 & Proposal 2.1-5 Here views are mixed.  While [LG, Lenovo, CATT, vivo, Ericsson] want to support **HPN**, [NTT DOCOMO, Xiaomi, OPPO, Samsung, ZTE, MediaTek, CMCC, Huawei] are fine without including the field.  While [LG, Nokia, Lenovo, CATT, Samsung, vivo, CMCC, Ericsson] want to support **NDI**, [NTT DOCOMO, Xiaomi, OPPO, MediaTek, Qualcomm, Huawei] do not support including the field.  @LG, Lenovo, Nokia, ZTE, vivo: We do not have any agreement on whether HARQ process from unicast/multicast are reused for broadcast or whether a dedicated HARQ process is defined (we could have one we thought it would be useful). Agreeing to this does not automatically mean that there will be a dedicated HARQ for broadcast. My understanding from Qualcomm/MediaTek’s response is that this would be up to UE implementation to use the HARQ processes for MCCH/MTCH in idle/inactive UEs for PDSCH repetition. Any thoughts to make progress?  It would be good to get comments from companies that do want to introduce HARQ Process Number whether the explanations from Qualcomm/MediaTek that in order to achieve soft-combining for PDSCH repetition the use of HARQ process is up to UE’s implementation. (Qualcomm, MediaTek, please correct me if I missed something!)  Another discussion is the one under Issue 7 Question 2.7-3 where it is proposed that broadcast is able to receive HARQ retransmissions, that would require both HPN and NDI. I think therefore, that **it would be better to first clarify the position of the group on Issue 7 Question 2.7-3 discussion before we conclude Proposals 2.1-4 & 2.1-5**. Question 2.1-6 Based on the comments form companies the support for the different options is as follows:   * Option 1: [NTT DOCOMO, Xiaomi, CATT, Samsung, ZTE, vivo, MediaTek. CMCC, Qualcomm, Huawei] * Option 2 [Nokia] * Option 3 [Lenovo, Ericsson]   Most companies, prefer Option 1, **therefore, FL proposes to agree Option 1 in Proposal 2.1-6** Proposal 2.1-7 **(for conclusion)**  This proposal is stable and is placed for email approval. Question 2.1-8 Most companies have not replied to the first bullet on whether to support a first DCI format for broadcast, which is the same as the first DCI format for multicast, with broadcast specific and multicast-specific fields made optional. Some companies have requested clarification since this does not seem clear. ZTE has expressed support for such proposal. **@Ericsson**, could you please clarify your proposal? thank you.  Most companies have replied to the second question on whether a second DCI should be supported for broadcast to enable functionality such as multi-layer MIMO and Type0 FDRA.  [Nokia, NTT DOCOMO, Lenovo, OPPO, Samsung, ZTE, vivo, MediaTek, CMCC, Apple, Intel, huawei] do not support to include a second DCI format for broadcast. Some companies have also mentioned that this could be considered for Rel-18.  Based on all the comments above, FL recommends not to pursue an agreement to support a second DCI format. Question 2.1-8 is revised to allow proponents to clarify on the first question. |

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

#### Proposal 2.1-1rev1

For FDRA determination of the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:

* is the size of CORESET 0
* If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,*

#### Proposal 2.1-2 [agreed]

For GC-PDSCH scheduled with DCI format 1\_0 for broadcast reception, RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR.

#### Proposal 2.1-3 [waiting feedback P2.1-1rev1]

For GC-PDSCH scheduled with DCI format 1\_0 for broadcast reception, the resource allocation granularity is single RB.

#### Proposal 2.1-7 [agreed]

**(for conclusion)**

for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH does not include the field TB scaling.

#### Proposal 2.1-4 [waiting feedback Issue 7]

**(for conclusion)**

for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH does not include the field HARQ Process Number.

#### Proposal 2.1-5 [waiting feedback Issue 7]

for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH includes the field New Data Indicator.

#### Proposal 2.1-6 [closed]

for broadcast reception, the following options is supported for VRB-to-PRB mapping field in the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH

* Opt-1: DCI includes the VRB-to-PRB mapping field with 1 bit according to Table 7.3.1.2.2-5 in TS 38.212

#### Question 2.1-8rev1 [awaiting clarifications from proponents]

Please provide your views on the following bullet on the potential inclusion for broadcast reception

* Support a first DCI format for broadcast, which is the same as the first DCI format for multicast, with broadcast specific and multicast-specific fields made optional.

**Please provide your answers in the table below considering the FL assessment above**

1. **Please focus on Proposals 2.1-1rev1 and 2.1-6 that are revisions or new proposals.**
2. **Please note that for Proposals 2.1-3, 2.1-4, 2.1-5 we are awaiting progress in other proposals/issues and Question 2.1-8rev1 we are awaiting clarifications from proponents.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.1-1rev1: Support. Same handling for FDRA interpretation for broadcast and multicast is preferred from our perspective. Proposal 2.1-4: We can accept that there is no HARQ Process Number in the DCI 1\_0 for broadcast scheduling, we would prefer to have a concrete conclusion on whether a dedicated HARQ process will be used for broadcast like that for Rel-15 SIB broadcast or it is totally up to UE implementation. From our perspective, we would prefer to have a dedicated HARQ process for broadcast.  Proposal 2.1-6 [NEW]: Support.  Question 2.1-8rev1: We support this bullet. Our understanding of this bullet is to say, both DCI fields for broadcast and multicast will be included in the same DCI field. For example  DCI format 1\_0 for G-RNTI  FDRA  TDRA  ……  PUCCH resource indicator, 3 bits, reserved if the G-RNTI is for broadcast  MCCH change notification, 2bits, reserved if the G-RNTI is for multicast |
| NOKIA/NSB | Proposal 2.1-1rev1: OK **Proposal 2.1-4:** It is important to discuss and align the understanding among companies on how the HARQ process should be handled for broadcast reception.  - For legacy NR, a dedicated HARQ process is used for SIB, meaning there is no sharing or no occupying the total number of HARQ processes from unicast. For Rel17 MBS, we prefer to apply the same approach for broadcast, meaning that there should have a dedicated HARQ process used for broadcast reception, instead of sharing the total number of HARQ processed from unicast/multicast.  - Moreover, a single dedicated HARQ process used for broadcast is sufficient for all broadcast services, which can be differentiated by broadcast reception UEs with different G-RNTIs.  And for a certain G-RNTI, for UE performs the RV combing of the same TB (with different RVs at each (re-)transmissions), the toggling of the NDI field in the DCI can be used to indicate a new initial transmission to the UE, and by which the RV combining UE could know on whether the soft combing should be performed with the previously received data in the soft buffer or the soft buffer should be clearly with deleting of previously received data in the buffer.  - Furthermore, for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, a dedicated HARQ process for broadcast reception can avoid limiting the number of HARQ processes used for unicast and multicast, and for unicast/multicast transmission with larger traffic payload required, the performance impact can be avoided. Proposal 2.1-5: As explained in above, the NDI field is needed for UE RV combining. Thus, we support to include it in the DCI format **Proposal 2.1-6:** If it is the majority view, then it is fine for us. Question 2.1-8rev1: Single DCI format 1\_0 is enough for broadcast, and we don’t see the need of second DCI format for broadcast reception in Rel17 MBS. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.1-1rev1: support Proposal 2.1-3: if proposal 2.1-1 rev 1 is supported, this proposal is not needed.  Proposal 2.1-4. Support. From our understanding, a dedicated HARQ process should be allocated for broadcast.  Proposal 2.1-6 [NEW]: support |
| OPPO | P2.1-1rev1: OK. P2.1-4: It is OK to have a dedicated HARQ process number allocated for broadcast. The proposal is also OK that there is no need to have HP field in DCI for always indicating the same value.  P2.1-6[NEW]: OK.  P2.1-8: One DCI format is sufficient. How to make some fields configurable/optional should be clarified. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 2.1-1rev1: We don’t support this proposal since there are sufficient bits in the DCI format 1-0 for broadcast to indicate FDRA with single RB granularity.  2.1-3: Support as there are sufficient bits in the DCI format 1-0 for broadcast to indicate FDRA with single RB granularity.  2.1-4: we still support HPN in DCI for blind HARQ retransmission.  2.1-5: Agree.  2.1-6: before reaching agreement on this proposal, one question from my side is whether resource allocation Type 0 is supported or not? Whether non-interleaved mapping is supported or not?  2..1-8: OK. Maybe better to remove “first” as there is single DCI format for broadcast.   * Support a DCI format for broadcast, which is the same as the first DCI format for multicast, with broadcast specific and multicast-specific fields made optional. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.1-1rev1: We have the similar view with Lenovo. We don’t think it is necessary to unify the FDRA interpretation for broadcast and multicast at the expense of scheduling flexibility. Proposal 2.1-6: Support |
| MeidaTek | Proposal 2.1-1rev1: we still slightly prefer the original version, but the current proposal is also ok for usProposal 2.1-4: Support. As we explained in previous round, the similar behaviour for SIB can be reused for HARQ combining buffer, which is totally up to UE implementation and no need to make any agreement from Spec perspective.Proposal 2.1-4: Not support.Proposal 2.1-6: Support.Question 2.1-8rev1: we think there is no need to discuss the proposal. We only can focus on which field is used for broadcast DCI format (G-RNTI, MCCH-RNTI) or multicast DCI format (G-RNTI, G-CS-RNTI). |
| CMCC | Proposals 2.1-1rev1： Support for the progress Proposal 2.1-6: Support  Question 2.1-8rev1: We don’t think there are any optional filed in the first DCI format, all the fields in the first DCI format are mandatory for UE. |
| CATT | Proposal 2.1-1rev1: OK.Proposal 2.1-6 [NEW]: Agree. |
| Ericsson | 2.1-1rev1: Support  2.1-3: Support  2.1-6: Support 2.1-8rev1: Support |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.1-1rev1, 2.1-2/3/7/4/6: Support  Proposal 2.1-5: Not support. NDI is not needed since HARQ process ID is not used.  Question 2.1-8rev1: This seems not essential discussion. We can discuss for broadcast, not for multicast here. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Proposal 2.1-1rev1: OK**  **Proposal 2.1-6:OK**  Question 2.1-8rev1: we support this proposal. |
| Moderator | The following revisions of Proposal 2.1-1rev1 and Proposal 2.1-6 have been agreed at GTW on 15 Nov  **Agreement**  For broadcast reception, the following options is supported for VRB-to-PRB mapping field in the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH   * Opt-1: DCI includes the VRB-to-PRB mapping field with 1 bit according to Table 7.3.1.2.2-5 in TS 38.212   + Note: DL resource allocation type 0 is not supported in DCI format 1\_0   **Working assumption**  For FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:   * is the size of CORESET 0if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell. * If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,*   **Regarding the WA on FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:**  Please provide your views on whether this WA can be confirmed. Proposal 2.1-3 This proposal is left on hold until we get a resolution on the WA above. Proposal 2.1-4 & Proposal 2.1-5These proposals are still on hold until resolution on Issue 7. Regarding the comments from [Nokia, ZTE, Xiaomi, OPPO, Lenovo, MediaTek] on the discussion on HARQ process for broadcast, please note that this discussion has been included in Issue 7 (PDSCH repetition/HARQ combining) Question 2.1-8rev1 The explanations of ZTE explain the meaning of this proposal. The specification impact would have less impact where a single section which deals with the DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with MCCH-RNTI, G-RNTI, G-CS-RNTI, with all relevant fields for broadcast and multicast. However, for fields that are only relevant for multicast, there would be a note where it is indicated that this field is reserved if it is G-RNTI for multicast, etc.  As explained in the previous round the support of a second DCI for broadcast has been de-prioritised due to the majority view not supporting it.  The question is made into a proposal to seek company comments. |

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

#### Working assumption

For FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:

* is the size of CORESET 0if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
* If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,*

#### Proposal 2.1-3 [closed]

For GC-PDSCH scheduled with DCI format 1\_0 for broadcast reception, the resource allocation granularity is single RB.

#### Proposal 2.1-4 [waiting feedback Issue 7]

**(for conclusion)**

for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH does not include the field HARQ Process Number.

#### Proposal 2.1-5 [waiting feedback Issue 7]

for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH includes the field New Data Indicator.

#### Proposal 2.1-8 [comments requested]

Support a ~~first~~ DCI format for broadcast, which is the same as the first DCI format for multicast, with broadcast-specific and multicast-specific fields ~~made~~ ~~optional~~ reserved.

**Please provide your answers in the table below considering the FL assessment above**

1. **Please provide your views on whether WA on FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception can be confirmed.**
2. **Please note that for Proposals 2.1-3, 2.1-4, 2.1-5 we are awaiting progress in other proposals/issues.**
3. **After the clarifications provided, provide your views on Proposal 2.1-8.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Agree to confirm the working assumption  **Proposal 2.1-8**: Fine for us |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Good to confirm the WA in this meeting. We don’t see there is fundamental problem.  2.1-3 is not needed since it deviates from the WA.  We think both HPN and NDI are not used in the DCI 1\_0 for broadcast. There is no HARQ-ACK feedback and also we have agreed to support slot-level repetition. We don’t see the need to use HPN and NDI on top of that.  2.1-8，please note that we have 38.212 draft CR agreed, the more discussion should be based on what has been reflected in the draft CR. As such, I don’t see the meaning to discuss this proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support to confirm the working assumption.  Proposal 2.1-8: Support |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | We support the WA above.  Proposal 2.1-8: Ok  For Proposal 2.1-5, we have a question. If MTCH repetition is used for an MBS session, the repetition times will be configured by RRC signalling. The continuous N DL timeslots are used to transmit a TB with the first timeslot for the TB is scheduled by a PDCCH, which means one PDCCH schedules N PDSCH timeslots for a same TB if the PDSCH repetition is configured.  If our understanding is right, the new data indicator field is not needed because UE can determine the position of the N DL timeslots for the PDSCH repetition each times PDCCH is decoded correctly by UE. |
| vivo | Proposal 2.1-8:  Given the following two agreements achieved previously, we are not quite sure why proposal 2.1-8 is needed.  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 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. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Regarding the working assumption, our understanding is listed below:   * So far, we have agreed CFR configuration with same frequency resource as CORESET 0 (Case A) and SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP (Case C). In Case A, the size of CFR is equal to size of CORESET 0 so that K=1; In Case C, when CORESET 0 is not configured, the size of CFR is equal to size of initial DL BWP and K=1; when CORESET 0 is configured, the size of CFR is larger than CORESET 0 then K may be larger than 1. The case where CFR is larger than initial DL BWP will not happen according to current agreed CFR configuration. * Due to no HARQ-ACK feedback for broadcast, there are total 10 useless bits in the DCI (TPC, DAI, HARQ timing, PRI) in addition to the 1 bit identifier. There are sufficient bits to support single RB granularity for FDRA. We don’t see any problem with it especially it is legacy behavior. * As mentioned before, the case where CFR is larger than initial DL BWP will not happen. One compromise from our side is to make slight change to remove the impossible case.   **Working assumption**  For FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:   * is the size of CORESET 0if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell. * If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,*   2.1.4 and 2.1.5: As HPN field is a normal field since LTE Rel-8, I don’t see any problem to keep it. At least it is helpful for UE to perform soft combining.  2.1.8: Regarding the update, we are a bit confused why broadcast-specific field is reserved in the DCI format. |
| CATT | Agree to confirm the working assumption  **Proposal 2.1-8**: Fine for us |
| Xiaomi | For the working assumption, we support Lenovo’s update. We think it is a good way forward. Proposal 2.1-3 : not need anymore based on the updated WA.Proposal 2.1-4: supportProposal 2.1-5: it related to Question 2.7-3. We don’t support this proposal as we don’t see the necessity. More detail comments from our side can be found under question 2.7-3.Proposal 2.1-8: Same question as Lenovo. And we are not sure why the ‘first’ is deleted. If the intention is to support both first DCI format and second DCI format to schedule broadcast, we don’t agree. |
| ZTE | Regarding the working assumption, we don’t see any issue with the current working assumption, it is just reuse what we already have in the spec.  Regarding Lenovo’s updates, we don’t think it makes any difference for broadcast because anyway CORESET#0 is always configured in the initial DL BWP.  Proposal 2.1-8: Support |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.1-4 and Proposal 2.1-4:** We still think the HAQR process number field and NDI field is not needed since no HARQ ACK feedback is supported for broadcast.  **Proposal 2.1-8**: We have the similar question with Lenovo/Xiaomi. What is the motivation to delete the “first” and why does the unused bit are reserved for broadcast/multicast? |
| Qualcomm | Share similar view as Huawei |
| Ericsson | Agree to confirm the WA.  2.1.4: Not support. We need to wait for the conclusion of the discussion about blind (gNB-triggered) HARQ retransmission.  2.1.5: Support. Important to support soft-combining of HARQ retransmissions  2.1-8: Similar to other companies we do not agree to remove “first”, since we also think a second DCI format should be supported to enable X-polar MIMO and Type 0 resource allocation. Apart from that we support the use of the same format for multicast and broadcast. |
| Moderator | Thank you for comments.  I have closed **Proposal 2.1-3** given the WA.  Regarding Working Assumption:   * agree to confirm (8) [Nokia, Huawei, NTT DOCOMO, TD TECH, CATT, ZTE, Qualcomm, Ericsson] * changes (2) [Lenovo, Xiaomi]   Most (9) companies would like to confirm the WA, while 2 companies would like to make some changes.  @Lenovo, Xiaomi: thanks for the explanations. Based on your explanation the WA is not broken since even with the agreed Cases (A/C) of CFR the set of instructions that the WA sets out are correct. The cases you detail also imply that K=1 and therefore single granularity as you were supporting is included. My understanding is that if there is no technical problem with WA it is therefore confirmed. Is this acceptable, please?  Regarding **Proposals 2.1-4 & 2.1-5**:  Thanks all for the comments, I propose we hold these two proposals until we clarify further the discussion in Issue 7.  On **Proposal 2.1-8**:  @Huawei, vivo, Lenovo, MediaTek: thanks for the comment. This proposal would have an impact on how the DCI description in TS 38.212 would be specified. With this proposal there would be a single section for DCI format 1\_0 with RNTIs for broadcast and multicast. Each of the fields would be reserved for broadcast if the field is only applicable to multicast and vice versa.  @Xiaomi, MediaTek: the “first” was deleted since for broadcast there is only one DCI and a second DCI for broadcast is not going to be pursued anymore based on the comments from previous rounds. |

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

#### Proposal 2.1-1rev2:

Confirm the following working assumption:

Working assumption

For FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:

* is the size of CORESET 0if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
* If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,*

#### Proposal 2.1-4 [hold on until Issue 7 clarified]

**(for conclusion)**

for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH does not include the field HARQ Process Number.

#### Proposal 2.1-5 [hold on until Issue 7 clarified]

for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH includes the field New Data Indicator.

#### Proposal 2.1-8 [comments requested]

Support a ~~first~~ DCI format for broadcast, which is the same as the first DCI format for multicast, with broadcast-specific and multicast-specific fields ~~made~~ ~~optional~~ reserved.

**Please provide your answers in the table below considering the FL assessment above**

1. **After clarifications, do you agree with Proposal 2.1-1rev2 which agrees the WA?**
2. **Please note that for Proposals 2.1-4 and 2.1-5 are on hold until progress in other proposals/issues.**
3. **After the clarifications provided, provide your views on Proposal 2.1-8.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.1-1rev2: Support **Proposal 2.1-8:** Similar view as above companies, we don’t need to discuss this proposal, how to define the DCI format 1\_0 for multicast and broadcast can be up to editor. |
| Nokia/Nsb | Proposal 2.1-1rev2 and Proposal 2.1-8: Support |
| Spreadtrum | 2.1-1: Ok  2.1-8: The discussion should be based on the 38.212 CR. |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.1-1rev2 and Proposal 2.1-8: Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK to confirm the WA for sake of progress.  2.1.8: We understand the motivation and suggest minor change as below:  Support a ~~first~~ DCI format for broadcast, which is the same as the first DCI format for multicast, with multicast-specific fields ~~made~~ ~~optional~~ reserved in the DCI format for broadcast. |
| Xiaomi | Regarding to proposal 2.1-8, we agree with CMCC/Spreadtrum, the detail information bit field design should up to editor. We don’t need to mention how to handle the multicast-specific fields and broadcast-specific fields. Actually, the key factor is that a same DCI format is used for both multicast and broadcast with the understanding that they have the same payload size. Hence we propose the following updated version.  *Support a ~~first~~ DCI format for broadcast, which is the same as the first DCI format for multicast~~, with broadcast-specific and multicast-specific fields made optional reserved~~.*  We are OK with other proposals. |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.1-1rev2:  As mentioned by moderator, there is no technical issue wrong with the current WA, but the condition “larger than initial DL Bandwidth part” will not happen based on current discussion. Therefore, this condition is technically not correct. To make the description more precise based on current discussion/agreements, we would like to confirm the WA by adding “equal to the size of”. Proposal 2.1-1rev2: Confirm the following working assumption:  Working assumption  For FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:   * is the size of CORESET 0if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell. * If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0/equal to the size of initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,* |
| vivo | Proposal 2.1-1rev2: Support to confirm. **Proposal 2.1-8:** If the motivation is to clarify how the DCI format for broadcast and multicast described in TS 38.212, we prefer to leave it to editor. |
| CATT | Support Proposal 2.1-1rev2 and Proposal 2.1-8. Fine with Xiaomi’s version. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.1-1rev2: Support Proposal 2.1-8: Support |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2.1-8: We share the similar view with CMCC/Spreadtrum/Xiaomi/vivo/CATT. Since the draft CR 38.212 has gave the DCI format structure for broadcast and multicast. Thus, we think the proposal is not necessary and we can further discuss based on the draft if we have concern on the current DCI format structure. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 2.1-8 no need. Please check what we agreed in draft 38212 CR. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 2.1-1rev2: support  Proposal 2.1-8: Support |
| Moderator | My proposal for the GTW on 17 Nov is to try to agree withProposal 2.1-1rev2: Confirm the following working assumption:  Working assumption  For FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:   * is the size of CORESET 0if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell. * If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,*   @OPPO: thanks for the comment. Please note as discussed with Lenovo/Xiaomi before, although the WA could be improved this WA is not broken and is technically correct even of some situation may not happen in the routine of instructions this proposal details. The current version seems acceptable to all the rest of companies. At the stage of the meeting/release I suggest that we do not open the WA that would require more time and energy and move on to make progress. |
| Moderator | **On Proposal 2.1-1rev2**:  There have not been further comments besides the suggestion from OPPO, where a clarification has been provide above.  On **Proposal 2.1-4** and **Proposal 2.1-5**  Based on the initial rounds of discussion this was the support for the proposals.  While [LG, Lenovo, CATT, vivo, Ericsson] (5) want to support **HPN**, [NTT DOCOMO, Xiaomi, OPPO, Samsung, ZTE, MediaTek, CMCC, Huawei] (8) are fine without including the field.  While [LG, Nokia, Lenovo, CATT, Samsung, vivo, CMCC, Ericsson] (8) want to support **NDI**, [NTT DOCOMO, Xiaomi, OPPO, MediaTek, Qualcomm, Huawei] (6) do not support including the field.  There are two sides to this discussion. One is regarding PDSCH repetition and argument highlighted from vivo as follows:  “For UE in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE, as no unicast and groupcast transmission is expected, HARQ processes defined for unicast and groupcast can be used for combing broadcast PDSCH repetition. And it is possible to leave it to RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UE implementation to select one HPN without any indication in DCI. 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. This is because network has no information about the HPN selected by UE for broadcast PDSCH combination and may indicate the same one for the subsequent unicast and multicast transmission”  Companies not supporting these fields have argued that it is up to UE implementation how the soft combining is done for idle/inactive UEs. I understand companies mean that is up to UE how the available receiver buffers from the HARQ process are used for soft combining while idle/inactive state. Based on discussion on Issue 7, the option to define dedicated HARQ process for broadcast which may increase UE complexity was not well received due to increased UE complexity which is highlighted in the WID as a factor that should be minimised.  However, the point raised by vivo is relevant, since a UE that is receiving broadcast in idle/inactive and then enters the connected state and has been using a HARQ process for soft combining the PDSCH repetitions while in idle/inactive but then the same HARQ process is used by the gNB for unicast/broadcast, service degradation for broadcast may occur. It may be good to understand whether this is a common understanding.  The second aspect of the discussion is the support of HARQ retransmissions as per Issue 7 discussion. However, that discussion does not have consensus from companies so it may be harder to progress from that side.  Since multiple companies would like to include this fields, and there is space in the DCI field to include such fields, the proposal is to include those fields in the DCI. Proposal are put to collect company comments.  On **Proposal 2.1-8**   * Support [Nokia, ZTE, Lenovo, CATT, NTT DOCOMO, Ericsson] (6) * No support/no needed [CMCC, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, vivo, MediaTek, Huawei] (6)   There are split views on this proposal. Given it does not address a critical functionality, there is opposition from multiple companies and that discussion can happen during the implementation of the changes of the TS 38.212 specification, I therefore propose to deprioritise this proposal. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Ok for Proposal 2.1-1rev2**  **Ok for Proposal 2.1-8.** |

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

#### Proposal 2.1-1rev2:

Confirm the following working assumption:

Working assumption

For FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:

* is the size of CORESET 0if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
* If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,*

#### Proposal 2.1-4rev1

for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH includes the field HARQ Process Number.

#### Proposal 2.1-5

for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH includes the field New Data Indicator.

**Please provide your answers in the table below considering the FL assessment above**

1. **After clarifications, do you agree with Proposal 2.1-1rev2 which agrees the WA?**
2. **Do you agree with Proposal 2.1-4rev1 and 2.1-5?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | **Proposal 2.1-1rev2: Support** Proposal 2.1-4rev1: Not support, to our view, it is important to decide how the HARQ process is handled for broadcast reception for this case. If a dedicated HARQ process is there for broadcast reception, then this is no need to have such HARQ process number included in the DCI format. And we prefer to have the dedicated HARQ process for broadcast reception.Proposal 2.1-5: Support |
| vivo | **Proposal 2.1-1rev2:** Support Proposal 2.1-4rev1: Support. Including HP field enables sharing existed 16 HARQ processes which well maintains current UE complexity, and it provides possibility to allow multiple HARQ processes for broadcast if needed. Furthermore, when broadcast PDSCH repetition is received by RRC-connected UEs, it avoids ambiguity for HARQ combining.Proposal 2.1-5: Support |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 2.1-1rev2:** Support Proposal 2.1-4rev1: Do not support. From the clarification, it seems the solution is to assign one of the HARQ process to broadcast which belongs to unicast. It will further put restrictions on the unicast scheduling. Regarding the concerns on UE complexity, we don’t think it is an issue as the buffer for each HARQ process is actually handled by UE internally, especially MBS UE is a more advanced UE. If the concern on not supporting HPN comes from the additional HARQ process which is dedicated for broadcast reception, we are OK to put it as a FFS for now and have further check in the next meeting. Hence we propose the following update:Proposal 2.1-4rev1 for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH does not include the field HARQ Process Number.  FFS: whether to define a dedicated for broadcast reception |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 2.1.4: Support. We think including the HPN field in the DCI provides a certain flexibility. From UE’s point of view, it is up to UE implementation whether to combine or not combine the received soft bits.  2.1.5: Support. NDI is required for UE to know it’s a new transmission or retransmission. I don’t see any problem with it. |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.1-1rev2:Thanks FL for the clarification, and we can live with it for progress. Can we also add a note for clarification, because the current wording is still implying something else that has not been determined? Proposal 2.1-1rev2: Confirm the following working assumption:  Working assumption  For FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:   * is the size of CORESET 0if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell. * If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,* * Note: Confirm this WA does not have impact on the down-selection decision for CFR cases.   **Proposal 2.1-4rev1:** Not support.  First, if slot-level repetition is already supported and sufficient, allocating multiple HARQ processes to broadcast is not necessary. Second, similar view with Nokia/NSB that there has different impact on UEs by supporting a single HP or multiple HPs for broadcast. Single HP for broadcast does not need specific HPID indication. Therefore, the motivation and benefit for broadcast to support HARQ based soft-combination should be first clarified, and then how many HPIDs can be allocated to broadcast can be further discussed.  Proposal 2.1-5: OK for one HPID for broadcast. |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.1-1rev2: We support OPPO’s version. **Proposal 2.1-4rev1:** Not support. As discussion of above companies, there may exist HPN collision between broadcast/multicast/unicast, since gNB doesn’t know whether the broadcast GC-PDSCH is received by IDLE/INACTIVE UEs or not. If gNB reerves some HPNs for broadcast, this may cause the decrease of multicast/unicast transmission efficiency. Proposal 2.1-5: OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.1-1rev2: Support  Proposal 2.1-4rev1: Not support. We think a single HARQ process is enough even if HARQ retransmissions are performed. We don’t think it is necessary to include the HPN in the DCI format. Proposal 2.1-5: Support |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.1-1rev2:** Support Proposal 2.1-4rev1: We share the same with vivo that the current UE complexity can be maintained with including the HPID field. Moreover, we believe that using multiple dedicated HARQ processes for broadcast reception increases UE’s capability on buffer for multiple broadcast services. Proposal 2.1-5: Support |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.1-1rev2: Support  Proposal 2.1-4rev1: We share similar view as Nokia, a dedicated HARQ process should be sufficient and could be a middle group between UE complexity and performance gain.  Proposal 2.1-5: Support |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 2.1-1rev2: Support**  **Proposal 2.1-4rev1: Not support. A single HARQ process is enough for broadcast reception.**  **Proposal 2.1-5: Not clear about the motivation to keep NDI. It seems to be related to Issue 7. If gNB triggers blind retransmission is not supported, it seems not to be necessary to introduce NDI field. Hope the proponent can clarify the motivation.** |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2.1-4rev1: NOT Support. I am very confused that why does the moderator propose that supporting HARQ process number field since majority views don’t support the HARQ process number for broadcast. I repeat my comments again and again as following:  Firstly, we want to check that do you think supporting multiple HARQ process is a basic feature for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE UE supporting broadcast reception?  Secondly, it is the best effort reception for MBS broadcast UE, and the slot level is also supported for broadcast MTCH, Thus, we don't think it needs to consider more complicated feature design for broadcast reception.  Thirdly, we **don’t agree** with the explanation about the UE processing complexity. From UE’s processing perspective, the RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode structure is different than from the RRC CONNECTED mode, it will require major changes to UE hardware/software/….., which is not benefit to fast commercial deployment and also against the MBS WID as copied following:   |  | | --- | | **MBS WID Restrictions and assumptions:**  **In order to facilitate implementation and deployment of the feature, the overall implementation impact should be limited, and the UE complexity should be minimized (e.g. device hardware impact should be avoided).** |   Finally, please note that Rel-17 MBS is basic version for fast commercial deployment and further enhancement can be discussed in next release if needed. We think the MBS broadcast mechanism can work even if it does not have the proposal as you mentioned.  **To sum up, we don’t support the proposal!** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support proposal 2.1-1rev2. **Don’t support 2.1-4rev1**, broadcast scheduling may be received by both IDLE/INACTIVE and CONNECTED UEs. Even for Connected UE receiving multicast, we are concerned the same HPID may be used by both unicast and multicast for which we need to solve how to differentiate PTP is for unicast or is for retransmission of PTM initial transmission as discussed in AI 8.12.1. Assuming the total number of HPID is not increased, allowing more HPID for broadcast would even get the situation worse.  Don’t support proposal 2.1-5, broadcast has no HARQ-ACK feedback, repetition can use the fixed RV pattern as extensively supported. |
| Xiaomi2 | Regarding proposal 2.1-5, we agree with HW, we don’t support this proposal. |
| Ericsson | 2.1-1rev2: Support Proposal 2.1-4rev1 and Proposal 2.1-5: We disagree about the aspect of HPID conflict when a UE enters RRC CONNECTED. There are at least two mechanisms, which could be used to avoid any issues:   1. to allocate dedicated broadcast HPIDs from the available 16 HARQ processes. This would completely avoid any risk of conflict. This would of course reduce the number available HARQ processes for unicast/multicast, but we think it can be left to network implementation how to best exploit the available HARQ processes. There could e.g. be use cases without multicast, in which case broadcast could easily have some dedicated HARQ processes without compromising unicast performance. If there is a shortage of HARQ processes, when also considering the need for unicast/multicast, it is always possible, as a special case, for the network to use broadcast without using multiple HARQ processes. 2. to use the RAN2-agreed “UE interest signaling”, which allows a UE to signal which broadcast services it is interested in. For UEs in RRC CONNECTED, the gNB can then take this information into account when allocating HARQ processes. Essentially, all RRC CONNECTED UEs that are receiving a certain broadcast transmission would then be known by the network and could be treated in the same way as a multicast group in the allocation of HARQ processes.   If the HPID is used for broadcast, then the UE would not use a “random process” for broadcast but would know which HARQ processes the broadcast is associated with (via the DCI field) and would use other buffers for other HPIDs.  It seems to us that the use of NDI and HPID fields do not cost anything in complexity, for a UE that is anyway supporting unicast/multicast (which is the assumption here). Any issues of HPID conflict can be solved and it can be up to network implementation how to best exploit the total resource of HPIDs for unicast/multicast/broadcast.  @MediaTek, regarding your three points:   1. Yes, we think supporting multiple HARQ process could easily be a basic feature for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE UE supporting broadcast reception, with the main reason being that such UEs already support this for unicast/multicast. We could however compromise to have this as a UE capability in Rel-17. 2. Regarding the aspect that slot-level repetition is supported: as already explained multiple times, HARQ retransmission provides that additional dimension of time diversity which is expected to provide very significant additional gains on top of the mere repetition itself. Why not accept such large additional gain, which is more or less for free?  About UE complexity: we accept of course what you say as true for the current MediaTek design, but we do not see any fundamental reason for increased complexity for a new design. Therefore, we can accept, as a compromise, to have this as a UE capability (for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE), suitable for early designs, but still allowing for more advanced functionality in later designs. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 2.1-1rev2: OKProposal 2.1-4rev1: OKProposal 2.1-5: OK |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 2.1-1rev2: OKFor Proposal 2.1-4rev1, we don’t support it.For Proposal 2.1-5, we can include NDI in PDCCH for MTCH but may not need it for MCCH. The reasons are:   * For MCCH PDCCH, it is similar as that of SIB, where single HARQ process is enough for MCCH soft combining and HPID is not needed. NDI is also not needed if RAN2 define MCCH modification periodicity. * For MTCH PDCCH, multiple HARQ process(es) can be used for different G-RNTIs. But one HARQ process per G-RNTI is sufficient and UE just use G-RNTI to differentiate the HARQ processes for soft combining and HPID is not needed in DCI. Since there is no MTCH modification periodicity, NDI may be needed to let UE know when it is new or retx for combining. * For both MCCH/MTCH, we don’t prefer to define dedicated HARQ process(es). The broadcast reception is best efforts and the soft combining can be up to UE implementation. |
| Moderator | Thanks for discussion.  On **Proposal 2.1-1rev2**  @OPPO: as you mention that you can live with the proposal for progress, thanks for the compromise. Regarding the note, since the WA is not broken I think it is better to approve it directly. Please note that FDRA determination is essential and really need to get the agreement and the rest of companies are fine with it and we are at very late stage of the meeting. I also do not think this proposal is going to have any influence in the discussion on down-selection of CFR cases.  @CMCC: same comment as OPPO.  I therefore propose that the WA is agreed by email.  On **proposal 2.1-4rev1**   * Not support [Nokia, Xiaomi, OPPO, CMCC, NTT DOCOMO, ZTE, Spreadtrum, MediaTek, Huawei, Qualcomm] (10) * support [vivo, Lenovo, CATT, Ericsson, LGE] (5)   More companies have expressed concerns with including HPN for broadcast reception. Given the limited time left for the meeting, therefore, the FL proposes not to pursue this proposal.  **On Proposal 2.1-5**   * Not support [Spreadtrum, Huawei, Xiaomi] (3) * support [Nokia, vivo, Lenovo, OPPO, CMCC, NTT DOCOMO, CATT, ZTE, LGE, Qualcomm\*] (10)   + \* for MTCH only.   This has more support, although some companies do prefer not to include it. We can try with Qualcomm’s proposal to include it only for MTCH. The proposal is to discuss this proposal for email that with some discussion may achieve convergence. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Ok for Proposal 2.1-1rev2**  **proposal 2.1-4rev1: not support**  **proposal 2.1-5: not support** |

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

#### Proposal 2.1-1rev2: [for email approval]

Confirm the following working assumption:

Working assumption

For FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:

* is the size of CORESET 0if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
* If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,*

#### Proposal 2.1-5rev1 [for email discussion]

for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH includes the field New Data Indicator.

**Please provide your answers in the table below considering the discussion above**

1. **do you have concerns with confirming the WA in Proposal 2.1-1rev2?**
2. **Do you agree with Proposal 2.1-5rev1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.1-1rev2: OK Proposal 2.1-5rev1: Not support. We don’t see the clear motivation to use NDI while HARQ process ID is not used. |
| Nokia/Nsb | Support both |
| CATT | Support both proposals. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Support proposal 2.1 It’s better not to support proposal 2.1-5. But we can accept to support it if the majority support it. |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.1-1rev2: We can only live with confirming the WA by adding the note.  If the note is not acceptable, it means that confirming the WA will have impact on CFR discussion and down-selection. Proposal 2.1-1rev2: Confirm the following working assumption:  Working assumption  For FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:   * is the size of CORESET 0if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell. * If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,* * Note: Confirm this WA does not have impact on the down-selection decision for CFR cases.   Proposal 2.1-5rev1:  As discussed during the previous round of discussion, we found this proposal is relative to issue 7. Because if there is only one (dedicated) HPID indicated to broadcast, why such NDI field is still needed in DCI? No matter it is kept as reserve bit or to be interpreted in different ways, the clarification is needed. If not, we do not really see the necessity of keeping it. |

## [CLOSED] Issue 2: PDCCH: 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 and RAN2#116-e meetings:

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2#115-e   * **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.   RAN2#116-e   * **MCCH changes due to neighbouring cell information modification will be notified using the normal MCCH modification notification.** |

RAN1 discussed aspects related to RNTI and DCI design for carrying MCCH change notifications and made the following agreements during RAN1#105-e, RAN1#106-e and RAN1#106bis-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).  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 |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2110779, Huawei]
  + *Discuss*: As discussed in the last meeting, both alternatives can work. Since no fundamental problems have been discovered for Alt2 which was agreed as working assumption, this working assumption should be confirmed.
  + Proposal 4: Confirm the working assumption that Alt 2 (from previous agreement) is supported for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues for the notification of MCCH configuration changes.
* In [R1-2111551, Xiaomi]
  + Proposal 7: Confirm the following working assumption and send an LS to RAN2 accordingly.  
    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
* In [R1-2111629, CMCC]
  + *Discuss*: During the discussion in last RAN1 meetings, all companies acknowledge that both Alt 1 and Alt 2 are workable and Alt 2 doesn’t need the introduction of new RNTI. Some companies commented the bit for MCCH change notification is limited, but as the analysis above and as 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 7. Confirm the working assumption to support Alt 2 for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues for the notification of MCCH configuration changes.
* In [R1-2111763, Samsung]
  + Proposal 4. Confirm the Working assumption for MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2111899, Apple]
  + Proposal 2: Conform the following working assumption on MCCH change notification.
    - Alt 2 (from previous agreement) is supported for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues for the notification of MCCH configuration changes.
* In [R1- 2112082, Asustek]
  + Proposal 2: Confirm the working assumption: Alt 2 is supported for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues for the notification of MCCH configuration changes.
* In [R1-2112314, MediaTek]
  + Observation 1: UE needs more power consumption if Alt 2 is used for MCCH change notification.
  + Observation 2: The system latency is increased if Alt 2 is used for MCCH change notification.
  + Observation 3: The same DCI format used for MCCH/MTCH can be reused for MCCH change notification.
  + Proposal 8: MBS DCI format 1\_0 used for MCCH and MTCH reception is reused for NR MBS MCCH change notification.
  + Observation 4: The Alt 1 with DCI 1\_0 can keep the better decoding performance and backword compatibility.
  + Proposal 9: The Alt 1 is supported for MCCH change notification.
  + Proposal 10: MBS DCI format 1\_0 used for MCCH and MTCH reception is reused for NR MBS MCCH change notification.
  + Proposal 11: A new RNTI (e.g., MCCH-N-RNTI) is defined for MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2112348, Ericsson]
  + *Discuss*: Bit toggling- The two bits will signal MBS session activation and change of MCCH enovoing data. We propose that bit toggling is used, which means that the information of the change indication lies in the change of the bit value rather than the absolute value.  
      
