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# Introduction

This document aims at gathering companies’ views for the following offline discussion:

* [AT118-e][029][MBS] CP Broadcast (Huawei)

 Scope: Treat R2-2204604, R2-2204605, R2-2205112, R2-2205462, R2-2205747, R2-2206091, R2-2206108, R2-2204608, R2-2204682, R2-2205174, R2-2205215, R2-2205671, R2-2204607, R2-2204606, R2-2204829, R2-2205539, R2-2205744, R2-2205458, R2-2204681, R2-2205111, R2-2206159, R2-2206122, R2-2205712,

 Collect one round of comments, pave the way for on-line agreement (identify agreeable points, discussion points),

 Intended outcome: Report

 Deadline: For online CB W1 Friday

It is noted that some of the proposals provided in the Tdocs were resolved in the rapporteur CR in [25] and some were more related to UE capabilities, so not all issues are discussed in this document.

# Discussion

## MBS Interest Indication and MBS broadcast on SCell

In [1], it is noticed that it might happen that even though MII message is normally forwarded from source cell to target cell upon handover, it might happen that MII is sent from the UE to the gNB just before the handover. In this case the source gNB might have already sent *HandoverPreparationInformation* to target cell and the target cell will not be aware of UE’s interest in MBS services. The similar solution as in the case of *UEAssistanceInformation* message is then proposed, i.e.

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal: If the UE initiated transmission of a *MBSInterestIndication* message for the corresponding cell group during the last 1 second when handover happens, and the UE will continue to receive the broadcast MBS in target cell, the UE will trigger transmission of a *MBSInterestIndication* message to target cell after handover.** |

The related CR is provided in [2].

**Question 1: Do companies agree that if the UE initiated transmission of a MBSInterestIndication message for the corresponding cell group during the last 1 second before handover happens, and the UE will continue to receive the broadcast MBS in target cell, the UE should trigger transmission of a MBSInterestIndication message to target cell after handover? Please also provide the comments towards the proposed CR in [2], if needed.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Intent is ok.In the CR, there are some issues. Category should be F, not B.Some typos can be corrected: uopon -> uponUE still continue -> continues |
| Samsung | - | Agree with intent, but CR draft seems ambiguous with condition “if *reconfigurationWithSync* was included in *masterCellGroup* or *secondaryCellGroup*” and initiation of MII for corresponding cell group. We think SCG is not concerned for broadcast reception and MII reporting. Further condition for SIB21 transmission in the target cell is required for reporting MII. |
| OPPO | Yes  |  |
| CATT | Yes with comments | For the required change in 5.9.4.2, we think it is better to capture this proposal by:5.9.4.2 InitiationAn MBS capable UE in RRC\_CONNECTED may initiate the procedure in several cases including upon successful connection establishment, upon entering or leaving the broadcast service area, upon MBS broadcast session start or stop, upon change of interest, upon change of priority between MBS broadcast reception and unicast reception, upon change to a PCell broadcasting *SIB21*, upon completion of handover.. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| Nokia | No | If UE considers that MII has been missed by NW it can resend the indication as it can always consider interest to have changed – anyway PCell has changed to handover. |
| Apple | Yes | Agree with the intention, but the wording can be further check. For example, the MII is supported for the MCG, so “the corresponding cell group” should be changed to “MCG”. |
| Lenovo | Yes with comments | The change in section 5.3.5.3 is not needed. We prefer only keep the change in the section 5.9.4.2 |
| Kyocera | Yes | We’re fine to reuse the UAI behaviour for MII.  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Agree with the intention, but some enhancements are needed as above companies pointed out. |
| vivo | Yes | The intention is reasonable. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes with comment.  | Agree to align with UAI. In addition, we think the UAI report after CHO executions in this section as below should be also applied to MII as well.*3> if the RRCReconfiguration message is applied due to a conditional reconfiguration execution, and the UE is configured to provide UE assistance information for the corresponding cell group, and the UE has initiated transmission of a UEAssistanceInformation message for the corresponding cell group since it was configured to do so in accordance with 5.7.4.2:**4> initiate transmission of a UEAssistanceInformation message for the corresponding cell group in accordance with clause 5.7.4.3 to provide the concerned UE assistance information;**4> start or restart the prohibit timer (if exists) associated with the concerned UE assistance information with the timer value set to the value in corresponding configuration;* |
| Futurewei | No | It is normal operations that MII is sent before HO command is received. There is always a small chance that the source gNB failed to forward the MII to the target for whatever reason and the UE just need to follow the normal failure handling procedure. In case there is corner cases MII is sent right before HO command is received, the UE would just follow the normal procedure, check the availability of the MBS after HO is complete. If expect MBS is still not available, UE can send the MII to the newly connected target cell again. Requesting the UE blindly resending the MII to the target is overdone. How much time that should be before the HO command to trigger resending MII is also a question. Not clear how 1s is determined.  |
| ITRI | No | We share the same view as Futurewei that the normal failure handling procedure is sufficient to handle the case. |
| Intel | Yes | Intention is OK (similar to LTE MBMS behavior). Wording can be improved based on comments above.  |

In [3] it is observed that the network may not always provide a frequency information for a service in SIB21. In such case, the UE in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE may perform frequency prioritization for cell reselection if the frequency is provided in USD. However, according to current specifications, the UE in RRC CONNECTED mode will not treat such frequency as the frequency of interest for the sake of MII message. This leads to some discrepancy between service continuity for such services in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE and in RRC CONNECTED. Based on this, it was proposed to discuss the following question.

