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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] – [27] submitted to agenda item 8.6.1.1 and relevant parts of contributions [28] – [35] submitted to other agenda items and captures this email discussion on reduced maximum UE bandwidth:

|  |
| --- |
| [108-e-R17-RedCap-01] Email discussion for maintenance on aspects related to reduced maximum UE bandwidth – Johan (Ericsson)   * 1st check point: February 25 * Final check point: March 3 |

According to the latest WI status report, the following remaining details pertaining to reduced UE bandwidth are expected to be addressed during CR/maintenance phase in Q1 2022:

|  |
| --- |
| * Clarification of UE behavior when separate initial DL BWP is not configured * Presence of SSB transmission in separate initial DL BWP in connected mode for BWP#0 configuration option 1 * Remaining details of common PUCCH resource determination * If needed, address RAN2/RAN4 feedback on RAN1 working assumptions on DL BWP operation (see [R1-2112802](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_107-e/Docs/R1-2112802.zip)) |

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 are furthermore tagged FL13. The previous rounds in this discussion are captured in [42] – [45].

Follow the naming convention in this example:

* *RedCapBwFLS5-v000.docx*
* *RedCapBwFLS5-v001-CompanyA.docx*
* *RedCapBwFLS5-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*
* *RedCapBwFLS5-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 *RedCapBwFLS5-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*.
* CompanyC uploads an empty file named *RedCapBwFLS5-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 *RedCapBwFLS5-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 [R1-2200852](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2200852.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.

**FL13 Question 1-1a: Please consider entering contact info below for the points of contact for this email discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point of contact** | **Email address** |
| vivo | Xueming Pan | panxueming@vivo.com |
| Nordic | Karol Schober | karol.schober@nordicsemi.no |
| Spreadtrum | Huayu Zhou | huayu.zhou@unisoc.com |
| FUTUREWEI | Vip Desai | vipul.desai@futurewei.com |
| Qualcomm | Jing Lei | leijing@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Intel | Debdeep Chatterjee | debdeep.chatterjee@intel.com |
| Ericsson | Sandeep Narayanan Kadan Veedu | sandeep.narayanan.kadan.veedu@ericsson.com |
| Nokia, NSB | Rapeepat Ratasuk | rapeepat.ratasuk@nokia-bell-labs.com |
| CATT | Yongqiang FEI | feiyongqiang@catt.cn |
| Xiaomi | Qin MU | muqin@xiaomi.com |
| China Telecom | Jing Guo | guojing6@chinatelecom.cn |
| NEC | Takahiro Sasaki | takahiro.sasaki@nec.com |
| Sharp | Hiroki Takahashi | takahashi.hiroki@sharp.co.jp |
| NTT DOCOMO | Mayuko Okano | mayuko.okano@docomo-lab.com |
| Lenovo | Yuantao Zhang | zhangyt18@lenovo.com |
| Samsung | Feifei Sun | Feifei.sun@samsung.com |
| LGE | Jay KIM | jaehyung.kim@lge.com |
| ZTE | Youjun Hu | hu.youjun1@zte.com.cn |
| MediaTek | Chiou-Wei Tsai | cw.tsai@mediatek.com |
| CMCC | Lijie Hu | hulijie@chinamobile.com |
| Apple | Hong He | hhe5@apple.com |
| Panasonic | Shotaro Maki | maki.shotaro@jp.panasonic.com |

# Separate initial DL BWP

One of the FFSs identified in RAN1#106-bis-e is whether the separate RedCap initial DL BWP is always configured if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth:

|  |
| --- |
| * For a cell that allows a RedCap UE to access, network can configure a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs in SIB.   + FFS: It is always configured if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth. |

Regarding the configuration of a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap when the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, the contributions express different views. Few contributions [13, 16, 21, 22, 27] indicate that, considering the UE complexity and specification impacts, the separate initial DL BWP for RedCap should be always configured if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth. [13] points out that it needs to be carefully studied that whether to support that the RedCap UE can continue using the location/bandwidth/SCS of CORESET#0 for the initial DL BWP. Meanwhile, several contributions [6, 8, 9, 10, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 28] 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 can continue using the MIB-configured CORESET#0 (e.g., its location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix). In this case, for TDD, the center frequencies between CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP for RedCap can be different as long as the total bandwidth of the two is not larger than the RedCap maximum UE bandwidth.

Moreover, several contributions [10, 23, 24] mention that, in TDD, the center frequency of CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are not necessarily aligned but the total bandwidth of the two is not larger than the RedCap maximum UE bandwidth.

Some additional views are expressed as follows:

* [8]: 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 location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.
* [16]: A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.
* [19]: 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 CORESET#0 is defined as separate initial DL BWP. CORESET#0 can be used during and after initial access.
* [22]: For a cell that allows RedCap UEs to access, a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs shall always be configured if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UEs bandwidth.
* [23]: For TDD, the center frequencies between CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP for RedCap can be different as long as the total bandwidth of the two is not larger than the RedCap maximum UE bandwidth. Otherwise, they are the same.
* [31]: Support configuration of CORESET#0A in separate initial DL BWP
  + CORESET#0A has same properties as CORESET#0 in terms of size and length
  + FFS: first PRB of CORESET#0A in separate initial DL BWP.

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

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 2-1: For the case that the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, down-select between the following two options during RAN1#108-e:**

* **Option 1: A separate initial DL BWP is configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**
  + **Otherwise, the UE shall consider the cell as barred.**
* **Option 2: The RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**
  + **For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are not necessarily aligned, but the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Preferred option (if any)** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | Option 1 (1st preference)  Option 2 is also fine with modification | For Option 2, even for now the RRC\_CONNECTED non-RedCap UE does not support the non-aligned center frequency between DL and UL BWP. Therefore we cannot agree with Option 2 as is, since it will break the legacy rule for center-frequency alignment between DL and UL BWP with the same ID  We are fine with proposal 2 if following modification is made:   * **Option 2: The RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP needs to be ~~are not necessarily~~ aligned~~, but the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth~~.**   + **Otherwise, RedCap UE expects to be configured with separate initial DL BWP** |
| Nordic |  | Option 1 | As commented, in legacy initial DL BWP is always configured in SIB1. We do not understand why RedCap initial DL BWP should be handled otherwise. **Option 1 would automatically also resolve center-frequency issue.**  There are at least 3 sub-options for Option 2 for TDD   * Option 2-1 the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth. * Option 2-2: CORESET#0 is within BW of initial UL BWP * Option 2-3: CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP is center-frequency aligned, otherwise RedCap UE expects to be configured with separate initial DL BWP   We would be fine with Option 2-2 and 2-3 |
| Spreadtrum |  | Prefer Option 1, but can live with Option 2 if it is the majority view and have the modification | Option 1 is more simple way to avoid the “continue-to-use” mechanism, which is lack of flexibility.  For Option 2, if the RedCap UE continues to use the location/bandwidth/… of CORESET#0, e.g. during random access, the RedCap UE needs to perform RF retuning for DL/UL switch, when the center frequencies of CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are not aligned. It is not complexity and power efficient. Therefore, we share the similar modification as vivo. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Option 1 and option 2 with modifications | Option 1 is straightforward for the UE and eliminates checking by the UE. Option 2 can reduce the signaling overhead, especially if the network chooses not to configure a separate initial DL BWP. We are open to consider options including those mentioned by Nordic and vivo |
| Qualcomm |  |  | Either Option 1 or Option 2 is fine |
| Intel |  | Prefer Option 2, but … | We support Option 2. There is no need to mandate SIB1 signalling when it can be avoided. For most typical deployments in the initial phases when connection density of RedCap UEs is not very large, having the RedCap UEs use CORESET#0 is an desirable option that should be supported efficiently – i.e., by not mandating unnecessary overhead from SIB1 (which is already rather large).  We should not couple the discussion on DL BWP configuration and center frequency decision. These should be decoupled. For instance, the main issue in this proposal also applies to FDD where the question of center frequency alignment is moot.  Even for non-RedCap UEs, there is no requirement on center frequency alignment between CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP. However, there are requirements on alignment defined for BWPs with same BWP index in TDD.  So, the details on center frequency alignment in TDD and related requirements/expectations can be discussed and defined separately. |
| Ericsson | Y | Option 1 | Option 1 is the most straightforward solution from specification point-of-view. Option 2 would necessitate specifying yet another UE behavior during initial access and time-consuming discussions related to center-frequency alignment between initial DL BWP defined by MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP during random access. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Option 2 | In our understanding, there is no need to always configure a separate initial DL BWP for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth configure. The UE can use CORESET#0 during and after initial access. Therefore, we’d like to keep this flexibility. |
| LGE | Y | Option 2 | Option 2 is useful in the case where the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth and no separate initial DL BWP is needed, i.e., the MIB-configured CORESET#0 is intended to be used as the initial DL BWP for both non-RedCap and RedCap UEs. In this case, Option 1 still requires the signaling overhead. |
| FL2 | Based on the discussion in the online (GTW) session on Monday 21st February, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 2-1a: For the case that the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, down-select between the following two options during RAN1#108-e:**   * **Option 1: A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **~~Otherwise, the UE shall consider the cell as barred.~~** * **Option 2: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are not necessarily aligned, but the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.** | | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |  |
| CATT | Y | Option 2 | With Option 2, separate initial DL BWP can still be configured. If configured, then it should be used; if not configured, the CORESET#0 is reused. |
| Xiaomi |  |  | In our view, there is no need to down-select between these two options.  Our first preference is not to mandate the separate initial DL BWP and also guarantee the center frequency alignment in TDD system. E.g., with the following update for option 2   * **Option 2: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.** * **For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are ~~not~~ ~~necessarily~~ aligned, ~~but the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.~~**   But if the majority are OK with this proposal, we can accept it for progress and we prefer option 1 to option 2. |
| vivo |  |  | Based on the previous round of discussion, we think the following compromised proposal can also be considered for down-selection. (modified a bit for better clarity)   * **Option 3:**   + **If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**     - **For TDD, this is only applicable when the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are aligned**   + **If the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are NOT aligned, RedCap UE expects to be configured with separate initial DL BWP**   And we would be fine with either option 1 or option3, but not option 2. |
| China Telecom |  |  | In our understanding, the separate initial DL BWP can be configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, but not be mandatory. And we can use Option 2 with flexibility and simplification. The center frequency alignment in TDD system is another controversial topic, and it would be hardly to achieve the consistent agreement. |
| Panasonic | Y | Prefer Option 1. | Other than at least "the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0" needs to be agreed for option 2 with the consideration to avoid the overlap with the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs are necessary. The gain in our understanding is signaling optimization if it is sent in SIB1. A separate initial DL BWP case needs to be supported at the end in whatever SIB is used. We don't think to support option 2 is essential correction for the maintenance phase. |
| NEC | Y | Option 1 | Option 1 reuses existing specifications. Removed sub-bullet point of option 1 should be up to RAN2. |
| Sharp | Y | Option 2 | We are OK to down-select from current 2 options of the FL2 proposal. Since option 1 requires additional signalling overhead, we are supportive with option 2 if the center frequency alignment is stable as it is in the FL proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Y | Option 2 | We share the same view as proponents of Option 2 that it is beneficial in terms of signaling overhead reduction and we don’t see the need that a separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap UE when the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UE is larger than the maximum BW of RedCap UE.  For the sub-bullet in Option 2, we can be flexible on the center frequency alignment of the initial UL BWP and CORESET#0 and/or whether the separate initial UL BWP and CORESET#0 can span larger BW than RedCap UE’s BW, i.e., RF retuning is required or not. |
| Lenovo | Y | Option 1 | Option 1 is more straightforward and is a common solution for both TDD and FDD. |
| Samsung | Y |  | We cannot agree on Xiaomi’s modification, i.e., we don’t want to open the door to RF retuning for RedCap UE in TDD.  On the other hand, if companies do not want to explicit say that center frequencies of CORESET #0 vs UL BWP, we think it is sufficient to only keep the second part of option 2. We are also fine with original version.   * **Option 2: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **For TDD, ~~the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are not necessarily aligned, but~~ the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.**   For option 3, we don’t see the need to further restrict the center frequency of CORESET #0 and UL BWP, but won’t object it if this is the majorities’ view. |
| LGE | Y | Our preference is Option 2. | The Option 2 is more flexible and has the advantage of signaling overhead in the case where sharing the MIB-configured CORESET#0 is intended when the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth. It would be unfortunate if we cannot agree on Option 2 because of the controversy on sub-bullet of Option 2 on the center frequency alignment. The sub-bullet of Option 2 as proposed in the FL proposal is preferred, but there is room for compromise for us on the sub-bullet of Option 2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  |  | Y if without the sub-bullet under option 2 - what is the concern of the potential RF retuning for only once (or at least not frequent) during initial access even if the span across corset#0 and UL BWP exceed the max UE BW is not convincing.  Also it is very straightforward that if the configured DL BWP is to be used, a UE expect this DL BWP has aligned center frequency with UL while if the corset#0 is to be used, it does not matter where is the configured DL BWP. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Option2 with removing the subbullet. | The center frequencies alignment issue is an independent issue, i.e., option1 also need to discuss it. Therefore, it is suggest to remove the subbullet for option2 and discuss it separately.  Based on above, the following is proposed  **High Priority Proposal 2-1a: For the case that the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, down-select between the following two options during RAN1#108-e:**   * **Option 1: A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **~~Otherwise, the UE shall consider the cell as barred.~~** * **Option 2: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   We prefer Option 2 since it can save SIB1 signalling overhead by avoiding mandatory separate BWP configuration. Moreover, if MIB-configured CORESET#0 is aligned with initial UL BWP, there is no need to configure the separate initial DL BWP.  If there is no consensus in RAN1, the determination of Option 1 and Option 2 can be left to RAN2 decision, especially for the cell barring issue. |
| Spreadtrum2 | Y | Our preference is Option 1. | In our view, the Cons of Option 1 are mainly the signaling overhead, but it was mentioned by some companies that SIBx may be used for RedCap configuration, in which the signaling overhead is not issue.  The Cons of Option 2 are mainly the misalignment b/w CORESET#0 and the separate initial UL BWP. We don’t think it can be postponed for discussion, since it is critical for RedCap UE in terms of RF retuning during random access. And companies have some restrictions to avoid the RF retuning, and the restrictions are controversial in companies’ view. Even if we have the consensus on the restrictions and NW follows it, it is highly possible that the separate initial UL BWP is placed at the center of carrier for alignment, which is not welcome by NW vendors. It is almost common understanding that NW vendor would like to place CORESET#0 (SSB) in the center of carrier, and place the separate initial DL BWP (if configured) close to the edge of carrier to avoid the PUSCH fragmentations. From UE perspective, we share the similar view as E/// that there could be “another UE behavior”, because it is common understanding that typically RedCap UE may receive SIB/paging in CORESET#0 and receive RAR in the separate initial DL BWP close to the edge of carrier. E/// and QC have some figures to show this typical UE behavior, and with this behavior RedCap UE only needs one RF retuning for random access, e.g. (Scheme-1 in RP-213046, QC)    The current restriction in Option 2 will cause new UE behavior, i.e. open RF to cover the combined BW of CORESET#0 and the separate initial UL BWP.  Furthermore, we are curious about the signaling design aspect. The separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs may have the IE like:  DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB ::= SEQUENCE {  initialDownlinkBWP BWP-DownlinkCommonRedCap,  bcch-Config BCCH-Config,  pcch-Config PCCH-Config,  ...  }  BWP-DownlinkCommonRedCap ::= SEQUENCE {  genericParameters BWP, OPTIONAL, -- Need M  pdcch-ConfigCommon SetupRelease { PDCCH-ConfigCommon } OPTIONAL, -- Need M  pdsch-ConfigCommon SetupRelease { PDSCH-ConfigCommon } OPTIONAL, -- Need M  ...  }  If we have concern on the signaling overhead of *BWP*, RAN2 can add something on the default value for it without any RAN1 spec impact, e.g. “If *BWP* parameter is not configured, the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the BWP can be equal to CORESET#0”. Why do we need the large RAN1 spec impact to save RAN2 signaling overhead?  We also propose Option 4 based on Option 1:   * **Option 4: A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **~~Otherwise, the UE shall consider the cell as barred.~~**   + **Note: It is up to RAN2 to reduce the signaling overhead of the separate initial DL BWP, e.g. if *BWP* parameter is not configured, the RedCap UE continues to use the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0** |
| MediaTek |  |  | It seems center frequency alignment is not a concern with Option 1. As our concern is that UE may have to perform RF retuning for DL reception and UL transmission (for example during random access), we would like to hear from the group some more details about Option 1 in this aspect.  For Option 1, when a SIB-configured initial DL BWP is provided to RedCap,   1. Does the center frequency align between the initial DL and UL BWPs, regardless of whether or not it includes the entire CORESET#0?    * If the common understanding is yes, then it should be captured to Option 1. 2. If it does not include the entire CORESET#0, does UE need to monitor CORESET#0 during initial access including random access? |
| CMCC | Y | Our preference is Option 2. | We prefer gNB is not mandated to configure separate initial DL BWP for RedCap so that gNB can remain flexibility of configuration. For the sub-bullet of Option2, the center frequencies of CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP to be not necessarily aligned but within RedCap UE maximum bandwidth can avoid retuning and remain some flexibility of the location of CORESET0, which is fine to us.  To make Option2 more clear, we suggest the following modification.   * **Option 2: A separate initial DL BWP is configurable for RedCap, If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are not necessarily aligned, but the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.** |
| Spreadtrum3 |  |  | In response to MTK (thanks for MTK, since we can clearly understand each side).  For Option 1, when a SIB-configured initial DL BWP is provided to RedCap,   1. Does the center frequency align between the initial DL and UL BWPs, regardless of whether or not it includes the entire CORESET#0?    * If the common understanding is yes, then it should be captured to Option 1.   [SPRD]: It is our understanding. We have proposal in our contribution: ***For TDD, center frequencies are the same for the initial DL and UL BWP during random access for RedCap UEs, no matter whether or not it includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0 or not.*** We think it is the critical issue on top of some others.   1. If it does not include the entire CORESET#0, does UE need to monitor CORESET#0 during initial access including random access?   [SPRD]: In our understanding, UE does not need to monitor CORESET#0 during random access. Paging is outside, so SI update is not possible (SIBx is also outside).   * + 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. |
| Nordic | Option 1 |  | 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  }  Just to note, as per current 38.331 separate initial DL BWP, if configured to overlap with CORESET#0, **separate initial DL BWP would require only 16bit** + [3bit SCS], because pdcch-ConfigCommon  pdsch-ConfigCommon from legacy initial DL BWP can be reused. **16bits will not make much difference in SIB1 coverage, if any at all. This is not a reason for technical objections.**  We support Xiaomi and VIVO wordings, when it comes to center frequency alignment. |
| Ericsson | Y | Option 1 | Option 1 is straightforward and prevents significant specification impacts and potentially additional UE complexity/power consumption. Moreover, in TDD, cases in which CORESET#0 can be potentially used as initial DL BWP are not common. This is because in this case CORESET#0 can be used only if it is placed close to the carrier edge where initial UL BWP is located, which may not always be feasible. |
| Intel |  | Option 2/ 2A/ 3 | We can accept the FL proposal as well as the version with Option 3 from Vivo included.  As discussed during the previous GTW call, the issue of center frequency between initial DL BWP based on CORESET#0 and UL BWPs needs resolution for idle/inactive operations (even when SIB1-indicated initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs does NOT exceed RedCap UE max BW) and the resolution the group reaches for each case can apply on top of the main bullet of Options 2 or 3.  We are also open to update Option 2 to make it similar to Option 3 as:   * **Option 2A: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **For TDD, this is only applicable when ~~the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are not necessarily aligned, but~~ the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.**   + **If the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP exceeds the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth, RedCap UE expects to be configured with separate initial DL BWP**   **To Nordic**’s comment on value in SIB1 OH savings – SIB1 size has been a concern since before Rel-17. Now, we are dealing with larger payload due to RedCap-specific configurations while UE DL reception performance for RedCap gets worse considering reduced UE capabilities. Thus, a bit more careful and responsible design on RAN1 part would certainly be desirable, especially when the additional OH can be saved without any issue.  **To Huawei**’s comment “*what is the concern of the potential RF retuning for only once (or at least not frequent) during initial access even if the span across corset#0 and UL BWP exceed the max UE BW is not convincing*” – on the need for restrictions on center frequency for TDD in idle/inactive states, if UE is expected to perform RF retuning between the DL BWP and UL BWP that are associated with random access, it would be necessary to discuss switching times/gaps between the different messages in UL and DL, including between Msg1 Tx and monitoring for Msg2, Msg3 Tx to monitoring for Msg3 reTx or Msg4 scheduling, etc., which to us would not be desirable to pursue at this stage due to even more spec efforts in RAN1 and RAN4. Thus, it matters even if the UE needs to retune only once if such retuning is subject to specified tight timelines as are defined for random access. |
| SONY | Y | Option 1 | Agree with Ericsson that option 1 is straightforward and prevents significant specification impacts. Given that we are in the maintenance phase of Rel-17, option 1 would be our preferred approach. |
| Spreadtrum4 |  |  | We have modification for our proposal Option 4 to avoid misunderstanding.   * **Option 4: A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **~~Otherwise, the UE shall consider the cell as barred.~~**   + **Higher layer parameter *BWP* may or may not be configured. If the *BWP* is not configured, the RedCap UE continues to use the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0. For TDD, the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.**   Actually, current Option 4 and Option 2 are not different in essence. The tiny difference is the place of optionality. It is not so controversial now.  For Option 4, the possible IE of the separated initial DL BWP could be:  DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB ::= SEQUENCE {  initialDownlinkBWP BWP-DownlinkCommonRedCap,  ...  }  BWP-DownlinkCommonRedCap ::= SEQUENCE {  genericParameters BWP, OPTIONAL, -- Need M  pdcch-ConfigCommon SetupRelease { PDCCH-ConfigCommon } OPTIONAL, -- Need M  pdsch-ConfigCommon SetupRelease { PDSCH-ConfigCommon } OPTIONAL, -- Need M  ...  }  For Option 2, the possible IE of the separated initial DL BWP could be:  DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB ::= SEQUENCE {  initialDownlinkBWP BWP-DownlinkCommonRedCap, OPTIONAL, -- Need M  ...  }  BWP-DownlinkCommonRedCap ::= SEQUENCE {  genericParameters BWP,  pdcch-ConfigCommon SetupRelease { PDCCH-ConfigCommon } OPTIONAL, -- Need M  pdsch-ConfigCommon SetupRelease { PDSCH-ConfigCommon } OPTIONAL, -- Need M  ...  }  By the way, we share the similar view as Intel on the RF retuning for only once during initial access. And we share the similar view as some other UE vendors’ view, e.g. MTK, that center frequency alignment b/w DL and UL should apply for all cases for RedCap UEs similar as that for non-RedCap UEs. It seems that anything on center frequency alignment is not captured in draft of R17 38.213 for now. If no update, does it mean RedCap UEs follow center frequency alignment in R16 38.213? If the answer is yes, we can live with it. |
| IDCC |  | Option 1 | We prefer Option 1 but we are also fine with modifications from Vivo or their proposed option 3. |
| FL3 | Among the received responses, there is a larger support for Option 1 than for Option 2. Several responses proposed modifications of the options, and many responses discussed the potential benefits and drawbacks of the different options in terms of center frequency alignment and signaling overhead. Some responses expressing support for Option 2 expressed different preferences regarding the need for center frequency alignment between CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP in TDD. One response indicated that the signaling overhead difference between the options may be quite small (~16 bits).  Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered. Companies are requested to indicate their ‘Preferred option’ and ‘Acceptable option(s)’.  **High Priority Proposal 2-1b: For the case that the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, down-select between the following options during RAN1#108-e:**   * **Option 1: A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.** * **Option 2a: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **For TDD, ~~the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are not necessarily aligned, but~~ the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.** * **Option 2b: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are ~~not necessarily~~ aligned~~, but the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth~~.** | | |
| **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Acceptable option(s)** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Option 1, | Option 2a, 2b | Vivo’s proposal in last round also looks fine to us |
| vivo | Option 1 | Option 2b | Option 2a is not acceptable, as it will break the center frequency alignment principle between TDD DL and UL BWP with the same ID for CONNECTED mode UEs since Rel-15.  Suggest the following revision to option 2b to remove the unnecessary restriction that MIB-configured CORSET#0 and initial UL BWP has to be always center-frequency alignment, and if not aligned, network must provide a initial DL BWP configuration.   * **Option 2b: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **For TDD, it is only applicable when the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are ~~not necessarily~~ aligned~~, but the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth~~.** |
| Spreadtrum5 | Option 1 or Option 4 | TBD | Option 1 is our first preference. We also support the proposed Option 4 for compromise b/w Option 1 and 2.   * **Option 4: A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **Higher layer parameter *BWP* may or may not be configured. If the *BWP* is not configured, the RedCap UE continues to use the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0. For TDD, the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth, or the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are ~~not necessarily~~ aligned.** |
| Apple | Opt.1 | Opt.2b | Same concerns as vivo on Opt.2a. Support the revised opt.2b from vivo. |
| DOCOMO | Opt.2a | Opt.2b, Opt.1 | Our preference is still option 2 not to mandate gNB to configure separate initial DL BWP from signaling overhead reduction perspective.  If the concerns of option 2 is RF retuning between separate initial UL BWP and CORESET#0, we would like to note that both option 2a and option 2b don’t require RF retuning. Furthermore, we can accept center frequency alignment of separate initial UL BWP and CORESET#0 while we don’t see the need to restrict them to always be aligned.  However, it was pointed out that the overhead would not be considerable, thus, we can accept option 1 if majority of companies support it. |
| Sharp | Opt.2a | Opt.1, Opt.2b | As same reason as 1st round (Signalling overhead), our 1st preference is Option 2a. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | Option 2b | For option 2b, we support the update from vivo |
| CATT | Option 2a | Option 2b | Although Option 2b is not our 1st preference, it at least achieve the same merit, i.e. save SIB1 payload. |
| NEC | Option 1 | No strong view between option 2a and 2b | Regarding option 2, each sub-bullet point is a condition where option 2 can apply. In general, these conditions cannot be always met. Therefore vivo’s edit to option 2b is fine. Similar edit should be applied to option 2a. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | New Option2c | 2a | Option 2b does not make technical sense.  @Intel  Thanks for the following up. Mostly agree with your considerations.  From our opinion, option 1 is not the right direction with the following considerations. On one hand, as Intel explained, SIB overhead is always concerned even before Rel-17. More important is that the design principle to mandate configure a specific BWP for Rel-17 RedCap is not optimal. The original motivation for offloading does not serve, instead, will increase the overhead in cases that the BWP configuration is not needed but overhead would be added even for non-RedCap UEs. Another aspect is that we consider the framework built in Rel-17 could be used for future RedCap UEs, e.g. 5Mhz UEs. The logic behind Option 1 is that without better understanding the effect of UE retuning in non-frequent manner, network will still always need to configure a dedicated BWP, which further implies another dedicated BWP for a 5Mhz UE with sustained increment of overhead in SIB. The current option 2 will similarly impose sustained deployment restrictions to network with requirements on keeping the center frequency aligned for UEs. We understand some companies are not in favor of this new type of UEs but this will anyway be studied.  Therefore, the separate initial DL BWP is preferably to be configurable from our perspective, in order to be long-term evolved, and a design well taking UE RF retuning impact into account would be more future proof and scalable with UE BW limitation. From this perspective, change on the timeline as Intel pointed out (though Intel does not prefer) is also preferable to us, as it could be used for all later UEs. This can be listed as one more option, i.e. **no restriction on center frequency between coreset0 and UL BWP, with potential change on the timeline due to RF retuning during random access subject to RAN4 assessment.**   * **Option 2c: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are not necessarily aligned**     - **Impact on timeline is up to RAN4.** |
| Samsung | Opt 1 | Opt 2a |  |
| CMCC | Option2a | Option2b | Option2a provides high flexibility of gNB configuration, it does not preclude the configuration of separate initial DL BWP and also does not mandate gNB to configure separate initial DL BWP. For the sub-bullet of Option2a, the center frequencies of CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP to be within RedCap UE maximum bandwidth can avoid retuning and remain some flexibility of the location of CORESET0, timeline requirements for RACH is met.  For Option2b, there is more restriction on the location of CORESET0. As shown in figure below, as long as the center frequency of CORESET0 is not aligned with separate iUL BWP, gNB needs to configure separate iDL BWP. When separate iDL BWP overlaps with CORESET0, congestion of scheduling exists in overlapping frequency region.    We want to remind that the center frequency alignment issue of CORESET0 and separate iUL BWP may also occur when separate iDL BWP is configured and contains CORESET0. In this case, CORESET0 is used during initial access. If Option2b is agreed, does it mean CORESET0 and separate iUL BWP are also mandated to be aligned in this case? |
| Lenovo | Opt.1 |  | Vivo’s updates are also acceptable. |
| LGE | Option 2a | Option 1 |  |
| Nordic | Option 1 | Option 2b | We have concern about Option 2a, if CORESET#0 is not in BW of UL BWP, actually this may result in UE needing to retune center frequency between UL and DL even though sum <20MHz |
| IDCC | Option 1 | Option2a or Option 2b |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option 2a | Option 1c | We do not understand why the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP is not discussed for option 1 and it is only discussed for option2. From our understanding, even option 1 is agreed, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP also need to be decided, since the UE is required to receive SSB for measurement. Therefore, to be fair, for option1, the following subbulet is needed:  **Option 1: A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   * + **a) For TDD, the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.**   + **b) For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are aligned**   + **c) For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are not limited**   Based on above, option 2a provides the configuration flexbility for separate initial DL BWP and save signalling overhead. Option 1c provides the flexible separate initial BWP position. |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 2a | Option 1 | We support Option 2a based on the reasons provided in previous round. For the sake of progress, we can also accept Option 1 as separate initial BWP can already be configured (although our preference is that it is not always configured in this scenario).  For Option 2b, we feel this is unnecessarily restrictive and therefore not preferred. |
| FUTUREWEI | Opt. 2a | Opt. 1 | Opt. 2a has less signaling overhead compared to Opt. 1. Opt. 2a provides more flexibility in alignment than Opt. 2b. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |  | We think Option 2a is slightly better from the point-of-view of network configuration flexibility. |
| Intel | Opt. 2b | Opt. 2a | We continue to support Option 2b, including vivo’s updated version, and can accept Opt. 2a as well.  To reiterate, even with Opt. 1, we still need to discuss and resolve the handling of center frequencies for MIB-indicated CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP.  @vivo: while Option 2a does expand the “center frequency alignment” compared to Rel-15 when the UE moves to connected mode, we do not think it is unreasonable to provide flexibility to the NW in configuring BWPs considering the additional BW limitations of RedCap compared to non-RedCap. Most importantly, for RedCap UEs, it still would allow operations in DL and UL BWPs without any RF retuning.  We still have concerns on mandating Opt 1 for the reasons elaborated already in previous rounds. |
| FL5 | The following table summarizes the preferences expressed in the received responses:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Preferred | Acceptable | Preferred or Acceptable | | 1 | 11 | 5 | 11 + 5 = 16 | | 2a | 8 | 7 | 8 + 7 = 15 | | 2b | 1 | 11 | 1 + 11 = 12 |   Based on the received responses, down selection between options 1 and 2a can be considered. Companies are requested to indicate their ‘Acceptable option(s)’ and ‘NOT acceptable option(s)’.  **High Priority Proposal 2-1c: For the case that the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, down-select between the following options during RAN1#108-e:**   * **Option 1: A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.** * **Option 2a: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **For TDD, the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.** * **~~Option 2b: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.~~**   + **~~For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are aligned.~~** | | |
| **Company** | **Acceptable option(s)** | **NOT acceptable option(s)** | **Comments** |
| vivo | 1 | 2a | We consider option 2b is a middle ground between option 1 and option 2a, that’s why it has least preferred, but acceptable by most companies. Removing option 2b would lead to hard decision between option 1 and 2a, which is OK but we would NOT agree to option 2a given the reason expressed in the previous rounds. |
| CATT | 2a | 1, as long as center frequency issue of Option 1 is unclear | We also consider option 2b as a middle ground between option 1 and option 2a. Now 2b is out, unfortunately, seems we are just back to the beginning (although the wording is clearer).  **But we do feel this is unfair compare, since center frequency situation of Option 1 is hidden. We observe at least three different interpretations for Option 1**:  (1-1) Center frequency of separate initial DL BWP and (separate) initial UL BWP are always aligned, regardless it contains CD-SSB or not.  (1-2) Center frequency of separate initial DL BWP and (separate) initial UL BWP are aligned if NOT containing CD-SSB; if separate initial DL BWP contains CD-SSB, center frequencies are allowed to be not aligned.  - (1-2a) Not aligned but not spaning larger than max RedCap UE bandwidth, similar to Option 2a.  - (1-2b) Not aligned and not limiting the span range.  **May I ask proponents of Option 1, which interpretation are you really supporting?** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 2a | 1 | Perhaps no need to repeat anymore… |
| Apple | 1 |  |  |
| DOCOMO | Opt.2a, Opt.1 |  | Our preference is still Opt.2a as commented in the previous round. Opt.2a is obviously beneficial in terms of signaling overhead reduction even if it is not a huge gain, and also can provide a benefit from NW configuration flexibility point of view. |
| Spreadtrum6 | 1 | 2a (new criteria for judging RF retuning instead of center frequency, and new definition for the “combined bandwidth”) | For the unclearness issue mentioned by CATT, it is common understanding the separate initial DL/UL BWP are always aligned, i.e. (1-1). If the separate initial DL BWP is configured, interpretation (1-2a) is not needed. RedCap UE does not need to judge the combined bandwidth of the initial DL/UL BWP. If we open a door for the combined bandwidth, it will be new criteria to judge whether RF retuning is needed, and we will always consider the combining bandwidth instead of center frequency, which is not consistent with the legacy spec or methodology of spec. Following the legacy spec, center frequency alignment is the only criteria for judging RF retuning, and max channel bandwidth is only related to BWP bandwidth. Keeping this logic is simple for spec.  In addition, how to define the combined bandwidth (bandwidth spanning)? Does it need RAN4 spec? For each channel bandwidth, the PRB numbers, guard band and spectrum character are explicitly defined by RAN4. The combined bandwidth means the combined channel bandwidth or combined transmission bandwidths or PRBs number of BWP? CORESET#0 has subcarrier level offset relative to SSB, if combined bandwidth of SSB/CORSET#0/initial UL BWP exceeds the max RedCap UE bandwidth by several subcarriers, how to handle this case? In our view, RAN1 spec should not touch the bandwidth as much as possible.  In our understanding of Huawei’s comments, it seems RF retuning for UL/DL switch during random access is feasible for RedCap UEs, which is not the common understanding among UE vendors. Correct me if I’m wrong. |
| NEC | 1 |  |  |
| Samsung | Option 1,  Option 2a |  | Prefer option 1 |
| CMCC | Option2a | Option1 | We prefer Option2a, which provides high flexibility of gNB configuration, and does not preclude the configuration of separate initial DL BWP and also does not mandate gNB to configure separate initial DL BWP.  For Option1, we still have concern on network overhead if gNB is mandated to configure separate iDL BWP. |
| Panasonic | Option 1 |  | As commented before, Option 2a (or 2b) is less preferred as it would require further discussion for the detail. Option 1 is simpler. |
| Lenovo | Option 1 |  |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option2a | Option1 | If SSB is needed for measurement during RACH procedure in separate initial DL BWP and initial UL BWP, we think center frequency issue of option1 between MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BW also should be fairly treated as option2.  Based on above (similar as CATT), only when the center frequency issue is clear for option1, we can make a fair selection and make more progress. Currently, option 1 is not acceptable for us. |
| LGE | Option 2a |  | We agree with CATT in that the center frequency issue should still be there even if we go for the Option 1. For instance, for the case where the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is NOT wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, gNB may not configure the separate initial DL BWP and in this case the MIB-configured CORESET#0 (which is not necessarily center frequency aligned with the initial UL BWP according to the current spec) should be used for RedCap UEs. Then the same problem as the one in the sub-bullet of the Option 2a and 2b remains to be resolved. That is, by agreeing on the Option 1, we are just deferring the discussion on the center frequency alignment issue in TDD. So, if we could first make a decision on this center frequency alignment issue in TDD one way or the other, then it would be much easier to make an agreement on this issue. |
| IDCC | Option 1  Option 2a |  | Prefer option 1 |
| FUTUREWEI | Opt. 2a | Opt. 1 |  |
| MediaTek |  |  | We have similar questions as CATT. What’s the underlying assumption regarding cell frequency alignment between initial DL/UL BWPs in TDD for Option 1?  If it’s based on legacy BWP operation as stated in 38.213 and 38.331 that “***In case of TDD, a BWP-pair (UL BWP and DL BWP with the same bwp-Id) must have the same center frequency”*** (and assuming so far Redcap has not made agreements not to follow this legacy rule), then, in our view, the same legacy rule is and should be applied to Option 2 (without the sub-bullet) as well. In both options, the center frequencies of the initial DL/UL BWPs are the same based on legacy rule. But with the sub-bullet under Option 2, it is more clear that with Option 2, the center frequency alignment between initial DL/UL BWP will be changed. In our opinion, it is better to clearly capture the changes compared with legacy to the agreement.  o For TDD, the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth while the center frequency of MIB-configured CORESET#0 may or may not align.  The differences between these two options are (1) initial DL BWP in Option 1 is SIB-configured while it is MIB-configured in Option 2. Nevertheless, they both end up having index 0 which then should have the same center frequency as the initial UL BWP; and (2) NW is mandated to always configure a SIB-configured initial DL BWP in Option 1 for this particular case, and the only case discussed so far, when SIB-configured initial DL BWP for non-RedCap exceeds RedCap UE’s maximum BW.  Even with Option 1, we still have cases where separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP is not available, for example when the SIB-configured if provided or the MIB-defined initial DL BWP is *not* larger than the RedCap UE’s maximum BW. Then what should UE assume regarding center frequency alignment?  From the UE implementation perspective, what we care are:   1. Issue 1: Initial DL BWP determination    1. MIB-configured CORESET#0    2. SIB-configured DL BWP for non-RedCap UE    3. SIB-configured DL BWP for RedCap UE    4. **Question 1:** How does a RedCap UE determine its initial DL BWP from the above three candidates? 2. Issue 2: Center frequency alignment issue    1. **Case 1:** between initial DL BWP and initial UL BWP when the initial DL BWP (MIB-configured CORESET#0, SIB-configured for RedCap, or SIB-configured for non-RedCap) include CD-SSB and CORESET#0       * In this case, though UE monitors CORESET#0 at least during initial access and random access, we don’t need to mandate center frequency alignment between CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP when the initial DL BWP is SIB-configured. This is aligned with legacy behavior.    2. **Case 2:** between initial DL BWP and initial UL BWP when the separate initial DL BWP is configured for random access and it does not include the entire CORESET#0 and SSB       * In this case, our understanding is that UE does not need to monitor CORESET#0 after PRACH transmission and before dedicated RRC configuration is received.       * Hence, whether center frequency is aligned between CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP is not a concern.   From our review of companies’ contribution, consensus can be reached for Case 2 that initial DL BWP and initial UL BWP share a same center frequency. It is Case 1 that companies have different views. However, to us, the following agreements in RAN1#106bis-e have resolved Case 1 and the remaining issue is Case 2! Maybe we should align companies’ views on this agreement first.   |  | | --- | | 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. | |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |  | At this stage we prefer to only support Option 1 which is a straightforward approach with almost no specification impacts. Furthermore, as pointed out by Nordic, signaling overhead reduction from Option 2a seems to be rather small (~16 bits). In addition, Option 1 perhaps also simplifies the IODT efforts. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | Option 2a |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 2a,  Option 1 |  | Our first preference is 2a. We can also accept option 1. |
| Intel | Option 2a | Option 1 | As commented before, the center frequency issue for random access seems to be put “under the rug” for Option 1 when it still exists.  If companies supporting Option 1 could explain their position on center frequency alignment between CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP for random access when SIB1-indicated initial DL B  The claim from proponents of Option 1 is that if CORESET#0 resources are to be used, gNB can configure separate initial DL BWP overlapping with CORESET#0, thereby enabling reuse of CORESET#0. However, in this case, how is the situation different from Option 2b since for separate initial DL BWP and initial UL BWP, the center frequencies need to be aligned?  Thus, we do not think removal of Option 2b is appropriate since in effect it is a super-set of Option 1. If gNB wants to follow Option 1, it certainly can. However, what is the reason to mandate gNB behavior in this case and increase SIB1 payload unnecessarily. In our view, even ~20 bits of unnecessary OH is irresponsible design on part of RAN1 given prior history regarding concerns on SIB1 size (RAN2 had even written to RAN1 on this in the past).  **In this regard, we still think if not Option 2a, Option 2b is the right direction to achieve a consensus in the group. At the minimum, Option 1 proponents need to clarify which aspect of Option 1 is NOT possible with Option 2b.** |
| Nordic | Option 1 | Option 2a |  |
| FL6  FL7  FL8 | The following table summarizes the views expressed in the received responses:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Option | Acceptable | Not acceptable | Acceptable - Not Acceptable | | 1 | 13 | 6 | 7 | | 2a | 11 | 4 | 7 |   As can be seen above, the two options have roughly similar support, but compared to Option 1 slightly fewer responses express that Option 2a is not acceptable (6 vs 4). Based on this, **Proposal 2-1-2** below can be considered.  Regarding the case when a separate initial DL BWP is configured (as in Option 1), some responses pointed out that it is not clear whether the center frequencies for the separate initial DL BWP and the (separate or shared) initial UL BWP are always assumed to be the same or only when the separate initial DL BWP does not contain CD-SSB. A similar question can be asked about the case when a shared initial DL BWP is used. Based on this, **Proposal 2-1-1** below can be considered. | | |

