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# Introduction

As announced by chairman, one email thread is planned to discuss high-level aspects for NR MBS in this meeting.

[102-e-NR-MBS-01] Email discussion/approval using R1-2007001 as a starting point, focusing on high-level aspects – Fei (CMCC)

* By 8/19 – Classification of high priority/medium priority items for this e-Meeting
* By 8/24 – high priority items
* By 8/27 - medium priority items

The initial moderator summary is provided in R1-2007001 which can be found in the inbox. The issues in the summary are classified into two tiers.

The first tier issues are the ones for the high level concept and can be considered as starting point for this meeting, which are summarized in table 1 below and the details can be found in section 2 in R1-2007001.

The second tier issues are low priority issues and are mainly the ones for details or further step issues set up on the conclusion of the first tier issues, which are targeted to be discussed in the following meeting but some of them can also be discussed in this meeting upon the first tier issues are concluded. The summary and the details for the second tier issues can be found in section 3 in R1-2007001.

**Table 1: The first tier issues**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-agenda** | **Issues (summary in section 2 in R1-2007001)** |
| Group scheduling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs | **Issue 1 (Question 1 in R1-2007001)**: Regarding the two high level group scheduling mechanisms, i.e., group-common PDCCH based group scheduling and UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling, whether down selection is needed or both of them can be considered for MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs? |
| **Issue 2 (Question 2 in** **R1-2007001)**: Please share your views on the following two alternatives for frequency resource configuration for MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.• Alternative 1: Introduce a MBS specific BWP• Alternative 2: Define a MBS common frequency resource confined within UE’s active BWP. |
| **Issue 3 (Question 3 in** **R1-2007001)**: Whether the simultaneous operation with unicast reception in the WID means a UE is required to receive multicast PDSCH and unicast PDSCH simultaneously in one slot? If the answer is YES, which multiplexing type(s) of simultaneous reception of unicast PDSCH and multicast PDSCH in a slot can be supported in NR MBS? e.g., TDM, FDM, SDM. |
| Reliability improvement for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs | **Issue 4 (Proposal 1 in R1-2007001, with little update)**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for multicast without additional evaluation for it, i.e., no evaluation is needed to justify whether HARQ-ACK feedback is needed. |
| **Issue 5 (Proposal 2 in R1-2007001, with little update)**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, consider following reliability improvement mechanisms for MBS.• CSI feedback, FFS whether modification is needed on top of existing CSI feedback mechanism for unicast• PDSCH repetition, FFS whether spec impact is implied |
| **Issue 6 (Question 4 in R1-2007001, with little update)**: Whether a common evaluation methodology and assumptions are necessary for NR MBS? If the answer is YES, what’s the purpose of the evaluation? And what’s your suggestion on the common evaluation methodology and assumptions? |
| Basic functions for MBS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs | **Issue 7 (Proposal 3 in R1-2007001)**: For UE in IDLE/INACTIVE state, the frequency resource for PTM transmission is• Alt 1: Initial BWP• Alt 2: Configured with larger size to cover initial BWP• Alt 3: Configured to be within initial BWP |
| **Issue 8 (Proposal 4 in R1-2007001)**: Multi-beam/beam-sweeping operation is supported for PTM in IDLE/INACTIVE state. |

According to Chairman’s guidance, this email thread will be organized in three phases:

* Phase 1: by 8/19, classification of high priority/medium priority items for this e-Meeting based on the summarized first tier issues.
* Phase 2: by 8/24, discuss and conclude the high priority items.
* Phase 3: by 8/27, discuss and conclude the medium priority items.

In phase 1, based on companies’ views, the following high/medium priority items have been classified for this meeting:

* High priority:
	+ Issue 1/4/6
* Medium priority:
	+ Issue 2/3/5

For phase 2, companies are invited to provide their views on the high priority issues for this e-Meeting in section 2. Moderator will provide the observation and proposal on the high priority issues based on companies’ inputs.

For phase 3, companies are invited to provide their views on the medium priority issues for this e-Meeting in section 3. Moderator will provide the observation and proposal on the medium priority issues based on companies’ inputs.

# Email discussion on high priority issues (Phase 2)

## Company Views (1st round of email discussion)

***Group scheduling mechanisms for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs***

Based on companies’ submitted contributions, two group scheduling mechanisms were proposed. The first is group-common PDCCH based group scheduling, which is similar to LTE SC-PTM transmission. In this mechanism, CRC of PDCCH is scrambled by a common RNTI (e.g., G-RNIT) and the PDSCH is also scrambled by the common RNTI. Nine companies proposed to consider this mechanism for MBS.

The second is UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling. In this mechanism, CRC of PDCCH is scrambled by C-RNTI, but different PDCCHs schedule a group common PDSCH for a group of UEs. From UE’s perspective, it is the same as unicast transmission. Three companies proposed to also consider this mechanism.

One company proposed to also consider sub-G-RNTI PDCCH based group scheduling, in which sub-G-RNTI can be used to scramble a sub-group common PDCCH for a small group scheduling. This mechanism seems to fall into group-common PDCCH based group scheduling in high level, if any difference, the details can be considered in later stage.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **group scheduling mechanisms** | **Companies** |
| Option 1: group-common PDCCH based group scheduling | Huawei, Nokia, QC, Convida, ZTE, Intel, CATT, CMCC, LG |
| Option 2: UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling | CMCC, vivo, CATT |

**[High priority] Issue 1 (Question 1 in R1-2007001)**: *Regarding the two high level group scheduling mechanisms, i.e., group-common PDCCH based group scheduling and UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling, whether down selection is needed or both of them can be considered for MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs?*

Please share your views and comments in the table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Support Option 1 : group-common PDCCH based group schedulingComments on option 2:The PDSCH for unicast is bit-scrambled by C-RNTI. The group common PDSCH is impossible to be entirely same as the PDSCH for unicast.When the number of UEs is large, the PDCCH resource consumed becomes larger than the PDCCH resource used for beam-sweeping in Option 1.  |
| vivo | We think both of them can be considered for MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs for the following reasons:1. group-common PDCCH based group scheduling can be a basic scheduling mechanism, considering there may be quite lots of UEs in an MBS group, this mechanism is beneficial for PDCCH overhead reduction. But this mechanism will introduce many efforts when HARQ-ACK feedback is supported.
2. UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling can also be used in some cases, for example, the case that number of MBS UEs is medium and the MBS service reliability requirement is high, i.e., HARQ-ACK is needed for the service. In this case, there is no has no PDCCH blocking issue. Then UE-specific PDCCH can benefit from scheduling and HARQ-ACK feedback perspective as summarized in the following table.

In our view, group-common PDCCH mechanism will have large spec impact / standardization effort for HARQ-ACK feedback, multiplexing / prioritization between multicast and unicast, etc. It is more suitable for an MBS with no HARQ-ACK feedback or with only group-specific NACK only feedback. UE-specific PDCCH mechanism can the minimize spec impact / standardization effort for these aspects and is a good scheduling scheme for MBS PDSCH retransmission. Therefore, no down select is needed.Table 1 Comparisons of groupcast PDCCH and unicast PDCCH

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | group-common PDCCH | UE-specific PDCCH |
| PDCCH overhead | Low  | high |
| Search space configuration | Larger spec impact | No spec impact |
| DCI size alignment | If DCI 1\_1/1\_2 is used, it may have impact on DCI size alignmentIf DCI 2\_x is used, other group common DCI need to align the DCI payload size with it, which may reduce the PDCCH performance | Same as unicast PDSCH, no additional impact |
| Impact on HARQ-ACK feedback | PUCCH resource | Hard to indicate orthogonal PUCCH resources due to the same PRI value.  |
| HARQ-ACK feedback timing | Same timing, all UEs in an MBS group will feed back HARQ-ACK in the same slot, resulting PUCCH overload and collision  |
| TPC | Difficult to indicate different UEs’ TPC using one single DC |
| Impacts when considering simultaneous receptions of MBS PDSCH and unicast PDSCH  | DAI | Separating DAI counting for groupcast PDSCH and uncast PDSCH |
| HARQ-ACK Codebook | Separate or joint HARQ-ACK codebook needs to be discussed/specified |
| if separate codebook for MBS PDSCH and unicast PDSCH, multiplexing/prioritization of different codebooks needs to be discussed |
| RNTI | if UE is interested in multiple MBS services, UE needs to monitor a PDCCH with multiple g-RNTIs |

 |
| CMCC | Both group-common PDCCH based group scheduling and UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling can be supported for MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.It is noteworthy that the decision on which group scheduling mechanism should be supported should not only consider the overhead of PDCCH, but also the other aspects, e.g., the standization effort or spec impact to support HARQ-ACK feedback if it is supported, the PUCCH resource utilization efficiency for HARQ-ACK feedback, etc.From the comparison in the following table, we can see that, on the one hand, the PDCCH overhead of UE-specific PDCCH based scheme is larger than that of group common PDCCH based scheme, on the other hand, the standardization efforts for UE-specific PDCCH based scheme to support ACK-NACK based HARQ feedback is much less than group common PDCCH based scheme.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Group common PDCCH based scheme | UE-specific PDCCH based scheme |
| PDCCH overhead | Small  | **Larger** |
| PUCCH resource configuration for HARQ-ACK | **Less configuration flexibility, less PUCCH resource utilization efficiency and larger spec impact*** For ACK/NACK feedback, network needs to configure orthogonal PUCCH resources for UEs in the same group by RRC so that a single PRI field in DCI can optionally be used to select separate PUCCH resource for each UE. This will cause that NW has to reserve a certain amount of dedicated PUCCH resources for multicast transmission which cannot be shared with unicast transmission.
* Separate PUCCH resource configurations for multicast and unicast may be needed, which will introduce additional spec impact.
 | More Flexible, more efficiency and little spec impact* The same as for unicast.
 |
| HARQ-ACK multiplexing for multicast and unicast / HARQ-ACK codebook construction | **More complicated and large spec impact*** If HARQ-ACK multiplexing for multicast and unicast in a slot is supported, the joint codebook construction procedure is much more complicated and will induce more spec impact whether for semi-static or dynamic HARQ-ACK codebook.
* If HARQ-ACK multiplexing for multicast and unicast in a slot is not supported, HARQ-ACK for multicast or unicast has to be dropped which may impact the performance, or it has to be based on network implementation to avoid collision of HARQ-ACK feedback for multicast and unicast, which will introduce additional scheduling restriction.
 | NO spec impact* Can reuse Rel-15/Rel-16 HARQ codebook construction procedure.
 |

Considering the pros and cons of these two group scheduling schemes, we think they can be used for different use cases. * For the case with relatively less number of UEs in a MBS group (but multicast still has advantage on spectral efficiency compared with unicast transmission), it is more suitable to use UE-specific PDCCH group scheduling together with ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback to improve reliability with little spec impact and managable PDCCH / PUCCH overhead.
* For the case with large number of UEs in a MBS group, it is more suitable to use group common PDCCH scheduling for which NACK only based HARQ-ACK feedback can be used to improve reliability with small PDCCH / PUCCH overhead.

Therefore, we think both two group scheudling mechanisms can be supported. |
| LG | We think that group scheduling with G-RNTI is beneficial for the newtork especially when multiple UEs interested in a service can receive same TBs of the service via same time/frequency resources. However, it would not be always possible for certain UEs. Thus, it is also good to consider UE specific scheduling with C-RNTI. |
| Nokia | For RRC Connected mode UEs, in general we prefer option 1, because of the lower downlink signaling overhead. However, we can envisage of some scenarios where option 2 may also be beneficial to support additional feedback from certain UEs. In those scenarios, the UE could be configured with an additional USS to support additional UE specific reliability information. |
| ZTE | We suggest to support group-common PDCCH only.Compared with UE-specific PDCCH, group-common PDCCH can save lots of resources as all UEs in one group share the same PDCCH. Besides, for broadcast for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, only group-common PDCCH (or more specifically, cell-common PDCCH) can be applied. It is preferred to keep commonality between broadcast and multicast. That is, group-common PDCCH needs to be supported anyway considering broadcast service scheduling, and more standardization work will be needed for additional support for UE-specific PDCCH. We would also like to mention that the UE-specific PDCCH based solution may have RAN2 impact. Based on our understanding, UE MAC layer needs to know the G-RNTI (corresponding to a type of service/logical channel) of each PDSCH. If UE-specific PDCCH based solution is introduced, then how can the network indicate the G-RNTI to the UE?  |
| OPPO | Both options should be considered.Option 1 is beneficial in terms of PDCCH overhead reduction, however, there are some cases where gNB cannot transmit group-common PDCCH to a specific UE, e.g. UE active BWP is different from MBS BWP, or to multiplex HARQ-ACK for unicast and MBS in a single PUCCH, therefore UE-specific PDCCH is also needed. Furthermore, it is preferable to make the definition of group-common PDCCH and UE-specific PDCCH clearer, from our point of view, group-common PDCCH should be transmitted in CSS and scrambled by a RNTI shared by multiple UEs (e.g. G-RNTI), while UE-specific PDCCH should be at least transmitted in USS, as to the RNTI for scrambling the PDCCH, it should not be restricted to C-RNTI only at this stage. |
| Qualcomm | At least Option 1 should be supported, since Option 1 is more flexible to schedule a common PDSCH for a small group or a large group of UEs with the same PDCCH overhead. Option 2 does not scale for a very large number of UEs.FFS Option 2, which may be useful to schedule PDSCH for a small group of UEs or to schedule the retransmission of multicast data.  |
| Ericsson | We prefer option 1 (group-common PDCCH based group scheduling), and see no need to further study “UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling” |
| BBC | At this stage we propose to consider both options. Various companies mention that Option 1 has benefits for a large group of UEs while Option 2 has benefits for reduced number of UEs. However, it is not clear to us the number of UEs best supported by each option. Therefore, down-selection or support of both options could be confirmed after more studies have been conducted. |
| Intel | Both CSS and USS based scheduling should be supported. * Group common PDCCH based scheduling can be considered as the baseline. As mentioned before, this option is good for the cases when large number of UEs are grouped to receive multicast PDSCH. Type 3 CSS can be used with addition of at least a G-RNTI to the set of RNTIs which can scramble the DCI of the monitored PDCCH. Alternately a new CSS type can also be defined. This mechanism has the advantage of lower overhead, but support of HARQ will be limited to possibly NACK-only on a shared PUCCH resource. This can still be ok since network only needs to detect at least one NACK in order to trigger retransmission.
* USS can be used when the number of UEs is lower and the overhead due PDCCH is acceptable. With this mechanism ACK/NACK based HARQ can also be supported. Furthermore, USS can also be used for potentially scheduling retransmission to a sub-group of users. The RNTI for monitoring a multicast PDCCH should not however be limited to only C-RNTI.
 |
| Convida | We support to do down selection between option1 and option2. We support option 1 Group-common PDCCH based group scheduling. Group common PDCCH has advantage of lower signalling overhead. In addition, group common PDCCH can be considered as a universal approach which can be applied to both multicast and broadcast use cases.  |
| Spreadtrum | Both options have advantages respectively, Group-common PDCCH based group scheduling is beneficial for PDCCH overhead reduction, but needs more standardization work for HARQ feedback; UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling has little spec impact, but has more PDCCH overhead. Based on the latest agreements from RAN2:* Focus initially on NR SA, TBD to what extent other scenarios NR DC, NE DC can be supported.
* Confirm Will support PTM transmission in a cell.
* Confirm that We will, for multicast services introduce support for PTP and PTM transmission of shared traffic delivered by 5GC, at least for connected mode (does not exclude other cases)
* For a UE, gNB dynamically decides whether to deliver multicast data by PTM or PTP (Shared delivery)

It seems that both options from RAN1 should not be excluded to support PTP and PTM transmission. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Both options are discussed as above. Option 1 in our opinion should be the essence of PTM so should be at least supported. On top of option 1, whether option 2 is supported needs justification. Therefore, we suggest we can conclude at least option 1 is supported and FFS on option 2.  |
| CATT | Both options can be supported in NR MBS for different use cases. The pros and cons are anaylyzed in many contributions for both options, and each option has its own advantages in specific scenarios. There is no need to limit just one scheduling mechanism for NR MBS, and flexibility should be considered by supporting both options.For sub-group-common PDCCH based group scheduling, as FL mentioned that it seems to be defined as group-common PDCCH scheduling in high level. There is some difference between sub-group-common PDCCH and group-common PDCCH, e.g. use cases and RNTI definitions. To make sure that any other potential scheduling mechanism is not precluded, the sub-group scheduling mechanism should be added.While considering the two options, how to indicate/utilize PUCCH resources for HARQ-ACK feedback should be also taken into account. Different cases can be classified as:* Group-common PDCCH to schedule PDSCH + Group-common PUCCH
* Group-common PDCCH to schedule PDSCH + UE-specific PUCCH
* UE-specific PDCCH to schedule PDSCH + UE-specific PUCCH
* UE-specific PDCCH to schedule PDSCH + Group-common PUCCH
 |
| Samsung | Group-common PDCCH should be supported. I think we can more focus on the essential scheduling for multicast. |

***Reliability improvement mechanisms for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs***

Based on companies’ submitted contributions, three reliability improvement mechanisms have more supporters than others as illustrated in the following table, including HARQ-ACK feedback, CSI feedback and PDSCH repetition.