**Question 2: Do you agree it should be possible for the UE to include, in MBS Interest Indication, the frequency provided in USD even if this frequency is not provided in SIB21?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Even if UE includes USD-configured frequency(ies) in the MII and is able to receive Broadcast service, network should know which service the UE is receiving in that freq. This can help NW to maintain service continuity of that freq in CONNCTED state as well. |
| Samsung | Yes | There is a discrepancy as cell reselection considers SIB21 or USD (in IDLE/INACTIVE) and MII considers only SIB21 (in CONNECTED). |
| OPPO | Yes  |  |
| CATT | No | We prefer to follow the currently captured scheme for decision of MII frequency.If USD only mode is allowed for UE to report an interested frequency, UE only knows which frequency is providing which service but does not know whether the broadcast service area for a frequency include its neighbour cell. Thus UE may report an interested frequency to NW but it is useless to NW since NW will not handover UE to a cell deployed on that frequency. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Maybe | We would like to understand the scenario where SIB21 and USD has different information? Would this be real life scenario or error scenario? We assume that SIB21 has the most up to date information due possibility of changes in RAN. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes | We think the service continuity for broadcast sessions in RRC Connected should be ensured under the deployment scenario/network configuration which is assumed for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE.  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Not sure | Is that useful for NW scheduling? |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes | For broadcast service continuity, UE in CONN reports the interest of frequency instead of prioritizing the frequency, so the same rule should be applied to the frequency prioritization in IDLE and MII in CONNECTED. |
| Vivo | No strong view | This optimization may be useful for further scheduling (the NW may appropriately choose a cell as the target cell considering broadcast continuity). But the priority of ongoing unicast data might be higher and best effort is considered for broadcast. In this sense, the degree of need for broadcast continuity can be different between CONNECTED UE and IDLE/INACTIVE UE.Anyway, we have no strong view and are fine with the majority view. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | In case the network intends to allow the UE to report MII for a particular frequency, the network can include the frequency in the SIB21. If we allow the UE to report MII for a frequency not in SIB21 then the network is not able to prevent MII report for some frequencies while allowing MII report for other frequencies, i.e. the UE might report unexpected frequency(e.g. frequency for another operator) if SIB21 is enabled in serving cell. If this is allowed, we think the network should be able to turn such reporting on/off, e.g. if it does not want to receive MII for inter-PLMN frequencies. We are not sure there is time to discuss this now, so we would prefer to discuss this in Rel-18. |
| Futurewei | Maybe not | Not clear it is a valid use case that the MBS frequency is in USD but not in SIB21. Wouldn’t SIB21 provides the most updated neighboring frequency information from the network, and such information be broadcast? Need to understand more about this. |
| ITRI | Yes |  |
| Intel | Not sure | Not clear why SIB21 does not have up-to-date neighboring frequency information. |

In [4], [6], [8] it is indicated that currently the UE may only report MII in case its PCell is providing SIB20. However, it is possible that the UE is interested in a service which is provided on an SCell. In this case SIB20 of the SCell will be provided with dedicated signalling while PCell may not even provide SIB20. [4], [6] and [10] propose to clarify the procedure so that the UE may report MII in this scenario.

**Question 3: Do you agree to clarify that if *SIB20* for SCell is provided, UE should be allowed to initiate the transmission of MII message and include TMGIs when setting the contents of MII, under the condition that the UE’s PCell is providing *SIB21*.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Samsung  | Yes | Further, we should converge on a common term in specification e.g. “providing SIB20” instead of multiple terms presently used as broadcasting, scheduling etc. |
| OPPO | Yes  |  |
| CATT | ? | We are not sure that PCell knows the reported TMGI in this case.If SIB20 is not present in PCell, it means there is no broadcast services ongoing on the PCell. It is possible that PCell does not know the reported TMGI when PCell handles the MII message. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| Nokia |  | First, the Question should say “if SIB20 for SCell is provided but PCell does not broadcast SIB20”. Further, can the gNB process the MII if it does not broadcast SIB20? Why would PCell broadcast SIB21 but not SIB20? We have a general requirement under System Information section which says “The UE capable of MBS broadcast which is receiving or interested to receive MBS broadcast service(s) via a broadcast MRB shall ensure having a valid version of SIB20 and SIB21, regardless of the RRC state the UE is in.” |
| Apple | Yes | We should clarify the SCell belongs to the MCG.  |
| Lenovo | No | How to receive the broadcast in SCell is up to UE’s implementation. In this case, it is no need to send the MII for SCell broadcast reception.  |
| Kyocera | Yes | We support these proposals.  |
| Xiaomi | No strong view | If most companies consider that SCell should be considered for the MII reporting, we would suggest that we simply use the SIB20 of “any serving cell” for the MII reporting. |
| MediaTek | No | We have the similar question that whether gNB can handle the MII message if it does not broadcast SIB20. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | We agree that MII is reported only when SIB21 is provided on PCell (i.e. same as the current spec, no change is required). In our understanding, if the SCell of a UE is providing broadcast service, then the corresponding PCell should naturally provide the SIB21 for the sake of service continuity based on frequency level. The other case mentioned in the contribution seems not so valid in reality or a very corner case.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | MII report is enabled by SIB21 while whether to include TMGI in MII is controlled by SIB20. We should allow the UEs receiving broadcast in SCell to report TMGI even though SIB20 is not provided for PCell (MBS broadcast is provided in frequency of SCell while not in the frequency of PCell) to facilitate the network performing TDM scheduling of unicast/broadcast for UEs not supporting FDMed unicast/broadcast.It is mentioned in the question that the assumption is that SIB21 is provided, so it the network does not support MII, then it should not broadcast SIB21 (which is an implicit mechanism to turn MII on, as agreed in the past). |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| ITRI | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes | Need to clarify that the SCell belongs to MCG.  |

In [12], it is proposed that the UE should resend the MII in case the network does not reconfigure the UE in a way allowing the UE to receive an MBS service of interest.