**FL6 High Priority Proposal 2-1-1: For TDD, when a (separate or shared) initial DL BWP includes CD-SSB (for FR1 and FR2) and the entire CORESET#0 (for FR1), the center frequencies for the (separate or shared) initial DL BWP and the (separate or shared) initial UL BWP are assumed to be the same.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Spreadtrum7 | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y | We support Proposal 2-1-1 which is aligned with legacy.   1. For completeness, we should also discuss the case when the initial DL BWP does not include CD-SSB and CORESET#0. For which, we think the center frequencies for the initial DL BWP and the initial UL BWP should be assumed to be the same. 2. For clarify, we prefer to add “for FR1 and FR2” to the proposal. |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| CATT | Y and N | Yes for BWP#0 configuration option 2, since initial DL BWP may be frequently used in connected mode. We are OK to reuse the spirit of RRC dedicated BWP here. Same center frequency is suitable.  No for BWP#0 configuration option 1. RedCap UE only need to perform RF retuning during RACH (very few times), and once in connected mode, RedCap UE will have dedicated RRC BWP pair with aligned center frequency. The center frequency alignment of initial DL/UL BWP is no use. No need to introduce UL resource fragmentation to the network. |
| DOCOMO |  | Regarding shared initial DL BWP and shared initial UL BWP, which should follow the legacy principle, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same.  Regarding separate initial DL BWP and separate initial UL BWP, in our view, the center frequencies may not be aligned to avoid PUSCH fragmentation issue.  However, if majority of companies support to restrict as this proposal, we can live with it. It should be noted that even if the center frequencies of separate initial DL BWP and separate initial UL BWP is aligned, the center frequencies of CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP may not be aligned, hence, Proposal 2-1-2 can be supported if this proposal is agreed. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LGE | Y | We share the view with DOCOMO in that agreeing on the proposal does not exclude that the center frequencies of CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP may not be aligned. With that understanding, we are okay with this proposal. |
| Panasonic | N | But we can compromise to "Y" if it is majority. Our view is not to require the alignment has more network flexibility. |
| Nordic | Y | This is legacy, BWP#0 is always configured and BWPs of same index having same center qrequency. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y with update | For progress, we can accept this for progress with the adding following update  **The center frequencies for the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP does not need to be aligned.**  Additionally, for completeness, the case when the initial DL BWP does not include CD-SSB and CORESET#0 also is needed to be discussed. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We agree that this is legacy configuration and therefore should be supported. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | We have the same understanding as DOCOMO that the proposal does not preclude the case where the center frequencies of CORESET#0 and (separate or shared) initial UL BWP are not aligned (as in legacy). |
| FL7 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 2-1-1a: For FR1 and FR2, for TDD, when a (separate or shared) initial DL BWP includes CD-SSB (for FR1 and FR2) and the entire CORESET#0 (for FR1), the center frequencies for the (separate or shared) initial DL BWP and the (separate or shared) initial UL BWP are assumed to be the same.** | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Agree with DCM about CORESET#0. Agree with CATT about BWP#0 option 1. Also agree with Panasonic that the true legacy is that:  When a (separate or shared) initial DL BWP includes CD-SSB (for FR1 and FR2) and the entire CORESET#0 (for FR1), the **total frequency span of** (separate or shared) initial DL BWP and the (separate or shared) initial UL BWP **does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth**.  What is not supported by legacy is the case that when a (separate or shared) initial DL BWP does not include CD-SSB (for FR1 and FR2) and the entire CORESET#0 (for FR1), and in this case they should be aligned. |
| FL8 | The online (GTW) session on Friday 25th February made the following agreement.  Agreement:   * For FR1 and FR2, for TDD, when a (separate or shared) initial DL BWP includes CD-SSB (for FR1 and FR2) and the entire CORESET#0 (for FR1), the center frequencies for the (separate or shared) initial DL BWP and the (separate or shared) initial UL BWP are assumed to be the same. | |

**FL6/FL7/FL8 High Priority Proposal 2-1-2: For the case that the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, ~~down-select between the following options during RAN1#108-e:~~**

* **~~Option 1: A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.~~**
* **~~Option 2a:~~ If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**
  + **For TDD, the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Spreadtrum7 | N | “the total frequency span” is not clear. When we say “A UE expects the initial DL BWP and the active DL BWP after the UE (re)establishes dedicated RRC connection to be smaller than or equal to the maximum DL bandwidth that the UE supports” (in draft R17 38.213 [R1-2112935]), it means A UE expects the PRBs number of the initial DL BWP … to be smaller than or equal to the transmission bandwidth defined in 38.101.   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | SCS (kHz) | 5 MHz | 10 MHz | 15 MHz | 20 MHz | | NRB | NRB | NRB | NRB | | 15 | 25 | 52 | 79 | 106 |       Does “the total frequency span of CORESET#0 and the initial UL BW” mean the number of the union of PRBs of CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP in terms of the transmission bandwidth?  Anyway, it is new definition. If we open a door to judge the RF retuning according the total frequency span rather than the center frequency, there could be chain effects to the spec and UE implementation. |
| vivo | N | First of all, as commented by multiple companies since the first round of the discussion, the last sub-bullet violates the Rel-15 assumption on center-frequency alignment between DL BWP and UL BWP with same ID in RRC\_CONNECTED mode thus not agreeable.  Secondly, in this case the CORESET#0 will be the initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs before and after initial access, then the center-frequency alignment between initial DL BWP and initial UL BWP as proposed in **High Priority Proposal 2-1-1** shall still be applicable. If so, the relation between proposal 2-1-1 and 2-1-2 becomes unclear, or if there are contradictive to each other? |
| Xiaomi | N | We can’t accept this proposal. It seems we are back to the starting point again.  Option 2a has the risk of breaking the requirement on the centre-frequency alignment in TDD for UE in RRC connected mode which is already specified in current 38.213. |
| CATT | Y | But we think the outcome of **Proposal 2-1-1** will have significant impact on the sub-bullet here.  Prefer to wait for 2-1-1 first. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Panasonic | - | Our concern of option 2a is, because of the partial or full overlap between RedCap specific DL BWP and non-RedCap specific DL BWP (which is wider than RedCap specific DL BWP), some more optimization effort to avoid congestion of the scheduling at the standardization would be required to realize it in current maintenance phase. In addition, some of the comment seems just to reuse MIB-configured CORESET#0 instead of further optimization to reuse only location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix. The simplest option would be something following i.e. just “to use the MIB-configured CORESET#0” is enough and FDRA/SCS for PDSCH can be obtained by the legacy behavior. If the congestion handling between initial DL BWP for RedCap and initial DL BWP for RedCap is difficult by the scheduler, the network can simply configure separate initial DL BWP for Redcap.   * **If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use ~~at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of~~ the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **For TDD, the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.**   + **The congestion handling between initial DL BWP for RedCap and initial DL BWP for RedCap are up to gNB scheduler.** |
| Nordic | N | We share the same concern as Spreadtrum, Option 2a opens more questions on where the center frequency should be. It should be in middle of UL BWP, as per current spec?  It is clear that Option 1 works, same cannot be said about Option 2a |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Combine with **Proposal 2-1-1**, there are several cases need to be addressed together to avoid contradiction  **Case 1:**  **when a separate initial DL BWP includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0, the center frequencies for the separate initial DL BWP and the (separate or shared) initial UL BWP are assumed to be the same**   * **The center frequencies for the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP does not need to be aligned**   **Case 2:**  **when a separate initial DL BWP does NOT includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0, the center frequencies for the separate initial DL BWP and the (separate or shared) initial UL BWP are assumed to be the same**   * **The center frequencies for the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP does not need to be aligned**   **Case 3:**  **if separate initial DL BWP is not configured and initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   * + **For TDD, the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth or not.**   **Case 4:**  **if separate initial DL BWP is not configured and initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is NOT wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   * + **Legacy behavior is followed.**   + **Center frequency of initial DL BWP (Not CORESET#0) and initial UL BWP is the same. The center frequencies for the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP does not need to be aligned**   + **Center frequency of initial DL BWP (CORESET#0) and initial UL BWP is the same** |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| NEC | N |  |
| Ericsson | N | We prefer option 1 as: 1) it is a simple and clean solution and it does not create any additional discussions in RAN1 and RAN2 (unlike option 2a), and 2) it also ensures center frequency alignment between initial UL/DL BWPs in TDD.  Also, based on the comments from companies above, it is clear that it is difficult to arrive at a consensus on Option 2a, especially with regards to the issue on center frequency alignment for this special case. Therefore, in our view, Option 1 would be simplest way forward in RAN1. Furthermore, the center frequency issue for Option 1 will naturally be settled once there is an agreement for the general case in Proposal 2-1-1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | All companies are arguing that Option 2a is complicated in spec, One or two companies are arguing Option 1 ensures TDD center frequency alignments despite that Option 2a is the same.  Option 2a can be simply specified as that:   * **A UE does not expect to change its center frequency determined by the initial UL BWP before dedicated higher layer configurations (or something like that for referring to initial access).**   In this case it is what Option 2a means and ensures no RF retuning and simple as it is. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Intel | Y (see comments) | We do not see an issue or need to redefine what “center frequency means”. For a given DL/UL BWP, the “center frequency of the BWP” simply refers to the middle of the BWP. Nothing more than this is relevant. Thus, we do not agree that Option 2a brings forth any new questions/issues.  While we can accept this proposal, to reiterate our previous comment regarding the apparently-forgotten **Option 2b** – it still includes Option 1 and does not give rise to any new questions. It would be good to get a technical justification as to how Option 2b may not allow something that Option 1 does, especially with the agreement we just made in GTW w.r.t. the previous proposal. gNB can always configure separate initial DL BWP if it wishes, but why mandate all gNBs to do so when there can be more efficient mechanism to operate if it does not violate UE’s expectations on center frequencies, etc.? |
| FL9 | Since many of the received comments concern the center-frequency related sub-bullet, perhaps the following updated proposal can be considered, where the main bullet is kept, and the sub-bullet is replaced with a down selection between Options 2a and 2b from the earlier versions of this proposal.  **High Priority Proposal 2-1-2a: For the case that the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth,**   * **If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **Down select between the following options:**     - **Option a: For TDD, the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.**     - **Option b: For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are aligned.** | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Ok to further back to two options for down selection but this will need technical reasons to justify one of them.  We continue to support original FL8 and option a of FL-9.  Regarding the potential concern from a few companies on the potential issue of OPTION 2a when coreset0 is continued in RRC connected mode, even if such a case happens by e.g. BWP#0 with option 1, what matters is that whether the UE would perform RF retuning. As it is already required that the coreset0 does not exceed the max UE BW, there should be no any technical issue for this case. It is totally unclear on the reasons that it is concerned.  Unless there is technical justification, we will not be able to converge on Option 1. Even from spec impact point of view Option 2a can be simple enough using at most one sentence, which is trivial as explained in previous response. |
| MediaTek 9 | Y (Option b) | With Option a, we are not sure how to set the center frequency for a UE with only one LO/PLL? In addition, the initial DL BWP and initial UL BWP do not have to overlap *at all* as long as their frequency span does not exceed the RedCap UE’s maximum bandwidth. For example, the initial DL BWP can be in the lower 10MHz while the initial UL BWP can be in the higher 10MHz. This is very different from legacy design and we are not sure what problems it may bring.  In the aspect of center frequency alignment for TDD, we prefer the center frequencies of initial DL BWP (SIB-configured or MIB-configured) and initial UL BWP to be aligned.  Hence. we support Option b which should be captured as a *Note* because it is aligned with legacy design for TDD.  In addition, when the initial DL BWP configured for non-RedCap UE is not greater than 20MHz, it is not clearly specified in TS38.213 whether RedCap UE should use the SIB-configured iDL BWP for non-RedCap or use the MIB-defined CORESET#0 as its iDL BWP. The closest agreement that we found that may support RedCap to use the SIB-configured iDL BWP for non-RedCap is the agreement made at RAN1 #104e (as shown in the text box below). But because the agreement says “can,” it does not prevent NW from configuring a separate iDL BWP or asking a RedCap UE to use MIB-defined iDL BWP. We hence would like to clarify the common understanding of the group for this case. Either an agreement with a TP or a conclusion with a TP is fine to us.  ***Proposal or Conclusion:*** *If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap and if the SIB-configured initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is* ***not*** *wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, RedCap UE uses the SIB-configured initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs as its initial DL BWP.*   |  | | --- | | Agreements: (RAN1 #104e)   * Sharing of the same SSB and CORESET#0 between RedCap and non-RedCap UEs is supported when the bandwidth is no wider than the RedCap UE bandwidth * The initial DL BWP (derived based on MIB/SIB) for RedCap UEs ***can*** be the same as the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs at least when the initial DL BWP is no wider than the RedCap UE bandwidth.   + FFS: after initial access, whether a RedCap UE is allowed to operate with an initial DL BWP wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth     - Discuss further whether or not it is also applicable during initial access | |
| vivo |  | We would like to express our strong concern of option a. The whole proposal is an optimization after the completion of the WI, for ~16bits saving for SIB1 which has payload up to ~2000bits. Such an unconvincing benefit does not justify to change the center frequency alignment between DL and UL BWP in TDD since Rel-15.  We support option b and it should note that it does not mean the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP has to be always center-frequency aligned. If there is any reason that such alignment cannot be done, NW can configure the separate initial DL BWP according to the agreement reached last week. By this way, the full flexibility is allowed for NW.  We are fine to support the proposal assuming option b is selected, as the way to move forward. We are also fine to drop the whole proposal if the down-selection cannot be made. |
| CATT | Y | Prefer Option a. Can accept Option b. For Option b, as a whole:   * If separate initial DL BWP is configured, center frequency of CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP can be not aligned (as legacy); * If separate initial DL BWP is NOT configured and CORESET#0 is reused, center frequency of CORESET0 and initial UL BWP needs to be aligned. (following the rule in agreement of **Proposal 2-1-1a**)   @MTK, for the case when legacy SIB1-configured initial DL BWP is not larger than RedCap UE, we think your conclusion is correct but already captured. In fact, in current RRC parameters excel, separate initial DL BWP column, it already says ‘*When the parameter is not present, RedCap UEs use the same SIB-configured initial DL BWP as non-RedCap UEs if it does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth*’. |
| Samsung |  | We suggest to add option 1 back for down selection. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We support the proposal.  For the options, we guess it would be good to clarify the followings;  1) Whether the center frequencies of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP is always same or not for legacy operation.  2) Whether RF retuning is required when the center frequencies of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP is not aligned but the total frequency span of them does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.  For the 1st point, in our understanding, the MIB-configured CORESET#0 is not always located in the middle of the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs, i.e., the center frequencies of initial UL/DL BWP may be different for legacy UEs. We don’t see the need to support such additional restriction as Option b for RedCap UE.  For the 2nd point, our view is that Option a does not require RF retuning since the total bandwidth of CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP is confined within the maximum bandwidth of RedCap UEs.  Therefore, we support Option a. |
| vivo2 |  | We would like to share our view on the two points raised by DOCOMO   1. Agreeing on option b does not mean the center-frequency of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP shall always be aligned. Option b is only applied when the separate initial DL BWP is NOT configured to the RedCap UEs, when the separate initial DL BWP is configured, there is no requirement of center-frequency alignment between MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP (instead, the center frequency between the configured initial DL BWP and initial UL BWP needs to be aligned) 2. Option a would cause some new scenarios for UE implementation, as MTK commented, the CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP maybe completely non-overlapping (10MHz each), would the UE is required to set its RF BW to be 20MHz to cover the whole span to avoid frequency retuning? Would such requirement cause additional power consumption for the UE due to unnecessary larger RF BW? |
| Xiaomi | Y | We are OK with these two options for down-selection. And we support option b.  For option a, whether RF retuning is required depends on the UE implementation. Different UE implementation may result in different impact on the RF retuning. And it breaks the current spec requirement on the center-frequency alignment.  For option b, it is the same as legacy operation. For R15/R16 devices, if there is no SIB-configured initial DL BWP, then the MIB-configured initial DL BWP should be aligned with the initial UL BWP as well. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y (Option a is preferred) | We prefer Option a.  If the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth, the center frequency misalignment would not be a big issue since this behaviour is also supported in legacy as following.    Besides, we see some problem introduced by Option b. For R15/16 UEs, the center frequency of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 does not need to be aligned with that of the legacy initial UL BWP. Therefore, the mandatory center frequency alignment requirement in Option b means that the legacy initial UL BWP cannot be reused by RedCap UE and a separate initial UL BWP must be configured, which introduces unnecessary signaling overhead and potential PUSCH fragmentation issue.  Additionally, if the separate UL BWP for RedCap UEs is configured at the carrier edge to avoid PUSCH resource fragmentation, the configuration of the existing network needs to be modified that CORESET#0 is restricted to be placed at the carrier edge for aligning UL/DL center frequencies in Option b, which is detrimental to network scheduling flexibility. |
| Nordic | Y (option B) | Option 1 should still be a fall-back option since it is legacy, and it works  Option A would result in further work in RAN1/RAN4. BWPs must follow nominal channel BW.  Now it is not clear whether requirements would be defined for aggregation of CORESET#0 + UL BWP and would it be guaranteed that such would result in nominal BW, or if CORESET#0 is outside UL BWP, would UE need to retune?  What ZTE shows is NOT possible in R15, because initial DL BWP containing CORESET#0 and Initial UL BWP would have same center frequency. And to align center frequency, the initial DL BWP would need to be larger than 20MHz, in ZTE example.  Option B would work, since UE can set UL requirements based on UL BWP and use the same ones in DL. |
| CMCC | Y (option a) |  |
| Panasonic |  | Our understanding is not to have the agreement means option 1. As a separate initial DL BWP can be configured as option 1, if the choice between option a and b are required, our preference is option a. |
| Sharp | Y | We share same view with DOCOMO and our preference is option a. |
| Spreadtrum9 |  | We still prefer Option 1, but if it is the majority view, we accept it.  We share the similar view as vivo that the current proposal may only have benefit of ~16 bits overhead reduction. Re-emphasizing it, as shown in our early proposal, the signaling overhead reduction can be realized by many RAN2 methods, e.g. making *genericParameters* optional. To me, it seems we choose a hardest way for standardization. By the way, we have question: Will pdcch-ConfigCommon and pdsch-configCommon be used continuously also, and will they be specified in RAN1 spec also?  DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB ::= SEQUENCE {  initialDownlinkBWP BWP-DownlinkCommonRedCap,  ...  }  BWP-DownlinkCommonRedCap ::= SEQUENCE {  genericParameters BWP, OPTIONAL, -- Need M  pdcch-ConfigCommon SetupRelease { PDCCH-ConfigCommon } OPTIONAL, -- Need M  pdsch-ConfigCommon SetupRelease { PDSCH-ConfigCommon } OPTIONAL, -- Need M  ...  }  For Option 2, we prefer Option b. We still have strong concern on Option a.  Firstly, the total frequency span is not clear. The definition should be clear, e.g. the PRB number of union of two transmission bandwidth.  Secondly, the total frequency span open a new door for UE to judge the RF retuning, as mentioned by MTK. In legacy, UE only needs to check the center frequency to judge the RF retuning. The “BWP” in NW view is the bandwidth that UE should open, but now the bandwidth that UE should open is “the total frequency span”. That could be misunderstanding b/w NW and UE. Even worse, NW may always assume the RedCap UE opens the maximum bandwidth, e.g. 20MHz in FR1, and neglect the possibility of narrower bandwidth operation for power saving. |
| LGE | Y | Our preference is Option a.  How to set the center frequency to avoid RF retuning can be left to UE implementation as long as the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth. |
| NEC | N | This proposal is only applicable for cases where separate UL/DL BWP would include CORESET#0/CD-SSB. We are OK no agreement on this. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y (option a) | We prefer option a as this allows some flexibility in the UL BWP configuration. This option doesn’t require retuning and it would be up to the UE to determine where to place the center frequency.  Agree with others that option 1 can be considered as configuration option / fallback, and can already be supported. |
| Intel | Y (Either Option a or b) | As expressed in previous rounds of this discussion, we see that both options work fine. We do not quite agree there would be significant RAN2/RAN4 work or UE implementation issues for Option a. Yes, the UE may need to open a larger BW than the respective DL/UL BWP, but it’s still within 20 MHz. The impact on power consumption in such case anyway relies on gNB configuration and this would be an example where UE power consumption would be similar to having a 20 MHz BWP. However, there is nothing special about it beyond that. We also do not see any issues for UE implementation in deciding on center frequency, etc.  At the same time, we agree with vivo’s comment that Option b does not mandate that gNB has to align the center frequency between MIB-indicated CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP, and when not desired to align these center frequencies, falling back to the choice of providing a separate initial DL BWP is always available to the gNB.  So, while we see that Option a provides more flexibility to the gNB and is the preferred option, we can accept Option b as well. |
| Ericsson | N | Please see our comment from the previous round. With Option 1 (always configuring a separate initial DL BWP), the concern of TDD center frequency alignment can be also avoided.  As others have pointed out, Option 2 will only result in minor reduction in SIB1 size, and that too in some special deployment scenarios. Therefore, we think that the decision can be up to RAN2. Maybe this can be added as a note in the RRC parameter list. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | Ok to consider 2 options for down selection |
| FL10 | Based on the received responses, there appears to be no consensus possible for any of the discussed options. Some responses suggested that SIB signaling optimization should be up to RAN2. Companies are invited to comment on the following updated proposal, where Option 2a has been deleted, and the decision among remaining options for SIB signaling solutions is left up to RAN2.  **High Priority Proposal 2-1-2b: For the case that the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, the UE behavior is up to RAN2, e.g., according to one of the following options:**   * **Option 1: A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **Note: For TDD, the center frequencies of the separate initial DL BWP and the initial UL BWP are aligned (in accordance with earlier agreement).** * **~~Option 2a: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.~~**   + **~~For TDD, the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.~~** * **Option 2b: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are aligned.** | |
| vivo | Y but | We can accept the last proposal above. If down-selection is to be made, we prefer to conclude in RAN1, as RAN2 may not be aware of the center-frequency alignment issue. And we support option 1 if down-selection is made in RAN1.  However, we think option 1 and 2b are not contradictive to each other, they can be agreed together as a package this would allow more flexibility for the NW.  If NW cannot keep the center-frequency alignment between MIB configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP, NW can provide separate initial DL BWP to the UE by SIB. Otherwise, SIB configuration is not necessary if MIB configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP is center-frequenc aligned. |
| Intel | N | We do not think this is an issue that should be left to RAN2. Yes, the benefit is in avoiding unnecessary SIB1 OH, but the details all pertain to RAN1.  We agree with vivo that Option 1 is always possible if gNB would not want the constraint of center frequency alignment. Thus, we do not see how proponents of Option 1 can have concerns for Option 2b (or 2a for that matter, but let’s focus on Option 2b for now). In this regard, we see that Option 2b is indeed an approach that includes both ways to operate. |
| Lenovo | Y | We prefer option 1.  Option 2b introduces restrictions on legacy TDD and impacts legacy UEs, which is not desired. |
| MediaTek | Y | In our opinion, this issue should be concluded at this meeting. This issue is critical to product implementation as it is related initial DL BWP and initial access. In addition, RAN1 has spent a lot of time on this issue. We should set a hard deadline to conclude it.  If there is no agreement, in our view, Option 2b is the solution according to legacy design.  @CATT, thanks for your response to our previous question. Really appreciated. |
| CATT | Y, but | Fine to down-select between Option 1 and Option 2b. Although we think Option 2b already contains Option 1 functionally:   * If separate initial DL BWP is configured, go with the method described in Option 1; * If separate initial DL BWP is NOT configured and CORESET#0 is reused, center frequency of CORESET0 and initial UL BWP needs to be aligned.   But we prefer to address this in RAN1, rather than leave it to RAN2. |
| DOCOMO | N | We share the same view with Intel that the down-selection should be concluded in RAN1. We still support Option 2a for better flexibility, but can live with Option 2b if it can solve the concerns on center frequency alignment. Option 2b does not preclude the operation with separate initial DL BWP when the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UE exceeds maximum RedCap UE’s bandwidth. Furthermore, as commented by companies of proponent, Option 2b is obviously beneficial in terms of signaling overhead reduction. Thus, we don’t want to preclude this option and it should be up to NW whether a RedCap UE uses MIB-configures CORESET#0 or a separate initial DL BWP. |
| Nordic | Y | SSB size optimizations are in scope of RAN2, not RAN1, we do not understand Intel comment. |
| Samsung |  | Fine for down selection and also think this should be done in RAN 1  We prefer opt 1, can live with opt 2b. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | In this case, we do not think Option 2a shall be removed. We suggest to add it back.  For spec impact/capturing of option a/2a, it can be simplified as:  **For the case the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth and a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and does not expect to perform RF retuning between CORESET#0 and its initial UL BWP.**  We do not see any other interpretation is needed. If RAN1 cannot reach consensus we think we could say:  **No additional UE behavior is required for handling of center frequency issue.**  To us this means option 2a. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | @Nordic, In rel-15, the following behavior is supported: MIB-configured CORESET#0 does not need to be aligned with the initial UL BWP.    Therefore, from our understanding, if the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth, there is no problem for UE implementation, similar as Intel’s comment in last round.  Even though we prefer the option 2a from the technical point of view, we can also compromise to option2b for progress. Compared with option1, we do not see any technical benefits, since option 2a/2b actually contains Option 1 functionally and option1 cost more SIB1 overhead.  Additionally, for option1, the center frequency of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP also should be considered, since the UE may need to retune to receiving SSB if the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP is quite large. In another word, for option1, RF retuning is supported by default if we do not consider the center frequency issue of MIB-configured CORESET#0. |
| IDCC |  | We prefer option 1 but can also go with 2b. |
| Panasonic | N | If there is no RAN1 related FFS on option 2b, we can accept the proposal, but the proposal has several RAN1 related FFS because only "the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix" are reused and the remaining is not concluded compared with the MIB-configured CORESET#0. |
| Spreadtrum10 | Y | Selection of Option 1/2b still needs RAN2 to evaluate the signaling overhead. |
| CMCC | N | In prior round of discussion, opinions on each option are counted as follow.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Option1 | Option2a | Option2b | | Support or acceptable | 4 | 10 | 6 |   We can see option2a is the majority view.  When option 2a is agreed, gNB has more flexibility to decide whether to configure separate initial DL BWP and gains overhead reduction benefit compared with option1. If the span of BW can not be guaranteed to be within maximum bandwidth, it will configure a separate initial DL BWP. Taking network overhead and flexibility of location of CORESET0 into account, option2a is a compromise between option1 and option2b. |
| NEC | Y | We are fine with FL’s proposal. Our preference is option 1. |
| CMCC |  | One modification for our comment above, our first preference is option 2a. And we can compromise to option 2b.  We agree with Intel that when option 2b is agreed, gNB can make decision whether to configure separate initial DL BWP or not. If the center frequency alignment can not be guaranteed, it will configure a separate initial DL BWP.  So what option 2b has the configuration flexibility and also the overhead reduction benefit than option 1. |
| Ericsson | Y | Generally fine. It is our understanding that the above agreement does not preclude RAN2 from choosing an option where the cell is considered as barred for RedCap UEs, if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth and a separate initial DL BWP is NOT configured.  If RAN2 goes with Option 2b out of consideration for SIB overhead, RAN1 can update TS 38.213 with clarification on center frequency alignment for this special case. |
| LGE |  | We are okay with the approach itself which is to let RAN2 decide taking into account the signaling overhead, but we don’t understand the logic behind the removal of Option 2a for consideration in RAN2. |
| MediaTek2 | Y | @Ericsson, we fail to understand the two points you have made.  Firstly, ff the SIB-configured initial DL BWP is not provided, UE should take MIB-configured CORESET#0 as its initial DL BWP (i.e. with bwpId=0), as specified in Clause 12 of TS38.213 (See text box below). We don’t see how this cell is barred to RedCap just because no SIB-configured initial DL BWP is available.  Secondly, we don’t see Option 2b is a special case regarding center frequency alignment. In Option 2b, the MIB-configured CORESET#0 *is* the initial DL BWP for RedCap. In both 38.213 and 38.311, it clearly specifies for TDD, center frequencies of a BWP DL/UL pair (with same bwpId) are the same. Therefore, we think Option 2b has been supported by the specification as it is the legacy design.  Responding to Panasonic’ concern with the word “at least” Option 2b, we provide the following rewording. Hopefully, it can resolve the concern.   * **(Modified) Option 2b: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use ~~at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of~~ the MIB-configured CORESET#0 as its initial DL BWP.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are aligned.**   We are also fine with reusing the exact wording from TS38.213 with highlight in the below.   |  | | --- | | **[Clause 12, Ts 38.213]** 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*. | |
| FL11  FL12 | Based on the received responses, there appears to be no consensus possible for any of the discussed options.  **High Priority Proposal 2-1-2b: For the case that the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, ~~the UE behavior is up to RAN2, e.g., according to one of the following options~~ down select between the following options:**   * **Option 1: A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **Note: For TDD, the center frequencies of the separate initial DL BWP and the initial UL BWP are aligned (in accordance with earlier agreement).** * **Option 2a: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **For TDD, the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.** * **Option 2b: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are aligned.** | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | We propose the following way forward, which provides the simplicity of Option 1 and the possibility for some overhead reduction of Option 2a/2b.  **Modified High Priority Proposal 2-1-2b: For the case that the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth ~~down select between the following options~~:**   * **~~Option 1:~~ A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **Detailed signaling solutions are up to RAN2, including whether generic parameters (location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix) of this separate initial DL BWP need to be signaled or can be inherited from MIB-configured CORESET#0.**   + **Note: For TDD, the center frequencies of the separate initial DL BWP and the initial UL BWP are aligned (in accordance with earlier agreement).** * **~~Option 2a: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.~~**   + **~~For TDD, the total frequency span of MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP does not exceed the RedCap UE maximum bandwidth.~~** * **~~Option 2b: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0.~~**   + **~~For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are aligned~~** |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Our first preference is option 2a but we can also accept option 1 (also including the modified proposal from Ericsson above). |
| Intel |  | It would be good to understand what the technical reasons are for companies who have concerns with Option 2b.  The only difference we see between Options 1 and 2b is that Option 2b allows the gNB to NOT provide the separate initial DL BWP configuration and thereby save SIB1 overhead when it would wish the RedCap UE to continue using the MIB-configured CORESET#0 ***when the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP for RedCap UE have aligned center frequencies***. On the other hand, Option 1 does not allow that. It does not mandate any gNB behavior nor does it restrict BWP configurations in any way.  We are really interested in learning how Option 2b can be a cause for concern.  Further, the latest modification from Ericsson to Option 1 is not acceptable to us for the same reason why one of the previous versions wasn’t – this simply aims to pass the issue to RAN2 and we still think RAN1 has the right expertise to resolve this. |
| vivo |  | We prefer option 1 but can live with option 2b (as compromise)  We cannot accept option 2a due to the reason as repeated in previous rounds.  We are also fine with Ericsson’s wayforward. |
| CATT | Y, but | We share the same understanding with Intel. Option 2a/2b is the super-set of Option 1, which provides more flexibility. The gNB can judge and weight ‘SIB1 payload’ or ‘bandwidth of separate initial DL BWP’ by its demand. We still believe Option 2a/2b should be supported. |
| DOCOMO | Y | For the down-selection from the options, we are fine with either Option 2a or 2b (while our preference is Option 2a) and have the same view as Intel that the concern of Option 2b is unclear for us. As commented in the previous round, Option 2b (and 2a) does not preclude the operation of Option 1, and Option 2b has a clear benefit in potential overhead reduction compared to Option 1.  Regarding Ericsson’s way forward, we still think this discussion should be concluded in RAN1. |
| NEC | Y | Our preference is option 1. We are also fine with Ericsson’s proposal. Signaling details should be up to RAN2. |
| Samsung | Y | Fine with E’s way forward |
| MediaTek | Y | @Nordic, Ericsson, and any other companies that think Option 1 is the “fallback” solution if we can’t reach an agreement on this issue, could any of you please point out where in the specification (maybe 38.331?) it says that a *SIB-configured* initial DL BWP is ***always*** provided? What you have claimed really bothers me because it doesn’t say so in TS 38.213.  My understanding is that Option 2b *is* the fallback solution and has the least specification impact (and less signalling overhead than Option 1). In Option 2b, the MIB-configured CORESET#0 becomes/is *the* initial DL BWP for RedCap. Then, again per legacy design, its center frequency should be aligned with *the* initial UL BWP in TDD according to 38.213 and 38.331. So compared with Option 2a, it has much less if not no spec impact regarding this center frequency aspect.  We would like to take this opportunity to understand whether we’ve misunderstood the specification somehow. Any further clarification would be highly appreciated.   |  | | --- | | **[Clause 12, Ts 38.213]** **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*. |   Responding to Panasonic’s earlier concern with the word “at least” in Option 2b, we provide the following rewording. Hopefully, it can resolve the concern. In addition, we would like to add “as its initial DL BWP” to clarify in Option 2b, this MIB-configured CORESET#0 *is* the initial DL BWP for RedCap which again is nothing new compared with legacy.   * **(Modified) Option 2b: If a separate initial DL BWP is not configured for RedCap, the RedCap UE continues to use ~~at least the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of~~ the MIB-configured CORESET#0 as its initial DL BWP.**   + **For TDD, the center frequencies of the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP are aligned.**   Finally, we agree with Intel and Docomo that this issue should be resolved in RAN1, given the fact that it is late in R17 and this issue has taken so much discussion time in RAN1. If we pass this issue to RAN2, some, if not all, of the arguments will be repeated in RAN2 and delay the schedule further. We do hope this issue can be resolved by the end of RAN1 #108e meeting. |
| Sharp | Y | Although our first preference is option 2a, we are ok with option 2b since the option 2b covers operation of option 1 and it has a benefit of signaling overhead reduction. |
| Panasonic | Support Mediatek revision of option 2b. | We support the modification by Mediatek. It means the network can use the MIB-configured CORESET#0 if it is suitable. If MIB-configured CORESET#0 is not sufficient, a separate initial DL BWP can be configured. Yes, it resolves our concern on future RAN1 work and provide the flexibility of the network operation without increasing the complexity of UE. |
| Spreadtrum12 | Y | We support both Option 1 and E///’s revision.  Signaling overhead reduction is RAN2’s job, and RAN1 only needs to confirm the center frequency alignment as legacy.  For MTK’s question, in my understanding, the intial DL BWP is always configured except for the SCell case.  For PCell, it is mandatory in SIB1:  DownlinkConfigCommonSIB ::= SEQUENCE {  frequencyInfoDL FrequencyInfoDL-SIB,  initialDownlinkBWP BWP-DownlinkCommon,  bcch-Config BCCH-Config,  pcch-Config PCCH-Config,  ...  }  For SCell, it can be optional in dedicated RRC:  DownlinkConfigCommon ::= SEQUENCE {  frequencyInfoDL FrequencyInfoDL OPTIONAL, -- Cond InterFreqHOAndServCellAdd  initialDownlinkBWP BWP-DownlinkCommon OPTIONAL, -- Cond ServCellAdd  ...  }  As per 38.213 for RedCap, the IE for the separate initial DL BWP should be in another container than *DownlinkConfigCommonSIB*, e.g.  DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB ::= SEQUENCE {  initialDownlinkBWP BWP-DownlinkCommonRedCap,  bcch-Config BCCH-Config,  pcch-Config PCCH-Config,  ...  }  BWP-DownlinkCommonRedCap ::= SEQUENCE {  genericParameters BWP, OPTIONAL, -- Need M  pdcch-ConfigCommon SetupRelease { PDCCH-ConfigCommon } OPTIONAL, -- Need M  pdsch-ConfigCommon SetupRelease { PDSCH-ConfigCommon } OPTIONAL, -- Need M  ...  }  How to reduce the signaling overhead by ASN.1 is RAN2’s job. RAN1 group even does not know which parameter is optional, e.g. SIBx for RedCap, or *initialDownlinkBWP*, or *generaicParameters*, or others?  How about *pdcch-ConfigCommon* and *pdsch-ConfigCommon*?  Does *bcch-Config* (modification period) and *pcch-Config* (paging) can be configured for RedCap UE in *DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB*? |
| CMCC | Y | We think this down selection is in RAN1 scope. Our first preference is Option 2a, and we can accept Option 2b for compromise, similar view as CATT, DOCOMO for both flexibility and potential signaling overhead reduction benefit. And we also want to understand what the technical reasons are for companies who have concerns with Option 2b but can accept option1, as commented by Intel. |
| LGE | Y | Our preference is option 2a.  We assume this option is the most flexible one. And with proper tuning of the center frequency, which is up to UE implementation, the RF retuning can be avoid. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | We share the similar view with Intel that the initial DL BWP can be defined by MIB-configured CORESET#0 to save SIB overhead at least when the center frequencies of CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP for RedCap UEs are aligned.  Besides, as we mentioned in the last round, although we prefer option 2a from the technical point of view, we can also compromise to option2b for progress. Compared with option1, we do not see any technical benefits, since option 2a/2b actually contains option1 functionally and option1 costs more SIB1 overhead. So, for the proponents of option1, we want to know why option1 is better than option2b. |
| Xiaomi | Y | We are OK with option 1 and option 2b  Our intenstion is to keep the same center frequency between DL BWP and UL BWP at least after RACH. This intension also aligns current requirement specified in 38.213. |
| Lenovo | Y | We prefer option 1 and fine with E///’ updates for overhead reduction. We are also fine with option 2a for progress. |
| Nordic | Y | Ericsson wording is acceptable. It is clearly not in RAN1 scope to optimize SIB overhead.  And as said before we are OK with 2b. |
| FL13 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered as a compromise. According to this proposal, a separate initial DL BWP would always be configured if the ordinary initial DL BWP is too wide, but it would be possible to not include the *genericParameters* field in its configuration and then the values would be inherited from the MIB-configured CORESET#0, which would bring similar signaling overhead reduction as Options 2a and 2b. This proposal is from RAN1 perspective, and the final decisions on the necessity and feasibility of this signaling optimization would be up to RAN2.  **High Priority Proposal 2-1-2c: For the case that the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth,**   * **A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.** * **From RAN1 perspective, if generic parameters (location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix) of this separate initial DL BWP are not configured, RedCap UE can continue to use the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0. Necessity and feasibility of signaling optimizations are up to RAN2.** * **Note: For TDD, the center frequencies of the separate initial DL BWP and the initial UL BWP are aligned (in accordance with earlier agreement).** | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We can accept this in order to make progress. |
| Nordic | Y | We are OK with FL proposal.  @MTK it is in 38.331 as pointed out by Spreadtrum and our contribution.  To clarify our concern on 2a we draw a Figure.  UE should be able to maintain center frequency between UL and DL and at the same time BWP must fit nominal channel BW granularity.  **Unfortunately, 2a would result in UE needing to retune or support RF BW greater than 20MHz.**  Setting RF and center given sum of UL and DL BWP is in principle feasible and requirements could be developed, but we would not feel comfortable to agree on this without RAN4 input.    **On the other hand, Option 1 works, as it worked since R15.** |
| Intel | N | Unfortunately, our questions on technical concerns for Option 2b have not been answered yet. So, we understand that there aren’t any.  In this case, we do not see any reason to go with Option 1 instead of Option 2b.  We cannot accept the latest version of the FL proposal that again just aims to put the ball in RAN2’s court while retaining the first sub-bullet that mandates gNB behavior.  Once again, could companies having concerns with Option 2b kindly clarify any technical issue we may be missing? |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Ericsson | Y | We are fine with the proposal for the sake of progress.  Regarding potential technical issues with Option 2b:   * Option 2b may unnecessarily force defining new UE behavior and specification changes, considering that in TDD it is not typically possible to ensure exact center frequency alignment between the MIB-configured CORESET#0 and the initial UL BWP (the frequency location of CORESET#0 is related to location of CD-SSB which itself must be on a sync raster with specific granularities). So, it has limited practicality but requires additional works. * Option 2 is only relevant when the size of non-RedCap initial DL BWP is almost the same as the size of initial UL BWP. However, due to power saving benefits, the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap is not typically as wide as initial UL BWP. The initial DL BWP can act as a default BWP for power saving purposes, so it is not typically wide. * We should not pursue non-critical optimization at this late stage in the WI. The optimization concerns a special case where initial DL BWP > 20 MHz and CORESET#0 is contained within the separate initial DL BWP. The signaling overhead reduction corresponding to ~15 – 20 bits is achieved only in this case. * Assuming a separate initial DL BWP is not configured, and the generic parameters are inherited from CORESET#0, as proponents proposed, where would the NW configure the parameters *PDCCH-ConfigCommon* and *PDSCH-ConfigCommon*? In our view, we should not unnecessarily cross-link different BWPs, as this would make processing at the gNB more complicated, and note that RAN2 made the following agreement on Wednesday to explicitly configure *PDCCH-ConfigCommon* in the separate initial DL BWP:   + *In case RedCap-specific initial DL BWP contains CD-SSB and CORESET#0, PDCCH-ConfigCommon is included in the configuration of RedCap-specific initial DL BWP. RedCap UEs don't need to read the PDCCH-ConfigCommon configuration from legacy initial BWP if RedCap-specific initial BWP is signalled.* * Although it is not our first preference, the way forward in Proposal 2-1-2c has the potential to provide similar signaling overhead reduction as Options 2a/2b and avoids the need for further discussion on the center frequency aspects. |
| vivo | Y | We view the latest proposal as a compromise, merging option 1 and option 2b. |
| CATT | Y | For the sake of progress. |
| MediaTek | Y | @Spectrum and Nordic, thanks for clarification and my apology for misreading the specification.  We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel2 | N | Thanks @Ericsson for sharing your thoughts on Option 2a.  Going through the points, we fail to see any technical issues/concerns being raised with the Option itself. Even if it may not be possible *always* to ensure the center frequency alignment between MIB-indicated CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP, that does not mean that it is never possible to have such scenarios.  In this regard, Option 2 simply enables SIB1 payload reduction ***only when the conditions can be satisfied.*** There is nothing mandating gNB behavior if center frequency alignment may not be possible.  Now, having said that, we would like to quote a recently-made agreement:  *Agreement:*  *For FR1 and FR2, for TDD, when a (separate or shared) initial DL BWP includes CD-SSB (for FR1 and FR2) and the entire CORESET#0 (for FR1), the center frequencies for the (separate or shared) initial DL BWP and the (separate or shared) initial UL BWP are assumed to be the same.*  As can be seen from the above, this agreement applies to both idle/inactive and connected modes. Considering UEs in idle/inactive mode, the above agreement means that, for TDD, initial DL BWP (which, when separate initial DL BWP is not configured, is same as MIB-indicated CORESET#0) and (shared or separate) initial UL BWP should have aligned center frequencies.  Therefore, in effect, the center frequency alignment between initial DL BWP defined by MIB-indicated CORESET#0 and (separate/shared) initial UL BWP is already expected by the UE even for Option 1. Thus, we do not see a reason why and how Option 2b can be seen as “new UE behavior” or demand “additional efforts” from the gNB.  Further, the typicality of scenarios, including likelihood of initial DL BWP of non-RedCap being greater than 20 MHz or not, is speculative at best and should not be a reason against Option 2b.  Lastly, we do not think Option 2b imposes *any* additional level of complexity to UE, gNB, or specifications. The UE simply determines that it should continue in CORESET#0 if it finds SIB1-indicated initial DL BWP is larger than RedCap max UE BW. UE anyway needs to know this information for regular operation. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| DOCOMO |  | We support Intel’s view.  We still don’t see the need to mandate gNB to always configure a separate initial DL BWP. Whether a separate initial DL BWP is configured or the configurations of MIB-configured CORESET#0 is inherited should be up to gNB. Actually, we have already compromised to support RF retuing-less operation as mandatory capability in RRC connected stae and also fine to restrict that the center frequencies of CORESET#0 and tha initial UL BWP are aligned if a separate initial DL BWP is not configured while we don’t think such restriction is necessary. Thus, our preference is option 2b.  However, we also don’t have any technical concern on option 1, so we can accept this proposal if majority of companies support it while we don’t see any advantage on option 1 compared to option 2a/2b. |
| CMCC | Y with minor modification | We understand the sentence in the proposal “**A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap”** means BWP-DownlinkCommon is always configured and the genericParameters can be absent if gNB wants UE to use CORESET#0 as separate initial DL BWP. Since absent is often used in IE field description, we suggest the following modification.  **High Priority Proposal 2-1-2c: For the case that the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth,**   * **A separate initial DL BWP is always configured for RedCap if the initial DL BWP for non-RedCap UEs is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **From RAN1 perspective, if generic parameters (location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix) of this separate initial DL BWP are ~~not configured~~ absent, RedCap UE can continue to use the location, bandwidth, SCS, and cyclic prefix of the MIB-configured CORESET#0. Necessity and feasibility of signaling optimizations are up to RAN2.** * **Note: For TDD, the center frequencies of the separate initial DL BWP and the initial UL BWP are aligned (in accordance with earlier agreement).** |
| Panasonic | Y | Now flexible configuration for SIB1 reduction is possible by FL proposal as well. Then we don’t see the big difference from Option 2b. FL proposal is acceptable for the progress.  We also support the clarification by CMCC. |

