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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 meetings are listed in the Annex A of this document.

In R1-2104165, RAN2 respectfully asks RAN1 to take RAN2 agreements, as detailed in R1-2104165, into account in their work on MBS and discuss RAN1 aspects of MCCH as requested in the LS. The LS is reproduced in Annex B of this document for convenience. In particular RAN2 requests:

|  |
| --- |
| 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. |

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

[105-e-NR-MBS-03] Email discussion/approval on basic functions for broadcast/multicast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with checkpoints for agreements on May 24, May 27 – David (BBC)

In this document the Feature Lead (FL) provides a summary of the technical documents (tdocs) submitted to RAN1#105-e to the. This document also presents proposals for discussion at RAN1#105e.

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

# Issues

One of the key issues to discuss at this meeting is MBS Common Frequency Resource (CFR). At RAN1#104-e five cases (Case A-E) of configured/defined specific common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH were identified for further study. Figure 1&2below from [R1-2104552, Nokia] and [R1-210433, ZTE] are copied below to facilitate the discussions of the issues identified for this RAN1#105-e meeting.



*Figure 1: configured/defined specific common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH were identified for further study at RAN1#104-e. From [R1-2104552, Nokia].*



*Figure 2: Options for Case D of configured/defined specific common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH. From [R1-2104338 ZTE].*

## Issue 1: MBS Common Frequency Resource for MCCH channel

### **Background**

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

The following agreements for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs at RAN1#103-e and RAN1#104-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. |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2104250, Huawei et al.]
  + Proposal 1: Separate CFR configurations for MCCH and MTCH(s) can be supported.
* In [R1-2105927, Huawei]
  + Proposal 1: One common frequency resource can be configured for MCCH that is with the same size or smaller bandwidth than the SIB1 configured initial BWP. If the CFR is not configured, UE may assume the initial BWP as the default CFR.
  + Proposal 2: The CFR if configured for MCCH contains CORESET#0.
* In [R1-2104338, ZTE]
  + Observation 1: Case C requires UE to activate the initial BWP configured by SIB1 in RRC\_IDLE state, which is conflicting with the Rel-15/Rel-16 legacy mechanism. Furthermore, Case C requires the same frequency bandwidth range for MBS and unicast, which is too restrictive.
  + Observation 2: Case B can be implemented through FDRA under case A.
  + Proposal 12: MCCH transmission is contained within the frequency range of CORESET#0.
* In [R1-2104493, CATT]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1: The case where a CFR is defined based on a configured BWP (Case E) is not supported due to the BWP switching.
  + Proposal 2 Both the case where the initial BWP fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain (i.e. Case B and D) and the case where the initial BWP has same size as the CFR in the frequency domain (i.e. Case A and C) are supported.
  + Proposal 3: For the case where the initial BWP fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain, the indication of the starting PRB can be based on the starting point of the initial BWP or the starting point of the carrier.
  + Proposal 4: The current SLIV indication mechanism can be reused for common frequency resource of starting PRB and length of PRBs.
* In [R1-2104552, Nokia]
  + Proposal-1: Support CFR [Case-A/C/D/E], but do not support CFR [Case-B].
  + Proposal-2: Support the same or different CFR configuration for MCCH and MTCH.
* In [R1-2104634, CMCC]
  + Proposal 1. Initial BWP with the same frequency resources as CORESET0 is used for MCCH transmission, including PDCCH used for scheduling MCCH and MCCH message.
* In [R1-2104697, Qualcomm]
  + Proposal 1: Separate CFR configuration for MCCH/MTCH.
    - For MCCH, the CFR can be configured with the frequency size same as CORESET#0 or initial BWP.
* In [R1-2104761, OPPO]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, Case B and Case D are NOT supported.
  + Proposal 2: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, Case C is used if initial DL BWP is configured in SIB1, and Case E is used otherwise.
* In [R1-2104867, Lenovo]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1: If a specific common frequency resource is configured for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, it should be confined within the initial DL BWP and share same numerology.
  + Proposal 2: The starting PRB index and the number of contiguous PRBs of the specific common frequency resource are configured within the initial DL BWP via RRC signaling.
  + Proposal 4: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, for CFR configuration for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, both Case A and Case C are supported.
  + Proposal 5: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, for CFR configuration for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, none of Case B, Case D and Case E is supported.
* In [R1-2104930, Intel]
  + Proposal 1: For CFR configuration only Case A and C can be supported for both configuration and data reception. Case E can be supported only for data reception but not for configuration reception via MCCH if BWP switch is assumed to be required for Case E. If CFR is wider than initial BWP, CFR should fully contain the initial BWP or CORESET#0 such that common control and paging signals can be received.
* In [R1-2105130, Apple]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 2: For MBS UE in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE mode, if CFR is configured for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, the CFR size should be larger than SIB1 configured initial BWP, or equal to initial BWP configured by MIB or SIB1.
* In [R1-2105338, Samsung]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1. SIBx can configure a frequency region for MBS. If that configuration for MBS CFR is not provided, the frequency region is the initial DL BWP (as configured by SIB1 or, if SIB1 does not configure an initial DL BWP, the BWP of CORESET#0).
* In [R1-2105383, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 3: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, a configured CFR for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be smaller or equal to the initial BWP based on network configuration.
  + Proposal 6: The configured CFR for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE states can be reused to NR MBS MCCH transmission.
* In [R1-2105916, Ericsson]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Observation 1: If the Initial BWP is contained within the unicast BWP and the Common Frequency Resource, then a UE that is moved from RRC Connected to RRC Inactive/Idle may continue to use the same BWP to receive the multicast in RRC Inactive/Idle and to monitor the Initial BWP in a seamless way, without involving any BWP switching.
  + Proposal 6: The initial BWP should be contained within the Common Frequency Resource/the configured BWP, for the use case when UEs continue to receive a multicast/broadcast after having been moved from RRC Connected to RRC Inactive/Idle.
* In [R1-2105439, LG]
  + Proposal 3: For idle/inactive UEs receiving broadcast, CFR associated to initial DL BWP can be configured with a wider bandwidth than the initial DL BWP or a bandwidth equal to or smaller than the initial DL BWP.
    - If configured as a wider bandwidth, the initial DL BWP should be confined within the MBS specific BWP.
  + Proposal 7: Idle/inactive UE monitors PDCCH for a PDCCH CSS set on the initial DL BWP or the CFR associated to the initial DL BWP to detect a DCI with SC-RNTI.
    - It is up to gNB whether PDCCH/PDSCH for MCCH is transmitted on the initial DL BWP or the CFR associated to the initial DL BWP.
* In [R1-2105602, Convida Wireless]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 2: Define the CFR that can be configured with wider frequency range than the initial BWP should be supported and should be prioritized than other cases.
  + Proposal 3: Support Case E for the CFR design for the RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.
* In [R1-2105673, Google]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Observation 1: Initial BWP with a bandwidth identical to CORESET #0 should be sufficient to provide similar broadcast services as LTE SC-PTM.
  + Proposal 1: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UE consuming broadcast services, at least support using the CFR with the same frequency resource as CORESET #0, regardless whether an initial BWP is configured in SIB-1 or not.
    - If an initial BWP is configured by SIB-1, the base station can indicate UE to apply either the frequency resource of CORESET #0 or the initial BWP as the MBS CFR.
  + Proposal 2: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UE consuming broadcast services, the base station can configure a MBS BWP which is larger than the frequency resource of CORESET #0, regardless whether an initial BWP is configured by SIB-1 or not.
    - The CORESET #0 should be fully contained in the configured MBS BWP
* In [R1-2105722, NTT DOCOMO]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1: Support all cases to configure/define a specific common frequency resource for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.
* In [R1-2105849, CHENGDU TD TECH]
  + Proposal 2: If all CFRs are configured within the initial BWP for DL, the UE receiving MBS works on the initial BWP for DL. Otherwise, the UE receiving MBS works with the combined CFR as the working BWP where the combined CFR consists of the initial BWP for DL and the CFRs providing the MBS sessions received by the UE.
* In [R1-2104197, FUTUREWEI]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1a: 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).
  + Proposal 1b: CORESET0 is the default common frequency resource (CFR) i.e., the UE may assume the initial BWP as the default CFR if a specific CFR is not configured.
* In [R1-2104389, vivo]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, support that one configured/defined CFR fully contains the initial BWP in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
* In [R1-2104444, Spreadtrum Communications]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, do not support to configure a dedicated BWP that is larger than the initial BWP.

### **FL Assessment**

For this issue, contributions in [Huawei, ZTE, Nokia, CMCC, Qualcomm, Intel, MediaTek, LG, Chengdu TD] have made an analysis of the CFR for broadcast services making a distinction between MCCH and MTCH channels. Also based on the RAN2 LS to RAN1 in R1-2104165 where feedback is requested for the design of MCCH, the discussion in this document is separated into separate discussions for MCCH and MTCH, respectively. The other contributions that do not explicitly make a discussion in terms of the designs of MCCH and MTCH are also taken into consideration in this issue.

***Discussion on Cases A (CORESET#0 has same size as the CFR in the frequency domain) and   
Case C (SIB-1 configured initial BWP has same size as the CFR in the frequency domain)***

Contributions in [Huawei, ZTE, CATT, Nokia, CMCC, Qualcomm, Lenovo, Intel, Apple, Samsung, MediaTek, LG, Google, NTT DOCOMO, FUTUREWEI, vivo] propose that the configured CFR for the transmission of MCCH channel contains CORESET#0 or initial BWP.

Contributions in [Huawei, CATT, Nokia, Qualcomm, OPPO, Lenovo, Intel, Apple, Samsung, MediaTek, LG, Google, NTT DOCOMO, FUTUREWEI, vivo] also propose that the configured CFR for the transmission of MCCH channel contains the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.

It is worth noting that RAN2 has made the following agreement “*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*.”. A CFR for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as CORESET#0 or the SIB-1 configured initial BWP would allow the monitoring of both MCCH channel and SI/Paging without BWP switching.

However, [ZTE, Apple] also raise the issue that UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. [Apple] also discusses that this restriction could be lifted for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs receiving MBS.

These cases have significant support.

***Discussion on Case E (CFR is defined based on a configured BWP)***

[Qualcomm, Intel] discussing configuration details for the transmission of MCCH channel, do not support Case E for the transmission MCCH channel. [CATT, Lenovo, Spreadtrum] discussing general aspects of CFR configuration, not explicitly for the transmission of MCCH channel, do not support Case E mainly due to concerns of potential BWP switching, specification impact or increased UE complexity.

For this issue, it is not clear contributions not discussing explicit aspects for transmission configuration of MCCH channel, address Case E for this channel. More discussion clarification on this CFR alternative for MCCH channel may be needed and there is no clear support for this alternative for MCCH channel. It is also worth mentioning that tdocs submitted to this AI have not discussed in detail for Case E potential issues with BWP switching, which may make progress difficult for the support of this CFR configuration.

***Discussion on Case B (CORESET#0 fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain)***

Although [ZTE, CATT, MediaTek, LG, NTT DOCOMO] contributions support Case B due to the higher flexibility in addition to other CFR alternatives, other contributions [Nokia, OPPO, Lenovo, Intel, Apple] do not support case B due to not clear motivation or because there is no need to have an specific CFR configuration/definition when Case B could be achieved by network implementation (e.g. FDRA) as discussed in [ZTE, Intel, MediaTek].

Based on the above, it is not clear whether contributions not discussing explicit aspects for transmission configuration of MCCH channel, address Case B for this channel. Also worth pointing out that some contributions do not clearly separate the CFR cases between CORESET#0 and SIB-1 configured initial BWP. Hence, more discussion/analysis may be need for Case B as a potential alternative for transmission configuration of MCCH channel.

***Discussion on Case D (SIB-1 configured initial BWP fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain)***

Here, similar to the discussion above for Case B, although [Huawei, CATT, Nokia, Lenovo, MediaTek, LG, NTT DOCOMO] support Case D, other contributions [OPPO, intel, Apple] do not support case D due to not clear motivation or because there is no need to have an specific CFR configuration/definition when Case D could be achieved by network implementation (e.g. FDRA) as discussed in [Intel, MediaTek].

Based on the above, it is not clear whether contributions not discussing explicit aspects for transmission configuration of MCCH channel, address Case D for this channel. Also worth pointing out that some contributions do not clearly separate the CFR cases between CORESET#0 and SIB-1 configured initial BWP. Hence, more discussion/analysis may be need for Case D as a potential alternative for transmission configuration of MCCH channel.

***Discussion on CFR configurations for MCCH and MTCH channels***

Contributions in [Huawei, Nokia, Qualcomm, Intel] explicitly support that the CFR configurations for the transmission of MCCH and MTCH channels can be different. [ZTE] although without an explicit proposal, the contribution discusses and proposes in detail different alternatives for CFR configuration, while for the transmission configuration of MCCH only a CFR contained within CORESET#0 is proposed, fact that FL interprets such as different configurations for MCCH and MTCH could be enabled. This discussion seems to have support from companies while there are not apparently from the contributions strong position onto using the same CFR configuration for both MCCH and MTCH channels.

Considering the inputs above and the subsequent analysis, the FL makes the following proposal for discussion and consideration.

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

**Proposal 2.1-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the CFR for MCCH reception can be configured with the same frequency range as CORESET#0 or the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.

* FFS are modifications required (if any) for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs to use the SIB-1 configured initial BWP without first receiving *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.

**Proposal 2.1-2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, different CFR configurations for the transmission of MCCH channel and MTCH channel can be supported.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | For P2.1-1: We are fine with this proposal.  For P2.1-2: We are fine with this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | P2.1-1: OK with this main proposal. The FFS is not clear to us. Does it mean “modification on bandwidth of SIB1 configured initial BWP?  P2.1-2: Ok with this proposal. |
| ZTE | It seems that all companies have the middle ground on the following part, i.e., the bandwidth for MCCH reception is the same as CORESET#0. We can first agree on the middle ground and discuss the remaining open issues. From our perspective, it seems the MCCH can be received without introducing the CFR conception.  **Proposal 2.1-1 (Updated by ZTE)**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the bandwidth for MCCH reception can is the same frequency range as CORESET#0.   * FFS whether the bandwidth for MCCH reception can be the same as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP, if yes, whether there are modifications required (if any) for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs to use the SIB-1 configured initial BWP without first receiving *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. * FFS whether configure the bandwidth for MCCH reception as a CFR.   If companies agree to use CFR for MCCH reception, Then we can start discussing Proposal 2.1-2. |
| CMCC | 2.1-1: Only support the same frequency range as CORESET#0. From our perspective, the modifications are required to support SIB-1 configured initial BWP.  2.1-2: Support |
| Futurewei | 2.1-1: Do not understand what ‘can be..” in the proposal meant. I am assuming that it can also be different from the freq range of CORESET#0? |
| NOKIA/NSB | We support both proposals from the FL |
| Qualcomm | Support 2.1-1 and 2.2-2. |
| vivo | We support both 2.1-1 and 2.2-2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | P2.1-1: fine. ZTE’s modification can also be considered if p2.1-1 is not agreeable to some companies. SIB-1 configured initial BWP is taken by UE in RRC\_CONNECTED states, then the modification now is something like it is used for UE in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE for receiving MCCH/MTCH.  P2.1-2: ok. |
| Apple | Proposal 2.1-1: we are not so sure this proposal is really needed, what is the relationship with below agreements? “can be” seems precluding nothing.  **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.   Proposal 2.1-2: just want to know what the motivation is to configure different CFR for MCCH and MTCH. Two CFRs are overlapped or not? UE could monitor MCCH/MTCH from two different CFRs at the same time. Supporting two CFRs also impacts on the RRC connected UE. |
| MTK | **Proposal 2.1-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-2**: Not support. From our understanding, the one unified CFR can be used for MCCH and MTCH transmission. There is no clear motivation to defined two CFR within unicast BWP for UE supporting MBS. |
| Spreadtrum | For P2.1-1: We are fine with this proposal.  For P2.1-2: We are not sure the necessary of configuring two CFRs if one initial BWP (**CORESET**#0 or SIB1 configured) is used, since the BWP can be fully shared between MCCH and MTCH, the frequency configurations can be up to gNB. |
| CATT | OK with both 2.1-1 and 2.2-2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We have the same view as ZTE on MCCH transmission. We think it is not necessary to apply the CFR concept to MCCH transmission. MCCH transmission could be similar to SIB. Using different CFRs for MCCH and MTCH would require at least two CFRs, which is not desirable. |
| Google | P2.1-1: We share the same view as ZTE and DOCOMO  P2.1-2: We can discuss this proposal after P2.1-1 |
| OPPO | OK with both 2.1-1 and 2.2-2 |
| Ericsson | 2.2-1: For broadcast, we see “CFR” as a generic term that should be mapped to the following three cases, but no more:   1. Coreset0 BW 2. Initial BWP, as configured by SIB1 3. MCCH-configured BWP, fully containing the Initial BWP   We wish to point out that, in contrast to RRC Connected multicast, where UEs may have *different* BWPs and the benefit of the CFR is to indicate the overlapping common BW to use for multicast, in the broadcast-to-Idle/Inactive case all UEs are configured in the *same* way, since they all receive the same DL signal. There is therefore no possibility for UE-specific use of CFR. This changes fundamentally the scope of CFR from “indicating a common overlap” to indicating one or more BWs to use, which are common for all UEs. We think the flexibility provided by the three options above is fully sufficient for all foreseeable use cases.  Proposal 2.1-1 covers both cases (1) and (2) above, which we therefore support, but we think no dedicated standardization of CFR is needed for these.  2.1-2: Support, in the sense that the CFRs for MCCH and MTCH can be selected from the three options above. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.1-1: We don’t need to restrict to have a CFR as the same as the initial BWP. The CFR can be configured within the initial BWP (as configured by SIB1 or, if SIB1 does not configure an initial DL BWP, the BWP of CORESET#0). So, we suggest  **Proposal 2.1-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the CFR for MCCH reception can be configured within the ~~same~~ frequency range as CORESET#0 or the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.  Proposal 2.1-2: it is not clear why the separate CFRs are needed. The initial BWP can be configured as large as the carrier BW from SIB1. In this regards, we don’t need to separate configurations for MCCH and MTCH. |
| Intel | **Proposal 2.1-1:** We are ok with the current FL proposal. We still do not see a use case for CFR smaller than the CORESET#0 BW and it can be handled using FDRA. Also, the proposal says “can be” which may imply other options are not precluded. In our understanding, the wording should be revised to “should be”.  **Proposal 2.1.-2:** The motivation for this proposal is the case where bandwidth wider than CORESET#0 is needed for receiving the MTCH. However, in this case, we still need to ensure that the CFR for receiving MTCH is mapped to frequency resources which fully contain the CORESET#0 BW so that common control information can be received. Therefore we suggest the following  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, different CFR configurations for the transmission of MCCH channel and MTCH channel can be supported, where the CFR for MTCH fully contains the CFR for MCCH.  Alternately, this can also be resolved by agreeing that the BW for receiving MTCH fully contains CORESET#0. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for the discussion.  @Lenovo: may be wording can be improved. Given analysis by ZTE and Apple that SIB-1 configured initial BWP cannot be applied to idle/inactive UEs since the SIB-1 initial BWP conf is only applied after *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment.* What the FFS intends to say to study what needs to be done so idle/inctive UEs can receive the SIB-1 configured initial BWP without entering connected state.  @ZTE, NTT DOCOMO, Google: I think we can try what you suggest for the benefit of progress, i.e. try to agree on bandwidth for MCCH reception is the same as coreset#0. However, please note that the SIB-1 configured initial BWP has significant support and I would like to keep discussing the possibility to include as another option with a separate proposal (new **Proposal 2.1-3 below**). I have also reused RAN2 LS wording that my help remove the ambiguity for the term “can be”.  @CMCC: Although I understand that your position is that CMCC would only be initially interested in enabling the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as CORESET#0, I think the case where the frequency range is the same as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP has support form many companies so I would like to keep the discussion to allow for companies to exchange more views.  @Futureway: thanks for the comment. In the proposals below I have changed the wording (reusing RAN2 LS wording) that may address your concern. Please do let me know if not and any suggestions on improved wording would be very welcome!  @Apple: thanks for comment. Regarding the term “can be” I have changed it in the proposals below but the initial intention was to allow support of different configurations of the bandwidth for MCCH reception. Hopefully with the new wording this ambiguity is removed. Another reason for such a proposal is to fulfil RAN2 request to RAN1 regarding configurations of the bandwidth for MCCH reception. Regarding the relation to the previous agreement at RAN1#103-e, as per the discussion at RAN1#104-e it was highlighted that for the initial BWP there were two alternatives (that I do not think were considered at the point when the RAN1#103-e agreement was made): one initial BWP configured by MIB (frequency range as coreset#0) and two, SIB-1 configured initial BWP. For RAN1#104-e we proposed to discuss in more detail different scenarios and based on analysis from ZTE and Apple it has been found out that SIB1 initial BWP may require changes to be able to be receivable by idle/inactive UEs. Hope this clarifies.  @MTK, Spreadtrum: thanks for comment. Please note that for P2.1-2 there various companies that support such an approach. One option is to leave it as an study but it would be good to hear arguments from proponents on this issue.  @ Ericsson, **All**: thanks for detailed comments. I think we may not have all the same understanding of the terms “CFR”, “defining or configuring a CFR”. One question may be useful to answer as a group is “what are the implications to configure/define a CFR?” and by implications I mean standard impact. It seems that if we say something like “the bandwidth for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as CORESET#0” may be fine but saying “the CFR for MCCH reception is the same as the frequency range as CORESET#0” has different impact. **Could we get views on this?**  @Samsung: thanks for comments. I have divided the proposal 2.1-1 into two separate proposals to see if we can separate agreements. I have also changed the wording that may address your concern. The original wording was motivated by the case that various companies did not see a motivation for configuring a CFR within the frequency range of coreset#0. However, I think the new proposal does not use the term CFR and may better address the RAN2 request to RAN1.  @Intel: thanks for comments, I hope the revised wording below addresses your comments.  @**All**: based on the discussion I propose the following revisions of the proposals.  **Proposal 2.1-1rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as CORESET#0.  (Please note that in **Proposal 2.1-1rev1** I am using the same wording as RAN2 LS for “configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception”).  **(NEW)Proposal 2.1-3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.   * FFS application of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs without first receiving *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the same bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception.   * FFS support of different bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception.   (Please note that in **2.1-2rev1** I have changed the wording to align with the previous discussion and restricting the agreement to same configuration while leaving different confs to FFS.”). |

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

**Proposal 2.1-1rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as CORESET#0.

**Proposal 2.1-3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.

* FFS application of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs without first receiving *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.

**Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the same bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception.

* FFS support of different bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | We are ok with Proposal 2.1-1rev1 and Proposal 2.1-2rev1.  However, we are not sure about motivation to have Proposal 2.1-3. The size of MCCH is pretty limited, there is no need to use bandwidth configured by SIB-1 to transit MCCH. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.1-1rev1**: OK.  **Proposal 2.1-3**: When we take both 2.1-1rev1 and 2.1-3 together into account, the two proposals may be a little bit conflicted. Should both proposals be supported for a given UE or the main intention is to define two UE capabilities, with one capability support of CORESET 0 size MCCH and another support SIB-1 configured MCCH? If so, why not choose a larger one for the UE?  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: OK. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.1-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-3**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: Support |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.1-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-3**: Similar concern as ZTE, the motivation to support a larger bandwidth than CORESET0 for MCCH is not strong.  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: We also discuss CFR for MTCH in section 2.2, there is no need to agree this proposal as all, if the bandwidth for MCCH/MTCH has its own agreements. |
| Google | **Proposal 2.1-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-3**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: Support |
| Apple | Maybe Proposal 2.1-1 rev1 and Proposal 2.1-3 can be combined together as two options, we can discuss whether down select or support both. |
| NOKIA/NSB | **Proposal 2.1-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-3**: To our view, it makes sense to let the gNB to configure either CORESET#0 (Proposal 2.1-1) or SIB1 configured initial BWP (Proposal 2.1-3) as the CFR of MCCH. In legacy, there are limited size with CORESET#0, and practically it may already “crow” with the information payload of OSI/Pagin/RAR. Now adding additionally information payload of MCCH, the capacity of CORESET#0 may not enough. Therefore, SIB1 configured initial BWP with larger size than CORESET#0 could solve this capacity issue when needed by network.  We hope the above comments could reply to the concerns from some of the companies.  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: Support |
| LG | We are generally fine with all proposals.  However, we do not see a good motivation for **Proposal 2.1-1rev1** in addition toProposal 2.1-3. We thinks that Proposal 2.1-3 seems enough for MCCH.  Considering that whether or not to support multiple MCCH is FFS in RAN2, we could also add FFS as follows:  **Proposal 2.1-3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.   * FFS application of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs without first receiving *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. * FFS how to configure the bandwidth for multiple MCCH, if agreed in RAN2. |
| MTK | **Proposal 2.1-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-3**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with FL’s proposals. |
| CATT | Ok with these three proposals. |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| Ericsson | 2.1-1rev1: Support  2.1-3: Support  2.1-2rev1: Support |
| Moderator | Thanks for comments. Some quick come backs.  @Lenovo: I see your point. Please note that the original proposal was also including the possibility to configure the bandwidth of the MCCH as SIB-1 configured initial BWP. The configuration would be one or the other. This follows the agreement at RAN1#104-e as follows:  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   At this point of the standardisation, only one common frequency resource can be configured.  @CMCC: for the GTW on 21/05 I am not going to propose to discuss proposal 2.2-2, but we can see how the discussion goes in Section 2.2.  @Apple, LG: thanks for the comment. Please note that the original Proposal 2.1-1 had combined both the possibility to configure the bandwidth of the MCCH as SIB-1 configured initial BWP (where the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception would be either the frequency range of SIB-1 configured initial BWP or coreset#0). However, the only option that has consensus at this point is to configure the bandwidth for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as coreset#0.  @LG: I have agreed your line to both Proposal 2.1-1 and 2.1-3 as I think the comment is valid for both.  **Proposal 2.1-1rev2**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as CORESET#0.   * FFS how to configure the bandwidth for multiple MCCH, if agreed in RAN2.   **Proposal 2.1-3rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.   * FFS application of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs without first receiving *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. * FFS how to configure the bandwidth for multiple MCCH, if agreed in RAN2.   **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the same bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception.   * FFS support of different bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception. |

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

**Proposal 2.1-1rev2**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as CORESET#0.

* FFS how to configure the bandwidth for multiple MCCH, if agreed in RAN2.

**Proposal 2.1-3rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.

* FFS application of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs without first receiving *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.
* FFS how to configure the bandwidth for multiple MCCH, if agreed in RAN2.

**Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the same bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception.

* FFS support of different bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Moderator | On the GTW on 21 May, after discussions and comments from companies the latest version of the proposal 2.1-1 was as follows:  *Proposal:*  *For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the bandwidth with the same frequency range as CORESET#0 to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.*  The proposal did not reach agreement based on discussions whether the proposal covered cases A and B from the agreement at RAN1#104-e. After some offline discussion, the problem may be that different companies may have different interpretations of Case B or the CFR definition.  The FL interprets the *Proposal* above is as follows: the frequency range [f\_max, f\_min] of the GC PDCCH/PDSCH carrying the MCCH channel has the same frequency range as CORESET#0.If the gNB wanted to schedule something inside the [f\_max, f\_min] frequency range that could be done via implementation, e.g., through FDRA for PDSCH. It is worth noting that with this interpretation tdocs submitted to RAN1#105-e had different conclusions for the potential support of case B.   * tdocs discussing that because a CFR smaller than CORESET#0 could be achieved via implementation (e.g. FDRA for PDSCH), therefore Case B is supported; * tdocs discussing that because gNB could schedule within the frequency range of CORESET#0, therefore case B should not be supported.   I believe this highlights that there may be different interpretations on the definition of CFR for case B. (Similar ambiguity can be followed for Case C and Case D.)  However, I think the current wording of the proposal decouples the issue of the CFR resource definition or whether case B is supported or not. What we are saying with current *Proposal* is that the frequency range [f\_max, f\_min] of the GC PDCCH/PDSCH carrying the MCCH channel has the same frequency range as CORESET#0. If the gNB wanted to schedule within the [f\_max, f\_min] frequency range, that could be done via implementation. FL thinks that whether this is Case B or not is not as important as whether companies agree to enable such a functionality with the current wording of the proposal. Please if you think this is wrong or does not go in the right direction please provide your comments – thanks.  Based on the discussion above the FL modifies the proposals as follows. Also based on comments Proposal 2.1-3 is downgraded to a study. (Please note that the FFS on RAN2 possible decision on potential multiple MCCHs has been removed as per discussion at GTW. I have also changed *support* to *can use* on Proposal 2.1-2 as per Apple comments to other proposals on concerns on term *support*):  **Proposal 2.1-1rev3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the bandwidth with the same frequency range as CORESET#0 to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.  **Proposal 2.1-3rev2**: For broadcast reception, study the option of RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using the bandwidth with the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.   * Note that the UE that UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception.   * FFS use of different bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception. |

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

**Proposal 2.1-1rev3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the bandwidth with the same frequency range as CORESET#0 to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.