**Question 4: Do you think the UE should be allowed** t**o resend the MII in case the network does not reconfigure the UE in a way allowing the UE to receive an MBS service of interest?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Proposal seems ok but we wonder whether it is not already allowed. I.e., how is it restricted today or what spec clarification/change is expected? |
| Samsung | No | Resending of MII is not needed as it is up to NW implementation to provide SIB20. We do not see the purpose of resending MII by UE. |
| OPPO | No  |  |
| CATT | No | It is network’s decision whether to reconfigure the UE in a way allowing the UE to receive an MBS service of interest. We do not understand why UE needs to resend the MII in this case |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | No |  |
| Nokia | Maybe | Nothing needs to be specified for this one. This case is also covering the handover case in Q2. How does resending the MII help UE to get the SIB20 of SCell? Of course it is possible that NW will not respond to MII e.g. in case of error/missing it or just not being able to comply with the request. But then UE should not continuously send MII that I’m interested but this is impossible to prevent anyway as UE can always “pretend” that interest has changed. Thus more important is to prevent frequent resending. |
| Apple | Yes | It’s to clarify that UE can resend the same interested MBS services if NW doesnot provide the expected information, e.g. the SIB20 of the SCell. For SCell MBS broadcast reception case, if NW doesnot provide the SCell SIB20 after UE reports the MBS interested indication, at least UE operation should be clarified.  |
| Lenovo | No |  |
| Kyocera | No | We’re wondering what happens if the gNB (i.e., PCell) does not want to configure the UE with the SCell of interest, i.e., we just concern the UE sends MIIs with the same content again and again even though the gNB already knows the UE’s interest.  |
| Xiaomi | No strong view | It is not clear to us on the expected specification change. |
| MediaTek | No | It should be up to network implementation |
| Spreadtrum | No | Whether to reconfigure UE is up to gNB, it is no needed for UE to resend the MII. |
| LGE | No | It should be up to network implementation. |
| vivo | No | If the NW does not provide broadcast service due to some reason, then the UE consequently is not required to resend the MII. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | The network already knows the interested frequencies from the reported MII. If the network does not reconfigure the UE to allow the UE to receive MBS, there might be good reasons for this and resending of MII will not help at all.  |
| Futurewei | Maybe | If the UE consider the previous MII is failed, it can resending again. Not sure if we need to add new requirement for this. If yes, then it should the limit of retry times. |
| ITRI | No | This should be up to network implementation. |
| Intel | No | There is no need for UE to resend MII given that the network has already received the same MII before. |

In [5] and [7], it is indicated that frequent changes of UE’s interests in MBS broadcast services or changes of priority between unicast and broadcast services, may lead to excessive signalling overhead. Some proposals are made on how to address this potential issue are made, e.g. introduce a prohibit timer or to allow the network to turn MII on/off.

**Question 5: Do you think additional network control over MII reporting from the UE is needed? If, yes, please indicate your preferred option, e.g. from the ones mentioned in [5] and [7].**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | No | We do not think additional network control is needed.* Current NR MII reporting behaviour is same as that in LTE MBMS.
* It is up to NW whether to use or ignore UE reported MII.
* MII is sent by the UE only when a UL resource is provided. Unlike UA signalling, “UE that (too) frequently changes its mind about what is interesting” does not make sense because the user trying to receive broadcast service and changing his/her mind in the timescale of milliseconds is not normal!
 |
| Samsung  | No | Agree with Qualcomm. We have already discussed and settled on the issue in earlier meeting. |
| OPPO | No  |  |
| CATT | No strong view | We see benefits of network control on MII reporting, but we follow the majority view |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | No |  |
| Nokia | Maybe prohibit timer | There is already control for NW that is common for all UEs. Turning off per UE is not necessary. Prohibit timer should be sufficient then to control badly behaving UE not to send interest indication too frequently. |
| Apple | No | Agree with Qualcomm.  |
| Lenovo | No | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Kyocera | No | We share Qualcomm’s view; especially, MII is based on user preference whose characteristic is different from UAI.  |
| Xiaomi | No strong view | We can accept to have a prohibit timer if the control of excessive signalling is needed, considering that the UE may frequent change its interests by browsing the MBS services. |
| MediaTek | No |  |
| Spreadtrum | No | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| LGE | No | Same view as QC. |
| vivo | No  | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We think the conditions for when the UE initiates MII are well defined and there is no need for such optimization. |
| Futurewei | No |  |
| ITRI | No |  |
| Intel | No |  |

In [9], it is proposed to clarify that *sCellSIB20* is provided only for a single SCell at a time. This is already captured in the rapporteur CR, so no further discussion is needed. Another proposal from [9] is to clarify that MCCH should be received from the cell upon reception of *sCellSIB20*.

**Question 6: Do companies agree to clarify in 38.331 that MCCH should be received from the cell upon reception of sCellSIB20, as proposed in [9]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Samsung | - | It depends as UE can receive interested broadcast service from either PCell or Scell at a time. If UE is already receiving interested broadcast service on PCell or SCell does not provide interested broadcast service, UE need not receive MCCH from SCell. |
| OPPO | Yes  |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Maybe | OK in-principle but the text proposal in Appendix 2, Section 5.9.2.2 is not clear. Alternate TP provided below:"and from a SCell if the SIB20 from the Scell is configured in UE using sCellSIB20 in dedicated RRC signaling" |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No strong view | We can capture something like this. |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| ITRI | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |

In [10] and [11], it is proposed to clarify that:

1. The network does not configure *dormantBWP-Config* on an SCell which is used by the UE to receive MBS broadcast.
2. The network does not configure *sCellDeactivationTimer* when an SCell is configured for MBS broadcast.
3. The network does not indicate sCellState when an SCell is configured for MBS broadcast.