Several contributions [6, 18, 19, 22, 27] also discuss aspects related to reception of DCI Format 1\_0 for RedCap. In particular, when a separate initial DL BWP is configured for RedCap, clarification is needed for the DCI size determination in a CSS. Contributions [18, 19, 22, 27] propose that the size determination for DCI Format 1\_0 should be based on the size of CORESET #0. In [6], it is proposed to down-select two options: Option 1: it is determined by the size of CORESET 0, and Option 2: it is determined by the size of the separate initial DL BWP.

**FL1 Medium Priority Proposal 2-2: For RedCap UE reception of DCI format 1\_0 in a CSS:**

* **DCI size always depends on size of CORESET#0.**
* **Resource allocation starts at first PRB of CORESET where DCI format has been received**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y | We assume, this should be a Conclusion, as no spec change needed. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Before a decision is made, we should consider some implications of DCI size bullet. If a separate initial DL BWP is provided, then its size must be at least the size of CORESET#0. A network implementation may want to consider a different size for the separate initial DL BWP. Another point is the RB alignment for a CORESET (starting at multiple of 6 RBs). It may not be possible to ensure RB alignment, TDD center frequency alignment and size. |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| FL2 | The online (GTW) session on Monday 21st February made the following conclusion:  Conclusion: For RedCap UE reception of DCI format 1\_0 in a CSS:   * DCI size always depends on size of CORESET#0. * Resource allocation starts at first PRB of CORESET where DCI format has been received | |

# SSB for BWP#0 configuration option 1 in connected mode

Another open issue is related to presence of SSB in a separate initial DL BWP when used in connected mode for BWP#0 configuration option 1. Several contributions argue that for BWP#0 configuration option 1, the use of initial DL BWP in connected mode is very limited from functionality and power saving point of view [9, 16, 19]. Also, these contributions indicate that based on RAN2 feedback, NCD-SSB is not provided for the initial DL BWP. Therefore, several contributions propose that, for BWP#0 configuration option 1, the UE does not expect SSB in the separate initial DL BWP that is configured for random access when it is used in connected mode [9, 10, 16, 19, 24]. In [12], it is noted that BWP#0 configuration option 1 can be supported for RedCap UE irrespective of the presence of CD-SSB and entire CORESET#0 in a separate initial DL BWP. Contribution [5] mentions that a RedCap UE can use BWP#0 option 1 in the connected state if the RedCap UE is configured with a separate initial DL BWP that contains CORESET#0/SSB. However, one contribution [17] argues that a RedCap UE can expect to be provided with NCD-SSB transmission in the separate initial DL BWP.