Regarding HARQ-ACK feedback, nine companies suggested to support it for at least multicast for RRC\_CONNECTED state, some companies [Huawei, HiSilicon] have submitted some simulation results for justifying the benefits of HARQ-ACK feedback, one company proposed to study the potential gain and standardization impact for HARQ-ACK feedback,

Regarding CSI-feedback, six companies proposed that CSI feedback can be supported to improve reliability. Four of them [CMCC][VIVO][CATT][ZTE] think the existing CSI-RS configuration and CSI feedback mechanism for unicast can be directly used for MBS without additional spec impact. Two of them [QC][E///] think some modifications may be needed.

Regarding PDSCH repetition, some of the proponents think the existing PDSCH repetition mechanism for unicast can be reused for MBS.

Regarding multi-beam/beam sweeping operation, two companies [Sony, CATT] mentioned it in the sub-agenda for reliability improvement. Beam sweeping was also raised in some contributions for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs and two other companies [ZTE, LG] also raised similar issue for group scheduling, it can be discussed later in which sub-agenda it should be discussed.

Each of other potential mechanisms only have one proponent, including conservative scheduling based on network implementation, multi-DCI based M-TRP transmission and HARQ-based time-interleaving.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reliability improvement mechanisms** | **Companies** |
| HARQ-ACK feedback | CMCC, Huawei, OPPO, vivo, CATT, Convida, QC, E///, Samsung, Nokia  |
| CSI feedback | CMCC, E///, CATT, vivo, QC, ZTE |
| PDSCH repetition | CMCC, ZTE, Intel, vivo, LG, Nokia |
| Multi-beam/beam sweeping operation  | CATT, Sony  |
| Conservative scheduling (network implementation) | ZTE, Nokia |
| Multi-DCI based M-TRP transmission | LG |
| HARQ-based time-interleaving | BBC |

 **[High priority] Issue 4 (Proposal 1 in R1-2007001, with little update)**: *For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for multicast without additional evaluation for it, i.e., no evaluation is needed to justify whether HARQ-ACK feedback is needed.*

Please share your views and comments in the table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| TD Tech and Chengdu TD Tech | The views and comments of ours are listed in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reliability improvement mechanisms** | **Companies: TD Tech and Chengdu TD Tech** |
| HARQ-ACK feedback | supported |
| CSI feedback | Comments: The further discussion and simulation are needed to make the decision. |
| PDSCH repetition | Supported |
| Multi-beam/beam sweeping operation  | Supported |
| Conservative scheduling (network implementation) | Comments: The further discussion and simulation results are needed to make the decision. |
| Multi-DCI based M-TRP transmission | Comments: The further discussion and simulation results are needed to make the decision. |
| HARQ-based time-interleaving | Comments: The further discussion and simulation results are needed to make the decision. |

 |
| vivo | We support the proposal.Diffentent from LTE, NR MBS support many use cases, and some case, such as V2X or Industry applications have very high reliabiility requirement, e.g. 99.9999%. It is impossible to meet this requirement simply using link adaption based on CSI feedback only or automatic repetition. Considering this perspective, HARQ-ACK is anyway needs to be supported. No evaluation is needed to justify this considering the limited TU for MBS WI.Table 1. Requirements for different MBS use cases

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| MBS use cases | Latency | Reliability |
| V2X | 5-100ms | 90% to 99.9999% |
| Live Video | 150ms | 99.9% |
| IOT Software update | Latency Tolerant | Higher reliability is beneficial |
| Industry applications | 0.5ms | 99.9999% |

 |
| CMCC | Support the proposal.* In Rel-13 LTE SC-PTM, simulations had been carried out to evaluate the gain of HARQ-ACK feedback and justify that HARQ-ACK can improve the reliability. The evaluations for SC-PTM aimed at supporting multicast/broadcast service for group communications as defined in 3GPP TS 22.468 and mission critical push to talk as defined in 3GPP TS 22.179, which are consistent with the requirement mentioned in the WID of NR MBS. In addition, considering both R17 NR MBS and LTE SC-PTM aim to support single cell multicast/broadcast, we think the evaluation results and observation for HARQ-ACK feedback in LTE SC-PTM are also applicable for R17 NR MBS.
* In addition, NR MBS also aims to support more services which may require much higher reliability, e.g., V2X applications. The higher reliability the service requires, the more adavatages can be expected from HARQ-ACK feedback.

Therefore, we think the HARQ-ACK feedback should be supported for CONNECTED UEs, and no additional evaluation is needed to justify whether to support it. |
| LG | If legacy UE specific scheduling is used for a multicast TB, it can already support HARQ-ACK feedback. Thus, HARQ-ACK feedback can be supported for multicast without additional evaluation at least for UE specific scheduling. |
| Nokia | Additional evaluation for HARQ-ACK is desirable, preferably with some minimum reliability to target.In our view, there are many variants of HARQ-ACK feedback that could be supported. We would like to see evaluations of these techniques compared against each other (justifying a common set of simulation assumptions) and against some minimum reliability targets.Subject to those evaluations, RAN1 can then make an informed decision about the support of HARQ-ACK. |
| ZTE | We suggest to evaluate the potential gain for HARQ-ACK for NR MBS first.In LTE SC-PTM, some preliminary evaluations on spectrum efficiency between ‘SC-PTM with CQI and HARQ ACK/NACK feedback’ and ‘SC-PTM with CQI feedback only and eOLLA’ had been done. Conclusions were made in TR 36.890 as follows.

|  |
| --- |
| Conclusions...SC-PTM performance in terms of spectral efficiency was evaluated by the simulations. The performance analysis results in the following conclusions:- Link adaptation allowed by the availability of UL feedback provides significant gains when the number of receiving UEs is rather small and decreases with increasing group size. HARQ with retransmissions can further improve the spectral efficiency in some scenarios but these improvements are small. It has not been concluded whether the gains provided by HARQ and retransmission are worth of the increased complexity of the system.  |

For NR MBS, the deployment scenarios have changed compared with LTE SC-PTM. The simulation assumptions, e.g., frequency, bandwidth, traffic model and antenna configuration, etc., should be updated accordingly.It is questionable on whether/under which conditions/how much gain can be achieved by supporting HARQ-ACK feedback under the new simulation assumptions. So some more careful evaluations on the gain of supporting HARQ-ACK feedback in NR MBS can be done prior to specific mechanism design. With more careful evaluation, companies can even compare the potential performance gain between different HARQ-ACK solutions, which is also beneficial to subsequent technical discussion if HARQ-ACK is supported. |
| OPPO | Support.HARQ feedback has already been supported in groupcast of NR sidelink as an effective mechanism to improve sidelink reliability, this can be used as baseline for HARQ feedback design in MBS. |
| Qualcomm | For multicast service with high reliability requirement (e.g., smart grid control for group communications and IoT applications, V2X applications, etc.), it is necessary to support L1 retransmission based on HARQ-ACK feedback to receive multicast transmission in RRC\_CONNECTED state. We believe it is not sufficient to rely on link adaptation using CQI feedback only to combat bursty interference. Based on the previous LTE study and the proposals so far, we think HARQ-ACK feedback should be supported for NR multicast (no need further simulation-based evaluation just for this). We can further discuss the details in upcoming meetings, e.g. whether to support NAK-based or ACK/NAK-based.  |
| Ericsson | We agree that HARQ-ACK should be supported without additional evaluation to justify this. The particular solution for HARQ-ACK is however FFS |
| BBC | We also agree that HARQ-ACK can be supported for RRC\_CONNECTED without additional evaluation. However, the specific HARQ-ACK solution needs to be selected based on further studies. |
| Intel | Configurable HARQ/ACK feedback can be supported for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs i.e., it may be switched off by configuration. This can be useful for cases when RRC\_IDLE UEs are also supported in the group or repetition is used as a reliability mechanism. Potential gains for HARQ/ACK, as well as the specific HARQ/ACK technique to be used can be further studied and evaluated. |
| Convida | Support the proposal. HARQ-ACK feedback can be assumed as the baseline in support of reliability enhancement. No additional evaluation may be needed. However, it is not clear if HARQ-ACK feedback will be suitable for all reliability vs latency combinations of MBS use cases, since HARQ-ACK feedback may have some impacts on latency in some cases although reliability could be improved. For reliability enhancement, additional methods such as PDSCH repetitions could also be considered.  |
| Spreadtrum | We also agree that HARQ-ACK can be assumed as the baseline for RRC\_CONNECTED without additional evaluation. HARQ-ACK solution needs be further studied. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We support the proposal.  |
| CATT | We agree with the proposal.* To improve the reliability, HARQ-ACK and SCI feedback should be considered. There is no additional evaluation needed.
* The gain of HARQ-ACK feedback is depending on the number of UEs and channel condition. It is suggested that gNB decide the enable/disable of UEs based on CSI reporting.
 |
| Samsugn | We support FL’s proposal. |

***Evaluation***

Regarding evaluation, four companies have contributions on evaluation in the “Others” sub-agenda. One company [ZTE] provided the evaluation results to support CSI feedback, one company [Huawei] provided the evaluation results to support HARQ-ACK feedback, one company [Nokia] proposed the methodology and assumptions for evaluation of different UL feedback schemes, and one company [E///] proposed the methodology and assumptions for evaluation of different PTM features.

Before we discuss a common evaluation methodology and assumptions, we need to first determine the purpose of the evaluation campaign.

**[High priority] Issue 6 (Question 4 in R1-2007001, with little update)**: *Whether a common evaluation methodology and assumptions are necessary for NR MBS? If the answer is YES, what’s the purpose of the evaluation? And what’s your suggestion on the common evaluation methodology and assumptions?*

Please share your views and comments in the table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| TD Tech and Chengdu TD Tech | The related simulaiton is needed to prove the corresponding method is nessesary for the NR MBS. The simulation assumptions shall be discussed to ensure that the simulation results from the different companies can be compared with each other. |
| vivo | From our understanding, a common evaluation methodology and assumptions are not necessary for NR MBS. As above proposed, HARQ-ACK for MBS should be supported without evaluation. Then, the motivation to spend much time to do evaluation is not clear to us. |
| CMCC | Not necessary.As the FL summary about reliability improvement mechanisms for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs above, HARQ-ACK feedback, CSI feedback and PDSCH repetition are three major mechanisms. * For HARQ-ACK feedback, as our comment in issue 4, no evaluation is needed to justify whether HARQ-ACK feedback is needed.
* For CSI feedback and PDSCH repetition, they are also efficient ways to improve reliability, and we think the spec impact is small and even none.

Therefore, we think there is no strong motivation to do any evaluation for NR MBS, and all these three reliability improvement mechanisms can be supported. |
| LG | Some assumptions for evaluations are already provided by a few companies in AI 8.12.5. Thus, it seems good to have common evaluation methodology and assumptions to justify a certain solution, if we cannot easily draw the benefit of the solution or reach an agreement on support of it. |
| Nokia | Yes, to enable a fair, efficient and meaningful comparison of different reliability techniques from different companies. Note, as part of these assumptions/methodology, we would like to see a baseline unicast scenario defined, to allow differences between different simulations to be more readily identified. |
| ZTE | Yes. As mentioned in our tdoc x5437, there are different candidate mechanisms to improve the reliability of NR MBS, e.g., HARQ-ACK, CSI feedback and repetition. The simulation results can further guide the subsequent discussion on whether/how to support reliability improvement. Further, the simulation results can provide some useful information for the operators who are interested in the MBS, e.g., which mechanism to deploy in the practical network if multiple mechanisms are specified for reliability improvement.Regarding the common evaluation methodology and assumptions, we have the following comments.* Using system-level simulations
* The Rural and Dense-Urban scenarios can be evaluated considering the main target use cases of Public safety and Mission critical.
* Full buffer or periodic deterministic traffic model can be used.
* Spectral efficiency or user experienced data rate can be considered as the performance metric.
* The details of the simulation assumptions can be fully discussed in the following e-mail discussion.
 |
| OPPO | Although common evaluation methodology and assumptions are helpful for performance comparison, from procedure point of view, the evaluation methodology work is not part of the WI and it will take up a lot of effort in RAN1, especially evaluation work is not considered when allocating TUs for this WI in RAN. In our view, evaluation results can be provided by companies with evaluation assumptions elaborated as some companies already done, it is not appropriate to go into detailed evaluation methodology and assumptions discussion. |
| Qualcomm | At current stage, we are not sure what the common simulation methodology and assumption will be used for. The evaluation may be needed to compare detailed mechanisms for potential enhancement. It would be preferable to first list up the options with clear description and then to discuss the assumption for further comparison, e.g. if there is a proposed new MIMO codebook for multicast, then we need evaluation to see the relative gain to the existing codebook.Depending on the scheme, evaluation methodology may be based on LLS or SLS. The evaluation assumption may be also variant for different RRC states. For example, if we want to consider implementation-SFN deployments for IDLE mode reception, the assumption would be different than the ones that are being proposed, and probably closer to the methodology used in TR 36.776. |
| Ericsson | We think most aspects of this WI can be agreed on without computer simulation-based evaluations, since most functionality is expected to be legacy PTP functionality that is adapted to the PTM case, or can be decided based on other type of evaluation. However, there may be cases where such computer simulations are necessary. In these cases it is important to have a common methodology and assumptions. There is however no urgency in agreeing this. Such agreements may be made when the need arises. |
| BBC | As in our response to Issue 4, we do not think simulations are needed to confirm the gains of HARQ-ACK. However, simulations may be needed to select a specific solution of HARQ-ACK. In which case, we think a common evaluation methodology and assumptions are necessary for NR MBS. |
| Intel | Baseline simulation assumptions are good to have. For evaluations for reliability improvements, especially CQI feedback, repetition and HARQ/ACK schemes, it might be advantageous to agree on baseline SLS assumptions with respect to traffic models, deployment scenarios etc., to align results from companies for fair comparison. |
| Convida | As discussed in issue 4, we think HARQ-ACK feedback should be supported without further evaluation. However, whether HARQ-ACK feedback alone is sufficient in order to meet reliability versus latency requirements for all NR MBS use cases might need some further evaluation.  |
| Spreadtrum | For HARQ-ACK feedback, major companies think no further evaluation is need. For other reliability mechanisms, if supported, we also think there is no strong motivation to do any evaluation. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | As commented to issue 4, we don’t see necessity of evaluations for HARQ-ACK nor other techniques so far. If later on, evaluation is needed for some potential enhancement within the WID scope, proponents can report the evaluations.  |
| CATT | We do not observe the necessity of evaluation for NR MBS, e.g. HARQ-ACK feedback. |
| Samsung | We think RAN1 may not need evaluation in some topics.If evaluation is needed, then the common assumption is needed. However, before that, we need to have the common understanding of the purpose of the evaluation, e.g., in order to compare what.  |

## Initial Proposals (2nd round of email discussion)

18 companies have provided their views on high priority issue 1/4/6 in 1st round input, the following observation is made based on these inputs:

**Observation**:

* **For issue 1:**
	+ 9 companies [vivo, CMCC, LG, Nokia, OPPO, BBC, Intel, Spreadtrum, CATT] think both option 1 and option 2 can be considered for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs. One of them [OPPO] suggests to make the definition of two group scheduling schemes clearer.
	+ 5 company [QC, Huawei, HiSilicon, MTK, Samsung] thinks at least option 1 should be supported, and FFS for option 2 to keep it open for consideration.
	+ 4 companies [TD Tech, ZTE, Ericsson, Convida] support option 1 only. Three of them [ZTE, Ericsson, Convida] are also fine to at least support option 1 and FFS for option 2.
* **For issue 4:**
	+ 15 companies support the proposal.
	+ 1 company [ZTE] suggests to evaluate the potential gain of HARQ-ACK feedback. 1 company [Nokia] thinks additional evaluation is desirable to compare different HARQ-ACK schemes with some minimum reliability targets. 1 company [Intel] thinks potential gains for HARQ-ACK feedback and the specific HARQ-ACK schemes to be used can be further studied and evaluated.
* **For issue 6:**
	+ 10 companies [vivo, CMCC, OPPO, QC, Spreadtrum, Huawei, HiSilicon, MTK, CATT, Samsung] think the motivation to agree on common evaluation methodology and assumptions at current stage is not clear. One of them mentioned the evaluation methodology and assumptions may be different for different proposed schemes.
	+ 1 company [E///] thinks it is not urgent to agree on common evaluation methodology and assumptions at current stage, and such agreements may be made when the need arises.
	+ 7 companies [TD Tech, LG, Convida, Nokia, ZTE, Intel, BBC] think it is good to have common evaluation methodology and assumptions. The purpose could be, e.g., to verify whether other reliability improvement schemes except HARQ-ACK feedback are needed [TD Tech, LG, Convida], or to enable meaningful comparisons of different reliability improvement schemes from different companies [Nokia, ZTE, Intel], or to select a specific solution for HARQ-ACK feedback [BBC].

