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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 understanding on RAR impact with the collision of DCP and RAR, RAN1’s view is:

* RAR addressed to C-RNTI would not be impacted if the DCI scheduling RAR addressed to C-RNTI is configured on type-3 CSS with lower index than that of DCP, according to current TS 38.213;
* RAR addressed to C-RNTI would not be prioritized over DCP if it is configured on USS or on type-3 CSS with higher index than that of DCP;
* A continuous collision during the RAR window is not expected between the monitoring occasions of DCP and RAR address to C-RNTI considering the DCP monitoring duration is expected to be much shorter than a RAR window for power saving.

RAN1 also discussed whether there is any need for a new prioritization rule in the specification for RAR with CRC addressed to C-RNTI. However, RAN1 could not reach an agreement on whether specification change is needed to prioritize RAR addressed to C-RNTI configured on USS (or on type-3 CSS with higher index than that of DCP) 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