**Proposal 2.1-3rev2**: For broadcast reception, study the option of RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using the bandwidth with the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.

* Note that the UE that UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.

**Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception.

* FFS use of different bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Qualcomm | Referring to pervious RAN1 agreement, it is clear that CFR is configured/defined for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH and Case A~E have clear definition.  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:   * … * 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.   Based on GTW discussion, it seems companies have different understanding of ‘the bandwidth…to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH’, we prefer to use the wording base on the RAN1 agreement.  Confirmed online, **Proposal 2.1-1rev3** is targeting to support Case A, instead of Case A+B. So, we suggest to revise it as:  **Proposal 2.1-1rev3:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.  For **Proposal 2.1-3rev2**, it should align with the wording of Case C.  Regarding the Note, we think the CFR for broadcast reception should NOT change the UE behaviour for legacy signal reception, i.e., IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only assume SIB-1 configured initial BWP to receive paging/SIB after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. It’s fine to keep the Note but need to address it as for legacy SIB/paging reception.  For broadcast reception, the IDLE/INACTIVE UEs can use the CFR with same size as SIB-1 configured initial BWP even before *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.  **Proposal 2.1-3rev2**: For broadcast reception, study the option of RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using the CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.   * Note that RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP to receive SIB/paging until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. * RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   For **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**, since MCCH/MTCH is using GC-PDCCH/PDSCH, we prefer to use CFR for MCCH/MTCH to align with the RAN1 agreement. An FFS is added to address some companies’ concern.  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of MCCH reception and the CFR of MTCH reception.   * FFS use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of MCCH reception and the CFR of MTCH reception. * FFS same or different CFR for MCCH and MTCH |
| NOKIA/NSB | **Regarding Proposal 2.1-1rev3**: To our understanding, the Proposal 2.1-1rev3 is generally saying that the CORESET#0 can be used as the CFR of MCCH for RRC\_Idle/Inacitve UEs for broadcast reception. Moreover, when looking at the CFR cases shown in Figure-2, there are the CORESET#0 shown in all Case A-E, meaning that the CORESET#0 can be configured as MCCH CFR with not only limited to Case-A, but also apply to Case-C/D/E.  And before answering the “detailed and complicated” FDRA query for Case-B raised during GWT discussion, we should discuss a simple question on **whether it makes sense to support Case-B?** To our view, the benefit of CFR smaller than CORESET0 is unclear. Moreover, by considering the large coverage needed to be served by broadcast/multicast in a cell, the limited number of CCEs within the CFR size smaller than CORESET0 is questionable to provide enough coverage. Therefore, Case-B is not supported.  **Proposal 2.1-3rev2**: We support the FL’s proposal (with targeting on Case-C/D/E in Figure-2)  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: We support the FL’s proposal (with targeting on Case-A/C/D/E in Figure-2) |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.1-1rev3**: Generally OK with us. Some modification for better understanding the intention of this proposal is to align with Case A.  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use same frequency range as CORESET#0 to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.  **Proposal 2.1-3rev2**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: Support |
| OPPO | On **Proposal 2.1-1rev3**, we prefer Lenovo’s wording.  OK with **Proposal 2.1-3rev2** and **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.1-1rev3：** Our intention is that this proposal is to align with Case A not Case A+B, Qualcomm or Lenovo’s version are fine with us.  **Proposal 2.1-3rev2** and **Proposal 2.1-2rev1:** Support. |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.1-1rev3:** Share with same views with CMCC, both version from Qualcomm and Lenovo is OK for us.  **Proposal 2.1-3rev2:** Ok with FL’s proposal  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1:** Ok with FL’s proposal |
| MTK | **Proposal 2.1-1rev3**: From our perspective, the current proposal includes Case A and Case B. The current wording just say using the “bandwidth” to receive, but the exact resource is defined as common frequency resource (CFR), which can be larger equal or smaller than CORESET#0. For the case that CFR smaller than CORESET#0, we think there is no need to preclude this case considering the operating flexible, especially when the UE scheduling broadcast services with less data packet. Whether and how to schedule the CFR with smaller than CORESET#0 can be up to network implementation. Thus, the proposal can be updated for clarification as following:  **Proposal 2.1-1rev3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the CFR with the same or smaller frequency range as CORESET#0 to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.  **Proposal 2.1-3rev2**: According to the same logic, the proposal can be updated as followings:  **Proposal 2.1-3rev2**: For broadcast reception, study the option of RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using the CFR with the same or smaller frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.   * Note that the UE that UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: We are Ok with the proposal. |
| ZTE | We are fine with all the three proposals.  Regarding Lenovo’s change, we prefer current wording from FL proposal, which is exactly the same as what asked by RAN2 in the LS. We should try to keep the consistence, otherwise, RAN2 may be confused.  Since some companies still comment about the CFR configuration for MCCH. In the first round of discussion, companies have diverging views on whether to have CFR for MCCH. From our perspective, the current proposals are the best middle ground between companies, which answer RAN2 questions and also make some progress. But to address companies’ comments for the CFR, we may add the following FFS for the three proposals above.   * Whether a CFR needs to be configured to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.1-1rev3:** OK  **Proposal 2.1-3rev2**:Ok to study itself, but we think we don’t need to restrict to use the same bandwidth. SIB-1 configured initial BWP can be as large as the carrier BW. So, we proposal to use the same or smaller BW compared to the initial BWP.  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1:** OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.1-1rev3**: We prefer Lenovo’s wording.  **Proposal 2.1-3rev2**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Same view as QC.  The proposals are not going to the right direction than the previous round.  In P2.1-1rev3, “can use the bandwidth with same frequency range as CORESET0” was interpreted in different ways by different companies on GTW, it should be refined to address this situation. On the other hand, we have agreed if CFR is not configured, the UE may assume the initial BWP as the default common frequency resource, including SIB1 configured initial BWP and CORESET0. Based on this, we should directly discuss how the CFR is when it is configured.  P2.1-3rev2: The note is the communing understanding of the current specification. If SIB1 configured initial BWP is used by default or CFR is configured with the same size as that for SIB1 configured initial BWP, specification change is needed to make UE in IDLE/ACTIVE states to use it. The note should NOT be a reason to revert the previous agreement of SIB1 configured initial BWP used for broadcast in IDLE/INACTIVE. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with all the three proposals, QC’s update is also supported. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposals. |
| vivo | For Proposal 2.1-1rev3, we share same view with other companies to align with Case A only.  We are ok with Proposal 2.1-3rev2 and Proposal 2.1-2rev1 in principle. |
| Ericsson | 2.1-1rev3: Support  2.1-3rev2: Support, although we think this can be strengthened to the same level as 2.1-1rev3, i.e. “UEs can use the bandwidth” for MCCH (i.e. SIB1-configured Initial BWP).  2.1-2rev1: Support  Following up on FL’s comments about the Cases A/B, C/D and E, we have the following comments, which apply generally for broadcast to Idle/Inactive UEs, i.e. both to MCCH and MTCH:  For the case where there is no SIB1-configured Initial BWP, i.e. the Initial BWP is equal to the Coreset#0 BW, we see no need to configure any CFR subset of the Initial BWP (i.e. Coreset#0) for MBS, be it for MCCH and/or MTCH reception.  This is because the UE is anyway expected to apply the frequency window of the Initial BWP, to be able to receive SI/paging anywhere in this, so further reducing the frequency window is not possible.  It is also possible, by implementation, to let the actually-used bandwidth be smaller than Coreset#0, by scheduling MBS into a narrower portion of the Initial BWP. We do however not see any real reason to do so, since there is no power saving gain associated with this. Our conclusion is therefore that there is no need to specially configure a CFR subset of the Initial BWP in this case, which means that Case B does not need dedicated specification support. If there is a wish to anyway transmit MBS within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP, this is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.  For the case where the Initial BWP is configured via SIB1, the situation is like the previous Coreset#0 case. Again, the UE is anyway expected to apply the frequency window of the Initial BWP (although now SIB1-configured), to be able to receive SI/paging. By implementation MBS could be transmitted in a subset of the Initial BWP, but like the previous case, we do not see any advantage of this, since power saving would not be affected. The conclusion is therefore the same also in this case, that there is no point in configuring a CFR subset of the Initial BWP. This means that Case D does not need dedicated specification support either.  Regarding Case E, a broadcast BWP, larger than the Initial BWP, needs to be configured. This should be configured by the physical layer in addition to the Initial BWP.  In summary, we think that Case A, Case C and Case E need to be supported, whereas Case B and D can be dropped in the sense that they do not require dedicated specification support.  Case A and C reuse the legacy Initial BWP and Case E requires a new physical layer configuration mechanism. There is no need to configure any subset of either the Initial BWP or the configured broadcast BWP. |
| Apple | **Proposal 2.1-1rev3:** the updatedversion from either Qualcomm or Lenovo is OK for us.  **Proposal 2.1-3rev2**: Support, and agree with comments form Huawei.  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: Support  The proposal on MTCCH corresponding to Case E is missing. But it appears in the MTCH proposal, i.e, **Proposal 2.2-2rev1** |
| Moderator | Thank you all for the detail comments.  @Qualcomm: thanks for concrete comments. I have included most of your wording in the revised proposals below. Please note that I have focused **Proposal 2.1-1rev4** and **Proposal 2.1-3rev3** on the default CFR instead of a specific defined/configured CFR. This is to accommodate other companies views that there is no need to configure a CFR for the case when the CFR is the initial BWP.  @Nokia, MTK: Please see that I have revised the proposals and below I also provide an analysis on the scope of the revised proposals (**Proposal 2.1-1rev4** and **Proposal 2.1-3rev3**). Regarding Case B, as explained below, this is not supported with the current revision in **Proposal 2.1-1rev4.** However, I would like to point that **Proposal 2.1-1rev4** only covers Case A. It does not cover Cases C/D/E as per your comment (and neither it covers Case B). Any other case would need a different agreement that is not covered by **Proposal 2.1-1rev4.** I am not sure whether you were thinking that in an hypothetical scenario where we would agree to support Case E whether coreset#0 could also be used, but as I mentioned this would need a separate agreement that we are not discussing for this proposal. I hope this makes sense.  @Lenovo, OPPO, CMCC, CATT, NTT DOCOMO, vivo: I have made various changes to the proposals, please see below analysis and new proposals for your consideration – thanks!  @MTK: I also think that your comments regarding being able to schedule by implementation within the initial BWP is addressed with this new wording.  @ZTE: Thanks for the comments. Please see more detailed analysis below (addressed to All). However, I wanted to see whether the new wording of the proposals would be acceptable to you. Various companies would like to align the wording to the previous RAN1 agreements. Based on the discussion we have clarified the scope of the proposal (e.g. for Proposal 2.1-1rev4 it addresses Case A and not Case B). Given your comment on concerns on CFR definition, I have also tried to focus the proposal on the default CFR that assumes the initial BWP and it is not a configured CFR as per RAN1#103-e agreement (this is also aligned with Ericsson’s comments that Case A can reuse legacy initial BWP). Regarding whether the current wording may be confusing to RAN2, I am thinking that for our progress it would be convenient to focus on a wording that we can accept at RAN1 level. We may need a separate discussion for a potential LS reply to RAN2. What do you think?  @Samsung: I think the notes in **Proposal 2.1-3rev3** may address your comment to be able to use GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling).  @Huawei: Let me know whether new wording is better and acceptable. Also, although this proposal addresses the default CFR, which we agreed at some extent at RAN1#103-e, I think the current proposal addresses the specific case of a GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH. I think there is more consensus on using the default CFR for the case of initial BWP (coreset#0 or SIB-1 configured) instead of a configured/specific CFR.  @Ericsson: thank you for the detailed comments that are very helpful to have a complete picture of the situation. For Proposal 2.1-1rev4 and Proposal 2.1-3rev3 I am focusing the discussion on the default CFR that does not require a configured CFR.  @Apple: I have updated proposals around Qualcomm’s wording. Hope this addresses your comments. Regarding the missing case E for MCCH, this was intentional. This is based on the tdoc submissions where there was not support from companies to allow Case E for MCCH. (Case E was supported by various companies for MTCH transmisson).  @All:  The below **Proposal 2.1-1rev4** clarifies that the proposal is targeting Case A and it does not address Case B. A note is included to clarify that GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.  The below **Proposal 2.1-3rev3** clarifies that the proposal is targeting Case C and it does not address Case D. A note is included to clarify that GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.  Multiple companies have expressed objections on Cases B/D with a configured CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP (either coreset#0 or SIB-1 configured) where the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial. Please note that it is clarified (based on the discussion on previous rounds and at GTW) that cases B/D are not the same as to a GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP by implementation via appropriate scheduling.  **Proposal 2.1-1rev4**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the default ~~bandwidth with the same frequency range as CORESET#0~~ CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.   * 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.   **Proposal 2.1-3rev3**: For broadcast reception, study the option of RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using the default CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, ~~bandwidth with the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP~~ to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.   * GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling. * Note that RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP to receive SIB/paging until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. * RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   **Proposal 2.1-2rev2**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of MCCH reception and the CFR of MTCH reception.   * FFS use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of MCCH reception and the CFR of MTCH reception. |

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

**Proposal 2.1-1rev4**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the default CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.

* 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.

**Proposal 2.1-3rev3**: For broadcast reception, study the option of RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using the default CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.

* GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.
* Note that RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP to receive SIB/paging until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.
* RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.

**Proposal 2.1-2rev2**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of MCCH reception and the CFR of MTCH reception.

* FFS use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of MCCH reception and the CFR of MTCH reception.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| vivo | For Proposal 2.1-1rev4 and Proposal 2.1-3rev3, we are a little bit confused about the default CFR, does it apply to MCCH only or also to MTCH? Further, from our understanding, the 1st sub-bullet to clarify ‘implementation via appropriate scheduling’ may not be necessary, as it is due to network’s implementation.  Ok with Proposal 2.1-2rev2 in principle |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.1-1rev4**: We are OK with the main bullet. For the sub-bullet, seems it is intended to clarify how to support the case of narrower bandwidth than CFR via implementation. Since there is no standard impact on the sub-bullet, we suggest leaving it as a note, e.g.,   * 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.   **Proposal 2.1-3rev3**: We are OK with the main bullet. For the 1st sub-bullet, seems it is intended to clarify how to support the case of narrower bandwidth than CFR via implementation. Since there is no standard impact on the 1st sub-bullet, we suggest leaving it as a note, e.g.,   * Note: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.   **Proposal 2.1-2rev2**: We are not sure whether “same bandwidth configurations” means “same CFR configurations”. We think same CFR can be used for receiving MCCH and MTCH then FFS different CFR configurations for receiving MCCH and MTCH. Some suggestions from my side are listed below for reference:  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same CFR configurations for the MCCH reception and MTCH reception.   * FFS use of different CFR configurations for the MCCH reception and the MTCH reception. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Thanks for the above reply from the FL.  Regarding **Proposal 2.1-1rev4**, we understand the intention of the main bullet is targeting on Case-A, and the sub-bullet is NOT targeting on Case-B. And we don’t think anything we need to agree on the sub-bullet regarding the implementation issue. Therefore, suggest removing the sub-bullet of Proposal 2.1-1rev4 as below:  **Proposal 2.1-1rev4**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the default CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.   * ~~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.~~   Regarding **Proposal 2.1-3rev3**, we see the FL’s comment regarding **“Proposal 2.1-1rev4** only covers Case A. It does not cover Cases C/D/E as per your comment (and neither it covers Case B). Any other case would need a different agreement that is not covered by **Proposal 2.1-1rev4.”** Furthermore, we also understand from the FL’s comment in above stating that “The below **Proposal 2.1-3rev3** clarifies that the proposal is targeting Case C and it does not address Case D.” Then, **for Case C as now being targeted in Proposal 2.1-3rev3,** one question similar as Proposal 2.1-1, **could the gNB also utilize CORESET#0 as MCCH CFR for Case C?** do we then need a separate agreement to address this issue for completeness of Case-C?  Furthermore, regarding **Proposal 2.1-3rev3**, we understand the first sub-bullet is NOT targeting on Case-D. Similar as above, we don’t think anything need to be agreed on the implementation issue. Therefore, suggest removing the sub-bullet of Proposal 2.1-3rev3 as below.  Regarding the second sub-bullet, we understand the “the frequency resources configured by SIB1” ONLY targeting on the MBS services, where the receiving of SIBs/paging is not possible for idle/inactive UEs without reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. Meaning that, the receiving of SIBs/paging payload is still associated with CORESET#0 before reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. We hope that is the intention and our understanding from the FL.  **Proposal 2.1-3rev3**: For broadcast reception, study the option of RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using the default CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.   * ~~GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.~~ * Note that RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP to receive SIB/paging until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. * RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   **Proposal 2.1-2rev2**: We are fine with the FL’s proposal |
| Intel | The wording on Proposal 2.1-1rev3 and 2.1.3-rev3 appears better aligned with CFR definition. We agree with Lenovo’s comment above that the sub-bullet does not have spec impact and it can be deleted. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.1-1rev4**, **Proposal 2.1-3rev3**: We are generally fine with the proposal. We agree to make the sub-bullet a note.  **Proposal 2.1-2rev2**: We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | @Moderator, thanks for the explanation. For progress, we can go with the direction with CFR as proposed above. But we have some detailed comments on the wording.  1. As also commented by other vivo, we are also a little confused with the term “default”. We suggest to delete “default” in all the proposals including proposals for Issue 2. In any case, it would impact the overall meaning of these proposals.  2. Based on our understanding, the following note is clear. The SIB-1 configured initial BWP is also for unicast reception. We don’t understand why we need to mention “to receive SIB/paging” here. The note in last version is clear and correct. We suggest to go back to the previous version, i.e., deleting “~~to receive SIB/paging~~”.  Note that RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP ~~to receive SIB/paging~~ until after the reception of RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.1-1rev4**, **Proposal 2.1-3rev3**: Fine to remove the first sub-bullet.  **Proposal 2.1-2rev2**: To address ZTE’s concern, we can modify the note as to differentiate the UE behaviour of applying CFR as the same size with SIB-1 configured initial BWP:   * Note that RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP except for broadcast reception ~~to receive SIB/paging~~ until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks to Moderator for trying to address all the comments.  Same concern on ‘default’ here. Based on the following RAN1 agreement, it already supported the main bullets of Proposal 2.1-1rev4 and 2.1-3rev3.  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.   Therefore, we suggest deleting ‘default’ in both proposals.  For the first subbullets in both proposals, we agree with other companies to delete them.  For the second subbullet of 2.1-3rev3, replying ZTE’s concern, the Note is for IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, who is not related with any unicast reception. The note is to say the CFR has no impact on the legacy behavior ‘to receive SIB/paging’. We are also fine with the wording by CMCC. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | I checked the comments back and forth but failed to understand why the proposals are worded in such ways. Again, I want to point out we have agreed if CFR is not configured, initial BWP (including COREST0 and SIB1 configured) will be used by default. No reason to revert such agreements. From this sense, what is new is p2.1-1rev4, if the proposals intend to support CFR configured with the same size as the initial BWP, that is fine because anyway we need to solve what CFR is. Also, why do we need to study the case that CFR is the same size as SIB1 configured initial BWP? The intention is reverting the previous agreements? That is absolutely not possible nor unacceptable and I don’t see any reason to do that.  I see the cases A/B/C/D/E are controversial, but we can figure out which cases have to be supported and whether others can be supported, etc. Introducing new term “default CFR” or even reverting previous agreement is not helpful for progress. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 2.1-1rev4**, **Proposal 2.1-3rev3:** We are a little bit confused with the default CFR. If a default CFR has same bandwidth as initial BWP (CORESET#0 or SIB1 configured), does it still need gNB to configure it or not? And if the use of different CFR configurations for MCCH and MTCH is supported，and a CFR that different as initial BWP for MCCH is configured but no CFR is configured for MCTH, can MTCH still use the default CFR in this case?  **Proposal 2.1-2rev2**: Fine with Lenove’s update. |
| CATT | We have the same concern with the new term ‘default CFR’.  Also, in order to make progress, we agree with Huawei to firstly figure out which cases have to be supported and whether others can be supported among cases A/B/C/D/E. |
| Ericsson | As pointed out by Huawei and Qualcomm, there is already an agreement to use the Initial BWP as the default common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, if a specific common frequency resource is not configured. This applies to both 2.1-1rev4 and 2.1-3rev3.  What proposals 2.1-1rev4 and 2.1-3-rev3 do is however to add the possible mapping of MCCH to this Initial BWP, which is not in the earlier agreement, so seems fine.  To simplify a bit, one may also consider merging 2.1-1rev4 and 2.1-3-rev3 into the following single merged Proposal x that would replace FL’s Proposals 2.1-1rev4/2.1-3-rev3:  **Proposal x:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the Initial BWP to receive MCCH. This applies both for the case where the Initial BWP has the same frequency range as Coreset#0 and when it is configured via SIB1.   * RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   **2.1-2rev2**: Support.  One could argue that the SIB1-configured Initial BWP should be enough for Idle/Inactive UEs to receive broadcast, since this BWP could be configured to any desirable frequency range within the carrier bandwidth. We think nevertheless that there is still a need to separate the initial BWP and the configured broadcast BWP when also RRC Connected UEs are considered.  When the inactivity time expires for UEs in RRC Connected they will go to the Initial BWP (unless they are RRC Configured to go to the default BWP) to save power. The simplest thing would then be to let this Initial BWP be rather narrow, to allow for power saving for these UEs. However, the broadcast transmission may require a large bandwidth, which is in contradiction with the power saving needs for Connected UEs if only the same Initial BWP is available for both broadcast reception and power saving. If instead the Initial BWP is narrow and the broadcast BWP is wide, all UEs could receive broadcast over the wide broadcast BWP, whereas there would still be a possibility for power saving using the narrow Initial BWP when no data is received.  As pointed out in earlier comments, we see no added value of allowing for a special configuration of CFR subsets of Coreset#0 (Case B) or SIB1-configured Initial BWP (Case D). There is no power saving gain with this, since the UE anyway needs to keep the frequency open to the full Coreset#0 or SIB1-configured Initial BWP and if there is, for some reason, a wish to transmit in a subset this is possible by implementation using scheduling. This means that there is no need for explicit specification support of Case B and D. The remaining cases A and C are covered via the legacy Initial BWP (Coreset#0 and SIB1) and the new Case E requires special configuration. |
| Moderator | Thank you for the comments. Below we copy the email discussion on 25 May started by the FL on this issue.  -------------------------- Start of email discussion ------------------------  **1. Question on Default vs. Configured CFR**  The following agreement in RAN1#103-e [  Agreements: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, define/configure common frequency resource(s) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.   1. 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. 2. FFS: the relation of the common frequency resource(s) (if configured) and initial BWP. 3. FFS: whether to configure one/more common frequency resources 4. FFS: configuration and definition details of the common frequency resource]     indicates that we can either have a configured CFR, or if not configured, the default CFR is the initial BWP.  My understanding from comments was that since the initial BWP can be used by default, there is no need to configure a CFR that has the same frequency resources as the initial BWP. Proposal 2.1-1rev4 was targeting the default case as agreed in RAN1#103-e.  HW-> Failed to find Proposal 2.1-2rev4, so I assume you mean Proposal 2.1-1rev4. Firstly, since the initial BWP can be used by default, to us, whether the CFR when configured should have the same freq resource as the initial BWP is purely RAN2 designing the parameter issue, i.e., whether the size value as initial BWP should be excluded from the set of candidates size values for the CFR. This is not fundamentally essential actually. Coming back to the proposal (Proposal 2.1-1rev4), this proposal does not solve this issue at all. The default CFR is definitely the same freq size as CORESET0 because it has been agreed as is. The issue is about the configured CFR.  [FL] Apologies for the confusion, you are right and I was referring to Proposal 2.1-1rev4.    If consensus is to remove “default” from Proposal 2.1-2rev4 I would like ask you whether we are then considering the case of a Configured CFR.  HW-> as said, default CFR is agreed to the initial, so the issue we are facing is the configured CFR. Sorry if I don’t follow your logic, but really I didn’t get the point of the proposal.   [ZTE] Thanks for the informative explanation. Previous, we think the default CFR in the quoted agreements is not clear whether it refers to CORESET#0 or SIB-1 configured initial BWP. That's why we prefer not to use the term "default" here. But if companies have the common understanding that, at least the CORESET#0 can be the default CFR. Then, we are fine to keep the term "default" in the proposal corresponding to CORESET#0. In this case, there is no need to configure a CFR explicitly.  HW2-> Put aside SIB-1 configured initial BWP, as you said at least CORESET0 can be the default CFR, then why do we need this proposal? On the other hand, as the agreements state the initial BWP can the default CFR, whatever the initial BWP is is supported and should be the common understanding of course!  [vivo] For the default CFR, our concern is if both coreset#0 and SIB-1 configured initial BWP are available, according to the agreements listed above, does it mean we have two default CFRs？ Then,  which one is to be used  for MCCH and MTCH? and further, is it allowed to support different default CFRs for MCCH and MTCH? i.e., CORESET#0 for MCCH and SIB-1 configured initial BWP for MTCH, and vice versa. Or the same one should be always applied to both MCCH and MTCH?  Currently, it seems there are four possible combinations of the default CFR for MCCH and MTCH.  [FL] I wanted to propose that we focus on the configured CFR case. However, we still need to get to a resolution to the case of default CFR, so I would appreciate more comments to try to resolve this situation. Thank you. @ vivo, just one quick comments is that whether the same of different CFR for MCCH and MTCH is supported is a proposal for discussion.  [Lenovo]: According to TS38.213, the initial BWP is defined based on CORESET 0 if UE is not provided initialDownlinkBWP; the initial BWP is provided by initialDownlinkBWP, otherwise. Meanwhile, initialDownlinkBWP can be configured by SIB-1 or dedicated RRC signaling. In that sense, it is necessary to further clarify the meaning of “initial BWP” here. For RRC idle/inactive UEs, the initial BWP is defined either by CORESET 0 or configured by SIB-1.  Checking the agreements we have made in previous meeting, regarding the first FFS highlighted in yellow, it is clear that the configured CFR is not the initial BWP; otherwise, we don’t need to further study the relation between the configured CFR and initial BWP.  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   Regarding **Proposal 2.1-1rev4**, since companies have concern on the default CFR and initial BWP, can we make it clearer as below?  **Proposal 2.1-1rev4**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the ~~default~~ CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 if *initialDownlinkBWP* is not provided, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.    **Proposal 2.1-3rev3**: For broadcast reception, study the option of RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using the ~~default~~ CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 if *initialDownlinkBWP* is provided in SIB-1, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.  **[NOKIA/NSB:] We think the current proposals from the FL is clear for us regarding the “default CFR”, where based on our understanding, the term “Initial BWP” agreed in RAN1#103-e refer to either CORESET#0 or SIB-1 configured initial BWP, and that’s why there are two proposals proposed by the FL with either Proposal 2.1-1rev4 (targeting on CORESET#0) or Proposal 2.1-3rev3 (targeting on SIB-1 configured initial BWP). Actually the previous version (Proposal 2.1-1rev3 and Proposal 2.1-3rev2) has much better wording and could also avoid the term of “default CFR”. But anyway, we are fine with both.**  [Ericsson] The existing agreement refers to the Initial BWP as default. There is never any ambiguity as to what is the Initial BWP – it can never be both Coreset#0 and SIB1-configured Initial BWP. It is either based on Coreset#0 (if no SIB1-configured Initial BWP) or follows from the SIB1-configured Initial BWP. There is therefore no problem with the proposal from this perspective. When another (wider) BW is configured this overrides the Initial BWP as the BWP to be used for broadcast.  [QC] As RAN1 agreed, default CFR is initial BWP if a specific CFR is not configured. The initial BWP is CORESET0 if there is no SIB1 configured initial BWP; otherwise, it is SIB1-configured initial BWP. There is no confusion to our understanding. If ‘no specific CFR is configured’, it means no specific parameters, i.e., neither BW size nor other parameters (including pdsch-config, pdcch-config, etc.) are configured for broadcast. Therefore, the broadcast transmission if using default CFR would be just like a new SIB.  Now, as pointed out by FL, we are discussing a configured CFR and whether its BW size can be Case A, B, C, D, E. So, the Proposal 2.1-1rev4 and 2.1-3rev3 if the ‘default’ is deleted will be clear, which correspond to Case A and C for MCCH, respectively. For a configured CFR, the BW size can be same as initial BWP but there are other parameters configured for broadcast, e.g., SS based on broadcast periodicity, MCS different than SIB/paging, etc.. What other parameters are needed to be configured for MCCH for Case A and C are separate issues.  **2. Question on Default CFR with initial BWP configured by SIB-1**  As per the agreement above on RAN1#103-e, the default CFR assumes the initial BWP. As per discussions at RAN1#104-e, we further analysed that the initial BWP could be either coreset#0 or SIB-1 configured. However, I understood from ZTE’s tdoc to RAN1#104-e that since specification changes would be needed to support initial BWP SIB-1 configured, therefore, ZTE did not support this case. (If this is not the case, ZTE, do please let me know), that’s why following discussions the case of initial BWP SIB-1 configured was moved to study. Do we now agree that even though the support of SIB-1 configured initial BWP may require specification changes can be the default CFR when a CFR is not configured?  HW-> It is not about the thing whether support it or not because due to spec impact. The thing is that it is what we have agreed and surely what spec impact is implied is the thing we are doing. If we are targeting no spec impact for anything, what are we doing here in 3GPP? Anyone does not support what we have agreed is reverting the agreements! We are not moving forward but backward!  [ZTE] Thanks for the discussion. Yes, we still have concern on using the SIB-1 configured initial BWP for IDLE/INACTIVE UE, which is not inline with what we have in Rel-15/Rel-16. And we propose to further study this case.  Currently, we still think the SIB-1 configured initial BWP can not be the default CFR due to the following reasons.      1. This will end up with two default CFRs, which requires more specification impact to determine the application condition/scenario of the two default CFRs.      2. This is not in line with what we have in Rel-15/Rel-16 (SIB-1 confgured initial BWP can only be applied after entering RRC\_CONN).  Thus, we prefer not to mention the term "default" for the proposal corresponding to the SIB-1 configured initial BWP. But in any case, since the proposals for SIB-1 configured initial BWP is for further study, I guess companeis can still study whether SIB-1 configured initial BWP can be the default CFR or not in next meeting.  HW2-> Technically, the broadcast can be received by IDLE/INACTIVE and CONNECTED UEs, if the SIB1 configured initial BWP is used by UE (in RR- connected as current spec supports) for broadcast, it should be naturally used by UE in idle/inactive. Another reason is that CORESET0 may not be sufficient for broadcast and a larger bandwidth is desirable, considering the UE may transmit from idle/inactive for broadcast and the broadcast is expected to be received by other UEs in RRC CONNECTED, using SIB1-configured initial BWP is nature and straightforward. The above two bullets regarding spec impact should absolutely not be the reasons for people to revert the previous agreements and such attempt of revering agreement is not respectful.  [FL] I wanted to propose that we focus on the configured CFR case. However, we still need to get to a resolution to the case of default CFR, so I would appreciate more comments to try to resolve this situation. Thank you.  **[NOKIA/NSB:] Our understanding is that we have agreed the “default CFR with initial BWP configured by SIB-1” in RAN1#103-e. And for Rel17 MBS, we are going to have a new UE behavior for MBS UEs in RRC\_Idle/Inactive state regarding the reception/application of SIB-1 configured initial BWP, meaning that something new and different from the Rel15/Rel16 RRC\_Idle/Inactive UE behavior is going to be there..**  [Ericsson] The fact that SIB1-configured Initial BWP cannot – in legacy – be used without prior RRC configuration should not stop us from investigating whether there could be additional specification support to allow such usage for broadcast. We agree with HW that we should expect specification impact of what we are doing.  [QC] Regarding SIB1-configured initial BWP, we agree with Ericsson and Huawei that IDLE/INACTIVE UEs can use the SIB1-configured initial BWP for broadcast but use CORESET#0 for legacy transmission (SIB/paging). The last two subbullets of 2.1-3rev3 are clarifying this.  -------------------------- End of email discussion ------------------------  Based on the email discussion the FL concludes the following:  Regarding whether the default CFR, is a CFR is not configured, as agreed in RAN1#103-e agreement. [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]   **The majority view is that the initial BWP as the default CFR covers both the cases: (1) the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured as CORESET#0 and (2) the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1.**  **It has also been clarified that there is no ambiguity as to what is the Initial BWP – it can never be both CORESET#0 and SIB1-configured Initial BWP. It is either based on CORESET#0 (if no SIB1-configured Initial BWP) or follows from the SIB1-configured Initial BWP.**  **Also, based on the explanations, FL understands that although the default CFR is the initial BWP, when a CFR is not configured, it may still make sense to configure a CFR with the same frequency resources as the initial BWP since there are other parameters (e.g. SS based on broadcast periodicity, MCS different than SIB/paging, etc.) that may be different to those used for SIB. (please share if you think this is wrong!)**  Based also on the comments to the modified proposals it is clear that discussing the case of the default CFR as per the agreement at RAN1#103-e is not supported by the companies.  The FL therefore proposes to delete the term “default”. However, the FL considers it may be adequate to include the term “configured CFR” as per the RAN1#103-e agreement. This also aligns with the agreement on RAN1#104-e on studying different cases (A to E) for a configured CFR.  Various companies have mentioned either deleting the subbullet that clarifies that transmission within a narrower portion of the initial BWP or leaving it as a note. The FL proposes to leave it as a note given that it clarifies the discussions.  Some more specific comments per company below:  @lenovo: Here, I think here we want to focus on the configuration of the BW rather than other parameters that may not be related to BW (e.g. CSS or MCS)  **Proposal 2.1-1rev5**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a configured ~~the default~~ CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0, 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.   **Proposal 2.1-3rev4**: For broadcast reception, study the option of RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using ~~the default~~ a configured CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, 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 frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling. * Note that RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP except for broadcast reception ~~to receive SIB/paging~~ until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. * RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   **[unchanged] Proposal 2.1-2rev2**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of MCCH reception and the CFR of MTCH reception.   * FFS use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of MCCH reception and the CFR of MTCH reception. |