    The bit for MBS session activation is thus toggled each time a new MBS session is activated. If the initial value is e.g. ‘0’, this means that at the first MCCH PDCCH DCI in a Modification Period the UE will check whether the bit value has changed. If the UE detects that the value has changed to ‘1’ this implies that one MBS session is activated, and the UE will find out more by investigating the MCCH content. This bit value of ’1’ is retained in all MCCH PDCCH DCIs until there is a new MBS session activation to be notified to the UE, in which case the bit value changes back to ‘0’ and stays like that until a new change occurs etc.  
      
    If the UE misses the first MCCH PDCCH carrying the toggled bit, this is not catastrophic, since the UE can have one or more new attempts on the following MCCH PDCCH Monitoring Occasion.  
      
    The bit for change of MCCH content would work in the same way, i.e. the UE would check the first MCCH PDCCH DCI in each Modification Period whether the second bit has changed and, if so, would further investigate the MCCH content. If none of the bits are toggled, the UE can safely ignore the MCCH PDCCH until the start of the next Modification Period.
  + Proposal 26: Confirm the Alt2 WA from RAN1#106b-e
    - For each of the bits indicating MBS session activation and MCCH content change: the bit value is toggled each time there is a change and the bit retains that value until the next change occurs.

### **FL Assessment**

[Huawei, Xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, Apple, AsusTek] propose to confirm the working assumption made at RAN1#106bis-e on supporting Alt 2 for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues for the notification of MCCH configuration changes. [Huawei] further clarifies that no fundamental issue has been found with Alt 2 and therefore this alternative works.

[MediaTek] proposes that Alt 1 is supported for MCCH change notification. They present drawbacks of Alt 2 and benefits of Alt 1. In particular, it is clarified that Alt 1 would not need a new DCI format and that the DCI 1\_0 format already agreed for broadcast can also be used for Alt 1 – this aspect was already clarified at the last meeting by proponents of Alt 1 and included in the FL summary discussions of RAN1#106bis-e. [MediaTek] also discusses that compared to Alt 1, Alt 2 needs more power consumption, it has increased latency, it has worse decoding performance and it has less forward compatibility in case more bits need to be added for notification changes.

Most companies propose to confirm the working assumption (i.e., Alt 2), while one company proposes to support Alt 1 based on better performance compared with the working assumption. It is worth pointing out that no fundamental issue has been reported in the submitted tdocs demonstrating that Alt 2 does not work. Therefore, the FL proposes to confirm the working assumption in **Proposal 2.2-1**.

Another aspect on bit toggling has been presented by [Ericsson], which can increase the robustness of Alt 2 as per tdoc analysis above. This approach was already reported for the last meeting, although there was no time for discussion. Therefore, **Proposal 2.2-2** to introduce this approach is put forward for discussion.

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

#### Proposal 2.2-1 [agreed]

Confirm the working assumption made at RAN1#106bis-e:

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

#### Proposal 2.2-2

For the bits notifying MCCH configuration changes, each bit value is toggled each time there is a change and the bit retains that value until the next change occurs.

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above: do you agree with Proposals 2.2-1 and 2.2-2? Please provide reasons and views in general if you do not agree.**

**FL note: based on the discussion a potential LS to RAN2 will also be discussed.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Proposal 2.2-2: OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.2-2: We think the same method as LTE SC-PTM (i.e., ‘1’ indicates the change of MCCH) will be sufficient. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 2.2-1: Although we prefer Alt 1, we can live with Alt 2.2.2-2: we think predetermined values for specific purpose is reliable enough. Using toggled or untoggled bits for indicating specific purpose may lead to problem when one DCI is missing. |
| Xiaomi | I am not sure how the toggling mechanism works if more than 1 bit is needed for MCCH notification. Hence we would like to see some clarifications from proponents. |
| CATT | Proposal 2.2-2: OK |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.2-2: The motivation/benefit of toggling multiple bits for MCCH change notification is not clear. The proponent should provide more details on how to use the “at least 2 bits” for the change notification. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.2-2: OK |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.2-2: It seems we didn’t have the toggling mechanism in LTE. Our preference is to have the same LTE mechanism for NR here. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2.2-2: reuse LTE solution is enough. The additional benefit for toggling is not clear to us. |
| Vivo | Proposal 2.2-2 : Not support. Toggling bit value causes misunderstanding when UE miss-detects previous PDCCH, we think fixed value is better for reliability, i.e., the 1st bit’1’ indicates a session start, and the 2nd bit ‘1’ indicates session modification. |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.2-2 : Not support. Reuse LTE mechanism is enough. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 2.2-2: Support.Toggling is important to increase the robustness. Maybe there are different understandings of toggling. What we mean is that with toggling, the bit value is constant until there is a change indication and then the change indication lies in the change of bit value and not in the absolute value. After the change the new bit value is retained until there is a new change etc. There is therefore no issue with a lost DCI – rather the contrary. But *without* toggling the indication becomes very sensitive to a lost DCI, e.g. if the normal value is ’0’ and then the value ‘1’ is signalled only in one DCI, then loss of that DCI implies catastrophic consequences if the change is only signalled in one DCI. |
| Apple | Proposal 2.2-2: Reuse LTE mechanism is sufficient. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 2.2-2: Similar view as DCM/ZTE/CMCC/Apple that toggling bit is not needed, which may result in unnecessary misunderstanding. |
| Intel | Proposal 2.2-1: OK to confirm WA.Proposal 2.2-2: Toggling is not needed. |
| Moderator | Proposal 2.2-1 was agreed at GTW3 on 11 Nov. **Agreement**  Confirm the working assumption made at RAN1#106bis-e:  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   A Draft LS has been placed in the drafts 8.12.3 folder for your consideration. Please provide your views on the LS.  **On Proposal 2.2-2**   * Support [Nokia, Samsung, Ericsson] * Not support/unnecessary [NTT DOCOMO, Lenovo, ZTE, Spreadtrum, vivo, CMCC, Apple, Qualcomm, Intel] * clarifications needed [Xiaomi, OPPO]   Although this proposal has received some support, most companies do not see this functionality necessary. There have been some companies requesting more information from proponents. Ericsson has provided some clarifications, I also copy here for convenience the text from the tdoc that may be useful background from R1-2112348:  “Bit toggling  The two bits will signal MBS session activation and change of MCCH enovoing data. We propose that bit toggling is used, which means that the information of the change indication lies in the change of the bit value rather than the absolute value.  The bit for MBS session activation is thus toggled each time a new MBS session is activated. If the initial value is e.g. ‘0’, this means that at the first MCCH PDCCH DCI in a Modification Period the UE will check whether the bit value has changed. If the UE detects that the value has changed to ‘1’ this implies that one MBS session is activated, and the UE will find out more by investigating the MCCH content. This bit value of ’1’ is retained in all MCCH PDCCH DCIs until there is a new MBS session activation to be notified to the UE, in which case the bit value changes back to ‘0’ and stays like that until a new change occurs etc.  If the UE misses the first MCCH PDCCH carrying the toggled bit, this is not catastrophic, since the UE can have one or more new attempts on the following MCCH PDCCH Monitoring Occasion.  The bit for change of MCCH content would work in the same way, i.e. the UE would check the first MCCH PDCCH DCI in each Modification Period whether the second bit has changed and, if so, would further investigate the MCCH content. If none of the bits are toggled, the UE can safely ignore the MCCH PDCCH until the start of the next Modification Period.  This toggling mechanism provides increased robustness thanks to the inherent repetition – one or even more missed MCCG PDCCHs would not be catastrophic – subsequent PDCCH DCIs carry the same change information.”  **Companies please check the clarifications and provide comments and whether this has addressed your concerns.** |

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

#### Proposal 2.2-2 [comments needed]

For the bits notifying MCCH configuration changes, each bit value is toggled each time there is a change and the bit retains that value until the next change occurs.

#### DRAFT LS 2.2-3 [NEW]

Please provide your comments to the “DRAFT LS on MCCH change notification” in: Inbox/drafts/8.12.3/LS/

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

1. **do you agree with Proposal 2.2-2? Please provide reasons and views in general if you do not agree.**
2. **Please provide your comments to the “DRAFT LS on MCCH change notification” in: Inbox/drafts/8.12.3/LS/**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.2-2: One compromised way is to indicate this proposal in the LS to RAN2 and let RAN2 to dedicate whether it is needed or not. Because RAN2 will specify the detailed behaviours for UE on when to detect the notification change. |
| NOKIA/NSB | We also prefer the legacy method of LTE SC-PTM, i.e., ‘1’ indicates the change of MCCH |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.2-2 [comments needed]: Thanks for the further clarification. However, we tend to agree with majority views that the current mechanism is sufficient. |
| OPPO | P 2.2-2: Based on the clarification, we prefer to use existing mechanism for MCCH change notification rather than bits toggling mechanism. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 2.2-2: We don’t think legacy mechanism can’t work for MCCH change notification. In legacy spec, there are several indicators in DCI format 1-0 with specific purpose which don’t adopt toggling mechanism. |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2.2-2 [comments needed]: No need. We prefer to reuse the legacy mechanism for MCCH change notification. |
| CMCC | P 2.2-2: No, reuse legacy LTE mechanism |
| Ericsson | P 2.2-2: Support. We agree with the LS approach proposed by ZTE Draft LS 2.2-3: Support, provided the bit toggling proposal is included as a possibility, for RAN2 to decide whether to adopt. |
| Samsung | We don’t see the necessity of toggling. The legacy method of LTE SC-PTM is enough, which is ‘1’ indicates the change of MCCH. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Proposal 2.2-2: not support. The same mode in LTE can be reused, which means 0/1 is used to indicate no change/the change of MCCH. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for the comments. Based on the discussion, a potential way forward is to include the discussion on bit toggling on the LS to RAN2 and leave the decision on whether to adopt it or not to RAN2.  A new LS has been updated in <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_107-e/Inbox/drafts/8.12.3/LS> including   * some editorial changes on the “Title”, “response to” and “source” * an explanation on bit toggling and explaining to RAN2 that it is up to RAN2 to decide whether to adopt it or not. |

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

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

1. **Please provide your comments to the “DRAFT LS on MCCH change notification” in: Inbox/drafts/8.12.3/LS/, which includes editorial corrections as well as • an explanation on bit toggling and explaining to RAN2 that it is up to RAN2 to decide whether to adopt it or not.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Firstly, we don’t see the need of toggling the MCCH change notification bit. Whether it is needed should be discussed and decided in RAN1 instead of RAN2. If RAN1 cannot conclude on this issue, it should not be mentioned in the draft LS. The draft LS should stick to the agreement we have. |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | We think there’s no need to introduce the bit toggling method in LS. Since how to indicate the MCCH change with two bits is up to RAN2, there’s no need to introduce the bit toggling method in LS. RAN only needs to confirm two bits can be provided in the DCI format scheduling MCCH. |
| Vivo | Regarding ‘The bit for MBS session activation is thus toggled each time a new MBS session is activated. If the initial value is e.g. ‘0’, this means that at the first MCCH PDCCH DCI in a Modification Period the UE will check whether the bit value has changed.’, ‘Modification Period’ has to be changed to each MCCH repetition period, as RAN2 agreed that MCCH change notification is sent in the first MCCH monitoring occasion of each MCCH repetition period. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with Huawei. The LS simply including RAN1 agreement is OK. |
| OPPO | Thanks for the clarification on the new introduced new mechanism for MCCH change notification by toggling bits.  By following majority companies’ view, we are not supportive on this mechanism. The legacy notification mechanism works quite well, why we should enhance it without observe any extra benefit? We would like to suggest that following LTE method: 0 means No change, and 1 means change of MCCH.  For the DRAFT LS, we do not think it is a proper way to reply it on RAN2 for decision while majority RAN1 companies do not support such a new mechanism.  We also agree with Huawei/HiSi that the LS can simply include RAN1’s agreements. |
| CATT | Agree with Huawei/ Lenovo/ TD Tech that the LS only include RAN1 agreement. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with Huawei/HiSI. |
| ZTE | Ok to let RAN2 to decide. Regarding the detailed contents, we would prefer a simplified version as shown below.  During RAN1#107-e meeting, RAN1 discussed further aspects on bit toggling for each of the bits indicating MCCH configuration changes. With bit toggling the information of the change indication lies in the change of the bit value rather than the absolute value.  RAN1 confirms that it is up to RAN2 to decide whether bit toggling or the absolute value for the MCCH configuration changes is adopted or not. |
| MediaTek | No need to introduce the toggling the MCCH change notification bit mechanism since the legacy behaviour is can work for MCCH change notification. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t support to include the need of toggling the MCCH change notification bit in the LS to RAN2. |
| Ericsson | We agree with the draft LS |
| Moderator | It seems the only agreeable way forward for the LS is to only include the agreements we have so far given the comments form [Huawei, TD Tech, Lenovo, OPPO, CATT, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Qualcomm].  The LS has been updated in  [DRAFT R1-200XXXX LS on MCCH change notification v003\_TD\_Tech\_Mod.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_107-e/Inbox/drafts/8.12.3/LS/DRAFT%20R1-200XXXX%20LS%20on%20MCCH%20change%20notification%20v003_TD_Tech_Mod.docx) with the following updates:   * change of “Title” to include the word “Reply” * text regarding bit toggling removed. |

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

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

1. **Please provide your comments to the “DRAFT LS on MCCH change notification” in: Inbox/drafts/8.12.3/LS/, which includes an editorial corrections and only includes the RAN1 agreements without bit toggling explanations.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | Agree with this LS. |
| ZTE | Ok |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | OK |
| Xiaomi | OK |
| OPPO | OK with the updated draft LS by moderator. |
| Samsung | OK |
| vivo | OK for update |
| CATT | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ok |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Nokia/Nsb | OK |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | ok |

## [DEPRIO] Issue 3: PDCCH: Details of CSS for MCCH/MTCH channels

### **Background**

The following agreement for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues at RAN1#103-e, RAN2#104-e, RAN1#105-e, RAN1#106-e and RAN1#106bis-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.  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. |

The following agreements for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues at RAN1#105-e, RAN1#106-e and RAN1#106bis-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.  Agreement:  The first and second DCI formats for multicast can be configured in the same or different search space sets belonging to type-x CSS. |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2110897, TD tech]
  + Proposal 15: The CORESET/search spaces for GC-PDCCH carrying MCCH/MTCH can be configured as below.
    - 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 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 on MCCH to indicate which CORESETs/search spaces by *initialDownlinkBWP* are used by MBS sessions.
* In [R1- 2111041, vivo]
  + Proposal 3: 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 [R1-2111137, Nokia]
  + Proposal-12: 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 [R1-2111305, OPPO]
  + 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.
  + Proposal 7: Type-x CSS for RRC\_IDLE is configured and the enovoing is carried via SIB.
* In [R1-2111518, Intel]
  + *Discuss*: The PDCCH which schedules the MCCH carrying the MBS configuration can be monitored in a Type0-PDCCH CSS set configured by *searchSpaceZero* in *PDCCH-ConfigBroadcast* and associated with a CORESET#0 for both RRC\_CONNECTED and IDLE mode Ues. 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 6: The PDCCH scheduling the MCCH can also be monitored in a Type-x CSS set configured by the MBS specific PDCCH-ConfigBroadcast
* In [R1-2111629, CMCC]
  + *Discuss*: 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. For RRC\_CONNECTED Ues, all configured CSS PDCCHs are counted into the monitored BD/CCEs and the left BD/CCEs capability are used for USS in Rel-15/16. However, it’s up to UE’s implementation to receive Rel-17 broadcast services or not, that is UE may not receive some configured broadcast service MTCH GC-PDCCHs. If current CSS type is reused for broadcast MTCH GC-PDCCH and the same PDCCH overbooking rule is reused for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues, these non-received broadcast MTCH GC-PDCCHs will also be counted into monitored BD/CCEs, which causing the reduction of USS scheduling opportunity. If we take new Type-x CSS for MTCH, the monitoring priority is according to the search space index and the non-monitored broadcast MTCH GC-PDCCHs are not counted into the monitored BD/CCEs for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues in order to not decrease USS scheduling opportunity.  
    During the discussion in last RAN1 meeting, some companies commented that the GC-PDCCH CSS configuration signalling is different from RRC\_CONNECTED Ues and RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues. From our point of view, the definition of CSS doesn’t have any relationship with the configuration signalling. For example, the paging search space can be configured in SIB for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues and can also be configured within UE’s active BWP by dedicated RRC signalling for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues.
  + Proposal 4. For CSS of GC-PDCCH for broadcast, the same CSS type as multicast is supported, i.e., Type-x CSS.
* In [R1-2111763, Samsung]
  + *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 enovoing).
  + Proposal 2. Support avoidance of permanent collisions for PDCCH candidates of search space sets for GC-PDCCH for broadcast and multicast.
* In [R1-2112065, LGE]
  + Proposal 1: Idle/inactive UE monitors PDCCH for Type0A-PDCCH CSS set to detect a DCI with SI-RNTI and receive MBS specific SIB on the corresponding PDSCH on the initial DL BWP of a serving cell for broadcast.
* In [R1-2112130, NTT DOCOMO]
  + Proposal 3: For CSS for broadcast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, use the same CSS type as multicast (i.e., type-x CSS).
* In [R1-2112163, Lenovo]
  + *Discuss*: Correspondingly, an associated common search space is configured for the common CORESET, which can reuse current CSS type.
  + Proposal 14: New type-x CSS is configured for RRC IDLE/RRC INACTIVE Ues.
* In [R1-2112241, Qualcomm]
  + *Discuss*: If a CSS other than searchSpace#0 is configured in the broadcast CFR, RAN1 needs to discuss whether the *searchSpaceBroadcast* if configured in a *CFR-Config-Broadcast* is similar as legacy CSS or multicast Type-X CSS with configurable monitoring priority. If the broadcast DCI formats in the broadcast CSS is treated similar as SIB/paging in legacy CSS, it will always have higher monitoring priority than USS for unicast and CSS for multicast. Since a RRC\_CONNECTED UE may receive broadcast/unicast/multicast in a BWP, we prefer to reuse the design of multicast Type-X CSS with configurable monitoring priority for the broadcast CSS.
  + Proposal 3: The *searchSpaceBroadcast* if configured in a CFR-Config-Broadcast is using same Type-X CSS as that of multicast CSS.
* In [R1-2112314, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 6: 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 [R1-2112348, Ericsson]
  + *Discuss*: It has been argued that broadcast cannot use the same CSS type as multicast, due to different way of configuration (RRC vs SIBx/MCCH), but how the configuration is conveyed is a totally different question from what is configured. There is nothing that prevents the same Ies to be conveyed via either RRC or SIBx/MCCH and be used for both multicast and broadcast. This means that the same CSS type can be used for both multicast and broadcast.
  + Proposal 23: The CSS type for broadcast should be the same as the CSS type for multicast.

### **FL Assessment**

***On reusing Type-x CSS for multicast reception for broadcast reception in RRC idle/inactive UE states***

[vivo, Intel, CMCC, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, MediaTek, Ericsson] propose that the same type of CSS supported for multicast in connected RRC state is reused for broadcast reception in idle/inactive RRC states.

On whether the CSS type being discussed for multicast can be reused for broadcast, [Nokia] discusses that the Type-x CSS defined for connected RRC state cannot be reused for idle/inactive RRC states, since the configuration is different, i.e., RRC dedicated signalling vs. SIB/MCCH signalling for connected and idle/inactive states, respectively. However, [Ericsson, OPPO, CMCC] discuss that what is relevant is first to discuss whether the parameters for the CSS for multicast and broadcast are the same/different and second the way it is configured is a separate aspect that would not preclude reusing the same CSS type for multicast and broadcast.

While [OPPO, Samsung] propose to reuse one the existing CSS types for broadcast reception in idle/inactive RRC states, [Nokia, Lenovo] proposes to use a new CSS type rather than reusing the CSS type from multicast.

Finally, [TD Tech] discuss configuration options for the CSS.

***On Draft CR TS 38.213 NR MBS [R1-2112445]***

It is important to highlight the discussions related to the Draft CR for TS 38.213 on NR MBS [R1-2112445]. The relevant text if the draft CR is copied below:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Here, Type0-PDCCH CSS and Type0B-PDCCH CSS are configured for broadcast reception. On the other hand, for multicast Type3-PDCCH CSS is defined.

Regarding the CSS prioritization of CSS for broadcast in RRC connected state, the editor has the below note highlighting that RAN1 has not yet discussed this. Therefore, an agreement may be needed, but this may be better discussed at other AI on RRC connected UE state.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Based on the above, it seems that CSS types for broadcast reception in RRC idle/inactive states is concluded. However, to collect companies views on whether this is correct the FL puts forward for discussion **Question 2.3-1**.

Finally, as per the draft CR, Type3-PDCCH CSS is defined for multicast reception. Given [vivo, Intel, CMCC, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, MediaTek, Ericsson] propose that the same type of CSS supported for multicast is reused for broadcast reception in idle/inactive RRC states, the FL puts forward **Question 2.3-2** to confirm whether given the current draft CR there is still need for this.

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

#### Question 2.3-1

Given the current draft CR on TS 38.213 [R1-2112445], are there any other critical aspect left for discussion on CSS types for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC idle/inactive states?

#### Question 2.3-2

Given the current draft CR on TS 38.213 [R1-2112445], should the multicast Type3-PDCCH CSS also be used for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC idle/inactive states?

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above, please provide your views on Questions 2.3-1 and 2.3-2:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Question 2.3-1: Thanks for the CR update information from the 38.213 editor. And specifically, the term Type0B-PDCCH CSS can be understood as the Type-X CSS as discussed, and if the general term “*pdcch-Config-Broadcast*” is defined to be received by both idle/inactive and connected mode Ues for broadcast reception, then the definition of Type0B-PDCCH CSS is fine for us.Question 2.3-2: NO, we don’t think Type-3-PDCCH CSS can be applied for idle/inactive Ues as legacy definition |
| NTT DOCOMO | Question 2.3-2: We don’t see any problem with using type-3 CSS for broadcast reception. |
| Xiaomi | For question 2.3-1, we think there is no other critical aspect left on CSS types for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC idle/inactive states.  For question 2.3-2, we don’t think multi-cast Type3-PDCCH CSS is needed for broadcast reception considering Type0B CSS is already captured in the CR. |
| OPPO | Q 2.3-1: No other critical issue is left.  Q 2.3-2: Type-3 CSS can be considered. |
| Samsung | We think Question 2.3-1 is not needed to discuss.  For Q 2.3-2, the existing CSS types can be reused for broadcast reception. |
| ZTE | We are ok with the description for SS for broadcast in draft CR on TS 38.213 [R1-2112445], and we don’t think type-3 should be added for broadcast. |
| Spreadtrum | Q2.3-1: No  Q2.3-2: No. Since we already have Type0B for broadcast, there is no need to reuse type-3 CSS for broadcast. |
| CMCC | Q 2.3-1: No  Q 2.3-2: Yes |
| Ericsson | Question 2.3-1: No Question 2.3-2: No |
| CATT | Question 2.3-1: Per our understanding, the priorities between Type0B-PUCCH CSS for broadcast and the legacy CSS type/ USS type should be clarified.Question 2.3-2: We share same views with NOKIA/Xiaomi/ ZTE/Spreadtrum/Ericsson and don’t think multi-cast Type3-PDCCH CSS is needed for broadcast reception considering Type0B CSS is already captured in the CR. |
| Apple | Question 2.3-2: No, Type0B CSS for MBS broadcast is enough. |
| Qualcomm | No matter whether it is Type-0B or Type-3 or Type-x for broadcast DCI formats, we need to clarify:  - whether the DCI formats of other RNTI can be configured in the same CSS as broadcast DCI formats?  - whether the CSS for broadcast DCI formats can have configurable monitoring priority? Or will it be always higher than the unicast DCI format in USS or multicast in Type-x CSS for RRC\_CONN Ues?  - If a new Type-0B CSS is agreed for broadcast DCI formats, whether same Type-0B CSS can be used for multicast DCI formats? |
| Intel | Same view as Ericsson |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Question 2.3-1: No comments Question 2.3-2: can be reused |
| Moderator | Thank you for the comments.  Regarding **question 2.3-1**:   * [Nokia, Xiaomi, OPPO, Spreadtrum, CMCC, Ericsson, Intel] think there is no critical aspect left for discussion * [CATT, Qualcomm] critical aspects left for discussion.   Although most companies think that there are no critical aspects left for discussion, 2 companies highlight similar aspects for discussion. Two questions relevant to this AI on idle/inactive Ues are therefore as follows   * whether the DCI formats of other RNTI can be configured in the same CSS as broadcast DCI formats? * Can the CSS for broadcast DCI formats have different monitoring priority to legacy CSS?   The FL proposes that aspects raised related to RRC connected Ues are discussed in related Ais.  Regarding **question 2.3-2**:   * (8) [Nokia, Xiaomi, ZTE, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, CATT, Apple, Intel] do not support using Type-3 PDCCH CSS for idle/inactive Ues. * (5) [NTT DOCOMO, OPPO, Samsung, TD Tech, CMCC] do not see an issue using/can be considered Type-3 PDCCH CSS for idle/inactive Ues.   Here, there are more companies that do not support using Type-3 CSS for broadcast. Hence, giving the opposition the FL proposes not to pursue further whether Type-3 CSS can be used for broadcast. |

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

#### Question 2.3-3 [NEW]

Please provide your views on the following two aspects for CSS for broadcast reception with Ues in in RRC idle/inactive states:

* whether DCI formats of other RNTIs can be configured in the same CSS as broadcast DCI formats?
* whether the CSS for broadcast DCI formats can have different monitoring priority to legacy CSS?

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above, please provide your views on Questions 2.3-3:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | For RRC idle/inactive Ues, there is no monitoring priority issue. Thus, there is no need to have CSS for broadcast DCI formats with different monitoring priority from legacy CSS. Moreover, we don’t see the issue why the DCI formats of other RNTIs cannot be configured in the same CSS as broadcast DCI format, for RRC idle/inactive Ues.  However, if the SS set monitoring priority needs to be applied for RRC Connected mode for multicast/broadcast reception, during the RRC transition period, the gNB may need to re-configure the SS set based on SS-index, which can be different from the DCI format of other RNTIs that associated with legacy CSS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | According to the current agreed draft 38213 CR, type0 and Type0B are used for broadcast. We tend to agree it is the just naming issue and what matters actually is what can be configured in the same CSS configuration. At this stage, we don’t see problems to configure formats with other RNTI (including SI-RNTI and C-RNTI) is the same CSS configuration.  For UE in CONNECTED state, for overbooking case on Pcell, CSS is always high priority than USS, the CSS for scheduling broadcast is supposed to be low priority. However, for simplicity, it can be up to network to avoid the overbooking case on Pcell, so no need to have a different monitoring priority for legacy CSS. |
| NTT DOCOMO | There is no need to support CSS that has different monitoring priority than legacy CSS, at least for idle/inactive Ues. There would be no problem in allowing DCI formats of other RNTIs to be configured in the same CSS as broadcast DCI formats for idle/inactive Ues. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Question 1: yes  Question 2: which scenarios exist for such uses? |
| Xiaomi | For the first question, we don’t think it is possible as there is no C-RNTI for each UE during RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.  For the second one, yes, the CSS for broadcast is separately configured and should carter to the requirement of MBS service. |
| ZTE | Regarding the first bullet, we think DCI formats of other RNTIs can be configured in the same CSS. It is similar as legacy design, e.g., for type-0 SS, different RNTIs including SI-RNTI, P-RNTI, C-RNTI etc can be configured for it.  Regarding the second bullet, we think the same monitoring priority to legacy CSS is sufficient. |
| Qualcomm | For Question 2: yes  For IDLE/INACTIVEs, there is no overbooking issues.  However, for CONN Ues, the monitoring priority of the CSS for broadcast DCI formats matters. Not fully understand Nokia’s solution: ‘during the RRC transition period, the gNB may need to re-configure the SS set based on SS-index’. The CSS for broadcast can be monitored by IDLE/INACTIVE and CONN Ues. Do you mean a UE will be configured with a different CSS after joining CONN mode?  For Huawei’s solution, we are not sure network can always avoid the overbooking case on Pcell, especially considering a CONN UE may monitor multiple broadcast services, multiple multicast services in addition to uncast in the same active BWP. |
| Intel | Q2. No need to support different CSS priority than legacy. |
| Ericsson | Question 1: yes.  Question 2: Agree with other companies that priorities for CSS for broadcast should not be needed at last for idle inactive. |
| Moderator | Most companies [Nokia, NTT DOCOMO, ZTE, Qualcomm, Intel, Ericsson] that for idle/inactive Ues there seems that there are no overbooking issues and therefore there it is not proposed to different monitoring priorities between the CSS for broadcast DCI formats and legacy CSS. There has been discussion and potential implementation of different monitoring priorities in RRC connected, however, this would be better discussed in the relevant AI 8.12.1.  Regarding the question whether DCI formats of other RNTIs can be configured in the same CSS as broadcast, [Nokia, Huawei, NTT DOCOMO, TD TECH, ZTE, Ericsson] do not see an issue, However, [Xiaomi] does see an issue as e.g., C-RNTI is only for RRC connected Ues. There does not seem that a follow up on this since it does not seem that it addresses a basic functionality for the operation of broadcast CSS.  Given the discussion in this and previous rounds, the FL proposal is to deprioritise the discussion of this Issue given that for idle/inactive Ues there does not seem to be any critical aspect left for discussion in this meeting and the potential open issues concern Ues in RRC connected state, that would be better addressed in the relevant AI 8.12.1 on RRC connected Ues. |
| CMCC | Q1: yes  Q2: Agree with companies, there is no PDCCH monitoring priority for IDLE/INACTIVE Ues. |
| Qualcomm | Ok to discuss the CSS monitoring priority for broadcast DCI format in 8.12.1 for CONN UEs. |

## [DEPRIO] Issue 4: Parameters and configuration of the CFR for MCCH/MTCH

### **Background**

The following agreements for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues at RAN1#103-e, RAN1#106-e, and RAN1#106bis-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   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. |

### **Tdoc analysis**

***PDSCH TDRA table determination***

* In [R1-2110912, ZTE]
  + Discuss: If search space 0 is used for MBS reception, it is viable to reuse the same default B table and C table for MBS PDSCH under the corresponding multiplexing patterns with the above restriction as shown in Figure-3. However, if search space other than 0 is used for MBS reception, the above restriction is invalid. And it will seriously affect the flexibility and capacity of MBS transmission, because most of the entities only have a length of 2 or 4 symbols for PDSCH allocation. This does not meet the requirement of mass data transmission, e.g., video service under MBS. The following approach is proposed to address this issue.
  + Proposal 6: Adding the following PDSCH TDRA table determination rule for broadcast to Table 5.1.2.1.1-1 of TS38.214.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RNTI** | **PDCCH search space** | **SS/PBCH block and CORESET multiplexing pattern** | **pdsch-ConfigCommon includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config-broadcast includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **PDSCH time domain resource allocation to apply** |
| MCCH\_RNTI, G\_RNTI for broadcast | Type-x Common for broadcast | 1 | No | - | No | Default A  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 2 | No | - | No | Default B  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 3 | No | - | No | Default C  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 1,2,3 | No | - | No | Default A  (if SearchSpaceZero is NOT configured) |
| 1,2,3 | Yes | - | No | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-ConfigCommon |
| 1,2,3 | No/Yes | - | Yes | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-Config-broadcast |

***Point A as reference for starting PRB***

* In [R1-2111137, Nokia]
  + Proposal-5: 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 for all Case C, Case D and Case E.
* In [R1-2111232, CATT]
  + *Discuss*: Since CFR has the same size as the initial BWP (configured by SIB1) in Case C, so it is reasonable that the *locationAndBandwidth* of Case C is optional and can reuse the *locationAndBandwidth* of initial BWP. Regarding Case D and Case E, to configure the CFR, the indication of the MBS common frequency includes starting PRB and length of PRBs. Following the same approach to determine reference for starting PRB as that defined in AI8.12.1 for RRC-CONNECTED Ues, the Point A can be applied as the reference for starting PRB for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues. The indication method of starting point and length of PRBs can reuse the current RIV (resource indicator value) mechanism in Rel-15.
  + Proposal 3: The *locationAndBandwidth* parameter for PDSCH/PDCCH can be optional for Case C.
  + Proposal 4: 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 [R1-2112348, Ericsson]
  + Proposal 11: 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.
    - Note: With Case A, the frequency resources of BWP/CFR are – by definition – equal to CORESET#0 initial BWP, which is already defined by legacy, so no dedicated configuration of the frequency resources are required for the CFR.

***Different BW configurations for MCCH and MTCH***

* In [R1-2110779, Huawei]
  + Discuss: MTCH may require larger frequency resources than MCCH, so the CFR for MTCH can be configured in MCCH.

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 enovoing design.

* + Proposal 3: The CFR, CORESET, and search space for MCCH and MTCH can be configured separately.
* In [R1-2110912, 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.
  + Proposal 3: Network supports configuring different CFRs for MCCH and MTCH.
* In [R1-2111137, 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. An example is shown in Figure-1 with CFR Case C-1, where the MCCH CFR can be configured in CORESET#0 region and the MTCH CFR can be configured differently with larger CFR identical to initial BWP.
  + Proposal-2: CFR for MCCH and MTCH can be configured differently.
* In [R1-2111232, CATT]
  + Proposal 5: 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 [R1-2112348, Ericsson]
  + *Discuss*: For the reception of MCCH data, the bandwidth is probably not that important, since the MCCH is cyclic, and the UE only needs to receive one cycle and can then monitor for changes. It is then more important that the monitoring of change notifications of the MCCH can be done in a power efficient way, which is possible with TDM due to the sparse way the change notifications are transmitted.
  + *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.
  + Proposal 9: Only a single common CFR for both MCCH and MTCH is supported in Rel-17.
* In [R1-2111305, OPPO]
  + 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 [R1-2111551, 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 [R1-2112163, Lenovo]
  + Discuss: In RAN1#106bis meeting, regarding CFR configuration for RRC connected mode UEs, RAN1 has agreed that no more than one CFR is configured per dedicated unicast BWP in Rel-17. Following this agreement, it is straightforward to extend it to RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs. Since only one CFR is configured for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, same CFR is used for receiving MCCH and MTCH.
  + Proposal 3: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, only same CFR for MCCH and MTCH is supported.
* In [R1-2112314, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 1: The unified CFR is defined/configured for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

***Different PDCCH-Config and PDSCH-Config for MCCH and MTCH***

* In [R1-2110779, Huawei]
  + *Discuss*: As for the PDSCH configurations of MCCH and MTCH, some of them can be different. Similar to SIB, the GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH could fixed as QPSK and MCS Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214, and one layer is sufficient. While for GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH which may be with high data rate, the MCS for MTCH should be flexible, i.e., qam256 or qam64LowSE can be configured by high layer. In addition, due to only DCI format 1\_0 was agreed for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH, there is no Antenna port(s) information can be configured. In order to minimize specification impact, GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH can also use one layer.
  + Proposal 6: GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH can be fixed as QPSK and single layer.
  + Proposal 7: GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH can be fixed as single layer and mcs-Table can be configured as qam256 or qam64LowSE by high layer.
* In [R1- 2112082, AsusTek]
  + Proposal 1: 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 [R1-2112241, Qualcomm]
  + 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 [R1-2111629, CMCC]
  + *Discuss*: As the discussion above, we think the same CFR is used for MCCH and MTCH and the CFR is configured in SIBx. We also agreed that separate PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config can be configured for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH for MCCH/MTCH in CFR, but one issue is if the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for MCCH and MTCH are the same or not. From our point of view, considering the MCCH is similar to system information PDSCH and MTCH is similar to data PDSCH, and different broadcast service can also have different traffic parameters, the PDCCH/PDSCH configuration can be different. Thus, the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for MCCH is configured by SIB, and the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for MTCH is configured by MCCH.
  + Proposal 3. For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues:
    - The CFR used for MCCH and MTCH is configured by SIBx;
    - PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH is configured by SIBx;
    - PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH is configured by MCCH. If the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for MTCH is not configured, the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH configured by SIBx is reused for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.
* In [R1-2112348, Ericsson]
  + Proposal x: For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues:
    - the set of parameters configured for PDCCH/PDSCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH can be configured by SIBx
    - the set of parameters configured for PDCCH/PDSCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH can be configured by MCCH
  + At RAN1#106b-e it was also discussed whether different configurations for MCCH and MTCH could be used on the same CFR. This could e.g. be different PDCCH-config, allowing for different Monitoring Occasions for MCCH and MTCH. We think such functionality could be useful to have, since the requirements to receive MCCH and MTCH are expected to be quite different.
  + Proposal 10: For Ues receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, support different configurations of PDCCH and PDSCH for MCCH and MTCH within a broadcast CFR.
* In [R1-2112241, Qualcomm]
  + Discuss: Even if using same BW size for MCCH and MTCH, it is also possible to use different pdsch-config, and/or pdcch-config. For example, the MCCH can use TDRA in the pdsch-Config-Common and SS#0 similar as SIB; while the MTCH can use flexible MCS, RM patterns, and CORESET/SS for broadcast data services. More detailed discussion is in Sect. 2.3 and 2.4.
  + Proposal 2: Different CFR-Config-Broadcast can be configured for MCCH and for MTCH.
* In [R1-2112314, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 2: The CFR for MCCH and MTCH is configured via MBS specific SIB (e.g., SIB-x).
* In [R1-2111899, Apple]
  + *Discuss*: According to RAN2 incoming LS in [4], MCCH related configurations will be carried by MSB specific SIB, it should include the CFR configuration to enable the reception of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying the MCCH. The scheduling information for MTCH is included in MCCH contents, it’s natural CFR configurations for MTCH is delivered via the MCCH.
  + Proposal 3: For broadcast reception by RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs,
    - the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH is configured by MBS specific SIB
    - the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH is configured by MCCH

***RateMatchPattern***

* In [R1-2111232, CATT]
  + Proposal 2: If RAN1 wants to configure *RateMatchPattern*/ *RateMatchPatternLTE-CRS*, the following issues should be discussed.
    - Issue1: Whether both *RateMatchPattern* and *RateMatchPatternLTE-CRS* are needed configured by SIBx/MCCH.
    - Issue2: The relationship between unicast and broadcast rate matching parameters when UE receiving both unicast and broadcast services.

