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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.

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

[106-e-NR-MBS-03] Email discussion/approval on basic functions for broadcast/multicast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs and the LS in [R1-2106410](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP%20documents\RAN1\TSGR1_106-e\Docs\R1-2106410.zip) (from AI5) including any reply LS as necessary with checkpoints for agreements on August 19, 24 and 27 – David (BBC)

In this document the Feature Lead (FL) provides a summary of the technical documents (tdocs) submitted to RAN1#106-e to the. This document also presents proposals for discussion and agreements reached at RAN1#106-e.

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

# Issues

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

### **Background**

During RAN2#113bis-e meeting, RAN2 discussed further aspects of MCCH scheduling with RAN1 impacts. Here we reproduce relevant RAN2 agreements relevant to the discussion on the 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 in [R1-2104165] requests RAN1 to investigate and provide feedback, considering agreements made by RAN2 as indicated in the LS where the following request is relevant for the discussion on CFR:

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

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

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, define/configure common frequency resource(s) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.   * the UE may assume the initial BWP as the default common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, if a specific common frequency resource is not configured. * FFS: the relation of the common frequency resource(s) (if configured) and initial BWP. * FFS: whether to configure one/more common frequency resources * FFS: configuration and definition details of the common frequency resource   Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, further study the following cases of a configured/defined specific common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, and identify which case(s) will be supported:   * [Case E] the case where a CFR is defined based on a configured BWP.   + In particular, study the following:     - whether a configured BWP for MBS is needed or not.     - whether BWP switching is needed or not.   + In this study, the configured BWP has the following properties:     - The configured BWP is different than the initial BWP where the frequency resources of this initial BWP are configured smaller than the full carrier bandwidth.     - The CFR has the frequency resources identical to the configured BWP.     - The configured BWP needs to fully contain the initial BWP in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + Note: The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth * the case where the initial BWP fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain.   + In this study the following sub-cases are considered:     - [Case B] A CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.     - [Case D] A CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + In particular, study the following:     - Whether the considered two options with a CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP are needed or not for MBS. * the case where the initial BWP has same size as the CFR in the frequency domain.   + In this study the following two sub-cases are considered:     - [Case A] A CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0. In this case the CFR has the same frequency resources and same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.     - [Case C] A CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the same frequency resources and same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + In particular, study the following:     - Whether the considered two options with a CFR with the same size as the initial BWP are needed or not for MBS.   Agreement:  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case A), to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.   * Note: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.   Agreement:  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case A), to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   * Note: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling. |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2106440, R1-2107662, Huawei]
  + *Discuss*: Comparing 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 1: For broadcast scheduling, support configuring a CFR for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH of MCCH/MTCH with the same size as the initial BWP configured by SIB1, and the configured CFR should contain CORESET#0.
  + Observation 1: For receiving broadcast, MCCH and MTCH may have different requirements, which result in necessary separate discussions.
  + Proposal 4: The CFR, CORESET, and search space for MCCH and MTCH can be configured separately.
    - The CFR, CORESET, and search space for MTCH scheduling can be included in MCCH.
* In [R1-2106625, vivo]
  + *Discuss*: And thus, we believe Case B and Case D are not necessary. If gNB wants to schedule MBS service only in a CFR smaller than initial DL BWP configured by CORESET0 or SIB1, it can be up to gNB’s implementation but no need to configure a smaller CFR additionally.
  + *Discuss*: Furthermore, in order to ensure RRC idle/inactive UEs to monitor both MCCH and SI/paging without BWP switching, CORESET0 shall be included in the configured/defined CFR, and thus, we support that one configured/defined CFR fully contains the CORESET0 in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as CORESET0.
  + 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, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.
* In [R1-2106664, Nokia]
  + *Discussion*: So for Rel17 MBS, it is understood that there can be a new SIBx configured CFR parameter introduced, where it allows the RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs to operate with bandwidth more than just the legacy CORESET#0 narrow region for carrying larger MBS service payload if needed.
  + Proposal-1: Considering introducing a new SIBx configured CFR parameter, where it allows the RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs to operate with bandwidth more than just the legacy CORESET#0 narrow region.
  + Proposal-2: Support of CFR Case C, Case D-1 and Case E on top of Case A.
  + Proposal-3: CFR for MCCH and MTCH can be configured to be the same or differently.
  + Proposal-4: Support more than one CFRs, with separate CFR for MCCH and MTCH, respectively.
  + Proposal-5: Considering having multiple CFRs is 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.
  + Proposal-6: It is proposed that the CFR for MCCH can be configured other than default CORESET#0.
* In [R1-2106718, Spreadtrum]
  + Proposal 2: RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, do not support to configure a dedicated BWP that is larger than the initial BWP.
* In [R1-2106747, ZTE]
  + *Discuss*: For broadcast services carried on MTCH, if they can only use the initial DL BWP defined by CORESET#0, it would be too restrictive. As we know, all the common signals/channels have to be squeezed into this initial DL BWP, which makes it difficult to accommodate common PDCCH/PDSCH for broadcast services. Thus, it is critical to configure a CFR that is larger than CORESET#0 for broadcast services.
  + *Discuss*: The essential difference between Case E and other cases is whether a high-layer signalling is introduced to configure a special BWP for the UE in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states for receiving broadcast services. Under Case C and Case D, the CFR configuration depends on the initial BWP configured by the existing signalling in the SIB1.
  + Proposal 1: Case E is clarified as follows,
    - A high-layer signalling is introduced to configure a special BWP for the UE in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states for receiving broadcast services.
    - The CFR has the frequency resources identical to the configured BWP.
    - The configured BWP needs to fully contain the initial BWP defined by CORESET#0 in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
    - The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth.
  + *Discuss*: When the UE enters the RRC\_CONNECTED state, some companies worry about BWP switching issue under the case E. That is, the UE will receive broadcast within the configured BWP, and switch to SIB1 configured initial BWP for receiving unicast. In our opinion, this problem is caused by a configuration error, which also exists under the Case C. More specifically, the first active BWP after the UE enters the RRC\_CONNECTED state is configured through signalling *firstActiveDownlinkBWP-Id*. The gNB can configure any BWP as the first active BWP. For example, the BWP configured in the RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states for broadcast is configured as the first active BWP. Thus, unicast and broadcast will be received within the configured BWP, and there will be no BWP switching problem. The first active BWP can also be configured to completely contain the BWP for broadcast service. Thus, the BWP configured under the RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states will degrade into a frequency range within the first active BWP, which is also consistent with the definition of CFR in the RRC\_CONNECTED state.
  + Observation 1: Potential BWP switching issue under Case E as well as Case C can be avoided through reasonable RRC configurations, i.e., a first active BWP containing the CFR.
  + Observation 2: Case C requires UE to activate the initial BWP configured by SIB1 in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, 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.
  + Proposal 2: Case E is supported for broadcast service carried on MTCH in R17 NR MBS.
  + 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 3: Case D-2 (Initial DL BWP configured by SIB1 fully contains CFR, CFR is not required to fully contain CORESET#0) can be used to increase the capacity of broadcast service on MTCH for bandwidth-restricted UEs, e.g., Redcap UE.
    - FFS: other restrictions on CFR configuration.
  + Observation 4: The motivation of a CFR larger than CORESET#0 for broadcast control information carried on MCCH is not strong in R17 NR MBS.
* In [R1-2106914, Samsung]
  + *Discuss*: It is noted that unlike RRC\_CONNECTED UEs for which the active DL BWP is UE-specific, the active DL BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs is UE-common and it is not necessary for a gNB to configure a CFR for MBS – the gNB can do so by indicating the initial DL BWP in the SIB if the gNB wants a large CFR; otherwise, the CFR can be the BWP of CORESET#0. It is also noted that the gNB can provide the initial DL BWP with an extension in SIB1 that is only applicable to MBS UEs (if not provided for legacy UEs or non-MBS UEs which can remain unaffected if the gNB so chooses).
  + *Discuss*: If SIB1 configures an initial DL BWP, then Case C or Case D would be used. If SIB1 does not configure an initial DL BWP, then Case A or Case B would be used, because CORESET#0 becomes the initial DL BWP as default.
  + *Discuss*: Also, when the UE monitors the initial BWP regardless of MBS configuration, there is no benefit to monitor different frequency regions between MCCH and MTCH.
  + 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).
  + Proposal 2. For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.
* In [R1-2106947, CATT]
  + Proposal 1: Case C i.e. UE use a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP configured by SIB1, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH is supported.
  + *Discuss*: For Case E, an extra BWP (i.e. Configured BWP) is configured, and it fully contains the initial BWP. In this case, UEs will maintain two BWPs to receive MBS and SIB-x information, which will bring the BWP switching delay.
  + Proposal 2: The case where a CFR is defined based on a configured BWP (Case E) is not supported due to the BWP switching.
* In [R1-2107095, Futurewei]
  + 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 [R1-2107162, Lenovo]
  + 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 signalling.
* In [R1-210723, OPPO]
  + Proposal 1: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use 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.
  + Proposal 2: For broadcast reception, case C and/or case E can be considered for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with a configured CFR to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.
  + Proposal 3: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.
* In [R1-2107371, Qualcomm]
  + *Discuss*: Now, we are discussing the UE behavior of new Rel-17 UEs capable of broadcast reception. If a CFR is configured with the same size as initial BWP broadcasted by SIB (i.e., Case C), it is common for Rel-17 UEs in all states to receive broadcast GC-PDCCH/GC-PDSCH. For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, the CORESET#0 is still the “initial BWP to receive SIB/paging” but the broadcast CFR with bandwidth size of “SIB-indicated initial BWP” larger than CORESET#0 can be regarded as a new BWP, differentiated from the “initial BWP to receive SIB/paging”. For Case B and D, it seems unnecessary to further limit a CFR with size smaller than the initial BWP for broadcast MCCH/MTCH.
  + Proposal 2: For MCCH/MTCH.
    - The CFR can be configured with the frequency size same as CORESET#0 or SIB-configured initial BWP or larger than that of initial BWP.
    - Different PDSCH/PDCCH parameters can be configured in the CFR for MCCH and the CFR for MTCH.
  + Proposal 3: For IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, the CFR for broadcast with frequency size larger than CORESET#0 can be configured as a BWP.
* In [R1-2107427, CMCC]
  + *Discuss*: From this point of view, Case C and Case E can both achieve to configure CFR larger than CORESET#0. But comparing between these two cases, Case E has more spec impact than Case C, e.g., the BWP switching time between initial DL BWP and MBS specific BWP, the configuration of MBS specific BWP. In addition, after UE goes into RRC\_CONNECTED mode, more things need to be considered, e.g., whether both initial DL BWP configured by SIB1 and MBS specific BWP are activated if UE-specific BWP is not configured by RRC dedicated signalling, the fallback BWP switching behaviour when BWP timer expires. Therefore, Case C can be supported which has little spec impact to configure a CFR larger than CORESET#0 used for broadcast service and both suitable for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.
  + Proposal 1. For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, Case C can be supported as configured/defined specific CFR for MTCH/MCCH.
  + Proposal 2. If initial DL BWP is configured by SIB1 which larger than CORESET#0, gNB can configure whether the CFR equals to the bandwidth of CORESET#0 (Case A) or initial DL BWP (Case C).
* In [R1- 2107458, LGE]
  + Observation 1: If the CFR is associated with the initial DL BWP for a connected UE, the CFR can be also used by idle/inactive UEs.
  + Proposal 2: For Rel-17, the CFR associated to the initial DL BWP cannot be configured with a different numerology than that of the initial DL BWP.
  + Observation 2: Limiting to broadcast transmission within the initial DL BWP would lead to low broadcast capacity in CFR and potentially cause overload in initial DL BWP.
  + Proposal 3: For idle/inactive UEs receiving broadcast, CFR associated to initial DL BWP can be configured with a wider bandwidth than the initial DL BWP or a bandwidth equal to or smaller than the initial DL BWP.
    - If configured as a wider bandwidth, the initial DL BWP should be confined within the MBS specific BWP.
* In [R1-2107516, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 1: The unified CFR is defined/configured for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.
  + Proposal 2: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can be configured a CFR with same or smaller size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources configured by SIB1, to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH.
  + Proposal 3: Not support MBS specific BWP configuration for UE supporting broadcast reception in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE states.
* In [R1-2107765, Apple]
  + 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 SIB1.
* In [R1-2107883, NTT DOCOMO]
  + Proposal 1: For GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH, support Case C, D and E.
  + Proposal 2: For GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH, not support Case C, D or E.
* In [R1-2107952, Chengdu TD Tech]
  + Proposal 1: CFR-II can be configured to contain the initial BWP for DL.
  + Proposal 2: If CFR-II is far greater than the initial BWP for DL, it can be divided into several sub-BWPs. Each sub-BWP contains the initial BWP for DL, the CORESETs for the MCCH and MBS session monitoring, and MCCH.
* In [R1-2108028, Convida]
  + Proposal 1: 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 2: Support Case E for the CFR design for the RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.
* In [R1-2108172, Ericsson]
  + *Discuss*: Regarding the possibility to use SIB1-configured Initial BWP in all RRC states, this seems difficult since legacy unicast operation requires the UE to use the CORESET#0 Initial BWP while in Idle/Inactive to receive system information and paging. Assuming the UE cannot simultaneously use two different Initial BWPs, the UE can therefore not at the same time use the legacy-required Coreset#0 Initial BWP and a SIB1-configured Initial BWP, even with special spec changes for broadcast, assuming a UE receiving broadcast will also need to behave according to legacy unicast requirements.
  + *Discuss*: One reason to map MCCH and MTCH to different BWPs could perhaps be power saving. However, most part of the power saving comes from the time-domain power saving using e.g. DRX. Some additional power saving could also be achieved if the frequency window of the UE could be dynamically changed depending on whether MCCH (smaller BWP) or MTCH (larger BWP) is received. If the actual frequency window is dynamically changed this implies true BWP switching, which has unacceptable consequences, especially considering that RRC Connected UEs also need to receive the transmissions, together with unicast and potentially multicast. Without such true BWP switching there is no frequency-domain power saving, since the UE then needs to keep the frequency window fixed to receive the BW of the largest BWP. The fact that MCCH is actually transmitted in a small BWP does then not allow for any power saving, since the large frequency window is anyway used all the time.
  + *Discuss*: When MCCH and MTCH are instead both transmitted in a configured BWP the UE still needs to receive SI/paging, transmitted in the CORESET#0 Initial BWP. This is similar to the case with RRC Connected UEs receiving data in the active BWP and at the same time monitoring SI in the CORESET#0 Initial BWP. Since Connected UEs have this required functionality it looks natural to require the same for UEs receiving broadcast data on a configured BWP at the same time as receiving SI/paging in the CORESET#0 Initial BWP.
  + Proposal 10: For broadcast, a configured CFR/BWP may be used, which contains the CORESET#0 Initial BWP.
  + Proposal 11: The MCCH and MTCH may be mapped to the same CFR/BWP (CORESET#0 or configured CFR/BWP)
  + Proposal 12: No support for a CFR smaller than (i.e. subset of) the CORESET#0 Initial BWP or smaller than (i.e. subset of) a configured BWP.
  + Conclusion: SIB1-configured Initial BWP is not used for broadcast by RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.

### **FL Assessment**

The discussion on Common Frequency Resources (CFR) for MBS has been discussed extensively during the past meetings and multiple inputs to this meeting have addressed this topic. The discussion in this Issue on MBS CFR for broadcast reception is divided in the following sub-topics: i) discussion on down-selection from Case B to Case E, as identified at RAN1#104-e, for CFR of MCCH and MTCH, and ii) discussion on separate/same bandwidth (BW) configurations for CFR of MTCH and MCCH.

***Down-selection from Cases B, C, D and E for a configured/defined CFR for MCCH and MTCH***

The topic on configured/defined CFR was discussed extensively during the last meetings and at RAN1#105-e, it was agreed to support Case A for both MCCH and MTCH. This section discusses down-selection for the rest of cases identified at RAN1#104-e.

* *A configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET#0*

[Huawei, vivo, Nokia, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Samsung, CATT, Futurewei, Lenovo, OPPO, Qualcomm, CMCC, LGE, MediaTek, Apple, NTT DOCOMO, Chengdu TD Tech, Ericsson] discuss/propose that at least MTCH should be able to use a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET#0. The limited BW of CORESET#0 together with allocation of system information signals in the same frequency range is the main motivation the use of configured/defined CFR with larger size to accommodate bit-rates required for MBS broadcast services.

[ZTE, NTT DOCOMO] while supporting CFR larger than the frequency resources of CORESET#0 for MTCH, they do not see strong motivation for MCCH.

There is clear consensus on a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET#0, at least MTCH. For MCCH, there are two companies that do not see a strong motivation.

A configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET#0 can be accommodated with either Case C or Case E. However, this is a disputed topic that is addressed below.

* *Case C (SIB-1 configured initial BWP has same size as the CFR in the frequency domain) and Case E (CFR is defined based on a configured BWP)*

[Huawei, vivo, Nokia, Samsung, ZTE, CATT, Futurewei, Lenovo, OPPO, Qualcomm, CMCC, LGE, MediaTek, Apple, Ericsson] support a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., Case C), for both MCCH and/or MTCH (or do not make a distinction between channels).

However, it is important to note that there are different opinions on how to achieve a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In particular, [Nokia] proposes introducing a new SIBx configured CFR parameter, [Samsung] discusses the gNB can provide the initial DL BWP with an extension in SIB1 that is only applicable to MBS UEs, and [Qualcomm, ZTE, Ericsson] propose that the CFR in this case can be regarded as a configured new BWP with higher layer signalling.

The benefit of Case C avoiding BWP switching when UEs transit to RRC connected state by receiving broadcast and unicast in the SIB-1 configured initial BWP is discussed in [Huawei, CMCC]. However, [Ericsson] and similarly argued by [ZTE] discuss that assuming UEs cannot simultaneously use two different Initial BWPs, UEs can therefore not at the same time use the legacy-required Coreset#0 Initial BWP and a SIB1-configured Initial BWP, even with special spec changes for broadcast, assuming a UE receiving broadcast will also need to behave according to legacy unicast requirements.

There seems to be consensus on the size of the configured/defined CFR being with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. However, there is no consensus whether to add new parameters to SIBs or to use a configured BWP. As for past meetings, whether BWP switching occurs under different configurations remains a main concern.

Therefore, the FL proposes to try to agree Case C, while leaving the signalling aspects for further study. A relevant question is whether the design of the adequate signalling is better suited for RAN2 rather to RAN1.

For Case E, defined/configured CFR based on a defined BWP is supported at least for MTCH in [vivo, Nokia, ZTE, OPPO, Qualcomm, LGE, Apple, NTT DOCOMO, Chengdu Td Tech, Ericsson]. Concerns about BWP switching for a configured BWP are presented in [Huawei, CATT, CMCC, MediaTek]. However, [ZTE] discusses that BWP switching for a configured BWP can be avoided through reasonable RRC configurations.

Although with support from various companies, there seems not to be consensus for the support of a defined/configured CFR based on a defined BWP for MCCH or MTCH at this stage. Therefore, the FL proposes to leave this case FFS.

* *Case B (CORESET#0 fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain) and Case D (SIB-1 configured initial BWP fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain)*

Most inputs have focused on the discussion on Case-C and Case-E above.

Explicit support/use for Case B or Case D has been proposed in [Nokia, ZTE (subset of case D), NTT DOCOMO, Samsung], while explicit discussion on not supporting Case B or Case D has been discussed in [vivo, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Apple].

Also, as discussed in previous meetings and in some contributions, GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 or where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0) could be possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling, which reduces the motivation to support Cases B and D.

There is no strong support nor consensus on Case B and Case D and therefore, the FL proposes not to provide specification support for these two cases in Rel-17.

***Discussion on Separate/Same BW configurations for CFR of MCCH and MTCH***

This topic was also discussed at RAN1#104-e but without reaching an agreement.

[Huawei, Nokia, ZTE, NTT DOCOMO] propose/discuss that the CFR BW configuration for MCCH and MTCH can be configured separately. In fact [ZTE, NTT DOCOMO] while supporting CFR larger than the frequency resources of CORESET#0 for MTCH, they do not see strong motivation for MCCH. Hence, this may imply that the CFR for MCCH and MTCH can be different.

On the other hand [Samsung, OPPO, MediaTek, Ericsson] propose/discuss that the same CFR BW configuration for MCCH and MTCH is used. However, Ericsson details concerns on mapping MCCH and MTCH to different CFR/BWPs which may lead to UE receiver front ends requiring to switch between different CFR of different size, a situation that should be avoided.

Finally, [Qualcomm] proposes/discusses that same or different CFR BW configuration for MCCH and MTCH can be used.

There is no clear support for either same or different BW configuration CFR for MTCH and MCCH. However, based on concerns raised on potential UE receiver switching by using different CFR BW configuration for MCCH and MTCH, the FL proposes to start with the last version of the proposal discussed at RAN1#104-e which tries to agree using the same CFR BW configuration for MCCH and MTCH, while leaving using different CFR BW configurations for MCCH and MTCH as FFS.

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

**Proposal 2.1-1:** No specification support in Rel-17 for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with configured/defined CFRs for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP either has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case B) or has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., Case D).

**Proposal 2.1-2**: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0.

In Rel-17, at least support the following case:

* a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., 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.
  + FFS: whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling.
* FFS: a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1.

**Proposal 2.1-3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are NOT fine with **Proposal 2.1-1** and **Proposal 2.1-2**.  The excluding of Case B is fine for us, but we don’t see why Case D-1 (as shown in our Tdoc) have to be excluded. As discussed in our Tdoc, the difference among the CFR Case C, Case D-1 and Case E is the configured bandwidth value of CFR for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs. Practically depending on the MBS traffic payload size, the support of all 3 cases may allow the network to flexibly configure the size of CFR for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs to monitor and receive MBS services. Therefore, we propose to support the CFR Case C, Case D-1 and Case E on top of Case A.  Regarding **Proposal 2.1-3**, it is fine for us.  @FL: Relate to Proposal 2.1-3, currently it is understood that the CORESET#0 region can be used as (default) CFR for MCCH CFR as we discussed at last RAN1 meeting. But it is still unclear if CFR of MCCH can be configured with size larger than CORESET#0 region? As discussed in our contribution, so far, the payload size of MCCH traffic is not clear. For MCCH carrying the information with small payload size, the capacity of limited CORESET#0 region can be enough. But if larger payload size is intended to be carried via MCCH traffic, the larger CFR size than default CORESET#0 region may be needed for MCCH. Thus, it is proposed that the CFR for MCCH can be configured other than default CORESET#0 region. I hope it is also aligned with the intention of Proposal 2.1-3. |
| Qualcomm | Fine with 3 proposals |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.1-1: Support.**  **Proposal 2.1-2**: We have question on this proposal. Does it imply SIB1 configures the CFR larger than initial DL BWP?  **Proposal 2.1-3**: Support. |
| vivo | Not support Proposal 2.1-2.  As stated by many companies in FL’s summary, CFR with larger frequency size is a need to accommodate various MBS broadcast services.  However, if case C is the only solution, it will cause big constraint on initial BWP configuration by SIB1.  Currently, as given in 38.331 and 38.321, configuring *initialDownlinkBWP* isoptional, and if not configured, CORESET 0 is used as the initial BWP. In this sense, if *initialDownlinkBWP* is not configured, CASE C cannot define/configure a CFR with larger frequency size than CORESET0.  Furthermore, when *initialDownlinkBWP* is configured, its frequency size heavily relies on the MBS services, otherwise, some broadcast services cannot be accommodated. Enlarging the size of SIB-1 configured initial BWP affects both legacy UEs and R17 UEs supporting MBS services. According to current spec, SIB 1-configured initial BWP is only used after reception of RRCSetup/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment. For a UE initiating random access procedure but without PRACH occasions configured for the active UL BWP, it has to switch to the initial UL/DL BWP, and thus, an enlarged initial BWP causes unnecessary power consumption by RF switching to a large frequency range. Furthermore, unnecessary power consumption is also observed by using the enlarged initial BWP as the default BWP.  Regarding to the BWP switching issue for case E raised by some companies, we do not see additional operation is needed compared to case C: For RRC idle/inactive UEs, as the configured/defined CFR includes CORESET0, both system information and broadcast services can be received simultaneously. For RRC connected UEs to receive broadcast services, it is up to gNB’s implementation to configure one BWP including the configured/defined CFR.  Consequently, Case E should be also supported on top of case C, and leave the network flexibility to select among case A, C, and E.  In Rel-17, at least support the following case:   * a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., 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.   + FFS: whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling.   ~~FFS:~~ a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1(i.e., Case E). |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with 3 proposals |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | **Proposal 2.1-1:Ok**  **Proposal 2.l-2: OK. But some update is needed.**  **Proposal 2.1-2**: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial DL BWP, where the initial DL BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0.  In Rel-17, at least support the following case:   * a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial DL BWP, where the initial DL BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., 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.   + FFS: whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling. * FFS: a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial DL BWP but containing the initial DL BWP, where the initial DL BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 and the configured/defined CFR has the same numerology as the initial DL BWP.   **Proposal 2.1-3**: Ok but we think the proposal shall be updated as below.  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH if the CFR is the initial DL BWP.   * FFS: use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH. |
| CATT | OK with **Proposal 2.1-1 and 2.1-3.**  **Proposal 2.1-2**: The proposal is not clear to us. The relation between the main bullet and the sub-bullet confuse us and we have the same question with Lenovo. |
| CMCC | Support three proposals.  Our understanding the proposal 2.1-2 is supporting Case C, we can re-use the wording of previous agreement if this proposal brings ambiguity. |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.1-1: Support.  Proposal 2.1-2: OK with the proposal in general.  One question for clarification (switching issue): Case C and Case E have similar mechanism/configurations, and the only difference is CFR equals or larger than initial BWP configured by SIB1. Based on my understanding, for both case C and case E, no switching between CFR and CORESET#0 is needed. Please correct me if my understanding is not right.  Proposal 2.1-3: Support the main bullet. We do not see quite strong motivation/benefit to support the FFS that different CFR bandwidth configurations for MTCH and MCCH. I think it transparent in physical layer that both MTCH/MCCH are PDSCH. |
| ZTE | The essential difference between Case E and other cases (Case C and Case D) is whether **a high-layer signalling is introduced to configure a special BWP for the UE in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states for receiving broadcast services**. Under Case C and Case D, the CFR configuration depends on the initial BWP configured by the existing signalling in the SIB1. Case E requires a new high-layer signaling to configure a BWP for MBS reception. However, Case E has the highest flexibility by decoupling from ‘SIB1 configured initial BWP’.  The initial BWP configured in the SIB1 can be used only when the UE enters the RRC\_CONNECTED state as described in Rel-15/16 specification TS38.331. In other words, for IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, the CORESET#0 is still used as the frequency domain receiving range, even if initial BWP is configured by SIB1. From this perspective, if Case E requires any BWP switching from IDLE to RRC\_CONNECTED, Case C also requires such BWP switching.  We don’t understand the agreement that BWP switching may be needed for Case E between unicast and multicast. Network can always configure a larger bandwidth part that fully contains the CFR and indicate it as the first active BWP, there is no BWP switching at all. If we follow the same logic from opponents of Case E, Case C will also require BWP switching between unicast and multicast if the activated BWP is not the initial BWP configured by SIB1.  Overall, we didn’t see any benefits for Case C over Case E. We would propose to support Case E instead of Case C.  Thus, we are not ok with Proposal 2.1-2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.1-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-2**: The statement “CFR with larger size than the initial BWP” in the main bullet may be interpreted as referring to Case E. To avoid misreading, we would like to change the main bullet as follows:  **Updated Proposal 2.1-2**: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR with larger size than CORESET0.  **Proposal 2.1-3**: Support |
| Ericsson | P2.1-1: Support  P2.1-2: We support the idea of using a SIB1-configured Initial BWP to receive broadcast in RRC Connected. However, UEs in RRC Inactive/Idle will need to use CORESET#0 Initial BWP and cannot at the same time use a SIB1-configured Initial BWP, so the Proposal needs to be reformulated to clarify that “Initial BWP” refers to RRC Connected UEs.  With different Initial BWPs for UEs in RRC Connected and RRC Idle/Inactive, we note however that SI/paging will have to be duplicated, i.e. sent in the SIB1-configured Initial BWP for UEs in RRC Connected and in CORSET#0 Initial BWP for UEs in RRC Inactive/Idle, which is unattractive.  When broadcast is instead received in all RRC states via a separately configured CFR (i.e. other than the Initial BWP) all UEs can receive SI/paging in the CORESET#0 Initial BWP (if that is used as Initial BWP for all UEs), so no duplication is required.  As we have proposed in our contribution, the broadcast CFR can then be aligned with the active BWP or the multicast CFR to allow for simultaneous reception of unicast/multicast and broadcast within the UE complexity constraints of one supporting one CFR.  We suggest the following reformulation:  **Proposal 2.1-2x**: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0.  In Rel-17, at least support the following case:   * a configured/defined CFR for UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state with the same frequency resources ~~size~~ as the initial BWP of UEs in RRC CONNECTED, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. ~~(i.e., 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.   + FFS: whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling. * FFS: a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1.   P2.1-3: Support.  We think this should apply also to UEs in RRC Connected, but this may be a topic for the Group scheduling agenda point. |
| Apple | We are ok with three proposals |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.1-1:** When the initial BWP is configured by SIB-1 instead of default CORESET#0, the gNB can configure the smaller CFR than initial BWP based on service requirement. It doesn’t need always to configure the CFR equal to initial BWP.  **Proposal 2.1-2**: The proposal is confused for us, especially for the initial BWP concept in the main bullet and sub-bullet. We update the proposal as following:  **Updated Proposal 2.1-2**: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR ~~with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0~~ with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., 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. * FFS: whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling. * ~~FFS: a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1.~~   **Proposal 2.1-3**: Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 2.1-2 and Proposal 2.1-3 can affect each other.  At least MTCH requires larger bandwidth, if current Proposal 2.1-2 is not agreeable to others, at least we can have it for MTCH. If it turns out case C is supported for MTCH but not supported for MCCH, the FFS under Proposal 2.1-3 will automatically be supported. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for the good discussion, hopefully increases the understanding of each other’s views.  **Two points that I would like to make.**  **First**, is that there seems to be consensus that there is need to have a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the size of CORESET#0. How we achieve that, may need more discussion and hopefully we can get an agreement this meeting so we can finish the details of the option in the remainder 2 meetings (which are shorter than this one).  **Second**, as I understand the situation, Case-C is defined as follows form the agreement on RAN1#104-e:  *“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 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. ….”*   I do not think *how Case-C is configured* is discussed in the agreement above. What I understand is that the agreement above for Case-C is describing its frequency characteristics. Then, how to configure Case-C is the controversial bit, as I understand form the comments. Some companies put arguments forward that if the configuration of Case-C has to rely on the SIB1 (by adding extension fields or whatever approach), therefore there are issues (e.g. approach does not comply with existing specs) and that’s why by using a configured BWP that would solve the issue. Other companies, on the other hand do not see issues of configuring Case-C with SIB1, and do not support the configuration of BPW (e.g., potential BWP when transiting to RRC connected). That’s why the proposal is formulated in this way: first trying to agree the frequency size and region, in this case being larger than coreset#0 and with the same size and region as the frequency region as defined by SIB-1 configured BWP, and how it is configured/defined is FFS.  Anyhow, we need more discussion, please continue proving your views. Here, I provide some comments per company.  @Nokia: Regarding not supporting case D-1 in your proposal: let’s assume that either Case C or Case E are agreed, as per the note GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling. Therefore, other companies positions is that there is not motivation to define a CFR that the maximum frequency span is in between Case A and Case C. My interpretation of Case D-1 in your tdoc, would not allow to schedule anything outside the blue region. Does my explanation make sense and is my interpretation of your case D-1 correct?  @Lenvo, CATT: regarding your question on Proposal 2.1-2. Please note the following FFS “*FFS: whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling*”. Please also see my general comments above.  @vivo: thanks for the detailed comments. please check my general comments above, and do please let me know what you think about this reasoning.  @OPPO: I am not sure whether all companies have the same understanding on this. My understanding is that when UEs are in RRC idle/inactive state, Case C and Case E both containing coreset#0 would not require BWP switching.  @ZTE: thanks for detailed comments. Could you please check my general comments above and let me know what you think?  @Chengdu TD Tech: thanks for modifications which will be taken into account.  @NTT DOCOMO: thanks for suggestion, which will be incorporated.  @MediaTek: thanks for comments, regarding P2.1-1, please see the note “*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.*” that I think refers to your comment. I am going to include some changes as proposed by some companies and please check whether the reformulated proposals is more clear.  @Huawei: Thanks and I see your point will scope it to include only MTCH.  Based on comments revised proposals as follows:  **Proposal 2.1-1 and Proposal 2.1-3 are kept unchanged in this round.**  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR with larger size than ~~the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as~~ CORESET0.  In Rel-17, at least support the following case:   * a configured/defined CFR for UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state with the same frequency resources ~~size~~ as the initial BWP of UEs in RRC CONNECTED, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., 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.   + FFS: whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling. * FFS: a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 and the configured/defined CFR has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP (i.e., Case E). |

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

**Proposal 2.1-1:** No specification support in Rel-17 for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with configured/defined CFRs for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP either has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case B) or has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., Case D).

**Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR with larger size than ~~the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as~~ CORESET0.

In Rel-17, at least support the following case:

* a configured/defined CFR for UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state with the same frequency resources ~~size~~ as the initial BWP of UEs in RRC CONNECTED, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., 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.
  + FFS: whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling.
* FFS: a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 and the configured/defined CFR has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP (i.e., Case E).

**Proposal 2.1-3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | We do not support **Proposal 2.1-1**, due to the reason that we don’t understand why Case-D-1 cannot be supported and has to be excluded.  Regarding **Proposal 2.1-2**, following re-wording with blue-font is proposed:  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR with larger size than ~~the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as~~ CORESET0.  In Rel-17, at least support the following case:   * a configured/defined CFR for UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state with the same frequency resources ~~size~~ as the initial BWP of UEs in RRC CONNECTED, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., 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.   + FFS: whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling. * FFS: a configured/defined CFR with **smaller or** larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 and the configured/defined CFR has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP (i.e., Case E).   @Moderator: Regarding “My interpretation of Case D-1 in your tdoc, would not allow to schedule anything outside the blue region. Does my explanation make sense and is my interpretation of your case D-1 correct?”, I confirm that your understanding is correct! |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.1-1: Support.**  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: Support.  **Proposal 2.1-3**: Support. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposals. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**:  We think   1. The initial BWP is applied to all UE states. 2. For the 2nd FFS item, the sentence “the configured/defined CFR has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP” doesn’t mean the configured/defined CFR contains the initial BWP.   Therefore, the following update is suggested.  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: In Rel-17, at least support the following case:   * a configured/defined CFR for UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state with the same frequency resources ~~size~~ as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., 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.   + FFS: whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling. * FFS: a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP and containing the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 and the configured/defined CFR has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP (i.e., Case E). |
| Intel | **Proposal 2.1-1:** OK  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1:** There can be a use case for CFR larger than CORESET#0 and in our understanding, this is addressed by Case C. However, we still have concerns on Case E. In Case E, the CFR is larger than the initial BWP configured by SIB1. In this case, when the UE moved to RRC\_CONNECTED mode, the UE then has an active BWP with a CFR which is larger than the active BWP. In this case for the UE to receive broadcast, the UE needs to be reconfigured with another BWP which contains the broadcast CFR, otherwise the CONNECTED mode behaviour of CFR contained within active BWP is violated. If a MBS needs CFR larger than SIB1 configured initial BWP, then we can further reconfigure the initial BWP for MBS capable UEs with additional signalling in SIB1 or another MBS specific SIB, i.e., this case is handled under Case C. Therefore, to address CFR larger than initial BWP we propose to add an FFS for handling this using case C rather than Case E which has technical issues for CONNECTED mode. Note than if CFR is desired to be larger than CORESET#0 and smaller than initial BWP, it can be handled by FDRA under Case C.  **Proposal 2.1-3:** can be discussed after proposal 2.1-2 is finalized. Also we need to finalize if there is a separate MCCH CFR and MTCH CFR which can be configured. |
| ZTE | Thanks FL for the update and clarification.  Proposal 2.1-2rev1, we are still not convinced why the CFR can only be configured the same as the SIB1-configured initial BWP.  From CFR perspective, any size larger than CORESET#0 can be supported as long as it is within carrier bandwidth. All the 4 configurations shown in the figure can be supported by a unified solution, i.e., Case E. Case C is just one specific case of Case E.  For IDLE UE, the SIB1-configured initial BWP has no special use case as it can only be used under RRC\_CONNECTIVE. Restricting CFR = SIB1-configured initial BWP doesn’t provide any meaningful benefits from our perspective.  For BWP switching between unicast and CFR, if the unicast BWP doesn’t fully contain the CFR, BWP switching is needed. But this issue is for both Case C and Case E, we don’t understand why companies only have this concern for Case E but not for Case C.    To facilitate the discussion, it would be good if proponents of Case C can provide some detailed advantages of Case C over Case E. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.1-1: Not Support.  If SIB1 does not configure the initial BWP, then it makes sense that the CFR for MBS is the same as CORESET#0 (not smaller than CORESET#0).  However, SIB1 configures the initial BWP, then SIBx can configure the CFR smaller than the initial BWP configured by SIB1. There is no reason to restrict how to configure CFR.  Especially, if we consider the simulateneous transmission to RRC\_idle/inactive UEs and RRC\_connected UEs, then it is much better to give flexibility to the gNB on how to configure CFR.  Proposal 2.1-2(rev1): Not support. This is totally opposite way of Proposal 2.1-1. There is no reason to allow to configure the CFR larger than the initial BWP.  We don’t think this proposal is needed.  Proposal 2.1-3: Support |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2.1-1: We share the similar view as Samsung. We still think there is no need to preclude the possibility of case D since gNB can flexible configure the CFR size based on the broadcast traffic size.  Proposal 2.1-2(rev1): The following updated proposal is preferred, we can live with the last FFS note for further discussion:  **Updated Proposal**: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR ~~with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0~~ with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., 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. * FFS: whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling. * FFS: a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1.   **Proposal 2.1-3**: We are fine with the main bullet. |
| Qualcomm | Fine with the proposals.  We also support Case E, in addition to Case C. For progress, we are fine to keep Case E as FFS for now.  If a CFR is configured with BW larger than CORESET#0, a CFR/BWP is needed for IDLE/INACTIVE UEs. Case C is just to use existing SIB-1 configured initial BWP to associate with the broadcast CFR; while, Case E would need a new signaling. But, with this new signaling, Case E is more flexible for MTCH without impact on SIB1-configured initial BWP used for legacy CONN UEs. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with the proposals. |
| OPPO | **P 2.1-1:** Support.  **P 2.1-2(rev1):** Fine and with the following clarifications for better understanding.  The are 3 key points should be addressed in this proposal:   * **Valid time:** For case C, the initial DL BWP configured by SIB 1 can be used immediately after SIB 1 decoded and the enabled time is during IDLE/INACTIVE. The configuration of the CFR can reuse that of the initial DL BWP in SIB 1 because the CFR and initial DL BWP are using the same frequency resources. * **Configuration signalling:** For case E, the valid time is same with that of case C. However, the configuration in SIB 1 cannot be used for CFR because CFR is different (larger than) from initial DL BWP. As Qualcomm mentioned, new configuration signalling will be introduced. * **Switching** between CFR and CORESET#0: As explained by FL, there should be no switching between CFR and CORESET#0 if CFR fully contains CORESET#0. Based on my understanding, for case C and Case E, a UE have to maintain both CFR and CORESET#0. The CFR should be configured associated with a BWP (i.e. similar with CFR config. for multicast AI 8.12.1), the switching can be avoided. Therefore, the configuration of CFR should also be discussed/considered.     **P 2.1-3:** Only support the main bullet, and the FFS can be removed. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.1-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-2rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-3**: Support |
| CATT | OK with these three proposals. |
| vivo | Regarding to proposal 2.1-2(rev1), we support case E in addition to case C, as in case E, configuring/defining a CFR with a proper size has no impact on SIB-1 configured BWP used by UEs in RRC-connected state.  **@intel ‘**reconfiguring the initial BWP for MBS capable UEs with additional signalling in SIB1 or another MBS specific SIB’ may lead to two different initial DL BWP between MBS capable UEs and the other UEs. This may cause misunderstanding in many cases, i.e., for DCI 1-0 size determination, the size of initial DL bandwidth part is used if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell. And we think for RRC-connected UEs to receive broadcast services, gNB can configure one BWP to the UEs containing the CFR defined/configured in case E by implementation. |
| CMCC | Support three proposals.  Regarding the comparison between Case C and Case E, one additional issues needs discussion is UE’s behaviour going into RRC\_CONNECTED mode. For example, the initial BWP configured by SIB1 are available after UE goes into RRC\_CONNECTED mode, and additional UE-specific BWP is not configured by RRC dedicated signalling. For Case E, whether both initial DL BWP configured by SIB1 and CFR are activated, if the answer is yes, that means CFR is larger than UE’s active BWP which is conflicts the agreement for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs. But for Case C doesn’t have this issue. |
| Ericsson | P2.1-2rev1: Support.  We do not see why some companies have problems with a CFR which is larger than the initial BWP. If the initial BWP for UEs in RRC Connected is configured via SIB1, then this initial BWP may be a subset of a larger configured broadcast CFR, which in turn is a subset of the active BWP. For the RRC Connected UE the broadcast CFR would then play the same role as a multicast CFR, which obviously can contain the initial BWP. UEs in RRC Idle/Inactive can receive the broadcast CFR, which needs to contain the CORESET#0 initial BWP. |
| Convida | Proposal 2.1-1: OK with the proposal.  Proposal 2.1-2rev1: Not OK with the proposal. We share the similar view with ZTE that we should support case E instead of case C as case C has the drawbacks mentioned by vivo, ZTE and Ericsson.  We think we should remove the FFS in the second sub-bullet, i.e., ~~FFS:~~ a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 and the configured/defined CFR has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP (i.e., Case E).  Also, after adopting the suggestion from Ericsson, we think the CFR described in the first sub-bullet now is different from the CFR defined in case C. So, we also think we should remove the wording of ‘(i.e., Case C)’ in the first sub-bullet as proposed by Ericsson.  Proposal 2.1-3: OK with the proposal. |
| Moderator | Thank you for good discussion.  (I hope to provide more detailed comments per company in the next revison).  Based on comments, Proposal 2.1-1 is revised to only exclude Case B. There are multiple companies that would like to keep the door open for case D and this has been included in the revised version of Proposal 2.1.2.  For proposal 2.1-2: I have included the wording for the different cases as that of the agreement for RAN1#104-e. As mentioned above, Case D has been included as FFS. The proposal tries to agree Case C, while leaves Case E and D as FFS.  Proposal 2.1-3 is left unchanged until more progress on Proposal 2.1-2 is done.  **Proposal 2.1-1rev1:** No specification support in Rel-17 for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with configured/defined CFRs for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP ~~either~~ has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case B) ~~or has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., Case D)~~.  **Proposal 2.1-2rev2**: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR with larger size than ~~the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as~~ CORESET0.  In Rel-17, at least support the following case:   * a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the same frequency resources and same SCS and CP as the initial BWP (i.e., 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.~~   + FFS: whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIB1 or other SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling. * FFS: a configured/defined CFR with larger 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 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 (i.e., Case E). * FFS: a configured/defined 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 (i.e., Case D).   + study whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIB1 or other SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling.   **Proposal 2.1-3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   * FFS: use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH. |

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

**Proposal 2.1-1rev1:** No specification support in Rel-17 for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with configured/defined CFRs for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP ~~either~~ has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case B) ~~or has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., Case D)~~.

**Proposal 2.1-2rev2**: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR with larger size than ~~the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as~~ CORESET0.

In Rel-17, at least support the following case:

* a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the same frequency resources and same SCS and CP as the initial BWP (i.e., 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.~~
  + FFS: whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIB1 or other SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling.
* FFS: a configured/defined CFR with larger 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 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 (i.e., Case E).
* FFS: a configured/defined 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 (i.e., Case D).
  + study whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIB1 or other SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling.7

**Proposal 2.1-3**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | We are generally fine with the proposals. We support Case E. |
| Samsung | We don’t support Case E. Even now, the gNB can configure the initial BWP by SIB1 with up to the whole range of its carrier. So, if the gNB wants to use larger BW for MBS, then the gNB first sets up the initial BWP with larger BW by SIB1. In this reason, there is no reason to support larger CFR than the initial BWP configured by SIB1. If this is allowed, the UE should switching its effective BWP.  We think we need to keep the principle of a BWP, which is a range of Tx/Rx. If Case E is supported, the UE should receive the signal in wider range of its BWP.  For Case D, we think it should be supported for network flexibility for managing MBS. |
| NOKIA/NSB | In order to make the progress, we are fine with the proposals.  But again, we don’t see the key issues why the size of CFR cannot be configured differently (smaller/larger) from SIB1 configured initial BWP. For Case D and E, the BWP operation when UE transits to RRC\_CONNECTED state does not be impacted at all. And the flexibility and benefit provided by Case D and E with new introduced signalling is also acceptable. |
| ZTE | Thanks Teng for the nice figure. We added some more info on top of Teng’s nice figure below.  **For the Case C below,**  The spec impact at least includes the following  1) CFR configuration, the frequency resource may be not needed if it is the same as SIB1-configured initial BWP. But PDCCH/PDSCH/CORESET/SS configures for CFR are needed.  2) UE needs to activate the SIB1-configured initial BWP after receiving SIB1, which is not allowed for legacy UE  The drawbacks of Case C:  1) Unnecessary restrictions on the size of CFR;  2) Unnecessary coupling the CFR for MBS with initial DL BWP for unicast. For a unicast not receiving MBS, its previous initial DL BWP can be small (even the same as CORESET#0). However, if there is one UE in this cell receiving MBS, the gNB has to set a large initial BWP for all UEs, even they are not receiving MBS service.  **For Case E below:**  The spec impact includes the following  1) CFR configuration, RAN2 can reuse the same configuration of BWP, including frequency resource/PDSCH/PDCCH/CORESET/SS, etc.  2) If UE receives MBS, UE activates the Case E CFR (as a BWP) after receives SIB1.  The benefits of Case E:  1) Decoupling the SIB1-configured initial BWP for UEs receiving MBS and UEs not receiving MBS. Please note that, this mechanism is similar as what being discussed in REDCAP, different initial BWPs are used for REDCAP UE and Non-REDCAP UE. This is beneficial for power saving for UEs not receiving MBS;  2) Flexible configuration of CFR size to accommodate different MBS requirement.  Note that, there is no such thing as BWP switching between unicast and MBS for Case E. As shown below, the UE receiving MBS will be configured with a BWP equal to larger than CFR. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Ok |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are generally fine with the proposals. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | All three proposals look generally fine. We should at least agree on the case that CFR can be configured with the same bandwidth as SIB1 configured initial BWP.  SIB1 configured initial BWP may be of a big size or small size depending on NW configuration. If it is really configured of small size in the deployed 5G network, introducing another BWP larger than SBI1 configured initial BWP for broadcast may not be impossible but in such a case it would be better to be named as initial BWP as well just for broadcast so as not to break RAN2’s logic of defining different BWP (refer to the last section of 38.331 regarding BWP) and UE after entering RRC CONNECTED does not have to switch to the current SIB1 configured initial BWP but definitely such case will cause additional spec impact which is worth considering as well. |
| OPPO | Some comments  Proposal 2.1-2 rev2  For the two FFS sub-bullets of case E and case D: My understanding that we already had the agreements as FFS for case E and D. Do the above FFS in this proposal introduce something new/different from the agreement? If not, we do not need to agree on the same thing again as another two FFS cases.  Proposal 2.1-3  OK with the main bullet.  One question for clarification that do we have clear agreement or the detailed bandwidth configurations mechanism for MTCH/MCCH? Because we are not sure whether we are making such a decision is based on a clear CFR configuration design. |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.1-1rev1:**Ok  **Proposal 2.1-2rev2:** We think the initial BWP which is configured by SIB1 can be used to receive broadcast services. And this will not affect the Non-MBS UE by configuring the first active BWP per UE.  **Proposal 2.1-3:** We are ok with the main-bullet. |
| MediaTek | We are generally fine with the **Proposal 2.1-1rev1**.  For **Proposal 2.1-2rev2**, we support Case C and Case D.  Regarding the size configuration of between initial BWP and CFR, it can be based on the broadcast and unicast services requirement, which can be up to NW implementation. However, if the CFR range is larger than initial BWP, when UE receiving broadcast enter RRC connected mode from RRC idle/inactive mode, it will cause CFR is larger than active BWP, which will cause the BWP switching issue and also against the agreement achieved in RRC Connected, e.g., a CFR for group-common PDCCH / PDSCH is confined within the frequency resource of a dedicated unicast BWP.  For **Proposal 2.1-3**, we are OK with the main bullet. The same and one CFR is sufficient for MCCH/MTCH. If the CFR for MCCH and MTCH is different, it will make the UE handle the two CFRs at the same time, which will cause the UE processing complexity. |
| Ericsson | The Proposal targets UEs in RRC Inactive/Idle, but when the term “Initial BWP” is mentioned in the Proposal it seems like it sometimes refers to the Initial BWP for UEs in RRC Connected and sometimes to UEs in RRC Inactive/Idle. To clarify this, we propose the changes below (changes in green).  We also think it is necessary to add a new FFS to cover Case E when SIB1 does not configure the Initial BWP for UEs in RRC Connected. It may e.g. be the case that UEs in all RRC states use CORESET#0 Initial BWP.  We also wish to point out that although the CORESET#0 Initial BWP needs to be contained in the CFR for UEs in RRC Inactive/Idle, the initial BWP for UEs in RRC Connected does not need to be contained within the CFR since legacy UEs are expected to monitor SI/paging throughout the entire initial BWP, which may occupy any subset of the active BWP. One may thus have a case with an active BWP fully containing an Initial BWP and also fully containing the CFR, but there is no required relationship between the initial BWP and the CFR.  **Proposal 2.1-2rev2: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR with larger size than ~~the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as~~ CORESET0.**  **In Rel-17, at least support the following case:**   * **a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP for UEs in RRC Connected, where th~~eis~~ 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 for UEs in RRC Connected (i.e., 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.~~**   + **FFS: whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIB1 or other SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling.** * **FFS: a configured/defined CFR with larger size than the initial BWP for UEs in RRC Connected, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources identical to the configured BWP. The configured BWP needs to fully contain the CORESET#0 initial BWP in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP (i.e., Case E).** * **FFS: a configured/defined CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP for UEs in RRC Connected, where th~~e~~is initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP for UEs in RRC Connected and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP (i.e., Case D).**    + **study whether signalling to enable this is included/extended as part of SIB1 or other SIBs, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling.** * **FFS: a configured/defined CFR with a larger size than the CORESET#0 Initial BWP, where the CFR fully contains the CORESET#0 Initial BWP and is fully contained within the active BWP of RRC Connected UEs. In this case the CFR has the same SCS and CP as the active BWP and the Coreset#0 Initial BWP (i.e., Case E without reference to SIB1-configured Initial BWP).**   As a simplification we think the three FFS bullet points above should be combined into one FFS, since they are all about the CFR being different from the Initial BWP. When the CFR is different from the initial BWP it is irrelevant whether the initial BWP is configured via SIB1 or not. The proposed simplified bullet point reads:   * **FFS: a configured/defined CFR with a different location/size than the initial BWP for UEs in RRC Connected. The configured BWP needs to fully contain the CORESET#0 initial BWP in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP (i.e., Case E).**   The logic is therefore that if CFR and Initial BWP is the same then no separate configuration of CFR is required and CFR is then identical to CORSESET#0 Initial BWP (Case A) or SIB1-configured Initial BWP (Case C). If CFR and Initial BWP are different, a separate configuration of CFR is used, i.e. Case E. In Case E the CFR can be anything larger than CORSET#0 up to the active BWP. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Ericsson to SIB-1 configured initial BWP is for CONN UEs. We cannot change initial BWP, which is used by all UEs, including legacy UEs and Rel17 MBS UEs.   * **for IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, the initial BWP is CORESET#0** * for CONN UEs, the initial BWP is SIB-1 configured initial BWP   Now, what we want to do is to configure a CFR for broadcast for only Rel17 MBS UEs in all states.  For Case C:   * Alt1: reuse the SIB-1 configured initial BWP and add CFR (configured within SIB1) within the SIB-1 configured initial BWP or associate CFR (configured in SIB-x) with the SIB-1 configured initial BWP   + **Not isolate initial BWP and CFR, which will change the initial BWP of IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.** * Alt2: configured a CFR/BWP (configured in SIB1, SIB-x) and reuse the frequency range of SIB-1 configured initial BWP for CONN UEs   + Isolate initial BWP and CFR/BWP   For Case E:   * Similar as Alt2 for Case C, configured a CFR/BWP but with BW containing CORESET#0 and SIB-1 configured initial BWP   + Isolate initial BWP and CFR/BWP   + For IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, UEs can receive broadcast in CFR/BWP and SIB/paging in CORESET#0 without BWP switching   + For CONN UEs, UEs can receive broadcast in CFR/BWP and unicast/SIB/paging in SIB1-configured BWP without BWP switching.  🡪 similar as no BWP switching for legacy CONN UEs receiving active dedicated BWP and initial BWP simultaneously.   We think Alt1 for Case C cannot work because it will change initial BWP of IDLE/INACTIVE UEs. So, we prefer Alt2 for Case C. In a similar way, Case E can be also supported if allowing more flexible BW size.  Therefore, we support Case C and Case E.  For Case D, we think gNB can schedule GC-PDCCH/PDSCH within the CFR based on Case C or Case E. |
| Moderator | Thank you for all the good discussion. There has been also significant email discussion on this Issue, in special on proposal 2.1-2.  Regarding proposal 2.1-2, my reading of the situation is as follows. There is consensus to support case C. There is no consensus to support Case D and/or Case E but there are multiple companies with strong interest on these two options. Therefore, my proposal is that we at least agree Case C while leave the support of Case D and E FFS.  A second aspect is how to configure the different cases in the table Case C, D and E. The email discussion has focused mainly on Case C. Although good progress has been done on listing different alternatives to configure and achieve Case C, there is clearly no consensus on the way Case C will be configured. Different alternatives on how to configure Case C are listed below based on FL understanding:   * Option 1: reuse the SIB1 configured initial BWP and remove the restriction that is only applicable when UEs enter RRC connected state. * Option 2: reuse the SIB1 and add additional parameters that are only understandable for Rel-17 MBS UEs to create an initial BWP that is only applicable to Rel-17 MBS UEs. * Option 3: use a configured BWP and in that configured BWP configure the frequency range with the same as the frequency range of the SIB-1 configured initial BWP. This may be configured in SIB1, MBS SIB or possibly MCCH for MTCH.   However, the options and which option to select is still under discussion and may be difficult to reach a decision at this meeting on which option to select. Therefore, it is proposed to leave this as FFS.  There have also been comments on whether the agreement in Proposal 2.1-2 is changing the agreements on the definition of Cases A-E reached in RAN1#104-e, since this is not the intention, the FL proposes to simplify the wording.  Based on the above, the revised proposal is as follows:  **Proposal 2.1-2rev3**: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR with larger size than CORESET0. In Rel-17, at least support Case-C.   * FFS: whether signalling to enable Case-Cis included/extended as part of SIB1 or other SIB, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, whether CFR configuration for MTCH can be provided by MCCH (e.g. if different CFR configuration is needed for MTCH), or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling. * FFS: support of Case D and/or Case E.   Regarding Proposal 2.1-1, there has not been any objection so this proposal is considered stable.  Regarding Proposal 2.1-3, comment from OPPO is whether there is a clear definition on bandwidth configurations for MTCH/MCCH. The discussion on the definition of CFR is addressed on Issue 3. Here we are referring that the frequency range and location is used for MCCH and MTCH. Given the comments, the proposal may be agreeable removing the FFS. Therefore are revision is done by removing the FFS.  **Proposal 2.1-3rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   * ~~FFS: use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.~~ |

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

**Proposal 2.1-1rev1[stable]:** No specification support in Rel-17 for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with configured/defined CFRs for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP ~~either~~ has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case B) ~~or has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., Case D)~~.

**Proposal 2.1-2rev3**: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR with larger size than CORESET0. In Rel-17, at least support Case-C.

* FFS: whether signalling to enable Case-Cis included/extended as part of SIB1 or other SIB, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, whether CFR configuration for MTCH can be provided by MCCH (e.g. if different CFR configuration is needed for MTCH), or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling.
* FFS: support of Case D and/or Case E.

