**3GPP TSG RAN WG1 #101 R1-20xxxxx**

**e-Meeting, May 25th – June 5th, 2020**

**Source: Moderator (NTT DOCOMO, INC.)**

**Title:** **Summary on [101-e-NR-UEFeatures-2step-01]**

**Agenda Item:** **7.2.11.1**

**Document for:** **Discussion and Decision**

1. Introduction

This contribution summarizes the following email discussion/approval regarding UE features for two-step RACH.

[101-e-NR-UEFeatures-2step-01] Email discussion/approval on feature group structure for two-step RACH (25th – 29th May) – (DCM, Hiroki)

* Discuss and decide whether FG9-3 (Parallel MsgA and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA) is kept or removed
* Discuss and decide whether FG9-4 (MsgA operation in a band combination including SUL) is kept or removed
* Discuss and decide whether FG9-6 (up to X of msgBs per slot/within the msgB window) is kept or removed
* Discuss and decide whether any other new FG(s) is added or not
* Discuss and decide capability signaling design for FG(s) decided to be kept/added in this email discussion (if any)

1. Discussion on UE features for two-step RACH

## 2.1 FG[9-3]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Features | Index | Feature group | Components | Prerequisite feature groups | Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported | Applicable to the capability signalling exchange between UEs (V2X WI only)”. | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | Need of FDD/TDD differentiation | Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation | Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2 | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| 9. NR\_2step\_RACH | [9-3] | [Parallel MsgA and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA] | [Parallel MsgA and SRS./PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA with msgA in PCell/PScell] | 9-1  TBD | Yes | N/A | UE cannot transmit an MsgA and other UL transmissions in parallel across CCs in inter-band CA | Per BC | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | Optional with capability signalling |

* **Necessity of FG[9-3]**
  + **FG is removed: [3], [6], [9], [11], [13]**
    - **FG 4-26 should be extended to support 2-step RACH: [3]**
  + **FG is kept: [2], [4], [5], [7], [10], [12]**
    - **FG is updated with only MsgA PUSCH: [2]**

Above remaining issues and proposals are identified based on following feedbacks provided in contributions for the RAN1#101-e meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | **Proposal 2: For FG 9-3, we are fine to keep it with an update to clarify that only MsgA PUSCH is needed to be included in the FG, i.e. parallel MsgA PUSCH and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA with msgA in PCell/PScell** |
| [3] | ***Proposal 1:*** If there is a common understanding that 4-26 and 6-16 can be applied to MsgA PRACH and MsgA PUSCH, then there is no need of introducing a different UE feature for Rel-16 2-step RACH. And FG 4-26 and 6-16 should be extended to support 2-step RACH.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 4-26 | Parallel PRACH and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA | Parallel PRACH (or MsgA PRACH) and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA | | 6-16 | Supplemental uplink | 1) RACH (type 1 or type 2), PUSCH, PUCCH, SRS operations in a band combination including SUL  2) Supplemental uplink with same numerology between SUL and non SUL carriers | |
| [4] | **Proposal 2: We suggest keeping FG 9-3 as single FG** |
| [5] | **Proposal 2**   * *FG9-3 and 9-4 are kept.* * *FG9-5 is not needed.* * *FFS on FG9-6, pending on RAN2 feedback.* |
| [6] | ***Proposal 2: remove FG9-3,9-4; adopt FG9-5 (or maybe put in FG9-1).*** |
| [7] | ***Proposal 1:*** Parallel transmission of msgA with other signals and msgA operation in SUL are needed. |
| [9] | **Proposal 2: The feature group 9-3 and 9-6 can be removed.** |
| [10] | **Observations**:   * FG 9-3 may clarify operation for 2-step in RRC connected, but the alternative of relying on Rel-15’s 4-26 also seems workable.   **Proposals**:   * Keep FGs 9-3, 9-4 |
| [11] | **Proposal 1:** **Remove FG of “Parallel MsgA and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA”.**  **Proposal 2:** **For FG of “Parallel MsgA and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA”, if some reason for this feature is identified and this feature is kept, this feature should focus on “Parallel MsgA PUSCH and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA”.** |
| [12] | **FG 9-3**  We think it should be kept, since msgA is associated with a new channel structure (i.e. PRACH+ TX Gap+ PUSCH) in NR Rel-16. |
| [13] | * 9-3: Do not introduce the FG. The FG does not make sense for initial access, as for such case the UE could simply rely on 4-step RACH. The gNB would anyway not know the capability during initial access. As optional FG, the potential use cases are much more limited, as gNB may potentially utilize the information of the capability in case of UE in RRC connected mode only. |

Based on above, following FL proposals are made.