### **FL Assessment**

***PDSCH TDRA table determination***

[ZTE] discusses limitations of the current PDSCH TDRA table determination for broadcast. The determination of the resource allocation table to be used for PDSCH has also been discussed as part of the draft CR to TS 38.214 [R1-2112485]. This issue has not been discussed yet for broadcast reception in idle/inactive Ues, therefore **Proposal 2.4-1** uses table from ZTE as starting point for the discussion.

***Point A as reference for starting PRB***

[Nokia, Ericsson] propose to use The Point A as reference of the starting PRB for the CFR configuration of RRC idle/inactive Ues as it has been agreed for multicast. [CATT] proposes that for case C, this configuration can be optional.

This discussion is related to Issue 6 on definition of CFR and down-selection of case D/E. For Case A/C they may reuse the configuration from CORESET#0/SIB-1 initial BWP and may not require a dedicated configuration to indicate the frequency resources within the carrier. **Proposal 2.4-2** is put for discussion and collect company views.

***Different BW configurations for MCCH and MTCH***

[Huawei, ZTE, Nokia] propose that MCCH and MTCH can have different bandwidth configurations between MCCH and MTCH, where the frequency resources of the MTCH can be larger and contain the frequency resources of MCCH.

[CATT, Ericsson, OPPO, Xiaomi, Lenovo, MediaTek] only support that both MCCH and MTCH have the same frequency resources for the CFR. [Ericsson] argues that if power saving is the criteria for configuring a frequency resource smaller for MCCH than for MTCH, power saving is better achieved by time domain DRX operation.

This aspect has been discussed at previous meetings without reaching a conclusion after various rounds of discussion. Based on the submitted tdocs, companies have not changed their position. Based on this, the FL proposes not to discuss this aspect and focus on other aspects that may require more discussion. Companies are welcome to provide their views in the table below.

***Different PDCCH-Config and PDSCH-Config for MCCH and MTCH***

[Huawei, Qualcomm, CMCC, Apple] discuss that the some of the PDSCH configurations of MCCH and MTCH can be different, for example the MCS Table. [Huawei] discusses that for PDSCH carrying MCCH table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS 38.214 could be used while for PDSCH carrying MTCH MCS should be more flexible, i.e., qam256 or qam64LowSE can be configured by higher layers. [Ericsson] also argues that the PDCCH-Config could also be different between MCCH and MTCH where different Monitoring Occasions are configured for MCCH and MTCH. [Apple] notes that MCCH related configurations will be carried by MSB specific SIB, it should include the CFR configuration to enable the reception of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying the MCCH. The scheduling information for MTCH is included in MCCH contents, it’s natural CFR configurations for MTCH is delivered via the MCCH. [Asustek] discusses that only basic parameters should be configured.

[MediTek] proposes that both MCCH and MTCH are both configured via MBS specific SIB.

There is stronger support for having different PDCCH/PDSCH-Config parameters between MCCH and MTCH and justification on why some parameters could be different has been provide for this meeting. Based on this **Proposal 2.4-3** puts forward an agreement to enable this.

***RateMatchPattern***

[CATT] proposes further discussion on *RateMatchPattern* / *RateMatchPatternLTE-CRS*. Given that this aspect was discussed at the past meeting without reaching an agreement and the limited time to close critical aspects in this meeting, the FL proposes to focus on the other aspects first. Companies are welcome to provide inputs in table below.

***On the determination of modulation and target code-rate & TBS***

The following agreements have been made in AI 8.12.1 for RRC connected Ues:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH:   * The maximum number of layers can be provided by *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value is defined.   + FFS the default value. * The maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR;   + FFS: if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, a value determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast in the active DL BWP is used; if the *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast is not configured, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16). * xOverhead can be provided in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value of zero is used. * The number of PRBs is determined based on the size of CFR.   Agreement:  For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH, the default value of the maximum number of layers is 1 if *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR is not configured.  Agreement:  For determination of maximum modulation order for LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH,   * if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16). |

However, these have not been discussed for broadcast reception in idle/inactive Ues. It is not clear whether this agreement do also apply for broadcast reception. However, as per the draft CR on TS 38.214 [R1-2112485] below, the above agreements have only been implemented for multicast.

|  |
| --- |
| Text, application  Description automatically generated |

|  |
| --- |
| Text  Description automatically generated |

Therefore, the FL includes **Proposal 2.4-4** to confirm whether these agreements can also be confirmed for broadcast reception with Ues in idle/inactive RRC states.

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

#### Proposal 2.4-1

Adding the following PDSCH TDRA table determination rule for broadcast to Table 5.1.2.1.1-1 of TS38.214.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RNTI** | **PDCCH search space** | **SS/PBCH block and CORESET multiplexing pattern** | **pdsch-ConfigCommon includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config-broadcast includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **PDSCH time domain resource allocation to apply** |
| MCCH\_RNTI, G\_RNTI for broadcast | Type-x Common for broadcast | 1 | No | - | No | Default A  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 2 | No | - | No | Default B  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 3 | No | - | No | Default C  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 1,2,3 | No | - | No | Default A  (if SearchSpaceZero is NOT configured) |
| 1,2,3 | Yes | - | No | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-ConfigCommon |
| 1,2,3 | No/Yes | - | Yes | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-Config-broadcast |

#### Proposal 2.4-2

For Case D/E (if supported), the definition of the broadcast BWP/CFR frequency resources reuses 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.

#### Proposal 2.4-3

For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues:

* The CFR frequency resources used for MCCH and MTCH are configured by SIBx;
* PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH is configured by SIBx
* PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH is configured by MCCH. If the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for MTCH is not configured, the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH configured by SIBx is reused for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

#### Proposal 2.4-4

The following agreements for RRC\_CONECTED Ues also apply for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states:

Agreement:

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH:

* The maximum number of layers can be provided by *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value is defined.
  + FFS the default value.
* The maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR;
  + FFS: if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, a value determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast in the active DL BWP is used; if the *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast is not configured, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).
* xOverhead can be provided in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value of zero is used.
* The number of PRBs is determined based on the size of CFR.

Agreement:

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH, the default value of the maximum number of layers is 1 if *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR is not configured.

Agreement:

For determination of maximum modulation order for LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH,

* if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).

**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** |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 2.4-3: We are fine with this proposal. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Proposal 2.4-1: Please find our proposal of the table in below  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **RNTI** | **PDCCH search space** | **SS/PBCH block and CORESET multiplexing pattern** | **pdsch-ConfigCommon includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config-broadcast includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **PDSCH time domain resource allocation to apply** | | MCCH\_RNTI, G\_RNTI for broadcast | Type-x Common for broadcast | 1 | No | - | ~~-~~  ~~No~~ | Default A  ~~(if SearchSpaceZero is configured)~~ | | 2 | No | - | ~~-~~  ~~No~~ | Default B  ~~(if SearchSpaceZero is configured)~~ | | 3 | No | - | ~~-~~  ~~No~~ | Default C  ~~(if SearchSpaceZero is configured)~~ | | ~~1,2,3~~ | ~~No~~ | ~~-~~ | ~~No~~ | ~~Default A~~  ~~(if SearchSpaceZero is NOT configured)~~ | | 1,2,3 | Yes | - | No | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-ConfigCommon | | 1,2,3 | No/Yes | - | Yes | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-Config-broadcast |  Proposal 2.4-2: Not only for Case D/E, also for Case C, all 3 cases should be configured with the same manner.Proposal 2.4-3: Not OKFor the 1st sub-bullet, to our view, the CFR for MCCH and MTCH can be different, and the MCCH CFR can be configured by SIBx. And the MTCH CFR can be the same as MCCH CFR, if MTCH CFR is not configured. Alternatively, the MTCH CFR can be also configured differently from MCCH CFR via MCCH configuration.  * **For the 2nd sub-bullet, we are OK with it** * **For the 3rd sub-bullet, OK**  Proposal 2.4-4: To our view, for Rel17 MBS with broadcast reception, single-MIMO layer with low MCS associated MCS table is enough for robust operation of broadcast reception based on SSB. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the four proposals. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 2.4.1: we prefer default TDRA table as legacy operation. 2.4.2: we don’t support as Case D or Case E is not agreed now.  2.4.3: we have some comments on the proposal.  (1) for the first sub-bullet, is there a single CFR for both MCCH and MTCH?  (2) for the third sub-bullet, we think same SIBx for configuring MCCH and MTCH should not be excluded. We suggest replacing “is” with “can be” and including “SIBx”. 2.4.4: OK. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.4-1: We are not sure why search space#0 matters for TDRA table selection.Proposal 2.4-2: Considering there is no consensus on case E, we propose to remove ‘case E(if supported)’. Proposal 2.4-3: OK  Proposal 2.4-4: OK |
| CATT | Proposal 2.4-2: OKProposal 2.4-3: OK |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.4-2: It would be better not mentioning the specific cases on CFR which is still under discussion. ~~For Case D/E (if supported), t~~The definition of the broadcast BWP/CFR frequency resources reuses 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. Proposal 2.4-3: OK.Proposal 2.4-4: OK |
| Samsung | Agree |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.4-1: We support this proposal. The motivation to have separate TDRA table for SS#0 and other SS#0 is as following. Most of SLIVs in default B table and default C table are short PDSCH length in order to align with the beam of SSBs, e.g., L=2 or L=4. This restriction is Ok for SS#0. However, if search space other than 0 is used for MBS reception, the above restriction is invalid and not needed. And it will seriously affect the flexibility and capacity of MBS transmission, because most of the entities only have a length of 2 or 4 symbols for PDSCH allocation. This does not meet the requirement of mass data transmission, e.g., video service under MBS. The following approach is proposed to address this issue. In case of other SS, default A is the better choice.  **Proposal 2.4-2**: Similar view as Nokia, it should be the same for Case C, Case D and Case E. Proposal 2.4-3: We are fine with this proposal in general. We also see some benefits of supporting different CFRs for MCCH and MTCH.Proposal 2.4-4: For broadcast, maybe single-MIMO-layer is enough. Regarding the MCS table, maybe we can also define one default MCS table in the specification. |
| Vivo | Proposal 2.4-3: Shall we allow a case that PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH is not configured? |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2.4-2: OkProposal 2.4-3: Support |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.4-1: Prefer Nokia’s versionProposal 2.4-2: Don’t need to say Case D/E in the main bullet. Proposal 2.4-3: OK Proposal 2.4-4: OK |
| Ericsson | P2.4.2: Support P2.4.2: Support P2.4.3: Support |
| Apple | Proposal 2.4-2: OK Proposal 2.4-3: OK  Proposal 2.4-4: OK |
| Qualcomm | Ok with the proposalsOur understanding of the first subbullet of Proposal 2.4-3 is only talking about the frequency bandwidth size of the CFR for MCCH and MTCH. |
| Intel | OK with the proposals |
| Moderator | Thanks for comments.  **Proposal 2.4-1**  Nokia has provided some changes that may address also comments from Xiaomi as well as preferred by other companies [CMCC]. The changes from Nokia are put forward for agreement.  **Proposal 2.4-2**  [Nokia, OPPO, ZTE, CMCC] have proposed that the methodology to indicate the resources within the carrier should be common to all cases. This suggestion is put forward for agreement.  **Proposal 2.4-3**  Some comments/clarifications:  @Nokia, while I understand that some companies prefer that the frequency resources of the CFR of MCCH and MTCH can be different, I think that the majority of companies only support that both MCCH and MTCH have the same frequency resources. I think this is the most agreeable form.  @Lenovo: on 1) yes, both MCCH and MTCH would be configured with the same frequency resources for the CFR, i.e., frequency range is not different. On 2) this is what the proposal is saying on the third sub-bullet. MCCH is configured by SIBx. MTCH is configured by MCCH. If MTCH is not configured in the MCCH, then the values that have been used to configure MCCH by SIBx are also used for MTCH.  @ZTE: thanks for the compromise.  @vivo: I am not sure I completely understand your point, can you please elaborate? Thanks.  @Qualcomm: yes.  Besides the clarifications, there seems to be good support for this proposal, it remains unchanged and I would like to check whether it is agreeable after clarifications.  **Proposal 2.4-4:**  Multiple companies have shown support. Some companies have indicated that single layer MIMO may be enough.  @Nokia, ZTE: single-layer MIMO is the only scheme supported so far, since there is no agreement on including a second DCI. Do you think we still need a clarification, or can you live with the current wording? |

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

#### Proposal 2.4-1rev1

Adding the following PDSCH TDRA table determination rule for broadcast to Table 5.1.2.1.1-1 of TS38.214.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RNTI** | **PDCCH search space** | **SS/PBCH block and CORESET multiplexing pattern** | **pdsch-ConfigCommon includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config-broadcast includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **PDSCH time domain resource allocation to apply** |
| MCCH\_RNTI, G\_RNTI for broadcast | Type-x Common for broadcast | 1 | No | - | ~~-~~  ~~No~~ | Default A  ~~(if SearchSpaceZero is configured)~~ |
| 2 | No | - | ~~-~~  ~~No~~ | Default B  ~~(if SearchSpaceZero is configured)~~ |
| 3 | No | - | ~~-~~  ~~No~~ | Default C  ~~(if SearchSpaceZero is configured)~~ |
| ~~1,2,3~~ | ~~No~~ | ~~-~~ | ~~No~~ | ~~Default A~~  ~~(if SearchSpaceZero is NOT configured)~~ |
| 1,2,3 | Yes | - | No | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-ConfigCommon |
| 1,2,3 | No/Yes | - | Yes | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-Config-broadcast |

#### Proposal 2.4-2rev1

~~For Case D/E (if supported),~~ the definition of the broadcast BWP/CFR frequency resources reuses 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.

#### Proposal 2.4-3 [closed]

For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues:

* The CFR frequency resources used for MCCH and MTCH are configured by SIBx;
* PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH is configured by SIBx
* PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH is configured by MCCH. If the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for MTCH is not configured, the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH configured by SIBx is reused for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

#### Proposal 2.4-4

The following agreements for RRC\_CONECTED Ues also apply for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states:

Agreement:

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH:

* The maximum number of layers can be provided by *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value is defined.
  + FFS the default value.
* The maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR;
  + FFS: if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, a value determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast in the active DL BWP is used; if the *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast is not configured, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).
* xOverhead can be provided in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value of zero is used.
* The number of PRBs is determined based on the size of CFR.

Agreement:

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH, the default value of the maximum number of layers is 1 if *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR is not configured.

Agreement:

For determination of maximum modulation order for LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH,

* if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).

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

1. **do you support revised proposals 2.4-1rev1 and 2.4-2rev1?**
2. **after the clarifications provided, do you support Proposals 2.4-3 and 2.4-4.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | We support the previous Proposal 2.4-1 rather than 2.4-1rev1. We have provided the reason for this in the previous round, let us further clarify it. The following is the default table B. Most of SLIVs in default B table and default C table are short PDSCH length in order to align with the beam of SSBs, e.g., L=2 or L=4. This restriction is Ok for SS#0 since the PDSCH has to use the same as the overlapped SSB. However, if search space other than 0 is used for MBS reception, the above restriction is invalid and not needed. The beam indication should be more flexible and the SLIV length should be more flexible. Thus, in case of SS other than SS#0, default A table is preferred.  Table 5.1.2.1.1-4: Default PDSCH time domain resource allocation B   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Row index** | ***dmrs-TypeA-Position*** | **PDSCH mapping type** | ***K0*** | ***S*** | ***L*** | | 1 | 2,3 | Type B | 0 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2,3 | Type B | 0 | 4 | 2 | | 3 | 2,3 | Type B | 0 | 6 | 2 | | 4 | 2,3 | Type B | 0 | 8 | 2 | | 5 | 2,3 | Type B | 0 | 10 | 2 | | 6 | 2,3 | Type B | 1 | 2 | 2 | | 7 | 2,3 | Type B | 1 | 4 | 2 | | 8 | 2,3 | Type B | 0 | 2 | 4 | | 9 | 2,3 | Type B | 0 | 4 | 4 | | 10 | 2,3 | Type B | 0 | 6 | 4 | | 11 | 2,3 | Type B | 0 | 8 | 4 | | 12 (Note 1) | 2,3 | Type B | 0 | 10 | 4 | | 13 (Note 1) | 2,3 | Type B | 0 | 2 | 7 | | 14 (Note 1) | 2 | Type A | 0 | 2 | 12 | | 3 | Type A | 0 | 3 | 11 | | 15 | 2,3 | Type B | 1 | 2 | 4 | | 16 | Reserved | | | | | | Note 1: If the PDSCH was scheduled with SI-RNTI in PDCCH Type0 common search space, the UE may assume that this PDSCH resource allocation is not applied | | | | | |   Proposal 2.4-2rev1: Prefer to add “For Case C, Case D (if supported) and Case E (if supported)” to make it clear.  Proposal 2.4-4: It seems companies have the same understanding, it is just how to word it. We would suggest the following proposal to make it clear.  **Proposal:**  For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH for broadcast,  The maximum number of layers is 1  The maximum modulation order can be determined from mcs-Table in PDSCH-Config in CFR for broadcast, if mcs-Table in PDSCH-Config is not configured in CFR for broadcast, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Proposal 2.4-1rev1 and Proposal 2.4-2rev1: Support BTW, the exact term of “Type-x” in Proposal 2.4-1rev1 may need to be updated later  **Proposal 2.4-3: Not supporting the first sub-bullet point, where to our view, the CFR for MTCH can be configured by MCCH, and the CFR for MCCH and MTCH can be different.**  Generally, as in legacy SC-PTM, the contents of MCCH carrying the scheduling information of MTCH. And the MTCH CFR is one kind of scheduling information of MTCH. Thus, it is proposed that   * the CFR frequency resource used for MTCH is configured by MCCH, * and the CFR frequency resource used for MCCH is configured by SIBx, * if the CFR frequency resource used for MTCH is NOT configured, then the CFR frequency resources configured for MCCH is applied.  Proposal 2.4-4: @FL, to our view, an agreement could be great to clarify if only single MIMO layer is supported for Rel17 MBS with broadcast reception. And in such case, the broadcast reception UE should not expect the configuration of “the maximum number of layers can be provided by *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR”, and if it is errorly configured by gNB, then the broadcast reception UE should ignore the configuration, and assume only the single MIMO layer applied for broadcast reception. |
| Xiaomi | We are OK with all the proposals. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposals by moderator. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 2.4-1: OK. 2.4-2: For Case A, it is not necessary to define the BWP/CFR using combination of Point A, offsettocarrier and locationandbandwidth. For Case C, the BWP/CFR is already defined via SIB-1. Do we need to define it again?  2.4-3: OK.  2.4-4: OK. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.4-1rev1: SupportProposal 2.4-2rev1: SupportProposal 2.4-3: SupportProposal 2.4-4: Support |
| MeidaTek | Proposal 2.4-3: Support the proposal.Proposal 2.4-4: Support. |
| CMCC | Support all the proposals |
| CATT | We are OK with all the proposals. |
| Ericsson | 2.4-2rev1: Support2.4-3: Support2.4-4: Support |
| Samsung | OK |
| Moderator | Thanks for the comments. I will provide more updates for all the proposals after the GTW session, but regarding **Proposal 2.4-4**, based on the comments Proposal 2.4-4rev1 The following agreements for RRC\_CONECTED Ues also apply for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states, with the following updates:  Agreement:  For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH:   * The maximum number of layers can be provided by *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value is defined.   + FFS the default value. * The maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR;   + FFS: if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, a value determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast in the active DL BWP is used; if the *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast is not configured, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16). * xOverhead can be provided in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value of zero is used. * The number of PRBs is determined based on the size of CFR.   Agreement:  For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH, the default value of the maximum number of layers is 1 if *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR is not configured.  Agreement:  For determination of maximum modulation order for LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH,   * if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).   For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH for broadcast reception:   * the maximum number of layers is 1 * the maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for broadcast. * If *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* is not configured in CFR for broadcast, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | 2.4-1: We think default A can be used for all multiplexing modes2.4-2rev1: ok2.4-3: ok. But if the CFR for MTCH is different from that for MCCH, maybe it can be configured on MCCH. 2.4-4: ok |
| Moderator | Proposal 2.4-3 has been agreed as below in the GTW 15 Nov. **Agreement**  For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues:   * The CFR frequency resources used for MCCH and MTCH are configured by SIBx; * PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH is configured by SIBx * PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH is configured by MCCH. If the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for MTCH is not configured, the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH configured by SIBx is reused for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   On **Proposal 2.4-1**:  ZTE has provided more clarifications. It has been clarified that with the previous version, more flexibility is provided when a SS other than SS#0 is configured with a default table A where default table B has limited flexibility. It seems a reasonable request and FL would like to check with further clarifications provided by ZTE whether Proposal 2.4-1 (first version) is acceptable.  On **Proposal 2.4-2**  There have been comments on whether for Case A and case C, these parameters can be derived from the configurations of CORESET#0 and SIB1. It is also recognised in multiple comments that a unified configuration approach is also desirable. Hence, a note in a revised version of proposal 2.4-2 tries to accommodate the comments on Case A and Case C.  On **Proposal 2.4-4**:  As per the previous comment a revision has been made including ZTE’s clarifications to make the wording more clear. This also should address Nokia’s comments on the maximum number of layers for MIMO.  **On discussion at GTW on different bandwidth configurations for MCCH and MTCH**.  As discussed at the GTW, a new proposal is put forward to seek comments on whether it would be acceptable to have different BW configurations for MCCH and MTCH in Proposal 2.4-5 [NEW]. |

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

#### Proposal 2.4-1

Adding the following PDSCH TDRA table determination rule for broadcast to Table 5.1.2.1.1-1 of TS38.214.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RNTI** | **PDCCH search space** | **SS/PBCH block and CORESET multiplexing pattern** | **pdsch-ConfigCommon includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config-broadcast includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **PDSCH time domain resource allocation to apply** |
| MCCH\_RNTI, G\_RNTI for broadcast | Type-x Common for broadcast | 1 | No | - | No | Default A  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 2 | No | - | No | Default B  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 3 | No | - | No | Default C  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 1,2,3 | No | - | No | Default A  (if SearchSpaceZero is NOT configured) |
| 1,2,3 | Yes | - | No | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-ConfigCommon |
| 1,2,3 | No/Yes | - | Yes | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-Config-broadcast |

#### Proposal 2.4-2rev2

~~For Case D/E (if supported),~~ the definition of the broadcast BWP/CFR frequency resources reuses 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.

* Note: for Case A and Case C, the above parameters (Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and *locationAndBandwidth*) can be derived from the configurations in MIB and SIB1, respectively.

#### Proposal 2.4-4rev1

The following agreements for RRC\_CONECTED Ues also apply for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states, with the following updates:

Agreement:

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH:

* The maximum number of layers can be provided by *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value is defined.
  + FFS the default value.
* The maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR;
  + FFS: if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, a value determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast in the active DL BWP is used; if the *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast is not configured, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).
* xOverhead can be provided in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value of zero is used.
* The number of PRBs is determined based on the size of CFR.

Agreement:

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH, the default value of the maximum number of layers is 1 if *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR is not configured.

Agreement:

For determination of maximum modulation order for LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH,

* if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH for broadcast reception:

* the maximum number of layers is 1
* the maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for broadcast.
* If *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* is not configured in CFR for broadcast, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used.

#### Proposal 2.4-5 [NEW]

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

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the FL comments above: do you support revised proposals 2.4-1, 2.4-2rev2, 2.4-4rev1 and [NEW] Proposal 2.4-5?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | **Proposal 2.4-5:**  Before the discussion on “different CFRs for MCCH and MTCH” specifically, we may also need to agree on whether there can be “different MTCH CFR for different G-RNTI”  Below agreement is from RRC\_Connected mode UE discussion in AI 8.12.1, where it has been agreed that the CFR can be configured per BWP for multicast. By considering that there can be 4 active BWP configured to a single RRC\_Connected UE, then in total there can be 4 CFR configured to that UE. And from network point of view, it means that there can be multiple CFRs configured for multicast transmission, and with each CFR corresponds to a different multicast services with associated G-RNTI.  Now for idle/inactive UE discussion, based on currently understanding, there can be two BWPs as well, i.e. one CORESET#0 as initial BWP, and the other one CFR/BWP for broadcast service. It is preferred that the same common design as RRC\_Connected mode UE discussion, where **the number of CFRs for broadcast is no more than one per idle/inactive BWP**, i.e. it can be one broadcast service associated with CORESET#0, and the other broadcast service associated with configured (e.g. Case C) CFR/BWP.  **Agreement:** [RAN1#106b-e] The **number of CFRs for multicast is no more than one per dedicated unicast BWP** in Rel-17. |
| NOKIA/NSB2 | Regarding the PDSCH TDRA table, we still prefer Proposal 2.4-1rev1 instead of Proposal 2.4-1. Following the legacy approach as proposed in Proposal 2.4-1rev1, the selection of default A/B/C table is not based on the condition of SS#0 configuration or not. And we prefer to keep the legacy approach.  For the SS configuration other than SS#0, the selection of TDRA table can be always configured via the rows of pdsch-ConfigCommon or pdsch-Config-broadcast, instead of the row proposed by ZTE.  Thus, we think this row in the table of Proposal 2.4-1with “Default A (if SearchSpaceZero is NOT configured)” is not necessarily needed |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.4-1: SupportProposal 2.4-2rev2: SupportProposal 2.4-4rev1: Support Proposal 2.4-5: Support |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | We support all proposals.  But we think if MCCH and MTCH can have different CFRs, it’s better to make the CFR for MCCH is CORESET 0/initial DL BWP if CORESET 0 is configured/not configured. Such configuration for the MCCH specific CFR can make Ues in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE acquire MCCH with no BWP switch, which means the CFR for MCCH is CORESET 0/initial DL BWP even if the CFR for MTCH is bigger than CORESET 0/initial DL BWP.  We suggest to discuss the CFR configuration for MCCH. |
| Vivo | Proposal 2.4-5 [NEW]: support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.4-2rev2: OK. Proposal 2.4-5: Not support. As agreed in AI8.12.1, there is at most one CFR per BWP. We think it is also applied to idle/inactive mode Ues, i.e., same bandwidth/CFR for MCCH and MTCH. |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.4-2rev2:  We are general OK with the proposal with some clarifications:   * In the main bullet, it mentioned “BWP/CFR”, does the “BWP” mean that a BWP rather than a CFR can be configured for broadcast reception? * For the new added note, the intention is to make the main bullet clear by adding the case A and case C. The note may be redundant if the main bullet is already have the meaning of the parameter obtaining method which are from MIB and SIB1, respectively.   Proposal 2.4-4rev1: It is supported to apply the agreements in multicast for broadcast.  But for the new added wording on LBRM/TBS determination, I would like to suggest to agree with it as an independent agreement if it is technically supported. Just to make sure that it is newly made for RRC\_IDLE.  Proposal 2.4-2-x:  For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH for broadcast reception:   * the maximum number of layers is 1 * the maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for broadcast. * If *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* is not configured in CFR for broadcast, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used.   Proposal 2.4-5: Not support.  We thought the agreement during last GTW session is already a compromised result by all companies, and we are confusing that why we re-open the door to discuss about it? Since we already had long time discussion and finally reached an agreement, we would prefer not repeating the argument.  Furthermore, we do not observe any relationship between number of CFR\_IDLE and number of CFR\_CONN, which is to say they are independent and do not impact each other’s design. We do neither observe the relationship between CFR and multicast service with one-to-one mapping, which may result in that up to only 4 multicast services can be supported if there are 4 CFRs. |
| CATT | OK with Proposals 2.4-1, 2.4-2rev2, 2.4-4rev1. Not support Proposal 2.4-5 [NEW]. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.4-1: Not support. We prefer 2.4-1 rev 1. Agree with Nokia, legacy mechanism is sufficient. There is no relationship between the SS and PDSCH allocation. We never have such restriction that only the PDSCH scheduled by a PDCCH transmitted in SS#0 can be use default table B and C. The SS/PBCH block and CORESET multiplexing pattern matters, instead of search space.  Proposal 2.4-4rev1: Support.  Proposal 2.4-5 [NEW]: Not support. There is no need to configure different CFR for MTCH and MCCH. We don’t think the BWP-related comments from Nokia is relevant. It should be noted that a RRC\_CONNECTED UE can only support single active BWP at one time. All the G-RNTI should be configured with each BWP. We don’t think it is possible to use different BWP for different service as it will mandate gNB to switch BWP in order to accommodate different services. It will jeopardize the power saving gain from BWP switching, complicate gNB scheduling and increase delay for each service.  For IDLE/INACTIVE UE, we don’t think we have two BWPs for a UE. It is true only if case E is supported. |
| ZTE | We are ok with all the above proposals including Proposal 2.4-5.  @Nokia, “Default A (if SearchSpaceZero is NOT configured)” actually is used to increase the scheduling flexibility for broadcast if the detailed TDRA for broadcast is not configured. |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2.4-5 [NEW]: Not support. As we agreed that in AI8.12.1, at most one CFR is supported in a dedicated BWP. Actually, there is only one CFR at a same time since only one active BWP is supported in current spec. We think the similar mechanism can be reused for broadcast. |
| LG Electronics | We support all proposals. |
| Qualcomm | Fine with all proposals |
| Ericsson | 2.4-1: OK.  2.4-2rev2: Support  2.4-4rev1: Support  2.4-5: Not support. We see no need to support different bandwidth configurations for MCCH and MTCH |
| Moderator | On **Proposal 2.4-1**:  Based on this round of discussion and past rounds, it seems most companies are fine with either Proposal 2.4-1 or 2.4-1rev1. There are difference of views mainly between 3 companies, where [Nokia, Xiaomi] prefer 2.4-1rev1 (legacy) and [ZTE] who prefers 2.4-1 (to allow for more flexible resource allocation for SS other than SS#0). I understand that the key advantage of 2.4-1 is that if TDRA table is not configured via *pdsch-ConfigCommon* or *pdsch-Config-broadcast* then the default option for SS other than SS#0 uses default table A which provide more flexible scheduling. However, as pointed by Nokia, it should also be possible to configure a TDRA table via *pdsch-ConfigCommon* or *pdsch-Config-broadcast* with more flexible scheduling. One comment from Xiaomi is that there is no relationship between the SS and the PDSCH allocation. This comment is discussed in ZTE’s contribution: “*Regarding the default TDRA tables, default table B and C are designed specifically for SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern 2 and 3, respectively. For multiplexing pattern 2 or 3, paging/OSI transmission will be FDMed with the corresponding SSB. Then, the time domain resource allocation of paging/OSI PDSCH will be limited by its associated SSB*.” It seems both alternatives would work. It would be good to check whether based on this discussion comments from Xiaomi and Nokia have been addressed or whether there are more comments.  On **Proposal 2.4-2rev2**   * Support [NTT DOCOMO, Lenovo, CATT, Ericsson] * Clarifications [OPPO]   @OPPO: thanks for good question. Regarding your first question, we have not yet decided for neither of Case A nor Case C the relationship between CFR and a BWP. The proposal is general to accommodate the different point still under discussion, taking into account that CFR down-selection is very controversial and we never know when/if we would get a resolution on the CFR controversial discussion. Do you have any other suggestion to improve the proposal? (thanks!)  Regarding your second point, the note is to clearly single out Case A and Case C which may derive the values from MIB, SIB1. However, for other cases of under discussion Case D and Case E the note would not apply but the main point would be more relevant. Again, we are working with the limitations on our slow progress on the discussion on down-selection of case D/E. Does this clarify?  On **Proposal 2.4-4rev1**  This proposal has been placed under stable proposal for email agreement. So far, comments from OPPO/Ericsson have been clarified. Thank you for your constructive approach.  No other concerns have been raised for this proposal.  On **Proposal 2.4-5**  There has been a comment on Nokia requesting comments on whether the CFR can be configured per RNTI where the CFR for one RNTI could be configured with different frequency resources to the CFR frequency resources of a different RNTI. This would be limited to the number of BWPs configured for idle/inactive Ues which would follow similar agreement to multicast AI. Please comment on this aspect raised by Nokia. |

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

#### Proposal 2.4-1

Adding the following PDSCH TDRA table determination rule for broadcast to Table 5.1.2.1.1-1 of TS38.214.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RNTI** | **PDCCH search space** | **SS/PBCH block and CORESET multiplexing pattern** | **pdsch-ConfigCommon includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config-broadcast includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **PDSCH time domain resource allocation to apply** |
| MCCH\_RNTI, G\_RNTI for broadcast | Type-x Common for broadcast | 1 | No | - | No | Default A  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 2 | No | - | No | Default B  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 3 | No | - | No | Default C  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 1,2,3 | No | - | No | Default A  (if SearchSpaceZero is NOT configured) |
| 1,2,3 | Yes | - | No | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-ConfigCommon |
| 1,2,3 | No/Yes | - | Yes | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-Config-broadcast |

#### Proposal 2.4-2rev2

~~For Case D/E (if supported),~~ the definition of the broadcast BWP/CFR frequency resources reuses 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.

* Note: for Case A and Case C, the above parameters (Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and *locationAndBandwidth*) can be derived from the configurations in MIB and SIB1, respectively.

#### Proposal 2.4-4rev1 [for email approval]

The following agreements for RRC\_CONECTED Ues also apply for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states, with the following updates:

Agreement:

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH:

* The maximum number of layers can be provided by *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value is defined.
  + FFS the default value.
* The maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR;
  + FFS: if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, a value determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast in the active DL BWP is used; if the *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast is not configured, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).
* xOverhead can be provided in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value of zero is used.
* The number of PRBs is determined based on the size of CFR.

Agreement:

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH, the default value of the maximum number of layers is 1 if *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR is not configured.

Agreement:

For determination of maximum modulation order for LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH,

* if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH for broadcast reception:

* the maximum number of layers is 1
* the maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for broadcast.
* If *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* is not configured in CFR for broadcast, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used.

