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# 1 Introduction

Based on the conclusion of the e-meeting preparation phase [18] and the vice-Chairman’s guidance, the following e-mail discussion has been kicked-off:

[101-e-NR-unlic-NRU-ULSignalsChannels-01] Email discussion/approval on the following from R1-2003842 until 5/29; if necessary, endorse associated TPs by 6/4 – Steve (Ericsson)

* Issue #1: RB set allocation when interlaced transmission is configured for PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant, PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC\_RNTI, and cell-specific PUCCH
* Issue #2: RB set allocation for PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 in a CSS to accomodate CORESET bandwidth spanning more than one UL RB set

The following topics are included in this email discussion

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue****#** | **Description** | **Tdoc****References** |
| 1 | RB set allocation when interlaced transmission configured for PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant, PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC\_RNTI, and cell-specific PUCCH* Requires discussion on supporting the two configuration alternatives for initial DL/UL BWP specified in 38.331 – Please see Appendix A of this summary.

TPs needed to 38.213 §8.3, 9.2.1 and 38.214 §6.1.2.2.3 | R1-2004041: P2-P4, TP2-TP4R1-2003511: TP#2R1-2003727: P2R1-2004012: P1,P2R1-2004084: P1,P2R1-2004442: P2R1-2003859: P2R1-2004323: P3-P6, TP1-3R1-2004003: P1R1-2003449: P1, TPR1-2003369: P1R1-2003841: P1,P3,P5,TP1,TP3,TP5 |
| 2 | PUSCH allocation rule for PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 in a CSS to accomodate CORESET bandwidth spanning more than one UL RB set, e.g., for carrier configured without intra-cell guardbandsTPs needed to 38.214 §6.1.2.2.3 | R1-2004041: P1, TP1R1-2003511: TP#1R1-2003727: P1R1-2004012: P3R1-2003822: P2,P3R1-2004274: P2,P3R1-2004084: P3R1-2004442: P1R1-2003859: P1R1-2004323: P7R1-2003841: P4,TP4 |

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 Issue #1: UL RB Set Allocation Rules

### 2.1.1 Issue #1-1: RB set allocation for PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant and DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC\_RNTI

**Description**:

In RAN1#100b-e, the following agreement was made, but the FFS between Alt-1 and Alt-2 was not resolved:

Agreement:

To resolve the FFS in TP#1, support one of the following two alternatives for the PUSCH allocation rule.

* When UL resource allocation Type 2 is configured, the UE assumes that PUSCH is allocated as follows:
	+ Alt-1: PUSCH is allocated to the RB set of the active UL BWP that intersects the RB set of the active DL BWP in which the DCI 0\_1 that schedules the PDSCH containing the RAR UL grant is received. If there is no intersection, PUSCH is allocated to RB Set 0 of the active UL BWP.
	+ Alt-2: PUSCH is allocated to the initial UL BWP if the active UL BWP fully overlaps the initial UL BWP, otherwise PUSCH is allocated to RB Set 0 of the active UL BWP.
* FFS: Rule for PUSCH allocation for an UL carrier without intra-cell guard bands.

During the meeting, it was observed that Alt-1 by itself has a technical issue where it can happen, e.g., with SUL, that there is an ambiguity on which UL RB set the gNB should expect to receive Msg3 in the case of two different users in contention (CBRA) using different BWPs.

In the same meeting, the following alternative Alt-3 was proposed as a hybrid (compromise) between Alt-1 and Alt-2 to solve the technical issue with Alt-1, and also benefit from increased chance of LBT success for Msg3 transmission.

Alt-3 Proposal:

* When UL resource allocation Type 2 is configured, the UE assumes that PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL grant is allocated as follows:
	+ If the active UL BWP fully overlaps the initial UL BWP, PUSCH is allocated to the initial UL BWP
	+ Otherwise, PUSCH is allocated to the RB set of the active UL BWP that intersects the RB set of the active DL BWP in which the DCI 0\_1 that schedules the PDSCH containing the RAR UL grant is received. If there is no intersection, PUSCH is allocated to RB Set 0 of the active UL BWP

During the meeting is was also discussed to have a common rule for RB set allocation for PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL grant and PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI. The rationale is that Msg3 and Msg3 re-transmissions should use the same UL RB set. Based on this observation, the following proposal was made in the FL summary in the last meeting (see [19]).

Proposal 8 Further discuss next meeting whether or not PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 in a CSS addressed to TC-RNTI should be allocated differently than for C-RNTI / CS-RNTI / MCS-RNTI.

#### Unified Rule for PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL Grant and DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI

For this meeting, multiple companies have provided input on these issues, and there is strong support for a common RB set allocation rule, hence the FL suggestion is to make the following intermediate proposal. Please comment if you have technical concerns with this proposal.

1. For the case of UL resource allocation Type 2, adopt a common RB set allocation rule for PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL grant and PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI to ensure that initial and re-transmissions of PUSCH occur in the same UL RB set.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Moderator(Ericsson) | Support this intermediate proposal in order to make further progress |
| Huawei | Support the proposal |
| LG | Support the proposal to keep design consistency with Rel-15 NR |
| Sharp | We support it in principle. We can directly discuss the issue below. |
| Fujitsu | Support the proposal |
| OPPO | OK in principle, unless it is impossible to do it.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support it in principle |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Samsung  | Support it in principle |
| Intel | Support the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal |
| vivo | Support the proposal |

#### Capturing NR-U Study Item Agreement on 20 MHz Initial UL/DL BWP

As described in Appendix A, it is still an open issue how to capture the NR-U study item agreement that is listed in Section 7.2.1 of TR 38.889 [16]:

Initial active DL/UL BWP is approximately 20MHz for 5GHz band, though the final value will be quantized to number of PRBs. Initial active DL/UL BWP is approximately 20MHz for 6GHz band if similar channelization as 5GHz band is used for 6GHz band.

As described in Appendix A, this agreement is already captured implicitly for the initial DL BWP with existing Rel-15 specifications and Rel-16 agreements on the configuration of CORESET0. The way it is captured in specifications is to place limitations on what part of the initial DL BWP can be used for transmissions prior to the UE entering RRC\_CONNECTED mode, i.e., Msg2, Msg4 (Note: the restrictions are that the addressable PRBs must be confined to the bandwidth location of CORESET0. This is to be consistent with the Option 1 and Option 2 BWP configuration options specified in Rel-15 (see Appendix A,B).

* 38.212 Section 7.3.1.2.1 specifies that DCI 1\_0 addressed to SI-RNTI / RA-RNTI / TC-RNTI restricts the FDRA to the size of CORESET0
	+ e.g., for TC-RNTI the following is specified:

- Frequency domain resource assignment – bits

-  is the size of CORESET 0

* 38.214 Section 5.1.2.2 specifies that the PDSCH scheduled by DCI 1\_0 in CSS is restricted to the bandwidth of CORESET0 by virtue of the RB numbering, i.e.,

For a PDSCH scheduled with a DCI format 1\_0 in any type of PDCCH common search space, regardless of which bandwidth part is the active bandwidth part, RB numbering starts from the lowest RB of the CORESET in which the DCI was received; otherwise RB numbering starts from the lowest RB in the determined downlink bandwidth part.

Since for NR-U it has been agreed and already specified that the CORESET0 configuration is always within an LBT bandwidth of 20 MHz, the above agreement limiting the “initial active DL BWP of approximately 20 MHz” is implicitly captured.

However, the above agreement is not yet captured for the UL. To be consistent with the DL, it is straight forward to place restrictions on the UL transmissions prior to the UE entering RRC\_CONNECTED mode, i.e., Msg3 PUSCH initial transmission, Msg3 PUSCH re-transmission(s), and PUCCH for HARQ-ACK of Msg4). As for the DL, the restriction would be such that the UL transmissions are within the same bandwidth location as occupied by CORESET0. This can be achieved with a straightforward modification of Alt-2 and Alt-3 proposals discussed in the previous meeting.

#### Modification of Alt-2 and Alt-3 to capture NR-U Study Item Agreement

Multiple companies have provided input on Issue #1, but there is a split between companies supporting Alt-2 and those supporting Alt-3, hence further discussion is needed to down-select. In addition, it is needed to account for the NR-U study item agreement (see previous section) which restricts the bandwidth location of UL transmissions prior to the UE entering RRC\_CONNECTED mode. This should be done in a consistent way as for the DL which already captures the SI agreement. The following also assumes that a common RB set allocation rule is adopted for PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL grant or by DCI 0\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI.

1. Down select to one of {Alt-2’ and Alt-3’} in the following proposal which are based on modified versions of Alt-2 and Alt-3 discussed in RAN1#100b-e. This assumes intermediate Proposal 1 is agreed.
* For PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL Grant (conveyed via PDSCH scheduled by DCI 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by RA-RNTI) or by DCI 0\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI when UL Resource Allocation Type 2 is configured, the PUSCH is transmitted as follows:
	+ If the active UL BWP and the initial UL BWP have the same SCS and the active UL BWP includes all RBs of the initial UL BWP, or the active UL BWP is the initial UL BWP, the initial UL BWP is used for PUSCH, otherwise the active UL BWP is used.
	+ If the initial UL BWP is used:
		- PUSCH is allocated to the RB set of the initial UL BWP that intersects the lowest-indexed RB in the initial DL BWP of the CORESET in which the UE detects the DCI. If there is no intersection, PUSCH is allocated to RB set 0 of the initial UL BWP.
	+ Otherwise, if the active UL BWP is used:
		- Alt-2’
			* PUSCH is allocated to RB Set 0 of the active UL BWP
		- Alt-3’
			* PUSCH is allocated to a single RB set of the active UL BWP as per the intersection rule in [Alt-1 or Alt-2 or Alt-3 for Issue #2 (need to down-select)]. If there is no intersection, PUSCH is allocated to RB set 0 of the active UL BWP.

