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# Introduction

The WI NR\_MBS was approved in RAN plenary #86 meeting [1], and the WID was revised in RAN plenary #88 e-meeting [2]. One of the objectives is to specify a group scheduling mechanism to allow UEs to receive Broadcast/Multicast service, and this objective also includes specifying necessary enhancements that are required to enable simultaneous operation with unicast reception.

The following email thread for group scheduling is announced by chairman in RAN1#106-e:

[106-e-NR-MBS-01] Email discussion/approval on mechanisms to support group scheduling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs with checkpoints for agreements on August 19, 24 and 27 – Fei (CMCC)

In this contribution, we summarized the related issues and proposals based on the contributions submitted in RAN1#106-e under the agenda item 8.12.1 [4]-[30]. The reply LS on G-RNTI and G-CS-RNTI for MBS from RAN2 [3] was also be taken into account, the response from RAN2 is as follows:

**During RAN2#114-e meeting, RAN2 agreed that in order to receive multiple MBS services, UE need to support multiple G-RNTIs and/or G-CS-RNTIs. And it is FFS whether this depends on UE capability.**

Based on the contributions, the following sections are structured as follows:

From section 2 to 7, we categorized the key issues raised by contributions into 6 kinds and each section covers one kind of issues. In each section, we first provide the background and related proposals submitted in this meeting in sub-section X.1, then one or several initial proposals related to this issue are recommended by moderator in sub-section X.2, and then in sub-section X.3 one or more tables are provided to collect company views for the initial proposals in the 1st round email discussion, and then in sub-section X.4 the proposals will be updated based on companies’ inputs. As email discussion goes on, we may add more sub-sections for companies to provide views for the next round email discussion and for moderator to provide further updated proposals.

In section 8, some proposals will be selected for discussion in the GTW session.

If possible, please try to provide your replies within 24h. Moderator will try to update the proposals based on companies’ inputs on a daily basis.

The following were agreed in this meeting:

Agreement:

Confirm the working assumption with the following update:

Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP other than initial DL BWP is supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs.

* ~~FFS: CFR associated with initial BWP~~
* ~~FFS: CFR larger than initial BWP~~

Note: The deleted FFSs can be discussed in another AI.

Agreement:

For multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs, align the size of the first DCI format for GC-PDCCH with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI monitored in CSS.

Agreement:

Confirm the following working assumption:

The maximum number of CORESETs per BWP is not increased for support of MBS, and the number of CORESETs configured within the CFR is left to gNB implementation.

Agreement:

For indication of the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of CFR for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs,

* the starting PRB is referenced to Point A, i.e., the starting PRB is a PRB determined by *subcarrierSpacing* of the associated BWP and *offsetToCarrier* corresponding to this subcarrier spacing, similar as how *locationAndBandwidth* of a BWPis indicated as described in TS 38.331.
* FFS: Indication mechanism.

Agreement:

For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH:

* The maximum number of layers can be provided by *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value is defined.
  + FFS the default value.
* The maximum modulation order can be determined from mcs-Table in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR;
  + FFS: if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, a value determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast in the active DL BWP is used; if the *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast is not configured, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).
* xOverhead can be provided in PDSCH-Config for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value of zero is used.
* The number of PRBs is determined based on the size of CFR.

Agreement:

The first DCI format for GC-PDCCH uses the same fields as DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI with the following modifications:

* At least ‘Identifier for DCI formats’ is not needed.
  + FFS: Whether the field should be ignored and reserved, or should be removed.
* For FDRA determination, down-select from following options:
  + Option 1:
    -  is given by
      * the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
    - For resource indication value (*RIV*) of downlink resource allocation type 1, the resource blocks that can be indicated are
      * the resource blocks in the CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the resource blocks in the initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
  + Option 2:
    -  is given by
      * the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
    - For resource indication value (*RIV*) of downlink resource allocation type 1, the similar scheme as for the case that the DCI size for DCI format 1\_0 in USS is derived from the size of DCI format 1\_0 in CSS but applied to an active BWP is used.
      * FFS details, e.g., if the size of CFR (i.e. ) is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where K is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 8} which satisfies ;otherwise,
  + Option 3:  is given by the size of CFR in the active DL BWP

Agreement:

The second DCI format for GC-PDCCH uses the same fields as DCI format 1\_1 with the following modifications:

* At least ‘Identifier for DCI formats’ and ‘SRS request’ are not needed.
  + FFS whether the fields should be ignored and reserved, or should be removed.
* Note: At least the configurable fields in DCI format 1\_1 remain configurable for the second DCI format

Agreement:

For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH with the second DCI format,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in the CORESET in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH; otherwise.
* FFS: Values for . Choices include one or more of the following:
  + Alt1: G-RNTI used for the GC-PDCCH.
  + Alt2: 0
  + Alt3: Other fixed values

Agreement:

If a SPS-config for MBS is configured in CFR, one G-CS-RNTI is associated with the SPS-config.

* FFS: Multiple G-CS-RNTIs associated with one SPS-config

Agreement:

For FDRA determination of the first DCI format for GC-PDCCH, down-select from Option 2 and updated Option 3.

* + Option 2:
    -  is given by
      * the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
    - For resource indication value (*RIV*) of downlink resource allocation type 1, the similar scheme as for the case that the DCI size for DCI format 1\_0 in USS is derived from the size of DCI format 1\_0 in CSS but applied to an active BWP is used.
      * FFS details, e.g., if the size of CFR (i.e. ) is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where K is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 8} which satisfies ;otherwise,
  + Option 3:  is given by the size of CFR in the active DL BWP
    - If the size of the first DCI format for GC-PDCCH prior to truncation is larger than the size of DCI format 1\_0 monitored in CSS, the bit width of the FDRA field in the first DCI format for GC-PDCCH is reduced by truncating the first few most significant bits such that the size of the first DCI format for GC-PDCCH equals the size of DCI format 1\_0 monitored in CSS.
    - FFS: Whether the removed/reserved fields can be repurposed for FDRA
    - FFS: Solution for the case where the size of the first DCI format for GC-PDCCH prior to padding is smaller than the size of DCI format 1\_0 monitored in CSS.

# Issue #1: CFR and general configurations for MBS

## Background and submitted proposals

***Background***

In RAN1#104&104bis&105 meetings, the following agreements were achieved for CFR for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs.

**Option 2A vs 2B for CFR:**

Agreement (#104):

For multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs, a common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH / PDSCH is confined within the frequency resource of a dedicated unicast BWP to support simultaneous reception of unicast and multicast in the same slot

* Down select from the two options for the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/ PDSCH
  + Option 2A: The common frequency resource is defined as an MBS specific BWP, which is associated with the dedicated unicast BWP and using the same numerology (SCS and CP)
    - FFS BWP switching is needed between the multicast reception in the MBS specific BWP and unicast reception in its associated dedicated BWP
  + Option 2B: The common frequency resource is defined as an ‘MBS frequency region’ with a number of contiguous PRBs, which is configured within the dedicated unicast BWP.
    - FFS: How to indicate the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of the MBS frequency region
* FFS whether UE can be configured with no unicast reception in the common frequency resource
* FFS on details of the group-common PDCCH / PDSCH configuration
* FFS whether to support more than one common frequency resources per UE / per dedicated unicast BWP subjected to UE capabilities
* FFS whether the use of a common frequency resource for multicast is optional or not
* FFS whether the common frequency resource is applicable for PTM scheme 2 (if supported) or not

Agreement (#104):

* If Option 2B is supported for common frequency resource for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs, the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of the MBS frequency region within a dedicated unicast BWP are configured via UE-specific RRC signaling.
  + The starting PRB is referenced to one of the two options:
    - Option 1: Point A
    - Option 2: the starting PRB of the dedicated unicast BWP
  + FFS the detailed signaling
* If Option 2A is supported for common frequency resource for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs, the configurations of the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of the MBS frequency resource reuse the legacy BWP configuration.

Agreement (#104):

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

Conclusion (#104b):

It is based on gNB implementation to schedule unicast on the frequency resources covered by CFR configured for multicast.

Agreement (#104b):

The down-selection of Option 2A and Option 2B for CFR for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs will be made before the end of RAN1#105-e.

Working assumption (#105):

Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP other than initial BWP is supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs.

* FFS: CFR associated with initial BWP
* FFS: CFR larger than initial BWP

**Number of CFRs and optionality of CFR:**

Agreement(#104b):

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

**Rate matching and TBS determination:**

Agreement:

For multicast of RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, further study

* How the LBRM (Limited buffer rate-matching) for GC-PDSCH TBS is determined.
* How the xOverhead for GC-PDSCH TBS determination is configured.
* Whether MAC-CE over GC-PDSCH is needed for activation/deactivation of semi-persistent ZP CSI-RS resource set if the semi-persistent ZP CSI-RS resource set is configured in PDSCH-Config in CFR.

***Submitted Proposals***

***Option 2A vs 2B for* CFR:**

* *Huawei, HiSilicon*
  + Proposal 1: For the common frequency resource configuration for multicast
    - Confirm the Working Assumption of Option 2B:
      * The common frequency resource is defined as an ‘MBS frequency region’ with a number of contiguous PRBs, which is configured within the dedicated unicast BWP.
* *OPPO*
  + Observation 1: Even though CFR is configured as MBS specific BWP, it is not necessarily to activate the BWP for MBS reception.
  + Proposal 1: Option 2A should be agreed for CFR configuration, where MBS specific BWP should not occupy BWP ID 0~4 and should not be activated.
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 1: Confirm the working assumption that Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP other than initial BWP is supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs.
* *Nokia*
  + Proposal-1: Confirm the working assumption related to option 2B for configuring multicast common frequency resources, due to the additional complexities involved in the use of option 2A related to BWP switching.
* *MediaTek*
  + Proposal 1: Confirming the following working assumption:
    - Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP other than initial BWP is supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs.
* *FUTUREWEI*
  + Proposal 2: Confirm the Working Assumption on the support of Option 2B.
* *ETRI*
  + Observation1: The option 2A requires BWP switching which causes huge overhead for unicast and MBS multiplexing.
  + Proposal1: Confirm the working assumption:
    - Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP other than initial BWP is supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs.
      * FFS: CFR associated with initial BWP
      * FFS: CFR larger than initial BWP
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 1. Confirm the working assumption:
    - Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP other than initial BWP is supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs.
      * FFS: CFR associated with initial BWP
      * FFS: CFR larger than initial BWP
* *Intel*
  + Proposal 1: The working assumption on adoption of Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP other than initial BWP should be confirmed.
* *Samsung*
  + Observation 1: The WA on the CFR has no technical problem and can be confirmed.
* *Lenovo*
  + Proposal 1: Confirm the working assumption that Option 2B is supported for CFR configuration.
* *Ericsson*
  + Proposal 10: Confirm the working assumption about Option 2B and turn this into an agreement
* *Sony*
  + Proposal 4: RAN1 to agree that both Option 2A and Option 2B are supported for MBS and inform RAN2 of this decision.
* *NEC*
  + Proposal 1: Confirm the following working assumption for the definition of CFR.
    - Working assumption:
      * Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP other than initial BWP is supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs.
* *Xiaomi*
  + Proposal 1: Confirm the following working assumption with the following updates:
    - Working assumption:
      * Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP ~~other than initial BWP~~ is supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs.
        + ~~FFS: CFR associated with initial BWP~~
        + ~~FFS: CFR larger than initial BWP~~

***Relation between CFR and initial BWP:***

* *Huawei, HiSilicon*
  + Proposal 1: For the common frequency resource configuration for multicast
    - Support CFR associated with initial BWP and is not larger than the SIB1 configured initial BWP.
* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 4: The association between CFR and initial BWP is up to network configuration.
* *ZTE*
  + Proposal 1: CFR can be configured larger than active downlink BWP, if the active downlink BWP is the initial BWP defined by CORESET#0.
    - Prioritize the corresponding discussion in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state to strive for a consistent solution for all RRC states
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 2：CFR associated with initial BWP is also supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UE, and bandwidth of the CFR associated with initial BWP shall not be larger than initial BWP.
  + Proposal 3: when CFR is not associated with initial BWP by RRC configuration, the bandwidth of CFR can be larger than initial BWP, it is gNB implement issue.
* *Nokia*
  + Observation-4: Initial BWP is configured using SIB1 and could be used for initial access RRC connection is established, and CFR is configured using RRC configurations after initial access and establishing the RRC connection, in order to receive multicast traffic.
  + Observation-5: If a case UE is simultaneously receiving broadcast and multicast traffic, the CFR could be overlapping in the frequency domain with initial BWP.
  + Proposal-2: The association between CFR and initial BWP should be left to gNB implementation.
  + Observation-6: The association of CFR is with the UE’s dedicated unicast BWP and not the initial BWP.
  + Proposal-3: The size of the CFR relative to the initial BWP could also be left to gNB implementation.
* *MediaTek*
  + Proposal 2: For multicast reception, the CFR can be flexible configured, which can be larger, smaller or equal to initial BWP.
* *Intel*
  + Proposal 2: The UE does not expect a CFR larger than the initial BWP if the initial BWP is the active BWP of the UE. In case of a CFR larger than initial BWP, it should be configured within an unicast BWP which can fully contain the CFR and the UE is expected to be switched this BWP before MBS reception within the CFR.
* *LGE*
  + Proposal 1: For a connected UE receiving multicast (as well as 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.
  + Proposal 4: For broadcast, CFR of a cell is associated at least to initial DL BWP of the cell for any RRC state.
    - FFS whether broadcast CFR is associated to UE’s active DL BWP for UE in RRC\_CONNECTED.
* *Ericsson*
  + Proposal 8: A CFR may be associated with the Initial BWP, provided the CFR and Initial BWP occupy identical frequency regions.
  + Proposal 9: When the active BWP is other than the initial BWP, a configured CFR (on the active BWP) may be larger than the Initial BWP, provided the Initial BWP is contained within the CFR.

***Starting PRB and length of PRBs* of Option 2B for CFR*:***

* *ZTE*
  + Proposal 2: Regarding the CFR configuration,
    - The reference of starting PRB for CFR is Point A.
* *vivo*
  + Proposal 1: For CFR for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs, the starting PRB of the CFR within a dedicated unicast BWP configured via UE-specific RRC signaling is referenced to the starting PRB of the dedicated unicast BWP.
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 6: For MBS CFR, the starting PRB is referenced to the Point A.
  + Proposal 7: RIV indication mechanism in Rel-15 NR can be reused to indicate CFR.
* *Nokia*
  + Proposal-24: The key requirement for receiving multicast data using group common PDCCH is to signal the starting PRB relative to the UE-dedicated BWP as a frequency resource / PRB offset parameter, and the length of PRBs or CFR size for the MBS CFR.
    - Note: The signaling details of these parameters could be RAN2 decision.
  + Proposal-25: The starting PRB should be referenced to the starting PRB of the dedicated unicast BWP.
* *MediaTek*
  + Proposal 7: Point A is referenced to the starting PRB of the dedicated unicast BWP.
* *FUTUREWEI*
  + Proposal 3: The starting PRB and the number of PRBs of the CFR within the unicast BWP is signaled in the SIB as a baseline. Additional configuration using RRC can also be considered. In the absence of SIB signaling, the starting PRB and the number of PRBs of the CFR equal the unicast BWP. Both starting location and the length can be jointly encoded to reduce overhead in the signaling.
* *ETRI*
  + Observation2: It is natural to indicate location of the MBS frequency region refer to the BWP which includes the MBS frequency region.
  + Proposal3: The starting PRB of the dedicated unicast BWP is used as a reference point to indicate the starting PRB of the MBS frequency region.
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 4. If the CFR is equal to the unicast BWP, the signalling of starting PRB and the length of PRBs is not needed, which UE assumes the bandwidth of CFR equals to the unicast BWP.
* *Apple*
  + Proposal 1: The starting PRB of CFR is referenced to the Point A.
* *Lenovo*
  + Proposal 2: The starting PRB index and the number of contiguous PRBs of the MBS frequency region are configured within the dedicated unicast BWP via RRC signaling.
  + Proposal 3: The starting PRB of the MBS frequency region is configured with reference to the starting PRB of the dedicated unicast BWP.
* *Ericsson*
  + Proposal 11: We therefore propose to support Option 1 for functionality reasons and for having a common solution for multicast and broadcast. The reference point for the starting PRB of the CFR is Point A.
* *Xiaomi*
  + Proposal 2: The starting PRB of CFR should be referenced to point A.

**Number of CFRs:**

* *Huawei, HiSilicon*
  + Proposal 2: For CFR for multicast scheduling confined within a dedicated unicast BWP,
    - One CFR per a dedicated BWP is sufficient in Rel-17.
* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 2: Support more than one common frequency resources per UE / per dedicated unicast BWP subjected to UE capabilities.
* *ZTE*
  + Proposal 2: Regarding the CFR configuration,
    - More than one CFR can be supported per dedicated unicast BWP.
* *vivo*
  + Observation 1: When considering whether to support more than one CFR per UE / per dedicated unicast BWP subjected to UE capabilities, the issue of power consumption should be considered.
  + Proposal 3: More than one CFR is supported based on UE capability per dedicated unicast BWP for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs.
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 4：At most one CFR can be associated with a dedicated unicast BWP.
  + Proposal 5: One CFR configuration can be present when CFR is associated with more than one BWP.
* *MediaTek*
  + Proposal 5: Not support more than one common frequency resources for NR MBS.
* *FUTUREWEI*
  + Proposal 4: Only 1 CFR per unicast BWP per UE can be configured.
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 2. Don’t support more than one CFR for multicast service per dedicated unicast BWP.
* *Intel*
  + Proposal 6: One CFR per dedicated BWP is sufficient for scheduling MBS transmissions.
* *Samsung*
  + Observation 2: There is no need to support more than one CFR per active DL BWP for a UE.
* *LGE*
  + Proposal 3: If a CFR is confined within more than one UE active BWP with a same numerology, the CFR can be associated to more than one BWP.
    - Upon unicast BWP switching between UE’s active BWPs associated to the same CFR, UE does not change CFR and continues to receive PTM/PTP (re-)transmissions on the CFR during/after unicast BWP switching.
* *NTT Docomo*
  + Proposal 1: Support at most one common frequency resource per dedicated unicast BWP.
* *Chengdu TD Tech*
  + Proposal 3: More than one CFRs can be supported per unicast BWP.
* *Ericsson*
  + Proposal 12: Limit number of CFRs for multicast to one in Rel.17.

**Optionality of CFR:**

* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 3: Multicast is not supported in a dedicated unicast BWP when no CFR is configured for that BWP.
* *ZTE*
  + Proposal 2: Regarding the CFR configuration,
    - The parameters configured under the dedicated unicast BWP can be used for MBS transmission if these parameters are not configured under the CFR.
* *Nokia*
  + Proposal-4: Agree that CFR for multicast defaults to the UE-dedicated unicast BWP, and when there is no explicit unicast traffic scheduled within the BWP.
  + Proposal-5: Agree that it is up to RAN2 decision regarding the provisioning of CFR configurations when the CFR is same as the dedicated unicast BWP.
* *MediaTek*
  + Proposal 6: CFR should be configured if UE wants to receive multicast broadcast services.
* *FUTUREWEI*
  + Proposal 5: Without CFR configured, multicast reception by default is not supported. In combination with Proposal 3, the support of Option 4 (listed above) is proposed i.e., the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP cannot be used for multicast transmission even if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, but the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission.
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 3. Multicast cannot be supported in a dedicated unicast BWP when no CFR is configured for that BWP.
  + Proposal 5. If the PDSCH-config/PDCCH-config for MBS is not configured, the PDSCH-Config/PDCCH-config of the dedicated unicast BWP can be re-used for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 8: When some fields in PDSCH-Config for MBS are same as the fields in PDSCH-Config of the dedicated unicast BWP, the corresponding fields in PDSCH-Config of the dedicated unicast BWP can be the default configuration.
  + Proposal 9: When some fields in PDCCH-Config for MBS are same as the fields in PDCCH-Config of the dedicated unicast BWP, the corresponding fields in PDCCH-Config of the dedicated unicast BWP can be the default configuration.
* *Intel*
  + Proposal 3: A default CFR identical to active unicast BWP can be defined for UEs when no CFR configuration is provided
* *Samsung*
  + Observation 3: RAN2 can determine whether or not configuration for a CFR is provided to a UE when the CFR is same as the active DL BWP for the UE.
* *NTT Docomo*
  + Observation 1: In order to support multicast when no CFR is configured, it is needed to specify how does a UE decide whether or not to perform multicast reception processing.
  + Proposal 2: Multicast is not supported when no CFR is configured.
* *Chengdu TD Tech*
  + Proposal 4: If the current cell supports MBS, for the scenario that no CFR is configured for a unicast BWP, the unicast BWP can be by default used as the CFR for MBS.
* *Ericsson*
  + Observation 8: If the unicast BW is considered default for MBS BW, no CFR (frequency region) needs to be configured for the case where the unicast and MBS BWs are the same.
  + Proposal 13: PDCCH-config, PDSCH-config and SPS-config for MBS that are partly or wholly the same as their unicast counterparts do not need to be explicitly configured, but can be inferred from unicast configurations
  + Proposal 14: MBS is supported also when no CFR (frequency region) is configured for the case where the unicast and MBS BWs are the same.
* *Xiaomi*
  + Proposal 3: Multicast can be supported in a dedicated unicast BWP when no CFR is configured for that BWP.

**Rate matching and TBS determination:**

* *vivo*
  + Proposal 2: For multicast of RRC\_CONNECTED UEs,
    - LBRM (Limited buffer rate-matching) for GC-PDSCH TBS is determined based on bandwidth of CFR.
    - xOverhead in PDSCH-config in CFR is used for GC-PDSCH TBS determination if it is configured.
    - It is up to gNB to guarantee the activation/deactivation of semi-persistent ZP CSI-RS resource set at the same time if the semi-persistent ZP CSI-RS resource set is configured in PDSCH-Config in CFR.
* *Nokia*
  + Proposal-23: The parameters such as mcs-table, xOverhead, size of BWP indicator field, priority indicator, etc., which would have a mismatch between the configurations for UE-dedicated BWP and CFR could be synchronized across all the UEs receiving MBS traffic.
* *MediaTek*
  + Proposal 8: The LBRM for GC-PDSCH TBS is determined by CFR configuration.
  + Proposal 9: Define a xOverhead-MBS value within CFR for GC-PDSCH TBS determination.
* *Qualcomm*
  + Proposal 3: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, the LBRM for GC-PDSCH TBS is determined per CFR.
  + Proposal 4: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, the xOverhead for GC-PDSCH TBS determination is configured per CFR.
  + Proposal 5: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, the MAC-CE over GC-PDSCH can be used to active SP ZP CSI-RS configured per CFR.
* *Samsung*
  + Proposal 7: For LBRM determination and TBS calculation for GC-PDSCH:
    - The maximum number of layers can be provided by maxMIMO-Layers in PDSCH-Config for MBS; if not provided, a default value is defined.
    - The maximum modulation order can be determined from mcs-Table in PDSCH-Config for MBS; if mcs-Table in PDSCH-Config for MBS is not provided, a default value or a value determined from mcs-Table in PDSCH-Config for the active DL BWP is used.
    - xOverhead can be provided in PDSCH-Config for MBS; if not provided, a default value of zero or the value for the active DL BWP is used.
    - The number of PRBs is determined based on the size of CFR.
  + Observation 12: For LBRM/TBS determination, a UE can receive a TB according to MBS parameters when the TB is provided by a GC-PDSCH and according to unicast parameters when the TB is provided by a unicast PDSCH.
  + Proposal 8: PDSCH-Config for MBS provides two rate matching groups.
  + Observation 13: Whether or not the PDSCH-Config for multicast includes configuration of semi-persistent ZP CSI-RS resource sets would depend or whether or not support of CSI reports for multicast is specified.
* *Ericsson*
  + Proposal 39: All the parameters that affect TBS of LBRM for group PDSCH need be configured within CFR.
  + Proposal 40: xOverhead for group PDSCH TBS determination need be configured within CFR.
  + Proposal 41: ZP-CSI-RS configuration should be UE specific and thus shall not be configured in PDSCH-Config in CFR. Due to this, MAC-CE to activate/deactivate semi-persistent ZP CSI-RS resource set should be still transmitted over UE specific PDSCH.
* *Xiaomi*
  + Proposal 4: BWP should be used to determine the LBRM for GC-PDSCH TBS.
  + Proposal 4: BWP should be used to determine the LBRM for GC-PDSCH TBS.
  + Proposal 5: The xOverhead configured per BWP should be reused for GC-PDSCH TBS determination.
  + Proposal 6: The current mechanism for semi-persistent ZP CSI RS is reused, i.e. do NOT introduce common trigger signalling for ZP CSI-RS within CFR.

**BWP-InactivityTimer related issues:**

* *Qualcomm*
  + Proposal 1: For timer-based activation/deactivation of BWP for a UE to switch its active BWP to a default BWP
    - If a UE is configured with an MBS CFR associated with the active DL BWP, the UE maintains the active BWP timer for both unicast and MBS within the active DL BWP.
      * A UE starts or restarts the timer when it successfully decodes a PDCCH addressed to unicast RNTI (e.g., C-RNTI or CS-RNTI) or a GC-PDCCH addressed to group RNTI (e.g., G-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI) in the MBS CFR within the active DL BWP.
* *Samsung*
  + Proposal 1: Introduce MBS-BWP-InactivityTimer for multicast PDCCH receptions.
  + Proposal 2: Support search space set group switching for multicast PDCCH.

**Broadcast for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs:**

* *Nokia*
  + Observation 17: Broadcast and multicast or unicast can be on separate BWPs – with broadcast CFR associated with initial BWP / CORESET0, and multicast or unicast associated with UE’s dedicated unicast BWP, if a UE is receiving different services simultaneously.
  + Proposal 21: Agree to support separate CFRs and associated BWPs for simultaneous reception of broadcast and multicast / unicast.
  + Proposal 22: Support for broadcast and unicast reception in different frequency bands require enhanced signaling to avoid unnecessary BWP switching.
* *MediaTek*
  + Proposal 3: For broadcast reception, the unified CFR is supported for RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs (e.g., CFR is equal to or smaller than the initial BWP).
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 21. For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, the same CFR with RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs is used for broadcast reception when the same group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH are received by both RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs and RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, but can be different from the CFR used for multicast reception.
  + Proposal 22. For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, the group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH for broadcast reception are transmitted in UE-specific active BWP, which can be different from the group-common PDCCH/PDSCH received by RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE does not totally contain the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.
  + Proposal 23. For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, the same CFR is used for broadcast reception and multicast reception, when UE-specific active BWP of RRC\_CONNECTED UE does not totally contain the common frequency resource of RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.
  + Proposal 24. For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, only the group-common PDCCHs belong to broadcast service reported in MBS Interest Indication procedure are counted in the monitored CSS PDCCH candidates and non-overlapping CCEs  in a slot or span.

**Other issues:**

* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 20: A separate TCI states space is activated by MAC CE for group common PDSCH.
* *MediaTek*
  + Proposal 4: Network implementation guarantee the allocation of CFR for UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED mode to receive the MBS transmission.
* *Intel*
  + Proposal 4: RAN1 should strive for unified CFR for CONNECTED and IDLE mode UEs
  + Proposal 5: The UE expects no restriction on unicast reception within the CFR since it is contained within the active DL BWP of the UE.
* *Qualcomm*
  + Proposal 2: GC-PDCCH monitoring on/off in a CFR can be supported.
  + Proposal 10: Discuss whether/how to share the TCI-state pool for unicast and multicast within a dedicated BWP.
  + Proposal 15: Discuss whether G-RNTI(s)/G-CS-RNTI(s) for multicast is(are) configured per DL BWP, per serving cell or per cell Group
* *LGE*
  + Proposal 2: At least for multicast, unicast BWP switching between UE’s active BWPs may immediately triggers CFR change between different CFRs associated to different UE’s active BWPs.
  + Proposal 6: support transmission of multiple TDMed group-common PDSCHs carrying a same TB with selectively different RSs for both broadcast and multicast.
    - Different UE in the group selectively receive same or different PDSCHs among TDMed PDSCHs carrying the TB.
  + Proposal 7: Multiple TCI states can be configured in PDSCH-config for group common PDSCH for the CFR.
* *NTT Docomo*
  + Observation 9: In the current specification, the QCL assumption of group-common PDSCH will not be aligned among UEs in the same group if the offset between the group-common PDCCH and the corresponding PDSCH is less than the threshold timeDurationForQCL.
  + Proposal 17: The default QCL assumption of group-common PDSCH should be specified for the case that the time offset between the group-common PDCCH and the corresponding PDSCH is less than the threshold timeDurationForQCL.
* *ASUSTeK*
  + Proposal 1: For NR MBS group-scheduling, a reference TDRA table for mapping the group-common PDSCH transmission occasion in time domain needs to be identified and known to a corresponding group of UEs.
  + Observation 1: Using the default TDRA tables, the cell-specific TDRA table, or the UE-specific TDRA table may not be possible or efficient or may limit the flexibility and the capacity of NR MBS group-scheduling.
  + Proposal 2: A “group-common TDRA table” is configured per MBS group for NR MBS group-scheduling.
  + Observation 2: A UE is not able to receive multicast PDCCHs/PDSCHs if the UE’s active BWP is switched to an MBS-incapable BWP.
  + Proposal 3: If a UE’s active BWP is switched from an MBS-capable BWP to an MBS-incapable BWP, it needs some studies for the UE to resume multicast PDCCH/PDSCH receptions.
* *Sony*
  + Proposal 1: Support dedicated beam configuration for MBS beam report to identify suitable beams for group-common PDSCH/PDCCH in addition to unicast.
  + Proposal 2: The network shall configure time/frequency resources of the beam sweeping for the group common PDCCH/PDSCH.
  + Proposal 3: When the UE in RRC CONNECTED mode, it shall report preference/capability to keep same MBS content reception in IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE.
* *NEC*
  + Proposal 2: When the UE constructs a Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for unicast service, the PDSCH configured outside CFR should not be included in the occasions for candidate PDSCH receptions if the HARQ-ACK feedback for MBS is disabled by gNB.

## Initial Proposals based on contributions

***Summary***

Regarding down-selection of option 2A and 2B of CFR for RRC\_CONNECTED state, option 2B was agreed as working assumption in RAN1#105-e. Based on contributions submitted in this meeting, 13 companies propose to confirm the working assumption, 1 company [OPPO] proposes to support option 2A, 1 company [Sony] proposes to support both 2A and 2B. Moderator proposes to confirm the working assumption (Initial proposal 1-1).

Regarding the two FFS in the working assumption of CFR, i.e., ‘FFS: CFR associated with initial BWP’ and ‘FFS: CFR larger than initial BWP’, companies expressed different views from different perspectives. From moderator perspective, based on the working assumption, when the active BWP is other than initial BWP, it is up to gNB implementation that the CFR configured in the active BWP may be larger, smaller or equal to the initial BWP. For the case that the initial BWP is the active BWP, we can reuse the CFR design for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state as much as possible, so it is proposed to prioritize the corresponding discussion in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state first, and then to determine what else needs to be done based on the agreement of CFR in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state.

Regarding the reference point of the starting PRB of Option 2B for CFR, 10 companies have explicit proposals, 6 [ZTE, CATT, MediaTek, Ericsson, Apple, Xiaomi] of them propose to take Point A as the reference for the starting PRB of the CFR (i.e., option 1), 4 [vivo, Nokia, ETRI, Lenovo] propose to take the starting PRB of the dedicated unicast BWP as the reference point (i.e., option 2). Based on majority view, moderator suggests to take option 1 (Initial proposal 1-2). Regarding the indication mechanism of the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of CFR, 1 company [CATT] proposes that RIV indication mechanism can use used (Initial proposal 1-2).

Regarding the FFS whether more than one CFR is supported per dedicated unicast BWP subjected to UE capabilities, 6 companies propose that one CFR per dedicated BWP is sufficient. 4 companies [OPPO, ZTE, vivo, Chengdu TD Tech] propose to support more than one CFR per dedicated BWP subject to UE capability. Based on majority view, moderator thinks it is not possible to agree supporting more than one CFR per dedicated BWP for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs subject to UE capability at this moment, and we do not need to discuss this issue in this meeting.

Regarding the FFS whether multicast can be supported or not in a dedicated unicast BWP when no CFR is configured for that BWP, 5 companies [OPPO, Futurewei, CMCC, MediaTek, NTT Docomo] propose multicast is not supported when no CFR is configured for that BWP, 4 companies [Intel, Chengdu TD Tech, Ericsson, Xiaomi] propose that the CFR for multicast is optional and it can default to the dedicated unicast BWP if no CFR configuration is provided in this dedicated unicast BWP, 2 companies [Samsung, Nokia] think RAN2 can determine whether or not configuration for a CFR is provided to a UE when the CFR is the same as the active DL BWP for the UE, 1 company [NTT Docomo] thinks, in order to support multicast when no CFR is configured, it is needed to specify how does a UE decide whether or not to perform multicast reception. The situation seems not change much compared with last meeting. This issue was also discussed in the 1st round email discussion in RAN1#105-e, in which moderator proposed an initial proposal that it is up to RAN2 whether or not configuration for a CFR is provided to a UE when the CFR is the same as the dedicated unicast BWP for the UE. However no conclusion was made in RAN1#105. Based on proposals in this meeting and comments in last meeting, moderator thinks it would be better that companies who think CFR is optional for multicast reception can clarify that how does a UE decide whether or not to perform multicast reception if no CFR is configured in the active BWP (Question 1-3), e.g., is it possible that the MTCH configuration provided by RRC signalling to CONNECTED UEs can be used to indicate the UE to perform multicast reception even if no CFR is configured in the active BWP? The signalling design regarding the CFR and the MTCH configuration is more relevant to RAN2 and is not clear at this moment. It should be noted that, based on agreements until now, the CFR not only includes the starting PRB and the number of PRBs, but also includes PDCCH-config / PDSCH-config / SPS-config(s) for MBS.

Regarding the LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH, based on companies’ proposals, all the parameters that affect LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH need to be aligned across all the UEs in the same MBS group. Moderator suggests initial proposal 1-4. Regarding whether MAC-CE over GC-PDSCH is needed for activation/deactivation of semi-persistent ZP CSI-RS resource set, companies have different views, 3 companies [vivo, Ericsson, Xiaomi] think MAC-CE over GC-PDSCH is not needed, 1 company [Qualcomm] thinks it is needed, 1 company [Samsung] thinks it depends on whether or not support of CSI reports for multicast is specified. Moderator thinks companies may need more time to study on this. Additionally, 1 company [Samsung] also proposes *PDSCH-Config* for MBS can include two rate matching groups (e.g., *MBS-rateMatchPatternGroup1* and *MBS-rateMatchPatternGroup2)* to indicate unavailable REs within a CFR. Companies are recommended to further study on this.

A UE may change the active unicast DL BWP to the default/initial DL BWP when *BWP-InactivityTimer* expires, and the default/initial BWP may not contain the CFR. This is because in Rel-16, *BWP-InactivityTimer* is reset upon reception of a DCI format with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI or CS-RNTI, but G-RNTI of GC-PDCCH of PTM scheme 1 is not supported. 1 company [Qualcomm] proposes a UE also starts or restarts the *BWP-InactivityTimer* when it successfully decodes a GC-PDCCH addressed to G-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI in the CFR associated with the active DL BWP. 1 company [Samsung] thinks that will partially cancel the reason for having a default DL BWP, and result in unnecessary power consumption. Samsung proposes to introduce *MBS-BWP-InactivityTimer* for multicast PDCCH receptions, and the UE does not switch to the default/initial DL BWP unless both *MBS-BWP-InactivityTimer* and *BWP-InactivityTimer* expire, but it seems more clarifications are needed for the UE behavior when one of the two timers expires. Moderator suggests to further study this issue (Initial proposal 1-5)

1 company [Nokia] raises a question whether for a UE receiving both multicast and broadcast services simultaneously, the broadcast CFR and multicast CFR need to be overlapping, and proposes to support separate CFRs and associated BWPs for simultaneous reception of broadcast and multicast/unicast. It seems the question is based on a prerequisite that the initial BWP in which a broadcast CFR is configured is not within the active DL BWP in which a multicast CFR is configured. However, it is not clear whether to support UE simultaneously receiving both multicast and broadcast if the initial BWP is not within the active DL BWP. Moderator suggests companies to further study on this issue (Question 1-6).

***Initial Proposals***

The following moderator recommendations are made.

[Moderator’s recommendation]

**[High] Initial Proposal 1-1**:

Confirm the working assumption:

Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP other than initial BWP is supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED Ues.

* FFS: CFR associated with initial BWP
* FFS: CFR larger than initial BWP

**[High] Initial Proposal 1-2**:

For indication of the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of CFR for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs,

* the starting PRB is referenced to Point A.
* RIV (Resource indicator value) indication mechanism is used.

**[High] Question 1-3**: If no CFR configuration is provided in the active BWP, how does UE decide whether or not to receive multicast?

* Note: ‘no CFR configuration’ here means all the elements of CFR such as the starting PRB, the number of PRBs, PDCCH-config, PDSCH-config and SPS-config(s) for MBS are not configured.

**[High] Initial Proposal 1-4**: For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH:

* The maximum number of layers can be provided by *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, a default value is defined.
* The maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, a value determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast in the active DL BWP is used.
* *xOverhead* can be provided in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, the value for the active DL BWP is used.
* The number of PRBs is determined based on the size of CFR.

**[High] Initial Proposal 1-5**: If a UE is configured with a CFR in the active DL BWP, for timer-based active DL BWP switching to a default BWP, further study the following options:

* Option 1: UE also starts or restarts *BWP-InactivityTimer* when it successfully decodes a GC-PDCCH addressed to group-common RNTI (e.g., G-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI).
* Option 2: Introduce a new *MBS-BWP-InactivityTimer* for GC-PDCCH receptions.

**[High] Question 1-6**: Whether/How to support simultaneous reception of broadcast and multicast for RRC\_CONNECTED UE if the broadcast CFR associated with the initial BWP is not within the active DL BWP?