#### Proposal 2.4-5 [more comments needed]

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

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

1. **do you support proposals 2.4-1, 2.4-2rev2?**
2. **Proposal 2.4-4rev1 is placed for potential email approval, please share if you have concerns asap**
3. **Provide your further views on Proposal 2.4-5 and the question regarding whether the CFR can be configured per RNTI where the CFR for one RNTI could be configured with different frequency resources to the CFR frequency resources of a different RNTI?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | Fine with all the proposals. |
| Nokia/Nsb | We support Proposal 2.4-1rev1, which is similar to the legacy approach, and working without a technical issue. **@ZTE:** Thanks for your intention explanation of the proposal, and we fully understand it is necessary to have such scheduling flexibility, but the way of such configuration, when SS is different SS#0, should always be there via either *pdsch-ConfigCommon* or *pdsch-Config-broadcast*. Therefore, such adding row (“if the detailed TDRA for broadcast is not configured”) in the table is not needed and can be avoided. Proposal 2.4-2rev2: Support **Proposal 2.4-5: Our query is, should we have the agreement about “the number of CFRs for broadcast is not more than one per idle/inactive BWP?”, which is similar as agreed for UE in connected mode, shown in below, but it was only intended for multicast.  And to our knowledge, this issue has not be widely discussed among companies within idle/inactive AI for broadcast specifically:**  **Agreement:** [RAN1#106b-e] The **number of CFRs for multicast is no more than one per dedicated unicast BWP** in Rel-17.  **@Xiaomi, MediaTek, ALL:** Thanks for your comments from Xiaomi and MediaTek, and we do agree that there should be a ‘single active BWP/CFR’ for RRC idle/inactive Ues at a time, as legacy approach. However from network point of view, there may have different Ues interested at different broadcast services at a time, e.g. UE-1 interested at (low data rate) broadcast service-1 that is associated with CFR Case A (CORESET#0), and the other UE-2 interested at (high data rate) broadcast service-2 that is associated with configured CFR Case C.  And please noted that for each UE-1 and UE-2, there will be a single active CFR at a time from UE point of view, i.e. the Case A CFR for UE-1, and Case C CFR for UE-2.  Specifically for UE-1, who is only interested at (low data rate) broadcast service-1, it could only need to be with narrow band Case A CFR, and it is benefit for UE-1’s power saving, as well as it is benefit the operation of other Redcap Ues, i.e. if the (low data rate) broadcast service-1 is only catering for Redcap Ues with only narrow band UE capability.  Thus, from network point of view, there can be different CFRs configured for different broadcast services, and targeting for different UE’s interests. And it is restrictive to allocate all broadcast services to the same configured CFR. But again, from UE point of view, there is always a single active CFR/BWP at a time. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2.4-2: we are not clear about what is the broadcast BWP. Would one new BWP be defined/configured for broadcast reception? In our understanding, CFR is enough. |
| ZTE | @Nokia, it seems companies agree that the current proposal 2.4-1 has better flexibility than the previous Proposal 2.4-1rev1. The issue is whether we need to support this flexibility now. From perspective, the discussion is to allow a reasonable default TDRA table for broadcast. Of course companies can configure whatever they want by pdsch-Config-broadcast. Then we don’t need to discuss the whole default table at all. However, if we are going to discuss the default table with the goal of reducing RRC overhead, the default table should be reasonable. As we have clarified previously, the default B/C TDRA table is too limited for broadcast transmission since they are mainly L=2/4. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.4-2rev2: The main intention is to define the CFR for broadcast. Since the broadcast BWP is still unclear, as mentioned by Spreadtrum, maybe we need to remove “BWP” in the bullet to avoid any ambiguity.Proposal 2.4-2rev2 ~~For Case D/E (if supported),~~ the definition of the broadcast CFR frequency resources reuses 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.   * Note: for Case A and Case C, the above parameters (Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and *locationAndBandwidth*) can be derived from the configurations in MIB and SIB1, respectively.   Proposal 2.4-5: Not support. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.4-1: don’t support. We know default table B/C is used for different SSB/PDSCH multiplexing pattern. As I said, there is never a restriction on the SS when gNB schedule a PDSCH. Only SS/PBCH block and CORESET multiplexing pattern matters, the SS doesn’t matter at all. There is no scheduling flexibility issue as gNB already have power to additionally configure a TDRA list. We don’t understand why RRC signalling overhead is a concern here. If flexibility is really a concern, the best way for gNB is to configure a TDRA table list as it wants. Proposal 2.4-2rev2: support Lenovo’s update. Proposal 2.4-5: From the explanation from Nokia, I understand the intention. However, how can gNB knows the power saving interests for different RRC IDLE/INACTIVE Ues? We would like to hear more clarifications. |
| OPPO | [OPPO2]  Proposal 2.4-1: Not support.  We share the similar view with Xiaomi. To our understanding, there should be no restriction on the utilization of default table B and C. There is neither a connection between SS and PDSCH allocation. We do not observe the limitation of current mechanism, and extra flexibility is not necessary for basic functionality of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE MBS services.  Proposal 2.4-2rev2: thanks moderator for the clarification.  For the terminology, maybe only call it “CFR” rather than “BWP/CFR” is proper. So we are OK with the suggested update by Lenovo.  For the note, it is clear now and thanks for the further explanation.  Proposal 2.4-5: Not support.  CFR configured based on per G-RNTI results in multiple CFRs for broadcast transmission/reception. For the Ues who are interested in multiple services have to maintain multiple CFRs as well as multiple CFR configurations. We do not observe the mentioned benefit which may need more clarification. |
| Nokia/Nsb2 | @OPPO: Regarding your concern, from network perspective, it is true that the CFR configured based on per G-RNTI results in multiple CFRs for broadcast transmission/reception. But for the Ues who are interested in multiple services, the largest configured CFR could always be applied by the Ues, and there is no need to have multiple CFRs maintained by the Ues.  @Xiaomi: For instance, the network could configure the CFR, i.e. either Case A and Case C, based on the required data rate of broadcast services. And by receiving the corresponding configuration, the broadcast services interested by the RRC idle/inactive Ues can be received respectively. |
| Vivo | Proposal 2.4-1: Not ok. Additional flexibility to be provided by default table is not necessary. In our understanding, the legacy rule for OSI with type 0A CSS is enough for transmitting MCCH. For MTCH, if packet with large size is required, for flexible scheduling, TDRA table can be configured via *pdsch-Config-broadcast in MCCH,* and thus modification to the legacy rule is not necessary. Please note that *pdsch-Config-broadcast* in MCCHdoesn’t involve additional system signalling.Proposal 2.4-1rev1 in 2nd round FL proposal is ok for us **Proposal 2.4-5**: ok |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.4-1: SupportProposal 2.4-2rev2: SupportProposal 2.4-5: Support |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2.4-5: Not Support. @Nokia, we think one CFR is sufficient for broadcast. I am confused about your comments that “And please noted that for each UE-1 and UE-2, there will be a single active CFR at a time from UE point of view, i.e. the Case A CFR for UE-1, and Case C CFR for UE-2. ”, do you mean that different UE have different CFR for broadcast? In current proposal, we understand that it means different CFR is used for MTCH and MCCH for one UE, if the MCCH and MTCH is overlapped in time domain, it will exist two CFRs in the same slot, which is not preferred. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ok |
| Ericsson | Proposal 2.4-1: SupportProposal 2.4-2rev2: SupportProposal 2.4-5: Not support. Enough with one bandwidth configuration. Assuming no dynamic BWP switching (with UE dynamically changing frequency window), we do not see the gain of supporting separate bandwidth configurations for MCCH and MTCH. |
| Nokia/Nsb3 | @MediaTek: Regarding “do you mean that different UE have different CFR for broadcast?”, yes, different broadcast services can be associated with different CFRs, thus different Ues can have different CFR for different broadcast services reception that is interested. And from UE perspective, at a certain slot, the largest configured CFR can be always applied, meaning that single CFR in a slot. |
| Moderator | For the GTW3 on 17 Nov my proposal would be to discuss the following proposals **Proposal 2.4-1 and Proposal 2.4-2rev3**.  For Proposal 2.4-1, most companies are fine with the two versions of the proposal, although there is a difference of view between a few companies. Let’s start with the Proposal 2.4-1 and try to converge at the GTW.  For Proposal 2.4-2 I propose that we incorporate the change proposed by Lenovo and supported by other companies as follows. (@lenovo, I have removed another BWP instance below) Proposal 2.4-2rev3 ~~For Case D/E (if supported),~~ the definition of the broadcast ~~BWP/~~CFR frequency resources reuses 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.   * Note: for Case A and Case C, the above parameters (Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and *locationAndBandwidth*) can be derived from the configurations in MIB and SIB1, respectively. |
| MediaTek2 | @Nokia: Thanks for your clarification. We have the following comments:  * From my understanding, the current proposal means that different CFR can be configured for the same UE’s MCCH and MTCH, and it does not mean that “different Ues can have different CFR for different broadcast services reception” as you confirmed. If my understanding is not right, please correct me. * Besides, we have agreed that “The CFR frequency resources used for MCCH and MTCH are configured by SIBx”. However, the SIBx is common to all UE not for dedicated UE. Thus, it is not reasonable to configure the different CFR for different UE. * Finally, considering the limited meeting time and fast commercial deployment for MBS feature, we think the current CFR mechanism can work for UE receiving broadcast. Do you think the MBS broadcast will not work if the proposal is not achieved? |
| Nokia/Nsb4 | @MediaTek:  * Right, your understanding is correct regarding “different Ues can have different CFR for different broadcast services reception” * Right, the current agreement for CFR configuration of MCCH and MTCH via SIBx is one way. However, our question is that shall the configured MTCH CFR in SIBx associated with all broadcast services or it can be that the configured MTCH CFR in SIBx associated with some broadcast services? If the configured MTCH CFR in SIBx can be associated with some broadcast services, then it can be that different UE interested at different broadcast services will have different CFR being configured. * To our view, the issue/question mentioned in the above 2nd bullet need to be clarified. So far, it is un-clear for us on how the MTCH CFR is associated with different broadcast services. It is worthwhile to be discussed among companies with consensus. |
| Moderator | **Agreement**  Adding the following PDSCH TDRA table determination rule for broadcast to Table 5.1.2.1.1-1 of TS38.214.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **RNTI** | **PDCCH search space** | **SS/PBCH block and CORESET multiplexing pattern** | **pdsch-ConfigCommon includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config-broadcast includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **PDSCH time domain resource allocation to apply** | | MCCH\_RNTI, G\_RNTI for broadcast | Type-x Common for broadcast | 1 | No | - | - | Default A | | 2 | No | - | - | Default B | | 3 | No | - | - | Default C | |  |  |  |  |  | | 1,2,3 | Yes | - | No | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-ConfigCommon | | 1,2,3 | No/Yes | - | Yes | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-Config-broadcast |   **Agreement**  The definition of the broadcast CFR frequency resources reuses 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 CFR with respect to the carrier starting RB.   * Note: for Case A and Case C, the above parameters (Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and *locationAndBandwidth*) can be derived from the configurations in MIB and SIB1, respectively. |
| Moderator | Please note that **Proposal 2.4-4rev1** has been under email approval for more than 30h with no concerns. This proposal is moved to Section 4 [stable proposals for email approval].  The last Proposal for discussion in this Issue is **Proposal 2.4-5**.  There has been good discussion on this. One point I would like to make is that my understanding is that RAN2 has agreed that a single MCCH is supported for Rel-17. Hence, my understanding is that based on the current agreements (frequency range of the CFR can be the same for MCCH and MTCH) it forces that even for different G-RNTIs there would be only one CFR. Is this understanding correct? To allow different G-RNTIs with different frequency ranges of the CFR, we would need to allow that MCCH and MTCH can have different frequency ranges (or bandwidth configurations) of the CFR as per proposal 2.4-5. Is this common understanding? |

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

#### Proposal 2.4-5 [more comments needed]

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

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Considering the discussion and FL comments above:**

1. **Provide your further views on Proposal 2.4-5 and the question regarding whether the CFR can be configured per RNTI where the CFR for one RNTI could be configured with different frequency resources to the CFR frequency resources of a different RNTI?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | **Proposal 2.4-5: Support**  @FL: to our understanding, the previous agreement did not mean it forces the CFR of MCCH and MTCH to be the same, it is just one configuration option with other alternative still open. With one agreement to force the door close to other alternatives is not something we preferred in this email thread discussion, for the sake of moving forward of the discussion.  And your understanding is correct, different broadcast services associated with different CFR configuration may require the MCCH and MTCH in different CFR. And that’s why we also proposed the issue on how to handle the CFR configuration for different broadcast services, shall all the broadcast services in the same configured CFR or it can be configured in different CFR. |
| Vivo | In general, we are ok to configure CFR per G-RNTI if there is a need. |
| Xiaomi | No. We don’t support configuring different CFR for different service/G-RNTI. One single CFR is sufficient.  Regarding the following clarifications from Nokia ‘*For instance, the network could configure the CFR, i.e. either Case A and Case C, based on the required data rate of broadcast services. And by receiving the corresponding configuration, the broadcast services interested by the RRC idle/inactive Ues can be received respectively.*’, we are not convinced.  A UE typically support different service type. In the end, a UE needs to receive data from multiple CFRs. The claimed benefits from power saving doesn’t exist. It is equivalent to have a single CFR with a frequency range covers several small CFR. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Don’t support.  We support at most one CFR per BWP to maximize the commonality between IDLE mode and Connected mode. We think configuring CFR per G-RNTI is more useful for connected mode than idle mode. |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.4-5: Not support.  For this proposal, we think there are still some issues that need more clarifications.  The motivation to support different CFRs in IDLE is not clear. Since one CFR configuration for broadcast reception as the basic functionality can work well without any issue, there is no necessary to introduce this optimization design. Considering about power saving and RedCap Ues, firstly we do not observe extra power consumption by using current CFR mechanism, i.e. case A and case C agreed by now, and the bandwidth of the two cases are also configurable. Second, we think power saving and RedCap UE is totally out of Rel-17 MBS scope. Furthermore, configuring multiple CFR for broadcast transmission may cause CFR switching/transition when UE need to change reception from small CFR to a larger CFR. |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.4-5: Not support.  We don’t see the motivation to configure more than one CFRs for IDLE/IANCTVE Ues, considering the broadcast services are with low QoS and a proper CFR can be used to schedule multiple broadcast services. 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/CFR switching. |
| CATT | Share the same views with Xiaomi/ Lenovo/ OPPO/CMCC that different bandwidth configurations are not supported. We did not see how it saves power when multiple CFR are configured. |
| Spreadtrum | Not support. At least one CFR is enough for basic functionality of MBS in idle state, and more spec work are needed if supporting multiple CFRs. |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2.4-5: Not support.  @ Nokia  Please not that RAN2 has achieved the following agreements as following:   |  | | --- | | * one-to-many mapping between G-RNTI and MBS sessions is supported and it is assumed that this does not introduce additional specification work. |   According to the agreement we can see that the multiple MBS is associated with one G-RNTI. Thus, one CFR is sufficient for multiple broadcast services. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support.  Disagree with MediaTek’s view that RAN2’s agreement leads to one G-RNTI/CFR being sufficient.  At least Case A and Case C have been supported with one smaller and one larger bandwidth. It is also nature and common understanding that MCCH carrying configuration of MTCH is supposed to be in demand of smaller bandwidth but MTCH as to carry traffic normally requires larger bandwidth. In addition, if MCCH does not carry the MTCH which UE is interested in, UE may not receive MTCH at all but only need to check MCCH. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Not support.  Agree with Xiaomi/OPPO/Spreadtrum/CMCC/CATT/MediaTek. If different bandwidth is required for MCCH and MTCH, then the single CFR configuration can be determined according to the larger bandwidth of MTCH. No power saving gain is achieved if a smaller bandwidth is configured for MCCH and a lager bandwidth is configured for MTCH. |
| Ericsson | Not support. We agree with the Moderator that the default situation is that the same CFR frequency range is used for MCCH and MTCH. We do not see the need for having different CFR frequency ranges for MCCH and MTCH. |
| LG Electronics | We support Proposal 2.4-5.  In addition, we think that the CFR could be associated with one or more RNTIs. UE may configure different CFRs for different RNTIs on different frequency resources, at least on different cells, considering the following RAN2 agreements:   * From RAN2 point of view, the UE may receive MBS broadcast service from SCell in intra-PLMN case and if supported this may be a separate UE capability. Send an LS to RAN1 to ask to check the feasibility of MBS broadcast reception on SCell. * If supported by the UE implementation, the idle/inactive UE may receive MBS broadcast service from non-serving cell (no network impact). * From RAN2 point of view, the connected UE may if supported receive MBS broadcast service from non-serving cell in intra-PLMN case, under the condition this does not have any impact to operation on serving cell(s). This may be a separate UE capability. Send an LS to RAN1 to ask to check the feasibility. |
| Qualcomm | We think it is beneficial to consider a larger BW for the MTCH with high data rate broadcast transmission. We support Proposal 2.4-5 with this clarified. Proposal 2.4-5 [more comments needed] For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues can use different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH, where the bandwidth of the MCCH CFR is confined within that of MTCH CFR. |
| Moderator | Thanks for discussion.  @Nokia: thanks for the comment. Apologies, what I meant was the following: I was understanding your comment that with the current agreements (not including Proposal 2.4-5) it may be possible to have different G-RNTIs where while both MCCH and MTCH would have the same bandwidth of CFR, the bandwidth configurations could be different between different pairs of MCCH/MTCH with different RNTI, e.g., MCCH1/MTCH1 with CFR1 and MCCH2/MTCH2 with CFR2 where CFR1 is CORESET#0 and CFR2 is Case C. However, my comment was trying to say that, since RAN2 has agreed a single MCCH (and with the current agreements), the bandwidth configuration of MCCH would limit the possibility to have different bandwidth configurations for different RNTIs. (may be “forcing” was not well chosen but better would “limit”). And then my point was that to be able to have different CFR bandwidth configurations per RNTI we would then need to agree in Proposal 2.4-5. Hope makes sense.   * Support [Nokia, vivo, Huawei, LG, Qualcomm] * do not support [Xiaomi, Lenovo, OPPO, CMCC, CATT, Spreadtrum, MediaTek, Ericsson]   Multiple companies do not support Proposal 2.4-5. With the limited time left for the meeting, it does not seem possible to converge. The FL proposes to deprioritise this discussion. |
| Nokia/Nsb | @FL: Many Thanks for your comments and feedback regarding Proposal 2.4-5, your understanding is correct, and that exactly our point that we do see the benefits of having different CFR bandwidth configurations per RNTI, therefore it is sensible from our side to agree of Proposal 2.4-5. And similarly, if we could not reach the agreement of Proposal 2.4-5 in RAN1, we prefer to capture it in the LS to RAN2 as stated in Proposal 2.6-1  ok |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | ok |

## [UPDATE] Issue 5: 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, RAN1#106-e and RAN1#106bis-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.   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:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues for broadcast reception, MTCH scheduling is associated with a window defined by the MTCH monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity   * FFS: the window is associated to one or multiple or all G-RNTI.     Agreement:  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 MTCH transmission 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. |

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 [R1-2110779, Huawei]
  + *Discuss*: In addition, an offset should be defined to determine the starting of the window, and it should not be replaced by the parameters defined for DRX because of the offset for beam sweeping window should be independent from DRX configurations.
  + *Discuss*: In our opinion, since the SSB is associated with the PDCCH monitoring occasions in search space, and the GC-PDCCHs scrambled by different G-RNTI may use different search spaces, the window should be associated to one G-RNTI.
  + Proposal 8: The MTCH transmission window is associated to one G-RNTI.
  + Proposal 9: An offset to the starting of the MTCH transmission window should be defined, e.g., :
    - the PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) in slot in the frame is given by , where is the number of slots in a radio frame.
* In [R1-2110897, TD Tech]
  + Proposal 12: For a CSS for MCCH other than search space 0, the mapping between GC-PDCCH occasions and SSB beams within each transmission window of MCCH is defined as:
    - The GC-PDCCH occasions within each transmission window are numbered in sequence with index 0 for the first GC-PDCCH occasion.
    - The GC-PDCCH occasion with index k=(N\*x+n) is associated with SSB beam n, where n=0,…,N-1, N is the number of the SSB beams, SSB beam n is for SSB index n, x=0,…,INT[L/N]-1, and L is the number of the GC-PDCCH occasions in each transmission window.
  + Proposal 13: For a CSS for MTCH other than search space 0, the mapping between GC-PDCCH occasions and SSB beams within each monitoring period of the CSS is defined as:
    - The GC-PDCCH occasions within each monitoring period are numbered in sequence with index 0 for the first GC-PDCCH occasion.
    - The GC-PDCCH occasion with index k=(N\*x+n) is associated with SSB beam n, where n=0,…,N-1, N is the number of the SSB beams, SSB beam n is for SSB index n, x=0,…,INT[L1/N]-1, and L1 is the number of the GC-PDCCH occasions in each monitoring period.
* In [R1-2111137, Nokia]
  + 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.
  + *Discuss*: To our understanding, the configured MTCH scheduling window corresponds to the broadcast DRX pattern, where the corresponding parameters, i.e. *onDuration* (periodicity) and *SlotOffset* (starting of the periodicity) have already been agreed and defined in RAN2-115-e meeting, as shown in below. And correspondingly, the MTCH scheduling window is configured per G-RNTI, and practically a MTCH scheduling window can be configured by gNB to be associated with multiple G-RNTI.
  + Proposal-23: The configured MTCH scheduling window corresponds to the broadcast DRX pattern, as already been agreed in RAN2.
  + Proposal-24: The MTCH scheduling window is configured per G-RNTI, and practically a MTCH scheduling window can be configured by gNB to be associated with multiple G-RNTI.
  + Proposal-25: 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-26: 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-27: Allow the network to control the number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the on-duration window.
* In [R1-2111232, CATT]
  + Proposal 7: In NR MBS system, PDCCH Mos in one MBS-window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive MO should be considered.
  + Proposal 8: The MTCH scheduling window can be associated with one or multiple or all G-RNTI.
* In [R1-2111305, OPPO]
  + *Discuss*: First, whether multiple MTCH windows can be overlapped in time domain should be discussed. If multiple MTCH windows can be overlapped, and each window is associated with one G-RNTI, then it may work normally, but it increases the complexity. Within a MTCH window, if different G-RNTIs are associated with different MTCH TDM, it technically works. However, it still needs discussion that whether G-RNTI should be associated with MTCH window or they are two independent scheduling components. From the perspective of system and simple scheduling mechanism, a MTCH window associated with one G-RNTI is preferred for broadcast MBS services in this release.
  + Proposal 11: One MTCH window is associated with one G-RNTI.
* In [R1-2111551, Xiaomi]
  + Proposal 10: The association between the PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSB within the MCCH scheduling window is same as that of MTCH scheduling window.
  + *Discuss*: One open issue is how to define the association between the scheduling window and G-RNTI, considering more than one G-RNTI can be configured for a MBS UE. From UE complexity point of view, there is no additional burden for a UE tries to decode a DCI with different RNTI assumptions. On the other hand, gNB can configure multiple search spaces in a single monitoring occasion if different services may collide in time domain. Hence we have the following proposal:
  + Proposal 11: A MTCH scheduling window is associated with all G-RNTIs configured by gNB.
* In [R1-2112065, LGE]
  + *Discuss*: For scheduling of OSI in NR, different SI messages can be scheduled in different SI windows with different scheduling parameters e.g. different SI periodicities. Multiple SIBs having a same SI periodicity can be scheduled in a same SI message while different SIBs having different SI periodicities can be separately scheduled in different SI messages. With such basic principle of scheduling OSI, we think that group common transmissions for different G-RNTIs with different traffic patterns can be scheduled in different transmission windows, while Group common transmissions for different G-RNTIs with similar traffic pattern can be scheduled in same transmission windows.
  + Observation 3: Different SI messages can be scheduled in different SI windows with different scheduling parameters e.g. different SI periodicities.
  + Proposal 3A: Group common transmissions for different G-RNTIs with different traffic patterns or even for different SFN areas 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 3B: Group common transmissions for different G-RNTIs with similar traffic pattern can be scheduled in same transmission windows. If SFN is used, group common transmissions for different G-RNTIs in the same cell group i.e. the same SFN area can be scheduled in same transmission windows.
  + Observation 4: A certain broadcast service may be available only at a specific local service area within a cell. Besides, if a cell is at the boundary of SFN area, only a limited number of SSBs could participate in the SFN area for one or more services in the cell group in SFN.
  + Proposal 4: For a certain broadcast service, the number of actual transmitted SSBs used to determine PDCCH monitoring occasions within certain transmission windows 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 5: PDCCH monitoring occasions are determined in DRX on-durations for MTCH of a broadcast service for idle/inactive Ues.
* In [R1-2112130, NTT DOCOMO]
  + *Discuss*: An MTCH scheduling window will be useful to limit the duration of the MTCH reception processing. Regarding the association between the scheduling window and G-RNTI, one window for all G-RNTI would be sufficient. Because RAN2 has already agreed that the DRX pattern for broadcast is configured per G-RNTI [5]. Even if there is only one MTCH scheduling window, the ‘on duration’ for each G-RNTI can be configured within the window. We don’t see a clear benefit in defining a different window for each G-RNTI.
  + Proposal 7: An MTCH scheduling window is associated with all G-RNTI.
* In [R1-2112348, Ericsson]
  + *Discuss*: We seek clarification how the MTCH scheduling window is related to the DRX for Multicast MBS that is part of the running CR 38.321 (R2-2108926). The DRX parameters are contained in the MCCH, therefore we assume it is relevant for reception of broadcast in RRC idle/inactive, not only for multicast in RRC connected. MTCH scheduling for broadcast must be done in accordance with the PTM-DRX scheme, which is inherited from the unicast scheme, i.e. using parameters like *onDurationTimer*, *InactivityTimer* and *drx-LongCycle* and *drx-StartOffset*. Any MTCH transmission window would have to coincide with the onDuration of the DRX cycle. We therefore think that parameters like a MTCH transmission window offset and periodicity are not needed.  
    We believe that different MBS services can have different latency requirements and different typical packet interarrival time. In order to avoid that Ues interested in a service with relaxed latency and long interarrivals has to monitor PDCCH as frequently as that may be necessary for other services, we propose the window can be different for different G-RNTI.
  + Proposal 14: The MTCH scheduling is associated with one G-RNTI.
  + Proposal 15: For the purpose of associating PDCCH monitoring occasion for MTCH and SSB, the UE assumes that, in the MTCH scheduling window, if any PDCCH for an MTCH scrambled by G-RNTI is transmitted, then such a PDCCH is transmitted in at least one PDCCH monitoring occasion corresponding to each transmitted SSB.

### **FL Assessment**

* + - 1. ***On configuration of MTCH transmission window***
* *Monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity*

[Huawei] discusses that the configuration of the parameters of the MTCH scheduling window (monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity) should not be determined by the DRX parameters and further provide details on the definition of the parameters. On the other hand, [Nokia, Ericsson, LGE, NTT DOCOMO] discuss/question whether the MTCH scheduling window parameters directly correspond to the DRX parameters defined in RAN2.

This question, whether window parameters are already determined by DRX parameters, was presented for discussion at the last meeting in the FL summary in one of the rounds of discussion for this issue. However, not many companies commented on this aspect. **Question 2.4-1** is put for discussion to collect company comments.

* *Association of window & G-RNTI(s)*

While [Huawei, Nokia, CATT, OPPO, LGE, Ericsson] propose that the window should be associated to one G-RNTI, [CATT, Xiaomi, NTT DOCOMO] proposes that the window should be associated all G-RNTI. [LGE] also proposes that transmissions with different G-RNTIs can be transmitted in the same window.

Based on majority view, **Proposal 2.5-2** tries to agree that the window should be associated with one G-RNTI.

***ii) On clarifications of mapping of PDCCH monitoring occasions to SSBs for MTCH***

[Ericsson] proposes to clarify one of the sub-bullets in one of the previous agreements to avoid forcing the network to transmit PDCCH even if there is no MTCH traffic in a window. **Question 2.4-3** seeks feedback from companies on this proposal.

***iii) Other aspects***

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

[Nokia, CATT, LGE] proposes that additional association rules between SSB indexes and UE MO other than those defined for OSI are considered. These aspects have been discussed as well in previous meeting. In previous meetings multiple companies did not support such approaches as they were not considered essential for this release. The FL therefore proposes to first focus on finishing critical aspects open for beam sweeping. Companies are welcome to provide their views in the table below.

* *Same association between PDCCH MO and SSBs for MCCH and MTCH*

[Xiaomi] proposes that the association between the PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSB within the MCCH scheduling window is same as that of MTCH scheduling window. As per the comment above, the FL proposes to first focus on finishing the critical issues open for beam sweeping. Companies are welcome to provide their views in the table below.

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

#### Question 2.5-1

regarding the parameters of MTCH scheduling window, i.e., monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity.

* Option-1: there is no need to define these parameters since they are already determined by the RAN2 parameters agreed for DRX for NR broadcast.
* Option-2: the configuration of the DRX and the MTCH scheduling window are independent and therefore these parameters need to be defined.

#### Proposal 2.5-2

For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the MTCH scheduling window is associated to one G-RNTI.

#### Question 2.5-3

Provide your views on whether the second sub-bullet of the following agreement made at RAN1#106bis-e:

Agreement:

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 MTCH transmission 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.

Should be updates as follows:

* For the purpose of associating PDCCH monitoring occasion for MTCH and SSB, the UE assumes that, in the MTCH scheduling window, if any PDCCH for an MTCH scrambled by G-RNTI is transmitted, then such a PDCCH is transmitted in at least one PDCCH monitoring occasion corresponding to each transmitted SSB.

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

1. **please provide your views on Questions 2.5-1 and 2.5-3.**
2. **do you agree with Proposal 2.5-2? Please provide your views and reasons.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| LG Electronics | Question 2.5-1 RAN2 recently made agreements as follows:   * *Confirm that the same PTM DRX configuration parameters can be applied to multiple G-RNTIs.* * *Allow RRC signalling to configure the same DRX configuration instance to multiple G-RNTIs.* * *In case mtch-schedulingInfo is absent for a G-RNTI (i.e. no PTM DRX), the UE should monitor for PDCCH scrambled with G-RNTI in any slot according to the search space configured for MTCH.*   Meanwhile, RAN1 agreed that MTCH scheduling is associated with a window defined by the MTCH monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity. RAN1 also agreed to support the association between the PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSB within the MTCH scheduling window. FFS: the window is associated to one or multiple or all G-RNTI.  In our view, the MTCH window is mainly determined for the association between the PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSB. Thus, we would still need the MTCH window defined by the periodicity and the starting of the periodicity. Note that the MTCH scheduling window could be simply changed to ‘MTCH window’, like the existing term SI-window.  Accordingly, both the configuration of the DRX and the MTCH window can be ‘separately’ configured and used for a UE to determine when UE actually receive MTCH. Considering RAN2 agreements, we think that one or more G-RNTIs can be scheduled in a same MTCH window according to DRX configuration(s) of the G-RNTI(s), and if DRX is not configured (i.e. no PTM DRX), UE monitors PDCCH monitoring occasions only based on the MTCH windows for interested G-RNTI(s). Proposal 2.5-2: We think that this proposal is not aligned with what RAN2 recently agreed.  * *Confirm that the same PTM DRX configuration parameters can be applied to multiple G-RNTIs.* * *Allow RRC signalling to configure the same DRX configuration instance to multiple G-RNTIs.*   So, this proposal can be changed to:  ***Proposal 2.5-2:***  *For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the MTCH scheduling window is associated to one or more G-RNTIs based on DRX configuration.* Question 2.5-3: We are OK with this update “if any PDCCH for an MTCH scrambled by G-RNTI is transmitted, then such’ in order to avoid forcing the network to transmit PDCCH even if there is no MTCH traffic in a window. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Question 2.5-1: Option-1 is preferredProposal 2.5-2: Support **To our information and knowledge, the above latest RAN2 agreements quoted by LG is only targeted for multicast, but it is not related to broadcast.** Question 2.5-3: OK for the re-wording to avoid forcing network to send GC-PDCCH if there is nothing to transmit. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Question 2.5-1: We have the similar view with LG. We think the MTCH window is necessary to determine the association between PDCCH MO and SSB.  Proposal 2.5-2: We prefer the modified version by LG. Question 2.5-3: We are fine with the update. |
| Xiaomi | Question 2.5-1: same views as LGE. Proposal 2.5-2: There is no additional UE complexity for UE is MTCH scheduling window is associated to all the G-RNTIs. Even the DRX is configured per G-RNTI, one-to-many mapping between window and G-RNTI works well. Hence we don’t support the proposal.  Question 2.5-3: It depends on what is the answer to question 2.5-1. From our perspective, we don’t see the need to update the previous agreement unless something is broken. We prefer to defer this discussion until we achieve a consensus on question 2.5-3. |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.5-2:** The window can be associated to one/multiple/all G-RNTI based on traffic pattern and/or repetition. There is no need to limit the associated number. Proposal 2.5-3: OK |
| OPPO | Question 2.5-1: Similar view with LG  Proposal 2.5-2: OK Question 2.5-3: We prefer not to change agreements unless it is not working. |
| Samsung | Question 2.5-1) Option 1.  Proposal 2.5-2) Agree Question 2.5-3) It seems not to be needed for the modification. |
| ZTE | Question 2.5-1: From our perspective, this issue is more related to RAN2, we suggest to leave it to RAN2.Proposal 2.5-2: Although we support this proposal, we still think it can be up to RAN2. Question 2.5-3: **OK.** |
| Vivo | Question 2.5-1: option 2 **Proposal 2.5-2**: we don’t see the motivation to associate one MTCH scheduling window to one G-RNTI, as multiple G-RNTIs can use the same search space Question 2.5-3: ok for updates |
| CMCC | Question 2.5-1: Option 1  Proposal 2.5-2: OK Question 2.5-3: Don’t need the update. |
| Ericsson | Question 2.5-1: Neither Option 1, nor Option 2 are OK. More discussion on this is required, which we will provide in a later comment.  Proposal 2.5-2: We agree with LG’s proposed update:  *For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the MTCH scheduling window is associated to one or more G-RNTIs based on DRX configuration.*  Question 2.5-3**:** Support |
| Qualcomm | We think the proposals should be up to RAN2 decision. |
| Intel | **Question 2.5-1:** Option 1  **Proposal 2.5-2:** OK |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Question 2.5-1: option 1Question 2.5-2: not support We think for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the MTCH scheduling window is associated to one CSS for broadcast mode. All MBS sessions with broadcast mode use the same MTCH scheduling window. Question 2.5-3: ok |
| Moderator | Thanks for the comments.  **Question 2.5-1**  regarding the parameters of MTCH scheduling window, i.e., monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity.   * Option-1: there is no need to define these parameters since they are already determined by the RAN2 parameters agreed for DRX for NR broadcast.   + [Nokia, Samsung, CMCC, Intel, TD Tech] (5) * Option-2: the configuration of the DRX and the MTCH scheduling window are independent and therefore these parameters need to be defined.   + [LG, NTT DOCOMO, Xiaomi, OPPO, vivo] (5) * Up to RAN2 [ZTE, Qualcomm] (2)   Given the comments, it is not clear whether the parameters are already determined by the DRX agreements on whether separate configurations need to be defined. 2 companies also think that this discussion is up to RAN2 decision. This can be a way forward given there is no clear view in RAN1 on this. Ericsson is also to provide more comments on this to justify why neither Option 1 not Option 2 are adequate. The FL proposes to get more comments form companies based on the discussion in this round.  **Proposal 2.5-2**:  Although there has been support on the proposal, LG has proposed some changes that have been supported by multiple companies. These are put forward to check if is an acceptable proposal.  **Proposal 2.5-3**  Multiple companies are fine with the update. Some companies believe that there is no strong need for the change. However, no technical concerns have been raised the change. Therefore, the FL puts forward the proposal for agreement to collect company comments. |

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

#### Question 2.5-1 [waiting for more comments]

regarding the parameters of MTCH scheduling window, i.e., monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity.

* Option-1: there is no need to define these parameters since they are already determined by the RAN2 parameters agreed for DRX for NR broadcast.
* Option-2: the configuration of the DRX and the MTCH scheduling window are independent and therefore these parameters need to be defined.

#### Proposal 2.5-2rev1

For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the MTCH scheduling window is associated to one or more G-RNTIs based on DRX configuration.

#### Proposal 2.5-3

The second sub-bullet of the following agreement made at RAN1#106bis-e:

Agreement:

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 MTCH transmission 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.

Is updates as follows:

* For the purpose of associating PDCCH monitoring occasion for MTCH and SSB, the UE assumes that, in the MTCH scheduling window, if any PDCCH for an MTCH scrambled by G-RNTI is transmitted, then such a PDCCH is transmitted in at least one PDCCH monitoring occasion corresponding to each transmitted SSB.

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

1. **please provide your views on Proposals 2.5-2rev1 and 2.5-3.**
2. **Please note that more comments/justification are needed for the discussion on Question 2.5-1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | **Question 2.5-1: We prefer Option-1,** and it could be good if the proponents could clarify why RAN2 DRX agreement with corresponding parameters for broadcast could not work, without defining the “parameters of MTCH scheduling window, i.e., monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity”. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Question 2.5.1: DRX configuration is optional. Without DRX configuration, MTCH window is still needed for beam sweeping mechanism, so the answer is option-2.  2.5-2rv1: similar comment to question 2.5.1, the window should be dependent of DRX configuration. Essentially, it is up to network configuration. If DRX configuration impact is really worth consideration, then the proposal could be more generic as “…, the MTCH scheduling window is associated with one or more G-RNTI based on network configuration”  2.5-3, we don’t see the need to update the previous agreement, the second sub-bullet starts with “for the purpose of associating xx and yy” is supposed to address the concern of “PDCCH may not be actually transmitted”. We should not spend too much effort on this not essential. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Question 2.5-1: Option 1 is not clear to us how to determine the association between PDCCH MO and SSB without those parameters.  Proposal 2.5-2rev1: Support in principle  Proposal 2.5-3: Support |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Question 2.5-1: We support option 2.**  The mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSB is defined for a CSS. Which part of the CSS is applied to an MBS session is determined by the DRX mode of the MBS session. It’s better each DRX period of the DRX mode starts from a PDCCH occasion associated with the first SSB.  The definition of the mapping can benefit the PDCCH monitoring by UE: if UE is covered by an SSB, UE can only monitor PDCCH in the occasions associated with this SSB, which will save the power consumption in UE. Proposal 2.5-2rev1: We don’t agree with the proposal. We think the proposal can be updated as below. The MTCH scheduling window is defined for a CSS instead of defining for one G-RNTI or more G-RNTIs.  For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the MTCH scheduling window is defined for a CSS.  Proposal 2.5-3: Ok |
| vivo | **Question 2.5-1:** ok for up to RAN2  **Proposal 2.5-2rev1:** we are not clear why the G-RNTIs associated to the MTCH scheduling window should be based on DRX configuration, when we are considering the association between PDCCH and SSB. |
| CATT | Proposal 2.5-2rev1: OK Proposal 2.5-3:OK |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.5-2rev1: We still don’t see the necessity of defining different window for different G-RNTI. One window for all G-RNTI is sufficient. If we need to define multiple windows, I am not sure what the relationship among windows is, e.g. the window can be overlapped or not. We understand that different service associated with G-RNTI may have different periodicity. But still, single window is sufficient with taking all the service into account. One example is that the window length is determined by the largest periodicity among services. |
| ZTE | After checking companies’ views above in the last round, it seems companies have different understandings on the RAN2 agreements/conclusion. We still keep our views to let RAN2 to decide this issue. We can include this in the LS under discussion. |
| Qualcomm | We think these should be up to RAN2 discussion/decision. |
| Ericsson | We are OK with the proposals. Regarding question 2.5.1, we think option 2 is the way forward. Proposal 2.5-3 defines the MO to SSB mapping relative to an MTCH window. So as it stands, it seems natural that there is a need for an agreement on an MTCH window definition.  Huawei made a proposal:  ***Proposal 9: An offset to the starting of the MTCH transmission window should be defined, e.g., :***   * ***the PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) in slot in the frame is given by , where is the number of slots in a radio frame.***   It has, however, not become clear to us why the offset *OG-RNTI* and period *KG-RNTI* should be G-RNTI specific nor any guidelines to set those parameters. There also has not been any discussion on the window duration. We therefore assume the intention is to have the duration equal to the period, so the windows would appear front-to-back. Only in this case it is avoided that there are longer gaps in the Mos for MTCH scheduling. Any gaps in the Mos should be avoided because they would require coordination with DRX scheme so that the UEs do not wake up unnecessarily in the gaps.  Due to lack of clarity and motivation of the MTCH transmission window related parameters, we can as well propose the trivial definition:  ***Proposal: An offset to the starting of the MTCH transmission window should be defined:***  This would make the “MTCH window” equal to the window that the SFN can cover (i.e. before it wraps around). |
| Moderator | Thanks for comments.  Regarding **Question 2.5-1** and **Proposal 2.5-2rev1**  As per previous round there are different views on Option 1 and Option 2 which highlight the difference of opinion on the agreements on RAN2. There are multiple companies (3) that suggest that is up to RAN2 the decision on:   * the parameters of MTCH scheduling window (monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity) and * the MTCH scheduling window is associated to one or multiple or all G-RNTIs   This may be the best Way Forward for this discussion. **Proposal 2.5-4 [NEW]** is a way forward on this.  Regarding **Proposal 2.5-3**:  Based on the previous rounds and this round of discussion, there are split views on whether companies are fine with update and whether the change is not needed. Huawei clarifies that the sub bullet of the original proposal addresses the concern of “PDCCH may not be actually transmitted”. If we can confirm that this is common understanding, my proposal would be to **deprioritise proposal 2.5-3**. |

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

#### Proposal 2.5-3 [proposed to deprioritise]

The second sub-bullet of the following agreement made at RAN1#106bis-e:

Agreement:

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 MTCH transmission 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.

Is updates as follows:

* For the purpose of associating PDCCH monitoring occasion for MTCH and SSB, the UE assumes that, in the MTCH scheduling window, if any PDCCH for an MTCH scrambled by G-RNTI is transmitted, then such a PDCCH is transmitted in at least one PDCCH monitoring occasion corresponding to each transmitted SSB.

#### Proposal 2.5-4 [NEW]

(**conclusion**)

Is up to RAN2 decision:

* the definition of the MTCH scheduling window parameters: monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity:
* whether the MTCH scheduling window is associated to one or multiple or all G-RNTIs

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

1. **please provide your views on Proposals 2.5-4 [NEW].**
2. **Please note that for Proposal 2.5-3, it is proposed to be deprioritised.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | **Proposals 2.5-4:** Considering the discussion situation, we support to bring this discussion to RAN2.  Considering the following agreement made by RAN2 in RAN2#116-e meeting,   * Confirm that the same PTM DRX configuration parameters can be applied to multiple G-RNTIs.   We think the same MTCH scheduling window can be associated to multiple G-RNTIs, but we also want to listen the accurate response from RAN2. |
| Nokia/Nsb | Proposal 2.5-4 [NEW]: Support **Proposal 2.5-3: Support to deprioritize** |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.5-4 [NEW]: Support |
| Xiaomi | OK |
| vivo | Proposal 2.5-4 [NEW]: Support |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 2.5-4: We think that RAN1 can agree that the MTCH scheduling window is associated to one or multiple or all G-RNTIs. However, if RAN1 cannot conclude, it is also fine to defer this to RAN2. |
| CATT | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.5-4: Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 2.5-4, the first sub-bullet I guess the intention was to say the configuration instead of definition. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 2.5-4: Support |
| Moderator | If there is time, we could discuss this proposal at GTWProposal 2.5-4rev1 (**conclusion**)  Is up to RAN2 decision:   * the ~~definition~~ configuration of the MTCH scheduling window parameters: monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity: * whether the MTCH scheduling window is associated to one or multiple or all G-RNTIs |
| Moderator | **On Proposal 2.5-3:**  Based on the discussion on previous rounds and this round, FL does not recommend pursuing this proposal for the rest of the meeting.  **On Proposal 2.5-4**:  It seems leaving the discussion to RAN2 has very good support, I have included the modification from Huawei in the proposal and propose to agree this. |
|  |  |

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

#### Proposal 2.5-4rev1

(**conclusion**)

Is up to RAN2 decision:

* the ~~definition~~ configuration of the MTCH scheduling window parameters: monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity:
* whether the MTCH scheduling window is associated to one or multiple or all G-RNTIs

**Please provide your comments in the table below. Considering the FL assessment above, do you support Proposal 2.5-4rev1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | Proposal 2.5-4rev1: Support, it ups to RAN2 |
| vivo | Support the conclusion |
| Xiaomi | ok |
| OPPO | OK |
| CMCC | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| CATT | OK |
| ZTE | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ok with this conclusion. With this, we may need to send LS to RAN2 and let them know it. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| LG Electronics | OK |
| Qualcomm | Ok to send LS to RAN2 |
| Moderator | @Huawei, Qualcomm: thanks for the suggestion. I have included a note in the proposal to send an LS to RAN2. This proposal is therefore proposed for email approval before the end of the meeting. |
|  |  |

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

#### Proposal 2.5-4rev2 [stable for email approval]

(**conclusion**)

Is up to RAN2 decision:

* the ~~definition~~ configuration of the MTCH scheduling window parameters: monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity:
* whether the MTCH scheduling window is associated to one or multiple or all G-RNTIs
* Send an LS to RAN2 to inform about RAN1 conclusion.

