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# Introduction

In this meeting, it is necessary to continue the discussion on the remaining physical layer issues, i.e. mapping details of SSB-to-PUSCH resource, BWP, search space and L1 feedback. Besides, in new coming LS [R1-2108715](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108715.zip)(R2-2109222), RAN2 has asked five questions for RA-SDT and CG-SDT, RAN1 will discuss these questions and reply to RAN2 by the end of this meeting.

This document contains the summary of remaining issues related to the physical layer aspects of small data transmission in RAN1#106bis-e meeting.

[106bis-e-NR-R17-SDT-01] Email discussions on remaining issues on NR SDT in INACTIVE state – Ziyang (ZTE)

* 1st check point: October 14
* Final check point: October 19

# SSB to PUSCH mapping details for CG-SDT

Agreements from the last meeting are copied as below. There are still some remaining details need to be discussed.

Agreement in 106-e:

* Each N of consecutive SSB indexes associated to one CG configuration are mapped to valid CG PUSCH resources
  + first, in increasing order of DMRS resource indexes, where a DMRS resource index is determined first in an ascending order of a DMRS port index and second in an ascending order of a DMRS sequence index
  + second, in increasing order of CG period indexes in the association period
* The mapping ratio N is explicitly signalled and the association period is implicitly derived
  + FFS candidate value set of mapping ratio, and whether it is configured per CG configuration or per cell
  + The SSB to CG PUSCH association period is the duration of multiple of CG periods depending the smallest time duration in the set determined by the CG period such that all SSBs associated with the CG configuration are mapped at least once to CG PUSCH resources.
  + An association pattern period includes one or more association periods and is determined so that a pattern between CG PUSCH occasions and SS/PBCH block indexes associated with the CG configuration repeats at most every 640 msec.
* Note: The mapping ordering and steps may be revisited if multiple CG PUSCH occasions in one CG period is supported

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement in 106-e  Support multiple DMRS resources per CG configuration when single layer PUSCH transmission is assumed, and each DMRS resource could be mapped to the same or different SSB(s)   * FFS if multi-layer PUSCH transmission is supported for CG-SDT * FFS any limitation on the DMRS configuration if multiple CG PUSCH occasions per CG period is supported |

Agreement in 106-e:

* The following PUSCH occasion validation rule is applied for CG-SDT
  + for unpaired spectrum and for SS/PBCH blocks with indexes provided by *ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *SIB1* or by *ServingCellConfigCommon*
  + if a UE is provided tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon, the valid PO is the PO in UL part in a slot, or at least Ngap symbols after the end of the DL part in a slot or after the end of the SSB in a slot
  + if a UE is not provided tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon, the valid PO does not precede a SS/PBCH block in the PUSCH slot, starts at least *Ngap* symbols after a last SS/PBCH block symbol
  + *Ngap* is provided in Table 8.1-2 in TS 38.213
  + FFS if any validation rule following the CG-PUSCH in RRC connected state is applicable, and whether and how to handle the overlapping between CG-PUSCH occasions for CG-SDT and any valid PRACH occasion or MsgA PUSCH occasion.
  + FFS the rule for paired spectrum, and whether/how to support CG-SDT for UEs operating in Type-A HD-FDD.

## Mapping ratio and association period

Companies’ views from the submitted contributions are collected in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2108752](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108752.zip) Spreadtrum [2] | ***Proposal 3: The mapping ratio N can configured per CG configuration.*** |
| [R1-2108950](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108950.zip) vivo [3] | **Proposal 1: the candidate value set of mapping ratio of SSB-to-PRACH occasion can be reused for the mapping ratio between SSB and CG PUSCH resource, e.g. {1/8, 1/4, 1/2, 1, 2, 4, 8, 16}**  **Proposal 2: mapping ratio of SSB-to-CG PUSCH can be defined per CG configuration.** |
| [R1-2109026](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109026.zip) ZTE [4] | ***Proposal 1: Reuse the mapping ratio value set of SSB to RO mapping for CG-SDT, and it should be per CG configuration.*** |
| [R1-2109377](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109377.zip) Xiaomi [5] | **Proposal 1: Reuse the similar mapping relationship between SSBs and ROs.** |
| [R1-2109590](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109590.zip) Intel [7] | **Proposal 6**   * *For the association between SSBs and CG-PUSCH resources*   + *N 1 is supported.*   + *Do not support N < 1.*   + *Candidate values of N can be {1,2,4}* * *Multiple PUSCH occasions in a CG-PUSCH period are supported for a CG-PUSCH configuration.* |
| [R1-2109762](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109762.zip) Ericsson [9] | 1. The mapping ratio between SSB and CG PUSCH can be similar to SSB to RO mapping ratio. 2. Candidate values of SSB to CG PUSCH association period is defined similar to the candidate values of SSB to RO association period, according to table 1 if the CG period values for SDT are the same as those defined for CG Type 1 PUSCH. |
| [R1-2110012](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2110012.zip) Apple [13] | **Proposal 1: The SSB index to valid CG PUSCH resource mapping ratio is configured per CG configuration, the candidate value set of mapping ratio include {1, 2, 4, 8}.** |

### 2.1.1 First round discussion

For candidate value set of mapping ratio, 4 companies prefer to reuse the candidate value set of SSB to RO mapping, while 2 companies propose a different set of values respectively. The options of candidate value set are summarized as below:

* Option 1: Reuse the candidate value set of SSB to RO mapping ratio, i.e. {1/8,1/4,1/2,1,2,4,8,16} [3][4][5][9]
* Option 2: {1, 2, 4} [7]
* Option 3: {1, 2, 4, 8} [13]

4 companies[2][3][4][13] think that mapping ratio should be configured per CG configuration, no companies propose other options, so moderator would like to check if it’s agreeable.

One company[9] suggests to define the candidate value set of association period for SSB to CG PUSCH mapping, but according to previous agreement, the association period is implicitly derived based on the mapping ratio and CG period, and RAN1 has asked RAN2 about whether to restrict CG period value set, so moderator suggests to wait for RAN2’s decision on CG period and then come back to association period if needed.