## Company Views (1st round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | **Proposal 1-1:** Only support to confirm the main bullet of the WA, and the two sub-bullets of FFS should be removed. The design target of CFR and initial BWP are totally different respectively for multicast and unicast. Whether CFR is larger than initial BWP or not is up to network’s configuration based on various requirements.  **[High] Initial Proposal 1-1**:  Confirm the working assumption:  Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP other than initial BWP is supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED Ues.   * ~~FFS: CFR associated with initial BWP~~ * ~~FFS: CFR larger than initial BWP~~   **Proposal 1-2:** Support the first sub-bullet “Point A” and the second sub-bullet “indication mechanism” can be further studied. The first step is to determine on the selection of starting point in frequency domain, and the indication mechanism may related to more detailed design. We would like to propose the following update on the proposal:  **[High] Initial Proposal 1-2**:  For indication of the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of CFR for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs,   * the starting PRB is referenced to Point A. * FFS: Indication mechanism. ~~RIV (Resource indicator value) indication mechanism is used.~~   **Question 1-3:**   1. The question implies that even CFR is not configured on an active BWP, UE still can support to receive multicast. The question is about “how does UE decide whether to receive…”, so it means that gNB may schedule multicast to UEs, and UEs can determine whether to receive it or not. 2. Even multicast (the cast-type) is not supported when no CFR is configured on an active BWP, unicast/PTP can be used to transmit MBS services on the active BWP. That is to say, multicast is not supported but MBS services/data can still be transmitted to UEs. The target is reached by using different cast-types.   **[High] Question 1-3**: If no CFR configuration is provided in the active BWP, whether or not to receive multicast services on the active BWP?   * Note: ‘no CFR configuration’ here means all the elements of CFR such as the starting PRB, the number of PRBs, PDCCH-config, PDSCH-config and SPS-config(s) for MBS are not configured.   **Proposal 1-5: May need more discussion/clarification.**   1. If the Rel-16 timer-based BWP switching mechanism is supported in Rel-17, it seems like a UE anyway will switch from an active BWP to the default/initial BWP whenever the timer is expired. It is more reasonable that a CFR should be configured in the default DL BWP if timer-based mechanism is supported in Rel-17 MBS. Even the timers for DL BWPs of UEs may different/misaligned with each other, gNB can make it feasible by proper configuration. With network implementation, it seems like that such timer issue can be avoided. 2. For option 1, one issue is that UE may not receive the GC-PDCCH. This issue may happen when the GC-PDCCH is transmitted on the CFR after *BWP-InactivityTimer* expires and UE has already switched to default/initial BWP, so UE may not be able to start/restart the timer while the GC-PDCCH is missed. 3. For option 2, introducing a new timer for MBS CFR can be a solution to compensate the impact of DL BWP timer, but how to deal with the relationship between these two timers should be further considered. A UE may have to support two different timers on an active DL BWP, one timer is for unicast while the other timer is for CFR within the DL BWP. When one of the timers is expired and the other timer is still on, whether to do BWP switching?   **Question 1-6:** As moderator analysis, this question is based on a prerequisite that the initial BWP in which a broadcast CFR is configured is not within the active DL BWP in which a multicast CFR is configured. It is not clear that why should we support the simultaneous reception of multicast and broadcast under this situation. If this kind of CFR/BWP configuration is not fulfilling the prerequisite, what is the motivation/benefit to support simultaneous reception? |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1-1: we are generally fine with the proposal. We share the same views as the other companies that we should not put any restrictions on the configuration of CFR for the UEs in CONNECTED mode, i.e. it can be larger, smaller or equal to initial DL BWP. We should focus on the CONNECTED mode UE and we are not clear why should we consider the initial DL BWP. We still think the wording related to initial DL BWP should be removed.  Proposal 1-2: support  Question 1-3: If a UE is configured with MBS traffic, e.g. it was configured with G-RNTI, it knows it should try to receive the PDCCH with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI to schedule MBS traffic. The PDCCH-config and PDSCH-config configured for the BWP can be directly reused. Network can guarantee all the UE-dedicated BWPs align with each other. It totally depends on gNB’s decision.  Proposal 1-4: For the first two bullets, we are OK as MBS traffic may not need advanced mechanism from reliability perspective. For the last two bullets, we don’t think any enhancement is needed compared to the current mechanisms.  For xOverhead, it is configured per BWP and actually applied to each RB. The CFR is definitely contained within the active BWP. For the number of RBs to determine LBRM buffer, the current mechanism may leads to a larger buffer sizes for MBS than necessary. However, there is no harm for MBS. On the other hand, the buffer size saved by the CFR-based buffer cannot be used for the unicast data.  Proposal 1-5: The ‘*BWP-InactivityTimer*’ is optional, in the other word, what kind of BWP switching is totally under control of network. Additionally, the value of *BWP-InactivityTimer* can be aligned across BWPs if timer based BWP switching is configured. The motivation here is not crystal clear.  Question 1-6: We are not sure why a UE needs to receive broadcast MBS and multicast MBS simultaneously, which targets to idle/inactive mode UE and CONNECTED UE respectively. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 1-1: Support  1-2: We have concern on the first bullet. Since the CFR configuration is associated with a unicast BWP and the unicast BWP is RRC configured per UE, it implies the CFR configuration is also configured per UE. Then the starting PRB can be referenced to the starting PRB of the associated unicast BWP so that the signaling overhead can be reduced.  1-3: We think “no CFR configuration” means “no MBS reception”.  1-5: Option 1 is preferred.  1-6: The motivation is not clear to us. Why does not gNB transmit the broadcast data also in multicast manner to the group of UEs? |
| ZTE | Proposal 1-1: OK to confirm the working assumption.  Proposal 1-2: Support. As also mentioned by many companies, reference to Point A can have the following benefits,  1) Avoid unnecessary reconfiguration in case of BWP configuration update;  2) Keep consistent configuration between IDLE and CONNECTIVE;  3) Save configuration overhead, e.g., one CFR configuration is applicable to multiple unicast BWPs.  Question 1-3: A RRC parameter (e.g., *MBS-Reception*) can be used to indicate whether UE needs to receive MBS or not. If MBS-Reception is included and CFR is configured, UE receives MBS via following the CFR configuration. If MBS-Reception is included and CFR is NOT configured, then UE receives MBS via following the configuration in unicast BWP.  Proposal 1-4: We are generally ok with the proposal. But we just want to mention, the handling for maxMIMO-Layers is not aligned with that for mcs-Table and xOverhead, i.e., if not configured in CFR, mcs-Table and xOverhead will following the corresponding configuration for unicast, while maxMIMO-Layers will follow a default value. Maybe we can try to use the same handling for all parameters. That is, if not configured in CFR, maxMIMO-Layers can also follow the value configured for unicast PDSCH.  Proposal 1-5: Some more clarification is needed at least for Option 2, for example, how to use this new timer. In this stage, we prefer a more general proposal like below.  **[High] Initial Proposal 1-5**: If a UE is configured with a CFR in the active DL BWP, further study whether enhancement for timer-based active DL BWP switching to a default BWP~~, further study the following options:~~   * ~~Option 1: UE also starts or restarts~~ *~~BWP-InactivityTimer~~* ~~when it successfully decodes a GC-PDCCH addressed to group-common RNTI (e.g., G-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI).~~ * ~~Option 2: Introduce a new~~ *~~MBS-BWP-InactivityTimer~~* ~~for GC-PDCCH receptions.~~   Question 1-6: We see it as an implementation issue for now. If network wants the UE to receive broadcast and multicast simultaneously, network needs to make sure broadcast and multicast can be transmitted in the same BWP. But we are also open if companies can agree to support multiple active BWPs for MBS reception, where one BWP is for broadcast and another is for multicast. |
| CMCC | 1-1: Support  1-2: Support  1-3: We think if there is no CFR configuration, UE will not receive MBS services.  1-4: Support  1-5: Prefer Alt 1. It is not necessary to introduce another MBS BWP timer.  1-6: We think in this case, the group-common PDCCH and the corresponding scheduled group-common PDSCH for broadcast reception are transmitted in UE-specific active BWP. Otherwise, UE will always switch to the CFR configured for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs to receive broadcast service, but this will cause the BWP switching and service delay. In addition, the BWP switching signalling will introduce large useless PDCCH overhead, gNB will send the BWP switching signalling each time between the transaction of multicast service and broadcast service. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 1-1: Generally ok to confirm the WA. But for the first FFSs, it is better to leave it to be discussed in AI8.12.3, instead of AI8.12.1. For the second FFS, it is not necessary to set the restriction, and it can be up to gNB implementation.  Proposal 1-2: Ok.  Question 1-3: For clarification, does the main bullet mean ‘whether or not to receive multicast service’, or mean to receive the MBS by multicast type?  Proposal 1-4: Generally Ok for the proposal.  Proposal 1-5: Support option 1.  Question 1-6: We have not seen necessarity. In addition, support simultaneously two active BWPs obviously would increase UE’s complexity, and even change UE’s implementation architecture. It is against the WID. |
| Samsung | 1-1: Support  1-2: Support  1-3: At least the PDSCH/PDCCH/PUCCH configurations need to be provided  1-4: Support  1-5: Option 2.  With option 1, a main purpose of having a default BWP (reduce PDCCH monitoring) is lost for either multicast or unicast and corresponding UE power consumption is not reduced.  1-6: If “simultaneous” means overlapping receptions (FDMed), that should not be supported.  Otherwise, if the receptions are at different times, the support is up to the NW. |
| vivo | Proposal 1-1: support to confirm the WA. We are fine to remove the two FFS.  Proposal 1-2: we think it should discuss how to configure CFR firstly, i.e, CFR is configured per UE per BWP, or CFR is configured per UE and if multiple BWPs contain the same CFR, one CFR configuration is used. If CFR is configured per UE per BWP, we think the starting PRB can be referenced to the starting PRB of the associated unicast BWP so that the signaling overhead can be reduced  Question 1-3: same view with Lenovo. We think “no CFR configuration” means “no MBS reception”. When the starting PRB and length of PRBs are same as unicast BWP, these parameters can be reused that of unicast. But it doesn’t all parameters are the same as that of unicast BWP.  Proposal 1-4: same view with ZTE. We prefer to use the same handling for all parameters. That is, if not configured in CFR, maxMIMO-Layers can also follow the value configured for unicast PDSCH.  Proposal 1-5: we are generally fine to further study the issue. We think it may have some relation with the issue of CFR configuration. i.e., if CFR is configured per UE per BWP, option 1 can be considered. If CFR is configured per UE and multiple BWPs can share the same CFR, option 2 is slightly preferred.  Question 1-6: For broadcast reception, the association between CFR and initial BWP is still discussing. The question can be “Whether/How to support simultaneous reception of broadcast and multicast for RRC\_CONNECTED UE if the broadcast CFR ~~associated with the initial BWP~~ is not within the active DL BWP?”. From our view, BWP switching may be needed in this case. if UE wants to receive both multicast and broadcast. |
| Apple | P1-1: ok.  P1-2: we support this proposal.  P1-4: ok.  P1-5: ok.  P-16: If the initial BWP and active BWP are not overlapped, and simultaneous reception of broadcast and multicast is allowed, UE would require to monitoring two active BWPs at a given time. It’s quite challenging for UE implementation, we prefer this case is supported. |
| MediaTek | 1-1: We are OK to confirm the working assumption. Regarding the relationship b/w CFR and initial BWP, it can be up to NW implementation for multicast of RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, e.g., CFR for multicast can be equal to or larger or smaller than initial BWP size.  1-2: Support.  1-3: Since CFR concept has been defined for MBS, it is better to configure the services parameter for MBS reception, especially for some MBS dedicated parameter, e.g., MBS\_PDSCH-config, MBS\_PDCCH-config, new Type-x CSS, etc.  1-4: Support.  1-5: Ok with further study.  1-6: We share the similar view with Samsung. Besides, we don’t see the clear motivation to support simultaneous reception of broadcast and multicast. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 1-1, 1-2, 1-4: ok in general.  Proposal 1-5: Option 1 is preferred. Not clear of Samsung’s concern on Option 1 “With option 1, a main purpose of having a default BWP (reduce PDCCH monitoring) is lost for either multicast or unicast and corresponding UE power consumption is not reduced.”  Clarification questions on Option 2:   * + - * If *MBS-BWP-InactiveTimer* is configured, does the UE start and restarts *MBS-BWP-InactiveTimer* when it successfully decodes a GC-PDCCH addressed to group-common RNTI (e.g., G-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI)?       * If so, the difference between Option 1 and Option 2 is just the UE counter unicast and multicast by different timers. The UE cannot fall back to the default BWP for power saving when either *BWP-InactiveTimer* or *MBS-BWP-InactiveTimer* expires. What is the benefit/necessity to use a different timer for multicast?   Question 1-3: Firstly, we prefer to change the wording based on the WA. Secondly, considering the MBS traffic will be different than unicast traffic, we think at least SS/CORESET in PDCCH-config and SPS periodicity in SPS-config are needed. Thirdly, it may be related how to configure G-RNTI(s)/G-CS-RNTI(s) for multicast.  **[High] Question 1-3**: If no CFR is associated with the active BWP, how does UE decide whether or not to receive multicast in the active BWP?   * Taking into account how to configure G-RNTI(s)/G-CS-RNTI(s) for multicast * Note: ‘no CFR configuration’ here means all the elements of CFR such as the starting PRB, the number of PRBs, PDCCH-config, PDSCH-config and SPS-config(s) for MBS are not configured.   Question 1-6: Need clarification of the simultaneous reception here, i.e., FDM? or TDM? |
| Nokia, NSB | 1-1: We agree with OPPO and support only the main bullet point regarding confirming the working assumption regarding option 2B. We do not see any clear link between initial BWP size, association of CFR with initial BWP – when it is made clear that the CFR is associated with UE active BWP which is different from the initial BWP. We are fine with OPPO’s updated proposal.  1-2: We also have concerns related to the use of Point A as reference for the starting PRB. Since the CFR is associated with UE’s active BWP, there is no technical reason as to why Point A should be used. Since BWPs are not frequently reconfigured, the argument that signaling could be reduced for this solution rather than simply associating the starting PRB of CFR in reference to the starting PRB of the active BWP does not make technical sense.  Regarding RIV mechanism, does this imply that resource allocation type-1 mechanism is always used and type-0 is precluded?  1-3: We agree that if no CFR configurations such as starting PRB, the number of PRBs, PDCCH-config, PDSCH-config and SPS-config(s), then the UE would not be able to receive MBS traffic. However, it could be further studied whether the UE could assume active BWP = CFR, if starting PRB and the number of PRBs are not configured.  1-4: Support  1-5: We are fine with this proposal and support Option 1.  1-6: We think that the simultaneous reception of broadcast and multicast for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs with broadcast CFR associated with initial BWP which is not within active DL BWP should be left to gNB and UE implementation. It has already been agreed in RAN2 that the RRC\_CONNECTED UE would send MBS interest indication mechanism, informing the gNB regarding the broadcast services it is interested in receiving. Based on receiving this message the gNB can configure DRX occasions and the UE can autonomously switch between the active DL BWP and BWP where broadcast CFR is scheduled. As mentioned in our contribution, we see some additional signaling enhancements necessary to avoid unnecessary BWP switching. Configuring broadcast CFR and multicast CFR to overlap would cause all UEs to monitor unnecessarily large BWPs, which would be inefficient from UE power consumption perspective. |
| Futurewei | 1-1: Support. The FFS can be left out.  1-2: Support but the RIV mechanism should be clarified that it is adaptation from existing mechanism.  1-5: Ok to further study  1-6: Should be left to network configuration. |
| CATT | **Proposal 1-1:** Support.  **Proposal 1-2:** Support.  **Question 1-3:** We think the MBS cannot be scheduled when no CFR configuration is provided in the active BWP.  **Proposal 1-4:** Support.  **Proposal 1-5:** Mayrequire further study  For option 1, we concern that it will affect the active unicast DL BWP switch to default/initial BWP, when the DCI used for active BWP change is missed detection and a GC-PDCCH is transmitted on the CFR contained in active BWP before the *BWP-InactivityTimer* expires.  According to the understanding of the option 2, the UE will switch to default/initial DL BWP until both MBS-BWP-InactivityTimer and BWP-InactivityTimer expire. Thus, the concern raised in the option 1 still exists in the option 2.  Therefore, we prefer to support the CFR is always associated with default/initial DL BWP to avoid such timer issued.  **Question 1-6:**It’s not clear for us the benefit to support simultaneous reception of broadcast and multicast for RRC\_CONNECTED UE if the broadcast CFR associated with the initial BWP is not within the active DL BWP. In addition, the broadcast in RRC\_CONNECTED state has not been discussed, and we suggest postponing the discussion about this question. |
| Ericsson | P1-1: We are fine confirming the Working Assumption.  Regarding the two FFSs, we have the following comments:   * FFS: CFR associated with initial BWP   Since the multicast 2B-CFR is associated with the initial BWP this logically means that the initial BWP is the active BWP. The CFR could then be contained within the Initial BWP in the same way as any other active BWP. For the case where the Initial BWP is the CORESET#0 Initial BWP or SIB1-configured Initial BWP, the Initial BWP is the same for all UEs, via broadcast configuration. There is then no point in specifying a CFR to be smaller than the Initial BWP since all UEs will anyway have to monitor the same Initial BWP. However, in the case the Initial BWP is RRC configured, different UEs may have different, but overlapping, Initial BWPs, in which case the CFR may be configured in such an overlap zone.   * FFS: CFR larger than initial BWP   When the Initial BWP is the active BWP the CFR can never be larger than the Initial BWP, since it needs to be “confined within the frequency resource of a dedicated unicast BWP”. However, when the initial BWP is *not* the active BWP then nothing prevents the active BWP to fully contain a CFR, which in turn fully contains a smaller initial BWP. So CFR can be larger than initial BWP for this case.  P1-2: We agree with the proposal (Point A) with the small modification/clarification that the reference point needs to be to the first RB of the carrier grid. This point is already provided in legacy via the SIB (combination of Point A and offset to this point), available to all UEs. In legacy, the RIV parameter defines the exact location of the BWP with reference to this point.  It would be highly desirable to reuse the same configuration method/format, as the one used for BWP, also for CFR. This is very natural since two have the same need, i.e. exactly the same potential frequency occupancy. It is also worth noting that the existing single 16-bit RIV (RRC locationAndBandwidth parameter) is more bit efficient than having independent parameters for offset and length. Another reason for this solution is to have commonality with broadcast to Inactive/Idle UEs, where this reference point is naturally available but not the starting RB of the active BWP.  P1-3: If no CFR configuration (with the given definition) is provided, the UE may still be configured with G-RNTI. As a general rule configurations from unicast are used as default unless something else is explicitly configured for multicast.  P1-4: Support  P1-5: Support  We prefer Option 2 with the understanding that the two timers may have different lengths and that a UE moves to the default BWP only when both timers have expired.  P1-6: Any CFR (multicast or broadcast) the UE receives while in RRC Connected needs to be within the active DL BWP. For UEs in RRC Connected the FFT window/frequency range of the UE needs to equal the active BWP. Then the multicast CFR and broadcast CFR needs to be within this window for parallel reception. If a broadcast CFR is received outside this window the UE needs to perform BWP switching to/from the broadcast CFR in which case the continuity of unicast/multicast reception may be impacted. |
| Convida | 1-1: We are OK to confirm the WA and FFS.  1-2: OK.  1-3: We think “no CFR configuration” means “no MBS reception”.  1-5: OK to further study it. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 1-1**: Support.  **Proposal 1-2**: Support. Option 1(i.e., Point A) is simpler when considering the processing of gNB.  **Question 1-3**: It would take a lot of discussion to come to a consensus on the answer to the question. There is no need to support multicast when no CFR is configured.  **Proposal 1-4**: Support  **Proposal 1-5**: Support. We prefer Option 2. Option 1 would require UE to perform both unicast and multicast reception while the timer is running. But multicast transmissions may not always be performed while the BWP is active. It may be useful to introduce a new timer to limit the duration of multicast receive processing.  **Question 1-6**: There is no need to support simultaneous reception in such cases. Because BWP switching will be required between broadcast and multicast reception, which causes BWP switching delay. For a UE that wants to receive both multicast and broadcast, gNB should configure and activate a BWP that contains both multicast CFR and broadcast CFR. |
| Intel | **Proposal 1-1:** OK to confirm WA. For the first FFS, it is not clear what issue we are looking to address. CFR associated with an initial BWP should be contained within the initial BWP. For the second FFS, we do not see any case for CFR larger than initial BWP when the initial BWP is the active BWP. In this case, CFR is contained within the initial BWP. For the case when active BWP is larger than initial BWP, CFR can consequently be larger and there is no issue in this case either. Therefore, the second FFS can be removed.  **Proposal 1-2:** OK with first sub-bullet. The second sub-bullet can be “FFS: Indication mechanism”. Not sure if Type 0 can be precluded at this point.  **Question 1-3:** Not sure if this question is the correct one. What does it mean “UE decides to receive multicast or not? Also, if no configuration is provided and there is a default configuration, it is upto gNB to schedule the multicast within the default CFR (if defined). If not, then the UE cannot receive multicast transmission.  **Question 1-6:** Not sure why we need to support such operation if UE has a different active BWP. In this case, it should be up to network to configure an appropriate BWP and associated CFR if simultaneous reception is desired. Additionally, it needs to be clarified if this is FDM or TDM? |
| LG | P1-1: Support  P1-2: Support  P1-3: Meaning of ‘no CFR configuration’ in the note is not clear to us. We think that CFR configuration can be constructed as new IE CFR-Config e.g. including PDCCH-config, PDSCH-config. In this case, ‘no CFR configuration’ can mean one of the following cases:   * + - * Case 1: If new IE CFR-Config is not present, UE determines that no CFR configuration is provided.       * Case 2: if new IE CFR-Config is present but new IE CFR-Config does not contain any element (or any core element), UE determines that no CFR configuration is provided.   For case 1, we think that UE could determine that this is no CFR. Alternatively, UE could determine that UE active BWP is used for multicast.  For case 2, we think that UE could possibly use core configurations such as PDCCH-config and PDSCH-config in BWP configuration associated to the CFR.  P1-5: In Rel-15, upon expiry of *BWP-InactivityTimer*, UE switches to default BWP or initial BWP. Considering that multicast is also served by default BWP and initial BWP, we think that no special handling is needed upon expiry of *BWP-InactivityTimer*. Thus, we propose to add Option 3 as follows:  **[High] Initial Proposal 1-5**: If a UE is configured with a CFR in the active DL BWP, for timer-based active DL BWP switching to a default BWP, further study the following options:   * Option 1: UE also starts or restarts *BWP-InactivityTimer* when it successfully decodes a GC-PDCCH addressed to group-common RNTI (e.g., G-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI). * Option 2: Introduce a new *MBS-BWP-InactivityTimer* for GC-PDCCH receptions. * Option 3: Multicast reception has no impact on Rel-15/16 UE behavior related to *BWP-InactivityTimer*.   P1-6: Considering user experience, we could say that it is desirable for connected UE to receive broadcast as well as multicast in any case. We think that for the concerned case, there are two options for connected UE to receive both broadcast and multicast:   * + - * Option 1: Allowing connected UE to switch to broadcast CFR from UE active BWP depending on UE capability.       * Option 2: The network makes sure that UE active BWP configured for this UE always accommodates the broadcast CFR (at least for MTCH).         + Note that if one CFR does not cover both broadcast and multicast, UE supporting multicast and broadcast should support at least two CFRs (i.e. one CFR for broadcast and one CFR for multicast)         + In this option, it can be beneficial to support the broadcast CFR outside the initial BWP for flexibility in gNB’s configuration of UE active BWP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Initial Proposal 1-1**:  Support to confirm WA. If UE receives unicast by SIB1 configured initial BWP, then the CFR should be contained in this initial BWP as well.  **Question 1-3 and initial Proposal 1-4:**  In general, if UE is configured with G-RNTI, UE is usually configured with CFR. The question is whether the configuration (not only CFR but also others) for multicast should the same or can be different from that for unicast.  **Initial Proposal 1-5:**  Prefer option1. Existing *BWP-InactivityTimer* can be reused for multicast.  **Question 1-6:**  UE in RRC\_CONNECTED subject to UE capability can support simultaneous reception of broadcast and multicast, which however does not mean broadcast and multicast will be scheduled in the same slot. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | **[High] Initial Proposal 1-1**: OK for option 2B. But we think the two FFSs need further clarifying.  **[High] Initial Proposal 1-2**: OK  **[High] Question 1-3**: We prefer that the active BWP is by default the CFR for multicast if the CFR is not configured.  **[High] Initial Proposal 1-4**: OK  **[High] Initial Proposal 1-5**: We think the further discussion is needed for the two options. Before the selection can be made, what UE will do after switching to the default BWP/initial BWP shall be taken into account in order to evaluate which option is better. The rules for selecting one option may include the following items:   1. Have no effect on the UE not supporting MBS or the UE supporting MBS but not receiving a multicast session 2. The selected method can save the power of UE as much as possible. 3. Compared with working on the default BWP/initial BWP when the existing timer expires, what will bring to the UE which has more time to stay on the active BWP due to the reception of at least one multicast session? 4. UE may receive more than one multicast sessions. The selected option will support such case with a simple processing.   We think the detailed description of the two options are needed.  **[High] Question 1-6**: OK but we think the requirement on the simultaneous reception of both the broadcast session and the multicast session shall be clarified firstly. If such requirement exists, the related method shall be studied. |
| Moderator | **Proposal 1-1:**  The following was agreed in GTW session.  Agreement:  Confirm the working assumption with the following update:  Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP other than initial DL BWP is supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs.   * ~~FFS: CFR associated with initial BWP~~ * ~~FFS: CFR larger than initial BWP~~   Note: The deleted FFSs can be discussed in another AI.  **Proposal 1-2:**  Regarding the reference of the starting PRB of CFR, 2 companies [Lenovo, Nokia] have concern. Ericsson suggests to make a clarification that the starting PRB is actually referenced to the first PRB of the resource grid of the carrier, which is derived from the subcarrierSpacing of a BWP and offsetToCarrier corresponding to this subcarrier spacing as described in TS38.331 for locationAndBandwidth of a BWP. Therefore, I may it more clear in the first bullet to check if companies share the same view.  @ vivo, regarding your comments, based the following agreement in previous meetings, I think it is clear that the CFR is configured within the dedicated unicast BWP.  *“Option 2B: The common frequency resource is defined as an ‘MBS frequency region’ with a number of contiguous PRBs, which is configured within the dedicated unicast BWP.”*  *“One CFR is supported per dedicated unicast BWP for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs.”*  Regarding RIV indication mechanism in the second bullet, it seems it was misunderstood by Nokia and Intel. This is not related to the frequency resource allocation type 0/1, the original intention is to jointly indicate the starting PRB and the length of the PRBs.  **Question 1-3:**  Based on companies’ comments, at least 6 companies think no CFR configuration can be regarded as no need to receive multicast service by the UE. Some companies think at least PDSCH/PDCCH configurations for MBS need to be provided. 2 companies [Ericsson, Xiaomi] think the configuration of G-RNTI can be used to indicate UE to receive multicast service. Some companies suggest to modify the question for better understanding. Considering this relates to signalling design, I think it is not essential issue to be decided now, I updated the Question 1-3 for better understanding, but companies are free to make more comments or not.  **Proposal 1-4:**  Most companies are OK with this proposal, 1 company [Xiaomi] sees not OK with last two bullets. Based on comments from ZTE and vivo, I updated the first bullet.  **Proposal 1-5:**  I updated the proposal based on companies’ comments.  **Question 1-6:**  Some companies think it is based on network implementation to make sure the broadcast CFR is within the active DL BWP if the RRC\_CONNECTED UE wants to simultaneously receive broadcast and multicast. Some companies think network can use PTP transmission method for broadcast service even if the broadcast CFR is not within the active DL BWP. Some companies suggest to clarify the simultaneous reception here refers to FDM or TDM, my original intention is to ask the group whether we need to enhance the specification to better support UE switching between the multicast CFR and broadcast CFR to simultaneously receive the multicast service and broadcast service in TDM manner (not in the same slot or in a FDM manner) based on the Nokia’s related proposals. Considering that Nokia also commented that this can be left to gNB and UE implementation. Whether additional specification enhancements are needed to avoid unnecessary BWP switching can be further discussed based on companies’ more inputs in future meetings. Moderator suggests to postpone the discussion, but the Question 1-6 was also updated for better understanding as follows.  **[High] Updated Question 1-6**: Whether specification enhancements are needed for RRC\_CONNECTED UE to support simultaneous reception of multicast service and broadcast service by switching between the multicast CFR and broadcast CFR in TDM manner, if the broadcast CFR is not within the active DL BWP? |

## Updated Proposals (after 1st round of inputs)

**[High] Updated Proposal 1-2**:

For indication of the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of CFR for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs,

* the starting PRB is referenced to Point A, i.e., the starting PRB is a PRB determined by *subcarrierSpacing* of the associated BWP and *offsetToCarrier* corresponding to this subcarrier spacing, similar as how *locationAndBandwidth* of a BWPis indicated as described in TS 38.331.
* FFS: Indication mechanism, e.g., whether the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of CFR is jointly indicated similar as RIV (Resource indicator value) indication mechanism as described in TS38.214.

**[High] Question 1-3**: If the new IE CFR-Config is not present in the active BWP, whether or not UE perform multicast reception in the active BWP?

* Taking into account how to configure G-RNTI(s)/G-CS-RNTI(s) for multicast.
* Note: For RAN1 discussion, assume the new IE CFR-Config may include the configurations of the starting PRB, the number of PRBs, PDCCH-config, PDSCH-config and SPS-config(s) for MBS. The details of signalling design are up to RAN2.

**[High] Updated Proposal 1-4**: For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH:

* The maximum number of layers can be provided by *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, *maxMIMO-Layers* of *PDSCH-ServingCellConfig* of the serving cell is used.
* The maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, a value determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast in the active DL BWP is used.
* *xOverhead* can be provided in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, the value for the active DL BWP is used.
* The number of PRBs is determined based on the size of CFR.

**[High] Updated Proposal 1-5**: If a UE is configured with a CFR in the active DL BWP, for timer-based active DL BWP switching to a default BWP, further study the following options:

* Option 1: UE also starts or restarts *BWP-InactivityTimer* when it successfully decodes a GC-PDCCH addressed to group-common RNTI (e.g., G-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI).
* Option 2: Introduce a new *MBS-BWP-InactivityTimer* for GC-PDCCH receptions.
* Option 3: Multicast reception has no impact on Rel-16 UE behavior related to *BWP-InactivityTimer*.
* Note: Other options are not precluded.

## Company Views (2nd round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia, NSB | 1-2: While we think that it is beneficial to refer the CFR to the start PRB of the UE active BWP, we are fine with this proposal since majority of companies support it.  1-3: The question perhaps seems not entirely clear to us – especially including the first sub-bullet. Is the question better rephrased as: “If G-RNTI(s)/G-CS-RNTI(s) are configured for multicast, and if the new IE CFR-Config is not present in the active BWP, whether or not UE perform multicast reception in the active BWP?”  It would be better to clarify the question before we can answer it. Assuming our understanding of the question is correct, one of our concerns with the “using group-common RNTI” approach to determine that the active BWP is the CFR, is what SS/DCI type would the UE be expected to monitor?  1-4: Support  1-5: We do not support adding option 3 since the justification seems to be related to the relation between multicast CFR and initial BWP. Since it was agreed during the meeting that the CFR is associated with the UE active BWP other than initial DL BWP, we would prefer not to include this option. We are fine with including the note, which does not preclude other solutions, if companies are interested in proposing them. |
| Qualcomm | **1-2, 1-4:** ok  **1-3:**  How to configure the CFR-Config is not discussed yet. We prefer to use the wording “If the new IE CFR-Config is not associated with the active BWP, …”, based on the following RAN1 agreement  Agreement:  Confirm the working assumption with the following update:  Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP other than initial DL BWP is supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs.  **1-5:**  We don’t think Option 3 can work. In 38.321, the *bwp-InactivityTimer* is only counting the unicast PDCCH addressed to C-RNTI or CS-RNTI. If a CFR is associated with the active BWP, the UE can receive unicast and multicast transmission. The UE currently receiving its interested multicast services with GC-PDCCH in the CFR should not switch from the active BWP to default BWP. The suggested modified 1-5 is:  **[High] Updated Proposal 1-5**: If a UE is configured with a CFR associated with the active DL BWP, for timer-based active DL BWP switching to a default BWP, further study the following options:   * Option 1: UE also starts or restarts *BWP-InactivityTimer* when it successfully decodes a GC-PDCCH addressed to group-common RNTI (e.g., G-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI). * Option 2: Introduce a new *MBS-BWP-InactivityTimer* for GC-PDCCH receptions. * Note: Other options are not precluded. |
| Samsung | 1-2: Support.  The issue is simple, either way is OK.  1-3: OK with Nokia’s update.  We think it is possible to support multicast PDSCHs without CFR (for a subset of features) if G-RNTI/G-CS-RNTI are configured.  1-4: Do not support  The reason is that “*maxMIMO-Layers* of *PDSCH-ServingCellConfig*” is optional. If not provided, *maxMIMO-Layers* then depends on UE capability which of course doesn’t work for multicast. Either the default value needs to be kept in the proposal (at least if “*maxMIMO-Layers* of *PDSCH-ServingCellConfig*” is not provided), or a *maxMIMO-Layers* needs to be defined for multicast.  1-5: Support the update by Qualcomm and agree with the justification given.  To respond to a previous comment/question by Qualcomm, the difference between Option 1 and Option 2 is that, with Option 2, the UE can at least monitor GC-PDCCH more sparsely, similar to switching to a default DL BWP in Rel-16 upon timer expiration. So, the benefit is reduced UE power consumption and the cost is an MBS timer. We think it is clearly a better tradeoff in favor of Option 2. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | **[High] Question 1-3**: We suggest to update the proposal as below.  If the new IE CFR-Config is not present in the active BWP, can gNB use the active BWP to transmit a multicast session ?   * Option 1: gNB can use the active BWP to transmit a multicast session, which means the active BWP is by default the CFR if the new IE CFR\_Config is not present. * Option 2: gNB can’t use the active BWP to transmit a multicast session, which means the active BWP can be regarded as the CFR by default if the new IE CFR\_Config is not present. * Note: For RAN1 discussion, assume the new IE CFR-Config may include the configurations of the starting PRB, the number of PRBs, PDCCH-config, PDSCH-config and SPS-config(s) for MBS. The details of signalling design are up to RAN2.   **[High] Updated Proposal 1-5**: In order for companies to select between the options, we think the detailed description on each option is needed. We suggest a possible update as below.  **[High] Updated Proposal 1-5**:If a UE is configured with a CFR in the active DL BWP, for timer-based active DL BWP switching to a default BWP, further study the following options:   * Option 1: UE also starts or restarts *BWP-InactivityTimer* when it successfully decodes a GC-PDCCH addressed to a group-common RNTI (e.g., G-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI). Before the timer expires, UE needs to monitor C-RNTI and each group-common RNTI. * Option 2: Introduce a new *MBS-BWP-InactivityTimer* for GC-PDCCH receptions. UE will switch to the default/initial BWP when both timers expires. Before the new timer expires, UE needs to monitor each group-common RNTI which is associated with at least one multicast session received by UE (1: N>=1 mapping between G-RNTI/G-CS-RNTI and MBS session may be supported in RAN2). If UE successfully decodes a GC-PDCCH, it restarts the new timer. If the new timer expires, UE stops monitoring any group-common RNTI. When the old timer *BWP-InactivityTimer* expires, UE stops monitoring C-RNTI. * Option 3: Multicast reception has no impact on Rel-16 UE behavior related to *BWP-InactivityTimer*. (our comment: the description of option 3 is too simple.) * Note: Other options are not precluded.   Other proposals: OK from our side |
| LG | 1-5: We think that option 3 works. If legacy timer expires, UE will move to initial BWP or default BWP which will also support multicast for this UE or other UE in the group. It will be great to solve this issue without any change to the current specification.  In addition, if this issue is really essential, RAN2 should be involved in this discussion, considering that this timer has been specified in 38.321. We think that this issue is not so essential, though. |
| ZTE | We are ok with Proposal 1-2, 1-4, and 1-5.  For Proposal 1-3, we think it is possible to use G-RNTI(s)/G-CS-RNTI(s) for multicast to indicate whether UE needs to receive MBS if new type-X of search space sets are configured in this BWP. |
| OPPO | **P 1-2:** We agree with the main bullet. The two sub-bullets should be updated as following suggestion.   * The intention of referring to Point A can be supported. The only concerns that whether we need to clarify all the details in an agreement while it is reusing the current Rel-15/16 mechanism. Furthermore, capturing the words after “i.e.” as in the agreement should be very careful because people may think it as a new definition of point A that is different from legacy Point A. If it is clear to everyone, we would like to suggest to make it short and simple. * The second sub-bullet is already FFS, and any Indication mechanism will be discussed in the following meetings. If we restrict the direction of this mechanism, we may not need this FFS here.   **[High] Updated Proposal 1-2**:  For indication of the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of CFR for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs,   * the starting PRB is referenced to Point A~~, i.e., the starting PRB is a PRB determined by~~ *~~subcarrierSpacing~~* ~~of the associated BWP and~~ *~~offsetToCarrier~~* ~~corresponding to this subcarrier spacing, similar as how~~ *~~locationAndBandwidth~~* ~~of a BWP~~~~is indicated as described in TS 38.331~~. * FFS: Indication mechanism~~, e.g., whether the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of CFR is jointly indicated similar as RIV (Resource indicator value) indication mechanism as described in TS38.214~~.   **Q 1-3:** This Question is more like a proposal of FFS instead of a Question.  We understand the intention of this proposal which is good for the group for better understanding. We still have some question for more clarifications:   * Did we agree to have an independent IE specifically for MBS-specific CFR configuration? My understanding is that we the CFR configuration may also be part of the configuration of dedicated BWP, is that correct understanding? * The main bullet now implies that: the presence of the IE CFR-config directly determines whether multicast is supported or not, which is not a proper way to lead the further discussion.   **P 1-5:** More discussion and clarification are needed for timer-based BWP switching.   * Should timer-based BWP switching must be supported for multicast services? We do not think it appropriate to agree this proposal now before we support it. * At least in this release of MBS, the impact to current unicast mechanism by supporting MBS should be minimized, as well as any enhancement/optimization. * Then we may have chance to discuss about the solution to those issues cause by it, if it must be supported inevitably. * We would like to suggest to firstly discuss whether timer-based BWP switching mechanism is supported or not when multicast is enabled for the group of UEs.   **[High] Updated Proposal 1-5**: If a UE is configured with a CFR in the active DL BWP, further study for timer-based active DL BWP switching to a default BWP~~, further study the following options:~~   * ~~Option 1: UE also starts or restarts~~ *~~BWP-InactivityTimer~~* ~~when it successfully decodes a GC-PDCCH addressed to group-common RNTI (e.g., G-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI).~~ * ~~Option 2: Introduce a new~~ *~~MBS-BWP-InactivityTimer~~* ~~for GC-PDCCH receptions.~~ * ~~Option 3: Multicast reception has no impact on Rel-16 UE behavior related to~~ *~~BWP-InactivityTimer~~*~~.~~   ~~Note: Other options are not precluded.~~ |
| Xiaomi | 1-2: support.  1-3: we are fine with Nokia’s rephrasing on the question. Regarding Nokia’s concern on SS/DCI configuration, our thinking is that BWP configuration provides completed information for DL assignment and reception. The details can be further studied once we achieve consensus on the answer to the question.  1-4: After the first round discussion, it seems we are the only companies objecting the proposal. We would kindly ask for response to our previous comments from the proponents. We can give up our ‘minority view’ only if the technical arguments behand the last two bullets is clear to us, instead of only counting the pros and cons. I would like to raise our question again for convenience:  For the number of RB to determine the LBRM buffer size: if the current mechanism is respected, it may result a larger buffer size for MBS traffic as typically BWP is larger than CFR. It is not harmful to MBS transmission, is it correct? On the other hand, if we determine the LBRM buffer based on CFR, which may result in a smaller LBRM buffer for MBS, what is the benefit for both unicast transmission and MBS transmission? It should be noted that the LBRM buffer size is only determined by the maximum TBS and the number of CB.  For xOverhead, it is actually parameter to reflect the overhead in a RB. It is configured per BWP and applied to each RB contained in the BWP. Considering the CFR is contained in a active BWP, why do we need to define an additional xOverhead for MBS? If an additional xOverhead is configured for CFR, how should a UE handle the xOverhead if the unicast PDSCH is overlapped with CFR as there are two xOverhead for the same PRB?  1-5: support. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 1-2: we prefer starting PRB of CFR is referenced to starting PRB of the associated unicast BWP. If the starting PRB is defined with reference to Point A, we are afraid that the CFR configuration would be irrelevant to the associated BWP, which may be against the existing agreement.  1-3: as mentioned in the first round of discussion, we think “no CFR configuration” means “no reception of MBS”.  1-4: I suggest deprioritized this proposal as it is a bit detailed.  1-5: As it is quite relevant to RAN2’s work, one way is to leave it in RAN2; another way is based on OPPO’s proposal. Either is fine with us. |
| vivo | 1-2: Although we prefer to use starting PRB of the associated unicast BWP as the reference point, we can accept to use point A if it is the majority’s view. For the FFS, we agree with OPPO to keep it more general.  1-3: We share the same concern as Nokia. The first DCI format/second DCI format for MBS scheduling is monitored in type-x CSS. We think type-x CSS is configured in CFR. If there is no CFR-config, does it mean that the first DCI format/second DCI format can be monitored in a type-3 CSS, or UE can be configured a type- x CSS in unicast dedicated BWP rather than CFR?  1-4: OK  1-5: OK |
| MediaTek | 1-2: Support  1-3: Regarding the question, we still thinks CFR is needed for MBS reception since some new MBS dedicated parameter (e.g., CSS) will be introduced. If no CFR configuration, UE will not obtain these parameter and not receive multicast services.  1-4: We are generally OK with the direction and need more time to check Samsung’s concern.  1-5: it is not reasonable for all UEs switch to default BWP for MBS reception when only unicast *BWP-InactivityTimer* expirer and without considering the multicast behavior. Since more discussion and clarification is needed, OPPO’s updated version is fine for us. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 1-2**: Support. For the 2nd sub-bullet, the same mechanism as the existing *locationAndBandwidth* can be reused.  **Question 1-3**: It would be wasteful to always perform multicast reception while G-RNTI is configured, since multicast transmission would not always performed. It would be better to include some parameter in CFR-Config to determine whether or not to perform multicast reception. There is no need to perform multicast reception when CFR-Config is not present.  **Proposal 1-4**: Support  **Proposal 1-5**: Support. We don’t think Option 3 is a proper behavior. In Option 3, if a UE is only receiving multicast with no unicast, *BWP-InactivityTimer* may expire during multicast repetition. Then BWP switching is performed, but if the BWP after the switching does not contain CFR, the UE cannot continue to receive multicast. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 1-2: support**  **Proposal 1-3: Like one proposal not one question. We are fine to study.**  **Proposal 1-4: support**  **Proposal 1-5: support** |
| CATT | **Proposal 1-2:** Support.  **Question 1-3:** We are fine with the Qualcomm’s update. Because how to configure new IE CFR-Config has not been discussed, ‘the new IE CFR-Config is not associated with the active BWP’ is better.  In addition, if the new IE CFR-Config is not associated with the active BWP**,** whydoes the gNB schedule the UE on this active BWP to perform the MBS reception? The motivation to support MBS reception for UE in this case is not clear for us. Therefore, we think if the active BWP is not associated with the CFR, there is no need to support MBS reception on the active BWP for the UE.  **Proposal 1-4:** Support.  **Proposal 1-5:** We think this proposal may need more discussion before we support it.   * May I consider this proposal is about whether support Rel-16 timer-based active DL BWP switching mechanism when UE is configured with a CFR in the active DL BWP?   If my understanding is right, we think this proposal want to introduce a new timer-based active DL BWP switching mechanism for multicast services instead of legacy mechanism.   * One of the purposes of introducing a timer-based active DL BWP switching in Rel-16 is that when the DCI used for active BWP change is missed, the UE can switch to default/ initial BWP when the timer expires to ensure that the UE and g-NB can align their understanding. * While, we have some concerns about Option1 and Option 2. Since both option 1 and option 2 will affect the active DL BWP switch to default/initial BWP, when the DCI used for active BWP change is missed detection and one or multiple GC-PDCCHs are transmitted before the *BWP-InactivityTimer* of unicast expires. As shown in the figure, when the UE missed detecting the DCI for active BWP changing to BWP#2, and if option 1 or option 2 was supported, the UE will receive multicast serves on BWP#1 although the *BWP-InactivityTimer* of unicast expired and gNB won’t known which BWP to schedule unicast service. Consider the above analysis, we think both of the option 1 and option 2 will affect current unicast mechanism. |
| Ericsson | P1-2: Ok  Q1-3: Assuming the multicast DCI can be instantiated in a search space which is part of the unicast PDCCH-config, MBS reception should be possible without CFR-config. In that case the frequency range and all parameters from PDCCH-config, PDSCH-config and SPS-config are inherited from unicast.  P1-4: Not support. We agree with Samsung comment. We prefer the previous round proposal.  P1-5: Not support. We share Qualcomm’s concerns about Option 3 and support their Proposed update to further study Option 1&2. |
| Qualcomm2 | Regarding questions on 1-4 from Xiaomi (LBRM/TB alignment):   * + - * The LBRM for unicast is dependent on BWP RBs, max MIMO layer, max modulation order. If any of the parameters is different among the UEs in a multicast group, the LBRM for MBS is not common. Let’s say UE1 has 100MHz and UE2 has 20MHz and CFR is only use 20MHz for MBS. The buffer based on LBRM for unicast is larger than that of MBS. However, the circular buffer with the N\_cb of unicast will result in incorrect bit counting for the starting point per RV of the MBS.       * xOverhead for TBS is just a value counting average overhead due to CRS, CSI-RS, etc.. So, different UEs in the multicast group may have different unicast xOverhead. A common xOverhead is needed to calculate TBS for MBS.   Regarding questions on 1-5 from CATT, LGE and OPPO (bwp-InactiveTimer):   * + - * Using the CATT’s future as below, BWP1 and BWP2 can be associated with the same CFR. But when BWP1 switch to BWP2, there is BWP switching time and MBS reception in the green part will be interrupted in the middle. So if gNB is transmitting MBS service, it should not send DCI to switch the BWP during the MBS reception time. The assumption of missing this DCI will not happen.       * To LGE, let’s say the default BWP is the BWP2 associated with the same CFR. If the bwp-InactiveTimer does not count during the MBS green part, the UE will switch to default BWP. The MBS service cannot be received during the BWP switching time (similar problem as above).       * To OPPO, both timer-based BWP switching and MBS reception are optional features. However, do we want to write in the spec that UEs configured with MBS cannot use timer-based BWP switching or UEs configured with timer-based BWP switching cannot receive MBS? It is not reasonable to set such restrictions. So, we need to consider FL’s proposal 1-5. |
| Moderator | **Proposal 1-2:**  @OPPO, since some companies propose to clarify the first bullet in first round discussion, I think it is better to keep the “i.e.” part if it is the common understanding. Regarding the example of the second bullet, we can delete it for now.  **Question 1-3:**  I modified the question for better understanding. Based on comments so far, some companies think it is possible to support UE performing multicast reception in the active BWP in this condition, but some companies think at least some configurations for MBS need to be provided in the CFR (e.g., SS/DCI type configurations for MBS). Considering the discussion on optionality of CFR relates to the concrete configurations of G-RNTI(s)/G-CS-RNTI(s) and CFR, which are premature now, I suggest to postpone the discussion until the signaling design is clear.  **[Low] Question 1-3**: If G-RNTI(s)/G-CS-RNTI(s) are configured for multicast and if the new IE CFR-Config is not present in the active BWP, whether/how UE perform multicast reception in the active BWP?   * Note: For RAN1 discussion, assume the new IE CFR-Config may include the configurations of the starting PRB, the number of PRBs, PDCCH-config, PDSCH-config and SPS-config(s) for MBS. The details of signalling design are up to RAN2.   Regarding the QC’s comments that how to configure the CFR-Config is not discussed, I think it should be clear that the CFR is configured within the dedicated unicast BWP according to the following agreement. I think this is not contradictory with the agreement in this meeting “Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP other than initial DL BWP is supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs”. In my understanding, if a CFR is configured in a BWP, then this CFR is also associated with this BWP.  Agreement (#104):  For multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs, a common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH / PDSCH is confined within the frequency resource of a dedicated unicast BWP to support simultaneous reception of unicast and multicast in the same slot   * Down select from the two options for the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/ PDSCH   + Option 2A: The common frequency resource is defined as an MBS specific BWP, which is associated with the dedicated unicast BWP and using the same numerology (SCS and CP)     - FFS BWP switching is needed between the multicast reception in the MBS specific BWP and unicast reception in its associated dedicated BWP   + Option 2B: The common frequency resource is defined as an ‘MBS frequency region’ with a number of contiguous PRBs, which is configured within the dedicated unicast BWP.     - FFS: How to indicate the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of the MBS frequency region * FFS whether UE can be configured with no unicast reception in the common frequency resource * FFS on details of the group-common PDCCH / PDSCH configuration * FFS whether to support more than one common frequency resources per UE / per dedicated unicast BWP subjected to UE capabilities * FFS whether the use of a common frequency resource for multicast is optional or not * FFS whether the common frequency resource is applicable for PTM scheme 2 (if supported) or not   **Proposal 1-4:**  As raised by Samsung, either the default value needs to be kept in the proposal (at least if “maxMIMO-Layers of PDSCH-ServingCellConfig” is not provided), or a maxMIMO-Layers needs to be defined for multicast.  @Xiaomi, regarding your comments, my understanding is that, for multicast UEs in a group, the length  of the circular buffer for a CB should be the same, so all the parameters that affect  need to be aligned.  **Proposal 1-5:**  Different companies have different views, and some companies have doubt on whether timer-based BWP switching must be supported for multicast services or not. Based on companies’ comments, I updated the proposal. |