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

1. **do you have concerns with approving by email Proposal 2.5-4rev2, please share your concerns asap?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | OK |
| CATT | OK |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | It’s better to discuss the related question in RAN1. How to ensure the performance of an MBS session is up to RAN1. The beam sweeping method is more related to the performance of an MBS session. But if most companies think the question is up to RAN2, we agree. |

## [UPDATE] Issue 6: Definition and 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 |

At RAN1#106bis-e the was no agreement on the down-selection of Case D/E and the following was reported in the Chair’s notes:

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal:  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 * Working assumption: Support Case E * Note: Case D and E are defined in previous agreements   Objection sustained by: Lenovo, CMCC, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, Oppo  Proposal:  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 * FFS: Support Case E * Note: Case D and E are defined in previous agreements   Objection sustained by: NSB, ZTE, vivo, LG, Qualcomm |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2110891, 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).
* In [R1-2110897, TD Tech]
  + Proposal 1: The CFR for MCCH is the initial DL BWP.
  + Proposal 4: The CFR for MTCH for broadcast mode can be larger than the initial DL BWP, which means the CFR for MTCH can contain the initial DL BWP and has the same numerology as the initial DL BWP.
* In [R1-2110912, ZTE]
  + Proposal 1: For a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support both Case D and Case E.
* In [R1- 2111041, vivo]
  + *Discuss*: During transition from RRC CONNECTED before RRC (re)-configuration to RRC CONNECTED after RRC (re)-configuration, it is observed that service continuity is kept for case C and D when *firstActiveDownlinkBWP-Id* is not configured, but not kept when *firstActiveDownlinkBWP-Id* is configured to indicate the first active downlink BWP. And for case E, service continuity is kept when *firstActiveDownlinkBWP-Id* is configured to indicate the first active downlink BWP to the broadcast CFR. But not kept when firstActiveDownlinkBWP-Id is not configured. Consequently, depending on conditions, whether service continuity could be kept or not is quite similar for the three cases.
  + *Discuss*: Another issue is how network identifies Ues having interest or not in broadcast services. One possible approach is via MBS interest indicator, even though it maybe optional from UE side, it helps network to ensure the broadcast performance of the Ues reporting their MBS interest. For the Ues not reporting, network may not have information for their interest and broadcast performance doesn’t have to be guaranteed in this case. When UE reports its MBS interest, network can configure it with first active DL BWP including the broadcast CFR, otherwise, network can configure it with first active DL BWP by considering unicast and multicast only. The network operation on this issue is common in case-C, -D, and –E.
  + *Discuss*: It is not wise to consider case E as an optimized solution over case C, on the contrary, case E is complementary to case C and is essential to be supported in Rel-17.
  + 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-E.
    - Note: Case C and E are defined in previous agreements.
* In [R1-2111115, Spreadtrum]
  + *Discuss*: Regarding Case E, firstly, we have not seen the egacye use cases, which must be delivered in idle sate, and are high data volume. In NR Rel-15/Rel-16, only small data, or even no egacy 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 egacyey in connected state. The necesarity of introducing CFR with large bandwidth.e g., case E in idle state, is not clear to us.
  + Discuss: In idle state, no matter case C or case E, there is no impact on legacy UE. This is because that SIB1 configured initial DL BWP can be active only in RRC egacye state, and legacy UE only camp in the bandwidth of CORESET#0.
  + In RRC egacye state, assuming all MBS Ues report MBS interest indication to Gnb, then for case C, Gnb can configure first active BWP and default BWP by UE RRC signalling to make SIB1 configured initial DL BWP invalid. There is no impact on legacy UE even if in the case where SIB1 configured inital DL BWP is enlarged due to MBS as the proponent of case E claimed.
  + In RRC egacye state, assuming MBS Ues not report MBS interest indication to Gnb, then for both case C and case E, it is completely up to Gnb’s implementation to configure unicast BWP by RRC signalling for each UE, which may be larger than the bandwidth of BWP configured by case E/ SIB1 configured initial DL BWP, or equal to the bandwidth of BWP configured by case E/ SIB1 configured initial DL BWP, or smaller than the bandwidth of BWP configured by case E/ SIB1 configured initial DL BWP. For this case, there is no difference between case C and case E.
  + In RRC egacye state, assuming MBS Ues not report MBS interest indication to Gnb, and first active BWP is not configured by Gnb for each UE, some companies of proponent E claim that for case E, legacy UE use SIB1 configured intial BWP as the first active BWP, and MBS UE uses the BWP configured by case E as the first active BWP by default. So, there will be no impact on legacy Ues for case E. While for case C, due to the enlarged SIB1 configured inital DL BWP as the proponent of case E claimed, there will be additional power cost on legacy Ues. But for this, we have different understanding.
    - For case E, it measn two initial DL BWPs are being maintained in the system.
    - For case E, in this case, Gnb doesn’t know who is MBS UE, who is legacy UE. There is no common understanding between Gnb and UE. There will be too much impact. For example, if Gnb mistake one legacy UE as MBS UE, and egacye it in the frequency resource not overlapping with SIB1 configured initial DL BWP, obviously the performance of egacy UE will be deteriorated, i.e., case E brought negative impact to legacy Ues.
    - For case C, there is no discrepancy between Gnb and UE. There is no legacy bahivor change for legacy UE.
  + Proposal 1: For CFR configuration for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, Case E is not supported.
* In [R1-2111137, Nokia]
  + To our view, the support of Case C, Case D, and Case E can be achieved in the same manner with a common ignalling design approach, and all three cases should be treated with the same design priority. The difference among the Case D, Case E, as well as previously agreed Case C, is just the matter of configured value of CFR size, and the Case C and Case D can be seen as a subset of Case E.
  + Proposal-1: Support of CFR Case D and Case E.
* In [R1-2111232, CATT]
  + Discuss: When low data rate is required, Case D can be supported for power saving. When high data rate is required, both Case C and E can be generally supported. However, Case C will affect legacy UE due to initial BWP with increased bandwidth. Case E can solve the issue. For Case E, the first active BWP should contain the CFR, so that the MBS Ues can receive broadcast and SIB/paging/unicast without BWP switching. All in all, Case D and Case E can be supported for Gnb scheduling flexibility.
  + Proposal 1: Support Case D and E for Gnb scheduling flexibility.
* In [R1-2111305, OPPO]
  + *Discuss*: In order to keep the MBS reception continuous, the bandwidth of CFR should be maintained for unicast and MBS service reception even UE has transferred from RRC\_IDLE to RRC\_CONN state. This larger bandwidth is considered as the applicable “initial DL BWP” rather than the initial DL BWP which is configured by SIB1. Ues may have different initial DL BWPs because some of the Ues may use initial DL BWP configured by SIB1 while some other Ues are using a larger bandwidth equal to 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, 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 [R1-2111408, SONY]
  + Proposal 1: Support Case E.
* In [R1-2111518, Intel]
  + Discuss: This method of coupling the CFR with the initial BWP also means that the related configurations can then be re-used for the CFR which does not need an independent reference point, starting PRB and length in PRBs to be additionally configured.

For Case D, it assumes that CFR is smaller than the SIB1 configured initial BWP but potentially larger than and containing the resources of CORESET#0. In our understanding, this case can be resolved using FDRA within Case C. Case D should not provide any added advantage in terms of UE power consumption since the UE will move the wider SIB1 configured initial BWP when it transitions to CONNECTED mode.

* + 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.
  + Discuss: . To our understanding, a configured BWP can be anything which is different from the legacy SIB1 configured initial BWP or CORESET#0. However, we also need to ensure that that configured BWP contains CORESET#0. Assuming that CFR in Case E is different (wider) from the initial BWP, there is an issue that the UE will need to transition to the smaller initial BWP when entering CONNECTED mode and in this case the CFR lies outside of the initial active BWP. Therefore, in this implementation of Case E, for CONNECTED mode Ues to continue receiving broadcast transmission within the broadcast CFR, the Gnb needs to switch the relevant Ues to wider active BWP as part of the initial access procedure.
  + 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. In fact, it is reasonable also to assume that the UE which required a wider CFR would also require a wider initial BWP to continue receiving broadcast and it does not have any additional power consumption issues. 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 [R1-2111551, Xiaomi]
  + *Discuss*: Case C would be a possible solution to resolve the capacity issues for MBS. However, Gnb still needs to consider the multiplexing issues between MBS and legacy broadcast channels. Case D can provide more tools for network to handle MBS scheduling and consequently the system can benefit from flexibility harvested via case D. Furthermore, as case D only requires a CFR which fully contained by the initial DL BWP, Gnb can use the CFR seamlessly when it enters RRC CONNECTED state. It is pretty aligned with the spirit of ‘the aim of keeping maximum commonality between RRC\_CONNECTED state and RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state for the configuration of PTM reception’.
  + 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. For a legacy UE, it can be configured with a first active DL BWP other than initial DL BWP. The first active DL BWP can be much smaller than the initial DL BWP as it doesn’t need to receive MBS.
  + *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. It would also complicate the scheduling at Gnb side as it has to maintain two ‘initial DL BWPs’ if the intention is to make legacy UE and MBS UE associate with separate initial DL BWP, i.e. SIB1-configured initial DL BWP and MBS-specific 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 [R1-2111629, CMCC]
  + *Discuss*: Case D: RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE first receives SIB-1 and then receives the CFR configuration (Case D) in SIBx. If this UE wants to receive the broadcast service, it is UE’s implementation whether to always keep RF bandwidth same as Case D CFR to receive broadcast service and receive legacy behaviour, e.g., paging in the bandwidth of CORESET#0 or switch between CORESET#0 and Case D CFR according to the search space monitoring occasion.  
    And when UE transits into RRC\_CONNECTED state, the SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP is used as first active BWP regardless UE whether sends MBS interest indication or not. There is no BWP switching/service interruption between the RRC state transition because UE can always set the RF bandwidth equals to Case D CFR or timely switch to Case D CFR before the complement of RRC connection establishment or re-establishment or resume.

*Discuss*: Case E: When in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, the UE behaviour is similar as Case D, which it is UE’s implementation whether to always keep RF bandwidth same as Case E CFR or switch between CORESET#0 and Case E CFR.  
But when UE transits into RRC\_CONNECTED mode, UE will either take the SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP as the first active BWP when an active BWP is not configured or the configured new active BWP as first active BWP. In the first method which SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP used as the first active BWP, UE cannot receive the broadcast service considering the SIB1-configured initial DL BWP is smaller than Case E CFR.  
In the second method, Gnb can configure an active BWP to cover the frequency resources of Case E CFR, but the critical issue is that how Gnb knows which Ues receive the broadcast service since the MBS interest indication is an optional feature. In addition, the broadcast service is interrupted during BWP re-configuration. There are two potential ways proposed by companies to relieve this problem, which the first one is all MBS-capable UE taking Case E MBS BWP as the first active BWP (there is additional RAN2 spec impact to define new first active BWP) or UE will not receive broadcast service if not report MBS interest indication (cannot guarantee all Ues’ broadcast reception).  
Compared with Case D, Case E has these natural drawbacks and may introduce more spec impact. In addition, as the previous agreement, Case E is an MBS specific BWP, whether can or how to support two BWPs simultaneously by UE have never been widely discussed. Considering these, we don’t support Case E but Case D as the CFR for MCCH/MTCH.

* + Proposal 1. For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, Case D can be supported as configured/defined specific CFR for MTCH/MCCH
* In [R1-2111763, Samsung]
  + *Discuss*: However, considering that RAN1#107-e is the last meeting for Rel-17, in order to complete this WI, supporting only Case D could be done because Case E needs many details related to BWP such as BWP switching and restrictions.
  + Proposal 1: Support Case D.
* In [R1-2111899, Apple]
  + Proposal 2: For MBS UE in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE mode, the Case E is supported for broadcast reception.
* In [R1-2112065, LGE]
  + Proposal 2: PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH transmission can be transmitted on a CFR defined based on a configured BW or a CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, depending on MCCH information.
* In [R1-2112130, NTT DOCOMO]
  + Discuss: 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. Both cases should be supported in the specification, and it should be up to network to choose which case to use.
  + Proposal 1: For a CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH for broadcast, support both Case D and E.
* In [R1-2112163, 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.
  + *Discuss*: RAN2 has already agreed that transmitting MBS interest indication to Gnb for Idle/Inactive mode UE is not supported. Furthermore, the Idle/Inactive mode UE can’t transmit MBS interest indication to Gnb due to lack of TA. Without such indication, Gnb can’t know which Idle/Inactive mode UE is interested in the MBS with larger CFR and will not configure the first active BWP same as the MBS-specific BWP in Case E to the interested Idle/Inactive mode UE.
  + Observation 4: Idle/Inactive mode UE can’t send MBS interest indication to Gnb.
  + *Discuss*: To support MBS-specific BWP with large CFR in Case E, standards should support Idle/Inactive mode UE to transmit MBS interest indication to Gnb and support configuring first active BWP as MBS-specific BWP via SIBx or MCCH for Idle/Inactive mode UE.

In addition, how to configure the CFR with larger size than SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP is unknown and whether different parameters for CFR in Case E are configured for Case A or Case C has not been discussed.

Regarding group-common DCI format design for support of Case E, since CFR is larger than CORESET 0/SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP, solution is needed to determine the FDRA field size in case of Case E so as to align the DCI payload size of the group-common DCI with size of DCI format 1-0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI in CSS.

* + Observation 5: Significant standard impact is caused in Case E.
  + Observation 6: Case E is an optimization on top of Case C.
  + 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 [R1-2112241, Qualcomm]
  + *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”.
  + *Discuss*: If network does not configure SIB1-configured initial BWP, we should allow the network to configure a broadcast CFR/BWP larger than CORESET#0 for MBS Ues and it would be pointless to down-select Case C, D or Case E. The unified solution is preferred no matter whether it is Case E or Case C, and no matter whether there is SIB1-configured initial BWP or not. If Case C or Case E is configured, Case D can be implemented by using CORESET for GC-PDCCH and FDRA for GC-PDSCH by implementation. We don’t see the point to support the option of Case D only.
  + Proposal 1: Support Case E for a CFR-Config-Broadcast.
* In [R1-2112314, MediaTek]
  + Discuss: 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 discuss the CFR configuration independently.
  + Proposal 3: CFR can be configured with any size as long as it covers CORESET#0.
* In [R1-2112348, Ericsson]
  + Observation 1: In NR, all data channels and reference signals used for transmission/reception between the UE and network occur in a DL/UL Bandwidth Part (BWP).
  + Observation 2: For Case A, this BWP is the CORESERT#0 initial BWP, which is configured for all Ues in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE and does therefore not need to be specifically configured for broadcast.
  + Observation 3: For Case C, D and E, since the CFR exceeds the CORESET#0 frequency resources, a specific BWP for broadcast needs to be configured.
  + Proposal 1: For Ues receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, the CFR is configured within a BWP.
    - Note1: For Case A this BWP is the CORESET#0 initial BWP (already agreed)
    - Note: Specific naming and configuration of the BWP is up to RAN2.
  + Proposal 2: For Ues receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE according to other Cases than Case A, a specific BWP for broadcast, different from CORESET#0 initial BWP, is configured: “BWP-B”.
  + Proposal 3: The legacy CORESET#0 initial BWP is used to receive System Information and paging and for Random Access also for Ues receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE.
  + Observation 4: Ues is RRC IDLE/INACTIVE receiving broadcast will need to receive in parallel legacy type of data, such as System Information, paging and RA ignalling in the CORESET#0 initial BWP and broadcast data. For Case C, D and E, the broadcast is received in a specific broadcast BWP, wider than CORESET#0 initial BWP, but containing this.
  + Observation 5: With Case C, the configured broadcast BWP-B can naturally have identical frequency resources to the SIB1 initial BWP.
  + Observation 6: With Case D, the configured broadcast BWP-B can naturally have identical frequency resources to the configured CFR.
  + Observation 7: With Case E, the configured broadcast BWP-B can naturally have identical frequency resources to the configured CFR.
  + Observation 7: For all cases C, D and E, the configured broadcast BWP-B can naturally have identical frequency resources to the configured CFR
  + Proposal 4: For all cases, other than Case A, the configured broadcast CFR and BWP-B have identical frequency resources.
  + *Discuss*: With Case E as a starting point, it supports any CFR/BWP-B size within the carrier, independently of SIB1 initial BWP, Case D adds a constraint in that the CFR/BWP-B is required to be contained within the SIB1 initial BWP frequency resources. Case C adds a further constraint in that the CFR/BWP-B needs to have identical frequency resources to SIB1 initial BWP.

It is not clear what gains there could be of introducing such Case C/D constraints, when the solution could just as well be fully flexible with Case E.

* + Observation 9: When SIB1 does not configure the initial BWP, Case C and D are not applicable. Broadcast would then be limited to Case A, unless Case E is supported.
  + Proposal 5: Broadcast in a wider CFR/BWP than CORESET#0 initial BWP is supported when SIB1 does not configure the initial BWP.
  + Specification complexity: Case C allows for a simplification of the configuration of frequency resources for the CFR/BWP-B, in that the SIB1 initial BWP configuration can be reused for both CFR and BWP-B.

For both Case D and E there is a need to separately configure a CFR/BWP-B, which is different from the SIB1 initial BWP. This will require the same type of additional configuration in both cases, which is likely to be a *locationAndBandwidth* parameter in SIBx that will define the frequency resources of the CFR/BWP.

* + Observation 10: There is no significant difference in specification complexity between Case D and Case E.
  + Observation: There is no significant difference in UE complexity between Case D and Case E.
  + *Discuss*: In all cases C, D and E, without further information about whether the UE receives broadcast, the Gnb would need to decide depending on what it finds most important, but there is no difference between the cases regarding the impact of this.
  + Observation 11: For Ues supporting broadcast, without additional RRC ignalling support, the network cannot know whether a UE entering RRC Connected state is receiving broadcast or not, so cannot make an informed choice on which active BWP is optimum to use. It can either select an optimum active BWP, without broadcast considerations, or it can let the UE keep its current BW to allow for seamless transition of the broadcast service. This issue is however identical for all Cases C, D and E.
  + Observation 12: There are no significant differences in operational issues between Case D and Case E.
  + Proposal 6: 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.The BWP (”BWP-B”) to receive the broadcast CFR in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE has the same frequency resources as the CFR.
  + Proposal 7: When the UE state is changed from RRC INACTIVE/IDLE to RRC CONNECTED, the UE formally keeps its BWP-B used to receive Case E broadcast in RRC INACTIVE/IDLE until completion of RRC configuration. After RRC configuration, the UE releases the BWP-B but keeps the CFR, which is inherited by all configured BWPs in RRC CONNECTED, provided the CFR is contained within the respective BWP.
  + *Discuss*: Note: Only using a CFR (i.e. without a BWP) in RRC INACTIVE/IDLE is not possible since a BWP always needs to be used to receive data, for consistency with legacy NR. Only using a BWP is not possible either since the BWP needs to be released after completion of RRC configuration and Ues in all RRC states need to have something in common to receive the broadcast, which is the CFR. The CFR thus stays the same when a UE moves from RRC INACTIVE/IDLE to RRC CONNECTED, but the BWP changes.
  + The BWP\_ID numbering used by Ues in RRC INACTIVE/IDLE is independent from the numbering used by RRC CONNECTED Ues. For Ues in RRC INACTIVE/IDLE, CORSESET#0 initial BWP is used by all Ues and BWP-B is used for Ues receiving broadcast with Case C, D or E. For Ues in RRC CONNECTED, the legacy numbering is unaffected.
  + Proposal 8: 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**

***On configuration of a BWP for the CFR (including agreed Case A/C)***

In parallel to the discussion on down-selection of Case D/E, it is proposed to focus on critical aspects that may be open even for the already agreed Cases of CFR, i.e., Case A and Case C. The discussion should also consider the other two open cases if possible.

As per the background section, Cases A, C and D are defined as a CFR. However, whether the relationship of these cases within a BWP has not been concluded yet.

The contributions in [Ericsson, Qualcomm] detail, for Cases other than D/E, the relationship of the CFR and a BWP and proposes that the CFR is configured as a BWP. [Intel] also discusses potential implementation of Case E as an BWP, however, in this case as a specific initial BWP only MBS Ues. [Xiaomi] similarly proposes that for Case C, MBS Ues apply as initial BWP the one configured in the SIB-1 configured initial BWP. In previous meetings, some companies also proposed to leave this decision to RAN2. However, this was directly discussed at the last meeting and multiple companies expressed that it should be RAN1 that decides at least basic functionality such as whether it is based on BWP or not.

The common point in all the contributions above in this aspect is that the CFR is configured within a BWP since this is the basic operational mode to receive signals in NR. Therefore, **Proposal 2.6-1** for discussion tries to agree this for all cases other than Case A. The proposal further details that the frequency resources of the CFR and the BWP are identical. The formulation is general to potentially accommodate Case D/E after down-selection. However, this agreement should also cover Case C that has already been agreed.

***Down selection of Case D/E***

This issue was debated at length at the past meetings without reaching a conclusion.

Multiple companies have contributed to this aspect of the discussion. Although some contributions have provided more detailed analysis based on the technical discussion from the last meeting, most companies provide similar arguments to support/not support the different Cases. Compared to the last meeting, most companies have not changed their views on the support Case D/E.

Please see FL summary#5 [R1-2110595] from RAN1#106bis-e for detailed discussions on this issue on down-selection.

* *Support of Cases D/E*
* Support of Case D
  + [Futurewei, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung] (5)
* Support of Case E
  + [TD Tech, vivo, SONY, Intel\*, Apple, LGE, Qualcomm, Ericsson] (8)
    - Intel proposes Case E implemented as a new MBS initial BWP.
* Support of Case D/E
  + [ZTE, Nokia, CATT, NTT DOCOMO, MediaTek,] (5)
* Not support of Case E
  + [Spreadtrum, OPPO, Xiaomi, CMCC, Lenovo] (5)
* *Technical issues*

Based on the technical discussion on potential interruption due to Ues frequency range change and service continuity from previous meetings and tdocs to this meeting the following observations are done:

* potential interruption situations where were identified for Case C/D/E when the UE changes the frequency range from RRC idle/inactive to RRC connected. Some examples below:
  + for Case C this can happen for example when active BWP in RRC connected has a frequency resource larger than the frequency resources of Case C.
  + For Case D this can happen for example when UE has to change to the frequency resources to the frequency resources of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP (which are larger)
  + For Case E this can happen for example when active BWP in RRC connected has a frequency resource larger than the frequency resources of Case E
  + Note: it was also recognised that the potential interruption in all cases may be acceptable for broadcast reception.
* regarding service continuity when UE changes from RRC idle/inactive to RRC connected: situations were identified where service continuity cannot be guaranteed for cases C/D/E.
  + Since the Gnb does not have any knowledge whether Ues are receiving the broadcast service or not, the Gnb could configure an active BWP in RRC connected with frequency resources smaller than those of Case C/D/E, causing service loss.
    - For case C/D, in the case that Gnb uses default active BWP (i.e., SIB-1 conf initial BWP) service continuity would be maintained but if the Gnb configures an active BWP with frequency resources smaller than those of Case C/D service loss would occur.
  + To solve this potential service loss for all Cases, UE interest notification could be sent from Ues to Gnb, however, this is a functionality that is not mandated in the current specifications.
* *Motivation*

Regarding motivation for Case E, there were multiple discussions.

Companies supporting Case E argue that using only Case D (and Case C) has an impact on legacy non-MBS Ues since configuring Case D and Case C both rely on changing the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP. These companies consider not having an impact on legacy Ues while being able to schedule broadcast services a basic function.

Companies that do not want Case E argue that they do not see the argument above as a limitation. Legacy Ues can use the SIB-1 configured initial BWP, therefore, nothing is broken. Case C already provides sufficient flexibility and therefore Case E is an optimisation, not a basic function and therefore should not be discussed/included.

After multiple exchanges of discussion, not consensus was reached.

* *Specification Impact*

One aspect that has been discussed in less detail is the potential specification impact of standardising case D and Case E and whether there is more/less/same specification impact for both cases. Contribution in [Ericsson] argues that specification impact of case D/E is similar, while [Lenovo] discusses aspects presenting significant more specification impact for Case E.

The proposal from the FL is that we also discuss potential specification impact of both case D/E. If there is a common understanding that the specification impact to introduce Case D and Case E are the same/similar both cases could be considered to be agreed. However, if there is a Case that has significant more impact than the other this would help the group reach a decision to down-select one Case over the other. **Question 2.6-2** will be used to collect companies’ views on this.

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

#### Proposal 2.6-1

For Ues receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, the CFR is configured within a BWP.

* for Case A (already agreed) this BWP is the CORESET#0 initial BWP
* for other Case(s) than Case A, a specific BWP for broadcast, different from CORESET#0 initial BWP, is configured
* the CFR and the specific BWP have identical frequency resources
* Specific naming and configuration of the specific BWP is up to RAN2.

#### Question 2.6-2

Regarding potential specification impact of Case D and E, please provide your views on whether the specification impact of Case D is the same/larger/smaller than the specification impact of case E.

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

1. **Do you support Proposal 2.6-1? If you don’t, please provide additional proposals or modifications to work towards a compromise.**
2. **Please provide your views on Question 2.6-2.**
3. **Please provide your views, if any, on the FL assessment above.**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Proposal 2.6-1: To our view, there is no need to have such restriction/limitation. All Case C/D/E can be applied with the same manner. Targeting and support only on Case C is no preferred. For Ues receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, the CFR is configured within a BWP.   * for Case A (already agreed) this BWP is the CORESET#0 initial BWP * for other Case(s) than Case A, a specific BWP for broadcast, different from CORESET#0 initial BWP, is configured * ~~the CFR and the specific BWP have identical frequency resources~~ * Specific naming and configuration of the specific BWP is up to RAN2.  Question 2.6-2: To our view, the specification impact of Case D and Case E are the same:  * As stated in Proposal 2.6-1 by FL, the Case D and Case E together with Case C are commonly considered as new BWPs for idle/inactive Ues in addition to CORESET#0 initial BWP. * As stated in Proposal 2.4-2 by FL, the BWP/CFR configuration of Case D and E as well as Case C are commonly the same, by simply re-use the legacy definition of BWP frequency resources for unicast, i.e. with the parameter combination of Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and *locationAndBandwidth* to indicate the exact location of the BWP/CFR with respect to the carrier starting RB. * During the RRC-transition period, there may have the BWP switching impact as intensively discussed at last meeting, and the transmission “dis-continuity” issue is commonly exist for Case D and Case E, as well as to some cases of Case C. * Moreover, it is commonly that Case D and Case E have different bandwidth configuration than SIB1-configured initial BWP, with either narrower or larger than the bandwidth of SIB1-configured initial BWP. From network point of view, different broadcast services can be associated with different CFRs, i.e. one broadcast service G-RNTI-1 is with Case A CFR (CORESET#0), and other broadcast services G-RNTI-2/G-RNTI-3 is with Case D or Case E CFR. And different idle/inactive Ues may receive their own interested broadcast services respectively based on the configured CFR associated with the broadcast services. Meaning that from network point of view, there can be multiple CFR configured for different broadcast services, and from UE point of view, there can be either single CFR applied or multiple CFR utilized, depends on UE capability. And during the RRC-transition period, the idle/inactive Ues with different interests of broadcast services may need to indicate their MBS interests for assisting the Gnb to make the proper BWP configuration, when entering the RRC connected mode. And in such case, it is the same for Case D and Case E, since it is anyway different from the bandwidth of SIB1-configured initial BWP |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.6-1: Support Question 2.6-2: We think Case C, D and E can be achieved with a unified configuration framework. So we don’t think there is any difference in specification impact between Case D and Case E. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 2.6.1: we agree with the first sub-bullet and have concern on the remaining three sub-bullets. For Case C, as defined, the BWP is SIB-1 configured BWP so the CFR has same frequency resource as it and same numerology. In that sense, we don’t need to define the CFR again. 2.6.2: if CFR is configured within the SIB-1 configured DL BWP, then Case D doesn’t bring additional complexity than Case C. However, for Case E, the motivation, use case, data rate requirements, BWP switching, first active BWP configuration, interest indication and RAN2 work need quite a lot discussion. Furthermore, only basic function for broadcast is needed in Rel-17 as stated in WID. We don’t want to repeat such discussion in the last Rel-17 meeting. But we are OK to enhance idle/inactive broadcast in Rel-18. |
| Xiaomi | a) we only support the main bullet. Even for the main bullet, it is obvious.  b) Same views as Lenovo. We don’t support case E. Case E has more standard impacts as it introduces a larger BWP compared to what we have for now. We don’t see holes without case E. We should follow the objective captured in Rel-17 MBS WID, i.e. only focus on the basic functionality for broadcast for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues. |
| OPPO | 1. The main bullet is introducing a new terminology “BWP for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE” as the container of CFR, if our understanding is correct. If the intention of the main bullet is to keep it aligned with that of CFR in multicast, it seems OK. But for the sub-bullets, we are not sure if they are necessary, and need further discussion. 2. With technical concerns on case E, we also think it has spec impact. With current agreement of case A and case C, the basic function of MBS can work normally. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.6-1) Agree  Q 2.6-2) Case D has less impact due to introduction of a new BWP. |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.6-1: We support the proposal with the understanding that both Case C, Case D and Case E are supported in a unified manner with this proposal.Question 2.6-2: After lengthy discussion in previous several meetings, we draw the following observations. 1) The potential interruption time may happen for all the three cases, i.e., Case C, Case D and Case E;  2) The MBS interest indication, if needed, is required for all the three cases, i.e., Case C, Case D and Case E;  3) Case C, Case D and Case E can be implemented via the same framework with even the same configuration;  4) Without supporting Case E would be too restrictive especially if network configures a small initial BWP in the legacy unicast network;  Another point we want to make is, eventually the UE has to support two CFRs in the initial DL BWP, one for the broadcast and another one for multicast. Let’s say CFR for broadcast is 40MHz and CFR for multicast can be 100MHz. However if UE supports Case E for broadcast, probably network can configure the same CFR for both broadcast and multicast. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2.6-1: The proposal is not needed. The definition of case A, case C, case D and case E have been clearly captured in the previous agreement. We should not waste time to re-discuss it again, especially in last RAN1 meeting. Q2.6-2: Share the same view with Samsung. |
| Vivo | Question 2.6-2: we think specification impact of Case D is the same as the specification impact of case E. This is because the CFR in both cases is larger than CORESET0 and can’t be covered by valid initial BWP configured for Ues in RRC idle/inactive, frequency range of the CFR should be newly configured via SIB or MCCH. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.6-1:** **Not support.**  We should focus on whether the case A and case C is sufficient for broadcast reception. Regarding how to configure the CFR for multicast, we don’t support to define a specific MBS BWP for broadcast because the CFR need a container to configure. If it introduces a another BWP concept for MBS broadcast reception, it will exist two active BWP, and against the legacy rule that just only one activate BWP is supported for legacy Ues, it needs more RAN4’s work. In addition, it needs against the WID that **“In order to facilitate implementation and deployment of te feature, the overall implementation impact should be limited, and the UE complexity should be minimized (e.g. device hardware impact should be avoided).”** Regarding how to configure the CFR for broadcast reception**,** the **Proposal 2.4-3** has gave the specific method that **“**The CFR frequency resources used for MCCH and MTCH are configured by SIBx”, and the IE configuration structure is RAN2’s work scope. To sum up, we suggest to defer the discussion and the proposal is not necessary.   |  | | --- | | Proposal 2.4-3 For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues:   * The CFR frequency resources used for MCCH and MTCH are configured by SIBx; | |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.6-1: Actually we don’t see this proposal can make progress on this issue, especially considering there are so many details need to be discussed, e.g., for Case C does Gnb needs to configure another BWP with the same frequency resource as SIB-1 configured initial DL BWP or just reuse the current initial DL BWP configuration in SIB-1 and only needs to configure a CFR?  Q2.6.2: Similar view as Lenovo/Xiaomi/OPPO/Samsung/Spreadtrum, Case D has less spec impact. |
| Ericsson | P2.6.1: Support P2.6.2: We think the specification impact of Case D and E is the same. Assuming the legacy SIB1 is reused, without modification, and a new SIBx is used for additional broadcast configurations, Case D and E both require the configuration of the CFR/BWP (assumed to be the same) in SIBx, to be used for broadcast. This configuration would use the same *locationAndBandwidth* mechanism for this.  With Case D, the *locationAndBandwidth* would need to be constrained to be within the same frequency range as the initial BWP configured by SIB1, which is not necessary for Case E, which means that the specification impact is, if anything, larger for Case D than for Case E, since Case D adds an additional rule that is not needed in Case C. However, in both cases the UE would simply use the parameter provided in SIBx and would not need to involve SIB1 in the determination of the frequency resources to be used for the Case D/E CFR/BWP.  In both cases, Ues that have just entered RRC Connected would receive RRC ignalling on the SIB1 initial BWP. It would be a UE implementation functionality of broadcast Ues to be able to support parallel reception in that case, so no specification impact is required.  @Lenovo: The Case D CFR cannot be configured as a part of the SIB1 configured BWP, since the latter only exists in RRC Connected. Instead, a logically separate BWP is required to receive broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE. The frequency resources of this are configured by SIBx.  As a compromise, we are also fine with the alternative solution, as proposed by Intel, where broadcast Ues would use a separate SIBx-configured initial BWP, which would always have the same frequency resources as the CFR/BWP for broadcast transmission. With that solution, there is no difference at all between Case C, D and E – they could all be seen as a modified Case C, “Case Cx”, with SIBx initial BWP to be used by broadcast Ues instead of the legacy SIB1 initial BWP. Case C, D and E, as currently defined could then be supported without any difference in any way, since they would all be part of the same “Case Cx” solution. |
| Apple | Proposal 2.6-1: ok Question 2.6-2: if the proposal 2.6-1 is agreed, then the specification impact of Case D and Case E are the same. The exact size of CFR or size of the specific BWP is just configuration issue. |
| Qualcomm | P2.6.1: SupportP2.6.2: Any CFR larger than CORESET#0 will require the configuration of the CFR/BWP in SIBx for broadcast reception of IDLE/INACTIVE Ues. So, the specification impact of Case C, D and E is the same. |
| Intel | Proposal 2.6-1: We support the general direction of this proposal i.e., that a common configuration framework is used to address Case C, D and E. However, as we have proposed before, we think the SIB-x configured BWP should be the new initial BWP of the MBS capable Ues. This SIB-x configured initial BWP should over-ride the SIB-1 configured initial BWP for MBS Ues which can decode this SIB-x. This way, the CFR is always within the initial BWP of the MBS Ues when transitioning to RRC\_CONNECTED mode and legacy Ues are not impacted i.e., they continue using SIB-1 configured initial BWP or CORESET#0. In Case C, D, E, the only constraint required is for the CFR to contain the CORESET#0. We do not think we need to push this further to RAN2 since this is a RAN1 issue. We propose the following update to the Proposal:Proposal 2.6-1 For Ues receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, the CFR is ~~configured within a~~ has frequency resources identical to a new initial BWP (different from CORESET#0) which is configured by SIB-x   * For MBS Ues which can decode the SIB-x, the configured initial BWP replaces the SIB-1 configured initial BWP * Note: For Case A (already agreed) this initial BWP is not configured, and the frequency resources of the CFR are identical to CORESET#0 * ~~for other Case(s) than Case A, a specific BWP for broadcast, different from CORESET#0 initial BWP, is configured~~ * ~~the CFR and the specific BWP have identical frequency resources~~ * ~~Specific naming and configuration of the specific BWP is up to RAN2.~~   With the above proposal, we do not need to differentiate Case C, D and E any more. Question 2.6-2: We do not think this is a relevant question to ask at this stage. Specification impact is secondary to making the feature work. The above proposal achieves that and should be considered as a compromise proposal that supports all Cases A-E. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Question 2.6-1: okQuestion 2.6-2: we support case E. |
| Moderator | On **Proposal 2.6-1**:  @Lenovo, Spreadtrum, MediaTek, CMCC: please note that the definition of Case C only discusses a CFR where the frequency resources are the same as the frequency resources of SIB-1 conf Initial BWP. However, it does not say is the SIB-1 initial BWP. The motivation of the proposal is that for case C (as well as for Case A) is to associated with a BWP, since this is that basic NR operation, i.e., everything is received in a BWP.  @MediaTek: one comment for clarification besides the point above. This proposal is nor saying that there would be two active BWPs. Let’s say that we agree to have a BWP for Case C. This BWP could be different to the initial BWP for idle/inactive Ues (i.e., CORESET#0). The BWP for Case C would be active but since it would contain CORESET#0 it would still be possible to receive System information. This is analogous to unicast operation where there is only one active BWP which contains CORESET#0 allowing to receive system information.  @Intel: thanks for the way forward. I think it would be good to get companies’ opinions on this way forward. As per the discussion in past meetings, I suggest to include a note to clarify that SIB/paging is still received within CORESET#0 to clarify that that basic operation of idle/inactive Ues is not changed by MBS operation.  On **Question 2.6-2**:  @All, I think we need to provide detailed comments on why specification impact would be different for case D and Case E.  @NTT DOCOMO: could you please provide more details on why there is no specification difference between Case D and Case E?  @Lenovo: Could you please clarify why Case D does not bring additional complexity? I think it would be useful to understand this point. Regarding comments on BWP switching, interest notification, as per FL assessment these are common to all considered cases. Can you elaborate why these are different to case E compared to Case D and Case C.  @Xiaomi. CMCC: could you please clarify why introducing a larger BWP would have larger spec impact than Case D?  @Samsung, Spreadtrum: my understanding is that case D would also need to introduce a new BWP.  I think it would be useful to have more discussion and for companies to provide more details to move the discussion forward. |

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

#### Proposal 2.6-1rev1

For Ues receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, the CFR ~~is configured within a~~ has frequency resources identical to a new initial BWP (different from CORESET#0) which is configured by SIB-x

* For MBS Ues which can decode the SIB-x, the configured initial BWP replaces the SIB-1 configured initial BWP
* Note 1: For Case A (already agreed) this initial BWP is not configured, and the frequency resources of the CFR are identical to CORESET#0
* Note 2: RRC IDLE/INACTIVE Ues receive SIB/paging within CORESET#0.
* ~~for other Case(s) than Case A, a specific BWP for broadcast, different from CORESET#0 initial BWP, is configured~~
* ~~the CFR and the specific BWP have identical frequency resources~~
* ~~Specific naming and configuration of the specific BWP is up to RAN2.~~

#### Question 2.6-2rev1

Regarding potential specification impact of Case D and E, please provide your views on whether the specification impact of Case D is the same/larger/smaller than the specification impact of case E and provide technical justification.