Based on the above observation, the following initial proposals are made:

* **Potential Proposal 1 for issue 1**: Both group-common PDCCH based group scheduling and UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling can be considered for MBS fFor RRC\_CONNECTED UEs
	+ The general description of two group scheduling mechanisms are clarified as follows:
		- Group-common PDCCH based group scheduling:
			* For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs in the same MBS group, the PDSCH of a MBS TB is common for the group of UEs and it is scheduled by a group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI (e.g., G-RNTI, sub-G-RNTI).
		- UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling:
			* For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs in the same MBS group, the PDSCH for a MBS TB is common for the group of UEs, and it is scheduled by each UE-specific PDCCH with CRC scrambled by UE-specific RNTI (e.g., C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, etc.) for each UE.
* **Potential Proposal 2 for issue 4:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for multicast and no additional evaluation is needed to justify this.
* **Potential Proposal 3 for issue 6:** Take the following high level evaluation methodology and assumptions as starting point for potential evaluations in MBS.
	+ System-level simulation is recommended
	+ Evaluation scenarios: Rural and Dense-Urban scenarios for FR1 defined in TR38.901.
	+ FFS: Which traffic model is used
		- Option 1: CBR traffic model
		- Option 2: Periodic deterministic traffic model
		- Option 3: Full buffer
	+ FFS: Performance metrics
	+ FFS: The details of the simulation assumptions
	+ FFS: Which reliability improvement scheme(s) needs evaluation
		- Note: No evaluation is needed to justify the support of HARQ-ACK feedback for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs

Companies can comments directly in the email thread or in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | For proposal 1, if option 1 is supported, I fail to see the necessity to additionally support option 2 at this stage. Since no companies object option 1, at least we can agree on option 1 and FFS on option 2. (Note: there are some typos in the proposal 1 basically for RNTIs..)Ok with proposals 2&3.  |
| MTK | For issue 1:For NR MBS, group-common PDCCH based group scheduling can be a basic mechanism, which can reduce PDCCH resource overhead and access more UEs. So, we share the same view with QC/HW, at least optional 1 is supported and option 2 is FFS.For issue 4:In R16 V2X groupcast communication, it had already introduced the HARQ-ACK feedback mechanism to ensure the reliability. So, it is best to reuse HARQ-ACK feedback mechanism directly and no need to spend extra time to evaluate it. We can mainly focus on how to design the feedback mechanism in NR MBS. For issue 6:As our mentioned in Phase 1 stage and issue 4 above, we think there is no need to do any simulation evaluation for MBS. So, I suggest to revise proposal 3 based on newest comments. |
| CATT | For proposal 1:* Both options can be supported based on different scenarios, e.g. different number of UE receiving the same MBS. Both options have its benefit in terms of specific scenarios, e.g. HARQ resource indication, signaling overhead. The network can decide which kind of scheduling mechanism can be used. Additionally, both options should also consider about PUCCH resources for HARQ feedback.
	+ Group-common PDCCH to schedule PDSCH + Group-common PUCCH
	+ Group-common PDCCH to schedule PDSCH + UE-specific PUCCH
	+ UE-specific PDCCH to schedule PDSCH + UE-specific PUCCH
	+ UE-specific PDCCH to schedule PDSCH + Group-common PUCCH
* For Group common PDCCH, we also think sub-group-common PDCCH can be applied when the number of UEs in the same MBS group is too large and the locations of UEs are scattered. So we would like to suggest to add sub-G-RNTI in the e.g. in the bracket.

We are fine of proposal 2 and proposal 3. |
| vivo | We are fine with proposals 1&2.For proposal 1, it is saying both group scheduling mechanism “can be considered”, rather than “are supported”, there is no need to put option 2 in FFS. As commented by many companies, the decision on which group scheduling mechanism should be supported should not only consider the overhead of PDCCH, but also the other aspects, e.g., the standardization effort or spec impact to support HARQ-ACK feedback if it is supported, etc. Now, it seems everybody is ok to support HARQ-ACK for MBS, but there are many variants of HARQ-ACK feedback, we haven’t made decision on which one(s) to be supported. If only group-specific NACK feedback is supported, I admit option 1 may be enough. But if UE-specific HARQ-ACK feedback is supported, the pros for option 2 is very clear. In that case, option 2 should be supported. So, no need to do down selection now.For proposal 3, we still don’t find the reason to have this evaluation methodology and assumptions based on the proposal. In our view, the first thing we should be clear is the purpose of evaluation. If there is no clear purpose now, I think we don’t need to take time on it and there are so many FFS need to be solved if we support this. If proponents think evaluation is needed for some potential enhancements later, they can report the evaluations. |
| ZTE | For proposal 1, considering that group common PDCCH is supported by all companies. We agree with Huawei/MTK that we could first agree on supporting Option1 (group-common PDCCH) and FFS for Option2 (UE-specific PDCCH). For proposal 2, we are generally fine. But we want to clarify the following two aspects:1. HARQ-ACK feedback contains both ACK/NACK feedback and NACK-only feedback;2. HARQ-ACK feedback should be supported at least for group-common PDCCH based group scheduling because all the companies agree to support the group-common PDCCH based group scheduling.With this, we would like to propose the following updated proposal.* **Potential Proposal 2 for issue 4:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for multicast and no additional evaluation is needed to justify this.
* HARQ-ACK feedback is supported at least for group-common PDCCH based group scheduling.
* FFS ACK-NACK HARQ or NACK-only HARQ

For proposal 3, it seems the last Note is not needed as proposal 2 has already clarifies that HARQ-ACK will be supported. Besides, it is not clear whether HARQ-ACK feedback contains both ACK-NACK HARQ and NACK-only HARQ, thus we propose to delete the last Note.  |
| Ericsson | For proposal 1, we agree with Huawei. Every company that commented has expressed support for option 1, so we can go ahead with a proposal to support option 1. For option 2, we are OK with keeping the option open for consideration and having it as an FFS.For proposal 2, we agree with the proposal with the understanding that this means that the use of HARQ-ACK as such is agreed without further evaluation, but that different proposals for HARQ-ACK solutions may later need to be evaluated. For Proposal 3 we can agree to that. We wish however to re-iterate that we think most aspects of this WI can be agreed on without computer simulation-based evaluations and we see no urgency. |
| OPPO | * Proposal 1 is general fine for us except some comments:
	+ - If this proposal is agreed later, the meaning of group-common PDCCH based group scheduling and UE-specific PDCCH based group should be defined, “general description” reads like only for informative purpose.
		- For the 2 group scheduling schemes, the current description is from MBS group perspective, however, it seems that in PHY layer there is no such definition for now, maybe to describe from one RRC\_CONNECTED UE perspective would be better.
		- For UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling, which RNTI is used for scrambling is dependent on further design, we prefer to keep it open now.
		- In summary, we suggest following changes for Proposal 1:
* **Potential Proposal 1 for issue 1**: Both group-common PDCCH based group scheduling and UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling can be considered for MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.
	+ ~~The general description of two group scheduling mechanisms are clarified as follows:~~
		- Group-common PDCCH based group scheduling:
			* For an RRC\_CONNECTED UE~~s in the same MBS group~~, the PDSCH of an MBS TB is ~~common for the group of UEs and it is~~ scheduled by a group-common PDCCH in CSS with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI (e.g., G-RNIT).
		- UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling:
			* For an RRC\_CONNECTED UE~~s in the same MBS group~~, the PDSCH for an MBS TB ~~is common for the group of UEs, and it~~ is scheduled by each UE-specific PDCCH in USS ~~with CRC scrambled by UE-specific RNTI (e.g., C-RNIT, MCS-C-RSNTI, etc.) for each UE~~.
* Proposal 2: Agree.
* Proposal 3: Based on the summary of issue 6 from the moderator, there is no clear majority that a common evaluation methodology is needed. Among the companies who support to do this work, their motivation and purpose are not aligned. Furthermore, there are a number of FFS items listed, what is worse, many aspects and models are not included in the list. All these imply that a significant amount of work is required to come up with a common evaluation methodology in RAN1. This is a work item where study on performance gain is not really a top priority, can we simply rely on company contributions to bring evaluation results to justify the performance to get the work completed?
 |
| BBC | We are fine with Proposal 1.For Proposal 2, we think at the moment is not clear which specific HARQ-ACK solutions will be supported and this needs further study and discussion. Hence, we suggest the following addition to the Proposal 2 (highlighted in yellow):* **Potential Proposal 2 for issue 4:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for multicast and no additional evaluation is needed to justify this. FFS specific HARQ-ACK solutions to be supported.

We are also fine with the initial assumptions of Proposal 3. |
| Qualcomm | For proposal 1, our observation is as follows:* + - * + There is no objection to support Option 1 but no clear consensus on Option 2.
				+ For Option 2, the current description seems only allow using UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a common PDSCH for a group of UEs. We would like to keep other possibilities open, e.g., using UE-specific PDCCH for unicast retransmission of an MBS TB.
				+ Better not to include the details of RNTI and CSS/USS, since they have not been fully discussed yet.

Therefore, we recommend the proposal 1 is updated as:**Potential Proposal 1 for issue 1**: At least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule an MBS PDSCH for a group of RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.* + - FFS UE-specific PDCCH for scheduling an MBS PDSCH

For proposal 2, we support it. For the guidance of next meeting, we can add ‘FFS’ to further consider the options of HARQ feedback proposed by majority companies.**Potential Proposal 2 for issue 4:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for multicast and no additional evaluation is needed to justify this.* FFS ACK/NACK-based and NACK-based HARQ feedback

For proposal 3, it seems not mature for companies to have consensus in this meeting. We would like to revise the main bullet as **Potential Conclusion for issue 6: Companies are recommended to t**ake the following high level evaluation methodology and assumptions as starting point for potential evaluations in MBS.   |
| Convida | For proposal 1 for issue 1, we share the same view with HW/MTK/ZTE that we can agree on supporting option 1 first and have option 2 for FFS.For proposal 2, we are fine with the proposal for issue 4. Regarding the comments provided by ZTE and QC, we think that the details on HARQ-ACK feedback mechanism should be further studied and discussed in the future meetings without putting any constrain on it at the early stage. For proposal 3, we are fine with the proposal for issue 6. We are also OK with the approach suggested by Ericsson, e.g., discuss the evaluation methodology and assumptions later when there is a need.  |
| Intel | Proposal 1: We are ok to support group common scheduling and have FFS for UE specific scheduling.Proposal 2: We would like to add the following FFS points:* FFS: The details of HARQ feedback schemes that will be supported
* FFS: HARQ can be optionally disabled by DCI or RRC configuration

We think that while HARQ is useful, there should be an option to configure it ON or OFF.Proposal 3: We are ok with Proposal 3 |
| Moderator | After received more companies’ inputs in 1st round, and also some inputs for the initial proposal in the 2nd round, I updated the proposals for the three issues below this table. **For issue 1:** It seems everyone agrees to at least support group-common PDCCH scheduling group-common MBS PDSCH. For UE-specific PDCCH based scheduling, most companies can accept to keep it open for consideration, some companies suggest to keep it open for UE-specific PDCCH to schedule group-common MBS PDSCH or UE-specific MBS PDSCH.@Huawei/MTK/ZTE/Ericsson/Convida/Intel: Your concern should be addressed in the updated proposal, please see if it is OK.@QC: Your concern and suggestions are reflected in the updated proposal, please see if it is OK.@CATT: For the PUCCH resource indication scheme for HARQ-ACK feedback, I think it can be discussed later and separately with the current proposal. For sub-G-RNTI, I didn’t directly capture it in the updated proposal since people may don’t know the exact meaning of it and it seems it wasn’t used before, but I think it also belong to the common RNTI in the updated proposal, so hope the updated proposal is OK for you.@vivo/BBC: As I explained, it seems many companies want to first agree the group-common PDCCH based scheme, and the UE-specific PDCCH based scheme is still open with the updated proposal. @OPPO: Regarding the meaning of the group-common PDCCH based group scheduling and UE-specific PDCCH based group scheduling, please see if it is clear with the updated proposal. Regarding the CSS and USS in your suggestion, I didn’t capture them now, since it seems companies have different views on the SS type, and I think it can be discussed later and separately with the current proposal.**For issue 2:** It seems generally the proposal is OK for most companies. To address some companies’ comments, the proposal was updated to give some guidance for discussion in the next meeting.@QC/ZTE/BBC/Intel: Your comments are reflected in the FFS part.@Ericsson: Yes, I think this proposal didn’t preclude that different proposals for HARQ-ACK feedback solutions may later need to be evaluated.**For issue 3:**Firstly, based on more companies’ inputs, it seems the majority view becomes that there is no urgency or no clear motivation to agree the common evaluation methodology and assumptions in this meeting. Secondly, few companies provided contributions on the common evaluation methodology and assumptions in this meeting, it seems it is not mature to have a stable agreement on this, since you can see even we try to take a lot of time to discuss in this meeting there may still be many FFS parts. Thirdly, companies who think it is good to have common evaluation methodology and assumptions may not mean to have a stable proposal in this meeting. Although the purpose of the evaluation mentioned by companies are generally related to reliability improvement, but it seems they are not converged enough. Based on the above, I suggest not to spend time on discussing the common evaluation methodology and assumptions in this meeting, and we can move on to discussion the other parts. We still can further discuss the common evaluation methodology and assumptions later after the motivation of the evaluation is clear enough and the group has a good consensus on that. So I deleted the proposal for the time being and we don’t need to have an agreement on this in this meeting.Please see if this is OK for everyone.  |

## Updated Proposals (3rd round of email discussion)

Based on the above observation and 2nd round input, the proposals are updated (The reason for the update and the response to companies’ comments can be found in the table above):

* **Updated Proposal 1 for issue 1**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule an MBS PDSCH.
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule an MBS PDSCH which could be UE-specific or common for a group of UEs.
* **Updated Proposal 2 for issue 4:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for multicast and no additional evaluation is needed to justify this.
	+ FFS: The detailed HARQ-ACK feedback solutions, e.g., ACK/NACK based, NACK-only based.
	+ FFS: HARQ-ACK feedback can be optionally disabled.
* **~~Potential Proposal 3 for issue 6:~~** ~~Take the following high level evaluation methodology and assumptions as starting point for potential evaluations in MBS.~~
	+ ~~System-level simulation is recommended~~
	+ ~~Evaluation scenarios: Rural and Dense-Urban scenarios for FR1 defined in TR38.901.~~
	+ ~~FFS: Which traffic model is used~~
		- ~~Option 1: CBR traffic model~~
		- ~~Option 2: Periodic deterministic traffic model~~
		- ~~Option 3: Full buffer~~
	+ ~~FFS: Performance metrics~~
	+ ~~FFS: The details of the simulation assumptions~~
	+ ~~FFS: Which reliability improvement scheme(s) needs evaluation~~
		- ~~Note: No evaluation is needed to justify the support of HARQ-ACK feedback for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs~~

Companies can provide comments directly in the email thread or in the table below for the updated proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| LG | Regarding Proposal 1, the meaning of the MBS PDSCH is not clear to us, epecially with UE specific PDCCH. We think that PDSCH transmssion of a MBS data can be either specific to a single UE (i.e. UE specific PDSCH) or common to a group of UEs (i.e. group common PDSCH). Accordingly, we propose to clarify the Proposal 1 as follows :* **Updated Proposal 1 for issue 1**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule an MBS PDSCH.
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule an ~~MBS~~ PDSCH which could be UE-specific or common for a group of UEs for transmission of MBS data.