**Question 7: Do companies agree with bullets 1-3 mentioned above (as per the CR in [11])?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Partly | #1 and #2 are ok. But wondering what #3 means. sCellState as it is currently defined “Indicates whether the SCell shall be considered to be in activated state upon SCell configuration.” So, not including this means SCell is not considered as activated upon configuration. Is that the intention?Given that SCell cannot be dormant or deactivated for MBS, does this mean network always needs to activate MBS SCell with a MAC CE?Then wondering, couldn’t this actually the opposite? I.e., isn’t it better for MBS SCell to be always activated upon config? Regarding the field sCellState, it can either be clarified that NW shall always include sCellState when SCell is configured for MBS broadcast. Or, field description can be clarified that for MBS SCell, it is considered as set to be activated regardless of this field being included or not (to avoid extension marker overhead).Based on this, comments for the CR in [11]: - change in conditional presence *SCellAddSync*: “and the SCell is not configured for MBS broadcast reception” -> See comment above. The change could be something like the field is mandatory present when the SCell is configured for MBS broadcast reception. OR, no change needed here if field description is clarified instead.- in ***dormantBWP-Config*** field description “and the SCell is not configured for MBS broadcast reception” 🡪 should remove “and the SCell is” from the new text. It should be enough to add the rest.- conditional presence *ServingCellWithoutPUCCH:* new text “or” should be “and” in the ‘except’ part. |
| Samsung | No | Broadcast is only best effort basis. Presently only configured and activated SCell is considered for broadcast reception. We think no new change is needed to redefine configuration for deactivation and dormant BWP. It is up to NW implementation to freely configure as required. |
| OPPO | Yes  | If this SCell can be deactivated, the UE should monitor the PDCCH and receive PDSH on this SCell and the following text for deactivated SCell and dormant BWP should be revised.For simplicity, the option 1 is preferred.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deactivated SCell** | **SCell in dormancy behaviour** |
| 1> if the SCell is deactivated:2> not transmit SRS on the SCell;2> not report CSI for the SCell;2> not transmit on UL-SCH on the SCell;2> not transmit on RACH on the SCell;2> not monitor the PDCCH on the SCell;2> not monitor the PDCCH for the SCell;2> not transmit PUCCH on the SCell. | 1> if a BWP is activated and the active DL BWP for the Serving Cell is dormant BWP:2> stop the *bwp-InactivityTimer* of this Serving Cell, if running.2> not monitor the PDCCH on the BWP;2> not monitor the PDCCH for the BWP;2> not receive DL-SCH on the BWP;2> not report CSI on the BWP, report CSI except aperiodic CSI for the BWP;2> not transmit SRS on the BWP;2> not transmit on UL-SCH on the BWP;2> not transmit on RACH on the BWP;2> not transmit PUCCH on the BWP;2> clear any configured downlink assignment and any configured uplink grant Type 2 associated with the SCell respectively;2> suspend any configured uplink grant Type 1 associated with the SCell;2> if configured, perform beam failure detection and beam failure recovery for the SCell if beam failure is detected. |

 |
| CATT | No strong view | We tend to agree with Samsung that it can be up to NW implementation, but we follow the majority view. |
| Nokia | No | No strong need to do anything on this one in specification. There is no power saving possibility (or very limited) to deactivate/dormant SCell in case UE is receiving MBS from that cell. Thus it may make not sense to deactivate such a scell but sometimes it may be needed for NW operation thus we should not write any limitation to specification. If desired by UE it could still receive MBS from deactivated/dormant SCell as long as it does not impact UE behaviour towards NW. |
| Apple | No  | Agree with Samsung. For the spec impact as OPPO indicated, we can clarify that the UE operation on the deactivated SCell and dormant BWP is only applicable for the UE dedicated transmission, not for MBS broadcast.  |
| Lenovo | No | Share the view with Samsung. |
| Kyocera | No | We think the deactivation and dormant of SCell was intended for unicast. So, we wonder if it’s better to allow the UE to receive MBS services via SCell even if the SCell is in deactivation/dormant, i.e., the deactivation/dormant is only applicable to unicast.  |
| Xiaomi | No strong view | We think that this is up to the gNB implementation, but would like to ensure that the UE is not required to receive MBS via dormant or deactivated SCell. |
| MediaTek | No | Agree with Samsung.  |
| Spreadtrum | No | Agree with Samsung.  |
| LGE | No | We can leave it up to reasonable NW implementation. No change is needed. |
| vivo | No | We share a similar view with Samsung. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Bullet 1 is not needed as it is about dormant BWP while the UE can still receive on CFR. Bullet 2 can be left up to NW implementation, e.g. the timer can still be configured, but the network may ensure the cell does not get deactivated while the UE is receiving MBS on it. Bullet 3 is incorrect as the sCellState is needed to indicate the SCell is activated. No changes are needed.  |
| Futurewei | No | No new change for unicast (regarding 1, 2, 3) is needed due to broadcast reception is enabled at a Scell |
| ITRI | No | Agree with Samsung. |
| Intel | No  | Agree with Samsung |

[10] further proposes to clarify which cell is used for the DRX control when the UE is receiving MBS broadcast on an SCell, i.e. either SpCell or SCell.

**Question 8: Which cell should be used for DRX control by the UE for the MBS broadcast service received on an SCell:**

1. **SCell where the MBS broadcast service is provided**
2. **SpCell of the UE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **a/b** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | a |  |
| Samsung | None | In CA, inter-subframe synchronization is assumed.[OPPO] It is for broadcast, it will be always based on SFN of the cell who broadcasts MCCH. |
| OPPO | a |  |
| CATT | b | It seems the principle of unicast DRX is to use SFN of SpCell//38.321, 5.7 Discontinuous Reception (DRX)NOTE 2: In case of unaligned SFN across carriers in a cell group, the SFN of the SpCell is used to calculate the DRX duration. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | b | UE shall consider the DRX cycle of SpCell and the DRX cycle of the broadcast session received by it. |
| Nokia | a | It seems impossible to be SpCell as this is common resource and not all UEs will have same SpCell? |
| Apple | b | UE is only aware of the SFN of the SpCell which is used for the MBS broadcast DRX control.  |
| Lenovo | a | It is common configuration for all related in the SCell |
| Kyocera | a |  |
| Xiaomi | a |  |
| MediaTek | a | Agree with Nokia.  |
| Spreadtrum | a |  |
| LGE | a | We think that the DRX control information (*mtch-SchedulingInfo*) is shared by UEs receiving an MBS broadcast. From the RRC description (5.9.3.3 Broadcast MRB establishment), the SCell is proper for MBS broadcast DRX control.1> receive DL-SCH on the cell where the *MBSBroadcastConfiguration* message was received for the MBS broadcast service for which the broadcast MRB is established and using *g-RNTI* and *mtch-SchedulingInfo* (if included) in this message for this MBS broadcast service; |
| vivo | a |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | a with comment | We should clarify this does not mean the UE needs to read MIB of Scell, the UE can derive SFN from SFN of PCell. |
| Futurewei | a |  |
| ITRI | a |  |
| Intel | b |  |

## MCCH and MTCH reception

In [13] and [14], it is proposed to move the principles of mapping between MTCH PDCCH occasions and SSBs from TS 38.331 to TS 38.321.