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

**FL1/FL2 High Priority Proposal 3-1: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, if the separate initial DL BWP is used in connected mode and it is only used for random access, the UE does not expect it to always contain SSB.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | N | Firstly, we need to have a decision whether to allow BWP#0 configuration option 1 for the initial DL BWP configuration. From our perspective, we do not see the benefits/motivation to support BWP#0 configuration option 1 to configure the separate initial DL BWP, using BWP#0 configuration option 2 might be sufficient.  Even if BWP#0 configuration option 1 is allowed for separate initial DL BWP configuration, it is not clear to us how to capture the proposal 3-1 into specification, as to our understanding it is hard to define a BWP in connected mode “only used for random access purpose”, i.e. to prevent other scheduling beyond random access. |
| Nordic | Y, but | If this would be the case for short time until UE gets dedicated RRC, we would be fine. Otherwise, UE not supporting optional capabilities would be in trouble. |
| Spreadtrum | Maybe N | We are not sure whether or not RAN1 should have the further agreement on it. The previous agreement has such meaning already, and in spec 38.213, “during random access” is written as “monitoring Type1-PDCCH” which is also fine for connected mode.   * + **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.** |
| Qualcomm | N | First of all, it is necessary to clarify the relationship between RedCap-specific DL BWP#0 configured by option 1 and the separate initial DL BWP of idle/inactive RedCap UE.  If the separate initial DL BWP of RedCap UE does not contain the entire CORESET#0 and Type-2 PDCCH CSS, an idle/inactive RedCap UE does not need to monitor paging when performing random access in the separate initial DL BWP. However, whether or not the separate initial DL BWP contains SSB depends on the BWP configuration.  If DL BWP#0 configured by option 1 includes the entire initial DL BWP separately configured for idle/inactive RedCap UE, the following examples indicate BWP#0 contain CD-SSB or NCD-SSB. |
| Intel | N | Similar concerns as Vivo – it is not clear how “only used for random access procedure” or the case mentioned by Nordic “If this would be the case for short time …” can be specified or enforced. Once the RRC connection is setup, the UE may simply be kept on this BWP for connected mode operations by the gNB. In such a case, the UE without optional capability to operate without SSB in (RRC configured) DL BWP cannot function since the basic challenge for the UE’s inability is same as for a RRC-configured DL BWP in this case.  Thus, we think for BWP#0 configuration option 1, UE can expect NCD-SSB if CD-SSB is not included.  Alternatively, we are also fine with the suggestion from Vivo to preclude use of BWP#0 configuration option 1 for BWP#0 for RedCap UEs. |
| Ericsson | Y | The proposal is consistent with the UE behavior in idle/inactive mode. If the UE does not expect SSB while performing random access in idle/inactive mode, the UE should not expect it while performing random access in connected mode.  The proposal could be modified as follows for more clarity:  FR1 and FR2  For BWP#0 configuration option 1, if the separate initial DL BWP, which does not include CD-SSB, is used in connected mode and it is only used for random access, the UE does not expect it to ~~always~~ contain SSB.  Note that after initial access the use of initial BWP is not very likely for BWP#0 configuration option 1, as the UE typically operates on a non-initial BWP (e.g., BWP#1). However, in some cases, the UE may fallback to BWP#0 for performing random access. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Our view is that the if the BWP is only used for random access, then there is no need for the BWP to contain SSB.  Our view is that the use case for BWP#0 configuration option 1 in connected mode is very limited. Likely UE will be switched to RRC-configured BWP later on. |
| LGE | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | Just to remind that, in BWP#0 configuration option 1, only SIB1 configuration is applied in initial DL BWP. There is no UE-dedicated RRC configuration in the initial DL BWP.  Meanwhile, NCD-SSB can only be indicated via UE-dedicated RRC signaling. As RAN2 is not going to pursue NCD-SSB in IDLE mode, configuring NCD-SSB in initial DL BWP will be contradictory to the definition of BWP#0 configuration option 1 itself. |
| Xiaomi | N | We have similar view with vivo. And we are also not clear how to guarantee this initial DL BWP is only used for RACH.  In addition, the initial DL BWP configured via BWP#0 configuration option 1 can also be used as default BWP for BWP switch when default BWP ID is not explicitly configured. Then in this case, at least NCD-SSB is expected. |
| Vivo2 | N | About Ericsson’s comments for the following  “However, in some cases, the UE may fallback to BWP#0 for performing random access.”  It is not possible that the BWP#0 configured by configuration option 1 for a connected UE is only used for RACH based on following spec in TS 38.213  If a UE is provided  - one or more search space sets by corresponding one or more of *searchSpaceZero, searchSpaceSIB1*, *searchSpaceOtherSystemInformation*, *pagingSearchSpace*, *ra-SearchSpace*, and  - a C-RNTI, an MCS-C-RNTI, or a CS-RNTI  the UE monitors PDCCH candidates for DCI format 0\_0 and DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by the C-RNTI, the MCS-C-RNTI, or the CS-RNTI in the one or more search space sets in a slot where the UE monitors PDCCH candidates for at least a DCI format 0\_0 or a DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI, RA-RNTI, MsgB-RNTI, or P-RNTI. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| NEC | N | For BWP#0 configuration option 1, we don’t consider the proposed case exists where an initial BWP (assumed to be BWP#0) is used in CONNECTED. In our understanding, a separate initial BWP is not an active BWP and would not be used in connected for BWP#0 configuration option 1. It would be BWP#0 configuration option 2 to use a separate initial DL BWP in connected. |
| Sharp | Y | We share same view with Nokia, NSB. RedCap UEs basically operate in dedicated BWP in connected mode and the use case of BWP#0 configuration option 1 is limited. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Y | We support the updated proposal by Ericsson. |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y | Similar view as Ericsson and Nokia  Regarding on vivo’s comment, we don’t think it is necessary/mandatory for NW to provide other SS than SS for RAR in BWP #0. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | It is written in spec already that the BWP#0 with option 1 can only be used with limited manner as in 331 for example because the UE does not have any dedicated configuration to monitor other PDCCHs or other UE specific functions, thus it can only be used for random access. Function wise it is the same as an initial DL BWP in idle state.  **TS38.331, Clause B.2**   |  | | --- | | For option #1:  *… the BWP#0 is not considered to be an RRC-configured BWP, i.e. UE only supporting one BWP can still be configured with BWP#1 in addition to BWP#0 when using this configuration. The BWP#0 can still be used even if it does not have the dedicated configuration, albeit in a more limited manner since only the SIB1-defined configurations are available. For example, only DCI format 1\_0 can be used with BWP#0 without dedicated configuration, so changing to another BWP requires RRCReconfiguration since DCI format 1\_0 doesn’t support DCI-based switching.* | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | From our understanding, one search space is possible to be configured in the separate initial DL BWP. And the the update from Ericsson is fine with us. If only short-time transmission is on the separate initial DL BWP which does not contain CD-SSB, we are OK to support. |
| Spreadtrum2 | N | With further check, it seems that BWP#0 configuration Option 1 means the a bit higher UE complexity, since 38.331 said “UE only supporting one BWP can still be configured with BWP#1 in addition to BWP#0 when using this configuration”. Thus, BWP#0 configuration Option 1 may not be supported by RedCap UE necessarily.  We suggest listing the two Alternatives for this proposal to reflect the current situations.  **Down-select the alternatives:**   * **Alt-1: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, if the separate initial DL BWP is used in connected mode and it is only used for random access, the UE does not expect it to always contain SSB.** * **Alt-2: BWP#0 configuration option 1 is not supported by RedCap UEs.**   As UE vendor, we slightly prefer Alt-2 but are open for NW flexibility. |
| MediaTek | Y if spec supports | In principle, we support FL’s proposal so that the case without SSB can be limited to a separate initial DL BWP via BWP#0 configuration option 1 and it is configured for RACH only. But if it is not clear to the group whether the specification supports to configured a BWP for RACH only as vivo has pointed out, we prefer vivo’s proposal that BWP#0 configuration option 1 is not used for the separate initial DL BWP.  We think **FL1/FL2 High Priority Question 3-2** below can be discussed together with this proposal for completeness. |
| CMCC | Y | Similar view as CATT, since RedCap does not expect NCD-SSB in idle/inactive mode when separate initial DL BWP is configured for RACH but not paging, NCD-SSB is not configured in SIB. In connected mode, based in definition of BWP#0 configuration option 1, there is no way to configure NCD-SSB in separate initial DL BWP since there is no UE-dedicated RRC configuration. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | This behavior is consistent with the separate initial DL BWP during initial access |
| Intel2 | N | We continue to share the same concerns voiced by vivo2. There is nothing in the specs that can guarantee that UE is only scheduled for random access and not kept in the BWP#0 in RRC connected state.  **To CATT/CMCC**’s comments on apparent contradiction with RAN2 decisions. We do not think so. RAN2 decisions do NOT mean that configuration of NCD-SSB for separate initial DL BWP cannot be indicated via SIB signaling – the decision is regarding the expectation of NCD-SSB for paging monitoring in idle/inactive modes. |
| IDCC |  | We have the same concern as Vivo. How can we restrict the BWP to random access only? |
| FL3 | One received response points out that the case under discussion may already be supported by the specification. Consider the following specification text from [TS 38.213 V17.0.0](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Specs/archive/38_series/38.213/38213-h00.zip) clause 17.1:   |  | | --- | | For an initial DL BWP provided by *initialDownlinkBWP* in *DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB*, if a UE monitors PDCCH according to a Type1-PDCCH CSS set and does not monitor PDCCH according to Type2-PDCCH CSS set, the UE assumes that the initial DL BWP does not include SS/PBCH blocks or the CORESET with index 0. |   The above specification text indicates that a RedCap UE monitoring Type1-PDCCH (RA) CSS but not Type2-PDCCH (Paging) CSS does not expect SSB/CORESET#0.  **High Priority Question 3-1a: Considering the above specification text, is some specification change required regarding the SSB presence in a separate initial DL BWP used by a RedCap UE in connected mode for BWP#0 configuration option 1? If yes, please describe the required changes in the Comments field.** | |
| Qualcomm |  | As we commented before, the separate initial DL BWP configured for RA but not for paging can include CD-SSB actually (please see the illustration below). Therefore, the 213 spec text in V17.0.0 can be updated as follows:  For an initial DL BWP provided by *initialDownlinkBWP* in *DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB*, if a UE monitors PDCCH according to a Type1-PDCCH CSS set and does not monitor PDCCH according to Type2-PDCCH CSS set *and if the initial DL BWP does not contain SS/PBCH blocks indicated by ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *SIB1* or in *ServingCellConfigCommon*, the UE assumes that the initial DL BWP does not include SS/PBCH blocks or the CORESET with index 0. |
| vivo |  | From our understanding, the quoted spec text was intended to describe the IDLE/INACTIVE mode UE behavior, i.e. the following part of agreement made in RAN#107e (copied below). However, here we are discussing the CONNECTED mode UE behavior, which is a separate issue.   * For FR1,   + 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. |
| Spreadtrum5 |  | Agree with QC and vivo for interpretation of the agreement.  As most of UE vendors we don’t like BWP#0 configuration Option 1. There are two alternatives for now. The current spec seems supporting Alt-1, but most UE vendors would not support Alt-1.  **Down-select the two alternatives:**   * **Alt-1: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, if the separate initial DL BWP is used in connected mode and it is only used for random access, the UE does not expect it to always contain SSB.** * **Alt-2: BWP#0 configuration option 1 is not supported by RedCap UEs.** |
| Apple |  | We have same understanding as vivo regarding the quoted spec context, i.e., it is for RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE UEs to implement the previous agreement highlighted by vivo.  What we are discussing here is for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs after completing the initial access procedure. |
| DOCOMO | N |  |
| Sharp | N |  |
| Xiaomi |  | In our understanding, even if there is no USS configuration, UE could also detect the UE-specific DCI once there is one or more of *searchSpaceZero, searchSpaceSIB1*, *searchSpaceOtherSystemInformation*, *pagingSearchSpace*, *ra-SearchSpace* considering the following description in TS 38.213 (which is also mentioned by vivo during last round discussion)  If a UE is provided  - one or more search space sets by corresponding one or more of *searchSpaceZero, searchSpaceSIB1*, *searchSpaceOtherSystemInformation*, *pagingSearchSpace*, *ra-SearchSpace*, and  - a C-RNTI, an MCS-C-RNTI, or a CS-RNTI  the UE monitors PDCCH candidates for DCI format 0\_0 and DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by the C-RNTI, the MCS-C-RNTI, or the CS-RNTI in the one or more search space sets in a slot where the UE monitors PDCCH candidates for at least a DCI format 0\_0 or a DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI, RA-RNTI, MsgB-RNTI, or P-RNTI.  Considering this point, we suggest the following update to preclude other usage and ensure the separate initial DL BWP is only used for RACH purpose in connected mode.  For an initial DL BWP provided by *initialDownlinkBWP* in *DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB*, if a UE monitors PDCCH according to a Type1-PDCCH CSS set and does not monitor PDCCH according to Type2-PDCCH CSS set/Type0-PDCCH CSS set/Type 0A-PDCCH CSS set , the UE assumes that the initial DL BWP does not include SS/PBCH blocks or the CORESET with index 0. |
| CATT | N | We think the current spec is clear.  @Intel, thanks for sharing your view. Previously we are clarifying the current situation. We do not think RAN1 can make the decision whether NCD-SSB can be broadcasted in SI/SIB1. In fact RAN2 has the following agreement.   |  | | --- | | *RAN2#116bis-e*   * *In RRC connected mode NCD-SSB may be configured for a RedCap UE in dedicated DL BWP.* |   We are open to check with RAN2 if strong interest arises, internally or formally.  @vivo, Xiaomi, regarding to the quoted part of 38.213, we think it is filling the short gap between Msg4 reception and dedicated RRC configuration reception. Anyway, the dedicated RRC configuration is delivered by PDSCH so gNB need to transmit a scheduling DCI in a predefined SS. Once dedicated RRC configuration is received and activated, the UE should naturally work in a RRC-dedicated BWP (as already clarified by Ericsson).  One more thing, it is unclear to us whether both BWP#0 configuration option 1 and 2 are mandatory features and directly succeeded by RedCap UE. We are open to discuss whether RedCap UE may not support BWP#0 configuration option 1. |
| NEC |  | This specification text would be applicable for both BWP#0 configuration option1 and option 2 during random access. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Seems no | Although the spec does not exactly say so (to guarantee it is only used for RA), without any dedicated configuration for that BWP, it is unlikely for gNB to schedule any meaningful traffic/data on the BWP using fallback DCI only, without any measurement report, any SRS, dedicated PUCCH feedback etc. |
| Samsung | N | In our understanding, current spec doesn’t precluded gNB to configure a paging CSS in an active BWP without CD-SSB in connect mode. Although the bandwith of initial BWP and the active BWP are within the UE RF bandwidth, since it might have different SCS, UE still needs to some adjustment on RF. Therefore, we think the situation is quite similar as now for RedCap UEs. We don’t see the need to further change the spec for RedCap UE. The network is expected to provide proper configuration to the UE based on its capability. |
| CMCC | N | Our first preference is not transmit SSB in connected mode with BWP#0 configuration option 1.  If SSB is transmitted only in connected mode, we are open to further discuss this issue. If SSB is configured in SIB and RedCap UEs in idle/inactive mode can also use the SSB, it is not acceptable. On the other hand, when only idle/inactive mode UEs exist in network, configuring SSB in SIB will increase network overhead. |
| Lenovo | N |  |
| LGE | N | Even if we also think the current draft CR captures the agreement on idle/inactive mode UE behavior, we don’t think any spec change is needed out of this discussion. |
| Nordic | Y | Specification should be always aligned to agreement, not the other way around. |
| IDCC | N | The spec may reflect the agreement on idle/inactive state. However, we think change is not needed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | The spec is clear and works well. |
| Nokia, NSB | N |  |
| FUTUREWEI | N | No change to the draft CR seems necessary |
| Ericsson | See comments | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Intel | Y | As pointed out by vivo and many others above, the quoted spec text is to capture UE expectation in Idle/inactive modes. It was unfortunate that in the agreement from RAN1 #107e, we missed classifying the first part of the agreements about initial DL BWPs were for idle/inactive modes and we realized this aspect in context of GTW discussion on not confirming the RAN1 WA on paging monitoring and SSB presence following RAN P guidance.  This needs to be fixed – and as Nordic said, specs should follow as well to fix this part.  Coming back to BWP#0 configuration option 1, we still think that a UE w/o optional capabilities like FG 6-1a, etc., still would need NCD-SSB configuration if active DL BWP does not include CD-SSB. We do not see any issue in having such configuration via SIB signalling. If RAN2 sees an issue, they can let us know. |
| FL5 | Most of the received responses express that no specification change is required regarding the SSB presence in a separate initial DL BWP used by a RedCap UE in connected mode for BWP#0 configuration option 1.  A few of the responses express that the following update proposed by Qualcomm may be needed in [TS 38.213 V17.0.0](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Specs/archive/38_series/38.213/38213-h00.zip) clause 17.1 in order to capture the earlier agreement (regardless of RRC state) that the UE expects CD-SSB and CORESET#0 if CD-SSB is present in the separate initial DL BWP.   |  | | --- | | For an initial DL BWP provided by *initialDownlinkBWP* in *DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB*, if a UE monitors PDCCH according to a Type1-PDCCH CSS set and does not monitor PDCCH according to Type2-PDCCH CSS set and if the initial DL BWP does not contain SS/PBCH blocks indicated by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *SIB1* or in *ServingCellConfigCommon*, the UE assumes that the initial DL BWP does not include SS/PBCH blocks or the CORESET with index 0. |   **High Priority Question 3-1b: Companies are invited to comment on the above text proposal. Note that the text proposal applies regardless of RRC state.** | |
| Vivo |  | We understand QC’s point and are fine with the change in general.  However, as commented before, the previous agreement was only about IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, the current text does not accurately capture the agreement thus has to be updated.   |  | | --- | | For an initial DL BWP provided by *initialDownlinkBWP* in *DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB*, if a UE in RRC\_IDLE state or RRC\_INACTIVE state monitors PDCCH according to a Type1-PDCCH CSS set and does not monitor PDCCH according to Type2-PDCCH CSS set and if the initial DL BWP does not contain SS/PBCH blocks indicated by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *SIB1* or in *ServingCellConfigCommon*, the UE assumes that the initial DL BWP does not include SS/PBCH blocks or the CORESET with index 0. |   Spec can be further updated based on additional agreement on CONNECTED mode, if any. |
| CATT | N | We do not think any update is necessary.  Regarding QC’s TP, it gives the impression that, if CD-SSB is not included, and if only RACH is configured, the UE assumes no any kind of SSB (including NCD-SSB), either?  Regarding vivo’s update, we afraid that physical layer specs (213) generally does not use terminology of RRC\_IDLE, RRC\_INACTIVE… not sure this is a good idea to open the door. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Clarification | Understand the intention but would like to know whether *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *SIB1* or in *ServingCellConfigCommon* refer to CD-SSB only or any SSB here.  We think more fundamentally, the logic of the texts should be: if a UE receives indication of an initial BWP, it will then know whether the BWP has any SSB, and also then know what type of CSS to monitor. The current texts are directly translated from RAN1 agreements, which however was made for discussion of UE capability/expectation. Strictly, SSB expectation does not depend on SS monitoring but depend on the indication (network will be responsible for proper indication). But we can accept the changes after clarified. |
| Apple |  | Support vivo’s update.  As commented earlier, this paragraph expects to capture the behavior for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs.  For RRC\_CONNECTED UE, if the initial BWP with option 1 is used for Type1-CSS monitoring (and possible C-RNTI DCI format 1\_0 per current spec), the presence of SSB depends on the UE capability. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We understood that even if the separate initial DL BWP is configured for random access but not for paging reception, CD-SSB can be expected by RedCap UE when the separate initial DL BWP includes CD-SSB.  We support the text proposal. |
| Spreadtrum6 |  | After further check BWP#0 configuration Option 1, we correct our understanding. Changing from BWP#0 to BWP#x (x>0) requires RRCReconfiguration, but changing from BWP#x (x>0) to BWP#0 can be RRC/MAC/DCI.  TS 38.331:   |  | | --- | | For example, only DCI format 1\_0 can be used with BWP#0 without dedicated configuration, so changing to another BWP requires RRCReconfiguration since DCI format 1\_0 doesn’t support DCI-based switching. |     If RedCap UE needs to monitor Type1-PDCCH, it should switch to BWP#0 at first. In this regard, we wonder whether there is any issue?  Anyway, QC/vivo’s revision is fine for us, since it is clearer for capturing the previous agreement. |
| NEC |  | Intention of change would be fine assuming “SS/PBCH blocks indicated by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *SIB1* or in *ServingCellConfigCommon*” refers to CD-SSB. On the other hand, a RedCap UE knows whether CD-SSB is transmitted in a separate initial DL BWP without information of ssb-PositionsInBurst. Therefore we prefer using “CD-SSB” (used in RAN2 specifications) or “SS/PBCH blocks type-A or type-B” (used in TS38.211) instead of using RRC parameters for non-RedCap UE. |
| Samsung |  | First of all, we would like to clarify that the newly added text doesn’t intend to introduce NCD-SSB signaling in SIB1, just to align with existing agreement with correct condition. |
| CMCC |  | We understand the intention of this proposal. Similar question with Samsung, does “ UE assumes that the initial DL BWP does not include SS/PBCH blocks” mean SIB will not contain configuration of NCD-SSB? |
| Panasonic | N | We think the current description w/o TP is fine. Just BWP with type-1 only without type-2 PDCCH always assume not containing SSB/CORESET, i.e. simple FDMed operation without overlap in the frequency between BWPs with and without type-2 PDCCH could be sufficient. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We agree with the intention of proposal’s update. However, “SS/PBCH blocks indicated by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *SIB1* or in *ServingCellConfigCommon*” does not only refer to CD-SSB. |
| IDCC | Y | We are fine with the text proposal. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Thanks for constructive discussion. We now understand the issue is when the CORESET#0 BWP and separate initial DL BWP overlap and the overlap includes the CD-SSB. The statement in the current standard states the CD-SSB is not present. Can the TP below be a simpler solution?  For an initial DL BWP provided by *initialDownlinkBWP* in *DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB*, if a UE monitors PDCCH according to a Type1-PDCCH CSS set and does not monitor PDCCH according to Type2-PDCCH CSS set, the UE assumes that the initial DL BWP may ~~does not~~ include SS/PBCH blocks ~~or~~ and does not include the CORESET with index 0. |
| MediaTek |  | We also support vivo’s proposal to clarify it applies to idle/inactive modes.  In Clause 17 of TS 38.213, the spec editor differentiates CD-SBB from NCD-SSB by whether the UE has used the SS/PBCH block to obtain SIB1.  Since the proposed TP is for 38.213, maybe we can align with the terminology currently used by the spec editor? Hopefully, this can resolve the concern about NCD-SSB signaling raised by some companies.  A TP modified from Qualcomm and vivo’s version is provided as follow:   |  | | --- | | For an initial DL BWP provided by *initialDownlinkBWP* in *DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB*, if a UE in RRC\_IDLE state or RRC\_INACTIVE state monitors PDCCH according to a Type1-PDCCH CSS set and does not monitor PDCCH according to Type2-PDCCH CSS set and if the initial DL BWP does not include the SS/PBCH block the UE used to obtain SIB1, the UE assumes that the initial DL BWP does not include SS/PBCH blocks or the CORESET with index 0. | |
| Ericsson |  | We propose the following update:  For an initial DL BWP provided by *initialDownlinkBWP* in *DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB*, if a UE monitors PDCCH according to a Type1-PDCCH CSS set and does not monitor PDCCH according to Type2-PDCCH CSS set and if the initial DL BWP does not contain SS/PBCH blocks indicated by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *SIB1* or in *ServingCellConfigCommon* and in FR1 does not contain CORESET with index 0, the UE assumes that the initial DL BWP does not include SS/PBCH blocks or the CORESET with index 0. |
| Qualcomm | Y | We are also fine with the update suggested by Vivo and Ericsson |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We also support the update from vivo. |
| Intel | N | The updated TP is still inaccurate in our view.  Our question remains unanswered – how is the UE guaranteed that it will not be kept on the separate initial DL BWP after connection setup if Type1 CSS is continued to be used for scheduling with C-RNTI?  Corresponding spec-reference:   |  | | --- | | If the UE has not been provided a Type3-PDCCH CSS set or a USS set and the UE has received a C-RNTI and has been provided a Type1-PDCCH CSS set, the UE monitors PDCCH candidates for DCI format 0\_0 and DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by the C-RNTI in the Type1-PDCCH CSS set. |   Thus, we support the update from vivo. If RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE is to be avoided in 213 specs, we can say:   |  | | --- | | For an initial DL BWP provided by *initialDownlinkBWP* in *DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB*, if a UE is not provided with a C-RNTI and ~~in RRC\_IDLE state or RRC\_INACTIVE state~~ monitors PDCCH according to a Type1-PDCCH CSS set and does not monitor PDCCH according to Type2-PDCCH CSS set and if the initial DL BWP does not contain SS/PBCH blocks indicated by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *SIB1* or in *ServingCellConfigCommon*, the UE assumes that the initial DL BWP does not include SS/PBCH blocks or the CORESET with index 0. | |
| FL6  FL7  FL8 | Several responses express that the suggested 38.213 text proposal should indicate that the text only concerns idle/inactive mode. Before polishing the text proposal further, it would be good to establish whether a RedCap UE should be able to expect SSB/CORESET#0/SIB or not when performing random access in connected mode in a separate initial DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB in case of BWP#0 configuration option 1 (similar to what has been agreed for an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode). The following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 3-1c:**   * **For FR1, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.** * **For FR2, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.** | |
| Spreadtrum7 |  | It seems necessary for clarification. It seems the only case without SSB in connected mode for RedCap UE with basic capability. However, gNB can still sent NCD-SSB as well due to connected mode. We would like to know other companies’ view. |
| MediaTek |  | Does UE need to monitor/receive any DL that is outside this separate initial DL BWP? |
| vivo | N | Although we understand reasonable NW implementation would not schedule the UE for a long time on the BWP#0 configured by option 1 after initial access, due to limited functionality, the spec does not prevent NW to do so. Theoretically NW may schedule the UE in the BWP#0 with fallback DCI, it would be problematic if UE does not have SSB available and frequent RF retuning will again be required.  Secondly, there are various cases when UE performs random access in connected mode, for example, for UL scheduling request or BFR, in such case data scheduling (C-RNTI) is possible even during random access procedure. This is different from IDLE/INACTIVE case where no C-RNTI based scheduling is possible during random access.  Furthermore, it would be necessary to reach common understanding on what is the UE expectation after random access procedure in connected mode?  Understanding 1: UE does not expect to be scheduled on the BWP#0 configured by option 1 after random access procedure, if the BWP#0 does not contain SSB.  Understanding 2: The UE expectation of SSB is not specified in this case, meaning that NW shall avoid scheduling the UE after random access procedure on the BWP#0 configured by option 1.  Understanding 3: The UE can expect SSB after random access procedure on the BWP#0 configured by option 1. |
| Xiaomi |  | Generally, we share the same understanding with the FL on the presence of SSB/CORESET#0/SIB during a random access.  But in our view, even if we agree proposal 3-1c, it still can’t guarantee the separate initial DL BWP configured with BWP#0 configuration option 1 is only used for RACH.  In our understanding, for UE in connected mode or with C-RNTI, separate initial DL BWP configured via BWP#0 configuration 1 is not only used during random access procedure. It can be used for other purpose, e.g., acting as default BWP. When the separate initial DL BWP acts as default BWP, even if there is no USS in the separate initial DL BWP, the RedCap still be able to monitor DCI scrambled with C-RNTI in the e.g., type 0/0A CSS. |
| CATT | Y | If a RedCap UE does not need SSB for RACH in idle/inactive mode, we have no doubt that it does not need SSB for RACH in connected mode, either.  Only for the purpose of RACH. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC |  | Currently, the proposal seems to mention only one of connected mode procedures for BWP configuration option1. As mentioned by other companies, although the use case may be limited for this BWP, it will still have data transmission, for example, after initial access, it needs to receive RRC configurations to switch to other BWP.  So anyway, the UE behavior about SSB need to be concluded for this configuration. From this point of view, we share similar view as vivo that common understanding is needed.  We understand UE without FG6-1a will except SSB for connected mode operation. However, we have also made the following agreement during RAN1#107e, the motivation is to avoid unnecessary network overhead for separate initial DL BWP during idle/inactive mode.  Agreement  For FR1,   * 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.   To satisfy both the UE capability for connected mode and network overhead concern for idle/inactive mode, a middle ground needs to be found. The perfect solution maybe gNB transmits NCD-SSB only when there are UEs who actually use BWP option1 for connected mode.  However, the limitation of BWP configuration option1 cannot support BWP0 specific configuration for NCD-SSB, otherwise, it will be option2. And if NCD-SSB is configured by SIB1, it may mean gNB should transmit NCD-SSB even when there are no connected UEs. So the compromise solutions may be the following:   1. BWP#0 configuration option1 is supported, and if the gNB wants to serve connected UEs with BWP configuration option1, and the UEs doesn’t report optional capability of FG6-1a, it can configure NCD-SSB in SIB, but the specification states that gNB only needs to transmit SSB for connected UEs, idle/inactive UEs cannot use this SSB. 2. BWP#0 configuration option 1 is not supported for RedCap UEs. |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y | During a random access procedure, it would be similar with idle/inactive. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | We think the UE capability 6-1 and 6-1a actually reflect the SSB expectation for the UE. That’s to say:  If UE only supports 6-1, the separate initial DL BWP can only be used for RACH without expecting SSB. Both BWP#0 configuration option1 and option2 can be configured for the UE. If separate initial DL BWP are configured with other channels, e.g., USS, paging, then SSB is expected.  If UE supports 6-1a, the separate initial DL BWP can also be used for RACH and other channel scheduling. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Similar view as other companies that it is not needed just like in idle/inactive. |
| NEC |  | OK with understanding this only applicable in the case where RedCap UE fallback to the initial DL BWP due to indication by DCI to switch to BWP#0 or in case a timer expired; and RRC reconfiguration is needed to switch to RRC configured BWP (e.g. BWP#1) in BWP#0 configuration option 1.  We are also fine BWP#0 configuration option 1 is not supported for RedCap UE. |
| Ericsson | Y | In BWP#0 configuration option 1, a UE cannot have dedicated configurations. Therefore, RedCap UEs should not expect SSB/CORESET#0/SIB during random access in all RRC states (idle/inactive/connected). Also, if the UE can handle random access without SSB on the separate initial DL BWP in idle/inactive mode, it can do so in connected mode. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Intel | N | The proposal seems to effectively contradict the idea that the “baseline RedCap UE” expects NCD-SSB in connected mode and we share the exact same concerns as expressed by vivo. Here, what is more important is how the UE operates rather than whether the DL BWP is RRC-configured or not. In terms of the presence of SSB or not for purpose of T-F tracking and measurements, it does not matter how the DL BWP configuration is signaled to the UE.  The issue is not just about random access. In connected mode, the UE that does not support FG 6-1a (or equivalent for RedCap) gets no guarantee that it will not be scheduled in the BWP#0 without any SSB for long. So, just isolating the random access procedure and equating it to random access in idle/inactive modes is not accurate.  We do not see any fundamental issue in NCD-SSB configuration being provided by SIB signaling and without any specific feedback to that effect from RAN2, what is the basis to reject the option. |
| FL9 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered, which reflects “Understanding 1” in Vivo’s comment above.  **High Priority Proposal 3-1d:**   * **For FR1, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.** * **For FR2, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.** * **Note: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE in connected mode does not expect to be scheduled on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB other than for connected-mode random access procedure.** | |
| Qualcomm |  | We prefer the following update for proposal 3-1d:   * **For FR1, for BWP#0 configuration option 1, if the BW of DL BWP#0 is the same as the BW of the initial DL BWP:**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain ~~SSB/~~CORESET#0/SIB.**     - **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT always expect it to contain SSB~~/CORESET#0/SIB~~.** * **For FR2, for BWP#0 configuration option 1, if the BW of DL BWP#0 is the same as the BW of the initial DL BWP:**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain ~~SSB/~~CORESET#0/SIB.**     - **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT always expect it to contain SSB~~/CORESET#0/SIB~~.** * **Note: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE in connected mode does not expect to be scheduled on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB other than for connected-mode random access procedure.** |
| vivo |  | Thanks for FL to address our question, if the group can converge on understanding 1, it is fine for us. However, the last bullet should not be a note but part of the agreement (to be captured in the specification). Suggest the following **update**  **Updated High Priority Proposal 3-1d:**   * **For FR1, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.** * **For FR2, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.** * **~~Note:~~ For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE in connected mode does not expect to be scheduled on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB other than ~~for~~ during connected-mode random access procedure.** |
| MediaTek 9 |  | For a UE to support an initial DL BWP w/o SSB, the performance loss it may suffer in initial access/idle/inactive mode is different from that in connected mode.  Without SSB and TRS, the UE is not able to maintain DL time/frequency synchronization. The longer UE stays in a DL BWP w/o SSB and TRS, the less synchronized it is. When it is switched (if it can successfully receive DCI 1\_0 for *RRC reconfiguration*) back to an active DL BWP that has SSB or TRS, it takes UE *longer time* to reach the same level of synchronization as it was which consequently implies throughput loss in connected mode. TRS is an alternative to SSB UE can use for synchronization. We can support the proposal if TRS transmission is guaranteed instead. However, this is an initial DL BWP by BWP#0 configuration option 1 and does not contain UE-specific configuration for TRS transmission.  Therefore, we still have concerns with the uncertainty about *how long* UE has to stay in the separate initial DL BWP after it finishes RACH. With vivo’s proposal, our concern may be able to be resolved in a very subtle and implicit way. But if it can be resolved in a more direct way, it would be highly appreciated. |
| CATT | Y, but | Generally fine, but can we clarify that, the update new note is limited to the RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 only? Or even covers the RedCap UE supporting optional FG 6-1a? |
| Samsung |  | Clarification question for the note: If UE reports the support of FG 6-1a, whether this “Note” also preclude such configuration?  In general, we believe gNB will do a proper configuration. We never say in the spec, if UE doesn’t report to support feature A, gNB cannot configure/enable feature A. There is the same. So, we don’t think the following note shall become an agreement.   * **Note: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE in connected mode, who cannot operate in a BWP without SSB, does not expect to be scheduled on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB other than for connected-mode random access procedure.** |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Generally Y | We have similar question with CATT and Samsung. And we suggest the following update  **Note: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE in connected mode, who supports mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) , does not expect to be scheduled on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB other than for connected-mode random access procedure.** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y with update | We propose the following update for completeness:   * **Note: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE only supporting mandatory FG6-1 in connected mode does not expect to be scheduled on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB other than for connected-mode random access procedure.** |
| Nordic | Y | Looks like reasonable compromise |
| CMCC |  | We have similar question with CATT and Samsung. Since RedCap UEs can report UE capability before connected mode, whether they can work on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB in connected mode depends on UE capability.  For RedCap UEs not supporting FG6-1a, SSB is required for other function such as data transmission and paging, the existing note is reasonable. When there is requirement for data transmission or paging, RedCap UEs can be scheduled in other active DL BWPs.  For RedCap UEs supporting FG6-1a, SSB is not required for BWP operation, RedCap UEs can be scheduled in separate iDL BWP for other function besides random access. |
| Panasonic | N | On note, when random access procedure is used for SR, the network doesn’t know which UE is under the random access procedure until the decoding of Msg 3. Therefore, “does not expect to be scheduled” is impossible when gNB has something to be sent. Therefore, our thinking is following modification.   * Note: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE in connected mode **is not required to receive ~~does not expect to be scheduled on~~** a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB other than for connected-mode random access procedure. |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum9 |  | Basically fine for it. We are not sure how to capture “**connected-mode random access procedure**” in RAN1 spec. Is it “UE monitors PDCCH according to Type2-PDCCH CSS after the UE (re)establishes dedicated RRC connection”?  Also, this is no definition of BWP#0 configuration option 1 in RAN1 spec, maybe it can be captured in RAN2 spec, e.g. 38.331. |
| LGE | Y | We are okay with the proposal for the RedCap UEs in general, i.e., for RedCap UEs supporting FG 6-1a as well, but we can also live with agreeing on the RedCap UEs supporting mandatory FG 6-1 as suggested from ZTE. |
| NEC | Y | We are fine with vivo’s understanding 1. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Intel |  | We are not quite sure if just a note would address the UE implementation concern, as also raised by vivo and MTK.  It is also not clear how to specify this – in addition to some of the issues raised by other companies, how to interpret “not expected to be scheduled” once the UE finishes random access procedure? Is it at Msg4 or after receiving dedicated RRC configuration or something else? Similar questions apply for connected mode RA as well.  On the other hand, we still do not see if there is a fundamental issue in providing NCD-SSB configuration by SIB signalling in case of BWP#0 configuration option 1. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | For progress |
| Apple | Y with modification | We are supportive on the FL-9 with modified wording from Xiaomi on the context of ‘Note’.  On keeping ‘Note’ or making it part of the agreement (i.e., removing ‘Note’), our understanding is that it has spec impact (e.g., capturing in spec as ‘A UE indicating a capability … does not expect …’) and hence the ‘Note’ should be removed.  On the need of context of ‘Note’, our view is that it is necessary; Otherwise, it means that UE supporting FG 6-1 only can be scheduled with unicast PDSCH in the initial DL BWP #0 without SSB.  It should be clarified that the previous agreement that UE indicating FG 6-1 only expect SSBs is applied for ‘RRC-configured active BWP’ only, which does NOT cover BWP#0 option 1 in RRC CONNECTED state as it is NOT ‘RRC-configured BWP’. It is what we are discussing here and try to conclude. |
| FL10 | Several received responses discuss whether RedCap UEs supporting FGs 6-1 and 6-1a, respectively, should have different behaviors in the cases covered by the proposal. However, since FGs 6-1 and 6-1a concern UE-specific RRC-configured DL BWP, while this proposal concerns the operation with separate initial DL BWP (per BWP#0 configuration option 1), it may be good to treat these issues separately.  Some responses propose to clarify that the UE might sometimes include SSB. In the updated proposal below, this is clarified by repeating the note made in an earlier agreement that “The network may choose to configure SSB or MIB-configured CORESET#0 or SIB1 to be within the respective DL BWP”.  Some responses express concerns regarding the meaning “for connected-mode random access” and question whether the specification can mandate restricting the operation to this case. The concerns seem to be of such magnitude, especially considering the limited time left in this WI, that the feature lead would like to add the option that RedCap UE operation in connected mode when the UE is configured with a separate initial DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB is not supported.  Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered. Companies are requested to indicate their preferred option, if any.  **High Priority Proposal 3-1e: Down select between the following options:**   * **Option 1:**   + **For FR1, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**     - **A RedCap UE in connected mode does not expect to operate in a separate initial DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0.**   + **For FR2, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**     - **A RedCap UE in connected mode does not expect to operate in a separate initial DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~.** * **Option 2:**   + **For FR1, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.**   + **For FR2, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.**   + **~~Note:~~ For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE in connected mode ~~does not expect to be scheduled~~ is not required to receive on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB other than ~~for~~ during connected-mode random access procedure.**   + **Note: The network may choose to configure SSB or MIB-configured CORESET#0 or SIB1 to be within the respective DL BWP.** | |
| vivo |  | We prefer Option 1.  Option 2 is also acceptable. |
| Intel |  | We support Option 1.  We still are not sure how “**a RedCap UE in connected mode ~~does not expect to be scheduled~~ is not required to receive on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB other than ~~for~~ during connected-mode random access procedure**” can be guaranteed by specs, and have concerns that this will potentially give rise to new issues impacting beyond RAN1. |
| Lenovo | Y | We prefer option 1. |
| MediaTek | Y (Option 1) | **We support Option 1.**  We think some further clarification is needed for Option 2.  For the third bullet under Option 2, we think “UE is not required to receive” is not complete and may be too strong. Not to receive any DL? Including Msg2 and Msg4?  If our understanding is correct, UE vendors don’t want the separate initial DL w/o SSB to be used as a normal BWP and to be scheduled PDSCH with user-plane data. We basically want to be switched back to a DL BWP with SSB as soon as we finish RACH. In other words, this separate initial DL BWP without SSB is indeed for RACH only.  We hence suggest the following with changes in **purple**:   * For the third bullet,   + For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE in connected mode is not required to receive **any DL signals except for RACH-related messages and RRC-based BWP switch signal** on ~~a~~ **the** separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB ~~other than for during connected-mode random access procedure~~. * In the first two bullet, remove “from RAN1 perspective”. |
| CATT | Y | Prefer Option 2.  Option 1 will strongly restrict the use of separate initial DL BWP. It means: if the separate initial DL BWP does not include CD-SSB, all it can do is RACH for idle/inactive mode. It is reasonable to allow at least RACH in connected mode.  We doubt that Option 1 will lead to even more complicated situation for RACH in connected mode. For Option 1, for RedCap UE, how to perform RACH in connected mode if separate initial DL BWP indeed does NOT contain CD-SSB? Want to duplicate the RO/preamble, Type1 CSS, and common CORESET in another RRC-dedicated BWP…? |
| DOCOMO | Y | Our preference is Option 2 which is beneficial in terms of configuration flexibility and RedCap UEs offloading. It is unclear for us what is the issue on using a separate initial DL BWP for random access in connected mode while a RedCap UE can perform random access procedure in a separate initial DL BWP with BWP#0 configuration option 1 during initial access, and we believe Option 2 is also a valid option so far. However, we are open to discuss supporting Option 1 considering the limited time. |
| Nordic | Y | We are fine with both options |
| Samsung |  | The proposal is discussing on connected mode, we prefer to consider different UE capability. For the sake of progress, we can consider the proposal to change as:  **Down select between the following options at least for the UE does not support FG 6-1a:**  And add  FFS: for the UE supports FG 6-1a |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | Option1 does not work since the same BWP inherited from initial access without SSB is gone, even if a UE supports 6-1a.  The option that depending on UE capability similar to handling of BWP#0 with Option 2 is also acceptable (and may be easier for the time being) to us.  And, understand it could be a separate topic but since nowhere (or other aspects but with low priority which is not desirable) to comment, we choose to input here.  We want to clarify if the below **in idle/inactive mode and during initial access** means the same thing and the same UE behavior, i.e. it is not the case that the UE should use separate BWP in idle/inactive mode but CORESET#0 during initial access, when the separate initial DL BWP includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0.  **Agreement**   * **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 the case when the separate initial DL BWP includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0 is supported**   + **It can be used in idle/inactive mode (including paging) and during and after initial access, when applicable**   + **It is no wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.**   + **This applies to both TDD and FDD (including FD FDD and HD FDD) cases.**   **Agreement**   * + **Note: If a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs contains the entire CORESET#0, the RedCap UE shall use the bandwidth and location of the CORESET#0 in DL during initial access.** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | We prefer option 2. At least RACH should be supported for BWP#0 configuration option 1. Furthermore, to avoid frequent BWP switching or RRC reconfiguration, short-time transmission can also be supported in the BWP#0 that excludes CD-SSB, including RRC configuration and UE capability report. |
| IDCC | Y | We prefer Option 2 due configuration flexibility. |
| Panasonic | Y | We are ok with option 1 for BWP#0 configuration option 1. |
| Spreadtrum10 | Y | We are fine with both options. If Option 1 is too restrictive for NW, Option 2 can be used which is just the complementary for the previous agreement for RACH on the separate initial DL BWP. |
| CMCC |  | As comment by CATT, Samsung, xiaomi, ZTE, Apple in last round, here we are try to discuss whether the agreement about SSB transmission related to UE capability can be extended to BWP#0 option 1 in RRC CONNECTED state.  Assuming with BWP#0 option 1, whether RedCap UEs can work on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB in connected mode also depends on UE capability. For RedCap UEs not supporting FG6-1a, SSB is required for other function such as data transmission and paging, a RedCap UE can only be scheduled on a separate initial DL BWP for RACH. When there is requirement for data transmission or paging, RedCap UEs can be scheduled in other active DL BWPs containing SSB. Or, gNB can configure RedCap UEs not supporting FG6-1a with BWP#0 option 2, so that NCD-SSB is expected in active DL BWP.  For RedCap UEs supporting FG6-1a, SSB is not required for BWP operation, RedCap UEs can be scheduled in separate iDL BWP with BWP#0 option 1 for other function besides random access.  We are fine with Samsung, xiaomi, ZTE’s modification in last round. |
| NEC | Y | Our preference would be Option 1. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Option 2 is preferred |
| Ericsson | Y | Option 1 or Option 2 is fine with us. |
| LGE | Y | Option 2 is preferred. |
| FL11  FL12 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered. Companies are requested to indicate their preferred option, if any.  **High Priority Proposal 3-1f: Down select between the following options:**   * **Option 1:**   + **For FR1, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**     - **A RedCap UE in connected mode does not expect to operate in a separate initial DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0.**   + **For FR2, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**     - **A RedCap UE in connected mode does not expect to operate in a separate initial DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~.** * **Option 2:**   + **For FR1, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.**   + **For FR2, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.**   + **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE in connected mode is not required to receive any DL signals except for RACH-related messages and RRC-based BWP switch signal** **on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB ~~other than during connected-mode random access procedure~~.**   + **Note: The network may choose to configure SSB or MIB-configured CORESET#0 or SIB1 to be within the respective DL BWP.** | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | We have a slight preference for Option 2 over Option 1. However, we are also fine with Option 1 for the sake of progress. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We prefer option 2. We can also accept option 1 if there is clear majority support for this option. |
| Intel | Fine with Option 1 | We still would request to get some clarification on how Option 2 (in particular, the following bullet) is expected to be specified:   * + **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE in connected mode is not required to receive any DL signals except for RACH-related messages and RRC-based BWP switch signal** **on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB ~~other than during connected-mode random access procedure~~.**   Does this include the RRC configuration setup message? Does it include scheduling of PUSCH for Msg5, for UE capability reporting? How to interpret the above in case of connected mode RA? |
| vivo | Option 2 is not clear | We prefer Option 1.  If Option 2 is to be considered, we think the “**and RRC-based BWP switch signal**” should be deleted. First of all, it extends the operation without SSB for FG6-1 UEs in CONNECTED mode beyond the initial access which is undesirable. Secondly, RAN1 spec does not see the content of a PDSCH/PUSCH (whether it contains certain RRC message or not ), how can such condition be specified in RAN1 spec in practice? |
| CATT | Y and Option 2. | Regarding Option 1, can the proponent explans how a RedCap UE performs RACH in connected mode? This is surely a critical missing part in Option 1. There are too many unconsidered issues, e.g. whether it is suitable to have duplicated RedCap-specific RACH resource/CORESET/CSS is needed in another BWP.  Regarding Option 2, indeed we share similar question with vivo on ‘**and RRC-based BWP switching signal**’. It seems correct and of course a natural choice by gNB scheduling, but how does RAN1 spec specifies this? Currently, in RAN1 spec, all we have is a UE continues monitoring the DCI with C-RNTI in RACH CSS (which implicitly implies receiving RRC-based BWP switching singal). It seems as far as RAN1 spec can do. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We prefer Option 2 but can accept Option 1. |
| NEC | Y | Our first preference is option 1. We are also OK with option 2. |
| Samsung | N | For option 1, in connected mode, it basically means gNB has to configure another RRC configured BWP that contains PRACH resource, different from BWP #0. Since BWP #0 cannot be used in option 1, basically, option 1 declare that BWP configuration 1 cannot be used for Redcap at all!  For option 2, we strong concern on the following bullet:   * + **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE in connected mode is not required to receive any DL signals except for RACH-related messages and RRC-based BWP switch signal** **on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB ~~other than during connected-mode random access procedure~~.**   For a Redcap UE supports FG 6-1a can of course works on it.  Again, we see no different for a non-redcap and Redcap UE support FG 6-1a on handling of this NCD-SSB issue. We cannot agree on any restriction for all UEs. And, this shall not be an agreement but a note, which doesn’t need to be capture in RAN 1 spec since we don’t capture UE doesn’t do xx, if it doesn’t support xx.  Ttherefore, for the bullet, we sugges to modify to:   * + **Note: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE that cannot support FG 6-1a in connected mode is not required to receive any DL signals except for RACH-related messages and RRC-based BWP switch signal** **on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB ~~other than during connected-mode random access procedure~~.** |
| MediaTek | Y (Option 1) | We prefer Option 1. We are also fine with having Option 1 for baseline UEs while Option 2 as optional capability for more advanced UEs. |
| Sharp | Y | Our preference is option 2 though option 1 is also acceptable. |
| Panasonic | Y | We are ok with either option 1 or option 2. |
| Spreadtrum12 | Y | Both fine for us. It seems Option 1 is not so restrictive for NW. In my understanding, NW may configure BWP#x (x>0) and BWP#0 (the separate nvolve DL BWP) close to the edge of the carrier. If SSB (e.g. NCD-SSB) is present in BWP#x (the active DL BWP), the SSB may be also present in BWP#0. I guess so since NW vendor does not so object Option1… |
| CMCC |  | As commented in the last round, we think it is natural to extend the UE behavior for RRC configured active BWP to connection mode of BWP0 configuration option1 .  Since when gNB wants UE to use initial DL BWP during connected mode, it can decide whether to configure it as a BWP0 configuration option1 or option2.  If gNB learns that the UE only supports the basic FG6-1 by capability report during initial access, it can configure this initial DL BWP to BWP0 option2 which turns it to a RRC configured BWP, or keep it to BWP0 option1 but only RACH related procedure can be scheduled in this BWP.  If gNB learns that the UE supports optional FG6-1a without SSB in active BWP by capability report during initial access, it can configure this initial DL BWP to either BWP0 option1 or option2, the data scheduling operation is similar for this two option.  So update is needed for the following paragraph.  **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE without optional capability of “Not need NCD-SSB” in connected mode is not required to receive any DL signals except for RACH-related messages and RRC-based BWP switch signal** **on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB ~~other than during connected-mode random access procedure~~.**  We are also fine with Samsung’s suggestion. |
| LGE | Y | Our preference is option 2, as option 1 seems to prohit the separate initial DL BWP from being placed at the edge with the center frequency aligned with the separate initial UL BWP. From our perspective, the questions from CATT on option 1 need to be addressed before further considering option 1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We prefer Option 2 and agree with CATT that it would be rather inefficient to duplicate the RACH resource in another RRC-dedicated BWP. There would be no problem that a RedCap UE in inactive/idle/connected mode performs random access in the separated initial DL BWP for BWP#0 configuration option 1.  Besides, as many companies mentioned previously, the SSB transmission issue in RRC-connected mode for BWP#0 configuration option 1 can also depend on UE capability just like BWP#0 configuration option 2. Therefore, Samsung and CMCC’s update is fine with us.  Additionally, from our understanding, msg5/UE capability report also can be transmitted. Therefore, RRC signalling could be used to cover these cases. And the following update with blue can be considered:   * + **Note: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE that cannot support FG 6-1a in connected mode is not required to receive any DL signals except for RACH-related messages and RRC signalling~~-based BWP switch signa~~l** **on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB ~~other than during connected-mode random access procedure~~.** |
| Xiaomi | Y | Our preference is option 2. For option 1, as commented by several commanies, how to perform RACH in connected mode is one issue, it may nvolve additional specification impact. |
| Lenovo | Y | We prefer option 1 but can live with option 2 for progress. |
| MediaTek2 |  | We prefer Option 1.  We agree with multiple companies it would be difficult to implement the currenct version of the third bullet in Option 2 into specification. To capture the “***RACH-only***” concept, we suggest the following revision:   * + **(Updated)　For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE in connected mode performing a Random Access procedure** **on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB switches back to its previous BWP before the Random Access procedure unpon the successful completion of the Random Access procedure.**   “*Upon successful completion of the Random Access procedure*” is a term used in TS38.321. So the spec can implement it. We just need to send an LS to RAN2 and ask them to implement it to 38.321. |
| Nordic | Y | Option 1 is our preference, as it is simpler. Anyway this is corner case, gNB would configure RACH on dedicated BWP for Option 1. |
| FL13 | Based on the received responses, the support seems to be fairly evenly split between Option 1 and Option 2. Several companies have questions about how Option 2 is supposed to work and there seems to be some difficulty to converge on the meaning and wording of Option 2. Given the limited time left in this meeting, the feature lead would like to check whether Option 1 can be accepted for progress. This would mean that for BWP#0 configuration option 1, either the separate initial DL BWP would include CD-SSB, or the dedicated BWP would be configured for random access.  **High Priority Proposal 3-1g: ~~Down select between the following options:~~**   * **~~Option 1:~~**   + **For FR1, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**     - **A RedCap UE in connected mode does not expect to operate in a separate initial DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0.**   + **For FR2, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**     - **A RedCap UE in connected mode does not expect to operate in a separate initial DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~.** * **~~Option 2:~~**   + **~~For FR1, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,~~**     - **~~For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,~~**       * **~~During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.~~**   + **~~For FR2, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,~~**     - **~~For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,~~**       * **~~During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.~~**   + **~~For BWP#0 configuration option 1, a RedCap UE in connected mode is not required to receive any DL signals except for RACH-related messages and RRC-based BWP switch signal~~****~~on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB.~~**   + **~~Note: The network may choose to configure SSB or MIB-configured CORESET#0 or SIB1 to be within the respective DL BWP.~~** | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We can accept this in order to make progress. |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | For the sake of progress |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| CATT | N | The group put a lot effort to address RACH congestion issue (around CD-SSB), and decided to support separate initial DL BWP for RedCap RACH in idle/inactive mode without CD-SSB, but suddently, this is not valid for RACH in connected mode and bring back the RACH congestion burden around CD-SSB.  We think MTK’s proposal in last round as a good exercise for Option 2, if ‘upon successful completion of the random access procedure’ is already a spec terminology.  And Samsung and CMCC’s question is still not answered, which should be valid.  Suggest to go with the following update Option 2:   * **For FR1, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.** * **For FR2, for BWP#0 configuration option 1,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **During a random access procedure in connected mode, RedCap UE does NOT expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB.** * **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, upon successful completion of the random access procedure, a RedCap UE supporting FG 6-1 only (but not FG 6-1a) in connected mode is not required operate ~~to receive any DL signals except for RACH-related messages and RRC-based BWP switch signal~~** **on a separate initial DL BWP that does not contain SSB ~~other than during connected-mode random access procedure~~.** * **Note: The network may choose to configure SSB or MIB-configured CORESET#0 or SIB1 to be within the respective DL BWP.**   Isn’t this fair to accommodate RACH procedure in idle/inactive mode and UE capability? |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Samsung | N | We cannot accept this proposal which makes no sense.  We don’t think spec needs to bu update to support option 2. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | N | We also don’t see any technical reason that why a UE support RRC configured active BWP without SSB can not support BWP0 configuration option1 without SSB in connected mode.  And Option 2 of proposal 3-1 has the benefit of shared RACH configuration for both idle/inactive UEs and connected UEs, as pointed by CATT. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |

**FL1/FL2 High Priority Question 3-2: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, should it be supported to use the separate initial DL BWP in connected mode for other purposes than random access? If the answer is yes, please comment in the Comments field on whether the UE should expect it to always contain SSB.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | Firstly, we need to have a decision whether to allow BWP#0 configuration option 1 for the initial DL BWP configuration. From our perspective, we do not see the benefits/motivation to support BWP#0 configuration option 1 to configure the separate initial DL BWP, using BWP#0 configuration option 2 might be sufficient.  Even if BWP#0 configuration option 1 is allowed for separate initial DL BWP configuration, it is not clear to us how to capture the proposal 3-1 into specification, as to our understanding it is hard to define a BWP in connected mode “only used for random access purpose”, or “for other purposes than random access”. |
| Nordic | N | BWP#0 in Option 1 is used in legacy only until UE gets dedicated RRC. So clearly not meant for RRC connected mode. |
| Spreadtrum | Maybe N | For connected mode, gNB can also configure the CSS in the UE-specific DL BWP.  For BWP#0 configuration Option 1, if gNB configures the CSS (SIB/paging) in the separate initial BWP, RedCap UE should retune RF to monitor the CSS outside the active DL BWP, no matter the separate initial DL BWP contains SSB or not. Indeed, from the RAN plenary conclusion:   |  | | --- | | Scheme 1 (i.e. UE in IDLE and INACTIVE monitors paging in an initial BWP associated with CD-SSB) is adopted for further work in Rel-17. Scheme 2 (i.e. UE in IDLE and INACTIVE monitors paging in an initial BWP associated with NCD-SSB) is not considered further in Rel-17.  RAN2 should work on the assumption that the cell reselection measurements and cell ranking are performed based on measurements on the CD-SSB. This applies for intra- and inter-frequency measurements, and for IDLE and INACTIVE states. |   It seems more feasible that RedCap UE should receive SIB/paging in CORESET#0. Therefore, we think for BWP#0 configuration Option 1, RedCap UE should receive SIB/paging in CORESET#0, although we share the similar view as vivo that gNB should avoid such power inefficient configuration for UE. |
| Qualcomm | FFS | This issue has lower priority than other discussion points. |
| Intel | Y | As responded to Proposal 3-1, in this case is supported, UE can expect presence of SSB in the DL BWP.  @Nordic – We are not sure if there is anything in the specifications that enforce that a UE cannot be scheduled in BWP#0 after RRC connection setup if option 1 is used. It is up to gNB choice if the UE is to remain in BWP#0 for option 1 even after RRC connection setup. |
| Ericsson | Y | In principle (as in legacy), for BWP#0 configuration option 1, an initial DL BWP can also be used in connected mode albeit with a limited functionality as it does not have UE-specific configurations. Also, the initial BWP can act as a default BWP which can be used for the purpose of power saving after the initial access (i.e., in connected mode). As per RAN1 agreements, the UE expects SSB if the initial DL BWP is used for paging. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Our view is that the use case for BWP#0 configuration option 1 in connected mode is very limited. Likely UE will be switched to RRC-configured BWP later on. However, we believe it should still be possible to use this in connected mode.  However, if it is used for connected mode then the BWP should contain SSB. |
| LGE |  | Not sure if we need to restrict the usage of the separate initial DL BWP in connected mode to the random access only for BWP#0 configuration option 1. Also not sure if this discussion will lead to any specification impact. But, we are open for further discussion during this meeting. |
| CATT | FFS | We do not see too much use cases but open to discuss. For BWP#0 configuration option 1, only SIB1 configuration can be applied, hence Type 3 CSS and USS are not considered:  Possible use may include paging in CONNECTED mode, or transmission of RRC configurations/UE capability report in a short period. |
| Xiaomi | Y | Can also be used as default BWP for BWP switch when default BWP ID is not explicitly configured. |
| Vivo2 |  | Based on above companies’ comments, seems the majority share the views that BWP#0 configuration option 1 in connected mode is very limited and the UE should be switched to RRC-configured BWP once connection is established. If so, it is reasonable to exclude the atypical configuration that using BWP#0 configuration option 1 to configure the separate initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs. |
| Panasonic | Y | The UE should expect it to always contain SSB if the paging PDCCH is configured for the BWP. |
| NEC |  | Same comments as above. |
| Sharp | Y | We don’t need to exclude the use case of BWP#0 configuration option 1 in connected mode for other purpose. Then if paging is configured for the BWP#0, SSB should be contained within the BWP#0. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Y | We share the same view with Intel, Ericsson and Nokia that an initial DL BWP can be used in connected mode even for BWP#0 configuration option 1.  Regarding the presence of SSB, in our understanding, if a separate initial DL BWP with BWP#0 configuration option 1 is used in RRC connected mode and it does not include CD-SSB, a UE cannot expect SSB transmission in the initial DL BWP since the UE does not have dedicated configuration regarding SSB reception with the initial DL BWP. |
| Lenovo | Y | We have similar view with DOCOMO. |
| Samsung |  | We don’t see the potential spec changes for this issue. We think current agreement works. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | We don’t see how to work for other purposes but open to hear. For now with limited spec impact in mind, we think it’s Ok to not open too many possibilities.  Also, for companies that are not clear the use of BWP#0 with option 1 and/or proposing to preclude this case for RedCap, we would appreciate if you can share your view to the discussion over thread [[108-e-NR-CRs-16]](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Inbox/drafts/7.1/%5B108-e-NR-CRs-16%5D) assuming you also agree this would not be used in real site even for R15. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | To avoid frequent BWP switching or RRC reconfiguration, short-time transmission can be supported in the BWP#0, including RRC configuration, UE capability report. |
| Spreadtrum2 | N | Again, we think BWP#0 configuration Option 1 has a bit higher UE complexity. And we agree QC to postpone the discussion on BWP#0 configuration Option 1, since BWP#0 configuration Option 1 is not the must and CSS only in the initial DL BWP is not the must. The worst thing is only gNB has to use BWP#0 configuration Option 2 or configure CSS in the active DL BWP in connected mode. In this sense, this issue is also not critical.  We suggest listing the two Alternatives for this proposal to reflect the current situations.  **Down-select the alternatives:**   * **Alt-1: For BWP#0 configuration option 1, if the separate initial DL BWP is used in connected mode and it is used for other purposes than random access, the RedCap UE expects it to always contain SSB.** * **Alt-2: BWP#0 configuration option 1 is not supported by RedCap UEs.**   As UE vendor, we slightly prefer Alt-2 but are open for NW flexibility. By the way, Alt-1 is related to **High Priority Proposal 4-1a**. |
| MediaTek |  | We understand that the current spec (for legacy UE) does not prevent initial BWP configured by BWP#0 configuration option 1 from being used in connected mode. However, in principle, we would like to minimize the number of cases that UE cannot expect SSB on its BWP at least in connected mode.  **Proposal:** For a separate initial DL BWP configured by BWP#0 configuration option 1,   * Alt-1: RedCap UE does not expect it is used in connected mode for other purposes than random access. * Alt-2: RedCap UE expects SSB presence if it is used in connected for other purposes than random access   As we mentioned, this can be discussed with **FL1/FL2 High Priority Proposal 3-1.** |
| CMCC | Y | RedCap may be scheduled in separate iDL BWP based on SIB1-defined configuration when the number of non-initial RRC-configured DL BWP is less than 4. RedCap may use separate iDL BWP as default BWP. Thus, the use of separate iDL BWP is not limited to only for RACH, the use of BWP#0 configuration option 1 for RedCap UEs in connected mode should not be precluded.  Regarding SSB in separate iDL BWP, when separate iDL BWP contains CD-SSB, there is no problem. When separate iDL BWP does not contain CD-SSB, it is not necessary to mandate transmission of additional SSB, besides, the UE does not have dedicated RRC configuration for NCD-SSB with BWP#0 configuration option 1. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | In our understanding, there are two types of separate initial DL BWP: one with CORESET#0/CD-SSB and another with neither CORESET#0 nor SSB. For the former, the separate initial DL BWP has a SSB and that BWP can be used for BWP#0 option 1 (like legacy).  For the latter, it seems an SSB is needed for use besides RACH (e.g. paging) |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FL3 | This topic can be revisited later in this meeting once other topics have seen further progress. | |

# Update of RAN1 working assumptions on DL BWP operation

The remaining working assumptions from RAN1#107e are as follows for FR1. There are similar working assumptions for FR2.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * For FR1,   + 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.     - Note: RAN1 assumes REDCAP UE performing Random access in the separate DL BWP does not need to monitor paging in a BWP containing CORESET#0     - Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective   + For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,     - A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB     - A RedCap UE can indicate the following as optional capability:       * Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on for CSI-RS (working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities.   + 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.   + Note: If a separate SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs contains the entire CORESET#0, the RedCap UE shall use the bandwidth and location of the CORESET#0 in DL during initial access.   + Note: NCD-SSB periodicity is not required to be configured the same as that of CD-SSB   + Note: Periodicity of NCD-SSB shall be not less than periodicity of CD-SSB |

Regarding use of NCD-SSB in idle mode operation, RAN#94-e made the following agreement [36].

|  |
| --- |
| * Scheme 1 (i.e., UE in IDLE and INACTIVE monitors paging in an initial BWP associated with CD-SSB) is adopted for further work in Rel-17. * Scheme 2 (i.e., UE in IDLE and INACTIVE monitors paging in an initial BWP associated with NCD-SSB) is not considered further in Rel-17. |

RAN2 provided feedback [38] on the RAN1 working assumption on use of CSI-RS in DL BWPs for RedCap UEs [37]:

|  |
| --- |
| Regarding the following working assumption for FR1 and FR2 related to an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode: “A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on CSI-RS”   * The use of CSI-RS for cell/beam RLM and measurements is supported from RAN2 signalling standpoint as indicated earlier. RAN4 has informed RAN2 and RAN1 that CSI-RS cannot be used as a standalone mechanism for RRM measurements and existing requirements rely on the presence of SSB signals, in their reply LS provided in R4-2120327. RAN2 does not intend to introduce a new mechanism that would enable a RedCap UE to perform CSI-RS based RRM measurements and think that it is up to RAN4 to decide whether RAN1 working assumption regarding the use of CSI-RS in connected mode is acceptable based on the information provided above. |

RAN4 provided feedback [41] on the RAN1 working assumption on use of CSI-RS in DL BWPs for RedCap UEs [37]:

|  |
| --- |
| For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0):   * A RedCap UE that supports FG 6-1a but NOT support CSI-RS based L3 measurement operates in the BWP   + the UE can support RLM, BFD, CBD and L1 RSRP measurement based on CSI-RS if UE reports the corresponding capabilities.   + the UE can support SSB based L3 measurement but cannot support CSI-RS based L3 measurement. * A RedCap UE that supports FG 6-1a and CSI-RS based L3 measurement operates in the BWP   + the UE can support RLM, BFD, CBD and L1 RSRP measurement based on CSI-RS if UE reports the corresponding capabilities.   + the UE can support both SSB based L3 measurement and CSI-RS based L3 measurement with associated SSB.     - RAN4 will not define CSI-RS L3 based measurement requirements for Redcap 1RX UE in Rel-17. * For serving cell timing related requirements, RAN4 will not define requirements based on CSI-RS in Rel-17. |

In addition, regarding NCD-SSB properties, RAN4 provided the following feedback [40]:

|  |
| --- |
| * It is RAN4 assumption that NCD-SSB is ‘QCL’-ed with CD-SSB when the NCD-SSB and CD-SSB shares the same SSB index. |

Based on the received feedbacks, several contributions [5, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 23] propose to update the above working assumptions identified in RAN1#107e. In particular, it is proposed to remove (do not confirm) the working assumption about paging considering that in Rel-17 RedCap UE in idle/inactive mode monitors paging only in an initial BWP associated with CD-SSB. Also, a few contributions [5, 15, 16, 23] indicate that the working assumption regarding “Not need NCD-SSB” may need to be revised considering that CSI-RS is not used as a standalone mechanism for RRM measurements in Rel-17. However, two contributions [10, 19] propose to confirm the working assumption about “Not need NCD-SSB”.