Regarding Proposal 2, if HARQ-ACK feedback can be optionally disabled, it can be optionally enabled. Thus, we propose to clarify the proposal 2 as follows:* **Updated Proposal 2 for issue 4:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for multicast and no additional evaluation is needed to justify this.
	+ FFS: The detailed HARQ-ACK feedback solutions, e.g., ACK/NACK based, NACK-only based.
	+ FFS: HARQ-ACK feedback can be optionally disabled and/or enabled.
 |
| Nokia | For proposal 1, we like the LG suggestion but would like to support an additional FFS to support the modification of PUCCH resources (similar to @CATT). * **Updated Proposal 1 for issue 1**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule an MBS PDSCH.
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a~~n~~ ~~MBS~~ PDSCH which could be UE-specific or common for a group of UEs for the transmission of MBS data.
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to modify the PUCCH resources used to support the transmission of MBS data.

For proposal 2, we support the LG « and/or enabled » suggestionFor proposal 3, we are a little surprised this has been completely deleted. We would at least prefer a working assumption, given that :* 8 companies have shown an interest.
	+ Potentially some of these companies can co-author a joint proposal before the next meeting.
* In the various LTE releases where Broadcast enhancements were developed, a standard evaulation model was developed.
 |
| ZTE | Regarding proposal 1, we support the FL proposal. LG and Nokia’s version is also fine, we are ok to add the second FFS point raised by Nokia/CATT if this helps to converge.Regarding proposal 2, we are fine with the current formulation.Regarding proposal 3, as also commented by Nokia, it may be better to keep the proposal (or working assumption) considering there are at least 8 companies showing their interests. Maybe keeping it as a working assumption can be the middle ground. |
| OPPO | We have following comments on updated Proposal 1:1. We also prefer the wording proposed by LG, i.e. replace “MBS PDSCH” with “PDSCH for the transmission of MBS data”.
2. As to the PDSCH scheduled by UE specific PDCCH, whether the PDSCH is UE specific or group common seems a next step issue, to our understanding, whether the PDSCH is UE specific or group common may be up to gNB, and it may be also transparent to UE. What matters here for now is whether a PDSCH for the transmission of MBS data scheduled by UE-specific PDCCH is supported or not.
* **Updated Proposal 1 for issue 1**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule a~~n~~ ~~MBS~~ PDSCH for the transmission of MBS data.
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a~~n~~ ~~MBS~~ PDSCH ~~which could be UE-specific or common for a group of UEs~~ for the transmission of MBS data.

We are fine with updated proposal 2, to add “and/or enabled” at the end of the second FFS is also fine for us.We support to remove Proposal 3. |
| CATT | For proposal 1 of issue 1, it is okay for us in principle. The indication of PUCCH is also an important aspect when designing the HARQ-ACK feedback, and both ACK/NACK and NACK-only based mechanism needs UL resource indication. I think it is better to have an FFS in the proposal, to say that PUCCH indication can be discussed later. It would be clear to guide companies when they are preparing the designs in contributions. (similar to @Nokia). Because it is high level discussion in this meeting, and detailed mechanism can be discussed later, we can generally have an FFS about PUCCH indication.* **Updated Proposal 1 for issue 1**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule an MBS PDSCH.
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule an MBS PDSCH which could be UE-specific or common for a group of UEs.
	+ FFS: How to indicate PUCCH resources used for HARQ-ACK feedback..

For proposal 2 of issue 4, we are fine with LGE’s suggestion that HARQ-ACK can be enable/disabled.For proposal 3, we are also fine to remove it. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Updated proposal 1 is ok in principle, and we like the change from OPPO and keep it more generic under FFS. The FFS suggested by Nokia is unclear to us by “modifying the PUCCH resources”. If the intention is bringing up a new factor to consider UE-specific PDCCH, I don’t see the need to keep this FFS because we have FFS already to UE-specific PDCCH in general. CATT and Nokia echo each other for this point, but the changes are totally different. The change from CATT is not specific to UE-specific PDCCH. HARQ-ACK feedback resources have to be fixed at later anyway regardless of which option adopted, so I failed to see the necessity of the FFS from CATT. Updated proposal is ok and fine with the change of “and/or enabled”. We are ok with deleting proposal 3.  |
| vivo | For proposal 1, we like Nokia’s additional FFS suggestion but would like to change “modify” to “indicate/modify”, i.e., FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to indicate/modify the PUCCH resources used to support the transmission of MBS data.For proposal 2, we support the LG’s “and/or enabled” suggestionWe support to remove Proposal 3. |
| Ericsson | Regarding Proposal 1, since « PTP » already exists in NR, the variant of a UE-specific PDCCH scheduling a UE-specific PDSCH does not need to be mentioned. Further, the acronym « MBS » is more related to the IP Multicast service as such and does not have any relation to the physical layer. We prefer instead to talk about « PTP and « PTM » or « individual transmissions » and « group transmission ». This leads us to the following proposed reformulation of Proposal 1 :* For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule a group-common PDSCH, using the same common RNTI. .
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a group-common PDSCH.
* NOTE: The use of a UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a UE-specific PDSCH is already supported by NR and does not need agreement.

Regarding Proposal 2 we are fine with LG’s updated proposal.Regarding Proposal 3 we are fine with the moderator’s proposal and think it may be difficult to reach consensus at this meeting. We prefer to concentrate on other topics for the remaining part of this meeting. |
| CMCC | For proposal 1, we are fine with the LG’s version about proposal 1.Regarding Nokia and CATT’s comments, it seems they are not the same thing. For “support UE-specific PDCCH to modify the PUCCH resources” added by Nokia, it is not clear what does that mean, especially considering that it hasn’t been discussed how to indicate the PUCCH resources for the HARQ-ACK feedback for group-common PDCCH based group scheduling. It seems a little bit earlier to discuss how to modify the PUCCH resources, and it may not easy to converge now. Regarding CATT’s comments, we tend to agree with Huawei, anyhow we will discuss how to indicated PUCCH resource for HARQ-ACK feedback in the next step, and it seems not necessary to add the FFS “How to indicate PUCCH resources used for HARQ-ACK feedback”.Regarding OPPO’s second comment for proposal 1, for UE-specific PDCCH, we think it is not transparent to UE whether the PDSCH is UE-specific or group-common, because the scrambling initialization for UE-specific PDSCH and group-common PDSCH is not the same. Companies have explained the benefit of UE-specific PDCCH scheduling group-common PDSCH, especially the less spec impact on support of ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback, so we think it is better to keep “PDSCH which could be UE-specific or common for a group of UEs” in the second FFS to guide the discussion in next meeting.  For proposal 2, we are fine with the change of “and/or enabled”.For proposal 3, we are fine to delete it. |
| Nokia | Proposal 1: We would be happy with CATT’s latest proposal.FFS: How to indicate PUCCH resources used for HARQ-ACK feedback. |
| MTK | For Proposal 1, we are fine with moderator’s proposal. For Proposal 2, we prefer LG’s modification, adding “and/or enabled” for HARQ feedback mechanism. The HARQ ACK/NACK “disabled/enabled” indication is used in NR V2X broadcast or group cast communication. It also can be reused in NR MBS. Thus, LG’s updated proposal is more reasonable. For Proposal 3, we support to remove this proposal. |
| Qualcomm | For updated Proposal 1, we are ok to clarify the MBS PDSCH suggested by LGE. For the main bullet, it’s better to add ‘a PDSCH common for a group of UEs for transmission of MBS data’. Regarding other suggestions, we think how to support HARQ-ACK feedback by using PDCCH has been included in the FFS of Proposal 2. No need to add more FFS here.* **Updated Proposal 1 for issue 1**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule a PDSCH common for a group of UEs for transmission of MBS data.
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a PDSCH which could be UE-specific or common for a group of UEs for transmission of MBS data.

For updated Proposal 2, the LGE’s updates look good to us.For the issue 6, we are fine with moderator’s suggestion since it seems lack of common understanding to have any working assumption or agreement in this meeting.  |
| Moderator | **For issue 1 :*** Regarding the suggestion from LG/Nokia/ZTE/OPPO/Huawei/Qualcomm to replace “MBS PDSCH” with ”PDSCH with transmission of MBS data”, It was incorporated in the updated proposal.
* Regarding the suggestion from Nokia/CATT to add another FFS, i.e., “FFS: How to indicate PUCCH resources used for HARQ-ACK feedback”, there are different views from Huawei/CMCC/Qualcomm who think it is not necessary since anyhow the PUCCH resource for HARQ-ACK feedback will be discussed in next step, so I didn’t capture it in the updated version.
* Regarding the suggestion from OPPO/Huawei to keep it generic as “UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a PDSCH“ instead of “UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a UE-specific PDSCH or a group-common PDSCH“, I think it would be good to provide companies some guide for the next step discussion. This is also related to Ericsson’s comment.
* Regarding Ericsson’s comments, I try to reflect them in the latest version. I understand the use of a UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a UE-specific PDSCH is already supported by NR, however, as mentioned by Qualcomm in the 2nd round of inputs, it seems they are thinking using UE-specific PDCCH for unicast retransmission of an MBS TB. I provide two options here on proposal 1 for companies to select. From my point of view, both of them are OK. Please share your views on them.

**For issue 2 :**It seems everyone is ok with LG’s revision, so it was incorporated in the latest version.**For issue 3**:Two companies proposed to keep the proposal as an working assumption, and the other companies are fine to delete it. Although I don’t think we can easily have consensus on this, but I can give a last try to see if companies can accept it as an working assumption. I also deleted some of the FFS parts, since it seems some companies have concern on so many FFS parts. If there is objection to keep it as working assumption, we will not spend time on this discussion any more in this meeting. |

## Updated Proposals (4th round of email discussion)

Based on the 3rd round of inputs, the proposals are updated (The reason for the update and the response to companies’ comments can be found in the table above):

* **Updated Proposal 1 for issue 1**:
* **Option 1**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule a group-common PDSCH, using the same common RNTI, for transmission of MBS data.
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a UE-specific PDSCH or group-common PDSCH for transmission of MBS data.
* **Option 2**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule a group-common PDSCH, using the same common RNTI.
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a group-common PDSCH.
* **Updated Proposal 2 for issue 4:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for multicast and no additional evaluation is needed to justify this.
	+ FFS: The detailed HARQ-ACK feedback solutions, e.g., ACK/NACK based, NACK-only based.
	+ FFS: HARQ-ACK feedback can be optionally disabled and/or enabled.
* **Potential Proposal 3 for issue 6:** (Working assumption) Companies are recommended totake the following high level evaluation methodology and assumptions as starting point if evaluations in MBS are needed.
	+ System-level simulation is recommended
	+ Evaluation scenarios: Rural and Dense-Urban scenarios for FR1 defined in TR38.901.
	+ FFS: The details of the simulation assumptions
	+ FFS: Which reliability improvement scheme(s) needs evaluation

Companies can provide comments directly in the email thread or in the table below for the updated proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Convida | For updated proposal 1 for issue 1, we are fine with both options. Regarding the FFS suggested by Nokia and CATT, we agree with QC/HW/CMCC that it has already been covered by the FFS in the updated proposal 2 by moderator. Also, the motivation and meaning of the FFS proposed by Nokia is not clear to us. We agree with the moderator that those FFS should not be captured in the updated proposal. For updated proposal 2 for issue 4, we are fine with the moderator’s proposal.For updated proposal 3 for issue 6, we slightly prefer the previous proposal by moderator, i.e., removing and not keeping the entire proposal for proposal 3.  |
| Intel | For proposal 1, we ok with Option 1 since it’s a little more general at this stage of discussion.We are ok with Proposal 2.We are also ok with Working assumption for proposal 3, since we think harmonized assumptions might be useful for aligning evaluation results. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | For Proposal 1, it seems both the main bullets of option 1 and option 2 are same and the difference is only in the FFS part, right? Proposal 2 is fine with us.For Proposal 3, we tend to remove it, i.e., keep previous proposals by moderator. |
| Qualcomm | For Updated Proposal 1, we prefer Option 1.For Updated Proposal 2, we support it.For Potential Proposal 3, we prefer to remove it. If companies want to have something to guide further discussion in next meeting, we prefer to take it as a Conclusion rather than a WA.  |
| Spreadtrum | For updated proposal 1, the FFS proposed in these two options are not clear to us, for option1, it means that only one of them will be considered or both of them can be considered? For option2, UE-specific PDSCH is default to be supported and only group common PDSCH is FFS?For updated proposal 2, we are ok.For updated proposal 3, we also prefer the previous proposal by moderator, i.e., removing it,  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Regarding proposal 1, we prefer option 2, any detailed discussion should be the next stage especially when motivation of UE-specific scheduling UE-specific PDSCH in option 1 literally may be unclear without further detailed clarification, so I suggest we keep it more generic. Ok with proposal 2. Ok with proposal 3 for progress.  |
| ZTE | For proposal1, we slightly prefer Option1. It seems both options are almost the same and it doesn’t give much additional information via the FFS point. We are also fine with Option2 if majority companies prefer to go with Option2. For proposal2, we are fine.For proposal 3, we support to make such a WA as a starting point. |
| CATT | For proposal 1, we agree with it in principle, but further clarification is needed since many companies also mention about the unclear part.* **Question:** what is the main difference between the two options?
* **Clarification 1:** The same common RNTI (highlighted part): this common RNTI is used to scramble the group-common PDSCH.
* **Clarification 2:** The FFS bullet in option 1 contains two cases:
* Case 1: A UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a UE specific PDSCH.
* Case 2: A UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a common PDSCH for a group of UEs.
* **Clarification 3**: Why “for transmission of MBS data” is added to option 1 but not option 2? From our understanding, there should not have difference with/without this definition. But if it implies any other mechanism, it should be clarified.