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

**Proposal 2.1-1rev5**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a configured ~~the default~~ CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0, 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.

**Proposal 2.1-3rev4**: For broadcast reception, study the option of RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using ~~the default~~ a configured CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, 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 frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.
* Note that RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP except for broadcast reception ~~to receive SIB/paging~~ until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.
* RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.

**[unchanged] Proposal 2.1-2rev2**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of MCCH reception and the CFR of MTCH reception.

* FFS use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of MCCH reception and the CFR of MTCH reception.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are fine with FL’s proposal, although we still think the red-font note is not necessary and can be removed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Based on the clarification in email, the proposals should focus on discussing the configured CFR. From this sense, the proposal 2.1-1rev5 is fine to us.  However, since the default CFR can be the same size as SIB1 configured initial BWP, what is the problem to support it for the configured CFR? Why do need to further study this option? Is it the concern about spec impact of enabling IDLE/INACITVE UE to support it or is it the concern of supporting it because the same size can be used for the default CFR anyway so no need to support it for the configured CFR? With the agreement clarified in the email, support this option should be nature and straightforward to us so no reason to “study” in the main bullet. |
| ZTE | We are ok with the above proposals.  Regarding Huawei’s comments on Proposal 2.1-3rev4, we think at least the following parts are not clear yet, thus it is fair to further study.  1. which BWP is the active BWP, CORESET#0 or the SIB-1 configured BWP;  2. During Rel-15 discussion, RAN1 made the decision that SIB-1 configured BWP is not applied in the RRC\_IDLE because RAN1 doesn’t want to impact the previous designed SIB/RACH procedure. If we take the SIB-1 configured BWP as active BWP, further study is needed to confirm whether it has any impact on the legacy SIB/RACH procedure;  3. If we can configure a CFR the same size as SIB-1 configured BWP, do we allow to configure a CFR larger than the SIB-1 configured BWP? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.1-1rev5**: Regarding the word of “configured”, I want to confirm the understanding: “configured” means “SIB-1 configured” or “MIB configured”? Is there any ambiguity if we delete “configured”?  **Proposal 2.1-3rev4**: Regarding the word of “configured”, I want to confirm the understanding: “configured” means “SIB-1 configured” or “MIB configured”? Is there any ambiguity if we delete “configured”?  **Proposal 2.1-2rev2**: OK. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with these proposals. |
| MTK | For **Proposal 2.1-1rev5**, we support this proposal with a note, which is more clear for us.  For **Proposal 2.1-3rev4**, we share the similar view as HW, CFR with the same size as initial BWP can be nature used for broadcast reception since we have agreed that the initial BWP as the default common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, if a specific common frequency resource is not configured. Considering the meeting progress, if some companies still have concern on that, we are fine for further study and discuss it in next meeting.  For **Proposal 2.1-2rev2**, we are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We are fine with these proposals. We recommend the ‘a configured CFR’ change as to ‘the CFR’. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the three proposals. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 2.1-1rev5**, **Proposal 2.1-3rev4:** Similar question as Lenovo.  **Proposal 2.1-2rev2:** Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | **Proposal 2.1-3rev4:** the following note just claims the fact of current specification, it’s not new thing to be proposed. It can make it clear or simply remove it.  Note that according to current specification, RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP except for broadcast reception ~~to receive SIB/paging~~ until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. |
| LG | We are generally fine with the updated proposals. |
| vivo | By considering Proposal 2.1-1rev5 and Proposal 2.1-3rev4 together with the achieved agreements shown below, the following can be deduced:  If a specific CFR is configured based on Proposal 2.1-1rev5, CORESET 0 is used to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH;  If a specific CFR is configured based on Proposal 2.1-3rev4, SIB-1 configured initial BWP is used to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH;  If a specific CFR is not configured, initial BWP (CORESET 0 or SIB-1 configured initial BWP) can be used, and which one to be picked needs clarification.  From my understanding, it is kind of duplicated design by configuring a specific CFR in Proposal 2.1-1rev5 and Proposal 2.1-3rev4 compared to the non-configured case.  Agreements: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, define/configure common frequency resource(s) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.   1. 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. 2. FFS: the relation of the common frequency resource(s) (if configured) and initial BWP. 3. FFS: whether to configure one/more common frequency resources   FFS: configuration and definition details of the common frequency resource |
| Futurewei | The word ‘default’ and ‘configured’ should not be used interchangeably. ‘Default’ is used when there is the absence of being ‘configured’ By using the term ‘configured’ in the revised proposal now, it means that the Idle/Inactive UE is not allowed to receive broadcast until it received SIB1. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the updated proposals. Also ok with Apple’s revision on the Note.  The ‘configured CFR’ is used in previous RAN1 agreement. How/where to configure the CFR is a separate issue. |
| Ericsson | 2.1-1rev5: We assume that what the proposal wants to say is that the frequency range of the CFR for broadcast can be identical to the frequency range of Coreset#0, i.e. Case A. This proposal does not imply any other configuration than that already provided via Coreset#0. From the point of view of configuring the CFR there is therefore no specification impact.  With that understanding, we support the proposal. We think it is good to have the note for our internal clarification, but it should not be part of the final agreement.  2.1-3rev4: We have the same comment as for 2.1-1rev5 above, i.e. there is no specification impact to configure the CFR since the frequency range is in this case identical to the SIB1-configured Initial BWP, i.e. Case C. With that understanding we support the proposal.  Since the proposal is to “to study” we think the notes are fine to keep.  2.1-2rev2: Support  We also wish to point out that the Case E of **MCCH** reception using the configured broadcast BWP is missing. Since it is not yet clear whether MCCH and MTCH need to be received on the same BWP or can be received on different BWPs, we think this case needs to be considered for further study.  **Proposal X:** For broadcast reception, study the following case to be used for reception of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH:  RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a CFR defined based on a configured BWP. |
| Moderator | Thank you for comments.  @All: the proposals have been revised, please check.  @Nokia, there are companies that think keeping the note is not strictly necessary but it is useful.  @Lenovo, CATT, Spreadtrum: further to our email discussion, I have further added that **Proposal 2.1-1rev6** refers to Case A, which should provide further clarifications since directly related to previous RAN1 agreement. The same for **Proposal 2.1-3rev4.** What do you think?  @Apple: notes modified as per your comment.  @vivo: please note that the proposals below address the case of a Configured CFR, in particular case A and case C.  @ericsson: I have added a further clarification to **Proposal 2.1-1rev6 and Proposal 2.1-3rev4** that refer to Case A and Case C, respectively.  Regarding other cases (e.g. Case E) these can be discussed at next meetings.  Regarding the note, some companies think is useful to keep it. I think it is not strictly essential to keep it but it is useful give the discussion. However, if this is the reason to not agree the proposal I propose to remove it.  I propose to try to agree **Proposal 2.1-1rev6 and Proposal 2.1-2rev3** by email for the last check point.  **Proposal 2.1-1rev6**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a configured 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.   **Proposal 2.1-3rev5**: For broadcast reception, study the option of RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using a configured CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., Case C), 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 frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling. * Note that according to current specification, RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP except for broadcast reception until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. * RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   **Proposal 2.1-2rev3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH ~~reception~~ and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH ~~reception~~.   * FFS use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH ~~reception~~ and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH ~~reception~~. |

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

**Proposal 2.1-1rev6**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a configured 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.

**Proposal 2.1-3rev5**: For broadcast reception, study the option of RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using a configured CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., Case C), 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 frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.
* Note that according to current specification, RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP except for broadcast reception until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.
* RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.

**Proposal 2.1-2rev3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH ~~reception~~ and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH ~~reception~~.

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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | We think, if SIB1 does not configure initial BWP, then a UE applies Proposal 2.1-1rev6, and if SIB1 does configure initial BWP, then a UE applies Proposal 2.1-3rev5.  If this is the intention, we support three proposals above, with clarification, e.g., adding “when SIB1 does not configure the frequency resources of the initial BWP. |
| NOKIA/NSB | To our view, the **Proposal 2.1-1rev6** and **Proposal 2.1-3rev5** provides two ways for CFR configuration of MCCH, and it may not always tight with whether the SIB1 configure initial BWP or not. For example, alternatively, there can be a new IE parameter regarding MCCH CFR included in the SIB1 configuration of initial BWP. If the missing configuration of this new IE parameter in the configuration, the default **Proposal 2.1-1rev6** for MCCH CFR with CORESET#0 is applied. Else if the configuration of this new IE parameter is presented in the SIB1 configuration of initial BWP, then the **Proposal 2.1-3rev5** for MCCH CFR with configured initial BWP is applied. So how to apply the **Proposal 2.1-1rev6** and **Proposal 2.1-3rev5** is up-to the configuration, and probably RAN2 could better handle it … |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In the updated **Proposal 2.1-1rev6** and **Proposal 2.2-1rev5**, (i.e., Case A) is added. I check the previous agreement, where Case A is defined as below:     * + - [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.     Based on the definition of Case A, I can’t find the CFR in Case A is “configured”. Only “a CFR” is defined in Case A. I am not pretty sure this CFR is “configured” or “defined”. However, in Proposal 2.1-1rev6 and Proposal 2.2-1rev5, “the configured CFR” is still mentioned.  Regarding the word of “configured”, I want to confirm the understanding: “configured” means “SIB-1 configured” or “MIB configured”? Is there any ambiguity if we delete “configured”?  **Proposal 2.1-2rev3**: Support. |
| CMCC | We support these three proposals.  But we have different understanding with Samsung, that the CFR configuration is not bundled with whether the initial BWP is configured by SIB-1 or not. It has the agreement that 2-step based approach is used for broadcast reception, i.e., BCCH configures the transmission parameters of MCCH, it has no relationship with the initial BWP configuration itself. |
| ZTE | We are ok with the above 3 proposals except for the note.  From our perspective, the note is confusing. For example, what does the “broadcast reception” mean, paging/SIBx or MBS broadcast?  If it means paging/SIBx, then UE can still receive at least SIBx. Then the note is not correct as UE can receive still perform “broadcast reception ” after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.  If it means MBS broadcast, then the current spec doesn’t support this. Then the term “according to current specification” in the scentence is not correct.  We propose to delete “except for broadcast reception”.   * Note that according to current specification, RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP ~~except for broadcast reception~~ until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   @Samsung, based on our understanding, it seems that SIB1 will always configure the frequency resources of the initial BWP. The issue is whether the SIB-1 configured BWP has the same frequency resource as CORESET#0. |
| LG | We are generally fine with all the proposals. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with these proposals. |
| Spreadtrum | Generally fine with all the proposals. **Proposal 2.1-1rev6** and **Proposal 2.1-3rev5** being associated with Case A and Case D respectively are much clearer now, but we suggest to delete “configured” to ease ambiguous. |
| CATT | The proposal is still unclear for us.   * Since the **Proposal 2.1-1rev6** and **Proposal 2.1-3rev5** are associated with Case A and Case D respectively, the wording in **Proposal 2.1-1rev6** and **Proposal 2.1-3rev5 s**hould be same as the agreement that archived in last meeting. * **Proposal 2.1-3rev5:** what is the ‘study the option’ related about? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is important to keep “configured” or replaced by “defined/configured” because otherwise it cause confusion whether we are reverting the previous agreement since CFR can be configured or default if explicitly stated.  Given we have agreed the default CFR can be SIB1 configured initial BWP, it is strange to “study” whether the configured CFR can be that size also. This option should be supported instead of “study”.  **To answer ZTE’s questions in previous round** and sorry I could not make this response earlier.  1. For IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, there is no active BWP but only initial BWP which can be the same size as SIB1 configured initial BWP (some spec impact is implied to enable it as the same case for default CFR).  2. When the CFR with the same size as SIB1 configured initial BWP, it should contain COREST0 completely, as it is used in CONNECTED state but it does not affect SIB/RACH procedure.  3. Given it is still initial BWP for UE in IDLE/INACTIVE (regardless it is called broadcast BWP or CFR), there supposed no BWP switching. However, when UE enters RRC connected state, if the CFR is larger than SIB1 configure inial BWP, whether there is BWP switching might be controversial as the situation for RRC CONNECTED UE receiving multicast. Therefore, this is why we have been saying the CFR could be the same size or smaller size but should not be larger than SIB1 configured initial BWP.  So, we should delete “study the option of” from proposal 2.1-3rev4. Regarding the note we don’t need them at all because we all know what is stated in current spec and what spec impact is implied to support this option because we have accepted to support this option for default CFR and the spec impact for configured CFR and default CFR to enable the support SIB1 configured initial BWP size is the same.  Proposal 2.1-2rev2  MCCH and MTCH being configured with different CFR is more convincing than the same, so we prefer either defer the discussion this proposal after we fixed the first two proposals or keep them both open rather than agree the same but FFS the different CFR. |

## Issue 2: MBS Common Frequency Resource for MTCH channel

### **Background**

The following agreements for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs at RAN1#103-e and RAN1#104-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. |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2104250, Huawei et al.]
  + Proposal 1: Separate CFR configurations for MCCH and MTCH(s) can be supported.
  + They discuss “*For case D and case E, case D is beneficial over case E. The reason is that case D is an approach which can avoid BWP switching when UE enters RRC\_CONNECTED for receiving broadcast. When Rel-17 MBS UE after entering RRC\_CONNECTED state can continuing receiving broadcast in the initial BWP instead of switching to a CFR with a larger bandwidth than the initial BWP, so that broadcast and unicast can be both scheduled on the SIB1 configured initial BWP without the need of switching the BWP. Moreover, it should be noted that even though the CFR for case D is contained in the initial BWP configured by SIB1, it does not affect the UE not receiving broadcast services in RRC\_CONNECTED state to save power nor require such Ues to always stay in the SIB1 configured initial BWP in RRC\_CONNECTED state. The reason is that the UE not receiving broadcast services can be configured with a smaller dedicated BWP or a default BWP for power saving*”.
  + Proposal 2: For broadcast scheduling, support configuring a CFR for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH of MTCH within the initial BWP configured by SIB1, and the configured CFR should contain CORESET#0.
* In [R1-2104338, ZTE]
  + For Case A: “*As already agreed, the initial BWP is served as the default common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH if a specific common frequency resource is not configured. That is, case A is supported by default.*”
  + Observation 1: Case C requires UE to activate the initial BWP configured by SIB1 in RRC\_IDLE state, which is conflicting with the Rel-15/Rel-16 legacy mechanism. Furthermore, Case C requires the same frequency bandwidth range for MBS and unicast, which is too restrictive.
  + Observation 2: Case B can be implemented through FDRA under case A.
  + Observation 3: Case D-1 (Initial DL BWP configured by SIB1 fully contains CFR, CFR fully contains CORESET#0) requires UE to activate the initial BWP configured by SIB1 in RRC\_IDLE state, which is conflicting with the Rel-15/Rel-16 legacy mechanism. Furthermore, it can be implemented through case E.
  + Proposal 1: Case D-2 (Initial DL BWP configured by SIB1 fully contains CFR, CFR is not required to contain CORESET#0) can be used to increase the MBS transmission capacity for bandwidth-restricted Ues, e.g., Redcap UE. FFS: other restrictions on CFR configuration.
  + They discuss “*As the CFR and the initial BWP use the same numerology, and the CFR fully contains the initial BWP. In addition, the UE’s RF can always focus on the frequency range of the CFR. Undoubtedly, the MBS service transmitted within the CFR and the transmission within the initial BWP can be received at the same time*.”
  + Observation 4: As the most direct way to expand the MBS transmission capacity, case E decouples the CFR and the initial BWP configured by SIB1, by which the impact on legacy UE can be avoided.
  + Proposal 2: Case E should be supported in R17 NR MBS. – Case E: the CFR is defined as a configured BWP and the configured BWP fully contains the initial BWP defined by CORESET#0 in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
* In [R1-2104493, CATT]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1: The case where a CFR is defined based on a configured BWP (Case E) is not supported due to the BWP switching.
  + Proposal 2 Both the case where the initial BWP fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain (i.e. Case B and D) and the case where the initial BWP has same size as the CFR in the frequency domain (i.e. Case A and C) are supported.
  + Proposal 3: For the case where the initial BWP fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain, the indication of the starting PRB can be based on the starting point of the initial BWP or the starting point of the carrier.
  + Proposal 4: The current SLIV indication mechanism can be reused for common frequency resource of starting PRB and length of PRBs.
* In [R1-2104552, Nokia]
  + Proposal-1: Support CFR [Case-A/C/D/E], but do not support CFR [Case-B].
* In [R1-2104634, CMCC]
  + Proposal 8. For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, Case A and Case C can be supported as configured/defined specific CFR for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.
  + Proposal 9. If initial DL BWP is configured by SIB1 which larger than CORESET0, gNB can configure whether the CFR equals to the bandwidth of CORESET0 (Case A) or initial DL BWP (Case C).
* In [R1-2104697, Qualcomm]
  + Proposal 1: Separate CFR configuration for MCCH/MTCH.
    - For MTCH, the CFR can be configured with the frequency size same as CORESET#0 or initial BWP or larger than that of initial BWP.
  + Proposal 2: The CFR for broadcast is defined as a Broadcast BWP.
* [R1-2104761, OPPO]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, Case B and Case D are NOT supported.
  + Proposal 2: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, Case C is used if initial DL BWP is configured in SIB1, and Case E is used otherwise.
* In [R1-2104867, Lenovo]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1: If a specific common frequency resource is configured for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, it should be confined within the initial DL BWP and share same numerology.
  + Proposal 2: The starting PRB index and the number of contiguous PRBs of the specific common frequency resource are configured within the initial DL BWP via RRC signaling.
  + Proposal 4: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, for CFR configuration for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, both Case A and Case C are supported.
  + Proposal 5: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, for CFR configuration for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, none of Case B, Case D and Case E is supported.
* In [R1-2104930, Intel]
  + Proposal 1: For CFR configuration only Case A and C can be supported for both configuration and data reception. Case E can be supported only for data reception but not for configuration reception via MCCH if BWP switch is assumed to be required for Case E. If CFR is wider than initial BWP, CFR should fully contain the initial BWP or CORESET#0 such that common control and paging signals can be received.
* In [R1-2105130, Apple]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 2: For MBS UE in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE mode, if CFR is configured for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, the CFR size should be larger than SIB1 configured initial BWP, or equal to initial BWP configured by MIB or SIB1.
* In [R1-2105338, Samsung]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1. SIBx can configure a frequency region for MBS. If that configuration for MBS CFR is not provided, the frequency region is the initial DL BWP (as configured by SIB1 or, if SIB1 does not configure an initial DL BWP, the BWP of CORESET#0).
* In [R1-2105383, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 2: Not support MBS specific BWP configuration for UE supporting multicast/broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE states.
  + Proposal 3: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, a configured CFR for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be smaller or equal to the initial BWP based on network configuration.
* In [R1-2105916, Ericsson]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Observation 1: If the Initial BWP is contained within the unicast BWP and the Common Frequency Resource, then a UE that is moved from RRC Connected to RRC Inactive/Idle may continue to use the same BWP to receive the multicast in RRC Inactive/Idle and to monitor the Initial BWP in a seamless way, without involving any BWP switching.
  + Proposal 6: The initial BWP should be contained within the Common Frequency Resource/the configured BWP, for the use case when Ues continue to receive a multicast/broadcast after having been moved from RRC Connected to RRC Inactive/Idle.
* In [R1-2105439, LG]
  + Proposal 3: For idle/inactive Ues receiving broadcast, CFR associated to initial DL BWP can be configured with a wider bandwidth than the initial DL BWP or a bandwidth equal to or smaller than the initial DL BWP.
    - If configured as a wider bandwidth, the initial DL BWP should be confined within the MBS specific BWP.
  + Proposal 10: PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH transmission is transmitted on the initial DL BWP or CFR associated to the initial DL BWP, depending on a RRC message in MCCH.
* In [R1-2105602, Convida Wireless]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 2: Define the CFR that can be configured with wider frequency range than the initial BWP should be supported and should be prioritized than other cases.
  + Proposal 3: Support Case E for the CFR design for the RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues.
* In [R1-2105673, Google]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Observation 1: Initial BWP with a bandwidth identical to CORESET #0 should be sufficient to provide similar broadcast services as LTE SC-PTM.
  + Proposal 1: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UE consuming broadcast services, at least support using the CFR with the same frequency resource as CORESET #0, regardless whether an initial BWP is configured in SIB-1 or not.
    - If an initial BWP is configured by SIB-1, the base station can indicate UE to apply either the frequency resource of CORESET #0 or the initial BWP as the MBS CFR.
  + Proposal 2: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UE consuming broadcast services, the base station can configure a MBS BWP which is larger than the frequency resource of CORESET #0, regardless whether an initial BWP is configured by SIB-1 or not.
    - The CORESET #0 should be fully contained in the configured MBS BWP
* In [R1-2105722, NTT DOCOMO]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1: Support all cases to configure/define a specific common frequency resource for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues.
* In [R1-2105849, CHENGDU TD TECH]
  + Proposal 2: If all CFRs are configured within the initial BWP for DL, the UE receiving MBS works on the initial BWP for DL. Otherwise, the UE receiving MBS works with the combined CFR as the working BWP where the combined CFR consists of the initial BWP for DL and the CFRs providing the MBS sessions received by the UE.
* In [R1-2104197, FUTUREWEI]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1a: 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).
  + Proposal 1b: CORESET0 is the default common frequency resource (CFR) i.e., the UE may assume the initial BWP as the default CFR if a specific CFR is not configured.
* In [R1-2104389, vivo]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, support that one configured/defined CFR fully contains the initial BWP in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
* In [R1-2104444, Spreadtrum Communications]
  + This contribution does not separate the CFR discussion into MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 1: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, do not support to configure a dedicated BWP that is larger than the initial BWP.

