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# Introduction

This feature lead (FL) summary (FLS) concerns the Rel-17 work item (WI) for support of reduced capability (RedCap) NR devices [1]. Earlier RAN1 agreements for this WI are summarized in [2]. The final FLS for this agenda item from the previous RAN1 meeting can be found in [3].

This document summarizes contributions [4] – [29] submitted to agenda item 8.6.1.1 and relevant parts of contributions [30] – [36] submitted to other agenda items and captures this email discussion on reduced maximum UE bandwidth:

|  |
| --- |
| [107-e-NR-R17-RedCap-01] Email discussion regarding aspects related to reduced maximum UE bandwidth – Johan (Ericsson)   * 1st check point: November 15 * Final check point: November 19 |

The issues in this document are tagged and color coded with High Priority or Medium Priority. The issues that are in the focus of this round of the discussion in this meeting are furthermore tagged FL3. The FLS for the earlier rounds of the discussion can be found in [40].

Follow the naming convention in this example:

* *RedCapBwFLS2-v000.docx*
* *RedCapBwFLS2-v001-CompanyA.docx*
* *RedCapBwFLS2-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*
* *RedCapBwFLS2-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx*

If needed, you may “lock” a spreadsheet file for 30 minutes by creating a checkout file, as in this example:

* Assume CompanyC wants to update *RedCapBwFLS2-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*.
* CompanyC uploads an empty file named *RedCapBwFLS2-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.checkout*
* CompanyC checks that no one else has created a checkout file simultaneously, and if there is a collision, CompanyC tries to coordinate with the company who made the other checkout (see, e.g., contact list below).
* CompanyC then has 30 minutes to upload *RedCapBwFLS2-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx*
* If no update is uploaded in 30 minutes, other companies can ignore the checkout file.
* Note that the file timestamps on the server are in UTC time.

In file names, please use the hyphen character (not the underline character) and include ‘v’ in front of the version number, as in the examples above and in line with the general recommendation (see slide 10 in [R1-2110752](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_107-e/Docs/R1-2110752.zip)), otherwise the sorting of the files will be messed up (which can only be fixed by the RAN1 secretary).

To avoid excessive email load on the RAN1 email reflector, please note that there is NO need to send an info email to the reflector just to inform that you have uploaded a new version of this document. Companies are invited to enter the contact info in the table below.

**FL3 Question 1-1a: Please consider entering contact info below for the points of contact for this email discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point of contact** | **Email address** |
| Intel Corporation | Debdeep Chatterjee | debdeep.chatterjee@intel.com |
| Qualcomm | Jing Lei | leijing@qti.qualcomm.com |
| vivo | Xueming Pan | panxueming@vivo.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yi WANG | wangyi6@huawei.com |
| NTT DOCOMO | Mayuko Okano | mayuko.okano@docomo-lab.com |
| Nordic | Karol Schober | karol.schober@nordicsemi.no |
| Sharp | Hiroki Takahashi | takahashi.hiroki@sharp.co.jp |
| Panasonic | Shotaro Maki | maki.shotaro@jp.panasonic.com |
| ZTE | Youjun Hu | hu.youjun1@zte.com.cn |
| CATT | Yongqiang FEI | feiyongqiang@catt.cn |
| CMCC | Lijie Hu | hulijie@chinamobile.com |
| Xiaomi | Qin MU | muqin@xiaomi.com |
| MediaTek | Mohammed Al-Imari | mohammed.al-imari@mediatek.com |
| LG Electronics | Jay KIM | Jaehyung.kim@lge.com |
| FUTUREWEI | Vip Desai | vipul.desai@futurewei.com |
| Ericsson | Sandeep Narayanan Kadan Veedu | sandeep.narayanan.kadan.veedu@ericsson.com |
| Nokia | Rapeepat Ratasuk | rapeepat.ratasuk@nokia-bell-labs.com |
| NEC | Takahiro Sasaki | takahiro.sasaki@nec.com |
| OPPO | Weijie xu | xuweijie@oppo.com |
| Spreadtrum | Huayu Zhou | huayu.zhou@unisoc.com |
| Apple | Hong He | hhe5@apple.com |
| China Telecom | Jing Guo | guojing6@chinatelecom.cn |
| Samsung | Feifei Sun | feifei.sun@samsung.com |
| Vodafone | Diogo Martins | diogo.martins@vodafone.com |

# Separate initial UL BWP

RAN1#106bis-e [2] made the following agreement regarding separate initial UL BWP:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * For a cell that allows a RedCap UE to access, network can configure a separate initial UL BWP for RedCap UEs in SIB   + It can be used both during and after initial access.   + It is no wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.   + It is always configured if the initial UL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth   + This applies to both TDD and FDD (including FD FDD and HD FDD) cases |

In RAN1#106bis-e [3], there was a discussion on whether up to 2 separate initial UL BWPs can also be configured for RedCap:

|  |
| --- |
| High Priority Proposal 2.1-2d:   * It is FFS till RAN1#107-e whether up to 2 separate initial UL BWPs can also be configured. |

Several contributions [4, 8, 15, 16, 17, 28] indicate that only one separate initial UL BWP is configured for RedCap in Rel-17. These contributions argue that having more than one separate initial UL BWP for RedCap has a limited motivation while it results in PUSCH resource fragmentation, additional overhead, and complicated UL/DL BWP configuration especially when TDD centre frequency alignment is desired. However, a few contributions express that up to 2 initial UL BWPs should be configured for RedCap to be able to share 8 FDMed ROs between RedCap and non-RedCap UEs [5, 6, 12].

**FL1 High Priority Question 2-1a: How many separate initial UL BWPs for RedCap can be configured?**

* **Option 1: Up to 1 separate initial UL BWP for RedCap can be configured.**
* **Option 2: Up to 2 separate initial UL BWPs for RedCap can be configured.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option (1/2)** | **Comments** |
| Intel | 1 | Up to one separate initial UL BWP for RedCap is sufficient.  It is not justified to introduce significant complications to the RedCap BWP framework with support of more than one separate initial UL BWP, only to support the case of max number of FDM-ed ROs in some configurations that may exceed max RedCap UE BW.  The option of separately configuring ROs for RedCap UEs (that need not be shared with non-RedCap UEs and need not all be multiplexed via FDM as for non-RedCap UEs) in a separate initial UL BWP that is limited to within RedCap UE max BW is sufficient.  The RedCap BWP framework is already far from having a stable design with consideration of a single separate initial UL BWP; extending this further for a corner case would not be a prudent choice. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 |  |
| vivo | Option 1 | For Rel-17, we are fine with supporting up to 1 separate initial UL BWP for RedCap. |
| HW, HiSi | 2 | If a separate initial DL BWP is agreed to be used during initial access, then up to 2 separate initial UL BWP can be configured. Otherwise, one separate initial UL is fine. There is no single valid reason except for TDD centre frequency alignment for Msg4 PUCCH, to support a separate initial DL BWP. |
| DOCOMO | Option 1 |  |
| Nordic | Option 1 | As mentioned before, if configured ROs are shared between RedCap and non-RedCap UE, all configured ROs must have same SCS and must be confined within BW of aRedCap UEs. |
| Sharp | Option 1 |  |
| Panasonic | Option 1 | Our view is multiple separate initial UL BWP for RedCap would not be essential if ROs in separate initial UL BWP can be used instead of ROs in non-RedCap BWP. We propose to conclude that the network should be able to configure the RO configuration (1, 2 or 4 FDM) in one separate initial UL BWP for RedCap. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option 1 |  |
| CATT | Option 2(1st preference) | Option 2 is our 1st preference to allow full flexibility for ROs for non-RedCap UE when ROs are shared.  But we can compromise to Option 1 if it is the majority view. |
| CMCC | Option1 | One separate initial UL BWP can deal with the RO issue. If one separate initial UL BWP cannot guarantee that every SSB index has its associated RO within it, shared RO should not be used, and dedicated ROs for RedCap are configured within the BWP. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 |  |
| MediaTek | Option 1 |  |
| LGE | Option 1 |  |
| FUTUREWEI | clarification | We want to ensure any agreements for proposal 4-2a are not complicated by this proposal.  For TDD alignment (question 4-2a), several companies are supportive of   * For FR1,   + For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.   + For TDD, the center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.   In this case, we are unclear if there is an additional separate initial UL BWP that is center frequency aligned to the separate initial DL BWP but it is not used for random access. If this is possible, then it seems there are up to two separate initial UL BWPs. We note that only one separate initial UL BWP is active at a time. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 is preferred | In our view, the motivation for configuring two initial UL BWPs for RedCap is not clear. In general, configuring two initial UL BWPs for RedCap UEs makes the coexistence of RedCap and non-RedCap more complicated. It can potentially have the following drawbacks: 1) PUSCH resource fragmentation (e.g., when the two initial UL BWPs are configured as in the figure below), 2) May need corresponding DL BWP configuration in TDD (in case center frequency alignment is preferred), 3) May increase overhead and reduce spectral/energy efficiency.    Regarding RO sharing between RedCap and non-RedCap, it is not necessary to share (or configure) all 8 FDM-ed ROs if the total BW of ROs exceeds the RedCap UE BW. Furthermore, sufficient capacity can still be achieved with less than 8 FDM-ed RACH occasions (e.g., 4 FDM-ed RACH occasions) and multiplexing in the time domain can be used to increase PRACH capacity if needed. |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 1 |  |
| NEC | Option 1 |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 1 |  |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 2-1b:**   * **In Rel-17, up to 1 separate initial UL BWP for RedCap can be configured.** | |
| OPPO | Option 2 | **If separate initial UL BWP is used for cover the ROs that span outside of 20MHz, or it is used to cover PUCCH resources, at least 2 initial UL BWP are needed.**  So we support option 2. |
| Vivo | Y | Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Y | Support the proposal |
| China Telecom | Y | We are fine with up to 1 separate initial UL BWP for Rel-17 RedCap. Multiple separate initial UL BWPs can be further discussed in Rel-18. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y | We think option 2 might be beneficial, while option 1 has no issue to work. Considering this is the last meeting, and for the sake of progress, we are fine with option 1. |
| CATT | Y | For progress. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Vodafone | Y | OK |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | Can accept with the understanding that it does not prevent later agreement of versions of question 4-2a |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |

# Separate initial DL BWP

Related to configuring/defining a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs, we have the following working assumption in RAN1#105-e [2]:

|  |
| --- |
| Working assumption:   * At least for TDD, an initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs (which is not expected to exceed the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth) can be optionally configured/defined separately from the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs at least after initial access   + FFS the details of the configuration/definition     - The configuration for a separately configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is signaled in SIB.     - whether to support that separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs can include a configuration of CORESET and CSS(s)     - whether part of the configuration can be defined instead of signaled   + If a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is configured/defined, this separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs can be used at least after initial access (i.e., at least after RRC Setup, RRC Resume, or RRC Reestablishment).     - FFS during the initial access   + FFS: whether a separately configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs needs to contain the entire CORESET #0, and, if not, the RedCap UE behaviour for CORESET #0 monitoring   + FFS: supported bandwidths in the separate initial DL BWP   + FFS: whether additional SSB is transmitted in the separately configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs   + FFS: FDD case |

The working assumptions from RAN1#106bis-e [2] are as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| Working Assumption:   * For a cell that allows a RedCap UE to access, network can configure a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs in SIB.   + Working assumption: It can be used during initial access   + It can be used after initial access.   + It is no wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.   + FFS: It is always configured if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.   + This applies to both TDD and FDD (including FD FDD and HD FDD) cases.   + Working assumption: It applies at least after initial access for FR1 when MIB configured CORESET#0 is included |

The contributions generally agree that configuring/defining a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is beneficial for flexibility and/or offloading purposes and also it is needed in scenarios where non-RedCap initial DL BWP is larger than the RedCap UE bandwidth (e.g., [4, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 28, 29]). Moreover, most of the contributions propose to confirm the working assumptions from RAN1#106bis-e related to the configuration of a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap. It was also proposed that such configuration applies to both FR1 and FR2 [4].

Regarding “FFS: It is always configured if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth”, the contributions express different views. Two contributions [17, 29] indicate that the separate initial DL BWP for RedCap is always configured if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth. Meanwhile, several contributions [4, 10, 14, 15, 19, 24, 25] argue it is not necessary to always configure a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap. Specifically, if the separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is not configured, then the RedCap UEs may assume the MIB-configured CORESET#0 bandwidth as the initial DL BWP:

* [15]: There is no need to mandate separate initial DL BWP configuration for RedCap when the SIB-configured BWP#0 is larger than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.
* [19]: If SIB1-configured initial DL BWP has a wider bandwidth than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth and additional initial DL for RedCap UEs is not configured, a RedCap UE derives initial DL BWP corresponding to CORESET#0.
* [24]: If the separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is not configured, then the RedCap UEs may assume the MIB-configured CORESET#0 bandwidth as the initial DL BWP.
* [25]: When the parameter on the separate initial DL BWP is absent, a RedCap UE use the BW of CORESET#0 or configuration of initial DL BWP for non-RedCap.

Based on the above views, the following proposal and question related to the RedCap separate initial DL BWP can be considered.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 3-1a: The following working assumptions related to the separate initial DL BWPs for RedCap are confirmed for both FR1 and FR2:**