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

1. **Do you support Proposal 2.6-1rev1? If you don’t, please provide additional proposals or modifications to work towards a compromise.**
2. **Please provide your technically justified views on Question 2.6-2rev1.**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Proposal 2.6-1rev1: Not agree, we are a bit confused of the intension of new Proposal 2.6-1rev1, and it seems it is proposing a “a new initial BWP” for idle/inactive Ues. To our view, the configured CFR/BWP for broadcast reception should not be the “initial BWP” for idle/inactive UE, where the initial BWP for idle/inactive Ues is still CORESET#0 as legacy.Question 2.6-2rev1: We have provided our technical justification in the earlier round of discussion, please check in above |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2.6-1 rev1: Not support. The new initial BWP introduced by the proposal would result two initial BWPs maintained simultaneously in the system, and cause negative impact to legacy Ues. This is because that if w/o prior information, Gnb could not identify whether UE is MBS UE or legacy UE. So Gnb may mistake one legacy UE as MSB UE, and schedule unicast in CFR region not overlapped with SIB1 configured initial DL BWP. Question 2.6-2rev1: For case D, no BWP is introduced, and only CFR is defined. But for case E, both CFR and one new BWP are introduced. Thus, whether/how to use the new BWP for both idle/inactive state and connected state needs further discussion, which is the additional spec work for case E. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For 2.6-1rev1, I wonder when case C is used since case C has been agreed. We should not keep confusing companies by such different cases and we should stick to what we have agreed and see what more can be agreed. In light of this, the proposal can be updated as follows: **Proposal 2.6-1rev2**  For Ues receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, support the CFR has frequency resources identical to a BWP (different from CORESET#0/initial DL bandwidth part configured by SIB1) which is configured by SIB-x   * Note: RRC IDLE/INACTIVE Ues receive SIB/paging within CORESET#0. * It is up to RAN2 how to capture different cases of bandwidth configurations for the CFR.. * Send the LS to RAN2 by including all agreements made for CFR bandwidth configurations. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Proposal 2.6-1rev1: Ok.But we think the CFR in the proposal is not defined clearly. If MCCH and MTCH can have different CFRs, the proposal needs updating as below.Proposal 2.6-1rev1 For Ues receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, the CFR for MTCH has frequency resources identical to a new BWP (different from CORESET#0) which is configured by SIB-x  FFS： If MCCH and MTCH can have different CFRs, the CFR for MCCH is  Option 1: CORESET0/initial DL BWP if CORESET 0 is configured/not configured.  Option 1: same as the CFR for MTCH if no CFR or only one CFR is configured in SIBx. Otherwise the CFR for MCCH is also configured in SIBx.   * For MBS Ues which can decode the SIB-x, the configured initial BWP replaces the SIB-1 configured initial BWP * Note 1: For Case A (already agreed) this initial BWP is not configured, and the frequency resources of the CFR are identical to CORESET#0 * Note 2: RRC IDLE/INACTIVE Ues receive SIB/paging within CORESET#0. |
| Vivo | Proposal 2.6-1rev1:We can discuss how to configure the CFR first, and leave further details to RAN 2.We propose the following updates: For Ues receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, the CFR is configured within a ~~has frequency resources identical to a new initial~~ BWP (different from CORESET#0) which is configured by SIB-x.   * for Case A (already agreed) this BWP is the CORESET#0 initial BWP * for other Case(s) than Case A, a ~~specific~~ BWP ~~for broadcast~~, different from CORESET#0 initial BWP, is configured  Question 2.6-2rev1: we think specification impact of Case D is the same as the specification impact of case E. This is because the CFR in both cases is larger than CORESET0 and can’t be covered by valid initial BWP configured for Ues in RRC idle/inactive, frequency range of the CFR should be newly configured via SIB or MCCH. Please also note that SIB-1 configured initial BWP is not valid until RRC connection setup, CFR in case C and D cannot be configured within it, instead, a BWP with same frequency resource as SIB-1 configured initial BWP should be configured to define CFR in case C and D. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.6-1rev1: don’t support. In our understanding, there is no need to introduce new BWP for broadcast operation. CORESET 0/initial DL BWP can be directly used for broadcast reception.Question 2.6-2rev1: It is obvious that potential standard impact for Case D is significant less than that for Case E. If CFR is configured within the SIB-1 configured DL BWP, then Case D doesn’t bring additional complexity than Case C, no new BWP, no BWP switching, no need to send interest indication, no impact on first active BWP configuration, etc. |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.6-1rev1: More clarification/discussion are needed.  The newly updated proposal introduces more information/design than the previous version.  A CFR is used for MBS reception in RRC\_IDLE, whether this CFR is a BWP? If it is just a terminology, then the name of “CFR” can be kept rather than introducing a new BWP for extra ambiguity. If it is rather than an issue of terminology, then whether/how to define such a BWP as the container of the CFR should be discussed. Question 2.6-2rev1: Case E introduce more spec impact than that of case D. For case E, new BWP should be introduced as the container of the CFR larger than initial BWP. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.6-1 rev1: Not support. The CFR should not be another initial DL BWP. Same reason as raised by Spreadtrum/Lenovo/OPPO.  Question 2.6-2 rev1: Same view as Spreadtrum/Lenovo/OPPO. Case E has to introduce a larger BWP than initial DL BWP. |
| ZTE | Thanks for the discussion. We tend to agree with Huawei and Huawei’s proposal. RAN1 can first agree on support configuring a CFR as Case C, Case D and Case E, then the detailed signalling design can be up to RAN2. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.6-1rev1: Not support.**  Regarding how to configure the CFR, we have the clear agreement as following:   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues:   * The CFR frequency resources used for MCCH and MTCH are **configured** by SIBx; |   We think the proposal is NOT necessary. |
| Qualcomm | Similar view as Huawei, no need to say ‘initial’ and no need to have first and second subbullets.  In the main bullet, we can say ‘a BWP (different from CORESET#0/SIB-1 configured initial BWP) if configured in SIB-x’ |
| Intel | While the general direction is fine, we would like to make the following points with respect to the configured BWP being a new initial BWP:   * Since this is configured by SIB-x, the configured BWP only applies to MBS Ues and not legacy IDLE/INACTIVE Ues. Therefore, even if this configured BWP is an initial BWP, this applies only to MBS Ues which can decode the SIB-x * If we assume this is simply a configured BWP, then the issues discussed in the previous meetings still exist i.e., when this UE transitions to CONNECTED mode, depending on the Case that is being supported for broadcast (D or E), the UE would either transition to a smaller BWP (Case E) or a larger BWP (Case D). While Case D is ok, for Case E this would mean that the CFR is not contained within the initial active BWP at RRC Connection and reconfiguration is needed for service continuity. Therefore, it seems that simply assuming that this configure BWP is an initial BWP for ONLY MBS Ues, would solve this issue. * To Huawei’s comment, we don’t see why support of Case C is limited here. We can of course not reconfigure the initial BWP by SIB-x if Case A/C is supported. For Case D and E, this proposal would solve the issues. If needed, we can add Case C also to the note as follows:  Proposal 2.6-1rev1 For Ues receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, the CFR ~~is configured within a~~ has frequency resources identical to a new initial BWP (different from CORESET#0) which is configured by SIB-x   * For MBS Ues which can decode the SIB-x, the configured initial BWP replaces the SIB-1 configured initial BWP * Note 1: For Case A and C (already agreed) this initial BWP is not configured, and the frequency resources of the CFR are identical to CORESET#0 or SIB1 configured initial BWP respectively * Note 2: RRC IDLE/INACTIVE Ues receive SIB/paging within CORESET#0. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 2.6-1rev1: We agree with what we believe is the intention of the proposal, although we agree with Huawei that it requires some reformulation. We are fine with Huawei’s proposed reformulation. We think this proposal is a nice way of resolving the controversial discussion around Case C/D/E.  In our understanding, with (the HW reformulated variant of) Proposal 2.6-1rev1, the solution would essentially be a Case C solution in the sense that the broadcast CFR would always have identical frequency resources to the SIB configured initial BWP, although with the important difference that the SIB configured initial BWP is now specific for broadcast and defined by SIBx instead of SIB1. At the same time, the proposal would allow for independently configured SIB1 initial BWP, for legacy Ues, and SIBx configured initial BWP/broadcast BWP for broadcast Ues. It should be noted that the SIBx configured initial BWP as such is not used in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE. Therefore, the (Huawei reformulated) proposal only mentions a BWP, which shares the same frequency resources as SIBx initial BWP, but has other configurations so is with that another BWP. There is therefore only the legacy CORESET#0 initial BWP for all RRC IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, so no duplication of initial BWP for a given UE. We believe everyone should be reasonably OK with this solution.  Question 2.6-2rev1: As already mentioned in earlier comments, we do not see any difference in specification impact of Case D and E. We wish to comment that, assuming a BWP is always needed to receive broadcast, this BWP needs to be configured for all Cases C/D/E. It is not the case that legacy SIB1 initial BWP can be used to receive broadcast, since: (1) it only applies i RRC Connected and (2) it lacks the configurations to receive broadcast and also has unicast configurations that are not supposed to be used in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE. Apart from the frequency range, the configurations of SIB1 initial BWP are therefore totally inadequate to receive broadcast and to be used in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE. The BWP to be used for broadcast must therefore be specifically configured for this and is, with that, another BWP than SIB1 initial BWP. This applies also to Case C which is “unfinished” and lacks the technical solution of a BWP in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.6-1rev1: Not support.**  Similar view as Spreadtrum/Lenovo/OPPO/Xiaomi, the definition of case A~E is quiet clear in RAN1, there is no need to define a “new initial DL BWP” , especially this will cause a lot of spec impacts not only in RAN1 but in RAN2, e.g., the initial DL BWP definition, the IDLE/INACTIVE UE procedures.  Question 2.6-2 rev1: Same view as Spreadtrum/Lenovo/OPPO/Xiaomi. Case E has to introduce a larger BWP than initial DL BWP. |
| Samsung | Instead of trying to have a new formulation, it would be better for RAN1 to directly try to down-select one or both from Case D and Case E.  Considering that this meeting is the last one, the compromise solution would be to support both and which one is supported is up to UE capability.  We are also okay with HW’s modification, too. One question is, what is the difference of HW’s proposal and Case E, which defines a new BWP for MBS. It seems effectively same. |
| Vivo 2 | We support HW’s proposal to move forward on this issue. |
| Moderator | Before discussing each section in detail, I would like to make the following note: while discussion on **Proposal 2.6-1** tries to complete the design of the already agreed case C (as well as potentially including Cases D), the discussion on **Proposal 2.6-2** addresses down-selection of reminder Cases (D/E) of the CFR.  **Regarding Proposal 2.6-1**:  @All: it seems the way forward from Huawei has support. I have included Huawei’s version as proposal below to see if this is agreeable.  @Nokia, Spreadtrum: I think Huawei’s way forward would address your comments.  @Lenovo, MediaTek, OPPO: I do not understand the point about that there is no need to introduce a BWP for broadcast operation. Are you then assuming that the UE would receive the CFR (which is larger than CORESET#0) in a frequency range that is not within a BWP? As per my understanding everything in NR is received within a BWP. Are you assuming that for Case D/C the SIB1 configured initial BWP would be used? However, please note that there is not such agreement and that the definition of Case C only describes a frequency range and is not saying that it is the SIB1 initial BWP. SIB-1 initial BWP is only available in RRC connected Ues. Proposal 2.6-1 is trying to clarify for all cases, including Case C, that the frequency resources are identical to a BWP. For case C, the BWP would have the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP where the frequency resources are configured by SIB-x and in particular the values of *locationAndbandwidth*, etc. are derived from SIB1. Does this clarify?  @TD Tech: thanks for comments, I have included Huawei’s version that has more support. Also, regarding the discussion on different CFR frequency size for MCCH/MTCH that discussion is being handled in Issue 4. I recommend we focus here on the CFR regardless of the logical channel.  @Intel: Regarding the comments on service interruption and service continuity, please see my FL assessment on technical issues (also copied in the discussion of proposal below) where it is recognised that interruption and service continuity loss aspects can happen in all cases C/D/E. I think the proposal from Huawei has more support. Whether the BWP is called “initial BWP” could be up to RAN2 as discussed in past meetings and the note in the revised proposal should accommodate this.  @Ericsson: one clarification on your comment “*although with the important difference that the SIB configured initial BWP is now specific for broadcast and defined by SIBx instead of SIB1*” I think with the Huawei’s version, I think it would be a BWP but we are not explicitly calling it “initial”.  @Samsung: please note that proposal 2.6-2 now addresses the down-selection. However, please note that proposal 2.6-1rev2 is doing is for case C (and potentially case D) clarify that the frequency resources are identical to a BWP. Note that so far the definition of Case D/C only talks about a frequency range, it is not associated to a BWP. Since everything needs to be received in NR in a BWP we are trying to close that gap between the definitions of Case D/C. Case E was already linked to a BWP.  **Regarding Question 2.6-2rev1**:  Some of the discussion above also applies here. I think one key point is that while some companies think that for case D (and Case C) there is no need to use a BWP, multiple companies think that a BWP is required.  My understanding is that any CFR that is larger than CORESET#0 needs to use a BWP which will be different to the initial BWP in idle/inactive Ues which is CORESET#0. Since in idle/inactive Ues so far only exists the initial BWP as per CORESET#0, for MBS idle/inactive Ues SIB-x will configure a BWP (a requirement to receive anything in NR) and that BWP has a CFR (which can be with the same frequency resources as the BWP). The frequency resources of the CFR are configured by SIB-x. In Case C, the frequency resources information can be derived from SIB1. However, for case D and Case E for both the frequency resources reuses 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 CFR with respect to the carrier starting RB (as per recent agreement).  Based on this, the specification impact for case D and E seem the same.  Regarding the technical issues for Case C/D/E my FL assessment in previous section is copied here for convenience:  *-Technical issues*  Based on the technical discussion on potential interruption due to Ues frequency range change and service continuity from previous meetings and tdocs to this meeting the following observations are done:   * potential interruption situations where were identified for Case C/D/E when the UE changes the frequency range from RRC idle/inactive to RRC connected. Some examples below:   + for Case C this can happen for example when active BWP in RRC connected has a frequency resource larger than the frequency resources of Case C.   + For Case D this can happen for example when UE has to change to the frequency resources to the frequency resources of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP (which are larger)   + For Case E this can happen for example when active BWP in RRC connected has a frequency resource larger than the frequency resources of Case E   + Note: it was also recognised that the potential interruption in all cases may be acceptable for broadcast reception. * regarding service continuity when UE changes from RRC idle/inactive to RRC connected: situations were identified where service continuity cannot be guaranteed for cases C/D/E.   + Since the gnb does not have any knowledge whether Ues are receiving the broadcast service or not, the gnb could configure an active BWP in RRC connected with frequency resources smaller than those of Case C/D/E, causing service loss.     - For case C/D, in the case that Gnb uses default active BWP (i.e., SIB-1 conf initial BWP) service continuity would be maintained but if the Gnb configures an active BWP with frequency resources smaller than those of Case C/D service loss would occur.   + To solve this potential service loss for all Cases, UE interest notification could be sent from Ues to Gnb, however, this is a functionality that is not mandated in the current specifications.   Based on my best understanding of the current status of the situation, where the technical aspects on service continuity and service interruption for case C/D/E have been detailed as well as the standard impact on supporting case D/E, which seems the same/similar for case D and E, based on my best understanding, I therefore propose to support both Case D and Case E.  Now some comments, follow up comments/questions.  @Spreadtrum: I do not understand why you mention for Case D a BWP is not introduced. Please see explanation above. Are you assuming that the UE would receive the CFR (which is larger than CORESET#0) in a frequency range that is not within a BWP? As per my understanding everything in NR is received within a BWP. Are you assuming that for Case D/C the SIB1 configured initial BWP would be used? If this is the case, this would be a BWP and this has not been agreed yet (we would need to agree this) since SIB-1 initial BWP is only available in RRC connected Ues.  @Lenovo, Xiaomi, OPPO, CMCC: Please see my analysis above. Can you please check? I do not understand your point about “*If CFR is configured within the SIB-1 configured DL BWP, then Case D doesn’t bring additional complexity than Case C, no new BWP, no BWP switching, no need to send interest indication, no impact on first active BWP configuration, etc*”. I do not understand the point that case D does not introduce a BWP. How is the CFR with case D configured within the SIB-1 configured initial BWP? SIB-x will configure the resources of the CFR (as per agreements). I would like to understand this point since seems critical– thanks. Regarding comments on BWP switching, interest notification, etc, please check my analysis above and let me know your opinion. |

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

#### Proposal 2.6-1rev2

For Ues receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, support the CFR has frequency resources identical to a BWP (different from CORESET#0/initial DL bandwidth part configured by SIB1) which is configured by SIB-x

* Note: RRC IDLE/INACTIVE Ues receive SIB/paging within CORESET#0.
* It is up to RAN2 how to capture different cases of bandwidth configurations for the CFR.

Send the LS to RAN2 by including all agreements made for CFR bandwidth configurations.

#### Proposal 2.6-2

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: Case D and E are defined in previous agreements

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

1. **Do you support Proposal 2.6-1rev2 and Proposal 2.6-2?.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | Proposal 2.6-1rev2: SupportProposal 2.6-2: Support @FL: As discussed in the GTW session, for broadcast reception, shall we call the CFR as BWP for RRC idle/inactive Ues? To our understanding, the broadcast CFR for idle/inactive Ues is a new idle/inactive BWP. And we prefer to have it clarified. Thanks! |
| Vivo | Proposal 2.6-1rev2: SupportProposal 2.6-2: Support for progress though we prefer case E which provides benefits over case D. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.6-1rev2: Not support. The proposal implies we already support case E which is not true. Actually we are very confused on the proposal. The CFR definition is quite clear, i.e. it is a common frequency range within a current BWP. What we really agree or specify is that the CFR cannot be larger than initial DL BWP or CORESET#0.Proposal 2.6-2: Not support. We can only support case D for sake of progress. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.6-1rev2: Don’t support. This proposal is not needed according to below agreement. The frequency resource of CFR is derived from the configurations in MIB and SIB-1. **Agreement**  The definition of the broadcast CFR frequency resources reuses 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 CFR with respect to the carrier starting RB.   * Note: for Case A and Case C, the above parameters (Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and *locationAndBandwidth*) can be derived from the configurations in MIB and SIB1, respectively.  Proposal 2.6-2: Don’t support. Case D is OK with us due to less standardization impact compared with Case E. Furthermore, Case E is optimization of Case C which is not essential to Rel-17 MBS. So we think Case E should be deprioritized as this is the last Rel-17 meeting.As we discussed in AI8.12.1, regarding LBRM/TBS determination for PTP retransmission of PTM initial transmission, the principle to finally select Option 2 is due to this option brings less issues compared with Option 1. We think such principle should be applicable here, otherwise, I am afraid each issue would have optimization solution and Rel-17 MBS could not finish timely. |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.6-1rev2: Not support. This proposal assumes that CFR cases have been determined on the down-selection which is not yet.  Proposal 2.6-2: Not support.  For progress, we can live with case D, but not case E. |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.6-1rev2: Not support. As the comment of Lenovo, the configuration of Case A and Case C is directly from the configuration in MIB and SIB1, which don’t need to define a new terminology of “BWP”, especially considering the sequent of defining it, e.g., two active BWPs for UE, etc,  Proposal 2.6-2: Not support. We only support Case D. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.6-1rev2: SupportProposal 2.6-2: Support |
| ZTE | We support both proposals. @Lenovo, the agreements you cited are only for CFR configuration. However, the CFR has to be associated with a BWP. The current proposal here is trying to define the BWP for CFR. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2.6-1rev2: Not support. We should respect the previous agreement, where no new BWP is introduced for the case A and case C.Proposal 2.6-1rev2: Not support. |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2.6-1rev2: Not support. Regarding how to configure the CFR, we have the clear agreement as following:   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues:   * The CFR frequency resources used for MCCH and MTCH are **configured** by SIBx; |   The proposal is not necessary. @Moderator: if we define a new BWP for broadcast for IDLE/INACTIVE UE, it will exist two active BWP, which is against the current Spec that only one activated is supported. Besides, whether it needs a BWP frame for CFR, I think it is not needed since we have agreed that CFR for MCCH and MTCH are configured by SIBx. Finally, regarding the IE parameter design for CFR, it is totally up to RAN2’s discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok with proposal 2.6-1rev2, to address some of concerns(e.g., whether it is a new BWP or initial BWP or two active BWP, etc.), we can delete “which is configured by SIB-x” from the main bullet because what RAN1 can hopefully compromise to is the size of CFR can be supported from RAN1 perspective and how to capture/configure different cases can be up to RAN2 as stated in the last sub-bullet. Also, we even can consider adding one more sub-bullet that UE is still supposed to support a single active BWP at a given time, so it can be updated as follows to move forward: **Proposal 2.6-1rev2**  For Ues receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, support the CFR has frequency resources identical to a BWP (different from CORESET#0/initial DL bandwidth part configured by SIB1)   * Note1: RRC IDLE/INACTIVE Ues receive SIB/paging within CORESET#0. * Note2: UE still only supports a single active BWP for a given time. * It is up to RAN2 how to capture different cases of bandwidth configurations for the CFR.   Send the LS to RAN2 by including all agreements made for CFR bandwidth configurations.  Proposal 2.6-1rev2 aims for compromise, so no need to pursue proposal 2.6.-2 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.6-1rev2: not support.@ZTE: We understand the motivation of Proposal 2.6-1rev2 is to define frequency resource of CFR. So we don’t need this proposal on top of existing agreement. **Regarding BWP for idle mode, we think it is not needed to introduce any new BWP. CORESET 0 / SIB1 configured initial DL BWP can be fully used for Case A or Case C.** Proposal 2.6-2: not support. The reason is listed above. |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 2.6-1rev2: Support.**  However, we think the original value of the proposal from Intel and also reflected in the previous version, is lost by removing “new initial”. The interesting new part was that broadcast UEs should use another SIB1 initial BWP than legacy UEs (similar to the case with RedCap UEs that can use another SIB initial BWP). If that idea is adopted, then broadcast UEs would totally neglect the frequency resources for the initial BWP, as given in SIB1, but instead use the frequency resources of SIBx (at least if different from those in SIB1).  With this new SIBx initial BWP in place (replacing the SIB1 initial BWP for broadcast UEs), the existing Case C framework could be used, i.e. the broadcast CFR would have identical frequency resources to the initial BWP that the broadcast UE would use in RRC Connected. The difference from the existing case C is that the frequency resources of this initial BWP would be configured by SIBx.  For UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE it repeated again and again from some companies that they believe that the SIB1 initial BWP is used as BWP in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE. But as we have explained multiple times, this is impossible for three reasons:   1. The legacy SIB1 initial BWP is only applicable in RRC CONNECTED 2. The SIB1 initial BWP does not have the required broadcast configuration 3. The SIB1 initial BWP has unicast configurations that are not supposed to exist in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE   For these reasons it is more than obvious that the legacy SIB1 initial BWP cannot be the BWP to be used for broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE – another BWP needs to be configured for this, for all Cases C/D/E. In RRC IDLE/INACTIE there is therefore, with this SIBx initial BWP approach, only one initial BWP, which is the CORESET#0 initial BWP. The broadcast BWP is not seen as an initial BWP while the UE is in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE. Similarly, for broadcast UEs in RRC CONNECTED, there is only one initial BWP – the SIBx initial BWP.  We see no issues with this variant. A possible updated proposal could therefore be the following:  **Proposal 2.6-1revx**  UEs supporting broadcast can be configured with an initial BWP in RRC CONNECTED, which is different from both CORESET#0 initial BWP and the initial BWP configured by SIB1.  This initial BWP can have any frequency range, larger than CORSET#0 and up to the full carrier BW, as long as it fully contains the CORESET#0 initial BWP.  UEs receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE support broadcast reception in a CFR which has identical frequency resources to the initial BWP to be used in RRC CONNECTED.  Note: This is equivalent to Case C, applied to the new initial BWP  For UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, the broadcast CFR is associated with a BWP, which has identical frequency resources to the CFR.   * Note1: Although the frequency resources of the BWP are the same as those of the initial BWP, to be used in RRC CONNECTED, other configurations are different, hence it is a different BWP. * Note2: RRC IDLE/INACTIVE Ues receive SIB/paging within CORESET#0. * Note3: UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE only supports a single active BWP at a time. The reception of SIB/paging within CORESET#0 is not counted as an active BWP, similar to the analogous case in RRC CONNECTED.   Send the LS to RAN2 by including all agreements made for CFR bandwidth configurations. Proposal 2.6-2 Support |
| ZTE | We just want to add that for UEs in CONNECTED mode, they can be configured with CFR larger than the initial DL BWP to receive both broadcast and multicast. It is the same mechanism between IDLE and CONNECTED mode, one CFR is well contained within one BWP. We don’t understand why companies don’t have concern for CONNECTED mode but only have concern for IDLE mode for the same mechanism to receive broadcast. |
| Qualcomm | **For Proposal 2.6-2**, we prefer Case E and do not support Case D only. For progress, we can compromise to support both Case E and Case D.  However, looking at the situation now, if RAN1 cannot solve the down-selection of ‘Support at least one of Case E and Case E’ as indicated in the RANP agreement, we need to send LS to RANP for the final decision.  **For Proposal 2.6-1**, If RAN1 cannot get consensus on the main bullet, we suggest sending LS to RAN2 for the detailed definition/configuration of a CFR larger than CORESET#0. Proposal 2.6-1rev2 Send the LS to RAN2 to consider the definition/configuration of a CFR larger than a CORESET#0 by including all agreements made for CFR bandwidth configurations. |
| Moderator | **On Proposal 2.6-1rev2**  A general comment is that this proposal was trying to complete the design of Case C and possibly Case D (if agreed).  Some companies think that Case C is already associated with the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.  Other companies do not share the same understanding and do not think that Case C implies that it is the SIB1 configured initial BWP. Hence, for case C the CFR has to be associated with a BWP, which is not the SIB1 initial BWP.  There is no convergence and RAN1 does not seem to be able to reach an agreement. FL proposes to take Qualcomm’s suggestion to conclude that RAN1 cannot reach agreement and is up to RAN2 to decide as per **Proposal 2.6-1rev3**.  **On Proposal 2.6-2**  On the down-selection of Case D/E it is very clear that reaching consensus is very difficult. Views have not changed, and further discussion and argumentation is not changing companies’ views.  There is no convergence and RAN1 does not seem to be able to reach an agreement. FL  proposes to take Qualcomm’s suggestion to conclude that RAN1 cannot reach an agreement and it is up to RANP to decide as per **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **ok** |

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

#### Proposal 2.6-1rev3

(**conclusion**)

Send an LS to RAN2 to consider the definition/configuration of a CFR larger than CORESET#0 by including all agreements made by RAN1 for CFR bandwidth configurations.

#### Proposal 2.6-2rev1

(**conclusion**)

RAN1 cannot get consensus on the support of Case D and/or Case E.

* Send an LS to RANP to inform about RAN1’s conclusion with a request for discussion and decision at RANP.

**Please provide your answers in the table below. Do you agree with the conclusions in Proposal 2.6-1rev3 and Proposal 2.6-2rev1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | OK for both For Proposal 2.6-1rev3, the proposal 2.4-5 should also be included as part of the LS information to RAN2. |
| CATT | OK |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Ok  But for proposal 2.6-2, it’s better to make decision in RAN1. |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.6-1rev3: Not support.  Such a conclusion is not supported since it is not necessary. In the coming soon RANP meeting, all of the agreements anyway will be captured into the status report and every WG can check about it. If there is no request for other action to RAN2, we do not see the necessity to send the LS or agree such a conclusion.  Proposal 2.6-2rev1: sub-bullet should be removed.  The sub-bullet is not supported. After long period of discussion, the basic function of MBS in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE has already supported by using CFR configuration of case A and case C. It is not necessary to send LS to RANP to make further decision on such optimization mechanism, while there are still technical concerns about the cases. |

## [DEPRIO] Issue 7: PDSCH repetition/HARQ combining

### **Background**

The following agreements at RAN1#102-e, RAN1#103-e, RAN1#104-e and RAN1#106bis-e for UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states 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.   Agreement:   * If configured, the *pdsch-AggregationFactor* for multicast dynamic scheduling is configured per G-RNTI. * If configured, the *pdsch-AggregationFactor* for multicast SPS is configured per *SPS-Config-Multicast*.   Agreement:  For slot-level repetition for SPS GC-PDSCH for multicast RRC\_CONNECTED Ues.   * + Config A or Config B can be configured to UE:     1. (Config A) UE can be optionally configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor* per *SPS-Config-Multicast*.     2. (Config B) UE can be optionally configured with TDRA table with *repetitionNumber* as part of the TDRA table in *PDSCH-Config-Multicast*. If UE is configured with Config B, UE does not expect to be configured with Config A for the same SPS group-common PDSCH.   + For Config A, if *pdsch-AggregationFactor* in *SPS-Config-Multicast* is not configured, default value is     1. Alt1: equal to 1.   Agreement:  For broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support slot-level repetition for MTCH. |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2110779, R1-2111917**,** Huawei]
  + *Discuss*: It was agreed in the last meeting to support slot-level repetition for MTCH for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states. However, based on the discussion, it is unclear such configuration should be semi-static as aggregation as supported in Rel-15 or it is part of TDRA set configuration and can be dynamically changed by TDRA indication in DCI as supported in Rel-16. It is an open issue that can be discussed. Considering it is for broadcast scheduling and DCI format 1\_0 with G-RNTI is the only format agreed to be supported, configured as slot aggregation for broadcast seems sufficient.
  + Proposal 10: Slot-level repetition is configured per G-RNTI as slot aggregation for broadcast.
  + Proposal 4: *repetitionNumber-Broadcast* is configured per G-RNTI and included in *pdsch-Config-Broadcast* for broadcast.
* In [R1-2110897**,** TD Tech]
  + Proposal 3: Support slot level repetition for MCCH
* In [R1-2110912, ZTE]
  + Discuss: The same mechanism as slot aggregation can be reused for broadcast repetition. The only remaining issue is how to configure the repetition number. The repetition number can be configured per G-RNTI via MCCH.
  + Proposal 4: For broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, the repetition number of slot-level repetition for MTCH is configured per G-RNTI via MCCH.
* In [R1-2111137, Nokia]
  + *Discuss*: Proposal-7: For broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support slot-level repetition for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH.
  + Proposal-8: Further discussion on whether both Config A and Config B could be supported for broadcast reception, and whether it can be applied for both dynamic and semi-persistent scheduling.
  + Proposal-9: It is proposed that “when receiving group-common PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 in group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI or G-CS-CRNTI for broadcast reception, with NDI=1, if the UE is configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor* in *pdsch-config*, the same symbol allocation is applied across the *pdsch-AggregationFactor* consecutive slots”.
* In [R1-2112065, LGE]
  + Proposal 6: 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 [R1-2112163, Lenovo]
  + *Discuss*: Regarding slot level repetition, there are two types specified in standard in Rel-15 and Rel-16: Type A and Type B. Since both types have been supported for RRC\_connected Ues, it is straightforward to extend both to RRC IDLE/RRC INACTIVE Ues. To support Type B, RRC configured TDRA table with number of repetitions in one or multiple entries should be supported.
  + Proposal 16: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, PDSCH repetition Type B is supported for MCCH and MTCH.
* In [R1-2112241, Qualcomm]
  + Proposal 5: For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues,
    - Support slot-level repetition for MCCH, using
      * (Config A) UE can be configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor*, applied to DCI format 1\_0 with MCCH-RNTI.
    - For slot-level repetition for MTCH, support
      * (Config A) UE can be configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor* per G-RNTI, applied to DCI format 1\_0 with the G-RNTI.
      * (Config B) UE can be configured with TDRA table with *repetitionNumber* as part of the TDRA table in *PDSCH-Config-Broadcast*
      * If UE is configured with Config B, UE does not expect to be configured with Config A for the same GC-PDSCH.
* In [R1-2112348, Ericsson]
  + *Discuss*: Obviously, with broadcast the UE would not send any feedback to trigger HARQ retransmissions, so these would need to be scheduled by the network without such feedback. We may call this gNB-triggered HARQ retransmission to contrast with legacy HARQ retransmission, where the UE triggers the retransmission via NACK feedback.
  + *Discuss*: The main purpose of gNB-triggered HARQ retransmission would be to provide increased time diversity, similar to that provided by time interleaving in some legacy broadcast systems.
  + *Discuss*: The time diversity offered by slot-level repetition is very limited. With a maximum of 16 slots in a “repetition burst” the total duration would only be 16 ms with SCS 15 kHz and half of this with SCS 30 kHz. With a more realistic repetition over e.g. four slots the duration would be only 4 ms (15 kHz SCS) or 2 ms (30 kHz SCS), which is too small values to provide any significant time diversity gain in most scenarios.
  + Observation 16: With gNB-triggered HARQ retransmission for broadcast, the time diversity may be very significantly extended, and be significant also for low speeds such as walking speed.
  + *Discuss*: To increase time diversity, one could alternatively use HARQ retransmission, where the total time duration of a Transport Block (TB), considering all (gNB-triggered) HARQ retransmission may be much longer, which could allow for better time diversity also with low overhead. If the repetitions are e.g. spread over 100 ms, which may be feasible with broadcast applications that are not very sensitive to latency, significant time diversity gain could be gained also at walking speed.  
      
    It appears thus that both the required DCI ehaviour fields and the UE soft-combining capability will anyway be available for broadcast, so supporting also HARQ combining, based on gNB-triggered HARQ retransmissions, would not require any significant additional complexity, neither specification-wise, nor UE complexity-wise. Since such functionality could also provide significant gains in certain scenarios, we think this functionality should be supported in Rel-17, which can be done with almost no additional specification work.
  + Proposal 14: Support gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions for broadcast
    - Note: UE ehaviour is the same as with Ues receiving multicast, but with no feedback from the UE. The UE would soft-combine successive HARQ transmissions of the same G-RNTI and HARQ process. The total number of transmissions is pre-determined by the gNB.

### **FL Assessment**

While for the support of slot-level repetition for MTCH, [Huawei, ZTE, Lenovo] propose to use Config B, [Nokia, LGE, Qualcomm] propose/discuss to use both Config A and Config B. [TD Tec, Qualcomm, Nokia] also propose to support slot-level repetition for MCCH, but for this case only semi-static configuration (Config A) would be supported.

Based on this input, **Proposal 2.7-1** is to agree for the support for slot-level repetition for MCCH and Config A, and **Proposal 2.7-2** extends the agreements on RRC connected Ues to RRC idle/inactive Ues for broadcast reception.

In [Ericsson] it is also proposed to support for broadcast reception with idle/inactive Ues the reception of the HARQ retransmissions (initiated by the gNB only and not by direct request from idle/inactive Ues using UL feedback) to significantly increase the time interleaving depth (to hundreds of ms) compared to the time interleaving depth of slot level repetition (of only a few ms). It is discussed that to support such an approach, very limited specification impact should be expected since the required fields in DCI are already included as part of the support of slot-level repetition.

**Question 2.7-3** collects companies’ views on this proposal that could be further extended for agreement based on company comments.

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

#### Proposal 2.7-1

Proposal 5: For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, support slot-level repetition for MCCH, using:

* (Config A) UE can be configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor*, applied to DCI format 1\_0 with MCCH-RNTI.

#### Proposal 2.7-2

For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, for slot-level repetition for MTCH, support:

* (Config A) UE can be configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor* per G-RNTI, applied to DCI format 1\_0 with the G-RNTI.
* (Config B) UE can be configured with TDRA table with *repetitionNumber* as part of the TDRA table in *PDSCH-Config-Broadcast*
* If UE is configured with Config B, UE does not expect to be configured with Config A for the same GC-PDSCH.

#### Question 2.7-3

Provide your views on the support of gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions for broadcast

* Note: UE ehaviour is the same as with Ues receiving multicast, but with no feedback from the UE. The UE would soft-combine successive HARQ transmissions of the same G-RNTI and HARQ process. The total number of transmissions is pre-determined by the gNB.