***Discussion point #2.1:***

* Mapping ratio of SSB to CG PUSCH is configured per CG configuration.
* Down-select one of the following options for candidate value set of SSB to CG PUSCH mapping ratio:
  + Option 1: Reuse the candidate value set of SSB to RO mapping ratio, i.e. {1/8,1/4,1/2,1,2,4,8,16}
  + Option 2: {1, 2, 4}
  + Option 3: {1, 2, 4, 8}
  + Option 4: Other values

Preference and comments on the above options?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We support option 1 |
| Nokia, NSB | We support option 1 |
| Samsung | We like to know the consequence for the first bullet.  If the mapping ratio is configured per CG configuration, does it imply that for one given SDT configuration containing multiple CG configuration, the different mapping ratio could be there. so as the number of CG-PUSCH, the periodicity, etc could also be different. does this mapping ratio be selected by gNB totally randomly or should there be some restrictions, e.g., targeting for same SSB-PUSCH association period, or association pattern period so something?  For the values, we think option 1 could be a good start. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 1 is fine for us |
| Intel | We support Option 2 and can compromise to Option 3. We do not think one to many mapping for SSB to CG-PUSCH resource is needed. |
| Apple | We support option 2 and option 3. We don’t see the motivation to support N<1, the PUSCH resources are reserved for the UE and could not be shared with other users. If N<1, it cuase the PUSCH resource waste. |
| Ericsson1 | Option 1. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with the first bullet.  For the second bullet, Option 1 is preferred. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Option 1. Given that multiple DMRS resources are supported in a CG occasion, it’s fine to have mapping ratio N<1. |
| vivo | Option 1 |
| CATT | We prefer option 1. |

### 2.1.2 Second round discussion

~~9~~10 of ~~11~~12 companies support Option 1 to reuse the candidate value set of SSB to RO mapping. 2 companies think that there is no need to support mapping ratio N<1, because it may cause resource waste. Given that multiple DMRS resources are supported in each CG occasion, N<1 may allow UEs to select appropriate DMRS port, and resource waste can be avoided by proper configuration of mapping ratio and number of DMRS resources per CG occasion.

Regarding the question on the consequence of first bullet, it’s moderator’s understanding that if there are multiple CG configurations, the mapping related parameters including mapping ratio are separately configured for different CG configurations without restriction.

Considering the majority’s views, and Option 1 is a super set of other options, it’s always up to gNB to configure a feasible value of mapping ratio, moderator recommends to agree on the following proposal.

***Proposal 2.1:***

* Mapping ratio of SSB to CG PUSCH is configured per CG configuration.
* Reuse the candidate value set of SSB to RO mapping ratio for SSB to CG PUSCH mapping, i.e. {1/8,1/4,1/2,1,2,4,8,16}

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal of FL |
| Samsung | No to first bullet, maybe we are not very clear in the first round comment. We don’t agree to have no restrictions, at least the how many PUSCH a SSB to be mapped should be same even for different CG-configuration. Otherwise, the resource assigned for each SSB is not even anymore. And this is not something upto gNB configuration, keep same number of resource per SSB is the key design principle. Suggested change:   * Mapping ratio of SSB to CG PUSCH is configured and same for all ~~per~~ CG configurations.   Ok to second bullet. |
| Ericsson2 | Fine. |
| Moderator | According to Samsung’s suggestion, the alternative proposal is provided as:  ***Proposal 2.1a:***   * Mapping ratio of SSB to CG PUSCH is configured and same for all ~~per~~ CG configurations. * Reuse the candidate value set of SSB to RO mapping ratio for SSB to CG PUSCH mapping, i.e. {1/8,1/4,1/2,1,2,4,8,16}   Let’s hear more companies’ views on Proposal 2.1 and 2.1a. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with FL proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We are wine with the Moderator’s proposal 2.1a |
| Intel | If N < 1, how resource waste can be avoided by proper configuration of mapping ratio and number of DMRS resources per CG occasion? It is not clear why this is needed without any benefit. Why does UE need to randomly select one CG-PUSCH resource as this is UE specific operation for CG-SDT. We do not support either 2.1 and 2.1a. |
| Samsung | We are fine with updated 2.1a.  Regarding intel’s concern, not sure if I get your point by saying “resource waste”; when one to many mapping is supported, which means one SSB will map to multiple POs or multiple DMRS, this could apply to the case that gNB configures the same SSB index to multiple UEs, or simply multiple UEs under the same SSB initiate the SDT procedure. This is the same purpose for SSB-RO association. Yes, we may say the number of UE to do SDT is not equal to the number of UE to do RACH, but it did not affect the <1 value is useful. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| Apple | We don’t agree with N<1. With the below RAN2 agreement, we understand the CG resources are dedicated reserved for one UE, there resources are not shared, thus if configured with N<1, it means the resources waste.  *The configuration of configured grant resource for UE uplink small data transfer is contained in the RRCRelease message. Configuration is only type 1 CG with no contention resolution procedure for CG.* |

### 2.1.3 Final round discussion

According to the comments received so far, there is still a concern on mapping ratio N<1, so moderator suggests the following alternative proposal.

***Proposal 2.1b:***

* Mapping ratio of SSB to CG PUSCH is configured and same for all ~~per~~ CG configurations.
* For the candidate value set of SSB to CG PUSCH mapping ratio, support at least {1, 2, 4, 8, 16}
  + FFS {1/8,1/4,1/2}

Companies are encouraged to provide benefit of mapping ratio N<1 if you support that.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia, NSB | Support proposal 2.1b |
| Huawei, HiSi | Not support.  We don’t see the reason to have restriction on CG configurations. Prefer the previous one. For UE specific CG configuration the distribution of mapped POs to SSB does not necessary to be even. To keep the ratio applied within each CG config. is sufficient. |
| Ericsson3 | Mapping ratio in our understanding should be per CG configuration as the SSBs and CG PUSCH resources are also configured per CG configuration.  Fine to FFS the number of SSBs per CG PUSCH resource with values less than 1. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposal. We don’t support one SSB associated with multiple DMRS resources regardless of whether the relationship between SSB and PO is 1-to-many or many-to-1, which will cause unnecessary blind detection of the gNB. Besides, there is no need for different UEs to randomly select the DMRS resources to avoid resource collision since the CG PUSCH resources is per UE configured. |
| Moderator | It seems the controversial part is on the first bullet, from Moderator’s understanding, the choice of per CG configuration or per cell is about the RRC configuration, Samsung’s modification is a restriction in addition to per CG configuration, it can be discussed further, so Moderator suggests the following Proposal 2.1c:  ***Proposal 2.1c:***   * Mapping ratio of SSB to CG PUSCH is configured per CG configuration.   + FFS whether to restrict the same value for all CG configurations * For the candidate value set of SSB to CG PUSCH mapping ratio, support at least {1, 2, 4, 8, 16}   + FFS {1/8,1/4,1/2}   Any comments? |

