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# Introduction

In [1], it is observed, perhaps also well-understood as explicitly captured in specifications that, a UE on BWP#0 with option 1 can only be used for limited manner with common configurations, e.g. random access, and can only be switched from that by RRC reconfiguration, once it is switched onto this BWP#0.

When a BWP is switched via DCI indication onto the BWP#0 with configuration option 1, if false alarm occurs and a UE switched to BWP#0 mistakenly, there could be misunderstanding between a UE and gNB when the default BWP is not configured. The above configurations can be typical in e.g. URLLC-like services thus the impact can be significant.

This contribution aims to provide summary of discussion with respect to the issue identified in [1], per the following
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Some technical understanding of the issue would be helpful. Therefore, the discussion is comprised of two aspects also considering companies input from preparation phase: is there any use case to use DCI based BWP switching to switch another BWP to the BWP#0 with configuration option 1, and is it possible to mitigate/overcome the issue with minimized/no specification impact and impact on the real site implementations.

# Discussion Point 1

* **Is there any potential use case or motivation for gNB to use DCI indicating a UE to perform BWP switching onto BWP#0 configuration option 1?**

It would be up to company’s view that whether false alarm is a corner case or not. However, the configurations mentioned in the scenario could be typical in many existing networks, and when it happens for other cases than BWP#0 configuration option 1, it is obvious that gNB can use non-fallback DCI to fast resume the UE to a target BWP thus the impact on services can be minimized. When it comes to BWP#0 with option 1, since DCI based BWP switch cannot be used, it has to rely on gNB RRC reconfiguration to resume the services. It is not clear that whether there are real use cases for motivating a gNB to use DCI based fast BWP switching to BWP#0 with configuration option 1 for limited use, on the contrary that not being able to switch back to other BWPs also using DCI.

Companies are invited to share your views/considerations.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| ZTE | One potential use case is to configure small bandwidth for BWP#0 and larger bandwidth for BWP#1. Network may indicate the UE to BWP#0 for power saving purpose.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No, we do not see the motivation to have such a kind of switching, neither see it is beneficial in the real deployment.The purpose to introduce DCI-based BWP switching is changing the BWP quickly and have a better channel condition to resume the service. However, for the BWP#0 without RRC configuration, it cannot support normal operations such as UL transmission, HARQ feedback, etc. If UE is switched to BWP#0 without RRC configuration, the service of UE might be interrupted. Thus, it seems no such a use case to switch UE from a dedicated BWP to the initial BWP without any RRC configurations via DCI signaling.As per the false alarm in UE side, it cannot be simply regarded as a corner case, and the requirement of dedicated service should be also considered. For example, the URLLC-like service requires the reliability as high as 99.9999%. Even the probability of false alarm is only 0.1% (very likely a corner case), the requirement might not be met. |

# Discussion Point 2

* **Is it possible to have minimized/no specification/implementation impact to avoid the issue as identified in [1]?**

During the preparation phase discussion, there are several companies mentioning that there would be gNB implementation approaches to resolve this, e.g. configuring a default BWP or using BWP#0 configuration option 2. However, it is moderator understanding that these mentioned counter-configurations will actually impose an even restricted configuration to gNB, compared with the proposal in [1] (i.e., to conclude that when *bwp-InactivityTimer* is not configured by gNB, a UE does not expect to receive a DCI format to switch from a BWP to BWP#0 with option 1). For example, mandating configuration of default BWP with BWP timer affects each of the dedicated BWPs, and mandating using BWP#0 with configuration option 2 affects the initial BWP configuration.

It is also moderator understanding that if there is no clear motivation/use case based on the discussion point 1, the proposal in [1] could be the simplest outcome without specification changes and real sites implementation impact. However, with more discussion based on the above, there could be other potential conclusion that can be drawn to mitigate the potential system impact.

Companies are invited to share your views/suggestions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| ZTE | From our perspective, the current specification works well. BWP switching to BWP#0 is the same as other BWP switching. From UE perspective, it seems no further implementation complexity is required.If network indicates the UE to switch to BWP#0 with Option1, network has to take the potential longer BWP switching time (to switch back to BWP#1 via RRC) into account.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with moderator that leaving this up to gNB implementation will make the situation and gNB configuration more complex. To avoid the service interruption due to switching to BWP#0 with option 1, gNB has to be mandated to configure a default BWP timer or always configure RRC parameters on BWP#0, which also impact on the initial BWP configuration. Based on the justification in section 2, there is no use case for a DCI format to switch from a BWP to BWP#0 with option 1, so precluding such a case in the spec is preferred. A conclusion in the chair’s note is also fine, but we think the issue shall be clarified. |

# Conclusions

TBD.
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