Anther comment for proposal 1 is about PUCCH resource indication. If the PUCCH resource indication will be discussed anyhow, why should not we add it as another FFS bullet under proposal 1? I did not observe anything wrong by add it as an FFS. Furthermore, this will be give companies guidance when preparing the tdoc for the following meeting.For proposal 2, we are fine with the update.For proposal 3, we also prefer the previous FL proposal that it can be removed. |
| LG | Regarding proposal 1, we prefer Option 1. We are OK with proposal 2 and 3 |
| CMCC | For proposal 1, we prefer option 1.Regarding the comment from CATT to adding FFS about PUCCH resource indication, we think it has been covered by the FFS in the updated proposal 2, and it is unnecessary to add it.For proposal 2, we agree with the update. For proposal 3, we prefer to delete it as the previous moderator proposal. |
| OPPO | For updated proposal 1, in our understanding, UE specific PDSCH and group-common PDSCH can all be scrambled by a sequence initialized with group-common RNTI, the only difference between them is whether the physical resource is dedicated for the UE or shared by the group of UEs, in this sense, whether a PDSCH is UE specific or group-common is transparent from a UE perspective. Having said that, Option1 is basically fine for us, but we prefer to add following note under the FFS, such as not to preclude any possibilities at this stage.**NOTE**: whether the PDSCH is UE specific or group-common may be transparent from UE perspective.We support updated Proposal 2.We prefer to remove updated Proposal 3. Before making any conclusion on common evaluation methodology or assumptions, we need to reach a common understanding and agreement on what is the purpose of the system evaluation, whether it is necessary and the timing in which we should do this. |
| vivo | For updated proposal 1, we prefer Option 1 since it helps us to have clearer study target.For updated proposal 2, we are fine with it.For updated proposal 3, we prefer moderator’s pervious proposal, i.e., removing it. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | For Proposal 1, option 1 is preferred since it is clearer than option 2. We are fine with keeping the FFS below option 1.Proposal 2 is fine with us.For Proposal 3, we tend to remove it, i.e., keep previous proposals by moderator. |
| TD Tech/Chengdu TD Tech | 1. For the updated proposal 1 for issue 1, we have the following comments:

The difference between option 1 and option 2 is reflected in the FFS parts of these two options. Option 1 has the following additional part:“support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a UE-specific PDSCH”If an MBS is sent with the unicast bearer to a UE when the MBS sent with the multicast/broadcast bearer is badly received by the UE, we prefer to option 1 to support the UE-specific PDCCH to schedule the UE-specific PDSCH, which means that the unicast bearer is used for the UE for the transmission of the same MBS.1. We are ok with the updated proposal 2 for issue 4
2. We are ok with the updated proposal 3 for issue 6
 |
| Moderator | **For issue 1:**Based on the above comments, although 8 companies prefer option 1, but some companies think it is not clear for the UE-specific PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in the FFS, it seems different companies may have different understandings especially on the UE-specific PDSCH here, so one way forward may be to keep it more generic to not preclude any schemes. I further updated the proposal to only mention “PDSCH” instead of mention “UE-specific PDSCH/group-common PDSCH” in the FFS part. Hope that could be acceptable for everyone, anyway we can discuss the details based on further inputs from companies in next meeting. **For issue 2:** I think it is table now. **For issue 3:** Although 5 companies can accept it as working assumption, majority still prefer to remove it. From my point of view, we do not need to spend time on this any more in this meeting. We can still discuss the evaluation in the next meeting, if there is consensus on which reliability scheme need to be evaluated. So my suggestion is to remove it for now. |
| Nokia | For updated proposal 1, we prefer Option 1, because it retains the UE-specific PDSCH sub-option. However, we would like some clarifications:Clarification A: Are the FFS options intended to operate in addition to the group-common PDCCH and/or independently of the group-common PDCCH?Clarification B: With both options, are we precluding the option of serving the same MBS traffic but with >1 group-common PDCCHes? For updated proposal 2, we are fine.For updated proposal 3, we support the WA. |
| Ericsson | Regarding Proposal 1 we prefer option 2, since UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a UE-specific PDSCH is already suported by NR and does not need agreement. For both options, we wish this fact to be noted in any agreement. In our understanding there is no difference in substance between option 1 and 2 – only a question of clarity. Although we prefer option 2, option 1 is acceptable.Regarding Proposal 2 we are fine with that.Regarding Proposal 3 we are fine with the substance of it, but we wish to point out that according to 3GPP practice a « Working assumption » is not allowed in offline discussions, so we cannot agree to using this expression here. We suggest that the parenthesis with this be removed. With that we can agree to the revised Proposal 3. |

## Updated Proposals (5th round of email discussion)

Based on the 4th round of inputs, the proposals are updated (The reason for the update can be found in the table above):

* **Updated Proposal 1 for issue 1**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule a group-common PDSCH, using the same common RNTI, for transmission of MBS data.
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a PDSCH for transmission of MBS data.
* **Updated Proposal 2 for issue 4:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for multicast and no additional evaluation is needed to justify this.
	+ FFS: The detailed HARQ-ACK feedback solutions, e.g., ACK/NACK based, NACK-only based.
	+ FFS: HARQ-ACK feedback can be optionally disabled and/or enabled.
* **~~Potential Proposal 3 for issue 6:~~** ~~(Working assumption) Companies are recommended to~~~~take the following high level evaluation methodology and assumptions as starting point if evaluations in MBS are needed.~~
	+ ~~System-level simulation is recommended~~
	+ ~~Evaluation scenarios: Rural and Dense-Urban scenarios for FR1 defined in TR38.901.~~
	+ ~~FFS: The details of the simulation assumptions~~
	+ ~~FFS: Which reliability improvement scheme(s) needs evaluation~~

Companies can provide comments directly in the email thread or in the table below for the updated proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia | Proposal 1 : We prefer the more generic wording, however we still have the following concerns :Clarification A: Is the FFS option intended to operate in addition to the group-common PDCCH and/or independently of the group-common PDCCH?Clarification B: Are we precluding the option of serving the same MBS traffic with >1 group-common PDCCHs?Proposal 2 : We are fine with this proposal. |
| Convida | We are fine with the updated proposals from moderator. |
| BBC | We are fine with the updated Proposal 1 and Proposal 2. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1 : we are ok with the reworded option 1Proposal 2 : we are ok with the proposal.  |
| Qualcomm | The updated version of Proposal 1 and Proposal 2 look good to us. |
| LG | We are fine with the updated proposal 1 and 2.Considering Chairman’s suggestion for Nokia’s comment, we propose the following update:Proposal:* For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule a group-common PDSCH, using the same common RNTI, for transmission of MBS data.
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a PDSCH for transmission of MBS data, not precluding potential interaction with the group-common PDCCH
 |
| Moderator | Based on Nokia/LG’s comments and Chairman’s update, the Proposal 1 is updated as follow, please see if it is ok for everyone:**Updated Proposal 1 for issue 1**: * For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule a group-common PDSCH, using the same common RNTI, for transmission of MBS data.
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a PDSCH for transmission of MBS data, not precluding ~~including~~ potential interaction with the group-common PDCCH
	+ FFS: whether or not support more than one group-common PDCCH for a UE
 |
| Moderator | Based on further comments received in the email thread, the proposal 1 is updated as follows, please check if it is ok for everyone.**Updated Proposal 1 for issue 1**: * For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule a group-common PDSCH~~, using the same common RNTI, for transmission of MBS data~~, where the group-common PDSCH ~~uses~~ is associated with the same common RNTI as for the corresponding group-common PDCCH.

o   FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a PDSCH ~~for transmission of MBS data~~. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | I think the “association” means using the common RNTI to scramble the PDSCH. If companies want to make it more generic, it is fine with me. |
| vivo | For the updated proposal 1, we are fine with the main bullet, but for the FFS part, we think it is not clear. As commented by other companies, “UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a PDSCH” is already supported by NR. In our view, considering the reliability for NR MBS can be up to 99.9999%, then it must be necessary to support unicast PDSCH for retransmission since unicast PDSCH can yield better performance than multicast PDSCH. We have the following suggestion for proposal 1.* For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule a group-common PDSCH~~, using the same common RNTI, for transmission of MBS data~~, where the group-common PDSCH ~~uses~~ is associated with the same common RNTI as for the corresponding group-common PDCCH.
	+ - * ~~FFS: whether~~ In addition to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a PDSCH associated with a UE-specific RNTI for re-transmission of an initial transmission of PDSCH associated with group common RNTI ~~for transmission of MBS data~~.
			* FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a PDSCH associated with a common RNTI
 |
| Nokia | Ok with the last Moderator update above, since it moves forward the discussion but in an open way, that includes “at least” and “ffs” without fixing/implying too many constraints. Do not understand the difference/aims of the Vivo’s bullets above. They seem to overlap if there is no difference between “group common RNTI” and “common RNTI”. Also, very wary of not having the FFS with the first bullet and the risk that this precludes using other “common RNTIs” to schedule other “MBS data” retransmissions for other “sub-groups” of UEs. |

## Updated Proposals (6th round of email discussion)

Based on the 5th round of inputs, the proposals are updated:

* **Updated Proposal 1 for issue 1**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule a group-common PDSCH, where the scrambling of the group-common PDSCH is based on the same common RNTI.
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a PDSCH for MBS.
* **Updated Proposal 2 for issue 4:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for multicast and no additional evaluation is needed to justify this.
	+ FFS: The detailed HARQ-ACK feedback solutions, e.g., ACK/NACK based, NACK-only based.
	+ FFS: HARQ-ACK feedback can be optionally disabled and/or enabled.
* **~~Potential Proposal 3 for issue 6:~~** ~~(Working assumption) Companies are recommended to~~~~take the following high level evaluation methodology and assumptions as starting point if evaluations in MBS are needed.~~
	+ ~~System-level simulation is recommended~~
	+ ~~Evaluation scenarios: Rural and Dense-Urban scenarios for FR1 defined in TR38.901.~~
	+ ~~FFS: The details of the simulation assumptions~~
	+ ~~FFS: Which reliability improvement scheme(s) needs evaluation~~

Companies can provide comments directly in the email thread or in the table below for the updated proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Moderator | Some responses to the comments in the 5th round of email discussion (Some comments were replied in the email thread) :@Ericsson, It seems you first said fine with the proposal 1 in section 2.5, but after a while you are not fine with it any more. Anyway, regarding your latest comment in the email thread, I deleted the ‘for transmission of MBS data’ in the main bullet, but for the sub-bullet, I adopted the suggestion from LG, since I also think it is still unclear how UE specific transmission will be used to support MBS data transmission. I agree your comment that ’MBS data’ does not imply group-common PDSCH, and group-common PDSCH probably implies IP Multicast. I also admit that the legacy NR PTP transmission can be used for initial transmission of MBS data, but there are also other possibilities related to ‘UE-specific PDSCH’. For one example, as commented by vivo, it could be using UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a PDSCH associated with a UE-specific RNTI for re-transmission of an initial transmission of PDSCH associated with group common RNTI, which may have some spec impact. For another example, as commented by OPPO /Qualcomm, it could also be using UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a PDSCH associated with a group common RNTI for re-transmission of an initial transmission of PDSCH associated with group common RNTI, which may also have some spec impact. So if we directly use ‘group-common PDSCH’, it may preclude some possibilities related to ‘UE-specific PDSCH’ for MBS.Base on the above, I use ‘for MBS’ to replace ‘for transmission of MBS data’ in the FFS part. I try to keep the FFS part generic enough to not preclude any possible solutions, and at the same time, I hope it can remind companies to provide further consderations on the details in next meeting. I think the current FFS part at least include the following possibiities which may have spec impact:* UE-specific PDCCH schedules group-common PDSCH associated with a group common RNTI for initial transmission
* UE-specific PDCCH schedules a UE-specific PDSCH associated with a UE-specific RNTI for re-transmission of an initial transmission of PDSCH associated with group common RNTI;
* UE-specific PDCCH schedules a UE-specific PDSCH associated with a group common RNTI (this is possible) for re-transmission of an initial transmission of PDSCH associated with group common RNTI

@vivo, I understand your intention of the revision, but I think it may be hard for companies to add such detailed FFS, especially considering the FFS listed by you still cannot cover other possibilities (as I mentioned above). Hope the generic form can be fine for you.@Haipeng from Lenovo,regarding the ‘association between same RNTI and the group-common PDSCH’ , I reworded the related part to use ’the scrambling of the group-common PDSCH is based on the same common RNTI’. Hope that clarified it.Companies please check if it is ok for you. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the updated Proposal 1.Proposal 2 has been agreed based on Chairman’s email. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the updated Proposal 1. |
| Samsung | We are fine with the updated Proposal 1. |
| vivo | We are fine with the updated Proposal 1.@ Nokia Sorry for my careless if it made you confused. Both should be “group common RNTI” in these two sub-bullets. |
| CATT | **We still have concerns on proposal 1.**The current proposal 1 precluded sub-group-common scheduling mechanism by using ‘the same common RNTI’, which may lead to different RNTI for different PDSCH.We would like to suggest to update the proposal 1 as follows with more general wording that ‘the same’ is replaced by ‘a’ : * **Updated Proposal 1 for issue 1**: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support group-common PDCCH with CRC scrambled by a common RNTI to schedule a group-common PDSCH, where the scrambling of the group-common PDSCH is based on ~~the same~~ a common RNTI.
	+ FFS: whether to support UE-specific PDCCH to schedule a PDSCH for MBS.

With the above modification, it is still including the previous meaning, as well as sub-group-common scheduling.  |
| LG | We are fine with the updated Proposal 1. |

# Email discussion on medium priority issues (Phase 3)

## Company Views (1st round of email discussion)

***High level issue related to BWP***

For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, different UEs may have different active BWPs for unicast transmission, while for MBS different UEs in the same MBS group need to receive the same group common PDSCH, so how to configure the frequency resources for MBS needs to be discussed.

Two options are proposed by companies for frequency resource configuration for NR MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.

* Option 1: Introduce a MBS specific BWP.
* Option 2: Define a common frequency resource for MBS confined within UE’s active BWP. The common frequency resource allocated to a group of UEs should be within the intersection of the active BWPs of all the UEs within the group. The common frequency resource could be configured per BWP.

The proponents for option 1 think it will be hard to find a common numerology and option 1 has better forward compatibility towards Objective B, while the opponents for option 1 think UE will be required to support two active BWPs for simultaneous operation with unicast reception, and if UE does not support two active BWPs, UE has to switch BWPs back and forth for receiving MBS or unicast, which is usually not desirable due to unnecessary latency caused by BWP switching. One company support option 1. Three or four companies support option 2. Another two companies [OPPO] [LG] also have some BWP related discussions and proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Options** | **Companies** |
| Option 1: Introduce a MBS specific BWP | ZTE |
| Option 2: Define a MBS common frequency resource confined within UE’s active BWP | CMCC, Huawei, Samsung, [vivo] |

**[Medium priority] Issue 2 (Question 2 in** **R1-2007001): Please share your views on the following two alternatives for frequency resource configuration for MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.**

* **Alternative 1: Introduce a MBS specific BWP**
* **Alternative 2: Define a MBS common frequency resource confined within UE’s active BWP.**

Please share your views and comments in the table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | We think a common frequency resource need to be defined for MBS reception (in both Alt1 and Alt2). But the key discussion here is whether to reuse the BWP framework or a different framework. In NR, the *pdsch-Config* is within *BWP-DownlinkDedicated*. The group-common PDSCH requires many parameter to be configured in a common way, such as PDSCH time/freq resource allocation, scrambling index, MBS table, RBG size, VRB-to-PRB interleaver, rate matching patterns, etc.. So, we can first define a common frequency resource for group-common PDSCH and further discuss whether to reuse the BWP framework or something new. In addition, a UE may belong to different UE groups receiving different multicast services. Therefore, one or more than one common frequency resource can be configured per UE. Therefore, we propose:* **Define common frequency resource for group-common PDSCH.**
	+ **FFS whether to reuse the BWP framework or not**
	+ **FFS one or more than one common frequency resource configured per UE**
 |
| ZTE | We prefer Alternative 1.For different UEs, there may have different configurations (e.g., numerology) for their own unicast downlink transmission and multicast transmission. Then, it will be hard to find a common configuration for both unicast downlink transmission and broadcast/multicast downlink transmission for them. Furthermore, considering the forward compatibility towards Objective B, different configurations will also be required for unicast downlink transmission and broadcast/multicast downlink transmission to a UE. It is more flexible for configuring a BWP specific to broadcast/multicast. And current RRC signaling configuration structure of BWP can be used for broadcast/multicast parameter configuration directly, which requires less standardization effort.  |
| LG | We support Alternative 1. We wonder whether every UE can be always configured with a MBS common frequency resource confined within UE’s active BWP. It seems hard to ensure that the MBS common frequency resource is always within the current active BWP of UE’s serving cell. |
| vivo | In the current spec, a time duration is needed for UE to do BWP switching regardless whether the target BWP and the old BWP have the same central frequency or not. Thus, Alternative 1 will introduce more complexity for UE implementation, and is inefficient when UE needs to receive unicast PDSCH and MBS PDSCH simultaneously. We agree with Qualcomm’s comments. The proposal from Qualcomm is fine to us. |
| TD Tech/Chengdu TD Tech | We think the clarification is needed to give the clear scenarios for issue 2. 1. Does issue 2 have no relationship with issue 7 ?

These two issues concern the frequency resource allocation for the differnt UE statuses. Isssue 2 is for UE in RRC\_CONNECTED state while issue 7 is for UE in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACITVE states.There is no agreement made in RAN2 for the MBS WI that there’s no need to present the same MBS over Broadcasat to UE in the diffrent states. It seems these two issues have a little contact so far.1. How to evaluate the different frequency resource allocaiton methods ?  no BWP switching fo a UE receiving an MBS is selected as a rule to evaluate the different methods ? are there any other factors/rules ?
2. How to bring a UE into RRC\_CONNECTED state ? The answer to this question will affect the soluton for issue 2.