Some other presented views are summarized below:

* [15]: Operation based on CSI-RS in an active BWP without either CD-SSB or NCD-SSB should not be considered in Rel-17 because RAN4 will not define requirement for it in Rel-17.
* [27]: Do not confirm the working assumption about CSI-RS and focus only on design of capability FG 6-1 by means of retuning gaps.
* [29]: The time offset of each NCD-SSB is explicitly configurable by the network, which could be different from that of CD-SSB in the same network.
* [29]: For a RedCap UE, at most one SSB can be configured within its active BWP.
* [30]: It is up to UE implementation about whether to receive the SIB when the UE retunes to CORESET0 and retunes back to separate initial UL BWP for RSRP measurement due to msg1/A retransmission.
* [33]: When initial DL BWP is shared or separate initial DL BWP contains legacy initial DL BWP, additional RedCap specific paging and RAR search space are supported.
* [35]: It is proposed update the description and figures corresponding to BWP#0 configuration for RedCap UEs in RAN2 specifications.

Some contributions discuss UE capability aspects (something which is also discussed under agenda item 8.16.6):

* [7]: Legacy behavior shall be followed that the RedCap UE can support CSI-RS based L3 measurement with associated SSB and RLM, BFD, CBD, L1 RSRP measurement based on CSI-RS if UE reports the corresponding capabilities.
* [12]: It is not necessary to either specify RedCap UE dedicated UE capability signaling or update existing UE features in the current specification which indicate the support of CSI-RS based operation for L3 measurement, RLM, BFD, CBD and L1 RSRP measurement.
* [13]: Remove “CORESET#0” or add a note in FG 6-1/6-1a/6-2/6-3/6-4. The note is “For RedCap UE, CORESET#0 here means CORESET#0 or CORESET of CSS”.
* [23]:
  + FG 1-5 (“CSI-RS based RRM measurement without associated SS-block”) is not applicable to RedCap UE.
  + FG 1-4 (“CSI-RS based RRM measurement with associated SS-block”) is not applicable to RedCap UE and add a new UE feature group(s) for RedCap UE to report its support for CSI-RS based RRM measurement with associated SSB.
    - The new UE feature group(s) is to be discussed in AI 8.16.6.
    - FG 6-1a is a prerequisite for the new UE feature group(s).

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

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 4-1: Replace the working assumption from RAN1#107e “Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective” with the following note based on the RAN plenary agreement [36]:**

* **Note (for FR1 and FR2): In Rel-17, a RedCap UE in idle/inactive mode monitors paging only in an initial BWP associated with CD-SSB.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y | We agree that paging in separate initial BWP is supported in RRC connected. Wording could be updated/simplified as follows:  **Note (for FR1 and FR2): In Rel-17, above applies only for RRC connected state.** |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | The note could be modified as follows:  Note (for FR1 and FR2): In Rel-17, a RedCap UE in idle/inactive mode monitors paging only in an initial BWP (default or RedCap-specific) associated with CD-SSB. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| FL2 | The RAN1 working assumption concerns paging in any RRC state. For idle/inactive mode, RAN2#116bis-e has already made the following agreement:   * A RedCap UE in idle/inactive mode monitors paging only in an initial BWP (default or RedCap specific) associated with CD-SSB and performs cell (re-)selection and measurements on the CD-SSB   Based on the discussion in the online (GTW) session on Monday 21st February, the following updated proposal can be considered, which replaces the RAN1 working assumption with a proposed RAN1 agreement for connected mode only.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1a: Replace the working assumption from RAN1#107e “Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective” with the following agreement:**   * **For FR1,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **For 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 FR2,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **For connected mode, if it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.** | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT |  | Not sure whether this has relationship with BWP#0 configuration option. As far as we expect, BWP#0 configuration option 1 cannot configure any UE-dedicated RRC configuration (e.g. NCD-SSB). Does this proposal mean if separate initial DL BWP is BWP#0 configuration option 1, it shall not be configured for paging in connected mode? |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| China Telecom |  | We think this proposal should be aligned with High Priority Proposal 3-1and High Priority Proposal 3-2 to avoid ambiguity. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Samsung | N | For connected mode paging reception, we wonder if there is a need to transmit paging in a separate (initial) DL BWP. Currently, there may have a case that no paging in active BWP. Since the SCS of the active BWP may not be the same as CORESET #0, it somehow requires RF processing for switching, which is similar as current situation for RedCap.  Therefore, we think there is no need to NCD-SSB and paging in separate initial DL BWP in connected mode.  If we need some agreements to replace the WA, we suggest the following proposal instead.  **If it is configured for paging for RRC\_CONNECTED mode, RedCap Ues follow the same rule as legacy Ues.** |
| LGE |  | Have a similar question to CATT. If the new FL proposal (Proposal 4-1a) is valid only for the BWP#0 configuration option 2, then we wonder if the second bullet on the RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode already covers the mandatory NCD-SSB transmission. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | If paging is configured in the separate initial DL BWP with NCD-SSB in the connected mode, in my understanding, during initial access, the separate initial DL BWP also should contain NCD-SSB, since the paging channel configuration would be changed because of one UE entering the connected mode.  However, if the separate initial DL BWP does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0, this separate initial DL BWP is only used for RACH and the UE does not need to contain SSB.  So, it is impossible that the separate initial DL BWP for RACH does not contain NCD-SSB during initial access, while this separate initial DL BWP contain NCD-SSB when the this UE enters the connected mode.  It is also impossible that paging is configured in the CORESET#0 associated with SSB during initial access, while paging is configured in separate initial DL BWP with NCD-SSB after this UE enters the connected mode.  If above understanding is right, the case in this proposal would not happen and it should not be supported. |
| Spreadtrum2 | Y |  |
| CMCC |  | With BWP configuration option2, for connected mode, no matter whether paging is configured in separate initial DL BWP, separate initial DL BWP is RRC configured BWP, NCD-SSB is expected in BWP.  With BWP configuration option1, paging is not configured in separate initial DL BWP in idle/inactive mode when separate initial DL BWP does not contain CD-SSB. In connected mode, based in definition of BWP#0 configuration option 1, we wonder how to configure paging CSS in separate initial DL BWP when there is no UE-dedicated RRC configuration. |
| Nordic | Y | Based on RAN guidance UE camps on CD-SSB. Since separate Initial DL BWP can be used in RRC connected, it may be re-configured (with sync) with paging SS after MSG4, we do not see any issue here.  If RAN2 finds further optimizations necessary, they can agree.  *ServingCellConfigCommon*  The IE *ServingCellConfigCommon* is used to configure cell specific parameters of a UE’s serving cell. The IE contains parameters which a UE would typically acquire from  SSB, MIB or SIBs when accessing the cell from IDLE. With this IE, the network provides this information in dedicated signalling when configuring a UE with a Scells or with  an additional cell group (SCG). It also provides it for SpCells (MCG and SCG) upon reconfiguration with sync. |
| Ericsson | See comments | If the proposal were to be agreed, RAN1 is essentially agreeing to have the possibility to provide NCD-SSB-related information in SI. Considering that RAN2 has already agreed to provide configuration of NCD-SSB in a dedicated BWP (see agreement copied below), perhaps whether to support paging in connected on a separate initial BWP without CD-SSB can be decided in RAN2.  *RAN2#116bis-e*   * *In RRC connected mode NCD-SSB may be configured for a RedCap UE in dedicated DL BWP.* |
| Intel | Y | To respond to the questions/comments from CATT and LGE: this can apply even for BWP#0 option 1 as clarified in our response related to FL2 Proposal 3-1. Common RRC (SIB signaling) can be used to configure NCD-SSB in such a case as well. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FL3 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered, which replaces the RAN1 working assumption with a proposed RAN1 agreement for BWP#0 configuration option 2 and connected mode only.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1b: Replace the working assumption from RAN1#107e “Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective” with the following agreement:**   * **For FR1,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **For BWP#0 configuration option 2, for 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 FR2,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **For BWP#0 configuration option 2, for connected mode, if it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.** | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| vivo |  | According to our understanding, BWP#0 configuration option 2 is also an RRC-configured BWP, therefore the updated proposal seems to be covered already by the agreement made in last meeting (as below). Or does it intend to say that RedCap UE always expect NCD-SSB regardless of its capability (FG6-1, or 6-1a), if paging monitoring is configured?   * + For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,     - A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB     - A RedCap UE can indicate the following as optional capability:       * Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on for CSI-RS (working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities. |
| Spreadtrum5 |  | Share the similar view as vivo. |
| Apple |  | Per TS 38.331, the BWP#0 configuration option 2 is treated as RRC-configured BWP and consequently has been covered by the agreement highlighted by vivo, i.e., presence of NCD-SSB depends on the support of FG 6-1 or FG 6-1A.  Note sure about the intention of the new agreement. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Xiaomi |  | Same understanding with vivo. It seems this proposal contradicts with the achieved agreement mentioned by vivo |
| CATT | Minor update | Things seem to be a little overturned…  We have no doubt that BWP#0 configuration option 2 can configure NCD-SSB and paging CSS together. But the current version, as pointed out by vivo, seems always mandating configuring NCD-SSB for paging, even if the RedCap UE supports FG 6-1a (or FG 6-1a with CSI-RS). This is not the original intention.  Can we make it more clear, i.e. valid for basic capability RedCap UE:  **For BWP#0 configuration option 2, for connected mode, if it is configured for paging, RedCap UE** **supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a)** **expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.** |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Our understanding is that the FL proposal refers to the case that the UE does not support BWP without restriction/SSB. |
| Samsung | N | We don’t see the need for new agreement, we share similar view with Apple. |
| CMCC | N | With BWP configuration option2, for connected mode, no matter whether paging is configured in separate initial DL BWP, separate initial DL BWP is RRC configured BWP, NCD-SSB is expected in BWP. This proposal is contained in agreement in last meeting and is not necessary. |
| LGE |  | Not against this FL proposal, but as we commented in the previous round, and similar to vivo and many other companies, we think the second bullet on the RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode already covers the mandatory NCD-SSB transmission. |
| Nordic | Y | The update from CATT/HW has not been part of original agreement. There is nothing broken with the WA in RRC connected mode. FL proposal should be agreed. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | Not sure about the intention of this proposal. The NCD-SSB transmission within the BWP#0 with configuration option 2 (i.e., RRC-configured active BWP) depends on the support for FG 6-1 or FG 6-1a. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | In our understanding of BWP#0 option 2, dedicated BWPs are configured as mentioned by other companies. It is unclear whether the separate initial DL BWP would be used in connected mode. |
| Ericsson |  | Agree with Vivo and Apple regarding that the above proposal is already captured in a way in the agreement from RAN1#107-e under the sub-bullet on “For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode”.  @Vivo: Regarding “does it intend to say that RedCap UE always expect NCD-SSB regardless of its capability (FG6-1, or 6-1a), if paging monitoring is configured?”, we believe the intention is rather to capture that for RedCap UEs not supporting FG 6-1a, if the RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0 (in FR1), the UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB. |
| Intel | Y | We acknowledge the observation from vivo, and in our understanding the proposal now aims to ensure NCD-SSB in the separate initial DL BWP w/o CD-SSB when paging monitoring is configured, regardless of UE capability of FG 6-1a.  We think the additional requirement on NCD-SSB in context of paging monitoring is necessary, especially if FG 6-1a for RedCap will require measurement gaps. |
| FL4 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal was considered in the online (GTW) session on Wednesday 23rd February.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1c: The following working assumptions from RAN1#107-e are NOT confirmed.**   * **For FR1,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective** * **For FR2,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective** | |
| FL5 | Based on the discussion in the online (GTW) session on Wednesday 23rd February and on the RAN1 email reflector, the following updated proposal can be considered, where the working assumption is removed for idle/inactive mode but kept for connected mode.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1d: Replace the working assumption from RAN1#107e “Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective” with the following agreement:**   * **For FR1,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **Working assumption: For 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 FR2,**   + **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **Working assumption: For connected mode, if it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB.** | |
| Vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | FFS | Prefer to make it clearer. True, for idle/inactive mode, this WA cannot be confirmed. But we observe 3 possible interpretations to deal with connected mode:  (1) Connected mode paging always requires NCD-SSB, regardless of the RedCap UE supports FG 6-1a or not.  (2) Connected mode paging requires NCD-SSB for RedCap UEs supporting FG 6-1 only; it does NOT require NCD-SSB if it supports FG 6-1a.  (3) Connected mode paging requires CD-SSB, regardless of RedCap UE capability. In this case, connected mode paging cannot be configured in separate initial DL BWP, if it does not contain CD-SSB.  It seems the current proposal is suggesting interpretation (1)? But we feel that interpretation (2) is more technically correct and aligned with connected mode behavior. (3) may be a little restrictive, we admit. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | Proposal 4-1d makes more sense and we support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum6 | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Samsung | N | We don’t see the need of this agreement, we think in connect mode, this just a special case as general DL reception, i.e., gNB should provide a proper configuration based on UE’s capability, e.g., FG 6-1a.  As we commented before, current spec doesn’t preclude gNB to configure a paging CSS in an active BWP without CD-SSB in connect mode. Although the bandwidth of initial BWP and the active BWP are within the UE RF bandwidth, since it might have different SCS, UE still needs to some adjustment on RF. Therefore, we think the situation is quite similar as now for RedCap UEs. We don’t see the need to further change the spec for RedCap UE. The network is expected to provide proper configuration to the UE based on its capability.  Therefore, there is no need for such agreement and no need to update the spec for paging in connected mode. |
| CMCC |  | We share similar view with CATT. For connected mode, paging reception is similar as normal PDCCH/PDSCH reception, so when UE supporting FG 6-1a, it will not expect NCD-SSB regardless paging is configured or not. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We share the similar view with Samsung.  For the interpretation (2) from CATT, it is same understanding with Samsung, which is actually based on the UE capability 6-1 or 6-1a.  So, what we need to propose is that  **For BWP#0 configuration option 1,**   * **If only RACH is configured in separate initial DL BWP, RedCap UE does not expect it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell (which is discussed in Question 3-1b)** * **If paging is configured in separate initial DL BWP, whether RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell depends on the UE capability 6-1 or 6-1a** |
| LGE | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | We are also open to additional clarification as CMCC/CATT mention |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Ericsson | N | Time has come to resolve the Was rather than coming up with new ones. It is unlikely that RAN2 will specify a solution to provide NCD-SSB related information for the separate initial DL BWP at this late stage in the WI. Therefore, we support Proposal 4-1c (and not Proposal 4-1d). |
| Qualcomm | Y | We also agree with the comments of Ericsson on resolving the Was of RAN1#107.  To resolve the pending issue above, we think it is a good idea to clarify the Was are not confirmed for idle/inactive mode. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We also support additional clarification for RedCap UE with 6-1 or 6-1a capability |
| Intel |  | Considering the points from CATT, option (2) from CATT seems reasonable – that is UE’s support (or lack of) FG 6-1a would determine its expectation on NCD-SSB, regardless of paging configuration.  **Thus, we are also now okay to support the earlier version of the proposal, i.e., Proposal 4-1c.** |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| FL6  FL7  FL8 | Based on the received responses, it seems that the proposed working assumption for connected mode in Proposal 4-1d may have significant implications on, e.g., the RAN2 signaling solution. For example, it may require that the NCD-SSB configuration is provided in SIB rather than just in UE-specific RRC configuration.  Both when it comes to legacy NR and existing RedCap agreements, FGs 6-1 and 6-1a concern UE-specific RRC-configured BWPs, not initial BWPs. Considering the limited time left in this WI, it seems like a potentially rather big step to make FG 6-1a for RedCap applicable also for this special use of an initial DL BWP for paging in connected mode.  From previous discussion rounds, it seems to be common understanding that the proposed working assumption for connected mode in Proposal 4-1d is only relevant for BWP#0 configuration option 1, since for BWP#0 configuration option 2, an RRC-configured active DL BWP would instead be used in connected mode.  Given the above considerations, the feature lead would like to propose that the following updated proposal is considered.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1e:**   * **The following working assumptions from RAN1#107-e are NOT confirmed.**   + **For FR1,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective**   + **For FR2,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective** * **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, for a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode, paging can only be configured if it contains CD-SSB.** | |
| Spreadtrum7 |  | The center frequencies of BWP#0 and BWP#x (x>0) are not aligned. For BWP#0 configuration option 1, if RedCap UE has to monitor Type2-PDCCH in BWP#0, it will retune RF for BWP switch. In this regard, it seems more straightforward that RedCap UE monitors Type2-PDCCH in CORESET#0 like that in idle/inactive mode. Maybe Scheme 1 can be extended to CONNECTED mode.   |  | | --- | | Scheme 1 (i.e. UE in IDLE and INACTIVE monitors paging in an initial BWP associated with CD-SSB) is adopted for further work in Rel-17. Scheme 2 (i.e. UE in IDLE and INACTIVE monitors paging in an initial BWP associated with NCD-SSB) is not considered further in Rel-17. |   We would like to hear other companies’ opinions. |
| Vivo | Modification required | There have been concern express by multiple companies that reverting the above working assumption without clarification may cause misunderstanding about the CONNECTED mode behavior, as the working assumption itself is not restricted to IDLE/INACTIVE mode only. We think adding a note as below would be necessary to resolve such concern.  In addition, for the BWP#0 configuration option1 and RRC\_CONNECTED mode, in order to allow paging monitoring, we think NCD-SSB should also be possible. Suggest to change CD-SSB to SSB.   * **The following working assumptions from RAN1#107-e are NOT confirmed.**   + **For FR1,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective**   + **For FR2,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective** * **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, for a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode, paging can only be configured if it contains ~~CD-~~SSB.** * Note: According to the previous agreement, a RedCap UE in RRC\_CONNECTED mode supporting FG6-1 (but not [FG6-1a]) can expect NCD-SSB for the serving cell but not CORSET#0/SIB on a separate initial DL BWP configured by BWP#0 configuration option 2. |
| CATT |  | (1) Regarding the new bullet, we agree…  (2) Regarding the case of BWP#0 configuration option **2**, if FL’s explanation above (*since for BWP#0 configuration option 2, an RRC-configured active DL BWP would instead be used in connected mode.*) means interpretation (2) as following:  **For BWP#0 configuration option 2, for a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0), for a RedCap UE configured to monitor paging in connected mode:**   * **RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB if it only supports the mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a).** * **RedCap UE does not expect it to contain NCD-SSB if it supports the optional FG 6-1a.**   This seems to be the complete form of vivo’s note. |
| DOCOMO |  | We are fine with the first bullet. For the second bullet, we don’t think such restriction is necessary in connected mode according to the LS reply, but open to discuss. |
| CMCC |  | If proposal 3-1c end up with: BWP configuration option1 is supported and for connected UEs without FG6-1a capability, network will provide NCD-SSB, then paging can also be supported on this.  But for UEs with optional capability of 6-1a, we think paging can be configured regardless of SSB.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1e:**   * **The following working assumptions from RAN1#107-e are NOT confirmed.**   + **For FR1,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective**   + **For FR2,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective** * **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, for a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode without optional capability of not need NCD-SSB, paging can only be configured if it contains ~~CD-~~SSB. For a RedCap UE in connected mode with optional capability of not need NCD-SSB, paging can be configured regardless of SSB present.** |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We have similar view as **Proposal 3-1c** |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Another note is preferred:  **UE does not need to perform RF retuning between paging reception and SIB reception.** |
| Intel | Y | We support the updates from vivo as well as the suggested additions from CATT and CMCC. |
| FL9 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1f:**   * **The following working assumptions from RAN1#107-e are NOT confirmed.**   + **For FR1,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective**   + **For FR2,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective** * **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, for a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode, paging can only be configured if it contains ~~CD-~~SSB.** * **Note: For BWP#0 configuration option 2,**   + **For FR1,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0), if it is configured for paging,**       * **A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB**       * **A RedCap UE supporting FG 6-1a does not expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB**   + **For FR2,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~), if it is configured for paging,**       * **A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB**       * **A RedCap UE supporting FG 6-1a does not expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB** | |
| Qualcomm |  | We are fine with the note for BWP#0 configuration option 2  For consistency, the main bullet should be clarified as:   * **The following working assumptions from RAN1#107-e are NOT confirmed for idle/inactive state.** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| MediaTek 9 | Y (with modification) | The WA was agreed for paging in all RRC states. Only idle/inactive modes were revoked in later RAN plenary and RAN2 meetings. This means Proposal 4-1d should have been agreed.  As a compromise, we can support Proposal 4-1f with Qualcomm’s suggested revision. |
| Vivo |  | We think the updated proposal looks good in general. We support the additional revision as suggested by Qualcomm above. |
| CATT | Y | Long but accurate. |
| Samsung |  | Thanks for the efforts and all the discussion.  We are not sure on the following bullet,   * **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, for a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode, paging can only be configured if it contains ~~CD-~~SSB.**   With this bullet, does this mean SIB configured CSS for paging will be supported? Currently RAN 2 doesn’t not agree on NCD-SSB configuration in SIB yet. So, does this mean, SSB here can only be CD-SSB? Or, it also includes a situation that UE is configured with a DL BWP in connect mode with NCD-SSB, which is overlapped with the separate initial DL BWP?  We would like add clarification that   * **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, for a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode, paging can only be configured if it contains ~~CD-~~SSB.**   + This doesn’t imply CSS for paging or NCD-SSB can be configured in SIB   With all the notes clarification in this and previous proposals, all we want to say is that, gNB shall configure NCD-SSB based on UE’s capability. We really don’t think this kind of issues worthwhile to be discussed…. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We support the proposal. Also fine with Qualcomm’s update. |
| CATT2 |  | Qualcomm’s update is OK to us.  We agree with Samsung’s new sub-bullet, to avoid any misinterpretation.  We do not agree if deleting ~~CD-~~SSB means allow configuring NCD-SSB in SIB1. |
| Xiaomi | Generally Y  but | We have one question for clarification on the following text   * **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, for a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode, paging can only be configured if it contains ~~CD-~~SSB.**   Does this bullet apply to all RedCap UEs or only apply to RedCap UEs supporting FG6-1 (not supporting FG6-1)  In our understanding, this bullet is related to the Note of **Proposal 3-1d.** E.g., if RedCap supporting FG6-1a can be scheduled on BWP without SSB, then paging can be received on this BWP as well. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | A clarification on our understanding for the following sentence  **“paging can only be configured if it contains ~~CD-~~SSB”**  It means the UE specific paging can be configured in a separate initial DL BWP in connected mode, instead of SIB configuration. |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| CMCC |  | For BWP0 configuration option2, no problem, since there is one sentence below in 38.331,  *With the second option (illustrated by figure B2-2 below), the BWP#0 is considered to be an RRC-configured BWP.*  So it is obvious that the UE behavior will follow agreements made in RAN1#107e for RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode.  For BWP0# configuration option1, we think a simple way to define connected UE behavior for BWP option1 is that the reception of both data and paging are based on UE capability, since we don’t see any difference between paging reception and data reception, both including PDCCH and PDSCH.  Our analysis about whether to configure paging for BWP0 configuration option 1 is as following.  For BWP0 configuration option1,   * When it contains CD-SSB, the operation is simple. * When it does not contain CD-SSB, and gNB doesn’t want UE to receive paging on this BWP, it will not configure paging for it. If gNB wants to provide paging for connected UEs with optional capability on this BWP, how to realized this?   Since paging SS is configured in BWP-DownlinkCommon—>PDCCH-ConfigCommon, and the description in TS38.331 for BWP-downlinkCommon is that,  *The IE BWP-DownlinkCommon is used to configure the common parameters of a downlink BWP. They are “cell specific” and the network ensures the necessary alignment with corresponding parameters of other UEs. The common parameters of the initial bandwidth part of the Pcell are also provided via system information.*  So we understand that gNB has to configure this for all UEs and also configure it in SIB.  Then for connected UEs, since NCD-SSB configuration in SIB is not supported currently as Samsung pointed out, UE with FG6-1 can not monitor paging when BWP0 contains no SSB. But UE with FG6-1a can monitor paging on this BWP to avoid re-tuning for paging if current active BWP is BWP0.  The corresponding modification is as following,   * **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, for a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode, whether paging ~~can~~ is monitored depending on whether optional capability of “not need NCD-SSB” is supported when it does not ~~only be configured if it~~ contains ~~CD-~~SSB.**   And according to above analysis, the application case for this BWP option1 for paging reception is limited, since connected UEs can select any PO during one paging cycle to get SI update information. It can get SI update when it works on other active BWP since we have also discussed the limited use case for BWP0 option 1 before.  So although our first preference is depending on UE capability, we can also accept no paging configuration for BWP0 configuration opiton1 without CD-SSB for progress. It is better that the SSB is changed back to CD-SSB, since currently, NCD-SSB cannot be configured with BWP0 configuration option1.   * **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, for a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode, paging can only be configured if it contains CD-SSB.** |
| Panasonic | Y | We support the revision from Qualcomm. |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum9 | Basically Y | Just reminder: There is no “CD” or “NCD” in draft 38.213 for RedCap (R1-2112935). “CD” or “NCD” in this agreement may not be captured in 38.213? |
| LGE | Y | Also okay with the Qualcomm’s update. |
| NEC | Y | We are fine with Qualcomm’s update. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are also OK with Qualcomm’s update. |
| Intel | Y | Also support the update from Qualcomm. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | Also OK with Qualcomm’s revision |
| Apple | Y | Support Qualcomm’s update to make it clearer. |
| FL10 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1g:**   * **The following working assumptions from RAN1#107-e are NOT confirmed for idle/inactive mode and furthermore they are replaced by the agreements further down for connected mode.**   + **For FR1,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective**   + **For FR2,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective** * **For BWP#0 configuration option 1, for a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode, paging can only be configured if it contains CD-SSB.** * **Note: For BWP#0 configuration option 2,**   + **For FR1,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0), if it is configured for paging,**       * **A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB**       * **A RedCap UE supporting FG 6-1a does not expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB**   + **For FR2,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~), if it is configured for paging,**       * **A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB**       * **A RedCap UE supporting FG 6-1a does not expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB** | |
| vivo |  | Fine with the latest proposal for progress |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y | For the sake of progress, we can accept the proposal. |
| CATT | Y | The current version seems consistent with CMCC’s exhaustive analysis and reasonable suggestion in the previous round. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Samsung |  | Suggest to separate the “not confirmed WA parts” and “new proposal parts”, since it is a little bit hard to read.  We can accept the proposal for the sake of progress. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | For the following case, there is possibility that the BWP#0 does not cover corset#0 but cover CD-SSB, however it is not desirable for UE to read Paging on BWP#0 but then CORESET#0 somewhere else with retuning for SI update. Suggestion below   * **~~For BWP#0 configuration option 1,~~ for a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode, paging can only be configured if it contains CD-SSB and entire CORESET#0.** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum10 | Y | To be symmetric.  **~~Note:~~ For BWP#0 configuration option 2,** |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| FL11 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered, where the BWP#0 configuration option 1 case has been split into FR1/FR2 subcases. Note that the BWP#0 configuration option 2 case is indicated as a ‘Note’ since it only reflects an earlier agreement.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1h:**   * **The following working assumptions from RAN1#107-e are NOT confirmed for idle/inactive mode and furthermore they are replaced by the agreements further down for connected mode.**   + **For FR1,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective**   + **For FR2,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**       * **Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective** * **For BWP#0 configuration option 1,**    + **For FR1,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode, paging can only be configured if it contains CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0.**   + **For FR2,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode, paging can only be configured if it contains CD-SSB.** * **Note: For BWP#0 configuration option 2,**   + **For FR1,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0), if it is configured for paging,**       * **A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB**       * **A RedCap UE supporting FG 6-1a does not expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB**   + **For FR2,**     - **For a separate initial DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~), if it is configured for paging,**       * **A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB**       * **A RedCap UE supporting FG 6-1a does not expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB** | |
| FL12 | The online (GTW) session on Tuesday 1st March made the following agreement.  Agreement:   * The following working assumptions from RAN1#107-e are NOT confirmed for idle/inactive mode and furthermore they are replaced by the agreements further down for connected mode.   + For FR1,     - For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,       * Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective   + For FR2,     - For a separate initial DL BWP (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,       * Working assumption: If it is configured for paging, RedCap UE expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB from RAN1 perspective * For BWP#0 configuration option 1,   + For FR1,     - For a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode, paging can only be configured if it contains CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0.   + For FR2,     - For a separate initial DL BWP, for a RedCap UE in connected mode, paging can only be configured if it contains CD-SSB. * Note: For BWP#0 configuration option 2,   + For FR1,     - For a separate initial DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0), if it is configured for paging,       * A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB       * A RedCap UE supporting FG 6-1a does not expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB   + For FR2,     - For a separate initial DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~), if it is configured for paging,       * A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB       * A RedCap UE supporting FG 6-1a does not expect it to contain SSB/CORESET#0/SIB | |