## Updated Proposals (after 2nd round of inputs)

**[High] Updated Proposal 1-2**:

For indication of the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of CFR for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs,

* the starting PRB is referenced to Point A, i.e., the starting PRB is a PRB determined by *subcarrierSpacing* of the associated BWP and *offsetToCarrier* corresponding to this subcarrier spacing, similar as how *locationAndBandwidth* of a BWPis indicated as described in TS 38.331.
* FFS: Indication mechanism.

**[High] Updated** **Proposal 1-4**: For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH:

* The maximum number of layers can be provided by *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, *maxMIMO-Layers* of *PDSCH-ServingCellConfig* of the serving cell is used; if the *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-ServingCellConfig* is not configured, a default value is defined.
  + FFS the default value.
* The maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, a value determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast in the active DL BWP is used; if the *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast in not configured, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).
* *xOverhead* can be provided in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, the value of *xOverhead* in *PDSCH-ServingCellConfig* is used; if the *xOverhead* in *PDSCH-ServingCellconfig* is not configured, a default value of zero is used.
* The number of PRBs is determined based on the size of CFR.

**[High] Updated Proposal 1-5**: For UE configured with CFR(s) in the active DL BWP, further study the issues related to timer-based active DL BWP switching.

## Company Views (3rd round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Ok with Proposal 1-2 and 1-5.  Regarding Proposal 1-4, if companies still have concern on this version, we would like to propose the following simpler sone.  **[High] Updated Proposal 1-4**: For LBRM and TBS determination for GC-PDSCH:   * The maximum number of layers can be provided by *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, *~~maxMIMO-Layers~~* ~~of~~ *~~PDSCH-ServingCellConfig~~* ~~of the serving cell is used; if the~~ *~~maxMIMO-Layers~~* ~~in~~ *~~PDSCH-ServingCellConfig~~* ~~is not configured,~~ a default value is defined.   + FFS the default value. * The maximum modulation order can be determined from *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS is not configured in CFR, ~~a value determined from~~ *~~mcs-Table~~* ~~in~~ *~~PDSCH-Config~~* ~~for unicast in the active DL BWP is used; if the~~ *~~mcs-Table~~* ~~in~~ *~~PDSCH-Config~~* ~~for unicast in not configured,~~ Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16). * *xOverhead* can be provided in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS in CFR; if not provided, ~~the value of~~ *~~xOverhead~~* ~~in~~ *~~PDSCH-ServingCellConfig~~* ~~is used; if the~~ *~~xOverhead~~* ~~in~~ *~~PDSCH-ServingCellconfig~~* ~~is not configured,~~ a default value of zero is used. * The number of PRBs is determined based on the size of CFR. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 1-2**: Support  **Proposal 1-4**: Support. There is a typo in the 2nd sub-bullet.  if the *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast is~~n~~ not configured, Table 5.1.3.1-1 in TS38.214 is used (similar as the default value in R16).  **Proposal 1-5**: Support |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 1-2: Support**  **Proposal 1-4: Not support.**  **Too complex to consider two-level default mechanism, especially the first level default mechanism is UE specific, and difficult to align among group members. We prefer no default mechanism, or updated version from ZTE.**  **Proposal 1-5: Support.** |
| OPPO | **P 1-2:** Agree with the proposal in principle.  We slightly think the i.e. part is little bit redundant because we all know what “point A” means here. Besides, the last sentence also refers to the mechanism in TS 38.331 to make double confirmation. If proponents of point A do want to make a clear agreement, then maybe we can just say like “i.e. the indication mechanism of BWP is reused”.  **[High] Updated Proposal 1-2**:  For indication of the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of CFR for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs,   * the starting PRB is referenced to Point A, i.e., The current indication mechanism of BWP is reused.. * FFS: Indication mechanism.   **P 1-5:** OK with the current version.  Thanks Qualcomm for replying on our question in the previous round of discussion.  We also do not expect words like those as you mentioned in the spec to restrict the functions that is already supported in current system. What we suppose is that current timer-based mechanism will not be impacted by supporting multicast; in the meantime, timer-based mechanism should not have impact on multicast reception. For the later one, we think there is no such impact exist based on configuration up to network implementation.  It is OK to further study about it. |
| vivo | Ok with the three proposals. |
| Xiaomi | 1-2: support  1-4: fine with it for sake of progress  For the LBRM buffer, I understand the intention to achieve the common understanding among UEs for Ncb. Ncb is derived from the smaller value between N and Nref, wherein N is the decoding bits of MBS data(which is common to all the UE belonging to the same group) while Nref is calculated by the maximum TBS, fixed coding rate RLBRM and number of CB. I agree that the Nref would be different among UEs if active BWP is used to calculate the maximum TBS. However, considering there is a minimize operation between N and Nref, I think the result would be N. Only if the TBS of MBS is pretty large, i.e. a coding rate even much larger than 2/3 is used, Nref would be adopted and misunderstanding occurs. I don’t think transmit MBS traffic with high CR is reasonable considering it is transmitted in a group common manner. This is the reason why I think the current mechanism is sufficient. On the other hand, even for the other parameters, e.g. the maximum MIMO layers, the MCS table(modulation order and CR) can use the current value, in this case I don’t see much point we use a new parameter for maximum RB but reuse the current parameter of MIMO layer and MCS table.  For xOverhead, it is a per BWP configuration and applied to each RBs contained in the BWP, including the CFR within the BWP. In the other words, there are two xOverhead parameters for a same set of PRBs, as gNB can also schedule unicast data on the CFR. It means UE has to have to hypotheses on the same RB, it is a bit wired.  1-5: support |
| Nokia, NSB. | **1-2:**Support  **1-4:**  Support  (with typo correction)  **1-5:**Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 1-2: we are fine with it for sake of progress.  1-4: OK  1-5: OK |
| Ericsson | P1-2: Support  P1-4: we think the default values from unicast may not be equal for all UEs, and therefore cannot be used for MBS LBRM. The modified proposal from ZTE seems ok to us.  P1-5: Support |
| Apple | Proposal 1-2 and 1-5: ok  Proposal 1-4: ok with ZTE’s updates. |
| CATT | Proposal 1-2：Support.  Proposal 1-4：Support. We are also fine with the ZTE’s updates.  Proposal 1-5：We are OK with the current proposal.  Thanks Qualcomm for response our question in the last round of discussion.  As you mentioned above, do we want to write in the spec that UEs configured with MBS service are not expected to receive the DCI used for active BWP change? We can’t make such assumption based on the current discussion. In additional, what we describe in the figure is MBS service instead of MBS reception, there is no problem with a time gap between two MBS receptions.  Maybe the following figure is clearer. The BWP1 and BWP2 can be associated with the same CFR. If the option1 is supported, the UE can’t switch to default BWP when the UE doesn’t detect the DCI used for active BWP change and the first GC-PDCCHs is transmitted before the BWP-InactivityTimer of unicast expires, and the second GC-PDCCHs is transmitted before the BWP-InactivityTimer of first GC-PDCCHs expires. Anyway, we think the current timer-based mechanism should not be affected by the multicast mechanism. |
| Samsung | Support P1-2 and P1-5  Also OK with P1-4 although it probably makes more sense to start with *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast (as in the last proposal) because it may already exist.  But no issue, the NW can always choose to not provide *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for MBS when it provides *maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast. Just the structure now is a bit weird (MBS 🡪 unicast 🡪 default for MBS, instead of unicast 🡪 MBS 🡪 default for MBS). |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 1-2: ok  Proposal 1-4: for max MIMO layer and xOverhead, it may be fine to define a default value.  However, for *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* of CFR*,* it can be treated as other parameters in pdsch-Config. If no configured in CFR, unicast parameter can be used.  Proposal 1-5,  Since the companies’ concerns have been addressed (I hope), it’d better to keep the original wording to FFS Option 1 and 2 till next meeting unless strong objections.  **[High] Updated Proposal 1-5**: If a UE is configured with a CFR in the active DL BWP, for timer-based active DL BWP switching to a default BWP, further study the following options:   * Option 1: UE also starts or restarts *BWP-InactivityTimer* when it successfully decodes a GC-PDCCH addressed to group-common RNTI (e.g., G-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI). * Option 2: Introduce a new *MBS-BWP-InactivityTimer* for GC-PDCCH receptions. * Note: Other options are not precluded.   follow-up CATT’s comment:  The key thing is the current timer-based mechanism only for unicast will affect the multicast reception.  As you mentioned, “the first GC-PDCCHs is transmitted before the BWP-InactivityTimer of unicast expires”. But it does not work. Even if GC-PDCCH is transmitted before timer expires, the scheduled GC-PDSCH may not. The multicast transmission will be interrupted. The UE will fall back to default BWP before or during GC-PDSCH reception.  Also, I’m confused by “the second GC-PDCCHs is transmitted before the BWP-InactivityTimer of first GC-PDCCHs expires”. It seems you also count the timer also for multicast GC-PDCCH, as proposed by Option 1. |
| MediaTek | Proposal 1-2：Support.  Proposal 1-4：Not support. Since the *mcs-Table* in *PDSCH-Config* for unicast is UE dedicated, it does not make sense to be used as a default for group UE. ZTE’s updated version is preferred.  Proposal 1-5: We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Moderator | Proposal 1-2 and proposal 1-4 were agreed in the GTW session.  **Proposal 1-5**:  Considering QC’s comments, let’s try again to see if companies have strong concern on listing option 1 and option 2 with the note saying that other options are not precluded. |

## Updated Proposals (after 3rd round of inputs)

**[High] Updated Proposal 1-5**: If a UE is configured with a CFR in the active DL BWP, for timer-based active DL BWP switching to a default BWP, further study the following options:

* Option 1: UE also starts or restarts *BWP-InactivityTimer* when it successfully decodes a GC-PDCCH addressed to group-common RNTI (e.g., G-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI).
* Option 2: Introduce a new *MBS-BWP-InactivityTimer* for GC-PDCCH receptions.
* Note: Other options are not precluded.

## Company Views (4th round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | **P 1-5:** We prefer the proposal in previous round of discussion by FL.  All of the configuration information, including the *BWP-InactivityTimer*, are known by gNB. We do not think gNB will always schedule GC-PDCCH and GC-PDSCH crossing the time point of BWP switching when timer is expired. *BWP-InactivityTimer* is optional, and even the candidates of values are spanning large ranges in milli-seconds. The BWP switching can also be indicated by other methods instead of timer, such as DCI, RRC signaling. We are not quite convinced that we need to consider solve the assumed issues above.  For compromise and progress, we are OK with the following proposal to further study about it.  **[High] Updated Proposal 1-5**: For UE configured with CFR(s) in the active DL BWP, further study the issues related to timer-based active DL BWP switching. |
| Xiaomi | We share the similar views as OPPO. We are OK either with the original version including option 3 or the version from OPPO. |
| vivo | We are fine to further study the issue. To be fair, we can list no option or list all options including option 3. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We think the previous version in the third round of discussion is better. |
| Nokia, NSB | 1-5: Support |
| CATT | Proposal 1-5: We still have concern on this proposal. We prefer to further study the issues related to timer-based active DL BWP switching. |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| Qualcomm | support |
| Samsung | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine. |
| LG | We do not understand why option 3 is deleted for the updated proposal. Once again, we think that option 3 works. If legacy timer expires, UE will move to initial BWP or default BWP which will also support multicast for this UE or other UE in the group. It will be great to solve this issue without any change to the current specification.  In addition, if this issue is really essential, RAN2 should be involved in this discussion, considering that this timer has been specified in 38.321. We think that this issue is not so essential, though.  Thus, we should keep option 3 in P1-5.  **[High] Updated Proposal 1-5**: If a UE is configured with a CFR in the active DL BWP, for timer-based active DL BWP switching to a default BWP, further study the following options:   * Option 1: UE also starts or restarts *BWP-InactivityTimer* when it successfully decodes a GC-PDCCH addressed to group-common RNTI (e.g., G-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI). * Option 2: Introduce a new *MBS-BWP-InactivityTimer* for GC-PDCCH receptions. * Option 3: Multicast reception has no impact on Rel-16 UE behavior related to *BWP-InactivityTimer*. * Note: Other options are not precluded. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| MediaTek | We prefer the previous version. |
| Apple | The previous version is preferred. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Ok with the proposal description. We prefer to option 2. |
| Moderator | **Proposal 1-5**:  Several companies prefer the previous version, so I changed it back. I think it is the most agreeable version. |

## Updated Proposals (after 4th round of inputs)

**[High] Updated Proposal 1-5**: For UE configured with CFR(s) in the active DL BWP, further study the issues related to timer-based active DL BWP switching.

## Company Views (5th round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia, NSB. | 1-5: Support |
| Samsung | 1-5: Support |
| Xiaomi | 1-5: Support |
| vivo | 1-5: Support |
| OPPO | 1-5: OK to further study about it. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| MediaTek | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| Ericsson | P1-5: Support. We would like also to include that the study should be resolved by RAN1#106b-e. |

## Updated Proposals (after 5th round of inputs)

# Issue #2: GC-PDCCH configuration for MBS

## Background and submitted proposals

***Background***

In RAN1#104&104bis&105 meetings, the following agreements were achieved.

**CORESET:**

Agreement (#104b):

If a CFR is configured for multicast in RRC-CONNECTED state and confined within a dedicated unicast BWP, further study the following options.

* Option 1: the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP can be used for multicast transmission if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, and the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission.
* Option 2: the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP cannot be used for multicast transmission even if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, and the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR cannot be used for unicast transmission.
* Option 3: the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP can be used for multicast transmission if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, but the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR cannot be used for unicast transmission.
* Option 4: the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP cannot be used for multicast transmission even if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, but the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission.

Working assumption: (#105)

The maximum number of CORESETs per BWP is not increased for support of MBS, and the number of CORESETs configured within the CFR is left to gNB implementation.

**Search space set:**

Agreement (#104):

For search space set of group-common PDCCH of PTM scheme 1 for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED state, at least support CSS

* FFS: reuse existing CSS type(s) in Rel-15/16 or define a new Type CSS
* FFS: Two options for monitoring priority:
  + Option 1: the monitoring priority is the same as existing Rel-15/16 CSS
  + Option 2: the monitoring priority is determined based on the search space set indexes of search space set(s) for multicast and USS sets.

Agreement (#104b):

For CSS of group-common PDCCH of PTM scheme 1 for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED state, down-select from the following alternatives (to be decided in RAN1#105):

* Alt 1: support Type-3 CSS
  + The monitoring priority of Type-3 CSS for group-common PDCCH is the same as existing Rel-15/16 CSS, regardless of which DCI format of group-common PDCCH is configured in Type-3 CSS
* Alt 2: support a new Type-x CSS
  + The monitoring priority of new Type-x CSS is determined based on the search space set indexes of the new Type-x CSS set and USS sets, regardless of which DCI format of group-common PDCCH is configured in the new Type-x CSS.
* Alt 3: support both Alt 1 and Alt 2

Agreement (#105):

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

**DCI formats:**

Agreement (#104b):

For group-common PDCCH of Rel-17 MBS, support at least two DCI formats.

* DCI format 1\_0 is used as the baseline for the first DCI format with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI.
* DCI format 1\_1 or 1\_2 is used as the baseline for the second DCI format with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI
  + FFS: Which of DCI format 1\_1 or 1\_2 is used as the baseline
* FFS: Details of the reuse (or not) of DCI format 1\_0, 1\_1 or 1\_2 fields

Agreement (#105):

As a baseline, reuse existing fields in DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI for the fields of first DCI format with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI.

* FFS: how to determine the bitlength of FDRA field.
* FFS: Whether ‘Identifier for DCI formats’, ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ are needed.
* FFS: How to perform DCI size alignment
* FFS: Whether to include new DCI fields
* Note: All of the fields may not be reused and the size of the fields may not be the same

Agreement (#105):

As a baseline, reuse existing fields in DCI format 1\_1 for the fields of the second DCI format with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI.

* FFS: whether ‘Identifier for DCI formats’, ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’, ‘Carrier indicator’ and ‘Bandwidth part indicator’ are needed.
* FFS: How to perform DCI size alignment
* FFS: Whether to include new DCI fields for the second DCI format
* Note: All of the fields may not be reused and the size of the fields may not be the same

**Maximum number of BD/CCE:**

Agreement (#104):

The maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates and non-overlapped CCEs per slot per serving cell defined in Rel-15 is kept unchanged for Rel-17 MBS.

* FFS whether the budget of BDs/CCEs of an unused CC can be used for group-common PDCCH to count the number of BDs/CCEs for UEs supporting CA capability based on configuration, which is similar to the method used for multi-DCI based multi-TRP in Rel-16.

**DCI size budget and DCI size alignment:**

Working Assumption (#104):

Keep the “3+1” DCI size budget defined in Rel-15 for Rel-17 MBS.

* FFS: Whether the G-RNTI is counted as “C-RNTI” or as “other RNTI” when considering the “3+1” DCI size budget rule for group-common PDCCH.

Agreement (#105):

Confirm the working assumption:

Keep the “3+1” DCI size budget defined in Rel-15 for Rel-17 MBS.

* FFS: Whether the G-RNTI is counted as “C-RNTI” or as “other RNTI” when considering the “3+1” DCI size budget rule for group-common PDCCH.

***Submitted Proposals***

**CORESET:**

* *Huawei, HiSilicon*
  + Proposal 2: For CFR for multicast scheduling confined within a dedicated unicast BWP,
    - It is up to gNB to configure the same or different CORESETs for unicast and multicast scheduling within the CFR.
    - The total number of CORESETs is not expected to be increased in Rel-17 comparing to the number UE supported in Rel-16.
* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 16: The working assumption on CORESETS in RAN1#104b-e is confirmed:
    - The maximum number of CORESETs per BWP is not increased for support of MBS, and the number of CORESETs configured within the CFR is left to gNB implementation.
  + Proposal 17: It is up to gNB on the configuration of CFR, e.g. CORESETS, and the dedicated unicast BWP that contains this CFR.
  + Proposal 18: A CORESET can be used by multicast and unicast transmission, when the CORESET is fully contained in frequency domain in a CFR which is configured in a dedicated unicast BWP.
* *Spreadtrum*
  + Proposal 6: Confirm the working assumption: The maximum number of CORESETs per BWP is not increased for support of MBS, and the number of CORESETs configured within the CFR is left to gNB implementation.
* *vivo*
  + Proposal 12: If a CFR is configured for multicast in RRC-CONNECTED state and confined within a dedicated unicast BWP, option 1 is supported.
    - Option 1: the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP can be used for multicast transmission if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, and the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission.
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 17: The CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP can be used for multicast transmission if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, and the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission.
* *Nokia*
  + Observation-7: It would be beneficial to maintain currently defined limits for the total number of CORESETs within PDCCH-config for unicast and MBS, in order to minimize UE and gNB complexity and to ensure backward compatibility.
  + Proposal-6: Confirm the working assumption that the maximum number of CORESETs per BWP is not increased for support of MBS, and the number of CORESETs configured within the CFR is left to gNB implementation.
* *MediaTek*
  + Proposal 10: Confirming the working assumption as following:
    - The maximum number of CORESETs per BWP is not increased for supporting of MBS, and the number of CORESETs configured within the CFR is left to gNB implementation.
  + Proposal 11: No need to define an extra explicit rule whether the CORESETs can be shared for unicast and multicast and it is up to network implementation.
* *FUTUREWEI*
  + Observation 1: The number of CORESET(s) for group-common PDCCH within the common frequency resource for group-common PDSCH is left to gNB implementation, subjected to the restriction that the maximum number of CORESETs per BWP is not increased.
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 7. Support Option 1: the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP can be used for multicast transmission if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, and the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission.
  + Proposal 8. The mandatary maximum number limit of CORESETs per BWP (i.e., 3 for single-TRP or 5 for multi-TRP) is kept for Rel-17 MBS. Additional CORESETs for MBS can be optionally supported.
* *Intel*
  + Proposal 11: The CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP can be used for multicast transmission if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, and the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission.
  + Proposal 12: For PTP or PTM scheme 2, the CORESET scheduling MBS (re)transmission can be configured outside the MBS frequency region.
* *Qualcomm*
  + Proposal 6: If a CFR is configured for multicast in RRC-CONNECTED state and confined within a dedicated unicast BWP,
    - Option 4: the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP cannot be used for PTM-1 multicast transmission even if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, but the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission including PTP transmission for unicast and PTP retransmission for multicast.
* *Samsung*
  + Proposal 6: Confirm the WA that the number of CORESETs remains as in Rel-16 and that it is a gNB choice how to configure CORESETs.
  + Observation 7: Whether or not a UE monitors PDCCH for detection of unicast DCIs and multicast DCIs in a same CORESET is a gNB implementation issue. No further discussion is needed.
* *LGE*
  + Proposal 8: From gNB perspective, gNB may configure multiple CORESETs and transmit group common PDCCHs to multiple UEs in a group. The DCI can be repeated on multiple CORESETs with same or different TCI states
  + Proposal 9: Multiple TCI states can be configured for a CORESET ID for a Search Space of group common PDCCH by RRC.
* *Lenovo*
  + Proposal 12: A common CORESET is configured within the common frequency region for MBS for the group of UEs.
* *NTT Dococmo*
  + Proposal 3: Support Option 4 for sharing CORESETs between PDCCH-Config for unicast and PDCCH-Config for multicast.
* *Chengdu TD Tech*
  + Proposal 1: The CORESETs for MBS can be used for unicast scheduling.
  + Proposal 2: For a CORESET for unicast, if it’s within the CFR, it can be used for MBS scheduling.
* *Ericsson*
  + Proposal 27 Group common PDCCH for multicast can be configured in CORESET0 if CORESET0 is within a CFR.
  + Proposal 28 Group common PDCCH and unicast PDCCH can be configured within the same CORESET
  + Proposal 29 Support option 1 from RAN1#104b regarding using CORESETs from unicast with multicast:
    - a. If a CFR is configured in a dedicated unicast BWP for multicast in RRC-CONNECTED state, the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP can be used for PTM-1 transmission if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain.
    - b. the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for PTP transmission.
  + Proposal 30 The UE does not expect a search space configured with multicast DCIs to be configured in a CORESET with bandwidth not corresponding to a CFR bandwidth.
* *ETRI*
  + Proposal2: Confirm the working assumption:
    - The maximum number of CORESETs per BWP is not increased for support of MBS, and the number of CORESETs configured within the CFR is left to gNB implementation.
* *Futrurewei*
  + Proposal 5: Without CFR configured, multicast reception by default is not supported. In combination with Proposal 3, the support of Option 4 (listed above) is proposed i.e., the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP cannot be used for multicast transmission even if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, but the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission.
* *Xiaomi*
  + Proposal 8: Confirm the following working assumption:
    - Working assumption:
      * The maximum number of CORESETs per BWP is not increased for support of MBS, and the number of CORESETs configured within the CFR is left to gNB implementation.
  + Proposal 9: If a CFR is configured for multicast in RRC-CONNECTED state and confined within a dedicated unicast BWP, the following option1 should be adopted:
    - Option 1: the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP can be used for multicast transmission if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, and the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission.

**Search space set:**

* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 20: For CSS of GC-PDCCH of PTM scheme 1 for multicast in NR MBS, the Type-x CSS is not configured as a Type-3 CSS.
* *Spreadtrum*
  + Proposal 3: For search space type for Rel-17 MBS, support to define a new search space type for multicast.
* *ZTE*
  + Proposal 7: If the type-x CSS is defined as a type-3 CSS, the following UE behavior on Type-3 CSS monitoring should be defined,
    - For DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI and G-RNTI within type-3 CSS, it should always be monitored by the UE.
    - For DCI format 1\_1 (and 1\_2) with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI within type-3 CSS, the UE determines monitoring priority according to search space index and further decides whether to monitor
  + Proposal 4: For NR multicast, introduce beam sweeping via defining association between MOs of GC-PDCCH and SSBs or CSI-RSs.
  + Proposal 3: Monitoring configurations (e.g., CORESETs, Search Spaces, etc.) for GC-PDCCH of PTM retransmission can be configured separately from that for GC-PDCCH of PTM initial transmission.
* *vivo*
  + Proposal 13: For search space set of group-common PDCCH of PTM scheme 1 for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED state, only DCI formats with CRC scrambled with g-RNTI for multicast scheduling can be monitored in the search space.
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 18: A Type-3A/Type-MBS CSS can be introduced for the CSS of group-common PDCCH of PTM scheme1 for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED state.
  + Proposal 19: If the Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook is configured, the g-NB is not allowed scheduling the group-common PDCCH when the Type-3A/Type MBS CSS of the group-common PDCCH was dropped by any UE in the multicast group.
* *Nokia*
  + Observation-14: Search space defined for multicast has different characteristics in terms of monitoring priority as compared to currently defined common search space.
  + Observation-16: In the scenario where DCI format 1\_1 is used for PTP retransmissions of the PTM scheme 1 initial transmission and the new common / multicast search space is used for scheduling the retransmissions, it would be straightforward for the UE to assume that the received TB is actually the PTP retransmission of PTM traffic.
  + Proposal-18: Clarify whether PTP retransmission of PTM scheme 1 initial transmission would be scheduled using CSS or USS.
  + Proposal 20: Define a new type-x CSS or multicast search space with differentiated monitoring priority based on SS index and FDRA field size of the downlink DCIs associated with this search space calculated based on the size of the CFR.
* *MediaTek*
  + Proposal 12: Define a new Type-x PDCCH CSS type (e.g., Type-4 PDCCH CSS not Type-3 PDCCH CSS) for UE supporting multicast service.
* *FUTUREWEI*
  + Proposal 1: A new Type-x CSS is defined. It should be clear that this Type-x is not a Type-3 CSS and the rule of monitoring priority of Type-x CSS is determined based on the search space set indexes of the Type-x CSS set and USS sets, as agreed.
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 6. The Type-x CSS of group-common PDCCH of PTM scheme 1 for multicast can both be monitored on PCell/PSCell and SCell.
    - The Type-x CSS is not a Type-3 CSS.
* *Intel*
  + Proposal 13: Type-x CSS is a new CSS type different from Type 3 CSS which can be treated similar to USS in case of PDCCH overbooking.
* *Apple*
  + Proposal 2: The new Type-x CSS set for MBS is the same as type-3 CSS set.
* *Qualcomm*
  + Proposal 7: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, Type-x CSS can be configured with 1st and/or 2nd DCI format with G-RNTI(s) for multicast.
* *Samsung*
  + Observation 4: There is no reason to introduce a new Type-x CSS for MBS scheduling.
  + Observation 5: PDCCH monitoring for multicast PDSCH scheduling according to CSS requires material specification and UE implementation support while it can be as in Rel-16 if the PDCCH monitoring is according to USS.
  + Proposal 3: Support PDCCH monitoring for multicast PDSCH scheduling according to USS.
  + Proposal 4: For PDCCH monitoring according to CSS for multicast PDSCH scheduling, when a UE monitors PDCCH only according to USS sets and CSS sets for multicast in CORESETs with qcl-Type set to same 'typeD' properties, the CORESETs are the ones having same 'typeD' properties as the CORESET corresponding to the USS set or CSS set with the lowest index.
  + Proposal 5: For PDCCH monitoring for multicast PDSCH scheduling according to CSS, consider how to avoid constant collisions among PDCCH candidates for different multicast services.
* *Lenovo*
  + Proposal 13: A common search space is configured associated with the common CORESET for MBS for the group of UEs.
* *NTT Dococmo*
  + Proposal 4: For CSS of group-common PDCCH of PTM scheme 1, define a new type CSS.
* *Chengdu TD Tech*
  + Proposal 5: The group common PDCCH of PTM scheme 1 and the SPS group common PDCCH have the same CSS.
* *Convida*
  + Proposal 4: Type-x CSS is a new type of CSS.
* *Ericsson*
  + Proposal 31 Extend the existing type3 CSS from Rel-15/16 to support additional DCIs for scheduling via group common PDCCH
* *Xiaomi*
  + Proposal 7: Type-x CSS should not be a type 3 CSS.

**DCI formats:**

* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 12: A new DL DCI format should be defined for the scheduling of group-common PDSCH.
  + Proposal 15: For a UE receiving group-common PDSCH transmitted with PTM scheme 1, a TPC-PUCCH-RNTI different from that for unicast should be configured.
* *Spreadtrum*
  + Proposal 4: For connected UE, when DCI 1\_0 is used as group-common PDCCH for MBS,
    - the bitwidth and interpretation of ‘FDRA’ field depends on the CORESET configuration and CFR configuration for MBS in idle state
  + Proposal 5: For connected UE, when DCI 1\_1 is used as group-common PDCCH for MBS,
    - The bitwidth for each field in the DCI is common to all member UEs in a group, and
    - For each member UE, each field could be interpreted in light of its specific configuration
* *ZTE*
  + Proposal 5: For MBS GC-PDCCH,
    - The bit-length of FDRA field of DCI format 1\_0 in Type-x CSS is determined according to the legacy mechanism (It is based on the size of CORESET#0 if CORESET#0 is configured for the cell. Otherwise, the size is determined basing on the size of initial DL BWP. )
    - The fields of ‘Identifier for DCI formats’ and ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ in DCI format 1\_0 and 1\_1 can be reserved for other functionalities for MBS, e.g., HARQ-ACK feedback activation/deactivation..
    - The fields of ‘carrier indicator’ and ‘Bandwidth part indicator’ in DCI format 1\_1 can be reused in the second DCI format with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI.
    - DCI format 1\_2 can be further supported according to UE capability.
* *vivo*
  + Proposal 14: For the fields of first DCI format and second DCI format with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI,
    - FDRA field is determined based on the configuration of CFR.
    - ‘Identifier for DCI formats’ is not needed.
    - ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ can be included in the DCI format for NACK only feedback.
    - ‘Carrier indicator’ and ‘Bandwidth part indicator’ can leave to gNB to configuration.
  + Proposal 15: When UE is configured with multiple g-RNTIs, it is supported to configured two DCI formats with CRC scrambled different g-RNTIs. Otherwise, there is no need to configure two DCI formats for a UE simultaneously
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 21: Reuse the entire field in DCI format 1\_0 for the fields of the first DCI format.
  + Proposal 22: The fields of the first DCI format with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI/G-CS-RNTI which may not be needed can be reserved or applied for other indications.
  + Proposal 23: The bitlength of FDRA field of first DCI format is determined based on CORESET0/initial bandwidth part.
  + Proposal 24： The fields of second DCI format with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI/G-CS-RNTI i.e. ‘Identifier for DCI formats’, ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ and ‘Carrier indicator’ are not present.
* *Nokia*
  + Proposal-15: UE should assume that the FDRA field of the DCI format 1\_0 scheduled within a multicast search space is dimensioned based on the size of the CFR.
  + Proposal 16: Repurpose existing unused fields such as ‘Identifier for DCI formats’, ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ for both DCI formats 1\_0 and 1\_1, and ‘Carrier indicator’ and ‘Bandwidth part indicator’ for DCI format 1\_1, for indicating PTP retransmission of PTM initial transmission.
* *MediaTek*
  + Proposal 13: Define a new field (e.g., “HARQ feedback option”) within MBS DCI format to indicate which HARQ feedback option will be used by multicast services.
  + Proposal 14: Define a new field (e.g., “HARQ feedback enable/disable”) within MBS DCI format to indicate whether HARQ feedback is used for multicast services.
  + Proposal 15: Not define “Identifier for DCI formats” field within MBS DCI format for MBS transmission.
  + Proposal 16: The bit length of FDRA field within MBS DCI format is based on CFR size.
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 10. Regarding DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI,
    - The bitlength of FDRA field is determined by CORESET#0 or initial DL BWP.
    - ‘Identifier for DCI formats’, ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ are not needed.
  + Proposal 11. The RIV value in DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI is defined by a K scaling factor similar to TS 38.214 chapter 5.1.2.2.2, when the bitlength of FDRA field is determined by CORESET#0 or initial DL BWP but applied to the CFR.
  + Proposal 12. Regarding DCI format 1\_1 with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI, ‘Identifier for DCI formats’, ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’, and ‘Bandwidth part indicator’ are not needed.
* *Intel*
  + Proposal 15: For DCI 1\_0 and 1\_1 when used for MBS scheduling, the “identified for DCI formats” field can be assumed to be reserved.
  + Proposal 16: When HARQ feedback is disabled by RRC, the following fields of DCI format 1\_0 can be assumed to be reserved:
    - PUCCH resource Indicator
    - PDSCH-to-HARQ timing indicator
    - TPC command for scheduled PUCCH
    - HARQ Process Number
    - New Data Indicator
    - Redundancy Version
* *Apple*
  + Proposal 3: The following fields can be removed from DCI format 1\_0 and/or DCI format 1\_1 for multicast PDSCH scheduling, including Identifier for DCI formats, TPC command for scheduled PUCCH, Carrier indicator BWP indicator, SRS request, CBG transmission information and CBG flushing out information.
* *Samsung*
  + Observation 8: For multicast PDSCH, the FDRA field needs to address the CFR, there is no need for a TPC command field, and there is no need for UL/DL differentiation for a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a G-RNTI.
  + Observation 9: For the second DCI format to be meaningful, the sizes for at least some of the fields need to be configurable (and smaller than the corresponding ones for DCI format 1\_0). The second DCI format can be an optional UE feature.
* *Lenovo*
  + Proposal 6: RB numbering within the common frequency region is with reference to the lowest RB of the common frequency region.
  + Proposal 7: The number of bits for frequency domain resource assignment indicator in DCI is determined based on the bandwidth of the common frequency region.
  + Proposal 8: DCI with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI does not include one-bit identifier.
  + Proposal 9: DCI with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI does not include two-bit TPC field.
  + Proposal 10: DCI with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI does not include carrier indicator.
  + Proposal 11: DCI with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI does not include BWP indicator.
  + Observation 1: DCI with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI is a new DCI and each field can be configurable.
  + Observation 2: Each field of the DCI with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI should be same for UEs in same group.
* *NTT Dococmo*
  + Proposal 7: The following DCI fields are not included in DCI format 1\_0 for multicast.
    - Identifier for DCI formats
    - TPC command for scheduled PUCCH
  + Proposal 8: The following DCI fields are not included in DCI format 1\_1 for multicast.
    - Identifier for DCI formats
    - TPC command for scheduled PUCCH
    - Bandwidth part indicator
    - Carrier indicator
  + Proposal 9: For DCI format 1\_0 for multicast, include following new DCI fields.
    - Priority indicator (1bit)
    - Number of layers (1bit)
  + Observation 2: If the existing RB numbering rule for PDSCH is reused, there may be RBs that cannot be allocated with DCI format 1\_0 for multicast.
  + Proposal 10: For PDSCH scheduled with DCI format 1\_0 for multicast, RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CFR.
  + Observation 3: If the granularity of PDSCH allocation is 1RB, there may be RBs that cannot be allocated with DCI format 1\_0 for multicast.
  + Proposal 11: For PDSCH scheduled with DCI format 1\_0 for multicast, support resource allocation with granularity of multiple RBs.
  + Observation 4: If the existing k1 list for DCI format 1\_0, which is fixed as {1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8} is reused for MBS, PUCCH scheduling flexibility is low since a larger slot offset cannot be indicated and HARQ feedback slot becomes the same among UEs receiving a group-common PDSCH.
  + Proposal 12: A list of k1 values for DCI format 1\_0 for multicast is configurable.
* *Ericsson*
  + Proposal 32 The non-fallback DCI for multicast is using the same fields as DCI1\_1 with the following modification:’
    - a. TPC command for PUCCH is removed
    - b. UL DL identifier bit is removed.
    - c. SRS request is removed
    - d. The FDRA field uses the PRB size and start PRB of the CFR (or the DL BWP if CFR is not configured) in the definition of the FDRA.
  + Proposal 33 The fallback DCI for multicast is using the same fields as DCI 1\_0 with the following modification:
    - TPC command for PUCCH is removed
    - UL DL identifier bit is removed.
    - The FDRA field for the DCI in the common search space is given by
      * the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the size of CFR if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
        + The size of the initial BWP if no CFR is configured.