## Multi-layer PUSCH transmission

Companies’ views from the submitted contributions are collected in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2108752](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108752.zip) Huawei[1] | ***Proposal 1:*** *Multi-layer PUSCH transmission is not supported for CG-SDT.* |
| [R1-2108752](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108752.zip) Spreadtrum [2] | ***Proposal 4: Multi-layer PUSCH transmission is not supported for CG-SDT in R17.*** |
| [R1-2108950](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108950.zip) vivo [3] | **Proposal 3: multi-layer PUSCH transmission is not supported for CG-SDT.** |
| [R1-2109026](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109026.zip) ZTE [4] | ***Proposal 2: Multi-layer PUSCH transmission is not supported for CG-SDT.*** |
| [R1-2109377](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109377.zip) Xiaomi [5] | **Proposal 9: Support only a single layer for small data transmission.** |
| [R1-2109590](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109590.zip) Intel [7] | **Proposal 7**   * *Multi-layer PUSCH transmission is not supported for CG-SDT.* |
| [R1-2109762](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109762.zip) Ericsson [9] | 1. Only single layer is supported for CG SDT in RRC inactive state, and DMRS configuration can be independent from multiple CG PUSCH occasion configurations. |
| [R1-2110012](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2110012.zip) Apple [13] | **Proposal 2: Multi-layer PUSCH transmission is not supported for CG-SDT.** |

### 2.2.1 First round discussion

8 companies mentioned the issue of multi-layer PUSCH transmission for CG-SDT, and they share same view that multi-layer PUSCH transmission is not supported.

The other remaining issue is whether there is any limitation on the DMRS configuration if multiple CG PUSCH occasions per CG period is supported. Moderator thinks it can be discussed once we reach a consensus on section 2.5.

***Discussion point #2.2***:

* Multi-layer PUSCH transmission is not supported for CG-SDT.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the FL proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with the FL proposal |
| Samsung | Fine. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Agree with the FL proposal |
| Ericsson1 | Fine. |
| Xiaomi | Agree. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with the FL proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree |
| vivo | Agree with the FL proposal |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |

### 2.2.2 Second round discussion

It seems all companies reach a consensus on this issue, so moderator would like to ask for email approval for the following proposal before the 1st check point.

***Proposal 2.2:***

* Multi-layer PUSCH transmission is not supported for CG-SDT.

Please provide comments only if you don’t agree with the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal of FL |
| Ericsson2 | Fine. |
| LG | We are fine with proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Agree |

## Repetitions

Companies’ views from the submitted contributions are collected in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2109026](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109026.zip) ZTE [4] | ***Proposal 3: For CG-SDT, the repetitions are considered as a bundle of transmission occasions that are mapped to the same SSB(s).*** |
| [R1-2109465](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109465.zip) Samsung [6] | ***Proposal 2: Configure the number of PUSCH transmission occasion (PO) in one CG-PUSCH period by re-interpreting the number of repetitions configured.***  ***Observation 1: the repetition in CG-SDT is not motivated.***  ***Proposal 3: the repletion in CG-SDT is not supported.*** |
| [R1-2109590](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109590.zip) Intel [7] | **Proposal 8**   * *Repetition of CG-PUSCH is supported.*    + *The repetitions are considered as a bundle of transmission occasions that are mapped to a same SSB.* |
| [R1-2110012](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2110012.zip) Apple [13] | **Proposal 4: Time domain repetition can be supported for CG-SDT.** |
| [R1-2110297](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2110297.zip) Nokia [15] | **Observation 1: When SDT-CG-PUSCH configuration is associated to an SSB, there is no additional SSB mapping complication when repetitions are allowed.**  **Proposal 1: Allow using PUSCH repetition with SDT-CG-PUSCH without any spec changes.**  **Observation 2: There is no obvious use case for PUSCH repetition with SDT**  **Proposal 2: If it is difficult to agree on the PUSCH repetition support, rather than continue discussion, conclude that PUSCH repetition is not supported with SDT.** |
|  |  |

### 2.3.1 First round discussion

5 companies mentioned repetitions, 4 companies[4][7][13][15] among them support repetitions and consider the repetitions as a bundle of transmission occasions that are mapped to the same SSB(s), no additional specification rule is needed, while one company[6] prefers to re-interpret the configured repetitions as PUSCH transmission occasions within a CG period. One company[15] also thinks that if it is difficult to agree on the PUSCH repetition support, rather than continue discussion, conclude that PUSCH repetition is not supported with SDT. The situation is unchanged from the last meeting, the moderator would suggest to make decision in this meeting since it has RRC impact.

***Discussion point 2.3***:

Down-select between the following three options for the interpretation of PUSCH repetition:

* Option 1: Re-interpret the configured repetitions as TDMed transmission occasions within a CG period.[6]
* Option 2: The repetitions are considered as a bundle of transmission occasions that are mapped to the same SSB(s), no additional specification rule is needed. [4][7][13][15]
* Option 3: PUSCH repetition is not supported for CG-SDT. [6][15]

Any preference and comments on above options?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We prefer Option 2 |
| Nokia, NSB | We prefer option 2. If no agreement is reached, then option 3 is the end result and we would prefer option 3 to save time, if reaching an agreement is prolonged. |
| Samsung | Thx FL for the summary.  Yes, it is indeed discussed a lot in last meeting, regarding the motivation to have repetition or not, but still given the CG-SDT is a prior SDT to be used only above certain RSRP threshold, we are failing to see why the repetition is needed. And support the repetition as a buddle will be problematic if option 2 supported. Thus our position is NO to option 2.  Preference is option 1, can live with option 3. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer Option 2 |
| Intel | We support Option 2. |
| Apple | We prefer Option 2. Repetition could relax the RSRP threshold, more users could get the benefits of the SDT. It’s network choice whether to setting repetition or not. |
| Ericsson1 | Option 2. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer Option 2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2. In RRC\_INACTIVE, UE’s TA may not be such accurate even though the TA is valid, so that the repetition is required to improve the PUSCH receiving performance. Also agree with Apple’s view. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option 2 |
| vivo | Option 2 |
| CATT | We prefer option 2. |

### 2.3.2 Second round discussion

The situation has not changed for several meetings, 11~~0~~ of 12~~1~~ companies support Option 2, but Samsung still has concern on supporting that. Since repetition has RRC impact and it’s not clear to me how to understand the situation if finally no agreement can be made on that.

***Proposal 2.3***:

Down-select among the following three options for the interpretation of PUSCH repetition for CG-SDT:

* Option 1: Re-interpret the configured repetitions as TDMed transmission occasions within a CG period.
  + Samsung
* Option 2: The repetitions are considered as a bundle of transmission occasions that are mapped to the same SSB(s), no additional specification rule is needed.
  + Qualcomm, Nokia, Spreadtrum, Intel, Apple, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Huawei, ZTE, vivo, CATT
* Option 3: PUSCH repetition is not supported for CG-SDT.
  + Samsung(2nd preference), Nokia(2nd preference)

It’s noticed that in RAN1#104bis-e meeting, we made the following conclusion:

**Conclusion:**

* It is RAN1’s common understanding that the CG configuration mechanism in licensed band can be reused for CG-SDT in principle.

