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**1. Overall Description:**

RAN1 would like to thank RAN2 on DCP open issues. RAN1 discussed the issue on the collision of DCP and RAR when a DCP monitoring occasion overlaps with the *ra-ResponseWindow* or *msgB-ResponseWindow.* Regarding RAN2’s question on RAR impact with the collision of DCP and RAR, RAR would not be impacted if the DCI used for scheduling RAR with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI is on type-3 CSS with lower index than that of DCP. Further, RAN1 notes that a transmission period for DCP is typically much shorter than a RAR window and a continuous collision is not expected and that a similar issue was discussed in Rel-15 for a UE in RRC connected state where RAN1 decided that no specification support was needed. RAR addressed by C-RNTI would not be prioritized over DCP if the PDCCH is on USS.

RAN1 discussed whether there is any need of for a prioritization rule by specification of PDCCH monitoring. However, RAN1 could not reach any agreement on whether any specification change is needed to prioritize RAR for BFR when the DCI format with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI on USS over DCP on Type-3 CSS.

RAN1 also agree to have the CR to align the updated parameter *ps-TransmitOtherPeriodicCSI* in RAN1 specification.

**2. Actions:**

**To RAN2**

**ACTION:** RAN1 respectfully asks RAN2 to take into account consideration of RAN1’s agreements.

**3. Date of Next TSG-RAN WG1 Meetings:**

TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #102 24th - 28th August, 2020 e-Meeting

TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #103 12th -16th October, 2020 China