**Proposal 2.1-3rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | We are fine with all updated proposals.  Proposal 2.1-2rev3:  We are fine with updated FFS. In our view, if MCCH and MTCH use different CFR configurations, the configured CFR for MTCH could be possibly configured by MCCH instead of new SIBx or SIB1. The benefit of using MCCH for CFR configuration is that MCCH is mostly used to announce G-RNTIs. Thus, if one or more of PDCCH-config, PDSCH-config and SPS-config in CFR configuration can be easily associated with G-RNTIs (e.g. SPS-config or PDSCH repetition in CFR configuration for MTCH), considering that SIBx won’t include a list of G-RNTIs like in LTE MBMS.  Meanwhile, if MCCH and MTCH are under same CFR configuration, the configured CFR for MTCH should be configured by new SIBx or SIB1. In this case, we prefer to configure the configured CFR for broadcast by new SIBx instead of SIB1, considering limited SIB1 TBS which is 2976 bits.  Moreover, CFR for MCCH and CFR for MTCH can be configured with different cases. For example, CFR for MCCH is configured with Case B while CFR for MTCH is configured with Case C or E. We want to further discuss whether separate CFR configurations for MCCH and MTCH can be supported. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.1-1:** Support.  **Proposal 2.1-2**: Support.  **Proposal 2.1-3**: Support. |
| OPPO | **P 2.1.2 rev3:**  For the first FFS, from my observation, the updated wording is related with the deleted FFS in proposal 2.1-3rev1. I would prefer not keeping it in the first FFS.  OK with the second the FFS, and thanks David for the great effort!  Also OK with the other 2 updated proposals. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with updated proposals. We do not support Case E since we do not see much need to support larger CFR than the initial BWP configured by SIB1 for idle UEs. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with updated proposals. |
| CMCC | We support three proposals.  We don’t support Case E, with the same concern mentioned in the email reflector.  When UEs goes into RRC\_CONNECTED mode, if additional UE-specific BWP is not configured by RRC dedicated signalling, the initial DL BWP configured by SIB1 is the active BWP. But for Case E, assuming ‘MBS configured BWP’ can be configured by such as SIBx, does it means UE support two BWPs simultaneously,? i.e., one is initial DL BWP and the another one is BWP with an CFR associated on it. Or UE can only work on one BWP, but how gNB knows which BWP the RRC\_CONNECTED UEs work on?  Although vivo gave some answer which gNB can depend on “MBS interest indication’ to differentiate some CONN UEs work on initial DL BWP configured by SIB1, some CONN UEs work on MBS configured BWP. But we think the “MBS interest indication’ is an optional feature, whether UE reports it to gNB is up to UE’s implementation, that is the vivo’s method cannot work.  But for Case C, it has no problem, because whatever UE reports “MBS interest indication’ or not, the active BWP is the initial BWP, there is no ambiguity.  The intention of discussing Case C and Case E is to configure a larger BW than CORESET0, since Case E has some drawbacks, supporting Case C is enough.  As some companies mentioned there is restricting of Case C or we should not couple initial BWP and Case C, we don’t think they are any technical errors compared with the drawbacks of Case E. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for the discussion at the GTW. Given the discussion I propose the following revisions.   * That **we revise proposal 2.1-2** to simplify and clearly agree to case C while leaving the support of Case D and/or E as FFS. I believe this is the intention so we can simplify the text.   + The text that the CFR is larger than coreset#0 is removed from the main bullet.   + The FFS detailing signalling options is removed, however, a new proposal is created, see below. * A **new proposal 2.1-2a is created** that lists of alternatives for down selection for the configuration for Case C. I believe the list of alternatives is also more clearly worded than in the previous proposal under the FFS. This proposal would also help progress in the next meeting than with the previous proposal since this list reflects better the discussion so far, including the email discussion.   For proposal 2.1-3, there have not been much comments, please confirm this is fine.  Proposal 2.1-1 is under consideration for email approval before quiet period.  **Proposal 2.1-2rev5:** At least support Case-C for a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.   * ~~FFS: whether signalling to enable Case-C~~~~is included/extended as part of SIB1 or other SIB, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, whether CFR configuration for MTCH can be provided by MCCH (e.g. if different CFR configuration is needed for MTCH), or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling.~~ * FFS: support of Case D and/or Case E.   **(NEW)Proposal 2.1-2a:** for signaling to enable Case-C as configured/defined CFR for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, further study and down select one of following alternatives:   * Alt 1: As for the legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED state, Rel-17 MBS capable UEs can use the initial BWP configured by SIB-1 as initial BWP. * Alt 2: add additional parameters for Rel-17 MBS capable UEs only, to create a new initial BWP with the same frequency range as the frequency rage of the initial BWP configured by SIB-1. * Alt 3: use a configured BWP and in that configured BWP configure the frequency range equal to the frequency range of the initial BWP configured by SIB-1. * FFS: it is up to RAN2 whether the configuration of Alt 2 and Alt 3 is in SIB1, SIB-x, MBS-specific SIB, or MCCH for MTCH.   **Proposal 2.1-3rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   * ~~FFS: use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.~~ |

### **[H] 5th round FL proposals for Issue 1**

**Proposal 2.1-1rev1[stable]:** No specification support in Rel-17 for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with configured/defined CFRs for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case B)

**Proposal 2.1-2rev4:** At least support Case-C for a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.

* ~~FFS: whether signalling to enable Case-C~~~~is included/extended as part of SIB1 or other SIB, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, whether CFR configuration for MTCH can be provided by MCCH (e.g. if different CFR configuration is needed for MTCH), or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling.~~
* FFS: support of Case D and/or Case E.

**(NEW)Proposal 2.1-2a:** for signaling to enable Case-C as configured/defined CFR for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, further study and down select one of following alternatives:

* Alt 1: As for the legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED state, Rel-17 MBS capable UEs can use the initial BWP configured by SIB-1 as initial BWP.
* Alt 2: add additional parameters for Rel-17 MBS capable UEs only, to create a new initial BWP with the same frequency range as the frequency rage of the initial BWP configured by SIB-1.
* Alt 3: use a configured BWP and in that configured BWP configure the frequency range equal to the frequency range of the initial BWP configured by SIB-1.
* FFS: it is up to RAN2 whether the configuration of Alt 2 and Alt 3 is in SIB1, SIB-x, MBS-specific SIB, or MCCH for MTCH.

**Proposal 2.1-3rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.1-1rev1: OK  Proposal 2.1-2rev4: We prefer to support Case D as well. If Case C is only supported, Starting PRB and the number of PRBs are not necessary to be indicated as in Proposal 2.3-1rev2.  (NEW)Proposal 2.1-2a: Alt 1. RAN1 needs to decide whether there is a new BWP for MBS or not clearly. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.1-1rev1: has been agreed in RAN1.  Proposal 2.1-2rev4: We are Ok with the proposal.  (NEW)Proposal 2.1-2a: We are OK to further study the listed alternatives. Some suggestions are listed below for reference:   1. For Alt 1, it could be better to add “Rel-17 non-MBS UE” to “As for the legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs and Rel-17 non-MBS UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED state. 2. For Alt 3, we suggest to add one note: BWP switching between the configured BWP and the initial DL BWP is not desired.   Proposal 2.1-3rev1: OK. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Regarding **Proposal 2.1-2rev4**, based on the latest email discussion, we prefer the following:   * **Support all Case-C/D/E** for a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.   Furthermore, regarding **(NEW)Proposal 2.1-2a**, as discussed via email by many companies, configuration of **Case C can be the common configuration method as Case D and Case E**. And the SIBx/MBS-specific SIB is preferred way to going forward for all Case C/D/E, and clearly the impact to legacy UEs should be largely avoided, i.e. via SIB1.  Regarding **Proposal 2.1-3rev1**, we prefer to keep the red-font FFS part. If Case-C is going to be agreed in this meeting, the red-font FFS part is an important aspect we need to discuss.  **Proposal 2.1-3rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.  FFS: use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH. |
| OPPO | **Proposal 2.1-1rev1:** Approved as a conclusion.  **Proposal 2.1-2rev4:** OK with the proposal rev4 (only with a minor change highlighted as below)   * Whether MCCH and MTCH can use different CFR is not determined, and using same CFR for MCCH and MTCH are the baseline that should be first determined. It can also be aligned with Proposal 2.1-3rev1   **Proposal 2.1-2rev4:** At least support Case-C for a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and ~~or~~ MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.   * ~~FFS: whether signalling to enable Case-C~~~~is included/extended as part of SIB1 or other SIB, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, whether CFR configuration for MTCH can be provided by MCCH (e.g. if different CFR configuration is needed for MTCH), or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling.~~ * FFS: support of Case D and/or Case E.   **(NEW)Proposal 2.1-2a:** We support the intention that FFS the configuration signalling.  The current wordings in the alternatives seems a little unclear. The main bullet is about configured/defined CFR, and the alternatives are about configurations for initial BWP. Is the initial BWP in the alternatives can be used as the CFR, or different configured frequency range corresponding to initial BWP can be used for CFR?  **Proposal 2.1-3rev1**: OK. |
| ZTE | Regarding Proposal 2.1-2rev4 and (NEW)Proposal 2.1-2a, this issue has been extensively discussed. We share similar view with Nokia that Case C/D/E can be supported. Case C is just one specific case of Case E and the spec impact of Case C and Case E are similar.  For progress, we suggest the following two methods,  Method 1: The same proposal as Nokia   * **Support all Case-C/D/E** for a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state.   Method 2: Support Case C + support Alt.2 in (NEW)Proposal 2.1-2a and FFS case E  This can avoid impacting the legacy UEs in the serving cell. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.1-2rev4**: Support. We also support Case D and Case E.  **Proposal 2.1-2a**: Support  **Proposal 2.1-3rev1**: Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **2.1-2rev4: support**  **(NEW)Proposal 2.1-2a: I wonder whether we really need to down-select between Alt 1 and Alt 2 or they can be both supported. For example, depending on whether the parameters as introduced in Alt 2 is configured, Rel-17 MBS capable UEs either use the initial BWP configured by SIB-1 as initial BWP or the new initial BWP with the same frequency range as the frequency rage of the initial BWP configured by SIB-1.**  **2.1-3rev1: important to keep FFS. Since we are going to have CORESET0 or initial BWP for MCCH/MTCH, UE is motivated to monitor MCCH and MTCH with different CFR configurations because MTCH usually requires larger bandwidth.** |
| Apple | **Proposal 2.1-2rev4**: Support. We support Case D and Case E as well.  **Proposal 2.1-2a**: for Case C, or especially for Case D and Case E, the point is we need to configure a BWP for IDLE/INACTIVE UE to assign frequency region for a CFR, then the CFR can be configured the same size as or larger than Initial BWP is just gNB configuration issue, according to the configured size of BWP. The CFR can be configured the same size of BWP or smaller than the configured BWP.   * **Alt3:** Alt 3: use a configured BWP and in that configured BWP configure the frequency range equal to or larger than the frequency range of the initial BWP configured by SIB-1.   **Proposal 2.1-3rev1**: Support |
| CMCC | **2.1-2rev4：Support**  **(NEW)Proposal 2.1-2a:** Same concern as OPPO, we don’t know why all the alternatives are about initial BWP but not CFR?  First, we want to clarify what initial DL BWP means, from our understanding, all Rel-15/16 behaviours, e.g., SI, Paing and RAR are applied on initial DL BWP. For Rel-17 broadcast CFR, UE only needs to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCG for MCCH/MTCH. Therefore, we think for Rel-17 UE, the initial BWP are still CORESET0, but CFR equals to SIB1-configured initial BWP.  We add a alt 4 as the following,   * Alt 4: add additional parameters for Rel-17 MBS capable UEs only, to create a CFR  ~~new initial BWP~~ with the same frequency range as the frequency rage of the initial BWP configured by SIB-1, but for Rel-17 MBS capable UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACIVE states the initial BWP still equals to CORESET0.   **2.1-3rev1: support** |
| vivo | **Proposal 2.1-2rev4:**  We share similar view as Nokia, ZTE, Docomo, and Apple to further support case D and case E, with potential issues extensively discussed last week.  **Proposal 2.1-2a:**  we understand the intention here, however, before touching the signaling to enable Case C in detail, can we make clear whether a new initial BWP in alt 2 has different frequency range with the SIB-1 configured initial BWP defined in R15/R16, in other words, there will be two initial BWPs, one is associated with CFR in idle/inactive, the other one is not. An illustrative figure is given below.    **Proposal 2.1-3rev1: we prefer to keep the FFS to provide the flexibility** |
| CATT | **OK with these three proposals.** |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.1-2rev4:** Support the updated version  **(NEW)Proposal 2.1-2a:** we are fine with the discussion direction. We also are confused about the wording in the main-bullet and sub-bullet, there seems on relationship between CFR and initial BWP. It is better to reword the association b/w initial BWP and CFR.  **Proposal 2.1-3rev1**: we are fine with the updated version. |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 2.1-2rev4:**  We understand the **“**At least support Case-C” to mean that the CFR for Idle/Inactive UEs may have identical frequency resources to the Initial BWP configured by SIB1. In legacy (and we assume also for Rel-17 MBS UEs) the latter is configured for RRC Connected UEs, i.e. the initial BWP for Idle/Inactive UEs would remain to be CORSET#0 (as in legacy) in parallel to an MBS CFR that is larger. With that understanding we agree that this should be supported.  We believe however that this Case C is a very special case and that more flexible cases need to be supported in addition. It is therefore a bit strange to agree on this special case first without addressing the wider picture.  **Proposal 2.1-2a:** We disagree to have a downselection of signaling methods for Case C before addressing which of CaseD/E should also be supported.  If e.g. Case D and/or E are also supported this will require a way of configuring the CFR that is independent of the legacy signaling of SIB1-configured Initial BWP. With such a generic method in place this could then be used for all C/D/E configurations, i.e. including Case C.  However, If Case D/E are not agreed and the RAN1 solution is limited to Case A & C, then it would instead make sense to reuse the legacy SIB1 signaling for the Initial BWP to also apply for the CFR, since they are then – by the definition of Case C – the same, so there is then no reason to transmit this again separately – it would be redundant information!  The choice of signaling solution would therefore depend on which of the Cases C/D/E are agreed. We therefore think this needs to be determined first. The signaling method can then follow from that.  Regarding the three Alternatives, we think they all require some clarification. Below we suggest some modifications to make them more understandable.  *Alt 1: ~~As for the legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED state,~~ Rel-17 MBS capable UEs can use a configured CFR in all RRC states that is identical to the initial BWP configured by SIB-1 ~~as initial BWP~~.*  Comment: In legacy, the SIB1-configured initial BWP applies only for RRC Connected UEs, but here we are addressing primarily Idle/Inactive UEs, which in this case do not have the same initial BWP as RRC Connected UEs. In legacy RRC Idle/Inactive UEs have CORSET#0 Initial BWP and we assume this will continue to be the case also with Rel.17 UEs (MBS supporting or not).   * *Alt 2: add additional parameters for Rel-17 MBS capable UEs only, to create a ~~new~~ ~~initial BWP~~ configured CFR with the same frequency range as the frequency rage of the initial BWP configured by SIB-1.*   Comment: Why would Rel-17 MBS capable UEs need to have a new Initial BWP? If the legacy signaling of SIB1-configured initial BWP is reused to configure the Case C CFR then this would not imply any new Initial BWP. The existing SIB1 fields would simply be reused (re-interpreted) as applying also as a CFR for Idle/Inactive UEs (and for RRC Connected UEs as well).   * *Alt 3: use a configured BWP ~~and in that configured BWP configure the~~ with a frequency range equal to the frequency range of the initial BWP configured by SIB-1.*   FFS: it is up to RAN2 whether the configuration of Alt 2 and Alt 3 is in SIB1, SIB-x, MBS-specific SIB, or MCCH for MTCH  Comment: OK to let RAN2 decide about the way of configuration.  **Proposal 2.1-3rev1:**  Support  \*\*\*  Since most companies seem to be in favor of supporting a more flexible solution than just Case C (which would tie the CFR to the SIB1-configured Initial BWP) we suggest trying with the following new Proposals, which aim at addressing independently   * the situation for Idle/Inactive UEs (for which the SIB1-configured initial BWP and active BWP of RRC Connected UEs are not of any concern) * the situation for RRC Connected UEs for which the active BWP, the initial BWP and the CFR may all be different (similar to the multicast case). * The signaling to enable this.   (New) **Proposal1: S**upport a configured/defined CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state that could have any size larger than CORSET#0 up to the carrier bandwidth.  [Comment: For UEs in Idle/Inactive this should not be any issue, e.g. for use cases where broadcast only targets Idle/Inactive UEs.]  (New) **Proposal2:** For reception by RRC Connected UEs, the CFR needs to be contained within the active BWP.   * When the active BWP is identical to the initial BWP configured by SIB1, the CFR needs to be contained within the initial BWP (Case D)   + As a special case the CFR may be identical to the initial BWP configured by SIB1 (Case C) * When the active BWP is different from the initial BWP configured by SIB1, the CFR does not need to be contained within the initial BWP (Case E) * (New) **Proposal3:** Further study signaling to allow for CFR configuration supporting Cases C/D/E. * FFS: Whether this requires RAN1 and or RAN2 work |
| Moderator | **Proposal 2.1-1rev1** was agreed by email before the quiet period on 20 August.  Conclusion:  There is no specification support in Rel-17 for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with configured/defined CFRs for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case B).  Regarding Proposal 2.1-3: based on all rounds of discussion, the main bullet of the proposal is stable. Multiple companies prefer to keep the FFS so my proposal is to keep it to allow companies to come back to other meetings. I think this proposal is otherwise stable. I am therefore reverting to the original version of the proposal. Hence, I am going to put it for potential email approval by the second checkpoint on the 24 August.  Regarding proposal 2.1-2 and 2.1-2a, there has been a lot of discussion as well as detailed analysis from companies, including the last contribution from Ericsson. Before, we update the proposals I would like to check whether companies that have not been supporting Case D and/or Case E have updated their view based on the discussion.  Based on my understanding   * the following companies did not support case D   + [Qualcomm, Intel] * The following companies did not support case E   + [Samsung, Huawei, CATT, CMCC, MediaTek, Intel]   I would therefore like to ask [**Qualcomm, Intel, Huawei, CATT, CMCC, MediaTek**] to share their views on the support of Case D and/or Case E and their concerns. (If I missed any company that has concerns with case D and/ or Case E, apologies and do please share your view asap.)  **Proposal 2.1-3[agreeable]**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   * FFS: use of different bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH~~.~~ |

### **[H] 6th round FL proposals for Issue 1**

**FL comments**:

Regarding proposal 2.1-2 and 2.1-2a, there has been a lot of discussion as well as detailed analysis from companies, including the last contribution from Ericsson. Before, we update the proposals I would like to check whether companies that have not been supporting Case D and/or Case E have updated their view based on the discussion.

Based on my understanding

* the following companies did not support case D
  + [Qualcomm, Intel]
* The following companies did not support case E
  + [Samsung, Huawei, CATT, CMCC, MediaTek, Intel]

I would therefore like to ask [**Qualcomm, Intel, Huawei, CATT, CMCC, MediaTek**] to share their views on the support of Case D and/or Case E based on the discussion and their concerns if any. (If I missed any company that has concerns with case D and/ or Case E, apologies and do please share your view asap.)

**Proposal 2.1-3[agreeable]**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Qualcomm | We support Case C and Case E. It’s ok to support Case D1 but not general Case D, where CFR is smaller than SIB1-configured initial BWP but larger than CORESET#0. For progress, we can accept proposal **2.1-2rev4** for now and further study the alternatives**2.1-2a** taking into account of Case C, D1 and E.  For IDLE/INACTIVE MBS UEs, any CFR with BW size larger than CORESET#0 (Case C, D1 and E) requires a new CFR/BWP. Remember SIB-1 configured initial BWP is optionally configured for CONN UEs to receive SIB/paging/unicast, no need to bundle the CFR/BWP for MBS with it.   * For IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, the MBS UE camp on the CFR/BWP confining CORESET#0 to receive broadcast and SIB/paging without BWP switching.   For CONN MBS UEs, the same CFR/BWP can be used, and the **first active BWP** (configured by SIB not by unicast RRC for MBS UEs) can be defined as either SIB1-configured initial BWP or the new CFR/BWP whoever with a larger BW size, so that the MBS UEs can receive broadcast and SIB/paging/unicast without BWP switching. |
| Intel | We are ok to accept Proposal 2.1-2rev4.  For Proposal 2.1-2a, we are not sure what Alt. 3 means i.e., why should we configure a separate BWP which has the same frequency range as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP. We also think that Alt1 and Alt2 can co-exist depending on the need to configure larger initial BWP or not, with the understanding that in Atl.2 the new initial BWP replaces the SIB1 configured (smaller) initial BWP and does not imply 2 BWPs.  From our perspective, we do not support the implementation of Case E as discussed. We think that if a CFR larger than SIB1 configured initial BWP is desired for MBS-capable UEs, it is reasonable to increase the initial BWP of such UEs. This would ensure that such UEs can continue to receive the broadcast CFR (analogous to Case E) when they transition to CONNECTED mode and the initial BWP becomes the active BWP. Since these UEs are receiving broadcast already with a larger BW than that of the SIB1 configured initial BWP, we do not see any need for their initial BWP to be smaller than CFR when transitioning to CONNECTED mode.  For Case C (or any case with CFR larger than CORESET#0), we think the CFR and/or initial BWP should contain the frequency resources of CORESET#0.  We still do not see the need for Case D. We think that any CFR smaller than CORESET#0 or initial BWP can be the same size of the initial BWP and FDRA can handle scheduling. We do not think a smaller CFR should be mandated. |

## Issue 2: Number of MBS Common Frequency Resources

### **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, define/configure common frequency resource(s) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.   * the UE may assume the initial BWP as the default common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, if a specific common frequency resource is not configured. * FFS: the relation of the common frequency resource(s) (if configured) and initial BWP. * FFS: whether to configure one/more common frequency resources * FFS: configuration and definition details of the common frequency resource   Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, one common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be defined/configured.   * FFS: whether to define/configure more than one common frequency resources |

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

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

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2106625, vivo]
  + Proposal 2: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, more than one common frequency resource can be defined/configured.
* In [R1-2106664, Nokia]
  + Proposal-4: Support more than one CFRs, with separate CFR for MCCH and MTCH, respectively.
  + Proposal-5: Considering having multiple CFRs is 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.
* In [R1-2106747 , ZTE]
  + Observation 5: It is beneficial for power saving by supporting more than one CFR.
  + Observation 6: It is beneficial for MBS service expansion by supporting more than one CFR.
  + Observation 7: It is particularly important for redcap UE to support multiple CFRs, which means that more MBS services can be received.
  + Proposal 4: More than one CFR is supported for MTCH for Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states.
* In [R1-2106914, Samsung]
  + *Discuss*: Regarding the number of CFRs, suggestions for configuring more than one CFRs were made in order to support Ues with different BW capabilities (i.e. RedCap Ues). However, regardless of any possible reason to do so, that is not in scope of the WID and would further complicate the overall design as support for RedCap Ues would require support for additional specifications in order to be functional (e.g. to address differences in coverage due to 1 Rx antenna).
  + Observation 1: One CFR is sufficient for Rel-17 MBS.
* In [R1-2106947, CATT]
  + Proposal 5: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, multiple CFRs for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH are not supported.
* In [R1-2107095, Futurewei]
  + Proposal 3: For Idle/Inactive Ues, only one common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH can be defined/configured.
* In [R1-2107162, Lenovo]
  + Proposal 3: Only one common frequency resource is configured within the initial DL BWP for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues.
* In [R1-2107427, CMCC]
  + Proposal 3. For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, only support one CFR.
* In [R1- 2107458, LGE]
  + Proposal 1: From idle/inactive UE perspective, one CFR is associated to the initial DL BWP of UE’s serving cell for REL-17.
* In [R1-2107516, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 4: Not support more than one CFR for UE supporting MBS in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE states.
* In [R1-2107613, Intel]
  + Proposal 2: Only one common frequency resource may be configured for MBS reception for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE mode Ues.

### **FL Assessment**

This issue was not discussed at RAN1#105-e.

From the inputs to this meeting, [vivo, Nokia, ZTE] support more than one CFR at least for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH while [Samsung, CATT, Futurewei, Lenovo, CMCC, LGE, MediaTek, Intel] explicitly do not support more than one CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCCH/MTCH. [ZTE] describes the potential benefits of multiple CFRs in terms of power saving, service expansion and support of RedCap Ues. On the other hand, [Samsung] highlights that support of RedCap Ues is not in the scope of the WI. Some companies also express that a single CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCCH/MTCH also aligns with the agreements for multicast reception in RRC connected UE states AI.

Although some companies see a benefit on supporting more than one CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCCH/MTCH there is significant opposition from multiple companies. Based on this, the FL will make a proposal to deprioritise more than one CFR for Rel-17.

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

**Proposal 2.2-1**: No specification support in Rel-17 for more than one CFR for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Try to check my understanding of **Proposal 2.2-1**, does this mean the CFR of MCCH and MTCH always have to be configured to be the same? For example, the MCCH CFR associated with CORESET#0 and MTCH CFR associated with Initial BWP is NOT supported by Proposal 2.2-1? If it is the case, then we are not fine with Proposal 2.2-1. |
| Qualcomm | Not support  Also prefer to defer this discussion after clarifying what is the parameters included in a CFR for broadcast MCCH/MTCH in 2.3.4.  Our understanding is that the pdsch/pdcch parameters in MCCH CFR and MTCH CFR can be different, which means different CFRs are supported. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support.  Our understanding is if more than one common frequency resource is required, these common frequency resources should be confined within the initial DL BWP. In that sense, more straightforward solution is to configure a larger frequency resource to cover the multiple separate common frequency resources. Hence, one common frequency resource is enough for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH reception. |
| Vivo | We are not fine with Proposal 2.2-1.  Regarding to a variety of MBS broadcast services, supporting more than one CFR is definitely beneficial for UE power saving by switching RF to only the bandwidth accommodating the interested services. Furthermore, switching among multiple CFRs can be up to UE’s implementation and spec effort is not needed for CFR switching. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | From gNB side, we think only one CFR is enough. But for an MBS sesson with delivery mode 2, if the CFR is too big, the CFR for the MBS session can be a portion of the CFR. For example, the CFR is far greater than the initial DL BWP, the MBS sessions of voice type are scheduled with SPS GC-PDSCH and the SPS GC-PDSCHs of voice type are confined within a portion of the CFR. The portion of the CFR can be indicated as the CFR for these SPS GC-PDSCHs to save the power in UE as much as possible. |
| CATT | Support.  The benefit is not clear with multiple MBS CFR configurations. When more than one CFR are configured, how many CFRs can be active at a certain time is a potential issue. And more effort and specification works are need to handle the issue. Thus, a wider CFR with a number of contiguous PRBs, rather than multiple CFRs, is more feasible and beneficial in initial BWP when wide band is required. |
| CMCC | Support  The motivation to support multiple CFRs is not clear. In addition, how to switch between different CFRs need to be studied because DCI format 1\_0 cannot be used for BWP/CFR switching. |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.2-1: Support.  The motivation/benefit is not quite match with the description/requirements for Rel-17 MBS services for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state. Regardless of the multiple various services, it is broadcast which is facing to all kinds of Ues. We do not think it realistic to configure so many CFRs for IDLE Ues.  One more question for clarification: If multiple CFRs are configured, is switching between different CFRs needed or not? |
| ZTE | Proposal 2.1-3 has a FFS on whether to support different CFR for MCCH and MTCH. If the FFS is confirmed, then UE will directly supports at least two CFRs, one for MCCH and another for MTCH. It is conflicting with the above Proposal 2.2.-1. Thus, we would suggest to address the FFS in Proposal 2.1-3 first and come back to this later.  From our side, we support to have more than one CFR at least for MTCH. If multiple MBS services are configured, UE needs to support a large CFR to cover all the MBS service if only one CFR is allowed, which may not be feasible for some UEs. However, if multiple CFRs can be configured, this issue can be addressed. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We don’t think we have the same understanding of the definition of CFR. When CFR for MCCH and CFR for MTCH have the same frequency resources but different PDCCH/PDSCH configurations, are they considered the same CFR or different CFRs? We need to align our understanding. |
| Ericsson | P2.2-1: Support.  We think this should apply also to Ues in RRC Connected, but this may be a topic for the Group scheduling agenda point. |
| Apple | We support this proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support. One CFR is sufficient for MBS reception. |
| Huawei, HiSiicon | This proposal is also affected by the proposals in section 2.1. If case C is supported for MTCH but not supported for MCCH, UE needs to support two different CFRs for MCCH and MTCH respectively. |
| Moderator | Thank you for comments. I have reformulated the proposal below, please check.  @Nokia, Qualcomm, Huawei: I think the proposal was ambiguous, so it has been reformulated. The intention is that for MTCH multiple CFRs cannot be configured (and the same for MCCH).  @vivo: thanks for comments. I have reformulated the proposals. I would like to check whether with the adequate understanding companies are still objecting to this.  @Chengdu TD tech: thanks for comments. Related to discussion in Issue 1, please see for example that for Case C under consideration the following note would apply (we had the same note for the agreement of Case A): “*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.*”  @NTT DOCOMO: thanks for the comment and very good point. I have reformulated the wording of the proposal so it is hopefully clearer. Hopefully together with discussion in Issue 3 we will improve common understanding.  **Proposal 2.2-1rev1**: No specification support in Rel-17 for multiple ~~more than one~~ CFRs with the same/different bandwidth configurations for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH~~/MTCH~~ for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.  **(new)Proposal 2.2-2**: No specification support in Rel-17 for multiple CFRs with the same/different bandwidth configurations for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state. |

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

**Proposal 2.2-1rev1**: No specification support in Rel-17 for multiple ~~more than one~~ CFRs with the same/different bandwidth configurations for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH~~/MTCH~~ for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.

