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# Introduction

This document summarizes the following offline discussion.

* [AT115-e][111][CE] Msg3 repetition (ZTE)

Initial scope: Continue the discussion on p4-p9 from [R2-2107745](file:///C:\Data\3GPP\Extracts\R2-2107745%20Consideration%20on%20Msg3%20repetition%20in%20CE.docx), p2-p7 from [R2-2107220](file:///C:\Data\3GPP\Extracts\R2-2107220_RAN2%20enhancements%20for%20Msg3%20repetition.docx), p3 from [R2-2107008](file:///C:\Data\3GPP\Extracts\R2-2107008_MAC%20Aspects%20of%20UL%20Coverage%20Enhancements.doc) and p1-p3 from [R2-2108003](file:///C:\Data\3GPP\Extracts\R2-2108003.docx)

Intended outcome: Summary of the offline discussion with e.g.:

* + - List of proposals for agreement (if any)
    - List of proposals that require online discussions
    - List of proposals that should not be pursued (if any)

Initial deadline (for companies' feedback): Monday 2021-08-23 10:00 UTC

Initial deadline (for rapporteur's summary in R2-2108895): Monday 2021-08-23 16:00 UTC

Proposals marked "for agreement" in R2-2108895 not challenged until Tuesday 2021-08-24 0800 UTC will be declared as agreed via email by the session chair (for the rest the discussion will further continue online).

# Contact from companies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Email |
| Lenovo | hchoi5@lenovo.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Background

Following agreements were reached after first (Wednesday) online discussion:

Agreements:

1. RAN2 should focus on Msg3 repetition for 4-step RACH, unless RAN1 makes solid conclusion to support Msg3 repetition for fallbackRAR
2. Agreed. Msg3 repetition is applicable to all cases that trigger 4-step CBRA procedure (can come back if we identify that some specific case should not be covered)
3. A separate RSRP threshold is introduced for requesting Msg3 repetition.

# Discussion

## Msg3 repetition on NUL/SUL

A NR cell can be configured with both NUL carrier and SUL carrier, so far, RAN1 hasn’t discussed whether Msg3 repetition can be configured on SUL carrier. In [3], it lists the following 4 scenarios:

* **Scenario 1: Cell is configured with only NUL, and Msg3 repetition is enabled;**
* **Scenario 2: Cell is configured with both NUL and SUL, and Msg3 repetition is only configured on NUL;**
* **Scenario 3: Cell is configured with both NUL and SUL, and Msg3 repetition is only configured on SUL;**
* **Scenario 4: Cell is configured with both NUL and SUL, and Msg3 repetition is configured on both NUL and SUL.**

For flexibility, it is proposed to confirm all above scenarios can be supported in Rel-17. So Msg3 repetition function can be enabled on either NUL or SUL, or both.

Companies are invited to show your views on this.

**Q1. From RAN2 perspective, do companies agree Msg3 repetition can be configured on either NUL or SUL, or both?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

According to RAN2 agreement, a separate RSRP threshold will be introduced for requesting Msg3 repetition. When measured RSRP is below the threshold, UE can request network to enable Msg3 repetition.

So if answer ‘Yes’ to Q1, the next question is whether separate RSRP thresholds are needed for requesting Msg3 repetition on NUL and SUL. Companies are invited to show your views.

**Q2. If answer ‘Yes’ to Q1, do companies agree separate RSRP thresholds are needed for requesting Msg3 repetition on NUL and SUL?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Based on online discussion, some companies think we should consult RAN1 on the support of Msg3 repetition on NUL/SUL. From rapporteur’s point of view, I think this more relates to network deployment, and it has no RAN1 impact, so RAN2 should be able to make decision. But if there is strong concern, we can send LS to RAN1 for confirmation. Companies are invited to show your view on whether LS is needed.

**Q3. Do companies think RAN2 needs to ask RAN1 if they have concern on support of Msg3 repetition on NUL&SUL (e.g. sending LS)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Yes | We think it’s good to inform RAN1 about our agreements on NUL/SUL, so that they can raise concerns if they have any. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Potential impact on cell selection

In [3] and [2], the impact on cell selection are discussed. In short, for UEs capable of Msg3 repetition, even if its RSRP results is lower than legacy UEs, the UE is able to RACH and get connected to the target cell, because Msg3 repetition can help make up the shortage in link budget. So the UL coverage for Msg3 capable UEs can be different from those non-Msg3 capable UEs. This is similar to SUL.

For SUL, separate cell selection/reselection threshold can be broadcasted in SIB, similarly, separate cell selection threshold (e.g. Qrxlevmin, Qqualmin) needs to be provided for UEs capable of Msg3 repetition.