UE comes into RRC\_CONNECTED state only when UE have a common unicast service different than an MBS?UE needs to go into RRC\_ CONNECTED state when UE has a multicast MBMS to receive ?Based on the above questions, we think the following scenarios shall be considered with the UE state ( RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACITIVE ) and the MBS type (multicast or broadcast) as the two dimentions/factors for the considered issues.For the MBS broadcast in the cell, there are three scenarios, which scenario needs considering ? **Scenario1** : With the frequency resource allocation for the UE in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state as the baseline, if the corresponding frequency resource allocation for a given MBS can NOT be applied to some UE in RRC\_CONNNECTEED state (for instant, the corresponding frequency resource allocation leads to the BWP switching for some UE in RRC\_CONNECTED), consider the frequency resource allocation method for these UE ?**Scenario2 :** With the frequency resource allocation for the UE in RRC\_CONNNECTEED state as the baseline, if the corresponding frequency resource allocation for a given MBS can NOT be applied to UE in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state, consider the frequency resource allocation method for these UE ?**Scenario 3 :** There’s no relationship between issue 2 and issue 7. For a given MBS braodcast in the cell, the frequency resource allocation for the UE in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state and the frequency resource allocation for the UE in RRC\_CONNECTED state are indepentent from each other.Among the three scenarios liste above, if only scenario 1 is taken into account, we think we need to discuss issue 7 firstly and then discuss issue 2.Among the three scenarios liste above, scenario 2 is NOT reasonable.Among the three scenarios liste above, if only scenario 3 is taken into account, we prefer to option 2. But we think option 1 can be futher studied.For a multicast MBS in the cell, which working assumptions for such MBS need to be considered ? With all the UE in the corresponding multicast group going into RRC\_CONNECTED as a woking assumption ? Based on the above working assumption to consider how to allocate the frequency resource for the UE in the same multicast group ?For a multicast MBS in the cell, based on the above working assumption, there’s no need to provide this MBS to the UE in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACITIVE state. Therefore, for the multicast MBS, we prefer to option 2. Option 1 needs the further discussion.If there is no common frequency resource shared by all UE in the same multicast group, how to do ? Classify the UE into the different sub-group, the UEs in the same sub-group receive the same MBS on the same frequency resource ?How to define the factors/rules for evaluating the differnt methods ? This question needs furhter disscution. |
| Nokia | We would prefer this deferred to the next meeting.  In our mind, though we have a slight preference for alternative 1, there are a number of options to explore, including, overlapping BWP/Coreset/SSs, that could mean in some scenarios, alternative 2 is a subset of alternative 1. |
| Convida | We support Alt 1. We share the similar view with ZTE and LG. Unless the gNB forces that the UEs receiving the MBS have a common frequency resource confined within their UE-specific active BWPs through the configurations, it is hard to ensure such common frequency resource confined within UE’s active BWP always exist. We think that there are restrictions of configurations and scheduling for using MBS common frequency resource. We doubt whether Alt 2 can work for all the scenarios. Also, we agree with Nokia that Alt 2 can be considered as a subset of Alt 1 in some scenarios.  |
| Ericsson | We support alternative 2. For alternative 1, the consequence is that a PTM transmission may not be able to coexist with a PTP transmission, if the BWPs are not compatible. This will introduce more complexity and potentially increase the latency of PTP due to the need of TDD’ing the transmissions with broadcast.  |
| CMCC | We support alternative 2.In NR, BWP framework is used to configure physical layer channels and signals, and the DCI field sizes, e.g., FDRA size are also determined based on the size of the active DL/UL BWP. As the proposal 1 in high priority discussion, group common PDCCH based scheduling is supported, the multiple UEs in one MBS group receive the same group common PDCCH which means the DCI fields and sizes should be the same for these UEs.However, different UE may have different UE-specific active DL BWPs, there are two general ways to realize these UEs receive the same group common PDCCH, which is two alternatives in this proposal**• Alternative 1: Introduce a MBS specific BWP****• Alternative 2: Define a MBS common frequency resource confined within UE’s active BWP.**For alternative 1, the MBS frequency resource is a dedicated BWP to guarantee multiple UEs receive the same group common PDCCH. But this method will cause the BWP switching delay between UE-specific BWP and MBS specific BWP when one UE have unicast and multicast service. As the discussion in **Issue 3 (Question 3 in R1-2007001): Whether the simultaneous operation with unicast reception in the WID means a UE is required to receive multicast PDSCH and unicast PDSCH simultaneously in one slot?***This objective includes specifying necessary enhancements that are required to enable simultaneous operation with unicast reception.*Most companies think the answer is **Yes**. But the alternative 1 is used, UE cannot simultaneous receiving unicast PDSCH and unicast PDSCH in one slot, which is conflicted with the WID.For alternative 2, a common MBS frequency resource can be defined within each UE’s active DL BWP for UEs in the same group. The group common PDCCH/PDSCH for MBS can only be transmitted in this frequency resource, and the FRDA field of the G-RNTI based PDCCH for MBS is determined based on the MBS frequency resource instead of UE’s active DL BWP. In this way, UE can receive unicast PDCCH/PDSCH in UE active DL BWP and MBS PDDCH/PDSCH in MBS common frequency resource without the BWP switching delay, because there is only one active BWP. The MBS common frequency resource is used to restrict the MBS PDCCH/PDSCH frequency domain resource range and guarantee multiple UEs have the same understanding the MBS PDCCH/PDSCH configuration and DCI fields and sizes. |
| MTK | We support alternative 2.Introducing a MBS specific BWP as mentioned in alternative 1 will enlarge the system delay due to BWP switching between different BWP types, which is not desirable. Also, considering the simultaneous receiving the unicast and multicast in one slot, the alternative 2 is the better solution. |
| OPPO | We support alternative 1.We share the view with some other companies that Alt 2 may not be able to work in all scenarios, active BWP of multiple UEs may not be overlapping, where there is no common frequency resources. For a given UE, numerology configured for the active BWP may not be suitable for MBS transmissions, in these case, frequency resources for MBS cannot be configured on the active BWP also.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We support alternative 2. Agree with the reasoning mentioned by Ericsson, CMCC and MTK.  |
| Spreadtrum | We slightly prefer alternative 1 considering that different numerology requirement for a BWP if the BWP framework is reused, and we shared the same views as Nokia that Alt 2 can be considered as a subset of Alt 1 up to NW’s configuration in some scenarios. For alternative 2, there are some restrictions of BWP configuration for UEs, it may reduce the system resource utilization and BWP configuration flexibility in some senses. |

***Clarification on simultaneous operation with unicast reception in the WID***

The WID of NR MBS mentioned to specify necessary enhancements that are required to enable simultaneous operation with unicast reception. One company [vivo] proposed to clarify whether the simultaneous operation with unicast reception means a UE is required to receive multicast PDSCH and unicast PDSCH simultaneously in one slot. Three companies [CMCC] [vivo] [Intel] proposed to discuss whether TDM/FDM/SDM can be supported for simultaneous reception of unicast PDSCH and multicast PDSCH in one slot.

Since the clarification and discussion on this issue has great impact on the detailed design for simultaneous operation with unicast reception, it is proposed to discuss this issue in this meeting.

**[Medium priority] Issue 3 (Question 3 in** **R1-2007001)**: **Whether the simultaneous operation with unicast reception in the WID means a UE is required to receive multicast PDSCH and unicast PDSCH simultaneously in one slot? If the answer is YES, which multiplexing type(s) of simultaneous reception of unicast PDSCH and multicast PDSCH in a slot can be supported in NR MBS? e.g., TDM, FDM, SDM.**

Please share your views and comments in the table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | We think simultaneous operation with unicast reception in the WID means a UE is required to receive multicast PDSCH and unicast PDSCH simultaneously in one slot. LTE SC-PTM supports FDM between unicast and multicast PDSCH, based on the UE capability. It could be the starting point for NR multicast reception. Therefore, we propose* **Support FDM between unicast PDSCH and multicast PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability.**
	+ **FFS TDM or SDM in a slot.**
 |
| ZTE | NoBased on our understanding, simultaneous operation means that UE at least has to support dynamic switching between unicast reception and multicast/broadcast reception. On top of dynamic switching between unicast reception and multicast/broadcast reception, UE can further supports TDM, FDM or SDM subject to further UE capabilities. |
| LG | At least FDM can be supported as in LTE SC-PTM |
| vivo | We think the discussion on this issue may have significant impact on HARQ-ACK design if supported, so we think it’s better to have a common understanding as earlier as possible. We think FDM between unicast PDSCH and multicast PDSCH as that of LTE SC-PTM can be supported as a UE capability for NR MBS. In addition, since NR support type B PDSCH mapping, TMD in one slot can also be supported.  |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We are OK with FDM as the starting point. |
| TD Tech/Chengdu TD Tech | We agree that simultaneous operation with unicast reception in the WID means a UE is required to receive multicast PDSCH and unicast PDSCH simultaneously in one slot. We support the following proposals* **Support FDM between unicast PDSCH and multicast PDSCH in a slot.**
* **FFS: TDM in a slot**
* **SDM: In general, SDM is transparent to UE. But if SDM has effect on the SPEC, it needs further study.**
 |
| Nokia | Yes, FDM based on UE capability.Support the Qualcomm proposal.  |
| Convida | We are fine with QC’s proposal. |
| BBC | We agree with Qualcomm’s proposal |
| Ericsson | We support Qualcomm’s proposal, i.e. Yes, FDM, with FFS for TDD and SDM. |
| CMCC | Yes, we think simultaneous operation with unicast reception means a UE is required to receive multicast PDSCH and unicast PDSCH simultaneously in one slot.As the comment from Qualcomm, FDM is used in LTE SC-PTM, it would be better to also support FDM in NR MBS, but the HARQ codebook design for multiple FMDed PDSCHs in one slot needs more spec effort.In addition, Rel-15 NR has already supported PDSCH mapping type B and more than one PDSCHs can be TDMed in one slot. Some extension/modification of Rel-15 HARQ codebook design for TDMed PDSCH is needed for NR MBS. Therefore, we think both FDM and TDM can be supported.  |
| MTK | We generally agree with QC’s view.At least FDM supported by LTE SC PTM is a baseline. |
| OPPO | Yes, FDM can be taken as starting point. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We agree with FDM similar as LTE SC-PTM should be a baseline. TDM in slot for unicast has been supported for unicast, so TDM between unicast and MBS can also be supported in a slot. SDM can be FFS.  |
| Spreadtrum | In Rel-15/Rel-16, the UE capabilities regarding the maximum number of unicast PDSCHs per slot is specified in NR, and as mentioned by Qualcomm that LTE SC-PTM has supported FDM between unicast and multicast PDSCH, so if the same BWP is used for both MBS and unicast receptions, at least FDM supported by LTE SC PTM based on the corresponding UE’s capability is a baseline. |

**[Medium priority] Issue 5 (Proposal 2 in R1-2007001, with little update)**: **For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, whether the following reliability improvement mechanisms can be supported for MBS:**

* **CSI feedback**
	+ **FFS: whether modification is needed on top of existing CSI feedback mechanism for unicast**
* **PDSCH repetition**
	+ **FFS: whether spec impact is implied**

Please share your views and comments in the table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | Firstly, we support the CSI feedback to improve the reliability of NR multicast reception for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs. The multicast beam for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH is not same as that of unicast. If the multicast beam fails, the RRC\_CONNECTED UEs can make use of unicast connection to assist the beam management for multicast. Whether to use P/SP/A-CSI-RS for multicast CSI feedback need further study. Another approach is SRS-based CSI measurement for DL transmission in TDD band. The SRS for multicast transmission may need different configuration than that of unicast due to different frequency resource and user multiplexing. Secondly, regarding PDSCH repetition, the unicast PDSCH support slot aggregation. The PDSCH aggregation factor is configured in *pdsch-Config* per *BWP-DownlinkDedicated*. The repetition can be supported to improve the multicast coverage. But if we support PDSCH slot aggregation for multicast, the configuration for group-common PDSCH could be different from that of unicast.Therefore, we propose:* **For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support CSI feedback for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH.**
	+ **FFS the configuration of TRS/CSI-RS for multicast transmission**
	+ **FFS the configuration of SRS for multicast transmission**
* **For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support repetition for group-common PDSCH.**
	+ **FFS the configuration of group-common PDSCH repetition**
 |
| ZTE | YesFor CSI feedback, as preliminary evaluation result shown in our contribution x5439, CSI feedback is beneficial to improve the reliability of NR broadcast/multicast. A low standardization complexity can be expected as most of R15/R16 mechanism can be reused. For example, the same wideband PMI with cycling of subband PMIs can be used for multicast to UEs with the same reported wideband PMI. The current spec supports CQI reporting for such transmission mode with *reportQuantity* set to 'cri-RI-i1-CQI' in CSI reporting. In addition, CSI feedback considering closed-loop spatial multiplexing can be reused for MBS. Further processing (e.g. averaging) can be done at gNB taking into account of CSI reports of the targeted UEs. For PDSCH repetition, it is also supported in current specification. That is, number of repetitions can be configured by RRC signaling semi-statically. For further improving system efficiency, indicating the number of repetitions in DCI, as already introduced for DG-PUSCH in Rel-16 URLLC, can be reused for MBS.  |
| LG | In NR, when a UE is configured with *pdsch-AggregationFactor* > 1 for unicast PDSCH, the parameter *pdsch-AggregationFactor* provides the number of PDSCH transmissions of a TB within a bundle. We think that a bundle of PDSCH repetitions can be supported to improve reliability of MBS transmissions. |
| vivo | Regarding CSI feedback, for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, CSI feedback may be transparent to UE in terms of the usage of CSI feedback. A UE is configured/scheduled to do CSI measurement and CSI report, the UE just does this as legacy behaviour. It’s up to gNB to determine how to configure a proper CSI report or how to use the CSI for subsequent scheduling.When considering small-area SFN from a set of gNBs to a group of UE, coordination of CSI-RS/CSI-IM resource among SFN gNBs may need further study. Whether the current QCL framework (based on SSB and CSI-RS) can be directly reused or not may need further study.Regarding PDSCH repetition, the reliability requirements for unicast PDSCH and multicast PDSCH may be different, so it should support to configure PDSCH aggregation factor for unicast PDSCH and multicast PDSCH separately. In addition, for different MBS services, the requirements can also be different, so PDSCH aggregation factor may need to be configured per TMGI.  |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We support PDSCH repetition for reliability enhancement with the number of repetitions preconfigured by RRC signaling. We think this can be the baseline. |
| TD Tech/Chengdu TD Tech | Because UE may go into RRC\_CONNECTED state under the different scenarios, therefore we have the different views for the different scenarios.**For RRC\_CONNECTED UE which is receiving a common unicast service different than an MBS*** **Support CSI feedback**
	+ **FFS: whether modification is needed on top of existing CSI feedback mechanism for unicast**
* **Support PDSCH repetition for an MBS**
	+ **FFS: whether spec impact is implied**

For a UE receiving a common unicast service different than an MBS, the CSI feedback is needed for the unicast service. Therefore, we support the CSI feedback under such scenario.**For RRC\_CONNECTED UE which enters into RRC\_CONNECTED state just for receiving a multicast MBS:** * **It’s better to support CSI feedback, but no CSI feedback is also ok.**
	+ **FFS: whether modification is needed on top of existing CSI feedback mechanism for unicast**
* **Support PDSCH repetition for an MBS**
	+ **FFS: whether spec impact is implied**
 |
| Nokia  | We support at least the use of PDSCH repetition. |
| Convida | We think PDSCH repetition can be considered as the baseline and supporting the CSI feedback is FFS.  |
| BBC | We support both CSI feedback and PDSCH repetition mechanisms for NR MBS. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal, i.e. CSI feedback and PDSCH repetition, with FSS for possible spec impact.  |
| CMCC | We support the proposal, both CSI feedback and PDSCH repetition should be supported in NR MBS. |
| MTK | Both CSI feedback mechanism and PDSCH repetition can improve the reliability in NR MBS, we are fine with this proposal. |
| OPPO | We support both CSI feedback and PDSCH repetition. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We are ok with the proposal.  |
| Spreadtrum | At least PDSCH repetition can be considered. |

## Initial Proposals (2nd round of email discussion)

Based on the 1st round of input, the following observation can be made:

* **For issue 2:**
	+ It seems not easy for companies to converge to one of the two alternatives for now. 5 companies [ZTE, LG, Convida, OPPO, Spreadtrum] explicitly support Alt 1, 5 companies [Ericsson, CMCC, MTK, Huawei, HiSilicon] explicitly support Alt 2. One company [Nokia] propose to delay this discussion to next meeting. 2 companies [Qualcomm, vivo] propose to first define a common frequency resource for group-common PDSCH and further discuss whether to reuse the BWP framework or define new method. Maybe we can try with Qualcomm’s proposal.
* **For issue 3:**
	+ 16 companies agree that the simultaneous operation with unicast reception in the WID means a UE is required to receive multicast PDSCH and unicast PDSCH simultaneously in one slot, and they also agree to at least support FDM between unicast PDSCH and multicast PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability, and TDM/SDM can be FFS. 4 company [vivo, CMCC, Huawei, HiSilicon] also support TDM in a slot.
	+ One company [ZTE] do not agree this. They think simultaneous operation means that UE at least has to support dynamic switching between unicast reception and multicast/broadcast reception.
* **For issue 5:**
	+ All the 15 companies support repetition for group-common PDSCH, with FFS for possible spec impact, e.g., how to configure the repetition of group-common PDSCH, whether the configuration/indication is based on RRC signaling and/or DCI, whether to support different PDSCH repetition configurations for unicast and multicast or for different multicast services, etc.
	+ 8 or 9 companies [Qualcomm, ZTE, vivo, TD Tech, BBC, Ericsson, CMCC, MTK, OPPO] support CSI feedback for multicast, with FFS for possible spec impact, e.g., the configuration of TRS/CSI-RS for multicast transmission, the configuration of SRS for multicast transmission, etc.