### **FL Assessment**

For this issue, contributions in [Huawei, ZTE, Nokia, CMCC, Qualcomm, Intel, MediaTek, LG, Chengdu TD] have made an analysis of the CFR for broadcast services making a distinction between MCCH and MTCH channels. Also based on the RAN2 LS to RAN1 in R1-2104165 where feedback is requested for the design of MCCH, the discussion in this document is separated into separate discussions for MCCH and MTCH, respectively. The other contributions that do not explicitly make a discussion in terms of the designs of MCCH and MTCH are also taken into consideration in this issue.

***Discussion on Cases A (CORESET#0 has same size as the CFR in the frequency domain) and   
Case C (SIB-1 configured initial BWP has same size as the CFR in the frequency domain)***

Contributions in [ZTE, CATT, Nokia, CMCC, Qualcomm, Lenovo, Intel, Apple, Samsung, MediaTek, LG, Google, NTT DOCOMO, FUTUREWEI] propose that the configured CFR for the transmission of MTCH channel contains CORESET#0 or initial BWP (Case A).

Contributions in [Huawei, CATT, Nokia, CMCC, Qualcomm, OPPO, Lenovo, Intel, Apple, Samsung, MediaTek, LG, Google, NTT DOCOMO, FUTUREWEI] propose that the configured CFR for the transmission of MTCH channel contains the SIB-1 configured initial BWP (Case C).

However, contributions in [ZTE, Apple] also raise the issue that Ues only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP until after the reception of RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment. [Apple] also discusses that this restriction could be lifted for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues receiving MBS.

These cases have significant support.

***Discussion on Case E (CFR is defined based on a configured BWP)***

Contributions in [ZTE, Nokia, Qualcomm, OPPO, Intel, Apple, Ericsson, LG, Convida, Google, NTT DOCOMO, vivo] support Case E due to additional configuration flexibility and benefits over only using a Case C (SIB-1 configured initial BWP has same size as the CFR in the frequency domain).

Contributions in [Huawei, CATT, Lenovo, MediaTek, Spreadtrum] do not support Case E due to e.g., potential additional UE complexity or potential BWP switching. [Nokia] discusses that Case E may only be enabled based on UE capability, which may be a way forward to address companies’ concerns over additional UE complexity for the basic function of the feature for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues.

There are various companies that assert that Case E does not imply BWP switching and other companies assert that Case E would require BWP switching. However, it is also worth mentioning that docs submitted to this AI have not discussed in detail for Case E potential issues with BWP switching, which may make progress difficult for the support of this CFR configuration.

For this case, although there are various companies that see a benefit for this case and would like to enable it, there are other companies that have concerns over potential additional UE complexity and potential BWP switching. A way forward would be to enable this case only based on UE capability.

***Discussion on Case B (CORESET#0 fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain)***

Although [CATT, MediaTek, LG, NTT DOCOMO] contributions support Case B due to the higher flexibility in addition to other CFR alternatives, other contributions [Nokia, Qualcomm, OPPO, Lenovo, Apple] do not support case B due to not clear motivation. Also relevant is that other inputs [ZTE, Intel, MediaTek] discuss that there is no need to have an specific CFR configuration/definition when Case B could be achieved by network implementation (e.g. FDRA).

It is also worth pointing out that some contributions do not clearly separate the CFR cases between CORESET#0 and SIB-1 configured initial BWP.

More discussion/analysis may be need for Case B as a potential alternative for transmission configuration of MCCH channel.

***Discussion on Case D (SIB-1 configured initial BWP fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain)***

Although [Huawei, ZTE, CATT, Nokia, MediaTek, LG, NTT DOCOMO, FUTUREWEI] contributions support Case D due to the higher flexibility in addition to other CFR alternatives, other contributions [Qualcomm, OPPO, Lenovo, Intel, Apple] do not support case D due to not clear motivation.

[Huawei] discusses that Case D case would not imply that all Ues that transition to CONNECTED state would be forced to receive the SIB-1 configured initial BWP since the gNB could configure a (potentially smaller) dedicated BWP Ues that are not receiving an MBS broadcast service. Also, in [CATT] is argued that even if SIB-1 configured initial BWP would be configured with a larger frequency range to cope with higher bit-rate services, RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues could still use CORESET#0 to receive common control OSI/paging etc.

[ZTE] further divides Case C into two subcases: Case D-1 where configured MBS BWP fully contains CORESET#0 and Case D-2 where the configured MBS BWP does not need to fully contain CORESET#0. While Case D-1 would still have the same issue as the one discussed for Case C, Case D-2 can be used to increase MBS transmission capacity.

[Intel, MediaTek] discuss that there is no need to have an specific CFR configuration/definition when Case D (i.e. smaller CFRs within the SIB-1 configured initial BWP) could be achieved by network implementation (e.g. FDRA).

It is also worth pointing out that some contributions do not clearly separate the CFR cases between CORESET#0 and SIB-1 configured initial BWP.

More discussion/analysis may be need for Case D as a potential alternative for transmission configuration of MTCH channel.

Considering the inputs above and the subsequent analysis, the FL makes the following proposal for discussion and consideration.

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

**Proposal 2.2-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, the CFR for MTCH reception can be configured with the same frequency range as CORESET#0 or the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.

* FFS are modifications required (if any) for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues to use the SIB-1 configured initial BWP without first receiving *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.

**Proposal 2.2-2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, the CFR for MTCH reception can be defined based on a configured BWP based on UE capability.

* 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.
* The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | For P2.2-1, we think that CFR for MTCH can be configured by MCCH.  For P2.2-2: we are fine with this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | P2.2-1, OK with this main proposal. The FFS is not clear to us. Does it mean “modification on bandwidth of SIB1 configured initial BWP?  P2.2-2: does “the configured BWP” means SIB-1 configured BWP? |
| ZTE | We propose to agree Case A, Case E. Then, Case C and Case D can be a specific case of Case E.  For Proposal 2.2-1, it seems that Case A is the middle ground among all companies. As analysed in our tdoc, if switching delay is needed for Case E, then Case C also needs switching delay because during IDLE/INACTIVE, the active BWP for UE is CORESET#0 instead of the initial BWP configured by SIB-1. Based on our understanding, no BWP switching is needed for Case E between MBS reception and non-MBS reception as long as the SCS and CP are the same. Case C can be a specific case of Case E. Actually, Case D can also be a specific case of Case E.  Regarding the way forward to have a UE capability for UE to indicate support of MBS BWP, it is not clear how network can know this UE capability in IDLE/INACTIVE states.  BWT, we corrected some typos in the 2.2.3 regarding the contents of our proposal. Copied below for reference.  *[ZTE] further divides Case C into two subcases: Case D-1 where configured MBS BWP fully contains CORESET#0 and Case D-2 where the configured MBS BWP does not need to fully contain CORESET#0. While Case D-1 would still have the same issue as the one discussed for Case C, Case D-2 can be used to increase MBS transmission capacity.* |
| CMCC | 2.2-1: Support.  2.2-2: Not support. We still have concern about the BWP switching time between initial BWP and configured BWP for broadcast. |
| Futurewei | Same comment as in our comment for 2.1-1: Do not understand what ‘can be..” in the proposal meant. I am assuming that it can also be different from the freq range of CORESET#0? |
| NOKIA/NSB | 2.2-1: Support  2.2-2: Try to understand what is the meaning of the configured BWP, as shown in below with red-font  **Proposal 2.2-2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, the CFR for MTCH reception can be defined based on a configured BWP based on UE capability.   * 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. – Is this the Case D-2 in Figure-2? * The CFR has the frequency resources identical to the configured BWP. – Which CFR case it is? * The configured BWP needs to fully contain the initial BWP in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP. – This is CFR Case-E * The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth. |
| Qualcomm | Ok with 2.2-1.  For 2.2-2, generally fine but prefer to delete ‘the UE capability’ in the main bullet. For IDLE Ues, network does not know the UE capability. We assume the Ues capable of supporting broadcast can support it without additional reporting of UE capability. |
| Convida | Proposal 2.2-1: This proposal is not clear to us. We think case E covers the cases that the initial BWP is smaller, equal and wider than the MBS BWP. This proposal can be merged into proposal 2.2-2 to support case that CFR (defined as MBS BWP) has the same frequency range as the initial BWP.  Proposal 2.2-2: Fine with the proposal. |
| Vivo | We support 2.2-2 by deleting ‘based on UE capability’, as UE capability is not known to network for IDLE/INACTIVE Ues.  While for 2.2-1, from our understanding, the CFR with the same frequency range as CORESET#0 or the SIB-1 configured initial BWP is supported by default, if a specific CFR, i.e., as defined in 2.2-2, is not configured. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | P2.2-1: I assume what FL suggested is for compromise within the group even though each company can still have own preference, so we are fine. Similarly to MCCH, the modification is assumed to be the necessary spec impact to enable SIB-1 configured initial BWP to be used by Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.  P2.2-2: need more discussion. If we take p2.2-1 as the compromise, we don’t need proposal p2.2-2. Esp. for the 3rd sub-bullet, “fully contain the initial BWP” means the BWP can be larger than initial BWP, if it is the case, we tend to think BWP switching is needed when UE in RRC connected state to receive broadcast in the new BWP and unicast in the SIB-1 configured initial BWP. |
| Apple | Proposal 2.2-1: same comments as Proposal 2.1-1.  Proposal 2.2-2: OK with proposal. |
| MTK | **Proposal 2.2-1**: partially support. We support that the CFR can be used for MCCH transmission in addition to MTCH as we commented in **Proposal 2.1-2**.  **Proposal 2.2-2**: Not support. We share the similar view with CMCC that the BWP switching delay is a big concern. |
| Spreadtrum | 2.2-1: Support.  2.2-2: Not support. We share the same view as CMCC. |
| CATT | OK with P2.2-1.  NOT OK with 2.2-2, we still concern the BWP switching issue. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.2-1**: We are fine with the proposal.  **Proposal 2.2-2**: We are fine with the proposal. We think no BWP switching is needed for Case E because the CFR fully contains the initial BWP and uses same numerology. |
| Google | **P2.2-1:** OK  **P2.2-2:** Support |
| OPPO | 2.2-1 OK 2.2-2: Basically, support the proposal, however it should not be based on UE capability. If it is based on UE capability, it could not be used for broadcast as long as there is one receiving UE does not have the capability. Furthermore, if initial BWP is not configured by SIB1 (i.e., only CORESET#0), this option is needed to guarantee the capacity of broadcast, please note that in this case the configured BWP for MTCH would not cause BWP switching for a UE as the BWP could be treated as the initial BWP configured by SIB1. Therefore, this option should be supported for all UEs supporting broadcast reception. |
| Ericsson | 2.2-1: Although we agree in substance, this should not be a new agreement since this is already agreed: “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.”  2.2-2: Support.  We think the foreseen operation in Idle/Inactive should be similar to the operation in RRC Connected, in the sense that a UE should be able to receive data on the configured BWP and also monitor SI/paging, without BWP switching. With that there is no BWP switching issue for a configured BWP. |
| Samsung | Similar to Proposal 2.1-1, we suggest  **Proposal 2.2-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the CFR for MTCH reception can be configured within the ~~same~~ frequency range as CORESET#0 or the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.  For Proposal 2.2-2, we don’t think this is needed. The initial BWP can be configured as large as the carrier BW from SIB1. In this regards, we don’t need to separate configurations for MCCH and MTCH. |
| Intel | Ok with both proposals. We suggest to “can be” to “is configured” similar to 2.1-1. For Proposal 2.2-2 we can put the UE capability part as FFS. |
| Moderator | Thank you for the discussion.  @ALL: I think there are similar comments in this Issue 2 as in Issue 1. Therefore, I have aligned the wording on the proposals for this issue as the wording used for Issue 1. Please check revised proposals and comments in Issue 1 and here Issue 2.  @ZTE: Thank you also for the careful checking of the FL assessment and the corrections!  @ZTE, CMCC, Convida, Huawei, MTK, Spreadtrum, CATT, NTT DOCOMO, Ericsson: I think it will be worth having some online discussion on the issue on potential BWP switching. It seems to be the crucial aspect we need to clarify for Case E.  @ZTE, Qualcomm, vivo, OPPO, Intel: thanks for the clarification on the UE capability which makes sense. I have removed the UE capability part of the text.  @Nokia: thanks for the comments, just to mention that all the sub-bullets of Proposal 2.2-2 where from the description of Case E from RAN1#104-e. Hope this clarifies.  @Ericsson: Regarding the relation to the previous agreement at RAN1#103-e, as per the discussion at RAN1#104-e it was highlighted that for the initial BWP there were two alternatives (that I do not think were considered at the point when the RAN1#103-e agreement was made): one initial BWP configured by MIB (frequency range as coreset#0) and two, SIB-1 configured initial BWP. For RAN1#104-e we proposed to discuss in more detail different scenarios and based on analysis from ZTE and Apple it has been found out that SIB1 initial BWP may require changes to be able to be receivable by idle/inactive UEs. Hope this clarifies.  Revised proposals:  **Proposal 2.2-1rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MTCH reception with the same frequency range as CORESET#0.  **(NEW)Proposal 2.2-3** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCTH reception with the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.   * FFS application of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs without first receiving *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCTH reception based on a configured BWP.   * 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. * The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth. |

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

**Proposal 2.2-1rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MTCH reception with the same frequency range as CORESET#0.

**Proposal 2.2-3** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCTH reception with the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.

* FFS application of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs without first receiving *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.

**Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCTH reception based on a configured BWP.

* 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.
* The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | We are ok with Proposal 2.2-1rev1 and Proposal 2.2-2rev1.  Regarding Proposal 2.2-3, we think it is a subset of Proposal 2.2-2rev1 and can be implemented to via Case E. From our perspective, if Proposal 2.2-3 is supported, then case E (Proposal 2.2-2rev1) should also be supported because the UE behaviour change if any of them are the same considering that UE can’t activate initial DL BWP configured by SIB1 during IDLE/INACTIVE. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.2-1rev1**: OK.  **Proposal 2.2-3:** When we take both 2.2-1rev1 and 2.2-3 together into account, the two proposals may be a little bit conflicted. Should both proposals be supported for a given UE or the main intention is to define two UE capabilities, with one capability support of CORESET 0 size MTCH and another support SIB-1 configured MTCH? If so, why not choose a larger one for the UE?  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: Generally OK with us. One question for clarification: “the initial BWP” means initial BWP defined by CORESET 0 or configured by SIB-1 or both? Why is “the initial BWP” not equal to carrier bandwidth? |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.2-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.2-3**: Support  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: Support. In Case E, the initial BWP is fully contained in the CFR. A UE receiving CFR will also receive the initial BWP without BWP switching. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.2-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.2-3**: Support, there should be “MTCH” in the proposal.  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: Not support, as the concern in 1st round, UE may need BWP switching for the “configured BWP”. In addition, if we agree **Proposal 2.2-3** to support SIB-1 configured BWP as the bandwidth for MTCH to realize higher data rate than only restricting MTCH reception within CORESET0, we don’t need support an additional **Proposal 2.2-2rev1.** |
| Google | **Proposal 2.2-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.2-3**: Support  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: Support |
| Apple | Similar as commented in section 2.1.5, Proposal 2.2-1 revl and Proposal 2.2-3 can be combined together as two options, then down select or support both. If both initial BWP as supported, i.e., MIB-initial BWP and SIB1-inititla BWP, if CFR is not configured, which initial BWP as the fallback BWP need to be clarified. |
| NOKIA/NSB | **Proposal 2.2-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.2-3:** Typo of “MCTH”, it should be “MTCH instead”, otherwise it is fine for us.  Additionally, based on the agreement in RAN1-104-e meeting, whether to define/configure more than one CFRs is FFS. If multiple CFRs are supported, it is enough to have single MCCH CFR configured, but there can be multiple MTCH CFRs configured corresponding to difference MBS service types applied. For example, the network gNB may configure one MBS service(s) with MTCH CFR of CORESET#0 (**Proposal 2.2-1rev1**) and other MBS service(s) with MTCH CFR of SIB1 configured initial BWP (**Proposal 2.2-3**). MBS UEs that interested at both MBS services need to be configured with both MTCH CFRs, otherwise one MTCH CFR is configured to the MBS UE that is interested in.  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: Typo of “MCTH”, it should be “MTCH instead”. Thanks for the clarification from the FL, and now we understand the intention of Proposal 2.2-2 is supporting of the CFR Case-E for MTCH, we are fine with it. |
| LG | We are generally fine with all proposals.  However, we do not see a good motivation for **Proposal 2.2-1rev1** in addition toProposal 2.2-3. We thinks that Proposal 2.2-3 and Proposal 2.2-2rev1 seem enough for MTCH.  **2.2-2rev1**: we think that the configured BWP can be configured by MCCH. Thus, we could add FFS as follows:  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCTH reception based on a configured BWP.  FFS: whether the configured BWP can be configured by MCCH. |
| MTK | **Proposal 2.2-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.2-3**: Support  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: Not support. We still have the concern about the BWP switching delay if defining a MBS specific BWP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with the first two proposals from FL. We still concern the “configured BWP” for broadcast is larger than SIB-1 configured initial BWP.  The FFS LG added for p2.2-2rev1 is generic and applicable to the first two proposal as well. Since MCCH configuring necessary parameters for MTCH, CFR for MTCH should be naturally part of that, and may also include other parameters that could be further discussed. |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.2-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.2-3**: Support,  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: Not support, share the same views with CMCC. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 2.2-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.2-3**: Support  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: We still have concern regarding BWP switching issue, if it can be confirmed that BWP switching (delay) is not needed if the CFR fully contains the initial BWP, we can go with it. |
| Ericsson | 2.2-1rev1: Support  2.2-3: Support (should be “MTCH”)  2.2-2rev1: Support |
| Moderator | Based on the discussion on Issue 1, I have updated the proposals to also reflect the preferred wording on Issue 1.  @ZTE, Lenovo, NTT DOCOMO, CMCC, Nokia, LG, MTK, Huawei, CATT, Spreadtrum: Given the comments, I think to try to reach an agreement for Proposals 2.2-2 and 2.2-3 I propose an study since there are two camps of opinions, one (Case C) supporting only SIB-1 configured initial BWP and two only supporting a configured BWP (Case E).  @Lenovo: I see your point. Please note that the original proposal was also including the possibility to configure the bandwidth of the MCCH as SIB-1 configured initial BWP. The configuration would be one or the other. This follows the agreement at RAN1#104-e as follows:  *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*   At this point of the standardisation, only one common frequency resource can be configured. If you have any suggestion to improve the wording that would be appreciated.  Regarding your point about the initial BWP I have included a clarification to clarify that would be both. Finally the initial BWP is not equal to the carrier bandwidth since as per discussions at RAN1#104-e it was clarified that it would not then make sense to have a configured BWP.  @Apple: we discussed this at the GTW and please see similar discussion as in Issue 1.  @LG: As per the discussion on GTW. My reading of the situation is that whether we approve SIB-1 configured initial BWP or a configured BWP is still controversial and therefore I propose a study. The case of using the frequency range as coreset#0 seems to have consensus on the other hand. I have also included your FFS in all the proposals.  Based on the above assessment, I make the following revisions to the proposals. Please check whether this is an acceptable compromise:  **Proposal 2.2-1rev2**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the bandwidth with the same frequency range as CORESET#0 to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   * FFS: whether the bandwidth to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH can be configured by MCCH   **Proposal 2.2-2rev1:** For broadcast reception, study the following alternatives and identify which case(s) can be used to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH:   * Alt 1: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the bandwidth with the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.   + Note that the UE that UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   + FFS: whether the bandwidth to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH can be configured by MCCH * Alt 2: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the bandwidth with the same frequency range as the one of a configured BWP.   + The configured BWP is different than the initial BWP (either SIB-1or MIB configured) 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 (either SIB-1or MIB configured) in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth.   + FFS: whether the bandwidth to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH can be configured by MCCH * Alt 3: both Alt 1 and Alt 2 can be used. |

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

**Proposal 2.2-1rev2**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the bandwidth with the same frequency range as CORESET#0 to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

* FFS: whether the bandwidth to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH can be configured by MCCH

**Proposal 2.2-2rev1:** For broadcast reception, study the following alternatives and identify which case(s) can be used to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH:

* Alt 1: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the bandwidth with the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.
  + Note that the UE that UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.
  + FFS: whether the bandwidth to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH can be configured by MCCH
* Alt 2: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the bandwidth with the same frequency range as the one of a configured BWP.
  + The configured BWP is different than the initial BWP (either SIB-1or MIB configured) 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 (either SIB-1or MIB configured) in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
  + The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth.
  + FFS: whether the bandwidth to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH can be configured by MCCH
* Alt 3: both Alt 1 and Alt 2 can be used.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.2-1rev2**: Generally OK with us. Some modification for better understanding the intention of this proposal is to align with Case A.  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use same frequency range as CORESET#0 to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1: OK to further study it.** |
| OPPO | **2.2-1rev2:** Fine with us in general. However, we do not think the FFS should be added, which signalling is used for configuration is RNA2’s expertise, it should not be discussed and decided in RAN1.  **2.2-2rev1:**  In the first sub-bullet of Alt 2, as UE does not apply the SIB-1 configured initial BWP until the reception of RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment, it seems ambiguous which BWP is initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs if there is SIB-1 configured initial BWP. If CORESET#0 is regarded as the initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs even there is SIB-1 configured initial BWP, then it seems Alt 2 can cover Alt 1.  If we assume the initial BWP is CORESET#0 if no SIB-1 configured initial BWP (Case 1), and it is SIB-1 configured initial BWP otherwise (Case 2), then we prefer to split Alt 2 according to Case 1 and Case 2, as we do not think it is reasonable to configure one more BWP for broadcast in Case 2.  Moreover, we think the FFS under Alt 1 and Alt 2 should be removed. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.2-1rev2**: For the main bullet, similar comment as issue 1 to align with Case A.  For the FFS, I am not sure if it is common under standing that all MTCH parameters are configure by MCCH or this FFS is up to RAN2’s decision. In LS R2-2104639, RAN2 only tells RAN1 that transmission configuration of MTCH(s) are configured by MCCH, bot no details.  **“**Based on the MCCH configuration received via SIB, UE reads MCCH, which carries transmission configuration of MTCH(s), e.g. G-RNTI.”  **“**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).”  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1:**Have the same comment about FFS as Proposal 2.2-1rev2 |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.2-1rev2**: The wording of main bullet can align with **Proposal 2.1-1rev3.**  For the FFS, we share the same views with CMCC.  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1:** Even we do not support Alt2, but we are OK for listing all the Alts and further study them. |
| MTK | For **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**, actually we are fine with it. However, considering there are different interpretations on the definition of CFR as discussed on issue 1. We suggest the following updated version is needed for clarification as modified in issue 1.  **Proposal 2.2-1rev2**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the CFR with the same or smaller frequency range as CORESET#0 to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   * FFS: whether the bandwidth to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH can be configured by MCCH   For **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**, we are fine with further study. For clarification, the wording of “bandwidth with the same frequency range” can be replaced by “CFR with the same or smaller frequency range”. |
| ZTE | We are ok with the two FL proposals above.  As commented before, we don’t support the wording change proposed by Lenovo since the current wording is exactly the same as what used in the RAN2 LS.  Regarding the concern raised by OPPO for the note under Alt.1 of Proposal 2.2-2rev1, we propose to update it a little bit as following to address OPPO’s concern.   * + Note that, per current specification, ~~the UE that~~ UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.2-1rev2:** OK  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1:** Ok to study itself, but we think we don’t need to restrict to use the same bandwidth. SIB-1 configured initial BWP can be as large as the carrier BW. So, we proposal to use the same or smaller BW compared to the initial BWP. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.2-1rev2**, **Proposal 2.2-2rev1:** Generally OK. However, we wonder if there is a need to discuss how to configure MTCH in RAN1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The proposals are not going to the right direction than the previous round.  In P2.2-1rev2, “can use the bandwidth with same frequency range as CORESET0” was interpreted in different ways by different companies on GTW, it should be refined to address this situation. On other hand, we have agreed if CFR is not configured, the UE may assume the initial BWP as the default common frequency resource, including SIB1 configured initial BWP and CORESET0. Based on this, we should directly discuss how the CFR is when it is configured.  In p2.2-2rev1: same comment here regarding “can use the bandwidth with same frequency range as CORESET0”. Again, we should respective the previous agreement that “when CFR is not configured, CORESET0 and SIB1 configured initial BWP is default”, so not understand why we should discuss Alt2. |
| Spreadtrum | Generally OK. Suggest to delete all the FFSs. |
| LG | We are fine with the updated proposals. |
| vivo | Proposal 2.2-1rev2: ok in principle by aligning to case A.  Proposal 2.2-2rev1: ok for further study and one clarification to Alt 1, therein initial BWP can be configured either equal to or smaller than the full carrier bandwidth. |
| Ericsson | 2.2-1rev2: Support (for main text).  Regarding the FFS, we see some issues of letting the MCCH configure the larger broadcast BWP. This would mean that the two logical channels MCCH and MTCH are received in parallel using different BWPs, which may be an issue.  An alternative is that both MCCH and MTCH are received with the same BWP at a specific point in time, but this BWP may change over time, as (re)configured via SIB. A wider bandwidth may be available for both MCCH/MTCH when MTCH is transmitted, whereas a smaller BWP may be available for MCCH when there is no MTCH traffic.  2.2-2rev1:Support.  We prefer Alt3 in the sense that the standard would support both, but not at the same time.  Regarding the FFS we have the same comment as for 2.2-1rev2 above.  See also our comments under Issue 1, which are equally applicable to Issue 2. |
| Apple | Generally the proposals are ok.  One comment on the relationship between Proposals on MCCH and Proposals on MTCH.  Maybe we can discuss Proposal 2.1-2rev1 first. If Proposal 2.1-2 rev1 is agreed, then we only discuss the Proposals on MCCH is enough. If not, then we can discuss MCCH proposals and MTCH proposals separately.  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for comments.  @Lenovo, OPPO: I have changed the wording as per our discussion in Issue 1.  @OPPO: I have removed the FFS since it seems to be controversial, and it does not preclude further discussion. Regarding the comments on Alt 2. I have now reworded the main point to be aligned with the Case E agreement at RAN1#104-e. The sub-bullets of Alt 2 were initially copied from RAN1#104-e agreement. The intention of **Proposal 2.2-2rev2** is that it studies two cases of CFR for MTCH (Case C) and (Case E) and I have aligned the wording as the one in RAN1#104-e agreement.  @CMCC: I have reworded the proposals (as per discussion in Issue 1). I have removed the FFS on MCCH configuring MTCH.  @CATT, MTK: updated proposals following wording as in Issue 1.  @ZTE: Thanks for the comments. Please see related discussion in Issue 1. However, I wanted to see whether the new wording of the proposals would be acceptable to you. Various companies would like to align the wording to the previous RAN1 agreements. Based on the discussion we have clarified the scope of the proposal. Given your comment on concerns on CFR definition, I have also tried to focus the proposal on the default CFR that assumes the initial BWP and it is not a configured CFR as per RAN1#103-e agreement. Regarding whether the current wording may be confusing to RAN2, I am thinking that for our progress it would be convenient to focus on a wording that we can accept at RAN1 level. We may need a separate discussion for a potential LS reply to RAN2. What do you think?  @Samsung: I have updated the proposals and aligned wording to RAN1#104-e agreement.  @Huawei: similar comments as in Issue 1.  @Spreadtrum: this has been done.  @vivo: thanks for comment. Alt 1 is aligned to Case C as in RAN1#104-e agreement.  @Ericsson: thanks for comments. Proposals have been reworded based on discussion in Issue 1.  @Apple: I see your point. Please note that (**2.1-2rev2**) tries to agree the same CFR configuration for MCCH and MTCH while different CFR is for FFS. Currently **Proposal 2.2-2rev2 is a study so** I understand we could there would not be a problem agreeing both proposal (unless I missed something).  **Proposal 2.2-1rev3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the default CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   * 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.   **Proposal 2.2-2rev2:** For broadcast reception, study the following alternatives and identify which case(s) can be used to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH:   * Alt 1: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using the default CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.   + GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.   + Note that RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP to receive SIB/paging until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   + RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. * Alt 2: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a CFR defined based on a configured BW. P~~use the bandwidth with the same frequency range as the one of a configured BWP~~.   + ~~The configured BWP is different than the initial BWP (either SIB-1or MIB configured) 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 (either SIB-1or MIB configured) in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.~~   + ~~The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth.~~ * Alt 3: both Alt 1 and Alt 2 can be used. |

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

**Proposal 2.2-1rev3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the default CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

* 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.