**Question 9: Do you think the principles of mapping between MTCH PDCCH occasions and SSBs should be moved from TS 38.331 to TS 38.321?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes, see comments | We are ok to move the mapping from 38.331 to 38.321.In RRC CR: The suggested text is incomplete. ms10 corresponds to cycle 10ms, but what about the offset (0..9)? The field description needs to clearly state what *cycle* and *offset* are from this jointly encoded field/IE. Also, better to add sub-clause in reference to 36.321.Related to the changes: we believe it is beneficial to have MTCH monitoring window duration (within each cycle) as well. Current signalling only allows to configure cycle and offset, but it is unclear what the duration of each MTCH monitoring window is. We should have possibility to configure separate/non-overlapping MTCH monitoring window per G-RNTI, each having a window duration (smaller or same as the periodicity). But that is not possible with current signalling. |
| Samsung | No  | The current 38.331 text is sufficient and clear. MAC spec does not capture similar texts for other cast type. Also, in 38.321 CR, ordering of text description for “PDCCH reception” and “mapping for PDCCH monitoring occasion for MTCH” is ambiguous |
| OPPO | Yes  | MTCH is data, it is better to capture the text for data reception in 38.321.For MCCH,OSI reception, they are signaling and it is OK to capture text for data reception in 38.331. |
| CATT | Yes | It is Ok to move it to 38.321 |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | No |  |
| Nokia | No | We do not see the need. For BCCH/PCCH this is in 38.331. But naturally we need to ensure that MAC DRX for broadcast is compatible with 38.331 PDCCH occasions text. Which seems to be case now in our opinion. |
| Apple | Yes | Fine to move it from field description part to the MAC spec.  |
| Lenovo | No strong view |  |
| Kyocera | Yes | We’re fine to move the principle for MTCH reception to TS38.321.  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | No strong view |  |
| Spreadtrum | No strong view |  |
| LGE | No | We think RRC is proper for the description. If it is required to capture it in a lower layer, physical layer spec. seems more proper than mac spec. because it is related to beam sweeping operation. |
| vivo | No strong view | It is a modeling issue. No strong view. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No strong view | We can follow majority view here. |
| Futurewei | No | We don’t see a strong need. |
| ITRI | No strong view |  |
| Intel | No |  |

In [15], it is proposed to clarify in the specifications that:

1. The network is not allowed to change the contents of MCCH for different MCCH repetitions inside a single MCCH modification period.
2. The change MCCH notifications are sent in each MCCH repetition period throughout the first MCCH modification period where the new contents of MCCH are sent.

This behaviour is depicted in the following figure:



**Question 10: Do companies agree an additional clarification should be captured in TS 38.331 to confirm the intended network behaviour for MCCH modifications?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Ok with intent. See comments | We think the contradiction (discussed by [16]) is real and that should be addressed. However, unlike [16], we support to keep the concept of MCCH modification period.Having said that, TP in [15] in 5.9.1.3 is incomplete and NOTE is not even needed.Also not convinced the stopping conditions of acquiring MCCH are needed as shown in TP for 5.9.2.3. |
| Samsung | No | We think it is sufficiently clear that MCCH contents can change only at modification period boundary, and change notification & MCCH can be received in the same slot at each repetition occasion in the modification period. For broadcast reception, latency concern is only that UE should be able to setup service quickly. There is no real latency concern on network to provision and start a new service in between the modification period. Further, all this is consistent with the legacy SC-PTM behaviour. |
| OPPO | No  |  |
| CATT | OK | We think the change is aligned with the below RAN2 agreement,* At least in case RAN1 decides to utilize RNTI other than MCCH-RNTI for MCCH change notification, MCCH change notification is sent in the first MCCH monitoring occasion of each MCCH repetition period.
 |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | See our comments | The MCCH change notification is sent on GC-PDCCH with CRC scrambled by MCCH-RNTI. Therefore, we think the MCCH change notification is sent in each GC-PDCCH monitoring occasion of each MCCH repetition period during the MCCH modification period with the new MCCH content. |
| Nokia | No | for “1.” We only need to define UE behaviour – if NW does stupid thing then that is up to NW to do so if it wants. For “2.” seems to be quite clear already in the specification |
| Apple | OK with the intention | We prefer to keep the concept of MCCH modification period. If there is any ambiguity, it’s better to make it clear in the spec.  |
| Lenovo | OK with the intent.  | The intent is OK but the current text seems already covered the intent.  |
| Kyocera | Yes | We agree to capture an additional clarification in TS38.331.  |
| Xiaomi | No | Agree with the comments provided by Nokia. |
| MediaTek | Maybe No | We think the current spec is clear enough. |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| LGE |  | No strong view, but the network behaviour seems already clear. |
| vivo | Yes | As the proponent, we are okay to keep the spec unchanged as we see all the companies share the same understanding. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No strong view | We think the specification is clear, but if companies think different interpretations are possible, we can try to clarify. |
| Futurewei | Ok with intent | We support the principle. We are fine if current spec need to be further clarified. |
| ITRI | No | Agree with Nokia. |
| Intel | See comments | Current specification is not clear regarding the MCCH modification period concept and the UE acquisition of MCCH upon receiving change notification. We think at least some clarification is needed if MCCH modificaiont period concept is kept, e.g. “The network shall always start to send the MCCH change notification from the beginning of a MCCH modification period”, as proposed in [15]. |

In [16] on the other hand it is proposed to completely resign from the MCCH modification period concept to allow for MCCH contents to be changed more dynamically. This means the UE is required to check whether MCCH content changed in every MCCH repetition period and to make it easier for the UE it is further proposed to modify the meaning of the 2-bit bitmap for change notification in a way that toggling of the value indicates there is a modification of MCCH information.