If we finally can not get an explicit agreement on repetition, it may cause ambiguity with the above conclusion.

Companies are encouraged to provide suggestions on how to proceed. Or do you think it’s a better idea to directly ask Chairman to make decision?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We support Option 2. OK to ask for the guidance of Mr. Chairman |
| CATT | We suggest to go with majority companies’ views. |
| Samsung | I think FL mis-understand my point,  The first concern is the motivation, why do we need to support repetition?  The second level concern is the feasibility, we think randomly support it will cause problem, in last meeting, the compromised proposal was if gNB can ensure the same number of valid PO for each SSB.  So such conclusion did not reflects our concern. |
| Ericsson2 | Option2. |
| LG | We support Option 2. |
| Moderator | @ Samsung: The motivation I provide the previous conclusion is to remind the group that if we cannot agree on any of the options on repetitions, it may cause confusion on how to interpret the RRC parameter repK, so we have to make decision in this meeting. In first round, Apple and Huawei have provided their thoughts on the motivation to support repetition. As for the concern on the feasibility, we could also try the compromised proposal in the last meeting, but it seems other companies cannot accept that in last meeting, I’m not sure if the situation has changed. Do you have any suggestion on the wording of the proposal that has more chance to converge? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2, while we don’t mind asking Mr. Chair again but is it really such controversial? |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 2. Would be OK to ask chair’ guidance over email, but would be opposed of spending any GTW time on this as we have bigger issues to resolve. |
| Intel | We support Option 2. This is clearly majority view. |
| Samsung | Regarding the motivations, we read the so called motivations. But really, if we targeting to use repetition to ease the RSRP threshold, why would we even setting the RSRP threshold. The purpose of setting a threshold to limit only qualified UE to use CG-SDT, not to the other way around. To HW’s proposal, the repetition could help the TA inaccuracy is quite doubtful. Because as long as the time shift is out of CP, all the repetitions will be out of CP, the reconstruction of the FFT is anyway not accurate. If this is really an issue, certainly we are not seeking repetition to solve this.  Despite the argument of motivations, I am willing to compromise that such repetition is allowed. The bottle-line of my compromise is that the uneven number PUSCH per SSB should not exist in the system. Keep repeating saying support option 2 and it’s majority view did not help and not constructive anyway, and such a pity to see only emphasizing the majority view. We have been raising the error cases even from last meeting. So our compromise will be following:   * The K>1 repetitions are supported and considered as a bundle of transmission occasions that are mapped to the same SSB(s), ~~no additional specification rule is needed~~ when a consistent number of valid repetitions across different CG periods can be guaranteed for each associated SSB.   In addition, if we did not reach consensus, it only reflects the repetition feature is not supported for SDT, and such parameter will be ignored by SDT UE. |
| Xiaomi | Option 2 and don’t mind asking for the guidance of Mr. Chairman if necessary. |
| Apple | We support option 2. |

### 2.3.3 Final round discussion

From Moderator’s understanding, if we cannot reach a consensus, we cannot say repetition is naturally supported or not supported, so we have to make a decision. Samsung proposes the following compromised proposal, let’s try the last time to see if we can reach a consensus.

***Proposal 2.3a***:

* The K>1 repetitions are supported and considered as a bundle of transmission occasions that are mapped to the same SSB(s), ~~no additional specification rule is needed~~ when a consistent number of valid repetitions across different CG periods can be guaranteed for each associated SSB.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia, NSB | Support proposal 2.3a |
| Huawei, HiSi | Prefer original ***Proposal 2.3***. The restriction to network is not necessary. High reliability by ensuring actual rep is more for URLLC. We prefer not to turn back and forth again and again given clearly majority preference. |
| Ericsson3 | Original wording in option 2 is enough. How the duration of K repetitions is expected by UE is clear in current spec., no optimization is necessary. |
| Intel | We prefer original Proposal 2.3. This is clear majority. This is not a good exercise to ignore the majority view and only in favor of the proposal from a single company. |
| Apple | We also think Proposal 2.3 is enough. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer original option 2. Since multiple POs may be configured in one CG period,  it can’t limit repetitions across different CG periods. |
| Moderator | At least 5 companies don’t agree with Proposal 2.3a, so let’s go back to the original option 2 of Proposal 2.3 and ask for Mr.Chairman’s guidance  ***Proposal 2.3b***:   * The repetitions are considered as a bundle of transmission occasions that are mapped to the same SSB(s), no additional specification rule is needed. |

## Validation of PUSCH occasion

Companies’ views from the submitted contributions are collected in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2108752](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108752.zip) Huawei[1] | ***Observation 1:*** *PUSCH occasion validation for CG-SDT is not related to any RA procedure. The configuration may be overlapped while the UE would apply one procedure at a time.*  ***Proposal 2:***  *For unpaired spectrum, keep the existing agreements as CG-SDT PUSCH validation rules. For paired spectrum, all the CG-SDT PUSCH occasions are valid.* |
| [R1-2108752](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108752.zip) Spreadtrum [2] | ***Proposal 5: For the overlapping between PO and PRACH occasion or MsgA PO, PRACH occasion or MsgA PO has higher priority than SDT PO.*** |
| [R1-2108950](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108950.zip) vivo [3] | **Proposal 10: It is up to UE implementation to handle the overlapping between CG-PUSCH occasions for CG-SDT and any valid PRACH occasion or MsgA PUSCH occasion.** |
| [R1-2109762](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109762.zip) Ericsson [9] | 1. A CG PUSCH occasion is not valid if it overlaps in time and frequency with any valid PRACH occasion associated with either a Type-1 random access procedure or a Type-2 random access procedurestate. 2. Further discuss in RAN1 on whether CG SDT can be allowed on flexible symbols when UE is in RRC inactive state. 3. If CG SDT is only allowed in uplink symbols, additional UE specific TDD uplink downlink configuration should be supported in RRC release message. 4. To support CG SDT in flexible symbols, *enableConfiguredUL* can be configured in RRC release message. 5. There’s no need to define validation rules for CG PUSCH for SDT for paried spectrum or for HD FDD. |

### 2.4.1 First round discussion

4 companies mentioned the remaining issues on validation rule of CG PUSCH occasion, companies’ views are split on how to handle the overlapping between CG PUSCH occasion and PRACH occasion or MsgA PUSCH occasion. For paired spectrum, 2 companies mentioned that there is no need to define validation rules.