#### **2.1.1.1 <1st Round Comments>**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Moderator (Ericsson) | Alt-3’Provides a unified solution with Issue #2 for the active UL BWP. |
| Huawei | We agree to capture the 20MHz restriction for initial UL BWP, but we don’t think that “ intersect ” needs to be specified, clarification like “ UE assumes that the initial UL BWP is same as initial DL BWP ” is enough. Besides, the original agreement acheived in RAN1#99 was:Agreement:* The UE transmits PUSCH scheduled by fallback DCI in CSS within the initial BWP on the interlaces indicated by the X bits of the FDRA field
* Note: The FDRA field for fallback DCI in CSS does not include Y bits

During the WI, the above agreement is based on the assumption that only 20MHz initial UL BWP is considered, therefore the Y bits is truly meaningless. In RAN1#100e, “the initial BWP” was changed to “the active BWP”. Since the assumption has already been changed, it is unnecessarily to restrict that Y bits cannot be included. Currently, the proposed alternatives are diverse and it is difficult to make the consensus. Introducing Y bits can achieve a unified design for RAR grant, and DCI 0\_0 in both CSS and USS, and provide more flexibility for scheduling, also can reduce the complexity.  |
| LG | Agree with Huawei on the point that applying “intersect“ behavior is not necessary for the case where the active UL BWP includes the initial UL BWP, based on the agreement in SI phase listed in Section 7.2.1 of TR 38.889: * *Initial active DL/UL BWP is approximately 20MHz for 5GHz band, though the final value will be quantized to number of PRBs. Initial active DL/UL BWP is approximately 20MHz for 6GHz band if similar channelization as 5GHz band is used for 6GHz band.*

Therefore, it is required to modify the above proposal 2 as following:

|  |
| --- |
| * For PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL Grant (conveyed via PDSCH scheduled by DCI 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by RA-RNTI) or by DCI 0\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI when UL Resource Allocation Type 2 is configured, the PUSCH is transmitted as follows:
	+ If the active UL BWP and the initial UL BWP have the same SCS and the active UL BWP includes all RBs of the initial UL BWP, or the active UL BWP is the initial UL BWP, the initial UL BWP is used for PUSCH, ~~otherwise the active UL BWP is used.~~
	+ ~~If the initial UL BWP is used:~~
		- ~~PUSCH is allocated to the RB set of the initial UL BWP that intersects the lowest-indexed RB in the initial DL BWP of the CORESET in which the UE detects the DCI. If there is no intersection, PUSCH is allocated to RB set 0 of the initial UL BWP.~~
	+ Otherwise, ~~if the active UL BWP is used:~~
		- Alt-2’
			* PUSCH is allocated to RB Set 0 of the active UL BWP
		- Alt-3’
			* PUSCH is allocated to a single RB set of the active UL BWP as per the intersection rule in [Alt-1 or Alt-2 or Alt-3 for Issue #2 (need to down-select)]. If there is no intersection, PUSCH is allocated to RB set 0 of the active UL BWP.
 |

Given the above modification, Alt-3‘ is strongly preferred in terms of technical benefit for sharing gNB’s COT to improve UE’s LBT success rate in case when the gNB/UE schedules/transmits the PUSCH including this Msg. 3 PUSCH. In addition, applying the intersection rule could also be benifitial to align UL RB set among the UEs with contention for Msg. 3 PUSCH transmission.It should be noted that the above Alt-3‘ is consistent/aligned with the rule applied in legacy Rel-15 as below: * If the active UL BWP contains the initial UL BWP, the Msg. 3 PUSCH is allocated to the initial UL BWP. Otherwise, the Msg. 3 PUSCH is allocated as for the PUSCH scheduled by CSS DCI format 0\_0.
 |
| Sharp | We share Ericsson’s view that „Initial active DL BWP“ indicates CORESET0. On the other hand, we need to discuss what is „Iniital active UL BWP“. Until Jule 2018 (before publication of V15.6.0 for each RAN1 specs), „initial active UL BWP“ was used to indiate the initial UL BWP. At RAN1 meeting in May 2019, R1-1907500 and R1-1907501 was agreed for alignment of Initial UL BWP and Initial active UL BWP. Based on this understanding, we think that RAN1 common understanding is Initial UL BWP having 20 MHz.For 1st bullet, shouldn’t we say „msg3“ rather than „PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant“?For 1st sub-bullet, „the same SCS“ should be „the same SCS/CP“. Msg3 can be transmitted with a BWP with 60 kHz SCS and normal/extended CP for connected UEs.For 2nd sub-bullet, If we agree support for an initial UL BWP wider than 20 MHz, we are fine with that. If not, we can remove this sub-bullet.For 3ed sub-bullet, Alt-3‘ is prefered for common solution as the CSS. Anyway, this option is for a BWP which doesn’t share the bandwidth for initial access (e.g., PSCell). On the other hand, 1st and 2nd sub-bullet intends to solve potential ambiguity for RRC connected and idle UEs. We may discuss those separetely. |
| Fujitsu | For the second bullet, in our understanding, according to the previous agreement, configuration of initial DL/UL BWP based on either Option 1 or Option 2 in Appendix A should be under the restriction of ‘approximately 20MHz’. That is, the initial UL BWP should include only one RB set (and this should be clarified in the spec.), no matter how to configure it. If so, it is unnessary to detemine the single RB set for PUSCH among multiple RB sets in the initial UL BWP and the second bullet can be removed. But if most companies agree to support initial UL BWP including multiple RB sets, we are fine with the second bullet.For the third bullet, support Alt-3‘. Compared with Alt-2‘, Alt-3‘ can provide benefit on COT sharing and more flexibility for gNB implemention, e.g. on BWP configuration. |
| OPPO | We agree with Huawei that the current wording in the proposal seems not necessary. But the most important thing to clairfy first is: for idle UE, how does the UE determine the RB set boundaries in initial UL BWP? How to configure? All these are not clear for the moment. This has also been commented by several companies. From our point of view, the initial UL BWP contains only 1 RB set. Then the original Alt-2 is our preference, i.e. for active UE, if the active UL BWP fully includes initial UL BWP (with SCS, CP condition), the PUSCH in transmitted in the RB set overlaps with the initial UL BWP, otherwise, PUSCH in RB set 0. For idle UE, PUSCH is in initial UL BWP. But, if we will go for the case where initial UL BWP includes more than one RB sets, the proposed solution by FL seems very complicted. And we should also look at more concise alternatives. Here we propose another alternative:Alt- 4: the PUSCH for Msg3 initial transmission and retransmissin are allocated in the same RB set as the Msg1. Or similar to Huawei’s proposal: Alt-5: Y bits in RAR to indicate RB set for PUSCH transmission. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | At this moment, maybe we need to reach consensus on whether to support more than 20MHz bandwidth configured for initial UL BWP. From our side, we support only 20MHz bandwidth is configured for initial UL BWP. Due to single RB set in initial UL BWP, there is no need to add the restriction of “intersect…”. We suggest to remove 2nd bullet.For the 3rd bullet, Alt 3 is slightly preferred since it has potential benefit of COT sharing. |
| ZTE | Similar as Huawei and OPPO, we also support to include Y bits in RAR to indicate RB set for PUSCH transmission, and also for DCI 0\_0 in CSS to achieve the unified design. If the agreement is not changeable, the simplified slotuion alt.4 mentioned by OPPO is preferred. |
| Qualcomm | To capture SI agreement, it is fine to align initial UL BWP to initial DL BWP, but in that case, the initial UL BWP will be limited to 48 RBs, which as 2 interlaces with 9 RBs only. We may want to allow UL BWP to be 50RBs as well. In current NR, we already have the mechanism to indicating the initial UL BWP. Why not just reuse that mechanism, while adding the restrictions that* The initial UL BWP RBs include the initial DL BWP RBs, and
* The initial UL BWP is up to 50RBs wide. Note that initial DL/UL BWP have to align in the center, so 51 RB size is not possible.
 |
| Samsung  | Agree with HW, LG, Fujitsu, OPPO and Qualcomm that “ intersect ” is not necessary. We understand that current spec supports both opt 1 and 2 for licensed band which allows more than 20MHz, but it does not mean NR-U needs to follow the same thing.For NR-U, we had a specific agreement of approximately 20MHz initial active DL/UL BWP. To correctly capture this agreement, it can be simply specified from the configuration of UL BWP without any addtional modification of original Alt 2 and Alt 3. We can send an LS to RAN2 to ask them to capture our agreement in RAN2 spec, i.e. for for the reconfiguration of initial BWP in SIB, it is the same BW as CORESET0 configured by MIB. |
| Intel | Since we have the agreements that initial DL/UL BWP is 20MHz, we share LG’s view that the proposal could be simpilified as LG proposed. Alt-2’ is preferred due to its simplicity. On the other hand, if it is hard to converge, Alt-5 (from Huawei and OPPO), i.e. adding Y bits in RAR UL grant and DCI 1-0 in CSS may be considered to have a unified design for all UL DCI in any search space.  |
| Fujitsu2 | It seems most companies think that the initial UL BWP should include only 1 RB set, and it is unnecessary to have a rule for determining RB set in initial UL BWP. But if we will support the case where the initial UL BWP include multiple RB set, we tend to agree that Alt-4 proposed by OPPO is simpler, also with consideration that Alt-5 may need to further discuss how to interpret the Y bits and how to guarantee the indicated RB set is within UE’s active UL BWP. Furthermore, we noticed that with modification as below, Alt-4 is applicable to all cases, no matter whether the active UL BWP is overlapping with the initial UL BWP and whether the initial UL BWP includes only one or multiple RB sets. And it can provide more flexibility for gNB implementation, e.g. on BWP configuration. Considering those above, Alt-4 with the modification is a simple way to resolve the issues of Msg3 scheduling. Alt- 4 (with modification): the PUSCH for Msg3 initial transmission and retransmissin are allocated in the same RB set of the active UL BWP as the Msg1.  |
| vivo | Agree with HW, LG, Fujitsu, OPPO, Qualcomm and Samsung that “ intersect ” is not necessary. We agree to capture the 20MHz restriction for initial UL BWP. The proposed solution by FL seems to be too complicted based on the condition that initial UL BWP can include more than one RB set.If we can have a common understanding that initial DL/UL BWP is 20MHz, Alt 2 is preferred due to its simplicity. On the other hand, if it is hard to converge, we agree to support Alt-5 (from Huawei and OPPO), i.e. adding Y bits in RAR UL grant and DCI 1-0 in CSS to have a unified design for all UL DCI in any search space. |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt 2‘ seems enough already given that the BWP is 20 MHz and comprises only one RB set. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with HW, LG, Fujitsu, OPPO, Qualcomm, Samsung and vivo that “ intersect ” is not necessary.For third bullet, alt 3’ may have the benefits of COT sharing. Therefore, we slightly pfefer alt 3’ |