Based on online discussion, one company commented this is out of scope of WID. (The objective of WID is copied/pasted below)

* **Specify mechanism(s) to support Type A PUSCH repetitions for Msg3 [RAN1, RAN2]**

From rapporteur point of view, for supporting Type A PUSCH repetition for Msg3, RAN2 is responsible to study any potential RAN2 impact, the objective does not preclude any technical point. In addition, some company commented Msg1 repetition is not supported, thus UL coverage can not be extended. But according to the study in RAN1, PRACH has better performance than PUSCH, so PRACH is not bottle neck of UL transmission. That is why Msg3 repetition is considered instead of Msg1 repetition.

Companies are invited to show your views.

**Q4. Do companies agree separate cell access thresholds (e.g. Qrxlevmin, Qqualmin) can be provided for UEs capable of Msg3 repetition?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | No | It is our understanding that the Msg3 enhancements are targeted only for UEs in connected state. Therefore, we think that cell (re)selection should not be impacted. We should not extend the scope of the WI unnecessarily. Unclarities of the WI scope can be discussed in RAN plenary. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Handling of Contention Resolution Timer

In current TS 38.321, the start of contention resolution timer is described as below (for HARQ retransmission):

|  |
| --- |
| 5.1.5 Contention Resolution  Once Msg3 is transmitted the MAC entity shall:  1> start the *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* and restart the *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* at each HARQ retransmission in the first symbol after the end of the Msg3 (re)transmission;  1> monitor the PDCCH while the *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* is running regardless of the possible occurrence of a measurement gap; |

Regarding Msg3 repetition, the handling of ra-ContentionResolutionTimer is discussed in several contributions, in summary, there are 3 options (companies please double check if any option is missing):

* Option 1: (Re)start *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* in the first symbol after all Msg3 repetitions [2][4].



* Option 2: (Re)start *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* in the first symbol after each Msg3 repetition [3].



* Option 3: Start *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* in the first symbol after 1st Msg3 transmission, and does not restart it after follow-up Msg3 repetitions [1].



For Option 2 and Option 3, early Msg3 repetition termination can be supported. But some companies commented there is challenge for UE to monitor PDCCH before finishing all the repetitions. Although this was discussed in RAN1 before, and no consesus was reached. From rapporteur’s point of view, this should be discussed and determined in RAN2, because it mainly impact MAC spec.

So regarding above options, companies are invited to show your views.

**Q5. Which option do companies prefer for handling *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* in Msg3 repetition?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2/3** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Option 1 | Is a straightforward solution. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

In [4], is also proposes to not extend ra-ResponseWindow and ra-ContentionResolutionTimer for Msg3, because PDCCH/PDSCH for Msg2/4 repetition are not supported in CE.

Proposal 3: No extension is needed for *ra-ResponseWindow* and *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* for MSG3 repetition.

Rapporteur understand this may also relate to the discussion in Q5 (e.g. if Option 3 is adopted). Companies are invited to show your views on this.

**Q6. For MSG3 repetition, do companies agree extension of *ra-ResponseWindow* and *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* is not needed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Yes | DL coverage enhancements are not in WI scope. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Separate RA parameters for Msg3 repetition

In [2], it mentions with Msg3 repetition, Msg1 transmission may become the coverage bottleneck in RACH procedure, so to achieve full benefit of Msg3 repetition, we can consider other method to improve the performance of Msg1 transmission, i.e. through different Tx power control and more transmission opportunities, more specifically:

(copied/pasted the text/proposal from [2])

* *preambleReceivedTargetPower* is the initial Msg1 Tx power. As a UE eligible for Msg3 repetition has poorer link quality than average UEs, its Msg1 Tx should have higher initial power to increase the likelihood of success.
* Size of power ramping step depends on expected interference level. Since a UE eligible for Msg3 repetition has poorer link quality, it is more likely located near cell edge and subject to inter-cell interference. Therefore, it can benefit from larger power ramping step size when overcoming interference in its Msg1 transmission.
* *preambleTransMax* controls the maximum number of Msg1 Tx. Since a UE eligible for Msg3 repetition has poorer link quality, it makes sense for the UE to have more retransmission opportunities to ensure comparable coverage with repeated Msg3.

Proposal 1. Msg1 transmission by UE to request Msg3 repetitions can be configured with its specific set of *preambleReceivedTargetPower*, *powerRampingStep*, *powerRampingStepHighPriority, preambleTransMax* and *groupBconfigured.*

**Q7. Do companies agree with above Proposal 1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | No | Msg1 enhancements were discussed during the SI phase but during scoping of the WI in RAN#90-e, no consensus could be reached to consider Msg1 enhancements in the WI. Therefore, we should not extend the scope of the WI unnecessarily. Unclarities of the WI scope can be discussed in RAN plenary. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Msg3 repetition for preamble group B

In [2], it proposes to allow network to configure Msg3 repetition also for Preamble group B.