**Proposal 2.2-2rev2:** For broadcast reception, study the following alternatives and identify which case(s) can be used to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH:

* Alt 1: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using the default CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.
  + GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.
  + Note that RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP to receive SIB/paging until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.
  + RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.
* Alt 2: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a CFR defined based on a configured BW.
* Alt 3: both Alt 1 and Alt 2 can be used.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| vivo | We also have some concern regarding to the default CFR. Is it possible that MCCH using CORESET 0 as the default CFR and MTCH using initial BWP configured by SIB1as the default one?  For Proposal 2.2-2rev2 Alt 2, do you intend to say a configured BWP instead of a configured BW? Also, a configured BW in alt 2 seems too general and we can discuss it further to include more details. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.2-1rev3**: We are OK with the main bullet. For the sub-bullet, seems it is intended to clarify how to support the case of narrower bandwidth than CFR via implementation. Since there is no standard impact on the sub-bullet, we suggest leaving it as a note, e.g.,   * 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.   **Proposal 2.2-2rev2:** We support Alt 1. BTW, it is better to add “note” at the end of the 1st sub-bullet as it has no standard impact. “configured BWP” in Alt 2 is not clear. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Regarding **Proposal 2.2-1rev3**: a question for clarification, similar as MCCH, does the **Proposal 2.2-1rev3** only targeting on Case-A in Figure-2 for MTCH?  **Proposal 2.2-1rev3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the default CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   * ~~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.~~   Regarding **Proposal 2.2-2rev2,** is it still focusing on Case-E with MTCH? It seems the Alt 2 is with Case-E MTCH and the Alt 1 is with Case-C MTCH, do I mis-understood something? And we hope Case-D MTCH is not precluded with this proposal.  For broadcast reception, study the following alternatives and identify which case(s) can be used to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH:   * Alt 1: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using the default CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying **~~MCCH~~ MTCH**.   + ~~GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.~~   + Note that RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP to receive SIB/paging until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   + RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. * Alt 2: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a CFR defined based on a configured BW. * Alt 3: both Alt 1 and Alt 2 can be used. |
| Intel | **Proposal 2.2.1-rev3 and Proposal 2.2-2rev2:** The sub-bullet on reception over a smaller BW than initial BWP can be removed as in Proposal 2.1-1rev4.  Alt 1, for second sub-bullet, not sure what “apply the configuration of SIB1 configured initial BWP” means. Overall, the 2nd and 3rd bullets are not clear to us.  Alt 2 is not very clear. Does it correspond to support of Case E?  On Vivo’s concern about MTCH and MCCH using different initial BWPs, it is part of the FFS in the previous section, although we think they should be aligned. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.2-1rev3**: We are generally fine with the proposal. We agree to make the sub-bullet a note.  **Proposal 2.2-2rev2**: Regarding Alt2, we prefer the previous version because current wording seems too general. |
| ZTE | We are ok with the current proposal in principle with the following modifications.  1. as commented earlier, deleting the “default”;  2. as commented earlier, deleting “to receive SIB/paging” in the note under Alt.1  3. In Alt.2, there is a typo in Alt.2, i.e., BW 🡪 BWP |
| CMCC | Similar comments as in issue 2.1. |
| Qualcomm | We suggest deleting ‘default’ in the main bullets of both proposals.  For the first subbullet of Proposal 2.2-1rev3 and first subbullet under Alt1 of Proposal 2.2-2rev2, we agree with other companies to delete them.  Regarding Alt2, we prefer to keep the details for the clarification of ‘a configured BWP’ (aligning with Case E)   * Alt 2: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the bandwidth with the same frequency range as the one of a configured BWP.   + 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 in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Same comments as to the previous one. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 2.2-2rev2:** If Alt 2 is supported, does it mean if a dedicated BWP is configured for MTCH, then UE cannot use SIB 1 configured BWP for MTCH but SIB 1 configured BWP can still be used by MCCH? |
| CATT | Same comments as to issue 1. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the general spirit of both proposals.  Our comments to Issue 1 are also applicable for Issue 2. |
| Moderator | Thank you for the comments. Please see related discussion of Issue 1.  The proposals are modified to remove the term “default CFR” and include the term “configured CFR”. The revised proposals also address the comments on whether implementation aspects can be removed or leave as a note. The revised proposals also include modifications to the note on legacy behaviour of UEs for SIB-1 configured initial BWP.  @Nokia: In **Proposal 2.2-2rev3** Alt1 considers Case C and Alt 2 considers Case E. Case D is not considered in Alt 1 and would not be supported. As per the note in Alt 1 GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.  @Intel: regarding your questions on subbullets in Alt 1 of **Proposal 2.2-2rev3** as per discussions, these are to clarify that legacy UEs are not affected in idle/inactive do not apply the SIB-1 configured BWP, while Rel-17 MBS UEs in idle/inactive can apply the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment.*  **Proposal 2.2-1rev4**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use ~~the default~~ a configured CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0, 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.   **Proposal 2.2-2rev3:** For broadcast reception, study the following alternatives and identify which case(s) can be used to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH:   * Alt 1: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using ~~the default~~ a configured CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1~~, 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 frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.   + Note that RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP except for broadcast reception ~~to receive SIB/paging~~ until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   + RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. * Alt 2: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a CFR defined based on a configured BWP.   + 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 in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth. * Alt 3: both Alt 1 and Alt 2 can be used. |

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

**Proposal 2.2-1rev4**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use ~~the default~~ a configured CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0, 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.

**Proposal 2.2-2rev3:** For broadcast reception, study the following alternatives and identify which case(s) can be used to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH:

* Alt 1: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using ~~the default~~ a configured CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1~~, 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 frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.
  + Note that RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP except for broadcast reception ~~to receive SIB/paging~~ until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.
  + RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.
* Alt 2: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a CFR defined based on a configured BWP.
  + 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 in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
  + The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth.
* Alt 3: both Alt 1 and Alt 2 can be used.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Missing “BWP” in Alt 2 as shown in below with red-font   * Alt 2: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a CFR defined based on a configured BWP.   + 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.   + The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth.   @FL: Just double check my understanding, we hope the Case-D is not precluded with **Proposal 2.2-2rev3**, meaning that we are going have future discussion on whether Case-D is supported or not, is that correct understanding? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Same comment as the previous one for p2.2-1rev4.  Regarding proposal 2.2-2rev3, since we have another proposal targeting to be agreed that UE configured CFR can use the same size as the SIB1 configured initial BWP for MCCH, it should be nature also for UE configured CFR using the same size as SIB-1 configured initial BWP for MTCH, so Alt 1 should be supported. On top of that whether Alt 2 can be supported can be further discussed.  This discussion here is a bit different from RRC connected UE because UE in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE in Rel-16 can only support CORESET0, so no need to concern the BWP switching issue. However, CORESET0 might be too narrow for MTCH, and that was why we earlier agreed SIB-1 configured initial BWP can be configured as CFR or default CFR as well for broadcast reception for IDLE/INACTIVE. From this sense, on top of Alt 1, another option can be considered, i.e., CFR can be smaller than SIB1 configured initial BWP esp. for MCCH, because some UEs may only receive MCCH but not MTCH in IDLE/INACTIVE, so that IDLE/IANCTIVE UE with a CFR (or even called configured BWP) smaller than SIB1 configured initial BWP can help saving power. From this sense, the CFR configuration for MCCH and MTCH can be separate. The Alt2 in this proposal with BWP larger than SIB1 configured initial BWP is not convincing to me, because when UE is entering RRC connected to continue receiving broadcast UE may have to switching BWP because currently UE in RRC connected state only use SIB-1 configured BWP for other reception (unicast, or even paging/SIB1, etc.). |
| ZTE | We are ok with the above proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.2-1rev4**: Regarding the word of “configured”, I want to confirm the understanding: “configured” means “SIB-1 configured” or “MIB configured”? Is there any ambiguity if we delete “configured”?  **Proposal 2.2-2rev3:** Regarding the word of “configured CFR”, in Alt 1, I want to confirm the understanding: “configured CFR” means “SIB-1 configured CFR” or “MIB configured CFR”? Is there any ambiguity if we delete “configured”? in Alt 2, what’s the meaning of “configured BWP”? Is it configured by SIB-1? |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are generally fine with these proposals. |
| MTK | We are generally Ok with the updated proposals. |
| CATT | We are fine with these proposals. We recommend the ‘a configured CFR’ change as to ‘the CFR’. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the three proposals. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 2.2-1rev4**: Fine.  **Proposal 2.2-2rev3:** Similar question as last round. If Alt 2 is supported, does it mean if a dedicated BWP is configured for MTCH, then UE can use configured BWP for MTCH reception and SIB1 configured initial BWP for MCCH reception? It also implies that the FFS in **Proposal 2.1-2rev2** is supported? |
| Apple | **Proposal 2.2-2rev3:** the following note just claims the fact of current specification, it’s not new thing to be proposed. It can make it clear or simply remove it.  Note that according to current specification, RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP except for broadcast reception ~~to receive SIB/paging~~ until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. |
| LG | We are generally fine with the updated proposals. |
| vivo | Proposal 2.2-1rev4: same concern as stated in issue 1  Proposal 2.2-2rev3: for alt 1, same concern as stated in issue 1, we are ok for studying alt 2 |
| Futurewei | The word ‘default’ and ‘configured’ should not be used interchangeably. ‘Default’ is used when there is the absence of being ‘configured’ By using the term ‘configured’ in the revised proposal now, it means that the Idle/Inactive UE is not allowed to receive broadcast until it received SIB1. |
| Qualcomm | Fine with the updated proposals. Also ok with Apple’s revision on the Note.  The ‘configured CFR’ is used in previous RAN1 agreement. How/where to configure the CFR is a separate issue. |
| Ericsson | 2.2-1rev4: We have the same comment as for Issue 1, i.e. if the intention is that there is no additional required configuration for the CFR, other than already provided for Coreset#0, i.e. Case A, we support the proposal. We also have the same comment about the note being useful for internal clarification, but it should not appear in the final agreement.  2.2-2rev3: Support |
| Moderator | Thank you for comments.  @All. I have further revised the proposals. I think **Proposal 2.2-1rev5 may be agreeable, but I think we may need more time for Proposal 2.2-2rev4 given all the comments and different views.**  @Nokia: I have modified the proposal to include Case D, however, my understanding is that there were multiple companies that did not support case D. However, it may be acceptable since we are proposing an study.  @Spreadtrum: At the moment, different bandwidth configuration for MCCH and MTCH are not agreed, hence, I do not think the current agreements would allow to have multiple CFRs as I understand your description of use case.  @Apple: thanks, included.  **Proposal 2.2-1rev5**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a configured 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.   **Proposal 2.2-2rev4:** For broadcast reception, study the following alternatives and identify which case(s) can be used to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH:   * Alt 1: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using a configured CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (Case C).   + Note: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.   + Note that according to current specification, RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP except for broadcast reception until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.   + RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*. * Alt 2: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a CFR defined based on a configured BWP (Case E).   + 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.   + The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth * Alt 3: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using a configured CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., Case D) * Alt 4: Alt 1, Alt 2 and Alt 3 can be used. |

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

**Proposal 2.2-1rev5**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a configured 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.

**Proposal 2.2-2rev4:** For broadcast reception, study the following alternatives and identify which case(s) can be used to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH:

* Alt 1: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using a configured CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (Case C).
  + Note: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.
  + Note that according to current specification, RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs only apply the configuration of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP except for broadcast reception until after the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.
  + RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs apply the CFR with same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP before the reception of *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.
* Alt 2: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a CFR defined based on a configured BWP (Case E).
  + 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.
  + The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth
* Alt 3: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs using a configured CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., Case D)
* Alt 4: Alt 1, Alt 2 and Alt 3 can be used.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | We think this is not needed if **Proposal 2.1-2rev3** is agreed. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Thanks FL for the update, and we are fine with the proposals |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.2-1rev5**: Regarding the word of “configured”, I want to confirm the understanding: “configured” means “SIB-1 configured” or “MIB configured”? Is there any ambiguity if we delete “configured”?  **Proposal 2.2-2rev4:** Regarding the word of “configured CFR”, in Alt 1, I want to confirm the understanding: “configured CFR” means “SIB-1 configured CFR” or “MIB configured CFR”? Is there any ambiguity if we delete “configured”? in Alt 2, what’s the meaning of “configured BWP”? Is it configured by SIB-1? |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.2-1rev5**: support  **Proposal 2.2-2rev4:** Not support. Regarding the Alt 4, it seems supports all above three alternatives, but it is possible to have other combinations, e.g., Alt1 and Alt 3. We think the intention of this proposal is only excluding Case B, that’s right? |
| ZTE | We are ok with the above proposals except for the note.  Regarding the note, similar comments as in Section 2.1.10. |
| LG | We are generally fine with the updated proposals.  **Proposal 2.2-2rev4:** We could modify Alt4 as follows:   * Alt 4: Alt 1, Alt 2 and Alt 3 can be used.   + FFS: whether to support all alternatives or only two of them. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with both proposals. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with the proposals. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Same comments as to the previous issue. |

## Issue 3: Details of Common Search Space design for MCCH/MTCH channels

### **Background**

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

|  |
| --- |
| * **Common search space is needed for MCCH scheduling. RAN2 should request RAN1 to discuss the details of CSS for MCCH.** * **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 clarifications from RAN2 are relevant for this discussion.

|  |
| --- |
| 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. |

RAN2 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:

|  |
| --- |
| 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. |

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

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2104197, FUTUREWEI]
  + Proposal 5: Reuse the CSS as agreed for Connected Ues as baseline, with both the Connected Ues and Idle/Inactive Ues sharing the same CSS but with a new RNTI for broadcast services.
* In [R1-2104389, vivo]
  + They discuss “It has been agreed that for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, CSS is supported for group-common PDCCH. Currently, UE can monitor a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a SI-RNTI in type 0 or type 0A CSS, a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a RA-RNTI, a MsgB-RNTI, or a TC-RNTI in type 1 CSS, and a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a P-RNTI in type 2 CSS. For MBS reception, UE needs to monitor a group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI (e.g., g-RNTI) to decode a group-common PDSCH. One alternative is that, once a UE is configured with g-RNTI, the UE will also monitor a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a g-RNTI in at least one of these CSS of types of 0/0A/1/2. Another alternative is to configure a new type of CSS (e.g., configured in PDCCH-ConfigCommon) for UE in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state, and UE will monitor a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a g-RNTI in this new type search space. As the monitoring occasion for these existed CSS types are very limited (e.g., the periodicity for type 0 CSS is fixed as 20ms, the periodicity for type 0A CSS is large, typically), they may not be suitable for different MBS service periodicities. Furthermore, considering that the same group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH can be received by both RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues and RRC\_CONNECTED Ues, defining a new type CSS for MBS transmission can provide flexibility when overbooking issue exists”
  + Proposal 3: A new type of common search Space can be configured for MBS services.
* In [R1-2105927, Huawei]
  + Proposal 3: An additional CSS can be configured for MCCH scheduling; otherwise, CSS#0 is used by default.
* In [R1-2104250, Huawei]
  + Proposal 3: For broadcast scheduling, additional CORESET/SS in addition to CORESET0/SS 0 can be configured for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH of MTCH.
* In [R1-2104338, ZTE]
  + Proposal 5: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, a new CSS type is defined for group-common PDCCH.
    - The same search space can be applied for MBS control information and different broadcast service depending on network configuration.
    - FFS detailed PDCCH dropping rule for the new CSS type.
* In [R1-2104576, ZTE]
  + proposal for LS answer: Both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be used for MCCH.
* In [R1-2104444, Spreadtrum]
  + Proposal 3: A new CSS type can be introduced for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues with group-common PDCCH receiving.
* In [R1-2104552, Nokia]
  + Proposal-8: Legacy SS configured for legacy Ues can be configured as search space for MCCH and/or MTCH.
  + Proposal-9: A new SS can be introduced for MBS Ues having different monitoring periodicity in CORESET#0 as well as other CORESET(s) associated with MBS services.
* In [R1-2104634, CMCC]
  + Proposal 3. The searchSpace#0 or a common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be used for MCCH scheduling.
  + Under the discussion of MTCH:   
    Proposal 13. The CSS type for multicast service group-common PDCCH and broadcast service group-common PDCCH should be the same.
  + Under the discussion of MTCH:   
    Proposal 14. New Type-x CSS can be defined for broadcast group-common PDCCH for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE/CONNECTED Ues.
  + Under the discussion of MTCH:   
    Proposal 15. The monitoring priority of new Type-x CSS is determined based on the search space set indexes of the new Type-x CSS set and USS sets.
* In [R1-2104697, Qualcomm]
  + They discuss: “To answer the RAN2 question on MCCH [R1-2104165], we think SS#0 or an SS other than SS#0 can be configured.”
  + They also discuss “The SS of GC-PDCCH for broadcast MTCH could be same as that of MCCH or configured by MCCH.”
  + Proposal 4: A new type of CSS is defined as the SS of MCCH/MTCH.
    - For MCCH, SS#0 or an SS other than SS#0 can be configured.
* In [R1-2104867, Lenovo]
  + Proposal 8: A CSS is configured for RRC IDLE/RRC INACTIVE Ues by reusing existing CSS type.
* In [R1-2105130, Apple]
  + They discuss “One of the differences between CSS and USS is the CCE index is different. For CSS, the same CCE index is applied to all the Ues. For USS, the CCE index is different from different Ues. Another difference is the CSS has high priority than USS if the PDCCH is overbooked. For MBS, the search space could be different from existing CSS set, i.e., type 0/0A/1/2/3 and USS set, it is a CSS but with lower priority than USS. It is more suitable for define a new search space type for MBS, i.e., MBS CSS, and this new search space type can be used by MBS UE in RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE states.”
  + Proposal 3: Define a new common search space type for multicast.
* In [R1-2105338, Samsung]
  + They discuss “There have been proposals to define a “new” CSS type but with little discussion on what “new” means which is what matters. It is preferable to first discuss whether the CSS sets for GC-PDCCH for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues need to be different (a) than the CSS sets for GC-PDCCH for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues, (b) between broadcast and multicast, and (c) the Type-3 PDCCH CSS sets.”
  + They also 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 *Yp*,-1=0.”.
  + Observation 3: 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 ignalling).
  + Proposal 3. Support avoidance of permanent collisions for PDCCH candidates of search space sets for GC-PDCCH for broadcast and multicast.
* In [R1-2105383, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 5: The CSS type defined in AI 8.12.1 for MBS group scheduling with MCCH-RNTI can be reused for MCCH reception on PDSCH.
* In [R1-2105916, Ericsson]
  + Proposal 8: If multicast to Ues in RRC Inactive/Idle is supported, we propose to reuse the same search space type as for multicast in RRC Connected.
* In [R1-2105439, LG]
  + Proposal 4: Assuming that RAN2 introduces a new MBMS SIB, idle/inactive UE monitors PDCCH for Type0A-PDCCH CSS set to detect a DCI with SI-RNTI and receive MBMS SIB on the corresponding PDSCH on the initial DL BWP of a serving cell for broadcast.
  + Proposal 6: For MCCH, support new CSS type of which the monitoring priority for group-common PDCCH is the same as existing Rel-15/16 CSS. New CSS type for MCCH is not used for MTCH.
  + Proposal 11: For MTCH, support new CSS type of which the monitoring priority for group-common PDCCH is determined based on the search space set indexes for MTCHs. The CSS for MTCHs is configured by MCCH.
* In [R1-2105602, Convida]
  + Proposal 5: A new CSS type should be defined for monitoring the group-common PDCCH.

### **FL Assessment**

For this issue, contributions in [Huawei, ZTE, Nokia, CMCC, Qualcomm, MediaTek, LG] have made an analysis of the Search Space for broadcast services making a distinction between MCCH and MTCH channels.

Based on the RAN2 LS to RAN1 in R1-2104165 where feedback is requested for the design of MCCH, the discussion in this Issue first address the question from RAN2 and the address other aspects raised in the contributions.

The contributions in [Samsung, ZTE] divide the problem into the following useful questions for other aspects of CSS design/configuration:

1. whether CSS sets for RRCIDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues are different between broadcast and multicast;
2. whether CSS sets for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues are different to RRC\_CONNECTED Ues;
3. whether CSS sets for RRCIDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues need to be different to Type-3 PDCCH CSS sets; and
4. whether the same or different CSS can be applied for both MTCH and MCCH channels.

This categorisation will be used below for the discussion of additional aspects on this issue.

***RAN2 request on discussion on Search Space for MCCH***

Contributions on [Huawei, ZTE, CMCC, Qualcomm, Nokia] support that both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for MCCH channel. On the other hand [MediaTek] propose to reuse the solution from AI 8.12.1 (connected Ues) and [LG] propose that a new CSS can be used MCCH.

Given that the use searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH channel is supported from various companies and this would not preclude discussions on potentially new CSS, the FL will make a proposal to support it.

***Discussion on whether CSS sets for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues are different between broadcast and multicast***

As per the RAN2 LS to RAN1, discussion for multicast support in Idle Ues will be considered later if time permits at RAN2. Hence, FL’s proposal is to focus in this meeting on broadcast reception and revisit this discussion if there is interest from companies later and after RAN2 has moved forward with the discussions.

***Discussion on whether CSS sets for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues are different to RRC\_CONNECTED Ues***

The following RAN1#104-e agreement is relevant for this discussion for broadcast reception.

|  |
| --- |
| 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. |

Is FL’s understanding that the agreement above means that for broadcast reception, the same CSS would be used for connected and inactive Ues. If preferred by the companies a statement to conclude this could be agreed at this meeting.

***Discussion on whether CSS sets for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues need to be different to Type-3 PDCCH CSS***

At RAN1#104-e the issue on whether a new CSS could be supported for broadcast reception for RRC idle/inactive Ues was discussed but without reaching an agreement. [vivo, ZTE, Spreadtrum, Nokia, CMCC, Qualcomm, Apple, LG, Convida] support defining a new CSS that could have different and more flexible monitoring occasions than existing CSS and could also address overbooking issues when the broadcast reception is received by Ues in all RRC states (i.e. connected and idle/inactive). On the other hand [Samsung, Lenovo] argue that existing CSS can be reused and different search space set equation initialisation can still be achieved even using existing e.g. Type-3 CSS sets. Another approach is the one in [Futureway, MediaTek, Ericsson] that propose reusing the solution from AI 8.12.3 (connected Ues).

Although some contributions have provided more detailed analysis, the situation is not very different to the previous meeting. Therefore, the FL will initially propose a further study on this issue.

***Discussion on whether the same or different CSS can be applied for both MTCH and MCCH channels***

For this issue while [ZTE] proposes that same CSS is applied to MCCH and MTCH, [Qualcomm, LG] propose that the CSS for MCCH and MTCH are different or can be different.

Given there has not been much discussion on this aspect in other contributions, the FL will propose a study for this.

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

**Proposal 2.3-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for MCCH channel.

**Proposal 2.3-2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study the following options for CSS other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:

* Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS
* Alt 2: support of a new Type-x CSS
* Alt 3: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues in AI 8.12.1 as baseline

**Proposal 2.3-3:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study whether the same or different CSS can be used for MCCH and MTCH channels.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | **Proposal 2.3-1**: we are fine with this proposal.  **Proposal 2.3-2**: we are fine with this proposal.  **Proposal 2.3-3**: we are fine with this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **We are Ok with the three proposals.** |
| ZTE | We support Proposal 2.3-1 and Proposal 2.3-3.  Regarding Proposal 2.3-2, we support defining a new type x for broadcast.  Currently, type-3 CSS can NOT be used in IDLE/INACTIVE. Alt.1 violates the current mechanism. The search type for IDLE/INACTIVE and CONNECTED UE can be different because beam sweeping is required for IDLE/INACTIVE while it may not be required for CONNECTED Ues. Thus, Alt. 3 is not appropriate. It seems only Alt. 2 is workable.  **Proposal 2.3-2 (Updated by ZTE)**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, support a new Type-x CSS for SS#0 and search space other than sSS#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels |
| CMCC | 2.3-1: Support  2.3-2: Not support. First we don’t see the motivation to support new type CSS for MCCH. In addition, for MTCH, we prefer alt 3.  2.3-3: Fine |
| Futurewei | 2.3-1: Support  2.3-2: Support  2.3-3: Support |
| NOKIA/NSB | 2.3-1: Agree  2.3-2: We thought the 2.3-3 should be discussed first before 2.3-2, then we could discuss further which alternative in 2.3-2 for either MCCH or MTCH or both.  2.3-3: Fine |
| Qualcomm | Ok with 2.3-1, 2.3-2, 2.3-3. |
| Convida | Proposal 2.3-1: Fine with this proposal.  Proposal 2.3-2: Fine with this proposal.  Proposal 2.3-3: Fine with this proposal. |
| Vivo | Proposal 2.3-1: support  Proposal 2.3-2: support Alt.2  Proposal 2.3-3: support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | P2.3-1: ok  P2.3-2: ok in principle as the main bullets says study. One comment for Alt3. Based on what we have agreed in AI 8.12.1, as clarified, if the essential thing for the agreement is the monitoring priority of the Type-x CSS, then it is not applicable to IDLE/INACTIVE because UE in IDLE/INACTIVE does not monitor USS anyway.  P2.3-3: ok to further study but wonder whether can go a bit further to support different CSS can be configured to MCCH and MTCH because we view the search space periodicity is typically different for MCCH and MTCH. |
| Apple | OK with these proposals. |
| MTK | **Proposal 2.3-1**: support  **Proposal 2.3-2**: fine with further study. We prefer Alt 3. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2.3-1: support  Proposal 2.3-2: support Alt.2  Proposal 2.3-3: support. |
| CATT | Proposal 2.3-1: Fine with this proposal.  Proposal 2.3-2: Fine with this proposal.  Proposal 2.3-3: Fine with this proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.3-1**: We are fine with the proposal.  **Proposal 2.3-2**: We are fine with the proposal. We prefer Alt 3.  **Proposal 2.3-3:** We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | OK with these proposals |
| Ericsson | 2.3-1: Support  2.3-2: Support. We prefer Alt3  2.3-3: Not support. We think the same CSS should be used for both MCCH and MTCH, since the physical channels are the same. |
| Samsung | We are basically okay for proposals, but we think there is no clear motivation to have separate configurations for MCCH/MTCH.  Also for “new” CSS type, it should be first discussed what “new” means. |
| Intel | Ok with Proposals 2.3-1, 2.3-3.  For 2.3-2 we should clarify the motivation for supporting new CSS Type. Based on discussion from 8.12.1, the motivation was for monitoring priority which does not apply. |
| Moderator | Thanks for all comments.  FL considers there is consensus for **Proposal 2.3-1.** Instead of placing this proposal on Stables Proposals subsection, we can try to have an online agreement given this is in the scope of the RAN2 LS to RAN1.  @ZTE. CMCC: thanks for comments. I think the term new Type-x CSS for broadcast is going to be controversial as per RAN1#104-e and also as per discussion on 8.12.2. I have changed the wording to avoid using the term new. Also at this point this a study and there are multiple companies that would like a Type-x CSS with potentially different characteristics to those from existing CSS in the specs.  @Nokia: thanks for the comment. One aspect I was thinking that I think we need to make progress on MCCH agreements, but this is an study anyway, so we can discuss as per your order as you suggest.  @Huawei, ZTE, CMCC: thanks for the suggestion since the discussion on new type-x CSS for broadcast can learn from discussion on 8.12.2. There seem to be different views on Alt. 3, so seems sensible to study those.  @Ericsson: I have changed the proposal to agree on same config and study whether they can be different.  @Samsung, Intel: I have changed the wording to avoid the term “new” and rather put some guidance that hopefully is more clear than previous wording.  **[unchanged] Proposal 2.3-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for MCCH channel.  **Proposal 2.3-2rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study the following options for CSS other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:   * Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS * Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16 * Alt 3: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues in AI 8.12.1 as baseline   **Proposal 2.3-3rev1:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues support the same CSS for MCCH and MTCH channels.   * FFS support of different CSS for MCCH and MTCH channels. |

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

**[unchanged] Proposal 2.3-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for MCCH channel.

**Proposal 2.3-2rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study the following options for CSS other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:

* Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS
* Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16
* Alt 3: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues in AI 8.12.1 as baseline

**Proposal 2.3-3rev1:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues support the same CSS for MCCH and MTCH channels.