**Maximum number of BD/CCE:**

* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 19: The budget of BDs/CCEs of an unused CC can be used for group-common PDCCH to count the number of BDs/CCEs for UEs supporting CA capability based on configuration.
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 20: The budget of BDs/CCEs of an unused CC can be used for group-common PDCCH to count the number of BDs/CCEs for UEs supporting CA capability based on configuration.
* *FUTUREWEI*
  + Observation 2: Both options, Option 1 and 2, are applicable for the limit of BDs/CCEs for Rel-17 MBS.
* *Intel*
  + Proposal 14: For determining BD/CEE limits for NR MBS in Rel-17, Option 1 should be supported for UEs without CA capability and Option 2 should be supported for UEs with CA capability. Down-selection is not necessary.
* *Qualcomm*
  + Proposal 9: For RRC\_CONNECTED multicast UEs supporting CA capability, support the following principles for determining /   and the maximum numbers of BD/CCE UE is required to monitor per slot for a serving cell supporting multicast reception:
    - When determining /   defined in 38.213, the number of DL serving cell(s) supporting multicast reception is increased as R times.
    - The maximum BD/CCE numbers are increased as R times and R times for a serving cell supporting multicast reception, where and  are defined in Table 10.1-2 and Table 10.1-3 in 38.213
    - R is a value reported by the UE
* *Samsung*
  + Observation 6: Increasing and for a UE does not relate to CA capability and there is no need to introduce such UE capability to support multicast scheduling in Rel-17.
* *LGE*
  + Proposal 5: The maximum BD/CCE numbers are increased as R times and R times for a serving cell supporting multicast reception, where and  are defined in Table 10.1-2 and Table 10.1-3 in 38.213
    - R is a value reported by the UE as part of MBS related UE capability, regardless of whether UE supports CA capability.

**DCI size budget and DCI size alignment:**

* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 13: The G-RNTI is counted as “other RNTI” when considering the “3+1” DCI size budget rule for group-common PDCCH.
  + Proposal 14: The size of the group common DCI is configurable up to 126 bits.
* *ZTE*
  + Proposal 6: Regarding DCI size alignment for GC-PDCCH,
    - DCI format 1\_0: it is counted as “C-RNTI”. The following two alternatives can be considered
      * Alt.1: aligning the size of DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI monitored in CSS first, and then aligning the size of DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI in USS with CSS
      * Alt.2: aligning the size of DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI in USS with CSS first, and then aligning the size of DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI monitored in CSS
    - DCI format 1\_1/1\_2: they are counted as “other RNTI”, and gNB will ensure that the number of DCI sizes does not exceed budget.
* *vivo*
  + Proposal 16: For the DCI size alignment, g-RNTI is counted as “C-RNTI”.
    - For the first DCI format, its size is aligned with the size of DCI 0\_0/1\_0 in CSS
    - For the second DCI format, the size of DCI format 1\_1/0\_1 or 1\_2/0\_2 in USS is aligned with the second DCI format by zero padding.
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 25: For first DCI format, G-RNTI is counted as “C-RNTI”; DCI size is aligned to DCI 1\_0 on CSS
  + Proposal 26: UE expect that at least one of the sizes of DCI with “C-RNTI” and “other RNTI” is smaller than the size of the second DCI.
  + Proposal 27: For second DCI format, G-RNTI can be counted as “C-RNTI” or “other RNTI” depending on RRC configuration.
* *Nokia*
  + Proposal 19: Count G-RNTI as C-RNTI, since it provides the most flexibility for the gNB to align DCI sizes among UE-specific and group-common PDCCHs.
    - FFS: whether other options need to be considered based on additional gNB complexity for size alignment
* *MediaTek*
  + Proposal 17: “G-RNTI” used for MBS is counted as “C-RNTI”.
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 9. For“3+1” DCI size budget, the G-RNTI is counted as “C-RNTI”.
  + Proposal 10. Regarding DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI,
    - The DCI size equals to the size of DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with C-RNTI in CSS.
  + Proposal 13. Regarding DCI format 1\_1 with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI, align the DCI size of DCI format 1\_1 with C-RNTI equals to the DCI size of DCI format 1\_1 with G-RNTI after current steps in Rel-16 DCI size alignment procedure.
    - The G-RNTI DCI format 1\_1 size can be configured by gNB, which is larger than the original calculation of bitlength of DCI fields according to configurations.
    - Zero bits are appended to DCI format 1\_1 with C-RNTI until the payload size equals that of the DCI format 1\_1 with G-RNTI.
* *Intel*
  + Proposal 17: For DCI 1\_0 DCI size alignment can be performed by either zero-padding or truncating the MSBs of the FDRA field, depending on the relative size of the CFR with respect to CORESET#0 or the initial BWP, such that the DCI size aligns with that of unicast DCI format 1\_0 corresponding to the CORESET#0 or the initial BWP.
  + Proposal 18: For DCI format 1\_0 and 1\_1, the DCI size can be aligned to a size which is configured by the network to the UE.
  + Proposal 19: For DCI size budget of “3+1”, the UE may be configured to align DCI size with either “3” scheduling DCIs or “1” other group-common DCI depending on network implementation.
* *Qualcomm*
  + Proposal 8: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, both DCI format 1\_1 and 1\_2 can be supported for GC-PDCCH.
    - DCI size if over the size budget is aligned between GC-PDCCH and unicast PDCCH using the same DCI format (G-RNTI is counted as C-RNTI).
* *Samsung*
  + Observation 10: There is no need to specify how to count the sizes of DCI formats with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI – the Rel-16 specifications are sufficient.
* *Lenovo*
  + Proposal 14: For DCI size alignment, G-RNTI for the first DCI format is counted as C-RNTI.
  + Proposal 15: For DCI size alignment, G-RNTI for the second DCI format is counted as other RNTI.
* *NTT Dococmo*
  + Proposal 5: Align the size of DCI format 1\_0 for multicast with the size of DCI format 1\_0 for unicast in CSS.
  + Proposal 6: Align the size of DCI format 1\_1 for multicast with the size of DCI format 2\_0/2\_1/2\_4/2\_5/2\_6.
* *Ericsson*
  + Proposal 34 The G-RNTI is counted as “C-RNTI” when considering the “3+1” DCI size budget rule for group-common PDCCH.
  + Proposal 35 The determination of non-fallback multicast DCI size, monitored in the common search space is inserted as step ”2B” in the DCI alignment procedure
  + Proposal 36 The fallback DCI for multicast is aligned in size with DCI 1\_0 and differentiated via the G-RNTI-based CRC check.
* *Potevio*
  + Proposal 1: The G-RNTI should be counted as C-RNTI when considering the “3+1” DCI size budget rule for group-common PDCCH.
  + Proposal 2: For DCI format 1\_0 with G-RNTI, its DCI size should be equal to the size for DCI format 1\_0 with C-RNTI monitored in a common search space.
  + Proposal 3: The DCI size of DCI format 1\_2 with C-RNTI should be aligned to be equal to the DCI size of DCI format 1\_2 with G-RNTI after current steps in Rel-16 DCI size alignment procedure.
  + Proposal 4: The DCI size of DCI format 1\_2 with G-RNTI should be configured by gNB, which is larger than the original calculation of bit length of DCI fields according to configurations.
* *Xiaomi*
  + Proposal 10: G-RNTI is counted as C-RNTI despite of DCI formats.

**Initializing scrambling of PDCCH:**

* *Huawei, HiSilicon*
  + Proposal 5: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for group common PDCCH for scheduling multicast in Type-x CSS,
    - nID should be configurable, and equals to a higher layer parameter pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID if configured.
    - nRNTI is given by the G-RNTI.
* *Ericsson*
  + Proposal 37 When scheduling with non-fallback DCI, Scrambling parameters n\_ID and n\_RNTI for group PDCCH DMRS in the CSS is given by pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID and the group PDCCH G-RNTI, respectively.
  + Proposal 38 Scrambling parameters n\_ID and n\_RNTI for group PDSCH schedule by the multicast non-fallback DCI in CSS is given by
    - a. N\_RNTI is given by G-RNTI
    - b. n\_ID = the higher-layer parameter dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH if CORESETPoolIndex is not configured
    - c. if the higher-layer parameters dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH and dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH2 are configured together with the higher-layer parameter CORESETPoolIndex containing two different values
      * i. n\_ID = the higher-layer parameter dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH if the codeword is scheduled using a CORESET with CORESETPoolIndex equal to 0
      * ii. n\_ID = the higher-layer parameter dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH2 if the codeword is scheduled using a CORESET with CORESETPoolIndex equal to 1;

## Initial Proposals based on contributions

***Summary***

Regarding whether the maximum number of CORESETs per BWP can be increased or not for support of MBS, we made a working assumption in RAN1#105-e. Based on submitted contributions in this meeting, 10 companies propose to confirm the working assumption.

Regarding whether the CORESETs can be shared for unicast and multicast, 4 options were listed for further study in RAN1#104bis-e. In RAN1#105-e it was further discussed but with no conclusion. Based on contributions in this meeting, 11 companies support option 1 or think it is up to gNB implementation to use the same or different CORESETs for unicast DCIs and multicast DCIs. 3 companies [Futurewei, QC, NTT Docomo] support option 4. Based on majority view and the related discussion in last meeting, moderator suggests initial proposal 2-2.

Regarding the FFS whether the Type-x CSS is a Type-3 CSS, 11 companies [OPPO, Spreadtrum, CATT, Nokia, MediaTek, Futurewei, CMCC, Intel, NTT Docomo, Convida, Xiaomi] propose that Type-x CSS is a new type CSS, 3 companies [Apple, Samsung, Ericsson] propose to extend the existing Type-3 CSS from Rel-16 to support functionality of Type-x CSS. 1 company [ZTE] propose that if the type-x CSS is defined as type-3 CSS the UE behavior on Type-3 CSS monitoring should be clarified. In my understanding, since the monitoring priority of legacy type-3 CSS is different from the that of Type-x CSS, if Type-x CSS is type-3 CSS, it should be clarified in which condition the legacy monitoring priority is applied and in which condition the new monitoring priority is applied, and it should also be clarified whether both DCI format 0\_0/1\_0/2\_x and DCI formats for multicast (including the first DCI format and the second DCI format) can be configured in the same search space set. 1 company [vivo] proposes only DCI formats with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI for multicast can be monitored in the search space used for multicast. Based on majority view, moderator suggests the initial proposal 2-3.

In addition, 1 company [Samsung] raises that PDCCH monitoring for multicast PDSCH scheduling according to CSS requires material specification and UE implementation support while it can be as in Rel-16 if the PDCCH monitoring is according to USS, and proposes to support PDCCH monitoring for multicast PDSCH scheduling according to USS (Initial proposal 2-4). It was also raised that, for PDCCH monitoring according to CSS for multicast PDSCH scheduling, when a UE monitors PDCCH only according to USS sets and CSS sets for multicast in CORESETs with qcl-Type set to same 'typeD' properties, the CORESETs are the ones having same 'typeD' properties as the CORESET corresponding to the USS set or CSS set with the lowest index. It was proposed to consider how to avoid constant collisions among PDCCH candidates for different multicast services for PDCCH monitoring for multicast PDSCH scheduling according to CSS. Moderator recommends companies to consider this issue.

Regarding the first DCI format for GC-PDCCH, most companies propose to reuse existing fields in DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI with some modifications, e.g., ‘Identifier for DCI formats’ and ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ can be removed or ignored, and the 3 bits can be reserved for other functionalities. 1 company [Intel] proposes to also assume ‘PDSCH-to-HARQ timing indicator’, ‘HARQ Process Number’, ‘New Data Indicator’ and ‘Redundancy Version’ to be reserved. For FDRA field of the first DCI format, there are basically two alternatives for determining , one alternative is to reuse the mechanism used for DCI format 1\_0 monitored in CSS, i.e.,  is given by the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell, and the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell. The other alternative is that  is given by the size of CFR. Based on majority view, moderator suggests the initial proposal 2-5.

Regarding the newly introduced fields, 1 company [MediaTek] proposes to define a new field (e.g., “HARQ feedback option”) to indicate which HARQ feedback option will be used by multicast services, and a new field (e.g., “HARQ feedback enable/disable”) to indicate whether HARQ feedback is used for multicast services. 1 company [NTT Docomo] proposes to introduce ‘Priority indicator (1bit)’ and ‘Number of layers (1bit)’ in first DCI format for multicast, and support that the list of k1 values in the first DCI format for multicast is configurable. Moderator thinks we can give companies more time to study which functionalities need to be indicated in DCI format for multicast.

Regarding the second DCI format for GC-PDCCH, companies’ views diverge a lot on which fields in the existing DCI format 1\_1 are not needed. Based on the contributions, moderator suggests initial proposal 2-6.

Regarding the FFS of maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates and non-overlapped CCEs per slot per serving cell, it has been discussed in RAN1#104b and RAN1#105 but with no conclusion. Based on contributions in this meeting, 6 companies [OPPO, CATT, Intel, QC, LGE, Futurewei] propose to support this, but 1 company [Samsung] still thinks there is no need to introduce a UE capability to support increasing and for multicast scheduling in Rel-17. The situation does not change much. Moderator suggests to defer this discussion.

Regarding the DCI size alignment for the first DCI format, most companies propose to align its size with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI monitored in CSS. Moderator suggests initial proposal 2-7.

Regarding the DCI size alignment for the second DCI format, 4 alternatives are proposed as follows based on the contributions:

* Alt-1: G-RNTI is counted as “C-RNTI”
  + Supporting companies: Nokia, MediaTek, CMCC, Nokia, Ericsson
* Alt-2: G-RNTI is counted as “other RNTI”
  + Supporting companies: Lenovo, NTT Docomo, OPPO
* Alt-3: G-RNTI is counted as “C-RNTI” or “other RNTI” depending on RRC configurations
  + Supporting companies: CATT, Intel
* Alt-4: No need to specify how to count the size of the second DCI format - the Rel-16 specifications are sufficient
  + Supporting companies: Samsung

Based on these, moderator suggests initial proposal 2-8 for a compromise.

Regarding the scrambling parameters n\_ID and n\_RNTI for GC-PDCCH and GC-PDSCH, 2 companies [Ericsson, Huawei] raise similar issues. It was proposed in [30] that, when scheduling with non-fallback DCI, scrambling parameters n\_ID and n\_RNTI for GC-PDCCH in type-x CSS is given by pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID and G-RNTI, respectively. Similarly, scrambling parameters n\_ID and n\_RNTI for GC-PDSCH scheduled by the non-fallback DCI in type-x CSS is given by dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH / dataScramblingIdentityPDSCH2 and G-RNTI. Moderator suggest to first discussion this issue for GC-PDCCH. Then, based on progress, it may be easier to further discuss the similar issue for GC-PDSCH. Moderator suggests initial proposal 2-9.

***Initial Proposals***

The following moderator recommendations are made.

[Moderator’s recommendation]

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-1**: Confirm the working assumption:

* The maximum number of CORESETs per BWP is not increased for support of MBS, and the number of CORESETs configured within the CFR is left to gNB implementation.

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-2**:

If a CFR is configured in a dedicated unicast BWP for multicast in RRC-CONNECTED state,

* the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP and fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain can be used for multicast transmission only when no CORESET is configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR
* the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission.
* Note: A CORESET ID is unique across all BWPs and CFRs for a serving cell.

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-3**:

For type-x CSS for GC-PDCCH in RRC\_CONNECTED state, Option 2 is supported.

* Option 1: The type-x CSS is a type-3 CSS
  + Only DCI formats of GC-PDCCH can be monitored in a type-3 CSS if the type-3 CSS is used for GC-PDCCH monitoring.
* Option 2: The type-x CSS is a new type CSS
  + FFS: whether DCI formats other than the DCI formats of GC-PDCCH can also be monitored in a type-x CSS if the type-x CSS is used for GC-PDCCH monitoring

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-4**: Additionally support USS for GC-PDCCH monitoring for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED state.

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-5**: The first DCI format for GC-PDCCH uses the same fields as DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI with the following modifications:

* ‘Identifier for DCI formats’ and ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ are ignored and the 3 bits are reserved
  + FFS: whether/how the reserved bits are repurposed for other functionalities
* For FDRA determination,

* +  is given by
    - the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
    - the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
  + If the size of CFR (i.e. ) is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where K is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 8} which satisfies ;otherwise,

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-6**: The second DCI format for GC-PDCCH uses the same fields as DCI format 1\_1 at least with the following modifications:

* ‘Identifier for DCI formats’, ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ and ‘SRS request’ are removed.
* Note: At least the configurable fields in DCI format 1\_1 remain configurable for the second DCI format

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-7**: Align the size of the first DCI format with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI monitored in CSS.

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-8**: For DCI size alignment for the second DCI format, G-RNTI is counted as “C-RNTI” or “other RNTI” depending on RRC configurations.

* The size of the second DCI format can be configured by gNB
* Based on RRC configurations, if both DCI format 1\_1 and DCI format 2\_x have smaller DCI size than the second DCI format for multicast, the DCI format 1\_1 or 2\_x with larger DCI size is aligned to the size of the second DCI format for multicast.
* Based on RRC configurations, between DCI format 1\_1 and DCI format 2\_x, if one of them has smaller DCI size than the second DCI format for multicast and the other one has larger DCI size than the second DCI format for multicast, the DCI format 1\_1 or 2\_x with smaller DCI size is aligned to the size of the second DCI format for multicast.

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-9**: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH with the second DCI format in Type-x CSS,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if configured; otherwise.
* is given by the G-RNTI.

## Company Views (1st round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | **Proposal 2-1:** Support to confirm the WA.  **Proposal 2-2:** Support it.  **Proposal 2-3:** Support Option 2.   1. If this proposal is to support Option 2, there is no necessary to keep option 1 as another sub-bullet which should be removed from the proposal. 2. For the FFS under option 2: If this Type-x CSS is introduced for multicast services reception, the motivation/benefit is not clear to support monitoring other DCI formats rather than GC-DCI. If Type-x CSS supports GC-DCI formats and other DCI formats, what is the difference between Type-x CSS and other Types of CSS (e.g. Type-3 CSS)?   **Proposal 2-4:** Not support.  **Proposal 2-5:** OK with the direction.  **Proposal 2-7:** OK.  **Proposal 2-8:** Not support. This compromised proposal introduces more decoding complexity/effort for UEs. Down-selection between “C-RNTI” and “other RNTI” for G-RNTI is more valid. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2-1: support  Proposal 2-2: support. The note seems obvious which aligns with the current mechanism. If no additional information can be provided, we propose to delete the note.  Proposal 2-3: support the spirit of proposal 2-3. We share the similar views as OPPO that the wording can be further refined as what is proposed is option 2. Option 1 is already discussed in the previous meeting and should not be included in the proposal. Hence we propose the following updates:  **Updated Proposal 2-3**  For type-x CSS for GC-PDCCH in RRC\_CONNECTED state, Option 2 is supported.   * ~~Option 1: The type-x CSS is a type-3 CSS~~   + ~~Only DCI formats of GC-PDCCH can be monitored in a type-3 CSS if the type-3 CSS is used for GC-PDCCH monitoring.~~ * Option 2: The type-x CSS is a new type CSS * FFS: whether DCI formats other than the DCI formats of GC-PDCCH can also be monitored in a type-x CSS if the type-x CSS is used for GC-PDCCH monitoring   Proposal 2-4: support. It provide more flexibility for network when scheduling MBS traffic.  Proposal 2-5: The determination on FDRA bit field is premature which needs further discussion. DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled with C-RNTI can be transmitted in a USS, in which case the bit width of FDRA can be determined by the active BWP. There is a possibility that the FDRA of a DCI with G-RNTI should be determined by the active BWP, wherein the same active BWP is configured for all the UEs belong to the same group. We propose to keep FFS for the FDRA determination.  **Updated Proposal 2-5**: The first DCI format for GC-PDCCH uses the same fields as DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI with the following modifications:   * ‘Identifier for DCI formats’ and ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ are ignored and the 3 bits are reserved   + FFS: whether/how the reserved bits are repurposed for other functionalities * ~~FFS~~ For FDRA determination   For proposal 2-6: we are agree that the information fields mentioned in the proposal are not useful for MBS scheduling. However, we think it may be better to use the same wording as DCI format 1-0, i.e. these information fields are reserved, from alignment point of view.  For proposal 2-7, as mentioned aforementioned, there is a possibility that the first DCI format can be aligned with the DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI in USS. Hence we do not support the proposal.  For proposal 2-8, we don’t see the necessity to introduce RRC signaling to configure how to count DCI size. It introduce additionally UE complexity as UE has to maintain two different procedure to align DCI size.  For proposal 2-9, support. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 2-1: Support  2-2: We think there is no need to add the limitation of “only when no CORESET is configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR”.  2-3: We agree with the proposal in principle. The FFS is not clear to us. Does GC-PDCCH (e.g., DCI format 2-x) can be monitored in Type-x CSS? Or the intention of this FFS is to cover this issue?  2-4: Don’t support.  2-5: Don’t support. We think the payload size of the first DCI format can be same to that of DCI format 1-0 with C-RNTI. We don’t know why the first DCI format should use the same field as DCI format 1-0 with C-RNTI. For the 1st bullet, we think the two fields should be removed instead of reserved. To align with proposal 2-6, we propose to remove the two fields. For FRDA determination, we think it should be based on CFR not initial BWP. We think the first step may be to make decision on the DCI payload size of the first DCI format and the second DCI format then we can discuss which field should be included in each DCI format. Some fields in DCI format with C-RNTI should be removed (e.g., TPC, PRI) or added (e.g., priority index).  2-6: Don’t support. Same reason as above. Regarding the first DCI format and the second DCI format, we don’t think there is substantial difference between the two DCI formats.  2-7: Support.  2-8: Don’t support. Detailed DCI size alignment should be not based on RRC configuration.  2-9: support. |
| ZTE | Proposal 2-1: Ok to confirm the working assumption.  Proposal 2-2: Support.  Proposal 2-3: We proposed a compromised solution in our tdoc as shown below, which tries to merge both options and reuse the existing spec as much as possible. If companies can’t converge on either Option1 or Option2, we would suggest to consider it.  *Proposal 7: If the type-x CSS is defined as a type-3 CSS, the following UE behavior on Type-3 CSS monitoring should be defined,*  * For DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI and G-RNTI within type-3 CSS, it should always be monitored by the UE.*  * For DCI format 1\_1 (and 1\_2) with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI within type-3 CSS, the UE determines monitoring priority according to search space index and further decides whether to monitor*  For progress, we can also go with Option 2.  We are ok with Proposal 2-5, Proposal 2-6 and Proposal 2-7.  Proposal 2-8: It seems we may need to first determine whether we need to configure a size for the second DCI format. If companies can agree to have such a configuration, we can further determine how to perform size alignment with such DCI size. Thus, we propose the following proposal.  **[High] Initial Proposal 2-8**: For DCI size alignment for the second DCI format, ~~G-RNTI is counted as “C-RNTI” or “other RNTI” depending on RRC configurations~~.   * The size of the second DCI format can be configured by gNB * FFS: Based on RRC configurations, if both DCI format 1\_1 and DCI format 2\_x have smaller DCI size than the second DCI format for multicast, the DCI format 1\_1 or 2\_x with larger DCI size is aligned to the size of the second DCI format for multicast. * FFS: Based on RRC configurations, between DCI format 1\_1 and DCI format 2\_x, if one of them has smaller DCI size than the second DCI format for multicast and the other one has larger DCI size than the second DCI format for multicast, the DCI format 1\_1 or 2\_x with smaller DCI size is aligned to the size of the second DCI format for multicast.   Proposal 2-9: Is the RRC parameter pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID a new parameter dedicated for MBS, or it is the same parameter for unicast PDCCH. Clarification is needed. |
| CMCC | 2-1: Support  2-2: Support  2-3: Support  2-4: Not support, there is a need of enhancement on hash function if USS is supported in order to align the CCE index calculation among UEs in the same MBS group  2-5: Support  2-6: Support  2-7: Support  2-8: We prefer to down select from “C-RNTI” and “other RNTI”  2-9: Support. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2-1: Support  Proposal 2-2: Just for clarification, for the first sub-bullet, why to set the restriction ‘only when no CORESET is configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR’.  Proposal 2-3: Support option 2. It is one clean solution.  Proposal 2-4: Not support. The motivation is not clear to us, and also if supported, there is much spec work to do.  Proposal 2-5: Fine  Proposal 2-6: Fine  Proposal 2-7: Fine  Proposal 2-8: Not support. If the comprised scheme is supported, obviously it increase UE’s complexity for maintaining two DCI size alignment mechanisms.  Proposal 2-9: Same question as ZTE. |
| Samsung | 2-1: Support  2-2: Support  2-3: Do not support. It is not a technical issue and does not require any agreement.  2-4: Support. Removes a large number of specification/implementation impacts for multicast scheduling without any drawback.  2-5: Requires further discussion.  2-6: Requires further discussion – the number of fields in DCI format 1\_1 is large. It may be better to first identify what fields the second DCI format should have that the first DCI format does not have.  2-7: Support  2-8: OK with the direction but requires further discussion. Size alignment may be up to the gNB and need not be specified.  2-9: Support |
| vivo | Proposal 2-1: support to confirm the WA.  Proposal 2-2: we have the same with the Lenovo. It would be preferred to delete the added limitation of “only when no CORESET is configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR”.  Proposal 2-3: we are not ok with the FFS. If DCI formats other than the DCI formats of GC-PDCCH can also be monitored in a type-x CSS if the type-x CSS is used for GC-PDCCH monitoring, it will change the monitoring behavior of other DCI formats in Rel-15/Rel-16, it is not in the scope of MBS AI.  Proposal 2-4: not support  Proposal 2-5/2-6: for TPC command in the DCI, we think it is still useful when NACK-only based feedback is used. In this case, the PUCCH resource for HARQ-ACK feedback is group-common, it is ok to set the TPC command in a group-common DCI.  Proposal 2-7: support  Proposal 2-8: we prefer to count G-RNTI as C-RNTI. When both DCI 1\_1 and DCI 1\_2 are configured, the second DCI format is aligned with DCI 1\_1 or DCI 1\_2 can depend on RRC configurations. i.e., the following is suggested.  For DCI size alignment for the second DCI format, G-RNTI is counted as “C-RNTI” or “other RNTI” depending on RRC configurations.   * The size of the second DCI format can be configured by gNB * Based on RRC configurations, if both DCI format 1\_1 and DCI format 1\_2 have smaller DCI size than the second DCI format for multicast, the DCI format 1\_1 or 1-2 with larger DCI size is aligned to the size of the second DCI format for multicast. * Based on RRC configurations, between DCI format 1\_1 and DCI format 1-2, if one of them has smaller DCI size than the second DCI format for multicast and the other one has larger DCI size than the second DCI format for multicast, the DCI format 1\_1 or 1-2 with smaller DCI size is aligned to the size of the second DCI format for multicast. |
| Apple | P2-1: the working assumption can be confirmed.  P2-2: for the second bullet, UE need to be configured with CORESET for unicast first, then it could be configured with MBS, so does this bullet mean no CORESET is configured for unicast?  P2-3: Option 1 is preferred. We don’t see the motivation to define a new CSS type, the search space index for Type-x CSS set is enough to differentiate from other existing use cases of type-3 CSS type. It’s not necessary to define new type CSS set, like type-4 CCS set.  P2-4: It’s not clear the benefits to support both USS and CSS set, it makes UE implementation complicated.  P2-6: OK  P2-9: The proposed parameters are according to the USS, but we agreed the new type-X search space is CSS. Why not we align the parameter setting as CSS? |
| MediaTek | 2-1: Support  2-2: We don’t think it need an explicit limitation for whether the CORESET can be shared for unicast and multicast, which can be up to NW configuration implementation.  2-3: Support  2-4: Not support.  2-5: Since the CFR was agreed for MBS reception, it is nature to determine the FDRA based on the CFR size.  2-6: Generally OK.  2-7: Support.  2-8: Not support. The current proposal will increase UE’s processing complexity and is not preferred. The original down selection b/w “C-RNTI” and “other RNTI” is preferred.  2-9: Support. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 2-1, 2-2, 2-7: ok  Proposal 2-3: Option 2  Proposal 2-4: need further study. The n\_RNTI in USS is using C-RNTI. If we change it for multicast, which G-RNTI should be used if the UE are configured with multiple G-RNTIs? It is also related to Proposal 2-9:  Proposal 2-9: we don’t support the second subbullet. According to the current spec, n\_RNTI=0 if it is not USS, which should be applied to Type-x CSS as well.  Proposal 2-5: prefer FFS FDRA  Proposal 2-6: prefer not to use ‘removed’. Instead can say ‘ignored and corresponding bits are reserved’  Proposal 2-8: prefer ZTE’s suggested wording. |
| Nokia, NSB | 2-1: Support  2-2: Support  2-3: Support  2-4: Support, we think that supporting USS in addition to type-x CSS would be beneficial.  2-5: We support the modification related to reserving ‘Identifier for DCI formats’ and ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ bits. We believe that they can be repurposed for indicating other functionalities.  We do not support the modification for FDRA field determination, we think that the field should be based on the size of the CFR.  2-6: We think that the fields should not be removed but rather reserved, similar to the modification for DCI format 1\_0.  2-7: We support this.  2-8: We do not support this and prefer to down-select from other-RNTI and C-RNTI.  2-9: Support |
| Futurewei | 2-1: Support  2-2: Support the second sub-bullet only. If no CORESET is configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR, then no UE multicast reception should be expected. |
| CATT | **Proposal 2-1:** Support to confirm the WA.  **Proposal 2-2:** We share same view with Lenovo and vivo, and support to remove the limitation ‘only when no CORESET is configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR ’  **Proposal 2-3:** We are OK with the proposal. If other other than the DCI formats of GC-PDCCH such as DCI format 1\_0 or DCI format 1\_1 can also be monitored in a type-x CSS, does it means the type-x CSS can be used to schedule unicast service?  **Proposal 2-4:** Not support. The motivation is not clear for us.  **Proposal 2-5:** We are generally ok with the proposal.  **Proposal 2-6:** We are generally ok with the proposal.  **Proposal 2-7:** Support.  **Proposal 2-8:** We support the proposal.  Firstly, since the second DCI targets a group UEs, so it is difficult to align the second DCI to each UE’s DCI format with C-RNTI/ other-RNTI. It is more feasible that the size of the DCI format with C-RNTI/other-RNTI should be aligned to the second DCI format for MBS.  Secondly, when the second DCI is counted as “C-RNTI”, it may bring some limitations during the DCI size alignment due to the size of DCI format 1\_1 is normally larger than the second DCI. When the second DCI is counted as “other-RNTI”, it is difficult to guarantee the size of DCI format with other-RNTI is always smaller than the size of second DCI.  Therefore, it is a reasonable solution to alignment the DCI size according to the RRC configuration. When both sizes of the DCI with “C-RNTI” and “other RNTI” are smaller than that of the second DCI, the DCI format 1\_1 or 2\_x with larger DCI size is aligned to the size of the second DCI format for multicast. When one of the size of DCI with “C-RNTI” or “other RNTI” is smaller than that of the second DCI, the DCI format 1\_1 or 2\_x with smaller DCI size is aligned to the size of the second DCI format for multicast.  **Proposal 2-9:** Support |
| Ericsson | P2-1: Support  P2-2: we do not support the proposal in its current wording.  Regarding the first bullet: the unicast CORESET need not be fully contain in the CFR. The gNB can by implementation make sure the PDCCH candidate containing the group scheduling is in CFR. We could specify the UE to skip PDCCH candidates for the group scheduling search space that are not in CFR range.  It is unclear what is the motivation for the restriction “only when no coreset is configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR”. if a UE can handle 2 coresets, why should specification limit where these are configured. As long as the UE has processing capability regarding the total number of search spaces / PDCCH candidate, this should not be an issue.  P2-3: Disagree. Instead extend existing Type 3 CSS.  P2-4: We think we need further discussion on how a group of UEs can access a GC-PDCCH in USS without (significant) spec changes.  P2-5: ok with the first two bullets, but the last bullet on CFR size larger than the coreset size seem to only apply in USS in current spec. propose to clarify if the intention is to apply it to CSS.  P2-6: Support  P2-7: Support  P2-8: Do not support. The solution overcomplicates the DCI budget.  P2-9: Support |
| Convida | 2-1: OK.  2-2: OK.  2-3: OK.  2-4: Not support.  2-5/2-6: We share the similar view with Lenovo that keeping the DCI payload sizes of the first DCI format and the second DCI format same as the DCI format 1\_0 and DCI format 1\_1 respectively is enough. No need to maintain exactly the same fields. So, instead of reserving and repurposing the existing field, we should remove the unnecessary fields and add new fields if needed. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2-1**: Support  **Proposal 2-2**: Support  **Proposal 2-3**: Support. If Type-3 CSS is used for multicast, the monitoring priority will be lowered from that in Rel-15/16. As a result, a Rel-17 UE configured with multicast may not be able to detect an important DCI, i.e. fallback DCI, which is sent in Type-3 CSS.  **Proposal 2-4**: Clarification is needed on whether C-RNTI or G-RNTI is used to determine PDCCH candidates in the USS.  **Proposal 2-5**: Support in principle. Reserved bits should be used for other purposes (e.g., priority indicator). The value of K needs to be considered further. For example, if CORESET0 size is 24RB and CFR size is 275RB, K=8 is not enough. Also, we would like to discuss the reference point for RB numbering (i.e., the lowest RB of the CORESET or the lowest RB of the CFR).  **Proposal 2-6**: Support  **Proposal 2-7**: Generally support. We would like to make the following changes for clarification.  Align the size of DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI monitored in CSS.  **Proposal 2-8**: We would like to make the following changes for clarification.   * “the second DCI format” -> “DCI format 1\_1 for multicast” * “DCI format 1\_1” -> “DCI format 1\_1 for unicast” * “DCI format 2\_x” -> “DCI format 2\_0/2\_1/2\_4/2\_5/2\_6”   (Because the sizes of DCI format 2\_2 and 2\_3 are aligned with DCI format 1\_0 in CSS)  **Proposal 2-9**: Support |
| Intel | **Proposal 2-1**: OK  **Proposal 2-2:** OK  **Proposal 2-3:** Support Option 2  **Proposal 2-4:** OK  **Proposal 2-5/2-6:** The TPC command field may be useful for groupcast transmission with co-located UEs. Furthermore, since HARQ is RRC configured ON/OFF, we think it is important to reserve the related fields when HARQ is configured to be OFF.  **Proposal 2-8:** Ok with the main bullet and first sub-bullet. The second and third sub-bullets should be FFS for now. |
| LG | P2-2: We are generally fine with this proposal. We prefer to remove ‘only’ in red at this stage.  P2-3: Do not support  P2-8: We prefer to down select from “C-RNTI” and “other RNTI”  P2-9: Support this proposal. We could further discuss whether *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* can be a new parameter related to MBS. In addition,  should correspond to the G-RNTI associated with the PDSCH transmission for initializing scrambling sequence generator even for GC-PDSCH. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | **[High] Initial Proposal 2-1**: OK from our side.  **[High] Initial Proposal 2-2**: We think the condition in the first item in RED can be deleted. We think the corresponding description can be updated as below.  If a CFR is configured in a dedicated unicast BWP for multicast in RRC-CONNECTED state,   * the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP and fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain can be used for multicast transmission by default. If not permitted, the related indicator is added when the CORESET is configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR. * the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission. * Note: A CORESET ID is unique across all BWPs and CFRs for a serving cell.   **[High] Initial Proposal 2-3**: OK.  **[High] Initial Proposal 2-4**: need further discussion  **[High] Initial Proposal 2-5**:one question: in the formula defining K, which is used between :  The first DCI format for GC-PDCCH uses the same fields as DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI with the following modifications:   * ‘Identifier for DCI formats’ and ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ are ignored and the 3 bits are reserved   + FFS: whether/how the reserved bits are repurposed for other functionalities * For FDRA determination,   + is given by     - the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and     - the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.   + If the size of CFR (i.e. ) is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where K is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 8} which satisfies ;otherwise,   **[High] Initial Proposal 2-6**:OK  **[High] Initial Proposal 2-7**: need further discussion.  **[High] Initial Proposal 2-8**: need further discussion  **[High] Initial Proposal 2-9**:OK |
| Moderator | **Proposal 2-1:**  The proposal is stable. No comments in next round.  **Proposal 2-2:**  Several companies proposed to delete the red part in the first bullet, this red part was added based on comment from QC in last meeting. Based on companies’ comments, I updated the proposal, I think this is the best I can do now.  **Proposal 2-3:**  Based on companies’ comments and majority view, I deleted option 1 and the FFS in option 2. Although 4 companies still have concern on this, but I think this is what I can do now.  **Proposal 2-4**:  Based on companies’ comments, most companies do not support USS, so moderator suggests to not discuss this issue anymore.  **Proposal 2-5**:  Regarding the useless fields, 2 companies [vivo, Intel] think ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ may be useful, 2 companies [Lenovo, Convida] propose to remove them instead of reserve them. To me, using “removed” seems OK since anyway we need to do size alignment if the DCI size budget is exceeded.  Regarding FDRA determination, 4 companies [Lenovo, MTK, Nokia, QC] propose to change it to FFS or propose to use the size of CFR. Based on companies’ comments, I updated the proposal.  **Proposal 2-6**:  ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ was deleted in the updated proposal. I still use “removed” here since I’m not sure why we need to reserve them.  **Proposal 2-7**:  The proposal was updated based on GTW discussion.  **Proposal 2-8**:  Many companies prefer to down select from “C-RNTI” and “Other RNTI”. Based on comments, maybe we can first decide whether the size of the second DCI format can be configured by gNB.  **Proposal 2-9:**  Regarding whether the RRC parameter pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID is a new parameter dedicated for MBS, or it is the same parameter for unicast PDCCH, my understanding is that, the pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID is configured in the CORESET, and if the CORESET is used for multicast, then the pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID in the CORESET is used here. |

## Updated Proposals (after 1st round of inputs)

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-1 (Stable)**: Confirm the working assumption:

* The maximum number of CORESETs per BWP is not increased for support of MBS, and the number of CORESETs configured within the CFR is left to gNB implementation.