* **Working assumption: For a cell that allows a RedCap UE to access, network can configure a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs in SIB.**
  + **Working assumption: It can be used during initial access**
  + **It can be used after initial access.**
  + **It is no wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**
  + **This applies to both TDD and FDD (including FD FDD and HD FDD) cases.**
  + **Working assumption: It applies at least after initial access for FR1 when MIB configured CORESET#0 is included**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Y (see comments) | While we can confirm the working assumptions, the case not covered by the last working assumption needs to be addressed as well.  To elaborate, if the initial DL BWP is used during initial access, e.g., if PDCCH Type 1 CSS for random access is configured in the separate initial DL BWP, but MIB-configured CORESET #0 is not included within the separate initial DL BWP, the RedCap UE should continue to receive DL in the separate initial DL BWP after RRC connection establishment (“after initial access”).  Moreover, if any other PDCCH CSS (Types 0/0A/2) are (optionally) configured in the separate initial DL BWP, the RedCap UE can receive the corresponding common control in the separate initial DL BWP if the latter is included within its active DL BWP when in RRC\_CONNECTED mode.  Thus, if a separate initial DL BWP is configured to RedCap UE, it should be applicable for reception by RedCap UEs after initial access regardless of whether MIB-configured CORESET #0 is included or not. |
| Qualcomm | Y partially | Since there is no consensus yet on the configuration of RedCap-specific initial DL BWP which does not include the entire MIB-configured CORESET#0, we suggest to agree on the following initial DL BWP configurations for RedCap UE first:  For a cell that allows a RedCap UE to access in TDD or FDD,   * a RedCap UE can use a SIB-configured initial DL BWP during and after initial access, if the SIB-configured initial DL BWP is no wider than the max RedCap UE BW and includes both MIB-configured CORESET#0 as well as CD-SSB   + FFS: SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UE, which does not include the entire MIB-configured CORESET#0 and CD-SSB * if a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap UE in SIB, RedCap UE shall use the MIB-configured CORESET#0 as the initial DL BWP during and after initial access |
| vivo |  | The feasibility of using the separate initial BWP during or after initial access highly depends on the outcome of the other discussion, i.e. NCD-SSB. Therefore, we think the WA should be reviewed/confirmed later. |
| HW, HiSi |  | We foresee many potential issues (as below) if a separate initial DL BWP is to be introduced:   * Impact on CN and design for PEI associated with CORESET other than #0, if power saving is desirable for RedCap UEs * RF retuning/BWP switching time if separate initial DL BWP does not contain CORESET#0 * Presence of (CD/NCD)-SSB/CSI-RS/TRS during/after initial access needs RAN2 input and how the UE know which BWP contains what before capability report   It is also related to Proposal 3-3a discussing the motivation of the separate initial DL BWP. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y, but add note | While we agree that UE can receive within CORESET#0 during initial access, it is up to RAN2 to design conditions under which parameter is configured. In our opinion it depends whether pdcch-ConfigCommon would be configured separately for RedCap UEs or not.  Therefore, for sake of progress we could be fine if note is included   * **Working assumption: For a cell that allows a RedCap UE to access, network can configure a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs in SIB.**   + **Working assumption: It can be used during initial access**   + **It can be used after initial access.**   + **It is no wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **This applies to both TDD and FDD (including FD FDD and HD FDD) cases.**   + **Working assumption: It applies at least after initial access for FR1 when MIB configured CORESET#0 is included**   + **Note:** Whether it is always configured if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth is **up to RAN2**   Furthermore, **we disagree with QC** that CORESET#0 can be an active BWP after MSG4. In BWP configuration Option 1, gNB shall configure BWP#1 in our understanding. |
| Sharp | Y with modification | The relation between 1st bullet, 2nd bullet and last bullet is a little complicated. We suggest confirming the working assumption with following modification.   * **For a cell that allows a RedCap UE to access, network can configure a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs in SIB.**   + **Working assumption: It can be used during initial access at least when MIB configured CORESET#0 is not included**   + **It can be used after initial access.**   + **It is no wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **This applies to both TDD and FDD (including FD FDD and HD FDD) cases.**   + **~~Working assumption: It applies at least after initial access for FR1 when MIB configured CORESET#0 is included~~** |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | For the second working assumption, similar like the RRC configured BWP, the separate initial DL BWP can be used regardless of whether CORESET0 is included or not   * + **Working assumption: It applies at least after initial access for FR1 ~~when MIB configured CORESET#0 is included~~** |
| CATT | Partially | We are OK to confirm the WA in the main body and the last sub-bullet.  But for the 1st sub-bullet (especially for ‘during initial access’), we think it is highly related to the outcome of relationship between separate initial DL BWP and SSB. Prefer to live it open for now. |
| CMCC | Y | At least for TDD center frequency alignment and offloading purpose, and for simplifying BWP behavior when RRC configured initial DL BWP is larger than 20MHz, a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs can be configured/defined. At least when separate initial DL BWP does not contain entire CORESET0 and contains RACH CSS or paging CSS, it can be used during initial access. |
| Xiaomi |  | We prefer to discuss this proposal later when there is outcome of the feasibility of NCD-SSB |
| MediaTek | N | We prefer to wait until the discussion on the NCD-SSB is progressed. |
| LGE | Y | It is up to network If the separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is not configured, then the RedCap UEs may assume the MIB-configured CORESET#0 bandwidth as the initial DL BWP. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | In our understanding, there are many combinations of MIB-configured CORESET#0, SIB-configured DL BWP (for non-RedCap UEs), and separate initial DL BWP (e.g., proposal 3-2a). Then include active/idle/inactive states, and during initial access. The nested working assumptions do not address all these combinations. We should return to this proposal once other questions are resolved. |
| Ericsson | Y, with minor changes | The possibility of configuring a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap should be supported for both FR1 and FR2.  The last sub-bullet could be applicable for both FR1 and FR2. It could be clarified that “It” in the last sub-bullet refers to frequency domain location and bandwidth. Therefore, we propose he following clarification:   * **Working assumption: The *locationAndBandwidth* applies at least after initial access for FR1 and FR2 when MIB configured CORESET#0 is included** |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We also suggest the following modifications –   * It can be used during initial access at least when MIB configured CORESET#0 is not included * It applies at least after initial access for FR1 ~~when MIB configured CORESET#0 is included~~ |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | We are fine to confirm this WA. When/how the separate initial DL BWP is used for initial access and when/how to use it after initial access depends on discussions for other questions. |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered, where the working assumption for the main body is confirmed, and the working assumption in the first sub-bullet is modified, and the working assumption in the last sub-bullet is reverted. The working assumption in the first sub-bullet can be revisited after the proposals in Section 5 (“SSB transmission”) have seen further progress.  **High Priority Proposal 3-1b: The working assumptions related to the separate initial DL BWPs for RedCap are replaced with the following agreement and working assumption:**   * **~~Working assumption:~~ For both FR1 and FR2, for a cell that allows a RedCap UE to access, network can configure a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs in SIB.**   + **Working assumption: It can be used during initial access at least when MIB configured CORESET#0 is not included.**   + **It can be used after initial access.**   + **It is no wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **This applies to both TDD and FDD (including FD FDD and HD FDD) cases.**   + **~~Working assumption: It applies at least after initial access for FR1 when MIB configured CORESET#0 is included~~** | |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| vivo | Suggest to wait | Whether a separate initial BWP can be used after initial access depends on the discussion of NCD-SSB, therefore suggest to keep the main bullet as working assumption and confirm it later. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Apple | N | We can be ok to confirm the original working assumption without any change. However, the modified version is NOT ok for us due to the following reasons:   * The original working assumption for ‘during initial access’ covers two cases,   + Case 1: Initial DL BWP includes MIB configured CORESET #0   + Case 2: Initial DL BWP does not include MIB configured CORESET #0   + For case 1, initial DL BWP obviously can be used during initial access.   + For case 2, we are willing to compromise to use initial DL BWP during initial access due to less frequent event of initial access procedure.   + Therefore, we cannot understand the logic behind to support Case 2 but leave Case 1 as FFS.   + Instead, the original working assumption should be confirmed to cover both Case 1 and Case 2. * On the 2nd working assumption, this is the core part of this set of sentences to limit that initial DL BWP for Redcap can be used after initial access on condition that MIB-configured CORESET is included in it. Since CORESET#0 also covers CD-SSB, this working assumption ensures that initial DL BWP can be used after initial access only for the case that it covers CD-SSB. If it would be removed and keeping the 2nd sub-bullet only i.e., ‘It can be used after initial access’, it essentially means that UE is required to support initial DL BWP after initial access even it does not include CORESET#0 and not cover CD-SSB, which is exactly what we debated last meeting and why we added the last sub-bullet. This definitely should NOT be removed. |
| China Telecom | Y | We are fine to confirm this working assumption for both FR1 and FR2. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y with modification | In our understanding, this proposal only covers a general case for separate iDL BWP, i.e, when iDL BWP for non-RedCap is larger than max BW of RedCap UE.  Therefore, it is good to clarify it a little bit.  **For both FR1 and FR2, for a cell that allows a RedCap UE to access, network can configure a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs in SIB at least when initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than maximum RedCap UE bandwith.** |
| CATT | Y | Also OK to comeback after more progress on SSB issues in Section 5 is achieved. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| MediaTek | N | Should wait until the discussion on the NCD-SSB is progressed. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Nordic | N | We cannot support offloading without NCD-SSB. |
| Xiaomi | N | Firstly, we share similar view with vivo and MTK . The WA should be confirmed until there is conclusion for the feasibility of NCD-SSB  Secondly, we prefer to keep the last bullet. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | Further, remove ‘**at least when MIB configured CORESET#0 is not included.** ’ is also acceptable for us. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | If it helps, we could add an FFS to the bullet on “use after initial access” if companies are concerned regarding presence of NCD-SSB, etc.  **The working assumptions related to the separate initial DL BWPs for RedCap are replaced with the following agreement and working assumption:**   * **~~Working assumption:~~ For both FR1 and FR2, for a cell that allows a RedCap UE to access, network can configure a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs in SIB.**   + **Working assumption: It can be used during initial access at least when MIB configured CORESET#0 is not included.**   + **It can be used after initial access.**     - **FFS: Details of how it may be used and conditions**   + **It is no wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **This applies to both TDD and FDD (including FD FDD and HD FDD) cases.**   + **~~Working assumption: It applies at least after initial access for FR1 when MIB configured CORESET#0 is included~~** |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We prefer not to revert/delete the last working assumption, but we can accept it. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | N |  |
| FL3 | Aspects of this proposal have been merged into Proposals 5-1c and 5-2c. | |

**FL1 High Priority Question 3-2a: Should a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap always be configured if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Intel | N | The initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs, provided via SIB1, can be larger than max RedCap UE BW. If NOT configured with a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap, a RedCap UE ignores the “*locationAndBandwidth*” configuration for the initial DL BWP and continues to receive in the DL in the initial DL BWP defined by CORESET #0. Note that rest of the configuration for the initial DL BWP in SIB1 applies to RedCap UEs as when in Idle/Inactive modes. |
| Qualcomm | N | By default, a RedCap UE can use the MIB-configured CORESET#0 as the initial DL BWP during and after initial access, if a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap UE in SIB |
| vivo | Y if the NW allows RedCap UEs access | If a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap is NOT always configured when the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, then for a RedCap UE after the initial access, in order to efficiently and flexibly support RedCap UEs, anyway a separate initial DL BWP need to be configured. Therefore, we did not identify any actual benefits to for RedCap UEs use CORESET#0 derived by MIB for both during and after initial access. This also follows the existing mechanism for the configuration for the non-RedCap UEs that the initial DL BWP should always be configured even the initial DL BWP confines the CORESET#0.  In addition, always configuring a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap also aligns with the always configuring a separate initial UL BWP when the initial BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth. |
| HW, HiSi |  | If it is agreed that can be used during initial access, then it can be configured depending on network. If not configured, CORESET#0 is reused. If configured, this separate initial DL BWP is used. |
| DOCOMO | N | As commented by Intel and Qualcomm, MIB configured CORESET#0 BWP can be used as initial DL BWP during and after initial access for RedCap UE even if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UE is wider than the maximum RedCap UE BW. |
| Nordic | Y | UE receives within MIB-configured CORESET#0 until MSG4, but BWP-DownlinkCommon has also other parameters than *locationAndBandwidth.* Furthermore, as you can see below initialDownlinkBWP is not Optional  DownlinkConfigCommonSIB ::= SEQUENCE {  frequencyInfoDL FrequencyInfoDL-SIB,  initialDownlinkBWP BWP-DownlinkCommon,  bcch-Config BCCH-Config,  pcch-Config PCCH-Config,  ...  }  BWP-DownlinkCommon ::= SEQUENCE {  genericParameters BWP,  pdcch-ConfigCommon SetupRelease { PDCCH-ConfigCommon } OPTIONAL, -- Need M  pdsch-ConfigCommon SetupRelease { PDSCH-ConfigCommon } OPTIONAL, -- Need M  ...  }  BWP ::= SEQUENCE {  locationAndBandwidth INTEGER (0..37949),  subcarrierSpacing SubcarrierSpacing,  cyclicPrefix ENUMERATED { extended } OPTIONAL -- Need R  }  These aspects are in competence of RAN2. |
| Sharp |  | If BWP configuration for separate initial DL BWP is not provided and if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, a RedCap UE should follow the following current 38.331 principle except “until after reception of *RRCSetup*/*RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*”  The UE applies the *locationAndBandwidth* upon reception of this field (e.g. to determine the frequency position of signals described in relation to this *locationAndBandwidth*) but it keeps CORESET#0 until after reception of *RRCSetup*/*RRCResume/RRCReestablishment*.  On the other hand, if some BWP configuration (such as SS/CORESET configuration) for the separate initial DL BWP need to be provided, the BWP configuration for separate initial DL BWP including/or not including *locationAndBandwidth* should be provided.  For simplification, we are also fine that a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap always be configured. |
| Panasonic | N | We think it should be up to the network implementation whether to configure the separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP or not.  If the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, and if separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap is not configured, a RedCap UE can use MIB-configured CORESET #0 as initial DL BWP |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | It is not necessary to always configure a separately SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth. The following benefits can be observed.   1. The NW has the flexibility to configure the separate initial DL BWP or not., e.g., no any other resources can be allocated for the separate initial DL BWP and/or the MIB-configured CORESET#0 is located at the carrier edge, in this case, using CORESET0 is the simplest way. 2. Save the signalling overhead if the separate initial DL BWP is not configured in SIB1. |
| CATT | N | In this case, the RedCap UE can use the bandwidth and location defined by CORESET#0 instead. |
| CMCC | Y | In this case, it is necessary to support separate initial DL BWP to enable RedCap UE can work normally. To remain the flexibility of location of separate initial UL BWP, when it is at the edge of carrier, separate initial DL BWP can also be configured at the edge of carrier. When the center frequency of separate initial UL BWP is the same as CORESET0, CORESET0 can be defined as separate initial DL BWP.  We suggest to modify ‘configured’ in proposal as ‘configured/defined’. |
| Xiaomi | N | It is more flexible to leave NW decide whether configure a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap. If the separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP is not configured, then the RedCap could use the MIB-derived initial DL BWP when the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap is larger than RedCap’s UE BW |
| MediaTek |  | If the separate iBWP is not configured, CORESET#0 BWP should be assumed by RedCap UEs. |
| LGE | N | Share the view with Intel and Qualcomm. |
| FUTUREWEI | N | A RedCap UE can use the MIB-configured CORESET#0 as its initial DL BWP during initial access if no SIB-configured initial BWP is configured. |
| Ericsson | N | It is not necessary to **always** configure a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth. The RedCap UE uses the separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP (if configured), otherwise, it continues using the MIB-configured CORESET #0. Therefore, depending on the scenario, the MIB-configured CORESET #0 may be used as the initial DL BWP for RedCap.    Note that, according to TS 38.213, it is not necessary to always configure an initial DL BWP in SIB1 (see below).  *If a UE is not provided initialDownlinkBWP, an initial DL BWP is defined by a location and number of contiguous PRBs, starting from a PRB with the lowest index and ending at a PRB with the highest index among PRBs of a CORESET for Type0-PDCCH CSS set, and a SCS and a cyclic prefix for PDCCH reception in the CORESET for Type0-PDCCH CSS set; otherwise, the initial DL BWP is provided by initialDownlinkBWP.* |
| Nokia, NSB | N | It is not necessary to always configure the separate initial DL BWP as the UE can use CORESET#0. |
| NEC | Y | We are fine to use MIB-configured CORESET#0 if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth. On the other hand, in such case, RedCap UE is barred according to RAN2 specifications as shown below. RAN1 should not discuss RAN2 specifications. We suggests RAN1 agrees to use MIB-configured CORESET#0 if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth while signalling details is up to RAN2.  TS 38.331 5.2.2.4.2.  2> if the UE supports an uplink channel bandwidth with a maximum transmission bandwidth configuration (see TS 38.101-1 [15] and TS 38.101-2 [39]) which  - is smaller than or equal to the *carrierBandwidth* (indicated in *uplinkConfigCommon* for the SCS of the initial uplink BWP), and which  - is wider than or equal to the bandwidth of the initial uplink BWP, and  2> if the UE supports a downlink channel bandwidth with a maximum transmission bandwidth configuration (see TS 38.101-1 [15] and TS 38.101-2 [39]) which  - is smaller than or equal to the *carrierBandwidth* (indicated in *downlinkConfigCommon* for the SCS of the initial downlink BWP), and which  - is wider than or equal to the bandwidth of the initial downlink BWP:  <omitted>  2> else:  3> consider the cell as barred in accordance with TS 38.304 [20]; and  3> perform barring as if *intraFreqReselection* is set to *notAllowed*; |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | A separate initial DL BWP is always configured when the SIB-configured initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than RedCap UE BW.   * The separate initial DL BWP can be configured to contain entire MIB-configured CORESET#0, in which case CORESET#0 is used during initial access (same as legacy). |
| FL2 | Most received responses do not think that a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs always must be configured if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth. Based on this, the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 3-2b:**   * **If a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is not configured when the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, then the UE continues to use MIB-configured CORESET#0.** | |
| OPPO | Y | Support **Proposal 3-2b** |
| vivo |  | Acceptable for sake of progress. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | As many companies indicated, the problem is that SIB-configured “*locationAndBandwidth*” is automatically applicable for non-RedCap UEs after initial access, which is usually wider than CORESET#0. |
| Apple | Almost Yes. | We suggest the following editorial change to make it more precise:  **If a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is not configured when the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, then the Redcap UE continues to use MIB-configured CORESET#0.** |
| China Telecom | Y | In our understanding, it is no need to always configure separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs, when the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth. |
| NEC | Conditional | If the proposal intends that MIB-configured CORESET#0 is automatically used by RedCap UE if the SIB-configured initial DL BWP for non-RedCap is larger than max. RedCap UE BW, we would not support the proposal as it conflicts with RAN2 specifications.  If this does not imply signalling details (or if it is up to RAN2), we are fine with this proposal. |
| Panasonic | Y if the description is meant the network operation in principle. | Our view is RedCap UE is not required to check " the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth" but RedCap UE just follows "a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is not configured" or not. So we support the proposal as the network operation but not support as RedCap UE behaviour. Our concern can be addressed by having the sub-bullet like following.  **If a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is not configured when the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, then the RedCap UE continues to use MIB-configured CORESET#0.**  **Note: RedCap UE just follows a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs and not required to check whether the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.** |
| Samsung | FFS | We have some concerns to use CORESET #0 after initial access for the following aspects:   * Potential different center frequency of UL and DL for TDD, considering iUL might be seperated configured. * In this case, we think PDCCH/PDSCH configuration for iDL BWP for non-redcap will be reused. However, the iDL BWP is different from CORESET #0. In order to make it work, it might lead to some restriction on the configurations, e.g., location of CORESETs.   We think it is more clean to always configure a separate iDL BWP the iDL BWP for non-RedCap is larger than BW of RedCap. But of course, we need to further study the location, SSB transmission, and whether it can be used for during initial access. |
| CATT | Y | Also fine with Apple’s update. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LGE |  | The FL proposal is acceptable as a default behaviour, but the condition when the separate initial DL BWP may not be configured should be dependent on the parallel discussion on the center frequency alignment during initial access. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Vodafone | Y | Fine with Apple’s update |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Nordic | N | Proposal is technical non-sense for BWP configuration Option 2 |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | Fine with Apple’s revision |
| Intel | Y | **@Nordic** – for BWP configuration option 2, UE would be configured with initial DL BWP with locationAndBandwidth that is same as MIB-configured CORESET #0 as a UE-specific DL BWP configuration. There is nothing special about it. Again, in this case, the UE uses the rest of the configuration from iDL BWP configuration provided in SIB1 – the only parameter determined differently is ***locationAndBandwidth***. The latter parameter can even be perfectly aligned with MIB-indicated CORESET #0 when RedCap UE is provided with “separate initial DL BWP”, then we have exact same configuration as what is described in the proposal.  We also support the update from Apple. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | OK with update from Apple |
| Ericsson | Y | This is a natural behaviour for the UE. For legacy UEs, if a separate initial DL BWP is not configured, the UE uses CORESET #0 as its default initial DL BWP.  We are also fine with Apple’s update.  The decision could also made in RAN2. |
| Qualcomm | Y | Support Apple’s update |
| FL3 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  Regarding the note proposed by Panasonic, the FL’s understanding is that such a note may prevent RedCap UEs from using an initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs that is no wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, which is perhaps not the intention.  **High Priority Proposal 3-2c:**   * **If a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is not configured when the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, then the RedCap UE continues to use at least the *locationAndBandwidth* of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **Signaling details are up to RAN2.** | |
| vivo |  | Acceptable for sake of progress. |