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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | Ok with Proposal 2.3-1 and Proposal 2.3-3rev1.  Regarding Proposal 2.3-2rev1, our previous comments still hold. Currently, type-3 CSS can NOT be used in IDLE/INACTIVE. Alt.1 violates the current mechanism. The search type for IDLE/INACTIVE and CONNECTED UE can be different because beam sweeping is required for IDLE/INACTIVE while it may not be required for CONNECTED Ues. Thus, Alt. 3 is not appropriate. It seems only Alt. 2 is workable.  Besides, both Searchspace#0 and other search space should be included to determine the search space type, instead of just listing other search space. If we want to keep the current proposal formulation, we suggest the following.  **Proposal 2.3-2rev1 (Updated by ZTE)**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study the following options for CSS for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:   * Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS * Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16 * Alt 3: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues in AI 8.12.1 as baseline |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.3-1**: OK.  **Proposal 2.3-2rev1**: OK to list all the options and down-select in next meeting.  **Proposal 2.3-3rev1: OK.** |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.3-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.3-2rev1**: Support . We prefer Alt 3.  **Proposal 2.3-3rev1**: Support |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.3-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.3-2rev1**: support  **Proposal 2.3-3rev1**: Support |
| Apple | We are fined with the three Proposals. |
| NOKIA/NSB | **Proposal 2.3-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.3-2rev1**:  Alt 1: Regarding Type-3 CSS, if it can be only applied after RRC configuration, we are wondering if it can be applied to RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues?  Alt 2: The new added “different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16” is not necessary to our view. And proposal stick to “support of a Type-x CSS” is fine for us.  Alt 3: Based on the current discussion in AI 8.12.1, we are not sure if the solution discussed in AI 8.12.1 can be reused here  **Proposal 2.3-3rev1:** Support |
| LG | We are generally fine with all proposals.  For Proposal 2.3-2rev1, we prefer Alt 2. |
| MTK | **Proposal 2.3-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.3-2rev1**: Support. For the down-selection, we also prefer Alt 3.  **Proposal 2.3-3rev1**: Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with the proposals for progress.  But really concern we end up only support the same CSS for MCCH and MTCH because the monitoring periodicity is apparently different which is part of CSS configuration. |
| CATT | OK with these three proposals. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine. |
| Ericsson | 2.3-1: Support  2.3-3rev1: Support. We prefer Alt 3.  2.3-3rev1: Support |
| Moderator | @ZTE: I have included your proposal. I understand that you would accept to leave Alt1 in the proposal since it is study and to leave companies opportunity to argue. Is this correct?  @Nokia: thanks for comment, the issue is that I wanted to avoid the term new and just leaving Type-x CSS seemed to me that was not providing enough guidance, but we can check if other strong views.  **[unchanged] Proposal 2.3-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for MCCH channel.  **Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study the following options for CSS for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:   * Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS * Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16 * Alt 3: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues in AI 8.12.1 as baseline   **Proposal 2.3-3rev1:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues support the same CSS for MCCH and MTCH channels.   * FFS support of different CSS for MCCH and MTCH channels. |

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

**[unchanged] Proposal 2.3-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for MCCH channel.

**Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study the following options for CSS for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:

* Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS
* Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16
* Alt 3: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues in AI 8.12.1 as baseline

**[unchanged] Proposal 2.3-3rev1:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues support the same CSS for MCCH and MTCH channels.

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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Moderator | **Proposal 2.3-1:** was agreed at GTW on 21 May 2021.  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.  Please provide your comments on P**roposal 2.3-2rev2** and **Proposal 2.3-3rev1** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **We are OK to the above three proposals.** |
| OPPO | OK with **Proposal 2.3-2rev2** and **Proposal 2.3-3rev1**. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.3-2rev2:** Support  **Proposal 2.3-3rev1:** Support |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.3-2rev2:** Ok with the current proposal.  **Proposal 2.3-3rev1**: Ok with the current proposal. |
| MTK | We are fine with these proposals. |
| ZTE | Ok with both. Just one minor clarification as below.  **Proposal 2.3-3rev1:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues support the same CSS **type** for MCCH and MTCH channels.   * FFS support of different CSS **type** for MCCH and MTCH channels for broadcast reception. |
| Samsung | Support the above proposals. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: Support  **Proposal 2.3-3rev1**: Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | P2.3-3rev1, given the CORESETS for MCCH and MTCH can be different, different CSS for MCCH and MTCH should be supported as well because the CSS is associated with a CORESET.  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the CORESET configurations can be the same or different for MCCH and MTCH channels. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the above proposals. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposals. |
| Vivo | Ok with Proposal 2.3-2rev2 and Proposal 2.3-3rev1 in principle. |
| Ericsson | 2.3-2rev2: Support. We prefer Alt3.  2.3-3rev1: Support |
| Apple | We are OK with **Proposal 2.3-2rev2** and **Proposal 2.3-3rev1**. |
| Moderator | @Huawei: there seem to be concerns with supporting different CSS for MCCH and MTCH so at least we can agree that can be the same and study whether they can be different and that would make some progress. At this point, Coreset proposal is not agreed.  @All, check whether ZTE’s minor comment is fine.  Based on the above comments**, Proposal 2.3-2rev2 is considered stable and added to Section 4 of this document.**  **[stable]Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study the following options for CSS for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:   * Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS * Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16 * Alt 3: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues in AI 8.12.1 as baseline   **Proposal 2.3-3rev2:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues support the same CSS **type** for MCCH and MTCH channels.   * FFS support of different CSS **type** for MCCH and MTCH channels for broadcast reception. |

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

**[stable]Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study the following options for CSS for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:

* Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS
* Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16
* Alt 3: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues in AI 8.12.1 as baseline

**Proposal 2.3-3rev2:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues support the same CSS **type** for MCCH and MTCH channels.

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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| vivo | For Proposal 2.3-3rev2, if different CSS type supported for MCCH and MTCH channels, does it mean a Type-x CSS and a Type-x’ CSS should be supported in alt 2 in Proposal 2.3-2rev2? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK with above proposals. |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are fine with FL’s proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: Support  **Proposal 2.3-3rev2**: Support |
| ZTE | We support the above proposal.  Regarding vivo’s question, we think it can be discussed at a later stage, e.g., when RAN1 has agreed to introduce different CSS types. |
| CMCC | Ok |
| Qualcomm | fine |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Now that the proposal is changed to say the same CSS type for MCCH and MTCH, then it seems fine. Again, CSS is configured associated with monitoring duration and occasions, etc, we think different CSS configurations for MCCH and MTCH should be the normal case. |
| Spreadtrum | We are OK with above proposals. |
| CATT | Ok with this proposal, a slight modification is suggested as following:  **Proposal 2.3-3rev2:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues support the same CSS **type** for MCCH and MTCH channels.  FFS support of different CSS **types** for MCCH and MTCH channels for broadcast reception. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposals. |
| Ericsson | Both proposals are fine |
| Moderator | Thank you all for the comments.  @vivo, thanks for the question. I think ZTE may have addressed your comment and I would also like to point out that different CSS types are for FFS.  @CATT, thanks comment included.  **[stable]Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study the following options for CSS for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:   * Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS * Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16 * Alt 3: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues in AI 8.12.1 as baseline   **Proposal 2.3-3rev3:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the same CSS **type** for MCCH and MTCH ~~channels~~.   * FFS support of different CSS **types** for MCCH and MTCH channels for broadcast reception. |

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

**[stable]Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study the following options for CSS for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:

* Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS
* Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16
* Alt 3: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues in AI 8.12.1 as baseline

**Proposal 2.3-3rev3:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the same CSS **type** for MCCH and MTCH ~~channels~~.

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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Moderator | A revised version of **Proposal 2.3-3rev3** has been agreed at GTW on 25 May. More discussion is needed for **Proposal 2.3-2rev2** specially around the wording in Alt 2. A new round of discussion is created to focus on **Proposal 2.3-2rev2.** |

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

**Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study the following options for CSS for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:

* Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS
* Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16
* Alt 3: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues in AI 8.12.1 as baseline

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Same as our earlier comment, suggest removing the latter part of the sentence as shown in below to avoid the confusion  Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS ~~with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16~~ |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Since Fei commented on GTW that it should be “monitoring priority” in Alt 2 instead of “monitoring occasions”, I would follow-up to comment that if it is changed as Fei suggested it would mean the same thing as Alt 3 based on Aris commented that the essential thing for the Type-x CSS with all other CSS in specs is the monitoring priority in AI 8.12.1 discussion. Further, with this said, Alt 3 is not meaningful actually, because no need to discuss monitoring priority for UE receiving broadcast in IDLE/INACTIVE because there is no USS so no monitoring priority issue which is valid for RRC connected UE in AI 8.12.1 but not valid here. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with Nokia to delete the examples in Alt 2 to avoid any ambiguity. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. We would like to change the main bullet as below for clarification.  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, study the following options for CSS for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and/or MTCH: |
| MTK | Since this proposal is for the further study, we are Ok with it. |
| CATT | We share the same views with Huawei, seems that the Alt3 is redundant. |
| CMCC | Echo Huawei and CATT’s concern, in Rel-17 small date transmission WI, there is a working assumption from RAN2 that USS is used for CG-SDT, it is to early to conclude that INACTIVE UEs will not monitor USS.   1. Working assumption: UE-specific search space is configured for UEs performing CG-SDT. RAN2 asks RAN1 whether this working assumption can be confirmed |
| Spreadtrum | Support this proposal for further study. |
| Apple | We don’t see there is issue with current proposal, DCM’s updates are fine. |
| LG | Considering comments from other companies, we wonder if we can change to:  **Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study support of Type-x CSS ~~the following options for CSS~~ for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:   * FFS: Whether the Type-x CSS is a Type-3 CSS * ~~Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS~~ * ~~Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16~~ * FFS ~~Alt 3~~: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues in AI 8.12.1 as baseline |
| vivo | We are fine for further study. |
| Qualcomm | Based on the latest RAN1 agreement,  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   We think the Type-x CSS in Alt2 is coming from the above agreement. Therefore, Alt2 and Alt3 can be merged. The proposals can be simplified as:  **Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, down select the following alternatives for CSS for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:   * Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS * Alt 2: support of 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. |
| Ericsson | Support.  Comment to Huawei. The broadcast solution for RRC Idle/Inactive also needs to work for RRC Connected UEs (“All RRC states”), so the monitoring priority issue may arise there. |
| Moderator | Thanks for comments.  @All, proposal has been changed, please check.  @Huawei: thank you very much for providing the summary at GTW and related comments at other AIs. Please see comments from others regarding monitoring priority.  @DCM: thanks, your change is included.  @LG, Qualcomm: I have made a new version combining both of your suggestions, hope it captures your comments well.  **Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, study support of Type-x CSS ~~the following options for CSS~~ for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and/or MTCH ~~channels~~:   * 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 * ~~Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS~~ * ~~Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16~~ * ~~FFS Alt 3: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues in AI 8.12.1 as baseline~~ |

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

**Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, study support of Type-x CSS for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and/or MTCH:

* 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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | We think here we are discussing CSS “sets”. If so, we suggest  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, study how to define CSS sets for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and/or MTCH:   * 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. * Whether to reuse Type-3 CSS or not |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are fine with Samsung’s proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with Samsung’s proposal |
| CMCC | We are fine with Samsung’s proposal |
| ZTE | We don’t understand the sub-bullet.  This proposal is for IDLE/INACTIVE UE, why there is “USS sets” for these UEs? If there is no “USS sets”, in other words, all the search space sets are CSS, then there is no need to do overbooking/dropping for PDCCH, why do we define monitoring priority here?  More clarification is needed. |
| LG | We think that MCCH reception can be almost same as system information reception for MBS capable UEs. Thus, the monitoring priority of Type-x CSS could be same as that of Rel-15/16 CSS for MCCH. Meanwhile, we are fine with the monitoring priority of Type-x CSS for MTCH based on the search space set indexes which can be same as in connected UEs receiving multicast.  Thus, we propose to change to:   * The monitoring priority of Type-x CSS for MTCH 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: The monitoring priority of Type-x CSS for MCCH   Except the above change, we are generally fine with either FL’s proposal and Samsung’s proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We have the same concern as ZTE about “USS sets”. We don’t think the first sub-bullet is necessary. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with Samsung’s proposal |
| CATT | We have the same concern as ZTE about “USS sets”. At least there is no USS sets for IDLE/INACTIVE UEs. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are talking about broadcast reception, even though broadcast is targeting UE in all states. However, for a given UE, it can only stay in one state.  It is premature to suppose USS introduced by CG-SDT will be supported by UE receiving broadcast. It seems safer to focus on broadcast reception for now esp. UE might be only designed to receive broadcast only so no uplink at all. |

## Issue 4: RNTI and DCI design for carrying MCCH change notifications

### **Background**

RAN2 discussed the details of broadcast session delivery and agreements were made during RAN2#113-e meeting. Here we copy the relevant ones for this Issue:

|  |
| --- |
| * **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 leading to with RAN1 impacts. Here we reproduce relevant RAN2 agreements relevant to the discussion on the configuration of the CFR:

|  |
| --- |
| * **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 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** |

RAN2 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 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. |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2104338, ZTE]
  + Proposal 13: A DCI with a separate RNTI is used for carrying MCCH change notifications without scheduling the new MCCH. In this case, all bits in the DCI format can be re-interpreted. And the new MCCH will be transmitted with DCI and another RNTI specific for MCCH.
* In [R1-2104552, Nokia]
  + Proposal-10: Further discuss whether the integrated RNTI with MCCH and separated RNTI for MCCH change notification are both supported or down-selected needed.
  + Proposal-11: RAN1 may discuss the content of DCI for MCCH change notification, i.e. bit field content, as well as whether the same DCI format as MCCH or not.
* In [R1-2104634, CMCC]
  + they discuss “Regarding the MCCH change notification, there are two RAN1 related methods. The first method is defining a new M-N-RNTI to scramble the CRC of DCI format 1\_0, which is similar to LTE SC-PTM SC-MCCH change notification. If UE detects the DCI format 1\_0 with M-N-RNTI, UE will receive the updated MCCH at the MCCH period boundary. The second method is using the DCI field in DCI format 1\_0 to indicate the MCCH change notification. As the discussion in section 2.4, the DCI fields of DCI format 1\_0 with M-RNTI are the same with DCI format 1\_0 with SI-RNTI, and there are some reserved bits in DCI format 1\_0. Therefore, one flag can be added in the DCI format 1\_0, if UE reads the flag toggled, UE will receive the updated MCCH at the MCCH period boundary”
  + Proposal 7. Consider two following alternatives for MCCH change notification indication:
    - Alt 1. Define a new M-N-RNTI for scramble CRC of DCI format 1\_0;
    - Alt 2. Use a DCI field in DCI format 1\_0 with M-RNTI.
* In [R1-2104697, Qualcomm]
  + Proposal 5: DCI format 1\_0 can be used as the baseline for MCCH, MTCH, and MCCH change notifications.
  + Proposal 6: A dedicated RNTI (e.g., MCCH-N-RNTI) can be used for MCCH change notifications.
* In [R1-2105383, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 7: Define a new RNTI (e.g., G-N-RNTI) for NR MBS MCCH change notification.
  + Proposal 8: DCI format 1\_X scrambled by a new RNTI (e.g., G-N-RNTI) can be used for MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2105439, LG]
  + Proposal 8: MCCH change notification is indicated in a DCI of which CRC is scrambled by SC-N-RNTI.
  + Proposal 9: UE periodically monitors PDCCH for a PDCCH CSS set on the initial DL BWP or the CFR associated to the initial DL BWP to detect a DCI indicating MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2105849, CHENGDU TD]
  + Proposal 6: Several groups of modification period and repetition period can be configured. The different MBS types can use the different groups. For each MBS session, Gnb should indicate on MCCH which group of modification period and repetition period is used by the MBS session.
* In [R1-2105927, Huawei]
  + They discuss “For NR MBS, there is no need to introduce a new DCI format like DCI format 1C as in LTE to carry the MCCH change notification, which can be carried in the DCI format 1\_0 scheduling the MCCH. It should be further studied in RAN2 regarding the specific contents of the MCCH change notification, e.g., only inform the session start or some other information as well including multiple MCCHs and session modification/stop. In addition, the NR broadcast/multicast in Rel-17 is supposed not to consider the cases that MCCH and MTCH cannot be simultaneously received due to being in different subbands, so there is no need to carry the session start/modification/stop in the DCI scheduling the MTCH.”
  + Proposal 4: The MCCH change notification is carried in the DCI format 1\_0 scheduling the MCCH. The detailed contents of the MCCH change notification should be further studied in RAN2.
  + Proposal 5: There is no need to carry the information for session start/modification/stop in the DCI scheduling the MTCH.

### **FL Assessment**

RAN2 LS to RAN1 in R1-2104165 requests RAN1 feedback/investigations on details for RNTI and DCI design for carrying MCCH change notifications and contributions in [ZTE, Nokia, CMCC, Qualcomm, MediaTek, LG, CHENGDU TD, Huawei] discuss this issue.

***Discussion on whether a new DCI format is needed***

The DCI design for MCCH and MTCH channels is discussed in Issue 7 of this document. The proposals do not mention a specific DCI, i.e., whether an existing DCI (e.g. DCI\_1\_0) or a new DCI are used for the MCCH change notification.

***Discussion on RAN2 agreements and request to RAN1***

The following RAN2#113-e meeting and RAN2#113bis-e meeting agreements and RAN2 request, especially the highlighted parts are relevant:

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).** |

RAN2#113bis-e meeting

|  |
| --- |
| * **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** |

RAN2 requests RAN1:

|  |
| --- |
| * 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. |

These clarify that RAN2 has agreed that the notification is to inform about changes of MCCH configuration due to session start. However, whether a notification about modification/stop of an ongoing session is needed or not is still not decided.

***Discussion on alternatives for MCCH change notification***

Contribution in [CMCC] describes two alternatives that have been discussed in different contributions to this issue as follows: “*Regarding the MCCH change notification, there are two RAN1 related methods. The first method is defining a new M-N-RNTI to scramble the CRC of DCI format 1\_0, which is similar to LTE SC-PTM SC-MCCH change notification. If UE detects the DCI format 1\_0 with M-N-RNTI, UE will receive the updated MCCH at the MCCH period boundary. The second method is using the DCI field in DCI format 1\_0 to indicate the MCCH change notification. As the discussion in section 2.4, the DCI fields of DCI format 1\_0 with M-RNTI are the same with DCI format 1\_0 with SI-RNTI, and there are some reserved bits in DCI format 1\_0. Therefore, one flag can be added in the DCI format 1\_0, if UE reads the flag toggled, UE will receive the updated MCCH at the MCCH period boundary*.”

Two alternatives can be identified from this analysis: Alt 1 definition a dedicated RNTI to scramble the CRC of a DCI scheduling a MCCH, and Alt 2: Use of a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification. Contributions in [ZTE, Qualcomm, MediaTek, LG] propose solutions aligned with Alt 1. Contributions in [Nokia, CMCC] propose the discussion of both alternatives. The FL proposes a study of this issue to also allow companies to provide their ideas for the two alternatives in this meeting.

Regarding discussions on the contents of the MCCH change notification although [Nokia] discusses that such a discussion should be placed in RAN1, [Huawei] argues that such a discussion is in the scope of RAN2. Based on RAN2 request and clarifications (highlighted above e.g., need of notification for session modification/stop) the FL understands this is in the scope of RAN2. However, a proposal is put forward to allow discussion between companies.

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

**Proposal 2.4-1:** 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 scheduling a MCCH;
* Alt 2: Use of a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification;

**Proposal 2.4-2:** Is up to RAN2 to decide the specific contents of the MCCH change notification, e.g, whether only 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.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | **Proposal 2.4-1:** we prefer Alt 1 as in SC-PTM.  **Proposal 2.4-2:** we are fine with this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **We are Ok with the two proposals.** |
| ZTE | It seems the Alt.1 and Alt.2 are mixed together. It seems the following updated proposal is in line with what proposed by companies.  **Proposal 2.4-1 (Updated by ZTE):** 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 without scheduling a MCCH; * Alt 2: Use of a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification;   Regarding Proposal 2.4-2, our understanding is that it is RAN2’s scope. |
| CMCC | OK with two proposals. |
| Futurewei | Fine with both proposals. For 2.4-1: Prefer Alt 1. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Regarding Alt 1 in Proposal 2.4-1, you mean to define a dedicated RNTI specifically for MCCH change notification, is it correct understanding? |
| Qualcomm | It seems Alt1 should be ‘scheduling a MCCH change notification’.  For 2.4-2, is it a conclusion? |
| Vivo | Proposal 2.4-2: we are fine with 2.4-1 and 2.4-2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | P2.4-1: fine to further study but tend to agree with Alt2 which is not new but has been supported in LTE. Alt1 is not necessary or redundant from some sense.  P2.4-1: per RAN2 LS, RAN2 is discussing this and RAN1 should assume it is RAN2 expertise and up to RAN2. From this sense, we don’t need to have this proposal or can be a conclusion if helps. |
| Apple | OK with two proposals. |
| MTK | **Proposal 2.4-1:** Fine with the proposal, we prefer Alt 1 as used in LTE SC PTM.  **Proposal 2.4-2:** Generally OK. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with both proposals. |
| CATT | Ok with these two proposals. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.4-1:** We are fine with the proposal. We prefer Alt1 to reuse the same mechanism as SC-PTM.  **Proposal 2.4-2:** We are fine with the proposal. |
| Google | **P2.4-1:** OK  **P2.4-2:** Fine, but we don’t need this proposal. |
| OPPO | We are Ok with the two proposals |
| Ericsson | 2.4-1: Alt1 is interesting and can be studied.  We disagree with Alt.2, since this would impact the DCI and possibility for multicast and broadcast transmissions to receive the same data via the same PDCCH/PDSCH.  We think also change notifications could be detected on the MCCH. In addition, we also think other solutions should not be precluded.  2.4-2: We agree in substance, but this not normal RAN2 work, so should not be an agreement. |
| Samsung | Okay for both proposals. |
| Intel | Proposal 2.4-1: Alt 1 should be for MCCH change notification not for scheduling another MCCH right? |
| Moderator | Thanks for comments.  @ZTE, Qualcomm, Intel: thanks for careful checking, I have included Qualcomm’s wording in the updated proposal that also think addresses ZTE comment.  @ZTE, Qualcomm, Huawei, Ericsson: For proposal 2.4-2 I have changed it for Conclusion.  @Nokia: Yes, your understanding is correct.  @Ericsson: I have included another sub-bullet to address your comment.  **Proposal 2.4-1rev1:** 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 scheduling 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   **(Conclusion)Proposal 2.4-2rev1:** Is up to RAN2 to decide the specific contents of the MCCH change notification, e.g, whether only 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. |

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

**Proposal 2.4-1rev1:** 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 scheduling 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

**(Conclusion)Proposal 2.4-2rev1:** Is up to RAN2 to decide the specific contents of the MCCH change notification, e.g, whether only 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.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| ZTE | Ok with the two proposals in principle.  One minor comment, the word “scheduling” in Alt.1 is a little bit misleading because Alt.1 is a indication via DCI without scheduling any PDSCH. Maybe we can change “scheduling” to “indicating” to make it clear.  • Alt 1: Define a dedicated RNTI to scramble the CRC of a DCI indicating ~~scheduling~~ a MCCH change notification; |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | OK with the two proposals. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.4-1rev1**: Support. We prefer Alt1.  **Proposal 2.4-2rev1**: Support |
| CMCC | OK to two proposals. |
| Google | Support these two proposals |
| Apple | Ok with two proposals. ZTE’s update is more accurate. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Try to further clarify the understanding of Proposal 2.4-1 from our side:  To our understanding, there are two aspects regarding MCCH change notification, one is the RNTI design for MCCH change notification, and the other one is the DCI format design for MCCH change notification. Does the Proposal 2.4-1 address both aspects or only the RNTI for MCCH change notification issue? We may highlight the term “RNTI” in the main bullet of Proposal 2.4-1 if the proposal only intend for “RNTI for MCCH change notification”.  Furthermore, to our view, for the alternatives of “RNTI for MCCH change notification”, it can be a new introduced RNTI for MCCH change notification which is different from MCCH-RNTI (our understanding it is the current Alt 1 proposal), or the same RNTI as MCCH can be utilized for MCCH change notification, meaning that no new RNTI for MCCH change notification is needed and “a bit field” in the same DCI format as MCCH can be used to indicate the MCCH change notification (our understanding it is the current Alt 2 proposal). |
| LG | **Proposal 2.4-1:** we prefer Alt 1 as in SC-PTM.  **Proposal 2.4-2:** we are fine with this proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with the proposals. |
| CATT | Are we going to down-select these two Alts or support both? |
| Spreadtrum | OK with the two proposals. |
| Ericsson | 2.4-1rev1: Support |
| Moderator | @ZTE, Apple: thanks for comment, which has been included.  @Nokia: Thanks for the question. Proposal 2.4-1 does not address DCI format design. I have highlighted as per your advice. Regarding your question in your last paragraph: your description of the two alternatives is accurate. Alt1 would not change the contents of the DCI (whatever format we later agree) but uses the dedicated RNTI to indicate the change notification. Alt.2 does not have a dedicated RNTI but uses some of the fields in a DCI format to indicate that change notification. Please also note that a combination would be possible but it has been argued that combining Alt1 and Alt2 is not necessary due to MCCH and MTCH are supposed to be received in same band not like SC-PTM for MTC.  @CATT: have included additional text to address your comment.  **Proposal 2.4-1rev2:** 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)Proposal 2.4-2rev1:** Is up to RAN2 to decide the specific contents of the MCCH change notification, e.g, whether only 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. |

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

**Proposal 2.4-1rev2:** 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.

**[unchanged] (Conclusion)Proposal 2.4-2rev1:** Is up to RAN2 to decide the specific contents of the MCCH change notification, e.g, whether only 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.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK with the two proposals. |
| OPPO | OK with these two proposals. |
| CMCC | Support both |
| CATT | OK with these two proposals. |
| MTK | We are OK with these two proposals. |
| ZTE | Ok with both. |
| Samsung | Support both |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support both proposals. |
| Spreadtrum | Support both proposals. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposals. |
| Vivo | Ok with two proposals in principle. |
| Ericsson | 2.4-1rev2: Support  2.4-2rev1: Support |
| Apple | We are OK with these two proposals. |
| Moderator | Based on comments above **Proposal 2.4-1rev2 and (Conclusion)Proposal 2.4-2rev1 are considered stable and are added to Section 4.**  **[stable] Proposal 2.4-1rev2:** 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.   **[stable] (Conclusion)Proposal 2.4-2rev1:** Is up to RAN2 to decide the specific contents of the MCCH change notification, e.g, whether only 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. |

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

**[stable] Proposal 2.4-1rev2:** 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.

**[stable] (Conclusion)Proposal 2.4-2rev1:** Is up to RAN2 to decide the specific contents of the MCCH change notification, e.g, whether only 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.