**(new)Proposal 2.2-2**: No specification support in Rel-17 for multiple CFRs with the same/different bandwidth configurations for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | To our view, single CFR for MCCH is enough but practically there may need to have multiple CFRs for MTCH, which corresponds to different MBS services with different traffic types. Thus, we support **Proposal 2.2-1rev1,** but do NOT support **(new)Proposal 2.2-2** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support both proposals. |
| LG | Proposal 2.2-1rev1: We are fine with this proposal for MCCH.  (new)Proposal 2.2-2: We are fine with this proposal for broadcast MTCH.  Note that it seems beneficial for UE to support up to 2 CFRs. For example, idle/inactive Ues could support up to 2 CFRs, one for MCCH and one for broadcast MTCH, considering that the network may want to serve a large amount of MTCH data transmissions without collision with paging, system information and initial access which are normally prioritized and connected Ues can receive broadcast MTCH in UE’s active BWP other than initial BWP. In addition, connected Ues could support up to 2 CFRs, possibly one for broadcast MTCH and one for multicast MTCH when one CFR in UE active BWP cannot support broadcast MTCH. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | **No comment** |
| Intel | We would prefer for both the proposals to be worded to simply state that in Rel-17 NR MBS only one CFR is supported.  Additionally, we need to agree if one CFR each for MCCH and MTCH are separately supported. If we can agree on this, additional discussion would be much clearer. |
| ZTE | Ok with Proposal 2.2-1rev1.  Regarding Proposal 2.2-2, we see the benefits of supporting more than one CFR for UE to support different MBS services with different bandwidth requirement. But if majority companies prefer to have only one CFR for MTCH, we won’t object it. Maybe we can consider more than one CFR in Rel-18 MBS. |
| Samsung | Support the proposals. |
| MediaTek | We are generally fine with the two proposals. In additional, we prefer that one CFR is sufficient for MCCH and MTCH, and no need to configure the separate CFR for both. |
| Qualcomm | We think up to 2 CFRs can be supported, which allows  - CFR1 for MCCH and CFR2 for MTCH  - or CFR1 for MCCH and MTCH1 (e.g., broadcast with low data rate); CFR2 for MTCH2 (e.g., broadcast with higher data rate)  One CFR for MCCH is enough, so Proposal 2.2-1rev1 is ok but FFS Proposal 2.2-2rev1. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with the proposals. |
| OPPO | Support both proposals.  [OPPO2]  We share the similar view with Intel that a simpler statement can be used to avoid any ambiguous. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.2-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.2-2**: Support. Even when there are multiple broadcast services, a single CFR can transmit multiple services. If CFRs are separated for each service, a UE receiving multiple services needs to receive multiple CFRs, it would complicate UE processing. |
| CATT | OK with this two proposals. |
| Vivo | Not support (new)Proposal 2.2-2  We support multiple CFRs at least for MTCH for power saving purpose. As shown in the figure below, if several CFRs are defined and only a subset of MBS services are transmitted on each CFR, UE can perform RF tuning to one unique CFR depending on its interested services. But if only one CFR is supported, UE has to always perform RF tuning to a large bandwidth no matter its interested services, which causes poor energy efficiency.    @ Docomo, for case of multiple CFRs, a UE receiving multiple services can use a large CFR instead of receiving multiple CFRs |
| CMCC | Support two proposals. |
| Ericsson | P2.2-1rev1: Support  (new)Proposal 2.2-2: Support |
| Convida | Proposal 2.2-1rev1: OK with the proposal.  (new)Proposal 2.2-2: We also think there might be cases that supporting multiple CFRs for MTCH is beneficial. |
| Samsung | Support |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Our comments:   1. Several CFRs are configured.   We understand the concerns by ZTE and VIVO. They suggest to configure several CFRs with each CFR for one MBS type to save the power in UE. We think it’s feasible method.   1. One CFR in gNB side but the bandwidth for receiving an MBS session can be a portion of the CFR.   If many companies suggest one CFR just for simplifying the NR MBS design, we think it’s also feasible to only configure one CFR from gNB side. But how to use the unique CFR by gNB is worth more discussion.  gNB can divide the entire bandwidth of the CRF into several sub-CFRs with each sub-CFR for one MBS type. For the n-th MBS type, gNB can schedule each MBS session of the n-th MBS type within the n-th sub-CFR. Of course, if there’s no enough resource in the n-th sub-CFR, gNB can use the resource in another sub-CFR. Such scheduling method is a feasible and widely used scheduling method just as the method to schedule different unicast service types on different BWPs in NR.  If an MBS session of the n-th MBS type only uses the resource in the n-th sub-CFR, the bandwidth for receiving the MBS session of the n-th MBS type can be the n-th sub-CFR. Such processing can save the UE power.  If UE wants to receive several MBS sessions of different MBS types, UE can work on the combined bandwidth of the associated sub-CFRs where each sub-CFR is associated with one MBS session received by UE.  Under the worst scenario, UE works on the entire bandwidth of the CFR to receive several MBS sessions of different MBS types.  If only one CFR is configured, we think the proposal can be updated as below for the further discussion on how to use the CFR in gNB for saving the power of UE receiving at least one MBS session.  **(new)Proposal 2.2-2**: No specification support in Rel-17 for multiple CFRs with the same/different bandwidth configurations for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.  FFS: how to use the CFR for saving the power of UE receiving an MBS session |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | These two proposals look fine with the common understanding clarified that one small CFR for MCCH and one larger CFR for MTCH is supported in specification. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for comments. **All, please check** rewording specially for MCCH. Please note that for MCCH only one CFR could be configured. However, this would also mean that we could not have multiple CFRs for MCCH all with the same BW configuration but with different pdcch and pdsch configurations. I think most of companies have been focusing on the BW configuration aspect, but I would like to check. I have also revised Proposal 2.2-2 to limit multiple CFR with different BWP configurations.  @Nokia, LG, ZTE, TD Tech, vivo, Convida: I have changed Proposal 2.2-2 to study.  @LG, Huawei: please check my understanding is correct. What we are discussing here in this issue is whether we can have for MTCH multiple CFRs where the parameter that configures the frequency range is the same or different. The same for MCCH. Let’s assume for a moment that we conclude that multiple CFRs with different/same bandwidths configurations is not supported. Therefore, we could only have one BW configuration for the CFR of MCCH and one BW configuration for the CFR of MTCH. Whether the BWs configuration for MCCH and MTCH need to be the same or different is still under discussion at Issue 1. Does this makes sense?  @Intel, OPPO: please note the rewording – thanks. Intel, could you also elaborate more on what you mean by “*Additionally, we need to agree if one CFR each for MCCH and MTCH are separately supported. If we can agree on this, additional discussion would be much clearer*.” do you refer to BW configurations, or other parameters?  @Qualcomm: please see comment to all above and FFS for the second proposal.  @TD Tech: thanks for the detail explanation. Please note that proposal 2.2-2 has been changed to study so multiple CFR with different BW configurations could be studied. I do not think therefore, that we need to include explicitly the motivation of power saving – thanks.  **Proposal 2.2-1rev2**: Only one ~~No specification support in Rel-17 for multiple~~ CFRs can be configured ~~with the same/different bandwidth configurations~~ for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: ~~No specification support in Rel-17 for~~ Study multiple CFRs with the ~~same/~~different bandwidth configurations for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state. |

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

**Proposal 2.2-1rev2**: Only one ~~No specification support in Rel-17 for multiple~~ CFRs can be configured ~~with the same/different bandwidth configurations~~ for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.

**Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: ~~No specification support in Rel-17 for~~ Study multiple CFRs with the ~~same/~~different bandwidth configurations for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | OK |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.2-1rev2**: Agree. Maybe one type in “CFRs” where “s” needs to be deleted.  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: When multiple CFRs are configured for a UE, does it imply multiple DCI payload size for the UE to perform blind detection? |
| NOKIA/NSB | We support the two proposals. |
| OPPO | The updated two proposals go little beyond the original intention of the proposal in the first round of discussion.  The intention/baseline is to support one configured/defined CFR for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and MTCH for UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state. Based on the discussion and updated proposals, we think the following 2 alternatives can reflect the intention:  **Alt 1:** (1st round proposal)  **Proposal 2.2-1**: No specification support in Rel-17 for more than one CFR for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.  **Alt 2:** (updated based on 1st round proposal)  ~~No specification support I~~ In Rel-17 ~~for more than~~ one CFR is configured/defined for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.2-1rev2**: Support  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: Support |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.2-1rev2**: Agree.  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: Not support, have concern on different DCI sizes associated with different CFRs,. |
| vivo | We support both proposals |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.2-1rev2**: Support  **Proposal 2.2-2rev1**: Not Support |
| MediaTek | We are fine with the two proposals. |
| Qualcomm | ok |

## Issue 3: Definition and parameters of the CFR [closed]

### **Background**

At RAN1#105-e, as part of the discussion on *MBS Common Frequency Resource for MCCH channel*, it was highlighted that different companies may have different interpretations of what a defined/configured CFR entails.

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

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, define/configure common frequency resource(s) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.   * the UE may assume the initial BWP as the default common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, if a specific common frequency resource is not configured. * FFS: the relation of the common frequency resource(s) (if configured) and initial BWP. * FFS: whether to configure one/more common frequency resources * FFS: configuration and definition details of the common frequency resource   Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, further study the following cases of a configured/defined specific common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, and identify which case(s) will be supported:   * [Case E] the case where a CFR is defined based on a configured BWP.   + In particular, study the following:     - whether a configured BWP for MBS is needed or not.     - whether BWP switching is needed or not.   + In this study, the configured BWP has the following properties:     - The configured BWP is different than the initial BWP where the frequency resources of this initial BWP are configured smaller than the full carrier bandwidth.     - The CFR has the frequency resources identical to the configured BWP.     - The configured BWP needs to fully contain the initial BWP in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + Note: The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth * the case where the initial BWP fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain.   + In this study the following sub-cases are considered:     - [Case B] A CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.     - [Case D] A CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + In particular, study the following:     - Whether the considered two options with a CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP are needed or not for MBS. * the case where the initial BWP has same size as the CFR in the frequency domain.   + In this study the following two sub-cases are considered:     - [Case A] A CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0. In this case the CFR has the same frequency resources and same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.     - [Case C] A CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the same frequency resources and same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.   + In particular, study the following:     - Whether the considered two options with a CFR with the same size as the initial BWP are needed or not for MBS.   Agreement:  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues can use a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case A), to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.   * Note: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.   Agreement:  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues can use a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case A), to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   * Note: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling. |

The following agreement for multicast reception with RRC\_CONNECTED Ues is relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  From RAN1 perspective, the CFR (common frequency resource) for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs, which is confined within the frequency resource of a dedicated unicast BWP and using the same numerology (SCS and CP), includes the following configurations:   * Starting PRB and the number of PRBs * One PDSCH-config for MBS (i.e., separate from the PDSCH-Config of the dedicated unicast BWP) * One PDCCH-config for MBS (i.e., separate from the PDCCH-Config of the dedicated unicast BWP) * SPS-config(s) for MBS (i.e., separate from the SPS-Config of the dedicated unicast BWP) * FFS: Other configurations and details including whether signaling of starting PRB and the length of PRBs is needed when CFR is equal to the unicast BWP * FFS: Whether a unified CFR design is also used for broadcast reception for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED * FFS: Whether Coreset(s) for CFR in addition to existing Coresets in UE dedicated BWP is needed * Note: The terminology of CFR is only aiming for RAN1 discussion, and the detailed signaling design is up to RAN2   Note: This agreement does not negate any previous agreements made on CFR |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2106947, CATT]
  + 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 Point A.
  + Proposal 4: The current SLIV indication mechanism can be reused for common frequency resource of starting PRB and length of PRBs.
* In [R1-2107162, Lenovo]
  + 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 signalling.
* In [R1-2107371, Qualcomm]
  + *Discuss*: Based on the RAN1 agreements, the default CFR for broadcast is the initial BWP if not configured in SIB. However, it is not clear what is the configured/defined CFR for broadcast. We think the definition of a multicast CFR can be reused but only select the functionalities required for broadcast reception.
  + *Discuss*: The PDCCH-config includes the parameters for GC-PDCCH and the PDSCH-config includes those for GC-PDSCH of broadcast MCCH/MTCH. For example, PDSCH-Config in the CFR may include MCS, TDRA table, etc. for GC-PDSCH; and PDCCH-Config in the CFR provide the configuration of CORESET and SS for GC-PDCCH.
  + Proposal 1: The CFR for broadcast MCCH/MTCH if configured includes the following configurations:
    - Starting PRB and the number of PRBs
    - One PDSCH-config for broadcast
    - One PDCCH-config for broadcast

### **FL Assessment**

As part of the discussions at AI 8.12.3, the definition of the configured/defined CFR and how it is different from a default CFR has not been discussed in detail.

In [CATT, Lenovo, Qualcomm] discuss configuration parameters of the CFR. [CATT, Lenovo] discuss starting and length of the CFR, while [Qualcomm] discusses that the definition for multicast reception can be reused but only using adequate parameters for broadcast reception.

The FL will put forward a proposal to have a discussion on this issue.

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

**Proposal 2.3-1**: From RAN1 perspective, the CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, includes at least the following configurations:

* Starting PRB and the number of PRBs
  + FFS reuse of SLIV
* One PDSCH-config for broadcast
* One PDCCH-config for broadcast

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are generally fine with the FL’s proposal with below suggestion of re-wording:  **Proposal 2.3-1**: From RAN1 perspective, the CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, includes at least the following configurations:   * Starting PRB and the number of PRBs   + FFS reuse of SLIV * ~~One PDSCH-config~~ PDSCH configuration for broadcast reception with GC-PDSCH * ~~One PDCCH-config~~ PDCCH configuration for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH |
| Qualcomm | Support it |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Generally fine with it. Is it better to add the initial BWP in the main bullet?  **Proposal 2.3-1**: From RAN1 perspective, the CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues on the initial DL BWP, includes at least the following configurations:   * Starting PRB and the number of PRBs   + FFS reuse of SLIV * One PDSCH-config for broadcast * One PDCCH-config for broadcast |
| vivo | Fine |
| Spreadtrum | Support in general. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | OK but we suggest to add an item: Other configurations if needed |
| CATT | Ok with the FL’s proposal. |
| CMCC | Support |
| OPPO | Generally OK with the direction.  One question for clarification: In AI 8.12.1 group scheduling, CFR is configured associated a dedicated BWP. Here in AI 8.12.3, if the CFR is configured independently from CORESET#0 or initial DL BWP configured by SIB1, it seems like that the CFR is configured as a BWP for broadcast. Is my understanding correct? |
| ZTE | We are generally fine with the proposal.  However, we would like to add the following information. UE needs to receive broadcast in both IDLE/INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED, to keep the consistent configuration for UEs under different states, it is straightforward to use the Point A as reference for the starting PRB.  **Proposal 2.3-1**: From RAN1 perspective, the CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, includes at least the following configurations:   * Starting PRB and the number of PRBs   + The reference for starting PRB is Point A   + FFS reuse of SLIV * One PDSCH-config for broadcast * One PDCCH-config for broadcast |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| Ericsson | P2.3-1: We support the main proposal.  We suggest however to remove the FFS for now and wait for RAN1 agreements about how CFR is configured for Ues in RRC Connected. |
| Apple | Ok with this proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok in general. However, PDSCH-config and PDCCH-config could impliedly mean UE-specific configuration, which should not be the intention because SIBx configuring MCCH and MCCH configuring MTCH are supposed to be the common configuration. Generalized description as Nokia suggested seems fine. |
| Moderator | Thanks for the comments. I have included some re-wording based on comments.  @OPPO: Good point, I am not completely sure. Could you please what parameters would be required for the following cases (I think it would help the discussion - thanks): case is associated with coreset#0 initial BWP, case that configuration is included in SIB1 and the case where it is associated with a configured BWP?  **Proposal 2.3-1rev1**: From RAN1 perspective, the CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, includes at least the following configurations:   * Starting PRB and the number of PRBs   + The reference for starting PRB is Point A   + ~~FFS reuse of SLIV~~ * ~~One PDSCH-config~~ PDSCH configuration for broadcast reception with GC-PDSCH * ~~One PDCCH-config~~ PDCCH configuration for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH |

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

**Proposal 2.3-1rev1**: From RAN1 perspective, the CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, includes at least the following configurations:

* Starting PRB and the number of PRBs
  + The reference for starting PRB is Point A
  + ~~FFS reuse of SLIV~~
* ~~One PDSCH-config~~ PDSCH configuration for broadcast reception with GC-PDSCH
* ~~One PDCCH-config~~ PDCCH configuration for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKA/NSB | Regarding the new added “The reference for starting PRB is Point A”, it is suggested to align with the corresponding discussion in 8.12.1. It does not make sense to have discussions in both AI items. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal except “the reference for starting PRB is point A” since same discussion is also ongoing in 8.12.1. |
| LG | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | No comment |
| Intel | Agree with Nokia. Can be settled after 8.12.1 discussion is finalized. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal.  If companies have concern on “The reference for starting PRB is Point A”, maybe we can change it to “Follow the same approach to determine reference for starting PRB as that defined in AI8.12.1”. |
| Samsung | Support. |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| Qualcomm | ‘One PDSCH-config’ is to say only one set of parameters configured for PDSCH for broadcast.  ‘One PDCCH-config’ is to say only one set of parameters configured for PDCCH for broadcast.  If the new wording has same above meaning, instead of allowing more than one set of PDSCH parameters or more than one set of PDCCH parameters, we are fine. |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| OPPO | Generally OK.  For the question raised during 1st round of discussion:   * For Case C, we think that CFR configuration can reuse all of the configurations of initial DL BWP configured by SIB1. The only difference is that the enabling time is in-advance than the Rel-15/16 rule, which is in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state. We do not observe any other parameters should be introduced. (Please correct me if there is) * For Case E, it seems like a new frequency range is introduced other than CORESET#0/initial DL BWP configured by SIB1. Therefore, a set of new parameters, including but not restricted to starting point and length, can be introduced. Furthermore, we are not so sure if any other parameters for CFR can be shared with the configuration of initial DL BWP. This might be the essential part on how we define/configure the CFR for case E. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| CATT | Ok with the proposal. |
| vivo | Ok |
| CMCC | Support two proposals. |
| Ericsson | P2.3-1rev1: Support, but we agree that this needs to be aligned with AI8.12.1. |
| Convida | We are OK with the proposal except the newly added sub-bullet “the reference for starting PRB is point A”. |
| Samsung | Support |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | We think some Ies are optonal because the CFR may have some same parameters as the initial BWP.Therefore, the related propsoal is suggested to update as below.  **Proposal 2.3-1rev1**: From RAN1 perspective, the CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, includes at least the following configurations:   * Starting PRB and the number of PRBs   + The reference for starting PRB is Point A   + ~~FFS reuse of SLIV~~ * ~~One PDSCH-config~~ PDSCH configuration for broadcast reception with GC-PDSCH ( optional) * ~~One PDCCH-config~~ PDCCH configuration for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH (optional) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Two proposals seem ok in general. However, the situation now is that we seem to agree on no specification support for the smaller size cases, so the starting PRB and the number of PRBs is probably is same as CORESET0 or SIB1 configured itnial BWP. Hence, do we still needs such configuration (Starting PRB and the number of PRBs), at least it should be optional? |
| Moderator | Thank you for the comments. I have tried to incorporate the clarifications to the reference to starting PRB point A that was causing concerns to some companies. I have also added clarifying text as per Qualcomm’s comment. Regarding OPPO’s comment (and related to Chengdu TD Tech and Huawei) I have added an FFS that tries to address the current discussion at Issue 1.  **Proposal 2.3-1rev2**: From RAN1 perspective, the CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, includes at least the following configurations:   * Starting PRB and the number of PRBs   + The reference for starting PRB is Point A. (Following the same approach to determine reference for starting PRB as that defined in AI8.12.1.)   + ~~FFS reuse of SLIV~~ * ~~One PDSCH-config~~ Only one set of parameters configured for PDSCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDSCH * ~~One PDCCH-config~~ Only one set of parameters configured for PDCCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH * FFS: whether some parameters are optional/needed for Case A, C, D and E of the CFR. |

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

**Proposal 2.3-1rev2**: From RAN1 perspective, the CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, includes at least the following configurations:

* Starting PRB and the number of PRBs
  + The reference for starting PRB is Point A. (Following the same approach to determine reference for starting PRB as that defined in AI8.12.1.)
  + ~~FFS reuse of SLIV~~
* ~~One PDSCH-config~~ Only one set of parameters configured for PDSCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDSCH
* ~~One PDCCH-config~~ Only one set of parameters configured for PDCCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH
* FFS: whether some parameters are optional/needed for Case A, C, D and E of the CFR.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.3-1:** Support. |
| Moderator | A revised version of Proposal 2.3-1 has been agreed at the GTW session on 20 August. The discussion on this Issue is therefore closed. Thank you for all the discussion.  Agreement:  From RAN1 perspective, the CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, includes at least the following configurations:   * One set of parameters configured for PDSCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDSCH * One set of parameters configured for PDCCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH * FFS: whether some parameters configured for PDSCH/PDCCH are optional/needed for the supported cases of CFR. * FFS: If necessary, depending on the cases supported, starting PRB and the number of PRBs   + The reference for starting PRB is Point A. (Following the same approach to determine reference for starting PRB as that defined in AI8.12.1.) |

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

### **Background**

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

|  |
| --- |
| * **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. |

In [R1-2104165] RAN2 requested 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, RAN2#104-e and RAN1#105-e are relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, CSS is supported for group-common PDCCH.   * FFS: reuse current CSS type, define a new CSS type, etc. * FFS other details.   Agreement:  For broadcast reception, the same group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH can be received by both RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues and RRC\_CONNECTED Ues when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE contains the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues and the SCS and CP are the same.   * FFS: the case when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE does not contain the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues.   Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH.  Agreement:  For 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.   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. |

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

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

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2106440, Huawei]
  + Proposal 4: The CFR, CORESET, and search space for MCCH and MTCH can be configured separately.
    - The CFR, CORESET, and search space for MTCH scheduling can be included in MCCH.
* In [R1-2106664, Nokia]
  + Proposal-9: It is supported to have additional SS configuration(s) for MTCH in addition to SS#0 and SS for MCCH.
  + Proposal-10: Reusing legacy CSS for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues is enough, and there is no need to specify multicast SS (MSS) as it was discussed for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues.
  + Proposal-11: For the operation of MBS services, there is a need to define a new TypeX-PDCCH.
* In [R1-2106718, Spreadtrum]
  + Proposal 4: A new CSS type can be introduced for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues with group-common PDCCH receiving.
* In [R1-2106747, ZTE]
  + Proposal 6: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, a new CSS type can be used for MCCH and MTCH.
    - The same search space can be applied for MBS control information and different broadcast service depending on network configuration.
    - For the new CSS type, the monitoring priority is determined based on the search space set indexes of the Type-x CSS set and USS sets
    - FFS for further supporting existing CSS type for MCCH.
* In [R1-2106914, Samsung]
  + Observation 2: 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 signalling).
  + Proposal 3. Support avoidance of permanent collisions for PDCCH candidates of search space sets for GC-PDCCH for broadcast and multicast.
* In [R1-2106947, CATT]
  + Proposal 11：For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, supports define Type-MBS CSS sets for GC-PDCCH scheduling.
    - The monitoring priority of Type-MBS CSS is determined based on the search space set indexes of the Type-x CSS set.
* In [R1-2107095, Futurewei]
  + Proposal 4: 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 [R1-2107162, Lenovo]
  + Proposal 8: A CSS is configured for RRC IDLE/RRC INACTIVE Ues by reusing existing CSS type.
* In [R1-2107165, TCL]
  + Proposal 1: Consider same CSS type used for SI, for MCCH or define a new search space for MBS-SIB which carries MCCH.
  + Proposal 2: Support different or separate CSS types for MCCH and MTCH channels for broadcast reception.
  + Proposal 3: If proposal 2 is agreed, consider CSS type3 or define a new search space type for MTCH channel for broadcast reception.
* In [R1-2107231, OPPO]
  + *Discuss*: The monitoring periodicity of MCCH and MTCH can be different, correspondingly the search space for GC-PDCCHs scheduling MCCH and MTCH can be different. From perspective of physical layer, MCCH and MTCH are both mapped into PDSCH even with different periodicities, and the same CSS type can support it. Therefore, to reduce the design complexity in release-17 MBS, different CSS types for MCCH/MTCH is not supported.
  + Proposal 4: It is not support of different CSS types for MCCH and MTCH channels for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues for broadcast reception.
  + *Discuss*: Type-3, can be reused as a baseline with different search space sets equation initialization.
  + Proposal 5: One of the existing CSS types can be selected and reused for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_CONNECTED Ues for broadcast reception.
* In [R1-2107371, Qualcomm]
  + *Discuss*: Reuse the design for multicast RRC\_CONNECTED Ues, the Type-x CSS for GC-PDCCH can be used as the SS of MCCH/MTCH.
  + Proposal 5: Support Type-x CSS for the SS of MCCH/MTCH.
* In [R1-2107427, CMCC]
  + Proposal 4. For CSS of GC-PDCCH for broadcast, the same CSS type as multicast is supported, i.e., 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.
* In [R1- 2107458, LGE]
  + Proposal 4: Idle/inactive UE monitors PDCCH for Type0A-PDCCH CSS set to detect a DCI with SI-RNTI and receive MBS specific SIB on the corresponding PDSCH on the initial DL BWP of a serving cell for broadcast.
  + *Discuss*: In addition, we think that the monitoring priority of CSS for MTCH can be determined based on the search space set indexes for both multicast and broadcast.
  + Proposal 6: For MTCH, support CSS type of which the monitoring priority for group-common PDCCH is determined based on the search space set indexes for MTCHs. The CSS for MTCHs can be optionally configured by MCCH.
* In [R1-2107516, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 6: The CSS type defined in AI 8.12.1 (e.g., a new Type-x CSS) for MBS group scheduling can be used for both searchSpace#0 and search space other than searchSpace#0 for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH.
* In [R1-2107613, Intel]
  + *Discuss*: The PDCCH which schedules the MCCH carrying the MBS configuration can be monitored in a Type0-PDCCH CSS set configured by *searchSpaceZero* in *PDCCH-CommonConfig* and associated with a CORESET#0 for both RRC\_CONNECTED and IDLE mode Ues. Alternately it can be monitored in a new PDCCH CSS set e.g., *mcch-searchSpace* which is configured by the MBS specific PDCCH-ConfigCommon. The CSS set can be a Type-x CSS set similar to the case for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues.
  + Proposal 3: The PDCCH scheduling the MCCH can also be monitored in a Type-x CSS set configured by the MBS specific *PDCCH-ConfigCommon*.
  + Proposal 4: The DCI scheduling the MTCH and MCCH can both be monitored on the same CSS type.
* In [R1-2107765, Apple]
  + Proposal 4: Type-3 CSS set is used for MBS group common PDCCH monitoring.
* In [R1-2107883, NTT DOCOMO]
  + *Discuss*: For commonality of configurations, it is better to use the same CSS types for RRC\_CONNECTED state and RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE states. Which CSS type to use for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues is discussed in AI 8.12.1, and we propose to define a new type CSS [*ref therein*]. The new type CSS should also be used for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues as well. If gNB wants to use different scheduling (e.g., scheduling period) for MCCH and MTCH, gNB can configure multiple search spaces with the same type and use them separately. We don’t see clear motivation to define different CSS types for MCCH and MTCH.
  + Proposal 3: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, use the same new type CSS as for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues.
* In [R1-2108028, Convida]
  + Proposal 4: A new CSS type should be defined for monitoring the group-common PDCCH.
* In [Ericsson]
  + Proposal 14: Different CSS types not supported for MCCH and MTCH.
  + Proposal 15: The CSS type for broadcast should be the same as the CSS type for multicast.

### **FL Assessment**

This issue was discussed at RAN1#105-e without reaching an agreement.

***Discussion on different CSS types for MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception***

While [TCL] proposes to use different CSS types for MCCH and MTCH, [Ericsson, OPPO, NTT DOCOMO, Intel] proposes that different CSS types for MCTH and MCCH is not supported. It is discussed that even using the same CSS type for the two logical channels different configurations (e.g. monitoring) can still be applied to each logical channel while using the same CSS type. Separate SS configurations for MCCH and MTCH is also proposed in [Huawei].

Based on the inputs there is a bigger support on not having different CSS types for MTCH and MCCH, therefore the FL will put forward a proposal to conclude this.

***Discussion on Type-x CSS for MCCH and MTCH for broadcast reception and reusing solutions agreed for CSS for multicast reception in RRC\_CONNECTED UE state***

Inputs in [Nokia, Spreadtrum, ZTE, CATT, Futurewei, Qualcomm, CMCC, MediaTek, Intel, NTT DOCOMO, Convida, Ericsson] propose to use a Type-x CSS and [Futurewei, Qualcomm, CMCC, MediaTek, Intel, NTT DOCOMO Ericsson] explicitly propose to reuse the solution adopted for multicast reception in RRC\_CONNECTED UE state for broadcast reception in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UE states, i.e., using a Type-x CSS.

[Samsung, TCL, OPPO, Apple] propose to use Type-3 CSS, which is aligned with the agreement at RAN1#105-e on whether the Type-x CSS is a Type-3 CSS. [Lenovo] propose to reuse existing CSS.

Most companies support that the Type-x CSS supported for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED is reused for broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH which also covers the case whether the type-x CSS is a Type-3 CSS as proposed explicitly by some companies. Therefore, the FL will put forward a proposal to reach agreement on this basis.

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

**Proposal 2.4-1**: For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, no specification support in Rel-17 of different CSS types for MCCH and MTCH channels.