#### **2.1.1.2 <Summary of 1st Round Comments>**

Since Issue #1 and #2 are linked, it is suggested to agree on a solution for Issue #1 first, and then come back to issue #2. One point of progress, however, is there is support (even if only in principle) of having a common RB set allocation rule for PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL grant and PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI. Hence, we can try to build on that.

Based on company feedback in Section 2.1.1, three solution alternatives have emerged for the RB set allocation rule for PUSCH.

**Solution alternative #1**

* For PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL Grant (Msg3) or by DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI (Msg3 re-transmission) when UL Resource Allocation Type 2 is configured, the PUSCH is transmitted as follows:
	+ If the active UL BWP and the initial UL BWP have the same SCS and the active UL BWP includes all RBs of the initial UL BWP, or the active UL BWP is the initial UL BWP, PUSCH is allocated to the RB set of the initial UL BWP, otherwise
	+ Down-select to one of the following:
		- Alt-2’
			* PUSCH is allocated to RB Set 0 of the active UL BWP
		- Alt-3’
			* PUSCH is allocated to a single RB set of the active UL BWP as per the intersection rule in [Alt-1 or Alt-3 for Issue #2 (need to down-select)]. If there is no intersection, PUSCH is allocated to RB set 0 of the active UL BWP.

**Solution alternative #2**

* For PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL Grant (Msg3) or by DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI (Msg3 re-transmission) when UL Resource Allocation Type 2 is configured, the PUSCH is transmitted as follows:
	+ PUSCH is transmitted in the same RB set of the active UL BWP as PRACH (Msg1)

**Solution alternative #3**

* For PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL Grant (Msg3) or by DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI (Msg3 re-transmission) when UL Resource Allocation Type 2 is configured, the PUSCH is transmitted as follows:
	+ If the active UL BWP and the initial UL BWP have the same SCS and the active UL BWP includes all RBs of the initial UL BWP, or the active UL BWP is the initial UL BWP, PUSCH is allocated to an RB set within the initial UL BWP, otherwise PUSCH is allocated to an RB set within the active UL BWP
	+ Y = 4 bits in the FDRA field indicates the RB set in which PUSCH is allocated where Y indicates an RB set number starting from 0 for the carrier rather than for the BWP
* The FDRA field of DCI 0\_0 in a CSS addressed to C-RNTI / CS-RNTI / MCS-C-RNTI also includes Y bits interpreted in the same way as for DCI 0\_0 in a USS.

#### **2.1.1.3 <2nd Round Comments>**

Please provide your company view in light of these new solution alternatives.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| LG | **Solution alternative #1*** For PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL Grant (Msg3) or by DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI (Msg3 re-transmission) when UL Resource Allocation Type 2 is configured, the PUSCH is transmitted as follows:
	+ If the active UL BWP and the initial UL BWP have the same SCS and the active UL BWP includes all RBs of the initial UL BWP, or the active UL BWP is the initial UL BWP, PUSCH is allocated to the RB set of the initial UL BWP, otherwise
	+ Down-select to one of the following:
		- Alt-2’
			* PUSCH is allocated to RB Set 0 of the active UL BWP
		- Alt-3’
			* PUSCH is allocated to a single RB set of the active UL BWP as per the intersection rule in [Alt-1 or Alt-3 or Alt-4 for Issue #2 (need to down-select)]. If there is no intersection, PUSCH is allocated to RB set 0 of the active UL BWP.

Comment: Regarding the intersection rule (for Alt-3’), Alt-1 and Alt-2 would face the same situation that there would be no UL RB set intersecting the lowest REG depending on CORESET and active BWP configuration (as we commented in GTW meeting) since the REG is also one PRB as in Alt-2. In this sense, we can discuss another approach (as Alt-4 in red in the above) by considering the above situation and PDCCH AL ambiguity raised by QC.* Alt-4: the lowest indexed one amongst UL RB set(s) that intersect any RB of the CORESET in the active DL BWP in which the UE detects the DCI.

**Solution alternative #2*** For PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL Grant (Msg3) or by DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI (Msg3 re-transmission) when UL Resource Allocation Type 2 is configured, the PUSCH is transmitted as follows:
	+ PUSCH is transmitted in the same RB set of the active UL BWP as PRACH (Msg1)

Comment:As commented in GTW meeting, we have concern on this Alt #2 since PRACH resource reserved by RMSI and PUSCH resource for Msg3 transmission would be concentrated onto a same single RB set. It would cause restriction of Msg3 PUSCH scheduling in gNB side, and probably, increase of LBT blocking between different UEs.[OPPO]: the blocking issue in RAR scheduled PUSCH is naturally reduced. This is thanks to the first step PRACH. Note that if gNB decides to configure the PRACH resource in one RB set for the all the idle UEs and active UE, the blocking issue would rather happen during PRACH trasnmission. Here we are talking about the Msg3, which means the UEs have already transmitted PRACH, highly likely, they are already TDM‘ed. On the other hand, gNB can also select to configure PRACH resource in another RB set for only active UEs. Thus, the blocking problem can be reduced. In summary, the blocking issue for Msg3 PUSCH is not really severe, as it can be naturally relieved by the 1st step with Msg1. **Solution alternative #3*** For PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL Grant (Msg3) or by DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI (Msg3 re-transmission) when UL Resource Allocation Type 2 is configured, the PUSCH is transmitted as follows:
	+ If the active UL BWP and the initial UL BWP have the same SCS and the active UL BWP includes all RBs of the initial UL BWP, or the active UL BWP is the initial UL BWP, PUSCH is allocated to ~~an~~ the RB set ~~within~~ of the initial UL BWP by ignoring Y-bit in the FDRA field, otherwise PUSCH is allocated to an RB set within the active UL BWP based on Y-bit in the FDRA field
	+ Y = 4 bits in the FDRA field indicates the RB set in which PUSCH is allocated where Y indicates an RB set number starting from 0 for the carrier rather than for the BWP
	+ PUSCH is allocated to RB set 0 of the active UL BWP if the RB set indicated by the Y-bit is not within the active UL BWP
* ~~The FDRA field of DCI 0\_0 in a CSS addressed to C-RNTI / CS-RNTI / MCS-C-RNTI also includes Y bits interpreted in the same way as for DCI 0\_0 in a USS.~~