Based on companies’ views and the observation, the following initial proposals are made:

* **Initial Proposal 4 for issue 2:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, define common frequency resource for group-common PDSCH.
	+ FFS: whether to reuse the BWP framework or not
	+ FFS: one or more than one common frequency resource can be configured per UE
* **Initial Proposal 5 for issue 3:** Support FDM between unicast PDSCH and multicast PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability.
	+ FFS: TDM or SDM in a slot.
* **Initial Proposal 6-1 for issue 5:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support repetition for group-common PDSCH which is scheduled by group-common PDCCH, where the group-common PDCCH and the corresponding group-common PDSCH are associated with the same common RNTI.
	+ FFS the configuration of group-common PDSCH repetition
* **Initial Proposal 6-2 for issue 5:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support CSI feedback for multicast transmission with group-common PDCCH and group-common PDSCH, which are associated with the same common RNTI.
	+ FFS the configuration of TRS/CSI-RS for multicast transmission
	+ FFS the configuration of SRS for multicast transmission

Companies can comment directly in the email thread or in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For Proposal 4, would it be better to add « numerology » in addition to common frequency resource ? e.g.,* For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, define common frequency resource and common numerology for group-common PDSCH.
	+ FFS: whether to reuse the BWP framework or not
	+ FFS: one or more than one common frequency resource can be configured per UE

Proposal 5 is OK to us.For Proposal 6-1, maybe it is better to make « repetition » clear. Is it repetition type A or type B or both ?Proposal 6-2 is OK to us. |
| OPPO | For proposal 4, we prefer to replace “define” with “configure”, as for BWP, it is a definition already have, no need to define again.For Proposal 5, can we align the terminology, i.e. multicast PDSCH 🡪 group-common PDSCH?We are fine with proposal 6-1 and 6-2. |
| Ericsson | All proposals are ok to us.  |
| vivo | For Proposal 4 and 5, we are fine with them.For proposal 6-1, we think repletion for group-common PDSCH should be a generic feature, and should be decoupled with the group scheduling mechanism, i.e. no need to limit that the PDSCH is scheduled by group-common PDCCH. We suggest to update it as* For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support repetition for group-common PDSCH which is ~~scheduled by group-common PDCCH, where the group-common PDCCH and the corresponding group-common PDSCH are~~ associated with ~~the same~~ a common RNTI.
	+ FFS the configuration of group-common PDSCH repetition

For proposal 6-2, we do agree to support of using CSI feedback to improve PDSCH reliability for MBS service. But we think the CSI configuration for a UE is not necessary associated to any unicast or mulitcast service. Whenever it is configured by UE-specific RRC signaling to the UE, it is transparent to UE how gNB make use of the corresponding CSI report. Multicast specific CSI configuration which is not transparent to UE is not justified at this moment. Further studied is needed. Otherwise, UE can always make use of the current CSI framework. We suggest to update this proposal as* For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support CSI feedback for multicast transmission ~~with group-common PDCCH and group-common PDSCH, which are associated with the same common RNTI~~.
	+ FFS the configuration of TRS/CSI-RS for multicast transmission
	+ FFS the configuration of SRS for multicast transmission
 |
| Nokia | Proposal 4: Support with “define” replaced by “configure” @Oppo Proposal 5: Support Proposal 6-1: SupportProposal 6-2: No strong opinion |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer the initial version of the proposal for issue 2. It is pretty clear or straightforward that enabling a group-common PDSCH needs a common frequency resource, whether the existing configuration signaling can be reused or needs a separate can be discussed later or up to RAN2 for designing the signaling. For us, the urgent issue we need to make clear at the beginning is whether UE is required to support more than one active BWPs to enable simultaneous reception of unicast and MBS and whether BWP switching can be acceptable. Proposal 5, suggest putting TDM in the main bullet and keep FFS on SDM.Proposal 6-1, most part of the main bullet has been cover by one proposal in phase2, prefer simplify this proposal that PDSCH repetition is supported. * For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, PDSCH repetition is supported for group-common PDSCH.
	+ FFS whether enhancement is needed.

Proposal 6-2, the suggested proposal seems going too far, we suggest wording it as follows:* For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, the CSI feedback framework for unicast can be used for multicast transmission via group-common PDSCH.
	+ FFS whether enhancement is needed.
 |
| ZTE | For Proposal 4, based on our understanding, the common frequency resource is defined per group of UEs. Different common frequency resources may be defined for different groups. Thus, we propose the following update.* **Initial Proposal 4 for issue 2:** For each group of RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, define common frequency resource for group-common PDSCH.
	+ FFS: whether to reuse the BWP framework or not
	+ FFS: whether to define one or more than one common frequency resource can be configured per UE

For proposal 5, based on our understanding, if UE already supports FDM between unicast PDSCH and multicast PDSCH, UE is likely to also support TDM between unicast and multicast PDSCHs. Anyway, either FDM or TDM will finally be up to specific UE capability. Thus, we propose to add TDM in the main bullet.* **Initial Proposal 5 for issue 3:** Support FDM and/or TDM between unicast PDSCH and multicast PDSCH in a slot based on the corresponding UE capability.
	+ FFS: ~~TDM or~~ SDM in a slot.

For proposal 6-1, we are generally fine with the current proposal. Just one minor comment, regarding the FFS point, it is better to also include “indication” here as we usually apply “configuration” for semi-static grant while “indication” for dynamic grant.* **Initial Proposal 6-1 for issue 5:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support repetition for group-common PDSCH which is scheduled by group-common PDCCH, where the group-common PDCCH and the corresponding group-common PDSCH are associated with the same common RNTI.
	+ FFS the configuration/indication of group-common PDSCH repetition

For proposal 6-2, we are generally fine with the current proposal. Just one minor comment, regarding the first FFS point, we believe RAN1 should focus on the “mechanisms” instead of the “configuration” here. * + FFS the ~~configuration~~ mechanism of ~~TRS/CSI-RS~~CSI feedback for multicast transmission using TRS/CSI-RS.
 |
| LG | We are fine with Proposal 4, 5 and 6-1. Reagrding Proposal 6-2, we can add the following FFS :FFS whether existing CSI feedback for unicast is sufficient or not |
| MTK | For proposal 4: we have the same view as OPPO’s comments, replacing “define” with “configure”.For proposal 5: We suggest to modify the wordings as follow:* **Initial Proposal 5 for issue 3:** At least support FDM between UE-specific PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability.
	+ FFS: TDM or SDM in a slot.

For proposal 6-1: we support moderator’s proposal.For proposal 6-2: we agree with HW’s suggestion. |
| CATT | We are fine with proposal 4, proposal 6-1.For proposal 5, both TDM and FDM can be supported, while SDM can be further discussed. We prefer to leave only SDM in the FFS.For Proposal 6-2, we share the same view with LG with adding the FFS. There are lots of views that current unicast CSI feedback is sufficient to MBS. |
| CMCC | We support all the proposals. |
| Qualcomm | We support Proposal 4, 5, 6-2.For Proposal 6-1, the main bullet is also applicable to group-common PDSCH scheduled by UE-specific PDCCH as well, so we suggest* **Initial Proposal 6-1 for issue 5:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support repetition for group-common PDSCH.
	+ FFS the configuration of group-common PDSCH repetition
 |
| Intel  | For Proposal 4, we agree with OPPO that defined should be replaced with configured. Additionally, the major issue is whether UE needs to support separate BWP for MBS reception or if the MBS resource is within the active BWP. This would have implication on simultaneous reception of multicast and unicast PDSCH within a slot as well as on HARQ/ACK design. We think that precluding simultaneous reception at this early stage is not acceptable and would like to clarify the overall proposal as follows:* **Initial Proposal 4 for issue 2:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, ~~define~~ configure a common frequency resource for group-common PDSCH.
	+ FFS: ~~whether to reuse the BWP framework or not~~ whether the common frequency resource is always within the active BWP of UEs receiving the group-common PDSCH
	+ FFS: whether ~~one or~~ more than one common frequency resource can be configured per UE

For Proposal 5, since NR supports Type B PDSCH mapping, we prefer to also keep TDM in the main bullet and not as part of FFS. For the case of fully overlapped reception of unicast and multicast, it can be done over orthogonal DM-RS ports and can be an UE capabilityWe are ok with proposal 6-1For Proposal 6-2, we think that the main bullet can be changed as follows:* **Initial Proposal 6-2 for issue 5:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support CSI feedback for multicast transmission ~~with group-common PDCCH and group-common PDSCH, which are associated with the same common RNTI~~.
	+ FFS the configuration of TRS/CSI-RS for multicast transmission
	+ FFS the configuration of SRS for multicast transmission

The CSI feedback may not be needed separately for multicast transmission. The network can be free to configure and use legacy unicast CSI for scheduling of MBS transmission. |
| Spreadtrum | For proposal 4: we have the same view as OPPO’s comments, replacing “define” with “configure”.For proposal 5: we agree with MTK for the modified wording.For proposal 6-1: we support moderator’s proposal.For proposal 6-2: we agree with HW’s suggestion. |
| Samsung | For Proposal 4, we are fine in principle. Just for “frequency resource for group-common PDSCH”, we think this is different from PDSCH allocation by DCI. Then can we add “potential” or “possible” before group-common PDSCH?For Proposal 5, similar to ZTE/Sanechips, we also think TDM can be supported when FDM is supported. So, we support TDM as well as FDM between unicast and multicast.Proposal 6-1, we need to clarify “repetition” here. Does it mean slot aggregation of a group-common PDSCH? Then we are okay with that clarification.Proposal 6-2, we are fine with Huawei’s version. |

## Updated Proposals (3rd round of email discussion)

Based on the 2nd round of input, the proposals are updated as follows:

* **Initial Proposal 4 for issue 2:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, define/configure common frequency resource and common numerology for group-common PDSCH.
	+ FFS: whether to reuse the BWP framework or not
	+ FFS: whether more than one common frequency resource can be configured per UE
* **Initial Proposal 5 for issue 3:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support FDM between unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability.
	+ FFS: TDM or SDM in a slot.
* **Initial Proposal 6-1 for issue 5:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH.
	+ FFS the configuration/indication of group-common PDSCH repetition
* **Initial Proposal 6-2 for issue 5:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support CSI feedback for multicast transmission.
	+ FFS whether existing CSI feedback for unicast is sufficient or not
	+ FFS the configuration of SRS for multicast transmission

Companies can provide comments directly in the email thread or in the table below for the updated proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Moderator | **For Proposal 4:**@OPPO/Nokia/MTK/Intel/Spreadtrum, your comments are reflected in the updated proposal.@Lenovo, although I think the common numerology can be discussed separately, I updated the proposal based on your comment. We can check companies’ view on this. @ZTE, I agree that the common frequency resource will be same for the group of Ues, but it still can be configured per UE. I think the current proposal is more generic to cover your first point. Your second point was reflected in the updated proposal.@Intel, regarding your second modification, I think the current FFS and proposal didn’t preclude simultaneous reception.@Samsung, Sorry I didn’t get your point, but I also think this is different from PDSCH allocation by DCI, more like based on RRC configuration. Please check if the updated proposal is ok for you.**For Proposal 5:**@Huawei/ZTE/CATT/Intel/Samsung, I didn’t premote ‘TDM’ to the main bullet, but as MTK suggested, I add ‘at least’ in the main bullet. From my point of view, at least all the companies can acceptable FDM, let’s first agree this for progress.@OPPO/MTK/Spreadtrum, based on your comments, I replaced ‘multicast PDSCH’ with ‘group-common PDSCH’ since ‘group-common PDSCH’ should be clear for companies based on our discussions on proposal 1 and it is more general to include multicast and broadcast.  But I didn’t change ‘unicast PDSCH’ to ’UE-specific PDSCH’, since it seems unicast PDSCH is also clear and I don’t have strong view on this, we can check majority view.**For Proposal 6-1:**@vivo/Huawei/Qualcomm, your comments on simplification and generalization of the proposal are conidered in the updated proposal. @ZTE, your comment on add ‘indication’ is reflected in the updated proposal.@Lenovo/Samsung, regarding Lenovo’s comment on clarification on repetition type A/B, since in my understanding only slot-level repetition is suported for PDSCH in R15/16, I add ‘at least support slot-level repetition’ in the updated prposal. This should also addressed Samsung’s concern.**For Proposal 6-2:**@vivo/Huawei/ZTE/LG/MTK/CATT/Intel/Spreadtrum/Samsung, your comments are considered in the updated proposal. Basically, I try to make it more generic, I dopted the suggestion from LG to add ‘FFS whether existing CSI feedback for unicast is sufficient or not’, I think it can also cover Qualcomm’s consideration on the potential configuration enhancement for TRS/CSI-RS, and it can also address Huawei/MTK/Spreadtrum’s concerns. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 4: As commented earlier, the real meaningful question is firstly to answer the relationship between BWP for MBS and BWP for unicast, it affects the discussion later how to enable UE simultaneous receiving both unicast and MBS. We may all know the difficulties of supporting more than one active BWPs especially when they are with different numerologies as discussed in earlier releases. I doubt supporting MBS can justify it enough in Rel-17. The current proposal 4 is not necessary to have because it is the only way to have group-common PDSCH, is there any other way in people’s mind? People may argue the point for proposal 4 may lie in the FFSs. Also as commented earlier, as long as the design is clear in RAN1, how the signaling is going to be (whether reusing the current BWP/PDSCH configuration or can be different) does not matter at least for RAN1 and it is up to RAN2. The second FFS in proposal 4 may be worth being there, it is related to the resources needed for MBS which needs RAN1 to decide. If people prefer to have a bit more time and it can be deferred to the next meeting, it should be a FFS more worthwhile than the current first FFS. The following could be the compromise for us:* For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, define/configure common frequency resource and common numerology for group-common PDSCH.
	+ FFS: the relation between the common frequency resource and UE dedicated BWP.
	+ FFS: whether more than one common frequency resource can be configured per UE