Proposal 2. Preamble group B can be jointly configured with Msg3 repetition.

Preamble group B is used to request a large UL grant for Msg3, although repetition of large Msg3 looks resource consuming, but in [2], it explains Msg3 repetition can be useful for some use case, e.g. for UEs with only small amount of data to send and can leverage RACH based SDT or when cell loading is low. And it is fully within network’s control.

Companies are invited to show your views on whether to support Msg 3 repetition for large Msg3 case.

**Q8. Do companies agree preamble group B can be jointly configured with Msg3 repetition?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo |  | We think that this should be coordinated with RAN1. We don’t know which Msg3 sizes they have considered yet in the design of Msg3 repetitions. Therefore, we suggest to add this question in the LS to RAN1. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Similarly, for preamble group B, in [2], it is proposed to configure separate set of RA parameters for Msg3 repetition.

Proposal 3. If preamble group B is configured for Msg3 with repetitions, network can configure it with a separate set of ra-Msg3SizeGroupA, messagePowerOffsetGroupB, numberOfRA-PreamblesGroupA.

Companies are invited to show your views.

**Q9. If answer ‘Yes’ to Q7, do companies agree with above P3?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

On top of Q7, rapporteur thinks it worth to discuss whether network can control whether to enable Msg3 repetition for group B? For instance, if a cell is configured with preamble group B, can network enable Msg3 repetition only for preamble group A, or only for preamble group B, or both?

**Q10. If answers ‘Yes’ to Q7, for a cell configured with preamble group B, can network decide whether to enable/disable Msg3 repetition for preamble group B (e.g. only configure Msg3 repetition for preamble group A)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Msg3 repetition for specific beams

In [3], it mentions that Msg3 repetition may only be needed when UE is the coverage of partial beams. From network perspective, network can determine these ‘problematic’ beams based on MDT (e.g. RLF report). Considering RAN1 agreed to use “separate preamble with shared RO” approach for requesting Msg3 repetition, it will be a challenge for network to configure RACH resources for Msg3 repetition (because preamble resource is quite limited).

If network is able to only enable Msg3 repetition for partial beams, then network only needs to reserve RACH resources (e.g. RA preambles) for those problematic beams, more RACH resources can be reserved for other purpose.

Rapporteur understands this relates to RACH partition discussion, but it will be good if companies can confirm whether such requirement is needed. So we can provide guidance to the common session.

**Q11. Do companies think there is requirement to allow network to only enable Msg3 repetition on specific beams (e.g. in order to reduce the RACH resources reserved for CE purpose)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo |  | We were told by our RAN1 colleagues that RAN1 is discussing this topic. So, it may be good to coordinate with RAN1 on this topic. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Way to indicate the number of Msg3 repetitions

In [4], it further discusses the solutions for indicating the number of Msg3 repetitions in Msg2.

* Option 1: Using an information field from the existing information fields in RAR UL grant;
* Option 2: Using MAC RAR for indication

Above two options are provided by RAN1, and Option 1 has already been agreed in RAN1, so this paper proposes to discuss Option 2 in RAN2, and suggest not to consider it because extend/reuse existing RAR MAC CE is not straightforward and defining a new MAC CE requires more discussion and specification effort in RAN2.

Proposal 1: No enhancements on MAC RAR are needed for MSG3 repetition.

Rapporteur notices that RAN1 is only discussing the details of Option 1 at recent meetings. So it seems Option 2 will not considered. But it would be good to confirm company’s understandings.

**Q12. Do companies agree there is no need to enhance MAC RAR for Msg3 repetition (i.e. only Option 1 is used to indicate the number of Msg3 repetitions)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Yes | We were told by our RAN1 colleagues that RAN1 agreed on Option 1 as Working Assumption. Further details of Option 1 are under discussion and subject to downselection (either use the MCS field or TPC field or TDRA field). Due to this we see no reason to introduce another option from RAN2 side. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## UE capability

Regarding UE capability of Msg3 repetition, in [2], it proposes to not introduce UE capability, because PRACH resource for requesting Msg3 repetition is signalled in system information. If network wants to know the percentage of UE’s capability, other methods can be used. E.g. RACH report via MDT.

Rapporteur thinks this makes sense for initial access UEs, but we also need to consider other RACH events (e.g. handover, BFR) which UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED mode. Note that for BFR, network can configure separate RACH resource in BFR configuration, and for handover to non-initial BWP in target cell, the common RACH resource (for CBRA) is provided via RRC dedicated signalling.

**Q13. Do companies agree there is no need to introduce UE capability for Msg3 repetition?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Postpone | We should wait for RAN1 progress. RAN1 is discussing whether the UE capability of supporting Msg3 PUSCH repetition needs to be reported after initial access procedure or not. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusions

*To be added…*
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