Comment: As mentioned in GTW meeting, we are open to discuss this Alt #3 by limiting to the case of RAR UL grant (and/or DCI 0\_0 by TC-RNTI), without reverting the previous agreement made for the case of CSS DCI 0\_0. And we slightly modify some wording for consistency with the above Alt #1, and add one more sub-bullet to address the case where the RB set indicated by Y-bit is not within the UE’s active BWP.Overall, to keep design consistency with Rel-15, we prefer Alt-3’ of Alt #1, and we are also open to discuss further on the modified Alt #3 in the above. |
| Spreadtrum | For Alt#1, alt 3’ follows the common design principles of DCI 0\_0 in CSS. And it may have the benefit of COT sharing. Therefore, we slightly pfefer alt 3’For Alt#2, if Msg 3 and PRACH preamble are transmited in the same RB set, it may cause gNB scheduling to be restricted.For Alt#3, we are fine to the proposal revised by LG.  |
| Fujitsu  | Firstly, Alt #1 is based on the assumption that initial UL BWP can include only 1 RB set following the agreement that ‘initial active DL/UL BWP is approximately 20MHz’. We share the views as many other companies that it is not good to revert the agreement. In Alt #1, we prefer Alt-3’, but we are fine with Alt-2’ if it’s the majority view. Secondly, both Alt #2 and Alt #3 are with consideration that initial UL BWP may include multiple RB sets. If we do agree to revert the previous agreement to support that initial UL BWP can include multiple RB sets, between the 2 alternatives, we prefer Alt #2 for its simplicity as we commented in the 1st round discussion. Regarding Alt #3, it requires to revert another agreement. Meanwhile, as we also mentioned in the 1st round discussion, Alt #3 seems still an incomplete solution and needs to further discuss how to guarantee the indicated RB set is within UE’s active UL BWP, or how does the UE handle the case where the indicated RB set is outside its active UL BWP. And if we will anyway add Y bits in the FDRA field, it seems unnecessary to have the 1st sub-bullet of the 1st bullet in Alt #3.And regarding the modified Alt #3 proposed by LG, we agree that it’s better to be without reverting the previous agreement for the case of CSS DCI 0\_0. But we don’t quite understand the added sub-bullet from the gNB point of view. We are wondering whether/how the gNB can know the indicated RB set is within or not within the UE’s active UL BWP, or say whether/how the gNB can determine the exact RB set where the PUSCH is allocated.  |
| Huawei | Considering the current situation, a unified design is prefered. We also think that remove the restriction for 20MHz initial UL BWP is not acceptable. In CBRA, if one connected UE and one idle UE used the same RACH resource, it means that the active UL BWP for the connected UE should include the initial UL BWP, or the active UL BWP is the initial BWP. Obivously, gNB should indicate the RB set of initial UL BWP for the PUSCH transmission if gNB received the RACH transmission in the initial UL BWP. If only connected UEs used the same RACH resource, gNB could schedule the PUSCH flexibily by using the Ybit. RB set indicated by the Y-bit not within the active UL BWP is a corner case. If it is necessary to specify the UE behavior, we can just clarify the UE should ignore the indication(no PUSCH will be transmitted)The following alternative is provided:**Solution alternative #3*** For PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL Grant (Msg3) or by DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI (Msg3 re-transmission) when UL Resource Allocation Type 2 is configured, the PUSCH is transmitted as follows:
	+ Y = 4 bits in the FDRA field indicates the RB set in which PUSCH is allocated where Y indicates an RB set number starting from 0 for the carrier rather than for the BWP
* The FDRA field of DCI 0\_0 in a CSS addressed to C-RNTI / CS-RNTI / MCS-C-RNTI also includes Y bits interpreted in the same way as for DCI 0\_0 in a USS.
 |
| Samsung | As previously discussed and also commented by many companies during the GTW meeting, it is a more efficient way to focus solutions based on existing RAN1 agreement rather than revert one agreement. Solution Alt 1 and solution Alt 2 can work properly based on RAN1 agreement of 20MHz initial UL/DL BWP. Solution Alt 2 and Alt 3 provides a workable solution for the scenario with > 20MHz initial UL/DL BWP which reverts the previous NR-U agreement of approximately 20MHz initial BWP. Alt 3 with last bullet tries to provide a unified solution for all casses at the cost of further reverts one more previous agreement (the agreement for DCI 0\_0 with C-RNTI in CSS). We prefer Alt 2‘ in solution Alt 1 to align with Rel-15 mechanism. To make progress, we can be flexible on other alternatives without reverting any agreement.  |
| vivo | Alternative #3 is preferred from our perspective considering the following pros:1. A unified design for USS, [CSS with C-RNTI,] CSS with TC-RNTI and RAR UL grant would reduce the complexity for specfication and UE implementation.2. Provide more flexibility on RB set allocation for gNB scheduling.3. The ambiguity for PUSCH RB sets allocation in some cases (as shown in following figure) can be solved, where neither the active BWP for UE 1 nor that for UE 2 overlaps with initial UL BWP, but the active BWP for UE 1 overlaps with that for UE 2 and RB set 0 corresponds to different frequency location.4. No more discussions are needed for issue 2, because it is resolved if alternative #3 is adopted.Regarding the modification from LGE for the case that RB set indicated by the Y-bit is out of active UL BWP, we share similar veiw with Huawei, it can be handled by gNB.Regarding initial UL BWP, we still think it should be restricted as 20MHz.If some companies do not want to revert our previous agreements for DCI in CSS, we can support to discuss Alt #3 by limiting to the case of RAR UL grant (and/or DCI 0\_0 by TC-RNTI), without reverting the previous agreement made for the case of CSS DCI 0\_0 as commented by LEG. Otherwise, we can accept Alternative #1 with alt 2‘ for progress. |
| OPPO | We see there are diverged alternatives on table, maybe we can categorize them based on FL’s proposed two options, also followed by Havish’s recommendation that we should first agree on the option. To summarize: Option 1) initial UL BWP is restricted to 20MHz; Option 2) initial UL BWP size is not restricted, but Msg1/Msg3 are restricted to 20MHz overlapping with CORESET0 in initial UL BWP. To break things down, the alternatives under Option1 and Option2 are summarized below: For Option1: O1-Alt-1: if active UL BWP fully covers initial UL BWP and have the same SCS and CP length, the PUSCH is allocated in the RB set of the active UL BWP overlaps with the initial UL BWP; otherwise, the PUSCH in allocated in the RB set 0 of the active UL BWP. O1-Alt-2: PUSCH is allocated in Msg1 RB set. O1-Alt-3: if active UL BWP fully covers initial UL BWP and have the same SCS and CP length, the PUSCH is allocated in the RB set of the active UL BWP overlaps with the initial UL BWP; otherwise, PUSCH in allocated in the UL RB set that overlaps with the REG0 that carriers the DCI scheduling RAR, if no overlapped UL RB set, the PUSCH is allocated in the RB set 0 of the active UL BWP. O1-Alt-4: if active UL BWP fully covers initial UL BWP and have the same SCS and CP length, the PUSCH is allocated in the RB set of the active UL BWP overlaps with the initial UL BWP; otherwise, RAR includes Y bits. For Option 2:O2-Alt-1: if active UL BWP fully covers initial UL BWP and have the same SCS and CP length, the PUSCH is allocated in the RB set of the active UL BWP overlaps with CORESET 0; otherwise, the PUSCH in allocated in the RB set 0 of the active UL BWP. O2-Alt-2: PUSCH is allocated in Msg1 RB set.O2-Alt-3: if active UL BWP fully covers initial UL BWP and have the same SCS and CP length, the PUSCH is allocated in the RB set of the active UL BWP overlaps with CORESET 0; otherwise, PUSCH in allocated in the UL RB set that overlaps with the REG0 that carriers the DCI scheduling RAR, if no overlapped UL RB set, the PUSCH is allocated in the RB set 0 of the active UL BWP.O2-Alt-4: RAR includes Y bits. Pros and Cons analysisIn case option 1 is agreed:O1-Alt-1 and O1-Alt-2 are indeed the same for idle UE, the difference is for active UE whose active UL BWP does not include initial UL BWP. We slightly prefer O1-Alt-2 for its simplicity and flexibility for the gNB to configure Msg1 RB set. But we are completely okay with O1-Alt-1 as well. On the other hand, if companies are after scheduling flexibility, O1-Alt-4 should be considered. In case option 2 is agreed:O2-Alt-1 and O2-Alt-2 are still the same for idle UE, and O2-Alt-2 has the advantage of leaving more flexibility for gNB to configure RB set for Msg1 transmission for active UEs. Similarly, if companies are after scheduling flexibility, O2-Alt-4 should be considered. OPPO’s viewWe prefer Option 1 and support O1-Alt-1 and O1-Alt-2, with slight preference for O1-Alt-2. |
| Sharp | If we go with supporting BWP basic operation Option 1 and Option 2, we should stick to Rel-15 principle as much as possible to minimize potential error. In Rel-15, PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant is allocated within the initial UL BWP when the active UL BWP includes all RBs in the initial UL BWP and SCS/CP is the same as the initial UL BWP, and the PUSCH is allocated to the active UL BWP otherwise.For Alt#1Alt#1 is based on Rel-15 principle with incorporating the last meeting agreement on PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 in CSS. I believe it’s the safest option to minimize potential error.For Alt#2We don’t see there is a benefit to restrict PRACH resource and PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant in the same RB-set.For Alt#3Carrier can be reconfigured UE-specifically (by uplinkChannelBW-PerSCS-List in ServingCellConfig). To fix Y=4 indicating RB-sets within the carrier doesn’t solve the ambiguity between IDLE UEs and connected mode UEs. If we go with this alternative, we need to clarify that RB-set configuration doesn’t change by UE-specific carrier configuration. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | At this moment, we don’t think it does make sense to revert any agreement which we have reached. Especially, some agreements are reached after much effort was spent.Alt 1 follows the existing agreement of approximate 20MHz bandwidth for initial UL BWP and can work properly. Both Alt 2 and Alt 3 target the case of more than 20MHz bandwidth for initial UL BWP, which may not align with existing agreement. Alt 3 reverting existing agreement does not make sense.For Alt 1, Alt 3’ is preferred to us due to some potential gain of COT sharing. Alt-4 in Alt 3’ proposed by LG for determining the lowest indexed UL RB set is fine with us.  |
| OPPO | Based on the current situation, it seems that there are many diverged views on the enhancement. For the sake of progress, we would like to compromise to a basic principle so that the function is not broken. Compromised proposal:* Rel-16 adopts option 1, i.e. initial UL BWP is configured to be 20 MHz
* For active UE: if active UL BWP fully covers initial UL BWP and has the same SCS and CP length as initial UL BWP, the PUSCH is allocated in the RB set of the active UL BWP overlaps with the initial UL BWP; otherwise, the PUSCH in allocated in the RB set 0 of the active UL BWP.
* For idle UE: PUSCH is transmitted in initial UL BWP.
 |
| ZTE | We slightly prefer the Alt-3, i.e. introducing Y bits, or to limit the initial UL BWP to be 20MHz, and follow the Rel-15 principle, i.e. alt-2’ in Alt-1.We are also fine to remove the last bullet from Alt-3 so that it does not require to revert the previous agreement for CSS. |