**Regarding the presence of CORESET#0 and other CORESETs/CSSs in the separate initial DL BWP:**

Based on the latest feature lead summary in RAN1#106bis-e [3], the following aspects are under discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| High Priority Proposal 3.2-5-1a:  For FR1,   * If a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is configured,   + It contains at least one CORESET and at least one CSS.   + It can be used both during and after initial access. * FFS: However, if it contains the entire CORESET#0, the RedCap UE shall use the bandwidth and location of the CORESET#0 in DL during initial access. |

Many contributions propose that a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap (if configured) does not need to contain the entire CORESET#0 [4, 5, 10, 14, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24, 25]. Also, several contributions mention that the separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs can include a configuration of CORESETs and CSS(s) [4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23]. In addition, several contributions [4, 11, 23] mention that if the separate initial DL BWP contains the entire CORESET#0, the RedCap UE shall use the bandwidth and location of the CORESET#0 in DL during initial access.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 3-3a:**

* **For FR1 and FR2, if a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is configured,**
  + **It contains at least one CORESET and at least one CSS.**
  + **It may or may not contain the entire MIB-configured CORESET#0.**
    - **If it contains the entire CORESET#0, the RedCap UE shall use the bandwidth and location of the CORESET#0 in DL during initial access.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | FFS | We can agree with this proposal, if clarifications are provided for the SSB and CSS configuration.  Basically, we think a RedCap UE can support a SIB-configured initial DL BWP which does not contain the entire MIB-configured CORESET#0, as long as this initial DL BWP includes SSB (CD-SSB or NCD-SSB) and CSS for paging and RA.  If the SIB-configured initial DL BWP does not include CSS for paging, UE operating in this initial DL BWP cannot get SI update and/or PWS notification during initial access. For UE complexity reduction and power saving, a RedCap UE shall not monitor CSS for SIB1/OSI periodically (for each period of SI modification) by autonomous BWP switching from the SIB-configured initial DL BWP to the MIB-configured CORESET#0. Such autonomous BWP switching is not supported in NR R15/16, which incurs extra complexity and power consumption of RedCap UE. |
| vivo | Y |  |
| HW, HiSi | N | If the separate initial DL BWP is to be useful and used during initial access by being configured with at least one CORESET and CSS, the separate initial DL BWP can be used instead of the CORESET#0 only. The last sub-sub-bullet is not needed.  One possible scenario can be a 20 MHz carrier configured with 5 MHz CORESET#0, which is not desirable to be changed per the access of RedCap UEs. In this case, the network has to use the entire separate initial DL BWP e.g. 20 MHz with (additional) CORESET/CSS for offloading if needed, which anyway will contain the CORESET#0. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nordic | N | Cannot agree on this separately without agreeing also Option 2 |
| Sharp | N | We don’t need to have the limitation in last sub-sub bullet.  In Rel-17 RedCap, a separate (SIB-configured) initial DL BWP can be used during initial access and this principle is different from Rel-15/16 principle. Therefore, we think the separate initial DL BWP doesn’t need to follow the Rel-15/16 principle. For the configuration simplicity, whether a RedCap UE use the bandwidth and location of the CORESET#0 or not should depends on only whether CSS/CORESET for the separate initial DL BWP is configured or not irrespective of the existence of CORESET#0 in the separate initial DL BWP. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | If the separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs contains the MIB-configured CORESET#0, whether to use the separate initial DL BWP depends on the configuration of separate CSS.  If separate CSS for RACH is configured within the separate initial DL BWP, RedCap UEs shall use the separate initial DL BWP during initial access for the purpose of offloading and minimizing impacts on legacy UEs. If separate CSS for RACH is not configured, RedCap UEs shall use the bandwidth and location of the CORESET#0 in DL during initial access to minimize spec effort. Therefore, we prefer to consider the following revision:   * + **It may or may not contain the entire MIB-configured CORESET#0.**     - **If ~~it contains the entire CORESET#0~~ separate CSS for RACH is not configured, the RedCap UE shall use the bandwidth and location of the CORESET#0 in DL during initial access.** |
| CATT | Y | For the last sub-sub bullet, we think it is necessary.  This is not only because it follows the current NR principle, but also it is still workable for the case when early indication of RedCap is done during Msg3 but not Msg1 (i.e. RO and preambles are shared).  In this case, the gNB can only assume all the UEs (including non-RedCap UE and RedCap UE) are using the bandwidth and location of CORESET#0 for Msg2 reception (i.e. following legacy mechanism), until Msg3 is received.  BTW, we think it is not reasonable to assume the gNB always prefers a poor configuration of bandwidth. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| LGE |  | We think the last sub-bullet imposes an unnecessary restriction. There should be the cases where the separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP contains CSS for random access or paging as well as the entire CORESET#0 in which case offloading can still be achieved. |
| FUTUREWEI | N | The last sub-sub-bullet is not needed |
| Ericsson | Y | We are also fine with removing the last sub-bullet.   * **For FR1 and FR2, if a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is configured,**   + **It contains at least one CORESET and at least one CSS.**   + **It may or may not contain the entire MIB-configured CORESET#0.**     - **~~If it contains the entire CORESET#0, the RedCap UE shall use the bandwidth and location of the CORESET#0 in DL during initial access.~~** |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| NEC | Y | We are fine with the proposal but “**and at least one CSS**” would not be needed. It can be left for the network configuration though if no CSS would be meaningless. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | We prefer to add a sub-bullet for the case when the separate initial DL BWP does not contain MIB-configured CORESET#0,   * + **It may or may not contain the entire MIB-configured CORESET#0.**     - **If it contains the entire CORESET#0, the RedCap UE shall use the bandwidth and location of the CORESET#0 in DL during initial access.**     - **If it does not contain the entire CORESET#0, the RedCap UEs can still use the bandwidth and location of the CORESET#0 during initial access.** |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered. The removed sub-sub-bullet can be considered again in a later proposal if desired.  **High Priority Proposal 3-3b:**   * **For FR1 and FR2, if a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is configured,**   + **It contains at least one CORESET and at least one CSS.**   + **It may or may not contain the entire MIB-configured CORESET#0.**     - **~~If it contains the entire CORESET#0, the RedCap UE shall use the bandwidth and location of the CORESET#0 in DL during initial access.~~** | |
| OPPO | Y | Support **Proposal 3-3b** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | We are fine to remove the last sub-bullet. It seems having no impact to UE behavior at least for PDSCH frequency-domain resource allocation during initial access [38.214]:   |  | | --- | | For a PDSCH scheduled with a DCI format 1\_0 in any type of PDCCH common search space, regardless of which bandwidth part is the active bandwidth part, RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CORESET in which the DCI was received; otherwise RB numbering starts from the lowest RB in the determined downlink bandwidth part. | |
| Apple |  | We can be ok with this Proposal.  We share Qualcomm view above that:  Without additional agreement, Redcap UE expects gNB to deliver SIB in an on-demand manner and there is NO UE autonomous BWP switching for CSS monitoring on CORESET#0 that is outside of Redcap-dedicated initial DL BWP. |
| China Telecom | Y | We support FL proposal. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Samsung | FFS | We think it is too early to agree on the iDL BWP “may not” contain CORESET #0 part, without selecting between two options.  It is fine with the first sub-bullet only and remove the second sub-bullet. |
| CATT | N | As mentioned before, the last sub-sub-bullet is not only because it follows the current NR principle, but also it is essential for co-existence when early indication of RedCap is done during Msg3 but not Msg1 (i.e. RO and preambles are shared).  In this case, the gNB does not know there is a RedCap UE sending Msg1, but can only assume all the UEs (including non-RedCap UE and RedCap UE) are using the same bandwidth and location of CORESET#0 for Msg2 reception (i.e. following legacy mechanism), until Msg3 is received. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LGE | Y | We support **High Priority Proposal 3-3b**. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y as WA | This should be WA as the possibility of having separate initial DL BWP without CORESET#0 and CD-SSB will depend on the discussion of NCD-SSB. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Nordic | N | same comment as last time |
| Xiaomi | N | We share similar view with CATT.  If the last bullet is deleted, it preclude the possibility of multiplexing RAR of RedCap and non-RedCap together, that is not spectral efficient. In addition, that would mandate the early indication in Msg.1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | This proposal and proposal 3-1b are very similar. They should be treated together |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We prefer to keep the last sub-bullet. |
| Ericsson | Y | We have some sympathy for the point raised by CATT and Xiaomi and think that it needs further discussion, but perhaps it can be addressed in a separate proposal. |
| Qualcomm | N | Regardless NCD-SSB is transmitted or not in the SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UE, there are issues if the initial DL BWP of RedCap UE contains CORESET/CSS for RA but not paging.  As we know, an idle UE needs to monitor paging and the CBRA of an idle UE may take a long while to finish. If the CORESET/CSS for RA and paging are in different BWPs, can NW ensure:   1. the CSS sets for RA and paging do not overlap in time, and 2. there is sufficient gap for BWP switching between CSS sets for RA and paging?   If not, the RedCap UE may miss paging and/or msg2/4/B. Will such consequences be acceptable to NW? |
| FL3 | If needed, we can come back to this proposal once Proposals 5-1c and 5-2c have progressed further. | |

**Supported bandwidths in the separate initial DL BWP:**

There are only a few views on the supported bandwidth of the separate initial DL BWP:

* [4]: For RedCap UEs the bandwidth of the separate initial DL BWP can have any value up to the maximum UE bandwidth (i.e., 20 MHz in FR1 and 100 MHz in FR2).
* [7]: The supported bandwidths in the separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs can have any values up to the maximum UE bandwidth.
* [15]: If the separate initial DL BWP is configured by SIB1, limit the supported bandwidth to relieve the capacity limitation in SIB1.
* [16]: For RedCap UE being configured with separate initial DL/UL BWP, fallback DCI size for RedCap UE is determined by down-selected following alternatives:
  + Alt 1: Fallback DCI size for RedCap UE is the same as legacy Rel-15/16 which is determined by CORESET#0.
  + Alt 2: Fallback DCI size for RedCap UE can be determined by separate initial UL/DL BWP for RedCap UE.

Based on the presented views, the bandwidth of a separate initial DL BWP can be either be flexible (i.e., various values up to the RedCap UE bandwidth) or limited to a set of pre-defined values such as CORESET#0 bandwidths.

**FL3 Medium Priority Question 3-4a:**

* **For a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs, what bandwidths should be supported?**
  + **Option A: The supported bandwidths for the separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs can have any values up to the maximum UE bandwidth (as in legacy operation).**
  + **Option B: The supported bandwidths for the separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs must be limited to a set of pre-defined values such as CORESET#0 bandwidths.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option (A/B)** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | B | For the sake of signaling overhead reduction in SIB, quantization for the BW of initial DL BWP (e.g. pre-defined values 24/48/96 PRBs) is preferred. |
| vivo |  | No strong preference. |

# BWP center frequency

RAN1#106bis-e [2] made the following agreement related to center frequencies for DL/UL BWPs in TDD:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For FR1,   * For TDD, center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (FFS: if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.   + FFS: For Option 1 and Option 2, whether the case that the center frequencies are different is also supported, and whether RedCap UE can expect CD-SSB and CORESET#0 in this case * For TDD, center frequencies are assumed to be the same for non-initial DL and UL BWPs with the same BWP id for a RedCap UE. |

Several contributions support/accept having the possibility of separate TDD center frequencies for initial UL/DL BWPs [4, 5, 7, 16, 17, 19, 22, 25, 26]. Moreover, these contributions mention that TDD center frequency alignment can depend on the scenario that whether the initial DL BWP contains SSB and/or CORESET#0. However, some other contributions indicate that the same center frequency is preferred to be maintained for initial UL/DL BWPs [12, 14, 15]. One contribution proposes to confirm that CORESET#0 does not need to be aligned in center frequency with (separate) initial UL BWP, for both BWP-configuration Option 1 and Option 2.

* [4]: With the support of separate center frequencies for initial UL/DL BWPs in TDD during initial access, all concerns regarding the PUSCH resource fragmentation and the presence of SSB and CORESET#0 within the initial DL BWP are resolved.
* [4]: For TDD, RAN 1 should down-select between the following cases for RedCap:
  + Case 1: The center frequencies for initial UL/DL BWPs can be different, but the initial DL BWP always contains the CORESET#0 and SSB.
  + Case 2: The center frequencies for initial UL/DL BWPs are always the same, but the initial DL BWP does not necessarily contain CORESET#0.
* [7]: The center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs. The center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.
* [14]: For TDD, center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL BWP and initial UL BWP used during random access, regardless of whether the initial DL BWP includes CD-SSB and entire CORESET#0 or NOT.
* [15]: Assume the same center frequency for the initial DL and UL BWPs in all cases.
* [17]: For Option 1, the case that the center frequencies of initial BWPs are different is not supported. For Option 2, the case that the center frequencies of initial BWPs are different is supported, and RedCap UE can expect CD-SSB and CORESET#0 in this case.
* [19]: For initial DL/UL BWPs during initial access procedure, the RF-retuning latency and power consumption maybe acceptable from UE complexity perspective due to the less frequent operation and relaxed processing time requirement.
* [19]: Different central frequencies of separate initial DL/UL BWP during random access can be considered if separate initial DL BWP for RedCap includes CD-SSB and CORESET#0.
* [22]: For TDD, the center frequency can be different for the initial BWPs during random access.
* [25]: Support the case that center frequency for initial DL BWP including MIB configured CORESET#0 and separate initial UL BWP for RedCap UEs can be different.
* [25]: Center frequency should be assumed to be the same for initial DL BWP not including MIB configured CORESET#0 and separate initial UL BWP for RedCap UEs.
* [26]: For TDD, center frequencies are different for DL and UL BWPs with the same BWP id for RedCap UE.

Based on the expressed views, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 4-1a:**