**[High] Updated Proposal 2-2**:

If a CFR is configured in a dedicated unicast BWP for multicast in RRC-CONNECTED state,

* the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP and fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain can be used for multicast transmission ~~only when no CORESET is configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR~~
* the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission.
* Note: A CORESET ID is unique across all BWPs and CFRs for a serving cell.

**[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

**[High] Updated Proposal 2-5**: The first DCI format for GC-PDCCH uses the same fields as DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI at least with the following modifications:

* ‘Identifier for DCI formats’ is removed.
* For FDRA determination, down-select from following options:
  + Option 1:
    -  is given by
      * the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
    - For resource indication value (*RIV*) of downlink resource allocation type 1, the resource blocks that can be indicated are
      * the resource blocks in the CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the resource blocks in the initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
  + Option 2:
    -  is given by
      * the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
    - For resource indication value (*RIV*) of downlink resource allocation type 1, the similar scheme as for the case that the DCI size for DCI format 1\_0 in USS is derived from the size of DCI format 1\_0 in CSS but applied to an active BWP is used.
      * FFS details, e.g., if the size of CFR (i.e. ) is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where K is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 8} which satisfies ;otherwise,
  + Option 3:  is given by the size of CFR in the active DL BWP

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-6**: The second DCI format for GC-PDCCH uses the same fields as DCI format 1\_1 at least with the following modifications:

* ‘Identifier for DCI formats’~~, ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’~~ and ‘SRS request’ are removed.
* Note: At least the configurable fields in DCI format 1\_1 remain configurable for the second DCI format

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-7**: Align the size of the first DCI format with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI monitored in CSS when the size budget of 3 DCI formats scrambled by C-RNTI is exceeded.

**[High] Updated Proposal 2-8**: The size of the second DCI format for multicast can be configured by RRC signalling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.

**[High] Updated Proposal 2-9**: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH with the second DCI format in Type-x CSS,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in the CORESET used for the GC-PDCCH; otherwise.
* is given by the G-RNTI.

## Company Views (2nd round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia, NSB | 2-1: Support  2-2: Support  2-3: Support  2-5: Regarding ‘Identifier for DCI formats’: We would prefer to keep the bit reserved rather than removed. While DCI size alignment might require gNB to pad / truncate the DCI, the UE interpretation of the DCI fields would be different – depending on whether this field is removed or reserved. Hence, we would like to keep it reserved.  Regarding FDRA determination: We support the different options proposed. We would like to propose a minor modification to option 2:   * + Option 2:     - is given by       * the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and       * the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.       * the size of the CFR in the active DL BWP, if CORESET 0 and initial DL bandwidth part are not configured.   2-6: Similar comments as for Proposal 2-5, we would keep the fields reserved rather than removed. Our understanding of removing a field implies new fields would need to be defined, if we need to repurpose the field.  2-7: Support the intention, however we would like rewording to clarify:  (a) what is meant by "first DCI" (would it be clearer to say “first DCI format for GC-PDCCH " so as to better align with 2-5?)  (b) if size alignment is possible BEFORE the 3 DCI size limit is reached?  2-9: Support |
| Qualcomm | We have concerns on 2-2, 2-7 and 2-9:  **For 2-2:**  We prefer to keep the condition in the first subbullet and leave the case without common understanding as FFS.  **[High] Updated Proposal 2-2**: If a CFR is configured associated with a dedicated unicast BWP for multicast in RRC-CONNECTED state,   * the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP and fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain can be used for multicast transmission ~~only~~ when no CORESET is configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR * the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission. * FFS the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP and fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain can be used for multicast transmission when there is CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR * Note: A CORESET ID is unique across all BWPs and CFRs for a serving cell.   **For 2-7**  We think “when the size budget of 3 DCI formats scrambled by C-RNTI is exceeded” should be deleted. In a multicast group, UE-A may be over the BD budget, but UE-B may not. Based on the proposal, only UE-A align the DCI 1\_0 for GC-PDCCH to DCI 1\_0 for C-RNTI in CSS, resulting in different GC-DCI size for UE-B.  **For 2-9:**  We think both first and second DCI formats should use *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* configured for MBS. Considering the SFN scenarios, may not be applicable.  Regarding for Type-x CSS, more discussion is needed. Since multiple G-RNTIs are supported, reusing may be beneficial to reduce BD number.  Therefore, we propose to make following modification:  **[High] Updated Proposal 2-9**:  For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH with the first and second DCI formats in Type-x CSS,   * equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in the CORESET used for the GC-PDCCH in a CFR; otherwise. * FFS is given by   + Alt1: G-RNTI used for the GC-PDCCH in the CFR.   + Alt2: 0 |
| Samsung | Support: 2-1, 2-2, 2-5, 2-6, [2-7], 2-8, [2-9]  Do not support 2-3  The reason is that it is not a technical issue and no decision/agreement is needed. Nothing is affected about progressing the MBS WI without calling the CSS as Type-3 or as something else.  OK in principle with proposal 2-7 (there could be ways to not have the first DCI format be always size-aligned with DCI format 1\_0) but OK to not pursue such optimizations (they would be rare) and delete the “when the size budget of 3 DCI formats scrambled by C-RNTI is exceeded” (understand it was mentioned by Samsung but we’re fine to remove and progress on this topic).  OK with proposal 2-9 if the “in Type-x CSS” is removed (see explanation for 2-3) – should be possible as that is not the objective of 2-9. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | No comment |
| LG | **[High] Updated Proposal 2-2**: We are fine with this proposal.  **[High] Updated Proposal 2-9**: We are fine with this proposal. Similar proposal can be provided for GC-PDSCH. |
| ZTE | Ok with 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 2-6, 2-8 and 2-9.  For proposal 2-5, we support Option 2.  For Option1, we don’t understand how to handle the case when CFR has larger bandwidth than CORESET#0/initial BWP. It can only indicate the frequency resource up to the CORESET#0/initial BWP, which is restrictive.  For Option3, if the CFR is larger than CORESET#0/initial BWP, the DCI size will be exceeded.  For proposal 2-7, we would like to make it clear that this proposal is for multicast. The following update is suggested.  **[High] Initial Proposal 2-7**: For RRC-CONNECTED UEs receiving multicast, align the size of the first DCI format with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI monitored in CSS when the size budget of 3 DCI formats scrambled by C-RNTI is exceeded. |
| OPPO | P 2-1, 2-3: Support. P 2-2: Support it and deleting the note.  P 2-7: We are fine with the previous wording by FL. How to handle the DCI size alignment for the whole group of UEs is different from that of each UE.  P 2-8: We still think down selection between the two options is needed. |
| Xiaomi | 2-1: support  2-2: support  2-3: support  2-5: need modification  For the first sub-bullet, we share same views with Nokia. The information field sequence in the DCI should not be changed. We prefer to keep it as ‘reserved’.  For the FDRA determination, we should consider not only the scheduling in frequency domain but also the DCI alignment with the legacy DCIs. Option 1 put significant restrictions on the CFR configuration that CORESET#0 or initial DL BWP has to be contained in the CFR. Option 3 is not friendly to DCI alignment as it is a typical case that CFR doesn’t equal to the configured DL BWP. Hence option 2 is our preference. However, it does not cover the case that CFR equals to the active DL BWP. We propose the following modifications for option 2:   * + Option 2:     - is given by       * the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and       * the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell; and       * the size of active DL BWP despite of whether CORESET#0 is configured or not if CFR equals to BWP     - For resource indication value (*RIV*) of downlink resource allocation type 1, the similar scheme as for the case that the DCI size for DCI format 1\_0 in USS is derived from the size of DCI format 1\_0 in CSS but applied to an active BWP is used.       * FFS details, e.g., if the size of CFR (i.e. ) is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where K is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 8} which satisfies ;otherwise,   2-6: same view as Nokia, it should be reserved instead of remove.  2-7: support  2-8: Clarification is needed. It means the information fields in the second DCI is configurable or the payload size of the DCI format is directly configurable? The ambiguity is that if the second understanding is the intention, we need to introduce a RRC parameter like payload size and the final second DCI should be truncated or padded to achieve the configured payload size.  2-9: support. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 2-1: support.  2-2: support.  2-3: support.  2-5: not support since “uses the same fields” is unclear. Maybe we can discuss the fields in GC-PDCCH directly.  2-6: not support. Same reason as above.  2-7: not support. Regarding Proposal 2-7, I think the main point is for the group of UEs to have same understanding on the payload size of the first DCI format. Considering different UEs in the group may have different DCI size budgets, e.g., some UEs may exceed 3+1 budget and have to perform size alignment while others may not exceed and no need to perform size budget, so different UEs may have different understanding on the payload size of first DCI format. So we prefer the original wording of proposal 2-7.  2-8: support.  2-9: support. |
| vivo | 2-1: support  2-2: support  2-3: we are fine with option 2, but we think whether DCI formats other than the DCI formats of GC-PDCCH can also be monitored in a type-x CSS or not needs to be clarified. from our view, only the first and second DCI formats of GC-PDCCH can be monitored in type-x CSS.  2-5: fine with the proposal. Option 3 is preferred. If the size of the first DCI is larger than that of DCI 1\_0 in CSS, than FDRA truncation can be performed during DCI size alignment.  2-6: ok  2-7: agree with Lenovo. UE should align the DCI size regardless the size budget of 3 DCI formats scrambled by C-RNTI is exceeded or not, since the DCI size configuration is UE-specific.  2-8: agree with Xiaomi that clarification is needed  2-9: we support the proposal with Qualcomm’s update. |
| MediaTek | 2-1: support.  2-2: We still have concern on this issue. The “*pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID*” within legacy unicast CORESET is different from “*pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID\_mbs*” within multicast CORESET. The *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID\_mbs* for multicast is common for all UEs, if one of the group UE use the *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* within unicast to decode multicast PDCCH, it is not desirable. We prefer that it does not need an explicit limitation for whether the CORESET can be shared for unicast and multicast, which can be up to NW configuration implementation.  2-3: support.  2-5: we are ok with the proposal, Option 3 is preferred.  2-6: Ok  2-8: support.  2-9: support. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2-1**: Support  **Proposal 2-2**: Support  **Proposal 2-3**: Support  **Proposal 2-5**: Support. We prefer Option 2.  **Proposal 2-6**: Support  **Proposal 2-7**: The size of the first DCI format should be aligned with DCI format 1\_0 in CSS regardless of whether the size budget is exceeded or not. If there is even just one UE in the group that exceeds the size budget, the size of the first DCI should be aligned with DCI format 1\_0 in CSS. When gNB is transmitting multicast with the first DCI of the same size as DCI format 1\_0 in USS, if a UE that exceeds the size budget is added, gNB has to reconfigure the size of the first DCI to align with DCI format 1\_0 in CSS or send two first DCI format with different sizes. It would create unnecessary complexity.  **Proposal 2-8**: Support  **Proposal 2-9**: Support |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 2-5, 2-6, 2-8, OK;**  **Proposal 2-7: we prefer the original version.**  **Proposal 2-9: In current spec, only for PDCCH associated with UE specific search space, the srambling ID is related to the higher-layer parameter pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID shown below. In our understanding, no enhancement is needed even if pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID is configured in CORESET for MBS. The justification for proposal 2-9 is not clear to us. In Rel-17, SFN scenario is not in the scope. In addition, even if considering forward compatibility, e.g., support SFN case, one virtualized cell ID can be provided to replace .** 7.3.2.3 Scrambling The UE shall assume the block of bits , where is the number of bits transmitted on the physical channel, is scrambled prior to modulation, resulting in a block of scrambled bits according to  where the scrambling sequence  is given by clause 5.2.1. The scrambling sequence generator shall be initialized with    where  - for a UE-specific search space as defined in clause 10 of [5, TS 38.213],  equals the higher-layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if configured,  - otherwise  and where  -  is given by the C-RNTI for a PDCCH in a UE-specific search space if the higher-layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* is configured, and  -  otherwise. |
| CATT | **Proposal 2-2：**We can support the proposal after the wording modifications. The modification that ‘A CFR is associated with a dedicated unicast BWP’ is better for us.  **Proposal 2-3：**Support  **Proposal 2-5:** We share same views as Nokia, The field of ‘dentifier for DCI formats’ should be reserved instead of removed. When this field of first DCI is reserved, the DCI size of first DCI and DCI 1\_0 will be the same. Hence, it can bring benefit to DCI alignment procedure.  **Proposal 2-6:** Support  **Proposal 2-7:** Same view withQualcomm and Samsung, ‘when the size budget of 3 DCI formats scrambled by C-RNTI is exceeded.’ should be deleted. Because the original proposal means the size of first DCI may be different for the UEs who exceed DCI budget and the UEs who don’t exceed DCI budget with the group. It obviously the size of first DCI should be same among the UEs group of MBS service.  **Proposal 2-8:** Support.If the size of second DCI for multicast is configured by RRC signaling, it means the padding or truncation shall not be applied to second DCI. In addition, the second DCI targets a group UEs, the size of the DCI format with C-RNTI/other-RNTI should be aligned to the second DCI format for multicast.  **Proposal 2-9:** Support |
| Ericsson | P2-2: Support  P2-3: Not support.  There is nothing that prevents an extension of Type 3 CSS, without affecting legacy UEs.  P2-5: Support. We prefer Option 1. We wonder how Options 2&3 would function in CSS. If we want a wider BW we should use the non-fallback DCI for MBS.  P2-6: Support, with the understanding that TPC for GC-PDCCH DCI will not be used, but that the field may be repurposed.  P2-7: The multicast first DCI format should always be aligned with DCI 1\_0. Otherwise UEs above the DCI budget will expect a different DCI size than those within the DCI budget.  P2-9: Support, assuming the Type-x is a Type-3 CSS. |
| Moderator | **Proposal 2-2:**  The proposal was updated based on QC and OPPO’s comments.  **Propose 2-3:**  Samsung and Ericsson still have concern.  @vivo, your question can be discussed in the next level.  **Proposal 2-5:**  @Nokia, I’m not sure whether I understand your point or not, regarding the modification you made for option 2, what’s the case that both CORESET 0 and initial DL bandwidth part are not configured? Do you mean the case that the active BWP does not contain CORESET0/initial BWP?  @Lenovo, “uses the same fields” means the current fields in DCI format 1\_0 scrambled by C-RNTI also be used and present in the first DCI format except the fields listed in the sub-bullet.  **Proposal 2-8:**  @Xiaomi, regarding your question, the answer is the payload size of the DCI format is directly configured.  **Proposal 2-9**:  The proposal was updated based on comments.  @QC, I think it may be controversial for the first DCI format. Let’s first agree it for the second DCI format.  @Spreadtrum, regarding your comments, I think current proposal is a straightforward way. In addition, if it is not considered in this release, the Rel-17 UE may be hard to support the basic SFN operation. |

## Updated Proposals (after 2nd round of inputs)

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-1 (Stable)**: Confirm the working assumption:

* The maximum number of CORESETs per BWP is not increased for support of MBS, and the number of CORESETs configured within the CFR is left to gNB implementation.

**[High] Updated Proposal 2-2**:

If a CFR is configured in a dedicated unicast BWP for multicast in RRC-CONNECTED state,

* the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP and fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain can be used for multicast transmission ~~only~~ when no CORESET is configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR
* the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission.
* FFS the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP and fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain can be used for multicast transmission when there is CORESET(s) configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR
* ~~Note: A CORESET ID is unique across all BWPs and CFRs for a serving cell.~~

**[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

**[High] Updated Proposal 2-5**: The first DCI format for GC-PDCCH uses the same fields as DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI at least with the following modifications:

* ‘Identifier for DCI formats’ is not needed.
  + FFS whether the field should be ignored and reserved, or should be removed.
* For FDRA determination, down-select from following options:
  + Option 1:
    -  is given by
      * the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
    - For resource indication value (*RIV*) of downlink resource allocation type 1, the resource blocks that can be indicated are
      * the resource blocks in the CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the resource blocks in the initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
  + Option 2:
    -  is given by
      * the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
    - For resource indication value (*RIV*) of downlink resource allocation type 1, the similar scheme as for the case that the DCI size for DCI format 1\_0 in USS is derived from the size of DCI format 1\_0 in CSS but applied to an active BWP is used.
      * FFS details, e.g., if the size of CFR (i.e. ) is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where K is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 8} which satisfies ;otherwise,
  + Option 3:  is given by the size of CFR in the active DL BWP

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-6**: The second DCI format for GC-PDCCH uses the same fields as DCI format 1\_1 at least with the following modifications:

* ‘Identifier for DCI formats’ and ‘SRS request’ are not needed.
  + FFS whether the fields should be ignored and reserved, or should be removed.
* Note: At least the configurable fields in DCI format 1\_1 remain configurable for the second DCI format

**[High] Initial Proposal 2-7**: For multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs, align the size of the first DCI format for GC-PDCCH with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI monitored in CSS.

**[High] Updated Proposal 2-8**: The payload size of the second DCI format for multicast can be configured by RRC signalling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.

**[High] Updated Proposal 2-9**: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH with the second DCI format,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in the CORESET in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH; otherwise.
* FFS is given by
  + Alt1: G-RNTI used for the GC-PDCCH.
  + Alt2: 0

## Company Views (3rd round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2-1**: Support  **Proposal 2-2**: Support  **Proposal 2-3**: Support  **Proposal 2-5**: Support. It would be better to remove the unnecessary fields and put in new fields for other purposes.  **Proposal 2-6**: Support. Unnecessary fields should be removed to minimize the size of the second DCI format.  **Proposal 2-7**: Support  **Proposal 2-8**: Support  **Proposal 2-9**: Support. We prefer Alt2. A common scrambling seed should be used for multiple G-RNTIs to reduce the amount of UE processing. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2-1: OK  Proposal 2-2: OK  Proposal 2-3: OK  Proposal 2-5: OK  Proposal 2-6: OK  Proposal 2-7: OK  Proposal 2-8: OK  Proposal 2-9: Need clarification or justification.  @Moderator, thanks for the reply. In current spec, for PDCCH associated with CSS, the scrambling ID is even if the higher-layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* is configured in the CORESET. Following the current spec, the for GC-PDCCH is . It still could work in Rel-17 for MBS. In Rel-17, SFN scenario is not in the scope. My question is why we should do the enhancement shown as Proposal 2-9. |
| vivo | **Proposal 2-1**: Support  **Proposal 2-2**: ok. For the FFS, we think it is up to gNB to use the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP for multicast or not.  **Proposal 2-3**: Support. Hope we are on the same page that whether DCI formats other than the DCI formats of GC-PDCCH can also be monitored in a type-x CSS or not needs further discussion.  **Proposal 2-5**: Support. we think unnecessary fields should be removed  **Proposal 2-6**: Support. we also think unnecessary fields should be removed to minimize the DCI size.  **Proposal 2-7**: Support  **Proposal 2-8**: support in principle. It would be appreciated if FL can explain how to configure the payload size of the second DCI format? i.e. is it to configure the total payload directly or is to configure the size of each field?  **Proposal 2-9**: Support. |
| Xiaomi | 2-1: support  2-2: OK with the proposal. Regarding to MTK’s concern, there are some conditions for the case wherein the CORESET configured in a BWP can be used for MBS, e.g. the gNB intentionally doesn’t configure the CORESET for the CFR. From this perspective, it should be OK as there is no mandatory configuration for the network.  2-3: support.  2-5: OK with the proposal and option 2 is our preference. Option 1 introduce significant scheduling restriction and option 3 is unfriendly for alignment.  2-6: we prefer Nokia’s version that ‘Identifier for DCI formats’ and ‘SRS request’ should be reserved instead of removed.  2-7: The status of DCI budget across different UEs can be aligned by proper gNB configuration. On the other hand, we agree with Samsung that may be it is not a good idea to pursue optimization for everything at such a late stage. We are OK with the updated proposal 2-7.  2-8: if the intention is to directly configure the payload size of the second DCI format, we don’t support this proposal. From our understanding, the bit fields contained in the second DCI format for group scheduling is configurable. I am confused on the motivation to additionally configure a payload size for it.  2-9: I have some sympathies with comments from Spreadtrum. We would like to hear more views on this proposal. |
| LG | **[High] Initial Proposal 2-1 (Stable)**: We are fine to confirm the working assumption.  **[High] Updated Proposal 2-2**: We are fine with the updated proposal.  **[High] Updated Proposal 2-9**: We are fine with this proposal. We prefer Alt 1. |
| Nokia, NSB. | **2-1**:  Support  **2-2**:  Support  **2-3**:  Support  **2-5:**  Support  **2-6:**  Support, we are fine with the FFS related to the fields that are not needed.  Regarding the configurable fields, as mentioned in our contribution, we still think that different UEs might have different higher layer configurations, that given our current understanding for unicast, will mean they could derive different size estimates for different fields.  For example, one UE may be supporting switching between 4 BWPs, and hence assume a BWP indicator field size of 2, whereas another UE may only be supporting switching between 2 BWPs and therefore assume a BWP indicator field size of 1. Hence, we would prefer to add the following FFS:  ***FFS how to ensure that UEs with differing higher layer configurations (e.g. #BWPs) have the same DCI field size expectations.***  **2-7**:  Support  **2-8:**   We support the intent of the proposal, but agree with Xiaomi that proposal 2-6 already confirms that the configurable fields within the second DCI format is configurable. Thus, the motivation to define the overall payload size is not entirely clear.  Also, we are unclear if “payload” size includes the padding bits.  **2-9:**   Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | **Proposal 2-1**: Support  **Proposal 2-2**: Support  **Proposal 2-3**: Support  **Proposal 2-5**: Not support. As clarified, “@Lenovo, “uses the same fields” means the current fields in DCI format 1\_0 scrambled by C-RNTI also be used and present in the first DCI format except the fields listed in the sub-bullet.”, does it mean TPC/PRI/DAI in the DCI format 1-0 will be present in the first DCI format for PTM 1? So far, only one bit identifier is listed as one sub-bullet.  **Proposal 2-6**: Not support. As clarified, “@Lenovo, “uses the same fields” means the current fields in DCI format 1\_0 scrambled by C-RNTI also be used and present in the first DCI format except the fields listed in the sub-bullet.”, does it mean CBGTI/CBGFI/NFI/etc. in the DCI format 1-1 will be present in the second DCI format for PTM 1? So far, only one bit identifier and SRS are listed as one sub-bullet.  **Proposal 2-7**: Support  **Proposal 2-8**: Support  **Proposal 2-9**: Support. |
| Ericsson | P2-2:  We still do not understand the issue with having full flexibility to configure the Multicast DCI search spaces in a unicast coreset. The condition in the proposal do not simplify the problem (some CFR parameters still need to be made aware within the unicast configuration).  Propose to reword the proposal as:  If a CFR is configured in a dedicated unicast BWP for multicast in RRC-CONNECTED state,   * the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP ~~and fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain~~ can be used for multicast transmission ~~only~~ when no CORESET is configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR * the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission. * FFS the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP ~~and fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain~~ can be used for multicast transmission when there is CORESET(s) configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR * ~~Note: A CORESET ID is unique across all BWPs and CFRs for a serving cell.~~   P2-3: Not support.  P2.5: Support. We prefer Option 1.  P2-6: Support  P2-7: Support.  P2-8: the reason for payload size configuration is unclear. In our view, it is simpler and more economical to allocate a DCI size to multicast and align other DCIs.  P2-9: Support. We prefer Alt 1 (G-RNTI) |
| Apple | **Proposal 2-1**: OK  **Proposal 2-2**: OK  **Proposal 2-5/2-6**: the TPC command field needs to be clarified that is only applied to NACK-only based feedback.  **Proposal 2-9**: OK. |
| CATT | Proposal 2-1: support  Proposal 2-2: support  Proposal 2-3: support  Proposal 2-4: We share same view with Nokia and Xiaomi. The fields should be reserved instead of removed, and the reserved bits could be used for other purpose.  Proposal 2-6: support  Proposal 2-7: support  Proposal 2-8: support  Proposal 2-9: OK |
| Samsung | Support: 2-1, 2-5, [2-6], 2-7, 2-8, 2-9  Do not support: 2-2, 2-3.  For 2-2, there is no need for the added red text, or for the FFS, or for any restriction on what the gNB can configure in general. Proposal 2-2 can even be skipped without any agreement and the MBS specifications will be just fine. No need to spend any more time on it – should have been a simple conclusion.  For 2-3, the reasons were previously explained. The proposal has nothing to do with specifying MBS operation and is unnecessary. It is not RAN1’s business, and is a waste of time when so many things need to be resolved, to keep discussing what a name of a CSS set should be, or what a name of a DCI format should be, or …  For 2-6, DCI format 1\_2 should also be included. |
| Qualcomm | ok |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2-1: Support  Proposal 2-2: Not support  Regarding Xiaomi’s reply “there are some conditions for the case wherein the CORESET configured in a BWP can be used for MBS, e.g. the gNB intentionally doesn’t configure the CORESET for the CFR”. The CFR is common for all UEs receiving the MBS in the same group, and the unicast CORESET configuration is UE specific, it is strange that configure the same parameter in the unicast dedicated CORESET for all UEs to receive multicast service.  We still have concern on this issue. The “*pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID*” within legacy unicast CORESET is different from “*pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID\_mbs*” within multicast CORESET. The *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID\_mbs* for multicast is common for all UEs, if one of the group UE use the *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* within unicast to decode multicast PDCCH, it is not desirable. We prefer that it does not need an explicit limitation for whether the CORESET can be shared for unicast and multicast, which can be up to NW configuration implementation.  We also have the same understanding about Samsung’s comment that “Proposal 2-2 can even be skipped without any agreement and the MBS specifications will be just fine.”  Proposal 2-3: Support  Proposal 2-5: We suggest that the unnecessary bits can be removed and add some new fields for other purpose, e.g., “HARQ-ACK enable/disable” field.  Proposal 2-6: The same comment in Proposal 2-5  Proposal 2-7: Support  Proposal 2-8: Not support  We share the similar view with Xiaomi. We think the previous proposal means the field size is configurable instead of payload size is configurable as the similar mechanism of DCI 1\_2.  Proposal 2-9: OK |
| Moderator | **Proposal 2-1/2-5/2-6/2-7 has concluded.**  **Proposal 2-2:**  Considering Samsung and MTK’s comments, and the similar situation as for optionality of CFR, I also think this can even up to implementation. Therefore, I suggest to deprioritize this issue until the signalling design is clear enough, then maybe it is easier for us to converge if companies still think it is necessary to discuss this issue then.  **[Low] Updated Proposal 2-2**:  If a CFR is configured in a dedicated unicast BWP for multicast in RRC-CONNECTED state,   * the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP and fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain can be used for multicast transmission when no CORESET is configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR * the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission. * FFS the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP and fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain can be used for multicast transmission when there is CORESET(s) configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR   **Proposal 2-3:**  The situation is quite clear, maybe it can only be determined in GTW session.  **Question 2-5**:  I added a question relevant to proposal 2-5 to collect views on the down-selection among 3 options.  **Proposal 2-8:**@vivo, Xiaomi, Nokia, my understanding is the following. Although in proposal 2-6, we say that the fields of the second DCI format are configurable. However, it is typical that the size of the second DCI format is smaller than the size of DCI format 1\_1 for unicast if the second DCI format size is only determined based on the configurations of the DCI fields, since the size of CFR is typically smaller than the size the active BWP. Let’s assume there are two UEs in a group, for both UE1 and UE2, the size of the second DCI format is 50bits based on the configurable fields. For UE1, the size of DCI format 1\_1 for unicast is 60bits, and for UE2, the size of DCI format 1\_1 for unicast is 70bits. Then, if without such a configured size for the second DCI format, for UE1, for DCI size alignment, the second DCI format needs to be padded to 60bits, and for UE2, the second DCI format needs be padded to 70 bits. That will not work for multicast.  If the size the second DCI format can be configured, e.g., configured as 70 bits, then for both UE1 and UE2, their DCI format 1\_1 of unicast can be aligned to 70bits for DCI size alignment, and the second DCI format is also be padded to 70 bits on top of the configurable fields. This is for the case that G-RNTI is counted as C-RNTI.  For the case that G-RNTI is counted as other RNTI, the configured size for DCI format 2\_0/2\_1/2\_4/2\_5/2\_6 can be used for second DCI format, that means the size of the second DCI format is also configured by RRC signalling. For both cases, the second DCI format is be padded to the configured size on top of the configurable fields.  **Proposal 2-9:**  @SpreadtrumXiaomi, regarding your comments, in my understanding, for DCI format 1\_1 of unicast, scrambling of the PDCCH and DMRS is configured by *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID*, it is reasonable for DCI format 1\_1 of multicast to use the same scheme to ensure flexibility and performance. Otherwise, MBS UEs in different groups have to use the same Cell-ID for PDCCH scrambling, that will impact the performance. SFN is just another benefit that can be brought by this type of scrambling for multicast. |

## Updated Proposals (after 3rd round of inputs)

**[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

**[High]Question 2-5**: For FDRA determination of the first DCI format for GC-PDCCH, which option should be supported? Why?

* + Option 1:
    -  is given by
      * the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
    - For resource indication value (*RIV*) of downlink resource allocation type 1, the resource blocks that can be indicated are
      * the resource blocks in the CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the resource blocks in the initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
  + Option 2:
    -  is given by
      * the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
    - For resource indication value (*RIV*) of downlink resource allocation type 1, the similar scheme as for the case that the DCI size for DCI format 1\_0 in USS is derived from the size of DCI format 1\_0 in CSS but applied to an active BWP is used.
      * FFS details, e.g., if the size of CFR (i.e. ) is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where K is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 8} which satisfies ;otherwise,
  + Option 3:  is given by the size of CFR in the active DL BWP

**[High] Updated Proposal 2-8**: The size of the second DCI format for multicast can be configured by RRC signalling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs (similar as the configuration of the size of DCI format 2\_0/2\_1/2\_4/2\_5/2\_6).

**[High] Updated Proposal 2-9**: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH with the second DCI format,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in the CORESET in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH; otherwise.
* FFS is given by
  + Alt1: G-RNTI used for the GC-PDCCH.
  + Alt2: 0

## Company Views (4th round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Xiaomi | For question 2-5, we support option 2. The technical reasons have been announced in the previous round of discussion.  For 2-8, we still think it can be configured via the similar mechanism as non-fallback DCI. The most important thing is to configure a common DCI with same information fields which can be directly configured by gNB. We prefer to have further discussion in the next round discussion instead of making an agreement before everything is crystal clear. |
| vivo | Proposal 2-3: fine  Proposal 2-5: option 3 is preferred. In Rel-15, for DCI 1\_0 in CSS, FDRA is determined based on the bandwidth of CORESET0/initial DL BWP. For DCI 1\_1 or DCI 1\_0 in USS, FDRA is determined based on the bandwidth of active DL BWP. The reason to adopt such operation is to avoid the ambiguity on active DL BWP during RRC reconfiguration. But for the first DCI format for GC-PDSCH scheduling, there is no such ambiguity issue, same as that no such ambiguity issue for DCI 1\_1 or DCI 1\_0 in USS. So, there is no need to determine FDRA of the first DCI format based on CORESET0/initial DL BWP, which may result in not enough bits to allocate all PRBs in CFR. For option 3, if the DCI size of the first DCI is larger than that of DCI 1-0 in CSS, truncation of FDRA is performed to align the DCI size. Considering some fields in DCI 1\_0, such as ‘Identifier for DCI formats’ and some other fields may be removed, the FDRA bit-width of the first DCI format after DCI size alignment may be larger than that of DCI 1\_0 in CSS.  Proposal 2-8: fine  Proposal 2-9: fine |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 2-3: OK  2-5: Option 3 is supported. Since we have agreed the first DCI format has same size with DCI format with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI monitored in CSS, it means the payload size of the first DCI format is common and known to the group of UEs without any misunderstanding. So based on CFR, the FDRA field can address any RB in the CFR with the minimum signaling overhead. So we support Option 3.  2-8: OK  2-9: OK |
| Nokia, NSB. | 2-3: Support  2-5: We think option 3 should be supported, since the FDRA field of GC-PDCCH need to be aligned with the CFR. For UEs receiving DCI 1\_0 for both PTM and PTP in CSS, the DCI size can be aligned in a straightforward manner. For legacy UEs / UEs receiving DCI 1\_0 only in PTP – i.e., PTM / GC-PDCCH is not configured, legacy behavior as defined in TS 38.212 could be applied.  2-8: Thank you for the clarifications regarding our previous query. We agree that the overall size of the DCI could be signaled to the UE. However, in our mind, the issue still remains that while the total size of the DCI can be signaled to the UE, unless there is a common understanding between the UEs (for e.g., UE-1 and UE-2 mentioned in moderator’s reply) regarding the size of the configurable fields that are applied for multicast – differently from unicast, the UEs would still have different estimates of the payload bits and padding bits in the DCI. We propose to add the following FFS:  **[High] Updated Proposal 2-8**: The overall size of the second DCI format for multicast can be configured by RRC signalling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs (similar as the configuration of the size of DCI format 2\_0/2\_1/2\_4/2\_5/2\_6).  FFS: How UEs determine the same size for certain configurable DCI fields that can otherwise be different between different UEs.  2-9: Support |
| CATT | Proposal 2-3:support.  Question 2-5: we support option 2. The option 2 can make the size of the first DCI same as the DCI format 1\_0 in CSS, which has the least spec impact on the legacy unicast mechanism.  Proposal 2-8: the configuration of the size of second DCI is similar to the configuration of the size of DCI format 2\_0/2\_1/2\_4/2\_5/2\_6. Does it mean the second DCI will be regarded as ‘Other-RNTI’ when the DCI budget is exceeded? If this is the intension of the proposal, we would like to further study this issue.  Proposal 2-9: support. |
| Spreadtrum | 2-3: Support  2-8: Support  2-9: @Moderator, thanks for your detailed explanation. We are fine. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 2-3: ok  Question 2-5: We are ok with selecting an option as long as it can be similar design for first DCI format used for multicast and broadcast.  Proposal 2-8: ok in general. The “similar to the configuration of the size of DCI format 2\_0/2\_1/2\_4/2\_5/2\_6” may be misleading. It can be deleted or reworded like “similar to the configuration for the size alignment among DCI format 2\_0/2\_1/2\_4/2\_5/2\_6”, which means no specific intention to align the second DCI format size with that of ‘Other-RNTI’.  Proposal 2-9: support  Regarding the concern raised in GWT, I’m confused by the argument that SFN shall not supported in Rel-17. Referring to Rel-17 MBS WID as below, our understanding is SFN is not precluded in Rel-17 but in a non-standard manner. For example, UE does not need to know which TRP is used for SFN. The way to configure n\_ID (virtual cell ID) instead of using physical cell-ID is a typical/straightforward way to support transparent SFN. In addition, it is not specifically for SFN. As mentioned by FL, the configurable n\_ID can improve interference randomization, similar as DCI 1\_x in USS.  “SFN provides synchronized delivery of user plane packets over the air from different cells. No standardized support specifically for SFN, is provided in this WI. Any SFN operation is transparent to the UE, and any related synchronization is left to network implementation.  …  Any design decisions taken for this WI in Release 17 shall not prevent introducing the following features in future Releases:   * Standardised support of SFN over multiple cells above gNB-DU level;” |
| Samsung | Proposals 2-5, 2-8, 2-9: Support.  Proposal 2-3: Not support. There is no need for a RAN1 agreement. |
| ZTE | We support Proposal 2-3, 2-8, 2-9.  For Question 2-5, Option 3 is not workable. DCI format 1\_0 with G-RNTI has to be size aligned with DCI format 1\_0 with CSS, if  is given by the size of CFR in the active DL BWP and if the size of CFR is larger than CORESET#0, the size of DCI format 1\_0 with G-RNTI may be larger than that for DCI format 1\_0 with CSS.  Option1 and Option2 can have the same size as that for legacy DCI. If the CFR has larger size than CORESET#0, Option1 would be too restrictive.  Thus, we support Option2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 2-8,2-9 agree with QC. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 2-3**: Support  **Question 2-5**: We prefer Option 2. In Option 1, RBs which PDSCH can be allocated is too restrictive. In Option 3, it would be difficult to align the size of the first DCI format with DCI format 1\_0 in CSS when the CFR is larger than the CORESET0 or initial DL BWP. For example, if the size of CORESET0 is 48RB, the number of bits in the FDRA field in DCI format 1\_0 in CSS is 11. And if the size of the CFR is 275 RBs, the number of bits in the FDRA field in the first DCI format will be 16. In this case, 5bits have to be removed from the first DCI format. It is very unclear how to adjust the size of the first DCI format in Option 3.  **Proposal 2-8**: Support  **Proposal 2-9**: Support |
| Lenovo 2 | Regarding **Proposal 2-5**, further views on Option 3 are clarified:  The benefit of Option 3 is all the RBs within the CFR can be addressed even if the CFR is configured larger than CORESET 0.  As for the concern that Option 3 will lead to larger size of the first DCI format than DCI format 1-0 with C-RNTI in CSS, as we have agreed, the first DCI format has same size with DCI format with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI monitored in CSS. In any case, size alignment of both DCI should be ensured firstly.  Secondly, we are discussing the fields of the first DCI format, compared with DCI format 1-0 with C-RNTI in CSS, some fields, e.g., Identifier, TPC, PRI, DAI, may not be needed for the first DCI format. Then the reduced bits can be used for indicating FDRA according to CFR in case CRF is larger than CORESET 0. Even in some cases the saved bits can’t accommodate CFR size, some truncated solution like Rel-15 BWP switching case can be used.  Hence, Option 3 is preferred. |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2-3:  Support  Proposal 2-5:  We have concern about the current discussion.  In RAN1#103 e-meeting, the following agreement was achieved. If Option 1 or Option 2 are used for determining the FDRA, from our understanding, it will against the previous agreement.  Agreements**:** For PTM transmission scheme 1, if Option 2A or Option 2B for common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is agreed, the FDRA field of group-common PDCCH is interpreted based on the common frequency resource.  Proposal 2-8:  Regarding the current wording, it is highly relevant to how to count “G-RNTI” for the second DCI, we prefer to further study it. At current stage, we support the “field size” of the second size can be configurable.  Proposal 2-9:  Support. |
| Apple | Proposal 2-5: Option 3 is preferred. It’s aligned with previous meeting agreements. If concerning the DCI size, this discussion could be deferred after the first DCI fields are determined.  Proposal 2-8, Proposal 2-9: ok. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | No comments on the proposal description |
| Moderator | Proposal 2-5b and Proposal 2-9 were agreed with update in the GTW session.  **Proposal 2-8:**  I’m not sure I understand the comments of Ericsson and Samsung in GTW session. The initial proposal 2-8 is for DCI size alignment of the second DCI format of multicast, but it seems hard to down-select from counting G-RNTI as C-RNTI and counting G-RNTI as other RNTI. Some companies suggest to see if companies can first agree the first sub-bullet of the initial proposal 2-8. In my understanding, regardless of whether G-RNTI is counted as C-RNTI or other RNTI, the size of the second DCI format for multicast can be configured by RRC signalling. In last round, I gave an example to explain as follows:  Although we have agreed that the fields of the second DCI format are configurable. However, it is typical that the size of the second DCI format is smaller than the size of DCI format 1\_1 for unicast if the second DCI format size is only determined based on the configurations of the DCI fields, since the size of CFR is typically smaller than the size the active BWP. Let’s assume there are two UEs in a group, for both UE1 and UE2, the size of the second DCI format is 50bits based on the configurable fields. For UE1, the size of DCI format 1\_1 for unicast is 60bits, and for UE2, the size of DCI format 1\_1 for unicast is 70bits. Then, if without such a configured size for the second DCI format, for UE1, for DCI size alignment, the second DCI format needs to be padded to 60bits, and for UE2, the second DCI format needs be padded to 70 bits. That will not work for multicast.  If the size the second DCI format can be configured, e.g., configured as 70 bits, then for both UE1 and UE2, their DCI format 1\_1 of unicast can be aligned to 70bits for DCI size alignment, and the second DCI format is also be padded to 70 bits on top of the configurable fields. This is for the case that G-RNTI is counted as C-RNTI.  For the case that G-RNTI is counted as other RNTI, the configured size for DCI format 2\_0/2\_1/2\_4/2\_5/2\_6 can be used for second DCI format, that means the size of the second DCI format is also configured by RRC signalling. For both cases, the second DCI format is be padded to the configured size on top of the configurable fields. |

## Updated Proposals (after 4th round of inputs)

**[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

**[High] Updated Proposal 2-8**: The size of the second DCI format for multicast can be configured by RRC signalling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs (similar as the configuration for the size alignment among DCI format 2\_0/2\_1/2\_4/2\_5/2\_6).