**Proposal 2.4-2**: The Type-x CSS supported for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED is reused for broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Regarding **Proposal 2.4-1**, reusing legacy CSS for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE is enough, and there is no need to specify any other/different CSS, thus we are fine with it.  Regarding **Proposal 2.4-2**, to our view, there is a need to define a new TypeX-PDCCH that is similar to the Type3-PDCCH, where the configuration of TypeX-PDCCH can be associated with the configuration of MBS CFR via SIBx.  And we don’t quite understand how the Type-x CSS supported for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED can be reused for broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE. It could be great if it can be clarified. |
| Qualcomm | Ok with two proposals |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | OK with above two proposals. |
| Vivo | Fine with two proposals |
| Spreadtrum | OK with above two proposals. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | Proposal 2.4-1: Ok  Proposal 2.4-2: Ok |
| CATT | OK with above two proposals. |
| CMCC | Support two proposals |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.4-1: Ok  Proposal 2.4-2: Clarification is needed how to reuse Type-x CSS of RRC\_CONNECTED into RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state. |
| ZTE | Ok with Proposal 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.  One thing we want to make it clear. Broadcast and multicast have different beam mapping/indication mechanism. For broadcast, beam mapping mechanism like that for Rel-15 SIB is reused. For multicast, although not agreed yet, it will probably reuse the unicast mechanism, i.e., the PDCCH beam is indicated by MAC-CE and the PDSCH beam is indicated by DCI or default beam. In this sense, different beam mapping is used for the same type of CSS. Hope this is the common understanding. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.4-1**: Support. We don’t see clear motivation to use different CSS types for MCCH and MTCH.  **Proposal 2.4-2**: Support. For commonality with multicast configuration, it is better to use CSS for multicast also for broadcast. |
| Ericsson | P2.4-1: Support  P2.4-2: Support |
| Apple | We are ok with two proposals. The wording of proposal 2.4-1 could be updated.  **Proposal 2.4-1**: For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, no specification support in Rel-17 of different CSS types for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH channels. |
| MediaTek | Support the two proposals. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A bit concern for Proposal 2.4-2. As discussed in AI8.12.1, there was a view from editor that Type-x is characterized by defining monitoring priority across CSS and USS. If that is motivation to call it a new CSS, reusing Type-X is not meaningful because UE does not monitor USS in IDLE/INACTIVE state. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposals. |
| Intel | We are ok generally. It would be better to discuss the second proposal after 8.12.1 discussion on Type-x CSS is settled. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.4-1: Support  Proposal 2.4-2: Support |
| Moderator | Thank you for inputs.  For the first proposal, there seems to be consensus besides some improvements by Apple that are taking into account in the following revision.  **Proposal 2.4-1rev1**: For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, no specification support in Rel-17 of different CSS types for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH ~~channels~~.  For the second proposal, there are questions from [Nokia, OPPO, and Huawei] to clarify. Specially, Huawei mentions that since Ues in idle/inactive do not monitor USS it is not meaningful to reuse a Type-x CSS as for multicast.  Inputs from [Futurewei, Qualcomm, CMCC, MediaTek, Intel, NTT DOCOMO Ericsson] to this meeting support reusing the solution from multicast, it would be great if these companies can address comments from [Nokia, OPPO and Huawei].  The FL also thinks that the main intention for the proposal is to align the solutions for multicast reception and for broadcast reception. Multiple companies have made that proposal. The motivation to agree on this type of proposal is to focus the design for broadcast reception in next meetings, specially given the limited time to finish this WI. I have reformulated the proposal to leave it more open.  **Proposal 2.4-2rev2**: The Type-x CSS supported for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED is reused as baseline for broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH. |

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

**Proposal 2.4-1rev1**: For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, no specification support in Rel-17 of different CSS types for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH ~~channels~~.

**Proposal 2.4-2rev1**: The Type-x CSS supported for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED is reused as baseline for broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | OK |
| NOKIA/NSB | **Proposal 2.4-1rev1:** Support  **Proposal 2.4-2rev1:** NOT support.  With copy-paste the latest proposal from 8.12.1, based on this, we don’t see how the outcome of 8.12.1 can be reused (as baseline) here. Also it seems the discussion in 8.12.1 is going to the direction of “new type CSS” which is also contradict with about **Proposal 2.4-1rev1**.  **[High] Updated Proposal 2-3**:  For type-x CSS for GC-PDCCH in RRC\_CONNECTED state, Option 2 is supported.   * Option 2: The type-x CSS is a new type CSS |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Ok |
| CATT | Ok with these two proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support. |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.4-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.4-2rev1**: Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| Moderator | Thank you for additional comments.  For Proposal 2.4-1, there has not been any further concerns raised, therefore I think we can put it as stable.  For proposal 2.4-2, from the last round of discussion and this round of discussion, there are still concerns on this proposal [Nokia, OPPO, Huawei, Intel]. Given that it seems a decision has not been yet taken at AI 8.12.1 we could try with a study to address companies concerns.  **Proposal 2.4-1rev1[stable]**: For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, no specification support in Rel-17 of different CSS types for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH.  **Proposal 2.4-2rev2**: Study whether the Type-x CSS supported for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED can be ~~is~~ reused as baseline for broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH. |

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

**Proposal 2.4-1rev1[stable]**: For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, no specification support in Rel-17 of different CSS types for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH.

**Proposal 2.4-2rev2**: Study whether the Type-x CSS supported for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED can be ~~is~~ reused as baseline for broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | OK |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | OK |
| NOKIA/NSB | Fine for us |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposals. |
| vivo | Fine with both |
| CATT | OK |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.4-1rev1[stable]**:Ok  **Proposal 2.4-2rev2**: Considering the meeting progress, we are generally OK for the further study. |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 2.4-2rev2, it’s fine to go back to FFS although we think RAN1 should strive for unified design for multicast and broadcast SS, considering CONN UEs will receive both. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for the comments. Given the comments, I believe these two proposals are stable and therefore we can try to reach agreement by the 24 August check point. |

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

**Proposal 2.4-1rev1[stable]**: For broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, no specification support in Rel-17 of different CSS types for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH.

**Proposal 2.4-2rev2[sable]**: Study whether the Type-x CSS supported for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED can be reused as baseline for broadcast in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH and MTCH.

These two proposals are put forward for potential email for checkpoint at 24 August. Please share if you have any concerns:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
|  |  |

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

### **Background**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2106440, R1-2108067, Huawei et al.]
  + *Discussion*: From RAN2’s LS, RAN2 is still FFS on whether the possibility of UE missing an MCCH change notification needs to be addressed or can be left to UE implementation. Since Alt 2 can also reduce the possibility of UE missing an MCCH change notification because the DCI scheduling MCCH will be transmitted from network whenever MCCH is transmitted, an draft LS reply is also provided in [*ref therein*], which is supposed to resolve RAN2’s remaining FFS regarding MCCH change notification issue.
  + Proposal 1: A specific DCI scrambled by a dedicated RNTI is not necessary and not sufficient for notifying the session start and the modification of an ongoing session.
  + Proposal 2: Using a field in DCI scheduling MCCH to notify the session start and the modification of an ongoing session.
    - Reply RAN2’s LS with the mechanism RAN1 agreed.
* In [R1-2106718, Spreadtrum]
  + Proposal 3: A new dedicated RNTI can be used to scramble the CRC of a DCI to indicate a MCCH change notification for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues.
* In [R1-2106747, ZTE]
  + They discuss: According to the information provided by RAN2 in LS [*ref therein*], DCI size will add at least 2 bit under Alt.2, which may cause size of DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with SC-RNTI/G-RNTI to be greater than size of DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with P-RNTI/SI-RNTI. As a result, DCI size alignment cannot be executed. In addition, Alt.2 may also lead to a lower reliability.
  + Proposal 7: Define a dedicated RNTI to scramble the CRC of a DCI indicating a MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2106914, Samsung]
  + Proposal 6. Use of a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2106947, CATT]
  + *Discuss*: Since the bit size of the change notification and that of DCI format which scheduling the MCCH is not discussed and determined, the effect of these two alternatives are not clear during DCI size alignment.
  + Proposal 10: Alternatives for MCCH change notification indication can be postponed to discuss until the bits fields of broadcast DCI format and MCCH change notification are determined.
* In [R1-2107231, OPPO]
  + Proposal 6: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, define a dedicated RNTI to scramble the CRC of a DCI indicating a MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2107371, Qualcomm]
  + Proposal 6: Support Alt1: Define a dedicated RNTI (e.g., MCCH-N-RNTI) to scramble the CRC of a DCI indicating MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2107384, Google]
  + Proposal 1: For reliability of MCCH change notification
    - If Alt-1 is supported to introduce dedicated RNTI e.g. MBS-N-RNTI
      * Study using DCI format with smaller size
    - If Alt-2 is supported to introduce a field in DCI format e.g. MBS-RNTI
      * Study PDCCH repetition for the MCCH change notification
* In [R1-2107427, R1-2107387, CMCC]
  + *Discussion*: Alt 2 doesn’t need the introduction of new RNTI but the MCCH change notification filed bitlength may be limited, because the DCI format scheduling a MCCH is received by Ues in all three RRC states, the DCI size with MCCH-RNTI should be aligned with DCI format 1\_0 in CSS.
  + *Discussion*: As the FDRA filed, we are still discussing whether a larger CFR than CORESET#0 can be supported for MCCH. If the FDRA filed bitlength is depend on the size of CORESET#0, there are 16 reserved bits in DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by MCCH-RNTI which can be used as the MCCH change notification. Even if the FDRA filed bitlength is depend on CFR size not the bandwidth of CORESET#0, for example, the CFR is 272 PRB which needs 15 bits FDRA filed and the 48 PRB CORESET#0 needs 11bits FDRA field, there are still 12 reserved bits in DCI format 1\_0 for the MCCH change notification. From this perspective, the bitlength in Alt 2 is enough to be used as MCCH change notification and can also provide forward compatibility.
  + Proposal 5. For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, support using DCI bits in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification.
  + Proposal 1. Support using separate DCI fields in DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by MCCH-RNTI for MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2107516, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 9: Define a new RNTI (e.g., MCCH-N-RNTI) for NR MBS MCCH change notification.
  + Proposal 10: DCI format 1\_0 scrambled by a new RNTI (e.g., MCCH-N-RNTI) can be used for MCCH change notification.
* In [R1-2107613, Intel]
  + Proposal 5: For MCCH change notification, a dedicated RNTI is used to scramble the CRC of the scheduling DCI
* In [R1-2107765, Apple]
  + *Discussion*: For the discussed solutions, Alt 1 would require a new RNTI and new DCI format. The DCI size could be the issue for Alt 2, if there are multiple MBS sessions and 2 bits for each session. Another possible way is the MCCH change notification is indicated by the MAC CE in MAC PDU of the scheduled MCCH. The benefits are without introducing new DCI format and without impacts on DCI format size.
  + Proposal 3: MCCH change notification is indicated by the MAC CE in MAC PDU of scheduled MCCH, notification includes MBS sessions start and MSB sessions stop.
* In [R1-2107883, NTT DOCOMO]
  + *Discuss*: Based on the RAN2 agreements, 2 bits (i.e., a bit for modification of an ongoing session’s configuration and a bit for session start notification) are required for MCCH change notification. Since only 2 bits are needed, it will be possible to put it in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI. We don’t see clear motivation to define a dedicated RNTI to transfer only 2 bits of information.
  + Proposal 6: For MCCH change notification for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, support Alt 2.
* In [R1-2107952, Chengdu TD Tech]
  + Proposal 5: A new RNTI is used for the MCCH change notification. The MCCH change notification can be transmitted several times per the MCCH repetition period. The MCCH change notification is sent in the same CORESET/search space as MCCH.
  + Proposal 6: The MCCH specific RNTI is configured with a fixed value. The MCCH change notification specific RNTI is configured with fixed values.
  + Proposal 7: Alternatively, the MCCH change notification can be sent in the DCI format on the MCCH specific PDCCH.

### **FL Assessment**

RAN2 LSs indicate the MCCH change notification needs to accommodate i) the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and ii) the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop), i.e., 2 bits.

While [Spreadtrum, ZTE, OPPO, Qualcomm, MediaTek, Intel] propose defining a dedicated RNTI to scramble the CRC of a DCI indicating a MCCH change notification (i.e., Alt 1), [Huawei, Samsung, CMCC, NTT DOCOMO] discuss and propose using a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification (i.e., Alt 2).

[ZTE] discusses that the size of DCI 1\_0 format with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI cannot be larger than the size of DCI 1\_0 format with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI/P-RNTI. Since including the notification in the DCI would add two bits, DCI 1\_0 format with CRC scrambled G-RNTI would be larger than DCI 1\_0 format with CRC scrambled SI-RNTI/P-RNTI resulting in DCI size alignment not being able to be executed.

However, [CMCC] discusses fields required for DCI 1\_0 format with CRC scrambled G-RNTI and where only a subset of fields is proposed to be included. DCI 1\_0 formats specified in TS 38.212 (cf. section 7.3.1.2) indicate information transmitted for DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with P-RNTI and SI-RNTI that include at least 6 and 15 reserved bits, respectively, which can be used for the notification with sufficient space for forward changes.

[Huawei] also discusses that using a dedicated DCI with a dedicated RNTI to indicate one change forces Ues to monitor an additional DCI that is not used to schedule MCCH data, which also increases the likelihood of missing such notification and being able to notify one change is not sufficient to accommodate the two changes requested by RAN2.

[CATT] proposes to postpone the discussion until the fields of both the DCI format for broadcast and the MCCH notification are clarified. However, as per LS from RAN2, it is clarified that 2 bits would be required to notify of a MCCH configuration change due to a session start and change of ongoing session (including a session stop).

[Apple] proposes a different approach to Alt 1 & Alt 2 by including the notification in the MAC CE in MAC PDU without the need to define a new DCI format or having an impact on the DCI format size.

Finally, [Chengdu Ted Tech] proposes to support both alternatives while [Google] proposes to discuss reliability aspects for each of the alternatives.

Although there is similar support for both alternatives by the inputs, arguments presented indicate the following:

* using a dedicated RNTI to notify changes requires Ues to monitor an additional DCI not used for scheduling data increasing complexity,
* there are sufficient reserved bits in DCI 1\_0 format to accommodate these 2 changes in the notification without significant impact in DCI alignment, and
* transmitting the notification in the MCCH scheduling the MTCH also reduces the likelihood of missing the notification.

Given the requests of feedback from RAN2 and the last stages of the WI in Rel-17, the FL proposes to discuss this issue and try to reach an agreement.

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

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

**Proposal 2.5-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, at least Alt 2 is supported to notify MCCH change due to modification of an ongoing session’s configuration (including session stop) and to notify changes of MCCH configuration due to session start:

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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are fine with **Proposal 2.5-1**. Moreover, we think both Alt1 and Alt2 can be supported. |
| Qualcomm | We have concern on Alt2. The details of DCI format 1\_0 for MCCH need to be discussed first.  For LTE MTC, only 1-bit is inserted in SC-MCCH DCI format 6-2 to directly indicate MCCH change notification. However, the other fields in the DCI for MTC are relatively small. Compared with DCI format 6\_2, DCI format 1\_0 at least includes FDRA to indicate much more flexible BW size (for MTC, only indicate narrowband index), 4-bit TDRA (no TDRA for MTC), and 5-bit MCS (3-bit only for MTC). In addition, DCI for MTC can be configured with PDCCH repetitions for reliability.  We prefer Alt1 is better by using a separate RNTI for a compressed GC-DCI for reliable MCCH change notification. It is also similar as the way for legacy non-BL/CE Ues supporting LTE SC-PTM. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support. |
| Vivo | Fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Not support, share same view as Qualcomm. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | We think the proposal can be suspended due to the following reasons.   * So far only two bits are needed for the MCCH change notification. But during the last RAN2 meeting, whether or not the other information needs to be carried on the MCCH change notification has no conclusion yet.   The bit length of the MCCH change notification will lead to the different sending methods. If more bits are needed, the DCI format scheduling MCCH may have no enough reserved bits to send the MCCH change notification. |
| CATT | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| OPPO | We also prefer to consider Alt 1 instead of Alt 2. |
| ZTE | Our preference is Alt.1  If Alt.2 is adopted, UE needs to monitor and try to decode MCCH change notification in all the Mos for MCCH scheduling, which is not power efficient. However, if Alt.1 is adopted, UE only needs to receive the MCCH when change notification is received, which can save much power. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. Base on the RAN2 agreements, 2 bits (i.e., a bit for modification of an ongoing session’s configuration and a bit for session start notification) are required for MCCH change notification. It will be possible to put it in a DCI format 1\_0 scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI. For example, when the size of CORESET0 is 24RBs, the size of DCI format 1\_0 in CSS is the smallest and is 37bits. Considering the fields required in DCI format 1\_0 for scheduling MCCH (it is discussed in Proposal 2.6-2), it is feasible to include MCCH change notification.   |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | No. of bits | | FDRA field (size of CFR) | 16 (275RBs CFR) | | TDRA field | 4 | | VRB-to-PRB mapping | 1 | | Modulation and coding scheme | 5 | | Redundancy version | 2 | | MCCH change notification | 2 | | Total | 30 | |
| Ericsson | P.2.5-1: Support |
| Apple | Before we determine which solution is adopted, it need to be clarified how many bits are needed for MCCH change notification. If the network configured serval MBS sessions, each session could require 2bits, MCCH change notification indication of MBS session configuration change would require multiple bits. From this point, we consider MCCH change notification included in MAC CE of the MAC PDU could be the better choice. |
| MediaTek | Not Support.  Adding some field in the compact DCI will degrade the DCI performance. Besides, the following agreement was also achieved in R2#114 meeting.   * At least in case RAN1 decides to utilize RNTI other than MCCH-RNTI for MCCH change notification, MCCH change notification is sent in the first MCCH monitoring occasion of each MCCH repetition period.   So, The legacy SC-PTM operation with dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification can be reused for Rel-17 MBS MCCH change notification. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| Intel | Our preference is to use Alt.1 and agree with reasoning from Qualcomm |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.5-1: Support |
| Moderator | Thank you for inputs.  9 companies support Alt 2, 7 companies support Alt 1, 1 company discusses that the 2 bits may be per session (leading to potentially more than 2 bits needed for notification) and 1 company discusses that RAN2 has still not agreed all the required notifications yet.  I think we need to first address the question from Apple, on whether the 2 bits for notification are required for every session. If RAN1 is not the place to answer this, we may also need to consider asking RAN2.  Therefore, I am not going to change the proposal but will put a question for discussion:  **Question 2.5-2**: How many sessions does the notification of MCCH change of configuration need to accommodate? |

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

**Proposal 2.5-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, at least Alt 2 is supported to notify MCCH change due to modification of an ongoing session’s configuration (including session stop) and to notify changes of MCCH configuration due to session start:

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

**(NEW)Question 2.5-2**: How many sessions does the notification of MCCH change of configuration need to accommodate? Does RAN1 need to ask RAN2?

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | OK.  For the question, it seems ok to ask to decide the size. |
| NOKIA/NSB | **Proposal 2.5-1**: OK  **Regarding (NEW)Question 2.5-2, *to our understanding, one single MCCH change notification is accommodate to all sessions.***  And copy-paste below is the RAN2 related agreement from last RAN2 meeting:   **Indication of an MCCH change due to modification of an ongoing session’s configuration (including session stop) is provided with an explicit notification from the network (provided that RAN1 confirms a separate bit for this purpose can be accommodated in the MCCH change notification DCI, in addition to a bit for session start notification). FFS on whether this notification can be reused for modification of other information carried by MCCH, if any.**   **FFS whether the possibility of UE missing an MCCH change notification needs to be addressed or can be left to UE implementation.**   **At least in case RAN1 decides to utilize RNTI other than MCCH-RNTI for MCCH change notification, MCCH change notification is sent in the first MCCH monitoring occasion of each MCCH repetition period.** |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **W**e think proposal 2.5-1 and question 2.5-2 are related with each other.  With the answer to question 2.5-2, we can consider how to send the MCCH change notification. Before the answer is available from RAN2, proposal 2.5-1 can NOT be agreed.  We think the key question is how many bits are required for the MCCH change notification. If the needed bits can NOT be provided by MCCH, alt 2 can NOT be selected. We suggest question 2.5-2 is updated as below. Our answer to question 2.5-2 is: YES.  **(NEW)Question 2.5-2**: How many bits are required for the MCCH change notification? Does RAN1 need to ask RAN2? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **We support this proposal.**  Per RAN2 LS, our understanding is that only 2 bits are needed which are applied to all sessions, and it is the same as LTE SC-PTM.  In addition, defining a specific RNTI only cannot accommodate the two notifications. Including the two bits into the DCI scheduling MCCH can also improve the reliability because this DCI will be transmitted as long as MCCH is scheduled, which is exactly to solve the issue of DCI missing RAN2 worried per their LS. |
| CATT | And copy-paste below is the RAN2 related agreement from last RAN2 meeting:   **Indication of an MCCH change due to modification of an ongoing session’s configuration (including session stop) is provided with an explicit notification from the network (provided that RAN1 confirms a separate bit for this purpose can be accommodated in the MCCH change notification DCI, in addition to a bit for session start notification). FFS on whether this notification can be reused for modification of other information carried by MCCH, if any.**  Before discussing the Proposal 2.5-1, a common understanding should be achieved. From the RAN2 agreement that shown as above, in our understating, RAN2 would like RAN1 to confirm the 2bit things. This means the number of bit for MCCH change notification is not confirmed yet. And RAN1 should discuss this issue in advance. Does my understanding is right? If not, please correct me.  **(NEW)Question 2.5-2:** In our understanding, the number of sessions that the MCCH change notification configuration can be accommodated is determined by higher layer, not RNA1’s work. And the MCCH change notification can be applied to multiple sessions. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.5-1**: Not support.  We have the similar view with CATT.  From our understand, RAN2 did not make a conclusion that adding 2 bits in DCI format, which needs RAN1’s confirmation (it seems that some companies think it is an conclusion). The corresponding agreements are copied as following:   * Indication of an MCCH change due to modification of an ongoing session’s configuration (including session stop) is provided with an explicit notification from the network (provided that RAN1 confirms a separate bit for this purpose can be accommodated in the MCCH change notification DCI, in addition to a bit for session start notification). FFS on whether this notification can be reused for modification of other information carried by MCCH, if any.   Besides, RAN2 did not preclude the possibility that use a dedicated RNTI to inform MCCH change notification:   * At least in case RAN1 decides to utilize RNTI other than MCCH-RNTI for MCCH change notification, MCCH change notification is sent in the first MCCH monitoring occasion of each MCCH repetition period.   Regarding the contents of the MCCH change notification, RAN1 reached the following conclusion, which up to RAN2’s decision.  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.  However, RAN2 has not reached any agreement about it until now. From my understanding, DCI 6\_2 only has one bit used for MCCH notification instead of 2 bits and it supports repetition. However, for DCI format 1\_0 agreed for Broadcast reception, it may have support HARQ related field and doesn’t support repetition, if we still want to add more bit within the DCI, the performance and reliability will degrade.  Thus, the dedicated RNTI (e.g., MCCH-N-RNTI) used in LTE SC-PTM is preferred for MCCH change notification. |
| Moderator | Thanks for comments.  [Nokia, Huawei, CATT] discuss that a single MCCH change notification scheduled by (either DCI or dedicated RNTI) accommodates multiple sessions. @Apple: do you have the same understanding?  [CATT, MediaTek] discuss that RAN1 would need first to clarify whether the request from RAN2 can be accommodated, i.e., whether the 2 bits for the notification can be accommodated in the notification DCI. In order to verify this from RAN1 perspective, we would need to get to a conclusion in Issue 6 Design of DCI format for MCCH and MTCH channels.  **Can companies confirm whether we have the same understanding as CATT and MediaTek?** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.5-1**: Support  **Question 2.5-2**: We have the similar view with CATT. The MCCH change notification can be applied to all broadcast sessions. |
| CMCC | Support  We also think the 2bits MCCH change notification are applied to all sessions. |
| Moderator | Thank you additional comments. We need more inputs on this Issue.  [Nokia, Huawei, CATT, NTT DOCOMO, CMCC] discuss that a single MCCH change notification scheduled by (either DCI or dedicated RNTI) accommodates multiple sessions.  @Chengdu TD Tech: thank for comment. The current wording of the question is for our internal discussion so I prefer to keep it as it is for the time being – thanks for understanding.  Based on the comments from CATT and MediaTek on the previous round I would like organise the discussion with the following questions, and I would like to get views from companies.  **Q1: Common understanding on MCCH change notification at L1 addresses multiple sessions.**  **Please reply to the following question.**  **Question 2.5-2**: How many sessions does the notification of MCCH change of configuration need to accommodate? Does RAN1 need to ask RAN2?  **Q2: Request from RAN2 on whether an additional bit can be accommodated in MCCH change notification DCI**  **Question 2.5-3:** RAN2 request to RAN1 is to confirm whether a separate bit for this purpose can be accommodated in the MCCH change notification DCI, in addition to a bit for session start notification. Currently, in RAN1 we have two alternatives in the table under study:   * Alt 1 Define a dedicated RNTI to scramble the CRC of a DCI indicating a MCCH change notification;   + Please clarify whether 2 bits can be carried for notification in the DCI under this alternative. * Alt 2: Use of a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification;   + Please confirm that we need to complete discussion under Issue 6 first before being able that 2 bits can be carried for notification. |

### **[H] 3rd round FL proposals for Issue 5**

**Proposal 2.5-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, at least Alt 2 is supported to notify MCCH change due to modification of an ongoing session’s configuration (including session stop) and to notify changes of MCCH configuration due to session start:

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

**FL note**: **Please reply to the following questions.** Before we are able to make progress on Proposal 2.5-1, we need to have a common understanding on the following questions.

**Question 2.5-2**: How many sessions does the notification of MCCH change of configuration need to accommodate? Does RAN1 need to ask RAN2?

**Question 2.5-3:** RAN2 request to RAN1 is to confirm whether a separate bit for this purpose can be accommodated in the MCCH change notification DCI, in addition to a bit for session start notification. Currently, in RAN1 we have two alternatives in the table under study:

* Alt 1 Define a dedicated RNTI to scramble the CRC of a DCI indicating a MCCH change notification;
  + Please clarify whether 2 bits can be carried for notification in the DCI under this alternative.
* Alt 2: Use of a field in a DCI format scheduling a MCCH without a dedicated RNTI for MCCH change notification;
  + Please confirm that we need to complete discussion under Issue 6 first before being able that 2 bits can be carried for notification.

Please provide your comments and the answer to the above questions in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | Proposal 2.5-1: OK  Question 2.5-2: This can be asked to RAN2.  Question 2.5-3: Alt 2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.5-1: OK  Question 2.5-2: Up to RAN2.  Question 2.5-3: Alt 2 is preferred. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Regarding **Question 2.5-2**, based on our understanding from last round, we think the answer is clear to us.  Regarding **Question 2.5-3**, to our understanding, the RAN2 would like to define New stop/modification-indication on top of start-indication that was supported in LTE-PTM. We think no matter which Alternatives we are going to pick in RAN1, it impacts the DCI design on both Alt1 and Alt2. |
| OPPO | It seems like all the companies supporting Alt 1 did not follow-up in the second round of discussions. I am not sure whether Alt 1 is still alive or not.  **Proposal 2.5-1:** We still think Alt 1 instead of Alt 2 can be considered to notify the MCCH changes.  **Question 2.5-2:** Up to RAN2.  **Question 2.5-3:** Alt 1 is preferred. |
| ZTE | For Proposal 2.5-1, we have some concerns about Alt.2.  If Alt.2 is adopted, UE needs to monitor and try to decode MCCH change notification in all the Mos for MCCH scheduling, which is not power efficient. However, if Alt.1 is adopted, UE only needs to receive the MCCH when change notification is received, which can save much power.  Thus, we prefer to agree Alt.1. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.5-1**: Support  **Question 2.5-2**: Up to RAN2.  **Question 2.5-3**: We prefer Alt 2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Support proposal.**  **Based on RAN2’s LS, Alt2 is justified without further question asked to RAN2.**  To respond to ZTE’s concern, the power inefficiency issue can be solved by network try to schedule MCCH in the first slot of MCCH window (schedule MCCH in the rest slots only in case of first slot is occupied by other more important scheduling, which should be in rather limited cases). The point of Alt 2’s benefit is that PDCCH missing issue can be solved, which issue can lead to worse UE power consumption/data loss, i.e. if .the UE misses notification in Alt1, the UE may consider the notification is absent in the current modification period, this would lead the configuration mismatch between UE and network. If the missed modification is to stop a MBS service, the UE will continue to detect G-RNTI for a long time even if the service is stopped, this would lead to more serve power consumption issue. If the missed modification is to change configuration for ongoing services such as DRX parameters, this would lead to data loss as the UE might miss G-RNTI scheduling due to DRX mismatch. |
| Apple | Question 2.5-2: we need to ask RAN2 first, this will impact how many bits would be required for notification change indication in the DCI for Alt 2. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.5-1**: Support  **Question 2.5-2**: We also think the 2bits MCCH change notification are applied to all sessions, but can send a LS to RAN2  **Question 2.5-3**: We prefer Alt 2. |
| vivo | **Proposal 2.5-1: Support**  **Question 2.5-2: we don’t think this affects the RAN 1 design** |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.5-1**: Support  **Question 2.5-2**: We still think that the number of sessions that the notification of MCCH change of configuration can be accommodated is not RAN1’s work. And the MCCH change notification is applied to multiple sessions.  **Question 2.5-3:** We asked our delegates from RAN2 and whether the MCCH change notification is 2bits or not depends on RAN1. If RAN1 can allocate 2 bits for MCCH change notification, RAN2 will be happy with it. If not, RAN2 will re-consider the bit for MCCH change notification. In our understanding, RAN1 has sufficient DCI filed for the 2 bits of MCCH change notification. For example, without the HARQ-ACK feedback, the related HARQ-feedback fields such as PRI and K1 filed which are not needed can be used to indicate the MCCH change notification. Thus, we prefer Alt2. |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2.5-1: we still think Alt 1 is preferred.  Question 2.5-3: prefer Alt 1. |
| Ericsson | P2.5.1: We’re ok with the proposal, but we would like to clarify whether a specific broadcast DCI is required, or if the field for MCCH notification can be inserted in a multicast DCI as optional.  Question 2.5.2: is up to ran2.  Question 2.5.3: either solution can work. Alt1 would require multiple RNTI if multiple session changes should be handled, while alt2 would require more than 1 bit. |
| Qualcomm | **Question 2.5-2**: we think no need to ask RAN2 this question for now. Currently, RAN2 is discussion the contents of MCCH change notification, which can be on-going session start/stop and other reasons of MCCH change. It is FFS how many bits are needed.  For LTE SC-PTM for MTC/NB-IoT (as specified in 36.331), 2bits for MCCH change notification are used to indicate only start/change of one or multiple services (SC-MTCHs). The 2bits are not applied to all sessions but only indicate there is change of one or multiple on-going sessions or start of one or multiple new change sessions.  **Question 2.5-3**: We prefer Alt1.  Regarding Ericsson’s comment, assuming single MCCH per cell (majority view so far), we only need one new RNTI for MCCH change notification (Alt1). The DCI for MCCH change notification can be decoupled from MCCH one, which can include the required bits (to be decided by RAN2).  Regarding Huawei’s reply on reliability, we think smaller payload size is needed for MCCH change notification only. Since we don’t need scheduling info for GC-PDSCH of MCCH, Alt1 would have higher reliability than Alt2. |
| Moderator | All, to clarify, I did not modify proposal 2.5-1 since I wanted to first progress on the questions. I do not think at this stage there is consensus on whether Alt 1 or Alt 2 should be selected. Hence, Alt 1 is still under discussion.  **Regarding the question on 2.5-2**: while [Nokia, Huawei, CATT, NTT DOCOMO, CMCC, Lenovo, OPPO, vivo, Ericsson, Qualcomm] think that it is up to RAN2 to decide whether the MCCH notification addresses one or various sessions or that it does not affect RAN1, [Apple, Samsung] think that RAN1 should ask RAN2 (or that RAN1 can ask RAN2). The majority believes whether the MCCH notification accommodates one of multiple sessions is up to RAN2.  Based on this, I would like to make the following proposal for conclusion:  **(NEW)Proposal 2.5-4 (conclusion)**: it is up to RAN2 to decide whether the MCCH change notification informs about MCCH configuration changes of one or multiple sessions.  **Regarding the question on 2.5-3**: multiple companies only expressed their preference on the alternative they support but I do not believe they replied to the questions on whether 2 bits for notification can be accommodated in Alt 1 and Alt 2. Whether 2 bits can be accommodated for Alt 2 is also related to the discussion in Issue 6. Whether 2 bits can be accommodated for Alt 1 has only been briefly discussed by Ericsson in their comment. Hence, to move the discussion forward, the FL makes the following proposal:  **(NEW)Proposal 2.5-5**: study whether Alt1 and Alt2 for MCCH change notification indication can accommodate 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop). |

### **[H] 4th round FL proposals for Issue 5**

**Proposal 2.5-1[on hold]**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, at least Alt 2 is supported to notify MCCH change due to modification of an ongoing session’s configuration (including session stop) and to notify changes of MCCH configuration due to session start:

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

**(NEW)Proposal 2.5-4 (conclusion)**: it is up to RAN2 to decide whether the MCCH change notification informs about MCCH configuration changes of one or multiple sessions.