**FL proposal 1:**

* **FG9-3 is kept in the UE features list for 2 step RACH**
  + **FG name and components for FG9-3 are changed to “Parallel MsgA PUSCH and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA with MsgA in PCell/PSCell”**
  + **“TBD” is removed from prerequisite feature groups for FG9-3**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Features | Index | Feature group | Components | Prerequisite feature groups | Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported | Applicable to the capability signalling exchange between UEs (V2X WI only)”. | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | Need of FDD/TDD differentiation | Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation | Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2 | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| 9. NR\_2step\_RACH | 9-3 | Parallel MsgA PUSCH and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA with MsgA in PCell/PSCell | Parallel MsgA PUSCH and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA with MsgA in PCell/PScell | 9-1 | Yes | N/A | UE cannot transmit an MsgA and other UL transmissions in parallel across CCs in inter-band CA | Per BC | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | Optional with capability signalling |

Companies are encouraged to check above FL proposals and to provide feedback if any in below. If you cannot accept the FL proposals, please put your company name after “Cannot accept the proposals” below and please provide your alternative proposal (in your comment) which could be acceptable to all in your consideration.

Cannot accept the proposals:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | During last meeting email discussion, and also in our tdoc, we have responsed the comments that “msgA PUSCH with TA=0 is a new UE requirement”, which is incorrect. Clearly by Rel-15 supported TA value range, UE should be able to transmit a PUSCH with TA=0, so it is not new feature at all. We are not ok to keep it. |
| Nokia, NSB | The FG does not make sense for initial access, as for such case the UE could simply rely on 4-step RACH. The gNB would anyway not know the capability during initial access. As optional FG, the potential use cases are much more limited, as gNB may potentially utilize the information of the capability in case of UE in RRC connected mode only. Hence we are not OK to keep it. |
| CATT | Actually MSGA PUSCH surely have some different behaviors such as TA, Intra-slot frequency hopping and data scrambling with nRAPID etc. with normal PUSCH.  For use cases of FG9-3, MSGA in RRC connection mode can be used for MSGA for other SI, transition from RRC\_INACTIVE, Handover, RRCconnection reestablishment, BFR and so on.  In addition, MSGA PUSCH overlapping with other UL signals in intra-band CA is being discussed under 2s RACH session. This means transmission behaviour of MSGA PUSCH is different with that of normal PUSCH. And UE behaviour between intra-band CA and inter-band CA are similar.  We prefer to FG9-3 as single FG.  FL proposal1 on FG9-3 is incomplete because MSGA PRACH can’t be addressed under inter-band CA case.  So there are two alternatives to fix this issue.  **Alt1: FL proposal1+ modification on 4-26 FG as below**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 4-26 | Parallel PRACH and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA | Parallel PRACH (or MsgA PRACH) and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA |   **Alt2: Change FL proposal1 as below**  “Parallel MsgA ~~PUSCH~~ and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA with MsgA in PCell/PSCell”  We are fine with above two options. |
|  |  |

Based on the discussion in Wednesday GTW session, following updated proposals are made.