#### **2.1.1.4 <Summary of 2nd Round of Comments>**

Regarding Issue #1, the following agreement was made on-line

Agreement:

* As per prior agreement, initial UL BWP is 20 MHz
	+ FFS: The case of SUL in licensed band
* For PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL Grant (e.g., Msg3) or by DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI (Msg3 re-transmission) when UL Resource Allocation Type 2 is configured, the PUSCH is transmitted as follows:
	+ PUSCH is transmitted in the same UL RB set of the active UL BWP as PRACH (Msg1)
* FFS: The case where PRACH is configured in more than one RB set

#### **2.1.1.5 <3rd Round Comments>**

Please provide your company view on TP#a and TP#b below corresponding to the above agreement.

**The FL will draft an LS to RAN2 to adress the first part of the agreement on initial UL BWP. Please add comments on the LS directly here.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with both TPs.BTW, is it necessary to capture the first agreement of initial UL BWP is 20MHz in the spec? |
| Sharp | We support two TPs. We also support to send an LS to RAN2 for dicision on Initial BWP. |
| Huawei | Agree with TPa and TPb.We also share similar view as Lenovo, the 20MHz initial UL BWP should also be captured in the spec. |
| vivo | Agree with both TPs.We also support to caprute the 20MHz resctriction for initial UL BWP in the spec. |
| Fujitsu | Agree with the TPs in principle. And we also support to send an LS to RAN2 for dicision on Initial BWP and to capture the restriction in the spec.Just one question for clafication. Do we need to take into accout the case where the UE may (re-)transmit PRACHs in different RB sets of the active UL BW in a RA procedure? If so, maybe it is better to clarify e.g. that the RB set allocated to the PUSCH is “ the one in which the most recently transmitted PRACH corresponding to the RAR (or DCI 0\_0 with CRC scrambled with TC-RNTI) is transmitted“ ?Moderator comment:Is this a valid configuration? I would expect that all RACH occasions within the active BWP would be configured within a single BWP. Furthermore, RAN agreed to down-prioritize provision of multiple Msg1 opportunities in the frequency domain in RAN#84.  |
| LG | Agree with Fujitsu on the clarification of the PRACH.We think that “the one in which the most recently transmitted PRACH is transmitted“ would be sufficient for both two TPs. |
| Samsung  | Agree with both TPs. For the clarification of the PRACH suggested by Fujitsu, we think it would be sufficient to say “PRACH corresponding to the RAR (or DCI 0\_0 with CRC scrambled with TC-RNTI) “ without adding most recently transmitted, because UE and gNB has the same understanding of the PRACH accroding to RA-RNTI + preamble ID in RAR. For example, if UE transimts 1st PRACH in RB set 0 and fails to receive RAR, and then, transmits 2nd PRACH in RB set 1, RAR-RNTI is different for 1st and 2nd PRACH. We think it is neceesary to caprute the 20MHz resctriction for initial UL BWP in the spec. |
| OPPO | Fine with the TPa and TPb in principle and we are fine with Fujitsu’s modifications.  |

Reason for changes

Implementation of agreement for RB set allocation for PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL grant and DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI.

Summary of changes

Introduction of RB set allocation rule for for PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL grant and DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI

Specs/Sections impacted

38.213 Section 8.3

38.214 Section 6.1.2.2.3

Consequences if not approved

Undefined RB set allocation for PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL grant

----------------------------------------- Text Proposal (TP#a) for 38.213, Section 8.3 ---------------------------------

\*\*\* Unchanged text omitted \*\*\*

If *useInterlace-PUCCH-PUSCH* is provided in *BWP-UplinkCommon* or *BWP-UplinkDedicated*, the frequency domain resource allocation is by uplink resource allocation type 2 [6, TS 38.214]. A UE processes the frequency domain resource assignment field as follows

* truncate the frequency domain resource assignment field to the $X=6$ LSBs if $μ=0$, or to the $X=5$ LSBs if $μ=1$
* for the interlace allocation for PUSCH, interpret the X MSBs of the truncated frequency domain resource assignment field for the active UL BWP as for the $X$ MSBs of the frequency domain resource assignment field in DCI format 0\_0 [6, TS 38.214]
* for the RB set allocation for PUSCH, use the same RB set of the active UL BWP as the one in which the PRACH is transmitted

\*\*\* Unchanged text omitted \*\*\*

------------------------------------------------------ End Text Proposal -------------------------------------------------------

------------------------------------- Text Proposal (TP#b) for 38.214, Section 6.1.2.2.3 ------------------------------

\*\*\* Unchanged text omitted \*\*\*

6.1.2.2.3 Uplink resource allocation type 2

In uplink resource allocation of type 2, the resource block assignment information defined in [5, TS 38.212] indicates to a UE a set of up to *M* interlace indices, and for DCI 0\_0 monitored in a UE-specific search space and DCI 0\_1 a set of up to $ N\_{RB-set,UL}^{BWP}$ contiguous RB sets, where *M* and interlace indexing are defined in Clause 4.4.4.6 in [4, TS 38.211]. For DCI 0\_0 monitored in a UE-specific search space and DCI 0\_1, the UE shall determine the resource allocation in frequency domain as an intersection of the resource blocks of the indicated interlaces and the indicated set of RB sets and intra-cell guard bands defined in Clause 7 between the indicated RB sets, if any. For DCI 0\_0 monitored in a common search space the UE shall determine the resource allocation in frequency domain as an intersection of the resource blocks of the indicated interlaces and a single uplink RB set of the active UL BWP. For DCI 0\_0 monitored in a CSS with CRC scrambled by an RNTI other than TC-RNTI, t~~T~~he uplink RB set is the one that intersects with the downlink RB set of the active downlink BWP in which the UE detects the DCI 0\_0. If there is no intersection, the uplink RB set is RB set 0 in the active uplink BWP. For DCI 0\_0 monitored in a CSS with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI, the uplink RB set is the same one in which the UE transmits the PRACH.

\*\*\* Unchanged text omitted \*\*\*

------------------------------------------------------- End Text Proposal ------------------------------------------------------

### 2.1.2 Issue #1-2: RB set allocation for cell-specific PUCCH

As discussed in the previous section, the NR-U study item agreement is not yet captured for the UL. To be consistent with the DL and Proposal 2 above for PUSCH, it is straight forward to constrain the cell-specific PUCCH transmissions that are used prior to the UE entering RRC\_CONNECTED mode, i.e., for HARQ-ACK of Msg4. The constraint is that PUCCH is transmitted within the same bandwidth location as occupied by CORESET0.

1. Support the following proposal and associated TP#1.
* For cell-specific PUCCH resources used prior to dedicated configuration when *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* in *BWP-UplinkCommon* is configured, PUCCH is allocated to the RB set of the initial UL BWP that intersects the lowest-indexed RB in the initial DL BWP of the CORESET in which the UE detects the DCI scheduling a PDSCH reception. If there is no intersection, PUCCH is allocated to RB set 0 of the initial UL BWP.