**(NEW)Proposal 2.5-5**: study whether Alt1 and Alt2 for MCCH change notification indication can accommodate 2 bits for the notification of MCCH configuration changes due to a session start and the notification of MCCH configuration changes of an ongoing session (including session stop).

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
|  |  |

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

### **Background**

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

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

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2106664, Nokia]
  + Proposal-12: If the configured CFR size is larger than CORESET#0 region, the size of FDRA field in DCI format 1\_0 should be determined by the size of CFR.
* In [R1-2106718, Spreadtrum]
  + Proposal 1: If a specific CFR has been configured for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, the FDRA field should be based on the size of the CFR. On the contrary, the FDRA field should be determined by the size of the CORESET0 or the SIB1 configured initial BWP.
* In [R1-2107427, CMCC]
  + *Discuss*: Considering the MCCH is a broadcast channel without HARQ which is similar to BCCH, the current DCI fields when the CRC is scrambled by SI-RNTI except for system information indicator can be reused as the DCI fields in DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by MCCH-RNTI. As the discussion in section 2.1, we think both Case A and Case C can be used for MCCH, and the FDRA filed can be depended on CFR size because the current reserved bits are enough. For example, assume CORESET#0 is 48 PRB and CFR equals to CORESET#0, there are 16 reserved bits in DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by MCCH-RNTI. If the CFR is 272 PRB which needs 15 bits FDRA filed, there are still 12 reserved bits in DCI format 1\_0.
  + Proposal 6. The following DCI fields are needed in DCI format 1\_0 used for GC-PDCCH of MCCH,
    - FDRA filed which bitlength is depend on CFR size
    - TDRA filed Time domain resource assignment
    - VRB-to-PRB mapping
    - Modulation and coding scheme
    - Redundancy version
    - MCCH change notification
  + *Discuss*: the HARQ related DCI fields e.g., NDI, DAI, PRI, HARQ timing indicator, TPC command are not needed for GC-PDCCH of MTCH, which the remaining DCI fields are the same as GC-PDCCH of MCCH except for MCCH change notification.
  + Proposal 8. The following DCI fields are needed in DCI format 1\_0 used for GC-PDCCH of MTCH,
    - FDRA filed which bitlength is depend on CFR size
    - TDRA filed Time domain resource assignment
    - VRB-to-PRB mapping
    - Modulation and coding scheme
    - Redundancy version
  + *Discuss*: The last issue is about DCI size alignment, as the GC-PDCCH of MCCH/MTCH should be monitored by Ues in three RRC states, the DCI size of GC-PDCCH of MCCH/MTCH should be aligned with DCI format 1\_0 in CSS in order to not increase DCI sizes.
  + Proposal 9. The DCI size of GC-PDCCH of MCCH/MTCH should be aligned with DCI format 1\_0 in CSS.
* In [R1-2107516, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 7: At least the following fields are supported for broadcast reception for RRC INACTIVE/IDLE Ues
    - Frequency domain resource assignment
    - Time domain resource assignment
    - VRB-to-PRB mapping
    - Modulation and coding scheme
    - Redundancy version
    - Reserved bits
  + Proposal 8: For broadcast reception, the bit length FDRA field within DCI for scheduling MCCH/MTCH depends on the frequency size of CFR.
* In [R1-2107613, Intel]
  + Proposal 1: The FDRA field of DCI 1\_0 is based on the starting PRB index and size of the CORESET#0 or the initial BWP.
* In [R1-2107883, NTT DOCOMO]
  + Observation 1: If the existing RB numbering rule for PDSCH is reused, there may be RBs that cannot be allocated with DCI format 1\_0 for broadcast.
  + Proposal 4: For GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH, RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR.
  + Observation 2: If the granularity of GC-PDSCH allocation is 1RB, there may be RBs that cannot be allocated with DCI format 1\_0 for broadcast.
  + Proposal 5: For GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH, support resource allocation with granularity of multiple RBs.
* In [R1-2108172, Ericsson]
  + For the FDRA field in the DCI 1\_0 for broadcast (i.e. scrambled with G-RNTI):
    - The FDRA field size is given by the CFR size, i.e. one of the following
      * the size of orset#0
      * the size of the configured BWP.

### **FL Assessment**

The inputs to this issue mainly discuss the field in the DCI 1\_0 format currently supported for broadcast reception with RRC idle and inactive Ues. This has not been discussed at previous meetings.

***Discussion for DCI format 1\_0 fields for MCCH and MTCH***

[Nokia, Spreadtrum, CMCC, MediaTek, Intel, Ericsson] propose that the FDRA field is based on the size of the CFR. [CMCC, MediaTek] propose the minimum set of fields that are required for the DCI scheduling GC-PDSCH. [CMCC] separates the discussion on MCCH and MTCH channels where same parameters for both logical channels are proposed except the MCCH change notification for the DCI of scheduling an GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH. [NTT DOCOMO] further proposes that existing RB numbering rule should be changed to the lowest RB of the CFR, otherwise some RB would be left unused. They also additionally propose that resource allocation granularity is increase to multiple RBs.

The FL will put forward proposals covering the aspects proposed above.

***Discussion on DCI size alignment***

[CMCC] also proposes that in order not to increase the DCI size, the size of the DCI for GC-PDCCH should be aligned with the DCI format 1\_0 for CSS.

The FL will put forward proposals covering the aspect proposed above.

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

**Proposal 2.6-1**: For broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the bit length FDRA field within the DCI of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH depends on the frequency size of the CFR.

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

* FDRA field (size of CFR)
* TDRA field Time domain resource assignment
* VRB-to-PRB mapping
* Modulation and coding scheme
* Redundancy version
* MCCH change notification (if supported and only for MCCH)
* FFS: RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR and support of resource allocation with granularity of multiple RBs.

**Proposal 2.9-3**: For broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the DCI size of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH should be aligned with DCI format 1\_0 in the CSS.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are fine with **Proposal 2.6-1** and **Proposal 2.6-2**.  If understand correctly, there is a typo, it should be **Proposal 2.6-3** instead of **Proposal 2.9-3**. Moreover, there is also DCI size alignment discussion in 8.12.1, we prefer to postpone this discussion until the discussion in 8.12.1 is clarified. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 2.6-1: Prefer to delete “MCCH change notification (if supported and only for MCCH)”  Proposal 2.6-2: ok |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.6-1: OK.  Proposal 2.6-2: Generally fine with us. The field of VRB-to-PRB mapping may not be necessary. We can specify only interleaving is support so as to save one bit.  For FFS, we agree that RB numbering is from the lowest RB of CFR.  Whether to support larger RB granularity is FFS.  **Proposal 2.9-3**: It should be a typo on 2.6-3. We suggest to add “C-RNTI” for DCI format 1-0 in CSS.  **Proposal 2.6-3**: For broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the DCI size of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH should be aligned with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI in the CSS. |
| Vivo | The interpretation of DCI fields and DCI alignment to the existed DCI format for RRC idle/inactive Ues is highly related to the discussion for RRC-connected Ues. We propose to postpone discussing these proposals. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | **Proposal 2.6-1**: OK  **Proposal 2.6-2**: Ok  **Proposal 2.9-3**: The further discussion is needed. |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.6-1: Not support.**  We prefer to reuse the current mechanism which is similar with RRC\_CONNECTED UE, in where the bitlength is determined based on CORESET0/initial bandwidth part. If the bandwidth of CFR (i.e. ) is larger than that of CORESET0/initial bandwidth part, K can be the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 8} which satisfies ;otherwise, similar with unicast services.  **Proposal 2.6-2:** Apart from the fields that mentioned in the proposal, the HARQ process number (4 bits) and New data indicator (NDI, 1bit) fields are also needed for the case that the gNB blind retransmission the broadcast services. In such case, the soft-combine between initial transmissions and retransmission(s) should be considered. And the HARQ process number and NDI fields will be used.  **Proposal 2.6-3: Support.** |
| CMCC | Support three proposals |
| OPPO | Generally OK with the direction of the three proposals, even we think more discussions in details are needed. |
| ZTE | For proposal 2.6-1, the same issue for multicast reception with RRC\_CONNECTED UEs is discussed under 8.12.1. A unified method is recommended, as both broadcast and multicast can be received by RRC\_CONNECTED UEs. Besides, if CFR is larger than CORESET#0, the DCI size for fallback DCI may be exceeded, which is not preferred.  For proposal 2.6-2, according to the above comments for proposal 2.6-1 and 2.5-1, we suggest the following updates,  **Proposal 2.6-2**: The DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH at least includes the following fields for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state:   * FDRA field ~~(size of CFR)~~ * TDRA field Time domain resource assignment * VRB-to-PRB mapping * Modulation and coding scheme * Redundancy version * FFS: MCCH change notification (if supported and only for MCCH) * FFS: RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR and support of resource allocation with granularity of multiple RBs. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.6-1**: Support.  **Proposal 2.6-2**: Support. RB numbering should start from the lowest RB of the CFR. Otherwise, there will be RBs that PDSCH cannot be allocated when the starting PRB number of the CORESET for broadcast is larger than the starting PRB number of the CFR.  **Proposal 2.6-3**: Support. We would like to change the word for clarification.  “should be aligned” -> “is aligned” |
| Ericsson | P2.6-1: Support  P2.6-2: Disagree. We propose instead to use the first DCI format for multicast as the basis and then determine which fields are not applicable for broadcast.  P2.6-3: (i.e. “2.9-3” above): We suggest this is postponed until it is clarified whether a new DCI format is needed for broadcast. |
| Apple | **Proposal 2.6-1:** ok with this proposal.  **Proposal 2.6-2 and 2.6-3:** we need to align the discussion in AI 8.12.1, the fallback DCI will be used for both RRC\_CONNECTED UE and IDLE/INACTIVE UE. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.6-1**: Fine  **Proposal 2.6-2**: have the similar view with QC, suggest to delete “MCCH change notification” field.  **Proposal 2.6-3**: Since the DCI size alignment is being discussed in AI 8.12.1, maybe we can postpone this discussion until it has clear conclusion in AI 8.12.1 |
| Moderator | **Thanks for comments.**  @Nokia: Lenovo, vivo, Ericsson: thanks for spotting the typo! I think it would be good to try to get some progress since this discussion also affects the discussion in Issue 5.  @Qualcomm: I have included FFS for the notification.  @CATT: thanks for comment. Regarding P2.6-1 most companies seem to prefer the current formulation, but let’s see whether there are any change of views, I will leave the current formulation in this round. I have included your comments on HARQ processes.  @ZTE: thanks for comments, I have included your wording and we may need more discussion for the first proposal.  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: The DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH at least includes the following fields for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state:   * FDRA field ~~(size of CFR)~~ * TDRA field Time domain resource assignment * VRB-to-PRB mapping * Modulation and coding scheme * Redundancy version * FFS: MCCH change notification (if supported and only for MCCH) * FFS: RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR and support of resource allocation with granularity of multiple RBs. * FFS: HARQ process number and New data indicator   **Proposal 2.6-3**: For broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the DCI size of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH ~~should be~~ is aligned with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI in the CSS. |

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

**Proposal 2.6-1**: For broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the bit length FDRA field within the DCI of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH depends on the frequency size of the CFR.

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

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

**Proposal 2.6-3**: For broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the DCI size of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH ~~should be~~ is aligned with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI in the CSS.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are fine with **Proposal 2.6-1** and **Proposal 2.6-2**.  And prefer to delay the discussion of **Proposal 2.6-3** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.6-1**: OK.  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: We prefer predefined VRB-PRB interleaving so as to save one bit.  **Proposal 2.6-3**: SUPPORT. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | **Proposal 2.6-1**:OK  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: OK  **Proposal 2.6-3**: Further discussion is needed. |
| Intel | **Proposal 2.6-1/2:** OK  **Proposal 2.6-3:** Just to clarify that the need to align is mainly due to the need for alignment for CONNECTED mode Ues. For IDLE mode Ues, DCI size budget generally may not be an issue. |
| ZTE | Similar as what we commented in the last round, our concern for Proposal 2.6-1 still remains.  Ok with Proposal 2.6-2rev1 and Proposal 2.6-3. |
| Samsung | Fine with proposals. |
| Qualcomm | For 2.6-1: ‘depends on CFR’ means is given by CFR? Or other interpretation.  For 2.6-2: ok  For 2.6-3: ok  We think DCI size alignment is also needed for IDLE/INACTIVE Ues to minimize the BD number. |
| OPPO | OK. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.6-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.6-3**: Support |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.6-1:** If support, more details of how to ‘depends on the frequency size of the CFR’ should be considered.  **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.6-3**: Support |
| CMCC | Support in principle. We are also open to discuss how FDRA filed is ‘depends on the frequency size of the CFR’, from our view, we think it means equals to CFR size. |
| Ericsson | P2.6rev1: Support  P2.6-3: Support |
| Moderator | Thanks.  **For proposal 2.6-1**  @ZTE: I have added a FFS to try to address your concern, please check whether this is enough – thanks.  @Qualcomm, CATT, CMCC: I cannot see one of the characters you have in you comment. I have changed the wording, but please check and any rewording from your side is welcome.  **For proposal 2.6-2**  @lenovo, I have included an FFS for the VRB-to-PRB mapping  @Ericsson: I read that you disagree, but can you please let me know how the proposal can be reworded to accommodate your concern? thanks.  **For Proposal 2.6-3:**  Nokia, Chengdu TD Tech: there seems to be good support from other companies. What are your specific concerns? we should try to make as much progress as possible.  **Revised proposals:**  **Proposal 2.6-1rev1**: For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the bit length FDRA field within the DCI of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH is determined ~~depends on~~ by the frequency size of the CFR.   * FFS: alignment with solution for multicast reception with RRC\_CONNECTED UEs   **Proposal 2.6-2rev1**: The DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH at least includes the following fields for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state:   * FDRA field ~~(size of CFR)~~ * TDRA field Time domain resource assignment * FFS: VRB-to-PRB mapping * Modulation and coding scheme * Redundancy version * FFS: MCCH change notification (if supported and only for MCCH) * FFS: RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR and support of resource allocation with granularity of multiple RBs. * FFS: HARQ process number and New data indicator   **Proposal 2.6-3**: For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the DCI size of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH is aligned with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI in the CSS. |

### **[H] 3rd round FL proposals for Issue 6**

**Proposal 2.6-1rev1**: For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the bit length FDRA field within the DCI of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH is determined ~~depends on~~ by the frequency size of the CFR.

* FFS: alignment with solution for multicast reception with RRC\_CONNECTED UEs

**Proposal 2.6-2rev2**: The DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH at least includes the following fields for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state:

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

**Proposal 2.6-3**: For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the DCI size of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH is aligned with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI in the CSS.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| Samsung | OK |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK with above three proposals. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Regarding **Proposal 2.6-1rev1**, OK for us  Regarding **Proposal 2.6-2rev2**, to keep the door open, we could like also to include others shown in below:   * FFS: other fields if needed   Regarding **Proposal 2.6-3**, support |
| ZTE | For Proposal 2.6-1rev1, we are wondering how it is possible. If Case C is supported, the legacy DCI format 1\_0 will use CORESET#0 to determine DCI size. Since the CFR is larger than CORESET#0 in Case C, if the proposal is agreed, the GC-PDCCH DCI size will be larger than the legacy one, which is impossible to perform DCI size alignment. Thus, we are not ok with Proposal 2.6-1rev1. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposals. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposals. |
| CMCC | OK  To address the concern from ZTE, we don’t need PRI and TPC in DCI format 1\_0 with G-RNTI, these bits can be used to increase FDRA filed bitlength. |
| CATT | OK |
| MediaTek | Generally OK |
| Moderator | Regarding Proposal 2.6-1: for this proposal there are related discussions in AI 8.12.1. The progress on Issue 1 on CFR cases also affects this proposal. The discussion on proposal 2.6-2 in this same issue also has an impact on this proposal since depending on the fields required for the DCI it may be possible to use more/less bits for the FDRA field. Based on this the FL proposes to delay the discussion to next meetings.  Regarding Proposal 2.6-2: the comment from Nokia has been included. Ericsson that disagreed in previous rounds has not provided an updated view. If possible I would like to hear form Ericsson a way forward for this proposal. I think the current wording has good support, and I think we need to make progress and to help the discussion on the MCCH notification – thanks!  Regarding Proposal 2.6-3: although some companies that have expressed in previous rounds that this discussion should be delayed (e.g., NOKIA, Ericsson) have changed their opinion, there are companies that have shared in previous rounds that have not mentioned whether their opinion stays the same or whether it has changed (e.g., **Apple, vivo, MediaTek, Chengdu TD Tech**). I would like to hear from this companies before we decided whether we move the discussion of this proposal to next meetings – thank you!  **Proposal 2.6-2rev3**: The DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH at least includes the following fields for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state:   * FDRA field * TDRA field Time domain resource assignment * Modulation and coding scheme * Redundancy version * FFS:   + MCCH change notification (if supported and only for MCCH),   + RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR and support of resource allocation with granularity of multiple RBs.   + HARQ process number and New data indicator   + VRB-to-PRB mapping   + other field if needed. |

### **[H] 4th round FL proposals for Issue 6**

**Proposal 2.6-1rev1 [delay to next meetings]**: For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the bit length FDRA field within the DCI of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH is determined by the frequency size of the CFR.

* FFS: alignment with solution for multicast reception with RRC\_CONNECTED UEs

**Proposal 2.6-2rev3**: The DCI 1\_0 format for GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH at least includes the following fields for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state:

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

**Proposal 2.6-3**: For broadcast reception with UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the DCI size of GC-PDCCH scheduling a GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH is aligned with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI in the CSS.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
|  |  |

## Issue 7: PDCCH: CORESET for MCCH and MTCH channels

### **Background**

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

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

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2106440, Huawei]
  + Proposal 2: When the CFR for MCCH/MTCH is configured with the same size as SIB1 configured initial BWP, in addition to CORESET#0, the other CORESET larger than CORESET#0 can be configured.
* In [R1-2106664, Nokia]
  + Proposal-7: Support different/separate CORESET can be utilized for GC-PDCCH of MCCH and MTCH.
  + Observation-1: If CFR [Case C] in Figure-1 is agreed to be supported, the agreements that have been agreed for CFR [Case A] can be applied directly.
  + Proposal-8: If CFR [Case D-1] and [Case E] are agreed to be supported, the corresponding CFR\_CORESET configured via SIBx of CFR configuration can be applied accordingly, and CORESET#0 is applied as default if corresponding CFR\_CORESET is not configured.
* In [R1-2106747, ZTE]
  + Proposal 5: Regarding the CORESET configuration,
    - the CORESET configured within the CFR for GC-PDCCH can be applied for broadcast, multicast and unicast.
    - networks configures CORESET#0 or common CORESET configured by *commonControlResourceSet* for GC-PDCCH if MBS CORESET is not configured.
* In [R1-2107371, Qualcomm]
  + Proposal 4: 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 [R1-2107952, Chengdu TD tech]
  + Proposal 4: MCCH and MTCH share the same CORESETs/search spaces which are configured in the initial BWP for DL.
* In [R1-2108028, Convida]
  + Proposal 3: 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 [R1-2108172, Ericsson]
  + Proposal 13: For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily (in the minimum capability) supported for Rel-15/Rel-16 Ues, i.e., 2 CORESETs.
    - If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues can be configured with the following options:
      * CORESET#0 (default option if CFR is the initial BWP and CORESET is not configured); or
      * CORESET configured by commonControlResourceSet; or
      * CORESET#0 and CORESET configured by commonControlResourceSet.

### **FL Assessment**

[Huawei, ZTE, Convida] propose that an additional CORESET to CORESET#0 can be configured. However, is FL understanding that this is already possible based on the agreement at the last meeting [**is this is a misunderstanding, please do share your views in the discussion section below**]:

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

[Nokia, Qualcomm] propose that separate configurations of GC-PDCCH can done for MCCH and MTCH. While [ZTE] also proposes that the CORESET configured within the CFR for GC-PDCCH can be applied for broadcast, multicast and unicast.

Finally, [Ericsson] proposes to reformulate one of the agreements on the maximum number of CORESETs since the ongoing discussion on CFR with the same size as the SIB-1 configured initial BWP. However, in this case the FL suggests to wait until the discussion on CFR is more mature.

The FL puts forward proposals addressing the aspects above.

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

**Proposal 2.7-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the CORESET configured within the CFR for GC-PDCCH can be applied for broadcast, multicast and unicast.

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

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Regarding **Proposal 2.7-1**, so far, the discussion is focusing on the broadcast reception for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, we don’t see why it is necessary to agree anything relate to the CORESET configuration for multicast and unicast? Thus, we are not fine with **Proposal 2.7-1.**  We are fine with **Proposal 2.7-2**. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 2.7-1: not support it. There is no multicast/unicast for IDLE/INACTIVE Ues per our understanding.  Proposal 2.7-2: support it. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2.7-1: not support it. Only broadcast is supported.  Proposal 2.7-2: OK. |
| Vivo | We are not clear with Proposal 2.7-1, as RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues may not be able to support multicast and unicast in Rel 17. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2.7-1: Do not see the necessarily to also consider multicast and unicast.  Proposal 2.7-2: OK. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | **Proposal 2.7-1**:OK  **Proposal 2.7-2**:OK |
| CATT | Proposal 2.7-1: NOT support.  Proposal 2.7-2: OK. |
| CMCC | 2.7-1: Not support, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues cannot support multicast  2.7-2:OK |
| OPPO | Proposal 2.7-1: NOT support. Similar view with Qualcomm and Lenovo that it is only for broadcast.  Proposal 2.7-2: OK. |
| ZTE | OK with the intention. But seems more clarification is needed on the wording. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.7-1**: This proposal seems to be for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues, it’s not something to discuss in this AI.  **Proposal 2.7-2**: Support |
| Ericsson | P2.7.1: Support  P2.7.2: Support, provided separate CFRs for MCCH and MTCH are supported, which is not yet the case. We propose the following clarifying reformulation:  **Proposal 2.7-2z**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the CORESET of GC-PDCCH for MCCH and MTCH can be separately configured in corresponding CFR, if different CFRs for MCCH and MTCH is supported: CORESET for MCCH can be configured by SIB and CORESET for MTCH can be configured by MCCH.  We would also like to have clarification about whether “SIB” is one of the existing SIBs or a new SIB.  We also think it is unclear why there is a need to have separate configurations. |
| Apple | **Proposal 2.7-1**: maybe the intention of this proposal is the CORESET could be shared by broadcast, multicast and unicast.  **Proposal 2.7-2**: we are not sure why the CORESET of of GC-PDCCH for MCCH and MTCH can be different. If we assume the RRC\_CONNECTED mode UE can also receive the broadcast service, so it will be more than 3 CORESETs configured for this UE in a dedicated BWP, e.g., One CORESET for unicast, one CORESET for multicast, two CORESETs for broadcast. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.7-1**: Not support.  The multicast reception is TBD for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE in RAN2’s agreement and is down-prioritized. Until now, we only focus on the broadcast reception for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE Ues from RAN1’s perspective.  **Proposal 2.7-2**: Not support  The proposal is relevant the CFR for MCCH and MTCH, which is being discussed in issue 2. We can postpone the discussion until the clear conclusion is achieved in issue 2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | I did not get the intention of proposal 2.7-1, UE in IDLE/INACTIVE does not monitor multicast nor unicast, so?  Support **Proposal 2.7-2** |
| LG | **Proposal 2.7-1**: We wonder if this proposal is for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues because only connected Ues support all of broadcast, multicast and unicast.  **Proposal 2.7-2**: We are fine with this proposal. |
| Intel | **Proposal 2.7-1:** Not sure what is the significance of multicast and unicast in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE case. Only broadcast is relevant.  **Proposal 2.7-2:** Given the current wording, don’t we first need to agree that MTCH and MCCH can have their respective configured CFRs? |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposals |
| Moderator | Thanks for all the comments.  **Regarding the comments on Proposal 2.7-1**. The motivation for this proposal came from ZTE’s contribution as per the following text: “*Regarding whether the CORESET can be applied for broadcast, multicast and unicast, we can follow the same rule of CORESET#0. In Rel-15/Rel-16, CORESET#0 can be applied for both cell common information reception (e.g., SIB1) and unicast. Similarly, we can allow the CORESET to be applied to broadcast, multicast and unicast*.” **Would it be possible for ZTE to provide more detail?** It is likely that the current wording does not capture properly the intention.  I will reformulate as follows:  **Proposal 2.7-1rev1**: ~~For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues,~~ The CORESET configured within the CFR for GC-PDCCH can be applied for broadcast, multicast and unicast.  **Regarding the comments on Proposal 2.7-2.** There seems to be quite a lot of support for the current formulation. However, there are comments and questions from companies. I would like to ask **Qualcomm** and **Nokia** if the can provide further motivation for the proposal – thank you.  Some further comments from my side.  @Ericsson: I have included your wording but clarifying “different bandwidth configurations” that understand it was the intention, please do let me know if it is not. Regarding the SIB, I also understand is as per RAN2 agreement a MBS specific SIB.  @Ericsson, Apple, Intel: I understood the motivation that it may not only be because of different frequency location of the ignal but other parameters that could be configured in the ignal. (However, this better motivated by the proponents.)  **Proposal 2.7-2rev1:** For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, the CORESET of GC-PDCCH for MCCH and MTCH can be separately configured in corresponding CFR, if different bandwidth configurations for the CFRs of MCCH and MTCH are supported: CORESET for MCCH can be configured by MBS specific SIB and CORESET for MTCH can be configured by MCCH. |
| NOKIA/NSB | @FL: regarding motivation for Proposal 2.7-2, we had the view as the earlier reply from Ericsson. |
| ZTE | Thanks for the discussion.  The intention of Proposal 2.7-1 is not to allow IDLE/INACTIVE Ues to receive multicast and unicast. The intention is to say, the CORESET used for broadcast can also be used for multicast and unicast scheduling.  For example, if CORESET#X is configured for UE for MBS broadcast during IDLE. Once UE enters CONNECTED state, network can also use the same CORESET for multicast scheduling.  To make it clear, maybe we can try the following updated version from FL.  **Proposal 2.7-1rev1**: ~~For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues,~~ The CORESET configured within the CFR for GC-PDCCH can be applied for broadcast, multicast and unicast. |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.7-1rev1:** OK with the updated proposal.  **Proposal 2.7-2rev1:** According to the agreement that is achieved in last meeting as copied below, no more than 2 CORESETs (CORRSET0 and CORESET configured by SIB1) can be configured. We concern that ‘CORESET for MCCH can be configured by SIB and CORESET for MTCH can be configured by MCCH’ may lead three CORSETSs (i.e. CORESET0, CORESET for MCCH, and CORESET for MTCH) are configured, which is inconformity with current agreement.  Agreement:  For Rel-17, for broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs do not exceed the maximum number of CORESETs mandatorily (in the minimum capability) supported for Rel-15/Rel-16 UEs, i.e., 2 CORESETs.   * If the CFR has the same frequency range as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 or where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can be configured with the following options:   + CORESET#0 (default option if CFR is the initial BWP and CORESET is not configured); or   + CORESET configured by commonControlResourceSet; or   + CORESET#0 and CORESET configured by commonControlResourceSet. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.7-2rev1:** Not support.  We have the same concern with CATT. Besides, This proposal is related to CFR configuration for MCCH and MTCH, we suggest to postpone the proposal until the CFR’s discussion is clear. |

## Issue 8: PDSCH repetition/HARQ combining

### **Background**

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

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

This issue was also discussed for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues at RAN1#104-e without reaching an agreement since companies preferred to delay the discussion until after more progress was achieved at other Ais.