* **The center frequency of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP may or may not be aligned.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Intel | N | We suggest qualifying the proposal as below:   * **For TDD, the center frequency of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP may or may not be aligned:**   + **if the MIB-configured CORESET #0 and initial UL BWP do not span a bandwidth larger than maximum RedCap UE BW, or**   + **if the UE is provided with configuration of Type 1 PDCCH CSS for random access in a separate initial DL BWP with same center frequency as initial UL BWP.**   Without the above qualifiers, the proposal implies that RedCap UE should support RF retuning between initial DL and UL BWPs. In such a case, we need to revert the decision from last meeting for consistency - there would be no benefit in forcing NW to configure separate initial DL BWP to align center frequency with initial UL BWP for TDD.  On the other hand, if center frequency between separate initial DL BWP and initial UL BWP are to be aligned when separate initial DL BWP does NOT include MIB-configured CORESET #0, it is not clear how the presence of MIB-configured CORESET #0 within the initial DL BWP affects handling of different center frequencies between DL and UL BWPs when these are used for random access. |
| Qualcomm | Y (w/ clarification) | In FDD, the center frequencies of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP of RedCap UE are always not aligned.  In TDD, the center frequencies of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP of RedCap UE may or may not be aligned. If the center frequencies are not aligned, early indication of RedCap UE type in msg1 or msgA PRACH (if 2-step RACH is supported) should be enabled by SIB. |
| vivo | Y with modifications | Suggest modifying as below:   * **The center frequency of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP may or may not be aligned for RedCap UEs.** |
| HW, HiSi | Y | We think it is possible to be maintained as that in R15. |
| DOCOMO | Y | As pointed out by Intel and Qualcomm, “for TDD” can be added for the clarification. |
| Nordic | Y with clarification | Also could be clarified that in TDD CORESET#0 is within BW of initial UL BWP |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | For non-RedCap UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, the center frequency of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP configured by SIB1 can be the same or different. To minimize spec effort, the principle for non-RedCap UEs in current NR spec should be followed with unaligned center frequency of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP being allowed.  Additionally, if the center frequency of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP is kept aligned, then the separate initial DL/UL BWP configuration would be quite limited and the PUSCH resource fragmentation problem would be quite serious. |
| CATT | Y | Also prefer to clarify that this is for TDD case. |
| CMCC | Y | It is possible that separate initial UL BWP locates at edge of carrier to reduce PUSCH fragmentation, initial DL BWP defined by CORESET#0 is used during initial access to reduce overhead of NCD-SSB. |
| Xiaomi |  | We think we need to put a condition for this proposal, when there is separate initial DL BWP configured for RedCap, then it is OK to support different center frequency between the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP. But on the other hand, if there is no separate initial DL BWP and RedCap would use the MIB-configured CORESET#0 both during and after initial access, in this case, the center frequency of MIB-configured CORESET#0 MUST have the same center frequency with initial UL BWP.  We propose the following update:   * **If there is separate initial DL BWP configured for RedCap, the center frequency of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP may or may not be aligned for RedCap in TDD case** |
| MediaTek | N | We agree with comments from Intel.  Due to the difference in the supported BW between RedCap and non-RedCap UEs, the same principle can’t be applied.  For non-RedCap UE, if the center frequencies of MIB-BW and the UL iBWP are not aligned, it doesn’t imply that the UE will require re-tuning between UL and DL (because the total BW of UL & DL BWPs is still less than the UE supported BW). On the other hand, if the center frequencies of MIB-BW and the UL iBWP are not aligned and the total BW (of the MIB BW and the UL iBWP) is larger than the UE BW, this implies re-tuning. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y with clarification | We agree with several companies that for FDD, the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP do not have to be aligned in a relative sense.  For TDD, there are several scenarios where the MIB-configured CORESET#0 is not aligned to the initial UL BWP (see proposal 4-2a): (1) when a separate initial DL BWP contains a MIB-configured CORESET#0; (2) when a separate initial DL BWP does not contain a MIB-configured CORESET#0 but the separate initial DL BWP is aligned to the separate initial DL BWP. |
| Ericsson | Y | This is the existing case for legacy UEs as well. For example, we can have the following configuration where the center of CORESET #0 and initial UL BWP are not the same:    It is also good to clarify that the proposal is for the TDD case, as pointed out by other above. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| NEC | Y | We assume this only applies in TDD. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | We share same view that in legacy, the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP may or may not center frequency aligned. RedCap UEs should follow this principle. |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered. Note that there is already a RAN1#106bis-e agreement that “For TDD, center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs”, so it does not seem to be necessary to update this proposal to address that aspect.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1b:**   * **For TDD, the center frequency of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP may or may not be aligned for RedCap UEs.**   + **This corresponds to legacy behavior.** | |
| OPPO |  | Share similar understanding with intel/MTK/xiaomi.  In addition, as discussed in our contribution, TDD channel reciprocity can’t be guaranteed any more thus there would be performance loss for the TDD system if different centre frequencies are used for initial DL BWP and the initial UL BWP. This will degrade the system performance. So, we shall consider whether the pains really could cover the gains. |
| vivo |  | We are fine with the proposal for progress. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes, but | we are not sure about whether it is the legacy behavior and whether the figure shown by E/// is valid for the legacy UE. It was discussed in RAN1#95 in R15 [[R1-1813988](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_95/Docs/R1-1813988.zip)], but there was no consensus and no spec update, so we understand the alignment is still in the spec. In the RAN1#95 discussion [[R1-1812183](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_95/Docs/R1-1812183.zip)], HW shown the alignment and misalignment both. According to the current spec, we think the spec supports the left figure.    Therefore, we suggest removing the sub-bullet currently.  **~~This corresponds to legacy behavior.~~** |
| China Telecom | Y | We support to add “for TDD” in FL proposal. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO |  | We are generally fine with the proposal but share the similar view with Spreadtrum. We are not sure whether it is valid when the center frequencies of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP are not aligned. Thus, we agree to remove the sub-bullet as Spreadtrum suggested. |
| MediaTek | N | We can agree on having different center frequencies (between CORESET#0 and UL iBWP) if the total BW is not larger than the RedCap UE BW. This illustrated in the figure below.    However, we don’t agree on having different center frequencies (between CORESET#0 and UL iBWP) if the total BW is larger than the RedCap UE BW, as illustrated in the example below. This will require RF re-tuning between CORESET#0 and UL iBWP. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Nordic | N | Same comment as before, CORESET#0 must be within BW of initial UL BWP |
| Xiaomi | N | If we understand correctly, the legacy behavior mainly refers to the following agreement  *Agreements in RAN1#94:*   * *For PCell, the initial DL BWP can be configured in SIB1 to be the same as or different with the initial DL BWP as initially defined by CORESET#0*   + *The initial DL BWP configured in SIB1 includes the bandwidth of CORESET#0*   + *If the initial DL BWP configured by SIB1 is different with the initial DL BWP as initially defined by CORESET#0, the configuration of the initial DL BWP configured by SIB1 is applicable after the initial access*   Therefore, the condition of center frequency misalignment between MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP is a SIB-configured initial DL BWP. Considering this point, we suggest the following update   * **If there is separate initial DL BWP configured for RedCap, For TDD, the center frequency of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP may or may not be aligned for RedCap UEs.**   + **This corresponds to legacy behavior.** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | The subbullet on legacy behavior is unclear and is not needed |
| Intel | N | Same reasons as before. First of all, it seems “legacy behavior” itself is unclear. Secondly, it is not clear if with the proposal we also need to define RF retuning gaps to allow the UE to switch between CORESET #0 and initial UL BWP. If gaps are not defined, it’d be good to understand how UE can retune w/o any provisioned gaps in such cases, while it needs center frequency alignment between the iDL BWP and iUL BWP only if iDL BWP does NOT include CD-SSB and MIB-configured CORESET #0.  In fact, given that we have agreed on center frequency alignment for TDD between iDL and iUL BWPs used for random access, we do not see a need for the proposal in the first place. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | We are also fine with Xiaomi’s update to the proposal. |
| Qualcomm |  | The proposal does not mention whether or not the initial DL BWP of RedCap UE contains MIB-configured CORESET#0. In our view, the configuration of separate initial UL BWP is also a main reason for the center frequency misalignment in TDD.  Therefore, we suggest to clarify the FL proposal as the following:  **For TDD, if there is a separate initial UL and/or DL BWP configured for RedCap UE, and the initial DL BWP of RedCap UE contains the entire MIB-configured CORESET#0, the center frequency of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP of RedCap UE may or may not be aligned for RedCap UEs.** |
| FL3 | Note that there is already a RAN1#106bis-e agreement that “For TDD, center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs” and that “For TDD, center frequencies are assumed to be the same for non-initial DL and UL BWPs with the same BWP id for a RedCap UE”, so it does not seem to be necessary to update this proposal to address that aspect.  Regarding Spreadtrum’s comment, please note the following Conclusion from RAN1#98:   * For unpaired spectrum, the center frequencies of CORESET#0 and the initial DL/UL BWP configured by SIB1 can be the same or different.   + This does not change the following RAN1 agreement * Agreements in RAN1#94: * For PCell, the initial DL BWP can be configured in SIB1 to be the same as or different with the initial DL BWP as initially defined by CORESET#0   + The initial DL BWP configured in SIB1 includes the bandwidth of CORESET#0   + If the initial DL BWP configured by SIB1 is different with the initial DL BWP as initially defined by CORESET#0, the configuration of the initial DL BWP configured by SIB1 is applicable after the initial access   Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1c:**   * **For TDD, if there is separate initial DL BWP configured for RedCap, the center frequency of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP may or may not be aligned for RedCap UEs.**   + **~~This corresponds to legacy behavior.~~** | |
| vivo | Y |  |

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 4-2a:**

* **For FR1,**
  + **For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.**
  + **For TDD, the center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Intel | N | As explained in response to **Proposal 4-1a**, the second sub-bullet is not acceptable as the two bullets are not consistent in terms of expectations from the UE. Presence of CD-SSB/CORESET #0 does NOT impact retuning behavior between DL and UL BWPs in relation to the respective center frequencies.  We can accept the following version:   * **For FR1,**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL ~~(if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0)~~ and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.**   + **~~For TDD, the center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.~~** |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| vivo | Y | We are fine with the proposal for progress. |
| HW, HiSi | Y | We understand the first bullet is to offer something for RedCap UE if a separate initial DL BWP is to be useful for multiple purposes, and the second bullet is the legacy case as in R15. So we agree. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y, with clarification | * **For FR1,**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs until MSG4.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs until MSG4.** |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | If the initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is defined as the MIB-configured CORESET#0 or contains the entire CORESET#0, the center frequency of the initial DL BWP does not need to be aligned with that of the initial UL BWP located at the carrier edge. Otherwise, if TDD center frequencies alignment during initial access is mandatory, the configuration of the existing network needs to be modified that CD-SSB and CORESET#0 are restricted to be placed at the carrier edge for aligning UL/DL center frequencies, which is detrimental to network scheduling flexibility.  If the separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0, the separate initial DL BWP can be used during initial access for the purpose of offloading and center frequencies alignment. In this case, center frequencies can be kept aligned for the initial DL and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs in TDD. |
| CATT | Y | Both the cases can be supported by spec. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y | We can live with this proposal for progress |
| MediaTek | N | It is not clear to us why a UE that can support different center frequencies in the second bullet-point is not able to do so for the first bullet-point!  It will be good to get some technical clarification on how these two cases are different from UE implementation perspective.  We support the modified proposal from Intel. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y, with minor changes | By supporting different center frequencies for initial UL/DL BWPs for RedCap in TDD, the initial DL BWP can always contain CD-SSB/CORESET#0/SIB (at least in FR1). Also, note that the initial BWPs can be used in all RRC states.  We propose the following update:   * **For FR1,**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used at least during random access for RedCap UEs.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used at least during random access for RedCap UEs.** |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | We understand **the initial DL BWP in the second bullet is most the one defined by MIB-Configured CORESET#0.** |
| FL2 | A large majority of the received responses support the proposal as is. Two responses propose to replace “during random access” either with “until Msg4” or with “at least during random access”. Two responses propose to modify the proposal to say that “For FR1, for TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs”, but this was already agreed in RAN1#106bis-e, with some FFSs, and this proposal is an attempt to address the FFSs.  Based on the received responses, the same proposal can be considered again.  **High Priority Proposal 4-2b:**   * **For FR1,**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.** | |
| OPPO | Y | We can live with this proposal for sake of progress. |
| vivo |  | We are fine with the proposal for progress. |
| Apple | Y | Although we understand the concerns from some vendors on the power consumption and complexity, we can compromise to accept this, which provides certain level of flexibility for gNB to avoid NCD-SSB always transmission in case initial UL BWP has to be pushed to the cell-edge to mitigate the PUSCH resource fragment problem. The associated power consumption at Redcap UE maybe doable as the misalignment is limited to ‘during random access’ only. |
| China Telecom | Y | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Samsung |  | We understand that in R15 the center freq of CORESET #0 and iUL BWP may not be the same. However, we think the center frequency of iDL configured in SIB and iUL are the same.  Besides, we like to clarify the when combining with the agreement in RAN 1 #106b, which is the correct understanding:  **Interpretation #1:** If iDL BWP is configured and includes CD-SSB and entire CORESET #0, the center frequency of iDL BWP **is assumed to be the same** with iUL BWP. In this case, UE will use CORESET #0 frequency range for DL reception during initial access.  **Interpretation #2:** If iDL BWP is configured and includes CD-SSB and entire CORESET #0, the center frequency of iDL BWP **can be different from** iUL BWP.  Agreement: [38.213]  For FR1,   * For TDD, center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (FFS: if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.   + FFS: For Option 1 and Option 2, whether the case that the center frequencies are different is also supported, and whether RedCap UE can expect CD-SSB and CORESET#0 in this case * For TDD, center frequencies are assumed to be the same for non-initial DL and UL BWPs with the same BWP id for a RedCap UE.   Before we are sure to be able to down select one option over the other, we suggest to keep the door open to potential support RF retuning during initial access.  For the first bullet, we suggest the following change:   * **For FR1,**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0, if it is supported) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.** |
| CATT | Y | Also fine with Samsung’s update as it is a safer and robust version. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LGE | N | We share the same view with Intel. |
| MediaTek | N | We don’t agree with the second bullet point. Please see our explanation in the response to “Proposal 4-1b”. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Nordic | N | we cannot accept different center frequencies after MSG4 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | We share similar view Nordic.  Despite RA procedure, the initial DL BWP and UL BWP should have same center frequency for RedCap UEs, no matter the initial DL BWP and UL BWP are separate configured or not.  For RA procedure, the initial DL BWP and UL BWP might or might have same center frequency. If the initial DL BWPs defined by MIB-configured CORESET#0 is used for DL, the center frequency can be different between initial DL BWP and initial UL BWP. If the separate initial DL BWP is used, the center frequency should be same with the initial UL BWP. |
| Xiaomi | Y | We can live with proposal for progress |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Intel | N | It is true that with our earlier suggestion (copied below), the proposal appears very similar to the earlier agreement, but not quite.   * **For FR1,**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL ~~(if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0)~~ and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.**   + **~~For TDD, the center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.~~**   In fact, the above also answers the “FFS” points from RAN1 #106bis-e meeting and specifically says that presence of CD-SSB/CORESET #0 does NOT affect the center frequency alignment between iDL and iUL BWPs. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| FL3 | We can come back to this topic later once other topics have progressed further. | |

**FL1 High Priority Question 4-3a:**

* **For FR2, can the following (which is copied from FR1 Proposal 4-2a) apply?**
  + **For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.**
  + **For TDD, the center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.**
* **If the answer to the question is different for different SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, please elaborate in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Intel | N | We agree with the same handling for FR1 and FR2.  We also support NOT optimizing for particular SSB/CORESET #0 patterns.  However, for the same reasons as described in responses to **Proposal 4-1a and Proposal 4-2a**, we can accept the above proposal with the following modifications.   * **For FR2, can the following (which is copied from FR1 Proposal 4-2a) apply?**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL ~~(if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0)~~ and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.**   + **~~For TDD, the center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.~~** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| HW, HiSi | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y | We support QC proposal |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y with modification | In the proposal, the case, only CD-SSB or entire CORESET0 is included in the separate initial DL BWP, is missed. That means whether the center frequency should be aligned for the case is not captured.  If CORESET0 and/or SSB is included in the initial DL BWP, center frequency alignment may not be guaranteed since the initial UL BWP for RedCap UEs is placed at the carrier edge to mitigate PUSCH resource fragmentation.  Therefore, we suggest the following minor revision:   * + **For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes CD-SSB and/or the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.** |
| CATT | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| MediaTek | N | Please see our response to “Proposal 4-2a”.  We can support the modified proposal from Intel. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y with comments | It is not clear to us that this proposal applies to multiplexing patterns 2 and 3 without additional effort, suggest adding "at least for mux pattern 1". |
| Ericsson |  | By supporting different center frequencies for initial UL/DL BWPs for RedCap in TDD, the initial DL BWP can always contain CD-SSB/CORESET#0/SIB in FR2, except for a few special cases of multiplexing pattern 2.  RedCap UEs are not able to simultaneously receive SSB and CORESET #0 for one special CORESET #0/SSB multiplexing pattern in FR2, namely pattern 2 for 240 kHz SSB and 120 kHz PDCCH SCS. Based on (TS 38. 213, Table 13-10), only the cases listed in table below result in a total bandwidth larger than 100 MHz (around 126-128 MHz) which exceed the RedCap UE bandwidth in FR2. In the table, kssb is the number of subcarriers indicating SSB offset from the PRB grid. Therefore, in this case the DL BWP cannot contain both SSB and CORESET #0.    We agree with the proposal for SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern 1 (if “at least” is added before “random access”, as we suggested for the FR1 case). For patterns 2 and 3, the following update can be considered:   * + **For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (if it does not include ~~CD-SSB and~~ the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used at least during random access for RedCap UEs.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes ~~CD-SSB and the~~ entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used at least during random access for RedCap UEs.** |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered. Companies are encouraged to provide input on how to treat multiplexing patterns 2 and 3 in the Comments field.  **High Priority Proposal 4-3b:**   * **For FR2, at least for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern 1,**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.** | |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Samsung |  | We understand that in R15 the center freq of CORESET #0 and iUL BWP may not be the same. However, we think the center frequency of iDL configured in SIB and iUL are the same.  Besides, we like to clarify the when combining with the agreement in RAN 1 #106b, which is the correct understanding:  **Interpretation #1:** If iDL BWP is configured and includes CD-SSB and entire CORESET #0, the center frequency of iDL BWP **is assumed to be the same** with iUL BWP. In this case, UE will use CORESET #0 frequency range for DL reception during initial access.  **Interpretation #2:** If iDL BWP is configured and includes CD-SSB and entire CORESET #0, the center frequency of iDL BWP **can be different from** iUL BWP.  Agreement: [38.213]  For FR1,   * For TDD, center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (FFS: if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.   + FFS: For Option 1 and Option 2, whether the case that the center frequencies are different is also supported, and whether RedCap UE can expect CD-SSB and CORESET#0 in this case * For TDD, center frequencies are assumed to be the same for non-initial DL and UL BWPs with the same BWP id for a RedCap UE.   Before we are sure to be able to down select one option over the other, we suggest to keep the door open to potential support RF retuning during initial access.  For the first bullet, we suggest the following change:   * **For FR2, at least for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern 1,**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0, if it is supported) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.** |
| CATT | Y | Also fine with Samsung’s update as since is a safer and robust version. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LGE |  | We support the modification from Intel. |
| MediaTek | N | We don’t agree with the second bullet point. Please see our explanation in the response to “Proposal 4-1b”. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Nordic | N | we cannot accept different center frequencies after MSG4 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Intel | N | Same reasons as cited in response to Proposals 4-1b and 4-2b.  We do not see how presence of CD-SSB/CORESET #0 makes a difference to UE’s handling of RF retuning between iDL/iUL BWPs such that the UE would not need any retuning gaps even when the UE may need to perform RF retuning beyond its max UE BW. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | In FR2, at least for SSB/CORESET #0 multiplexing pattern 1 (where SSB and CORESET #0 are TDMed), the same proposal as that of FR1 holds.  For SSB/CORESET #0 multiplexing pattern 1, if the DL BWP covers the entire CORESET #0, then it also covers the SSB. For SSB/CORESET #0 multiplexing patterns 2 and 3, since SSB and CORESET #0 are FDMed, covering the entire CORESET #0 does not necessarily imply that SSB is also covered.      However, if different center frequencies for initial UL/DL BWPs are supported, then the initial DL BWP can typically be configured (with proper location and bandwidth) such that it contains both CD-SSB and CORESET #0. There are a few exceptions, which are listed in our reply to Question 4-3a above.    For patterns 2 and 3, if a clarification is desired, the following can be considered:   * **For FR2, for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns 2 and 3,**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL (if it does not include both CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies can be different for the initial DL (if it includes both CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) and UL BWPs used during random access for RedCap UEs.**   Or equivalently:   * **For FR2, for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns 2 and 3,**   + **If the initial DL BWP used during random access for RedCap UEs includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0,**     - **The center frequencies can be different for the initial DL and UL BWPs.**   + **Otherwise,**     - **The center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL and UL BWPs.** |
| FL3 | We can come back to this topic later once other topics have progressed further. | |