### **Updated FL proposal 1:**

* **FG9-3 is removed from the UE features list for 2 step RACH**

Companies are encouraged to check above FL proposals and to provide feedback if any in below. Especially as discussed in Wednesday GTW session, we should clarify whether and in which condition MsgA PUSCH is dropped in caes of parallel MsgA PUSCH and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CATT | We prefer to keep FG 9-3 as single FG.  There are 2 cases including TA misalignment across CCs in inter-band CA and over max power issue of UL transmission which lead to MsgA PUSCH or SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions is dropped.  1) Different TA across CCs  Because TA of MSGA PUSCH is always 0, this will lead to TA misalignment between MsgA PUSCH or SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs  TA misalignment causes signal interference between MsgA PUSCH or SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in gNB side.  2) Over max power of UE UL transmission  If total transmission power of MSGA PUSCH + SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs > MAX power of UE UL transmission，UE will drop 1 transmission between MSGA PUSCH and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions  For CBRA of 2s RACH, MSGA PUSCH is contention-based and need be blindly detected. So if MSGA PUSCH transmission is interfered, MSGA PUSCH need ramp-up power in order that MSGA PUSCH can be successfully received by gNB.  It leads to that MSGA PUSCH + SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs exceed max power of UE UL transmission. In this case, UE need drop SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions.  PUSCH behavior in R15 has a little bit different because PUSCH is always controlled and configured by gNB and the detection of PUSCH can be well predicted. So different TA for PUSCH transmission across CCs and over MAX power issue can be avoided.  But configuration of 2s RACH is cell-specific and periodic, it is difficult for gNB to schedule between MSGA PUSCH and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs.  If we don’t have this FG9-3, MSGA PUSCH need follow R15 PUSCH behavior. Parallel MSGA PUSCH and SRS across CCs need follow FG 4-25.  But parallel MSGA PUSCH and PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs have to be supported although there are TA misalignment and over max power of UE UL transmission issues.  Actually parallel MSGA PUSCH and PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions in intra-band CA is under discussion in 2s RACH session ([101-e-NR-2step-RACH-01] Email discussion/approval w.r.t. MsgA overlapping with other UL signal). And UE behavior is similar between intra-band CA and inter-band CA. If TP on parallel MSGA PUSCH and PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions in intra-band CA is accepted, FG9-3 should be supported.  I put related contribution number (R1-2003503, R1-2003855, R1-2003365, R1-2003455 and R1-2004130) for your information in this meeting.  Description of TP is as follows:  ===============================================  For single cell operation or for operation with carrier aggregation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PUSCH for Type-2 random access procedure and PUCCH/SRS or PUSCH not for Type-2 random access procedure in a same slot or when a gap between the first or last symbol of a PUSCH transmission for Type-2 random access procedure in a first slot is separated by less than  symbols from the last or first symbol, respectively, of a PUCCH/SRS or PUSCH not for Type-2 random access procedure transmission in a second slot where  for  or ,  for  or , and  is the SCS configuration for the active UL BWP.  ====================================================  My 2 open questions:   1. If MSG PUSCH behavior is similar with R15 PUSCH behavior, why need we propose above TP for intra-band CA case? 2. If parallel MSGA PUSCH and PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions in intra-band CA can’ t be permitted under some conditions, why can’t parallel MSGA PUSCH and PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions in inter-band CA be made as 1 UE feature group? |
| Qualcomm | We agree with CATT’s comments in general, and FG 9-3 should be kept. In addition, we’d like to point out the differences of FG 9-3 with respect to NR Rel-15:  1. In Rel-16, msgA has a new channel structure including PRACH+TXGap+PUSCH, wherein the mapping rule from PRACH resource to PUSCH resource is pre-configured by the network and the value of TXGap is determined by the mapping rule.  o There is no equivalent UE feature in Rel-15, which treats PRACH and PUSCH as a whole in discussing the parallel UL transmission across CCs in inter-band CA.  2. In Rel-16, UE assumes TA=0 for both PRACH and PUSCH transmission of msgA, regardless TA timer is running or not on the primary TAG.  o In Rel-15, when UE assumes “TA=0” for PUSCH, it means the TA timer is still running for the corresponding TAG. |
| Samsung | In short, we think it should adopt the “Updated FL proposal 1: FG9-3 is removed from the UE features list for 2 step RACH”, sorry that we are not convinced by the “reasons” by catt or qc. In response to CATT comments:  I thought we were discussed clearly during offline, but it seems not.  Your first comments on TA mis-alignment are incorrect. What do you mean “TA misalignment causes signal interference between MsgA PUSCH or SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in gNB side”, TA command is given by gNB, is UE has the capability of multiple TAG, gNB is able to configure different TA, and UE is able to transmit with different TA, the purpose is to make sure the UL signals to arrive at gNB side at the same time, so interference are not there. Note that, for the case gNB have different TA configured UE UL signals, it could be cases the receiving gNB is not at the same place, similar to mutipe TRP;  And your second comment on power limitation makes me even more confusing, in we have discussed the power priority of msgA prach and msgA pusch, if the total required power is exceeding the max power, UE drop the lower priority UL signals or transmited with reduced power, isn’t this normal behavior???  In additional to your open questions, as I already told me you before, it also involved the cross discussion from multiple agenda item and agreements from multiple agenda item. For intial access and UL group people, we make the spec to clearly specify the the UE behavior if the PRACH and ul signals are too close; if time allows, we for sure could do the same thing for inter-band, but as I told you, that the inter-band case was not raised at that time, and from implementation point of view, it is not an issue. At very very late stage, some company raised the feature on PRACH and other UL signals. You should ask them for the answers for rel-15; for your open question 2, that’s not even the points, the point is what UE is capable of doing and what UE already report to gNB, is already good enough for handling the msgA PUSCH vs other UL signals situation.  In response to QC comments:  We called it msgA, doesn’t mean it is a new intact channel. We called msg2, do you think the PDCCH and PDSCH in msg2 are the same channel??? Their resource, power control etc are quite different, if msgA PRACH and msgA PUSCH is same channel, why do we need to put different power priority on them?  For the second comments, yes, it’s applicable may caused the transmission of TA=0 in different TAG timer running situation, but we are talking about the UE capability on PUSCH transmission with TA=0, this will not change the capability whether UE can or cannot transmit PUSCH with TA=0; |
|  |  |