* It is up to network implementation to ensure different UEs in the same MBS group have the same understanding on the configurable DCI fields of the second DCI format for multicast.

## Company Views (5th round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia, NSB. | 2-3: Support  2-8: From our perspective, we do support the need for configuring the size of the second DCI format due to different size estimates for different UEs, based on the explanation provided by the moderator during the 3rd round of inputs.  However, we do not support the newly added text related to network implementation for ensuring all the UEs within a multicast group having a common understand on the configurable DCI fields. As we mentioned previously, if we consider a scenario where UE-A has number of DL BWPs  configured by higher layers = 3 and UE-B has the same parameter as 1. This would imply that UE-A and UE-B has two different understanding regarding the BWP indicator field (*bitwidth for this field is determined as bits* [TS 38.212]).  If UE-A is part of an ongoing multicast session to which UE-B joins at a later point in time, is the assumption here that the gNB should (re-)configure via RRC UE-B with two additional BWPs, just so that both UEs have the same interpretation of the size of the DCI field ‘Bandwidth part indicator’? or would it be better to configure the size of these variable size fields separately for multicast, as compared to unicast, so that all UEs have the same understanding of the payload bits within the configured overall DCI size? We believe that this issue requires further study and discussion, before selecting a solution regarding gNB implementation. Thus, we would propose to keep this topic FFS as the FL proposed during the GTW session:  **High] Updated Proposal 2-8**: The size of the second DCI format for multicast can be configured by RRC signalling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs (similar as the configuration for the size alignment among DCI format 2\_0/2\_1/2\_4/2\_5/2\_6).   * ~~It is up to network implementation~~ FFS: How to ensure different UEs in the same MBS group have the same understanding on the configurable DCI fields of the second DCI format for multicast. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2-3: Not support.  There is nothing related to the MBS work completion that is affected by 2-3. It is a non-technical proposal.  Proposal 2-8: More discussion needed.  Thanks to the moderator for the example. The confusion is probably due to a different understanding of what a configurable (fields/size) second MBS DCI requires. The agreement is to use fields from DCI 1\_1, not to size match to DCI 1\_1. In the example given by the moderator, the size of the second MBS DCI is 50 bits (based on the fields), and the size of unicast DCI 1\_1 is 60 and 70 bits for first and second UEs, respectively. Then, the NW can indicate 70 bits for the second MBS DCI size and the first UE will size match the unicast DCI 1\_1 to 70 bits. That is not reasonable as no network will have DCI 1\_1 increase in size, potentially by tens of bits and for many UEs, only to support a second MBS DCI. It is also not reasonable for the second MBS DCI to have a size that is the largest of all unicast DCI 1\_1 for the group of UEs as that will either limit coverage or require possibly double the PDCCH overhead (e.g. 2x the CCE aggregation level).  Our thinking is that the NW ensures that a size of the second MBS DCI is matched to either a DCI format 2\_x or to any of the unicast DCIs, including DCI 0\_0/1\_0 on CSS. Fields from DCI 1\_1/1\_2 that don’t exist in DCI 1\_0 can exist in the second MBS DCI but it is the NW’s responsibility to ensure the size matching through the configuration of the field sizes – i.e. no specification impact exists, a UE can expect the “3+1” size budget to apply, and there is no need for the NW to signal anything. The NW can size match to DCI 2\_x, DCI 1\_0 in CSS, or even to DCI 1\_1 in some cases (e.g. all UEs in the group have same size of DCI 1\_1) – that does not need to be specified.  We can continue discussions – our main viewpoints are:   1. It does not make sense, and is not supported by agreements, to size match the second MBS DCI to the largest unicast DCI 1\_1 of UEs in a group (and also size match all other unicast DCI 1\_1 to that largest unicast DCI 1\_1). 2. There is no need for any specification impact regarding the size of the second MBS DCI – it can be a NW implementation issue to ensure the “3+1” budget for each UE. |
| Nokia, NSB. | 2-8: Regarding Samsung’s reply, we agree that more discussion is required regarding this topic.  For the 2 points summarized by Samsung, we have the following queries/thoughts:  (a) Samsung state “(*and also size match all other unicast DCI 1\_1 to that largest unicast DCI 1\_1).*” In our view, there is no reason to match other unicast DCI1\_1 to the largest unicast DCI 1\_1. The key match that needs to be made, is to match the second DCI format to one of the existing DCI1\_1 formats (most likely to be the largest present). Can Samsung clarify why “other unicast DCI\_1\_1 must match the largest unicast DCI 1\_1?  (b) Samsung state “ *it can be a NW implementation issue to ensure the “3+1” budget for each UE”*. In our view, there are 4 DCI sizing aspects to be considered:  (1) The fixed DCI fields  (2) The configurable DCI fields explicitly sized by RRC signaling  (3) The configurable DCI fields implicitly sized by higher layer configuration (e.g. #BWP supported for switching that could be UE specific)  (4) The overall size (including padding) that we need to match to.  If it was not for (3), then we might consider network implementation as being an adequate solution. However, because of our current understanding of (3), we do not yet see an efficient method for the network to align the size of those implicitly sized fields between UEs which would otherwise assume different sizes. Hence why we would appreciate the FFS for companies to think further about this potential issue. |
| Xiaomi | 2-3: support.  2-8: We share the same views as Samsung and think more discussion is needed.  We wouldn’t like to repeat the technical arguments which have been presented very well by Samsung. However, we would like the point out that even the examples from FL may not be reasonable. The assumption that MBS DCI has a payload size of 50 bits is quite questionable as we don’t have a big picture on the contents of the second DCI format. From this point of view, how can we make a conclusion or agreement based on such an example?  Considering the DCI alignment issue, to configure a larger overall payload size for the second DCI format is definitely unexpected as it will significantly jeopardize the performance of group PDCCH. We do agree with Samsung that it is gNB’s responsibility to guarantee the DCI budget is respected, whether the second DCI format is aligned to a DCI format 1-0 in CSS, in USS or even to a DCI format 1-1/1-2 should be left to gNB.  Regarding to Nokia’s question on the 3) DCI sizing, I am not sure I correctly understand the issue. Although the bitwidth of BWP switching indicator is implicitly determined by the number of configured BWP, it is still configured by gNB. From this aspect, it seems gNB can still determines the bitwidth of this kind of information fields. |
| Vivo | 2-3: support.  2-8: Same as Nokia, we prefer to keep this topic FFS as the FL proposed during the GTW session.  We share the view as Nokia. Regarding the 4 DCI sizing aspects. (3) may lead different field sizes for UE with different canfigurations. To keep a common understanding on the DCI field size (1), (2) are also needed. (4) is aimed to do DCI size alignment to meet the size budget.  (1) The fixed DCI fields  (2) The configurable DCI fields explicitly sized by RRC signaling  (3) The configurable DCI fields implicitly sized by higher layer configuration (e.g. #BWP supported for switching that could be UE specific)  (4) The overall size (including padding) that we need to match to. |
| OPPO | 2-3: Support.  2-8: More discussion is needed. Second DCI format includes configurable fields as well as sizes, which make it difficult to make size alignment with existing DCI format. We would like to suggest firstly discussing the exact fields in second DCI format and then discussing how to align the size. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 2-3: Support.  2-8: Regarding DCI size alignment of 2nd DCI format for GC-PDCCH, we have below comments:  Assuming both the first DCI format with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI (size alignment with DCI format 1-0 in CSS) and DCI format 1-1 with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI (reusing DCI format 1-1 as baseline) are monitored by a UE, the typical case is there are 5 DCI formats with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI or G-RNTI:  (1)          DCI format 1-0/0-0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI  (2)          First DCI format with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI  (3)          DCI format 1-1 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI  (4)          Second DCI format with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI  (5)          DCI format 0-1 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI  To keep 3+1 budget, a straightforward way is to align the payload size of (1) and (2), (3) and (4), respectively, so that the total number of different payload sizes with C-RNTI including G-RNTI does not exceed 3. Aligning the size of (1) and (2) is more straightforward and has been agreed. However, aligning the size of (3) and (4) is quite difficult since the size of (3) is UE specific size while size of (4) should be group common size. Hence, as mentioned by Samsung, the maximum of {largest size of DCI format 1-1 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI among the group of UEs, Second DCI format with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI} has to be selected and other non-selected DCIs have to be padded with zeros to align the selected DCI format size. Thus, too much overhead may be caused. Hence, RNTI of 2nd DCI format should be regarded as “other RNTI”.  However, regarding the detailed DCI size alignment, from our side, we think maybe we need to determine the fields in the second DCI format firstly then we discuss how to align the DCI size budget. A good progress in the first DCI format has been made on the detailed DCI fields. Based on that, we can discuss which extra fields are needed for the 2nd DCI format compared with 1st DCI format, and whether the extra fields are configurable or not, as well as whether the extra fields are configured in group-common manner or UE-specific manner. Finally, we may have a whole picture on how to perform size alignment of 2nd DCI format. |
| MediaTek | 2-3: Support  2-8: We also agreed that more discussion is needed. Since the DCI format 1\_1 scrambled by C-RNTI is UE specific, it seems to be difficult to align the second DCI format with the DCI format 1\_1 scrambled by C-RNTI. “Other unicast DCI\_1\_1 must match the largest unicast DCI 1\_1” is not OK for us since it has some impact for the legacy UE. Whether the “C-RNTI” is counted as “other RNTI” as Lenovo mentioned needs more discussion. Considering some companies think more discussion is needed and some companies want keep this topic FFS, we propose the following solution:  **Working assumption**: The size of the second DCI format for multicast can be configured by RRC signalling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs (similar as the configuration for the size alignment among DCI format 2\_0/2\_1/2\_4/2\_5/2\_6).   * ~~It is up to network implementation~~ FFS: How to ensure different UEs in the same MBS group have the same understanding on the configurable DCI fields of the second DCI format for multicast. * FFS: Whether the G-RNTI is counted as “C-RNTI” or as “other RNTI” |
| Nokia, NSB | 2-8: Taking into account the views expressed by different companies here, we would like to support Lenovo’s view regarding the need to study the required fields of the second DCI format before agreeing on the size configuration procedure. However, whether the size budgeting should be done based on “other-RNTI” or “C-RNTI” also requires further study, once the required fields for the second DCI format are agreed. Regarding FL’s question about simultaneous configuration of first and second DCI format on type-x CSS, we think it is unlikely that both DCI formats are configured simultaneously – at least for the same multicast service. We agree that if they are both configured simultaneously on the same PDCCH candidates and have different fields (if that is the outcome of the second DCI field discussion) but same DCI size, the UE would not be able to distinguish between them. |
| ZTE | For Updated Proposal 2-3, we think the proposal is needed. Otherwise, it is not clear how to perform PDCCH overbook. If the existing CSS type is reused, it means different overbooking rules are defined for the same search space, which requires spec changes to support different overbookings rules for different RNTIs in the same type of search space type.  For Updated Proposal 2-8: After hearing all the views above, it seems better to postpone the discussion a little bit until we have a full picture on which fields are needed for the DCI scheduling MBS. |
| Ericsson | P2-3: Not support. We do not see a problem with the existing type that the proposal will resolve. Type 3 search spaces can already be optionally configured with some of the unicast formats. MBS DCIs will just be also optionally configurable in type3. We would like to hear arguments why this is not possible.  P2-8: We support Nokia about making the bullet point an FFS. In general, the proposal is not mature enough to be agreed at this stage. |

## Updated Proposals (after 5th round of inputs)

# Issue #3: Retransmission and HARQ process management

## Background and submitted proposals

***Background***

In RAN1#104&104bis&105 meetings, the following agreements were achieved.

**Retransmission and HARQ process management:**

Agreement (#104):

For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, if ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for PTM scheme 1, and if initial transmission for multicast is based on PTM transmission scheme 1, support retransmission(s) using PTP transmission.

* The HARQ process ID and NDI indicated in DCI is used to associate the PTM scheme 1 and PTP transmitting the same TB.

Agreement (#104b):

The same HARQ process ID and NDI are used for PTM scheme 1 (re)transmissions and PTP retransmissions of the same TB.

Conclusion (#104b):

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.

Agreement (#105):

For HARQ process management, further study whether/how to differentiate the HARQ process ID used for PTP (re)transmission for unicast and PTP retransmission for multicast.

***Submitted Proposals***

**NDI conflicts issue** **for PTM reception when different UEs have different “latest” NDI bit status for the same HPID:**

* *Ericsson*
  + Observation 1: NDI conflicts may occur for PTM reception, when different UEs have different “latest” NDI bit status for the HPID. A new rule, based on new received RNTI overriding the NDI bit toggling for the HPID, can solve the identified issue.
  + Proposal 1: Downselect from the following two options, which both can be used to solve the NDI issue when a switch occurs from unicast transmission to group transmission or from one group transmission to another group transmission.
    - a) When a G-RNTI DCI is received with a given HPID in the DCI, the data shall be considered new, i.e. be treated as if the NDI bit had been toggled, irrespective of actual NDI toggling, if the G-RNTI is different from the most recent earlier received RNTI (i.e. C-RNTI or another G-RNTI) of the same HPID. When the received G-RNTI is the same as the most recent use of the HPID, legacy NDI toggling is used to indicate new data or retransmission.
    - b) Irrespective of earlier used RNTIs for the HPID, NDI bit ‘0’ means new data transmission, NDI bit ‘1’ means retransmission.
* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 7: It is up to gNB to avoid NDI collision between multicast and unicast crossed scheduling with the same HPID.
* *Nokia*
  + Observation-15: NDI toggling between transmissions and retransmissions within the group-common DCI having the same HARQ process ID cannot be applied for multicast.
  + Proposal-17: For multicast, mechanism similar to SPS needs to be utilized where NDI=1 in the group-common DCI indicates new transmission and NDI=0 indicating retransmission.
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 16. If a same HPN is used for different DL grants corresponding to new transmissions of different G-RNTIs, UE will consider the NDI in DCI format with G-RNTI to have been toggled regardless of the value of the NDI.
  + Proposal 17. If a same HPN is used for different DL grants corresponding to unicast new transmission and multicast new transmission, UE will consider the NDI in DCI format with G-RNTI or C-RNTI to have been toggled regardless of the value of the NDI.
* *NTT Dococmo*
  + Observation 5: If a situation that UEs in the UE group before performing an initial PTM transmission have different NDI values is valid, and if the UEs ignore toggling of the NDIs, NDI management does not work as intended.
  + Proposal 13: RAN1 should discuss whether to consider different NDI values in the UE group for a certain HARQ PID before performing an initial PTM transmission.

**Whether/how to differentiate the HARQ process ID used for PTP (Re)Tx for unicast and PTP ReTx for multicast:**

* *Ericsson*
  + Observation 2: When the PDCCH of the PTM initial transmission is missed, a PTP retransmission of PTM may result on data corruption in the HARQ buffer depending on the NDI of the last PTP transmission prior to the PTM initial transmission
  + Observation 3: There are NDI issues with respect to PTM initial transmission followed by PTP retransmission, which may cause performance degradation. There are several different ways to handle this.
  + Proposal 2: RAN1 to study possible ways of ensuring that with PTM initial Tx followed by PTP ReTx, the following functionalities are simultaneously supported:
    - When PTM PDCCH is correctly received, soft-combining of PTM and PTP ReTx is supported, as well as detection of new data on PTP
    - When PTM PDCCH is missed, the data of PTP ReTx is detected as new data
  + Proposal 3: For the possible solutions, downselect from the following options:
    - Keep existing NDI agreement
    - Keep existing NDI agreement and add further enhancements (e.g. using new PTP DCI signaling bit)
    - Change existing NDI agreement and add further enhancements
    - Other solutions not precluded
* *Huawei, HiSilicon*
  + Proposal 3: Support DCI scheduling PTP transmission indicates whether the transmission is for unicast (re)transmission or for multicast retransmission.
    - For UE configured with multiple G-RNTIs, the DCI should further differentiate the PTP transmission is for which G-RNTI retransmission.
* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 8: There is no necessary to introduce any mechanism to differentiate the HPID used for PTP (re)transmission for unicast and PTP retransmission for multicast.
* *ZTE*
  + Proposal 8: Regarding how to differentiate the HARQ process ID used for PTP (re)transmission for unicast and PTP retransmission for multicast,
    - The value of the NDI in the PTP PDCCH for scheduling the retransmission of multicast TB can is toggled relative to the NDI in the UE’s latest PTP PDCCH for scheduling a unicast TB with the same HPID.
* *vivo*
  + Proposal 7: For HARQ process management, there is no need differentiate the HARQ process ID used for PTP (re)transmission for unicast and PTP retransmission for multicast.
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 12: A DCI field or different TB sizes can be applied to differentiate the HARQ process ID used for PTP (re)transmission for unicast and PTP retransmission for multicast.
* *Nokia*
  + Proposal 16: Repurpose existing unused fields such as ‘Identifier for DCI formats’, ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ for both DCI formats 1\_0 and 1\_1, and ‘Carrier indicator’ and ‘Bandwidth part indicator’ for DCI format 1\_1, for indicating PTP retransmission of PTM initial transmission.
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 18. Support using a DCI field in DCI format 1\_0/1\_1 with C-RNTI to differentiate the HPN is used for unicast transmission or for multicast PTP retransmission.
* *Intel*
  + Proposal 9: The HARQ process ID is used to associate PTM Scheme 2 based retransmission with the initial transmission using PTM Scheme 1. The UE does not expect to receive a unicast transmission using the same HARQ process ID as the ongoing MBS transmission.
  + Proposal 10: A UE does not expect PTM Scheme 1 based initial transmission or a PTP based retransmission of a MBS TB using a HARQ process number which is in use for an ongoing unicast transmission.
* *Qualcomm*
  + Proposal 12: For HARQ process management,
    - Support dynamic HPID management for unicast and multicast can be supported without increasing soft buffer size.
      * If the HPID for multicast is configured with NACK-only or no HARQ-ACK feedback, PTP cannot be used for PTM retx. So, PTP with the same HPDI can be used for unicast data transmission only.
      * If the HPID for multicast is configured with ACK/NACK-based feedback, the PTP with the same HPID can be used for PTM retransmission and select Alt1 or Alt2 subject to UE capability.
        + Alt1: PTP with the same HPID cannot be used for unicast data
        + Alt2: PTP with the same HPID can be used for unicast data, one DCI bit is used to differentiate PTP for multicast retransmission and PTP for unicast
* *Samsung*
  + Observation 11: The tradeoff from adding bit(s) to unicast DCI formats vs. using a multicast DCI format for a multicast TB retransmission when a gNB cannot differentiate NACK from DTX is negative.
* *Xiaomi*
  + Observation: There is no issue on differentiating the HARQ process ID used for PTP (re)transmission for unicast and PTP retransmission for multicast.
* *Google*
  + Observation 1: For PTP retransmission, the transmission received by UE-b in Phase-3 is a mistake gNB behavior. The soft-combining mistake can be avoid, if gNB is properly configured.
  + Observation 2: Error case may happen due to insufficient number of HARQ processes and mistake gNB behavior. Since companies have no problem on the maximum number of HARQ process, there is no need to introduce a feature to differentiate MBS and unicast transmission in physical layer.
  + Proposal 1: Increase the maximum number of HARQ processes, if HARQ ID collision between unicast and PTP is a concern to MBS

**Whether to simultaneously support PTP ReTx and PTM-1 ReTx for different UEs in the same group for the same TB:**

* *Huawei, HiSilicon*
  + Proposal 6: It is up to gNB to retransmit the failed TB via PTM scheme 1 or PTP.
    - UE does not need to be configured with PTM scheme 1 or PTP or both for retransmission.
* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 6: When PTM scheme 1 is used as initial transmission, PTM scheme 1 and PTP are not supported to be used simultaneously for the same TB for different UEs in the same multicast group.
* *Spreadtrum*
  + Proposal 2: If initial transmission for multicast is based on PTM transmission scheme 1, not simultaneously support PTM1 and PTP together as the retransmission scheme.
* *vivo*
  + Proposal 6: For the retransmission of group-common PDSCH for MBS service, the retransmission scheme(s) is configured:
    - Only PTM scheme 1 is supported, or
    - Only PTP is supported, or
    - Both PTM scheme 1 and PTP are supported
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 10: PTM scheme 1 retransmission and PTP retransmission cannot be used simultaneously for different UEs in the same MBS group.
* *FUTUREWEI*
  + Proposal 6: Different retransmission schemes (e.g., PTM scheme 1 and PTP) can be used simultaneously for different UEs in the same group.
    - The same HARQ process ID and NDI bit (not toggled) are used to signal transmission of the same TB.
    - The soft combining of the same TB from the PTM scheme 1 and PTP retransmissions is left up to UE implementation.
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 14. PTM scheme 1 retransmission and PTP retransmission can be used simultaneously for different UEs in the same MBS group.
  + Proposal 15. PTM scheme 1 retransmission and PTP retransmission are simultaneously for different UEs in the same MBS group, the PUCCH used for retransmission HARQ-ACK is determined by UE-specific PDCCH which for PTP retransmission.
* *Qualcomm*
  + Proposal 11: Retransmission schemes based on PTP and PTM-1 can be supported for different UEs in the same group.
* *LGE*
  + Proposal 10: Upon receiving PTP retransmission of a TB with a HPN, UE expects PTP retransmission of the TB after sending NACK to the TB.
    - It is up to UE whether to additionally receive retransmission of the same TB on group common PDSCH with the same HPN and non-toggled NDI.
* *Lenovo*
  + Proposal 4: A UE receiving multicast does not expect to receive both PTM scheme 1 based retransmission and PTP based retransmission at a same time for a same TB.
* *NTT Dococmo*
  + Observation 6: If simultaneous retransmissions of PTM scheme 1 and PTP are performed, a UE which receives retransmission using PTP might also receive retransmission using PTM scheme 1 in the same slot or in an adjacent slot before HARQ feedback for the retransmission by PTM scheme 1.
  + Observation 7: If simultaneous transmissions of retransmission using PTM scheme 1 and retransmission using PTP are supported, there are several issues that need to be considered.
* *Xiaomi*
  + Proposal 12: Do not support PTM scheme 1 based retransmission and PTP scheme based retransmission simultaneously for dynamic MBS transmission in the same MBS group.
* *Ericsson*
  + Observation 4: In the current specification, the UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH associated with the same HARQ process before it has decoded that process and responded with HARQ-ACK if configured to do so.
  + Proposal 4: Based on UE capability, a UE in a G-RNTI-based scheduling group may receive both PTM and PTP with same HARQ process, within the same HARQ-ACK feedback bundling window determined via dlDataToUL-ACK.
  + Observation 5: The existing type-1 or semi-static HARQ codebook construction supports HARQ feedback for different PDSCHs, so no additional specification work is required for the HARQ reporting in the case of combined PTM/PTP reception of the same TB.
  + Proposal 5: Within the same HARQ feedback cycle, a UE may assume that two PDSCH transmitted with the same HARQ process ID corresponds to the same transport block, irrespective of NDI or RNTI used, for the purpose of combining.

**Whether UE is expected to receive a new TB#2 transmitted by PTM-1 for a given HPN before the end of the expected transmission of HARQ-ACK of the previous TB#1, which is initially transmitted by PTM-1, for that HPN:**

* *Huawei, HiSilicon*
  + Proposal 4: For multicast services, when UE is scheduled to receive a PTM1 initial transmission and a PTP retransmission with the same HPN at the same time, UE should receive the PTP retransmission.
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 11: For a given HARQ process number, a UE is not expected to receive a new TB with the same HARQ process number before the completion of the transmission of a previous TB.
* *Qualcomm*
  + Proposal 12: For HARQ process management,
    - Not support OOO between PTM-1 and PTP for a given HPID
* *LGE*
  + Proposal 11: After transmitting PTP retransmission with a HPN, it is up to gNB whether group common DCI with the same HPN and a toggled NDI can be transmitted to schedule new TX of group common PDSCH.
    - If new TX has a lower priority than the PTP retransmission, a UE does not receive new TX of group common PDSCH before successfully sending ACK to PTP retransmission.
    - If new TX has a higher priority than the PTP retransmission, a UE receives new TX of group common PDSCH even before successfully sending ACK to PTP retransmission.
    - Otherwise (e.g. if new TX has an equal priority with the PTP retransmission), a UE does not receive new TX of group common PDSCH before successfully sending ACK to PTP retransmission.
  + Proposal 12: After transmitting unicast transmission with a HPN, it is up to gNB whether group common DCI with the same HPN and a toggled NDI can be transmitted to schedule new TX of group common PDSCH.
    - If new TX has a lower priority than the unicast transmission, a UE does not receive new TX of group common PDSCH before successfully sending ACK to unicast transmission.
    - If new TX has a higher priority than the unicast transmission, a UE receives new TX of group common PDSCH even before successfully sending ACK to unicast transmission.
    - Otherwise, a UE does not receive new TX of group common PDSCH before successfully sending ACK to unicast transmission.
  + Proposal 13: After transmitting group common PDCCH/PDSCH with a HPN, it is up to gNB whether UE specific DCI with the same HPN and a toggled NDI can be transmitted to schedule new TX of unicast PDSCH.
    - If new TX has a lower priority than the group common transmission, a UE does not receive new TX of unicast PDSCH before successfully sending ACK to the group common PDSCH.
    - If new TX has a higher priority than the group common transmission, a UE receives new TX of unicast PDSCH even before successfully sending ACK to the group common PDSCH.
    - Otherwise, a UE receives new TX of unicast PDSCH even before successfully sending ACK to the group common PDSCH.
* *Lenovo*
  + Proposal 5: For a given HARQ process number, a UE is not expected to receive a new TB with the same HARQ process number before the completion of the transmission of a previous TB.

**PTM scheme 2:**

* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 5: PTM scheme 2 is NOT supported as a (re)transmission scheme for NR MBS.
* *Spreadtrum*
  + Proposal 1: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs for NR MBS, not support PTM2 transmission scheme.
* *vivo*
  + Proposal 5: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support PTM transmission scheme 2 for multicast.
* *Nokia*
  + Observation-9: Having a UE-specific PDCCH that can schedule UEs to use a group-common PDSCH is desirable for the following reasons:
    - In scenarios where there is a low density of users receiving multicast traffic with high data rates and requiring uplink feedback, gNB will have the flexibility to choose the appropriate control channel signaling mechanism
    - Enables the support of seamless mobility and switching from multicast to unicast
    - Enables simultaneous BWP switching and scheduling of MBS PDSCH resources using the same DCI
    - For SPS, it ensures the reliable reception of the SPS activation, deactivation and modification messages.
  + Observation-10: In order to support both signaling options to access the same group-common PDSCH, new signaling mechanisms will be required to allow the network to configure and modify on a dynamic basis the use of either PTM schemes 1 or 2.
  + Proposal-9: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support UE-specific PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a C-RNTI for dynamic scheduling and CS-RNTI for SPS, to schedule a group-common PDSCH, where the scrambling of the group-common PDSCH is based on a common RNTI.
  + Proposal-10: The same group-common PDSCH for PTM transmission can be simultaneously accessed by:
    - A set of UEs using the same group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI, or
    - A set of UEs, where each UE uses a UE-specific PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a C-RNTI or CS-RNTI
  + Proposal-11: The network can dynamically modify the signaling using Alt 1 / group-common or Alt 2 / UE-specific PDCCH to configure a UE to access a group-common PDSCH.
* *Intel*
  + Proposal 7: PTM Scheme 2 should be supported when ACK/NACK based HARQ feedback is configured or enabled for the UEs within a group.
  + Proposal 8: Only one among PTP or PTM Scheme 2 can be supported for UE specific retransmission when the initial transmission was based on PTM Scheme 1. The support of PTP or PTM Scheme 2 can be configured by UE-specific RRC signaling. Different UEs in a group can potentially support different retransmission schemes but not both simultaneously.
  + Proposal 9: The HARQ process ID is used to associate PTM Scheme 2 based retransmission with the initial transmission using PTM Scheme 1. The UE does not expect to receive a unicast transmission using the same HARQ process ID as the ongoing MBS transmission.
* *Convida*
  + Proposal 1: PTP transmission and PTM transmission scheme 2 should be supported for initial transmission for MBS.
  + Proposal 2: PTM transmission scheme 2 should be supported for retransmission for MBS.
  + Proposal 3: 1-bit field is introduced in the DCI format for the UE to distinguish between the UE-specific PDCCH scheduling the MBS PDSCH and scheduling the unicast PDSCH.
* *NTT Dococmo*
  + Proposal 14: Not support PTM scheme 2 as retransmission scheme for PTM scheme 1.
* *Xiaomi*
  + Proposal 11: Do not support PTM transmission scheme 2.
* *ASUSTeK*
  + Proposal 5: PTM transmission scheme 2 for initial transmissions and retransmissions is supported for multicast.
* *Ericsson*
  + Observation 6: PTM-1 is more efficient than PTM-2 for initial transmission and retransmissions of group-common PDSCH
  + Observation 7: PTP is more efficient than PTM-2 for retransmission to individual UEs
  + Proposal 6: PTM-2 based initial transmission is not supported.
  + Proposal 7: PTM-2 based retransmission is not supported.

## Initial Proposals based on contributions

***Summary***

Several companies raise a similar issue that NDI conflict may occur for PTM reception, when different UEs have different “latest” NDI bit status for the HPID. As explained in [30], before receiving the G-RNTI DCI, two different UEs may have each received a TB using the same HPID, which for UE1 resulted in NDI bit status ‘0’ whereas for UE2 in NDI bit status ‘1’. When the gNB uses the same HPID for a new TB, with a G-RNTI that both UEs belong to, it is then logically impossible to toggle the NDI in a way that would satisfy the toggling rule for both UEs. This issue is not limited to previous reception via C-RNTI. The same conflict may arise when the earlier RNTIs are different G-RNTIs or G-RNTI and C-RNTI combinations. In my understanding, this issue may happen unless the HARQ processes are semi-statically split among unicast and different multicast services, which means a HPID can only be exclusively used by C-RNTI or one of the multiple G-RNTIs. It has been agreed in RAN1#104 meeting that how to allocate HARQ processes between unicast and multicast is up to gNB. If gNB dynamically allocates HARQ processes among unicast and different multicast services, this issue may happen. Therefore, moderator suggests RAN1 first to decide whether to solve this issue based on specification enhancement or just rely on gNB implementation to avoid such issue [Question 3-1a]. If we decide to solve this issue based on specification enhancement, then two options can be considered as follows [Question 3-1b]:

* Option 1: When a G-RNTI DCI is received with a given HPID in the DCI, the data shall be considered new, i.e. be treated as if the NDI bit had been toggled, irrespective of actual NDI toggling, if the G-RNTI is different from the most recent earlier received RNTI (i.e. C-RNTI or another G-RNTI) of the same HPID. When the received G-RNTI is the same as the most recent use of the HPID, legacy NDI toggling is used to indicate new data or retransmission.
* Option 2: Irrespective of earlier used RNTIs for the HPID, NDI bit ‘0’ means new data transmission, NDI bit ‘1’ means retransmission.

Regarding the FFS in last meeting that whether/how to differentiate the HARQ process ID used for PTP (re)transmission for unicast and PTP retransmission for multicast, it depends on the discussion result of question 3-1a and 3-1b. Companies’ views diverge based on submitted contributions. Some companies [OPPO, vivo, Samsung, Xiaomi] think there is no need to differentiate the HARQ process ID used for PTP (re)transmission for unicast and PTP retransmission for multicast. Some companies [Ericsson, Huawei, CATT, Nokia?, CMCC] are fine to introduce a DCI bit to differentiate PTP (re)transmission for unicast and PTP retransmission for multicast. 2 companies [ZTE, Ericsson] propose to change the existing agreement in a way so that the NDI of PTP ReTx is then not set to be the same as for PTM to indicate re-transmission, but to a value which is always different (i.e. toggled) from the latest earlier (PTP) use of the current HPID. 1 company [Google] propose to change existing agreement to increase the maximum number of HARQ processes. Moderator suggest to discuss this issue after we have decisions on Question 3-1a and 3-1b. If the decision on Question 3-1a is option 1 (i.e., rely on gNB implementation to avoid such issue), then we do not need to discussion this FFS. If the decision on Question 3-1a is option 2 (i.e., Resolve this issue with potential specification enhancement), then based on whether option 1 or option 2 is adopted for Question 3-1b we can further discuss how to differentiate the HARQ process ID used for PTP (re)transmission for unicast and PTP retransmission for multicast.

Regarding whether PTM-1 retransmission and PTP retransmission can be used simultaneously for different UEs in the same MBS group, it seems 6 companies [OPPO, Spreadtrum, CATT, Lenovo, NTT Docomo, Xiaomi] do not support this, 4 companies [Futurewei, CMCC, Qualcomm, Ericsson] propose to support this, 1 company [Huawei] thinks it is up to gNB to retransmit the failed TB via PTM scheme 1 or PTP, and UE does not need to be configured with PTM scheme 1 or PTP or both for retransmission. 1 company [LGE] proposes that upon receiving PTP retransmission of a TB with a HPID, UE expects PTP retransmission of the TB after sending NACK to the TB, and it is up to UE whether to additionally receive retransmission of the same TB on group common PDSCH with the same HPN and non-toggled NDI. Considering the situation does not change much compared to last meeting, moderator suggests to postpone the discussion in this meeting.

Regarding whether UE is expected to receive a new TB#2 transmitted by PTM-1 for a given HPN before the end of the expected transmission of HARQ-ACK of the previous TB#1, which is initially transmitted by PTM-1, for that HPN, 3 companies [CATT, Qualcomm, Lenovo] do not support this, 2 companies [Huawei, LGE] propose to specify some rules to support this. Considering the situation, moderator suggests to postpone the discussion in this meeting.

Regarding PTM scheme 2, 5 companies propose to support PTM-2 for initial transmission or retransmission, while 5 companies propose to not support it. It seems the situation does not change much compared with the last meeting. Moderator proposes to postpone the discussion.

***Initial Proposals***

The following moderator recommendations are made.

[Moderator’s recommendation]

**[High] Question 3-1a**: Regarding the NDI conflict issue that different UEs in a group may have different NDI values for a certain HPID before performing an initial PTM transmission, which option should be adopted?

* Option 1: Rely on gNB implementation to avoid such issue.
* Option 2: Resolve this issue with potential specification enhancement.

**[High] Question 3-1b**: If the answer is Option 2 for question 3-1a, which option do you prefer for the specification enhancement?

* Option 1: When a G-RNTI DCI is received with a given HPID in the DCI, the data shall be considered new, i.e. be treated as if the NDI bit had been toggled, irrespective of actual NDI toggling, if the G-RNTI is different from the most recent earlier received RNTI (i.e. C-RNTI or another G-RNTI) of the same HPID. When the received G-RNTI is the same as the most recent use of the HPID, legacy NDI toggling is used to indicate new data or retransmission.
* Option 2: Irrespective of earlier used RNTIs for the HPID, NDI bit ‘0’ means new data transmission, NDI bit ‘1’ means retransmission.

## Company Views (1st round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | **Question 3-1a:** Option 1 is supported that such kind of issue will not happen based on gNB’s implementation. The mentioned issue is clear to us, and it is said that such issue may be happened according to gNB’s cross scheduling on the HPID/NDI among the group of UEs between multicast and unicast. Meanwhile, gNB has the whole picture of the HPID/NDI allocation for all the UEs, gNB can also make smart decision to avoid it. Furthermore, occupying 16 HARQ processing simultaneously by all the UEs in the same group seems like quite a rarely case, because it challenges the UE’s buffer capability.  **Question 3-1b:** NO necessary for this question. |
| Xiaomi | Question 3-1a: option 1. gNB has full power to decide which HPN is allocated for MBS and unicast respectively. A proper scheduling mechanism should avoid the NDI collision. As mentioned by several companies, the issue is actually out of order which is already precluded in the previous meetings. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 3-1a: Option 1 should be agreed firstly as baseline. Whether other solutions are needed can be FFS.  3-1b: can be deferred due to dependent on outcome of 3-1a. |
| ZTE | Question 3-1a: Purely relying on network implementation may cause low HARQ process utilization efficiency. We would prefer to specify something to increase the HARQ process utilization efficiency, i.e., Option 2.  Question 3-1b: Another way to handle this issue is to toggle the NDI relative to the latest PDCCH with the same RNTI and HARQ process ID. In such case, the NDI toggle is performed independently between different RNTIs and HARQ process ID. While with the same RNTI and same HARQ process ID, the legacy toggling mechanism is reused.  Thus, we propose to add the following option for question 3-1b.  Option3: The NDI is toggled relative to the latest PDCCH with the same RNTI and HARQ process ID. With the same RNTI and same HARQ process ID, the legacy toggling mechanism is reused |
| CMCC | 3-1a: Option 2.  Considering the number of UEs in one MBS group may be huge, and the HPN/NDI of UEs’ unicast services are various among them, it may not possible for gNB to find a proper HPN for MBS service, therefore, we think some spec enhancement is needed.  3-1b: Option 1 is preferred.  One concern about Option 2, in Type-1 HARQ codebook, if UE miss detects the initial transmission DL grant DCI, UE will send a NACK, but gNB doesn’t know whether UE doesn’t decode PDSCH correctly or miss the DCI. If gNB thinks UE doesn’t decode PDSCH correctly, gNB will resend the DCI with NDI equals to 1, but this will cause UE’s ambiguity in soft buffer combination. |
| Spreadtrum | Question 3-1a: Support option 1. |
| Samsung | 3-1a: Option 1.  The suggested issue does not exist in practice as there is no issue with shortage of HARQ processes. The capability for PDSCH receptions within a time period is basically same as in R16. There is also no reason, and it is highly undesirable for UE implementation, to support out-of-order operation for MBS. |
| vivo | Question 3-1a: option 2. We think how to judge NDI toggle or not should be discussed. The logic is similar as that for C-RNTI and CS-RNTI in the current specification. For example, when a UE detects a PDCCH, UE judge whether NDI is toggled or not as:  if the downlink assignment is for the MAC entity's C-RNTI, and if the previous downlink assignment indicated to the HARQ entity of the same HARQ process was either a downlink assignment received for the MAC entity's CS-RNTI or a configured downlink assignment:  3> consider the NDI to have been toggled regardless of the value of the NDI.  Question 3-1b: we share similar with ZT. For DCI with g-RNTI, the NDI toggle is relative the NDI in the DCI with the same g-RNTI and HPID. Option 3a is modified form option 3.  Option3a: The NDI is toggled relative to the latest PDCCH with the same **g-**RNTI and HARQ process ID. With the same g-RNTI and same HARQ process ID, the legacy toggling mechanism is reused |
| Apple | Q3-1a: Option 1 is preferred; the issue can be avoided by gNB scheduling. |
| MediaTek | 3-1a: Support Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Question 3-1a: Option 2.  We have agreed not to increase the HARQ processes for multicast. The limited HARQ process number has to be shared by unicast and multicast. We shared the views with CMCC/ZTE that the NDI alignment is impossible for gNB scheduling. If we make it mandatory, it will increase the unnecessary delay to multicast and/or unicast transmission considering the UEs in multicast group have various unicast traffic.  Question 3-2b: Option 1.  The Option 2 and newly proposed Option 3a by ZTE/vivo are against the previous RAN1 agreement per our understanding:  Agreement:  The same HARQ process ID and NDI are used for PTM scheme 1 (re)transmissions and PTP retransmissions of the same TB. |
| Nokia, NSB | 3-1a: We prefer option 2 since it does not impose limitations on gNB implementation in terms of which HPID could be used for a G-RNTI DCI.  3-1b: We prefer option 2 here, since it is the simplest option. |
| Futurewei | 3-1a: Support Option 1. |
| CATT | **Question 3-1a:** Option2.  When the number of UEs in the multicast is huge, the HPID may be totally used by the UEs among them. Thus, potential specification enhancement or limitation for gNB scheduling is required. |
| Ericsson | Q3-1a: We strongly prefer Option 2. With Option 1, HARQ processes would need to be semi-statically allocated down to each RNTI, which is not acceptable for flexibility and efficiency reasons.  Q3-1b: We strongly prefer Option 1 since this would completely solve the identified issue. Option 2 would however only solve the issue when the UE actually receives the Initial PTM PDCCH, but if it misses this PTM PDCCH, it may wrongly believe a received PTM ReTx of the missed PTM PDCCH is instead a ReTx of an earlier received PTM using the same HPID and would then wrongly discard the retransmission or soft-combine it with the HARQ buffer. This may cause a lost TB every time the UE misses the initial PTM PDCCH (p<1e-3). |
| Convida | 3-1a: Support option 2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Question 3-1a**: We prefer Option1. For example, if gNB semi-statically splits HARQ PIDs between unicast and multicast, different HARQ PIDs will be used for unicast and multicast transmissions. Therefore, there will be no NDI conflict issue. If gNB allocates HARQ PIDs dynamically between unicast and multicast, gNB should ensure that the NDI values of all UEs in the group are the same before performing PTM transmission,  **Question 3-1b**: For both options, the impact of DCI miss-detection must be carefully considered.   * In Option 1, for example, in the following case   PTM1(NDI=1) -> unicast(NDI=0) -> PTM1(NDI=1)  If a UE missed the unicast transmission, the UE might misinterpret the second PTM1 as the retransmission of the first PTM1.   * In Option 2, for example, in the following case   PTM1(NDI=0) -> PTM1(NDI=0) -> PTM1(retx)(NDI=1)  If a UE missed the second PTM1 transmission, the UE might misinterpret the third PTM1 as the retransmission of the first PTM1. |
| Intel | **Question 3-1a:** Option 1 should be supported. As long as gNB ensures that the HPN released only after a unicast/multicast transmission is complete, there should not be any issues. Specification impact, if any, should simply be to specify UE behavior i.e., *“UE does not expect PTM Scheme 1 based initial transmission or a PTP based retransmission of an MBS TB using a HARQ process number which is in use for an ongoing unicast transmission”* |
| LG | P3-1a: Support Option 2  P3-1b: This discussion can be deferred. Note that Option 2 may not work well, if UE misses NDI=0 and then receives N=1 for same G-RNTI. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Question 3-1a:**  From perspective of putting less restriction on gNB, option 2 is preferred due to less restriction .  **Question 3-1b**  DCI indicating the PTP transmission is used for unicast or multicast should also be included in the options.  Thus we propose to add the following option for question 3-1b  Option3: DCI indicates a PTP transmission is for unicast or multicast. In this way, there is no need to enhance the NDI mechanism. |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | **[High] Question 3-1a**: option 2. But we think option 2 needs further detailed description. For example, the NDI fields are compared between the two adjacent DCI formats addressed to the same G-RNTI.  **[High] Question 3-1b**: We agree with Huawei’s view. |
| Moderator | **Question 3-1a:**  Based on the comments, 10 companies prefer option 1 and 10 companies prefer option 2. Although I share the same view that there will be great scheduling restriction for option 1, but considering the situation, I suggest to postpone the discussion in this meeting.  **Question 3-1b:**  This discussion is also postponed. |

# Issue #4: SPS for MBS

## Background and submitted proposals

***Background***

In RAN1#104&104bis&105 meetings, the following agreements were achieved.