# SSB transmission

The contributions express views on transmission of additional SSBs in a separate initial DL BWP and RRC-configured DL BWP related to the following two options (Option 1 and Option 2) discussed in RAN1#106bis-e [3].

|  |
| --- |
| * For FR1, following options:   + Option 1:     - For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.     - For an RRC-configured active DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.   + Option 2:     - For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * If it is configured for random access while not for paging in idle/inactive mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.         + FFS: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, whether the UE can expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP when it is used in connected mode.       * If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.     - For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell [FFS: or CSI-RS or measurement gap configuration] but not CORESET#0/SIB.   + Note: if a separate initial/RRC configured DL BWP is configured to contain the entire CORESET#0, CD-SSB is expected by RedCap UE.   + Note: The network may choose to configure SSB or MIB-configured CORESET#0 or SIB1 to be within the respective DL BWP.   + FFS: For Option 1 and Option 2, whether RedCap UE can/cannot expect SSB under certain other conditions, e.g., for SSB monitoring periodicity (i.e., SMTC configuration) and DRX cycle   + FFS: Whether additional mechanism for SI update or how SI update notifications and/or SI updates are signaled to RedCap UEs   + FFS: FR2 case |

RAN1#106bis-e sent an LS [37] to RAN2 and RAN4 with the following questions related to SSB transmission:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. [RAN2/4] whether it is feasible to use NCD-SSB for serving and non-serving cell measurements for idle, inactive, and/or connected mode for all or some of RRM, RLM, BFD, link recovery, RO selection, mobility, time/frequency tracking and AGC 2. [RAN2/4] whether it is feasible to use NCD-SSB as QCL source of other DL channels/signals and as spatial relation (for UL channels/signals) transmitted in idle, inactive, and/or connected mode in the initial/non-initial DL BWP of RedCap UE 3. [RAN2] whether/when the PCIs indicated by the NCD-SSB and CD-SSB can be the same/different, if both NCD-SSB and CD-SSB are transmitted on the serving cell of RedCap UE 4. [RAN2/4] whether/when periodicities and/or TX power and/or block indexes (provided by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in SIB1 or in *ServingCellConfigCommon*) and/or QCL sources of NCD-SSB can be same/different from those of CD-SSB, if both NCD-SSB and CD-SSB are transmitted on the serving cell of RedCap UE 5. [RAN2/4] whether it is necessary to introduce configuration limitations for NCD-SSB (e.g., regarding frequency locations, periodicity), e.g., to ensure coexistence with legacy UEs 6. [RAN2/4] if CD-SSB is not transmitted in the non-initial DL BWP of RedCap UE, whether it is feasible to transmit periodic CSI-RS for UE to use as an alternative of SSB in the non-initial BWP of RedCap UE or rely on UE performing RF retuning as in measurement gap outside active BWP for BWP without SSB nor CORESET#0 operation 7. [RAN2/4] whether it is feasible for a RedCap UE to retune to a CD-SSB rather than use an NCD-SSB of larger periodicity 8. [RAN2/4] any other potential impacts identified by RAN2/4 on support NCD-SSB for measurement |

RAN2#116-e has replied to the LS from RAN1 in [39]:

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 1** [RAN2/4] whether it is feasible to use NCD-SSB for serving and non-serving cell measurements for idle, inactive, and/or connected mode for all or some of RRM, RLM, BFD, link recovery, RO selection, mobility, time/frequency tracking and AGC  **Answer**  In connected mode, current RRC signalling allows configuring SSB-based RRM measurements on any (CD or NCD) SSB. For RLM, BFD, link recovery, RO selection, mobility, i.e., assuming that here “mobility” refers to the frequency indicated in *FrequencyInfoDL* in HO command, in TCI-states or for any other functionality (other than RRM measurements), current RRC signalling does not use NCD-SSB, however from signalling standpoint it would be feasible to inform the UE about an NCD-SSB which it shall use instead of the CD-SSB.  In idle/inactive mode it would be feasible to inform UEs about an NCD-SSB from signalling standpoint. The concept of non-cell-defining SSB (NCD-SSB) and the corresponding procedures, i.e., measurements, cell (re-)selection, do not exist in the current RAN2 specifications and using NCD-SSB for measurements and cell (re-)selection would still require the UE to re-tune to the CORESET#0 for reading SIBs.  RAN2 has different views on whether impact on specifications due to using NCD-SSB instead of CD-SSB for serving and non-serving cell measurements for idle/inactive mode, would be substantial or not and could not conclude the discussion due to limited time.  **Question 2** [RAN2/4] whether it is feasible to use NCD-SSB as QCL source of other DL channels/signals and as spatial relation (for UL channels/signals) transmitted in idle, inactive, and/or connected mode in the initial/non-initial DL BWP of RedCap UE  **Answer** From signalling perspective, it is feasible to inform UEs in idle, inactive and/or connected mode about an NCD-SSB. However, it is up to RAN1 and RAN4 to decide whether it is possible to use an NCD-SSB as QCL source and spatial relation.  **Question 3** [RAN2] whether/when the PCIs indicated by the NCD-SSB and CD-SSB can be the same/different, if both NCD-SSB and CD-SSB are transmitted on the serving cell of RedCap UE  **Answer** According to the current RRC specification, PCIs indicated by NCD-SSB and CD-SSB may either be same or different if both NCD-SSB and CD-SSB are transmitted by the same serving cell. However, RAN2 thinks that PCIs indicated by NCD-SSB and CD-SSB should be configured as same if both NCD-SSB and CD-SSB are transmitted by the same serving cell, even though this may limit network configuration.  **Question 4** [RAN2/4] whether/when periodicities and/or TX power and/or block indexes (provided by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in SIB1 or in *ServingCellConfigCommon*) and/or QCL sources of NCD-SSB can be same/different from those of CD-SSB, if both NCD-SSB and CD-SSB are transmitted on the serving cell of RedCap UE  **Answer** According to the current RRC specification, periodicities and/or TX power and/or block indexes (provided by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in SIB1 or in *ServingCellConfigCommon*) and/or QCL sources of NCD-SSB may either be same or different from those of CD-SSB, if both NCD-SSB and CD-SSB are transmitted on the serving cell. RAN2 thinks that those parameters can only be configured differently when needed to avoid further consideration required to investigate the impact on signalling and procedures, also considering input from RAN4 on periodicity in their LS in R4-2120327.  **Question 5** [RAN2/4] whether it is necessary to introduce configuration limitations for NCD-SSB (e.g., regarding frequency locations, periodicity), e.g., to ensure coexistence with legacy UEs  **Answer** RAN2 could not reach consensus on whether it is necessary to introduce configuration limitations for NCD-SSB. Some companies think that NCD-SSB should not be on the sync raster and/or periodicity of NCD-SSB should be equal to or larger than that of CD-SSB whereas others think that there seems to be no need to have any limitations for configuration, other than PCI as mentioned above, or even if it is so this should be up to RAN1/4 to decide.  **Question 6** [RAN2/4] if CD-SSB is not transmitted in the non-initial DL BWP of RedCap UE, whether it is feasible to transmit periodic CSI-RS for UE to use as an alternative of SSB in the non-initial BWP of RedCap UE or rely on UE performing RF retuning as in measurement gap outside active BWP for BWP without SSB nor CORESET#0 operation  **Answer** Use of CSI-RS for cell and beam RLM and measurements is already supported from RAN2 signalling standpoint. Use of CSI-RS for such measurements is optional UE capability. Regarding UE re-tuning to CD-SSB and CORESET#0; it is possible for the network to allow the UE to use gaps for intra-frequency measurements however whether those gaps are needed or feasible is up to RAN4 to decide.  **Question 7** [RAN2/4] whether it is feasible for a RedCap UE to retune to a CD-SSB rather than use an NCD-SSB of larger periodicity  **Answer** From RAN2 standpoint, it is already possible for a RedCap UE to retune to a CD-SSB rather than using an NCD-SSB of larger periodicity. However, it is up to RAN1/4 to judge whether it is preferable to retune to a CD-SSB or to configure an NCD-SSB with a periodicity comparable to that of CD-SSB.  **Question 8** [RAN2/4] any other potential impacts identified by RAN2/4 on support NCD-SSB for measurement  **Answer** There may be more potential impact due to the use of NCD-SSB instead of CD-SSB. This reply LS captures what RAN2 has identified at this point in time, but more discussion is needed for further consideration. |

RAN4#101-e has replied to the LS from RAN1 in [38]:

|  |
| --- |
| Question 1 [RAN2/4] whether it is feasible to use NCD-SSB for serving and non-serving cell measurements for idle, inactive, and/or connected mode for all or some of RRM, RLM, BFD, link recovery, RO selection, mobility, time/frequency tracking and AGC  RAN4 answer:  It is feasible to use NCD-SSB for serving and non-serving cell measurements for idle, inactive, and/or connected mode for all or some of RRM, RLM, BFD, link recovery, RO selection, mobility, time/frequency tracking and AGC.   * + RAN4 will further study for specific conditions when it is feasible to use NCD-SSB.   + It is RAN4 understanding that NCD-SSB measurements support may require additional signalling which is up to RAN2.   Question 2 [RAN2/4] whether it is feasible to use NCD-SSB as QCL source of other DL channels/signals and as spatial relation (for UL channels/signals) transmitted in idle, inactive, and/or connected mode in the initial/non-initial DL BWP of RedCap UE  RAN4 answer:  Based on the given information from RAN1 and current RAN4 understanding, it is feasible to use NCD-SSB as QCL source of other DL channels/signals and as spatial relation (for UL channels/signals) transmitted in idle, inactive, and/or connected mode in the initial/non-initial DL BWP of RedCap UE, if the NCD-SSB is QCL’ed with the CD-SSB of UE’s serving cell.  For the case when NCD-SSB is not QCL’ed with the CD-SSB of UE’s serving cell, RAN4 has not reached the conclusions and recommend RAN1 to make the decision.  Question 4 [RAN2/4] whether/when periodicities and/or TX power and/or block indexes (provided by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in SIB1 or in *ServingCellConfigCommon*) and/or QCL sources of NCD-SSB can be same/different from those of CD-SSB, if both NCD-SSB and CD-SSB are transmitted on the serving cell of RedCap UE  RAN4 answer:  It is RAN4 agreement that:   * + Periodicities of NCD-SSB are up to network configuration and can be same or different from those of CD-SSB, if both NCD-SSB and CD-SSB are transmitted on the serving cell of RedCap UE. Periodicity of NCD-SSB shall be not less than periodicity of CD-SSB.   + TX power of NCD-SSB can be same or different from those of CD-SSB     - If TX power is different, then UE needs to be informed on the power difference between NCD-SSB and CD-SSB     - It is RAN4 understanding that if power boosting is used for CD-SSB then it may not be always possible to use the same TX power for NCD-SSB.   Question 5 [RAN2/4] whether it is necessary to introduce configuration limitations for NCD-SSB (e.g., regarding frequency locations, periodicity), e.g., to ensure coexistence with legacy UEs  RAN4 answer:  RAN4 needs to further study this question and will provide an answer later if consensus can be achieved.  Question 6 [RAN2/4] if CD-SSB is not transmitted in the non-initial DL BWP of RedCap UE, whether it is feasible to transmit periodic CSI-RS for UE to use as an alternative of SSB in the non-initial BWP of RedCap UE or rely on UE performing RF retuning as in measurement gap outside active BWP for BWP without SSB nor CORESET#0 operation  RAN4 answer:  RAN4 has no conclusions on whether CSI-RS is a feasible alternative of SSB in the non-initial BWP of RedCap UE. It is RAN4 understanding that CSI-RS are not used as a standalone mechanism for RRM measurements and the existing requirements rely on the presence of SSB signals. Whether to support CSI-RS as an alternative to SSB is up to RAN1 decision.  Question 7 [RAN2/4] whether it is feasible for a RedCap UE to retune to a CD-SSB rather than use an NCD-SSB of larger periodicity  RAN4 answer:  RAN4 needs to further study this question and will provide an answer later if consensus can be achieved.  Question 8 [RAN2/4] any other potential impacts identified by RAN2/4 on support NCD-SSB for measurement  RAN4 answer:  RAN4 needs to further study this question and will provide an answer later if consensus can be achieved. |

The majority of the contributions agree that at least for FR1, Option 2 can be a compromise regarding the presence of SSB in the DL BWPs [4, 7, 9, 12, 15, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29]. Meanwhile, a few contributions do not support mandatory transmission of additional SSBs and prefer Option 1 [5, 11, 18]. One contribution [4] points out the significant overhead of additional SSB transmissions in FR2 and propose to support Option 1 for FR2. Meanwhile, one contribution [25] indicates that Option 2 should be supported for FR1 and FR2.

Two contributions [4, 5] mention that whether RedCap UE can/cannot expect SSB could be based on conditions such as SSB monitoring periodicity (i.e., SMTC configuration), DRX cycle, and measurement gap.

Moreover, related to the use of CSI-RS or measurement gap configuration instead of NCD-SSB in connected mode, the following views are presented:

* [4]: It may not be always feasible to use CSI-RS and/or measurement gaps instead of NCD-SSB.
* [17]: CSI-RS can be an alternative of NCD-SSB and has benefit in reducing network overhead.
* [18]: CSI-RS is used for RLM/BFD if there is no SSB transmission in the DL BWP.
* [27]: At least in FR1, CSI-RS should NOT be used as an alternative to SSB in RRM/BFD.