## 2.2 FG[9-4]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Features | Index | Feature group | Components | Prerequisite feature groups | Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported | Applicable to the capability signalling exchange between UEs (V2X WI only)”. | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | Need of FDD/TDD differentiation | Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation | Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2 | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| 9. NR\_2step\_RACH | [9-4] | [MsgA operation in a band combination including SUL] | [MsgA operations in a band combination including SUL] | 9-1, 6-16 TBD | Yes | N/A | UE does not support msgA operations in a band combination including SUL | Per BC | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | Optional with capability signalling |

* **Necessity of FG[9-4]**
  + **FG is removed: [2], [3], [6], [13]**
    - FG 6-16 should be extended to support 2-step RACH: [3]
  + **FG is kept: [4], [5], [7], [10], [12]**

Above remaining issues and proposals are identified based on following feedbacks provided in contributions for the RAN1#101-e meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | **Proposal 3: For FG 9-4, no need to introduce separate FG for 2-step RACH.** |
| [3] | ***Proposal 1:*** If there is a common understanding that 4-26 and 6-16 can be applied to MsgA PRACH and MsgA PUSCH, then there is no need of introducing a different UE feature for Rel-16 2-step RACH. And FG 4-26 and 6-16 should be extended to support 2-step RACH.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 4-26 | Parallel PRACH and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA | Parallel PRACH (or MsgA PRACH) and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA | | 6-16 | Supplemental uplink | 1) RACH (type 1 or type 2), PUSCH, PUCCH, SRS operations in a band combination including SUL  2) Supplemental uplink with same numerology between SUL and non SUL carriers | |
| [4] | **Proposal 3: We suggest keeping FG 9-4 as single FG** |
| [5] | **Proposal 2**   * *FG9-3 and 9-4 are kept.* * *FG9-5 is not needed.* * *FFS on FG9-6, pending on RAN2 feedback.* |
| [6] | ***Proposal 2: remove FG9-3,9-4; adopt FG9-5 (or maybe put in FG9-1).*** |
| [7] | ***Proposal 1:*** Parallel transmission of msgA with other signals and msgA operation in SUL are needed. |
| [10] | **Observations**:   * FG 9-4 seems needed, since there are specific parameters used with SUL for 2 step.   **Proposals**:   * Keep FGs 9-3, 9-4 |
| [12] | * **FG 9-4**   + It is OK to keep this FG. |
| [13] | * 9-4: Do not introduce the FG. Reasoning is essentially the same as for 9-3. |

Based on above, following FL proposals are made.