**Question 11: Do companies agree to remove the concept of MCCH modification period and redefine the 2-bit bitmap for change notification in a way that toggling of the value indicates there is a modification of MCCH information.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | No | We agree there is contradiction in the current text that needs addressing. But we prefer to keep the concept of MCCH modification period. So, "acquires the new MCCH information starting from the same slot" needs updating. |
| Samsung | No | As commented in Q10. Modification period concept is essential |
| OPPO | No  |  |
| CATT | No  | We prefer not to change the current MCCH change notification scheme that uses the combination of repetition period and modification period as this scheme also aligns with LTE SC-PTM at most extent. For the concern in [16] that UE could not in timely obtain the updated MCCH content when receiving MCCH change notification, this may be a misunderstanding. As shown in the Figure used in Q9, if NW would like to change MCCH content, MCCH change notification will be sent at the beginning of each repetition period, followed by the updated MCCH content, in next modification period. Thus once UE successfully decode the MCCH change notification DCI, it will perform the MCCH acquirement procedure to get the latest MCCH content in timely. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | No |  |
| Nokia | No | Although this is not totally odd thought we think it is bit late to redesign change mechanism at this point. |
| Apple | No |  |
| Lenovo | No |  |
| Kyocera | No | We prefer to keep the MCCH modification period, since we think it’s beneficial for UE power saving.  |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| MediaTek | No |  |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| LGE | No |  |
| vivo | No | A similar proposal had been discussed for SI reception in Rel-15 NR. However, no further enhancement is introduced considering the performance gain and complexity. So, for the MCCH reception, we prefer to keep the current mechanism (similar to that for SI reception) unchanged.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | The MP concept is used for power saving purpose, the proposed change will increase the Power consumption for UE and also require essential change in the spec and we don’t have enough time to discuss.  |
| Futurewei | No |  |
| ITRI | No |  |
| Intel | Yes (proponent of [16]) | Our understanding of RAN2’s agreement that “*If MCCH information acquisition is triggered by the first bit in the MCCH change notification, UE starts acquiring the MCCH message from the slot in which the MCCH change notification was received*” is to reduce the latency of MBS session start, which can only happen at beginning of modification period. In LTE, the notification is only applicable for next modification, and UE starts to acquire MCCH at next modification period upon receiving notification. Regarding UE power consumption aspect, we’d like to note that in LTE, PDCCH (a separate PDCCH from the one scheduling MCCH) carrying notification is also used, and UE receives such PDCCH to check whether there is a need to acquire MCCH. There is power saving gain that UE does not need to receive MCCH after checking PDCCH.Anyway it seems that majority companies are fine to keep MCCH modificaiont period. In that case, we think it would be better to clarify that “The network shall always start to send the MCCH change notification from the beginning of a MCCH modification period.”, as proposed in [15]. |

In [17], it is proposed to introduce a configurable time offset between the MCCH notification and MCCH control channel in SIB in order to allow the UE to obtain better power savings.

**Question 12: Do companies agree to introduce a configurable time offset between the MCCH notification and MCCH control channel in SIB?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | No | With the concept of MCCH modification period, UE should know when the next modification boundary is.There can be issues with such time offset. It seems the time offset is preconfigured. Then, for example, what if the notification is received around the edge of current boundary but the time offset is such that it pushes the next control for UE is pushed to next modification period?We are not sure if the added complexity brings in enough gain to be justified. |
| Samsung | No | Agree with Qualcomm. We think power saving gain may not be significant with typically large modification period for broadcast services. |
| OPPO | No  |  |
| CATT | No | It contradicts with RAN2 agreement,* If MCCH information acquisition is triggered by the first bit in the MCCH change notification, UE starts acquiring the MCCH message from the slot in which the MCCH change notification was received. (it doesn’t require any change of the current running CR.)
 |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | No |  |
| Nokia | No |  Unnecessary complexity. |
| Apple | No |  |
| Lenovo | No |  |
| Kyocera | No | We share Qualcomm’s view that it’s unclear whether the additional complexity can provide much gain on UE power saving.  |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| MediaTek | No |  |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| LGE | No | Not essential. |
| vivo | No | We understand that it should be discussed in RAN1 first if needed, not RAN2.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | There is no time to discuss this optimization. |
| Futurewei | No |  |
| ITRI | No |  |
| Intel | No |  |

## MRB configuration aspects

In [18], it is claimed that there is no clear use case of mapping multiple MRBs to one broadcast MBS session. Introducing multiple-to-one mapping between MRB and broadcast MBS session requires extra complexities at both the UE and the gNB. It is then proposed to disallow the 1:N mapping between MBS broadcast session and MRBs.

**Question 13: Do companies agree to disallow 1:N mapping between MBS broadcast session and MRBs (i.e. only 1:1 mapping between MBS session and MRB is allowed)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | No | This goes against previous RAN2 agreement. It is up NW implementation and configuration how to map. So, there is no strong reason to restrict it.  |
| Samsung | No | We prefer stick to earlier RAN2 agreement |
| OPPO | No  |  |
| CATT | No | Agree with QCOM and Samsung.It is not motivated to override previous RAN2 agreement. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | No |  |
| Nokia | No | Question should say 1:N mapping between MBS broadcast session and MRBs or N:1 mapping between MRBs and MBS broadcast session.MBS broadcast supports QoS flows. If all QoS flows are mapped to one MRB then the prioritization happens at PDCP. The DU will use only one “aggregated” QoS for MRB. With multiple MRBs, the DU can perform scheduling conscious of different QoS requirements. |
| Apple | No |  |
| Lenovo | No |  |
| Kyocera | No | We tend to share the intention of [18], but we don’t think such a restriction is necessary since RAN2 agreed N:1 mapping.  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Proponent. If the case as raised by Nokia is valid for gNB implementation, we can accept to have 1:N mapping between MBS broadcast session and MRBs. |
| MediaTek | No |  |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| LGE | No | We have similar view with Qualcomm. We also consider that an MBS session may consist of multiple MBS QoS flows and multiple MBS QoS flows can be mapped to one or more than one MRBs. |
| vivo | No | Within an MBS broadcast session, there are likely different QoS requirements for different data. Multiple MRBs within an MBS broadcast session are essential. We fail to see the motivation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We disagree with the analysis in [18]. Mapping of the session to multiple MRBs can happen very often, similarly as for PDU sessions. It is unclear why we need such restriction. |
| Futurewei | No |  |
| ITRI | No |  |
| Intel | No |  |

In [19], it is observed that the UE behavior upon modification of a configuration of a broadcast MRB is currently not specified. It is then proposed in [19] to specify that:

1. It is up to UE implementation to determine which MRB of an ongoing broadcast session has been modified.
2. For modification of a broadcast MRB, UE releases the concerned MRB and establishes it according to the new MRB configuration.