***Discussion point #2.4***

* For paired spectrum or HD FDD, all the CG-SDT PUSCH occasions are valid.
* Down-select among the following 2 options:
  + Option 1: It is up to UE implementation to handle the overlapping between CG-PUSCH occasions for CG-SDT and any valid PRACH occasion or MsgA PUSCH occasion.
  + Option 2: A CG PUSCH occasion is not valid if it overlaps with any valid PRACH occasion or MsgA PUSCH occasion.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | For the first bullet,   * all the CG-SDT PUSCH occasions are valid for UE operating in FD-FDD. * for UE operating in HD-FDD, we can follow the decision/rule made in R17 RedCap WI (under discussion in RAN1#106b).   For the 2nd bullet, we are not sure when the UE needs to handle such “overlapping” after the type of SDT procedure is selected by UE. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree on the 1st main bullet  Support option 2 for the 2nd main bullet to avoid CG-PUSCH collisions with PRACH transmissions of other UEs. |
| Samsung | First seems fine, as for the suggestion from Qualcom, we’d like to see what is the exactly decision or rules. Although we know HD-FDD might be discussed in Redcap, but sometimes, totally reuse should be carefully checked first.  Second one, does it still target for HD-FDD users? Our assumption is not.  Given 2step RACH is R16 feature, and for a UE supports 2step RACH, might not support SDT. So for BC purpose, we think option2 should be adopted, and one minor change is “valid MsgA PUSCH occasion”. |
| Spreadtrum | Share the similar view as QC |
| Intel | It seems first and second bullet are contradictory. If we agree with option 2 in the second bullet, we can not claim that all CG-SDT PUSCH occasions are valid.  Also for HD FDD, suggest to defer the discussion once decision is made in RedCap.  For the 2nd bullet, we prefer Option 2 as it follows MsgA PO validation rule. |
| Apple | For the first bullet, HD FDD can be checked further after the progress in RedCap.  For second bullet, Option 2 is preferred. |
| Ericsson1 | Fine for first main bullet, option 2 and fine with the updates from Samsung as well. |
| Xiaomi | Since there are common ROs for all UEs in the initial uplink BWP, there shouldn’t be conflict between the uplink CG-SDT transmission of one UE and the PRACH transmission of another UE. So, the collision between the RO and PO should be resolved and option 2 is preferred by us. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with the first bullet.  For the second bullet, we support Option 1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree on the 1st main bullet and Option 2 of second main bullet. |
| Vivo | Agree with the first bullet.  For the second bullet, we support Option 1. |
| CATT | We agree with the comment from Intel that the first bullet contradicts with the second sub-bullet of the second bullet.  For the second bullet, we would like to clarify whether overlapping here refers to overlapping in time only or overlapping REs? If it is the latter, we prefer option 2. |

### 2.4.2 Second round discussion

Based on the comments in the 1st round discussion, it seems HD FDD can be further checked after the decision is made in RedCap WI.

For the second bullet, for the question why UE needs to handle the collision, it has been explained by Nokia and Xiaomi that CG-PUSCH may collide with PRACH transmissions of other UEs. Companies’ views are summarized as below:

* Down-select among the following 2 options:
  + Option 1: It is up to UE implementation to handle the overlapping between CG-PUSCH occasions for CG-SDT and any valid PRACH occasion or MsgA PUSCH occasion.
    - Huawei, vivo
  + Option 2: A CG PUSCH occasion is not valid if it overlaps with any valid PRACH occasion or MsgA PUSCH occasion.
    - Nokia, Samsung, Intel, Apple, Ericsson, Xiaomi, ZTE, CATT

It seems majority companies prefer Option 2. Then moderator would like to check if the following proposal is agreeable. Samsung’s revision is also reflected.

***Proposal 2.4:***

* No need to define validation rule specific for paired spectrum.
* A CG PUSCH occasion is not valid if it overlaps with any valid PRACH occasion or valid MsgA PUSCH occasion.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | The two bullets are contradictory for FDD.  For the 2nd bullet, shall we say a CG-SDT UE is not expected to be configured with a CG PUSCH occasion, which overlaps with valid PRACH/msgA PUSCH occasion ? |
| CATT | The first bullet is not quite clear to us. In addition, it is not clear to us what kind of RedCap discussion/conclusion would be relevant here.  We agree with the second bullet but would like to clarify that overlap refers to overlap in time and frequency, but no overlap in time only. |
| Samsung | Some minor modifications. These two can be separated proposals, because companies now think second one is also for FDD, or HD-FDD. But I think it is a general new rule.   * No need to define validation rule specific for HD-FDD operation. ~~Paired spectrum.~~ * For both paired and unpaired pectrum, a CG PUSCH occasion is not valid if it overlaps with any valid PRACH occasion or valid MsgA PUSCH occasion. |
| Ericsson2 | Fine. |
| Moderator | It seems the first bullet causes confusion. We may drop it at this time. According to the suggestions above, the proposal is updated as:  ***Proposal 2.4a:***   * For paired and unpaired spectrum, UE is not expected to be configured with a CG PUSCH occasion which overlaps with valid PRACH/msgA PUSCH occasion   Companies are encouraged to comment on Proposal 2.4 and 2.4a. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | FFS. The issue for redcap UEs can be discussed later after the relevant RedCap discussion/conclusion is stable. But for non-redcap UEs, we still think the all the CG-SDT PUSCH occasions are valid because there is only one SDT procedure at the same time between RA/CG-SDT thus no relationship between PUSCH for CG-SDT and PRACH for RA-SDT.   * For paired spectrum ~~or HD FDD~~ for non-RedCap UEs, all the CG-SDT PUSCH occasions are valid.   + FFS the case for redcap UEs |
| Nokia, NSB | Not OK with proposal 2.4a. We understood proposal 2.4 to mean that   * No UL/DL pattern type of validation rule for FDD, while the one agreed in RAN1#106 applies for TDD * For both FDD and TDD: A CG PUSCH occasion is not valid if it overlaps with any valid PRACH occasion or valid MsgA PUSCH occasion. |
| Intel | We prefer the original second bullet in Proposal 2.4, but not 2.4a. It is similar validation rule as defined for MsgA PUSCH occasions.  A CG PUSCH occasion is not valid if it overlaps with any valid PRACH occasion or valid MsgA PUSCH occasion. |
| Samsung | Share the view as Intel, it’s a validation rule, not gNB scheduling to avoid. |
| Xiaomi | The second bullet should be supported for both paired and unpaired spectrum. |
| Apple | Proposal 2.4 is the option 2, proposal 2.4a has the same meaning with option 1.  We support **Proposal 2.4**, this is discussing the validation rule, not the dropping rule. |

### 2.4.3 Final round discussion

It seems companies have different understanding of this proposal, so Moderator suggests to separately discuss the 2 bullets.