**FL proposal 2:**

* **FG9-4 is kept in the UE features list for 2 step RACH**
  + **“TBD” is removed from prerequisite feature groups for FG9-4**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Features | Index | Feature group | Components | Prerequisite feature groups | Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported | Applicable to the capability signalling exchange between UEs (V2X WI only)”. | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | Need of FDD/TDD differentiation | Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation | Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2 | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| 9. NR\_2step\_RACH | 9-4 | MsgA operation in a band combination including SUL | MsgA operations in a band combination including SUL | 9-1, 6-16 | Yes | N/A | UE does not support msgA operations in a band combination including SUL | Per BC | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | Optional with capability signalling |

Companies are encouraged to check above FL proposals and to provide feedback if any in below. If you cannot accept the FL proposals, please put your company name after “Cannot accept the proposals” below and please provide your alternative proposal (in your comment) which could be acceptable to all in your consideration.

Cannot accept the proposals:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Based on the discussion in Tuesday GTW session, following agreements were made.

**Agreements:**

* **FG9-4 is kept in the UE features list for 2 step RACH**
  + **“TBD” is removed from prerequisite feature groups for FG9-4**

## 2.3 FG[9-6]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Features | Index | Feature group | Components | Prerequisite feature groups | Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported | Applicable to the capability signalling exchange between UEs (V2X WI only)”. | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | Need of FDD/TDD differentiation | Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation | Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2 | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| 9. NR\_2step\_RACH | [9-6] | [up to X of msgBs per slot/within the msgB window] | [up to X of msgBs per slot/within the msgB window] | TBD | Yes | N/A |  | [Per band] | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | Optional with capability signalling |

* **Necessity of FG[9-6]**
  + **FG is removed: [9], [10], [11], [13]**
    - **Clarify that this feature is for RRC\_CONNECTED UE, and if UE follows Rel-15 feature on the number of unicasts PDSCH reception, i.e., 5-11, 5-11a and 5-11b, this feature can be removed: [11]**
  + **FG is kept: [8], [12]**
    - **RAN2 to make final decision on whether this separate FG is needed: [8]**
  + **FFS (wait for RAN2 LS): [2], [3], [5], [6],**
* **Name of FG[9-6]**
  + **FG 9-6 is modified as up to X of msgBs per slot within the msgB window when msgB carries SuccessRAR with RRC configuration: [8]**
* **Type of FG[9-6]**
  + **Per band: [12]**

Above remaining issues and proposals are identified based on following feedbacks provided in contributions for the RAN1#101-e meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | **Proposal 4: For FG 9-6, wait for RAN2’s further discussion and conclusion on it before introducing the FG.** |
| [3] | Regarding the FG 9-6, as captured in the LS to RAN2 that this may be related to the payload size of MsgB, we can decide whether or not to support this FG after we get the feedback from RAN2, or left it to RAN2 for the final decision. |
| [5] | **Proposal 2**   * *FG9-3 and 9-4 are kept.* * *FG9-5 is not needed.* * *FFS on FG9-6, pending on RAN2 feedback.* |
| [6] | * *[9-6] [up to X of msgBs per slot/within the msgB window] [up to X of msgBs per slot/within the msgB window]*   Wait for RAN2 further reply. |
| [8] | ***Proposal 1***:  **FG 9-6 is modified as up to X of msgBs per slot within the msgB window when msgB carries SuccessRAR with RRC configuration**   * **It is kept without square bracket from RAN1 perspective assuming the maximum payload size can be as large as msg4 of 4-step RACH; a UE must report a value for this FG if reports support of FG 9-1 (similar to *pdsch-ProcessingType1-DifferentTB-PerSlot*)**   **RAN2 to make final decision on whether this separate FG is needed, e.g. after confirming that the maximum payload size of msgB would be similar to msg2 of 4-step RACH** |
| [9] | **Proposal 2: The feature group 9-3 and 9-6 can be removed.** |
| [10] | **Observations**:   * FG 9-6 does not seem to have a clear need yet to us, since the use case for multiple MsgBs in a slot is not really established.   **Proposals**:   * Do not define FGs 9-5, 9-6 |
| [11] | **Proposal 4:** **For FG of “up to X of msgBs per slot/within the msgB window”,**   * **Clarify that this feature is for RRC\_CONNECTED UE.** * **If UE follows Rel-15 feature on the number of unicasts PDSCH reception, i.e., 5-11, 5-11a and 5-11b, this feature can be removed.** |
| [12] | * **FG 9-6** * The type of this FG should be **per band**. * It is OK to be kept. |
| [13] | * 9-6: Do not introduce the FG. When monitoring for the MsgB, the UE will simply monitor configured search spaces for DCI. Also, for initial access the gNB would not know this feature and would hence not be able to act accordingly. For connected mode, it would not make much sense to have limitations compared to initial access. It should be noted that there are no UE features for restrictions on monitoring for Msg2 for 4-step RACH. |