**FL1 High Priority Question 5-1a: For FR1, which option is preferred, and which options are acceptable to you?**

* **Option 1 (defined as in the text box in the beginning of this section of this document)**
* **Option 2 (defined as in the text box in the beginning of this section of this document)**
* **Other option (please describe in the Comments field)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** | |
| Template | Preferred: Option X  Acceptable: Option X, Y | |
| Intel | Preferred: Option 2  Acceptable: Option 2.  Given the discussions so far, we think Option 2 offers the best compromise and it would not be worthwhile to bring back Option 1 again. The discussions so far in RAN2 and RAN4 clearly point towards fundamental feasibility of supporting Option 2.  Although we acknowledge feasibility of Option 1, we do not think this would be the right way forward towards wrapping up the WI this meeting considering the prior discussions and the current situation in RAN1. | |
| Qualcomm | **Un-acceptable**: Option 1  **Preferred: Option 2 with the following *modifications***   * + Option 2:     - For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * ~~If it is configured for random access while not for paging in idle/inactive mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.~~         + ~~FFS: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, whether the UE can expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP when it is used in connected mode.~~       * If it is configured for paging and random access, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.     - For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell ~~[FFS: or CSI-RS or measurement gap configuration]~~ but not CORESET#0/SIB.   **Acceptable: Option 2 with the following *modifications***   * + Option 2:     - For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * If it is configured for random access while not for paging in idle/inactive mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.         + FFS: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, whether the UE can expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP when it is used in connected mode.       * If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.     - For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell ~~[FFS: or CSI-RS or measurement gap configuration]~~ but not CORESET#0/SIB. | |
| vivo | Preferred: Option 2.  (Option 1 is NOT Acceptable for us)  Note that RAN4 reply LS has been endorsed in R4-2120327, which confirmed the feasibility of using NCD-SSB. | |
| HW, HiSi | Preferred: Option 1  Acceptable: depending on more understanding of NCD-SSB  We expect there would be comments to prefer to wait for further progress from RAN2/RAN4 and appreciate the efforts from FL to facilitate the discussion while keep an eye on other WGs.  From our side at this moment, NCD-SSB used for serving cell is not available, the spec impact and performance impact is unclear (**RAN4 agreeable draft LS did not seem to answer any of the performance impact, so it is un-useful for RAN1 to make decision**). Existing approach relying on CSI-RS/TRS and measurement gap should be assumed.  We don’t see any issue with Option 1 and we’d like to understand the NCD-SSB from RAN1 perspective first (as RAN2 input is pending and RAN4 draft LS seems not so useful) – which should not be agreed as a black-box, considering:   * If a separate initial DL BWP can be configured with RA without SSB in IDLE, why it is an issue for paging given that DRX is typically more than 1s and PEI can be used to tell the UE to receive PO in the separate BWP without SSB with very less frequent times; * If CSI-RS/TRS can be used for IDLE and INACTIVE and is expected by UE seeking for power consumption, can that be an alternative solution in most cases * What is the performance difference between NCD-SSB with large periodicity and UE performing measurement with gap with large DRX cycle and/or sparse gap pattern   With clear understanding of the above, NCD-SSB can be acceptable with the following principle:  **It is an optional feature and its properties in terms of periodicity, power, SSB block indexes in burst, the half frame of the SS burst set, QCL relation with CD-SSB are up to gNB configuration.**  **Option 2 would requires modifications in alternatives:**   * Do not support separate initial DL BWP in Rel-17 for IDLE/INACTIVE * If supported and configured for IDLE/INACTIVE, a RedCap UE does not expect SSB transmission (irrespective of RA and/or Paging) * For connected mode, one or neither of NCD-SSB and CSI-RS/TRS is expected depend on UE capability * No additional RAN1 work for NCD-SSB, e.g. mapping between NCD-SSB and RO, collision handling, QCL association rule etc. | |
| DOCOMO | Preferred: Option 2 with the following modification:   * + - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),**       * **If it is configured for random access while not for paging in idle/inactive mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.**         + **~~FFS: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, whether the UE can expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP when it is used in connected mode.~~**       * **If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.**     - **For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),**       * **RedCap UE expects measurement gap configuration, but does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.**       * **~~RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell [FFS: or CSI-RS or measurement gap configuration] but not CORESET#0/SIB.~~** | |
| Nordic | Only Option 2 is acceptable  Option 1 is unacceptable and reverting existing agreements  We can accept Option 2 or variants of it. For example, if idle camping (including cell reselection) would require too much work in RAN2, in R17 we propose to support IDLE paging/reselection only on CORESET#0. | |
| Sharp | Preferred: Option 2  Acceptable: Option 2  According the reply from RAN2/RAN4, NCD-SSB can be used for the separate initial DL BWP. At least for paging, (NCD-)SSB is needed and option 2 is preferred to perform paging on the separate initial DL BWP. | |
| Panasonic | Preferred: Option 2  Acceptable: Option 2 | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Preferred: Option 1  Acceptable: Option 2 with modification   * + Option 2:     - For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * If it is configured for random access while not for paging in idle/inactive mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.         + FFS: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, whether the UE can expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP when it is used in connected mode.       * If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.     - For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * Whether RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB/CSI-RS/TRS/measurement gap for serving cell ~~[FFS: or CSI-RS or measurement gap configuration]~~depends on UE capability ~~but not CORESET#0/SIB.~~   Note: No additional RAN1 work for NCD-SSB, e.g. mapping between NCD-SSB and RO, collision handling, QCL association rule etc.  We agree the analysis from Huawei regarding option2. Additionally, from the RAN4 agreement cited by FL, whether any specific conditions for NCD-SSB feasibility is still not clear. From RAN2 discussion, the massive spec impacts are foreseen especially when NCD-SSB is introduced in idle/inactive mode. Therefore, NCD-SSB introduction is not preferred for us in idle/inactive mode.  Moreover, in legacy NR spec, CSI-RS application also depends on the UE capability. From the gNB perspective, NCD-SSB/CSI-RS/TRS/measurement gap can be configured based on UE capability.  Considering the limited TU and this is the last Rel-17 meeting for RedCap, it is not expected that additional RAN1 work is introduced by the NCD-SSB. | |
| FL | RAN4#101-e has replied to the LS from RAN1 in [38]. The reply is inserted earlier in this section. | |
| CATT | Preferred: Option 1  Acceptable: Option 2 but only without mandating SSB when separate initial DL BWP is configured with CSS for paging. | |
| CMCC | Prefer:Option1  Acceptable: modified Option 2   * + **Option 2:**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),**       * **If it is configured for random access while not for paging in idle/inactive mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.**         + **FFS: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, whether the UE can expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP when it is used in connected mode.**       * **If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.**     - **For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),**       * **RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB or CSI-RS for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.**   As our analysis in R1-2111613, based on spec, CSI-RS can be an alternative of NCD-SSB in active DL BWP for RRM/RLM/BFD measurement, RO mapping and QCL source/spatial relation purpose. Compared with configuring additional NCD-SSB in active DL BWP, the CSI-RS resource can always be configured by network, no additional overhead is needed. | |
| Xiaomi | Preferred: Option 2  Acceptable: Option 2 | |
| MediaTek | Preferred: Option 2 with the following modifications   * Option 2:   + For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),     - If it is configured only for random access while not for paging in idle/inactive mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.       * ~~FFS: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, whether the UE can expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP when it is used in connected mode.~~     - If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.   + For an ~~RRC-configured~~ active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),     - RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell ~~[FFS: or CSI-RS or measurement gap configuration]~~ but not CORESET#0/SIB.   Also, if it is problematic to have NCD-SSB in the separate initial DL BWP that is configured for paging in idle mode, RAN1 can adopt the option of not having separate initial DL BWP configured for idle mode. There is no need for offloading for UEs in idle mode. | |
| LGE | Preferred: Option 2  Acceptable: Option 2. | |
| FUTUREWEI | Preferred: Depends on LS answers.  Acceptable: Both | |
| Ericsson | Preferred: Option 1  Acceptable: Option 2  Option 2 is acceptable as a compromise. We are also fine with not using separate initial DL BWP for paging, i.e., initial DL BWP is only available once the random access is initiated in idle and inactive states. | |
| Nokia, NSB | Preferred: Option 1  Acceptable: Option 2 | |
| NEC | Depends on LS responses. | |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Preferred: Option 1  Acceptable: Option 2 | |
| FL2 | Slightly more than third of the received responses (7/18) prefer Option 1. Slightly less than half (8/18) prefer Option 2, and an additional few (2/18) replied that they prefer modified versions of Option 2.  Slightly more than a third (7/18) replied that they can accept Option 1. A majority (12/18) can accept Option 2, and an additional third (6/18) replied that they can accept various modified versions of Option 2.  A third (6/18) expressed that they would be OK with not supporting paging in a separate initial DL BWP if it would be considered infeasible for some reason.  Based on the received responses, the following proposal based on Option 2 can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 5-1b:**   * For FR1, ~~following options:~~   + ~~Option 1:~~     - ~~For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),~~       * ~~RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.~~     - ~~For an RRC-configured active DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),~~       * ~~RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.~~   + ~~Option 2:~~     - For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * If it is configured for random access while not for paging in idle/inactive mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.         + ~~FFS: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, whether the UE can expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP when it is used in connected mode.~~       * Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.     - For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * A basic RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell ~~[FFS: or CSI-RS or measurement gap configuration]~~ but not CORESET#0/SIB.       * Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation based on CSI-RS instead of SSB in it.       * Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation without SSB or CSI-RS in it (RAN4 can decide a minimum measurement gap configuration if needed).   + Note: if a separate initial/RRC configured DL BWP is configured to contain the entire CORESET#0, CD-SSB is expected by RedCap UE.   + Note: The network may choose to configure SSB or MIB-configured CORESET#0 or SIB1 to be within the respective DL BWP.   + ~~FFS: For Option 1 and Option 2, whether RedCap UE can/cannot expect SSB under certain other conditions, e.g., for SSB monitoring periodicity (i.e., SMTC configuration) and DRX cycle~~   + ~~FFS: Whether additional mechanism for SI update or how SI update notifications and/or SI updates are signaled to RedCap UEs~~   + ~~FFS: FR2 case~~ | |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Partially Y | We are generally fine with the proposal. But the word “basic” mean?  Does it mean the mandatory UE feature? |
| vivo | Generally fine with updates | Based on the RAN4 LS (R4-2120327), the feasibility of using CSI-RS as alternative to SSB was not confirmed (no conclusion in RAN4), and CSI-RS cannot be used alone, meaning UE has to use CD-SSB (if NCD-SSB is not provided in the RRC configured active BWP) for timing adjustment and neighbor cell RRM which requires RF retuning anyway. Therefore it is not clear how much benefit would CSI-RS bring in this case. Consider the unclear benefit and amount of specification work required, we suggest to remove CSI-RS, i.e. updated as the following  Updated proposal:   * For FR1, ~~following options:~~   + ~~Option 1:~~     - ~~For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),~~       * ~~RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.~~     - ~~For an RRC-configured active DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),~~       * ~~RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.~~   + ~~Option 2:~~     - For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * If it is configured for random access while not for paging in idle/inactive mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.         + ~~FFS: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, whether the UE can expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP when it is used in connected mode.~~       * Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.     - For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * A basic RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell ~~[FFS: or CSI-RS or measurement gap configuration]~~ but not CORESET#0/SIB.       * ~~Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation based on CSI-RS instead of SSB in it.~~       * Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation without SSB ~~or CSI-RS~~ in it (RAN4 can decide a minimum measurement gap configuration if needed).   + Note: if a separate initial/RRC configured DL BWP is configured to contain the entire CORESET#0, CD-SSB is expected by RedCap UE.   + Note: The network may choose to configure SSB or MIB-configured CORESET#0 or SIB1 to be within the respective DL BWP.   + ~~FFS: For Option 1 and Option 2, whether RedCap UE can/cannot expect SSB under certain other conditions, e.g., for SSB monitoring periodicity (i.e., SMTC configuration) and DRX cycle~~   + ~~FFS: Whether additional mechanism for SI update or how SI update notifications and/or SI updates are signaled to RedCap UEs~~   + ~~FFS: FR2 case~~ |
| Spreadtrum | Y | Does “basic” mean the baseline capability to support BWP operation? |
| Apple | Almost Y | We support vivo’s comment to remove the CSI-RS.  Similar comment as OPPO to make ‘basic’ clear.  As one example:   * Introducing a new UE feature for Redcap to indicate whether it supports an active BWP without SSB. * A ~~basic~~ RedCap UE not supporting Feature-X expects NCD-SSB in the active BWP for serving cell ~~[FFS: or CSI-RS or measurement gap configuration]~~ but not CORESET#0/SIB.   …… |
| NEC |  | Share view with vivo. |
| Panasonic | Almost Y | Share the view from vivo and Apple modification. |
| Samsung | N | This is not acceptable for us.  We need to discuss more details for option 2. For example, what NCD-SSB can be used for, RRM? RLF? BFD? Hand over? and how.  Moreover, we suggest another option which basically reuse current procedure for iDL BWP, and further discuss separate iDL BWP in the future.  Preferred, Option 1  Acceptable: only support the separate iDL BWP that contains CD-SSB and reuse CORESET #0 BW as legacy. |
| CATT | N | If we have to compromise to Option 2, only if:  (1) At least keep CSI-RS as an optional capability.  (2) Remove the requirement of SSB if configured with paging CSS, or simply state that paging CSS is not configured in this case (if separate initial DL BWP does not contain CD-SSB)  Otherwise, we prefer to only support the case where separate initial DL BWP must contain CORESET#0 (and SSB) |
| DOCOMO |  | We support to take option 2 as baseline.  We still have a concern on the NCD-SSB transmission from NW overhead perspective. However, for the sake of progress, we can compromise to support the proposal that NCD-SSB can be transmitted in the RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0.  On the other hand, for the separate initial DL BWP, we would like to avoid NCD-SSB transmission. Considering the possible traffic pattern for RedCap UE such as infrequent communication, idle/inactive mode can be the dominant state over connected mode. If NW is forced to transmit NCD-SSB for idle/inactive mode UE, the overhead can be considerable. Therefore, we suggest transmitting NCD-SSB only in RRC connected mode.  For the support of CSI-RS as captured in working assumption, we share the vivo's update. |
| LGE | Y (with modification) | We are generally fine with the updates, but we think the two newly added working assumptions for the RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode should be removed.   * + - For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * A basic RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell ~~[FFS: or CSI-RS or measurement gap configuration]~~ but not CORESET#0/SIB.       * ~~Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation based on CSI-RS instead of SSB in it.~~       * ~~Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation without SSB or CSI-RS in it (RAN4 can decide a minimum measurement gap configuration if needed).~~   Those two newly added working assumptions can be discussed separately as additional features. |
| FL | RAN2#116-e has replied to the LS from RAN1 in [39]. The reply is inserted earlier in this section. | |
| IDCC | Y | We are ok with the updated proposal. |
| MediaTek | Y with modifications | 1. We share the same view as vivo regarding the WA on CSI-RS. RAN4 response is that there is no confirmation on whether CSI-RS is a feasible alternative of SSB. It is RAN4 understanding that CSI-RS are not used as a standalone mechanism for RRM measurements and the existing requirements rely on the presence of SSB signals. Hence, the RRM must be based on SSB (NCD-SSB in the active DL BWP or by re-tuning to the CD-SSB). So, the following WA should be removed:   “**~~Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation based on CSI-RS instead of SSB in it.~~**”   1. Given that the FFS on “BWP#0 configuration option 1” has been removed from updated proposal, the second bullet need to be updated to cover “BWP#0 configuration option 1”, i.e. having the following modification:   **“For an ~~RRC-configured~~ active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),”**   1. We can accept the second WA assumption as a compromise: “**Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation without SSB or CSI-RS in it (RAN4 can decide a minimum measurement gap configuration if needed)**” |
| Vodafone |  | Similar view as DOCOMO on the NW overhead caused by NCD-SSB transmission in idle/inactive mode. On the other hand we think measurements based on CSI-RS should be kept as optional capability as RAN4 has not reached consensus in questions 6, 7 and 8 of the reply LS |
| CMCC |  | The wording 'basic' needs clarification.  For the sake of progress, we can compromise to Option 2, but we want to keep CSI-RS as an optional capability, whether CSI-RS can replace SSB can be discussed further. |
| Nordic |  | We support VIVO wording |
| Xiaomi |  | As commented by OPPO, more clarification on the ‘basic’ is needed  And We support vivo’s comment to remove the CSI-RS |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | Similar as Samsung and CATT, we still have the concern on the use of NCD-SSB.   1. whether any specific conditions for NCD-SSB feasibility is still not clear, which may cause the NW more complicated and have the impact on the system robust. 2. Currently, many usages of NCD-SSB is not supported by RAN2. There would have a big impact on the spec. 3. The applicability of CSI-RS is supported by legacy NR. This should not be precluded in connected mode.   Based on the current situation, there are lots of concern on the usage of NCD-SSB. It would be a big risk for the system and UE to mandate the NCD-SSB in connected mode and also for paging.  So it is preferred that the use of NCD-SSB should not be always expected for paging and connected mode. Also, the gNB can configure the NCD-SSB or CSI-RS based on UE capability in connected mode. |
| Intel | Y | Also fine with the updates from vivo. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We can accept the proposal. Agree with others that the term basic is not clear, so suggest to remove it. |
| Ericsson | Y | We are fine with not supporting paging in the separate initial DL BWP (when it does not include SSB/CORESET#0/SIB).  We share CMCC’s view that CSI-RS can be kept as an optional capability (and let RAN4 consider further whether it can replace SSB in connected mode). |
| Qualcomm | N | Regardless SSB is transmitted or not in the SIB-configured separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UE, we think it is problematic for both NW and UE, if the initial DL BWP of RedCap UE contains CORESET/CSS for RA but not paging.  As we know, an idle UE needs to monitor paging and the CBRA of an idle UE may take a long while to finish. If the CORESET/CSS for RA and paging are in different BWPs, can NW ensure:   1. the CSS sets for RA and paging do not overlap in time, and 2. there is sufficient gap for BWP switching of RedCap UE between CSS sets for RA and paging?   If not, the RedCap UE may miss paging and/or msg2/4/B. Will such consequences be acceptable to NW? |
| FL3 | Proposal 5-1b was discussed during an online (GTW) session on Friday 12th November. Based on the online discussion and comments received on the RAN1 email reflector, the following updated proposal can be considered, where aspects from Proposal 3-1b have also been incorporated in the proposal.  **High Priority Proposal 5-1c:**   * **For FR1,**   + **For a cell that allows a RedCap UE to access, network can configure a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs in SIB.**     - **It can be used both during and after initial access.**     - **It is no wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **If it is configured for random access while not for paging in idle/inactive mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.**     - **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.**   + **For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),**     - **~~A basic RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.~~**     - **A RedCap UE supporting only mandatory FG 6-1 expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.**     - **Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation based on CSI-RS ~~instead of SSB in it~~.**     - **Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation without SSB or CSI-RS in it (RAN4 can decide a minimum measurement gap configuration if needed).**   + **Note: if a separate initial/RRC configured DL BWP is configured to contain the entire CORESET#0, CD-SSB is expected by RedCap UE.**   + **Note: The network may choose to configure SSB or MIB-configured CORESET#0 or SIB1 to be within the respective DL BWP.** | |
| vivo | Modification | Regarding the 2nd working assumption, it is clear from RAN4 LS that CSI-RS cannot work alone, UE still has to rely SSB for proper operation. Therefore, UE supporting the 2nd working assumption will still suffer from frequent RF retuning for SSB processing if this is acceptable for some UE implementation, why not implementing the 3nd working assumption directly since such a UE can do frequent RF retuning anyway and in such case there is no need for additional CSI-RS transmission which reduces the system overhead.  However, considering the spirit of compromise, we can live with the optional support of UE operation based on CSI-RS. But we should make it clear that this does not change what RAN4 is currently assuming, i.e. CSI-RS cannot work standalone. We think a note should be added to clarify this.   * **Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation based on CSI-RS ~~instead of SSB in it~~.**   + **Note: This does not mean CSI-RS can be used as a standalone mechanism.** |