#### **2.1.2.1 <1st Round Comments>**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Moderator (Ericsson) | Support the proposal |
| Huawei | There is no need to specify the “intersect“ , just clarify that UE assumes that the initial UL BWP is same as initial DL BWP  |
| LG | We have similar view with Huawei that the initial UL BWP consists of a single UL RB set of 20 MHz. |
| Sharp | The proposal is not necessary if wider than 20 MHz is not supported for the initial UL BWP. |
| Fujitsu | Similar to our comment on the second bullet of Proposal 2 in 2.1.1. According to the previous agreement, the initial UL BWP should include only one RB set, no matter how to configure it. If so, it is unnessary to detemine the single RB set for PUCCH among multiple RB sets in the initial UL BWP.  |
| OPPO | Not support this proposal. If the initial UL BWP contains only one RB set, this is no ambiguity. If the initial UL BWP contains more than one RB set, PUCCH can use the Msg1 RB set.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Not necessary.From our side, we support only 20MHz bandwidth is configured for initial UL BWP. Due to single RB set in initial UL BWP, there is no need to add the restriction of “intersect…”.  |
| ZTE | We share the similar views as above that initial UL BWP contains a single RB set. |
| Qualcomm | Not needed. The initial UL BWP can be either align with initial DL BWP or one RB more on each side. |
| Samsung | As commented in proposal 2 of 2.1.1, initial UL BWP is not wider than 20MHz, i.e. it contains a single UL RB set of 20MHz, so no need of this proposal. |
| Intel | No need the proposal assuming initial UL BWP is a just 20MHz, i.e. a RB set. The 20MHz for initial UL BWP should be clarified in RAN1 or RAN2 spec |
| vivo | Agree with views as above that initial UL BWP contains a single RB set. |
| Nokia, NSB | Since the initial UL BWP has just one RB set, the PUCCH mapping should be clear already |
| Spreadtrum | It seems that majority of companies agrees that the initial UL BWP contains only a single RB set, so this proposal is not necessary. |

Reason for changes

Implementation of agreement from NR-U study item to ensure transmissions prior to the UE entering RRC connected mode are restricted to ~20 MHz including HARQ ACK of Msg4 on cell-specific PUCCH resource

Summary of changes

Introduction of RB set allocation rule for cell-specific PUCCH resource

Specs/Sections impacted

38.213 Section 9.2.1

Consequences if not approved

Undefined RB set allocation for cell-specific PUCCH

--------------------------------------- Text Proposal (TP#1) for 38.213, Section 9.2.1 ---------------------------------

\*\*\* Unchanged text omitted \*\*\*

If a UE is provided a PUCCH resource by *pucch-ResourceCommon* and is provided *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* in *BWP-UplinkCommon*

- the UE determines for the PUCCH resource an interlace index $m$ as $m=\left(m\_{0}+\left⌊{r\_{PUCCH}}/{N\_{CS}}\right⌋\right)modM$ where $M$ is a number of interlaces [4, TS 38.211] and $m\_{0}=RB\_{BWP}^{offset}$ is an interlace index offset and $RB\_{BWP}^{offset}$ is as given in Table 9.2.1-1

- the UE determines the PRB allocation for the PUCCH resource from the intersection of the RBs corresponding to interlace $m$ and the RBs of a single UL RB set within the initial UL BWP. The UL RB set is the one that intersects with the lowest-indexed RB in the initial DL BWP of the CORESET in which the UE detects the DCI format. If there is no intersection, the UL RB set is RB set 0 in the initial UL BWP.

- the UE determines an initial cyclic shift index in a set of initial cyclic shift indexes as $r\_{PUCCH}modN\_{CS}$, where $N\_{CS}$ is the total number of initial cyclic shifts indexes in the set of initial cyclic shift indexes in Table 9.2.1-1

- if *pucch-ResourceCommon* indicates

- index 0: the first symbol is 9 for a PUCCH resource with PUCCH format 0 if $r\_{PUCCH}\geq 10$

- index 1 or 2: the first symbol is 9 for a PUCCH resource with PUCCH format 0 if $r\_{PUCCH}=15$

- index 3, 7, or 11: an orthogonal cover code with index 1 is used for a PUCCH resource with PUCCH format 1 if $r\_{PUCCH}\geq 10$

- the UE does not expect *pucch-ResourceCommon* to indicate index 15

\*\*\* Unchanged text omitted \*\*\*

------------------------------------------------------ End Text Proposal -------------------------------------------------------

#### **2.1.2.2 < Summary of 1st Round Comments >**

No consensus for a spec change.

## 2.2 Issue #2: PUSCH allocation rule for PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 in a CSS to accomodate CORESET bandwidth spanning more than one UL RB set

**Description**:

In RAN1#100bis-e, the following proposal was made in the FL summary [19] for further discussion in this meeting:

Proposal 9 Further discuss next meeting whether or not the PUSCH allocation rule corresponding to DCI 0\_0 in a CSS requires modification to facilitate a CORESET not confined to a single RB set.

Multiple companies have provided input on this issue, and there is strong support to adapt the PUSCH allocation rule for DCI 0\_0 in a CSS to accommodate CORESET bandwidth that is not confined to a single DL RB set. Companies have observed that this would be a typical configuration for a DL carrier without intra-cell guard bands where a legacy (Rel-15) CORSET would be configured in an arbitrary bandwidth, either localized or distributed.

The proposals from the different companies are quite similar for how to specify to which UL RB set the PUSCH is allocated. Paraphrasing to some extent, the following proposals have been made

The UL RB set to which PUSCH is allocated is the one:

* that intersects the first REG (or lowest-indexed REG) of the detected DCI 0\_0
* that intersects the first REG of the lowest indexed CCE of the detected DCI 0\_0
* that intersects the first (or lowest indexed) DL RB set of the detected DCI 0\_0
* that intersects the first RB of the CORESET in which the DCI 0\_0 is detected
* that is the lowest indexed UL RB set that intersects one or more DL RB sets in which the DCI 0\_0 is detected
* that is the lowest indexed UL RB set amongst UL RB set(s) that intersect any RB in which DCI 0\_0 is detected

All companies have proposed that if there is no intersection, the PUSCH is allocated to RB set 0 of the active UL BWP.

As can be seen, several of these proposals make reference to DL RB sets; however, there is ongoing discussion in the Wideband agenda item about whether or not RB sets even need to be defined for a DL carrier without intra-cell guard bands. Hence, it would be desirable to make the RB set allocation rule for PUSCH independent from whether or not RB sets are defined for the DL.

Eliminating the approaches that rely on the definition of DL RB sets, and merging the above approaches that are similar, there ends up being essentially 3 alternatives that can be discussed. Note that the discussion here is intentionally restricted to DCI 0\_0 in a CSS addressed to C-RNTI / CS-RNTI / MCS-C-RNTI since it proposed for Issue #1 to handle TC-RNTI separately.

The first alternative is similar to what is proposed in [11],[3],[5],[15],[7] which uses the wording “the first REG (or lowest indexed REG)”

The second alaternative is similar to what is proposed in [13] which uses the wording “the first RB of the CORESET in which the DCI 0\_0 is detected.”

The third alternative is similar to what is proposed in [10] which uses the wording “the lowest indexed UL RB set amongst UL RB set(s) that intersect any RB in which DCI 0\_0 is detected.”

1. Down select to one of {Alt-1, Alt-2, Alt-3} in the following proposal. Support associated text proposal TP#2 corresponding to selected alternative.

For PUSCH with UL resource allocation Type 2 scheduled by DCI 0\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI / CS-RNTI / MCS-RNTI received in a CSS, PUSCH is allocated to a single UL RB set in the active UL BWP where the UL RB set is

* **Alt-1**: the one that intersects the lowest-indexed REG of the PDCCH in the active DL BWP in which the UE detects the DCI
* **Alt-2**: the one that intersects the lowest-indexed RB in the active BWP of the CORESET in which the UE detects the DCI
* **Alt-3**: the lowest indexed one amongst UL RB set(s) that intersect any RB of the PDCCH in the active DL BWP in which the UE detects the DCI

If there is no intersection, PUSCH is allocated to RB set 0 of the active UL BWP.

### **2.2.1 <1st Round Comments>**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Moderator (Ericsson) | Alt-1 |
| Huawei | Considering that we have spent a lot of time on this topic, and it is difficult to achieve the consensus, like issue 1-1, we propose to introduce Y bits in CSS. A unified design for USS and CSS would reduce the complexity for implementation.  |
| LG | Alt-3 is desirable to acquire more chances of sharing the gNB’s COT for both contiguous and non-contigous CORESET configured for the DCI transmission. For example, as shown the figures below, if the PRBs for PDCCH (or CORESET or any DL RBs) in which the DCI 0\_0 is received are non-consecutive, the results of UL RB set for PUSCH would be different.According to above figures, three Cases are provided. Regarding to Case 3, the PUSCH will be transmitted in the UL RB set #0 using both Alt-1 and Alt-2, but those alternatives cannot achieve the benifit to share the gNB’s COT. However, using Alt-3, the PUSCH will be transmitted in the UL RB set #1 and this alternative can achieve the sharing of the gNB’s COT. |
| Sharp | Alt-3 is slightly prefered since Alt-3 uses similar approach for PUSCH allocation in a case where there is no intersection between DL RB-sets and UL RB-sets. From the functionality point of view, we think Alt.1 and Alt.3 achieves the same goal. Alt.2 has less flexibility than Alt.1 and Alt.3 since it relies on the semi-static RB allocation for CORESET. |
| Fujitsu | Support Alt-1. And we are also fine with Alt-3. |
| OPPO | We are fine with Huawei’s proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt 3 is preferred.  |
| ZTE | We are also fine to introduce Y bits in CSS. |
| Qualcomm | Alt 1. For Alt 3, the issue is for AL8 and AL16, the UE may not be able to figure out the set of RBs carry the PDCCH, as AL16 can decode as AL8 and AL8 can decode as AL16. |
| Samsung | To take advantage of gNB’s COT, we propose to modify Alt-2 as follows,Alt-2’: the one that intersects the lowest-indexed RB of the PDCCH in the active BWP in which the UE detects the DCIWe’re also fine with Alt-1. |
| Intel | We prefer Alt-1. It is not clear what *lowest-indexed REG* means? Is it the REG with lowest physical PRB index of the PDCCH, or lowest REG of the first CCE of the PDCCH? In interleaved CCE to REG mapping, lowest physical REG can be differnet from lowest REG of first CCE for a PDCCH. As Huawei and OPPO commented, relying Y bits for flexible indication is also fine for us.  |
| vivo | Alt 3 is preferred. In addition, we are also fine to introduce Y bits in CSS. |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt 2. However, this isssue is somewhat of an optimization, and if it is impossible to agree, we can also simply decide to use RB set 0 in this case. |
| Spreadtrum | Alt 3 is preferred. |