For the 1st bullet, it’s about the validation rule of FDD, it seems companies have the same understanding that there is no need to define UL/DL pattern type of validation for FDD at least for non-RedCap UE. So the following conclusion is provided:

***Conclusion 2.4:***

* No need to define UL/DL pattern type of validation rule specific for paired spectrum at least for non-RedCap UEs.
  + FFS the case for RedCap UEs

As for the 2nd bullet, it’s about how to handle the overlapping between CG PUSCH and valid PRACH/MsgA PUSCH occasion, it’s clear it’s for both TDD and FDD, and the overlapping is in time and frequency domain by default. From Moderator’s understanding, there are 3 different kinds of opinions on this issue according to the comments:

Alt 1) UE is not expected to be configured with a CG PUSCH occasion which overlaps with valid PRACH/msgA PUSCH occasion. (Proposal 2.4a)

* There is no validation issue with this, UE will not be configured with overlapping CG resources with PRACH/MsgA PUSCH occasion through gNB scheduling.

Alt 2) A CG PUSCH occasion is not valid if it overlaps with any valid PRACH occasion or valid MsgA PUSCH occasion. (Proposal 2.4)

* UE can be configured with overlapping CG resources, but these resources are invalid and cannot be mapped to SSBs. Another question, if some of the CG occasions in an association period overlap with PRACH /MsgA PUSCH occasion, is there any issues on mapping?

Alt 3) It is up to UE implementation to handle the overlapping between CG-PUSCH occasions for CG-SDT and any valid PRACH occasion or MsgA PUSCH occasion. (Original Option 1)

* UE can be configured with overlapping CG resources, and these resources are valid and can be mapped to SSBs, UE can decide whether to select these overlapping CG PUSCH to transmit.

Companies are encouraged to check whether Moderator’s understanding on these 3 alternatives is correct, and indicate which one if preferred.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia, NSB | OK with Conclusion 2.4  We prefer Alt 2) Proposal 2.4 over Alt 1) proposal 2.4a as it may not always be possible to provide the desired periodicity for CG-PUSCH occasions without occasionally colliding with PRACH, while it would be preferrable that CG-PUSCH that overlaps (in time and frequency) with a PRACH RO would never send PUSCH so that collisions with other UEs are avoided.  The Alt 3) “left up to UE implementation” doesn’t help as one UE with CG-PUSCH but no PRACH would not know if another UE is transmitting PRACH at the same time in the same REs. |
| Ericsson3 | Since for MsgA PUSCH validation we have:   |  | | --- | | A PUSCH occasion is valid if it does not overlap in time and frequency with any valid PRACH occasion associated with either a Type-1 random access procedure or a Type-2 random access procedure. |   So, at least for collision with PRACH occasions, we can have similar rule for CG PUSCH validation in RRC inactive state.   |  | | --- | | A CG PUSCH occasion for small data transmission is valid if it does not overlap in time and frequency with any valid PRACH occasion associated with either a Type-1 random access procedure or a Type-2 random access procedure. |   For collision with MsgA PUSCH, we’re fine to leave it up to implementation or same rule for MsgA PUSCH and CG type 1 PUSCH in RRC connected state is enough. |
| Intel | We prefer Proposal 2.4.  We should capture the same thing for MsgA PUSCH as mentioned by Ericsson. |
| Apple | We are fine with conclusion 2.4 and prefer Proposal 2.4. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer proposal 2.4. |
| Moderator | ***Proposal 2.4:***   * A CG PUSCH occasion is not valid if it overlaps with any valid PRACH occasion or valid MsgA PUSCH occasion.   Any comments? |

## Multiple CG occasions per CG period

Companies’ views from the submitted contributions are collected in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2108950](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108950.zip) vivo [3] | **Proposal 4: For CG-SDT, multiple TDMed and/or FDMed CG PUSCH occasions in one CG period can be configured.** |
| [R1-2109377](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109377.zip) Xiaomi [5] | **Proposal 3: Support multiple POs configured in a configured grant period.** |
| [R1-2109465](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109465.zip) Samsung [6] | ***Proposal 2: Configure the number of PUSCH transmission occasion (PO) in one CG-PUSCH period by re-interpreting the number of repetitions configured.*** |
| [R1-2109590](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109590.zip) Intel [7] | **Proposal 6**   * *For the association between SSBs and CG-PUSCH resources*   + *N 1 is supported.*   + *Do not support N < 1.*   + *Candidate values of N can be {1,2,4}* * *Multiple PUSCH occasions in a CG-PUSCH period are supported for a CG-PUSCH configuration.* |
| [R1-2109762](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109762.zip) Ericsson [9] | 1. Multiple CG PUSCH occasions in time and/or frequency domain can be configured per CG period for SDT in RRC inactive state. 2. Only single layer is supported for CG SDT in RRC inactive state, and DMRS configuration can be independent from multiple CG PUSCH occasion configurations. |
| [R1-2110012](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2110012.zip) Apple [13] | **Proposal 3: Multiple CG PUSCH occasions per CG period is not supported.** |

### 2.5.1 First round discussion

5 companies[3][5][6][7][9] support multiple CG PUSCH occasions per CG period, while 1 company[13] does not support multiple CG PUSCH occasions per CG period. Moderator encourages other companies to provide their views on whether to support multiple CG occasions per CG period.

As for how to support multiple CG occasions per CG period, one company[6] prefers to reinterpret repetitions as PUSCH transmission occasions, moderator would also like to ask other proponents to provide details on how to configure multiple CG occasions per CG period. Companies are also encouraged to clarify the corresponding spec impact, especially RRC impact because it’s better to make decision on the RRC related issues in this meeting.s

***Discussion point#2.5***

* Whether and how to support multiple CG occasions per CG period.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | OK to study |
| Nokia, NSB | OK a discussion point, but quick convergence would be needed for this to still make it. |
| Samsung | Ideally, it can be studied.  But given the time left for SDT, we don’t see much hope for this.  On one hand, we do see it could be beneficial by having multiple PO in one period, this is like multiple RO in one RACH period. However, the proposals to use additional signaling is not acceptable to us.  Thus, we can live with no multiple CG occasions. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| Intel | We support multiple CG occasions per CG period to allow more resources and reduce latency for CG-SDT operation.  Given that there is clearly the majority support, it is not clear to us why we cannot try to move forward to make proposal for this? |
| Apple | Considering the standard impacts, multiple POs per CG period are not supported. |
| Ericsson1 | Fine to support multiple CG PUSCH occasions when multiple time frequency resources are preferred than multiple DMRS resources in each CG period. RRC parameters needed may be number of POs FDMed and the number of POs TDMed on top of the configurations for time frequency resource allocation of the first PO. |
| Xiaomi | We support multiple CG occasions per CG period and share the same view as Ericsson that Both TDM and FDM can be applied. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If single PUSCH occasion with multiple DMRS is interpreted as multiple CG occasions, we support it. Otherwise we suggest to further study it, as multiple PUSCH occasion may introduce specification impact. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Supporting multiple CG occasions per CG period may require additional signaling such as TDMed and FDMed number. Latency issue can be addressed by configuring multiple DMRS resource, so considering that there is only 1 meeting left in RAN1, we think multiple CG occasions per CG period is not necessary. |
| vivo | We support multiple CG occasions per CG period |
| CATT | Although we understand the motivation, given the divergent views on how to support it, we prefer not to support it in Rel-17. |
| Nokia, NSB | We have a preference for multiple CG occasions per CG period to be supported, but it may be difficult to achieve in practice with the time available for us. So unless we can agree to this with relative ease, we should drop this direction. |