**FL1 High Priority Question 5-2a: For FR2, which option is preferred, and which options are acceptable to you?**

* **Option 1 (defined as in the text box for FR1 in the beginning of this section of this document)**
* **Option 2 (defined as in the text box for FR1 in the beginning of this section of this document)**
* **Other option (please describe in the Comments field)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** | |
| Template | Preferred: Option X  Acceptable: Option X, Y | |
| Intel | Preferred: Option 2  Acceptable: Option 2.  Same reasons as for FR1. | |
| vivo | Preferred: Option 2.  The same design principles should be applied to FR1 and FR2. | |
| HW, HiSi | Similar handling as FR1. | |
| DOCOMO | Preferred: Option 2 (with the same modification as Question 5-1a) | |
| Nordic | we could agree Option 2 at least for Pattern 1 and continue discussion on Pattern 2 and Pattern 3 | |
| Sharp | Preferred: Option 2  Acceptable: Option 2  Same view with FR1 | |
| Panasonic | Preferred: Option 2  Acceptable: Option 2  We see more overhead by SSB burst in FR2 than FR1. But longer NCD-SSB periodicity can be configured to mitigate the overhead. | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Preferred: Option 1  As captured in TS 38.331, the network configures the *locationAndBandwidth* so that the initial downlink BWP contains the entire CORESET#0 of this serving cell in the frequency domain. It is possible that the initial DL BWP for legacy UEs does not contain SSB, especially for SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns 2 and 3 in FR2. Therefore, it is not necessary to have stringent SSB acquisition requirements in FR2 and RedCap UEs can switch to the legacy CD-SSB by RF retuning when needed.  Besides, since up to 64 SSBs can be transmitted in one SSB burst, the additional overhead for NCD-SSB transmission in FR2 would be more significant that in FR1. As a result, we think that the transmission of SSB in the separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs is up to gNB configuration. The UE shall not always expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP in FR2.  Acceptable: similar as FR1. | |
| FL | RAN4#101-e has replied to the LS from RAN1 in [38]. The reply is inserted earlier in this section. | |
| CATT | Preferred: Option 1  Acceptable: Option 2 but only without mandating SSB when separate initial DL BWP is configured with CSS for paging. | |
| CMCC | Prefer:Option1  As mentioned by Ericsson, in FR2, up to 64 SSBs may need to be transmitted (i.e., one SSB per beam), the overhead of additional SSB is significant. Thus, we prefer RedCap UE does NOT expect SSB in DL BWP. | |
| Xiaomi | Preferred: Option 2  Acceptable: Option 2 | |
| MediaTek | Preferred: Option 2 with the following modifications  Similar views as for FR1. | |
| LGE | Preferred: Option 2  Acceptable: Option 2. | |
| FUTUREWEI | Both FR1 and FR2 should have the same handling for multiplexing pattern 1. For multiplexing pattern 2 and 3, we are unclear about additional efforts when the CD-SSB is not in bandwidth of CORESET#0. | |
| Ericsson | Preferred: Option 1  Acceptable: Option 2 (at least for multiplexing pattern 1). We are also fine with not using separate initial DL BWP for paging, i.e., initial DL BWP is only available once the random access is initiated in idle and inactive states.  The overhead of additional SSB transmissions can be significant in FR2. In particular, in FR2 with analogue beamforming where up to 64 SSBs can be transmitted, the additional overhead can be over 21%. Due to such significant overhead, increased inter-cell interference, and reduced network energy/spectral efficiency, additional SSBs should not be transmitted in FR2. Therefore, we prefer Option 1 regarding the presence of SSBs in RedCap DL BWPs in FR2.  For multiplexing patterns 2 and 3, RAN1 has already made the following conclusion. In our understanding, this conclusion implies that the UE has to do retuning to CD-SSB.  ***Conclusion:*** *RAN1 does not consider acquisition time improvements for FR2 RedCap UEs with SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns 2 and 3 as part of this WI.* | |
| Nokia, NSB | Preferred: Option 1  Acceptable: Option 2 | |
| NEC | Depends on LS responses. | |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Preferred: Option 1  Acceptable: Option 2 | |
| FL2 | Most received responses express similar views for FR2 as for FR1, meaning that there is larger support for Option 2 than for Option 1, although some responses argue that the motivations for Option 1 are stronger for FR2 than for FR1.  Some responses highlight that SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns 2 and 3 may require special attention, whereas multiplexing pattern 1 may be more straightforward.  Based on the received responses, the following proposal for FR2 based on Option 2 can be considered. It is identical to the FR1 proposal (Proposal 5-1b) except for the main bullet.  **High Priority Proposal 5-2b:**   * For ~~FR1, following options:~~ FR2, at least for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern 1,   + ~~Option 1:~~     - ~~For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),~~       * ~~RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.~~     - ~~For an RRC-configured active DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),~~       * ~~RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.~~   + ~~Option 2:~~     - For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * If it is configured for random access while not for paging in idle/inactive mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.         + ~~FFS: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, whether the UE can expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP when it is used in connected mode.~~       * Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.     - For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),       * A basic RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell ~~[FFS: or CSI-RS or measurement gap configuration]~~ but not CORESET#0/SIB.       * Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation based on CSI-RS instead of SSB in it.       * Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation without SSB or CSI-RS in it (RAN4 can decide a minimum measurement gap configuration if needed).   + Note: if a separate initial/RRC configured DL BWP is configured to contain the entire CORESET#0, CD-SSB is expected by RedCap UE.   + Note: The network may choose to configure SSB or MIB-configured CORESET#0 or SIB1 to be within the respective DL BWP.   + ~~FFS: For Option 1 and Option 2, whether RedCap UE can/cannot expect SSB under certain other conditions, e.g., for SSB monitoring periodicity (i.e., SMTC configuration) and DRX cycle~~   + ~~FFS: Whether additional mechanism for SI update or how SI update notifications and/or SI updates are signaled to RedCap UEs~~   + ~~FFS: FR2 case~~ | |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO |  | Same comment as the previous proposal. |
| vivo | Generally fine with modifications | Similar as for FR1, we suggest to remove CSI-RS from the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Samsung | N | This is not acceptable for us.  We need to discuss more details for option 2.  Moreover, we suggest another option which basically reuse current procedure for iDL BWP, and further discuss separate iDL BWP in the future.  Preferred, Option 1  Acceptable: only support the separate iDL BWP that contains CD-SSB and reuse CORESET #0 BW as legacy. |
| CATT | N | Same comment as the case in FR1. |
| DOCOMO |  | We have a similar view as FR1. |
| LGE | Y (with modification) | Same comment as for the previous question.  The two newly added working assumptions for the RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode should be removed. |
| FL | RAN2#116-e has replied to the LS from RAN1 in [39]. The reply is inserted earlier in this section. | |
| MediaTek | Y with modifications | Similar comments as the proposal for FR1. |
| Vodafone |  | Same as FR1 |
| CMCC |  | Same comment as the previous proposal. |
| Nordic |  | can be reused at least for Pattern 1 |
| Xiaomi |  | Same view as the case in FR1 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | Similar as FR1. Moreover, the additional overhead for NCD-SSB transmission in FR2 would be more significant that in FR1. |
| Intel | Y | Also can accept suggestion from vivo on CSI-RS. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Same comment as the previous proposal for FR1. |
| Ericsson | Y | The proposal can also apply to multiplexing patterns 2 and 3 if the note stating that “if a separate initial/RRC configured DL BWP is configured to contain the entire CORESET#0, CD-SSB is expected by RedCap UE” is modified somehow or simply modified.  We are fine with not supporting paging in the separate initial DL BWP (when it does not include SSB/CORESET#0/SIB).  We share CMCC’s view that CSI-RS can be kept as an optional capability (and let RAN4 consider further whether it can replace SSB in connected mode). |
| FL3 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal for FR2 can be considered. It is identical to the corresponding FR1 proposal (Proposal 5-1c) except for the blue parts.  **High Priority Proposal 5-2c:**   * **For FR2, ~~at least for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern 1,~~**   + **For a cell that allows a RedCap UE to access, network can configure a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs in SIB.**     - **It can be used both during and after initial access.**     - **It is no wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **If it is configured for random access while not for paging in idle/inactive mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.**     - **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.**   + **For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),**     - **~~A basic RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.~~**     - **A RedCap UE supporting only mandatory FG 6-1 expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.**     - **Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation based on CSI-RS ~~instead of SSB in it~~.**     - **Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation without SSB or CSI-RS in it (RAN4 can decide a minimum measurement gap configuration if needed).**   + **~~Note: if a separate initial/RRC configured DL BWP is configured to contain the entire CORESET#0, CD-SSB is expected by RedCap UE.~~**   + **Note: The network may choose to configure SSB or MIB-configured CORESET#0 or SIB1 to be within the respective DL BWP.** | |
| vivo | Modification | Same comment as for FR1 proposal. We suggest the following clarification for the 2nd working assumption.   * **Working assumption: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support operation based on CSI-RS ~~instead of SSB in it~~.**   + **Note: This does not mean CSI-RS can be used as a standalone mechanism.** |

For Option 2, we have also the following FFS pertaining to BWP#0 configuration option 1:

|  |
| --- |
| * For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),   + If it is configured for random access while not for paging in idle/inactive mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.     - FFS: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, whether the UE can expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP when it is used in connected mode. |

A few contributions provided views on the above FFS. Two contributions [4, 26] indicate that UE should not expect SSB for BWP#0 configuration option 1, while two other contributions [15, 28] mention that UE expects SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP when it is used in connected mode:

* [4]: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, the use of initial DL BWP in connected mode is quite limited from both functionality and power saving perspectives.
* [4]: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, if the separate initial DL BWP is configured for random access but not for paging, then the UE does not expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP in RRC idle/inactive/connected states.
* [15]: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, UE expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP when it is used in connected mode.
* [26]: RAN1 agrees on the support of Option 2 by removing FFS for BWP#0 configuration option 1, meaning that BWP#1 with dedicated RRC configuration which includes SSB reception related configuration would be used in connected mode.
* [28]: For connected mode operation, if UE can expect SSB configured in an RRC configured active BWP then so should be the case in the initial DL BWP configured by configuration option 1, too.

**FL1 High Priority Question 5-3a: Please provide your view on the following FFS in Option 2:**

* **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),**
  + **If it is configured for random access while not for paging in idle/inactive mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.**
    - **FFS: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, whether the UE can expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP when it is used in connected mode.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Intel |  | For BWP#0 configuration option 1 is not expected have much practical relevance for RedCap use-cases. Thus, to avoid long discussions on this issue that is likely a rather corner case, we propose that **BWP #0 configuration option 1 is NOT supported for RedCap.** |
| Qualcomm | N | If the separate initial DL BWP of idle/inactive UE is not configured with CSS for paging, it is a configuration error since the RedCap UE cannot meet the requirements for SI update and PWS notification when operating in the initial DL BWP.  If the separate initial DL BWP is configured for random access but does not include SSB, it cannot meet the timeline requirements for RACH (e.g. msg1 reTX after RAR window, Clause TS 38.213) if PRACH resource re-selection is needed based on the MAC procedure defined in Clause 5 of TS 38.321. Besides, the MG for SSB will impact the RAN4 spec for UL timing requirements and RACH test requirements.  To summarize, we have the following observation on the potential spec impacts of SSB-less BWP configured with CSS for RA only: |
| vivo |  | The FFS should be removed.  In current spec, same operation/procedure is used regardless of the BWP#0 configuration options. How the separate initial DL BWP is used for RedCap UEs in connected mode, it is already covered by the following bullets in option 2 (also regardless of the BWP#0 configuration options)   * For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0),   + RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell [FFS: or CSI-RS or measurement gap configuration] but not CORESET#0/SIB.   The Intel’s proposal above, i.e. not considering BWP#0 configuration option 1 for redcap UEs, would also be fine with us. |
| HW, HiSi |  | There is no need for UE to expect SSB for option 1 in connected mode, which is exactly the same as a UE in initial access after reading CD-SSB and choose to perform RA in another BWP. |
| DOCOMO |  | Regardless of BWP#0 configuration option 1 or 2, RedCap UE does NOT expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP. Regarding the configuration related to SSB reception in RRC connected mode, for BWP#0 configuration option 1, BWP#1 can be configured for RedCap UE with dedicated configuration related to SSB reception. |
| Nordic | Y, but | This would be acceptable only for BWP configuration option 1, where BWP#1 is configured after/in MSG4 and contains CD or NCD-SSB |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | For BWP#0 configuration option 1, if the separate initial DL BWP is configured for random access while not for paging, RedCap UE does not expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP in RRC idle/inactive/connected states. In connected mode, the gNB can configure the BWP containing SSB for the UE based on UE capability. Therefore, there is no need to differentiate the connected mode and idle/inactive mode. The FFS could be removed. |
| CATT |  | We have similar views with DOCOMO. |
| CMCC |  | Similar view as Huawei, FFS can be removed. |
| MediaTek |  | The FFS should be removed. |
| LGE |  | Share the view with vivo. The FFS in Option 2 should be removed. |
| Ericsson | N | For BWP#0 configuration option 1, the use of initial DL BWP in connected mode for RedCap is quite limited from both functionality and power saving perspectives. Since the initial DL BWP is rarely used in the connected mode, there is no need to transmit additional SSBs. In this case, the potential impact on the RedCap UE if SSB is not present is small and the UE can rely on the RF-retuning to CD-SSB (which might be rarely needed).  In our view, for BWP#0 configuration option 1, if the separate initial DL BWP is configured for random access but not for paging, then the UE does not expect SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP in RRC idle/inactive/connected states. |
| FL2 | In line with most received responses, the FFS has been removed in Proposals 5-1b and 5-2b. | |
| Qualcomm | Regardless SSB is transmitted or not in the RedCap-specific initial DL BWP, it is problematic to configure CORESET/CSS for RA and paging of an idle RedCap UE in different BWPs, due to the potential collisions of PDCCH monitoring for RA and paging.  If NW cannot ensure the CSS sets for RA and paging of an idle RedCap UE are not colliding in time, it is necessary to check with RAN2/4 regarding the feasibility and potential spec impacts of configuring CORESET/CSS for RA and paging in different BWPs. | |

# SI update mechanism

Another FFS identified in RAN1#106bis-e [2] concerns whether additional mechanism for SI update is needed and how SI update notifications and/or SI updates are signalled to RedCap UEs. Several contributions [4, 7, 8, 19, 24, 27, 29] discuss that in RRC connected state when the RedCap DL BWP does not contain the entire CORESET#0, RedCap UEs rely on dedicated SI delivery. Also, notification of SI update can be provided via paging DCI if the DL BWP contains the paging CSS [4, 30]. For SI update in RRC idle/inactive state when the RedCap initial DL BWP does not contain the entire CORESET#0, RedCap UEs rely on switching to CORESET#0 to acquire SI updates [4, 8, 15, 27, 30].

Based on the expressed views, the following proposal can be considered:

**FL3 Medium Priority Question 6-1a: What (if any) changes or clarifications are needed in order to support SI update for RedCap UEs in idle/inactive state?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | When an idle/inactive RedCap UE operates in a separate initial DL BWP which does not contain the entire CORESET#0, the RedCap UE is not expected to periodically monitor CD-SSB, *searchSpaceSIB1* and *searchSpaceOtherSystemInformation* associated with CORESET#0 by autonomous BWP switching.  If the separate initial DL BWP of idle/inactive UE is not configured with CSS for paging, it is a configuration error since the RedCap UE cannot meet the requirements for SI update and PWS notification defined in Clause 5.2.2.2.2 of TS 38.311 when operating in the initial DL BWP. |
|  |  |

**FL3 Medium Priority Question 6-2a: What (if any) changes or clarifications are needed in order to support SI update for RedCap UEs in connected state?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | When a RedCap UE operates in an RRC-configured DL BWP which does not contain the entire CORESET#0, the RedCap UE is not expected to periodically monitor CD-SSB, searchSpaceSIB1 and searchSpaceOtherSystemInformation associated with CORESET#0 by autonomous BWP switching. SI update for RedCap UE can be provided by serving cell via dedicated RRCReconfiguration message, or by paging PDCCH transmitted within the RRC-configured BWP of RedCap UE. Upon receiving a paging PDCCH for indication of SI update or PWS notification, Type-2 BWP switch delay specified in Table 8.6.2-1 of TS 38.133 can be defined for BWP switching of RedCap UE to/from CORESET#0.  **Proposal:**   * **If paging PDCCH is used to indicate SI update and/or PWS notification, RAN1 needs to send an LS to RAN4 to determine the interruption time for receiving PWS notification and/or SI update outside the RRC-configured DL BWP of RedCap UE.** * **Upon receiving paging PDCCH for indication of SI update or PWS notification in the RRC-configured BWP without CSS for SIB1/OSI, Type-2 BWP switch delay specified in Table 8.6.2-1 of TS 38.133 can be defined for BWP switching of RedCap UE to/from CORESET#0.** |
| IDCC | We think that both in idle and connect mode, the gNB can configure CSSs so that the UE can receive the SI updates in the new initial DL BWP. If the CSSs are not configured, then the UE uses CORESET#0. |
|  |  |

# FGs for BWP operation

RAN1#105-e [2] made the following agreement related to non-initial BWP operation:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements: Take the following as an agreement, revised from the RAN1#104bis-e working assumption:   * A RedCap UE cannot be configured with a non-initial (DL or UL) BWP (i.e., a BWP with a non-zero index) wider than the maximum bandwidth of the RedCap UE.   + At least for FR1, FG 6-1 (“Basic BWP operation with restriction” as described in TR 38.822) is used as a starting point for the mandatory RedCap UE type capability.     - This does not preclude support of FG 6-1a (“BWP operation without restriction on BW of BWP(s)” as described in TR 38.822) as a UE capability for RedCap UEs. |

Several contributions provide their views on non-initial BWP operation and in particular FG 6-1a “BWP operation without restriction on BW of BWPs”. In some of the contributions, it is proposed to make FG 6-1a mandatory for RedCap [5, 10]. In some other contributions, it is proposed to have FG 6-1a as an optional feature for RedCap [24, 27]. Meanwhile, several contributions propose to have new or modified FGs for RedCap [4, 9, 11, 14, 19]:

* [4]: The RedCap UE should support a new FG for BWP operation where an RRC-configured DL BWP contains SSB but not CORESET#0.
* [9]: Define new capabilities like FG 6-1/6-1a/6-2/6-3/6-4 to consider SSB and CORESET of CSS presence in the UE-specific DL BWP.
* [11]: RedCap UE should support a modified FG 6-1a, in which CORESET#0 is removed from the original FG 6-1a.
* [14]: FGs 6-1 and 6-1a (at least FGs 6-1) should be adapted for RedCap UEs such that RedCap UEs mandatorily support operation in active DL BWPs that may not necessarily include CORESET#0.
* [19]: Introducing a new UE feature for RedCap to indicate whether it supports an active BWP configured with UE-specific search space (USS) without SSB, denoting as Feature-X.