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

1. **do you agree with the proposals 2.7-1 and 2.7-2? Please provide reasons and views in general.**
2. **Please provide your views on Question 2.7-3.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 2.7-1: This proposal seems not needed. MCCH is periodically transmitted anyway like system information. Thus, slot-level repetition for MCCH seems not needed. Proposal 2.7-2: We support this proposal.Question 2.7-3: We support blind HARQ retransmissions for broadcast. We think that blind HARQ retransmissions can be same as HARQ retransmissions with disabling HARQ-ACK for multicast. The total number of transmissions can be pre-determined by the gNB. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Proposal 2.7-1: It seems Not needed In previous RAN1 agreement at last meeting, it said support slot-level repetition only for MTCH, and not mentioning for MCCH at all. **Proposal 2.7-2: Support** Question 2.7-3: To our view, the NDI in the DCI can be used to dynamically indicate the new broadcast TB transmission as legacy, and also implicitly indicate the number of (re-)transmission for UE combining of the same G-RNTI with a HARQ process. And “the total number of transmissions is pre-determined by the gNB” seems not necessary. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.7-1: Support Proposal 2.7-2: Support Question 2.7-3: We think slot-level repetition will be sufficient to improve the reliability of broadcast PDSCH. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.7-1: OK.Proposal 2.7-2: OK.Question 2.7-3: We support blind HARQ retransmissions for broadcast. There is no standard work to support it. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.7-1: share the same view with LGE.Proposal 2.7-2: We believe one of the repetition scheme is sufficient and we prefer configB which has more flexibility.Question 2.7-3: Clarification is needed. What is the difference between gNB-triggered HARQ retransmission and repetition? It should be noted that different repetition uses different RV and UE can certainly combine them. |
| CATT | Question 2.7-3: Support blind HARQ retransmissions for broadcast |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.7-1: We share the similar view with LG that this proposal is not necessary.Proposal 2.7-2: For Rel-17 MBS RRC\_IDLE, config B seems sufficient to support MTCH repetition.Question 2.7-3: The essential diffidence between this HARQ reTx and repetition should be clarified first, and then we can discuss whether gNB-trigger-based mechanism is needed or not. By now, we do not see the difference between these two mechanisms. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.7-1/2) Support Question 2.7-3) No need for retransmission of broadcast. Repetition is enough. |
| ZTE | We are open to support slot-level repetition for MCCH. However, for both MCCH and MTCH, we think only Config A is needed. The motivation of supporting dynamic change of repetition number is not strong for broadcast **considering that anyway conservative scheduling will be used for broadcast in most cases**.  Question 2.7-3) No need for retransmission of broadcast. Repetition is enough. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2.7-1: share the same view with LG  Proposal 2.7-2: One is enough, and prefer Config.A. Since it is broadcast, the flexibility is not needed.  Question 2.7-3: Not need. Repetition is enough. |
| Vivo | Proposal 2.7-1: slot-level repetition for MCCH is not necessary as it is sent periodically. **Question 2.7-3**: we are not quite sure about the gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions here, if it means slot-level repetition for MTCH, it has been supported already.  If not, what’s the difference between them? |
| MediaTek | Question 2.7-3) No need for retransmission of broadcast. Repetition is enough. |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.7-1: Agree with LG Proposal 2.7-2: OkQuestion 2.7-3: Not need. Repetition is enough. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 2.7-1: Support Proposal 2.7-2: Support  Question 2.7-3: Support.  We have the same understanding as Lenovo: *“We support blind HARQ retransmissions for broadcast. There is no standard work to support it”.* This assumes of course that the relevant DCI fields are available, i.e. HARQ process ID and NDI. With blind retransmission enabled, also HARQ process ID is needed to allow for large bit rates.  @Nokia: About “The total number of transmissions can be pre-determined by the gNB” this should only mean that the number of transmissions is up to the gNB, not relying on UE feedback, but should not be interpreted in such a way that the number needs to be fixed.  @NTT DOCOMO: As explained in our contribution, slot-level repetition will not provide any significant time diversity gain. However, with gNB-triggered (blind) HARQ retransmissions the time diversity gain could be quite large, since the time diversity can be far larger than with slot-level repetition. |
| Apple | Proposal 2.7-1: may not needed. Proposal 2.7-2: to make it clear, we support the repetition of PDSCH carrying MTCH, not for PDCCH carrying MTCH. We consider only supporting Config A is enough, don’t see strong motivation to support dynamic indication of repetition for inactive/idle UE. For config B, normally there are 64 entries in TDRA table for supporting full flexible resource allocation with dynamic repetition indication. There are 4bit (16 entries) TDRA table in first DCI format. The time domain resource allocation is restrictive to support dynamic repetition indication. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 2.7-1: Support Proposal 2.7-2: Support  Question 2.7-3: Need more clarification. Dynamic repetition by using TDRA seems can achieve the similar effect of soft-combining as gNB triggered HARQ retransmission. Does the gNB triggered HARQ retransmission indicate any RV instead of pre-defined RV order in the legacy slot-level repetition? |
| Intel | Proposals 2.7-1/2: OKQuestion 2.7-3: Our original proposal was to support HARQ for broadcast. Since that is not agreeable, we think repetition is the best we can do in this release and should strive to include full HARQ support in Rel-18. |
| Moderator | Thanks for discussion:  **Proposal 2.7-1:**   * Not needed for MCCH (8) [LG, Nokia, Xiaomi, OPPO, Spreadtrum, vivo, CMCC, Apple] (since MCCH is periodically transmitted) * Support for MCCH (4/5) [NTT DOCOMO, Lenovo, ZTE (open to discuss), Ericsson, Qualcomm, Intel]   Although there are more companies that do not see the need for PDSCH repetition for MCCH, there are multiple companies that want to support it. It think it would be good that in the next round the companies supporting/proposing PDSCH repetition for MCCH provide arguments to convince companies. I will leave the proposal unmodified to seek comments.  **Proposal 2.7-2:**   * Support both Conf A & Conf B  (8) [LG, Nokia, NTT DOCOMO, Lenovo, Samsung, CMCC, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Intel] * Only Conf A  (3) [ZTE, Spreadtrum, Apple] * Only Conf B  (2) [Xiaomi, OPPO]   The majority of companies support both Conf A and Conf B. Comments to support only one conf are on the basis that one configuration is enough. However, no fundamental problems have been raised regarding supporting any of the options. Apple raises the point that with Conf B the full flexibility is not available due to limited bit-width of the TDRA.  Given the stronger support, I still propose that both configurations are supported. Supporting both at least covers all the options proposed by proponents without fundamental issues by supporting them. Hope this an acceptable compromise.  **Question 2.7-3:**  Various companies have expressed support to support HARQ retransmissions for broadcast. However, multiple companies have also requested clarifications and details on the specific difference with PDSCH repetition. Introducing this would require including in the DCI (Issue 1) HPN and NDI fields so this discussion is relevant to DCI design.  Regarding clarifications, besides the comments form Ericsson, I copy here background from R1-2112348 that may help clarify. Please check whether you have more comments/questions:  **“Assuming the unicast/multicast mechanism for slot-level repetition will be re-used also for broadcast, the implication is that the DCI format will need to carry the Redundancy Version (RV) and UE is expected to perform soft-combining each new RV of a TB with the HARQ buffer. The DCI format will also need to carry a HARQ process ID. This means that the DCI support for broadcast could also cover HARQ combining.**  **Obviously, with broadcast the UE would not send any feedback to trigger HARQ retransmissions, so these would need to be scheduled by the network without such feedback. We may call this gNB-triggered HARQ retransmission to contrast with legacy HARQ retransmission, where the UE triggers the retransmission via NACK feedback.**  **One purpose of gNB-triggered HARQ retransmission would be to provide sufficient coverage where beam sweeping of PDSCH using narrow beams is not desirable and wide beams do not provide enough coverage.**  **The main purpose of gNB-triggered HARQ retransmission would be to provide increased time diversity, similar to that provided by time interleaving in some legacy broadcast systems.**  **The time diversity offered by slot-level repetition is very limited. With a maximum of 16 slots in a “repetition burst” the total duration would only be 16 ms with SCS 15 kHz and half of this with SCS 30 kHz. With a more realistic repetition over e.g. four slots the duration would be only 4 ms (15 kHz SCS) or 2 ms (30 kHz SCS), which is too small values to provide any significant time diversity gain in most scenarios.**  **Observation 16 With gNB-triggered HARQ retransmission for broadcast, the time diversity may be very significantly extended, and be significant also for low speeds such as walking speed.**  **Having very large repetition factors would also be costly from the overhead point of view.**  **To increase time diversity, one could alternatively use HARQ retransmission, where the total time duration of a Transport Block (TB), considering all (gNB-triggered) HARQ retransmission may be much longer, which could allow for better time diversity also with low overhead. If the repetitions are e.g. spread over 100 ms, which may be feasible with broadcast applications that are not very sensitive to latency, significant time diversity gain could be gained also at walking speed.**  **It appears thus that both the required DCI ehaviour fields and the UE soft-combining capability will anyway be available for broadcast, so supporting also HARQ combining, based on gNB-triggered HARQ retransmissions, would not require any significant additional complexity, neither specification-wise, nor UE complexity-wise. Since such functionality could also provide significant gains in certain scenarios, we think this functionality should be supported in Rel-17, which can be done with almost no additional specification work.**  **It should be noted that for the broadcast UE, the transmission and UE operation would look like multicast, for the case when no HARQ feedback is provided.**  **For non-SPS, the proposed HARQ functionality should be straight-forward. One may also consider using the same type of gNB-triggered HARQ retransmission with SPS. This would however require significant specification work since, unlike regular SPS, retransmissions would need to be part of the SPS configuration, which is not currently the case for SPS for legacy unicast. The proposed HARQ functionality for broadcast therefore only applies to non-SPS in Rel-17.**  **Proposal 24 Support gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions for broadcast**  **- Note: UE ehaviour is the same as with Ues receiving multicast, but with no feedback from the UE. The UE would soft-combine successive HARQ transmissions of the same G-RNTI and HARQ process. The total number of transmissions is pre-determined by the gNB.”** |

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

#### Proposal 2.7-1 [justification needed]

Proposal 5: For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, support slot-level repetition for MCCH, using:

* (Config A) UE can be configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor*, applied to DCI format 1\_0 with MCCH-RNTI.

#### Proposal 2.7-2

For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, for slot-level repetition for MTCH, support:

* (Config A) UE can be configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor* per G-RNTI, applied to DCI format 1\_0 with the G-RNTI.
* (Config B) UE can be configured with TDRA table with *repetitionNumber* as part of the TDRA table in *PDSCH-Config-Broadcast*
* If UE is configured with Config B, UE does not expect to be configured with Config A for the same GC-PDSCH.

#### Question 2.7-3 [motivation provided]

Provide your views on the support of gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions for broadcast

* Note: UE ehaviour is the same as with Ues receiving multicast, but with no feedback from the UE. The UE would soft-combine successive HARQ transmissions of the same G-RNTI and HARQ process. The total number of transmissions is pre-determined by the gNB.

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

1. **do you agree with the proposals 2.7-2?**
2. **Proponents of PDSCH repetition for MCCH, please provide the motivation**
3. **After clarifications provided, provide your views on the support of gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions for broadcast.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.7-1: We can support this proposal. Actually, both MCCH and MTCH are contained in PDSCH. The repetition is for PDSCH, it doesn’t matter whether it carriers MCCH or MTCH. We also didn’t see strong motivation to preclude this for MCCH.  Proposal 2.7-2: Although we think Config A is sufficient, we can also accept the current proposal. |
| NOKIA/NSB | **Question 2.7-3:**  @Ericsson: regarding ” *@Nokia: About “The total number of transmissions can be pre-determined by the gNB” this should only mean that the number of transmissions is up to the gNB, not relying on UE feedback, but should not be interpreted in such a way that the number needs to be fixed*.”, Yes, we agree, that is exactly our view as your explanation in above.  @All: And the number of “pre-determined” transmissions is up-to gNB implementation, and it should NOT be higher-layer signalled to the broadcast reception Ues, where the toggling of the NDI field in the DCI (associated with a certain G-RNTI) can be used to indicate a new initial transmission to the RV combining UE, and by which the RV combining UE could know on whether the soft combing should be performed with the previously received data in the soft buffer or the soft buffer should be clearly with deleting of previously received data in the buffer. Hope that is align with yours. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 2.7-1: This seems NOT needed.  @ ZTE: It is not clear to us how PDCCH can schedule both MCCH and MTCH in one PDSCH considering different RNTIs are used for MCCH and MTCH. How can UE avoid receiving MTCH for NON-interested G-RNTI, if a DCI is transmitted based on MCCH-RNTI, not G-RNTI.  Anyway, if both MCCH and MTCH can be multiplexed in one PDSCH, we assume that gNB does not perform slot-level repetition. It can be up to gNB whether to only transmit MTCH based on PDSCH repetitions or to transmit MTCH together with MCCH based on NO repetition.  Proposal 2.7-2: OK  Proposal 2.7-3: We support gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions for broadcast. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 2.7-1: OK  2.7-2: Generally Ok with us. One question for clarification is: in case of Config B, how many entries are defined in TDRA table? What’s the max value?  2.7-3: We support gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions for broadcast. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.7-2: Support |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2.7-1: Not support.  RAN2 has defined the corresponding MCCH behaviour, e.g., MCCH modification period, MCCH repetition period. Thus, the proposal is not needed. Proposal 2.7-2: prefer Config A for broadcast transmission. Question 2.7-3: Not support.  Since we have agreed repetition is supported for broadcast transmission, there is no need to consider the gNB triggered HARQ retransmission for broadcast. In addition, if supporting the gNB triggered HARQ retransmission for broadcast with multiple HARQ process, it definitely have larger impact from UE side, especially for the UE HARQ buffer and UE power saving side, and it also against the WID that “In order to facilitate implementation and deployment of the feature, the overall implementation impact should be limited, and the UE complexity should be minimized (e.g. device hardware impact should be avoided)”. |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.7-2: Support  Question 2.7-3: What’s the difference between “number of transmissions is pre-determined by the gNB” and *pdsch-AggregationFactor* or *repetitionNumber*, from UE’s behaviour, it can soft combine repetition PDSCHs. And what’s the spec impact of this proposal? |
| CATT | Proposal 2.7-3: We support gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions for broadcast. |
| Ericsson | 2.7-1: Support. The slot-level PDSCH repetition should be a general physical-layer functionality and not be linked to specific logical channels. It should be noted that, at the physical layer, the UE does not know which logical channel is received, so will in general support slot-level PDSCH repetition and will only discover at higher layers which logical channel was received. Any agreement not to support this functionality for MCCH would only mean a restriction for the gNB, which we see no reason for. Furthermore, if PDSCH repetition is used for MTCH then using it also for MCCH may provide matching coverage in challenging conditions.  2.7-2: Support  2.7-3: The motivation is significant performance increase without complexity increase. The reason for the performance increase (increased time diversity) should be clear from the FL’s quote from our contribution. On a channel without time variations, it does of course not matter whether repetitions come in subsequent slots or whether they are more time separated. In that case the resulting SINR improvement is the same, so there would not be any gain for broadcast in using HARQ retransmissions compared to PDSCH slot-level repetition (for the same amount of redundancy). However, when the channel is time varying, it is well known that time diversity is very valuable and may increase the reception performance a lot. As we showed in our contribution, the available time diversity to combat time variations, is negligible for slot-level repetition but can be very high for gNB-triggered HARQ retransmission. There does not seem to be any UE complexity issues either, since the soft-combining of PDSCH slot-level repetition is anyway supported.  @CMCC: The spec impact is that at least the NDI field is necessary, so that the UE can detect when a new TB starts. To support high bit rates also multiple HARQ processes should be supported. The same HPID/NDI fields as for multicast could thus be supported and UE behaviour would be the same, except no feedback with broadcast.  @MediaTek: About UE complexity etc: for a UE that already supports NR unicast/multicast, there is no increased complexity by the proposed functionality, i.e. it is fully in line with the WID. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.7-1: Support |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Proposal 2.7-1: support. In order to make UE acquire MCCH more faster or with higher BLER, MCCH slot-level repetition is needed. The feature is independent from the rpetition period of MCCH.  Proposal 2.7-2: ok  Proposal 2.7-3: no needed. |
| Moderator | On **Proposal 2.7-1**   * support [ZTE, Lenovo, Ericsson, Samsung, TD Tech] * not support [LG, MediaTek]   @LG, I understand from ZTE that PDSCH is the physical channel carrying MCCH and MTCH, I do not think it is intended that the same PDSCH is carrying both in a single instance MCCH and MTCH.  @MediaTek, could you please clarify this point in particular what is the RAN2 repetition period? Is to understand whether both MCCH repetition and the PDSCH repetition would be complementary or not.  On **Proposal 2.7-2**  I think it is stable, but there are some comments/questions  @Lenovo: please note that the TDRA field in DCI has 4 bits. Regarding max value, do you mean the maximum value of *repetitionNumber*? If that’s the case, I do not think this has been discussed, however, checking multicast agreements from which this proposal is derived, I do not see this has been discussed either but it has been agreed. Otherwise, could you clarify what do you mean by max value?  @MediaTek: I understand this would include your preferred option.  On **Proposal 2.7-3**  There are multiple companies supporting HARQ retransmissions but some companies do not see the need or have concerns on potential complexity increase.  @MediaTeK: one comment is that HARQ retransmissions targets larger interleaving depths that can be achieve with PDSCH repetition. Regarding HARQ processes, please see below.  @CMCC: please see comment from Erissson.  Regarding this proposal, a point that has been brough by multiple companies how HARQ processes are used in idle/inactive Ues. This has also an impact on the discussions on Issue 1 (DCI).  Some companies have argued to define dedicated HARQ processes for broadcast, however, multiple companies have argued that increasing the UE complexity would also go against the WID description of limiting UE complexity. Qualcomm/MediaTek’s discuss that is up to UE implementation to use the HARQ processes for MCCH/MTCH in idle/inactive Ues.  A second proposal has been that idle/inactive Ues reuse HARQ processes that are not used for multicast/unicast which would not increase UE complexity for idle/inactive Ues. Given the WID limitation, the starting point for discussion is this second approach as per Proposal 2.7-4. |

### **3rd round FL proposals for Issue 7**

#### Proposal 2.7-1 [closed]

Proposal 5: For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, support slot-level repetition for MCCH, using:

* (Config A) UE can be configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor*, applied to DCI format 1\_0 with MCCH-RNTI.

#### Proposal 2.7-2 [for email approval]

For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, for slot-level repetition for MTCH, support:

* (Config A) UE can be configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor* per G-RNTI, applied to DCI format 1\_0 with the G-RNTI.
* (Config B) UE can be configured with TDRA table with *repetitionNumber* as part of the TDRA table in *PDSCH-Config-Broadcast*
* If UE is configured with Config B, UE does not expect to be configured with Config A for the same GC-PDSCH.

#### Question 2.7-3 [awaiting more comments]

Provide your views on the support of gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions for broadcast

* Note: UE ehaviour is the same as with Ues receiving multicast, but with no feedback from the UE. The UE would soft-combine successive HARQ transmissions of the same G-RNTI and HARQ process. The total number of transmissions is pre-determined by the gNB.

#### Proposal 2.7-4 [close]

For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, the HARQ combining can be supported by using the available HARQ process(es) not used for unicast/multicast.

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

1. **do you have concerns with the proposals 2.7-2?**
2. **Clarifications have been provided for PDSCH repetition for MCCH, please check whether you still have concerns**
3. **After clarifications provided, provide your views on the support of gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions for broadcast.**
4. **Do you support Proposal 2.7-4?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Question 2.7-3: SupportProposal 2.7-4 [NEW]: Not support, a single dedicated HARQ process is preferred for broadcast reception, similarly as legacy SIB. It is a basic functionality for Rel17 MBS with broadcast reception, and it should not be considered as the UE complexity issue, thus it is not against the WID. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We should simply the broadcast scheduling/reception since it is going to the basic UE feature without UE capability reporting. In light of this, we don’t see the need of 2.7.-3 nor 2.7-4 especially we have supported slot-level repetition for which we are struggling whether it is component of the basic FG for broadcast given it is even optional for multicast subject to UE capability. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Proposal 2.7-1: Ok.One question from us: why not support configure B for MCCH? Proposal 2.7-2: Ok  Proposal 2.7-3: Not support  Proposal 2.7-4: not support. If UE knows the positions of the PDSCH occasions for a same TB, the soft combination can be made if the PDSCH repetition is used. |
| Vivo | Proposal 2.7-4 [NEW]: OK  Considering broadcast PDSCH with repetition can be also received by RRC\_CONNECTED UE, and thus, HPN and NDI are needed. Because if RRC\_CONNECTED UE randomly chooses a free HPN for combination, it will cause chaos for further unicast and multicast reception. |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.7-2: We think Config B is sufficient. If other companies are OK to keep the two configurations options A and B, we can live with it.  Question 2.7-3: For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state Ues, slot-level repetition is supported to provide reliability, we do not see the motivation and extra benefit to support such a mechanism. Proposal 2.7-4: Not support. |
| CATT | Proposal 2.7-4 [NEW]: Support. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.7-1: we still don’t see the necessity. Proposal 2.7-2: Can live with it for sake of progress.  Question 2.7-3: The necessity is questionable. For the coverage of DL channel, or equally the performance of DL channel( the metric is that throughput of DL channel with certain distance should be equal to or larger than a threshold) has been extensively evaluated in Rel-17 CE. The conclusion is that the DL channel is robust enough and no enhancement is needed. We think slot-level repetition is sufficient.  Proposal 2.7-4 [NEW]: We don’t understand how it works. For example, UE combine TBs using a HARQ process not used instantly, what if gNB want to schedule a unicast PDSCH with this HARQ process? gNB cannot know which HARQ process is currently occupied by the broadcast as it is totally UE’s implementation. |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.7-1: We support slot-level repetition for MCCH. Thanks for Moderator’s explanation and LG’s question, we meant to say that both MCCH and MTCH are carried by PDSCH. From physical layer, it doesn’t really matter whether it is MCCH or MTCH, thus we think slot-level repetition has already been supported for MTCH, it can also be applied to MCCH without any further work.Question 2.7-3: We support UE to have dedicated HARQ process for broadcast. From our perspective, adding only one dedicated HARQ process for broadcast may not complicate the UE implementation much. |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2.7-1: Not support Regarding the MCCH issue, the following agreements were achieved in RAN2 meeting:   |  | | --- | | * The MCCH transmission window is defined by MCCH repetition period, MCCH window duration and radio frame/slot offset. * The concept of MCCH transmission window, similar to the one used for LTE SC-PTM, is used for NR MCCH scheduling. * The values of mcch-RepetitionPeriodAndOffset, mcch-WindowStartSlot, mcch-WindowDuration, mcch-ModificationPeriodm, as captured in the RRC running CR in R2-2108970, are confirmed. |   Considering RAN2 has defined the corresponding MCCH behaviour(e.g., MCCH repetition period) as listed above. Thus, the proposal is not needed. Question 2.7-3: NOT support. For UE in IDLE/INACTIVE state, if multiple HARQ process is used as designed for multicast, it is not friendly to UE’s power saving. Besides, the broadcast is best effort reception and RAN2 has agreed that one-to-many mapping between G-RNTI and MBS sessions is supported, it is no clear motivation to support multiple HARQ process for broadcast. Regarding how to perform the HARQ combining for broadcast reception, it is totally UE’s implementation. Proposal 2.7-4 [NEW]: Not support.Regarding how to perform the HARQ combining for broadcast reception, it is totally UE’s implementation and the proposal is NOT necessary. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 2.7-1: We do not supportProposal 2.7-2: OKQuestion 2.7-3: OKProposal 2.7-4: Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE do not need to receive unicast/multicast. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 2.7-1: support. Proposal 2.7-2: support.  Question 2.7-3: We don’t support to define dedicated HARQ process(es) for broadcast, which requires additional buffer at UE side. Proposal 2.7-4 [NEW]: Support |
| Intel | Proposal 2.7-4: We don’t think this is necessary |
| Ericsson | Question 2.7-3: Support. We wish to comment that there is no complexity increase with this functionality when compared with slot-level repetition, since both use the same type of soft-combining. There is however a potential (in time varying channels) big performance gain thanks to the far larger time diversity provided by the HARQ retransmission. If anything, the HARQ combining, being a core feature of NR and supported by all Ues, should be easy to support for a UE that also supports broadcast, since it would just reuse functionality that for sure already exists. 2.7-4: For Ues that anyway support unicast/multicast, this proposal does not add complexity, but adds the possibility for higher bit rates, using multiple HARQ processes in parallel, which may be especially important with a large time spreading of HARQ retransmissions. For pure broadcast Ues, not supporting unicast/multicast, one may consider not using multiple HARQ processes according to P2.7-4, to reduce complexity. However, since the proposal addresses Ues in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE and not Ues in Receive Only Mode (which are anyway not covered by the WID) we must assume that these are Ues that also support unicast – otherwise they could not be in these RRC states! There should therefore not be any complexity issue with the proposal as formulated. We would like to invite companies that are concerned about the complexity of HARQ retransmission soft combining to explain what the issue is. If the UE already supports NR unicast, why would the same functionality for broadcast imply a complexity increase? This assumes that the total amount of buffers is kept the same as in unicast.  When broadcast shares HPIDs with unicast/multicast, some companies are concerned about possible collisions. In our understanding, the basic functionality should be the same for HARQ with broadcast as with unicast/multicast (except the feedback). This means that the gNB indicates the HPID in the DCI, which indirectly controls which HARQ buffer is being used (exactly as for unicast/multicast).  For the UE, there is therefore no difference in the handling of HARQ retransmissions for broadcast compared to unicast/multicast. Similar to the discussion about HARQ processes for unicast and multicast, where the conclusion was that the gNB needs to separate HPIDs for unicast and multicast by implementation, the same principle can be applied to broadcast. The gNB may thus allocate a certain number of dedicated HPIDs for broadcast, which will ensure that there are no collisions.  Ues in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE can in all cases use the HARQ buffers with no risk of collision. When going to RRC Connected, Rel-17 will support these Ues to indicate to the network an expression of interest for MBS sessions/G-RNTIs the UE is interested in receiving. When the Ues have done that, the gNB can treat related Ues in the same way as a multicast group, so there is no difference between multicast and broadcast in such a case from the perspective of HARQ processes handling.  If there is a collision of NDI/HPIDs, before the gNB has received such signaling, there may possibly be a short service interruption. However, this may anyway happen in the transition from RRC IDLE/INACTIV to RRC CONNECTED, for all Cases A/C/D/E, so is not specific to HARQ processes and only occurs if the gNB has not applied the above-mentioned separation of HARQ processes. In summary: there is no additional complexity associated with the support of multiple HARQ processes for broadcast, but there are advantages in terms of which bit rates that can be supported, which is especially important for the case when the spreading of HARQ retransmissions is large. |
| Moderator | On **Proposal 2.7-1**:  Based on the comments to previous rounds of discussion and this discussion, there are multiple companies that do not support PDSCH repetition for MCCH. MediaTek has also provided further details of the RAN2 agreements. I also understand that the PDSCH repetition for MCCH proposed by companies would be in addition to the MCCH repetition defined in RAN2. However, since given the sustained opposition to include this to MCCH I therefore propose to not continue pursuing PDSCH repetition for MCCH. FL recommendation to close **Proposal 2.7-1**.  On **Proposal 2.7-2**  This proposal is stable and under potential email approval. So far no concerns have been raised.  On **Question 2.7-3 & Proposal 2.7-4**:  Some companies have expressed concerns on HARQ retransmissions and potential complexity increase. Ericsson has provided clarification on the HARQ retransmissions and complexity aspects. With these clarifications, Question 2.7-3rev1 is reformulated to focus the discussion on complexity aspects of HARQ retransmissions.  Regarding Proposal 2.7-4, it seems it has not brought any more consensus and it has also been discussed that this would be up to UE implementation. I therefore propose that we only focus on the discussion raised in Question 2.7-3rev1 and **close Proposal 2.7-4**. |

### **4th round FL proposals for Issue 7**

#### Proposal 2.7-2 [for email approval]

For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, for slot-level repetition for MTCH, support:

* (Config A) UE can be configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor* per G-RNTI, applied to DCI format 1\_0 with the G-RNTI.
* (Config B) UE can be configured with TDRA table with *repetitionNumber* as part of the TDRA table in *PDSCH-Config-Broadcast*
* If UE is configured with Config B, UE does not expect to be configured with Config A for the same GC-PDSCH.

#### Question 2.7-3rev1 [request for comments]

Provide your views on the potential impact/no impact of gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions for broadcast as per clarifications in previous round of discussion.

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

1. **do you have concerns with the proposals 2.7-2?**
2. **please provide your comments on Question 2.7-3rev1 based on the explanations provided in previous section.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.7-2: Support |
| Nokia/Nsb | Proposal 2.7-2: Support  Question 2.7-3rev1: We don’t see the issue of gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions for broadcast. And it is feasible in practice. |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.7-2: Support  Question 2.7-3rev1: Similar view as Nokia. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.7-2: Support  Question 2.7-3rev1: no additional impact. It is widely used in 4G/5G. |
| OPPO | Question 2.7-3rev1: Thanks for the explanation in details. We would like to share our views below.  How many HPIDs will be required for broadcast reception? If only one HPID is needed, then it seems not increase the complexity and buffer requirement of Ues. If more than one HPID is required and allocated to MBS for broadcast transmission, the situation may change. If the maximum number of HPID is not increased, i.e. up to 16, then the total number of HPIDs have to be divided into three sub-sets for unicast services, multicast services and broadcast services. Proper allocation of HPID between multicast and unicast service seems acceptable for the total workload to a UE as well as a group of Ues, but adding extra broadcast services to share HPIDs (semi-statically allocation) may lead to short number of HPIDs for Ues in RRC\_CONN. It seems OK for Ues in RRC\_IDLE for broadcast reception since there is no other services (i.e. connected services) to be received or buffered. But for Ues in RRC\_CONN states, even the total buffer requirement is not increased, but there are always some buffers have to be maintained for broadcast reception besides unicast and multicast.  Slot-level repletion mechanism is supported for broadcast and already provided combination benefit. Furthermore, 1 HPID may also be used for broadcast transmission and potential HARQ based soft combination. However, to allocate more than one HPIDs for broadcast transmission (needs DCI indication on each HPID) may need more clarification/discussion in detail. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.7-2: Support |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 2.7-2: Support  Question 2.7-3rev1: Same view with Nokia. |
| CATT | Proposal 2.7-2: Support  Question 2.7-3rev1: Similar view as Nokia/ ZTE/ Lenovo/LG. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.7-2: Support |
| MediaTek | **Question 2.7-3rev1: Not support**  Copy our comments in previous round:  For UE in IDLE/INACTIVE state, if multiple HARQ process is used as designed for multicast, it is not friendly to UE’s power saving. Besides, the broadcast is best effort reception and RAN2 has agreed that one-to-many mapping between G-RNTI and MBS sessions is supported, it is no clear motivation to support multiple HARQ process for broadcast. Regarding how to perform the HARQ combining for broadcast reception, **it is totally UE’s implementation**. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok with 2.7-2.  Keep thinking slot-level repetitions is sufficient. |
| Ericsson | 2.7-2: Support  2.7-3rev1: There are three aspects to consider here: Potential performance gain, UE complexity and specification complexity:  About potential performance gain:  It is well understood theoretically and also well confirmed in practice that spreading the transmission of a codeword in time (e.g. exploited with “time interleaving”), may provide very significant performance gains, in the order of several dBs, on time varying channels. The HARQ retransmission functionality would provide such spreading and can therefore be expected to provide very significant gain for Ues receiving broadcast in time varying channels, also down to walking speed. We do not think any company can dispute that. It is important to understand the difference between the additional redundancy as such, which can be equivalent for PDSCH slot-based repetition, and the time diversity gain, which is unique for the HARQ retransmission.  About UE complexity:  Since the Proposal addresses Ues in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, this is not about broadcast only (ROM) devices (which cannot be in these states), this is about normal unicast-supporting Ues. We can therefore assume that the UE already supports the mandatory HARQ combining functionality, using NDI and HPIDs. Reusing this for broadcast, using the same set of HARQ buffers, cannot reasonably imply any significant increase in complexity compared to the reference unicast or unicast/multicast case.  About specification complexity:  The simplest thing, from a specification point of view, is to avoid exceptions for broadcast. When broadcast simply reuses unicast/multicast functionality, there is no specification impact at all by adding broadcast. The specification impact comes from introducing exceptions for broadcast and a need to specify how the UE should behave differently when it receives broadcast compared to unicast/multicast. With the proposed scheme, the UE would behave as with unicast/multicast, just not sending HARQ feedback.  All-in-all: If the above reasoning is true, it follows that there are only advantages by supporting HARQ retransmission for broadcast. Companies that disagree with anything above should explain why. |
| MediaTek2 | 2.7-3rev1:  @Ericsson,  Firstly, we want to check that do you think supporting multiple HARQ process is a basic feature for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE UE supporting broadcast reception?  Secondly, it is the best effort reception for MBS broadcast UE, and the slot level is also supported for broadcast MTCH, Thus, we don’t think it need to consider more complicated feature design for broadcast reception.  Thirdly, we don’t agree with your explanation about the UE processing complexity. From UE’s processing perspective, the RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode structure is different than from the RRC CONNECTED mode, it will require major changes to UE hardware/software/….., which is not benefit to fast commercial deployment and also against the MBS WID as copied following:   |  | | --- | | **MBS WID Restrictions and assumptions:**  **In order to facilitate implementation and deployment of the feature, the overall implementation impact should be limited, and the UE complexity should be minimized (e.g. device hardware impact should be avoided).** |   Finally, please note that Rel-17 MBS is basic version for fast commercial deployment and further enhancement can be discussed in next release if needed. We think the MBS broadcast mechanism can work even if it does not have the proposal as you mentioned. |
| Moderator | Thank you for further discussion.  Regarding Proposal 2.7-2, this proposal has been under email approval for more than 30h with no concerns. This proposal is moved to Section 4 [stable proposals for email approval].  Regarding the discussion on Question 2.7-3rev1:  Based on the last two rounds of discussion this the support/not support of HARQ retransmissions for broadcast idle/inactive Ues.   * Support [Nokia, LGE, Ericsson, ZTE, Lenovo, CATT] (6) * Not support [Huawei, TD Tech, OPPO, Xiaomi, MediaTek] (5)   There are split views but there has been useful discussion.  @OPPO, MediaTek: thanks for detail comments, it is my understanding that it is the intention not to increase the number of HARQ processes at the UE side rather reuse the existing HARQ processes in the UE. As you describe for idle/inactive Ues there the HARQ processes are available since are unused for unicast/multicast. However, a relevant point is what happens during RRC connected state as you discuss. I have included a question on this below to elaborate more from proponents. Regarding performance, I do agree that the potential performance benefit of HARQ retransmissions over time varying channels with interleaving depths over hundreds of ms can be significant. Time interleaving is a technique commonly used in broadcasting standards and the practical performance benefit is demonstrated. Regarding how the proposal on use of HARQ processes for idle/inactive Ues in the previous round, I have removed it since there was not consensus it is stated that is up to UE implementation.  @Ericsson, MediaTek: I think it would be good to get a common understanding on the point made by MediaTek that from Ues processing perspective, RRC idle/inactive Ues is different to that of RRC connected Ues, which would prevent reusing the HARQ retransmission functionality.  @Ericsson: Is there any specification impact for the operation of HARQ retransmissions during RRC connected Ues? |

### **5th round FL proposals for Issue 7**

#### Question 2.7-3rev1 [request for comments]

Provide your views on the potential impact/no impact of gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions for broadcast as per clarifications in previous round of discussion.

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

1. **please provide your comments on Question 2.7-3rev1 based on the explanations provided in previous section.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | **Question 2.7-3rev1: To our view, both/all “repetition” framework could work without an issue. Support both/all does not harm anything, the network could have the flexibility to choose on how the “repetition” could be applied, i.e. either via gNB-triggered HARQ transmission as above or pdsch-AggregationFactor/TDRA table approach.** |
| Vivo | Without feedback, gNB may have no idea whether the packet is successfully detected in gNB-triggered HARQ retransmissions, and thus, we are not sure how much gain can be achieved by this over scheme of blind repetitions. And it causes longer latency and occupies the HARQ process for longer period. |
| Xiaomi | Same views as Vivo. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | With blind retransmission, it is up to UE implementation to combine or not combine the received data. |
| OPPO | With single dedicated HARQ process allocated to broadcast, the impact can be minor. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We have the similar view with OPPO. |
| CATT | Support.  We share the same views with Lenovo. We believe that the gNB-triggered (not feedback based) HARQ retransmissions can bring the unique time diversity gain as discussed in Ericsson’s comments in last discussion round. And the combination is up to UE implementation. |
| ZTE | We share similar view as OPPO. |
| Spreadtrum | On top of repetition scheme, we have not seen additional benefit from blind retransmission. |
| MediaTek | **Not support.**  The same view as we commented for Ericsson in previous round.  @Moderator,   |  | | --- | | Moderator: Regarding performance, I do agree that the potential performance benefit of HARQ retransmissions over time varying channels with interleaving depths over hundreds of ms can be significant. |   I mean you are discussing the time diversity gain due to time interleaving, however, please note that broadcast reception is a best effort reception. Regarding your comments that “over time varying channels with interleaving depths over hundreds of ms can be significant”, it will need more buffer and have larger hardware impact from UE’s perspective which is against the MBS WID. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Slot-level repetition is sufficient. |
| Ericsson | This is strongly related to the earlier Proposal 2.1-4rev1 and Proposal 2.1-5 about NDI and HPID, so will not re-iterate all arguments here. Only a few points:  @Moderator/MediaTek about UE complexity impact. As mentioned in our comments to Proposal 2.1-4rev1 and Proposal 2.1-5, we cannot see that there is any fundamental complexity impact of supporting broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, since the relevant functionality is already supported for unicast/multicast in RRC CONNECTED.  If anything, supporting this functionality in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE should be easier since the UE is offloaded with a lot of Connected mode processing. We can however understand if adding this may cause issues for an existing design. Although we would fundamentally think this could be a core functionality for broadcast (considering that the starting point is a UE that already supports the same thing for unicast and multicast), we could nevertheless compromise on this and agree the HARQ combining, using multiple HARQ processes, to be a UE capability for reception in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE. For reception of broadcast in RRC CONNECTED this could however easily be a core functionality, considering the almost entire commonality with unicast/multicast, for which this is a core functionality. It should be up to network implementation how to optimize the use of HARQ processes and reception quality/coverage in RRC CONNECTED and RRC IDLE/INACTIVE.  @Moderator question: “Is there any specification impact for the operation of HARQ retransmissions during RRC connected Ues?”  The only impact we can see is that, as a minimum the DCI needs to contain the NDI field (1 bit). In this way the UE can detect new data and flush the buffer correctly. To support multiple HARQ processes for broadcast, the DCI field needs to contain the HPID field (4 bits), but we do not see anything else. The operation for broadcast UEs would be exactly like for unicast/multicast UEs. |
| Moderator | Although multiple companies support HARQ retransmissions, there companies with sustained concerns.  More discussion does not seem that is going to bring convergence at this state. Therefore, given that there is no consensus and the limited time left for the meeting, FL proposes to deprioritise this Issue. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Without HPI, the soft combination can be made for the MTCH slot repetition. |

## [UPDATE] Issue 8: 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 [R1-2110779, Huawei]
  + *Discuss:* Depending on the expected SFN operation performance and the SFN area to be implemented, form network perspective, either SSB or TRS is configured as QCL source for broadcast transmission. Hence, the presence of TRS will be optional as agreed in RAN#93-e.  
    The UE assumes that the DM-RS ports of PDSCH of a serving cell are quasi co-located with the SS/PBCH block determined in the initial access procedure with respect to qcl-Type set to ‘typeA’ for Doppler shift, Doppler spread, average delay and delay spread. For intra-DU SFN operation, the delay spread of multiple SFN cells may be quite different, so SSB cannot be associated with for the delay spread.  
    As agreed in Rel-17 UE Power Saving Enhancements WI, for a RS resource configured for TRS/CSI-RS occasion(s) for idle/inactive UEs, a quasi co-location type can be determined as ‘typeC’ with an SS/PBCH block and, when applicable, ‘typeD’ with the same SS/PBCH block and the QCL information of TRS/CSI-RS occasion(s) for idle/inactive UEs is indicated as a SSB index in range of 0 to 63. The broadcast deployment will dominate in low frequency range, e.g., 600MHz/700MHz, there is no beam selection problems in FR2. Hence, the UE can obtain cell timing and Doppler shift with “typeC” QCLed with SSB. Owing to the delay spread is not associated with SSB, the UE can have a more precise channel estimation for intra-DU SFN cells from period TRS.  
    In Rel-17 UE Power Saving Enhancements WI, configuration for TRS occasion(s) for idle/inactive UEs is based on periodic TRS only. For frequency range 1, the UE may be configured with one or more TRS resource set(s), where each TRS resource set configured by a high layer parameter consists of four periodic NZP CSI-RS resources in two consecutive slots with two periodic NZP CSI-RS resources in each slot. On top of it, the additional specification impact for configuring TRS for broadcast is including such configurations into SIBx/MCCH for MTCH.
  + Proposal 1: Periodic TRS can be configured as QCL source for MTCH transmission especially for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE. The configuration is included in SIBx/MCCH.
* In [R1-2111137, Nokia]
  + Observation-1: 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-2: 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-3: 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 [R1-2112065, LGE]
  + Observation 7: Assuming that low MCS is usually used for broadcast transmission, it is not clear how much we achieve better performance with TRS.
  + Proposal 7: If TRS is agreed to be supported, RAN1 is requested to agree the following proposals:
    - Proposal 7A: a list of NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS can be configured for the same cell group serving one or more G-RNTIs.
    - Proposal 7B: QCL-Info is associated with a NZP CSI-RS resource set for TRS and configured to be Type C QCLed with SSB (i.e. Doppler shift, average delay) via SIBx or MCCH.
    - Proposal 7C: The number of NZP CSI-RS resource sets in the list of NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS can be configurable for each cell group, similarly as specified in NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetList.
  + Proposal 8: For broadcast GC-PDCCH, UE assumes that a PDCCH Monitoring Occasion (MO) is associated with one *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* for TRS which is QCLed with the SSB-index mapped to the MO.
    - UE uses the TRS associated with the MO where GC-DCI scheduling GC-PDSCH is received for determining GC-PDSCH antenna port quasi co-location.
  + Proposal 9: If a same SSB index can be associated with more than one NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS e.g. in *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetPerSSB*,
    - for the [x×N+K]th PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) for MTCH in the scheduling window, the number of PDCCH monitoring occasions in MTCH transmission window is greater than N i.e. the number of actual transmitted SSBs; and
    - the same SSB index can be mapped to multiple Mos of which each is associated with one NZP CSI-RS resource set for TRS e.g. in *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetPerSSB*.
* In [R1-2112241, Qualcomm]
  + If broadcast is transmitted from SFNed multiple cells, GC-PDCCH/PDSCH should be QCL’d with periodic TRS with the multiple cells. The time delay spread of multi-cell transmission is different from that of serving cell’s SSB. The TRS can be configured in a broadcast CFR with transmission no larger than that of the CFR. The TRS can still be QCL-ed with SSB at least in terms of timing, oppler 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 CFR-Config-Broadcast 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, oppler.
* In [R1-2111552, Xiaomi]
  + 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.