Please indicate any further concerns:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| vivo | Ok in principle. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK with above proposals. |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are fine with FL’s proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.4-1rev2**: Support  **Proposal 2.4-2rev1**: Support |
| ZTE | We are ok with the above proposals. |
| CMCC | Ok |
| Qualcomm | fine |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ok |
| Spreadtrum | fine |
| CATT | OK |
| LG | OK |
| Ericsson | OK |
| Moderator | Thank you for the comments, no further edits are provided but if any other companies has concerns do please let us know. |
| Moderator | **Proposal 2.4-1rev2** and **(Conclusion)Proposal 2.4-2rev1 (or small revisions)** have been agreed at GTW on 25 May. Therefore the discussion of **this Issue is closed**. |

## Issue 5: Beam Sweeping for MCCH and MTCH channels

### **Background**

The following agreement for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs at RAN1#103-e and RAN2#104-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 |

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.** |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2104197, FUTUREWEI]
  + Observation1: The Idle/Inactive Ues monitoring of the group-common PDCCH transmissions corresponding to broadcast services is based on the operation:
    - Within the broadcast MCCH transmission window, UE assumes that the same broadcast messages are repeated in all beams of the sweeping pattern and thus the selection of the beam(s) for the reception of the broadcast message is up to UE implementation.
    - The MCCH transmission window is defined by MCCH repetition period, MCCH window duration and radio frame/slot offset, and is RRC configured to the UE.
* In [R1-2104389, vivo]
  + Proposal 4: Confirm RAN2 assumption on mapping between MBS PDCCH and SSBs:
    - In case searchSpace#0 is configured for MBS PDCCH, the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1.
    - If common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MBS PDCCH, the PDCCH monitoring occasions which are not overlapping with UL symbols are sequentially numbered from one in the PDCCH transmission window and mapped to SSBs using the similar rule as defined for OSI in TS 38.331.
* In [R1-2104250, Huawei]
  + They discuss “Beam sweeping mechanism for MCCH has been discussed in RAN2 and achieved some progress. What RAN1 discusses in this meeting is mainly for MTCH which is supposed to be discussed in RAN1.”
  + Proposal 5: If SS#0 is configured for MTCH scheduling, the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as that for SIB1 as defined in TS 38.213.
  + They discuss that “If SS other than SS#0 is configured for MTCH, similar to the mechanisms defined for paging and OSI in the specific SS other than SS#0, a window is needed so as to associate with SSB.”
  + Proposal 6: MTCH scheduling is associated with a window defined by the MTCH monitoring periodicity K\_(G-RNTI) and the offset to the starting of the periodicity O\_(G-RNTI):
    - the PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) in slot n\_slot in the frame SFN is given by (SFN∙N\_slot+n\_slot-O\_(G-RNTI) )mod K\_(G-RNTI)=0, where N\_slot is the number of slots in a radio frame.
  + Proposal 7: Within the MTCH scheduling window, the association between the PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSB is defined as:
    - the [x×N+K]th PDCCH monitoring occasion (s) for MTCH in the scheduling window corresponds to the Kth transmitted SSB, where x = 0, 1, ...X-1, K = 1, 2, …N, N is the number of actual transmitted SSBs determined according to ssb-PositionsInBurst in SIB1 and X is equal to CEIL(number of PDCCH monitoring occasions in G-RNTI window/N).
    - The UE assumes that, in the MTCH scheduling window, PDCCH for an MTCH scrambled by G-RNTI is transmitted in at least one PDCCH monitoring occasion corresponding to each transmitted SSB.
* In [R1-2104338, ZTE]
  + Proposal 10: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, an MBS window is defined as a time interval for PDCCH transmission corresponding to an MBS service in different beams.
    - Note: Different MBS services can share the same MBS window.
  + Proposal 11: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, when receiving MBS PDSCH, UE assumes that the DM-RS port of PDSCH is quasi co-located with the associated SS/PBCH block with respect to Doppler shift, Doppler spread, average delay, delay spread, spatial RX parameters when applicable.
* In [R1-2104493, CATT]
  + Proposal 9: In NR MBS system, both options of PDCCH MO configuration can be considered, and how to initiate these two options can be further studied.
    - Option 1: PDCCH Mos in one MBS-window length are allocated to different SSBs successively, same as the PDCCH Mos for SIBx.
    - Option 2: PDCCH Mos in one MBS-window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive Mos.
* In [R1-2104552, Nokia]
  + Proposal-12: Considering including the SSB association mapping for SSB beams without MBS transmission.
  + Proposal-13: Considering 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-14: Propose to allow the network to control the number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the MBS window duration.
* In [R1-2104634, CMCC]
  + Proposal 5. Confirm the RAN2 agreement, that in case searchSpace#0 is configured for MCCH, the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1 and in case common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MCCH, 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.
  + Proposal 6. The same beam is used for PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MCCH message PDSCH.
  + [MTCH design] Proposal 17. The association between transmitted SSB indexes and group-common PDCCH monitoring occasions using the similar rule as defined for OSI in TS 38.331 for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues.
  + [MTCH design] Proposal 18. The same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled PDSCH.
* In [R1-2104697, Qualcomm]
  + they discuss “For MCCH with QPSK, transmitted from serving cell, Alt1 may be sufficient. But for MTCH with higher modulation and/or SFN transmission, TRS is needed for GC-PDSCH reception.”
  + Proposal 9: UE may assume that the GC-PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB or periodic TRS if configured for broadcast reception.
* In [R1-2104761, OPPO]
  + Proposal 3: Since PDCCH monitoring occasions are directly related to the SSB locations due to beam sweeping, the higher layer parameter “MCCH duration” is no longer necessary. RAN1 should inform RAN2 about this and recommend to remove this parameter if there is no other use.
  + Proposal 4: The MBS window is defined as SFN mod T = offset, where the period T and offset are configured by the network. The MBS window is used to number PDCCH occasion from 0 for MTCH scheduling.
  + Proposal 5a: The first PDCCH occasion of each data are configured by the network and the PDCCH occasion from configured first PDCCH occasion in ascending order can be mapped to SSB index in ascending order of their SSB indexes for corresponding data.
  + Proposal 5b: If first PDCCH occasion of each data are not configured by the network, the PDCCH occasion from 0 in ascending order can be mapped to SSB index in ascending order of their SSB indexes data by data.
* In [R1-2105338, Samsung]
  + Observation 4: Broadcast PDCCH receptions from Ues without dedicated RRC connection are QCL-ed with the cell-defining SS/PBCH block as in Rel-16. There is no need to discuss beam sweeping.
* In [R1-2105439, LG]
  + Proposal 12: For group-common PDCCH to schedule MBS transmission, different SSB indexes can be related to different occurrences of a CORESET within monitoring periodicity (i.e. *monitoringSlotPeriodicityAndOffset*), i.e. Each repetition of a CORESET is related to one or more SSB indexes.
* In [R1-2105180, Sony]
  + Proposal 3: For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, the network shall provide multiple associations between SSB range and each group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.
* In [R1-2105722, NTT DOCOMO]
  + Proposal 3: For the association between SSB indexes and group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, reuse the association rule used for paging.
* In [R1-2105849, CHENGDU TD]
  + Proposal: Beam sweeping is used for the group common PDSCH to transmit the data of all the Non-SPS RBs of the MBS session with the same beams as the PBCH/SS block
* In [R1-2105916, Ericsson]
  + Proposal 3: When beam sweeping is used for unicast and/or multicast to RRC Connected Ues, the same beams may also carry multicast and/or broadcast, addressing Inactive/Idle Ues.
  + Group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCl’d with TRS if configured.

### **FL Assessment**

For this Issue there are multiple contributions discussing different aspects and at different levels of discussion for beam sweeping. The FL proposes to try to start agreeing from higher level aspects that could help more detailed discussions at next meetings.

***Discussion on beam sweeping aspects for MCCH channel***

[vivo, CMCC] propose to confirm the RAN2 agreements on mapping between PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSBs for MCCH channel. On the other hand, [Huawei] proposes to focus the discussion in RAN1 in MTCH channel. The FL will put forward a proposal to confirm the RAN2 agreements to check companies’ positions.

***Discussion on beam sweeping aspects for MTCH channel***

In [Huawei], as for the MCCH channel, for the MTCH channel is proposed to reuse PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSBs as done for SIB1. This approach seems to be aligned with the approach used for MCCH and agreed by RAN2. However, it is worth pointing out that there is a parallel discussion for this meeting on SS for MTCH (Issue 3).

While [CATT, Huawei, Nokia, CMCC, LG, Sony, NTT DOCOMO] discuss details of the PDCCH monitoring association with SSBs for MTCH with similar mechanisms to paging and OSI, [Huawei, ZTE, OPPO, Nokia] also discuss details of the MTCH transmission window (e.g. window duration, offset, repetitions).

[CMCC] proposes to use the same beam for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled PDSCH for both MCCH and MTCH channels.

[Qualcomm] also discuss that MTCH group-common PDSCH reception can be QCL’d with TRS if configured to allow for higher order modulation and/or SFN transmission transparent to the Ues.

[OPPO] also propose that the higher layer parameter “MCCH duration” is no longer necessary and RAN1 should inform RAN2.

[Samsung] proposes that there is no need to discuss beam sweeping since PDCCH reception from Ues in idle/inactive are QCL’d with cell-defining SSB as in Rel-17.

[Ericsson] that beam sweeping used for unicast and/or multicast should also be able to address idle/inactive Ues. They also propose that TRS can be enabled.

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

**Proposal 2.5-1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, RAN1 confirms the following RAN2 agreements:

* 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.

**Proposal 2.5-2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, in case searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH (if allowed), the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1 as defined in TS 38.213.

**Proposal 2.5-3:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, in case common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH (if allowed), the association between PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSBs for MTCH channel use the similar rules as defined for Paging and OSI.

* The MTCH transmission window is defined by repetition period, window duration and radio frame/slot offset.

**Proposal 2.5-4:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study whether same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled PDSCH for MCCH and MTCH channels.

* UE may assume that the group-common PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB or periodic TRS if configured.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | **Proposal 2.5-2:** We prefer to configure a separate search space for MTCH carrying user traffic.  **Proposal 2.5-3:** We do not understand how repetition period will work for user traffic, considering difference between various traffic pattern with changed user packets and periodic repetitions of same system information. If repetition is needed, we could refer to repetition of multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED. Thus, we propose to study MTCH transmissions as follows:  **Proposal 2.5-3:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, in case common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH (if allowed), study the association between PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSBs for MTCH channel ~~use the similar rules as defined for Paging and OSI.~~   * ~~The MTCH transmission window is defined by repetition period, window duration and radio frame/slot offset.~~   **Proposal 2.5-4:** We are not sure if TRS should be considered. Thus, we propose to change to:  **Proposal 2.5-4:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, study whether same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled PDSCH for MCCH and MTCH channels.   * UE may assume that the group-common PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB ~~or periodic TRS if configured.~~ * FFS: QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured |
| ZTE | We are ok with Proposal 2.5-1 and 2.5-2.  Regarding Proposal 2.5-3, our understanding is that MTCH should reuse the same mechanism as MCCH, i.e., reusing the OSI mechanism. Besides, the Paging mechanism is not suitable for broadcast as it separate different Ues into different Pos, which is not needed for broadcast. Thus, we suggest to reuse the OSI mechanism.  **Proposal 2.5-3 (Updated by ZTE):** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, in case common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH (if allowed), the association between PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSBs for MTCH channel use the similar rules as defined for OSI.   * The MTCH transmission window is defined by repetition period, window duration and radio frame/slot offset.   If we allow PDSCH for MCCH and MTCH to be QCLed with TRS, it would introduce huge spec change. We believe the SSB should be sufficient. We propose the following.  **Proposal 2.5-4:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, the same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled PDSCH for MCCH and MTCH channels. |
| CMCC | **2.5-1:** Support.  **2.5-2:** Support.  **2.5-3:** Not sure whether the association between PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSBs for MTCH channel use the similar rules as defined for Paging and OSI are the same. If we follow the same rule as MCCH, we can only agree similar rule as OSI as in proposal 2.5-1.  **2.5-4:** Same concern as LG |
| NOKIA/NSB | **Proposal 2.5-1 Support**  **Proposal 2.5-2 Support**  **Proposal 2.5-3:** Similar rule as OSI, not paging. And we agree with LG that we need to “study the association between PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSBs for MTCH channel**”**  **Proposal 2.5-4:** Do we have agreed yet the TRS is supported for Rel17 MBS? To our knowledge, it is not agreed yet. |
| Qualcomm | Agree to delete paging in 2.5-3.  Find with other proposals |
| vivo | 2.5-1: Support.  2.5-2: Support.  2.5-3: The MTCH transmission window is not clear to us, we’d better discuss this further before determining the association rule between PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSBs for MTCH channel  2.5-4: Same concern as LG, ZTE, Nokia |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | P2.5-1: fine.  P2.5-2: Fine in principle, but (if allowed) seems not needed or what’s the intention?  P2.5-3: Fine in principle, but (if allowed) seems not needed or what’s the intention? Also, we can also consider to delete “paging” from the main bullet. If putting “study” in the main bullet, we worry we may need step back earlier than RAN1#104 where it has been agreed to associate group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is QCL’d with SSB.  P2.5-4: ok to further study. I assume the intention is whether “the same beam” is used for “MCCH” and “MTCH” instead of “PDCCH” and “PDSCH”, as the main bullet may be misleading. Same comment as others for “TRS” |
| Apple | Proposal 2.5-1: ok.  Proposal 2.5-2: ok  Proposal 2.5-3: agree with LG’s comments.  Proposal 2.5-4: the details of TRS for idle UE is not cleared defined in other WI. Group common PDSCH QCL’d with SSB is enough. |
| Spreadtrum | **2.5-1:** Support.  **2.5-2:** Support.  **2.5-3:** Support to delete “paging”. And the association rule between PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSBs for MTCH channel should be further studied.  **2.5-4:** Same concern as LG and Nokia. |
| CATT | **2.5-1:** Support.  **2.5-2:** We agree that the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs can be the same as for SIB1. But, there are also other mapping methods such as the PDCCH Mos can be allocated to one SSB with more than one consecutive Mos. Thus, we suggest the 2.5-2 can be changed as following:  **Proposal 2.5-2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, in case searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH (if allowed), the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs ~~is~~ can be the same as for SIB1 as defined in TS 38.213.   * FFS other mapping method between Mos and SSBs.   **2.5-3:** OK with it.  **2.5-4:** Same concern as LG |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.5-1:** We are fine with the proposal.  **Proposal 2.5-2**: We are fine with the proposal.  **Proposal 2.5-3:** We are fine with the proposal.  **Proposal 2.5-4:** We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | We are fine with 2.5-1, 2.5-2 and 2.5-4.  For 2.5-3, same with other companies, we have the same concern with the sub-bullet. It should be deleted. |
| Ericsson | 2.5-1 Agree  2.5-2 and 2.5-3  Both proposals carry over the Proposal 2.5-1 for MCCH to the MTCH. However, we believe the MTCH monitoring should be more flexible than for MCCH.  We believe for the MTCH, an SPS-like scheduling mode should be supported in addition to PDCCH based. SPS schedule can be configured in MCCH.  We therefore prefer to talk about “PDSCH scheduling opportunities” which would encompass both PDCCH monitoring occasions and MCCH-SPS schedulable PDSCH opportunities.  Furthermore, we believe it should be possible to configure an association between multiple SSBs and one PDSCH scheduling opportunity. This would allow to transmit the MTCH on a wider beam, covering multiple SSB beams, without having to configure a separate SSB. We have elaborated in our contribution on the benefit of wider beams than SSB for MBS broadcast.  2.5-4 Agree |
| Samsung | **2.5-1:** Support.  **2.5-2/3:** Discuss after the decision on the separate configurations for MCCH/MTCH.  **2.5-4:** Same as LG’s comments. |
| Intel | OK with 2.5-1/2/3. For 2.5-4, OK to have the TRS part as FFS. |
| Moderator | FL will try to update this proposal before the GTW. |
| CATT2 | **Proposal 2.5-2:** The intention of adding the FFS is the power saving. In LTE, the power saving is considered. Thus, we think the mapping method between SSB and method between Mos and SSBs should be reconsidered for NR MBS if the power saving is further studied. But if major companies are not OK with it, we can live with the current proposal. |
| Moderator | @LG: thanks, comments included.  @ZTE, CMCC, Nokia, vivo, Huawei, Apple, Ericsson: I have changed the proposals following LG’s comments.  @ZTE, Nokia: Regarding Proposal 2.5-4 I have included your suggestion and merged it with LG’s one.  @Huawei: P2.5-2 and P2.5-3 is because this has not been agreed for MTCH yet.  Given the above **Proposal 2.5-1 will be placed as stable proposal for your consideration for potential email approval.**  The other proposals are revised or for further discussion.  **[unchanged]Proposal 2.5-1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, RAN1 confirms the following RAN2 agreements:   * 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.   **[unchanged] Proposal 2.5-2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, in case searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH (if allowed), the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1 as defined in TS 38.213.  **Proposal 2.5-3rev1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, in case common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH (if allowed), study the association between PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSBs for MTCH channel ~~use the similar rules as defined for Paging and OSI.~~   * ~~The MTCH transmission window is defined by repetition period, window duration and radio frame/slot offset.~~   **Proposal 2.5-4rev1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, ~~study whether~~ the same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled PDSCH for MCCH and MTCH channels.   * UE may assume that the group-common PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB ~~or periodic TRS if configured.~~ * FFS: QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured |

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

**[stable] Proposal 2.5-1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, RAN1 confirms the following RAN2 agreements:

* 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.

**[unchanged] Proposal 2.5-2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, in case searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH (if allowed), the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1 as defined in TS 38.213.

**Proposal 2.5-3rev1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, in case common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH (if allowed), study the association between PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSBs for MTCH channel ~~use the similar rules as defined for Paging and OSI.~~

* ~~The MTCH transmission window is defined by repetition period, window duration and radio frame/slot offset.~~

**Proposal 2.5-4rev1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, ~~study whether~~ the same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled PDSCH for MCCH and MTCH channels.

* UE may assume that the group-common PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB ~~or periodic TRS if configured.~~
* FFS: QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| OPPO | OK with these. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.5-1, Proposal 2.5-2, Proposal 2.5-4rev1:** support  **Proposal 2.5-3rev1:** If we add study in the main bullet, it says nothing. |
| CATT | OK with these. |
| ZTE | Ok with the above FL proposals. |
| Samsung | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support these four proposals. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposals. |
| Vivo | We are ok with the four proposals above. |
| Ericsson | 2.5-1: Support  2.5-2 & 2.5-3rev1: Not support, see our earlier comment above.  2.5-4rev1: Support |
| Apple | OK with the proposals. |
| Moderator | Thank you for comments. Not sure whether all companies had time to respond, so I will leave more time for potential comments. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Fine with FL’s proposals |
| Qualcomm | Agree with **Proposal 2.5-1, Proposal 2.5-2, Proposal 2.5-4rev1**  For **Proposal 2.5-3rev1**, we share similar view as CMCC, prob no need to be agreed. |
| Moderator | Thanks for further comments:  @CMCC, Qualcomm, **All**: Given the RAN1#104-e agreement below, I see that **Proposal 2.5-3rev1** being a study may not add much to the existing agreement. I propose therefore, we focus our efforts in the other proposals.  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   @Ericsson: Regarding 2.5-3rev1, I am proposing not to discuss it more in this meeting given that by being a study may not add much. Regarding 2.5-2, would you have a wording that could include your comments? I have modified the proposal 2.5-2 below from “is” to “can be” so it does not only consider the case of SIB1mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs.  @all: I have made a minor editorial change to **Proposal 2.5-4rev1** by removing “channels” after MCCH and MTCH.  **[stable] Proposal 2.5-1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, RAN1 confirms the following RAN2 agreements:   * 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.   **Proposal 2.5-2rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, in case searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH (if allowed), the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs can be ~~is~~ the same as for SIB1 as defined in TS 38.213.  **Proposal 2.5-4rev2:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, ~~study whether~~ the same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled PDSCH for MCCH and MTCH ~~channels~~.   * UE may assume that the group-common PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB ~~or periodic TRS if configured.~~ * FFS: QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured |

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

**[stable] Proposal 2.5-1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, RAN1 confirms the following RAN2 agreements:

* 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.

**Proposal 2.5-2rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, in case searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH (if allowed), the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs can be ~~is~~ the same as for SIB1 as defined in TS 38.213.

**Proposal 2.5-4rev2:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, ~~study whether~~ the same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled PDSCH for MCCH and MTCH ~~channels~~.

* UE may assume that the group-common PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB ~~or periodic TRS if configured.~~
* FFS: QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Moderator | A revision of **Proposal 2.5-1** has been agreed at the GTW on 25 May. A round is created to focus on the remainder proposals. |

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

**Proposal 2.5-2rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, in case searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH (if allowed), the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs can be ~~is~~ the same as for SIB1 as defined in TS 38.213.

**Proposal 2.5-4rev2:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, ~~study whether~~ the same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled PDSCH for MCCH and MTCH ~~channels~~.

* UE may assume that the group-common PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB ~~or periodic TRS if configured.~~
* FFS: QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | We would like to add back the discussion on **Proposal 2.5-3rev1**  **Proposal 2.5-3rev1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, in case common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH (if allowed), study the association between PDCCH monitoring occasions and SSBs for MTCH channel  Regarding **Proposal 2.5-4rev2**, is the proposal trying say that “the same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled PDSCH for MCCH” or “the same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled PDSCH for MTCH”, meaning that the applied beam between MCCH and MTCH can be different, is that correct understanding? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For proposal 2.5-2rev1, I didn’t get the reason of changing “is” to “can be” from the discussion context. Could I be reminded? |
| ZTE | We also share the view that it should be “is the same” instead of “can be the same” in the first proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.5-2rev1**: OK.  **Proposal 2.5-4rev2:** if the intention of this proposal is to support same beam for both GC-PDCCH and the scheduled GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH, I suggest to replace “and” with “or”.  **Proposal 2.5-4rev2:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, ~~study whether~~ the same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH ~~channels~~.   * UE may assume that the group-common PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB ~~or periodic TRS if configured.~~ * FFS: QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.5-2rev1**: We are generally fine with the proposal. We would like to change as below for clarification.  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, in case searchSpace#0 is configured for CSS of GC-PDCCH scheduling MTCH (if allowed),  **Proposal 2.5-4rev2**: We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | The ‘can be’ in **Proposal 2.5-2rev1** confuses us. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.5-2rev1: S**hould be “is” not “can be”  **Proposal 2.5-4rev2**: Fine with Lenovo’s version. |
| Apple | **Proposal 2.5-2rev1**: “(if allow)” in the proposal can be removed, as we already confirmed RAN2’s assumption in GTW. |
| Qualcomm | For **Proposal 2.5-2rev1**: In RAN2 assumption, it is for MCCH. For MTCH, if RAN1 can agreeSS#0 for MTCH as well (as in Proposal 2.3-2), the “(if allow)” can be removed.  For **Proposal 2.5-4rev1**: We suggest the following modifications:  **Proposal 2.5-4rev2:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, ~~study whether~~ the same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH for carrying MCCH or MTCH ~~channels~~.   * UE may assume that the group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MCCH is QCL’d with SSB. * UE may assume that the group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB ~~or periodic TRS if configured.~~ * FFS: group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured |
| Moderator | Thank you all for comments.  @Nokia: given the limited time we have, and previous comments and that 2.5-3rev1 is a study I propose we leave this aspect to the next meetings. For P2.5-4rev2.  @Nokia, Lenovo: From company comments, the FL thinks that common understanding is that the beams could be different for MCCH and MTCH. Changes, as proposed by various companies have been included.  @Huawei, ZTE, NTT DOCOMO, CATT, CMCC, Qualcomm: it was trying to accommodate Ericsson’s comments for P2.5-2rev1. But I think we may need to leave this proposal to the next meeting.  @Apple: thanks, the agreements at GTW were for MCCH.  @Qualcomm: thanks for detailed proposals.  Based on the comments above FL proposes to leave **Proposal 2.5-2rev1 for the next meetings and focus on Proposal 2.5-4rev3.**  **Proposal 2.5-2rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, in case searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH (if allowed), the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs can be ~~is~~ the same as for SIB1 as defined in TS 38.213.  **Proposal 2.5-4rev3:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, ~~study whether~~ the same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH for carrying MCCH or MTCH ~~channels~~.   * UE may assume that the group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MCCH is QCL’d with SSB. * UE may assume that the group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB ~~or periodic TRS if configured.~~ * FFS: group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with periodic TRS if configured |

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

**Proposal 2.5-4rev3:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, the same beam is used for group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH for carrying MCCH or MTCH.

* UE may assume that the group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MCCH is QCL’d with SSB.
* UE may assume that 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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | Support |
| NOKIA/NSB | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| CATT | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ok |

## Issue 6: CORESET for MCCH and MTCH channels

### **Background**

The following agreement for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues at RAN1#103-e is relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, a CORESET can be configured within the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH. CORESET0 is used by default if the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is the initial BWP and the CORESET is not configured.  FFS: configuration details of the CORESET for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH. |

Additionally, the discussion at RAN1#104-e highlighted (R1-2102180) that the agreement above on CORESET configuration, it may not be clear whether the configured CORESET is in addition to or instead of CORESET0. It also seems that different companies may have different interpretations on the RAN1#103e CORESET configuration agreement.

Another controversial aspect on this discussion was the number of CORESETs which a UE could be configured. Some companies wanted to support multiple CORESETs while other companies wanted to restrict the support to a single CORESETs.

It is also worth noting that the discussions about CFRs in Issues 1&2 may have an impact on this discussion but the FL will try to phrase the proposals in a way to try to move the discussion in parallel if possible.

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2104250, Huawei]
  + Proposal 3: For broadcast scheduling, additional CORESET/SS in addition to CORESET0/SS 0 can be configured for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH of MTCH.
* In [R1-2104338, ZTE]
  + Proposal 4: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues,
    - the CORESET configured within the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH can be applied for MBS control information reception, broadcast, multicast and unicast.
    - networks configures CORESET#0 or common CORESET configured by *commonControlResourceSet* for group-common PDCCH if MBS CORESET is not configured.
* In [R1-2104493, CATT]
  + Proposal 6: When the CFR contains CORESET0, CORESET0 can be used by default if the CORESET for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is not configured.
  + Proposal 7: When the CORESET is configured for group-common PDCCH, CORESET0 can be also used for configuring MBS search space.
* In [R1-2104552, Nokia]
  + They discuss “The introduced new additional CORESET may bring the UE capability issue as raised by some companies in earlier meeting, where as specified in TS 38.306 on UE capability, currently it is mandatory for Ues to support two CORESETs (CORESET#0+Additional CORESET, where the Additional CORESET is configured by *commonControlResourceSet*) per BWP, and the support of more than two CORESETs for UE is optional and depends on UE capability.”
  + Proposal-5: Considering defining additional new CORESET, CFR\_CORESET, for CFR [Case D] and [Case E], based on UE capability.
  + Proposal-6: Discuss whether the group-common PDCCH that scheduling corresponding group-common PDSCH can be carried outside the configured CFR.
  + Proposal-7: Separated CORESET configuration could also be considered for MCCH and MTCH respectively based on CFR configuration.
* In [R1-2104634, CMCC]
  + Proposal 2. CORESET0 or *commonControlResourceSet* can be re-used as the CORESET for PDCCH used for scheduling MCCH.
  + [MTCH design] Proposal 11. The *commonControlResourceSet* can be used as the configured CORESET for group-common PDCCH when the CFR with the same size as the frequency resources as CORESET0, i.e., Case A.
  + [MTCH design] Proposal 12. The *commonControlResourceSet* or an CORESET has larger bandwidth than CORESET0 can be used or configured as the CORESET for group-common PDCCH when the CFR with the same size as the SIB1-configured initial DL BWP, i.e., Case C. CORESET 0 is used by default if the *commonControlResourceSet* or the CORESET has larger bandwidth than CORESET0 are not configured.
* In [R1-2104697, Qualcomm]
  + Proposal 3: CORESET of GC-PDCCH for MCCH and MTCH can be separately configured in corresponding CFR.
    - CORESET for MCCH can be configured by SIB.
    - CORESET for MTCH can be configured by MCCH.
* In [R1-2105338, Samsung]
  + Observation 2: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues can be configured a maximum of 2 CORESETs (including CORESET#0).
  + Proposal 2. When SIB1 configures an initial DL BWP, SIBx can configure one CORESET (other than CORESET#0).
* In [R1-2105602, Convida]
  + Proposal 4: One or more CORESETs can be configured for group-common PDCCH within an MBS specific BWP for Ues in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE states.
* In [R1-2105849, CHENGDU TD]
  + Proposal 4: If only one MCCH is configured for a cell, the CORESETs for the MCCH monitoring and the MCCH specific group common PDSCH are configured within the initial BWP for DL.
* In [R1-2105916, Ericsson]
  + Proposal 9: If multicast to Ues in RRC Inactive/Idle is supported, we propose to reuse the same CORESET solution as for multicast in RRC Connected.
    - Note: CORESET0 is normally not used for multicast (only as fallback).