This can be discussed further (possibly as part of the UE capability discussion) once the related issues discussed in other sections of this document have progressed a bit further.

# PUCCH transmission

Regarding PUCCH (for Msg4/[MsgB] HARQ feedback) transmissions during initial access, we have the following agreement and FFSs:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * FFS: What specification changes (if any) are needed to support that the network can enable/disable intra-slot PUCCH frequency hopping (FH) within the separate initial UL BWP in the PUCCH resource for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB for RedCap * FFS: Whether any specification changes are needed and desired in order to support multiplexing of non-FH and FH PUCCH transmissions in PUCCH resources. |

**Disabling** **frequency hopping:**

The contributions generally agree that specification changes are required to support disabling the PUCCH FH in the PUCCH resource for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB for RedCap [4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 15, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29]. In particular, it needs to be specified which hop or PRB index is used for RedCap PUCCH resources when the FH is disabled. In this case, different solutions might be possible. Therefore, companies are invited to provide their comments on the specification changes needed for determining PRB indices to be used for PUCCH resources.

Based on the above views, the following question can be considered.

**FL1 High Priority Question 8-1a: Considering minimum specification changes, how should the PRB indices for RedCap PUCCH resources (for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB) with disabled FH be determined?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | | **Comments** | | |
| Intel | | The cell-common PUCCH resources are provided as part of separate PUCCH-ConfigCommon in the separate initial UL BWP for RedCap. For a PUCCH resource, the PRB indices can be determined as before – with the exception that, when FH is disabled, the location of the first hop is used for the entire PUCCH duration. With dynamic PRI and slot offset/starting symbol indications, the gNB would have sufficient degrees of freedom to indicate PUCCH resources for HARQ-Ack feedback from RedCap UEs while minimizing PUSCH resource fragmentation. | | |
| Qualcomm | | We are open for further discussion. Minimum spec change is preferred | | |
| vivo | | To effectively resolve the PUSCH resource fragmentation issue for non-RedCap UEs, there are two points we need to address  1, All 16 PUCCH resources for Msg4/MsgB for RedCap UEs should be put at one edge of the separate initial UL BWP.  2, Depending on the relative location between the separate initial UL BWP for RedCap and initial UL BWP for non-RedCap UEs, the lower edge or higher edge of the separate initial UL BWP for the 16 PUCCH resources should be indicated. See figure 1 below    Figure 1 PRB index determination for common PUCCH resources without FH  By taking into above two points, we propose following:   * **When intra-slot PUCCH frequency hopping within the separate initial UL BWP in the PUCCH resource for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB for RedCap UEs is disabled,** **UE determines the PRB index of the PUCCH transmission as ,**   **Where, the for PUCCH resource determination of HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB can be down-selected from following two options**   * + **Option 1: Separately configured by the NW**   + **Option 2: Reuse the values in Table 9.1.1-1 of TS 38.213 and clarify that it is the PRB offset relative to either the lower edge or higher edge which is configured by SIB1 of the separate initial UL BWP.** | | |
| HW, HiSi | | The current mechanism about the disabled PUCCH is the baseline.  To provide more PUCCH capacity, all 16 PUCCH resources can be concentrated on either side of BWP depending on the configuration, if provided. | | |
| DOCOMO | | When intra-slot PUCCH frequency hopping within the separate initial UL BWP in the PUCCH resource for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB for RedCap UEs is disabled, first hop should be used, i.e., UE determines the PRB index of the PUCCH transmission as follows:   * + if   + if | | |
| Nordic | | We prefer keeping the same structure of legacy PUCCH resources, but PRBs of different hops are back-to-back in frequency. This means, we need to only set PRB locations for fist hop and second hop differently in spec. To achieve this, spec-change should be minimal, and this solution allows also multiplexing with legacy UEs. | | |
| Sharp | | For the PUCCH capacity when the FH is disabled, 16 PUCCH resources should be available as same as non-RedCap UEs. Then, to provide all 16 PUCCH resources on same edge in the separate initial UL BWP, the condition in the current spec “If ” should be removed. Instead, the network should indicate which side of separate initial UL BWP is used as PUCCH resource in SIB.   * when PUCCH resources locate at the bottom side of the separate initial UL BWP * when PUCCH resources locate at the top side of the separate initial UL BWP. | | |
| Panasonic | | PUCCH resource for RedCap UE in (shared or separate) initial UL BWP can be configured in the similar way to legacy. When the FH is disabled, the PRB index determined for the first hop is used for non-FH PUCCH. The network can configure to use different PRBs between FH PUCCH and non-FH PUCCH. | | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | | If both PRB indexes of the first hop and second hop are used for PUCCH transmissions without any restriction on the indicated  for RedCap UEs, PUSCH resource fragmentation will inevitably be caused.  Although gNB can confine the value of  for RedCap UEs to avoid PUSCH resource fragmentation, it may reduce the number of available PUCCH resources and limit the location of PDCCH for Msg4/MsgB.  Therefore, it is suggested that all 16 PUCCH resources can be allocated on the edge of BWP. | | |
| CATT | | We think DOCOMO’s proposal is a good starting point, at least when the separate initial UL BWP is configured at the low frequency edge. All 16 PUCCH resources can be used.  Further modification is also considerable to allow the formula to be applied when separate initial UL BWP is configured at the high frequency edge (i.e. similar to Sharp’s consideration) | | |
| CMCC | | Between PRB index of two hop, the PRB index at one side of separate initial UL BWP is used. At lower side or higher side is indicated in SIB1. | | |
| Xiaomi | | Firstly, we think reuse the existing equations for PUCCH PRB determination could be baseline. . Furthermore, to avoid resource fragment, only assigning PUCCH PRB at one edge of initial UL BWP is more desirable. Depending on different scenario, different equations should be taken to avoid PUCCH PRBs is located in distributed way within the BWP. As shown in the following figure, in case (A), it is better to take the equation to determine the PRB index. In case(B), it is better to take equation  to determine the PRB index. Considering this point, NW can indicate which equation is used to determine the PRB index. | | |
| LGE | | Striving for a minimum spec change is fine. We think the first frequency hop should be used during the entire PUCCH transmission when the intra-slot FH is disabled. | | |
| FUTUREWEI | | It should be clarified whether 8 or 16 PUCCH resources are used for RedCap UEs. If 16 PUCCH resources are used, then whether the top or bottom of the BWP needs to be indicated. If 8 PUCCH resources are used, then legacy operation should be used. | | |
| Ericsson | | **General comment:** It is desired to have all the 16 PUCCH resources (before dedicated PUCCH resource configuration) on one edge of the UL BWP. Furthermore, the NW should be able to choose which edge, e.g., based on an indication in SIB. In addition, it should be possible to configure separate PUCCH resource sets for RedCap and non-RedCap UEs, e.g., using different values for *pucch-ResourceCommon*.  The frequency domain resource allocation for PUCCH before dedicated signaling with enabled PUCCH FH (i.e., two hops) is described in TS 38.213 (Section 9.2.1 PUCCH resource sets). This description needs to be updated for RedCap with the option of disabled PUCCH FH where only one frequency hop can be used. In addition, it needs to be specified which frequency hop (PRB) is used for PUCCH transmissions when the FH is disabled. In general, it is desired to have the PUCCH transmissions at the carrier edge to prevent the PUSCH resource fragmentation. Therefore, it is desired to use the PUCCH hop located at the carrier edge and disable the one which is in the middle of the carrier. It may also be beneficial to configure different sets of cell-specific PUCCH resources/parameters (using, for e.g., different indices in Table 9.2.1-1 of TS 38.213) for RedCap and non-RedCap UEs.  **More specific comment:** the UE determines the PRB index of the PUCCH transmission which are located only on either higher edge or lower edge of its BWP (in one carrier edge). This can depend on the location of the BWP. The UE determines the PRB indices of the PUCCH transmission by using one of the following equations:   * , which is located at the lower edge of the RedCap UL BWP. * , which is located at the higher edge of the RedCap UL BWP.   Here, is the size of RedCap UL BWP,  is the total number of initial cyclic shift indexes in the set of initial cyclic shift indexes. | | |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | | Preferred: Option 1  Acceptable: Option 2 | | |
| FL2 | | Based on the received responses, companies are invited to provide input on the following questions.  **High Priority Question 8-1b: When the frequency hopping for the RedCap PUCCH resources (for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB) is deactivated,**   1. **Should there be 8 or 16 PUCCH resources (i.e., what should be the range for the PUCCH resource index *rPUCCH*)?** 2. **Should each PUCCH resource (corresponding to a PUCCH resource index *rPUCCH*) be mapped to 1 or 2 PRBs?** 3. **Should the PUCCH resources be mapped to the same or different edges of the BWP?** 4. **Do you have some suggested solutions, concerns or other comments?** | | |
| vivo | | Our answers to the questions are as below  Q1: 16 PUCCH resources  Q2: 1 PRB  Q3: all PUCCH resources are mapped to same edge of the BWP, which can be either the lower edge or higher edge, configurable by NW.  Q4: We have described the preferred solution in the reply of previous round. | | |
| Apple | | **On Q1: W**e think it is necessary to keep at least same PUCCH capacity for Redcap UEs i.e., 16 PUCCH resources.  **On Q2:** Except unlicensed band, the PUCCH format 0 and format 1 are supported in legacy during initial access, which is single PRB in frequency domain. We do not see motivation to enhance it to multiple PRBs for Redcap, i.e., should keep single PRB.  **On Q3:** Our view is that this is related to the number of initial UL BWP. If we only support one initial UL BWP, the PUCCH has to be centralized at one edge of CC. | | |
| Panasonic | | O1: 16 PUCCH resources.  Q2: Single PRB  Q3: Yes. For example, PUCCH PRB with rPUCCH: 0-7 are mapped on lower edge of initial UL BWP for RedCap while PUCCH PRB with rPUCCH: 8-15 is mapped at higher edge  Q4: As commented by Intel and Ericsson, using different values for *pucch-ResourceCommon* for Redcap UEs allow such operation. | | |
| Samsung | | We prefer minimal changes of the spec other than optimization.  On the other hand, we think this is for the case of separated iUL BWP, assuming all the UL parameters can be configured separately from iUL BWP for non-RedCap. This should give enough flexibility for network. | | |
| CATT | | The principle is minimizing spec impact. Any optimization is not essential.  Q1: Prefer 16 but can live with 8 (if 8 requires little spec impact)  Q2: 1 PRB  Q3: Prefer to be same edge, can live with different edges.  Q4: It may not be easy to define ‘when separate initial UL BWP is at high/low edge’ by spec. Using the location of 1st hop can be a baseline as suggested by DOCOMO. | | |
| DOCOMO | | 1. 16 PUCCH resources should be supported as per current specification, i.e., the PUCCH resource index should be the range of 0 to 15. 2. We share the same view with Apple that it should be 1 PRB. 3. It can be different depending on which edge of BWP the separate initial UL BWP is configured to align with. 4. In our view, it is not preferable to indicate different PUCCH resource set index between RedCap and non-RedCap UE since it would interference each other with the PUCCH resources of the neighbor cells. | | |
| LGE | | 1. 16 PUCCH resources (same as in legacy) 2. 1 PRBs (same as in legacy) 3. Different edges of the initial UL BWP for RedCap (same mechanism as in legacy) 4. The frequency resource for PUCCH transmission when the intra-slot FH is disabled is determined by the first frequency hop. Same mechanism to calculate the PRB index for the first frequency hop is reused. We think this is the solution with the minimum spec change. | | |
| CMCC | | 1. We prefer 16 PUCCH resources. RedCap with disabled FH PUCCH and non-RedCap use different equations to determine their PRB index.  2 Each PUCCH resource can be mapped to 1 PRBs at one edge of BWP.  3. Different edges of the BWP. At which edge is indicated by SIB. The following equation suggested by Ericsson is fine to determine the PRB index.   * ,0<=*r*PUCCH<16, which is located at the lower edge of the RedCap UL BWP. * ,0<=*r*PUCCH<16, which is located at the higher edge of the RedCap UL BWP. | | |
| Nordic | | 1. 16 2. 2PRB can ensure that legacy PUCCH resource set table can be reused 3. different edges should be supported 4. 2PRB design can coexist with legacy UEs | | |
| Xiaomi | | Q1: 16  Q2: 1 PRB  Q3:different edges should be supported. And we also support Ericsson’s proposal | | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | | 1. 16 PUCCH resources is preferred. If gNB confines the value of  for RedCap UEs to avoid PUSCH resource fragmentation, it may reduce the number of available PUCCH resources and limit the location of PDCCH for Msg4/MsgB. 2. 1PRB. During the initial access, only PUCCH format 0/1 are used with 1PRB. So the background of this question seems to be not not clear to us. 3. All PUCCH resources should be mapped to the same edge (either lower edge or upper edge) of the BWP which is up to the gNB. 4. For simplicity, the location of PUCCH can be configured by gNB. | | |
| Intel | | 1. A total of 16 PUCCH resources 2. One PRB. 3. Different edges as legacy 4. gNB can indicate the proper resource in a given slot to minimize any PUSCH resource fragmentation. Only difference from legacy is that when FH is disabled, UE uses the first hop location for entire PUCCH transmission. | | |
| Nokia, NSB | | Q1: 16 PUCCH resources  Q2: 1 PRB  Q3: All PUCCH resources should be mapped to the same edge – up to gNB to configure which edge. | | |
| Ericsson | | 1) It is desired to have all 16 PUCCH resources for a higher PUCCH capacity.  2) Similar to legacy connected-mode operation without PUCCH frequency hopping, each PUCCH transmission should be mapped to 1 PRB, not 2 PRBs.  3) In general, it is desired to have the PUCCH transmissions at the carrier edge to prevent the PUSCH resource fragmentation. Therefore, it is desired to use the PUCCH hop located at the carrier edge and disable the one which is in the middle of the carrier. Hence, the PUCCH resources be mapped to the same edge and the edge can be configured by gNB (since it may, e.g., depend on the location of the RedCap UL BWP with respect to non-RedCap UL BWP/carrier).    4) It might be worthwhile to consider allowing configuration of different PUCCH resource set indices for RedCap and non-RedCap (e.g., with more symbols in the RedCap case) in order to recover some of the potential PUCCH performance loss from reduced frequency diversity when frequency hopping is disabled for RedCap. | | |
| Qualcomm | | Agree with the comments of DOCOMO. | | |
| FL3 | | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  Companies are also invited to provide their view in the Comments field on how to map each PUCCH resource to a PRB. If the solutions may be different for the 8-resource and 16-resource cases, please describe both cases.  **High Priority Proposal 8-1c:**   * **When the frequency hopping for the RedCap PUCCH resources (for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB) is deactivated,**   + **The UL BWP edge to which the PUCCH resources are mapped is configurable by the network.**   + **Each PUCCH resource is mapped to a single PRB.** | | |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y | | Our solution has been provided in the 1st round of discussion. |
|  |  | |  |
|  |  | |  |

**PUCCH multiplexing:**

The contributions express different views on multiplexing of non-FH and FH PUCCH transmissions in PUCCH resources. The majority of the contributions indicate that the multiplexing can be done by a proper configuration and avoiding overlap between time-frequency resources (e.g., using different PRBs) of non-FH and FH PUCCH transmissions [4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 17, 21, 23, 25, 28]. In addition, it is mentioned that such multiplexing problem for non-FH and FH PUCCH transmissions is not a new issue as it already exists for non-RedCap UEs in connected mode. Therefore, there might not be a need for any enhancements or specification changes in order to support multiplexing of non-FH and FH PUCCH transmissions in PUCCH resources. However, a few contributions [5, 19, 26] argue that two base sequences should be used for non-FH PUCCH transmissions to support multiplexing of non-FH and FH PUCCH transmissions in the same PRB.

**FL3 Medium Priority Question 8-2a: Are any specification changes necessary in order to support multiplexing of non-FH and FH PUCCH transmissions in PUCCH resources? If yes, please elaborate in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | Y | We support two base sequences generation for non-FH PUCCH transmissions to ensure the multiplexing capacity for multiplexing of non-FH and FH PUCCH transmissions.  It was argued that multiplexing of non-FH and FH PUCCH issue has been already exist for non-RedCap UE while we don’t think so. For PUCCH before dedicated PUCCH configuration, only PF0 and 1are available, and PUCCH resources are multiplexed with TDM/FDM/CS. While TD-OCC is supported for PF1 in RRC connected mode, multiplexing with TD-OCC is not supported in practice for the PUCCH before PUCCH before dedicated configuration since only OCC index 0 is used according to the current specification. On the other hand, for PUCCH resources after dedicated PUCCH configuration, they can be configured more flexibly in time/frequency domain, and also TD/FD-OCC is available for PF 1/4, then the multiplexing capacity would be larger and multiplexed more flexibly than that before dedicated configuration. We believe that the multiplexing capacity for initial access procedure is important for the system considering RedCap UEs become widespread, thus, it should be supported to ensure the multiplexing capacity between RedCap UE and non-RedCap UE. |
| vivo | N | We think FL has fairly summarized the views from companies and the motivation behind. We share the majority of companies view that there is no strong need to introduce additional spec change for this issue. |
|  |  |  |

# Other issues

In this section, companies are invited to bring up other issues relevant for the timely completion of the RAN1 part of the Rel-17 RedCap WI, if any.

**Medium Priority Question 9-1a: Companies are invited to bring up other issues relevant for the timely completion of the RAN1 part of the Rel-17 RedCap WI, if any.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Solutions consistent with the WI objectives of UE complexity reduction and have less spec impacts in RAN1/2/4 should be prioritized for R17 RedCap UE. |
|  |  |
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