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2106747, ZTE]
  + Proposal 9: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, consecutive slot-level PDSCH repetition with repetition number configured by higher layer (e.g., via SIB) is supported for MBS.
* In [R1-2107371, Qualcomm]
  + *Discuss*: For RRC\_CONNECTED Ues, we have agreed to support slot-level repetition for GC-PDSCH. Similar feature should be applied for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, when receiving broadcast services. Compared with multicast transmission, transmit diversity is relatively more important for broadcast transmission due to no CSI feedback and HARQ operation.
  + Proposal 9: Support semi-static and dynamic repetition configuration for broadcast MCCH/MTCH.
  + *Discuss*: In NR, a dedicated HARQ process is used for SIB, not occupying the total number of HARQ processes for unicast. For NR Rel-17 broadcast, RAN1 needs to discuss whether/how to allocate HARQ process(es) for broadcast.
  + Proposal 10: At least for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, support HARQ combining using the available HARQ process(es) of unicast/multicast.
* In [R1- 2107458, LGE]
  + Proposal 9: For slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues receiving broadcast,
    - (Config A) UE can be optionally configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor*.
    - (Config B) UE can be optionally configured with TDRA table with *repetitionNumber* as part of the TDRA table.
    - If UE is configured with Config B, UE does not expect to be configured with Config A for the same group-common PDSCH.
* In [R1-2107613, Intel]
  + Discuss: Additionally, slot-level repetition similar to the case for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues can be supported. The repetition is configured as part of the TDRA table configured to idle/inactive mode Ues via SIB signalling. The repetition can then be dynamically indicated by the group common PDCCH.
  + Proposal 10: Slot level repetition can be supported for RRC\_IDLE Ues with the repetition configured as part of the TDRA table via SIB and indicated dynamically through DCI.
* In [R1-2107883, NTT DOCOMO]
  + *Discuss*: It was agreed that existing parameters *pdsch-AggregationFactor* and *repetitionNumber* can be configured for slot-level repetition of group-common PDSCH for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues.
  + *Discuss*: Both semi-static and dynamic methods of indicating the number of repetitions would be useful. Their parameters should be configurable in MBS specific SIB or MCCH.
  + Proposal 7: *pdsch-AggregationFactor* and *repetitionNumber* can be configured for group-common PDSCH for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues.
* In [R1-2108028, Convida]
  + *Discuss*: As PDSCH repetition has been already agreed to be supported for MBS in RRC connected state, it should be also considered to support MBS PDSCH repetition RRC idle/inactive state.
  + Proposal 6: Support PDSCH repetition and PDCCH repetition for MBS for the RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues.
* In [R1-2108172, Ericsson]
  + As an example, time diversity could be increased by using pre-scheduled retransmissions, exactly like multicast HARQ retransmissions and/or PDSCH repetitions, but not triggered by UE feedback, but pre-scheduled, as decided by the gNB to achieve a certain target broadcast coverage.  
    With such alignment it would also be easier in future releases to find possibilities for an even higher degree of integration of the overall MBS system solution for unicast/multicast/broadcast, allowing increased flexibility and performance with a minimized complexity footprint.
  + Proposal 16: The NR broadcast solution should target maximum commonality/alignment with the NR multicast solution.

### **FL Assessment**

This issue was not discussed at RAN1#105-e.

[ZTE, Qualcomm, LGE, Intel, NTT DOCOMO, Convida, Ericsson] propose/discuss the support of slot-level repetition for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC Idle/inactive state.

[Qualcomm] discusses HARQ process for broadcast reception and [Ericsson] also discusses the benefits of aligning the solutions between unicast, multicast and broadcast.

Multiple companies propose slot-level repetition for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC idle/inactive state, a feature already supported for multicast reception for RRC connected Ues. Given that further progress has been made since the discussion of this issue at RAN1#104-e, the FL puts forward a proposal to also include the support for broadcast reception with idle/inactive states.

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

**Proposal 2.8-1**: For broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support slot-level repetition for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH.

* reusing solution adopted for multicast reception with Ues in RRC\_CONNECTED state.
* FFS HARQ combining using available HARQ process(es) of unicast/multicast.
* FSS dynamic and semi-static methods of indicating the number of repetitions.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are generally fine with the main bullet point of **Proposal 2.8-1** to support slot-level repetition.  But it seems the 2nd sub-bullet regarding HARQ combing has NO relation with slot-level repetition in the main bullet, we don’t understand why it is added here, maybe it should be removed or separated with a new proposal? |
| Qualcomm | Fine with the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | OK with the main bullet.  The first FFS is not necessary as combining is UE implementation issue. |
| Vivo | One clarification question, does this proposal also apply to ‘for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_CONNECTED states’?  As it has not been agreed using the available HARQ process yet, can we modify first FFS below  FFS HARQ combining ~~using available HARQ process(es) of unicast/multicast~~. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | Proposal 2.8-1: Ok |
| CATT | More clarification is needed. What is the solution adopted for multicast reception with Ues in RRC\_CONNECTED state? |
| CMCC | Not support  The first FFS has no relationship with main bullet  Regarding the second FFS, we have the agreement for RRC connected Ues as the following. As the main bullet says if we reusing solution of RRC connected Ues, that means Config A is semi-static and Config B is dynamic, so we don’t need the second FFS.  Agreement:  For slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues receiving multicast,   * (Config A) UE can be optionally configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor*. * (Config B) UE can be optionally configured with TDRA table with *repetitionNumber* as part of the TDRA table. * If UE is configured with Config B, UE does not expect to be configured with Config A for the same group-common PDSCH. |
| OPPO | Only support the main bullet of slot-level repetition. There is no necessary to have any FFS part at this stage of this topic. |
| ZTE | We support to have slot-level repetition for IDLE/INACTIVE UE for broadcast. Regarding the above proposal, if the first bullet is approved, then the last FFS is already covered by the first bullet. Thus, the last FFS can be removed.  If companies have concern on the sub-bullets for now, we can fist agree on the main bullet. |
| NTT DOCOMO | For the 2nd sub-bullet, we agree with Nokia. And there is a typo in 3rd sub-bullet (FSS -> FFS☺ |
| Ericsson | P2.8-1: Support |
| Apple | It seems too early to agree on this proposal. First, there is no progress on repetition in AI 8.12.1. second, the slot-level repetition seems only applied to PDSCH, not for GC-PDCCH. |
| MediaTek | Generally Ok with the proposal. |
| LG | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Intel | OK with the main bullet. Sub-bullets may not be required at this stage. |
| Samsung | Ok with proposal |
| Convida | OK with the proposal. |
| Moderator | Thanks for the comments. I think there is more consensus on agreeing only to the main point of the proposal.  @Nokia, Lenovo, CMCC: my understanding was that HARQ combining/process was relevant for slot-level repetition as per section 5.3.2.1 of TS 38.321 as follows “*When the MAC entity is configured with pdsch-AggregationFactor > 1, the parameter pdsch-AggregationFactor provides the number of transmissions of a TB within a bundle of the downlink assignment. Bundling operation relies on the HARQ entity for invoking the same HARQ process for each transmission that is part of the same bundle. After the initial transmission, pdsch-AggregationFactor – 1 HARQ retransmissions follow within a bundle.*” However, at this state agreeing to the main bullet may have more consensus.  @vivo: the scope of the proposal is Ues in RRC idle/inactive states.  @Apple: I have changed it to only PDSCH, but there seems to be good support for agreeing the main proposal without sub-bullets and FFSs. There have also been agreements on slot-level repetition for connected RRC Ues.  **Proposal 2.8-1rev1**: For broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support slot-level repetition for GC-~~PDCCH/~~PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH.   * ~~reusing solution adopted for multicast reception with Ues in RRC\_CONNECTED state.~~ * ~~FFS HARQ combining using available HARQ process(es) of unicast/multicast.~~ * ~~FSS dynamic and semi-static methods of indicating the number of repetitions.~~ |

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

**Proposal 2.8-1rev1**: For broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support slot-level repetition for GC-~~PDCCH/~~PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH.

* ~~reusing solution adopted for multicast reception with Ues in RRC\_CONNECTED state.~~
* ~~FFS HARQ combining using available HARQ process(es) of unicast/multicast.~~
* ~~FSS dynamic and semi-static methods of indicating the number of repetitions.~~

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Regarding **Proposal 2.8-1rev1**, we could only agree the following re-wording:  **Proposal 2.8-1rev1**: For broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states, support slot-level repetition for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH.  To our understanding, the support of slot-level repetition for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues is to improve (at least) the reliability of broadcast reception. We may need to discuss whether the slot-level repetition for GC-PDSCH is enough or not. To our understanding, the *pdsch-AggregationFactor* based mechanism is to use one DCI to schedule multiple consecutive DL slots for PDSCH. The number of consecutive slots can be 2/4/8, where the number of slots can be configured via higher-layer ignalling. Assume if there is no slot-level repetition being considered for GC-PDCCH, the missing detection of DCI by MBS idle/inactive UE could jeopardize the whole *pdsch-AggregationFactor* based mechanism.  But anyway, we may also need to discuss whether the *pdsch-AggregationFactor* based mechanism should be supported or TDRA table with *repetitionNumber* based scheme should be supported.  @FL: Many thanks for the clarification regarding “HARQ combining”, now I can see you had the *pdsch-AggregationFactor* based mechanism in mind. Because in the Tdoc proposal, there were HARQ combing being proposed by company, I can see now Proposal 2.8-1rev1 has no relation to do with that one. Thanks! |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | OK |
| CATT | OK |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| ZTE | Support |

## Issue 9: PDSCH: Semi Persistent Scheduling

### **Background**

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

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

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2106625, vivo]
  + *Discuss*: Semi-persistent scheduling (SPS) is beneficial for periodic transmissions. However, in broadcast, the received Ues are not known by gNB and HARQ feedback is not expected to be supported. If UE fails to detect the activation DCI for SPS MBS PDSCH, it will miss all the subsequent transmissions. Therefore, for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, SPS PDSCH with DCI activation/deactivation is not supported at least for broadcast reception. On the other hand, SPS PDSCH without dynamic activation/deactivation which is similar to uplink configured grant type 1 can be considered instead.
  + Proposal 4: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, at least for broadcast reception, SPS PDSCH with DCI activation/deactivation is not supported.
    - FFS: SPS PDSCH without DCI activation/deactivation.
* In [R1-2106747, ZTE]
  + Proposal 10: Support SPS group-common PDSCH for MBS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues.
* In [R1-2107883, NTT DOCOMO]
  + *Discuss*: SPS is beneficial to reduce PDCCH overhead. Based on RAN2 agreements, a UE can know the start/end of broadcast session by MCCH change notification. Therefore, SPS will work without activation/deactivation commands. Configurations required to receive SPS group-common PDSCH can be included in the MCCH. In other words, SPS group-common PDSCH with the same concept as Type-1 CG-PUSCH should be supported.
  + Proposal 8: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, support SPS group-common PDSCH without activation/deactivation commands.
* In [R1-2108028, Convida]
  + Proposal 5: Support scheduling without dynamic grant for the RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues.
* In [R1-2108172, Ericsson]
  + *Discuss*: SPS for MTCH in idle/inactive (i/i) has not be widely discussed. For SPS in i/i, a one-time activation signalled in PDCCH does not make sense, because 1) Ues can “enter” the cell by cell-reselection and we believe it should be possible that SPS is active or inactive on a per-cell basis and 2) for i/i Ues there is no HARQ-ACK/NACK, so PDCCH-based activation could not use ACK/NACK either to confirm the activation.
  + Proposal: For SPS to Ues in RRC-Idle/Inactive, we propose configuration and activation is in the MCCH.
  + Proposal: For SPS to Ues in RRC-Idle/Inactive, the slot offset is included in the SPS-Config IE and this IE is carried in MCCH.

### **FL Assessment**

This issue was not discussed at RAN1#105-e. For AI 8.12.3 this issue was discussed at RAN1#104-e without an agreement since various companies preferred to progress the feature adopted for AI 8.12.1 on multicast for RRC connected state Ues.

[vivo, ZTE, NTT DOCMO, Convida, Ericsson] propose the use of SPS for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC idle/inactive state.

[vivo, NTT DOCOMO, Ericsson] discuss that activation/deactivation carried in DCI is not a suitable solution for RRC idle/inactive Ues. Configuration carried in MCCH, including periodicity and offset, is proposed.

Given that this issue has progressed in the other 2 Ais of the WI and the proposals submitted to this meeting, the FL puts a proposal to try to reach agreement to enable SPS for GC-PDSCH for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTICE state.

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

**Proposal 2.9-1**: Support SPS GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTICE state.

* configuration to receive SPS GC-PDSCH, including an IE *SPS-Config*, is included in MCCH.
* FFS details of the IE *SPS-Config:* periodicity and offset.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are fine with **Proposal 2.9-1**. |
| Qualcomm | Need further clarification/study. Which kind of SPS is discussed here:   * + - * Type-1 SPS: DL SPS GC-PDSCH with SPS DCI activation/deactivation       * Type-2 SPS: DL SPS GC-PDSCH without SPS DCI activation/deactivation   For multicast, we only agreed to support Type-1 SPS. We think Type-1 SPS cannot be supported for IDLE/INACTIVE. If we say Type-2 SPS for broadcast MTCH, it will make CONN Ues to support two types of SPS for DL PDSCH. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | OK |
| vivo | One clarification question, does this proposal also apply to ‘ broadcast reception with Ues in RRC\_CONNECTED states’? |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine. |
| Chengdu TD Techy, TD Tech | Ok |
| CMCC | Further discuss.  In addition, we think the PDCCH activation/deactivation based SPS can not be used for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE Ues. |
| OPPO | OK |
| ZTE | We support to have SPS for MBS for IDLE/INACTIVE UE. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Similar view as Qualcomm. More clarification is needed. |
| Ericsson | P2.9-1: Support |
| Apple | The Proposal is ok in general. |
| MediaTek | The motivation is not clear for us. Could some proponents clarify why does it need SPS for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE Ues |
| LG | We are fine with this proposal. We assume that activation/deactivation DCI can be also used for broadcast SPS, assuming that connected Ues may not need to monitor MCCH. |
| Samsung | OK |
| Convida | We support to have SPS for MBS for IDLE/INACTIVE Ues. The two types of SPS raised by QC should be further studied. |
| Moderator | Thanks for comments.  Although there are 11 companies that are fine/support including SPS for broadcast reception with Ues in idle/inactive, there are 4 companies that request feedback from proponents on the motivation. Inputs to this meeting proposing SPS were [vivo, ZTE, NTT DOCMO, Convida, Ericsson]. **Could proponents provide further explanations to address companies comments**?  Some further comments from my side:  @Qualcomm: I understand that inputs were proposing not to use activation/deactivation in DCI and that configuration could be carried in MCCH.  @vivo, this proposal addresses RRC idle/inactive Ues.  @NTT DOCOMO: this proposal tries to build form your input proposing SPS. Any rewording that may express better the intention is greatly received, thank you. |
| ZTE | From our perspective, the motivation to support SPS for broadcast is as below.  1. Most of the broadcast service is periodic service;  2. The PDSCH scheduling for broadcast is more conservative in order to accommodate all Ues. In this sense, the scheduling info may not need to update frequently. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have concern to support broadcast SPS.  Assuming broadcast has no ACK/NACK feedback, then NW does not know whether UE receives the activation, it may result in data missing for a long time. |

## Issue 10: Beam Sweeping for MCCH and MTCH channels

### **Background**

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

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

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 [R1-2106440, Huawei]
  + 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.
  + 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.
  + Proposal 8: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH can be configured to be QCL’d with periodic TRS for IDLE/INACTIVE Ues receiving MTCH.
* In [R1-2106664, Nokia]
  + Proposal-13: Consider the SSB index to PDCCH MO mapping across the MBS window can be “disabled” by network. Thus, the mapped number of mapped SSB beams can be evenly distributed among each MCCH window duration.
  + Proposal-14: Propose to allow the network to control the number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the MBS window duration.
  + Proposal-15: Consider including the SSB association mapping for SSB beams without MBS transmission.
* [R1-2106718, Spreadtrum]
  + Proposal 5: Do not support group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH being QCL’d with periodic TRS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues.
* In [R1-2106747, ZTE]
  + Proposal 11: Regarding beam sweeping transmission of MTCH,
    - Both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be used for MTCH.
    - The mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs for SIB1 can be reused if searchSpace#0 is configured.
    - The similar rule as defined for OSI in TS 38.331 can be reused for mapping PDCCH occasions to SSBs in the MTCH transmission window if a common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH scheduling.
* In [R1-2106947, CATT]
  + *Discuss*: Considering the group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is for a group of Ues, the transmission mode is broadcast and the MCS (i.e. QPSK) of PDSCH is not high, so additional periodic TRS for broadcast is not necessary.
  + Proposal 7: The additional periodic TRS for broadcast is not necessary.
  + Proposal 8: In NR MBS system, both options of PDCCH MO configuration can be considered, and how to initiate these two options can be further studied.
    - Option 1: PDCCH Mos in one MBS-window length are allocated to different SSBs successively, same as the PDCCH Mos for SIBx.
    - Option 2: PDCCH Mos in one MBS-window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive Mos.
* In [R1-2107095, 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 [R1-2107231, OPPO]
  + Proposal 7: 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 8: 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 9:
    - 5a: The first PDCCH occasion of each data are configured by the network and the PDCCH occasion from configured first PDCCH occasion in ascending order can be mapped to SSB index in ascending order of their SSB indexes for corresponding data.
    - 5b: If first PDCCH occasion of each data are not configured by the network, the PDCCH occasion from 0 in ascending order can be mapped to SSB index in ascending order of their SSB indexes data by data.
* In [R1-2107371, Qualcomm]
  + Proposal 11: UE may assume that the GC-PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with SSB or periodic TRS if configured for broadcast reception.
* In [R1-2107427, CMCC]
  + *Discuss*: In addition, the impact of DRX also needs to be taken into account, the group-common PDCCH monitoring occasions will be extended when drx-Inactivity timer is running, and the association between monitoring occasions and SSB indexes needs to be defined.
  + Proposal 10. 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.
* In [R1-2108172, Ericsson]
  + Proposal 3: It should be configurable whether beams sweeping is used in the MBS broadcast mode. The beamwidth of PDSCH carrying MTCH should be possible to adjust separately from the SSB beamwidth.
  + Proposal 4: For scheduling a PTM-PDSCH, we propose the following schemes:
    - a) PDCCH in the same beam as the PTM-PDSCH
    - b) Multiple PDCCH, one per narrower beam, each pointing to the same PTM-PDSCH in a different, potentially wider, beam.
    - c) SPS
  + Proposal 5: The beamwidth of PDSCH carrying MCCH should be possible to adjust separately from the beamwidth of PDSCH carrying MTCH.
  + Proposal 6: 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.
  + Proposal 7: Group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for MTCH is QCL’d with TRS if configured.

### **FL Assessment**

***Discussion on SSB as QCL source by reusing similar rules as SIB1 and OSI***

[Huawei, ZTE, CMCC] propose that mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs reuse rules defined for SIB1 (for *searchSpace#0*) or OSI (for search space other than *searchSpace#0*) for MTCH, similarly as agreed for MCCH at the last RAN1 meeting.

These proposals for MTCH were proposed and discussed at RAN1#105-e without reaching an agreement. Arguments were put that more flexible configuration should be possible for MTCH. More flexible configurations are discussed in subsequent sections. FL will put forward proposals to agree at least this functionality, while also proposing further studies to allow for more flexible configuration than that provided by beam sweeping in SIB1 and OSI.

***Discussion on association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions***

[Nokia, CATT, OPPO] discuss and proposes association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions an open issue, as per previous agreements, for beam sweeping. It is understood that the proposals build on top of existing configuration flexibility available for SSB mapping to PDCCH monitoring occasion. To allow discussion at this meeting for the different proposals, the FL puts forward a study on the different options submitted to this meeting for more discussion with the group.

***Discussion on TRS as QCL source***

While [Huawei, Qualcomm, Ericsson] propose that GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception can be configured to be QCL’d with periodic TRS, [Spreadtrum, CATT] argue that such functionality is not needed.

QCL with periodic TRS has been proposed across past meetings and with increasing support form companies. The FL will put forward a proposal to include such functionality to allow companies to have more discussion at this meeting.

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

[Ericsson] has multiple proposals to allow separate beam sweeping configurations between GC-PDCCH and GC-PDSCH as well as to allow for separate beam sweeping configurations between MCCH and MTCH. The proposals also include allowing the configuration of beamwidths larger for GC-PDSCH and potential association from multiple GC-PDSCCH beams. These proposals were part of the discussion at the last meeting. To allow for more discussion at this meeting, the FL puts forward a study to get companies’ opinions on these approaches.

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

**Proposal 2.10-1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, if searchSpace#0 is configured for MCTH, the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1.

**Proposal 2.10-2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues with broadcast reception, if common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping of PDCCH monitoring occasions to SSBs can be configured with similar rules as those defined for OSI in TS 38.331.

**Proposal 2.10-3**: UE may assume that GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception can be configured to be QCL’d with periodic TRS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues.

**Proposal 2.10-4**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues with beam sweeping for broadcast reception, study the following for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH:

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

**Proposal 2.10-5**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues with beam sweeping for broadcast reception, further study the following aspects of association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH:

* mapping of SSB index to GC-PDCCH MO across transmission window can be disabled by network.
* number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the transmission window duration can be controlled by network.
* association of SSB beams without MBS transmission.
* GC-PDCCH Mos in one transmission window length are allocated to different SSBs successively, same as the PDCCH Mos for SIBx
* GC-PDCCH Mos in one transmission window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive monitoring occasions.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Regarding **Proposal 2.10-1**, there is a typo with MTCH instead of MCTH. Otherwise we are fine with it.  Regarding **Proposal 2.10-2**, we are fine with it.  Regarding **Proposal 2.10-3**, regarding TRS, we could like to see more concrete proposals and performance evaluation to justify it is worthwhile to go with the proceeding work. Especially the specification effort that is going to take considering now we have only 3 RAN1 meeting left.  Regarding **Proposal 2.10-4**, Rel17 MBS is the very first release for NR, we would like to keep the beam sweeping operation SIMPLE for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues for both MCCH and MTCH. But we are open to discuss firstly whether the beamwidth of MCCH is beneficial to be different from beamwidth of MTCH. Some performance evaluation justification provided could be helpful to better understand the issue.  Regarding **Proposal 2.10-5**, we are fine with it. |
| Qualcomm | Generally fine with 2-10-1/2/3.  For 2.10-4, 2.10-5, may need to understand the motivation first before further study. |
| Vivo | Regarding to Proposal 2.10-3, we are wondering what’s the periodic TRS here. Does it mean to reuse the periodic TRS defined in power saving session, or newly defined for MBS? |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with Proposal 2.10-1 and Proposal 2.10-1.  For Proposal 2.10-3, introducing TRS for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues may cause extra spec. effort.  For Proposal 2.10-4 and Proposal 2.10-5, share same view as Qualcomm. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | **Proposal 2.10-1**: Ok  **Proposal 2.10-2**: Ok  **Proposal 2.10-3**: need further discussion  **Proposal 2.10-4**: Ok  **Proposal 2.10-5**: OK |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.10-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.10-2:** Support  **Proposal 2.10-3:** Not support. Considering the group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is for a group of Ues, the transmission mode is broadcast and the MCS (i.e. QPSK) of PDSCH is not high, so additional periodic TRS for broadcast is not necessary.  For 2.10-4, 2.10-5, we share that same view with Qualcomm. The motivation should be discussed firstly. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.10-1**: OK to us. One typo on MTCH needs to be corrected.  **Proposal 2.10-2**: OK  **Proposal 2.10-3**: OK.  **Proposal 2.10-4**: The motivation of using narrow beam for GC-PDCCH and wide beam for GC-PDSCH is not clear to us. Usually, wide beam is adopted for control channel instead of data channel. We suggest deferring this discussion at a later stage.  **Proposal 2.10-5**: Definition of transmission window is needed then we can discuss the detailed aspects. |
| CMCC | **2.10-1，2.10-2：** Support.  **2.10-3, 2.10-4. 2.10-5:** Not support, the motivation is not clear, and need additional spec impact. We should focus on critical issues due to limited RAN1 meetings. |
| OPPO | We are generally OK with these proposals. |
| ZTE | We are ok with Proposal 2.10-1 and 2.10.2  For Proposal 2.10.3, more clarification is needed. The TRS in IDLE is introduced to reduce the power assumption for paging reception and the TRS can be activated by L1 signalling. We are not sure how can we allow the GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception to be QCLed with the TRS which may not be always present. Besides, the TRS in IDLE is still QCLed with SSB. To us, further allowing GC-PDCCH/PDSCH to be QCLed with TRS doesn’t offer much gain.  For proposal 2.10.4, we can revisit it once we approve Proposal 2.10.1 and 2.10.2 and see if we need any optimization on top of Proposal 2.10.1 and 2.10.2.  For Proposal 2.10.5, more clarification on the target scenario and use cases are needed from our perspective. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.10-1**: Support  **Proposal 2.10-2**: Support  **Proposal 2.10-3**: Higher-order modulation schemes are not likely to be used for broadcast transmissions. It is not clear how much benefit there is in using TRS to increase synchronization accuracy.  **Proposal 2.10-4**: OK to study.  **Proposal 2.10-5**: OK to study. |
| Ericsson | P2.10-1: Support  P2.10-2: Support  P2.10-3: Support  P2.10-4: Support  P2.10-5: Support.  We are however not clear why this proposal has the condition ‘with beam sweeping for broadcast reception’ whereas 10-1 and 10-2 have not.  We believe this proposal further details the PDCCH MO configuration defined by P2.10-1 and P2.10-2, i.e. it is not an alternative to it. Is this correct?  We are also not clear why this proposal mentions PDSCH, whereas the bullets are only on PDCCH. It is not clear what is a monitoring occasion for a PDSCH. Is this intended to relate to SPS? Please clarify or rather remove PDSCH from the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support P2.10-1, typo for “MCTH”  Support Proposal 2.10-2 intention, however, more details need to come up together. Otherwise, the proposal is basically saying nothing because what “similarity” is.  Support **Proposal 2.10-3** |
| LG | **Proposal 2.10-1**: We are fine with this proposal.  **Proposal 2.10-2**: For SS other than searchSpace#0 for MTCH, we think that the existing rule defined for OSI in TS 38.331 can be used as a baseline. However, in the rule, the number of actual transmitted SSBs in [x×N+K]th PDCCH monitoring occasions can be smaller than the number of SSBs determined in SIB1, considering that a certain broadcast service can be available only at a specific local area within a cell. Furthremore, **Proposal 2.10-5** may also have impact on this rule.  Thus, we propose to change to:  ***Proposal 2.10-2****: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues with broadcast reception, if common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping of PDCCH monitoring occasions to SSBs can be configured with a rule.*   * *The existing rule defined for OSI in TS 38.331 is used as a baseline to define the above rule.*   **Proposal 2.10-5**: We are generally fine with this proposal for MTCH. We think that the main issue is mapping rule between SSB and monitoring occasions for MTCH. As for MCCH, we do not need to improve MCCH transmissions. In addition, we think that definition of transmission window needs to be further discussed. In our view, SI window concept is too restricted to be used for MTCH. MTCH user data transmission will not be same as SI transmission, in terms of traffic characteristics. Instead of SI window concept, we could consider DRX on-duration. Furthermore, we can also add what we mentioned for **Proposal 2.10-2.**  Thus, we prefer to change to:  *For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues with beam sweeping for broadcast reception, further study the following aspects of association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying ~~MCCH/~~MTCH:*   * *mapping of SSB index to GC-PDCCH MO across transmission window can be disabled by network.* * *the number of actual transmitted SSBs in [x×N+K]th PDCCH monitoring occasions smaller than the number of SSBs determined in SIB1* * *number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the transmission window duration can be controlled by network.* * *association of SSB beams without MBS transmission.* * *GC-PDCCH Mos in one transmission window length are allocated to different SSBs successively, same as the PDCCH Mos for SIBx* * *GC-PDCCH Mos in one transmission window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive monitoring occasions.* * *Definition of transmission window for MTCH (e.g. based on SI window and/or DRX on-duration).* |
| Intel | **Proposal 2.10-1/2:** We can be ok with these proposals.  For the remaining more discussion/time is needed. |
| Samsung | OK with proposals |
| Moderator | Thank you for inputs.  **Regarding Proposal 2.10-1**, besides the typo (thanks all for spotting) there is consensus and we could try to agree it.  **Proposal 2.10-1rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, if searchSpace#0 is configured for M~~C~~TCH, the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1.  **Regarding Proposal 2.10-2**: most companies are fine with this one. However, Huawei would like more detail and LG does propose additional wording. Therefore, let’s use LG’s wording if this is more acceptable.  **Proposal 2.10-2rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues with broadcast reception, if common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping of PDCCH monitoring occasions to SSBs can be configured with ~~similar~~ a rule~~s~~ ~~as those defined for OSI in TS 38.331~~.   * *The existing rule defined for OSI in TS 38.331 is used as a baseline to define the above rule.*   **Regarding Proposals 2.10-3, 2.10-4 and 2.10-5**, multiple companies have expressed that they would like more discussion by proponents and motivation before we can take a decision. Therefore, **I would like to ask proponents to provide feedback to improve understanding** – thank you.  @Ericsson: I have removed the term beam sweeping. My understanding from proposal 2.10-4 is that it would provide additional configuration possibility on top of what is agreed in 2.10-1 and 2.10-2. This proposal is trying to capture your inputs to the meeting, so any rewording that may better reflect the full extend of the proposal is welcome – thanks.  **Proposal 2.10-4rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues ~~with beam sweeping~~ for broadcast reception, study the following for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH:   * multiple GC-PDCCH, one per narrow beam, each pointing to the same GC-PDSCH in a different potentially wider beam. * beamwidth of GC-PDSCH carrying MCCH is adjusted separately from the beamwidth of GC-PDSCH carrying MTCH.   For proposal 2.10-5, LG proposes an improved wording that is included as revision (with additional edits to address Ericsson’s comments).  **Proposal 2.10-5rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues ~~with beam sweeping~~ for broadcast reception, further study the following aspects of association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying ~~MCCH/~~MTCH:   * mapping of SSB index to GC-PDCCH MO across transmission window can be disabled by network. * the number of actual transmitted SSBs in [x×N+K]th PDCCH monitoring occasions smaller than the number of SSBs determined in SIB1 * number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the transmission window duration can be controlled by network. * association of SSB beams without MBS transmission. * GC-PDCCH Mos in one transmission window length are allocated to different SSBs successively, same as the PDCCH Mos for SIBx * GC-PDCCH Mos in one transmission window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive monitoring occasions. * Definition of transmission window for MTCH (e.g. based on SI window and/or DRX on-duration). |

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

**Proposal 2.10-1rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, if searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1.