### 2.5.2 Second round discussion

According to the comments received so far, companies’ views are quite split. Some companies think that multiple CG occasions per CG period could reduce latency, some other companies mentioned that multiple DMRS resources can alleviate latency issue as well. Several companies commented that the spec impact and RRC impact is quite large.

Companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* Whether to support multiple CG occasions per CG period
  + Support: Samsung, Intel, Ericsson, Xiaomi, vivo
    - Reasons: Reduce latency
  + Not support: Apple, ZTE, Samsung(can live with), CATT
    - Reasons: Standard impact, additional RRC signaling,
  + FFS: Qualcomm, Nokia, Spreadtrum(?), Huawei
* How to support multiple CG occasions per CG period
  + Re-interpret repetitions as multiple PUSCH transmission occasions
    - Support: Samsung
    - Not support:
  + Introduce additional RRC signaling, such as TDMed POs, FDMed POs
    - Support: Ericsson, Xiaomi
    - Not support: Samsung

Moderator thinks that quick convergence should be made, if we support multiple CG occasions per CG period, we also need to make decision on the configuration of CG occasions due to the RRC impact, so companies are encouraged to provide more specific solutions and benefits to convince each other.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | In our view, the major motivation for CG-SDT is UE power saving and signaling overhead reduction.  Latency reduction is secondary, which can be achieved by configuring a shorter CG period and/or a larger resource size. |
| Samsung | If we can do it without too much effort, e.g., Re-interpret repetitions as multiple PUSCH transmission occasions; we can do it.  Otherwise, we can drop it. |
| Ericsson2 | Regarding the signaling overhead, we do not really see that introducing 2 parameters to define multiple POs per CG period will be a big deal.  Regarding the benefits, with multiple POs supported per CG period, all SSBs can be mapped once quickly within one CG period or within a smaller number of CG periods, which is more important when more SSBs are configured.  Anyway, this multiple PO configuration doesn’t preclude single PO configuration, so we slightly prefer to allow network to configure multiple POs in each CG period for SDT. |
| LG | We do not support multiple CG occasions per CG period. |
| Intel | We support multiple POs for CG-PUSCH configuration. The design can simply reuse what was designed for MsgA PUSCH occasions, which does not need much spec effort. |
| Apple | Don’t support multiple CG occasions. And agree with Qualcomm, the current CG configuration provided various periodicity from 2symobl to 5120 slots. it’s equivalent to configure multiple CG ocassion with shorter CG-SDT periodicity. It’s redundant to define multiple with addition standard effort and implementation change. |

### 2.5.3 Final round discussion

According to the comments received so far, some companies do not support multiple CG occasions per CG period, and for companies that support multiple CG occasions per CG period, they have different opinions on the configuration of multiple CG occasions per CG period.

Given the split views, Moderator suggests to continue the discussion to see if there is any chance to converge.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia, NSB | As said above, we have a slight preference for supporting multiple CG occasions per CG period and would be OK to define support for it. |
| Ericsson3 | Support multiple CG PO configurations per CG period similar to multiple PO configurations for MsgA PUSCH and the gap is not necessary. Single PO per CG period is covered by this. |
| Intel | We support multiple POs for CG-PUSCH configuration. The design can simply reuse what was designed for MsgA PUSCH occasions. |
| Apple | We don’t see the strong motivation to support multiple CG occasions in a CG configuration. |
| Xiaomi | Support multiple CG PO configurations per CG period, which is benefit for URLLC services when SDT repetition is configured. |

## Other mapping issues

Companies’ views from the submitted contributions are collected in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2109762](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109762.zip) Ericsson [9] | 1. When multiple CG PUSCH configurations are configured, additional information from UE is required by the gNB to determine the SSB associated to the UL data received on an overlapping PUSCH resource configured by multiple CG configurations. 2. A UE specific TDRA list for CG PUSCH resource allocation in RRC inactive state should be configured in RRC release message. Which TDRA list or table to select for CG SDT can be based on predetermined rules when multiple TDRA lists or tables are available. |
| [R1-2109465](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109465.zip) Samsung [6] | ***Proposal 1: in case of the SSB set indication is absent, the UE determines the SSB(s) associated with the CG-PUSCH by one of the following***   1. ***Associating to all the indicated SSB in the SIB1*** 2. ***Determine the SSB according to the sequential order of CG-PUSCH configuration lists*** |
|  |  |

### 2.6.1 First round discussion

The following mapping related issues are summarized based on the submitted contributions:

Issue 2.7-1 Default SSB subset if not indicated [6]

Issue 2.7-2 UE specific TDRA table in RRC inactive state [9]

Issue 2.7-3 SSB determination based on overlapped PUSCH resource in multiple CG configuration [9]

These issues are proposed by single company, so moderator would suggest companies to provide views on these issues to identify which one is critical. Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia, NSB | 2.7-1: Default should be all SSBs  2.7-2: Not sure if this is necessary, but open to discuss  2.7-3: Not sure if there is a necessity to have any specific action specified. Fully overlapped in time and frequency would need a statement that one is selected in random. Partially overlapped should be a non-issue. |
| Samsung | We think all SSBs in SIB1 as default should be simple and effective. |
| Apple | 2.7-1: ok  2.7-2: *timeDomainAllocation* in *ConfiguredGrantConfig* seems enough.  2.7-3: according to our understanding, network configuration can avoid the issue. |
| Ericsson1 | One minor comment: this section should be 2.6.x instead.  -1: we also think that they should be all actually transmitted SSBs configured by SIB1.  -2: this is needed since this is in RRC inactive state and if only SIB1 configured TDRA table is used, it will be too restrictive for CG SDT. Note that dynamic repetition of CG PUSCH is only supported in dedicated TDRA list.  -3: when 2 POs from different CG configurations are fully overlapping, which CG configuration is used for actual transmission may be needed if the SSBs mapped to the 2 different CG configurations are different, otherwise gNB doesn’t know which SSB should be assumed. E.g. the rule can be introduced requiring that the CG configuration with lowest CG configuration index is always assumed to be used for this overlapping case. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | With lower priority to discuss |

### 2.6.2 Second round discussion

Regarding the default SSBs, 3 companies show similar views, so moderator would like to check if companies can reach a consensus on this issue. The typo mentioned by Ericsson is fixed.