### **FL Assessment**

***Discussion on number of CORESETs***

[Huawei, CATT, Convida] support that a CORESET in addition to CORESET0 can be configured for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH of MTCH.

[Samsung, Nokia] clarify that currently it is mandatory for Ues to support two CORESETs (CORESET#0+Additional CORESET). [Nokia] further clarifies that the Additional CORESET is configured by *commonControlResourceSet*) per BWP, and [Nokia, Convida] discuss the support of more than two CORESETs for UE is optional and depends on UE capability.

***Discussion on configuring common CORESET configured by commonControlResourceSet***

[ZTE, Nokia, CMCC] proposes (or discuss) that the network can configure CORESET#0 or common CORESET configured by *commonControlResourceSet* for group-common PDCCH if CORESET is not configured.

***Discussion on orset configuration for MCCH and MTCH***

While [ZTE] proposes that the same CORESET configuration can be applied to MCCH, MTCH (as well as broadcast, multicast and unicast), [Qualcomm, Nokia, CMCC] proposes that separate CORESET configuration could be considered for MCCH and MTCH.

***Discussion on reusing RRC\_CONNECTED CORESET configuration if multicast is supported in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE***

[Ericsson] also proposes if multicast to Ues in RRC Inactive/Idle is supported, we propose to reuse the same CORESET solution as for multicast in RRC Connected.

For the next proposals, the FL suggests starting the discussion for the case where the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP, that was the last stage of the discussion at RAN1#104-e. Also, given that multicast support for idle/inactive Ues will be discussed at RAN2 at a later point, the FL suggests focusing the discussion on for broadcast reception.

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

**Proposal 2.6-1**: For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily supported for Rel-15/Rel-16 Ues, i.e., 2 CORESETs. If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP, 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*.
* FFS is the possibility to configure more than 2 CORESETs based on UE capability.

**Proposal 2.6-2:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the CORESET configurations can be the same for MCCH and MTCH channels.

* FFS is whether the CORESET configurations can be different for MCCH and MTCH channels.
* FFS is reuse of CORESET configuration for multicast reception from RRC\_CONNECTED Ues.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | **Proposal 2.6-1**: we are fine with this proposal. We think that if the CORESET configurations can be different for MCCH and MTCH channels, CORESET for MTCH is configured by MCCH. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **We are Ok with two proposals.** |
| ZTE | Ok with the above two proposals. |
| CMCC | 2.6-1: support  2.6-2: not sure why we reuse CORESET configuration for multicast reception from RRC\_CONNECTED Ues? |
| NOKIA/NSB | Proposal 2.6-1: Support  Regarding 2.6-2, We had similar query as CMCC.  Also the CORESET configuration for MCCH and MTCH may depend on the CFR configuration for MCCH and MTCH. If there are different CFR configurations for MCCH and MTCH, it can be different CORESET configurations for MCCH and MTCH as well. |
| Qualcomm | For 2.6-1, for last FFS, UE capability of IDLE Ues is not known by gNB. We assume the Ues capable of supporting broadcast can support it without additional reporting of UE capability.  For 2.6-2, why different CORESET cannot be supported for MCCH/MTCH? It seems straightforward to configure same or different CORESETs for MCCH/MTCH if different CFR can be configured for MCCH and MTCH. |
| Convida | Proposal 2.6-1: Fine with this proposal.  Proposal 2.6-2: Fine with this proposal. |
| Vivo | 2.6-1: support by deleting FFS sub-bullet  2.6-2: support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | P2.6-1: Fine in principle. I suppose the intention of this proposal is that for UE RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UE, what kind of configuration are supported by UE including the case of MCCH and MTCH.  P2.6-2: I guess the baseline should be “same” and discuss whether “separate” is supported. Agree with QC’s comment. If we need agreement, we should agree them together. |
| Apple | Proposal 2.6-1: Fine with this proposal.  Proposal 2.6-2: to make the proposal clear, it could be updated as below.  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, at least the CORESET configurations ~~can be~~ is the same for MCCH and MTCH channels.   * FFS is whether the CORESET configurations can be different for MCCH and MTCH channels. * FFS is reuse of CORESET configuration for multicast reception from RRC\_CONNECTED Ues. |
| MTK | We are OK with these two proposals. |
| Spreadtrum | Ok with the above two proposals. |
| CATT | Proposal 2.6-1: Before discussing the configuration of CORESET, we think a clarification is firstly needed. If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP, whether the initial BWP is the default or the CFR is still configured? |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.6-1**: We are fine with the proposal.  **Proposal 2.6-2:** We are fine with the proposal. To keep the number of CORESETs low, it is desirable to be able to use CORESET0 or the CORESET configured by *commonControlResourceSet* for both MCCH and MTCH. |
| Google | We are fine with both proposals |
| Ericsson | 2.6-1: Support.  2.6-2: Support |
| Samsung | Okay for both proposals. |
| Intel | OK with Proposal 2.6-1  For Proposal 2.6-2, the first FFS is related to the different CFR configurations for MCCH and MTCH and can be discussed once that is concluded. Not sure about the motivation for the 2nd FFS point. |
| Moderator | The FL will try to update this discussion before GTW |
| Moderator | @CMCC, Nokia: is to accommodate Ericsson proposal but still FFS.  @Qualcomm: comment addressed on UE capability.  @Qualcomm, Huawei, Apple: proposal 2.6-2 revised.  @CATT: clarification included.  **Proposal 2.6-1rev1**: For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily supported for Rel-15/Rel-16 Ues, i.e., 2 CORESETs. If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP (default option), 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*. * FFS is the possibility to configure more than 2 CORESETs ~~based on UE capability~~.   **Proposal 2.6-2rev1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the CORESET configurations can be the same or different for MCCH and MTCH channels.   * ~~FFS is whether the CORESET configurations can be different for MCCH and MTCH channels.~~ * FFS is reuse of CORESET configuration for multicast reception from RRC\_CONNECTED Ues. |

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

**Proposal 2.6-1rev1**: For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily supported for Rel-15/Rel-16 Ues, i.e., 2 CORESETs. If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP (default option), 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*.
* FFS is the possibility to configure more than 2 CORESETs ~~based on UE capability~~.

**Proposal 2.6-2rev1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the CORESET configurations can be the same or different for MCCH and MTCH channels.

* ~~FFS is whether the CORESET configurations can be different for MCCH and MTCH channels.~~
* FFS is reuse of CORESET configuration for multicast reception from RRC\_CONNECTED Ues.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.6-1rev1**: Support.  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1:** Support. |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.6-1rev1:** As 3 options are listed, may I know are we going to down-select one of them or support all of them or other potential strategies?  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1:**OK. |
| MTK | For **Proposal 2.6-2rev1,** we prefer the previous version. We don’t see the necessity to support different CORESET configuration for MCCH and MTCH. |
| ZTE | Ok with both proposals. But some minor clarification change. We would prefer to change “CORESET configurations” to “CORESET index”. “CORESET configurations” may give us the implication that we are discussing RRC Ies under CORESET, which is not the intention in our view.  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the CORESET index ~~configurations~~ can be the same or different for MCCH and MTCH channels.   * ~~FFS is whether the CORESET configurations can be different for MCCH and MTCH channels.~~ * FFS ~~is~~ reuse of CORESET index ~~configurations~~ for multicast reception from RRC\_CONNECTED Ues. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.6-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: Support |
| LG | We are fine with the proposals. |
| Vivo | Proposal 2.6-1rev1: we are ok to the case that CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP considered here, what about other cases, i.e., CFR contains initial BWP.  Proposal 2.6-2rev1: ok in principle and details for the same or different CORESET configurations can be discussed later. |
| Ericsson | 2.6-1rev1: Support  2.6-2rev1: Support |
| Apple | **Proposal 2.6-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: this is depending on whether Proposal 2.1-2rev1 is agreed or not. If the CFR is the same for MCCH and MTCH, no strong motivation to configure separate CORESETs.  ***Proposal 2.1-2rev1****: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues can use the same bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception.*   * *FFS use of different bandwidth configurations for MCCH reception and MTCH reception.* |
| Moderator | Thank you all for comments.  @CATT: There is no down-selection. The three are options for potential configuration. The gNB would chose on option from the three.  @MTK, ZTE, Apple: given comments and discussion in other Issues (CSS and CFR) I think it may be better to agree same orset index and FFS whether different can be configured.  @ZTE: wording included.  @vivo:this proposal only considers initial BWP and does not consider other possibilities that may need different agreements.  Some more companies may provide input but I will update the proposals based on the comments so far.  **[unchanged] Proposal 2.6-1rev1**: For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily supported for Rel-15/Rel-16 Ues, i.e., 2 CORESETs. If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP (default option), 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*. * FFS is the possibility to configure more than 2 CORESETs ~~based on UE capability~~.   **Proposal 2.6-2rev2:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the CORESET index ~~configurations~~ can be the same ~~or different~~ for MCCH and MTCH channels.   * FFS whether the CORESET index ~~configurations~~ can be different for MCCH and MTCH. * FFS is reuse of CORESET index ~~configuration~~ for multicast reception from RRC\_CONNECTED Ues. |

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

**[unchanged] Proposal 2.6-1rev1**: For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily supported for Rel-15/Rel-16 Ues, i.e., 2 CORESETs. If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP (default option), 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*.
* FFS is the possibility to configure more than 2 CORESETs ~~based on UE capability~~.

**Proposal 2.6-2rev2:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the CORESET index ~~configurations~~ can be the same ~~or different~~ for MCCH and MTCH channels.

* FFS whether the CORESET index ~~configurations~~ can be different for MCCH and MTCH.
* FFS is reuse of CORESET index ~~configuration~~ for multicast reception from RRC\_CONNECTED Ues.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK with above proposals. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Regarding **Proposal 2.6-1rev1**, a question for clarification regarding the term “initial BWP (default option)”. Now in section 2.1, there are two initial BWP definitions as default CFR options, shall the **Proposal 2.6-1rev1** be applied to both **Proposal 2.1-1rev4** and **Proposal 2.1-3rev3**? Or single one of them? Because for the case of **Proposal 2.1-1rev4**, we see only the first-sub-bullet in **Proposal 2.6-1rev1** with CORESET#0 is sensible. And for the case of **Proposal 2.1-3rev3,** all options can be valid option candidates.  **Proposal 2.1-1rev4**: “default CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0,”  **Proposal 2.1-3rev3**: “default CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1,”  Regarding **Proposal 2.6-2rev2,** we prefer the wording of last revision **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**. And for the 2nd-sub-bullet, are we discussing here now about the multicast reception for RRC\_Idle/inactive Ues? If it is the case, we feel it is too early to discuss this case, suggest removing the 2nd-sub-bullet for the moment for simplicity.  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the CORESET configurations can be the same or different for MCCH and MTCH channels.   * ~~FFS is whether the CORESET configurations can be different for MCCH and MTCH channels.~~   ~~FFS is reuse of CORESET configuration for multicast reception from RRC\_CONNECTED Ues.~~ |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.6-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.6-2rev2**: Support |
| ZTE | We support the above proposals. Just one editorial issue for the last bullet, i.e, “FFS is reuse” 🡪 “FFS reuse”. |
| CMCC | Ok |
| Qualcomm | For **Proposal 2.6-1rev1**, why need ‘(default option)’ in the main bullet? We prefer to delete it.  For **Proposal 2.6-2rev2**, we can accept it although we like rev1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ‘(default option)’ is causing trouble, better to be deleted.  Fine to use the “corest index” |
| CATT | Share same views with Qualcomm/Huawei on the ‘(default option)’. |
| LG | We also prefer to delete ‘(default option)’. |
| Ericsson | Support both proposals |
| Moderator | Thank for the comments.  @Nokia: **Proposal 2.6-1rev1** has been revised to address your comment. I am not 100% sure the wording for the case where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 is completely acceptable since coreset#0 is the default option anyway, but let’s see what companies think. Regarding **Proposal 2.6-2rev2** it seems that companies are fine with using “index” instead of “configuration” and the FFS, Do you have a strong view on this?  @ZTE: thanks, included.  @Qualcomm, Huawei, CATT, LG: the term “default option” has been removed.  **Proposal 2.6-1rev2**: For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily 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, ~~(default option)~~, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can be configured with the following option~~s~~:   + CORESET#0 (default option if CFR is the initial BWP and CORESET is not configured); ~~or~~ * If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, ~~(default option)~~, 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*. * FFS ~~is~~ the possibility to configure more than 2 CORESETs ~~based on UE capability~~.   **Proposal 2.6-2rev3:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the CORESET index ~~configurations~~ can be the same ~~or different~~ for MCCH and MTCH channels.   * FFS whether the CORESET index ~~configurations~~ can be different for MCCH and MTCH. * FFS ~~is~~ reuse of CORESET index ~~configuration~~ for multicast reception from RRC\_CONNECTED Ues. |

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

**Proposal 2.6-1rev2**: For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily 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, ~~(default option)~~, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can be configured with the following option~~s~~:
  + CORESET#0 (default option if CFR is the initial BWP and CORESET is not configured); ~~or~~
* If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, ~~(default option)~~, 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*.
* FFS ~~is~~ the possibility to configure more than 2 CORESETs ~~based on UE capability~~.

**Proposal 2.6-2rev3:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the CORESET index ~~configurations~~ can be the same ~~or different~~ for MCCH and MTCH channels.

* FFS whether the CORESET index ~~configurations~~ can be different for MCCH and MTCH.
* FFS ~~is~~ reuse of CORESET index ~~configuration~~ for multicast reception from RRC\_CONNECTED Ues.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are fine with **Proposal 2.6-1rev2**,  Regarding the 2nd sub-bullet of **Proposal 2.6-2rev3**, just for our better understanding, any reason specifically we need to address here? If not, we still prefer to remove the 2nd-sub-bullet for simplicity. |
| ZTE | In our understanding, in Rel-15/Rel-16, even if the CORESET#0 is used as the initial BWP, network can still use the CORESET configured by *commonControlResourceSet*. Thus, it seems we also need to add the two sub-bullets under the first bullet.  **Proposal 2.6-1rev2**: For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily 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, ~~(default option)~~, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can be configured with the following option~~s~~:   + 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*.** * If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, ~~(default option)~~, 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*. * FFS ~~is~~ the possibility to configure more than 2 CORESETs ~~based on UE capability~~. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.6-1rev2**: OK.  **Proposal 2.6-2rev3:** Is the intention of this proposal to support same CORESET for MCCH and MTCH? |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with these proposals. |
| CATT | We are fine with these proposals. |
| CMCC | Same concern as ZTE. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with these proposals. |
| Apple | Update with wording to make the proposal clearer.  **Proposal 2.6-2rev3:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the CORESET index ~~configurations~~ can be the same ~~or different~~ for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH channels.   * FFS whether the CORESET index ~~configurations~~ can be different for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH.   FFS ~~is~~ reuse of CORESET index ~~configuration~~ for multicast reception from RRC\_CONNECTED Ues. |
| LG | We generally think that optional features could not work well for broadcast reception because gNB could not know capabilities of UEs while the UEs are in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE.  Considering that the possibility to configure more than 2 CORESETs is FFS, we wonder how gNB can make sure that such enhanced UE is in a cell for broadcast reception. |
| vivo | Proposal 2.6-1rev2: fine.  Proposal 2.6-2rev3: not clear about the intention of the 2nd FFS. |
| Ericsson | Both proposals are OK |
| Moderator | Thanks for the comments.  @Nokia: It seems ZTE and CMCC think that it is possible to also configure the two coresets for the case of initial BWP as coreset#0. I am going to include the points form ZTE. One alternative is just to agree to the main point of the proposal that discusses the UE capability in terms of number of coresets, and leave for the next meeting the discussion on what type of coresets can be configured.  @ZTE, CMCC: I have reworded the proposal to address your comment.  @Lenovo: regarding your question, the intention of the proposal is that for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, MCCH and MTCH can use the same coreset index.  @Apple: thanks, the update has been included.  @LG: the FFS has been removed.  @Nokia, vivo: FFS on multicast has been removed.  The FL proposes to try to agree **Proposal 2.6-2rev4 by email on last checkpoint.**  **Proposal 2.6-1rev3**: For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily 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*. * ~~FFS is the possibility to configure more than 2 CORESETs based on UE capability~~.   **Proposal 2.6-2rev4:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the CORESET index ~~configurations~~ can be the same ~~or different~~ for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH ~~channels~~.   * FFS whether the CORESET index ~~configurations~~ can be different for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH. * ~~FFS is reuse of CORESET index configuration for multicast reception from RRC\_CONNECTED Ues.~~ |

### **5th round FL proposals for Issue 6**

**Proposal 2.6-1rev3**: For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily 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*.
* ~~FFS is the possibility to configure more than 2 CORESETs based on UE capability~~.

**[stable] Proposal 2.6-2rev4:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, the CORESET index can be the same for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH.

* FFS whether the CORESET index can be different for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | Support without FFS. |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are fine with the FL’s proposal.  @All: Just checking if other companies have the same understanding as ZTE and CMCC? Thanks in advance!  **“In our understanding, in Rel-15/Rel-16, even if the CORESET#0 is used as the initial BWP, network can still use the CORESET configured by *commonControlResourceSet*.”** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.6-1rev3**: Support.  **Proposal 2.6-2rev4:** Generally Ok with us. I understand the intention of this proposal is to support same CORESET for GC-PDCCH for MCCH and MTCH. If it is right understanding, can we delete “index”? |
| CMCC | Support two proposals. |
| ZTE | Support the proposals above.  @Nokia, when we say “if CORESET#0 is used as the initial BWP”, we mean to say “initial BWP has the same frequency range as CORESET#0”. There are actually two sub-cases for this issue:  Sub-case1: Before receiving SIB1, UE use CORESET#0 as the initial BWP;  Sub-case2: After receiving SIB1, the SIB-1 configured initial BWP has the same frequency range as CORESET#0.  CORESET configured by commonControlResourceSet can’t be applied to Sub-case1 because commonControlResourceSet is configured in SIB1. While for Sub-case2, CORESET configured by commonControlResourceSet can definitely be used.  Besides, the network configures the commonControlResourceSet in SIB1 so that it is contained in the bandwidth of CORESET#0.  The proposal here say “the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0”, it can refer to Sub-case2 from our perspective. Hope this clarifies. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with both proposals. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with both proposals. |
| CATT | Support two proposals. |

## Issue 7: DCI format for MCCH and MTCH channels

### **Background**

For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs there has not been yet a discussion on DCI formats. Multiple inputs have discussed this issue in their tdocs to this meeting. The DCI format discussion is also related to Issue 4 (RNTI and DCI design for carrying MCCH change notifications) that also has in scope the RAN2 LS in R1-2104165 (and copied in Annex B of this document).

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2104250, Huawei]
  + They discuss “Regarding the DCI format for broadcast scheduling for UE in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, at least DCI format 1\_0 is supposed to be supported with some fields subject to necessary modification. One instance for the modification is the FDRA field, which should be dimensioned per the size of CFR for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVCE UEs instead of the bandwidth of CORESET0 or the bandwidth of the SIB1 configured initial BWP.”
  + Proposal 4: For broadcast scheduling, the FDRA filed in the DCI for scheduling MTCH or MCCH should be dimensioned per the bandwidth of the configured CFR.
* In [R1-2104634, CMCC]
  + They separate the discussion between MCCH and MTCH channels.
  + Proposal 4. DCI format 1\_0 is used for scheduling MCCH, which the Rel-15/16 fields of DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI can all be used.
  + [MTCH design] Proposal 16. DCI format 1\_0 is used for schedule group-common PDSCH.
* In [R1-2104697, Qualcomm]
  + Proposal 5: DCI format 1\_0 can be used as the baseline for MCCH, MTCH, and MCCH change notifications.
* In [R1-2104867, Lenovo]
  + Proposal 7: The number of bits for frequency domain resource assignment indicator in the group-common DCI is determined based on the bandwidth of the initial DL BWP if the specific common frequency resource is not configured or the specific common frequency resource if the specific common frequency resource is configured.
* In [R1-2104930, Intel]
  + Proposal 2: DCI format 1\_0 is used for scheduling group common PDSCH for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE

### **FL Assessment**

All inputs discuss/propose that DCI format 1\_0 should be supported at least as the baseline. [Huawei, Lenovo] also discuss that the FDRA may need to be adjusted according to the CFR size. [Qualcomm, CMCC] also separate the discussion between MCCH and MTCH channels but agree that DCI format 1\_0 can be used for both channels.

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

**Proposal 2.7-1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, DCI format 1\_0 is used as baseline for MCCH and MTCH channels.

* FFS details of FDRA.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | WE are fine with this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support. |
| ZTE | Ok with the above proposal.  Maybe it is better if we can clarify which RNTI for DCI 1\_0 is used as the baseline as the DCI fields for different RNTI for DCI format 1\_0 are different. But anyway, we can discuss these issue later. |
| CMCC | Support |
| Futurewei | Support |
| NOKIA/NSB | Support |
| Qualcomm | ok |
| vivo | Fine with 2.7-1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok. |
| Apple | OK. |
| MTK | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | OK |
| CATT | Support. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Google | Support |
| OPPO | OK |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| Intel | OK |
| Moderator | Thank you all. I think this proposal has consensus (also comment from ZTE as per their comment can be considered later). I am going to **place it in the Stable Proposals subsection** for email approval so we can spend online time in other discussions.  Based on some minor comments from Qualcomm the proposal **Proposal 2.7-1** is revised as follows:  **Proposal 2.7-1rev1:**For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, DCI format 1\_0 is used as baseline for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH ~~channels~~.   * FFS details of FDRA.   This proposal is considered stable and included in section 4 of this document. Please do share if your company has concerns. |

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

**[stable]Proposal 2.7-1rev1:**For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, DCI format 1\_0 is used as baseline for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH ~~channels~~.

* FFS details of FDRA.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Moderator | A revised version of **Proposal 2.7-1rev1** has been agreed at the GTW on 25 May. Therefore, the discussion for **this Issue is closed**. Thank you for your inputs. |

## Issue 8: RAN2 LS on broadcast session delivery and MCCH design

This is a place holder to discuss a potential reply to RAN2 based on LS on R1-2104165 based on progress on Issues 1, 2, 3 and 4.

## Other Issues

Here, we include other issues that have been discussed at the tdocs submitted to this meeting.

### **Other Issue 1: Number of MBS Common Frequency Resources**

* [R1-2104338, ZTE], [R1-2104552, Nokia], [R1-2105338, Samsung], [R1-2105849, CHENGDU TD]

### **Other Issue 2: HARQ feedback for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UE states**

* [R1-2104634, CMCC], [R1-2104761, OPPO], [R1-2104930 , Intel], [R1-2105338, Samsung], [R1-2104389, vivo]

### **Other Issue 3: PDSCH repetition/HARQ combining**

* [R1-2104338, ZTE], [R1-2104697, Qualcomm], [R1-2105722, NTT DOCOMO]

### **Other Issue 4: PDSCH Semi Persistent Scheduling**

* [R1-2104338, ZTE], [R1-2104634, CMCC], [R1-2105602, Convida], [R1-2105849, CHENGDU TD], [R1-2104389, vivo]

### **Other Issue 5: Multicast reception by UEs in IDLE/INACTIVE states**

* [R1-2105916, Ericsson]

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

* [R1-2104493, CATT]

### **Other Issue 7: PDSCH TDRA table configuration**

* [R1-2104338, ZTE]

### **Other Issue 8: PDSCH transmission parameters (MCS, MIMO layers, etc.)**

* [R1-2104697, Qualcomm]

### **Other Issue 9: Scrambling sequence initialisation for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH**

* [R1-2105338, Samsung]

### **Other Issue 10: Broadcast services supported for both RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs**

* [R1-2104493, CATT], [R1-2105383, MediaTek]

### **Other Issue 11: MBS Interest Indication for partial beam sweeping**

* [R1-2104552, Nokia], [R1-2105180, Sony]

# Proposals for Discussion at GTW sessions

This section will include proposals for potential discussion at the different GTW scheduled for MBS at RAN1#105-e.

## GTW 21 May

**Proposal 2.1-1rev2**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as CORESET#0.

* FFS how to configure the bandwidth for multiple MCCH, if agreed in RAN2.

**Proposal 2.1-3rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the configuration of the bandwidth for MCCH reception with the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP.

* FFS application of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs without first receiving *RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.
* FFS how to configure the bandwidth for multiple MCCH, if agreed in RAN2.

**Proposal 2.3-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for MCCH channel.

**Proposal 2.4-1rev2:** 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)Proposal 2.4-2rev1:** Is up to RAN2 to decide the specific contents of the MCCH change notification, e.g, whether only 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.

**Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, study the following options for CSS for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:

* Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS
* Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16
* Alt 3: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs in AI 8.12.1 as baseline

## GTW 25 May

**[stable]Proposal 2.7-1rev1:**For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, DCI format 1\_0 is used as baseline for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH ~~channels~~.

* FFS details of FDRA.

**[stable] Proposal 2.5-1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, RAN1 confirms the following RAN2 agreements:

* 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.

**[stable]Proposal 2.3-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, study the following options for CSS for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for MCCH and/or MTCH channels:

* Atl 1: support of Type-3 CSS
* Alt 2: support of a Type-x CSS with e.g., different monitoring occasions than supported CSS in Rel-15/Rel-16
* Alt 3: reuse solution defined for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs in AI 8.12.1 as baseline

**Proposal 2.3-3rev3:** For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs support the same CSS **type** for MCCH and MTCH ~~channels~~.

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

**[stable] Proposal 2.4-1rev2:** 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.

**[stable] (Conclusion)Proposal 2.4-2rev1:** Is up to RAN2 to decide the specific contents of the MCCH change notification, e.g, whether only 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.

# Stable Proposals

# Summary

This section will include the summary and potential agreements for the different issues discussed at RAN1#105-e.

Agreements on GTW 21 May 2021

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.

Agreements on GTW 25 May 2021

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.
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# Annex A: Agreements in previous RAN1 meetings

## RAN1#103-e agreements

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

* FFS details

Agreements:

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

Agreements: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, define/configure common frequency resource(s) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.

* the UE may assume the initial BWP as the default common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, if a specific common frequency resource is not configured.
* FFS: the relation of the common frequency resource(s) (if configured) and initial BWP.
* FFS: whether to configure one/more common frequency resources
* FFS: configuration and definition details of the common frequency resource

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

* FFS details.

Agreements: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, CSS is supported for group-common PDCCH.

* FFS: reuse current CSS type, define a new CSS type, etc.
* FFS other details.

Agreements: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, a CORESET can be configured within the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH. CORESET0 is used by default if the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is the initial BWP and the CORESET is not configured.

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

## RAN1#104-e agreements

Agreement:

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

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

Agreement:

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

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

Agreement:

For broadcast reception, the same group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH can be received by both RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs and RRC\_CONNECTED UEs when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE contains the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs and the SCS and CP are the same.

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

Agreement:

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

* [Case E] the case where a CFR is defined based on a configured BWP.
  + In particular, study the following:
    - whether a configured BWP for MBS is needed or not.
    - whether BWP switching is needed or not.
  + In this study, the configured BWP has the following properties:
    - The configured BWP is different than the initial BWP where the frequency resources of this initial BWP are configured smaller than the full carrier bandwidth.
    - The CFR has the frequency resources identical to the configured BWP.
    - The configured BWP needs to fully contain the initial BWP in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
  + Note: The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth
* the case where the initial BWP fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain.
  + In this study the following sub-cases are considered:
    - [Case B] A CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
    - [Case D] A CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
  + In particular, study the following:
    - Whether the considered two options with a CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP are needed or not for MBS.
* the case where the initial BWP has same size as the CFR in the frequency domain.
  + In this study the following two sub-cases are considered:
    - [Case A] A CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0. In this case the CFR has the same frequency resources and same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
    - [Case C] A CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the same frequency resources and same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
  + In particular, study the following:
    - Whether the considered two options with a CFR with the same size as the initial BWP are needed or not for MBS.

# Annex B: RAN2 LS on broadcast session delivery and MCCH design

R1-2104165 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 |
|  |