Reason for changes

* Support for legacy (Rel-15) CORESET in a DL carrier without intra-cell guard bands
* Removal of dependency of PUSCH allocation rule on DL RB sets
* Restriction of rule to DCI 0\_0 addressed to C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI (PUSCH allocation rule for TC-RNTI to be agreed and specified separately)

Summary of changes

* Restriction of PUSCH allocation rule to to DCI 0\_0 addressed to C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI (PUSCH allocation rule for TC-RNTI to be agreed and specified separately)
* Modification of UL RB set determination rule

Specs/Sections impacted

38.214 Section 6.1.2.2.3

Consequences if not approved

PUSCH allocation does not work for legacy (Rel-15) CORESET spanning more than one DL RB set

PUSCH allocation rule broken if RB sets are not specified for DL carrier without intra-cell guard bands

---------------------------- Text Proposal (TP#2) for 38.214, Section 6.1.2.2.3 -----------------------------

\*\*\* Unchanged text omitted \*\*\*

6.1.2.2.3 Uplink resource allocation type 2

In uplink resource allocation of type 2, the resource block assignment information defined in [5, TS 38.212] indicates to a UE a set of up to *M* interlace indices, and for DCI 0\_0 monitored in a UE-specific search space and DCI 0\_1 a set of up to $ N\_{RB-set,UL}^{BWP}$ contiguous RB sets, where *M* and interlace indexing are defined in Clause 4.4.4.6 in [4, TS 38.211]. For DCI 0\_0 monitored in a UE-specific search space and DCI 0\_1, the UE shall determine the resource allocation in frequency domain as an intersection of the resource blocks of the indicated interlaces and the indicated set of RB sets and intra-cell guard bands defined in Clause 7 between the indicated RB sets, if any.

[Alt-1]

For DCI 0\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, or MCS-C-RNTI, monitored in a common search space the UE shall determine the resource allocation in frequency domain as an intersection of the resource blocks of the indicated interlaces and a single uplink RB set of the active UL BWP. The uplink RB set is the one that intersects the lowest-indexed REG of the PDCCH in the active downlink BWP in which the UE detects the DCI ~~with the downlink RB set of the active downlink BWP in which the UE detects the DCI 0\_0~~. If there is no intersection, the uplink RB set is RB set 0 in the active uplink BWP.

[Alt-2]

For DCI 0\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, or MCS-C-RNTI, monitored in a common search space the UE shall determine the resource allocation in frequency domain as an intersection of the resource blocks of the indicated interlaces and a single uplink RB set of the active UL BWP. The uplink RB set is the one that intersects the lowest-indexed RB in the active downlink BWP of the CORESET in which the UE detects the DCI ~~with the downlink RB set of the active downlink BWP in which the UE detects the DCI 0\_0~~. If there is no intersection, the uplink RB set is RB set 0 in the active uplink BWP.

[Alt-3]

For DCI 0\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, or MCS-C-RNTI, monitored in a common search space the UE shall determine the resource allocation in frequency domain as an intersection of the resource blocks of the indicated interlaces and a single uplink RB set of the active UL BWP. The uplink RB set is the lowest-indexed one amongst uplink RB set(s) that intersect~~s~~ any RB of the PDCCH in the active downlink BWP in which the UE detects the DCI ~~with the downlink RB set of the active downlink BWP in which the UE detects the DCI 0\_0~~. If there is no intersection, the uplink RB set is RB set 0 in the active uplink BWP.

\*\*\* Unchanged text omitted \*\*\*

------------------------------------------------------ End Text Proposal -------------------------------------------------------

### **2.2.2 <Summary of 1st Round Comments>**

Based on the 1st round comments for Issue #2, the following still needs discussion and conclusion. Alt-2 is removed since it appeared to have little support. Based on Intel's comment about interleaved CCE to REG mapping, Alt-1 is clarified to refer to the "REG with the lowest-indexed PRB."

1. Down select to one of {Alt-1, Alt-2, Alt-3} in the following proposal. Support associated text proposal TP#2 corresponding to selected alternative.

For PUSCH with UL resource allocation Type 2 scheduled by DCI 0\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI / CS-RNTI / MCS-RNTI received in a CSS, PUSCH is allocated to a single UL RB set in the active UL BWP where the UL RB set is

* **Alt-1**: the one that intersects the REG with the lowest-indexed PRB of the PDCCH in the active DL BWP in which the UE detects the DCI
* **Alt-3**: the lowest indexed one amongst UL RB set(s) that intersect any RB of the [PDCCH or CORESET] in the active DL BWP in which the UE detects the DCI

If there is no intersection, PUSCH is allocated to RB set 0 of the active UL BWP.

### **2.2.3 <2nd Round Comments>**

**Q1: Please provide your company view on the preferred alternative (Alt-1 vs. Alt-3) – please limit your preference to a single alternative. If your preference is Alt-3, please select either "PDCCH" or "CORESET"**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt-3 with “CORESET“ is preferred.  |
| Sharp | We are fine with either. Slightly prefer Alt.3 with „PDCCH“.In our view, all the alternatives provides solution for AL 8/16 ambiguity. In my understanding, anyway the CCE with the lowest frequency is shared by AL8 and AL16 when potential ambiguity for AL8/16 occurs. The condition that occurs are as follows.TS38.214„If a UE monitors PDCCH candidates of aggregation levels 8 and 16 with **the same starting CCE index in non-interleaved CORESET** spanning one OFDM symbol“. |
| LG | Alt-3 is preferred to provide more chances of gNB’s COT sharing by the UE. From our perspective, in case of Alt-1, the resource unit used to check whether there is intersecting UL RB set seems too small. Since one REG (equivalent to one PRB) is only used to check the presence of intersecting, the intersecting location in UL BWP is likely to fall into outside of UL RB set or into the intra-carrier guard band in UL BWP. For this reason, use of coarser resource unit would be beneficial to meet the motivation to introduce this intersecting rule. |
| vivo | Alt-3 with PDCCH is preferred.Agree with LGE that Alt-3 can provide more chances of gNB’s COT sharing by the UE. |
| OPPO | Alt-3 with PDCCH  |
| Fujitsu | We are ok with either. For Alt-3, we slightly prefer “PDCCH”. |
| Samsung  | We slightly prefer Alt-1. For Alt-3 with ‘CORESET‘, in some scenarios, it provides more chances of gNB’s COT sharing than Alt-1, while in some scenarios, it leads to an UL RB set outside gNB’s COT. For exmaple, 2 DL and 2 UL RB sets, CORESET is localized, if gNB fails LBT in 1st RB set and succeeds in 2nd RB set, then gNB transmits PDCCH in 2nd RB set, but UE chooses 1st RB set to transmit PUSCH which is out of gNB’s COT.  |

# 3 Summary of Comments

# References

1. R1-2003369 Remaining issues on physical UL channel design in unlicensed spectrum vivo
2. R1-2003449 Remaining issues on the UL channels for NR-U ZTE, Sanechips
3. R1-2003511 Maintenance on uplink signals and channels Huawei, HiSilicon
4. R1-2003655 Remaining issues on UL signals and channels for NR-U MediaTek Inc.
5. R1-2003727 UL signals and channels for NR-unlicensed Intel Corporation
6. R1-2003822 Text proposals for UL signals and channels for NR-U Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
7. R1-2003841 UL signals and channels Ericsson
8. R1-2003859 UL signals and channels for NR-U Samsung
9. R1-2004003 Remaining issues in UL signals and channels for NR-U Spreadtrum Communications
10. R1-2004012 Remaining issues of UL signals and channels for NR-U LG Electronics
11. R1-2004041 Remaining issues on UL signals and channels for NR-U Fujitsu
12. R1-2004084 Discussion on the remaining issues of UL signals and channels OPPO
13. R1-2004274 Remaining Issues on UL Signals and Channels for NR-U Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell
14. R1-2004323 Remaining issues on UL signals/channels for NR-U Sharp
15. R1-2004442 TP for UL signals and channels for NR-U Qualcomm Incorporated
16. 3GPP TR 38.889, “Study on NR-based access to unlicensed spectrum,” v.16.0.0, December 2018.
17. 3GPP TS 38.331, “Radio Resource Control (RRC) protocol specification,” v.16.0.0, March 2020.
18. R1-2003842, “Feature lead summary for Maintenance of UL Signals and Channels,” Moderator (Ericsson), RAN1#101-e, May 2020.
19. R1-2003055, “FL Summary #2 for [100b-e-NR-unlic-NRU-ULSignalsChannels-01] Email discussion/approval,” Moderator (Ericsson), RAN1#100bis-e, April 2020.
20. R1-2003056, “FL Summary #2 for [100b-e-NR-unlic-NRU-ULSignalsChannels-02] Email discussion/approval,” Moderator (Ericsson), RAN1#100bis-e, April 2020.