Based on above, following FL proposals are made.

**FL proposal 3:**

* **FG[9-6] is removed from the UE features list for 2 step RACH**

Companies are encouraged to check above FL proposals and to provide feedback if any in below. If you cannot accept the FL proposals, please put your company name after “Cannot accept the proposals” below and please provide your alternative proposal (in your comment) which could be acceptable to all in your consideration.

Cannot accept the proposals:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Cannot accept the proposals.  Alternative 1: keep this FG from RAN1 perspective and revisit it depending on RAN2 reply LS;  Alternative 2: remove it from 2-step RACH UE feature list and revisit it on discussion of FGs proposed in [101-e-NR-UEFeatures-Others-01] where the following is proposed   * Defines whether the UE capable of processing time capability 1 supports reception of up to two, three or seven unicast PDSCHs for several transport blocks with PDSCH scrambled using C-RNTI, msgB-RNTI, TC-RNTI, or CS-RNTI in one serving cell within the same slot per CC that are multiplexed in time domain only. This FG is reported per FS.   + Note PDSCH(s) for MsgB/Msg.4 is included. |
| Samsung | We have included the question to LS to ran2 and ask for their input; we don’t think it is approperate to make this proposed move without getting their reply. Then what’s the point to send the LS question? Suggest to keep it in bracket at least for now. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are not supportive of the FG itself, however we tend to agree that it is fair to keep it in bracket for now so that RAN2 has an opportunity to reply to the LS sent last meeting about this very FG. |
| Qualcomm | We think this FG should be kept for further discussion. |

Based on the discussion in Wednesday GTW session, following agreements were made.

**Agreements:**

* **FG[9-6] is kept with bracket in the UE features list for 2 step RACH**
  + **Add a note “RAN2 to make final decision on whether this FG is needed or not considering the maximum payload size of msgB”**

## 2.4 Others

* **Necessity of FG “MsgA PUSCH frequency hopping with non-zero guard period”**
  + **No need (i.e., included in the basic feature): [3], [5], [10], [11], [12], [13]**
  + **Adopt this FG or maybe put in FG9-1: [6]**

Above remaining issues and proposals are identified based on following feedbacks provided in contributions for the RAN1#101-e meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [3] | Regarding the FG 9-5, from gNB vendor’s point of view, we do not think it is necessary to differentiate the intra-slot frequency hopping with and without guard period, and thus it should be included in the basic feature group. |
| [5] | **Proposal 2**   * *FG9-3 and 9-4 are kept.* * *FG9-5 is not needed.* * *FFS on FG9-6, pending on RAN2 feedback.* |
| [6] | ***Proposal 2: remove FG9-3,9-4; adopt FG9-5 (or maybe put in FG9-1).*** |
| [10] | **Observations**:   * FG 9-5 is not so desirable since performance enhancing feature such as frequency hopping need to be widely supported for the net gains in a cell to be achievable.   **Proposals**:   * Do not define FGs 9-5, 9-6 |
| [11] | **Proposal 3:** **MsgA PUSCH frequency hopping with non-zero guard period should not be separate feature group from basic feature group.** |
| [12] | * **FG 9-5** * We don’t think it is needed. |
| [13] | * 9-5: Confirm deletion of FG. Frequency hopping is supported by default, If this FG is introduced, there would be a potential segmentation of the UEs according to the feature. Since the MsgA PUSCH Occasion would be derived with reference to the guard period, it would not be possible to have multiplexing of UEs supporting this FG and UEs not supporting this FG. Hence, for gNB to support UEs supporting this feature, it would need to create two separate PUSCH configurations, which would be an extreme waste of resources. Hence, either all UE support the guard period between hops, or no UE support the guard period between hops (which would be equivalent to dropping the feature completely from specifications). |