**Question 14: Do companies agree to specify the UE behaviour upon modification of a configuration of a broadcast MRB, as per bullets 1-2 above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No | As in legacy MBMS, RRC determines the modification of configuration (i.e. changed parameter) and applies to lower layers. It is just modification and no release and establish of MRB is needed. |
| OPPO | Yes  |  |
| CATT | Yes | It is necessary to specify the corresponding UE behaviour, as in the current spec, it already states that the broadcast MRB configuration procedure is used by the UE upon modification of a configuration of a broadcast MRB received by the UE5.9.3 Broadcast MRB configuration5.9.3.1 GeneralThe broadcast MRB configuration procedure is used by the UE to configure PDCP, RLC, MAC and the physical layer upon starting and/or stopping to receive an broadcast MRB transmitted on MTCH, or upon modification of a configuration of a broadcast MRB received by the UE. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | No  | It’s up to UE’s implementation as long as UE can receive the data on the modified MRB. |
| Nokia | No | In our view no need to specify as this is UE internal behaviour on how to handle this. We don’t specify e.g BCCH reception at cell change in this detail. |
| Apple | No | We agree with the two bullets, but its’ no need to specify it.  |
| Lenovo | No | Same view with Nokia |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | No | For broadcast, it is not essential to specify the detailed UE behaviours for the configuration modification, as a smart UE implementation would handle it properly. Furthermore releasing the MRB at the configuration change seems causing lots of packet loss. |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | No | It is no need to specify this UE internal behaviour. |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| vivo | No | Agree with Samsung. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes to 1, no to 2  | How the modification is performed can be left to UE implementation, e.g. if the required change does not require re-establishment, the UE can select to not re-establish so that service interruption is minimized.  |
| Futurewei | No |  |
| ITRI | No | It may not need to specify the internal UE behaviour. |
| Intel | No | Our understanding is that it is UE implementation behavior. For 2, using release and add might have problems e.g. informing NAS about TMGI release and addition might not be desirable. |

## L1 parameters related issues

In [21], several modifications are proposed for *SIB20* and *CFR-ConfigMCCH-MTCH*, which would allow saving a few bits for some specific network configurations.

**Question 15: Do companies agree to introduce the changes in SIB20 and CFR-ConfigMCCH-MTCH signalling, as proposed by [21]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | The changes are simple, and it aligns with RAN1 agreements while making signalling more flexible and efficient. |
| Samsung | No strong view  | This is a signalling optimization for 1 bit. Note that RAN1 agreement quoted is about CORESET0 being used as default if CFR for GC-PDCCH/PDSCH is initial BWP and CORESET is not configured. It has no concern with or without the change. |
| OPPO | No strong view |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Maybe | We do not see strong need for this one but on the other hand we see nothing wrong with the proposal either. It may save some bits in some scenarios (and consume some more in some other due to additional optional bits). |
| Apple | No strong view |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | No strong view |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| vivo | No | The current specification is clearer. The gain is very limited.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Rather no | The saving (serval bits) is only obtained in the very special case, e.g. all CFR related parameters uses the same IEs as for initial BWP.On the change itself, simply changing "pdsch-ConfigMCCH-r17" to optional is not correct, the current Need S description for the child IEs only applies to the scenario where the pdsch-ConfigMCCH-r17 is present but the child IEs are absent. If the parent IE pdsch-ConfigMCCH-r17 is absent, the child IEs are “not configured” rather than “absent”, and how to specify applied default value needs to be updated. |
| Futurewei | Maybe not | Current spec is straight forward. |
| ITRI | Yes |  |
| Intel | No strong view |  |

In [22], it is noted that the maximum number of rate matching patterns the UE needs to support is four at a BWP level and four at a cell level and this number includes rate match patterns for both unicast and MBS. However, if the same rate matching resource is configured in *PDSCH-config* for both unicast and MBS, this resource configuration might be counted as two since they are configured as different entities in unicast BWP and in CFR separately. Similar issue can happen for rate match patterns configured in *ServingCellConfig*/*ServingCellConfigCommon* and the rate matching resources configured in SIB20/MCCH for MBS broadcast. It is then proposed to clarify that:

1. Clarify that the same RateMatchPatternId configured in CFR and associated BWP should include the same resource configuration and it should be counted as one pattern for the evaluation of the total number of configured rate mating patterns at the UE.
2. Clarify that the same RateMatchPatternId configured in ServingCellConfig/ServingCellConfigCommon and SIB20/MCCH should include the same resource configuration and it should be counted as one pattern for the evaluation of the total number of configured rate mating patterns at the UE.

**Question 16: Do companies agree to clarify rate match patterns configuration limitations as per bullets 1-2 above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes, see comments | Intent is ok, but for the text in the TP, some wording suggestion as follows:“..same and ~~such rate match patterns~~ they are counted as a single rate match pattern ~~for the evaluation of~~ in the total configured..” |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes  |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Maybe | this seems to be more RAN1 aspect and should be checked by RAN1 |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| vivo | Comments | Agree with the intention. But we should confirm this with RAN1 at first as they had never discussed this before. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | The same rate matching resources configured for MBS/unicast should not be counted twice. Without this change, the current mechanism would reduce the available rate matching resources significantly. |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| ITRI | Yes |  |
| Intel | Comments | This seems to be a RAN1 issue. |