Based on the online (GTW) session for agenda item 8.16.6 (on the RedCap UE feature list) on Monday 21st February, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL2 High Priority Proposal 4-1-1: A RedCap UE supports NCD-SSB based operation (including NCD-SSB based measurements) in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Y | We support FL2 proposal. It has no conflict with RAN1#107 agreements for NCD-SSB in terms of RedCap UE’s capability for SSB-based measurements. Moreover, the proposal is consistent with the reply LS from RAN2 and RAN4 on RedCap UE’s use of NCD-SSB of serving cell in the RRC-configured DL BWP. |
| CATT |  | Open to hear more views. But our first impression is that this proposal mandates a RedCap UE to support NCD-SSB based operations. We are OK if the majority is fine with it. |
| vivo | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Samsung |  | We think it can be an optional feature, considering the potential support of FG 6-1a. |
| LGE | Y | In our view, a RedCap UE shall at least support FG 6-1 as a baseline. If this is a common understanding, then what is proposed in the FL proposal should be a basic feature or a component of a basic FG. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Or modified by below to align with the previous agreements;  **RedCap UE supports NCD-SSB based operation (including NCD-SSB based measurements) in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB if the UE does not indicate support of BWP without SSB.**  Or nothing needs to be additionally agreed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We can wait for the RAN2 progress since it is in the discussion. |
| Spreadtrum2 | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y | We support FL’s proposal.  In fact, our perception of the previous agreement is more towards that all RedCap UEs expect SSB on an RRC-configured BWP, because in the following sub-bullet it says a RedCap UE can “***in addition optionally.***” But if this is different understand than the majority view, we are open to discuss.  Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can ***in addition optionally*** support relevant operation based on for CSI-RS (working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y | “A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB”  Even though UE supporting FG 6-1a does not require NCD-SSB, it still shall support NCD-SSB **as per mandatory feature group FG 6-1,** if gNB configures it with NCD-SSB but not with measuring gaps, every RedCap UE must function. This is why we have mandatory features. |
| Ericsson | Y | It could be clarified that the feature is mandatory for RedCap UEs. |
| Intel | Y | Same view as MTK and Nordic that it should be a mandatory capability following from the agreement in RAN1 #107-e. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FL3 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1-1a: A RedCap UE supports NCD-SSB based operation (including NCD-SSB based measurements) as a mandatory feature in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.** | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum5 | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y but | it needs to be conditioned that:  In frequency domain, a UE does not needs to handle more than one SSB on a BWP, since now companies view that both CD-SSB and NCD-SSB should be capable which should not be interpreted as capable of processing two SSBs (despite the possibility of scenarios);  In time domain, a configurable time offset between NCD-SSB and CD-SSB should be supported as well, since two SSBs transmitted at the same time will significantly increase the gNB Tx power and may cause interference for UE to measure, also may cause negative impact on the other channels/signals transmission considering that simultaneous power boosting for multiple SSBs will lead to lower power for other channels/signals. |
| CMCC |  | This proposal is consistent with the prior agreement about SSB. We want to align the understanding of the proposal, when optional capability based on FG6-1a and CSI-RS is reported, RedCap UE can do not perform NCD-SSB based operation in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB. |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We are not sure whether all the NCD-SSB based operation is mandatory, e.g., serving cell measurement discussed in RAN2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | Regarding Huawei’s comments, the configurable time-offset between NCD-SSB and CD-SSB is currently being discussed in RAN2/RAN4. So, we do not see a need to discuss this in RAN1 for now.  Regarding CMCC’s comments, our understanding is that if NCD-SSB is configured in the DL BWP but whatever configuration that is needed to support “Not need NCD-SSB” is not configured, then the UE should use NCD-SSB. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| FL4  FL5 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered again.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1-1a: A RedCap UE supports NCD-SSB based operation (including NCD-SSB based measurements) as a mandatory feature in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.** | |
| Vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | To solve ZTE’s concern, may be minor update can be considered.  **A RedCap UE supports the existing NCD-SSB based operation (including NCD-SSB based measurements) as a mandatory feature in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | The ‘operation’ needs to be complete to formulate a mandatory feature. Thus our previous comments apply.  @Ericsson  Thanks for letting us know. What we also see from previous RAN2 meeting is that  Agreements:   1. The network may provide absoluteFrequencySSB and ssb-periodicity explicitly for NCD-SSB, i.e., other properties such as PCI, ssb-PBCH-BlockPower, ssb-PositionsInBurst are configured with the same values from serving cell’s CD-SSB. FFS for the time offset (feedback from RAN1 might also be received)   Therefore, despite RAN2 is discussing it, we see the need to provide view from RAN1 perspective especially because NCD-SSB operation is generated from RAN1. |
| Apple | N | The proposal should be concrete, instead of approving a bucket of features without knowing the details.  As one example, the following SSB-based features are defined in Rel-15:   * FG 1-1: SSB-based RRM measurement🡺 Mandatory without UE capability * FG1-2: SS block based SINR measurement (SS-SINR) 🡺 Optional with capability signalling * FG 1-3: SS block based RLM 🡺 Mandatory with capability signalling which shall be set to ‘1’   For NCD-SSB, the mandatory features defined for CD-SSB can be maintained and re-used to maximize the NCD-SSB utilization and efficiency. However, there is no reason to force Redcap UE to implement an SSB-related feature even optional for normal Rel-15 UE e.g., FG 1-2.  In summary, we are ok to mandate the FG 1-1 and FG 1-3 for ‘NCD-SSB’ for Redcap UE. However, the FG1-2 should be kept as optional as it defined for CD-SSB.  The following modification reflects our position:  **(Modified) Proposal 4-1-1a:**   * **A RedCap UE supports NCD-SSB based RRM measurement and NCD-SSB based RLM operations ~~(including NCD-SSB based measurements)~~ as a mandatory feature in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.** * **A RedCap UE supports NCD-SSB based SINR measurement as ‘Optional with capability signalling’ feature in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.** |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum6 | Y |  |
| NEC | Y | We are also fine to make “NCD-SSB based operation” more specific. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| LGE |  | We are fine with the FL proposal in principle, but we also think some update is needed. The update from Apple is fine, or if we want to avoid explicitly listing those features, we could also consider the wording as suggested below:  **High Priority Proposal 4-1-1a: A RedCap UE supports existing mandatory feature(s) on the ~~NCD-~~SSB based operation using NCD-SSB (including NCD-SSB based measurements) as a mandatory feature(s) in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.** |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| MediaTek | N | We share a similar view with Apple: Only mandatory SSB related features in R15 should be mandated to RedCap.  Since the intention of the proposal to *mandate* RedCap UE to support NCD-SSB based operation, in our opinion, only the first bullet from Apple’s proposal is needed. We hence copy and modify Apple’s proposal as follows:  **(Modified-2) Proposal 4-1-1a:**   * **A RedCap UE supports NCD-SSB based RRM measurement and NCD-SSB based RLM operations ~~(including NCD-SSB based measurements)~~ as a mandatory feature in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.** |
| Ericsson | Y | We are also supportive of the update from LGE. We do not prefer to explicitly list the features in the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Y | We also support the proposal of LGE for clarification |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are fine with the update from LGE |
| Intel | Y | Also support LGE’s or Apple’s versions. |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Apple2 |  | To make progress, we can compromise with LGE’s version if concern raised on the completion of list proposed by us. |
| FL6 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1-1b: A RedCap UE supports existing mandatory feature(s) that are based on SSB using NCD-SSB ~~based operation~~ (including NCD-SSB based measurements) as ~~a~~ mandatory feature(s) in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.** | |
| Spreadtrum7 | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y | We support the proposal.  If companies prefer an explicit list of features, the following proposal is also fine with us.  **(Modified) Proposal 4-1-1b:**   * **A RedCap UE supports existing mandatory SSB-based RLM and SSB-based RRM measurement using NCD-SSB mandatory features in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.** |
| Vivo | Y | Having this agreement ASAP will facilitate the RAN1 UE feature and RAN4 RRM discussion next week. |
| Xiaomi | Y | We have slight preference on MTK’s proposal since it is more specific. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | As we commented in the previous round, we do not prefer to explicitly list the features in the proposal. |
| FL7  FL8 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1-1c: A RedCap UE supports existing applicable mandatory feature(s) that are based on SSB using NCD-SSB ~~based operation~~ (including NCD-SSB based measurements) as ~~a~~ mandatory feature(s) in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.** | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y if | Proposed modifications can be added:  A UE is not required to handle more than one SSB in a same BWP and a RedCap UE also mandatory support time offset between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| FL9 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1-1d:**   * **A RedCap UE supports existing applicable mandatory feature(s) that are based on SSB using NCD-SSB (including NCD-SSB based measurements) as mandatory feature(s) in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.** * **A UE is not required to handle more than one SSB in a same BWP and a RedCap UE also mandatory support time offset between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB.** | |
| Qualcomm | N | We are fine with the first bullet.  We cannot accept the second bullet, which is about the configuration of NCD-SSB and has nothing to do with the capabilities of RedCap UE.  Can the proponent clarify why “the offset between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB is mandatory” ? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | We thank QC comments on further understanding of the proposal.  The intention is to make the whole NCD-SSB operation workable in real networks. It is not possible to mandate CD-SSB and NCD-SSB always Tx at the same time instance and with the same periodicity, from gNB point of view. Thus we have the proposal. Also since for CD-SSB the time location is blind detected, having the location of NCD-SSB be explicitly configurable instead of blindly detected is the most natural approach to enable non-overlapping CD-SSB and NCD-SSB.  Configuration possibility is always part of UE feature discussion, for example, whether common PUCH FH is configurable. If this is uncomfortable, we can also propose to say: enabling of different time locations of NCD-SSB from CD-SSB. Either this or the below or the FL proposal is fine with us.   * **Explicitly configurable for the periodicity of NCD-SSB and time domain location within a period (no change to the existing SSB pattern).**   One more additional aspect is to confirm RAN4 LS about the QCL assumption  *NCD-SSB is ‘QCL’-ed with CD-SSB when the NCD-SSB and CD-SSB shares the same SSB index.* |
| MediaTek 9 | Y to First bullet | We support the first bullet in Proposal 4-1-1d.  For the second bullet, we would like to know how it is related to the first bullet and why the two have to be bundled together for discussion.  Specifically, we have the following questions for proponents for 2nd bullet.   1. Can you explain more why it is impossible for gNB to transmit CD-SSB and NCD-SSB at the same time instance and with the same periodicity? 2. How many candidate values for time offset are in your mind? 3. For UE in connected, the timing of its serving cell is clear. Then for a connected UE, the time offset, if any, should be clear as well. Why does a UE operating in an active BWP with NCD-SSB need to care about CD-SSB and the time offset between CD-SSB and NC-SSB? For NCD-SSB based measurements in serving cell, I don’t see how the second bullet is related to the first bullet. Maybe it is the neighboring cells that you identify the connection between the two bullets? Can you please explain more in details? |
| Vivo |  | We think the 2nd bullet cause confusion. In our understanding, specification shall not prevent the NW to configure more than one SSB in the same BWP, meaning that the case with two SSB within the DL BWP is not an error case, but a given UE is not required to measure both. However, the current sentence seems to mean that the configuration is invalid. We are fine to support time offset configuration between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB.  We could accept the proposal with the following **update**  **Updated High Priority Proposal 4-1-1d:**   * **A RedCap UE supports existing applicable mandatory feature(s) that are based on SSB using NCD-SSB (including NCD-SSB based measurements) as mandatory feature(s) in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.** * **A UE is not required to ~~handle~~ perform measurements on more than one SSB in a same BWP and a RedCap UE also mandatory support time offset between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB.** |
| CATT | Y | No problem to the 1st bullet.  For 2nd bullet, we do not find serious issues. But to clarify, RAN2 seems agreed that NCD-SSB indication follows CD-SSB (i.e. using *ssb-PositionsInBurst* bitmap), while the periodicity can be independent (and longer).  So for this ‘time offset’, is it going to just introduce an offset parameter with FFS values? Or extending the bitmap of *ssb-PositionsInBurst*? Or we leave it to RAN2? |
| Samsung | N for second  Y for first | For the second bullet, we cannot agree on “time offset between CD-/NCD-SSB”. We don’t think that had been discussed in RAN 1. We don’t know whether this is feasible or not. It may cause many issues, e.g., whether RedCap UE or any UE who can read NCD-SSB shall treat both CD/NCD-SSB as semi-DL all the time?  Fine with first bullet. |
| DOCOMO | Y for 1st  N for 2nd | We support the 1st bullet.  Regarding the 2nd bullet, we are fine that time domain configurations of NCD-SSB are configurable independent from that of CD-SSB. However, we cannot agree that a RedCap UE always expect the time offset between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB. It should be up to gNB implementation that CD-SSB and NCD-SSB can be transmitted at the same time. |
| Xiaomi | Y for 1st  N for 2nd | In our understanding , whether offset is configured between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB is NW implementation issue. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | For the second bullet, this is discussed in RAN2. If we want some feedback to RAN2, a separate issue discussion is needed.  For the first bullet, as we mentioned, the following agreement is achieved,. This bullet seem not to be so necessary.  Agreements: (no spec impact)   * For the RedCap UE capabilities, current definition of Rel-15/16 L1 UE capabilities mandatory without capability signalling in TR38.822 is reused by default, unless any update is agreed   + Note: UE capabilities related to CA, DC and wider max UE bandwidth are not applicable to RedCap UEs   + FFS: whether any L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability signalling are not applicable to RedCap UEs   Anyway, we are fine with it if majority are fine. |
| Nordic | Y for 1st  N for 2nd | We do not understand what is the issue with transmitting NCD and CD SSB at the same time. We prefer to keep the timing the same. |
| CMCC | Y | We are fine to configure the time location of NCD-SSB, the detail of configuration such as period and time offset can have a further discussion. |
| Panasonic | Y for first  N for second | We have same question from Qualcomm, i.e. can the proponent clarify why “the offset between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB is mandatory” ? |
| Spreadtrum9 | N for second | Concerns on the second bullet.   1. For AGC/sync, UE perform AGC/sync autonomously even if there are CD-SSB and NCD-SSB simultaneously. In RAN1 spec, NCD-SSB is not the new thing at all. It can occur in R15/R16 from perspective of PHY layer 2. For measurement, if measurement configurations (e.g. SMTC) cover both CD-SSB and NCD-SSB, it is up to UE implementation to process, e.g. select the SSB in the active DL BWP. |
| LGE |  | Support only the first bullet.  We prefer to separate the first and second bullet. We are still not convinced that there is an issue in transmitting the CD-SSB and NCD-SSB at the same time. We are open for further discussion, but we don’t agree if someone argues that the first and second bullets should be treated at the same time. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y for 1st  N for 2nd | We cannot agree on the mandatory support for time offset and also do not see why the second bullet should be treated together with the first (as this is a matter of network configuration). |
| Intel | Y for 1st  N for 2nd | Similar question as others – the second bullet can be discussed separately in our view, and in terms of formulation for the multiple SSB part, we agree with vivo that it should not be formulated as a network configuration restriction. |
| Ericsson | Y | We propose the following minor updates to the second bullet:   * **A RedCap UE is not required to handle more than one SSB at a time in a same BWP and a RedCap UE also mandatorily supports time offset between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB.**   Note that a similar agreement has already been made in RAN2 during RAN2#117-e: *A RedCap UE may be configured with multiple NCD-SSBs, but only one per BWP (FFS on what “only one per BWP” means).* |
| Apple | Y for 1st | We are not against 2nd proposal and open to discuss it.  Our problem is that we should go ‘step-by-step’ as usual in 3GPP. The UE feature discussion in 3GPP generally determines which of these **agreed** features/functions UE is mandatorily support or optionally support. However, RAN1 did not agree the timing relation between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB yet. We have to agree the support of configurable timing relation and then discuss whether this UE feature is mandatory or not.  If the ‘timing offset’ UE feature comes from RAN2 agreement, it is more nature to capture it into RAN2 UE features as we do not know what the justification is when RAN2 agreed and how strong it is. It is a bit wired for us to capture RAN2 agreement into RAN1 UE features.  Again, the 2nd bullet should not be coupled with 1st bullet. Instead, it should be separately discussed. We can create a new feature for it and even added into Basic FG for Redcap if the justification is made. However, it is premature to add it into this proposal at this moment. |
| FL10 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered, where the first main bullet has a new sub-bullet on QCL is added based on the reply from RAN4 in the LS in [R1-2200898](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2200898.zip). Among the received responses, there was very little support for treating the two main bullets together, so the second main bullet has been turned into a new separate Proposal 4-1-2.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1-1e:**   * **A RedCap UE supports existing applicable mandatory feature(s) that are based on SSB using NCD-SSB (including NCD-SSB based measurements) as mandatory feature(s) in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.**   + **NCD-SSB is ‘QCL’-ed with CD-SSB when the NCD-SSB and CD-SSB share the same SSB index.** * **~~A UE is not required to handle more than one SSB in a same BWP and a RedCap UE also mandatory support time offset between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB.~~** | |
| Vivo | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | We are fine to add the sub-bullet based on RAN4 reply. |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | More discussion | Thanks companies for a lot of open questions and constructive suggestions. The second bullet is of course talking about UE capability thus it intends to say UE mandatory support such possibility (time offset occur), if configured by gNB. Hence, we are NOT discussing network configuration restriction but flexibility.  While we technically agree that different issues can be separately discussed, we see potential problem if they are not discussed together and our proposal is inherited or precluded by the current proposal. To us, the main bullet naturally means Yes for both questions then some discussion is needed.   * Does the current proposal means that the time location of NCD-SSB is mandatorily blind detected, as CD-SSB? * Does the group agree with the current proposal that, the periodicity of NCD-SSB is explicitly configurable, as CD-SSB? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum10 | Y | For the question 1 from Huawei, in our view, NCD-SSB is RRC configured. Similar as the CD-SSB, the strongest of NCD-SSB or a subset of NCD-SSB for cell-level measurement (linear average) is up to UE implementation, which may be also called as a type of “blind detection”.  For the question 2, in our view, the answer may be yes. NCD-SSB is RRC configured. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| FL11 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered again.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1-1e:**   * **A RedCap UE supports existing applicable mandatory feature(s) that are based on SSB using NCD-SSB (including NCD-SSB based measurements) as mandatory feature(s) in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.**   + **NCD-SSB is ‘QCL’-ed with CD-SSB when the NCD-SSB and CD-SSB share the same SSB index.** | |
| FL12 | The online (GTW) session on Tuesday 1st March made the following agreement.  Agreement:   * A RedCap UE supports existing applicable mandatory feature(s) that are based on SSB using NCD-SSB (including NCD-SSB based measurements) as mandatory feature(s) in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.   + NCD-SSB is ‘QCL’-ed with CD-SSB when the NCD-SSB and CD-SSB share the same SSB index.   + Note: RAN1 assumes that NCD-SSB is configured by higher layer | |

Based on the received responses on Proposal 4-1-1d above, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL10 High Priority Proposal 4-1-2:**

* **A RedCap UE is not required to ~~handle~~ perform measurements on more than one SSB at a time in a same BWP.**
* **A RedCap UE ~~also~~ mandatorily supports configurable time offsets (including zero) between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | We support the 1st bullet.  We can accept the 2nd bullet if the majority of company support it. |
| Intel | Y to first bullet.  N to second bullet. | Ok with first bullet.  For second bullet, we think it would be proper to first achieve clarity on how these offsets are configured? If there are any associated conditions, etc. Otherwise, it seems like defining (and mandating) a UE feature/component for which the definition itself is not totally clear. It would be better to revisit second bullet once the configuration details of NCD-SSB are clear. |
| MediaTek | Y to 1st bullet | We support the 1st bullet.  For 2nd bullet, what are the candidate values of time offset? How will they be used by UE?  In our view, the two bullets can be discussed separately. |
| CATT |  | Y to the 1st bullet.  No strong view to the 2nd bullet. |
| DOCOMO | Y for 1st  N for 2nd | We support 1st bullet.  Regarding the 2nd bullet, if the time offset includes zero, it is unclear for us why it is necessary to agree on this such as a RedCap UE mandatorily supports the time offset. In our view, the time separation between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB should be configurable, i.e., time domain parameter of NCD-SSB is configured independently from CD-SSB configuration, and it does not need to be always different timing. |
| Nordic | Y for 1st  N for 2nd |  |
| Samsung | Y for 1st  N for 2nd | We need to discuss the feasibility and specification impact before agreeing on NCD-SSB with offset to CD-SSB. As we commented in previous round, we think at least the following aspects need to be discussed:   * Whether symbols contain NCD-SSB are treated as semi-DL symbols? * Whether NCD-SSB is used for RO validation? * Whether this maintain QCL-ed with same SSB index? And the impact to NW deployment flexibility. E.g., NW with single panel needs to always ensure same QCL for the symbols with NCD-SSB, which means this cannot be used for other QCL for any other DL transmission. * The impact to HD-FDD UEs. * The impact to legacy UEs   Moreover, we think we need to address there is issue for TDMed CD/NCD-SSBs to be addressed first. Then, investigate to introduce offset between CD/NCD-SSBs.  Besides, RAN 2 agreed the following, if this RAN 1 intends to agree on the time offset, we need to discuss on how to configure it assuming CD/NCD-SSB have the same properties.  RAN2-116bis   1. For connected mode operation NCD-SSB has the same properties (e.g., ssb-PositionsInBurst, PCI, ssb-periodicity, ssb-PBCH-BlockPower) as the corresponding CD-SSB. FFS if an additional property needs to be specified. 2. For connected mode operation if NCD-SSB is configured in a dedicated DL BWP, RedCap UE assumes that “SSB” in QCL-Info IE and “ssb-Index” in RadioLinkMonitoringRS IE refer to the beam with the same index in the NCD-SSB configured in that BWP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | But | We thank FL for providing this discussion point and for the suggested wording. We believe the (**including zero**) addresses some of the concerns expressed in previous round.  However for the aforementioned two questions, we think they should be discussed together with **Proposal 4-1-1e** as it is urrently unclear what features it include/imply.  Specifically, we are also ok to drop this first bullet from RAN1 and then we can focus on the second one since there is related progress in RAN2. We clarify that gNB can configure two SSBs, but the point is the RedCap UE is not required to use two SSBs therefore it says so from UE perspective. Also, “measurements” may not be sufficient since rate matching of two SSBs may also be problematic for UE.  For the second part, we think the candidate values of offset can be up to RAN2 while we are also fine to proceed in RAN1. If to make it more RAN1 friendly, we agree with DOCOMO and some others to use the below wording (which was also proposed in our previous response),   * **A RedCap UE ~~also~~ mandatorily supports explicitly configurable periodicity of NCD-SSB and time domain location within a period (no change to the existing SSB pattern).**   Regarding Samsung comments, we think many of them are actually means the proposal in 4-1-1e are not agreeable either. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y to 1st bullet | We are not sure whether second bullet should be left to RAN2, since they are also discussing this issue. |
| IDCC | Y for 1st  N for 2nd |  |
| Panasonic | Y to first bullet.  N to second bullet. | We share the view from Intel. |
| Spreadtrum10 | Y to 1st bullet (still prefer to discuss it in RAN2/4) | For the details of measurement on NCD-SSB, it can be discussed in RAN2/RAN4. If RAN1 needs to give opinions, the 1st bullet is good enough. We do not see the use case that UE should perform measurement for two FDMed SSB. In RAN2’s view, the two FDMed SSB (maybe CD-SSB) are feasible and it means two cells. If UE needs to measure the two FDMed SSB, it means UE measured two cells. Anyway, it should be discussed in RAN2. Again, from PHY perspective, UE can be aware of NCD-SSB in a cell with CD-SSB, and it is working now. |
| CMCC | Y to first bullet. | The configuration of time offsets between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB can be further discussed. |
| Ericsson |  | Both bullets are currently under discussion in RAN2. |
| LGE |  | Okay with the 1st bullet in principle.  Don’t think agreeing on the second bullet is needed. But okay to leave it to RAN2. |
| FL11 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  RAN2 has agreed that *“A RedCap UE may be configured with multiple NCD-SSBs, but only one per BWP (FFS on what “only one per BWP” means)”* and is currently discussing the FFS. RAN2 is also expected to discuss configurable time offset between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB in this meeting.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1-2a:**   * **A RedCap UE is not required to perform measurements on more than one SSB at a time in ~~a~~ the same BWP.** * **~~A RedCap UE mandatorily supports configurable time offsets (including zero) between CD-SSB and NCD-SSB.~~** | |
| FL12 | RAN1 can come back to these topics if necessary once they have been treated in RAN2. | |

**FL1/FL2 High Priority Question 4-2: Given the feedback from RAN2 and RAN4, can the CSI-RS-related working assumption in the following bullet from the RAN1#107e agreement be confirmed as is? Please provide potential updates or other additional comments regarding CSI-RS-based operation as needed in the Comments field.**

* **Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on for CSI-RS (working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | N | Based on RAN4’s feedback for CSI-based measurement that is always coupled with “A RedCap UE that supports FG 6-1a […]”, it means CSI-RS cannot be used as a standalone method. Therefore, we propose if the WA needs to be confirmed in Rel-17, FG6-1a should be the prerequisite for RedCap UE supporting relevant operations based on CSI-RS. Following update is necessary.   * **For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**   + **A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB**   + **A RedCap UE can indicate the following as optional capability:**     - **Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on for CSI-RS ~~(working assumption) and/or~~** **if FG 6-1a is supported by reporting optional capabilities.** |
| Nordic | N | Based on the feedback from RAN2 and RAN4 and given this is maintenance.   * **Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on ~~for CSI-RS (working assumption) and/or~~ FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities.** |
| Spreadtrum | N | Share the similar view as vivo. |
| Qualcomm | N | It is unclear to us if FG 6-1a implies a legacy UE can measure SSB outside its dedicated DL BWP without a measurement gap. If the answer is “yes” for legacy UE, FG 6-1a does not apply to R17 RedCap UE due to BW reduction. |
| Intel | N | We do not think that the WA can be confirmed based on feedback received from RAN2 and RAN4. The version from Nordic is preferred since use of CSI-RS in this context is mainly for measurements, and towards that, we already have separate optional UE capabilities since Rel-15 for CSI-RS-based L3 msmts, etc. |
| Ericsson | Y, but | It is clear from the RAN2 and RAN4 replies that CSI-RS cannot be used a standalone mechanism for RRM measurements in Rel-17. Therefore, the UE should rely either on FG 6-1a only or on both FG 6-1a and CSI-RS for these measurements.  We propose the following update:  Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on ~~for~~ FG 6-1a or both CSI-RS ~~(working assumption)~~ and~~/or~~ FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities.  We are also fine with the update proposed by Vivo. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We are OK with the proposal from vivo. |
| LGE | N | Either not supporting the CSI-RS based operation or supporting it with existing capabilities is preferred. For the latter, it would be acceptable to us if some changes are made as suggested below.   * + - A RedCap UE can indicate the following as optional capability:       * Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE supporting FG 6-1a can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on ~~for~~ CSI-RS ~~(working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a~~ by reporting optional capabilities. |
| CATT | update | To make it more accurate, we can update the WA as “based on FG 6-1a with supporting CSI-RS, or FG 6-1a without supporting CSI-RS”.  Ericsson’s version is fine to us. |
| Xiaomi | N | We are OK with the update from vivo |
| China Telecom |  | We have the same view with vivo. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Y, but | We support the updated proposal by vivo and Ericsson that according to RAN4 feedback, CSI-RS based operation can be optionally supported when UE supports FG6-1a. |
| Lenovo | N | We are fine with the updates from vivo. |
| Samsung |  | Fine with the update from Ericsson. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Clarification | It is OK for the purpose of operation of no-NCD-SSB that CSI-RS can be reported on top of a FG6-1a like FG to make the operation better, however it does not imply that CSI-RS related capabilities themselves can only be supported with 6-1a as pre-requisite. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We are OK with the modification of adding the 6-1a as the precondition. No strong view for the text update above, and they looks similar and OK with us. |
| MediaTek |  | Based on our understanding of RAN2 and RAN4 reply LS, we think   1. FG 6-1a should be a prerequisite. 2. CSI-RS based RRM measurements, i.e FG 1-4 and 1-5, are not supported. 3. We think the WA cannot be confirmed. The following proposal can be considered instead:  * A RedCap UE can indicate the following as optional capability:   + Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE supporting FG 6-1a can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on ~~for~~ CSI-RS ~~(working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a~~ by reporting optional capabilities except for CSI-RS based RRM measurements. |
| CMCC | Y with modification | We agree CSI-RS cannot be used as a standalone method and FG6-1a should be the prerequisite for RedCap UE supporting relevant operations based on CSI-RS  Based on LS from RAN4, CSI-RS cannot be used as a standalone method for L3 measurement, RedCap needs to retune to receive associated SSB. But CSI-RS is a standalone method for L1 measurement and can reduce the frequency of retuning for SSB when there is no SSB within BWP. Thus, CSI-RS can be used combined with FG 6-1a.  We prefer the update of Ericsson. |
| FL3 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered, which replaces the RAN1 working assumption with a proposed RAN1 agreement.  **High Priority Proposal 4-2a: Replace the working assumption from RAN1#107e “Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on for CSI-RS (working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities” with the following agreement:**   * **For FR1,**   + **For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB**     - **A RedCap UE can indicate the following as optional capability:**       * **Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on ~~CSI-RS (working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities~~ FG 6-1a with supporting CSI-RS, or FG 6-1a without supporting CSI-RS.** * **For FR2,**   + **For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB**     - **A RedCap UE can indicate the following as optional capability:**       * **Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on ~~CSI-RS (working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities~~ FG 6-1a with supporting CSI-RS, or FG 6-1a without supporting CSI-RS.** | |
| Qualcomm |  | We think this proposal can be further discussed after a clarification for RedCap UE’s measurement gap needed for FG 6-1a.  For the sake of progress, we can accept this proposal by adding a bracket to FG 6-1a and a FFS note for the measurement gap. |
| Vivo | Y in general | Given the UE feature discussion, we might introduce new FG for RedCap UE “FG6-1a like” operation, maybe it would be necessary to add a Note  “FG6-1a may be replaced by a new FG for RedCap UE if agreed in the UE feature session” |
| Apple |  | We support the proposal from Qualcomm and Vivo, i.e.,   * Add a note: ‘FG6-1a may be replaced by a new FG for RedCap UE if agreed in the UE feature session” and keep FG 6-1a with bracket. * Add ‘FFS on the measurement gap’ for Recap UEs supporting [FG 6-1a] |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Xiaomi |  | We support the proposal from QC and vivo |
| CATT | Y in principle | Also OK with the suggestion from vivo. |
| NEC |  | Either Qualcomm’s or vivo’s proposal would be fine. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Generally OK | Also since we are in the discussion of possible FG definition, if we are going to refine the previous agreements, we could add a note that “FG 6-1a in the context may be replaced with a new UE capability dedicated for RedCap, subject to further discussion”. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | Also OK with notes suggested by Qualcomm, Vivo, and Huawei. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| FL4 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered again.  **High Priority Proposal 4-2a: Replace the working assumption from RAN1#107e “Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on for CSI-RS (working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities” with the following agreement:**   * **For FR1,**   + **For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB**     - **A RedCap UE can indicate the following as optional capability:**       * **Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on ~~CSI-RS (working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities~~ FG 6-1a with supporting CSI-RS, or FG 6-1a without supporting CSI-RS.** * **For FR2,**   + **For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,**     - **A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB**     - **A RedCap UE can indicate the following as optional capability:**       * **Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on ~~CSI-RS (working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities~~ FG 6-1a with supporting CSI-RS, or FG 6-1a without supporting CSI-RS.** | |
| FL5 | The online (GTW) session on Wednesday 23rd February made the following agreement.  Agreement:  Replace the working assumption from RAN1#107e “Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on for CSI-RS (working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities” with the following agreement:   * For FR1,   + For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0) from RAN1 perspective,     - A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB     - A RedCap UE can indicate the following as optional capability:       * Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on ~~CSI-RS (working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities~~ [FG 6-1a] with supporting CSI-RS, or [FG 6-1a] without supporting CSI-RS. * For FR2,   + For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB ~~and the entire CORESET#0~~) from RAN1 perspective,     - A RedCap UE supporting mandatory FG 6-1 (but not optional FG 6-1a) expects it to contain NCD-SSB for serving cell but not CORESET#0/SIB     - A RedCap UE can indicate the following as optional capability:       * Not need NCD-SSB: A RedCap UE can in addition optionally support relevant operation based on ~~CSI-RS (working assumption) and/or FG 6-1a by reporting optional capabilities~~ [FG 6-1a] with supporting CSI-RS, or [FG 6-1a] without supporting CSI-RS.   Note: The cases that CSI-RS in this agreement can support are left to RAN4. | |
| FL13 | The above agreement could be captured in the LS to RAN4 being discussed in Proposal 4-2-2a.  **High Priority Question 4-2b: Should the above agreement be captured in the LS to RAN4?** | |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| vivo |  | We think it might be useful to include the following agreement in the LS as well, as RAN4/2 are discussing the NCD-SSB based UE operations. And the LS can be sent to both RAN4 and RAN2.  **Agreement**   * **A RedCap UE supports existing applicable mandatory feature(s) that are based on SSB using NCD-SSB (including NCD-SSB based measurements) as mandatory feature(s) in an RRC-configured DL BWP that does not include CD-SSB.**   + **NCD-SSB is ‘QCL’-ed with CD-SSB when the NCD-SSB and CD-SSB share the same SSB index.**   + **Note: RAN1 assumes that NCD-SSB is configured by higher layer** |
| Apple | Y | On the addition of agreement asked by vivo, it depends on how many LS would be sent to RAN2 and RAN4 at the end of this meeting.  If there is more than one LS e.g., including other agreements, our preference is to keep this LS context as what it is, i.e., only including measurement gap conclusion to make the LS clean and focus.  If there is only one LS, it is ok to add the agreement above into the LS. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y | We support FL’s proposal in addition to vivo’s suggestion. Either one or multiple LSs is fine with us. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |

Based on the online (GTW) session for agenda item 8.16.6 (on the RedCap UE feature list) on Monday 21st February, the following question can be considered.

**FL2 High Priority Question 4-2-1: Should FG 6-1a apply for RedCap?**

* **If yes, what updates/clarifications are needed for FG 6-1a (e.g., regarding on measurement gaps)?**
* **If no, please comment on what other FG(s) may need to be defined in place of FG 6-1a.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm |  | If a RedCap UE can optionally support RRC-configured BWP without CORESET#0 and SSB AND needs a measurement gap for L1/L3 measurements of serving cell’s SSB outside the SSB-less DL BWP , we think it is necessary to introduce a new RedCap-specific FG as such, to differentiate with FG 6-1a defined for non-RedCap UE. |
| CATT |  | We think FG 6-1a can be reused.  Not sure if we need to couple measurement gap in FG 6-1a. We already have other FGs related to measurement gap, e.g. FG 4-x, FG 9-x. |
| vivo |  | Feedback from RAN4/2 for FG6-1a on whether the FG6-1a includes both cases with measurement gap and without measurement gap is beneficial. If it also includes the case that without measurement gap, we share QC’s views that separate FG for RedCap is necessary. |
| NTT DOCOMO |  | In our understanding, there may exist two ways to support SSB-less DL BWP operation; update FG 6-1a or introduce new FG. We slightly prefer the latter one. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | We are ok to define a new FG for BWP operation without SSB, to be clear without CD or NCD-SSB, and the default value if the FG is not reported would mean that the UE expects one of CD-SSB and NCD-SSB (if CD-SSB is not included in the BWP).  If FG6-1a is reused it can be clarified that the SSB means neither CD-SSB nor NCD-SSB. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Whether to define a separate FG can be up to the discussion of measurement gap. |
| CMCC |  | If FG6-1a does not include the case with measurement gap, FG 6-1a can be updated or introduce new FG. |
| Nordic |  | We could clarify in RAN1 spec that  “A RedCap UE supporting FG6-1a, if not provided with NCD-SSB in active BWP, expects to be configured with measurement gap for the cell.“ |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Open to reuse FG 6-1a if the modifications are minor or the introduce a new FG if modifications are extensive |
| Ericsson | Y | With FG 6-1a, an RRC-configured DL BWP does not need to contain both SSB and CORESET#0. In this case: 1) UE may need to do re-tuning to acquire SSB and/or CORESET #0, or 2) UE can further open its RF BW to receive SSB/CORESET#0. Considering the limited BW of RedCap UEs, it is more likely to rely on the re-tuning option which requires defining measurement gaps.  (Note that, the option of opening the RF BW should still be considered for RedCap since the bandwidth of SSB/CORESET#0 can also be relatively small depending on the configuration (e.g., CORESET#0 BW with 24 PRBs and 15 kHz SCS: 4.32 MHz)). |
| Intel | Y | As such, we tend to agree on vivo’s point that clarification from RAN2/RAN4 on assumption/no assumption on availability of msmt gaps would be helpful towards resolving this.  It is not obvious on whether measurement gaps need to be mandated for this case for RedCap UEs. This is an **optional capability** and the situation is similar to non-RedCap UEs. For non-RedCap UEs, we do not specify any such UE expectation. Thus, our first preference would be to reuse FG 6-1a. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FL3 | Several of the received responses indicate that the support of operation without SSB in an RRC-configured active BWP could be part of FG 6-1a for RedCap UEs if the update of the FG 6-1a definition is small, but that a new FG should be defined if extensive updates are required. Therefore, the following question can be considered.  **High Priority Question 4-2-1a: Do RedCap UEs that support operation without SSB (and without CSI-RS) in an RRC-configured active BWP (e.g., FG 6-1a) require configured measurement gaps?** | |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Due to BW reduction (e.g. from 100 MHz to 20 MHz in FR1), a RedCap UE cannot open its RF BW to support FG 6-1a without a measurement gap. |
| Vivo |  | As confirmed by RAN4 LS, CSI-RS cannot work alone, therefore, even if UE supporting CSI-RS based measurement, it still requires measurement gap for CD-SSB if no SSB is available in the active BWP. So “**(and without CSI-RS)**” should be removed and the answer should be Yes (i.e. requires MG) |
| Apple | Yes | The measurement GAP is simply caused by the reduced BW and Redcap UE cannot extend RF BW to cover CD-SSB as in legacy. Therefore, we think MG is required even for Redcap UE supporting FG6-1a to perform RRM measurement on CD-SSB. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We share the same view with Qualcomm. |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| CATT | Y in principle | Just remind that the description on ‘CSI-RS cannot work alone’ is only valid for a few cases (e.g. RRM). So gap may not be needed in quite some cases.  Having say this, under the condition of **without SSB (and without CSI-RS)**, we think ‘requiring measurement gap’ is reasonable. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | This in our view actually was being discussed in the latest RAN4 meeting and the assumption seems to be up to UE implementation, with another way upon those explained by Ericsson. It can be notable that even for legacy UEs, supporting 6-1a does not require measurement gap to be configured. Both of using full RF BW or using retuning or using gap is up to UE. Besides, it is clear based on RAN4 discussion that measurement gap is for L3 measurement thus does not serve L1 measurement anyway from specification point of view. Mandating measurement gap does not in standard means a UE can measure L1 SSB, rather, a UE can be by implementation perform L1 measurements during the gap, implicitly. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LGE |  | We tend to agree that the measurement gap is unavoidable for RedCap UEs. We also share the view with vivo in that the **(and without CSI-RS)** should be removed. |
| Nordic | Y | Whether L3 gap is reused for L1 is secondary topic, but gap is needed. In Legacy, gap was not needed as UE support the whole configured carrier. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | It seems the measurement gap would be overlapped with the switching gap for HD-FDD RedCap UE. More discussion is needed. |
| Ericsson | Y in principle | There may be cases where no measurement gaps are required, as discussed in our earlier comment above. However, if there will be RedCap UEs which declare support for FG 6-1a that require measurement gaps in order to operate properly without NCD-SSB (which seems to be the understanding of many companies), this needs to be addressed somehow now. |
| Intel |  | As explained before, we do not see a strong need to mandate measurement gaps since it is an optional UE capability, and UE may support larger BW that it opens up for SSB reception. Fundamentally the same as for non-RedCap UEs.  Note that this is different from the handling of center frequency alignment between CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP since that is for idle/inactive modes and thus, would be mandatory for RedCap UEs.  Having said that we would not object to mandating msmt gaps for this case. |
| FL5 | Companies are encouraged to comment on the following question, taking into account the responses provided by other companies above.  **High Priority Question 4-2-1b: Under what conditions does a RedCap UE require to be configured with measurement gaps to support operation without SSB in an RRC-configured active BWP (e.g., FG 6-1a)?** | |
| vivo | If there is no SSB within the RRC-configured active BWP, a measurement gap is needed. | |
| CATT | When no SSB in the active BWP while UE has to measure SSB than other RS.  We are considering whether we can treat ‘with gap’ as mandatory, ‘without gap’ as option feature for RedCap UE supporting FG 6-1a. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not see hard conditions. If not clear, we can ask RAN4 to clarify.  @ Nordic  What kind of gap are you referring to? To our understanding whether it is L1/L3 is the most relevant issue for this discussion. We’ve been seeking for a complete understanding of 6-1a from the beginning with preference to ask RAN4, unfortunately it was debated for long till final RAN1 meeting, where the RAN4 only tells what may be feasible or not. The recent RAN4 LS does not mention any gap although function wise the L3 measurement can also be provided by configuring the L3 gap.  *For an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode (if it does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0):*   * *A RedCap UE that supports FG 6-1a but NOT support CSI-RS based L3 measurement operates in the BWP*   + *the UE can support RLM, BFD, CBD and L1 RSRP measurement based on CSI-RS if UE reports the corresponding capabilities.*   + *the UE can support SSB based L3 measurement, but cannot support CSI-RS based L3 measurement.*   Mostly, our concern is that if new gap is introduced for 6-1a (-like) operation, there would be frequent gaps required during data/traffic for this operation, leading to the situation that gNB will be unlikely to configure this operation. On the other hand, if by UE implementation it is already possible today (e.g. retuning, which is not necessarily by specified as gap), we’d like to take it for gNB to decide. The previous RAN2 LS seems to say so.  ***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.* | |
| Apple | The measurement gap is needed if the RRC-configured active BWP does not include SSB.  We may find more precise description e.g., if the entire BW covering RRC-configured active BWP without SSB and CD-SSB exceeds the maximum BW of Redcap, measurement gap is needed; Otherwise, measurement gap is not needed but RF retuning glitch maybe needed for RF bandwidth adjustment from ‘RRC-connected active BWP’ to a larger BW covering ‘active BWP + CD-SSB’.  Open to discuss more precise wording. | |
| DOCOMO | Depending on the presence of CD-SSB in the RRC-configured DL BWP, measurement gaps are required, i.e., a RedCap UE required to be configured with measurement gaps if CD-SSB is not confined within the DL BWP. | |
| Spreadtrum6 | Similar view as vivo. “no gap” conditions in 38.133 is not related to FG 6-1a. We don’t like to couple capabilities in mixed way. “no gap” should have 38.133 spec, maybe we can send LS to RAN2/4 for it. | |
| Samsung | We wonder why cannot we follow legacy FG 6-1a, i.e., without touching measurement gap? | |
| CMCC | We understand the situation that UE may have to re-tune to BWP with CD-SSB for L3 measurement, and even for L1 measurement if it doesn’t support CSI-RS based capabilities. But we think this can be based on UE implementation, or ask for RAN4 clarification. | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Measurement gap should be based on [FG 6-1a] and the spanned bandwidth exceeding the maximum UE bandwidth requires UE RF retuning. | |
| LGE | We share the view with Apple. On top of that, in TDD we may also need to take into account the bandwidth of the RRC-configured UL BWP with the same BWP id if there is an asymmetry in terms of bandwidth b/w the DL and UL BWP to check if RF retuning is required or not. | |
| Ericsson | To ensure that FG 6-1a can be properly employed for RedCap in various scenarios (e.g., various CORESET#0/SSB configurations), configuration of measurement gaps will typically be needed. If both SSB and active BWP fit within the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, measurement gaps may not be needed. Otherwise, we expect that measurement gaps will be needed. We are fine capturing the condition as “measurement gaps are needed if the RRC-configured active BWP does not include SSB and the span of the SSB and the active BWP is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth”*.* | |
| Qualcomm | Agree with Ericsson | |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with other companies that gaps may be needed if the SSB is not within the UE bandwidth | |
| Intel | We have same basic question as Samsung here – what is the fundamental difference compared to FG 6-1a for non-RedCap UEs? | |
| Nordic | If gNB does not provide CD-SSB nor NCD-SSB in BWP | |
| FL6  FL7  FL8 | The received responses express mixed views regarding whether and under what conditions a RedCap UE might require to be configured with measurement gaps to support operation without SSB in an RRC-configured active BWP (e.g., FG 6-1a).  Some responses suggest to simply follow the legacy FG 6-1a definition without mentioning measurement gaps. That could mean that the FG 6-1a definition can be reused without extensive updates.  **High Priority Question 4-2-1c: Assuming that the FG 6-1a definition in** [**TR 38.822 V16.2.0**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Specs/archive/38_series/38.822/38822-g20.zip) **can be reused with small updates for RedCap, what updates are needed?** | |
| Spreatrum7 | It seems the common understanding that “If there is no SSB within the RRC-configured active BWP, a measurement gap is needed”. We share the similar view. We have no strong position whether it belongs to FG6-1a or not, but suggest agree “If there is no SSB within the RRC-configured active BWP, a measurement gap is needed” at first. | |
| Vivo | We are fine to take Ericsson’s proposal and make it a note or component to FG6-1a, however, defining a new FG would be cleaner solution.  “measurement gaps are needed if the RRC-configured active BWP does not include SSB and the span of the SSB and the active BWP is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth | |
| CATT | We hope FG 6-1a and measurement gap can be independent to each other, and leave FG 6-1a as it is.  At least in legacy Rel-15 UE features, there is no measurement gap mentioned in FG 6-1a. We can consider another FG dedicated for measurement. | |
| DOCOMO | We tend to agree with Ericsson. FG6-1a can be updated to capture that measurement gap is configured for a RedCap UE if RRC-configured active BWP does not include SSB and SSB and the active BWP spans wider band width than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth. | |
| CMCC | Same understanding as Ericsson, and we are open to whether use the existing FG6-1a or defining a new FG. | |
| LGE | We are okay to capture the measurement gap with the condition, e.g., as suggested by Ericsson, based on the FG 6a-1. | |
| Ericsson | As suggested by other companies above, the note proposed by us in the previous round (copied below) seems to be enough.  *Measurement gaps are needed if the RRC-configured active BWP does not include SSB and the span of the SSB and the active BWP is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.* | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | There is no need to add that update.  Our compromise is to ask RAN4 to clarify whether the following highlights referring to the existing measurement gap or can be by UE implementation:   * A RedCap UE that supports FG 6-1a but NOT support CSI-RS based L3 measurement operates in the BWP   + the UE can support RLM, BFD, CBD and L1 RSRP measurement based on CSI-RS if UE reports the corresponding capabilities.   + the UE can support SSB based L3 measurement, but cannot support CSI-RS based L3 measurement. | |
| Intel | We are fine with the suggested note from Ericsson. | |
| FL9 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 4-2-1d: Add the following note for FG 6-1a:**   * **For a RedCap UE, measurement gaps are needed if the total span of the SSB and the UE-specific RRC configured BWP is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.** | |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | This is not clearly consistent with RAN4 LS and should be consulted with Ran4. |
| Vivo | Y with minor update | We think it would be necessary to clarify that the BWP is active BWP.  **Updated High Priority Proposal 4-2-1d: Add the following note for FG 6-1a:**  **For a RedCap UE, measurement gaps are needed if the total span of the SSB and the UE-specific RRC configured active BWP is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.** |
| MediaTek 9 |  | From UE implementation perspective, Proposal 4-2-1d should be further separated into two cases:   1. Case 1: The UE can measure the SSB by simply opening up to its maximum bandwidth *without* changing its center frequency assuming UE has set its center frequency in the middle of its active BWP. In this case, measurement gaps are not needed. 2. Case 2: The UE not only has to open up to its maximum bandwidth but also has to change its center frequency in order to measure SSB, assuming UE has set its center frequency in the middle of its active BWP. In this case, we think measurement gaps are needed.   We hence propose the following instead.  **Proposal: Add the following note for FG 6-1a:**   * **For a RedCap UE, measurement gaps are needed if SSB is not fully within the frequency range of the RedCap UE’s maximum bandwidth assuming the RedCap UE has set its center frequency in the middle of the UE-specific RRC configured active BWP.** |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | From our understanding, if the RRC configured BWP can be fully received, then the center frequency should be in the center of RRC configured BWP. In this case, if the UE switch to receive SSB0, the center frequency should be changed. However, if the total span of the SSB and the UE-specific RRC configured BWP is not wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth, the center frequency does not need to be changed, e.g., receiving SSB1 and SSB2.    Therefore, the switching time for UE receiving SSB is needed if the condition is satisfied. However, it is not quite sure whether the measurement gap should be specified in RAN1. At least, UE implementation can also be viewed as an alternative to realize the SSB receiving.  So, our question is whether this measurement gap should be necessarily configured by gNB if the condition is satisfied, or this measurement gap is only defined in RAN4 and how to receive SSB is depending on UE implementation? |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | Ok. Also can accept RAN4 to confirm this issue. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum |  | RAN4 to discuss. Still the frequency span, unfortunately…  I have question for non-RedCap UE the spec said anything on the frequency span for measurement gap? If so, there could be no any measurement gap, since non-RedCap is mandatorily full bandwidth, e.g. 100MHz in FR1. In our view, the measurement gap has the assumption of UE opens the RF of BWP instead of any “frequency span” or full bandwidth… |
| LGE |  | We have the same question as ZTE. |
| MediaTek 9’ | N | TS 38.133 clearly specifies when SSB is not within UE’s active DL BWP, UE needs a measurement gap. How is a RedCap UE supposed to be more capable than a non-RedCap UE?   |  | | --- | | *[TS 38.133, V15.16.0] The UE can perform intra-frequency SSB based measurements* ***without measurement gaps if***  *-* ***the SSB is completely contained in the active BWP of the UE****, or*  *-* ***the active downlink BWP is initial BWP****[3].* |   **Observation: Per TS 38.133, measurement gaps are needed when SSB is outside of RedCap UE’s active DL BWP.**  **Proposal:** We should hand over this discussion to RAN4 who are the experts on measurement gaps and have defined them for many scenarios. |
| MediaTek 9’’ | N | Besides, we don’t feel very comfortable reusing FG 6-1a. The corresponding UE behavior for supporting FG 6-1a has not been well defined since R15. This is why there is a discussion in RAN2 trying to clarify what operation UE is capable of performing when it indicates the support for FG 6-1a in the maintenance phase of R17! As far as we know, some companies think such a UE should support SSB-based measurement outside active DL BWP while some other companies think such as UE should support CSI-RS based RLM/BFR. Without clarifying the corresponding UE behavior for FG 6-1a, how can we reuse it? |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | Minor modification:  For a RedCap UE, measurement gaps are needed if the total span of the CD-SSB and the UE-specific RRC configured DL BWP is wider than the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth.  We can also be fine with leaving the issue to RAN4 (and concluding that no RAN1 specific changes are needed for 6-1a). |
| Apple |  | We support the modification from Vivo with adding ‘Active’.   * As quoted by MTK, the ‘Active’ word is also written in current RAN4 specification.   We are also open to leave the whole discussion on MG for FG 6-1a to RAN4 as MG is typically handled over there.  As brough up by MTK, we also realized the ongoing discussion in RAN2 about FG 6-1a. With this, it appears more reasonable to transfer this discussion to RAN4, who has been involved in the RAN2 ongoing discussions. |
| FL10 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 4-2-1e:**   * **Conclusion: Whether and under what conditions a RedCap UE requires to be configured with measurement gaps to support operation without SSB in an RRC-configured active BWP is up to RAN4.** | |
| Vivo |  | Fine to leave it to RAN4.  However, should we then assume a new UE FG is to be introduced in RAN1 for FG6-1a like behavior for RedCap UEs in this meeting as it might be too late to introduce new FG based on the RAN4 decision in the future. |
| Intel | Y | We can support the idea of letting RAN4 determine this.  In this case, we do not think it would be appropriate for RAN1 to still go ahead and define new FG instead of FG 6-1a. That decision should follow from the decision on need/configuration of gaps for RedCap UEs supporting FG 6-1a (or its equivalent). |
| MediaTek | Y | An LS4 with this conclusion should be sent to RAN4.  We also want to remind the group that a similar issue (i.e. whether RF retuning and measurement gaps are needed) exists in FG 1-4 which can be included in the LS to RAN4 as well.   * FG 1-4: CSI-RS based RRM measurement with associated SSB |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y with minor | Slightly  **Conclusion: Whether and under what conditions a RedCap UE requires to be configured with existing measurement gaps to support operation without SSB in an RRC-configured active BWP is up to RAN4.** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Basically Y | We think related UE feature discussion also should be RAN4. Therefore, we propose following.  Conclusion: Whether and under what conditions a RedCap UE requires to be configured with measurement gaps to support operation without SSB in an RRC-configured active BWP **and its related UE feature discussion** is up to RAN4. |
| Spreadtrum10 | Y | In our view, “no measurement gap for intra-frequency measurement” in 38.133 means the BWP include SSB rather than “the frequency span” include SSB. This principle should be followed by Reduced Capability UE. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | We can be fine with the update from Panasonic. |
| LGE | Y |  |
| FL11 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 4-2-1f:**   * **Conclusion: Whether and under what conditions a RedCap UE requires to be configured with existing measurement gaps to support operation without SSB in an RRC-configured active BWP and its related UE feature discussion is up to RAN4.**   + **Send an LS to RAN4 to inform them about the conclusion.** | |
| FL12 | The online (GTW) session on Tuesday 1st March made the following conclusion.  Conclusion:   * From RAN1 perspective, whether and under what conditions a RedCap UE requires to be configured with existing measurement gaps to support operation without SSB in an RRC-configured active BWP, and its related UE feature discussion (including measurement gaps) is up to RAN4. * Send an LS to RAN4 to inform them about the conclusion.   A corresponding draft LS is provided in Proposal 4-2-2 below. | |