**Proposal 2.10-2rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues with broadcast reception, if common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping of PDCCH monitoring occasions to SSBs can be configured with ~~similar~~ a rule~~s~~ ~~as those defined for OSI in TS 38.331~~.

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

**Proposal 2.10-3**: UE may assume that GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception can be configured to be QCL’d with periodic TRS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues.

**Proposal 2.10-4rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues ~~with beam sweeping~~ for broadcast reception, study the following for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH:

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

**Proposal 2.10-5rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues ~~with beam sweeping~~ for broadcast reception, further study the following aspects of association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying ~~MCCH/~~MTCH:

* mapping of SSB index to GC-PDCCH MO across transmission window can be disabled by network.
* the number of actual transmitted SSBs in [x×N+K]th PDCCH monitoring occasions smaller than the number of SSBs determined in SIB1
* number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the transmission window duration can be controlled by network.
* association of SSB beams without MBS transmission.
* GC-PDCCH Mos in one transmission window length are allocated to different SSBs successively, same as the PDCCH Mos for SIBx
* GC-PDCCH Mos in one transmission window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive monitoring occasions.
* Definition of transmission window for MTCH (e.g. based on SI window and/or DRX on-duration).

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | Support **Proposal 2.10-1rev1 and Proposal 2.10-2rev1**  Regarding **Proposal 2.10-3 and Proposal 2.10-4rev1,** We would like to see more concrete proposals and performance justifications from proponents.  Support **Proposal 2.10-5rev1** |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | **Proposal 2.10-1rev1**: OK  **Proposal 2.10-2rev1**:Ok  **Proposal 2.10-3**: need further discussion  **Proposal 2.10-4rev1**: need further discussion and the related performance evaluation shall be discussed and confirmed before the related agreement can be made.  **Proposal 2.10-5rev1: need updating.**  **Proposal 2.10-5rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues for broadcast reception, further study the following aspects of association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH:   * mapping of SSB index to GC-PDCCH MO across transmission window can be disabled by network. (we don’t understand the meaning of this item) * the number of actual transmitted SSBs can be smaller than the number of SSBs determined in SIB1 * number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the transmission window duration can be controlled by network. * How to determine SSB beams without MBS transmission. * GC-PDCCH Mos in one transmission window length are allocated to different SSBs successively, same as the PDCCH Mos for SIBx * GC-PDCCH Mos in one transmission window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive monitoring occasions. * Definition of transmission window for MTCH (e.g. based on SI window and/or DRX on-duration). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **2.10-2rev1, by baseline I assume you mean “starting point” which seems more accurate.**  **2.10-3, we support it. It is used for time/frequency tracking in SFN manner where SSB per cell is not workable. Regarding the question of spec impact, it could be minor, either reusing the mechanism of including the TRS configuration into SIB as adopted in R17 power saving work item, or the existing TRS configuration (currently configured only to RRC\_CONNECTED UEs) is moved to MCCH for configuring MTCH.** |
| CATT | Regarding the Proposal 2.10-2rev1, the case that a certain broadcast service can be available only at a specific local area within a cell is not clear for us. In our understanding, the broadcast can be serviced for all UE in a cell. The number of SSBs for multicast is determined by SIB1. Can proponents show more details of this case? |
| Ericsson | On Proposal 2.10-5 we repeat our previous comment: We are also not clear why this proposal mentions PDSCH, whereas the bullets are only on PDCCH. It is not clear what is a monitoring occasion for a PDSCH. Is this intended to relate to SPS? Please clarify or rather remove PDSCH from the proposal. |
| Moderator | Thank you for comments.  It seems **Proposal 2.10-1** is still stable.  Regarding Proposal 2.10-2: there is comment from Huawei that will be incorporated. Regarding the comment from CATT. The original version of the proposal used the term “similar rule as those defined in TS 38.331”. This is the wording we took from RAN2 and that used to agree for MCCH at the last meeting. I think that the term in the original proposal also left room for not using the exactly same rule as for OSI in TS 38.331.  **Proposal 2.10-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with broadcast reception, if common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping of PDCCH monitoring occasions to SSBs can be configured with ~~similar~~ a rule~~s~~ ~~as those defined for OSI in TS 38.331~~.   * The existing rule defined for OSI in TS 38.331 is used as ~~a baseline~~ starting point to define the above rule.   Regarding Proposal 2.10-3: Huawei has provided motivation. Could companies feedback what they think?  For proposal 2.10-4, there has been a request from companies that proponents motivate this. I would also like to point companies to the input to this meeting from **Ericsson** that provides discussion about this proposal.  For proposal 2.10-5:  Chengdu TD tech: what exact changes were you proposing? Apologies I could not catch that. Ericsson: apologies, in your previous comment it was not clear to me which proposal you referred to in the previous round. This can be fixed.  **Proposal 2.10-5rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs ~~with beam sweeping~~ for broadcast reception, further study the following aspects of association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions for GC-PDCCH~~/PDSCH~~ ~~carrying~~ scheduling ~~MCCH/~~MTCH:   * mapping of SSB index to GC-PDCCH MO across transmission window can be disabled by network. * the number of actual transmitted SSBs in [x×N+K]th PDCCH monitoring occasions smaller than the number of SSBs determined in SIB1 * number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the transmission window duration can be controlled by network. * association of SSB beams without MBS transmission. * GC-PDCCH Mos in one transmission window length are allocated to different SSBs successively, same as the PDCCH Mos for SIBx * GC-PDCCH Mos in one transmission window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive monitoring occasions. * Definition of transmission window for MTCH (e.g. based on SI window and/or DRX on-duration). |

### **[H] 3rd round FL proposals for Issue 10**

**Proposal 2.10-1rev1 [stable]**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, for broadcast reception, if searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1.

**Proposal 2.10-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with broadcast reception, if common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping of PDCCH monitoring occasions to SSBs can be configured with ~~similar~~ a rule~~s~~ ~~as those defined for OSI in TS 38.331~~.

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

**Proposal 2.10-3**: UE may assume that GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception can be configured to be QCL’d with periodic TRS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.

**Proposal 2.10-4rev1**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues ~~with beam sweeping~~ for broadcast reception, study the following for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH:

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

**Proposal 2.10-5rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs ~~with beam sweeping~~ for broadcast reception, further study the following aspects of association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions for GC-PDCCH~~/PDSCH~~ ~~carrying~~ scheduling ~~MCCH/~~MTCH:

* mapping of SSB index to GC-PDCCH MO across transmission window can be disabled by network.
* the number of actual transmitted SSBs in [x×N+K]th PDCCH monitoring occasions smaller than the number of SSBs determined in SIB1
* number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the transmission window duration can be controlled by network.
* association of SSB beams without MBS transmission.
* GC-PDCCH Mos in one transmission window length are allocated to different SSBs successively, same as the PDCCH Mos for SIBx
* GC-PDCCH Mos in one transmission window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive monitoring occasions.
* Definition of transmission window for MTCH (e.g. based on SI window and/or DRX on-duration).

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| LG | We are fine with all updated proposals.  @CATT, broadcast with all beams means that service area is equivalent with cell coverage. However, some broadcast services may not need to cover full cell coverage, but they can be broadcast at part of the cell coverage in case service area is only part of cell coverage. As far as I know, such local area broadcast has been discussed during specification of LTE MBMS and could be up to gNB implementation. We think that NR MBS broadcast should provide such flexibility by proper gNB’s configuration. Thus, gNB does not need to use all beams for a certain local broadcast service. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2.10-1rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.10-2rev2**: Support  **Proposal 2.10-3**: Support  **Proposal 2.10-4rev1**: Support  **Proposal 2.10-5rev2**: Support |
| CMCC | We are fine with these proposals. |
| Moderator | Please provide more views – thanks. |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are fine with **Proposal 2.10-1rev1**, **Proposal 2.10-2rev2**, **Proposal 2.10-5rev2**.  Regarding **Proposal 2.10-3**, with TRS configuration for RRC\_idle/inactive UEs, what could be the impact to RRC\_connected UEs? And shall the periodic TRS transmission always together with broadcast transmission, or how is the TRS transmission looks like?  Regarding **Proposal 2.10-4rev1**, we could like to check further details as commented in last round. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2.10-2rev2**: OK  **Proposal 2.10-3**: OK  **Proposal 2.10-4rev1**: The motivation of using narrow beam for GC-PDCCH and wide beam for GC-PDSCH is not clear to us. Usually, wide beam is adopted for control channel instead of data channel. We suggest deferring this discussion at a later stage.  **Proposal 2.10-5rev2**: Definition of transmission window is needed then we can discuss the detailed aspects. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support **2.10-2rev2, 2.10-3.**  **Regarding 2.10-4rev1 and 2.10-5rev2, further study is generally fine because anything can be further studied. However and more importantly, we need to figure out the fundamental remaining issue to complete the work item. To us, one fundamental issue is how to pursue the “starting point” in proposal 2.10-2rev2 but not sure which bullet in 2.10-4rev1 and 2.10-5rev2 is intended to pursue that. I suggest we can prioritize and proceed with the “starting point” firstly over other “optimization”.**  Regarding the existing rule defined for OSI in TS 38.331 is used as a baseline starting point to define the above rule, we think the fundamental features are a window defined by the MTCH monitoring periodicity and the association between the PDCCH monitoring occasions and the actual transmitted SSBs determined according to *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in SIB1. |
| CATT | We thank LG’s reply, now we are OK with these proposals. |
| Moderator | The **Proposal 2.10-1rev1** was agreed by email before the quiet period on 20 August.  Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, if searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1.  For Proposal 2.10-2, based on comments to this round and comments to previous rounds this proposal seems stable. It is proposed that we try to reach agreement on this by email on the checkpoint on 24 August.  For Proposal 2.10-3: there are follow up comments from Nokia. Can proponents reply to this? (And thanks Huawei for providing comments to the previous rounds.)  For Proposal 2.10-4: I would like to ask **Ericsson**, whether they can provide more details as requested by companies to motivate this proposal (comments from Nokia and Lenovo).  For proposal 2.10-5: based on comments from Huawei and Lenovo, the proposal has been reworded. @**Lenovo & Huawei**, the definition of the transmission window has also bee included as one of the aspects that need further study. **Huawei, All**, on the association between PDCCH monitoring occasions and the SSBs, I have made a prioritisation on my understanding of what are basic functionality vs. optimisation.  **Proposal 2.10-2rev2[stable]**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with broadcast reception, if common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping of PDCCH monitoring occasions to SSBs can be configured with a rule.   * The existing rule defined for OSI in TS 38.331 is used as starting point to define the above rule.   **Proposal 2.10-5rev3**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, further study for GC-PDCCH scheduling MTCH:   * aspects of association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions transmitted within periodically occurring time domain windows (referred to as transmission windows)   + GC-PDCCH monitoring occasions (MOs) in one transmission window length are allocated to different SSBs successively (same as the PDCCH MOs for SIBx) and/or GC-PDCCH MOs in one transmission window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive MOs.   + further optimisations on     - mapping of SSB index to GC-PDCCH MO across transmission window can be disabled by network.     - the number of actual transmitted SSBs in [x×N+K]th PDCCH monitoring occasions smaller than the number of SSBs determined in SIB1     - number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the transmission window duration can be controlled by network.     - association of SSB beams without MBS transmission. * definition of transmission window for MTCH   + monitoring periodicity and offset   + whether it is based on SI window and/or DRX on-duration. |

### **[H] 4th round FL proposals for Issue 10**

**Proposal 2.10-2rev2[stable]**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with broadcast reception, if common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping of PDCCH monitoring occasions to SSBs can be configured with a rule.

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

**Proposal 2.10-3 [unchanged]**: UE may assume that GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH for broadcast reception can be configured to be QCL’d with periodic TRS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.

**Proposal 2.10-4rev1 [unchanged]**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, study the following for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH/MTCH:

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

**Proposal 2.10-5rev3**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs for broadcast reception, further study for GC-PDCCH scheduling MTCH:

* aspects of association rules between SSB indexes and UE monitoring occasions transmitted within periodically occurring time domain windows (referred to as transmission windows)
  + GC-PDCCH monitoring occasions (MOs) in one transmission window length are allocated to different SSBs successively (same as the PDCCH MOs for SIBx) and/or GC-PDCCH MOs in one transmission window length are allocated to one SSB with consecutive MOs.
  + further optimisations on
    - mapping of SSB index to GC-PDCCH MO across transmission window can be disabled by network.
    - the number of actual transmitted SSBs in [x×N+K]th PDCCH monitoring occasions smaller than the number of SSBs determined in SIB1
    - number of repetition transmission for each SSB beam within the transmission window duration can be controlled by network.
    - association of SSB beams without MBS transmission.
* definition of transmission window for MTCH
  + monitoring periodicity and offset
  + whether it is based on SI window and/or DRX on-duration.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
|  |  |

## Issue 11: HARQ feedback for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UE states

### **Background**

This issue was discussed at RAN1#104-e without reaching a conclusion:

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

The following agreements at RAN1#104b-e and RAN1#105-e for RRC connected UEs for multicast reception is relevant for this discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  Support NACK-only based HARQ-ACK feedback for RRC\_CONNECTED Ues receiving multicast.  Agreement:  Support PUCCH format 0 and format 1 for NACK-only based HARQ-ACK feedback for multicast.  Agreement:  Support NACK-only based HARQ-ACK feedback at least for multicast SPS PDSCH without PDCCH scheduling.   * FFS for SPS activation/deactivation.   Conclusion:  PUCCH resource for NACK-only can be shared by Ues transmitting the NACK-only based HARQ-ACK feedback. |

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2106625, vivo]
  + Proposal 3: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues, at least for broadcast reception, HARQ feedback is not supported.
* In [R1-2106914, Samsung]
  + Proposal 5. RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues do not support UL feedback.
* In [R1-2107231, OPPO]
  + Proposal 10: It is proposed for RRC idle and inactive state Ues to provide HARQ feedback in order to meet reliability requirement of MBS application/service.
    - Only NACK feedback is needed since the number of RRC idle and inactive state Ues may not be accurately known by the network.
  + Proposal 11: To support “only NACK” HARQ feedback for idle and inactive Ues, it should be further consider using PUCCH or PRACH.
* In [R1-2107427, CMCC]
  + *Discuss*: As for NACK-only based HARQ-ACK feedback, we also think it has little motivation to be supported for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, the first reason is that the QoS requirement for broadcast service is much lower than multicast service and the second reason is that gNB can use PDSCH repetition to improve the reliability without HARQ-ACK feedback. Therefore, we think the HARQ feedback for group-common PDSCH for broadcast reception for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues should not be supported.
  + Proposal 7. For RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE Ues, don’t support HARQ feedback for group-common PDSCH for broadcast reception.
* In [R1-2107613, Intel]
  + Proposal 8: RRC\_INACTIVE/IDLE Ues can support HARQ feedback with NACK-only transmission on a common PUCCH resource configured by 4-bit RMSI indication and selected using the PRI in DCI and the starting CCE index of the PDCCH reception.

### **FL Assessment**

While [OPPO, Intel] propose the support of UL HARQ feedback for RRC idle/inactive Ues receiving broadcast, [vivo, Samsung, CMCC] do not supporting. [OPPO] discusses that UL HARQ feedback can help meet QoS requirements with low error rates, while [CMCC] argues that broadcast reception has lower QoS requirements than multicast reception with RRC connected state as well as that a reliability enhancement could be achieved by PDSCH repetition. [Samsung] also discusses that Ues in RRC idle/inactive state without uplink time synchronisation would result in severe interference to other Ues.

Although there are companies that support UL HARQ feedback to improve the reliability of broadcast reception for Ues in RRC idle/inactive state, other inputs have explicitly proposed that such a feature is not supported. Discussions at RAN1#104-e also showed multiple companies not supporting such a feature.

The FL will put a proposal for conclusion as RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE Ues do not support UL feedback to improve reliability of Broadcast/Multicast services in Rel-17 to check companies’ opinions.

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

**Proposal (conclusion) 2.11-1**: No specification support in Rel-17 for UL feedback for Ues in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state for broadcast reception.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | We suggest below re-wording:  **Proposal (conclusion) 2.11-1**: No specification support in Rel-17 for UL feedback to improve reliability for Ues in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state for broadcast reception. |
| Qualcomm | ok |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | OK. |
| Vivo | fine |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | **Proposal (conclusion) 2.11-1**: We think the feedback for delivery mode 2 has a lower priority. It can be discussed later. There’s no need to make the conclusion so far. |
| CATT | Support. |
| CMCC | Support |
| OPPO | Not support this proposal.  We still think it worth to discuss about the benefit by supporting HARQ-ACK feedback for IDLE Ues. |
| ZTE | We have also observed that supporting uplink HARQ feedback for Ues in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state for broadcast reception can improve reliability and efficiency as showed in our contribution [R1-2106748]. However, it is also fine for us to no specification support in Rel-17 if the major views is that.  Maybe we can consider it in Rel-18. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. |
| Ericsson | P2.11-1: Support |
| Apple | OK with this proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| Intel | Our preference is to support NACK-only feedback, however fine to go with majority view and consider in Rel-18 possibly. |
| Samsung | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok |

## Issue 12: Broadcast services supported for both RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs

### **Background**

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

|  |
| --- |
| 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 [R1-2106947, CATT]
  + Proposal 6: When the configured UE-specific BWP does not contain the common frequency resource, the existing BWP switching mechanism can be used for MBS reception.
* In [R1-2107095, Futurewei]
  + *Discuss*: However, it is up to network configuration to ensure that when a Connected UE starts to use broadcast service, it is configured such that its active BWP is in a CFR which also includes or serves as a new active BWP for unicast of the UE.
  + Proposal 2: For broadcast reception, a common CFR for both Idle/Inactive and Connected UEs is configured.
* In [R1-2107516, MediaTek]
  + Proposal 5: For broadcast reception, network implementation guarantee unified CFR for UEs in both RRC\_CONNECTED mode and IDLE/INACTIVE mode to receive the PTM transmission.
* In [R1-2107613, Intel]
  + Proposal 7: If the CFR for IDLE/INACTIVE UEs is outside the active CFR or active BWP of CONNECTED mode UEs, it is up to the gNB to reconfigure the CFR or switch BWP of CONNECTED mode UEs to receive broadcast transmission. The IDLE UEs are not expected to switch BWP to align with CONNECTED mode UEs.

### **FL Assessment**

[Futurewei, MediaTek, Intel] discuss that network implementation ensures that the configuration of UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE contains the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.

The FL puts forward a proposal reusing the wording provided in the inputs for discussion at this meeting.

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

**Proposal (conclusion) 2.12-1**: If the CFR for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs is outside the active CFR or active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, it is up to the gNB to reconfigure the CFR or switch BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UEs to receive the broadcast transmission. The RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs are not expected to switch BWP to align with RRC\_CONNECTED mode UEs.

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | We understand the intention of **Proposal (conclusion) 2.12-1**, and we are generally fine with it. Moreover, we have the below rewording proposal:  *For the case when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE does not contain the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, it is up to the gNB implementation to guarantee the proper reception of broadcast transmission by RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.* |
| Qualcomm | The intention of this proposal is to discuss UE behavior in CONN mode, which can be discussed in 8.12.1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | What does it mean “active CFR”? |
| vivo | We can discuss this after achieving consensus on the configured/defined CFR for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs. |
| Spreadtrum | Support in general. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | Ok |
| CATT | The current proposal is not clear for us, it need modification. What the ‘BWP switching ’last sentence means? Which two BWP are switching? |
| CMCC | Don’t know how to switch BWP for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs. |
| OPPO | Similar view with vivo that this issue can be discussed after the determination of CFR design. |
| ZTE | We think the broadcast can also be received within the active BWP of the RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, which similar as paging/SIB transmission in active BWP outside initial BWP. But this can be an implementation issue in the end. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| Ericsson | P2.12-1: Support |
| Apple | OK |
| MediaTek | We are Ok with the direction, the Nokia’s updated version is preferred. |
| LG | We think that it is up to the gNB to reconfigure the CFR or switch BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UEs to receive the broadcast transmission. However, the current proposal is unclear especially with the last sentence.  When it comes to connected UE, it seems beneficial for connected UE to support up to 2 CFRs. For example, connected UEs could support up to 2 CFRs, possibly one for broadcast MTCH and one for multicast MTCH when one CFR in UE active BWP cannot support broadcast MTCH. |
| Intel | Although the proposal here is mostly from our paper, we also ok with the rewording from Nokia. Our main intention was to make it clear that it is up to gNB implementation to ensure proper broadcast reception for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs. |
| Samsung | OK |

## Issue 13: RAN2 LS on broadcast session delivery and MCCH design

### **Background**

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. |

The following agreements are relevant for the aspects 1, 2 and 3 for which RAN2 requests feedback:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, both searchSpace#0 and common search space other than searchSpace#0 can be configured for GC-PDCCH scheduling MCCH.  Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, 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.   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 broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case A), to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH.   * Note: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.   Agreement:  For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use a configured/defined CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case A), to receive GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.   * Note: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH transmission within a narrower portion of the Initial BWP (where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0) is possible by implementation via appropriate scheduling.   Agreement:  For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, 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. |

Discussions proposed in this meeting on *PDCCH: RNTI and DCI design for carrying MCCH change notification* are also relevant for the requests from RAN2.

In R1-2106410 (cf. Annex C), RAN2 has sent a second LS where it requests RAN1 to take their agreements into account when discussing PHY layer aspects of MCCH design.

### **Tdoc analysis**

* In [R1-2108067, Huawei]
  + Proposal 2: Using a field in DCI scheduling MCCH to notify the session start and the modification of an ongoing session.
    - Reply RAN2’s LS with the mechanism RAN1 agreed.
* In [R1-2107371, Qualcomm]
  + Proposal 7: Send LS to RAN2 to ask
    - Whether RAN1 should consider the case of UE supporting multiple G-RNTIs for MTCH
    - Whether RAN1 should consider the case of UE supporting multiple MCCH-RNTIs
    - Whether RAN1 should consider the case of UE supporting multiple MCCH-N-RNTIs (if defined for MCCH change notification)
* [CMM in R1-2107387 and MediaTek R1-2107513] also discuss the LS from RAN2.

### **FL Assessment**

Given RAN1 has made some agreements that are relevant to the aspects which RAN2 has requested feedback, ongoing discussion at this meeting and further request form inputs to reply and ask questions to RAN2, it is therefore proposed to discuss sending an LS from RAN1 to RAN2.

### **1st round FL proposals for Issue 13**

**Proposal 2.13-1**: Send an LS to RAN2 regarding at least the following:

* agreements on Common Search Space design for MCCH channel,
* agreements on the allowed transmission bandwidth/BWP configurations for MCCH transmission.
* agreements on RNTI and DCI design for carrying MCCH change notifications (if any)
* whether RAN1 should consider the case of UE supporting: multiple G-RNTIs for MTCH, multiple MCCH-RNTIs, multiple MCCH-N-RNTIs (if defined for MCCH change notification).

Please provide your comments in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **company** | **comments** |
| NOKIA/NSB | We are generally fine with **Proposal 2.13-1**. |
| Qualcomm | ok |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | OK |
| vivo | For the last sub bullet, as RAN 2 has agreed that ‘We support single MCCH (in this release)’, we don’t see the need to support multiple MCCH-RNTIs, multiple MCCH-N-RNTIs (if defined for MCCH change notification). |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | We think the third item can be deleted due to the fact that there’s no conclusion in RAN2 whether or not the other information can be carried by the MCCH change notification. |
| CATT | We suggest postponing this proposal. |
| CMCC | OK |
| OPPO | We are OK with the main bullet and first two sub-bullets. The last two sub-bullets need more discussion before we send LS to RAN2. |
| ZTE | Agree with the intention of this proposal. But from our perspective, we don’t need to rush for this proposal. We can first focus on the other proposals first and see what we need to send to RAN2 in the end. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| Ericsson | 2.13-1: Following normal procedures the decision to send an LS should be included in the relevant RAN1 agreements and not be made as a separate agreement. |
| Samsung | OK |
| MediaTek | Generally ok except for the last sub-bullet. The last sub-bullet need more discussion if we want to send it to RAN2. We can mainly focus on the RAN2’s question in this AI. |

## Other Issues

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

### **Other Issue 1: Multicast reception by UEs in IDLE/INACTIVE states**

* [R1-2108172, Ericsson]

### **Other Issue 2: Discontinuous Reception (DRX) and Wakeup Signals (WUS)**

* [R1-2106947, CATT], [ R1-2107458, LGE]

### **Other Issue 3: PDSCH TDRA table configuration**

* [R1-2106747, ZTE]

### **Other Issue 4: PDSCH transmission parameters (MCS, MIMO layers, etc.)**

* [R1-2107371, Qualcomm], [R1-2106821, Sony]

### **Other Issue 5: Scrambling sequence initialisation for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH**

* [R1-2106914, Samsung], [R1-2107165TCL]

### **Other Issue 6: MBS Interest Indication for partial beam sweeping**

* [R1-2106664, Nokia], [R1-2106821Sony]

### **Other Issue 7: Support of RedCap UEs**

* [R1-2107765, Apple], [R1-2106747, ZTE]

# Proposals for Discussion at GTW sessions

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

## GTW 20 August

**Proposal 2.1-2rev3**: GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH or MTCH for broadcast reception with UEs in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state can use a configured/defined CFR with larger size than CORESET0. In Rel-17, at least support Case-C.

* FFS: whether signalling to enable Case-Cis included/extended as part of SIB1 or other SIB, whether signalling needs to use configured BWP framework, whether CFR configuration for MTCH can be provided by MCCH (e.g. if different CFR configuration is needed for MTCH), or whether it is up to RAN2 to ensure adequate signalling.
* FFS: support of Case D and/or Case E.

**Proposal 2.3-1rev2**: From RAN1 perspective, the CFR for broadcast reception of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, includes at least the following configurations:

* Starting PRB and the number of PRBs
  + The reference for starting PRB is Point A. (Following the same approach to determine reference for starting PRB as that defined in AI8.12.1.)
  + ~~FFS reuse of SLIV~~
* ~~One PDSCH-config~~ Only one set of parameters configured for PDSCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDSCH
* ~~One PDCCH-config~~ Only one set of parameters configured for PDCCH for broadcast reception with GC-PDCCH
* FFS: whether some parameters are optional/needed for Case A, C, D and E of the CFR.

**Proposal 2.1-3rev1**: For broadcast reception, RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs can use the same bandwidth configurations for the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MCCH and the CFR of GC-PDCCH/PDSCH carrying MTCH.

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

**Proposal 2.10-1rev1 [stable]**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, if searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1.

**Proposal 2.10-2rev2**: For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with broadcast reception, if common search space other than searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping of PDCCH monitoring occasions to SSBs can be configured with ~~similar~~ a rule~~s~~ ~~as those defined for OSI in TS 38.331~~.

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

**Proposal 2.1-1rev1[stable]:** No specification support in Rel-17 for broadcast reception with RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs with configured/defined CFRs for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP ~~either~~ has the same frequency resources as CORESET0 (i.e., Case B) ~~or has the frequency resources configured by SIB1 (i.e., Case D)~~.

# Stable Proposals

# Summary

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

Agreement:

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

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

Conclusion:

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

Agreement:

For RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, if searchSpace#0 is configured for MTCH, the mapping between PDCCH occasions and SSBs is the same as for SIB1.
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# Annex A: Agreements in previous RAN1 meetings

## RAN1#103-e agreements

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

* FFS details

Agreements:

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

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

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

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

* FFS details.

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

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

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

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

## RAN1#104-e agreements

Agreement:

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

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

Agreement:

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

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

Agreement:

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

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

Agreement:

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

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

## RAN1#105-e agreements

Agreement:

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

Agreement:

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

* FFS details of FDRA.

Agreement:

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

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

Agreement:

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

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

Agreement:

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

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

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

Conclusion:

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

Agreement:

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

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

Agreement:

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

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

Agreement:

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

Agreement:

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

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

Agreement:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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