**3GPP TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #104-e R1-210xxxx**

**e-Meeting, Jan 25th – Feb 5th, 2021**

**Agenda Item: 7.2.1**

**Source: Moderator (ZTE)**

**Title: Summary of email discussion for [104-e-NR-2step-RACH-01]**

**Document for: Discussion**

# Introduction

This document is intended to address the following corrections for 2-step RACH by email discussion.

[104-e-NR-2step-RACH-01] Corrections of 2-step RACH related issues till 1/28 – Li (ZTE)

* CR in R1-2008785, CR in R1-2101526, and TP in R1-2101573

# Correction on DMRS configuration for MsgA in 38.214

In R1-2100243, it is proposed to clarify that for MsgA PUSCH transmission, if a UE is not configured with *msgA-PUSCH-NrofPort*, the UE shall assume that it is only for the case of double-symbol DM-RS that 4 ports are configured per DM-RS CDM groups, because it should be clear that for single-symbol DM-RS case, there can be at most 2 ports configured per DM-RS CDM group.

And for MsgA PUSCH transmission, only PUSCH DM-RS configuration type 1 is supported, and there is no higher layer parameter “*dmrs-Type*”. It is proposed to make the correction in 38.214, similar to what has been provided in 38.211.

***Proposal 1:***

* Adopt the following TP#1 in 38.214, to clarify that it is “for double-symbol DM-RS” for MsgA PUSCH transmission when the UE is not configured with *msgA-PUSCH-NrofPort*, and remove the higher layer parameter “*dmrs-Type*” for MsgA PUSCH transmission.

|  |
| --- |
| **Reasons for change**1. It is clear that there can be at most 2 ports configured per DM-RS CDM group for single-symbol DM-RS case. Then for MsgA PUSCH transmission, if a UE is not configured with *msgA-PUSCH-NrofPort*, the UE shall assume that it is only for the case of double-symbol DM-RS that 4 ports are configured per DM-RS CDM groups. This is also aligned with the possible DMRS configuration defined in TS 38.211 and TS 38.212.2. For MsgA PUSCH transmission, only PUSCH DM-RS configuration type 1 is supported, and there is no higher layer parameter “*dmrs-Type*”. The corresponding correct description is already provided in TS 38.211.**Summary of changes**1. Clarify that it is “for double-symbol DM-RS” for MsgA PUSCH transmission, when the UE is not configured with *msgA-PUSCH-NrofPort*.2. Delete “For MsgA PUSCH transmissions, *dmrs-Type* is type 1.”**Consequences if not approved:**Incorrect number of ports is specified for single-symbol DM-RS case. Incorrect use of a non-applicable higher-layer parameter for PUSCH DM-RS configuration type.**Specs/Sections impacted**TS 38.214, Section 6.2.2------------------------- **Start of Text Proposal #1 for TS 38.214** ----------------------------6.2.2 UE DM-RS transmission procedure<Unchanged Text Omitted>When transmitted PUSCH is scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, SP-CSI-RNTI or MCS-C-RNTI, or corresponding to a configured grant, or being a PUSCH for Type-2 random access procedure,- the UE may be configured with higher layer parameter *dmrs-Type* in *DMRS-UplinkConfig*, and the configured DM-RS configuration type is used for transmitting PUSCH in as defined in Clause 6.4.1.1 of [4, TS 38.211]. <Unchanged Text Omitted>For MsgA PUSCH transmission, if the UE is not configured with *msgA-PUSCH-DMRS-CDM-group,* the UEshall assume that 2 DM-RS CDM groups are configured. Otherwise, *msgA-PUSCH-DMRS-CDM-group* indicates which DM-RS CDM group to use from the set of {0,1}. For MsgA PUSCH transmission, if the UE is not configured with *msgA-PUSCH-NrofPort,* the UEshall assume that 4 ports are configured per DM-RS CDM groups for double-symbol DM-RS. Otherwise, *msgA-PUSCH-NrofPort* with value of 0 indicates the first port per DM-RS CDM group, while a value of 1 indicates the first two ports per DM-RS CDM group.<Unchanged Text Omitted>------------------------- **End of Text Proposal #1**------------------------------- |

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Samsung | Seems fine. |
| CATT | We are fine with proposal 1. |
|  |  |

# Correction on the transmission timing adjustment procedure in 38.213

R1-2101526 pointed out that a 12-bit absolute TA can be in a DL-SCH with Absolute Timing Advance Command MAC CE which is already specified in 38.321 from 2-step RACH work item in NR R16. But in 38.213, the 12 bits absolute TA is only assumed to be in RAR, and only 6-bit TA is assumed for all other cases. So it should be clarify that in the description of the transmission timing adjustment procedure, the 12-bit absolute TA can be also in a DL-SCH with Absolute Timing Advance Command.

***Proposal 2:***

* Adopt the following TP#2 in 38.213, to clarify that the 12-bit absolute TA can be also in a DL-SCH with Absolute Timing Advance Command.

**Reasons for change**

A 12-bit absolute TA can be in a DL-SCH with Absolute Timing Advance Command MAC CE which is already specified in 38.321 from 2-step RACH work item in NR R16.

But in 38.213, the 12 bits absolute TA is only assumed to be in RAR, and only 6-bit TA is assumed for all other cases.

**Summary of changes**

### Clarify in the description of the transmission timing adjustment procedure that the 12-bit absolute TA can be also in a DL-SCH with Absolute Timing Advance Command.