**FL12 High Priority Proposal 4-2-2: Agree the draft LS in** [**RedCapDraftLs-v000.docx**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Inbox/drafts/8.6.1.1/LS/RedCapDraftLs-v000.docx)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | ‘SSB’ is used in the text but ‘NCD-SSB’ is used in the title. But maybe OK. Not a big deal. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum12 | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| FL13 | Based on the received responses, the following updated draft LS can be considered, where “NCD-SSB” has been changed to “SSB” in the title.  **High Priority Proposal 4-2-2a: Agree the draft LS in** [**RedCapDraftLs-v001.docx**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Inbox/drafts/8.6.1.1/LS/RedCapDraftLs-v001.docx) | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| vivo |  | We have provided some suggestions in **Question 4-2b:** |
| Apple | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |

Finally, RAN2 has discussed this scenario and how a RedCap UE performs RSRP measurements before Msg1 or MsgA retransmission on separate initial UL BWP and agreed on the following [39]:

|  |
| --- |
| * From RAN2 perspective, if a RedCap UE in idle/inactive mode is configured with a separate initial BWP associated with no SSB (CD or NCD) for RACH, it is up to UE implementation to perform new RSRP measurement in a DL BWP associated with CD-SSB before Msg1/A retransmission. |

**FL1/FL2 Medium Priority Question 4-3: Does the RAN2 agreement regarding RSRP measurement before Msg1/MsgA retransmission require any updates of RAN1 specifications? If yes, please elaborate in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | N |  |
| Nordic | N |  |
| FUTUREWEI | N |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | If RedCap UE needs to measure RSRP for RO re-selection (or RA type re-selection) before msg1/msgA retransmission, the following timeline requirements specified for non-RedCap UE in Clause 8.2 and 8.2A of TS 38.213 do not apply to RedCap UE.    Therefore, a clarification for R17 RedCap UE’s timeline of msg1/msgA retransmission needs to be included in 213 spec. |
| Ericsson |  | We think Qualcomm has a good point. However, RAN4 involvement may be needed to specify the new timeline requirement. |
| LGE | N |  |
| CATT | N |  |
| vivo | No | We do not think timeline requirement is needed for following reasons:   1. Based on RAN2’s agreements, it is up to UE implementation to perform new RSRP measurement in a DL BWP associated with CD-SSB before Msg1/A retransmission, so, the UE does not need to measure the SSB before transmitting the PRACH; 2. Even for normal UE, the timeline may not be sufficient to do the SSB measurement before the next PRACH transmission. 3. The next RO selection is decided by the UE, by UE implementation, the gap between the SSB measurement and RO can ensure the sufficient retuning time. |
| NTT DOCOMO |  | We think the timeline for random access which is pointed out by Qualcomm may need to be discussed. |
| Samsung | Y | Currently, higher layers of UE can indicate to the physical layer to transmit a PRACH, and if requested by higher layers, the UE is expected to transmit a PRACH no later than  msec after the last symbol of the window, or the last symbol of the PDSCH reception. If RedCap UE needs to retune to default iDL BWP before PRACH retx, it may not able to meet the restriction. However, on the other hand, UE does not have to do RSRP measurement before Msg1/Msg A retx. We think this at least worth some RAN 1 discussion on whether the restriction of PRACH retx needs to be relaxed or not apply for RedCap UE when there is no CD-SSB in the separate iDL BWP in idle/inactive mode. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | We think the current RAN2 response already means, if there is any issue as concerned by QC on the timeline, it is up to UE implementation since the UE may also not perform re-selection/re-measure timely. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | No update for msg1.  However, similar as msg1, whether the UE behaviour for SSB measurement should be specified is needed to be clarified, when msg2 and msg4 overlaps with the SSB |
| MediaTek | Y | We share a similar view with Qualcomm and Samsung that PRACH reTx timeline should be revisited based on RAN2’s agreement. In fact, we support Alt1 from Samsung’s contribution which is copied and edited below. With this proposal, the current requirement does not apply to RedCap UE. In our view, this is more aligned with RAN2’s agreement.  **Proposal:** RedCap UE does not follow current time restriction for PRACH re-transmission, i.e., N1+0.75 msec |
| CMCC | N | It is up to UE implementation whether RSRP measurement is required before Msg1/MsgA retransmission. |
| Intel | N | Same view as vivo in terms of interpretation of the RAN2 decision. Whether to measure on SSB before reTx and whether to use the earliest available RACH occasion (RO) is up to UE implementation. Further, note that in most typical cases, there may not even be an RO within NT,1 + 0.75 msec of the RAR window, etc. Our understanding of this timing is just to capture the earliest a UE may transmit RACH reTx considering PDSCH and MAC CE processing times assuming RO is available at the earliest opportunity. However, for actual operation, it would be up to UE implementation as explained by vivo. |
| FL3 | Most received responses see no need for a RAN1 specification update due to the RAN2 agreement regarding RSRP measurement before Msg1/MsgA retransmission. However, some responses see a need to clarify that a RedCap UE does not need to follow the current time restriction for PRACH retransmission (i.e., *N*T,1 + 0.75 msec). Based on this, the following proposal can be considered.  **Medium Priority Proposal 4-3a:**   * **If a RedCap UE in idle/inactive mode is configured with a separate initial DL BWP associated with no SSB (CD or NCD) for RACH,**   + **The RedCap UE does not need to follow current time restriction for PRACH retransmission, i.e., *N*T,1 + 0.75 msec.** | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| vivo | N | We do not see the need for such proposal at least for now.  As explained by companies, “***N*T,1 + 0.75 msec after RAR window” s**hould be understood as the earliest possible timing for PRACH (re)transmission, however, there could be different reasons that UEs cannot transmit PRACH immediately, e.g. no available RO, etc, even in legacy system. If there is different understanding on how to interpret the current spec, we might need to discuss in the CR session first. |
| Apple | Y | Our understanding is that UE is required to meet the timing requirement in TS 38.213 if there is valid RO. In other words, the processing pipeline at the UE needs to prepare for this, which is challenging for Redcap UE due to additional retuning for measurement and causes additional delay. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We share the same view as companies above. It was clarified by RAN2 that whether to measure SSB before PRACH retransmission is up to UE implementation and a RedCap UE may or may not be able to comply with the current time restriction for PRACH retransmission. Thus, whether a RedCap UE can follow the time restriction would be up to UE implementation. |
| CATT | N | Agree with vivo. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | It comes to the question that whether RAN2 made the agreements based on that: a UE needs to keep the timeline and within that it is up to UE implementation to decide whether to perform new measurement.  Although we could be open in the case that the timeline is not restrict followed from UE vendors point of view, it will increase the gNB detection complexity due to unknown of a reTx. Some further discussion may be needed or coordination with RAN4, if a change in RAN1 is targeted.  Then, if the timeline for the PRACH retransmission is intend to be modified, we propose to discuss the timeline during the whole random access procedure together. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| LGE | N | Not sure how the proposal, if agreed, is going to be captured in the spec. From our perspective, it is up to UE implementation anyway. So, we don’t need to take time to agree on this. |
| Nordic | N | Vivo has the point. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We share similar view with Huawei. When/how to receive SSB for measurement during RACH procedure would have impacts on the timeline related issue. |
| Ericsson |  | Perhaps RAN1 can make a conclusion that the RAN1 understanding is current text in the specification is compatible with RAN2 agreement. |
| Intel | N | As explained in previous round and in this round by vivo. |
| FL5  FL6  FL7  FL8 | Based on the received responses, there appears to be no consensus in favor of a RAN1 specification update due to the RAN2 agreement regarding RSRP measurement before Msg1/MsgA retransmission.  **Medium Priority Question 4-3b: The proponents of a RAN1 specification update due to the RAN2 agreement regarding RSRP measurement before Msg1/MsgA retransmission are invited to provide further comments taking into account the above comments from other companies.** | |
| Qualcomm | Without update for RAN1 specification, we think RAN1 needs to have a conclusion on the timeline of msg1/~~msg3~~ msgA retransmission when an idle/inactive RedCap UE is configured with an SSB-less initial DL BWP. | |
| CATT | RAN2 did not provide additional information on the time for measurement (up to UE). Possibly, we can conclude that RedCap UE may need longer time than the existing timeline for Msg1/MsgA retransmission, if separate initial DL BWP does not include CD-SSB?  And RAN2 only make conclusion on Msg1/MsgA (PRACH), i.e. between two different RACH procedures, we do not think it is related to Msg3. Not sure if Qualcomm has a typo or not. | |
| FL9 | **Medium Priority Question 4-3c: Companies are invited to provide further comments on the potential need for a RAN1 specification update due to the RAN2 agreement regarding RSRP measurement before Msg1/MsgA retransmission, taking into account the above comments from other companies.** | |
| Qualcomm | We think the RAN2 agreements do have impact on msg1/msgA retransmission timeline due to the introduction of HD-FDD and SSB-less initial DL BWP for idle/inactive RedCap UE.  Therefore, we prefer the previous FL proposal, and a clarification for RedCap UE’s procedure can be included in Clause 17.1 (or, clause 8.2 and 8.2A) of TS 38.213:   * If a RedCap UE in idle/inactive mode is configured with a separate initial DL BWP associated with no SSB (CD or NCD) for RACH,   + The RedCap UE does not need to follow current time restriction for PRACH retransmission, i.e., *N*T,1 + 0.75 msec. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | One thing we think we need to check is the impact on access successful rate if the timeline is not concerned any more, in addition to the obvious negative impact on gNB detection and combination of different PRACH Tx. | |
| Samsung | We can first clarify on Rel-15 NR spec on the time restriction. Then we can discuss on whether there is a need to relax this time restriction. | |
| FL10 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **Medium Priority Proposal 4-3b:**   * **If a RedCap UE in idle/inactive mode is configured with a separate initial DL BWP associated with no SSB (CD or NCD) for RACH,**   + **The RedCap UE does not need to follow current time restriction for PRACH retransmission, i.e., *N*T,1 + 0.75 msec.**   + **A corresponding clarification can be included in TS 38.213 (e.g., clauses 8.2 and 8.2A, or clause 17.1).** | |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | We prefer FFS on this issue and to reach common understanding on Rel-15 behavior first in AI 7.1. Companies may have different understanding on how to interpret Rel-15 specification. If Rel-15 specification is interpret in a way that the existing timeline is not always followed depending on the RO availability, there is no need to further clarify for RedCap UEs. |
| Intel |  | Same view as vivo. Prefer to come back to this later once interpretation of Rel-15 specs is aligned across companies. |
| MediaTek | Y | We support the proposal. |
| CATT |  | Agree with vivo. It is unclear what clarification will be introduced in 213, since the understanding on current spec is ambiguous. |
| DOCOMO |  | We support vivo’s suggestion. It is preferable to check whether we are on the same page or not first that the time restriction for PRACH retransmission should be always fulfilled. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | More discussion | Agree with Samsung comment in previous round, that the potential impact is not so clear why it is required for legacy UEs, and what would be the potential impact for performance e.g. access successful rate. |
| CMCC |  | Same view as vivo. |
| Ericsson |  | We support Vivo’s suggestion. |
| FL11  FL12 | Most of the received responses regard this as an issue that may need clarification in the general case under the Rel-15 NR maintenance agenda item before it is clear whether and what update may be needed in the RedCap case. Therefore, this issue is not pursued further in this meeting. | |
| Qualcomm | We can live with FL’s proposal | |
| vivo | Support | |
| Samsung | Fine | |
| MediaTek | Fine with FL’s proposal | |
| LGE | Okay | |

# PUCCH resource determination

From RAN1#107-e, we have the following agreement regarding RedCap PUCCH resources (for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB):

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * When the frequency hopping for the RedCap PUCCH resources (for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB) is deactivated,   + Each PUCCH resource is mapped to a single PRB.   + What side[(s)] of the RedCap UL BWP center frequency to which PUCCH resources are mapped is[/are] configurable by the network, including SIB-configurable [additional] offset (with no more than [4] candidate values) using the existing equations for determining the PRB index of the PUCCH transmission as a starting point. * RedCap and non-RedCap can be configured with the same or different PUCCH resource set indices (see TS 38.213 Table 9.2.1-1). |

Several contributions [4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 26, 27, 28] provided their views on the PUCCH resource determination with disabled frequency hopping in terms of whether both edges of UL BWP can be used or all PUCCH resources are mapped to one edge, 2) maximum number of PUCCH resources, 3) additional PRB offset, and 4) explicit equations.

Many of the contributions [5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 26, 27] propose that all PUCCH resources should be mapped to only one edge of the UL BWP considering the purpose of disabling PUCCH frequency hopping for minimizing the UL resource fragmentation. One contribution [4] supports also mapping the PUCCH resources to both edges of the UL BWP.

Most of these contributions [4, 5, 6, 9, 14, 16, 17, 19, 24, 26] propose to support the maximum 16 PUCCH resources in case of disabled PUCCH frequency hopping to achieve a higher capacity compared to the case with 8 PUCCH resources.

In addition, contributions are generally supportive of having additional PRB offsets for RedCap to avoid overlapping PUCCH resources. Contribution [27] proposes that additional offset values {0, 4, 6, 8} can be configured for RedCap default PUCCH resource set. Also, in [12], it is proposed that the candidate values are {2, 3, 4, 6} and if the field is absent, the RedCap UE assumes the value of 0.

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

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 5-1: When the frequency hopping for the RedCap PUCCH resources (for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB) is deactivated,**

* **All 16 PUCCH resources are mapped to one side, and it is SIB-configurable which side.**
* **The PRB index of the PUCCH transmission is determined using the existing equations as a starting point, with an additional PRB offset with 4 candidate values.**
  + **One of the candidate values is zero.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | OK |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| LGE | Y (almost) | For the additional PRB offset, we prefer to keep the number of candidate values in square bracket until we make a progress in the discussion in **Question 5-2**. We don’t have to stick to 4 candidate values if it somehow limits the flexibility in the common PUCCH resource set configuration. |
| FL2 | The online (GTW) session on Monday 21st February made the following agreement. The candidate values are considered in Question 5-2.  Agreement:  When the frequency hopping for the RedCap PUCCH resources (for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB) is deactivated,   * All 16 PUCCH resources are mapped to one side, and it is SIB-configurable which side. * The PRB index of the PUCCH transmission is determined using the existing equations as a starting point, with an additional PRB offset with [4] candidate values.   + One of the candidate values is [zero]. | |

**FL1/FL2 High Priority Question 5-2: Companies are invited to comment on suitable candidate values for the additional PRB offset values.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** | |
| vivo | We slightly prefer the additional offset values are {0, 4, 6, 8} for better co-exist with legacy common PUCCH resources. | |
| Nordic | As we contributed, {0,4,6,8} provides the best multiplexing with non-RedCap UE PUCCH | |
| FUTUREWEI | The values of {0,4,6,8} seem reasonable | |
| Qualcomm | OK with the proposal of Vivo and Nordic | |
| Intel | Support {0, 4, 6, 8} as candidate PRB-offset values. | |
| Ericsson | PRB offsets are useful to avoid overlapping between PUCCH transmissions from different sectors (e.g., 3 or 4 sectors) using the same PUCCH format. For example, the PRB offsets {0, 2, 4} avoid overlapping of PUCCH resources with index 4, 5, 6. For each of these indexes, 2 PRBs on each edge is used, so PRB offset values increases by value 2 ({0, 2, 4}).   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Index | PUCCH format | First symbol | Number of symbols | PRB offset | Set of initial CS indexes | | 1 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 | {0, 4, 8} | | 2 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 3 | {0, 4, 8} | | 4 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 0 | {0, 3, 6, 9} | | 5 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 2 | {0, 3, 6, 9} | | 6 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 4 | {0, 3, 6, 9} |   With disabled FH for RedCap, all PRBs will be located on one edge. In the above example, 4 PRBs will be on one edge. Therefore, to avoid overlap, the PRB offsets should be {0, 4, 8}.  Similarly, for index 1 and 2 in the above table, 3 PRBs are allocated on each edge and PRB offsets are {0,3}. For RedCap with disabled FH, 6 PRBs will be located on one edge. Therefore, the offset values should be {0, 6}.  The same argument is hold for other PUCCH indexes.  Currently, the set of all fixed PRB offset values are {0, 2, 3, 4} (for index 15 there is also an additional offset ). For RedCap with disabled FH where all PRBs are mapped to one edge of UL BWP, the fixed PRB offset values should be doubled. **Thus, we support values {0, 4, 6, 8} which are also proposed by companies above.** | |
| Nokia, NSB | No strong view, we are fine with {0, 4, 6, 8} | |
| CATT | Current PUCCH resource allocation has a , mainly with a value set of {0, 2, 4}, if we do not consider the special values appear only once, i.e. 3 and. Hence, the RB offset of RedCap PUCCH from BWP edge can be considered as {0, 2, 4}+{0, 2, 4}, i.e. {0,2,4,6,8}.  It seems considerable to adopt {2,4,6,8} as 4 explicit configurable value, while the value is equal to 0 if the field is absent.  If the field is mandated, we are fine with {0,4,6,8} | |
| Xiaomi | We share the similar view with DOCOMO-san’s comment during the GTW. When the configuration of additional PRB offset is absent, it implies the value of 0.  Then, for the other additional PRB offset, we are fine with 4,6,8 | |
| Panasonic | If “additional PRB offset” is described in the table for the non-FH PUCCH resource set (i.e., jointly specified with PUCCH format, symbol allocation etc.), we propose {0, 4, 6, 8}.  If “additional PRB offset” is configured RRC parameter which is independent from such a table, {0, 4, 6, 8} or CATT/Xiaomi/DOCOMO’s suggestion is fine. | |
| Sharp | We are fine with {0, 4, 6, 8} | |
| NTT DOCOMO | Firstly, it is unclear for us what is the common understanding on how to map 16 PUCCH resources in one side.  According to the current specification, PUCCH resources for a PUCCH resource set is mapped as follows, e.g., PUCCH resource set index is 13;    In the current specification, frequency hopping direction, UE-specific PRB offset and CS is indicated via 3 bit DCI and 1 bit from CCE index and 16 resources are mapped in one side.  On the other hand, if FH is disabled for RedCap UE, PUCCH resources for a PUCCH resource set can be mapped as follows, e.g., for PUCCH resource set index 13;    In our understanding, if FH is disabled for common PUCCH, there is only 8 resources in one side based on the current specification.  Thus, we suggest to make it clear how to map 16 PUCCH resources in one side before we discuss the exact values of additional offset.  In our view, it would be straightforward that PUCCH resources for the first hop in the current specification are used to map 16 PUCCH resources in one side as if FH is enabled with hopping distance is 0 as below;    Secondly, we would like to clarify the starting point of the additional PRB offset for RedCap UE.  According to the agreement above, the starting point is described as follow;   * The PRB index of the PUCCH transmission is determined using the existing equations as a starting point, with an additional PRB offset with [4] candidate values.   In our understanding, the additional offset starts from the PRB index which is indicated by the existing equation, i.e., cell-specific PRB offset indicated by RMSI and UE-specific PRB offset indicated by DCI and CCE index. In other words, the additional offset does not start from the edge of separate initial UL BWP. | |
| Lenovo | We are with {0,4,6,8} | |
| Samsung | Fine with {0,4,6,8} | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No strong opinion. | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We share the same view with Ericsson. [0,4,6,8] can be adopted. How to capture this can be to RAN2 discussion. | |
| CMCC | We are fine with {0, 4, 6, 8} | |
| Intel2 | While we are fine with the values of the “additional PRB offset” as indicated before, it seems necessary to clarify the interpretation of the following bullet from the GTW agreement:          The PRB index of the PUCCH transmission is determined using the existing equations as a starting point, with an additional PRB offset with [4] candidate values.  Our interpretation is that we use the following equations for lower and upper edge of the UL BWP:  **;**  Where *RBBWPoffset*is the value:   * indicated as the “additional PRB offset” when configured, and * is reused from Table 9.2.1-1 of TS38.213 when not configured.   That is, **the “additional PRB offset” replaces the offset from Table 9.2.1-1 for a given row, as against being an additive factor on top of** *RBBWPoffset***.**  Further, it’d also be good to clarify the determination of cyclic shifts in this case. In particular, the initial CS index can be determined as *(rPUCCH mod NCS)*. | |
| IDCC | We are ok with {0,4,6,8}. | |
| FL3 | Most of the received responses support {0, 4, 6, 8} as the candidate PRB offset values. A few responses suggest that the range can include 4 non-zero values, e.g., {2, 4, 6, 8}, since the default value (when no parameter is signaled) can be 0. Some responses propose to clarify whether the additional PRB offset is added to the existing PRB offset or replaces it entirely.  Based the received responses, the following proposal can be considered, where the intention is to down select between Options 1 and 2 later in RAN1#108-e.  **High Priority Proposal 5-2a:**   * **When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resources for RedCap is deactivated,**   + **When the additional PRB offset is configured,**     - **It replaces the legacy PRB offset (*RBBWPoffset*).**     - **It is counted from the edge of the separate initial UL BWP.**     - **Its range is {2, 4, 6, 8}.**   + **When the additional PRB offset is NOT configured,**     - **Option 1: The PRB offset is 0.**     - **Option 2: The legacy PRB offset (*RBBWPoffset*) is used.**     - **Down select between Options 1 and 2 in RAN1#108-e.** | |
| Qualcomm | Y | For the situation that additional PRB offset is not configured for RedCap UE, we think the proposal of DOCOMO makes sense. Therefore, we prefer option 2. |
| vivo | Y | We thought the additional PRB offset is added to the existing PRB offset, not to replace the existing one. But we are open to hear companies view on this.  We prefer option 2. |
| Apple | Y | Similar as Vivo, the additional PRB offset is relative to the existing PRB offset configured for normal UE for PUCCH transmission.  On the case of no additional RB, option 2 is a nature consequence if we define that ‘the additional RB’ is applied on top of legacy PRB offset. |
| DOCOMO | N | According to the description in the current agreement “All 16 PUCCH resources are mapped to one side”, it is still unclear how to map 16 resources in one side, i.e., how many PRBs are required for one PUCCH resource set. Depending on how to multiplex PUCCH resources (FDM, TDM, CS and/or OCC for PF1), we think the value range of additional PRB offset for RedCap UE would be different.  For example, if the multiplexing with non-RedCap UE is not considered, the “16” resources can consist of 4 FDMed resources and 4 CS-multiplexed resources in the same time domain resource as we described before. For this case, one PUCCH resource set for RedCap UE requires 4 PRB in frequency domain to provide 16 PUCCH resources.  For another example, the “16” resources can consist of 2 FDMed resources, 4 CS-multiplexed resources and 2 TDMed resources. For this case, one PUCCH resource set for RedCap UE requires 2 PRB in frequency domain to provide 16 PUCCH resources.  Therefore, we would like to discuss how to map 16 resources in one side to clarify the agreement before we discuss the exact value range of additional PRB offset for RedCap UE. |
| Sharp | Y | We prefer option 2 when the additional PRB offset is not configured.  Regarding DOCOMO’s comment, our understanding is 16PUCCH resources are FDMed with 4PRBs. |
| Xiaomi | Y | We prefer option 2.  As for DOCOMO-san’s comment, we have the same understanding with Sharp. But we also think it make sense to clarify how to map 16 resources in one side to understand the agreement well. So, we are also OK to agree this proposal after the clarification. |
| CATT | Y | OK. Slightly prefer Option 2, which seems more flexible, since legacy ***RBBWPoffset*** also includes {0}.  We are open to change {2, 4, 6, 8} in first bullet if DOCOMO thinks necessary. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | More discussion | Tend to agree with DCM and despite we have no strong preference on the candidate values, we are now confused by the interpretation from companies on the agreements. To us the original wording of the agreements is clear that the ‘additional’ offset means additional offset on top of the current PRB offset in order to place PUCCH for RedCap multiplexed and/or consecutively on top of legacy PUCCH for non-RedCap UEs. This naturally provides more flexibility than the currently proposed manner of using replaced PRB offsets, since for each legacy offset, there are additional 4 values as candidate, as per the agreements. Consequently similar to what DCM commented, the offset in this case does not need to be the fixed as e.g. 2RBs.  On the other hand, if the interpretation is to use the new offset values to replace the current ones, the motivation does not seem to serve as proponents proposed to avoid interference or avoid fragmentation. For example, for row index {4, 5, 6} corresponding to PRB offset {0, 2, 4} for legacy UEs, if the RedCap PUCCH is placed with offset {0, 4, 8}, it could turn to cause interference to non-RedCap UEs of different sectors of a same site, although the PUCCH resources for RedCap UEs across three sectors can be FDMed. Also in this case, the row index 1 and 2 will be replaced to be the exactly same offset values, which does not provide any additional flexibility. This can be avoided if the additional offset is separately and independently provided for RedCap UEs for each sector. Also, using additional PRB offset can directly be applied no matter the legacy PRB offset position, including the case of index 15 with value of . |
| Samsung | Y | Fine with opt 2 |
| CMCC |  | Similar view as DOCOMO and alues. If additional PRB offset replaces the legacy PRB offset and is counted from the edge of the separate initial UL BWP, the multiplexing capacity of non-FH PUCCH and legacy FH PUCCH is reduced when multiplexing is realized by configuring different PRB for non-FH and FH PUCCH. To remain high multiplexing capacity, configuring two base sequences for non-FH PUCCH needs to be considered.  If additional PRB offset is counted from PRB index determined using the existing equations, the multiplexing of non-FH PUCCH and legacy FH PUCCH can be solved. |
| Lenovo |  | The proposal is acceptable to us, although we shared same understanding with others that the additional offset is used on top of existing offset.  Besides, as per RAN1#107e agreements, “**RedCap and non-RedCap can be configured with the same or different PUCCH resource set indices”,** we wonder if such two signaling, one indicating an PUCCH resource set index, another indicating an additional offset, is efficient. Somehow one signaling can indicate both in our understanding. |
| LGE | N | We think it is quite clear from the agreement that the “additional” PRB offset is to be added on top of the legacy PRB offset not replacing the legacy PRB offset. And the main motivation of it is to avoid interference with the frequency hopping common PUCCH resources of the non-RedCap UEs.  We don’t have a strong view on the candidate values, but it feels that the set of suggested values {2, 4, 6, 8} in the FL proposal is based on the assumption that those values are to replace the legacy PRB offset. From our perspective, as the additional PRB offset is supposed to be added to the legacy PRB offset, some of those big values are not needed. Our suggested candidate values would be {0, 2, 3, 4}. These values together with a proper setting of the PUCCH resource set index would suffice to avoid interference with other frequency hopping common PUCCH resources of non-RedCap UEs. |
| Nordic | Y | Support Option 2 |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | We share the same view with Ericsson and Panasonic in the lase round that to avoid overlapping of non-FH PUCCH resources from different sectors, the four candidate alues for non-FH RedCap PUCCH should be set as {0,4,6,8}.  Besides, if a new PUCCH resource configuration table for non-FH PUCCH resource set is defined or a new RedCap-dedicated PRB offset is inserted in the legacy Table 9.2.1-1 in TS 38.213, then the corresponding PRB offsets can be obtained by doubling the legacy PRB offset directly. Additionally, the PRB offset for non-FH PUCCH resource can also be obtained by superimposing an additional offset on the legacy PRB offset.  How to interpret the PRB offset for non-FH PUCCH resource is up to RAN2 decision. Nevertheless, we can accept FL proposal with option2 for more progress. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are OK with option 2 |
| FUTUREWEI | N | The agreement was “an *additional* PRB offset with [4] candidate values”. This proposal negates that agreement. We have no preference to the candidate values as long as the values are added to *RBBWPoffset*. |
| Ericsson | Y | We prefer option 2.  We would also be fine with making the additional PRB offset additive to the legacy PRB offset. However, we would like to point out that the potential interference between common PUCCH resources for RedCap and non-RedCap UEs mentioned by Huawei can be avoided by careful configuration of the frequency location of the separate initial UL BWP relative to the ordinary initial UL BWP. If the two initial UL BWPs are offset by a few PRBs, collision between RedCap and non-RedCap PUCCH resources can be avoided.  As in non-RedCap, the main purpose of PRB offsets is to ensure that RedCap PUCCH resources do not overlap for different sectors/cells. For example, PUCCH Format 1 with indexes 4, 5, 6 can be sued for different sectors with proper PRB offsets.  Of course, such additional PRB offsets also provide flexibility to minimize overlap between RedCap and non-RedCap PUCCH resources, but they must be suitable for RedCap-only operation as well.  The total PRB offsets from the edge of separate initial UL BWP can be: {0, 2, 4, 6, 8}. This can be represented in terms of: 1) new PRB offset values for RedCap or 2) values added to the existing non-RedCap PRB offset values {0, 2, 3, 4}.  If the “addition approach” is considered, the offset values can be {2, 3, 4}.  Also, agree with ZTE comments, especially “the corresponding PRB offsets can be obtained by doubling the legacy PRB offset directly.”   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Index | PUCCH format | First symbol | Number of symbols | PRB offset | Set of initial CS indexes | | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 | {0, 3} | | 1 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 | {0, 4, 8} | | 2 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 3 | {0, 4, 8} | | 3 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 0 | {0, 6} | | 4 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 0 | {0, 3, 6, 9} | | 5 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 2 | {0, 3, 6, 9} | | 6 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 4 | {0, 3, 6, 9} | | 7 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 0 | {0, 6} | | 8 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 0 | {0, 3, 6, 9} | | 9 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 2 | {0, 3, 6, 9} | | 10 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4 | {0, 3, 6, 9} | | 11 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | {0, 6} | | 12 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | {0, 3, 6, 9} | | 13 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 2 | {0, 3, 6, 9} | | 14 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 4 | {0, 3, 6, 9} | | 15 | 1 | 0 | 14 |  | {0, 3, 6, 9} | |
| Intel |  | In general, if the new offset is additive, i.e., on top of (not replacing) PRB offsets from Table 9.2.1-1, then we need a smaller range of values of offsets compared to the case when the new offset replaces legacy PRB offset.  Next, we agree with the earlier analysis from Ericsson and others, that to avoid interference across cells/sectors between non-FH PUCCHs, the offsets need to be doubled since the resources are collected at one edge of the UL BWP.  Then, we are still left with case of avoiding overlaps/interference between non-RedCap (PUCCH w/ FH) and RedCap (PUCCH w/o FH).  Considering the range of values of legacy PRB offsets and configurations and the above motivations, ideally, we need offsets {0, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 14} if the new offset replaces the legacy one. The currently tabled values {2, 4, 6, 8} could only address avoiding overlaps between non-FH PUCCHs.  However, if it is additive, we need fewer values as we can rely on reusing legacy PRB values. In that case, we need the new offsets {0, 4, 8, 12}.  Thus, to provide the full flexibility to avoid both types of overlaps, we prefer that the **new offset is additive to legacy offset** as was also captured in last meeting’s agreement (which is what led us to raise this question in the last round), **with candidate values {0, 4, 8, 12}**. |
| FL5 | The received responses indicated rather high support for Proposal 5-2a, but some responses expressed that the additional PRB offset should be added to the legacy PRB offset rather than replacing it. The following updated proposal can be considered, where the proposed values for the parameter range are taken from contribution [12].  **High Priority Proposal 5-2b:**   * **When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resources for RedCap is deactivated,**   + **The additional PRB offset is added to the legacy PRB offset (*RBBWPoffset*).**   + **The additional PRB offset has a range {2, 3, 4, 6} and a default value of 0.** | |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | For the sake of progress. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Generally Ok | But consider what DCM is trying to explain may somewhat unresolved. |
| Apple | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | N | Comment#1  Regarding the 1st sub-bullet, we support the Proposal 5-2b. Our interpretation of the previous agreement is that the starting point of additional PRB offset is PRB which is indicated by legacy PRB offset.  Comment#2  Regarding the 2nd sub-bullet, we would like to repeat our comment in the previous round. The exact value range of additional PRB offset would be different depending on how to multiplex PUCCH resources (FDM, TDM, CS and/or OCC for PF1).  In our understanding, if RAN1 does not have any agreement on how to map 16 PUCCH resources in one side, we think **only 8 resources are available** in one side according to the current specification when FH is disabled.  In our view, it would be straightforward that PUCCH resources for the first hop in the current specification are used to map 16 PUCCH resources in one side as if FH is enabled with hopping distance is 0 as below;    Some companies gave us a response, but still not sure if we are on the same page or not. Therefore, **we would like to ask companies view whether it is common understanding on how to map 16 resources in one side**.  If this interpretation is correct, the additional PRB offset values would be larger than the values we proposed which are captured in Proposal 5-2b, since we assumed only 8 resources (i.e., a PUCCH resource consists of 2 or 3 PRB in one side same as the current specification) are mapped in one side. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | We agree that when the offset of separate initial UL BWP and initial UL BWP is 0, additional PRB offset should avoid overlap/interference among non-FH PUCCHs, and avoid overlap/interference between non-FH PUCCH and FH PUCCH. The candidate values suggested by FL can deal with both types of overlap/interference. |
| Panasonic | Y in principle | To us, the term “legacy” is a bit confusing. We suggest clarifying whether “the legacy PRB offset” is a shared value with non-RedCap UE (i.e. configured by *pucch-ResourceCommon*) or a RedCap-specific value (e.g. configured by *pucch-ResourceCommonRedCap*). Our understanding is the latter one. |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | As mentioned by many companies, to avoid overlap of non-FH PUCCH resources from different sectors for RedCap UEs, the four candidate values for replacing the legacy PRB offset should be set as {0,4,6,8}, which can be obtained by doubling the legacy PRB offset directly.  Besides, most of the companies have agreed in the last e-meeting that no specification changes are necessary to support multiplexing of non-FH and FH PUCCH transmissions in PUCCH resources. The additional PRB offset that is added to the legacy PRB offset can be replaced by adjusting the starting position of the initial UL BWP for RedCap UEs.  Nevertheless, if the additional PRB offset is considered to be added to the legacy PRB offset, we think the candidate values in the FL proposal are not large enough. We take the following figure as an example. To avoid the interference from neighbouring cell with FH PUCCH resources set index 10, the PRB offsets corresponding to the non-FH PUCCH resource set indexes 8 for RedCap UEs should be 6. Accordingly, to avoid the interference from neighbouring cell with non-FH PUCCH resources set index 8, the PRB offsets corresponding to the non-FH PUCCH resource set indexes 9 for RedCap UEs should be 10, in which case the additional PRB offset Is set to be 10-2=8. To take all kinds of interference into consideration, we propose that the additional PRB offset has a range {6,8,9,10}. |
| LGE | Y | Regarding how to map 16 PUCCH resources in one side, we have a similar view DOCOMO. That is “it would be straightforward that PUCCH resources for the first hop in the current specification are used to map 16 PUCCH resources in one side as”.  For the additional PRB offset values, we think those values in the latest FL proposal are all needed to avoid overlapping/interference with the FH PUCCH resource of non-RedCap UEs or with FH/non-FH PUCCH resources of RedCap UEs. But as commented by DOCOMO larger values such as 8 may also be useful e.g., if PUCCH resource set index indicates 11 and the FH is disabled. Then one way to go would be to increase the number of candidate values to [8] to accommodate more candidate values for flexibility. It should be okay as the number of candidate values 4 is a working assumption now. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | The proposal is fine and is needed for RRC parameters.  The question raised by DOCOMO about the mapping rule to place the 16 PUCCH resources should be addressed once the RRC parameters for PUCCH are stable. While we have an agreement “The PRB index of the PUCCH transmission is determined using the existing equations as a starting point”, exactly how the resources are arranged is the next step after this agreement. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Qualcomm |  | Agree with the first sub-bullet. For the second sub-bullet, the questions raised by DOCOMO are valid and can be further discussed. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Intel | Fine with first sub-bullet but not the second one. | We should consider multiplexing (in frequency) between non-RedCap and RedCap as well as between RedCap PUCCHs.  When considering new offset as additive factor, the legacy offset values can help avoid overlap between non-RedCap and RedCap PUCCH, but between RedCap PUCCH, we still need the “doubled” values: **{4, 6, 8, 12} for the new offset**, if 0 is defined as default when assuming that the PUCCH resources are provided to avoid overlap with non-RedCap PUCCH as well as between RedCap PUCCHs.  Note that the new offset need not support the smaller values, since if only small value of offset is desired in a cell for RedCap PUCCH, the legacy offsets can be used. |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| FL6  FL7 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered, where the value range for the additional PRB offset has been increased from 4 to 8 values (plus a default value of 0) in order to accommodate all requested configuration cases. (Some responses mentioned the need to clarification the PUCCH resource mapping. This is addressed in **Proposal 5-2-1** further down.)  **High Priority Proposal 5-2c:**   * **When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resources for RedCap is deactivated,**   + **The additional PRB offset is added to the ~~legacy~~ PRB offset (*RBBWPoffset*).**   + **The additional PRB offset has a range {2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12} and a default value of 0.** | |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| CATT | Y for 1st bullet  FFS for 2nd bullet | Combining **Proposal 5-2-1** below:  (1) The additional PRB offset is added to the PRB offset ***RBBWPoffset***, i.e. the bias is already the starting position of FH-PUCCH of normal UE.  (2) Based on (1), and the fact that FH-PUCCH of normal UE may occupy ‘at most’ 4 PUCCH PRB at one side (considering smallest Ncs), we think it is enough to consider the largest additional PRB offset as 4.  (3) If consider multiplexing with neighbor cell, we are OK to loose the range further. But we feel **{2, 4, 6, 8} should be enough (this is additional bias to the legacy *RBBWPoffset*…)**. And 0 is the default value.  (4) If special value is need, e.g. 3 is needed, gNB can just configure 4 instead. No need to introduce as much as 8 values… |
| DOCOMO |  | We support the first sub-bullet, but we agree with CATT and think second sub-bullet should be discussed after the progress on the Proposal 5-2-1.  Regarding the additional PRB offset value range, **if Proposal 5-2-1 is agreed,** we propose {2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10} based on the following analysis considering multiplexing with non-RedCap UE and/or RedCap UE in the neighbor sector.   1. When the total number of cyclic shift initial index is 2, i.e., PUCCH resource set index is 0, 3, 7 or 11, the required number of PRB additional offset is 4.      1. When the total number of cyclic shift initial index is 3, i.e., PUCCH resource set index is 1 or 2, the required number of PRB additional offset is 6 or 9.      1. When the total number of cyclic shift initial index is 4, i.e., PUCCH resource set index is 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13 or 14, the required number of PRB additional offset is 6, 8 and 10. Especially when PUCCH resource set index is 15, the required number of PRB additional offset is 2. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LGE | Y | In our opinion those 8 values proposed by the FL are a good compromise proposal as we think all of them can happen depending on the configurations. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y with modification | Fine for the first sub-bullet.  For the second sub-bullet, if the additional PRB offset is too large, the issue of resource fragmentation will be aggravated, which is against the intention of supporting non-FH hopping.  Therefore, we can accept the second sub-bullet as  **The additional PRB offset has a range {2, 3, 4, 6} and a default value of 0.** |
| FL8 | The online (GTW) session on Friday 25th February made the following agreement.  Agreement:   * When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resources for RedCap is deactivated,   + The additional PRB offset is added to the PRB offset (*RBBWPoffset*).   + The additional PRB offset has a [3]-bit range, [which can be {2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12},] and if it is not configured, a default value is assumed as 0.   Based on the above agreement, the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 5-2d:**   * **When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resources for RedCap is deactivated,**   + **The additional PRB offset has a 3-bit range, which is {2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12}.**   + **Note: It has already been agreed that if the additional PRB offset is not configured, a default value is assumed as 0.** | |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We can be fine with the values but the agreement should not indicate the number of bits, it should just specify the values and then let RAN2 determine how to represent the values. Can we just say  **The additional PRB offset ~~has a 3-bit range, which~~ is {2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12}.** |
| Intel | Y | We support the FL proposal.  The current proposal provides the maximum flexibility to the gNB in avoiding overlaps with (1) FH PUCCH from non-RedCap UEs (in the same or neighboring cells), and (2) non-FH PUCCH from RedCap UEs (in neighboring cells).  On the concern about potential resource fragmentation, we do not see an issue since this is entirely up to the gNB. Having larger values as candidate does not mean a gNB has to use them if not needed. However, the larger values help in aligning across cells the non-FH PUCCH resources that take “double the frequency resources at one edge” when FH is disabled. |
| LGE | Y | Agree with Intel. |
| FL9 | The online (GTW) session on Friday 25th February made the following agreement.  Agreement:   * When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resources for RedCap is deactivated,   + The additional PRB offset is added to the PRB offset (*RBBWPoffset*).   + The additional PRB offset has a [3]-bit range, [which can be {2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12},] and if it is not configured, a default value is assumed as 0.   Based on the agreement and received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 5-2e:**   * **When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resources for RedCap is deactivated,**   + **The additional PRB offset ~~has a 3-bit range, which~~ is {2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12}.**   + **Note: It has already been agreed that if the additional PRB offset is not configured, a default value is assumed as 0.** | |
| Qualcomm | OK | We can accept this proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N for the {8, 9 10, 12} | We agree that those values are configurable. However, the scenario behind is that the PUCCH will basically fall into normal PUSCH resources that potentially cause fragmentation.  If that (fragmentation to eMBB PUSCH) is not concerned by gNB for some reasons, the gNB can then configure a separate BWP with its edge unaligned with carrier edge, but still with small number of PRB offset value, which is still better than the scenario that the UL BWP is fixed to the edge of carrier BW, with larger PUCCH offset e.g. 12, but resulting in unused/fragmented PUSCH resources from RedCap UL BWP edge, i.e. PRB#0 to RedCap PUCCH resource PRB index 12 (RedCap BWP PRB 0~11). |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | Although we still think the current candidates are a little redundant, we can live with it for progress. |
| DOCOMO | Y | Same view as CATT. 3 and 12 is not required in our view, but can live with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y | 2,4,6,8 would sufficient, but can live with what is proposed |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y | We are also ok not to have {8, 9 10, 12} |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| LGE | Y | We think the set of the proposed candidate values is a good compromise. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| FL10 | Since most of the received responses are fine with the proposal, it can be considered again and hopefully be acceptable to everyone for progress.  **High Priority Proposal 5-2e:**   * **When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resources for RedCap is deactivated,**   + **The additional PRB offset is {2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12}.**   + **Note: It has already been agreed that if the additional PRB offset is not configured, a default value is assumed as 0.** | |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | We want to check whether the assumption behind the values with large PRB offsets {**8, 9, 10, 12**} is that gNB can configure those if PUSCH fragmentation is not an issue, and the RedCap UL BWP is fixed on carrier edge. However as commented, gNB can also move the RedCap UL BWP additional to the carrier edge with e.g. X=8 PRBs and with PUCCH additional offset Y=12-X=4 PRBs. The effect is the same since in this case, and more flexibility can be achieved by gNB with 1 bit saved, since the centre frequency of corset#0 and UL BWP may be more easily aligned because gNB is not concerned with PUCCH location in this case. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| FL11 | Since most of the received responses are fine with the proposal, it can be considered again and hopefully be acceptable to everyone for progress.  **High Priority Proposal 5-2e:**   * **When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resources for RedCap is deactivated,**   + **The additional PRB offset is {2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12}.**   + **Note: It has already been agreed that if the additional PRB offset is not configured, a default value is assumed as 0.** | |
| FL12 | The online (GTW) session on Tuesday 1st March made the following agreement.  Agreement:   * When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resources for RedCap is deactivated,   + The additional PRB offset is {2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12}.   + Note: It has already been agreed that if the additional PRB offset is not configured, a default value is assumed as 0. | |