Proposal 5 ok.Proposal 6-1: The main bullet is ok. Similar comment to the FFS, if it is just the signalling design it does not seem the issue to be fixed at this stage. I guess the point should be whether enhancement is needed, for example, whether the number of repetition supported for unicast can be reused or can be different set of values for MBS. If it is the case, I suggest make it clear; if it is not the case, we prefer to generalize the FFS to be whether enhancement is needed. Proposal 6-2: to us, CSI feedback for MBS is unknown so premature to agree it is supported. It is fair enough to say the existing CSI feedback at least can be used for MBS and FFS whether enhancement is needed. Again, FFS on configuration? If just talking about the configuration may be different from SRS for unicast, I don’t see it is necessary to be there because the signalling design is not important at this stage. If it talks about special SRS itself design different from so many SRS we already defined so far, it could be fine, but I doubt it is the case. * For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, existing CSI feedback can be used for multicast transmission.
	+ FFS whether enhancement is needed
 |
| LG | We are OK with all initial proposals.If possible, we prefer to change to ‘at least for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs’ or add ‘FFS for IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, if supported’ for Proposal 4 and 6-1, because those proposals can work even for IDLE/INACTIVE UE. However, we also understand that MBS reception in IDLE/INACTIVE UEs is de-prioritized during this week.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 4 is OK to us.Proposal 5 is OK to us.Proposal 6-1 is OK to us.Regarding Proposal 6-2, FFS the configuration of SRS is not clear. My understanding is the intention of this bullet is for multicast PDSCH transmission. So I am not sure why SRS for multicast transmission is listed here. If possible, we can remove this FFS.In addition, I agree with Huawei. Existing CSI mechanism can be the baseline then we can further study whether enhanced CSI is needed.So huawei’s proposal on 6-1 is fine with us. |
| Nokia | * **Initial Proposal 4 for issue 2:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, ~~define/~~configure common frequency resource ~~and common numerology~~ for group-common PDSCH.
	+ FFS: whether to reuse the BWP framework or not
	+ FFS: whether more than one common frequency resource can be configured per UE
* **Initial Proposal 5 for issue 3:** fine with us
* **Initial Proposal 6-1 for issue 5:** fine with us
* **Initial Proposal 6-2 for issue 5:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support CSI feedback for multicast transmission.
	+ FFS whether existing CSI feedback for unicast is sufficient or not
	+ FFS ~~the configuration of SRS for multicast transmission~~ whether existing SRS for unicast is sufficient or not
 |
| vivo | The updated Proposal 4 is OK to us.The updated Proposal 5 is OK to us.For the updated Proposal 6-1, we agree with Huawei’s comment, it is better to generalize the FFS to be whether enhancement is neededFor the updated Proposal 6-2, huawei’s proposal on 6-2 is fine with us. |
| ZTE | Regarding Proposal 4We are generally fine with Proposal 4. Just one question for clarification, does the “common numerology for group-common PDSCH” mean that the same numerology is applied for UEs receiving the same group PDSCH, or does it mean that the same numerology is applied for both unicast and multicast.Our understanding is the former, i.e., it means that the same numerology is applied for UEs receiving the same group PDSCH. If this is the common understanding, then we are fine with the current proposal 4.Regarding Proposal 5It seems no company objects to add “TDM” in the main bullet (Sorry if I missed any comments). Shall we at least try to add “TDM” in the main bullet and see if companies can agree to that.Besides, we checked the Rel-15 UE feature FG5-1 (copied below), type B PDSCH transmission for broadcast is mandatory without capability signaling. Maybe it is ok to move “TDM” to the main bullet.*- For type 1 CSS without dedicated RRC configuration and for type 0, 0A, and 2 CSS, PDSCH mapping type A with {4-14} OFDM symbols and type B with {2, 4, 7} OFDM symbols*Regarding Proposal 6-1 and 6-2, we are fine with the current formulation. |
| Ericsson | We agree with all proposals (4, 5, 6-1, 6-2) |
| CMCC | We are OK about update proposal 4 and proposal 5.For Proposal 6-1 and Proposal 6-2, we agree with Huawei’s comment, the FFS part can be more general, we are fine with Huawei’s version. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the updated Proposal 4 and proposal 5.For proposal 6-1 and proposal 6-2, we are fine with Huawei’s version. |
| MTK | We are OK with updated proposal 4 and proposal 5.For proposal 6-1 and proposal 6-2, we generally agree with HW’s comments. At this stage, generic description may be better. |
| OPPO | For Proposal 4, we have similar confusion as ZTE on “common numerology” , on the other hand, the current wording reads like the “common numerology” is defined/configured for the group-common PDSCH, then it is problematic if the “common frequency resource” is BWP as numerology is included in BWP configuration in this case, it seems better to remove this part and leave it for next step discussion.We also suggest a few revisions to make this proposal clearer:* **Initial Proposal 4 for issue 2:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, define/configure common frequency resource set ~~and common numerology~~ for group-common PDSCH.
	+ FFS: whether to reuse the BWP framework or not for the common frequency resource set;
	+ FFS: whether more than one common frequency resource can be configured per UE

We are fine with Proposal 5.For Proposal 6-1 and 6-2, we support Huawei’s proposal. |

## Updated Proposals (4th round of email discussion)

Based on the 3rd round of input, the proposals are updated as follows:

* **Initial Proposal 4 for issue 2:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, define/configure common frequency resource for group-common PDSCH.
	+ FFS: the relation between the common frequency resource and UE dedicated BWP
	+ FFS: whether more than one common frequency resource can be configured per UE
* **Initial Proposal 5-1 for issue 3:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support FDM between unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability.
	+ FFS: TDM or SDM in a slot.
* **Initial Proposal 5-2 for issue 3:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support TDM between unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability.
* **Initial Proposal 6-1 for issue 5:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least support slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH.
	+ FFS: whether enhancement is needed
* **Initial Proposal 6-2 for issue 5:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, existing CSI feedback can be used for multicast transmission.
	+ FFS: whether enhancement is needed

Companies can provide comments directly in the email thread or in the table below for the updated proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Moderator | **For Proposal 4:**@Nokia/ZTE/OPPO, regarding your comments, I removed ‘common numerology’ for now. @Lenovo, I think ‘common numerology’ can be discussed later. @Nokia, I still kept ‘define’, the reason is that ‘common frequency resource’ may need to be defined if it is not a MBS specific BWP, e.g., if it is a newly defined MBS common frequency resource for MBS within UE dedicated BWP. @LG, I understand your point, considering there is no much time left in this meeting, can we first agree it for RRC\_CONNECTED state without FFS for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE ? Anyway we will discuss the issue for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE later.@Huawei, considering your concern, I updated the 1st FFS. I think both the previous one and the new one are OK, but let’s check companies’ view on this.**For Proposal 5:**It seems all the companies are fine with it except ZTE still wants to give a try for TDM, so I add a separate proposal 5-2 for TDM to check companies view. I don’t want to check again if companies can accept both FDM and TDM in case some companies object it.**For Proposal 6-1:**I updated the FFS part to make it more generic, since many companies prefer a more generic FFS.**For Proposal 6-2:**I updated the proposal to make it more generic based on companies’ comments. |
| ZTE | Thank you the moderator for addressing our comments. We have the following further comments.Regarding Proposal 4:For the first FFS bullet, we prefer to use the previous wording, i.e., “whether to reuse the BWP framework or not”, which is clear and concise from our perspective. The current wording “the relation between the common frequency resource and UE dedicated BWP” is not clear to us, especially we are not sure about what the “relation” tries to say. Fine with Proposal 5-1 and 5-2.For proposal 6-1 and 6-2, although we prefer the previous wording, but we can accept this considering that this is the majority view. |
| OPPO | Proposal 4: As commented in the last round, we believe “common frequency resource” should be “common frequency resource set”, otherwise we need to discuss what “common frequency resource” look like. We also prefer to keep the original FFS “whether to reuse the BWP framework or not”, for progress, we can accept to further add “FFS: the relation between the common frequency resource and UE dedicated BWP”.Proposal 5-1 and 5-2:We are fine to add 5-2, but if 5-2 is accepted by all companies, 5-1 and 5-2 can be merged as below:* **Initial Proposal 5~~-1~~ for issue 3:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, ~~at least~~ support FDM and TDM between unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability.
	+ FFS: ~~TDM or~~ SDM in a slot.
 |
| Qualcomm | For Proposal 4, we think “whether to reuse the BWP framework or not” should not be deleted, which is discussing a different issue than that of “the relation between the common frequency resource and UE dedicated BWP”. If majority companies want to add “the relation between the common frequency resource and UE dedicated BWP”, we are fine to add additional FFS.For Proposal 5-1 and 5-2, we prefer to keep 5-1 only for now. The reason is that we are not sure whether FDM only, TDM only or FDM+TDM in a slot are all supported or not and what will be the impact on required UE capability. It may need further discussion.For Proposal 6-1, we prefer to keep the original wording of FFS, which is more clear.For Proposal 6-2, we think original wording is better. But as a compromise, we would like to keep support “CSI feedback for multicast transmission” in the main bullet as below: * **Initial Proposal 6-2 for issue 5:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, support CSI feedback for multicast transmission.
	+ Existing CSI feedback can be used for multicast transmission
	+ FFS: whether enhancement is needed
 |
| Intel | For proposal 5, since further discussion is needed for the support of TDM and SDM and all of the options are up to UE capability, we can list the possible options as alternatives for down-selection in the next meeting. Therefore, we can try the following :* **Proposal 5 for issue 3:** For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, the following alternatives for multiplexing between unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH in a slot based on UE capability can be considered for further down-selection
	+ Alt-1: FDM only
	+ Alt-2: FDM + TDM within a slot
	+ Alt-3 FDM+TDM+SDM (full or partial overlap) within a slot

For proposals 6-1 and 6-2, the FFS points are not clear and we prefer original wording clarifying the scope of enchantement. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with Proposal 4. We wish to keep Proposal 5-1 (FDM), but not 5-2, due to uncertainties now with TDM. We are also happy with Proposal 6-1 (repetition) and Proposal 6-2 (CSI). |
| LG | We are OK with all Proposals, except 5-2. Proposal 5-1 with FFS on TDM/SDM seems enough at this stage. |
| MTK | For Proposal 4, we generally agree with QC’s comments, at least, the original FFS should not be deleted.For Proposal 5-1 and Proposal 5-2, we have the same view with LG/Ericsson/QC. The wording of “at least” in Proposal 5-1 doesn’t preclude the possibility of TDM, which can be discussed in the future meeting.We are fine with the updated proposal 6-1 and 6-2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 4: we are OK to delete “common numerology”. But we suggest to keep the previous FFS “whether to reuse the BWP framework or not” because it is quite clear. Now, the new FFS is unclear, we don’t know what’s the intention of this FFS and which kind of “relation” means.Proposal 5-1: We are Ok.Proposal 5-2: we suggest to remove it as proposal 5-1 has captured TDM/SDM in FFS. We don’t know why 5-2 is needed.Proposal 6-1 is OK.Proposal 6-2 is OK. |
| vivo | For Proposal 4We are fine with the main bullet. We also prefer to keep the original FFS “whether to reuse the BWP framework or not”. We are fine with all the other updated proposals. i.e. Proposal 5-1, 5-2, 6-1 and 6-2. |

# Appendix A: Second tier issues summarized in R1-2007001

**Table A.1: Summary of second tier issues of group scheduling for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Second tier issues** | **Possible questions or proposals** |
| 3.1.1 Configuration of group scheduling for multicast/broadcast | Question: Whether broadcast and multicast need to be differentiated for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs? If the answer is YES, whether the same configuration mechanism of group scheduling for Broadcast is applied for both RRC\_CONNECTED UEs and RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs? |
| Proposal: For RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, at least part of the parameters for multicast configuration is received by dedicated RRC signaling. |
| 3.1.2.1 CORESET configuration for MBS | Proposal: For group common PDCCH based group scheduling and a MBS common frequency resource configured with in UE’s active DL BWP, the CORESET is configured within the MBS common frequency resource. |
| Proposal: For group common PDCCH based group scheduling and a MBS common frequency resource configured with in UE’s active DL BWP, the CORESET for MBS is configured per BWP. |
| 3.1.2.2 Search space configuration for MBS | Proposal: Consider the following options for search space configuration for MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs:• Option 1: CSS (existing CSS type or new defined CSS type)• Option 2: USS |
| 3.1.2.3 DCI format for MBS | Proposal: Consider the following options for DCI format for MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs:• Option 1: DCI format 1\_0• Option 2: DCI format 1\_1• Option 3: DCI format 2\_x• Option 4: New DCI format |
| 3.1.2.4 Blind decoding related issues | Proposal: The maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates and non-overlapped CCEs per slot are not increased for MBS. |
| Proposal: Keep the “3+1” DCI size budget for MBS with group common PDCCH based group scheduling. |
| 3.1.2.5 Multi-beam/beam sweeping operation | Proposal: Support multi-beam/beam sweeping operation for MBS PDCCH/PDSCH for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs. |
| 3.1.3 Simultaneous operation with unicast reception | Proposal: The UE is expected to process maximum two transport blocks for simultaneous reception of unicast PDSCH and multicast PDSCH. |
| 3.1.4 Other issues | Proposal: Support DL SPS for MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs. |
| Proposal: Support multi-layer MIMO for MBS PDSCH for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs. |
| Question: Whether modifications are needed for QCL framework in order to support MBS transmission? |
| Proposal: Introduce a new reception type of PDCCH and PDSCH for MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, if group common PDCCH based group scheduling is supported. |
| Question: Whether to support receiving MBS service on a Scell? |
| Question: Whether to support SFBC for MBS? |

**Table A.2: Summary of second tier issues of reliability improvement for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Second tier issues** | **Possible questions or proposals** |
| 3.2.1 HARQ-ACK feedback | Proposal: Consider the following two alternatives for HARQ-ACK feedback for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs:* Alternative 1: ACK/NACK based HARQ-ACK feedback
* Alternative 2: NACK-only based HARQ-ACK feedback
 |
| Proposal: HARQ-ACK feedback for NR MBS should be RRC configurable if it is supported for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs. |
| Proposal: Both PTM-based and PTP-based retransmissions can be supported for NR MBS for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs. |
| Question: Whether multiplexing of HARQ-ACK of unicast and multicast transmission should be supported for UEs receiving both unicast and multicast service. |
| Question: Whether prioritization of HARQ-ACK of unicast and multicast transmission should be supported for UEs receiving both unicast and multicast service. |
| 3.2.2 CSI feedback | Proposal: Consider to support following schemes for NR MBS:* Option 1: Single port transmission
* Option 2: Open-loop spatial multiplexing
* Option 3: Closed-loop spatial multiplexing
 |
| 3.2.3 Other issues | Question: Whether it is needed to discuss the reliability requirements for NR MBS from RAN1 perspective? If the answer is YES, then whether the reliability requirements are RRC state dependent and whether the reliability requirements for multicast and broadcast traffic are the same or not? |
| Question: If it is decided to discuss the reliability requirements for NR MBS in RAN1, then how to define the reliability requirements? |

**Table A.3: Summary of second tier issues of MBS for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Second tier issues** | **Possible proposals** |
| CORESET for PTM | For UE in IDLE/INACTIVE state, the CORESET for PTM is * Alt 1: CORESET0
* Alt 2: Configurable
 |
| Search space for PTM | For UE in IDLE/INACTIVE state, the search space for PTM is * Alt 1: One(s) of existing common search space
* Alt 2: A new type of CSS set
 |
| Multi-beam operation | Monitoring occasions for PTM is associated with SSB. |
| HARQ-ACK | Whether HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for PTM for UE in IDLE/INACTIVE state:Alt 1: Supported but NACK onlyAlt 2: Not supported |
| Search spaces for SIBx/MCCH if defined | Search spaces for SIBx/MCCH needs to be discussed.  |
| MCS table and number of layers | MCS table to be used and how many layers are used should be configured |

# Appendix B: Summary of Phase 1 discussion

Seventeen companies have provided their views on the classification of priorities for this meeting in phase 1 discussion. The statistics are shown in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Issue 1(Question 1 in R1-2007001) | Issue 2(Question 2 in R1-2007001) | Issue 3(Question 3 in R1-2007001) | Issue 4(Proposal 1 in R1-2007001) | Issue 5(Proposal 2 in R1-2007001) | Issue 6(Question 4 in R1-2007001) | Issue 7(Proposal 3 in R1-2007001) | Issue 8(Proposal 4 in R1-2007001) |
| # High | 17 | 8 | 7 | 14 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 2 |
| # Medium |  | 8 | 10 | 3 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| # Low |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 8 | 9 |

The following observations can be drawn from companies’ views:

* Issue 1/4/6: More than half of the companies think these three issues should be high priority items.
* Issue 2/3/5: Less than half of the companies think these three issues should be high priority items, but almost all of the companies think they should be at least medium priority items.
* Issue 7/8: About half of the companies think these issues should be low priority. It is explicitly mentioned in Chairman’s notes that no plan to treat 8.12.3 in this meeting.

Based on the above observation, the following proposal is made on the classification of high/medium priority items for this meeting:

**Proposal: The following high/medium priority items are classified for this meeting:**

* **High priority:**
	+ **Issue 1/4/6**
* **Medium priority:**
	+ **Issue 2/3/5**
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