### **FL Assessment**

[Huawei, Qualcomm, Xiaomi] support the introduction of TRS for broadcast reception with UEs in idle/inactive RRC state. [Huawei, Qualcomm] clarify that TRS would be optional and transparent to the UEs. For intra-DU SFN the combined delay spread of the multi cell transmission would be different to that of a single cell and SSB cannot be associated in terms of delay spread while SSB can be used to obtain cell timing and Doppler shift. They clarify that since the broadcast deployment would dominate in the 600MHz/700MHz frequency range, beam selection problems are not in the scope.

[Nokia] discuss that the WID has not been updated so no standardised support of SFN is provided and highlight that ongoing work on TRS for power saving WI should be considered. They acknowledge that if there is not time in this release, it could be considered for Rel-18.

[LGE] although also prefers to delay the introduction to future releases, provides further proposals for the introduction of TRS. Two sets of proposals are made in [LGE], the first set address definition and configuration of NZP CSI-RS for TRS, secondly, it also proposes additional configurations targeted for beam sweeping operation. Since, the proposal to introduce TRS is targeting lower frequency bands, the first set of proposals will be put forward for discussion.

**Proposal 2.8-1** addresses the potential agreement of introducing TRS for broadcast reception while **Question 2.8-2** discusses aspects proposed on the configuration of NZP CSI-RS.

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

#### Proposal 2.8-1

TRS can be configured in a CFR-Config-MCCH-MTCH 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, oppler.
* The configuration is included in SIBx/MCCH

#### Question 2.8-2

Provide your views on the following items on configuration of TRS:

* a list of NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS can be configured for the same cell group serving one or more G-RNTIs.
* QCL-Info is associated with a NZP CSI-RS resource set for TRS and configured to be Type C QCLed with SSB (i.e. Doppler shift, average delay) via SIBx or MCCH.
* The number of NZP CSI-RS resource sets in the list of NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS can be configurable for each cell group, similarly as specified in *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetList*.

**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, views in general if you do not agree.**
2. **Please provide your views on Question 2.8-2.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 2.8-1: We prefer to defer TRS to a later release.Question 2.8-2: If TRS is supported, the TRS can be configured as listed in this question. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Proposal 2.8-1: Not support, TRS should be handled in later release. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.8-1: Support |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2.8-1: We agree with the intention of the proposal. However, some refinement is needed: TRS can be configured in a CFR-Config-MCCH-MTCH for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.   * UE may assume that the DMRS of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured for broadcast. * The TRS can be QCL-ed with SSB, i.e. QCL type C ~~at least in terms of timing, oppler~~. * The configuration is included in SIBx/MCCH  Question 2.8-2: we are fine with this proposal. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.8-1: Agree Question 2.8-2: OK |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.8-1: **we are open to support this proposal.** |
| Vivo | Regarding ‘UE may assume that the GC-PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured for broadcast’, does it mean when TRS is configured, all UEs in the cell shall use TRS as QCL source for broadcast reception instead of SSB? |
| Ericsson | P2.8.1: OK to defer TRS to a later Release P2.8.2: If TRS is supported, then this is OK. |
| Qualcomm | P2.8.1: support.P2.8.2: Some modifications are needed. For SFN scenarios, the TRS cannot be Type C QCLed with SSB.  * a list of periodic NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS can be configured for the same cell group serving one or more G-RNTIs **in a CFR-Config-Broadcast**. * QCL-Info is associated with a NZP CSI-RS resource set for TRS and configured to be QCLed with SSB (i.e. timing, Doppler shift,) via SIBx or MCCH. * The number of NZP CSI-RS resource sets in the list of NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS can be configurable for each cell group, similarly as specified in *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetList*. |
| Intel | Handle in Rel-18 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 2.8-1: support2.8-2: ok with QC’s revision. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | 2.8-1: support2.8-2: ok with QC’s revision. |
| Moderator | Here, while multiple companies support to introduce TRS, other companies do prefer to delay the discussion to Rel-18:   * Support [NTT DOCOMO, Xiaomi, Samsung, ZTE, Qualcomm, Huawei, TD Tech] (7) * delay to later release [LG, Nokia, Ericsson, Intel] (4)   There are more companies that support to be introduce in this release. Other companies prefer to delay to Rel-18.  @vivo, I think that MBS idle/inactive UEs if configured with TRS would use it as QLC source but the TRS would be QCL with SSB in terms of timing and oppler.  It would be good to at least check if the modifications proposed by Xiaomi and Huawei are acceptable for proponents of TRS and see if companies can accommodate TRS given the support from multiple companies. |

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

#### Proposal 2.8-1rev1:

TRS can be configured in a CFR-Config-MCCH-MTCH for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.

* UE may assume that the DMRS of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured for broadcast.
* The TRS can be QCL-ed with SSB, i.e. QCL type C ~~at least in terms of timing, oppler~~.
* The configuration is included in SIBx/MCCH

#### Question 2.8-2rev1

Provide your views on the following items on configuration of TRS:

* a list of periodic NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS can be configured for the same cell group serving one or more G-RNTIsin a CFR-Config-Broadcast.
* QCL-Info is associated with a NZP CSI-RS resource set for TRS and configured to be QCLed with SSB (i.e. timing, Doppler shift,) via SIBx or MCCH.
* The number of NZP CSI-RS resource sets in the list of NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS can be configurable for each cell group, similarly as specified in *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetList*.

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

1. **do you agree with the proposal 2.8-1rev1? Please provide reasons, views in general if you do not agree.**
2. **Please provide your views on Question 2.8-2rev1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Still we are not convinced the benefits with performance justification of introducing TRS in Rel17 MBS. And we are introducing extra design complexity for enabling Rel17 MBS in reality. Thus, we do not support the proposal and question. Proposal 2.8-1rev1 and Question 2.8-2rev1: Not support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support.  We agree 2.8.2-rev1.  We have agreed one set of parameters configured for PDSCH for broadcast reception. As we agreed for multicast, PDSCH-config in general is supposed to include all parameters that are included in PDSCH-config for unicast if we are not going to discuss the parameters one-by-one. In light of this, we are assuming the parameters can also be included in SIBx/MCCH for MTCH including the TRS configuration. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.8-1rev1: Support |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | ok |
| Xiaomi | Support both proposals. |
| Qualcomm | Support both proposals with minor change from ‘i.e., QCL-C’ to ‘e.g., QCL-C’. |
| Ericsson | OK |
| vivo | ok |
| MediaTek | We share the similar view with Nokia. |
| Moderator | Based on the discussion on these two rounds, the number of supporting companies and the number of companies that prefer to delay to next releases are:   * Support [NTT DOCOMO, Xiaomi, Samsung, ZTE, Qualcomm, Huawei, TD Tech, vivo, Ericsson] (9) * delay to later release [LG, Nokia, Intel, MediaTek] (4)   The comments from companies not supporting the introduction of TRS are: i) prefer to delay to next release, ii) doubts on performance benefit and iii) additional complexity. It is proposed to focus on the technical concerns from companies to move the discussion forward.  Regarding potential performance benefit this has been highlighted in [Huawei, Qualcomm] contribution as follows:  R1-2110779:  “Depending on the expected SFN operation performance and the SFN area to be implemented, form network perspective, either SSB or TRS is configured as QCL source for broadcast transmission. Hence, the presence of TRS will be optional as agreed in RAN#93-e. The UE assumes that the DM-RS ports of PDSCH of a serving cell are quasi co-located with the SS/PBCH block determined in the initial access procedure with respect to qcl-Type set to 'typeA' for Doppler shift, Doppler spread, average delay and delay spread. For intra-DU SFN operation, the delay spread of multiple SFN cells may be quite different, so SSB cannot be associated with for the delay spread.”  R1-2112241:  “If broadcast is transmitted from SFNed multiple cells, GC-PDCCH/PDSCH should be QCL’d with periodic TRS with the multiple cells. The time delay spread of multi-cell transmission is different from that of serving cell’s SSB. The TRS can be configured in a broadcast CFR with transmission no larger than that of the CFR. The TRS can still be QCL-ed with SSB at least in terms of timing, doppler shift”  From the above, it seem clear that the benefit is on scenarios where UEs receive signals from multiple cells where the delay spread from SSB is not representative of the multi cell reception.  Regarding complexity, Huawei has provided a comment as follows:  “We have agreed one set of parameters configured for PDSCH for broadcast reception. As we agreed for multicast, PDSCH-config in general is supposed to include all parameters that are included in PDSCH-config for unicast if we are not going to discuss the parameters one-by-one. In light of this, we are assuming the parameters can also be included in SIBx/MCCH for MTCH including the TRS configuration”  It would be good to understand what are the concerns from companies to move on the discussion. Could companies that do not support TRS share what their concerns on complexity are in more detail, if any, building from the discussion on these two rounds?  Question 2.8-2rev1 is moved to proposal. |

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

#### Proposal 2.8-1rev2:

TRS can be configured in a CFR-Config-MCCH-MTCH for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.

* UE may assume that the DMRS of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured for broadcast.
* The TRS can be QCL-ed with SSB, ~~i.e.~~ e.g., QCL type C ~~at least in terms of timing, doppler~~.
* The configuration is included in SIBx/MCCH

#### Proposal 2.8-2

For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, the configuration of TRS at least supports:

* a list of periodic NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS can be configured for the same cell group serving one or more G-RNTIsin a CFR-Config-Broadcast.
* QCL-Info is associated with a NZP CSI-RS resource set for TRS and configured to be QCLed with SSB (i.e. timing, Doppler shift,) via SIBx or MCCH.
* The number of NZP CSI-RS resource sets in the list of NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS can be configurable for each cell group, similarly as specified in *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetList*.

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

1. **Do you have concerns with agreeing Proposals 2.8-1rev2 and Proposal 2.8-2?**
2. **Please provide you concerns, with technical details, building on the discussion on the previous two rounds.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | **Proposals 2.8-1rev2 and Proposal 2.8-2: Not support. We don’t think we had much time for such discussions, and prefer for further discussion in future release.** |
| vivo | **OK** |
| Nokia/Nsb2 | **Also it is unclear for us regarding what is the connection between Proposal 2.8-1rev2 and Proposal 2.8-2:**   * In **Proposal 2.8-1rev2,** it is said the configuration via CFR-Config-MCCH-MTCH, but in **Proposal 2.8-2,** it is stated the configuration via CFR-Config-Broadcast instead, are those two different parameters for TRS configurations? * Regarding QCL type, in **Proposal 2.8-1rev2**, it is said “e.g. QCL type C”, but in **Proposal 2.8-2,** it is stated (i.e. timing, Doppler shift), we request the proponents to provide simulation performance justification on what QCL Type should be applied. We could not specify something simply by assuming. If there is no time for providing such simulation performance justification, as said, we prefer to defer the discussion to coming release.   SSB based framework is the very basic functionality that should be supported in Rel17 MBS, any other optimization, i.e. support of TRS, should be considered in future release. |
| Xiaomi | **OK** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2.8-1rev2: Support  Proposal 2.8-2: Support |
| CATT | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support both proposals. |
| Ericsson | Support both proposals |
| LG Electronics | We still prefer to discuss this for a later release. |
| Qualcomm | Support.  As agreed in RANP#93-e, TRS is within the scope of Rel-17 MBS WID. Without TRS, it means no support of transparent SFN for broadcast transmission, which is against the Rel-17 MBS WID. |
| Moderator | Thanks for the continued efforts.  The situation has not changed much from previous rounds. There have been comments that there has not been enough time for discussion. However, it is also worth pointing out that TRS has been in the table since RAN1#104-e and this issue was also discussed at the RANP. There have also been discussion on whether TRS forms part of basic functionality or not.  @Nokia: regarding the comment on CFR-Config-Broadcast, I think it is meant in both CFR-Config-MCCH-MTCH. I have changed this to clarify.  Given that there was good support for TRS in general, my proposal is to try to check by email whether companies are willing to accept the two proposals below, or at least Proposal 2.8-1re2. |

### **4th round FL proposals for Issue 8**

#### Proposal 2.8-1rev2: [for email discussion]

TRS can be configured in a CFR-Config-MCCH-MTCH for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.

* UE may assume that the DMRS of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured for broadcast.
* The TRS can be QCL-ed with SSB, ~~i.e.~~ e.g., QCL type C ~~at least in terms of timing, doppler~~.
* The configuration is included in SIBx/MCCH

#### Proposal 2.8-2 [for email discussion]

For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, the configuration of TRS at least supports:

* a list of periodic NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS can be configured for the same cell group serving one or more G-RNTIsin a ~~CFR-Config-Broadcast~~ CFR-Config-MCCH-MTCH.
* QCL-Info is associated with a NZP CSI-RS resource set for TRS and configured to be QCLed with SSB (i.e. timing, Doppler shift,) via SIBx or MCCH.
* The number of NZP CSI-RS resource sets in the list of NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS can be configurable for each cell group, similarly as specified in *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetList*.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.8-1rev2: Support  Proposal 2.8-2: Support |
| Nokia/Nsb | Not support both, there is in-completed statement on what QCL Type there can be. |
| CATT | OK with both proposals. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | ok |

## [UPDATE] Issue 9: Multiplexing MCCH/MTCH and other PDCCH/PDSCH

### **Background**

As part of the discussion for the Draft CR on TS 38.202 [R1-2112515], companies discussed multiplexing of MCCH/MTCH and other PDCCH/PDSCH for RRC idle/inactive UE states. In the two figures below show the changes made to Table 6.2.1 on Downlink “Reception Types” where D5 and D6 corresponds to MCCH and MTCH, respectively.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Table 6.2-2 on Downlink “Reception Type” combinations of the Draft CR on TS 38.202 [R1-2112515] shows the comment from the Editor highlighting that more discussion is needed for the scenarios for which D5 and D6 are applicable.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* [R1-2112241, Qualcomm]
  + *Discuss*: For LTE SC-PTM
    - RRC\_IDLE UEs are not required to receive FDMed SC-PTM and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell.
  + For NR broadcast MCCH/MTCH, RAN1 needs to discuss
    - For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, whether the UE is required to support FDMed MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell.
  + In our view, NR broadcast MCCH/MTCH can be treated similar as LTE SC-PTM, but in addition, we need to consider the multicast case for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues.

RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues are not required to support FDMed MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell.

* + Proposal 8: For NR broadcast MCCH/MTCH
    - RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues are not required to support FDMed MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell.
    - RRC\_CONNECTED Ues,
      * Shall be able to support FDMed one PDSCH (for MCCH/MTCH, multicast, or unicast) and PBCH/SIB in a DL CC.
      * Whether to support FDMed one PDSCH (for MCCH/MTCH) and one PDSCH for unicast in a DL CC is subject to UE capability
      * Whether to support FDMed one PDSCH (for MCCH/MTCH), one PDSCH for multicast and unicast in a DL CC is subject to UE capability.

### **FL Assessment**

Only the contribution in [Qualcomm] address the issue of multiplexing MCCH/MTCH and other PDCCH/PDSCH. However, given the discussions with the CRs to TS 38.202 this issue is included for discussion in this meeting. [Qualcomm] presents that for LTE SC-PTM, RRC idle Ues are not required to receive FDMed SC-PTM and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell and consider that this “Reception Type” combination should be applied to NR broadcast. They also discuss the case for RRC connected Ues, but in this AI we initially would only need to focus on RRC idle/inactive Ues.

**Question 2.9-1** is put forward to collect company views. Based on rounds of discussion a further proposal for agreement could be included.

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

#### Question 2.9-1

Are RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues required to support FDMed MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell?

**Considering the FL assessment above, please provide your views on Question 2.9-1 in the table below.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | To our view, it mainly depends on UE capability.  If the idle/inactive Ues do not support simultaneous reception, it is straightforward that the high-priority PBCH/SIB/Paging PDSCH is received, with dropping of FDMed MCCH/MTCH GC-PDSCH. The network may try by implementation to avoid such dropping in reality, but if such dropping happened for idle/inactive Ues with broadcast reception, the performance of broadcast reception will be impacted. And for idle/inactive UE support simultaneous reception, then the performance impact can be avoided, but of course, with introducing the higher UE capability required. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | As discussed in AI8.12.1, for RRC connected UE, FDM between one multicast reception and another multicast reception is fully dependent on UE capability.  For Idle mode UE, we think network can avoid such overlapping since network doesn’t have UE capability info. |
| ZTE | Based on the following spec, at least for FR1, UE has the UE capability to decode overlapping unicast PDSCH and SIB PDSCH. The broadcast PDSCH is similar to unicast PDSCH, thus we think UE is required to support FDMed MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell at least in FR1.  *On a frequency range 1 cell, the UE shall be able to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI and, during a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI that partially or fully overlap in time in non-overlapping PRBs, unless the PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI requires Capability 2 processing time according to clause 5.3 in which case the UE may skip decoding of the scheduled PDSCH with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI.* |
| MediaTek | Since UE cannot report capability, FDMed reception is not supported. We have the similar view with Lenovo that “For Idle mode UE, network can avoid such overlapping since network doesn’t have UE capability info.” |
| Ericsson | In the context of the Case C/D/E discussion, seamless transition of broadcast reception between RRC IDLE/INACTIVE and RRC CONNECTED has been considered important. When a UE is receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, it can be expected to be a common situation that the UE is paged to go to RRC Connected to receive some service there. It may be difficult for the network to ensure that paging occasions do not coincide with broadcast transmissions. Therefore, without the FDM support, Ues are likely to experience a broadcast service interruption when paged, which would be undesirable.  To avoid this, Ues should support FDM, at least as a UE capability. |
| Apple | Share the similar view with Lenovo. FDM reception is optional UE feature for connected UE, it should not be mandate requirement for idle UE. |
| Qualcomm | We think RRC IDLE/INACTIVE Ues without UE capability indication are not required to receive FDMed MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell. |
| Intel | Since FDM is UE capability, it’s not supported for broadcast. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | We think UE needs to support as best as posible |
| Moderator | Regarding UE support of FDM of MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell in RRC Idle/Inactive state:   * Option 1: is required [ZTE, Ericsson, TD Tech]. * Option 2: is not required [Lenovo, Mediatek, Apple, Qualcomm, Intel] * Option 3: is not required, it depends on UE capability [Nokia, Ericsson]   Most companies [5] think it is not a mandatory feature. [3] companies believe it could be introduced as a UE capability. However, for idle/inactive Ues the network would not have the information of the capability of idle/inactive Ues. It has been highlighted by [Nokia, Ericsson] that it may not always be possible to guarantee that MCCH/MTCH transmission do not overlap in time. In such situations Ues without FDM capability would suffer an interruption and Ues with FDM capability would not suffer an interruption.  Based on the discussion Proposal 2.9-1 proposes that FDM support is not mandatory but notes that it could be introduced as UE capability with the understanding that network would not have the knowledge of such capability but only to improve the performance of those Ues with higher capability if network cannot guarantee that MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging do not overleap in time. |

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

#### Proposal 2.9-1:

Support of FDMed MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell is not mandatory for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues.

* it can be introduced as UE capability.

**Considering the FL assessment above, please provide your views on Proposal 2.9-1 in the table below.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | Proposal 2.9-1: Not support, we prefer the mandatory support for idle/inactive Ues, sometimes the overlapping between MCCH/MTCH and SIB/Paging in Pcell could not be avoided, and it may results in the performance impact for idle/inactive Ues. |
| Vivo | We prefer FDMed MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell is not supported and UE capability is not needed.We agree that it is up to gNB to avoid the overlapping between MCCH/MTCH and SIB/Paging,and when the overlapping happens, it is up to UE implementation for decoding. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with this proposal.We think network needs to avoid such overlapping. If overlapping happens, it is up to UE implementation to receive or drop the broadcast reception. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. We don’t think the UE capability is necessary. |
| ZTE | From our perspective, FDMed MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging should at least be supported for FR1, similar as what we have for previous reception of SIB/Paging and unicast PDSCH. |
| MediaTek | Agree with the proposal.The sub-bullet is not necessary because it cannot report capability for RRC IDLE/IACTIVE UE. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have been assuming UE has such capability because it is for UEs in IDLE/INACTIVE for which UE can use the resources that are used in connected to receive the FDM-ed broadcast in IDLE/INACTIVE state. |
| Ericsson | We prefer mandatory support but accept UE capability. |
| LG Electronics | gNB would not know whether a certain UE in RRC\_IDLE have such capability or not and even whether the UE in RRC\_IDLE will receive broadcast or not. Thus, we wonder how capability would work. The sub-bullet seems not necessary. |
| Moderator | There are mixed views on this.   * mandatory [Nokia, Huawei, Ericsson] (3) * not mandatory [vivo, Lenovo, NTT DOCOMO, MediaTek, LGE] (5) * mandatory only for FR1 [ZTE] (1)   Regarding the UE capability, for some companies it is not clear why this is needed since such capability cannot be reported to the network. Phrasing the text as “it is up to UE implementation” may capture better the intention here as has been highlighted by some companies. A possible middle point may be the option proposed by ZTE, where it is only mandatory for FR1 similar to as what it is done for SIB/Paging and unicast PDSCH. Proroposal 2.9.1-rev1 tries this to collect company comments while noting that it is up to UE implementation for FR2. |

### **3rd round FL proposals for Issue 9**

#### Proposal 2.9-1rev1: [for email discussion]

Support of FDMed MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell is ~~not~~ mandatory for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only for FR1.

* For FR2, support of FDMed MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell is up to UE implementation
* ~~it can be introduced as UE capability.~~

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | Support |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | ok |
| OPPO | Not support.  We prefer to make it “not mandatory”.  The overlapping scheduling should be avoided by gNB, and whenever the overlapping happens, it is up to UE implementation to determine receiving or dropping. |

## Other Issues proposed for lower priority

The proposal for the Issues below is that are considered with lower priority to focus on the other issues above in this summary. If companies think that any of the issues below address a critical functionality that is missing for this AI, please provide also these comments to the table below to evaluate the situation based on comments.

### **Other Issue 1: Number of CFRs for MTCH**

This issue has been discussed at past meetings without reaching a conclusion. Although some companies did support specifying more than one CFR for MTCH, multiple companies did not support it. The motivation to introduce multiple CFRs for MTCH is to provide higher flexibility to the network to deploy services with different requirements. To this meeting contributions from [ZTE, vivo, Nokia] supported more than one CFR for MTCH, while [OPPO, Intel, Xiaomi, CMCC, NTT DOCMO, Lenovo, MediaTek, Ericsson] explicitly mentioned that only supported one CFR for MTCH.

The FL initial proposal is not to discuss further this Issue for this meeting.

### **Other Issue 2: PDSCH: Semi Persistent Scheduling**

This issue has been discussed at multiple meetings including the last one. There are companies that want to introduce SPS for broadcast reception with idle/inactive UEs with the motivation to reduce PDCCH overhead for services that have periodic transmissions. However, there were companies that had concerns with the complexity of such functionality at such at such late stage of the release, or concerns were raised on SPS without activation/deactivation mechanisms.

Contributions to this meeting from [ZTE, vivo, Nokia, Xiaomi, NTT DOCOMO, LGE, Ericsson] propose to support/discuss SPS for broadcast reception in idle/inactive UEs. On the other hand, [OPPO, Apple] propose to not to support or to consider for next releases.

The FL initial proposal is not to discuss further this Issue for this meeting.

### **Other Issue 3: PDCCH: CORESET for MCCH and MTCH**

There have been multiple agreements on the configuration of CORESET in past meetings. Based on the agreements so far, FL understands that the basic functionality is in place. Please comment in the table below if this understanding is not correct.

Aspects that were proposed at the last meeting were the possibility to configure separately different CORESET for MCCH and MTCH to provide higher flexibility on the configuration of services. However, there was no conclusion on the discussion.

Contributions to this meeting discussing configuration of CORESET are [Huawei, TD Tech, Nokia, OPPO, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Ericsson]. While [Huawei, Nokia] discusses different configuration for MCCH and MTCH, [OPPO, Xiaomi, Lenovo] propose to use the same coreset for both channels.

A note is that Issue 4 in this summary is discussing separate PDCCH/PDSCH-Configs for MCCH and MTCH.

The FL initial proposal is not to discuss further this Issue for this meeting.

### **Other Issue 4: HARQ feedback for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UE states**

This issue has been discussed at previous meetings but not the last one. Most companies did not support introducing such a functionality for idle/inactive UEs. To this meeting contributions form [vivo, Xiaomi, Samsung, Lenovo] propose that HARQ feedback is not supported, while [OPPO] proposes to support.

The FL’s proposal is not to discuss further this Issue for this meeting.

### **Other Issue 5: Broadcast services supported for both RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs**

This aspect was discussed at initial meetings of this release but has not been discussed at the last meetings. Inputs to this meeting [CATT, Intel, MediaTek, Ericsson] discuss aspects on this issue. However, most of the discussions and proposals are to clarify that network implementation makes sure that UEs in RRC connected state use a BWP that contains the CFR.

The FL’s proposal is not to discuss further this Issue for this meeting.

### **Other Issue 6: Discontinuous Reception (DRX) and Wakeup Signals (WUS)**

This issue has only been discussed at [CATT].

The FL’s proposal is not to discuss this Issue for this meeting.

### **Other Issue 6: UE feedback for MBS Interest Indication for partial beam sweeping or MCS determination**

This issue has been discussed at [Nokia, Sony].

The FL’s proposal is not to discuss this Issue for this meeting.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 2.10.1: we support only one CFR for MTCH.  2.10.2: we support SPS for broadcast for saving PDCCH overhead.  2.10.3: We support same CORESET for MTCH and MCCH.  2.10.4: No HARQ feedback for broadcast transmission. |
| Moderator | Thanks for comment. As per the email discussion, companies can provide comments here if there is a topic that addresses a critical aspect or if there is a topic with significant interest it can be brought back for discussion. |
|  |  |

# Proposals for Discussion at GTW sessions

This section will include proposals for potential discussion at the different GTW scheduled for NR MBS at RAN1#107-e.

## GTW on 11 Nov

#### Proposal 2.2-1

Confirm the working assumption made at RAN1#106bis-e:

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

#### Proposal 2.1-1

For GC-PDSCH scheduled with DCI format 1\_0 for broadcast reception, the size of the FDRA field depends on the size of the CFR.

#### Proposal 2.1-2

For GC-PDSCH scheduled with DCI format 1\_0 for broadcast reception, RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR.

#### Proposal 2.1-3

For GC-PDSCH scheduled with DCI format 1\_0 for broadcast reception, the resource allocation granularity is single RB.

## GTW on 15 Nov

#### Proposal 2.1-6

for broadcast reception, the following options is supported for VRB-to-PRB mapping field in the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH

* Opt-1: DCI includes the VRB-to-PRB mapping field with 1 bit according to Table 7.3.1.2.2-5 in TS 38.212

#### Proposal 2.1-1rev1

For FDRA determination of the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:

* is the size of CORESET 0
* If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,*

#### Proposal 2.4-3

For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs:

* The CFR frequency resources used for MCCH and MTCH are configured by SIBx;
* PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH is configured by SIBx
* PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH is configured by MCCH. If the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for MTCH is not configured, the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH configured by SIBx is reused for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

#### Proposal 2.7-2

For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, for slot-level repetition for MTCH, support:

* (Config A) UE can be configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor* per G-RNTI, applied to DCI format 1\_0 with the G-RNTI.
* (Config B) UE can be configured with TDRA table with *repetitionNumber* as part of the TDRA table in *PDSCH-Config-Broadcast*
* If UE is configured with Config B, UE does not expect to be configured with Config A for the same GC-PDSCH.

#### Proposal 2.4-4rev1

The following agreements for RRC\_CONECTED UEs also apply for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states, with the following updates:

Agreement:

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH:

* The maximum number of layers can be provided by *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value is defined.
  + FFS the default value.
* The maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR;
  + FFS: if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, a value determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast in the active DL BWP is used; if the *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast is not configured, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).
* xOverhead can be provided in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value of zero is used.
* The number of PRBs is determined based on the size of CFR.

Agreement:

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH, the default value of the maximum number of layers is 1 if *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR is not configured.

Agreement:

For determination of maximum modulation order for LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH,

* if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH for broadcast reception:

* the maximum number of layers is 1
* the maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for broadcast.
* If *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* is not configured in CFR for broadcast, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used.

#### Proposal 2.4-1rev1

Adding the following PDSCH TDRA table determination rule for broadcast to Table 5.1.2.1.1-1 of TS38.214.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RNTI** | **PDCCH search space** | **SS/PBCH block and CORESET multiplexing pattern** | **pdsch-ConfigCommon includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config-broadcast includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **PDSCH time domain resource allocation to apply** |
| MCCH\_RNTI, G\_RNTI for broadcast | Type-x Common for broadcast | 1 | No | - | ~~-~~  ~~No~~ | Default A  ~~(if SearchSpaceZero is configured)~~ |
| 2 | No | - | ~~-~~  ~~No~~ | Default B  ~~(if SearchSpaceZero is configured)~~ |
| 3 | No | - | ~~-~~  ~~No~~ | Default C  ~~(if SearchSpaceZero is configured)~~ |
| ~~1,2,3~~ | ~~No~~ | ~~-~~ | ~~No~~ | ~~Default A~~  ~~(if SearchSpaceZero is NOT configured)~~ |
| 1,2,3 | Yes | - | No | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-ConfigCommon |
| 1,2,3 | No/Yes | - | Yes | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-Config-broadcast |

#### Proposal 2.4-2rev1

~~For Case D/E (if supported),~~ the definition of the broadcast BWP/CFR frequency resources reuses 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.

## GTW on 17 Nov

#### Proposal 2.4-1

Adding the following PDSCH TDRA table determination rule for broadcast to Table 5.1.2.1.1-1 of TS38.214.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RNTI** | **PDCCH search space** | **SS/PBCH block and CORESET multiplexing pattern** | **pdsch-ConfigCommon includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config-broadcast includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **PDSCH time domain resource allocation to apply** |
| MCCH\_RNTI, G\_RNTI for broadcast | Type-x Common for broadcast | 1 | No | - | No | Default A  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 2 | No | - | No | Default B  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 3 | No | - | No | Default C  (if SearchSpaceZero is configured) |
| 1,2,3 | No | - | No | Default A  (if SearchSpaceZero is NOT configured) |
| 1,2,3 | Yes | - | No | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-ConfigCommon |
| 1,2,3 | No/Yes | - | Yes | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-Config-broadcast |

#### Proposal 2.4-2rev3

~~For Case D/E (if supported),~~ the definition of the broadcast ~~BWP/~~CFR frequency resources reuses 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.

* Note: for Case A and Case C, the above parameters (Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and *locationAndBandwidth*) can be derived from the configurations in MIB and SIB1, respectively.

#### Proposal 2.5-4rev1

(**conclusion**)

Is up to RAN2 decision:

* the ~~definition~~ configuration of the MTCH scheduling window parameters: monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity:
* whether the MTCH scheduling window is associated to one or multiple or all G-RNTIs

#### Proposal 2.1-1rev2:

Confirm the following working assumption:

Working assumption

For FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:

* is the size of CORESET 0if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
* If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,*

## GTW on 19 Nov

#### Proposal 2.6-2rev1

(**conclusion**)

RAN1 cannot get consensus on the support of Case D and/or Case E.

* Send an LS to RANP to inform about RAN1’s conclusion with a request for discussion and decision at RANP.

#### Proposal 2.6-1rev3

(**conclusion**)

Send an LS to RAN2 to consider the definition/configuration of a CFR larger than CORESET#0 by including all agreements made by RAN1 for CFR bandwidth configurations.

# Proposals for email approval/discussion

The following are considered stable proposals:

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 2.1-1rev2: [for email approval] Confirm the following working assumption:  Working assumption  For FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:   * is the size of CORESET 0if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell. * If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,*  Proposal 2.5-4rev2 [for email approval] (**conclusion**)  Is up to RAN2 decision:   * the ~~definition~~ configuration of the MTCH scheduling window parameters: monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity: * whether the MTCH scheduling window is associated to one or multiple or all G-RNTIs * Send an LS to RAN2 to inform about RAN1 conclusion. |

The following are proposals that with email discussion possible convergence may be achieved.

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 2.1-5rev1 [for email discussion] for broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH includes the field New Data Indicator. Proposal 2.8-1rev2: [for email discussion] TRS can be configured in a CFR-Config-MCCH-MTCH for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.   * UE may assume that the DMRS of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured for broadcast. * The TRS can be QCL-ed with SSB, ~~i.e.~~ e.g., QCL type C ~~at least in terms of timing, doppler~~. * The configuration is included in SIBx/MCCH  Proposal 2.8-2 [for email discussion] For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, the configuration of TRS at least supports:   * a list of periodic NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS can be configured for the same cell group serving one or more G-RNTIsin a ~~CFR-Config-Broadcast~~ CFR-Config-MCCH-MTCH. * QCL-Info is associated with a NZP CSI-RS resource set for TRS and configured to be QCLed with SSB (i.e. timing, Doppler shift,) via SIBx or MCCH. * The number of NZP CSI-RS resource sets in the list of NZP CSI-RS resource sets for TRS can be configurable for each cell group, similarly as specified in *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetList*.  Proposal 2.9-1rev1: [for email discussion] Support of FDMed MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell is ~~not~~ mandatory for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only for FR1.   * For FR2, support of FDMed MCCH/MTCH and PBCH/SIB/Paging in Pcell is up to UE implementation * ~~it can be introduced as UE capability.~~ |

# Summary of Agreements

This section includes the agreements for RAN1#107-e.

**Agreement**

Confirm the working assumption made at RAN1#106bis-e:

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

**Agreement**

For GC-PDSCH scheduled with DCI format 1\_0 for broadcast reception, RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR.

**Conclusion**

For broadcast reception, the DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH does not include the field TB scaling.

**Agreement**

For broadcast reception, the following options is supported for VRB-to-PRB mapping field in the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH

* Opt-1: DCI includes the VRB-to-PRB mapping field with 1 bit according to Table 7.3.1.2.2-5 in TS 38.212
  + Note: DL resource allocation type 0 is not supported in DCI format 1\_0

**Working assumption**

For FDRA determination of the DCI format 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH for broadcast reception:

* is the size of CORESET 0if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
* If the size of CFR (i.e.)is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where *K* is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12} which satisfies *;*otherwise*,*

**Agreement**

For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs:

* The CFR frequency resources used for MCCH and MTCH are configured by SIBx;
* PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH is configured by SIBx
* PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH is configured by MCCH. If the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for MTCH is not configured, the PDCCH-config/PDSCH-config for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH configured by SIBx is reused for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

**Agreement**

Adding the following PDSCH TDRA table determination rule for broadcast to Table 5.1.2.1.1-1 of TS38.214.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RNTI** | **PDCCH search space** | **SS/PBCH block and CORESET multiplexing pattern** | **pdsch-ConfigCommon includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **pdsch-Config-broadcast includes pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList** | **PDSCH time domain resource allocation to apply** |
| MCCH\_RNTI, G\_RNTI for broadcast | Type-x Common for broadcast | 1 | No | - | - | Default A |
| 2 | No | - | - | Default B |
| 3 | No | - | - | Default C |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1,2,3 | Yes | - | No | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-ConfigCommon |
| 1,2,3 | No/Yes | - | Yes | pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList provided in pdsch-Config-broadcast |

**Agreement**

The definition of the broadcast CFR frequency resources reuses 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 CFR with respect to the carrier starting RB.

* Note: for Case A and Case C, the above parameters (Point A, *offsetToCarrier* and *locationAndBandwidth*) can be derived from the configurations in MIB and SIB1, respectively.

**Agreement**

For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, for slot-level repetition for MTCH, support:

* (Config A) UE can be configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor* per G-RNTI, applied to DCI format 1\_0 with the G-RNTI.
* (Config B) UE can be configured with TDRA table with *repetitionNumber* as part of the TDRA table in *PDSCH-Config-Broadcast*
* If UE is configured with Config B, UE does not expect to be configured with Config A for the same GC-PDSCH.

**Agreement**

The following agreements for RRC\_CONECTED UEs also apply for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states, with the following updates:

Agreement:

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH:

* The maximum number of layers can be provided by *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value is defined.
  + FFS the default value.
* The maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR;
  + FFS: if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, a value determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast in the active DL BWP is used; if the *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast is not configured, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).
* xOverhead can be provided in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value of zero is used.
* The number of PRBs is determined based on the size of CFR.

Agreement:

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH, the default value of the maximum number of layers is 1 if *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR is not configured.

Agreement:

For determination of maximum modulation order for LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH,

* if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH for broadcast reception:

* the maximum number of layers is 1
* the maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for broadcast.
* If *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* is not configured in CFR for broadcast, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used.

# References

1. RP-201038 Revised Work Item on NR Multicast and Broadcast Services, Huawei, HiSilicon

**Relevant tdoc from RAN#93-e**

1. RP-212559 Moderator's summary for email discussion [93e-19-MBS-WI] 3GPP RAN1 WG Vice-Chair

**Relevant tdoc from AI 5**

1. R1-2112311 Discussion on RAN2 LS on broadcast session delivery about MCCH design MediaTek Inc.

**Relevant tdocs from AI 8.12.3**

1. R1-2110779 Discussion on UE receiving broadcast in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state Huawei, HiSilicon, CBN
2. R1-2110891 MBS Support for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE UEs FUTUREWEI
3. R1-2110897 Discussion on basic functions for broadcast mode TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech
4. R1-2110912 Discussion on basic Functions for Broadcast or Multicast for RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE UEs ZTE
5. R1-2111041 Remaining issues on basic functions for broadcast/multicast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues vivo
6. R1-2111115 Basic Functions for Broadcast or Multicast for RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE UEs Spreadtrum Communications
7. R1-2111137 Basic Functions for Broadcast / Multicast for RRC\_IDLE / RRC\_INACTIVE Ues Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell
8. R1-2111232 Discussion on basic functions for broadcast multicast for RRC\_IDLE RRC\_INACTIVE UEs CATT
9. R1-2111305 Discussion on basic functions for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs OPPO
10. R1-2111408 Considerations on MBS functions for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs Sony
11. R1-2111518 NR-MBS for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs Intel Corporation
12. R1-2111551 Discussion on basic functions for broadcastmulticast for RRC\_IDLERRC\_INACTIVE UEs Xiaomi
13. R1-2111629 Discussion on NR MBS in RRC\_IDLE/ RRC\_INACTIVE states CMCC
14. R1-2111763 On basic functions for broadcast/multicast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs Samsung
15. R1-2111899 Discussion on MBS for RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE UEs Apple
16. R1-2112065 Basic function for broadcast/multicast LG Electronics
17. R1-2112082 Discussion on basic functions for broadcast or multicast for RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE UEs ASUSTeK
18. R1-2112130 Discussion on basic functions for broadcast/multicast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs NTT DOCOMO, INC.
19. R1-2112163 Basic functions for broadcast/multicast in idle/inactive states Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
20. R1-2112241 Views on group scheduling for Broadcast RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs Qualcomm Incorporated
21. R1-2112314 Discussion on MBS for RRC\_IDLE and INACTIVE UEs MediaTek Inc.
22. R1-2112348 Support for NR multicast reception in RRC Inactive/Idle Ericsson

**Relevant tdocs from AI 8.12.4**

1. R1-2111552 Discussion on remaining issues for idle and inactive UE Xiaomi
2. R1-2111917 Discussion on RRC parameters for NR MBS Huawei, HiSilicon, CBN

# 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

## RAN1#106bis-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 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

Agreement:

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, MTCH scheduling is associated with a window defined by the MTCH monitoring periodicity and the starting of the periodicity

* FFS: the window is associated to one or multiple or all G-RNTI.

Agreement:

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 MTCH transmission 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.

# 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 |