In [23], it is indicated that the mandatory UE capability is currently to support only a single CORESET in addition to CORESET0. Hence, the UE receiving MBS broadcast in RRC CONNECTED will have to use *commonControlResourceSetExt* configured in SIB20 for both unicast and MBS broadcast reception. However, it is currently only possible to configure TCI states for the CORESET(s) which are configured in the UE dedicated signalling (i.e. PDCCH-Config). Therefore, it is proposed in [23] to clarify that in case the network configures the control resource set with the same ControlResourceSetId as used for commonControlResourceSetExt via dedicated signalling, the configuration from PDCCH-Config always takes precedence and should not be updated by the UE based on SIB20 (similarly as currently captured for the CORESET configured by SIB1)

**Question 17: Do companies agree to clarify that in case the network configures via dedicated signalling the control resource set with the same ControlResourceSetId as used for commonControlResourceSetExt, the configuration from PDCCH-Config always takes precedence and should not be updated by the UE based on SIB20 (similarly as currently captured for the CORESET configured by SIB1).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes  |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Maybe | This seems to make sense but probably best to be checked also by RAN1 |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We think the logic of the common CORESET configured by SIB1 should be applied to MBS common CORESET for the same reason, i.e. to allow the network to configures TCI state resource in MBS common CORESET when UE enters active state. |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| ITRI | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |

## Other issues

In [24] some, it is proposed to confirm that maxFreqMBS should equal to 5 and maxNrofMRB-Broadcast should equal to 4. However, it was proposed by the RRC CR rapporteur to agree on the number 16 for maxFreqMBS, to align with the maximum number of carriers the UE may support in Carrier Aggregation. Therefore, the following question is asked.

**Question 18: Do companies agree to confirm that:**

1. ***maxFreqMBS-r17* = 16**
2. ***maxNrofMRB-Broadcast-r17* = 4**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No strong view |  |
| OPPP | Yes  |  |
| CATT | No strong view | We follow the majority view |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Partially | We prefer the same value of maxFreqMBS-r17 as in LTE, i.e. 5 is kept. |
| Spreadtrum | No strong view |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| ITRI | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |

In [20] notes it is not entirely clear by reading TS 38.304 what it means that “The cell […] is providing SIB20”. In consequence, it is proposed to clarify this using one of the following options:

1. Modify the word “providing” to “capable to broadcast”
2. Add a NOTE with “The UE considers the cell is providing SIB20 when SIB20 is configured in SIB1, regardless of broadcasting or notBroadcasting”

**Question 19: Do companies agree to clarify in TS38.304 the meaning of “The cell […] is providing SIB20”? If yes, please indicate your preferred option (e.g. as per bullet 1 or 2 above).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes, but see comments | Prefer #1 and it should be enough to change “providing” to “capable of providing”, i.e., add “capable of”. |
| Samsung | Yes (prefer #2) | Note may be added. We can rather utilize “providing SIB20” consistently instead of different terms of broadcasting/scheduling/not broadcasting used in different places for MBS SIB in spec. |
| OPPO | Yes  | #1 is enough.  |
| CATT | Yes  | Option 1 |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | better wording could be to replace “providing” with more precise wording “SIB1 scheduling information contains SIB20” |
| Apple | Yes | Slightly prefer Option 2.  |
| Kyocera | Yes | We slightly prefer 1) since it’s simpler and clearer, and we’re fine with Qualcomm’s wording. We’re also ok with 2) with Note.  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Either option 1 or 2 is fine to us. |
| MediaTek | Yes | Option 1 for simplicity |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Prefer Option 1. |
| LGE |  | We support the first change only. |
| vivo | Yes | Option 1 for reader-friendliness. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No to 1, no strong view for 2 | The wording proposed in 1 is even more unclear to us, so if the clarification is agreed, we prefer option 2.  |
| Futurewei | Maybe not | 1. Currently wording seems fine. 2) general principle is known including for SIB20.
 |
| ITRI | Yes | Option 1. |
| Intel | Yes | Option 1. |

Finally, companies are requested to indicate in case any other issue from the Tdocs in scope has to be discussed, e.g. it was not handled neither by the rapporteur CR nor by the questions above.

**Question 20: Any other issues?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Issue / reference** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | PDCCH for MBS | All the configuration for MBS PDCCH (i.e. field pdcch-ConfigMulticast-r17) is OPTIONAL. The field searchSpacesToAddModListExt2-r17 is OPTIONAL, both in PDCCH-Config, and in PDCCH-ConfigCommon.Within that, dci-Format4-0, 4-1, 4-2, all are OPTIONAL.However, if SearchSpaceExt2 is not configured, group-common PDCCH with DCI format 4\_0/1/2 are not supported. RAN2 should clarify the interpretation of ‘OPTIONAL’ and what is the default mode if not configured. |
| TD Tech, Chengdu TD Tech | Consider the broadcast session interruption question in LTE and solve it in NR MBS | We think the broadcast session interruption question in LTE is very serious. It shall be solved in NR MBS. It’s not an optimization question. The simplest solution is to support the same PTM configuration for both the source cell and target cell. That is, in the neighbour cell information an extra bit is added to show that the source cell and target cell have the same/different PTM configuration information. |

# Conclusion

TBD
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17. R2-2205744 Broadcast session start and MCCH Ericsson discussion Rel-17 NR\_MBS-Core
18. R2-2205458 RIL(X305) Discussion on the number of MRBs mapped to a MBS session Xiaomi Communications discussion Rel-17 NR\_MBS-Core
19. R2-2204681 [C003] Discussion on UE behavior for Broadcast MRB Modification CATT, CBN discussion Rel-17 38.331 NR\_MBS-Core
20. R2-2205111 Clarification of “providing SIB20” in TS38.304 Kyocera discussion Rel-17
21. R2-2206159 SIB20 signalling issues including optionality for cfr-ConfigMCCH-MTCH-r17 Qualcomm Incorporated discussion Rel-17 NR\_MBS-Core
22. R2-2206121 Discussion on rate matching resources for unicast and MBS (RIL: H093) Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-17 NR\_MBS-Core
23. R2-2206122 Discussion on configuration of additional common CORESET for MBS broadcast in RRC Connected mode (RIL: H009) Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-17 NR\_MBS-Core
24. R2-2205712 Discussion on MRB Configuration Samsung discussion Rel-17 NR\_MBS-Core
25. R2-2205938 MBS corrections for TS 38.331 Huawei, HiSilicon