**FL6/FL7/FL8 High Priority Proposal 5-2-1:**

* **When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resource for RedCap is deactivated,**
  + **The UE determines PRB index of PUCCH transmission in lower edge of UL BWP as:**
  + **The UE determines PRB index of PUCCH transmission in upper edge of UL BWP as:**
  + **where:**
    - **is the PUCCH resource index.**
    - **is the additional PRB offset.**
    - **Other parameters are as in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.1.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | Thank moderator for considering this issue and we support the proposal. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | N | This proposal is ok for NCS=2 and NCS=4 but not for NCS=3. With this proposal, for NCS=3 the distribution of the number of cyclic shifts per RB is {3,3,3,3,3,1} while with the existing equation, the distribution is {3,3,2,3,3,2}.  Starting with the existing equation, we can place the RBs next to each other (instead of the opposite sides of the BWP) as shown below. In addition to keeping the same distribution for NCS=3 as the existing equation, this placement of RBs has the added benefit of frequency diversity with a separation of RBs between hops.  proposal  2 ceiling(16/Ncs)  rpucch<8  Side-by-side  2 ceiling(16/Ncs)  First hop  2nd hop  2nd hop  First hop  rpucch<8  rpucch≥8  rpucch≥8  We would like to see the following equations be considered is (for lower edge) first hop  Second hop  It is not much change of the existing equation. |
| Intel | Y | Further, it’d also be good to close on the determination of initial cyclic shifts as *(rPUCCH mod NCS)*. |
| FL9 | Most received responses support the proposal. One response suggested to map each PUCCH resource to 2 PRBs in order to achieve a more even distribution of cyclic shifts per RB. However, that would contradict the RAN1#107-e agreement that *“When the frequency hopping for the RedCap PUCCH resources (for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB) is deactivated, each PUCCH resource is mapped to a single PRB”*. Another response commented that it would be good to include the determination of initial cyclic shift. The following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 5-2-1a:**   * **When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resource for RedCap is deactivated,**   + **The UE determines PRB index of PUCCH transmission in lower edge of UL BWP as:**   + **The UE determines PRB index of PUCCH transmission in upper edge of UL BWP as:**   + **The UE determines the initial cyclic shift index in the set of initial cyclic shift indexes as:**   + **where:**     - **is the PUCCH resource index.**     - **is the additional PRB offset.**     - **Other parameters are as in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.1.** | |
| Qualcomm |  | It is unclear to us if this proposal implies that RedCap UE can still transmit PUCCH on both edges of the initial UL BWP when FH is deactivated, or only one edge (aligned with the carrier edge of serving cell) the initial UL BWP will be configured for PUCCH transmission. |
| vivo | Y | Regarding the Qualcomm’s question, which side the PUCCH is mapped will be configured by SIB as agreed before, so at a given time, either the 1st or the 2nd sub-bullet would apply based on the configuration, not both. |
| CATT | Y | Also OK to consider the NRB introduced in Rel-17 FR2-2.  Regarding to QC’s concern, we already have the following agreement:   |  | | --- | | Agreement:  When the frequency hopping for the RedCap PUCCH resources (for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB) is deactivated,   * All 16 PUCCH resources are mapped to one side, and it is SIB-configurable which side. * The PRB index of the PUCCH transmission is determined using the existing equations as a starting point, with an additional PRB offset with [4] candidate values.   + One of the candidate values is [zero]. | |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| LGE | Y | We share the view with vivo on the question from Qualcomm. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm2 |  | To Vivo and CATT:  we think the description of lower/upper edge in this proposal may not be accurate in certain configurations for the initial UL BWP and the additional RB offset. For example, if the size of initial UL BWP is 24 RB whereas the additional RB offset is 10/12 RB, it may end up with:    That is, the so-called “upper edge” is mapped to a lower PRB index than the “lower edge”, hence our question above.  For clarification, perhaps we can revise this proposal as:  *When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resource for RedCap is deactivated, the UE determines PRB index of PUCCH transmission in one edge of the initial UL BWP by either formula below, but not both.* |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | N | From the email discussion and comment for the proposal, it is apparent that a common understanding about the number of RBs needed for PUCCH is necessary.  Even FL Proposal 5-2-1a requires more than 1 PRB to support all 16 possible values of rPUCCH.  For example, with NCS=3 (3 cyclic shifts per PRB), the mapping is  For 0 ≤ rPUCCH < 3, the PRB index is  For 3 ≤ rPUCCH < 6, the PRB index is  For 6 ≤ rPUCCH < 9, the PRB index is  For 9 ≤ rPUCCH < 12, the PRB index is  For 12 ≤ rPUCCH < 15, the PRB index is  For 15 ≤ rPUCCH < 16, the PRB index is  The mapping to a cyclic shift index from the value of rPUCCH is  This example shows that a total of 6 PRBs are needed to support the mapping of all possible values of rPUCCH.  The agreement the FL cited maps a cyclic shift to one PRB (which there is no disagreement, we never said a cyclic shift is mapped to 2 PRBs); The misunderstanding appears to be whether one PRB supports all 16 values of rPUCCH. Based on our understanding of 38.213, each PRB can support Ncs values of rPUCCH and that multiple PRBs are needed for all 16 values of rPUCCH. We hope this explanation clarifies the number of PRBs needed for PUCCH.  In our comment for FL8, for NCS=3, with the FL proposal, as the example shows, the first five PRBs each support 3 values of rPUCCH. The last PRB supports one value of rPUCCH.  Since agreement for FL1 5-1 stated “The PRB index of the PUCCH transmission is determined using the existing equations as a starting point”, we examined the mapping within the standards and noted that the existing equations for NCS=3 mapped the first 8 values of rPUCCH to 3 RBs and the last 8 values of rPUCCH to a different set of 3 RBs.  Since we have the agreement to use the existing equations as a starting point, a proposal that achieves the same mapping of rPUCCH to PRB as the existing equations was provided last time. But if that equation were too hard to understand, an alternative expression is (modification in blue)   * **When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resource for RedCap is deactivated,**   + **The UE determines PRB index of PUCCH transmission in lower edge of UL BWP as:**     - if and otherwise   + **The UE determines PRB index of PUCCH transmission in upper edge of UL BWP as:**   + **The UE determines the initial cyclic shift index in the set of initial cyclic shift indexes as:**   + **where:**     - **is the PUCCH resource index.**     - **is the additional PRB offset.**     - **Other parameters are as in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.1.**   Hopefully, the options are at least now clear to the FL and others |
| Apple | Y |  |
| FL10 | Most received responses support the proposal. One response suggested to modify the equations to achieve a more even distribution of cyclic shifts per RB, but it is not obvious to the feature lead that the modification has any significant benefits over the equations in Proposal 5-2-1. Another response pointed out that it might be better to use another wording than “lower edge” and “upper edge”. The following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 5-2-1b:**   * **When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resource for RedCap is deactivated,**   + **The UE determines PRB index of PUCCH transmission in ~~lower edge~~ one side of UL BWP ~~as~~ by using one of the following equations as configured by SIB:**   + **~~The UE determines PRB index of PUCCH transmission in upper edge of UL BWP as:~~**   + **The UE determines the initial cyclic shift index in the set of initial cyclic shift indexes as:**   + **where:**     - **is the PUCCH resource index.**     - **is the additional PRB offset.**     - **Other parameters are as in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.1.** | |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | Regarding Futurewei’s comment, we share the same view as FL and don’t see any issue on the current description on Proposal 5-2-1b. |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We are glad that our proposal was understood. There may be small performance benefits in some cases but we won't insist if they majority prefers the current proposal. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| FL11 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered again.  **High Priority Proposal 5-2-1b:**   * **When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resource for RedCap is deactivated,**   + **The UE determines PRB index of PUCCH transmission in one side of UL BWP by using one of the following equations as configured by SIB:**   + **The UE determines the initial cyclic shift index in the set of initial cyclic shift indexes as:**   + **where:**     - **is the PUCCH resource index.**     - **is the additional PRB offset.**     - **Other parameters are as in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.1.** | |
| FL12 | The online (GTW) session on Tuesday 1st March made the following agreement.  Agreement:   * When frequency hopping for common PUCCH resource for RedCap is deactivated,   + The UE determines PRB index of PUCCH transmission in one side of UL BWP by using one of the following equations as configured by SIB:   + The UE determines the initial cyclic shift index in the set of initial cyclic shift indexes as:   + where:     - is the PUCCH resource index.     - is the additional PRB offset.     - Other parameters are as in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.1. | |

Based on the online (GTW) session for agenda item 8.16.6 (on the RedCap UE feature list) on Monday 21st February, the following question can be considered.

**FL2 High Priority Question 5-3: Should it be supported to disable frequency hopping for common PUCCH resources for RedCap UEs in a shared initial UL BWP? Please provide your motivation in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | N | If RedCap UE and non-RedCap UE share the same initial UL BWP configuration, we don’t think it is necessary to disable FH for common PUCCH resources. As a result, the utilization efficiency of cell-specific PUCCH resources can be optimized for all UE types. |
| CATT | N | Legacy Rel-15/16 UEs mandates FH of common PUCCH in shared initial UL BWP.  If RedCap UE shares initial UL BWP with legacy UEs, the most proper way is follow legacy behavior, i.e. mandates FH for common PUCCH. This provides better coexistence and allows inter-UE multiplexing. |
| Xiaomi | N | Not necessary. Don’t see the motivation to disable the FH in this case. |
| Vivo | N |  |
| Panasonic | N | In the shared initial UL BWP, the legacy behavior is enough. |
| Sharp | N | PUCCH FH disabling is used to avoid PUSCH resource fragmentation by PUCCH resources in separate initial UL BWP. On the other hand, there is no additional PUSCH fragmentation issue on the shared initial UL BWP with RedCap UEs.  Moreover, on the shared initial UL BWP, since RedCap UEs will share PUCCH resources with non-RedCap UEs, disabling of PUCCH FH will not work in the shared initial UL BWP |
| NTT DOCOMO | N | Given that the motivation to support PUCCH FH disabling for common PUCCH is to avoid PUSCH fragmentation issue when a RedCap UE uses a separate initial UL BWP, we don’t see any benefit to disable FH in a shared initial UL BWP. |
| Lenovo | N |  |
| Samsung | N | We share similar view as Qualcomm. |
| LGE | N | We agree with most of the comments above. In our view, we already narrowed down the support of disabling common PUCCH FH to the case where the separate initial UL BWP is configured. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | Seems not necessary since the scenario is likely that the BW of BWP for non-RedCap does not exceed RedCap UE max BW, thus no fragmentation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | We are OK to not support disabling frequency hopping in shared BWP. |
| MediaTek | N | We don’t see the motivation for disabling FH for RedCap in shared initial UL BWP, either. |
| CMCC | N | There is no PUSCH fragment issue and enabling FH for common PUCCH guarantees multiplexing capacity of RedCap and non-RedCap UEs. |
| Nordic | N | We do not see benefit to support |
| FUTUREWEI | N | No benefit to support disabling of FH in shared initial UL BWP |
| Ericsson | N | There does not seem to be any obvious benefit with disabling FH in a shared UL BWP. The main purpose for disabling FH is to minimize the UL resource fragmentation when configuring a small initial UL BWP within a larger UL BWP. With a shared initial UL BWP between RedCap and non-RedCap, many configurations can be shared for minimizing the signaling overhead. |
| Intel | N |  |
| IDCC | N |  |
| FL3 | Based the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 5-3a: Disabling of frequency hopping for common PUCCH resources for RedCap UEs is only supported for separate (not shared) initial UL BWP.** | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | We may inform AI 8.16.6 a.s.a.p. once we agree on it. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| FL4 | Based the received responses, the following proposal can be considered again.  **High Priority Proposal 5-3a: Disabling of frequency hopping for common PUCCH resources for RedCap UEs is only supported for separate (not shared) initial UL BWP.** | |
| FL5 | The online (GTW) session on Wednesday 23rd February made the following agreement.  Agreement:  Disabling of frequency hopping for common PUCCH resources for RedCap UEs is only supported for separate (not shared) initial UL BWP. | |

# Other aspects

The following other aspects not covered in the earlier sections of this document are discussed in some contributions.

**UL/DL center frequency in TDD:**

* [6]: For TDD, the center frequencies are assumed to be the same for the initial DL BWP and initial UL BWP after initial access for RedCap UEs.
* [13]: For TDD, center frequencies are the same for the initial DL and UL BWP during random access for RedCap UEs, no matter whether or not it includes CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0 or not.
* [21]: For TDD, the initial DL BWP for RedCap UEs (separate or default) shall be center frequency aligned with the initial UL BWP for RedCap UEs (separate or default) for both during initial access and after initial access.
* [23]: For TDD, center frequencies are the same for the initial DL and UL BWPs for RedCap UEs, regardless of whether the initial DL BWP contains CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0.
* [27]: In TDD, initial UL BWP applicable to RedCap UEs is aligned in center frequency with initial DL BWP applicable to RedCap UEs.

**Multiplexing of FH and non-FH PUCCH:**

* [4]: Two base sequences are generated and applied for a non-FH PUCCH with time-domain symbol allocation and frequency domain PRB allocation the same as that of an intra-slot FH PUCCH.
* [12]: 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 generate two base sequences for the PUCCH as if intra-slot frequency hopping is enabled for the PUCCH transmission.
* [17]: Multiplexing between non-FH and FH PUCCH from RedCap and non-RedCap UEs respectively is left up to gNB implementation.
* [18]: If intra-slot FH is disabled for Redcap and overlapped RBs are used for non-FH and FH PUCCH transmissions, the base sequence group/sequence hopping for PUCCH format 1 is determined based on value of ‘pucch-GroupHopping’ IE configured for non-Redcap UE.

**RACH occasions:**

* [4]: For the shared ROs scenario, only ROs which fall within separate initial UL BWP can be regarded as valid ROs for RedCap UEs and the mapping of SSB-to-RO can be separately configured for RedCap UEs.
* [10]: When ROs are shared, a separate mapping between RO and SSB for RedCap UE may be needed.

Companies are invited to comment on whether any other critical issues (beside the ones covered in earlier sections) need to be resolved to conclude the Rel-17 RedCap WI.

**FL1/FL2 Medium Priority Question 6-1: Companies are invited to comment on whether any other critical issues (beside the ones covered in earlier sections) need to be resolved to conclude the Rel-17 RedCap WI.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | For the center-frequency alignment issue, we think the legacy principle should be maintained, i.e. a TDD UE assumes center-frequency alignment between DL BWP and UL BWP with the same BWP index. |
| Nordic | We believe it would be good to clarify what CORESET(s) can be configured in separate Initial DL BWP not containing CORESET#0 by MIB. If non-RedCap SIB1 shall be reused for RedCap, commonCORESET configuration requires more than 50bits, **this is critically high**. We believe there should be possibility for some simple CORESET configuration, be it called CORESET0A or something else. |
| Spreadtrum | 1. NW can configure the separate initial DL BWP, no matter whether the separate initial DL BWP contains CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0. We are not sure the current agreements (when combined) can imply it. If it can, we are fine for it. 2. Similar as vivo, we think the center-frequency alignment b/w DL/UL BWP should be applied to all cases for RedCap UE. In the current agreements, there is a FFS for the case when the initial DL BWP does not include CD-SSB and the entire CORESET#0. |
| Qualcomm | Based on the replies from RAN2 and RAN4, we think it is necessary to:   1. confirm that L1/L3 measurements based on NCD-SSB of serving cell are supported as mandatory capabilities of R17 RedCap UE and included as an additional component of FG 28-1 2. discuss the signaling aspects for NCD-SSB (with RAN1 impacts) in dedicated DL BWP of RedCap UE  * for example, whether or not the configuration/availability of NCD-SSB can follow a mechanism of SI plus RRC/DCI |
| Intel | The following issues (mentioned in our tdoc [17] although not listed above) needs to be addressed during this meeting:   * Center frequency alignment:   + Center frequency alignment between initial DL BWP and initial UL BWP for RedCap when the initial DL BWP includes CORESET#0 and CD-SSB.   + RAN1 specifications should capture the center frequency alignment between initial DL and UL BWPs when they are used for random access. The current text from Rel-15 in Subclause 12 of 38.213 is not sufficient as it only refers to BWPs with same index. With possibility of configuration of separate initial DL/UL BWPs, the Rel-15 text would be ambiguous as to how BWPs with same indices are identified in such a context. * The details of NCD-SSB needs to be finalized following the feedback from RAN2/RAN4 so that they can be captured in the RAN1 specifications appropriately. * RAN1 needs an agreement on configuration of CORESET in addition to *ra-searchSpaceSet* in separate initial DL BWP, including details of such CORESET configuration. |
| Xiaomi | As mentioned in our contribution [R1-2201955](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201955.zip), the following issues need discussion.   * The supported number of separate initial DL BWP: According to current agreement, it is possible that more than one separate initial DL BWP can be supported as shown in the following figure. But in our opinion, the motivation for such configuration is weak. To simplify the configuration and processing, it is desirable to support up to 1 separate initial DL BWP for RedCap      * Default BWP determination: In current NR system, once *bwp-InactivityTimer* associated with the active DL BWP expires, if the default BWP is explicitly configured via *defaultDownlinkBWP-Id,* UE perform BWP switching to the BWP indicated by the *defaultDownlinkBWP-Id*. Otherwise, UE would perform BWP switching to the *initialDownlinkBWP.* But for RedCap, here may be more than one *initialDownlinkBWPs.* For example*,* the original *initialDownlinkBWP* is mainly used for paging and SIB, and the separate *initialDownlinkBWP* is used for RACH. In this case, how to determine the target BWP for switching if default BWP is not explicitly configured via *defaultDownlinkBWP-Id* should be clarified. |
| Sharp | According to current description in 38.213 v17.0.0 as “A UE can be provided a DL BWP by *initialDownlinkBWP* in *DownlinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB*, and an UL BWP by *initialUplinkBWP* in *UplinkConfigCommonRedCapSIB*.”, it is unclear when a separate initial DL BWP is applied to RedCap UEs as initial DL BWP when the separate initial DL BWP does not contain CORESET#0. For this case, we would like to clarify that the separate initial DL BWP should be applied to the RedCap UE upon initiating to perform the random access procedure. |
| NTT DOCOMO | The common PUCCH resources for RedCap UEs without FH and for non-RedCap UEs with FH can be FDMed with additional PRB offset for RedCap UE. However, such configuration may result UL throughput degradation which is not desired from system perspective. Therefore, we propose to support multiplexing common PUCCH resources with/without FH by cyclic shifts. More specifically, if FH of common PUCCH for RedCap UEs is disabled, UE generate two base sequences for the PUCCH as if intra-slot frequency hopping is enabled for the PUCCH transmission. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | All the above |
| MediaTek | 1. How does UE determine its initial DL BWP from (a) SIB-configured initial DL BWP for RedCap, (b) SIB-configured initial DL BWP for non-RedCap, and (c) MIB-defined CORESET#0 for cases (1) initial access and random access, and (2) paging and SI update in Idle/Inactive mode? For (2), we are also ok with clarification on UE behavior. The approach with less specification is preferred.  2. Center frequency alignment between (1) initial DL and UL BWPs; and (2) CORESET#0 and initial UL BWP if Msg2/Msg4/MsgB reception is configured with CORESET#0   * If UE has to perform RF retuning during random access, RAN1 should revisits RACH timeline requirements by taking RF retuning time into consideration. |

# References

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [1] | [RP-211574](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/TSG_RAN/TSGR_92e/Docs/RP-211574.zip) | Revised WID on support of reduced capability NR devices | Ericsson |
| [2] | [R1-2112506](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_107-e/Docs/R1-2112506.zip) | RAN1 agreements for Rel-17 NR RedCap | Rapporteur (Ericsson) |
| [3] | [R1-2112501](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_107-e/Docs/R1-2112501.zip) | FL summary #5 on reduced maximum UE bandwidth for RedCap | Moderator (Ericsson) |
| [4] | [R1-2200917](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2200917.zip) | Remaining issues on reduced maximum UE bandwidth | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [5] | [R1-2200985](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2200985.zip) | Remaining aspects of Bandwidth Reduction for RedCap UEs | FUTUREWEI |
| [6] | [R1-2201099](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201099.zip) | Remaining issues on reduced maximum UE bandwidth | Vivo, Guangdong Genius |
| [7] | [R1-2201136](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201136.zip) | Bandwidth reduction for reduced capability NR devices | ZTE, Sanechips |
| [8] | [R1-2201277](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201277.zip) | Remaining issues on reduced UE bandwidth | OPPO |
| [9] | [R1-2201367](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201367.zip) | Remaining issues on reduced maximum UE bandwidth | CATT |
| [10] | [R1-2201404](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201404.zip) | Aspects related to reduced maximum UE bandwidth | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |
| [11] | [R1-2201441](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201441.zip) | Remaining issues on reduced maximum UE bandwidth for RedCap | China Telecom |
| [12] | [R1-2201482](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201482.zip) | Remaining issues on reduced maximum UE bandwidth for RedCap | NTT DOCOMO, INC. |
| [13] | [R1-2201549](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201549.zip) | Discussion on aspects related to reduced maximum UE bandwidth | Spreadtrum Communications |
| [14] | [R1-2201590](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201590.zip) | Aspects related to reduced maximum UE bandwidth for RedCap | Panasonic Corporation |
| [15] | [R1-2201605](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201605.zip) | Remaining issues on BWP operation for RedCap | NEC |
| [16] | [R1-2201668](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201668.zip) | Reduced maximum UE bandwidth for RedCap | Ericsson |
| [17] | [R1-2201702](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201702.zip) | On reduced BW support for RedCap | Intel Corporation |
| [18] | [R1-2201775](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201775.zip) | Reduced maximum UE bandwidth for Redcap | Apple |
| [19] | [R1-2201861](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201861.zip) | Remaining issues of reduced maximum UE bandwidth | CMCC |
| [20] | [R1-2201955](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201955.zip) | Discussion on the remaining issues of reduced UE bandwidth for RedCap | Xiaomi |
| [21] | [R1-2201970](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201970.zip) | Reduced maximum UE bandwidth for RedCap | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |
| [22] | [R1-2202020](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202020.zip) | UE complexity reduction | Samsung |
| [23] | [R1-2202061](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202061.zip) | On reduced bandwidth for NR RedCap UEs | MediaTek Inc. |
| [24] | [R1-2202192](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202192.zip) | Discussion on reduced maximum UE bandwidth | Sharp |
| [25] | [R1-2202250](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202250.zip) | Remaining issues on reduced maximum UE bandwidth | InterDigital, Inc. |
| [26] | [R1-2202344](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202344.zip) | Aspects related to the reduced maximum UE bandwidth of RedCap | LG Electronics |
| [27] | [R1-2202382](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202382.zip) | On aspects related to reduced maximum UE BW | Nordic Semiconductor ASA |
| [28] | [R1-2202146](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202146.zip) | Remaining Issues on UE Complexity Reduction | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| [29] | [R1-2200918](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2200918.zip) | On RAN1 aspects of RAN2 led issues for RedCap | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [30] | [R1-2201138](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201138.zip) | Higher layer support of Reduced Capability NR devices | ZTE, Sanechips |
| [31] | [R1-2202383](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202383.zip) | On RAN2 related aspects | Nordic Semiconductor ASA |
| [32] | [R1-2201864](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201864.zip) | Remaining issues of other aspects for RedCap UE | CMCC |
| [33] | [R1-2201892](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201892.zip) | Remaining aspects for RedCap | ZTE, Sanechips |
| [34] | [R1-2201958](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2201958.zip) | Discussion on the fast BWP switching for RedCap | Xiaomi |
| [35] | [R1-2202419](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202419.zip) | On RedCap UE BWP configuration | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [36] | [RP-213689](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/TSG_RAN/TSGR_94e/Docs/RP-213689.zip) | Moderator’s proposals from [94e-39-R17-RedCap-WI] | Moderator (Intel) |
| [37] | [R1-2112802](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_107-e/Docs/R1-2112802.zip) | LS on use of NCD-SSB or CSI-RS in DL BWPs for RedCap UE | RAN1, Ericsson |
| [38] | [R1-2200876](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2200876.zip) | Reply LS on the use of NCD-SSB or CSI-RS in DL BWPs for RedCap UEs | RAN2, Ericsson |
| [39] | [R1-2200877](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2200877.zip) | LS on RSRP measurement before Msg1 or MsgA retransmission | RAN2, Ericsson |
| [40] | [R1-2200898](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2200898.zip) | Reply LS on use of NCD-SSB for RedCap UE | RAN4, ZTE |
| [41] | [R1-2200904](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2200904.zip) | Reply LS on use of NCD-SSB or CSI-RS in DL BWPs for RedCap UE | RAN4, Vivo |
| [42] | [R1-2202528](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202528.zip) ([Inbox](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Inbox/R1-2202528.zip)) | FL summary #1 on reduced maximum UE bandwidth for RedCap | Moderator (Ericsson) |
| [43] | [R1-2202529](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202529.zip) ([Inbox](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Inbox/R1-2202529.zip)) | FL summary #2 on reduced maximum UE bandwidth for RedCap | Moderator (Ericsson) |
| [44] | [R1-2202530](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202530.zip) ([Inbox](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Inbox/R1-2202530.zip)) | FL summary #3 on reduced maximum UE bandwidth for RedCap | Moderator (Ericsson) |
| [45] | [R1-2202531](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Docs/R1-2202531.zip) ([Inbox](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_108-e/Inbox/R1-2202531.zip)) | FL summary #4 on reduced maximum UE bandwidth for RedCap | Moderator (Ericsson) |