Based on above, it seems not necessary to discuss again on the necessity of FG9-5 “MsgA PUSCH frequency hopping with non-zero guard period” as it was already removed from the UE features list for 2 step RACH.

Nevertheless, companies can provide comments if any below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

1. Conclusion

**Updated FL proposal 1:**

* **FG9-3 is removed from the UE features list for 2 step RACH**

**Agreements:**

* **FG9-4 is kept in the UE features list for 2 step RACH**
  + **“TBD” is removed from prerequisite feature groups for FG9-4**

**Agreements:**

* **FG[9-6] is kept with bracket in the UE features list for 2 step RACH**
  + **Add a note “RAN2 to make final decision on whether this FG is needed or not considering the maximum payload size of msgB”**
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Appendix: latest version of UE features list for 2 step RACH [1]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Features | Index | Feature group | Components | Prerequisite feature groups | Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported | Applicable to the capability signalling exchange between UEs (V2X WI only)”. | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | Need of FDD/TDD differentiation | Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation | Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2 | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| 9. NR\_2step\_RACH | 9-1 | Basic channel structure and procedure of 2-step RACH | 1. RACH type selection for CBRA according to SSB-based RSRP threshold 2. msgA PRACH resource configuration including separately configured ROs not applicable to 4-step RO configuration and fully or partially shared ROs but different preamble sequences partitioning with 4-step RO preamble sequences configuration 3. msgA PUSCH resource (DMRS included) and waveform determination for 2-step CBRA    1. Supporting up to two msgA PUSCH configurations in an UL BWP 4. Validation of MsgA PRACH and PUSCH 5. Mapping between preamble of MsgA PRACH and PUSCH occasion with DMRS resource of MsgA PUSCH 6. msgB monitoring and decoding for 2-step CBRA    1. (for UE in any RRC state) monitoring msgB PDCCH with CRC masked by msgB-RNTI in Type-1 CSS set, and decoding multi-cast msgB PDSCH carrying SuccessRAR, FallbackRAR and BI    2. (for RRC connected UE only) monitoring msgB PDCCH with CRC masked by C-RNTI in USS set, and decoding the unicast PDSCH carrying absolute TA MAC CE 7. PUCCH transmission for HARQ-ACK feedback to a msgB 8. Power control for msgA PRACH, msgA PUSCH and PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback to msgB |  | Yes | N/A | UE cannot initiate a 2-step RACH process, and thus would not be expected understand the 2-step RACH configurations | per band | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | Optional with capability signalling |
| 9. NR\_2step\_RACH | [9-3] | [Parallel MsgA and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA] | [Parallel MsgA and SRS./PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA with msgA in PCell/PScell] | 9-1  TBD | Yes | N/A | UE cannot transmit an MsgA and other UL transmissions in parallel across CCs in inter-band CA | Per BC | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | Optional with capability signalling |
| 9. NR\_2step\_RACH | [9-4] | [MsgA operation in a band combination including SUL] | [MsgA operations in a band combination including SUL] | 9-1, 6-16 TBD | Yes | N/A | UE does not support msgA operations in a band combination including SUL | Per BC | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | Optional with capability signalling |
| 9. NR\_2step\_RACH | [9-6] | [up to X of msgBs per slot/within the msgB window] | [up to X of msgBs per slot/within the msgB window] | TBD | Yes | N/A |  | [Per band] | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | Optional with capability signalling |