**SPS configuration:**

Agreement (#104):

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 (#104b):

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 (#104b):

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 (#104b):

Send an LS to RAN2 regarding at least the following questions:

* Whether RAN1 should take into account the case of UE supporting multiple G-RNTIs?

Agreement (#104b):

Include the following in the LS to RAN2:

* Whether RAN1 should consider the case of UE supporting multiple G-CS-RNTIs?
* The agreements related to SPS will also be included in the LS for information

**R1-2104045 LS on G-RNTI and G-CS-RNTI for MBS RAN1, CMCC**

**Decision:** As per email decision posted on April 22nd, the LS is approved.

**Reliability of SPS GC-PDSCH:**

Agreement (#104):

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 (#104b):

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 (#105):

For PTP retransmission of SPS group-common PDSCH, CS-RNTI is used for CRC scrambling of PDCCH with the NDI bit set to 1.

**Activation/deactivation of SPS GC-PDSCH:**

Working assumption: (#104)

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

Agreement (#104b):

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

Agreement (#105):

For reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, support at least one of the following alternatives.

* Alt 1: retransmit the activation command via group-common PDCCH.
* Alt 2: retransmit the activation command via UE-specific PDCCH.
* Alt 3: retransmit the activation command via MAC-CE.
* FFS other details.
* Note: Down-selection can take into account the HARQ-ACK feedback scheme for SPS activation

***Submitted Proposals***

**SPS configuration:**

* *vivo*
  + Proposal 8: For an SPS PDSCH configuration, it is indicated as a group-common SPS by RRC configuration.
  + Proposal 9: When a UE is configured with multiple SPS group-common PDSCHs, it should be supported to configure group-common RNTI for each SPS group-common PDSCH.
* *Nokia*
  + Observation-11: Configuration of uplink HARQ feedback for SPS-based MBS can be inherited from SPS for unicast in combination with uplink feedback for non-SPS-based MBS.
* *FUTUREWEI*
  + Proposal 10: Support of more than one SPS group-common PDSCH configuration.
* *Qualcomm*
  + Proposal 13: Support one or more activated SPS GC-PDSCH configurations per CFR subject to UE capability.
* *Ericsson*
  + Proposal 19: G-CS-RNTI is configured per SPS configuration. If not configured, the UE assumes CS-RNTI is used for PDSCH.
  + Proposal 20: CS-RNTI and G-CS-RNTI can be configured for the same SPS configuration.
  + Proposal 21: The number of supported G-CS-RNTI per UE up to UE capability. The maximum number of G-CS-RNTI can be aligned with the number of G-RNTI per UEs.

**Activation/deactivation of SPS GC-PDSCH:**

* *Huawei, HiSilicon*
  + Proposal 7: Support Alt 3: Retransmit the activation command via MAC-CE for reliability of multicast SPS.
* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 9: UE-specific PDCCH for activation/deactivation of SPS group-common PDSCH is not considered in Rel-17 MBS.
  + Proposal 10: Retransmission of activation command via GC-PDCCH can be considered when ACK/NACK-based feedback scheme is enabled for multicast SPS.
* *Spreadtrum*
  + Proposal 8: Regarding the reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, at least one of Alt.1 and Alt.2 could be supported.
* *ZTE*
  + Proposal 9: UE-specific PDCCH is not needed for activation/deactivation of an SPS GC-PDSCH given that group-common PDSCH has already been supported.
  + Proposal 10: NR MBS supports to retransmit the activation command via GC-PDCCH.
* *vivo*
  + Proposal 10: For activation/deactivation of SPS group-common PDSCH for MBS in RRC\_CONNECTED state, UE-specific PDCCH is supported
  + Proposal 11: For reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, support Alt 1and Alt 2.
    - Alt 1: retransmit the activation command via group-common PDCCH.
    - Alt 2: retransmit the activation command via UE-specific PDCCH.
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 14: UE-specific PDCCH can be also used for SPS activation for MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.
  + Proposal 15: UE-specific PDCCH cannot be used for SPS deactivation for MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.
  + Proposal 16: Both Alt 1 and Alt 2 can be supported for reliability of the group-common PDCCH retransmitted activation of SPS group-common PDSCH.
* *Nokia*
  + Proposal-7: For reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, support Alt 1 whereby missed SPS activation/deactivation could be handled using blind repetition of the SPS group-common PDCCH activation / deactivation messages – in case HARQ NACK-only feedback is utilized, and both Alt 1 and Alt 2 using UE-specific or group-common PDCCH for SPS group-common PDSCH – if HARQ ACK/NACK feedback option is used.
  + Observation-8: If the UE-specific PDCCH is used for SPS group-common PDSCH, there needs to be an association between the CS-RNTI and group-common G-CS-RNTI using higher layer signaling.
  + Proposal-8: RAN2 to consider how to associate CS-RNTI and group-common G-CS-RNTI using higher layer signaling when UE-specific PDCCH is used for SPS group-common PDSCH.
  + Observation-9: Having a UE-specific PDCCH that can schedule UEs to use a group-common PDSCH is desirable for the following reasons:
    - In scenarios where there is a low density of users receiving multicast traffic with high data rates and requiring uplink feedback, gNB will have the flexibility to choose the appropriate control channel signaling mechanism
    - Enables the support of seamless mobility and switching from multicast to unicast
    - Enables simultaneous BWP switching and scheduling of MBS PDSCH resources using the same DCI
    - For SPS, it ensures the reliable reception of the SPS activation, deactivation and modification messages.
  + Observation-10: In order to support both signaling options to access the same group-common PDSCH, new signaling mechanisms will be required to allow the network to configure and modify on a dynamic basis the use of either PTM schemes 1 or 2.
  + Proposal-9: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support UE-specific PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a C-RNTI for dynamic scheduling and CS-RNTI for SPS, to schedule a group-common PDSCH, where the scrambling of the group-common PDSCH is based on a common RNTI.
  + Proposal-10: The same group-common PDSCH for PTM transmission can be simultaneously accessed by:
    - A set of UEs using the same group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI, or
    - A set of UEs, where each UE uses a UE-specific PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a C-RNTI or CS-RNTI
  + Proposal-11: The network can dynamically modify the signaling using Alt 1 / group-common or Alt 2 / UE-specific PDCCH to configure a UE to access a group-common PDSCH.
* *MediaTek*
  + Proposal 18: UE-specific PDCCH with G-CS-RNTI is optional supported for activation of MBS group common PDSCH.
  + Proposal 19: MBS SPS activation/deactivation’s feedback mechanism only support ACK/NACK based HARQ feedback mode.
* *FUTUREWEI*
  + Proposal 8: At least UE-specific PDCCH is supported for deactivation of SPS group-common PDSCH.
  + Proposal 9: Re-sending of the activation command via group-common PDCCH (Alt1) and UE-specific PDCCH (Alt 2) should be supported.
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 19. For reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, support at least one of the following alternatives, support Alt 2: retransmit the activation command via UE-specific PDCCH.
* *Intel*
  + Proposal 21: For DL SPS configuration for NR MBS
    - Group common PDCCH is used for SPS activation with HARQ ID field set to all 0’s and RV field set to 00 for the TB being scheduled
    - PUCCH resource for HARQ feedback may be configured via RMSI, OSI or RRC
    - For SPS release, similar group common PDCCH can be used with HARQ ID set to all 0s, MCS and FDRA set all 1’s and RV set 0. For SPS release DCI, UE can be configured with PUCCH resource via RRC
    - The PUCCH resources for HARQ feedback for SPS PDSCH as well as the SPS release DCI can be UE-specific for ACK/NACK based feedback or a common PUCCH resource can be configured for the case when NACK-only feedback is configured.
* *Samsung*
  + Observation 14: For SPS GC-PDSCH activation/deactivation, the agreement from RAN1#104-bis-e to support GC-PDCCH is sufficient.
* *Qualcomm*
  + Proposal 14: For SPS GC-PDSCH activation/release,
    - Support UE-specific PDCCH in addition to GC-PDCCH.
    - Support separate activation of SPS GC-PDSCH by using GC-PDCCH or UE-specific PDCCH.
    - Support joint and separate release of SPS GC-PDSCH by using GC-PDCCH or UE-specific PDCCH.
* *LGE*
  + Proposal 14: For group common SPS, UE specific confirmation to group common SPS (de-)activation can be supported by PUCCH A/N.
    - UE specific PUCCH resource is allocated by DCI indicating SPS (de-)activation.
  + Proposal 15: For group common SPS activation/deactivation to multiple UEs in a group, (de)activation DCI can be repeated on multiple CORESETs with same TCI state or different TCI states.
  + Proposal 16: For a UE not confirming SPS activation, gNB can schedule PTP initial transmission of missed TB(s).
  + Proposal 17: After group common SPS activation, all UEs autonomously release the group common SPS right after a pre-determined slot
    - The pre-determined time is determined by RRC and/or DCI.
* *Chengdu TD Tech*
  + Proposal 6：The repetitions of the SPS group common PDCCH for the activation/deactivation of the SPS group common PDSCH is supported.
  + Proposal 7: The PUCCH resource for the HARQ-ACK feedback of the SPS group common PDSCH is used by UE to indicate whether or not the PDCCH is decoded correctly.
* *Convida*
  + Proposal 5: UE-specific PDCCH should be supported for activation/deactivation DCI for MBS SPS.
  + Proposal 6: PTM transmission scheme 2 should be considered for the MBS SPS PDSCH retransmission.
  + Proposal 7: Retransmitting the activation command via both group-common PDCCH and UE-specific PDCCH should be supported, i.e., both Alt.1 and Alt.2 should be supported.
* *Lenovo*
  + Proposal 16: For group-common SPS configuration, a UE-specific PUCCH resource is configured for each UE to transmit ACK upon reception of activation/deactivation DCI.
  + Proposal 17: For group-common SPS configuration, the UE-specific PUCCH resource for confirming reception of activation/deactivation DCI is used for the UE to transmit ACK for the SPS PDSCH.
  + Proposal 18: For group-common SPS configuration activated by group-common PDCCH, gNB can retransmit the group-common PDCCH if no ACK is detected from one UE.
* *NTT Dococmo*
  + Proposal 15: Use ACK/NACK based feedback for HARQ-ACK feedback for activation/deactivation of SPS group-common PDSCH regardless of feedback configuration/indication for SPS group-common PDSCH.
  + Observation 8: If a UE stops receiving SPS PDSCH without a deactivation command, it can lead to a mismatch in the HARQ-ACK feedback bits.
  + Proposal 16: Support UE-specific PDCCH for activation/deactivation of SPS group-common PDSCH.
* *Ericsson*
  + Observation 9: When activation command is re-transmitted via either group common PDCCH or UE specific PDCCH, UE might not able to derive the right SPS parameters in the original activation command.
  + Proposal 15: For group based SPS, MAC-CE should be used to retransmit the SPS activation command. This MAC-CE CE containing the same SPS related parameters that was carried in the original SPS activation command, which includes slot number where it was transmitted and the MCS/PRB allocation.
  + Proposal 16: For deactivation, UE specific PDCCH deactivation order can be sent to UEs not responding to the group de-activation PDCCH.
  + Proposal 17: For deactivation, UE specific PDCCH deactivation order can be used to deactivate a group-based SPS.
  + Observation 10: Unicast PDCCH scrambled with C-RNTI is not supported for group-common PDSCH
  + Proposal 18: Do not support unicast PDCCH scrambled with CS-RNTI for activation of group SPS PDSCH.
  + Proposal 24: The UE is expected to provide HARQ-ACK feedback for all PDCCH associated with a PDCCH activation or deactivation command for SPS whatever UE is configured to send ACK/NACK HARQ feedback, NACK-only HARQ feedback, or no HARQ feedback at all.
* *Xiaomi*
  + Proposal 14: For reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, retransmit the activation command via UE-specific PDCCH.

**Reliability of SPS GC-PDSCH:**

* *OPPO*
  + Proposal 11: PTM scheme 1 and PTP are not supported to be used as retransmission scheme simultaneously for a given SPS group-common PDSCH.
* *Spreadtrum*
  + Proposal 7: Not support simultaneously scheduling unicast and group-common retransmission for SPS group-common PDSCH.
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 13: PTM scheme 1 retransmission and PTP retransmission cannot be used simultaneously for different UEs in the same MBS group.
* *FUTUREWEI*
  + Proposal 7: The retransmission scheme for a given SPS group-common PDSCH can be either PTM scheme 1 or PTP for different UEs in the same group.
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 20. PTM transmission scheme 1 and PTP can be used as retransmission for SPS group-common PDSCH.
* *Ericsson*
  + Proposal 22: PTM scheme 1 retransmission and PTP retransmission can be used simultaneously for different UEs in the same MBS group
  + Proposal 23: The simultaneous reception of PTP and PTM retransmission for a given UE is up to UE implementation, pending a UE capability.
  + Proposal 25: The UE can be configured to either transmit HARQ-ACK feedback, NACK-only feedback, or no HARQ feedback at all for the SPS PDSCH not corresponding to a SPS PDCCH activation or deactivation.
  + Observation 11: For the PDCCH-less SPS-PDSCH the mechanism to support HARQ and HARQ-less or NACK-only can reuse what is designed for non-SPS MBS PDSCH scheduling.
  + Proposal 26: The SPS UL feedback framework for the SPS scheduled (i.e. PDCCH-less) PDSCH is the same as for non-SPS MBS PDSCH scheduling.
* *Xiaomi*
  + Proposal 13: Do not support PTM scheme 1 based retransmission and PTP scheme based retransmission simultaneously for SPS MBS transmission in the same MBS group.

**Other Issues:**

* *Nokia*
  + Observation-12: Significantly higher spectral efficiency can be achieved when relying heavily on HARQ retransmissions compared to operation with conventional first HARQ transmission BLER targets for the worst UE in the cell.
  + Proposal-12: Support HARQ retransmissions on SPS-allocated resources.
  + Proposal-13: Add in-band control signaling on PDSCH to facilitate retransmissions on SPS-allocated PDSCH resources.
  + Observation-13: The conventional NDI definition is not ideal in terms of the impact that an NDI decoding error has on the reliability of the MBS data delivery via SPS, especially when the NDI error occurs on the first transmission of a MAC PDU.
  + Proposal-14: At least for delivery of MBS traffic over SPS allocated resources, a new NDI definition is used that is toggled between HARQ transmissions belonging to one MAC PDU to HARQ transmissions belonging to the next MAC PDU on the same HARQ process. Further enhancements of in-band control signaling in case of SPS are FFS.
* *LGE*
  + Proposal 18: For a group common SPS configuration, UE can be optionally configured with either pdsch-AggregationFactor or TDRA table with repetitionNumber as part of the TDRA table.
  + Proposal 19: Discuss whether different TCI states can be configured for group common SPS received by different UE, e.g. different slots of group common SPS PDSCH repetitions or different SPS configurations can be associated to different TCI states for the same group of UEs.

## Initial Proposals based on contributions

***Summary***

Regarding SPS configuration for multicast, RAN1 has agreed more than one SPS group-common PDSCH configuration for MBS can be configured per UE subject to UE capability, 1 company [Qualcomm] proposes that one or more SPS GC-PDSCH can be activated per CFR subject to UE capability. Moderator suggests initial proposal 4-1. In addition, some companies propose that G-CS-RNTI is configured per SPS configuration for MBS. Moderator suggests initial proposal 4-2.

For reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, 3 alternatives were listed for further study in last meeting. Based on contributions submitted in this meeting, it seems 11 companies [Spreadtrum, vivo, CATT, Nokia, Futurewei, CMCC, Qualcomm, Convida, MediaTek, NTT Docomo, Xiaomi] support both Alt1 (GC-PDCCH) and Alt2 (UE-specific PDCCH), 3 companies [OPPO, ZTE, Samsung] support only Alt1, and 2 companies [Huawei, Ericsson] support Alt3 (MAC-CE). Moderator suggests initial proposal 4-3.

Regarding whether PTM-1 retransmission and PTP retransmission for SPS group-common PDSCH can be used simultaneously for different UEs in the same MBS group, this situation is similar as for non-SPS group-common PDSCH, 4 companies [OPPO, Spreadtrum, CATT, Xiaomi] do not support it and 4 companies [ZTE, Futurewei, CMCC, Ericsson] support it. Moderator suggests to postpone the discussion in this meeting.

***Initial Proposals***

The following moderator recommendations are made.

[Moderator’s recommendation]

**[High] Initial Proposal 4-1**:

For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, one or more SPS GC-PDSCH can be activated per CFR subject to UE capability.

**[High] Initial Proposal 4-2**:

If a SPS-config for MBS is configured in CFR, one or more G-CS-RNTIs should be configured in the SPS-config.

**[High] Initial Proposal 4-3**:

For reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, both Alt 1 and Alt 2 are supported.

* Alt 1: retransmit the activation command via group-common PDCCH.
* Alt 2: retransmit the activation command via UE-specific PDCCH.
* For SPS GC-PDSCH corresponding to a SPS activation PDCCH and SPS release PDCCH, only ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback is supported, irrespective of the HARQ-ACK feedback method used for SPS GC-PDSCH without PDCCH scheduling

## Company Views (1st round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | **Proposal 4-1:** More clarification of motivation/benefit are needed.  It was agreed in RAN1#104b-e as follows that how to configure SPS indexes for unicast and MBS is up to gNB implementation. Why do we need to agree this proposal to restrict the configuration/activating multiple SPS **per CFR**? gNB has all the UEs’ capabilities information, the corresponding configuration/scheduling must take all the UEs into account. Therefore, a proper gNB implementation can also be applied.  Agreement (#104b):  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.   **Proposal 4-2:** More clarification of motivation/benefit are needed.  Even only one G-CS-RNTI is configured, multiple SPS procedures still can be supported. Please correct me if it is not working.  Furthermore, if my understanding is correct, the intention of the initial proposal is to support one/more G-CS-RNTI(s) for one/more SPS configuration(s). The current wording seems like that one SPS configuration needs one/more G-CS-RNTI(s).  **Proposal 4-3:** Only Alternative 1 is supported. The third sub-bullet can be considered as a starting point. |
| Xiaomi | For proposal 4-1 and proposal 4-2, we don’t see the motivation. The purpose of supporting multiple active SPS in Rel-16 is to support low latency traffic, i.e. URLLC. We are not sure why do we need this for MBS. Furthermore, considering the SPS allocation is up to gNB, it will complicate the multiplexing between MBS and unicast.  For proposal 4-3, don’t support alt.1. If the activation command is transmitted via group-common PDCCH, it will introduce additional effort for the UEs who successfully decode the MBS PDSCH, as it will re-initialized the SPS again according to the newly received activation PDCCH. Furthermore, the power consumption also goes up because of the unnecessary PDCCH monitoring. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 4-1: the proposal is not clear to us. Do you mean one or more SPS configuration are activated by one DCI or configured within one CFR?  4-2: is it better to be discussed firstly in RAN2?  4-3: Alt 1 should be the baseline. Then we can discuss whether other solutions are needed. For the third bullet, we support it in principle. |
| ZTE | Proposal 4-1: The proposal is not needed.  Rel-16 already has UE capability to indicate the max number of activated SPS per BWP. It can be up to network implementation to configure how many SPS within CFR as long as the total number of SPS is not exceeded.  Proposal 4-2: Is the intention of this proposal to say that, each SPS configuration can be associated with one or more G-CS-RNTIs? If yes, then we are supportive of this proposal.  Proposal 4-3: Based on our observation, all companies agree that activation command via group-common PDCCH should be supported. Companies have different understandings on whether UE-specific PDCCH for activation is needed. We can first agree on Alt.1 and FFS Alt.2.  Regarding the 3rd bullet, it seems better to be discussed under 8.12.2. Thus, the following proposal is proposed from our side.  **[High] Initial Proposal 4-3**:  For reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, ~~both~~ Alt 1 ~~and Alt 2 are~~ is supported.   * Alt 1: retransmit the activation command via group-common PDCCH. * FFS whether to additionally support Alt 2: retransmit the activation command via UE-specific PDCCH. * ~~For SPS GC-PDSCH corresponding to a SPS activation PDCCH and SPS release PDCCH, only ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback is supported, irrespective of the HARQ-ACK feedback method used for SPS GC-PDSCH without PDCCH scheduling~~ |
| CMCC | 4-3: Support. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 4-1: Support. Given that there are some difference between SPS for MBS and SPS for unicast, e.g., HARQ-ACK feedback mechanism, one SPS for MBS capable of be associated with one or multiple RNTI as proposal 4-2 while not for unicast, we slightly prefer one separate UE capability for MBS, not reusing R16 UE capability for unicast.  Proposal 4-2: We are fine that one or more G-CS-RNTIs can be configured for a SPS-config for MBS.  Proposal 4-3: Support. Alt.1 and Alt.2 could be applied for different cases. For example, if a few of group member missed the activated group-common PDCCH, Alt.2 could be considered. UE specific PDCCH with higher aggregation level could be considered to improve the probability of successfully decoding. If the majority of group member missed the activated group-common PDCCH, Alt.1 is preferred, to alleviate the overhead cost. |
| Samsung | 4-1: Support  4-2: Support  4-3: Do not support.  Alt. 1 is sufficient. Unlike PDSCH scheduling, there is no benefit from UE-specific PDCCH for link adaptation as there is no spectral efficiency gain and the event is infrequent. Such support will only result to unnecessary specifications and UE complexity. |
| vivo | Proposal 4-1: same view with other companies that the proposal seems not needed. We have agreed to support to configure multiple SPS within CFR. It can be up to gNB to configure/activate how many SPS within CFR as long as the total number of SPS is not exceeded.  Proposal 4-2: we support to configure G-CS-RNTI for each SPS-config for MBS, but the motivation to configure more than one G-CS-RNTI for a certain SPS-config s not clear to us.  Proposal 4-3: we support the proposal. |
| Apple | P4-1: ok.  P4-2: ok. |
| MediaTek | 4-1 & 4-2: The further clarification of the motivation on this two issues are needed.  4-3: Support. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 4-1: support  Proposal 4-2: further study. Also, better to discuss how to configure G-RNTI(s)/G-CS-RNTI(s) for multicast together.  Proposal 4-3: support  We think ACK/NACK-based feedback is needed to confirm activation/deactivation. Alt1 requires all UEs in the group to send ACK/NACK for retransmitted GC-PDCCH. Alt2 is beneficial since it only requires specific UE who missed the initial GC-PDCCH activation/deactivation to receive the retransmitted activation/deactivation. |
| Nokia, NSB | 4-1: Support  4-2: Support  4-3: Support |
| CATT | **Proposal 4-1:** Not support. Since the number of SPS GC-PDSCH in the BWP has been limited, there is no need to limit that of SPS GC-PDSCH for per CFR.  **Proposal 4-3:** We support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | P4-1: Support  P4-2: Support  P4-3: Disagree.  Both Alt 1 and Alt 2 have problems. UE receiving either group-common PDCCH or UE specific PDCCH may not be able to derive the right parameters indicated by the original PTM PDCCH activation command. This is because the HARQ process ID is derived according to the slot/system frame number. If the slot/system frame number of the retransmitted activation command does not follow a strict rule, another HARQ process ID might be derived. Similarly, MCS/PRB in the retransmitted activation command is for its associated PDSCH which could occupy different PRB and use different MCS compared to the PDSCH associated to the original activation PDCCH command. It is also unclear how the PDSCH from the missed activation will be recovered. |
| Convida | 4-1: we share the same view with other companies that the proposal seems not needed.  4-2: Support.  4-3: Support. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 4-1**: Support.  **Proposal 4-2**: The motivation for configuring multiple G-CS-RNTIs in a SPS-config is not clear to us.  **Proposal 4-3**: Support. UE-specific PDCCH is useful not only for retransmission of group-common PDCCH activation, but also for adding individual UEs. |
| LG | P4-2: Only one G-CS-RNTI is enough for multiple group common SPS configurations.  P4-3: We generally prefer the changes from ZTE, except the last removal. We prefer to keep the last bullet point. For clarity, we propose to change to:  **[High] Initial Proposal 4-3**:  For reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, ~~both~~ Alt 1 ~~and Alt 2 are~~ is supported.   * Alt 1: retransmit the activation command via group-common PDCCH. * FFS whether to additionally support Alt 2: retransmit the activation command via UE-specific PDCCH. * For SPS GC-PDSCH corresponding to a SPS activation PDCCH and SPS release PDCCH, only ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback is supported, irrespective of the HARQ-ACK feedback method used for SPS GC-PDSCH without PDCCH scheduling |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | **[High] Initial Proposal 4-1**: Ok  **[High] Initial Proposal 4-2**: We don’t understand the proposal. One MBS session has more than one G-CS-RNTIs? We think the further clarification is needed for proposal 4-2.  **[High] Initial Proposal 4-3**: We prefer alt 1. The PDCCH repetition is supported without waiting for the retransmission of the group common PDCCH activation command. |
| Moderator | **Proposal 4-1:**  RAN1 has agreed to support up to 8 configured SPS configurations in a BWP of a serving cell for unicast and MBS in total, and it is up to gNB implementation to configure the SPS configuration indexes for unicast and MBS, respectively. Many companies think that this proposal is not needed, and it can be based on network implementation. Therefore, moderator suggests to postpone the discussion in this meeting.  **Proposal 4-2:**  The intention of this proposal is to discuss how to determine which G-CS-RNTI(s) is used for a SPS-Config for MBS configured in CFR. Based on companies’ comments, the proposal was updated.  **Proposal 4-3:**  Based on companies’ comments, the proposal was updated. |

## Updated Proposals (after 1st round of inputs)

**[High] Updated Proposal 4-2**:

If a SPS-config for MBS is configured in CFR, at least one G-CS-RNTI is associated with the SPS-config.

* FFS details on how to associate G-CS-RNTI with the SPS-config for MBS

**[High] Updated Proposal 4-3**:

For reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, at least Alt 1 is supported.

* Alt 1: retransmit the activation command via group-common PDCCH.
* FFS whether additionally support Alt 2: retransmit the activation command via UE-specific PDCCH.
* ~~For SPS GC-PDSCH corresponding to a SPS activation PDCCH and SPS release PDCCH, only ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback is supported, irrespective of the HARQ-ACK feedback method used for SPS GC-PDSCH without PDCCH scheduling~~

## Company Views (2nd round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia, NSB | 4-2: Support  4-3: Support |
| Qualcomm | 4-2: ok  4-3: We don’t see objection on 3rd subbullet except ZTE suggested to include it in 8.12.2. We prefer to keep the last bullet here because it is part of the reliability of SPS GC-PDCCH activation.  In addition, we support Alt2 since it can avoid UE keep sending ACK(s) for the retransmitted GC-PDCCH activation. |
| Samsung | Support both proposals (it is noted that proposal 4-3 is already an agreement (with different wording but same effect)). |
| Chengdu TD Tech, TD Tech | **[High] Updated Proposal 4-2**: We think the FFS item is not needed due to the fact that RAN2 doesn’t support one MBS session is mapped onto several G-RNTI/G-CS-RNTIs.  If a SPS-config for MBS is configured in CFR, at most one G-CS-RNTI is associated with the SPS-config.  We support alt1. In order to reduce delay, we suggest the PDCCH repetition can be directly applied to the group common PDCCH activation notification for SPS group common PDCCH.  **[High] Updated Proposal 4-3**: For reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, at least Alt 1 is supported.   * Alt 1: retransmit the activation command via group-common PDCCH. * Alt 2: PDCCH repetition can be directly applied to the group common PDCCH activation of SPS group common PDSCH. * FFS whether additionally support Alt 2: retransmit the activation command via UE-specific PDCCH. |
| LG | **[High] Updated Proposal 4-2**: We think that FFS is not needed.  **[High] Updated Proposal 4-3**: We are fine with this proposal. |
| ZTE | For proposal 4-2, we support to associate multiple G-CS-RNTI for each SPS-config. It will be beneficial if there are multiple MBS services and limited SPS configurations. Thus, the following FFS is added.  **[High] Updated Proposal 4-2**:  If a SPS-config for MBS is configured in CFR, at least one G-CS-RNTI is associated with the SPS-config.   * FFS details on how to associate G-CS-RNTI with the SPS-config for MBS * FFS multiple G-CS-RNTIs associated with one SPS-config.   We support Proposal 4-3, regarding the last bullet, we noticed that AI 8.12.2 has the same proposal under discussion. Maybe we need to clearly pick one place to discuss this issue to avoid potential confliction. |
| OPPO | **P 4-2:** If one G-CS-RNTI is associated with a SPS-config is a normal design which is also the same mechanism in unicast, and it is also work for multicast SPS, there is no clear reason to have this proposal.  **P 4-3:** OK with the current proposal. The “at least” is not needed if Alt 2 is kept as an FFS. |
| Xiaomi | 4-2: support  4-3: do not support. We would like to raise our concerns again: If the activation command is transmitted via group-common PDCCH, it will introduce additional effort for the UEs who successfully decode the MBS PDSCH, as it will re-initialized the SPS according to the newly received activation PDCCH. Furthermore, the power consumption also goes up because of the unnecessary PDCCH monitoring. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 4-2: support.  4-3: we think the last bullet which has been deleted is the prerequisite for the main bullet. Otherwise, we can’t agree with the main bullet unless the main bullet implies blind retransmission. |
| vivo | 4-2: according to RAN2’s LS, multiple G-CS-RNTI is supported for a UE. We prefer to configure G-CS-RNTI per SPS-config.  4-3: we are fine with the proposal and we support Alt 2. As comment before, UE-specific PDCCH is useful to add individual UEs and it is more reliable than group-common PDCCH. |
| MediaTek | 4-2: support  4-3: We also think the last sub-bullet is critical as Lenovo commented. Even though this sub-bullet is being discussed in other AI, it also can be discussed in this AI since it is vital for this proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 4-2**: Support  **Proposal 4-3**: We prefer the previous version. UE-specific PDCCH will be suitable when the number of UEs requiring retransmission is small. For UE-specific PDCCH, UE-specific coding and beamforming can be performed to improve retransmission reliability. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 4-2: Support**  **Proposal 4-3: Prefer the previous version.** |
| CATT | **Proposal 4-2:** support  **Proposal 4-3:** OK with the proposal. We still think Alt.2 should be supported. |
| Ericsson | P4-2: support  P4-3: we still have a concern with Alt1 / retransmission of the activation command via PDCCH. Could the proponents of the solution explain:   * How the initial HARQ process value of the SPS will be indicated. In SPS, the HARQ process is derived by the slot index where the activation was received. * How the missed PDSCH from the missed activation will be retransmitted.   We assume that only a fraction of UEs will miss the activation and thus most UEs will have SPS running while the remaining UEs will need to be activated. Therefore it is important to keep the ongoing HARQ ID counter according to the original activation. |
| Moderator | **Proposal 4-2:**  @OPPO, I think the point here is multiple G-CS-RNTIs can be configured, and how to associate the G-CS-RNTI and the SPS-config for MBS need to be determined. Even only one G-CS-RNTI can be associated with a SPS-config for MBS, that needs to be specified.  **Proposal 4-3:**  Several companies insist to support both Alt1&Alt2, Xiaomi has concern on Alt1 (If the activation command is transmitted via group-common PDCCH, it will introduce additional effort for the UEs who successfully decode the MBS PDSCH, as it will re-initialized the SPS according to the newly received activation PDCCH. Furthermore, the power consumption also goes up because of the unnecessary PDCCH monitoring). Regarding Xiaomi’s concern on Alt1, companies are encouraged to provide their understandings.  @Ericsson, sorry for forgetting to respond your concern in last round. My understanding is that for SPS the HARQ process is not derived by the slot index where the activation is received, while it is derived by the slot index where the SPS PDSCH is received. Please check it again, if I’m wrong, please let me know. |

## Updated Proposals (after 2nd round of inputs)

**[High] Updated Proposal 4-2**:

If a SPS-config for MBS is configured in CFR, at least one G-CS-RNTI is associated with the SPS-config.

* FFS details on how to associate G-CS-RNTI with the SPS-config for MBS
* FFS multiple G-CS-RNTIs associated with one SPS-config.

**[High] Updated Proposal 4-3**:

For reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, both Alt 1 and Alt 2 are supported.

* Alt 1: retransmit the activation command via group-common PDCCH.
* Alt 2: retransmit the activation command via UE-specific PDCCH.
* For SPS GC-PDSCH corresponding to a SPS activation PDCCH and SPS release PDCCH, only ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback is supported, irrespective of the HARQ-ACK feedback method used for SPS GC-PDSCH without PDCCH scheduling

## Company Views (3rd round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | For Proposal 4-3, we suggest to agree Alt 1 first and keep Alt 2 as FFS.  About Xiaomi’s concern about power consumption of the unnecessary PDCCH monitoring, we think the GC-PDCCH should anyway be monitored according to the Searchspace and CORESET configurations no matter it has successfully received the activation command or not. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 4-2**: Support  **Proposal 4-3**: Support |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 4-2: Support**  **Proposal 4-3: Support**  **In our understanding, Alt2 could provide higher reliability, e.g., with higher aggregation level. It benefits for low SNR case, e.g., cell edge group member UEs.** |
| OPPO | **P 4-2:** We still have concerns on the second FFS.  Multiple G-CS-RNTIs associated with one SPS-config will increase the UE capability.  As we agreed in the previous meeting, the total number of SPS configurations by a UE is not increased. The intention is to not increase UE capability. By supporting multiple G-CS-RNTIs to one SPS-config, it equivalents to support multiple sub-SPS configurations. It practically increases the total number of SPS-config supported by a UE.  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.   **P 4-3:** We have concerns on Alt 2.  If the first activation GC-PDCCH is missed, the UE-specific PDCCHs used for re-activation for those UEs are equivalently considered as initial activation. It is still FFS that UE-specific PDCCH as the activation/deactivation.  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 |
| vivo | Proposal 4-2: Support  Proposal 4-3: Support. see the comments in previous rounds. |
| Xiaomi | 4-3: don’t support. For power consumption issue, I agree with ZTE. But still, the re-initialization of SPS for the UE who successfully decode the DCI is not necessary. |
| LG | **[High] Updated Proposal 4-2**: We prefer to remove two FFSs.  **[High] Updated Proposal 4-3**: We wonder if we agreed to support UE specific PDCCH for activation/deactivation of group common SPS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | SPS in general should not be complicated in this release. Completing the specification on time for early commercialization is more crucial. In light of this, main bullet for 4-2 is fine and no need to FFS other cases.  4-3, I wonder it is urgent to make the decision because on one hand it does not seem to affect RRC parameter and on the other hand RAN2 may also need to be involved because the DRX configuration may affect whether alt1 and alt2 really workable in all cases. The last bullet should be discussed in AI8.12.2 frankly but here the discussion can assume only ack/nack is supported for SPS activation/deactivation. |
| Nokia, NSB. | **4-2:**  Support  **4-3:** Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 4-2: Support  Proposal 4-3: Agree with ZTE and Xiaomi that we can agree Alt 1 first and keep Alt 2 FFS. |
| Ericsson | P4-2: Support  P4-3: Not support. We have earlier explained why both Alt1 and Alt2 will have serious issues. We prefer the earlier Alt3 (MAC-CE), which avoids these issues.  To be more specific, we think that there are complication arising from using a PDCCH retransmission of the SPS activation command   * In order to align HARQ process IDs between UEs, the SPS configuration of the UEs who missed the first activation need to be reconfigured with a different HARQ\_ID offset in order for the new activation command to align with the previous activation command. This is an RRC reconfiguration so if the SPS periodicity is small this could be problematic. * The second activation cannot be made on G-RNTI PDCCH since other UEs have already received and acknowledged the PDCCH for activation and this would re-initialize the transmission for these UEs.   On a side note, The retransmission of the missed initial PDSCH needs to be done via scheduled unicast or multicast PDCCH/PDSCH, since the original SPS is ongoing for other UEs. We have not agreed to this in an agreement but we hope this is clear. |
| Apple | Proposal 4-2: OK.  Proposal 4-3: we share the views as OPPO and ZTE, the alt2 can keep it as FFS. |
| CATT | Proposal 4-2: We have concern on the second bullet. If multiple G-CS-RNTIs are associated with one SPS-config, it complex for UE to process multiple SPS-MBS services corresponding to different G-CS-RNTIs at the same time. We prefer to remove the second FFS.  Proposal 4-3: Support the current version. |
| Samsung | Support 4-2.  Do not support 4-3.  Alt.1 has been agreed for activation/deactivation and it is enough. No need to complicate the specifications and there is no material benefit from also supporting Alt.2.  No further agreement is needed. |
| Qualcomm | Ok  For Proposal 4-3,  GC-PDCCH can be monitored all the time. But retx GC-PDCCH for activation always request UE ACK/NACK feedback. The UE who successfully decodes the DCI still needs to send ACK, which is not power saving. If only a few UEs in the group requires retx, Alt2 is more better. |
| MediaTek | Proposal 4-2: support CATT’s view.  Proposal 4-3: Support. |
| Moderator | **Proposal 4-2:**  Based on comments, let’s try with deleting the second FFS.  **Proposal 4-3:**  I do not update it. If this version cannot be agreed, we can postpone the discussion.  @OPPO/LG, regarding your comment, I think if companies have consensus that UE-specific PDCCH is a solution for missed GC-PDCCH activation, then UE-specific PDCCH activation is supported.  @Ericsson, regarding your comments, I replied in last round that, in my understanding, for SPS the HARQ process is not derived by the slot index where the activation is received, and it is derived by the slot index where the SPS PDSCH is received. Regarding your comment “In order to align HARQ process IDs between UEs, the SPS configuration of the UEs who missed the first activation need to be reconfigured with a different HARQ\_ID offset in order for the new activation command to align with the previous activation command.”, I don’t understand why RRC reconfiguration is needed. I think the HARQ\_ID offset just determines which HARQ process numbers can be used for a SPS-config, but the HARQ process ID is determined based on the slot of PDSCH transmission. UE will have the same understanding on the HARQ process ID as long as the SPS PDSCH is transmitted in the right slot periodically. Hope other companies can also clarify and have some discussion on this issue. |

## Updated Proposals (after 3rd round of inputs)

**[High] Updated Proposal 4-2**:

If a SPS-config for MBS is configured in CFR, at least one G-CS-RNTI is associated with the SPS-config.