**Consequences if not approved:**

### The 12 bits Timing Advance Command carried in Absolute Timing Advance Command MAC CE in a DL-SCH will be treated as a 6-bit TA in “other cases” in 38.213.

**Specs/Sections impacted**

TS 38.213, Section 4.2

-----------------------**Start of Text Proposal #2 for TS 38.213** ----------------------------

4.2 Transmission timing adjustments

<Unchanged Text Omitted>

In case of random access response or Absolute Timing Advance Command MAC CE, a timing advance command [11, TS 38.321], , for a TAG indicates values by index values of  = 0, 1, 2, ..., 3846, where an amount of the time alignment for the TAG with SCS of  kHz is . is defined in [4, TS 38.211] and is relative to the SCS of the first uplink transmission from the UE after the reception of the random access response.

In other cases, a timing advance command [11, TS 38.321], , for a TAG indicates adjustment of a current value, , to the new value, , by index values of  = 0, 1, 2,..., 63, where for a SCS of  kHz, .

<Unchanged Text Omitted>

-------------------------**End of Text proposal #2** ----------------------------

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | Seems fine. |
| CATT | we are fine with the principal of proposal 2 but we would modify proposed text as below:In case of random access response ~~or Absolute Timing Advance Command MAC CE~~, a timing advance command or an absolute timing advance command [11, TS 38.321], |
|  |  |

# Multiplexing between MsgB and unicast PDSCH

In R1-2101573, it was proposed to add some restriction on the multiplexing between MsgB and other unicast PDSCH, i.e. the UE is not expected to be scheduled a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI, and another PDSCH in the same cell scheduled with MSGB-RNTI in a slot.

The motivation was questioned by several companies during the preparation phase, and the proponent company provided some further clarifications.

[Spreadtrum]

For TP in R1-2101573, we want to provide further elaborations on why we should consider the restriction on MsgB.

* The payload size of MsgB could be much larger than Msg2 and/or Msg4 when including RRC payload for multiple UEs. It poses more challenge and difficulty for UE processing for the case when MsgB and unicast PDSCH TDMed multiplexing in a slot than the case for Msg2 and unicast PDSCH TDMed multiplexing in a slot.
* In our understanding, the processing capability requirement for MsgB could be equivalent to one unicast PDSCH. In Rel-15, for msg4, actually there are some restrictions in UE feature session, i.e., when UE not support more than 1 unicast PDSCHs in a slot per CC, UE is not expected to be scheduled with msg4 and unicast PDSCH in a slot per CC.



In our opinion, similar to msg4, UE should be not expected to be scheduled with MsgB and unicast PDSCH in a slot per CC when UE not supporting FG5-11/5-11a/5-11b. Otherwise, it is possibly that the UE could not process MsgB when one MsgB and one unicast PDSCH TDMed multiplexing in a slot. Then, the latency would be increased (always fallback to 4-step RACH) and the benefit of 2-step RACH would loss.

Thus, we have the following proposal:

The UE is not expected to be scheduled a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI, and another PDSCH in the same cell scheduled with MSGB-RNTI in a slot.

***Proposal 3:***

* Adopt the following TP#3 in 38.214, to restrict that MsgB and unicast PDSCH TDMed in a slot should not be supported.

|  |
| --- |
| Reason for change:The payload size of MsgB is much larger than Msg2 and/or Msg4. The processing capability requirement for MsgB could be equivalent to unicast PDSCH. For UEs not supporting two unicast PDSCHs TDMed in a slot per CC, MsgB could not be treated. The accessing latency would be increased and the benefit of 2-step RACH would loss.Summary of change:Not support MsgB and unicast PDSCH TDMed multiplexing in a slot.Consequences if not approved:The benefit of 2-step RACH would loss, and even 2-step RACH could not be supported for UEs not supporting 2 unicast PDSCHs TDMed in a slot per CC. Clauses affected:TS38.214, Section 5.1-----------------------**Start of Text Proposal #3 for TS 38.214** ----------------------------5.1 UE procedure for receiving the physical downlink shared channel<Unchanged Text Omitted>The UE is not expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI if another PDSCH in the same cell scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time. The UE is not expected to be scheduled a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI, and another PDSCH in the same cell scheduled with MSGB-RNTI in a slot.<Unchanged Text Omitted>-----------------------**End of Text Proposal #3** ---------------------------- |

Please companies double-check if the above clarifications make sense, and if the TP is agreeable.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Samsung | Technically speaking, simply not allowing msgB and other PDSCH in one slot is a bit too much. For example, if a UE is with more than one PDSCH capability, then gNB can schedule one unicast PDSCH in the same slot which contains the MSGB. It only may matters to these UE who only holds single PDSCH capability. Even in this case, it can be up to gNB scheduling to avoid this, because when gNB schedules the unicast PDSCH, gNB knows the UE capability already.My preferred handling will be we draw a RAN1 conclusion, saying:*It’s up to gNB scheduling to handle the case that unicast PDSCH(s) TDMed with msgB in a slot per CC for different UE capability.* |
| CATT | Scheduling both MSGB and 1 unicast PDSCH or only MSGB message in a slot depends on gNB implementation. Certainly when gNB schedules MSGB and PDSCH for UE, gNB also refers to UE capability such as 5-11 etc.So proposed text in proposal 3 isn’t required. If we have common understanding on multiplexing between MsgB and unicast PDSCH, maybe RAN1 conclusion isn’t necessary. |
|  |  |

# Summary

The final proposals and the potential CRs are to be updated…
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