# Appendix A Configuration Options for Initial DL/UL BWP

In Section 7.2.1 of the TR from the NR-U study item, it is stated that the initial DL/UL BWP is ~20 MHz (see Section 7.2.1 of [16]):

This originated from an NR-U agreement during RAN1#93, which was the same meeting in which RAN1 discussed an LS from RAN2 on two possible configuration options for the initial DL/UL BWP. RAN1 ended up agreeing to support the two configuration options (Option 1 and Option 2) listed in Appendix B.2 of 38.331. This is copied into Appendix B below for convenience.

Initial active DL/UL BWP is approximately 20MHz for 5GHz band, though the final value will be quantized to number of PRBs. Initial active DL/UL BWP is approximately 20MHz for 6GHz band if similar channelization as 5GHz band is used for 6GHz band.

For the case of UL resource allocation Type 2 (interlace transmission), these configuration options are relevant for the discussion on RB set allocation for the following cases which make use of the initial UL BWP:

* RB set allocation rule for PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL Grant, i.e., Msg3 of the RACH procedure
* RB set allocation rule for PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI, i.e., for Msg3 re-transmissions
* RB set allocation rule for PUCCH transmissions prior to dedicated configuration, e.g., for HARQ ACK of Msg4

Since Rel-15 supports both Option 1 and Option 2, it should be further discussed how to capture the NR-U agreement on 20 MHz initial DL/UL BWP in consideration of both of these options. As it turns out, this is fairly straight forward to do, as will be discussed here. In fact, the Rel-15 spec already supports that the DL transmissions prior to the UE entering RRC\_CONNECTED mode (e.g., Msg2 and Msg4) are confined to the same bandwidth as CORESET0 (~20 MHz for NR-U), regardless of whether Option 1 or Option 2 is used, i.e., regardless of the size of the initial DL BWP:

* 38.212 specifies that DCI 1\_0 addressed to SI-RNTI / RA-RNTI / TC-RNTI restricts the FDRA to the size of CORESET0
* 38.214 Section 5.1.2.2 specifies that the PDSCH scheduled by DCI 1\_0 in CSS is restricted to the bandwidth of CORESET0.

Hence, what is left to discuss is UL transmissions prior to the UE entering RRC\_CONNECTED mode (see above 3 bullets). To help with the discussion, consider the basic UE BWP capability, i.e., support of single “RRC configured” UL/DL BWP. This basic capability is described in FG 6-1 in 3GPP TR 38.822. Whether or not the UE supports additional BWPs (up to 2 or up to 4) doesn’t affect the discussion. Figure 1 below illustrates Option 1 and Option 2 adapted to the NR-U scenario, i.e., CORESET0 confined to a single RB set (~20 MHz). It shows the case for UEs that support a single “RRC configured” DL/UL BWP of bandwidth 80 MHz (spanning 4 RB sets) which the UE will uses once in CONNECTED mode for PxSCH/PxCCH transmission/reception.

The diagram shows time on the x-axis and frequency on the y-axis to illustrate the sequence in moving from IDLE to CONNECTED mode and the size of the various BWPs along the way. The main difference between Option 1 and Option 2 is that two BWPs are configured in Option 1, i.e., DL/UL BWP #0 (1 RB set) and #1 (4 RB sets), whereas only a single BWP is configured in Option 2, i.e., DL/UL BWP #0 (4 RB sets). As per 38.331, in Option 1, BWP#0 is not configured with dedicated parameters – i.e., only *BWP-DownlinkCommon* and *BWP-UplinkCommon* are configured in this BWP. This can be viewed as a “temporary BWP,” that is typically not used again after initial access since it has quite limited functionality. Despite the fact that Option 1 has two BWPs, it is still counted (in terms of UE capability) as a single “RRC configured BWP” (see extract from 38.331 in Appendix B below).

As discussed previously, despite the fact that the DL BWP #0 is >20 MHz for Option 2, according to the Rel-15 specifications, the DL transmission prior to the UE entering RRC\_CONNECTED mode (e.g., Msg2, Msg4) are already restricted to be within the bandwidth of CORESET0. Hence, the agreement in TR is already captured by virtue of the fact that in NR-U it was agreed (and specified) that the CORESET0 bandwidth is 48 PRBs (~20 MHz). Note that Rel-15 specifies that the initial DL BWP must completely overlap CORESET0 (see parameter *initialDownlinkBWP* in *DownlinkConfigCommonSIB*).

Discussion Points:

What is left to discuss further is how to implement the agreement for the UL for both Option 1 and Option 2. A straightforward approach would be for NR-U to make a similar restriction that PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions prior to the UE entering connected mode (e.g., Msg3, HARQ ACK of Msg4) are restricted to an RB set that is contained within the bandwidth of CORESET0. This would then ensure that the agreement from the TR works for both Option 1 and Option 2.

1. For PUSCH transmission prior to dedicated configuration (e.g., Msg3 PUSCH and potential Msg3 re-transmissions), we are already discussing RB set allocation rules for PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant and DCI 0\_0 addressed to TC-RNTI (Issue #1 in the table in Section 2), and it should be straight forward to ensure that the rules apply to both Option 1 and Option 2.
	* Both Alt-2 or Alt-3 discussed in the last meeting can be easily be modified to apply to both Option 1 and Option 2 such that the PUSCH is transmitted within the initial UL BWP within the bandwidth of CORESET0 (if the active UL BWP overlaps the initial UL BWP or the active UL BWP is the initial UL BWP)
2. For PUCCH transmissions prior to dedicated configuration (PF0/1 configured via SIB1), a simple rule that would work for both Option 1 and Option 2 and is consistent to the already PUCCH resource configuration after dedicated configuration, could be the following (this text would go into 38.213 Section 9.2.1)
	* The UE determines the PRB allocation for the PUCCH resource from the intersection of the RBs corresponding to interlace $m$ and the RBs of a single UL RB set within the initial UL BWP. The UE expects that the intersection results in either 10 or 11 RBs. The UL RB set is the one that intersects with the CORESET in which the DCI format is detected. [If there is no intersection, the UL RB set is RB set 0 in the initial UL BWP]

Note that the UE is aware of RB sets prior to dedicated configuration, since when the parameter *intraCellGuardBandUL-r16* is not configured, the UE assumes the default guard band configuration from RAN4 specifications (38.101-1) according to the carrier bandwidth, from which the UE determines RB sets.

1. For PRACH transmissions, the Rel-15 specifications already support that PRACH resources can be configured within an UL RB set that is contained within the bandwidth of CORESET0, so both Option 1 and Option 2 already work.



Figure 1: Configuration options for initial and first active BWP for UEs capable of a single "RRC configured" BWP (according to Basic FG 6-1). Option 1 and Option 2 are according to Annex B.2 of 38.331 for the case of an 80 MHZ UL/DL BWP used in RRC\_CONNECTED mode.

# Appendix B Extract of Appendix B.2 from 38.331

B.2 Description of BWP configuration options

There are two possible ways to configure BWP#0 (i.e. the initial BWP) for a UE:

1) Configure *BWP-DownlinkCommon* and *BWP-UplinkCommon* in *ServingCellConfigCommon*, but do not configure dedicated configurations in *BWP-DownlinkDedicated* or *BWP-UplinkDedicated* in *ServingCellConfig*.

2) Configure both *BWP-DownlinkCommon* and *BWP-UplinkCommon* in *ServingCellConfigCommon* and configure dedicated configurations in at least one of *BWP-DownlinkDedicated* or *BWP-UplinkDedicated* in *ServingCellConfig*.

The same way of configuration is used for UL BWP#0 and DL BWP#0 if both are configured.

With the first option (illustrated by figure B2-1 below), the BWP#0 is not considered to be an RRC-configured BWP, i.e. UE only supporting one BWP can still be configured with BWP#1 in addition to BWP#0 when using this configuration. The BWP#0 can still be used even if it does not have the dedicated configuration, albeit in a more limited manner since only the SIB1-defined configurations are available. For example, only DCI format 1\_0 can be used with BWP#0 without dedicated configuration, so changing to another BWP requires RRCReconfiguration since DCI format 1\_0 doesn't support DCI-based switching.

****

**Figure B2-1: BWP#0 configuration without dedicated configuration**

With the second option (illustrated by figure B2-2 below), the BWP#0 is considered to be an RRC-configured BWP, i.e. UE only supporting one BWP cannot be configured with BWP#1 in addition to BWP#0 when using this configuration. However, UE supporting more than one BWP can still switch to and from BWP#0 e.g. via DCI normally, and there are no explicit limitations to using the BWP#0 (compared to the first option).

****

**Figure B2-2: BWP#0 configuration with dedicated configuration**

For BWP#0, the *BWP-DownlinkCommon* and *BWP-UplinkCommon* in *ServingCellConfigCommon* should match the parameters configured by MIB and SIB1 (if provided) in the corresponding serving cell.