* FFS details on how to associate G-CS-RNTI with the SPS-config for MBS
* ~~FFS multiple G-CS-RNTIs associated with one SPS-config.~~

**[High] Updated Proposal 4-3**:

For reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, both Alt 1 and Alt 2 are supported.

* Alt 1: retransmit the activation command via group-common PDCCH.
* Alt 2: retransmit the activation command via UE-specific PDCCH.
* For SPS GC-PDSCH corresponding to a SPS activation PDCCH and SPS release PDCCH, only ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback is supported, irrespective of the HARQ-ACK feedback method used for SPS GC-PDSCH without PDCCH scheduling

## Company Views (4th round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | **P 4-2:** We are OK with it.  **P 4-3:** We do not support to support both alternatives. Only Alt 1 is supported. |
| Xiaomi | P 4-3: do not support. We don’t see the necessity to support both alt 1 and alt 2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 4-2: We are OK with the main bullet. Regarding the FFS, we think it is up to RAN2 discussion.  4-3: Alt 1 is supported firstly then FFS Alt 2. |
| Nokia, NSB | 4-2: Support  4-3: Support |
| CATT | Proposal 4-2: we think the ‘at least’ in main bullet should be removed. For the legacy SPS configuration, only one CS-RNTI is associated with the SPS-config. We are not clear about the motivation to introduce multiple G-CS-RNTIs associated with one SPS-config. Therefore, we suggest update the proposal as following  **[High] Updated Proposal 4-2**:  If a SPS-config for MBS is configured in CFR, one G-CS-RNTI is associated with the SPS-config.   * ~~FFS multiple G-CS-RNTIs associated with one SPS-config.~~   Proposal 4-3: support. Both Alt 1 and Alt 2 should be supported. |
| Spreadtrum | 4-2: Support  4-3: Support |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Samsung | 4-2: Support  4-3: Do not support.  Alt.1 has been agreed for activation/deactivation and it is enough. No need to complicate the specifications and there is no material benefit from also supporting Alt.2.  No further agreement is needed |
| ZTE | For Proposal 4-2, we don’t think associating multiple G-CS-RNTI with one SPS-config will increase the UE complexity much. UE only needs to perform demodulation, decoding once but maybe do unscrambling more times depending on the number of G-CS-RNTI. Thus, we would suggest to keep the FFS.  For Proposal 4-3, for the last, we need to clarify whether the ACK/NACK for “For SPS GC-PDSCH corresponding to a SPS activation PDCCH” is ACK/NACK for the “first SPS PDSCH” or for the “PDCCH”. If it is for the “first SPS PDSCH”, then in any case, UE needs to transmit HARQ feedback for the SPS PDSCH, Alt.1 won’t increase the PUCCH overhead especially considering that SPS activation won’t be frequently transmitted. Thus, we suggest to keep Alt.2 as FFS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 4-2 is ok.  4-3. We still think it is not urgent for this meeting because the decision affects RAN2 as well. RAN2 may configure a DRX cycle, so UE if missed the initial command may expect to receive the command again as early as possible in case UE goes to inactive time after “on-duration” timers expires to prevent from missing PDSCH for a long time. However, the k1 value and SPS periodicity may not match to get SPS recovered as expected. |
| LG | **[High] Updated Proposal 4-2**: We prefer to delete all FFSs.  **[High] Updated Proposal 4-3**: We wonder if we already agree UE specific PDCCH for activation/deactivation. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 4-2**: Support  **Proposal 4-3**: Support. Activation via UE-specific PDCCH will be useful because gNB can select individual aggregation level and can perform UE-specific beamforming for UE-specific PDCCH to improve the reliability of the activation command. |
| MediaTek | 4-2: We are fine with the updated proposal  4-3: Support. |
| Apple | Proposal 4-2: ok  Proposal 4-3: Alt1 is enough. If no new agreements could be reached, Alt1 is applied as we agreed GC-PDCCH is used for activate/deactivate SPS. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | We support alt 1.  How about the PDCCH repetition of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH? That is, the group common PDCCH activation command is sent several times. The last group common PDCCH activation command has the HARQ-ACK feedback. |
| Moderator | Proposal 4-2 has been agreed in GTW session.  **Proposal 4-3:**  Moderator suggests to deprioritize the discussion. Based on companies’ comments, about 5 companies insist to support Alt1 only or first agree Alt1 and FFS Alt2, about 6 companies insist to support Alt1&Alt2, 1 company thinks this issue related to RAN2 DRX configuration and proposes to defer the discussion, 1 company thinks no agreement is needed for this issue. It seems not possible to reach consensus in this meeting. |

# Issue #5: Simultaneous operation with unicast reception

## Background and submitted proposals

***Background***

In RAN1#104&104bis&105 meetings, the following agreement was achieved.

Agreements (#103):

Further study the following cases for simultaneous reception of unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.

* Case 1: support TDM between multiple TDMed unicast PDSCHs and one group-common PDSCH in a slot
* Case 2: support TDM among multiple group-common PDSCHs in a slot
* Case 3: support TDM between multiple TDMed unicast PDSCHs and multiple TDMed group-common PDSCHs in a slot
* Case 4: support FDM between multiple TDMed unicast PDSCHs and multiple TDMed group-common PDSCHs in a slot
* Case 5: support FDM among multiple group-common PDSCHs in a slot
* FFS: maximum number of PDSCHs in a slot simultaneous received per UE

Agreement (#104b):

At least support the following cases for PDSCH reception for MBS in a slot based on UE capability for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs

* Case 1: support TDM between M (M>1) TDMed unicast PDSCHs and one group-common PDSCH in a slot per CC
  + FFS: the value(s) of M
* Case 2: support TDM among N (N>1) group-common PDSCHs in a slot per CC
  + FFS: the value(s) of N
* Case 3: support TDM between K (K>1) TDMed unicast PDSCHs and L (L>1) TDMed group-common PDSCHs in a slot per CC
  + FFS: the value(s) of K and L

Agreement (#105):

For Rel-17 MBS UE, the UE maximum number of TDMed PDSCH receptions capability in a slot per CC is kept as for Rel-15/Rel-16, i.e., {2/4/7} based on UE FG5-11/5-11a/5-11b.

* Note:   Group-common PDSCH(s) are counted as unicast PDSCH(s).

***Submitted Proposals***

* *vivo*
  + Proposal 4: For simultaneous reception of unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in a slot for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support the following cases.
    - Case 4: support FDM between multiple TDMed unicast PDSCHs and multiple TDMed group-common PDSCHs in a slot
    - Case 5: support FDM among multiple group-common PDSCHs in a slot
* *CATT*
  + Proposal 28: When the simultaneous reception of unicast and multicast is beyond a UE’s capability, a dropping principle should be considered.
* *Intel*
  + Observation 1: The use case for multiple simultaneous MBS PDSCH reception should be clarified further. If the intention is to support delivery modes 1 and 2, N, L =2 is sufficient. The total number of PDSCHs that can be simultaneously received may be subject to UE capability.
  + Proposal 20: The reception of MBS and unicast in FDM mode should be a UE capability
* *CMCC*
  + Proposal 25. Not support the following cases for simultaneous reception of unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.
    - Case 4: FDM between multiple TDMed unicast PDSCHs and multiple TDMed group-common PDSCHs in a slot;
    - Case 5: FDM among multiple group-common PDSCHs in a slot.
* *Qualcomm*
  + Proposal 16: The maximum PDSCH data rate of multicast and unicast in a slot per CC per UE is subject to UE capability.

## Initial Proposals based on contributions

***Summary***

Regarding the case 4 and case 5 for simultaneous operation with unicast reception, 1 company [vivo] support and 1 company [CMCC] do not support.

1 company [Intel] proposes that the reception of MBS and unicast in FDM mode should be a UE capability. However, in RAN1#102, we have agreed that at least support FDM between unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability. Therefore, I think it is clear that the reception of MBS and unicast in FDM mode is a UE capability.

1 company [Qualcomm] proposes the maximum PDSCH data rate of multicast and unicast in a slot per CC per UE is subject to UE capability. I’m not sure whether we need to discussion this issue now.

Moderator does not plan to discuss these issues in this meeting currently, if more companies propose to discuss some of the proposals, moderator will take that into account in the next round discussion.

## Company Views (1st round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | Agree with moderator that it is not such urgent discussing this issue in this meeting. |
| Samsung | Support the moderator’s proposal. |

# Issue #6: Other issues

## Background and submitted proposals

***Submitted Proposals***

* *ZTE*
  + Proposal 11: RAN1 further studies whether to support HARQ-ACK feedback for broadcast service for UEs under RRC\_CONNECTED state.
* *Intel*
  + Proposal 22: NR MBS uses PDSCH Mapping Type A with DM-RS Type 1 as a baseline. PDSCH Mapping Type B and use of Type 2 DM-RS are not precluded.
  + Proposal 23: For NR MBS support of multi-layer MIMO transmission with rank adaptation (from UE perspective) is not precluded.
  + Proposal 24: For groupcast transmission, all UEs within the group share the same DM-RS port(s). Additionally, UEs receiving unicast transmission are multiplexed on remaining orthogonal DM-RS ports.
  + Proposal 25: Advanced transmission schemes like multiuser superposition transmission (MUST) for improving group spectral efficiency are not precluded
* *ASUSTeK*
  + Observation 3: A UE may only be configured to monitor multicast PDCCHs of PTM scheme 1 on a PCell.
  + Observation 4: When a UE requires more and more MBS/multicast services, the traffic on the PCell may become congested.
* *LGE*
  + Proposal 20: UE configured with CA can support reception of multicast transmission depending on UE capability.

## Initial Proposals based on contributions

***Summary***

Moderator does not plan to discuss these issues in this meeting currently, if more companies propose to discuss some of the proposals, moderator will take that into account in the next round discussion.

## Company Views (1st round of inputs)

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

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

# Proposals for GTW session

**[High] Updated Proposal 2-9**: For initializing scrambling sequence generator for GC-PDCCH with the second DCI format,

* equals the higher layer parameter *pdcch-DMRS-ScramblingID* if it is configured in the CORESET in a CFR used for the GC-PDCCH; otherwise.
* FFS is given by
  + Alt1: G-RNTI used for the GC-PDCCH.
  + Alt2: 0

**[High] Updated Proposal 4-2**:

If a SPS-config for MBS is configured in CFR, at least one G-CS-RNTI is associated with the SPS-config.

* ~~FFS details on how to associate G-CS-RNTI with the SPS-config for MBS~~
* ~~FFS multiple G-CS-RNTIs associated with one SPS-config.~~

**[High] Updated Proposal 1-5**: For UE configured with CFR(s) in the active DL BWP, further study the issues related to timer-based active DL BWP switching.

**[High] Updated Proposal 2-8**: The overall size of the second DCI format for multicast can be configured by RRC signalling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs (similar as the configuration for the size alignment among DCI format 2\_0/2\_1/2\_4/2\_5/2\_6).

* It is up to network implementation to ensure different UEs in the same MBS group have the same understanding on the configurable DCI fields of the second DCI format for multicast.

**[High] Proposal 2-5b**: For FDRA determination of the first DCI format for GC-PDCCH, down-select from Option 2 and updated Option 3.

* + Option 2:
    -  is given by
      * the size of CORESET 0 if CORESET 0 is configured for the cell; and
      * the size of initial DL bandwidth part if CORESET 0 is not configured for the cell.
    - For resource indication value (*RIV*) of downlink resource allocation type 1, the similar scheme as for the case that the DCI size for DCI format 1\_0 in USS is derived from the size of DCI format 1\_0 in CSS but applied to an active BWP is used.
      * FFS details, e.g., if the size of CFR (i.e. ) is larger than the size of CORESET0/initial DL bandwidth part, the resource indication value (*RIV*) is defined as in section 5.1.2.2.2 in TS38.214, where K is the maximum value from set {1, 2, 4, 8} which satisfies ;otherwise,
  + Option 3:  is given by the size of CFR in the active DL BWP
    - If the size of the first DCI format for GC-PDCCH prior to truncation is larger than the size of DCI format 1\_0 monitored in CSS, the bitwidth of the FDRA field in the first DCI format for GC-PDCCH is reduced by truncating the first few most significant bits such that the size of the first DCI format for GC-PDCCH equals the size of DCI format 1\_0 monitored in CSS.
    - FFS: whether the removed/reserved fields can be repurposed for FDRA

**[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
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# Appendix 1: Agreements in #102 e-meetings

**RAN1#102-e**

Agreements:

For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for multicast and no additional evaluation is needed to justify this.

* + FFS: The detailed HARQ-ACK feedback solutions, e.g., ACK/NACK based, NACK-only based.
  + FFS: HARQ-ACK feedback can be optionally disabled and/or enabled.

Agreements:

For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least 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.

o   FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a PDSCH for MBS.

Agreements:

* For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, define/configure common frequency resource for group-common PDSCH.
  + FFS: whether to reuse the BWP framework or not
  + FFS: the relation between the common frequency resource and UE dedicated BWP, e.g., the common frequency resource is a MBS specific BWP, or the common frequency resource is confined within UE’s dedicated BWP, etc.
  + FFS: whether more than one common frequency resource can be configured per UE

Agreements:

* For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support FDM between unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability.
  + FFS: TDM or SDM in a slot.

Agreements:

* For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH.
  + FFS: whether enhancement is needed

Agreements:

* For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, existing CSI feedback can be used for multicast transmission.
  + FFS: whether enhancement is needed

# Appendix 2: Agreements in #103 e-meetings

**RAN1#103-e**

**Mechanisms to support group scheduling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs**

**Agreements:** For convenience of discussion, consider the following clarification as RAN1 common understanding.

* **PTP transmission**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, use UE-specific PDCCH with CRC scrambled by UE-specific RNTI (e.g., C-RNTI) to schedule UE-specific PDSCH which is scrambled with the same UE-specific RNTI.
* **PTM transmission scheme 1**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs in the same MBS group, use group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by group-common RNTI to schedule group-common PDSCH which is scrambled with the same group-common RNTI. This scheme can also be called group-common PDCCH based group scheduling scheme.
* **PTM transmission scheme 2**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs in the same MBS group, use UE-specific PDCCH with CRC scrambled by UE-specific RNTI (e.g., C-RNTI) to schedule group-common PDSCH which is scrambled with group-common RNTI. This scheme can also be called UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling scheme.
* Note: The ‘UE-specific PDCCH / PDSCH’ here means the PDCCH / PDSCH can only be identified by the target UE but cannot be identified by the other UEs in the same MBS group with the target UE.
* Note: The ‘group-common PDCCH / PDSCH’ here means the PDCCH / PDSCH are transmitted in the same time/frequency resources and can be identified by all the UEs in the same MBS group.
* FFS whether or not to have additional definition of transmission scheme(s)

Agreements**:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, if initial transmission for multicast is based on PTM transmission scheme 1, at least support retransmission(s) can use PTM transmission scheme 1.

* FFS: whether to support PTP transmission for retransmission(s).
* FFS: whether to support PTM transmission scheme 2 for retransmission(s).
* FFS: How to indicate the association between PTM scheme 1 and PTP transmitting the same TB.
* FFS: If multiple retransmission schemes are supported, then can different retransmission schemes be supported simultaneously for different UEs in the same group?

**Working assumption:**

For multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs, a common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH / PDSCH is confined within the frequency resource of a dedicated unicast BWP to support simultaneous reception of unicast and multicast in the same slot

* Down select from the two options for the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/ PDSCH
  + Option 2A: The common frequency resource is defined as an MBS specific BWP, which is associated with the dedicated unicast BWP and using the same numerology (SCS and CP)
    - FFS BWP switching is needed between the multicast reception in the MBS specific BWP and unicast reception in its associated dedicated BWP
  + Option 2B: The common frequency resource is defined as an ‘MBS frequency region’ with a number of contiguous PRBs, which is configured within the dedicated unicast BWP.
    - FFS: How to indicate the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of the MBS frequency region
* FFS whether UE can be configured with no unicast reception in the common frequency resource
* FFS on details of the group-common PDCCH / PDSCH configuration
* FFS whether to support more than one common frequency resources per UE / per dedicated unicast BWP subjected to UE capabilities

Agreements: Support TDM between one unicast PDSCH and one group-common PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.

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

Agreements: For PTM transmission scheme 1, the CORESET for group-common PDCCH is configured within the common frequency resource for group-common PDSCH.

* FFS: number of CORESET(s) for group-common PDCCH within the common frequency resource for group-common PDSCH

Agreements: For search space set of group-common PDCCH of PTM scheme 1 for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED state, the CCE indexes are common for different UEs in the same MBS group.

Agreements: Down select from the two options for BDs/CCEs limit for Rel-17 MBS

* Option 1: the maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates and non-overlapped CCEs per slot per serving cell defined in Rel-15 is kept unchanged for Rel-17 MBS.
* Option 2: For UEs supporting CA capability, the budget of BDs/CCEs of an unused CC can be used for group-common PDCCH to count the number of BDs/CCEs, which is similar to the method used for multi-DCI based multi-TRP in Rel-16.

Agreements:For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support inter-slot TDM between unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in different slots (mandatory for the UE supporting MBS).

Agreements:Further study the following cases for simultaneous reception of unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.

* Case 1: support TDM between multiple TDMed unicast PDSCHs and one group-common PDSCH in a slot
* Case 2: support TDM among multiple group-common PDSCHs in a slot
* Case 3: support TDM between multiple TDMed unicast PDSCHs and multiple TDMed group-common PDSCHs in a slot
* Case 4: support FDM between multiple TDMed unicast PDSCHs and multiple TDMed group-common PDSCHs in a slot
* Case 5: support FDM among multiple group-common PDSCHs in a slot
* FFS: maximum number of PDSCHs in a slot simultaneous received per UE

Agreements:For search space set of group-common PDCCH of PTM scheme 1 for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED state, further study the following options.

* Option 1: Define a new search space type specific for multicast
* Option 2: Reuse the existing CSS type(s) in Rel-15/16
  + FFS: whether modifications are needed for multicast
* Option 3: Reuse the existing USS in Rel-15/16 with necessary modifications for MBS
  + FFS: detailed modifications

Agreements:No specification enhancement in Rel-17 to support SDM between unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in a slot for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.

Agreements**:** For PTM transmission scheme 1, if Option 2A or Option 2B for common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is agreed, the FDRA field of group-common PDCCH is interpreted based on the common frequency resource.

Agreements: For search space set of group-common PDCCH of PTM scheme 1 for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED state, further study the following options for the monitoring priority of search space set

* Option 1: The monitoring priority of search space set for multicast is the same as existing Rel-15/16 CSS
* Option 2: The monitoring priority of search space set for multicast is the same as existing Rel-15/16 USS
* Other options are not precluded
* The monitoring priority is used at least for PDCCH overbooking case
  + FFS for other cases (e.g., to prune PDCCH in terms of whether it’s unicast or multicast, etc.)

**Mechanisms to improve reliability for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs**

Agreements:

For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs receiving multicast, at least for PTM scheme 1, support at least one of the following:

* ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback for multicast,
  + From per UE perspective, UE feedback ACK or NACK.
  + From UEs within the group perspective,
    - FFS: PUCCH resource configuration for ACK/NACK feedback e.g., shared or separate PUCCH resources.
  + FFS details including conditions for it to be used
* NACK-only based HARQ-ACK feedback for multicast,
  + From per UE perspective, UE only feedback NACK.
  + From UEs within the group perspective~~, further down-select between:~~
    - FFS: PUCCH resource configuration for NACK only feedback.
  + FFS details including conditions for it to be used
* To decide in RAN1#104-e whether or not to support only one or both of the above schemes
  + If both are supported, FFS configuration/selection of ACK/NACK-based and NACK-only based HARQ-ACK feedback

Agreements:

For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs receiving multicast, for ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback if supported for group-common PDCCH scheduling, PUCCH resource configuration for HARQ-ACK feedback from per UE perspective is, down-select one of the following options:

* Option 1: shared with PUCCH resource configuration for HARQ-ACK feedback for unicast
* Option 2: separate from PUCCH resource configuration for HARQ-ACK feedback for unicast
* Option 3: Option 1 or option 2 based on configuration

Agreements:

For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs receiving multicast, for NACK-only based HARQ-ACK feedback if supported for group-common PDCCH scheduling, PUCCH resource configuration for HARQ-ACK feedback from per UE perspective is separate from PUCCH resource configuration for HARQ-ACK feedback for unicast.

* FFS PUCCH format

Agreements:

Enabling/disabling HARQ-ACK feedback for MBS is supported, further down-select between:

* Option 1: DCI
* Option 2: RRC configures enabling/disabling
* Option 3: RRC configures the enabling/ disabling function and DCI indicates enabling /disabling
* FFS: Option 4: MAC-CE indicates enabling/disabling
* FFS: Option 5: RRC configures the enabling/ disabling function and MAC-CE indicates enabling /disabling

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

Agreements:

From the perspective of RRC\_CONNECTED UEs receiving multicast, at least for PTM scheme 1 initial transmission, retransmission supports, for the purpose of down-selection, options are:

* Option 1: group-common PDCCH scheduled group-common PDSCH
* Option 2: UE-specific PDCCH scheduled PDSCH
  + Alt 1: PDSCH is UE-specific PDSCH
  + Alt 2: PDSCH is group-common PDSCH
* Option 3: both option 1 and option 2
* FFS other options
* FFS CBG based retransmission

Agreements:

FFS whether CSI feedback enhancement is needed for MBS, including but not limited:

* New CQI measurement
* New CSI report formats
* Targeted BLER
* CSI-RS configuration
* A-CSI-RS transmission triggering
* SRS configuration

Agreements:

For ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback if supported, both Type-1 and Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook are supported for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs receiving multicast,

* FFS details of HARQ-ACK codebook design.
* FFS whether enhanced Type-2 and/or Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook is supported or not.

**Basic functions for broadcast/multicast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs**

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

# Appendix 3: Agreements in #104 e-meetings

**RAN1#104-e**

**Mechanisms to support group scheduling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs**

Agreement:

For multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs, a common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH / PDSCH is confined within the frequency resource of a dedicated unicast BWP to support simultaneous reception of unicast and multicast in the same slot

* Down select from the two options for the common frequency resource for group-common PDCCH/ PDSCH
  + Option 2A: The common frequency resource is defined as an MBS specific BWP, which is associated with the dedicated unicast BWP and using the same numerology (SCS and CP)
    - FFS BWP switching is needed between the multicast reception in the MBS specific BWP and unicast reception in its associated dedicated BWP
  + Option 2B: The common frequency resource is defined as an ‘MBS frequency region’ with a number of contiguous PRBs, which is configured within the dedicated unicast BWP.
    - FFS: How to indicate the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of the MBS frequency region
* FFS whether UE can be configured with no unicast reception in the common frequency resource
* FFS on details of the group-common PDCCH / PDSCH configuration
* FFS whether to support more than one common frequency resources per UE / per dedicated unicast BWP subjected to UE capabilities
* FFS whether the use of a common frequency resource for multicast is optional or not
* FFS whether the common frequency resource is applicable for PTM scheme 2 (if supported) or not

Agreement:

* If Option 2B is supported for common frequency resource for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs, the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of the MBS frequency region within a dedicated unicast BWP are configured via UE-specific RRC signaling.
  + The starting PRB is referenced to one of the two options:
    - Option 1: Point A
    - Option 2: the starting PRB of the dedicated unicast BWP
  + FFS the detailed signaling
* If Option 2A is supported for common frequency resource for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs, the configurations of the starting PRB and the length of PRBs of the MBS frequency resource reuse the legacy BWP configuration.

Agreement:

For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, if ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for PTM scheme 1, and if initial transmission for multicast is based on PTM transmission scheme 1, support retransmission(s) using PTP transmission.

* The HARQ process ID and NDI indicated in DCI is used to associate the PTM scheme 1 and PTP transmitting the same TB.

Agreement:

The maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates and non-overlapped CCEs per slot per serving cell defined in Rel-15 is kept unchanged for Rel-17 MBS.

* FFS whether the budget of BDs/CCEs of an unused CC can be used for group-common PDCCH to count the number of BDs/CCEs for UEs supporting CA capability based on configuration, which is similar to the method used for multi-DCI based multi-TRP in Rel-16.

Working Assumption:

Keep the “3+1” DCI size budget defined in Rel-15 for Rel-17 MBS.

* FFS: Whether the G-RNTI is counted as “C-RNTI” or as “other RNTI” when considering the “3+1” DCI size budget rule for group-common PDCCH.

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:

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

Agreement:

For search space set of group-common PDCCH of PTM scheme 1 for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED state, at least support CSS

* FFS: reuse existing CSS type(s) in Rel-15/16 or define a new Type CSS
* FFS: Two options for monitoring priority:
  + Option 1: the monitoring priority is the same as existing Rel-15/16 CSS
  + Option 2: the monitoring priority is determined based on the search space set indexes of search space set(s) for multicast and USS sets.

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

**Mechanisms to improve reliability for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs**

Agreement:

For ACK/NACK based feedback if supported for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs receiving multicast, UE can be optionally configured a separate *PUCCH-Config* for multicast. Otherwise, *PUCCH-Config* for unicast applies.

Agreement:

The priority for HARQ-ACK feedback for RRC\_CONNECTED UE receiving multicast can be,

* Lower, higher than or equal to the HARQ-ACK feedback for unicast
  + FFS: How to reflect the priority in specification, e.g., whether it is configured or indicated to the UE
  + FFS: The total number of priorities across multicast and unicast
* FFS the priority between HARQ-ACK feedback for multicast and other UCI for unicast (SR, CSI) or PUSCH for unicast.

Agreement:

For ACK/NACK based feedback if supported for multicast, for Type-2 HARQ-ACK feedback construction for PTM scheme 1,

* DAI for unicast and DAI for multicast are separately counted.
* Concatenation of Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook for unicast and multicast is supported.
  + FFS details on concatenating the codebooks.
* FFS whether to support concatenating more than one Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook for multicast.

Agreement:

For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs receiving multicast, support the following:

* ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback for multicast,
  + It is up to network to configure orthogonal PUCCH resources among UEs within the same group.
* FFS: NACK-only based HARQ-ACK feedback for multicast,
  + It is up to network to configure the PUCCH resources and the PUCCH resources can be shared among UEs within the same group.
* FFS details.

Agreement:

For the cases of HARQ-ACK feedback (at least for ACK/NACK based feedback) is available for multicast and unicast for a given UE receiving multicast, for determining the PUCCH resource,

* Support multiplexing for the same priority and prioritizing for different priorities at least when the corresponding PUCCH resources overlap in time in a slot.
  + FFS whether it is subject to UE capability.
* FFS the case of non-overlapping PUCCHs resources for HARQ-ACK in the same slot.
* FFS whether sub-slot based PUCCH transmission for HARQ-ACK is supported.
* FFS the case of HARQ-ACK feedback for multicast and other UCI for unicast.

Agreement:

For ACK/NACK based feedback if supported for multicast, construction of Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook based on the union of the PDSCH TDRA sets of the unicast service and the multicast service (if they are separately configured), at least of the same priority, is supported

* FFS details of Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook construction for FDM-ed unicast and multicast.
* FFS details of Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook construction for FDM-ed multicast and multicast if supported.
* FFS: whether/how to optimize the Type-1 codebook construction to reduce the HARQ-ACK feedback payload size.

Agreement:

For enabling/disabling HARQ-ACK feedback for RRC\_CONNECTED UE receiving multicast,

* Option 3: RRC signalling configures the enabling/ disabling function of DCI indicating the enabling /disabling HARQ-ACK feedback.
  + If RRC signalling configures the function, DCI indicates (explicitly or implicitly) whether HARQ-ACK feedback is enabled/disabled
    - FFS details on RRC signalling and DCI indicating.
  + If RRC signalling does not configure the function, DCI does not indicate enabling/disabling the HARQ-ACK feedback.
    - FFS whether enabling or disabling the feedback is the default mode.
* Option 2: RRC indicates enabling/disabling.
* FFS: whether down-selection between option 3 and option 2 is needed or support the both options.
* FFS: enabling/disabling by MAC-CE.

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.

**Basic functions for broadcast/multicast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs**

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.

# Appendix 4: Agreements in #104b e-meetings

**RAN1#104b-e**

**Mechanisms to support group scheduling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs**

Agreement:

For group-common PDCCH of Rel-17 MBS, support at least two DCI formats.

* DCI format 1\_0 is used as the baseline for the first DCI format with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI.
* DCI format 1\_1 or 1\_2 is used as the baseline for the second DCI format with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI
  + FFS: Which of DCI format 1\_1 or 1\_2 is used as the baseline
* FFS: Details of the reuse (or not) of DCI format 1\_0, 1\_1 or 1\_2 fields

Agreement:

The same HARQ process ID and NDI are used for PTM scheme 1 (re)transmissions and PTP retransmissions of the same TB.

Agreement:

At least support the following cases for PDSCH reception for MBS in a slot based on UE capability for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs

* Case 1: support TDM between M (M>1) TDMed unicast PDSCHs and one group-common PDSCH in a slot per CC
  + FFS: the value(s) of M
* Case 2: support TDM among N (N>1) group-common PDSCHs in a slot per CC
  + FFS: the value(s) of N
* Case 3: support TDM between K (K>1) TDMed unicast PDSCHs and L (L>1) TDMed group-common PDSCHs in a slot per CC
  + FFS: the value(s) of K and L

Agreement:

If a CFR is configured for multicast in RRC-CONNECTED state and confined within a dedicated unicast BWP, further study the following options.

* Option 1: the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP can be used for multicast transmission if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, and the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission.
* Option 2: the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP cannot be used for multicast transmission even if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, and the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR cannot be used for unicast transmission.
* Option 3: the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP can be used for multicast transmission if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, but the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR cannot be used for unicast transmission.
* Option 4: the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for unicast in the dedicated unicast BWP cannot be used for multicast transmission even if the CORESET is fully contained in the CFR in frequency domain, but the CORESET configured in PDCCH-config for MBS in the CFR can be used for unicast transmission.

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

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.

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.

Agreement:

Send an LS to RAN2 regarding at least the following questions:

* Whether RAN1 should take into account the case of UE supporting multiple G-RNTIs?

Agreement:

Include the following in the LS to RAN2:

* Whether RAN1 should consider the case of UE supporting multiple G-CS-RNTIs?
* The agreements related to SPS will also be included in the LS for information

**R1-2104045 LS on G-RNTI and G-CS-RNTI for MBS RAN1, CMCC**

**Decision:** As per email decision posted on April 22nd, the LS is approved.

Agreement:

For CSS of group-common PDCCH of PTM scheme 1 for multicast in RRC\_CONNECTED state, down-select from the following alternatives (to be decided in RAN1#105):

* Alt 1: support Type-3 CSS
  + The monitoring priority of Type-3 CSS for group-common PDCCH is the same as existing Rel-15/16 CSS, regardless of which DCI format of group-common PDCCH is configured in Type-3 CSS
* Alt 2: support a new Type-x CSS
  + The monitoring priority of new Type-x CSS is determined based on the search space set indexes of the new Type-x CSS set and USS sets, regardless of which DCI format of group-common PDCCH is configured in the new Type-x CSS.
* Alt 3: support both Alt 1 and Alt 2

Agreement:

The down-selection of Option 2A and Option 2B for CFR for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs will be made before the end of RAN1#105-e.

Conclusion:

It is based on gNB implementation to schedule unicast on the frequency resources covered by CFR configured for multicast.

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

**Mechanisms to improve reliability for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs**

Agreement:

Support NACK-only based HARQ-ACK feedback for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs receiving multicast.

Agreement:

Two priority indexes are introduced for multicast, with

* Index 0 meaning low priority and index 1 meaning high priority.
* Priority index can be included in DCI formats scheduling the group-common PDSCH.
  + FFS details for DCI formats.
* FFS: the priority comparison between multicast and unicast with the same priority index.

Agreement:

For a separate *PUCCH-ConfigurationList* for multicast that is optionally configured, at least for ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback,

* The separate *PUCCH-ConfigurationList* for multicastconfigurationcan be a list which includes up to 2 *PUCCH-Config* configurations corresponding low priority codebook and high priority codebook, respectively.
* FFS other configurations

Agreement:

For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook concatenation to be multiplexed in the same PUCCH resource,

* The first Type-2 HARQ-ACK sub-codebook for unicast precedes the second Type-2 HARQ-ACK sub-codebook for multicast.
* FFS: The number of Type-2 HARQ-ACK sub-codebooks for multicast.
* Note: The case of SPS PDSCH will be discussed separately.

Agreement:

For multiplexing the ACK/NACK-based HARQ-ACK feedback for multicast and unicast, determining the PUCCH resources for transmission is based on the PRI indicated in the “last DCI”, where the “last DCI” refers to, down-select the following alternatives:

* Alt.1: the last DCI for unicast;
* Alt.2: the last DCI across unicast and multicast;

# Appendix 5: Agreements in #105 e-meetings

**RAN1#105-e**

**Mechanisms to support group scheduling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs**

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

Agreement:

For PTP retransmission of SPS group-common PDSCH, CS-RNTI is used for CRC scrambling of PDCCH with the NDI bit set to 1.

Agreement:

As a baseline, reuse existing fields in DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI for the fields of first DCI format with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI.

* FFS: how to determine the bitlength of FDRA field.
* FFS: Whether ‘Identifier for DCI formats’, ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’ are needed.
* FFS: How to perform DCI size alignment
* FFS: Whether to include new DCI fields
* Note: All of the fields may not be reused and the size of the fields may not be the same

Working assumption:

Option 2B for CFR associated with UE active BWP other than initial BWP is supported at least for multicast of RRC-CONNECTED UEs.

* FFS: CFR associated with initial BWP
* FFS: CFR larger than initial BWP

Agreement:

For multicast of RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, further study

* How the LBRM (Limited buffer rate-matching) for GC-PDSCH TBS is determined.
* How the xOverhead for GC-PDSCH TBS determination is configured.
* Whether MAC-CE over GC-PDSCH is needed for activation/deactivation of semi-persistent ZP CSI-RS resource set if the semi-persistent ZP CSI-RS resource set is configured in PDSCH-Config in CFR.

Agreement:

Confirm the working assumption:

Keep the “3+1” DCI size budget defined in Rel-15 for Rel-17 MBS.

* FFS: Whether the G-RNTI is counted as “C-RNTI” or as “other RNTI” when considering the “3+1” DCI size budget rule for group-common PDCCH.

Agreement:

For Rel-17 MBS UE, the UE maximum number of TDMed PDSCH receptions capability in a slot per CC is kept as for Rel-15/Rel-16, i.e., {2/4/7} based on UE FG5-11/5-11a/5-11b.

* Note:   Group-common PDSCH(s) are counted as unicast PDSCH(s).

Agreement:

For reliability of the group-common PDCCH activation of SPS group-common PDSCH, support at least one of the following alternatives.

* Alt 1: retransmit the activation command via group-common PDCCH.
* Alt 2: retransmit the activation command via UE-specific PDCCH.
* Alt 3: retransmit the activation command via MAC-CE.
* FFS other details.
* Note: Down-selection can take into account the HARQ-ACK feedback scheme for SPS activation

Working assumption:

The maximum number of CORESETs per BWP is not increased for support of MBS, and the number of CORESETs configured within the CFR is left to gNB implementation.

Agreement:

As a baseline, reuse existing fields in DCI format 1\_1 for the fields of the second DCI format with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI.

* FFS: whether ‘Identifier for DCI formats’, ‘TPC command for scheduled PUCCH’, ‘Carrier indicator’ and ‘Bandwidth part indicator’ are needed.
* FFS: How to perform DCI size alignment
* FFS: Whether to include new DCI fields for the second DCI format
* Note: All of the fields may not be reused and the size of the fields may not be the same

Agreement:

For HARQ process management, further study whether/how to differentiate the HARQ process ID used for PTP (re)transmission for unicast and PTP retransmission for multicast.

**Mechanisms to improve reliability for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs**

Agreement:

The signalling for URLLC feature can be reused to configure separate codebooks for unicast and multicast, respectively, at least for the case of different priorities, at least for Type-2 HARQ codebook

* FFS: The case for the same priority.
* FFS: The case of Type-1 HARQ codebook
* FFS: Whether this applies to separate PUCCH transmissions only

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.

Agreement:

The priority of multicast is the same as the priority of unicast for the same priority index of HARQ-ACK at least for ACK/NACK based feedback.

Agreement:

NR supports at least the following cases for UE supporting multicast:

* UE supports two non-overlapping slot-based PUCCHs for ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback for multicast with different priorities in a slot subject to UE capability.
* UE supports two non-overlapping slot-based PUCCHs for ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback for multicast and unicast with different priorities, respectively, in a slot subject to UE capability.

Agreement:

For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook construction for FDM-ed unicast and multicast with the same priority from the same TRP, support

* Opt 4: HARQ-ACK bits for all the PDSCH occasions over all the slots for all serving cells for unicast, precede, HARQ-ACK bits for all the PDSCH occasions over all the slots for all serving cells for multicast. (This is similar to the joint Type-1 codebook for mTRP).
* FFS: If UE reports the capability of supporting the FDM-ed unicast and multicast in the same slot, UE can be indicated semi-statically to generate Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook as FDM-ed manner (i.e., Opt 4).
  + Otherwise, UE does not expect unicast and multicast are to be scheduled in FDM-ed.

**Conclusion:**

PUCCH resource for NACK-only can be shared by UEs transmitting the NACK-only based HARQ-ACK feedback.

Agreement:

For ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback for multicast, the multiplexing/prioritizing rule between the HARQ-ACK for multicast and SR/CSI can reuse Rel-16 multiplexing/ prioritizing rule between the HARQ-ACK for unicast and SR/CSI.

Agreement:

For support of ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback for SPS multicast,

* the HARQ-ACK codebook index corresponding the HARQ-ACK codebook for SPS PDSCH is included in the configuration for SPS multicast.
  + UE determines a priority index from the HARQ-ACK codebook index
* UE can be optionally configured a separate SPS-PUCCH-AN-List for all SPS multicast configurations. Otherwise, a common SPS-PUCCH-AN-List applies to all SPS unicast and SPS multicast configurations.

Agreement:

For TDM-ed unicast and multicast, for Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook construction for ACK/NACK-based unicast and multicast to be multiplexed in the same PUCCH resource, determining PDSCH reception candidate occasions is based on down-selecting one of the two alternatives as follows:

* Alt 1:
  + for slot timing values in the intersection of set for unicast (termed set *A*) and set for multicast (termed set *B*), based on union of the PDSCH TDRA sets,
  + for slot timing values in set A but not in set B, based on PDSCH TDRA set for unicast, and
  + for slot timing values in set B but not in set A, based on PDSCH TDRA set for multicast.
* Alt 2: for slot timing values in the union of set for unicast and set for multicast, based on the union of the PDSCH TDRA sets.
* Companies are encouraged to continue discussion of pros and cons for each alternative for further down-selection in the next meeting.

assumption:

For enabling/disabling ACK/NACK-based HARQ-ACK feedback for RRC\_CONNECTED UE receiving multicast via dynamic group-common PDSCH:

* RRC signalling configures the enabling/ disabling function of group-common DCI indicating the enabling /disabling ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback.
  + If RRC signalling configures the function of group-common DCI based indication, group-common DCI indicates (explicitly or implicitly) whether ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback is enabled/disabled
  + Otherwise, enabling/disabling ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback is configured by RRC signalling.
  + FFS details on RRC signalling and group-common DCI indicating.
* FFS whether/how this option is extended to apply to NACK-only based feedback and multiple G-RNTI cases.
* FFS the relation to the HARQ-ACK codebook types and HARQ-ACK codebook construction.
* FFS the relation to the enabling/disabling ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback for retransmission.
* FFS whether/how to allow UE not to react to the DCI signalling, but instead follow UE-specific RRC configuration for HARQ feedback.
* FFS whether/how to apply it to SPS group-common PDSCH.

**Basic functions for broadcast/multicast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_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, 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*.