***Proposal 2.6:***

* When SSB set indication is absent, UE assumes the SSB set includes all actually transmitted SSBs configured by SIB1.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Samsung | Ok |
| Ericsson2 | Fine. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support. |
| Apple | OK |

# SDT related procedures

## Search space

Companies’ views from the submitted contributions are collected in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2108752](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108752.zip) Huawei[1] | ***Proposal 4:*** *RAN1 confirms the UE-specific search space is configured for UEs performing CG-SDT.* |
| [R1-2108752](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108752.zip) Spreadtrum [2] | ***Proposal 2: The CORESET associated to the search space set for monitoring the PDCCH addressed to the C-RNTI after successful completion of the RACH procedure during RA-SDT is a common CORESET.*** |
| [R1-2108950](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108950.zip) vivo [3] | **Proposal 8: RAN1 confirms the following working assumption, i.e. UE-specific search space is configured for UEs performing CG-SDT.** |
| [R1-2109026](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109026.zip) ZTE [4] | ***Proposal 5: Since a separate common search space for RA-SDT is supported, a new type should be defined in TS 38.213, such as Type4-PDCCH CSS set.***  ***Proposal 6: Confirm the RAN2 WA that UE-specific search space is configured for UEs performing CG-SDT.*** |
| [R1-2109590](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109590.zip) Intel [7] | **Proposal 9**   * *RAN1 to confirm the working assumption that UE-specific search space is configured for UEs performing CG-SDT.* * *RAN1 to confirm that CG-SDT resource can be configured on either initial BWP or separate SDT BWP.* |
| [R1-2109771](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109771.zip) Sony [10] | **Proposal 2: RAN1 to discuss whether CSS or USS is suitable for UEs performing CG-SDT.**  **Proposal 6: Confirm the RAN2 agreement as follows:**   * **The separate search space is common to the UEs performing RA-SDT.** * **If the separate SearchSpace is not configured, type-1 PDCCH CSS can be reused.**   **Proposal 7: A separate CORESET should be configured for the UEs performing RA-SDT and if the separate CORESET is not configured, CORESET#0 should be reused.** |
| [R1-2109911](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109911.zip) Interdigital [11] | ***Proposal 1: Confirm working assumption that UE-specific search space is configured for UEs performing CG-SDT*** |
| [R1-2109960](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109960.zip) LGE [12] | ***Proposal 3: UE-specific search space for UEs performing CG-SDT can be configured in the separate DL SDT BWP.*** |

### 3.1.1 First round discussion

6 companies[1][3][4][7][11][12] suggest to confirm the RAN2 working assumption that UE-specific search space is configured for UEs performing CG-SDT. One company[4] mentions that since a separate common search space for RA-SDT is supported, a new type should be defined in TS 38.213, such as Type4-PDCCH CSS set. One company[2] mentions that the CORESET for UE performing RA-SDT should be a common CORESET, another company[10] thinks a separate CORESET should be configured for RA-SDT, and it is noticed that there is an remaining FFS on whether it should be UE specific CORESET or common CORESET for RA-SDT in RAN1#104-e, so moderator would also to check companies’ views on this issue.

***Discussion point 3.1***:

* RAN1 confirms the working assumption in RAN2 that UE-specific search space is configured for UEs performing CG-SDT.
* A new type of common search space set should be defined in TS 38.213 for RA-SDT, such as Type4-PDCCH CSS set.
* CORESET for UE performing RA-SDT should be a common CORESET.
  + Whether to define separate CORESET for RA-SDT

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | * For UE performing CG-SDT in the initial BWP, both USS and CSS can be configured. * For RA-SDT, a new type of CSS associated with a common CORESET can be specified for the UE operating in initial BWP. |
| Nokia, NSB | RAN1 can confirm that UE specific SS can be configured for CG-SDT.  New CSS type for RA-SDT may be needed, but this would seem to require increase in # of search spaces the UE supporting SDT is required to be able to handle. |
| InterDigital | Support the bullets above. Please note the wording used by RAN2 is “UE-specific search space is configured”. |
| Samsung | First and third ones are fine.  Second one is not needed, from RAN1 discussion point of view, support a separate search space is enough, we don’t need to say whether it’s type 4 or sth. It should be upto the editor. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| Intel | First bullet is fine.  We do not think second bullet is needed.  We support main bullet in the 3rd bullet and we do not think separate CORESET for RA-SDT is needed. |
| Apple | Ok to confirm the working assumption in RAN2.  Clarify the third bullet that the common CORESET is CORESET#0 |
| Ericsson1 | Fine. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | fine |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Fine |
| vivo | Agree with 1st and 3rd bullets.  Not clear for 2nd bullet. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposals. |

### 3.1.2 Second round discussion

It seems no company shows objection to confirm the working assumption in RAN2. It’s also noted that BWP discussion is under another section, so it is better to concentrate on search space discussion here. Some companies mentioned that the second bullet is not needed and can be decided by editor to define which kind of CSS type. As for the 3rd bullet, the common CORESET does not need to be restricted to CORESET#0 from moderator’s understanding. So the following proposal is provided for 2nd round discussion.

***Proposal 3.1***

* RAN1 confirms the working assumption in RAN2 that UE-specific search space is configured for UEs performing CG-SDT.
* CORESET for UE performing RA-SDT should be a common CORESET.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We have concerns for the 1st bullet on USS configuration. A CG PUSCH occasion can be associated with multiple SSB index/beams. If a USS is configured for CG-SDT UE only, it is unclear to us which SSB will be the QCL source of the unicast PDCCH. To solve this issue, CSS is a more appropriate choice.  The second bullet of FL proposal is fine for us. |
| Samsung |  |
| Ericsson2 | Fine.  The UE specific search space in CG SDT in our understanding is mainly used for monitoring PDCCH scheduling retransmission of SDT, subsequent SDT and MAC Ces (e.g. with TAC). |
| LG | We are fine with the proposal 3.1. |
| Moderator | @Qualcomm From my understanding, UE can assume the UE selected SSB as the QCL source of PDCCH as commented by other companies in section 4.2. I don’t quite understand your concern on USS, could you clarify a bit more?  I’d like to hear more views from other companies on Qualcomm’s concern. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine. We think the case is close to UE in RRC connected state such that no ambiguous. |
| Nokia, NSB | We’d be fine with the proposal 3.., but would prefer stating that USS can be configured rather than ~~is configured.~~ Did not quite understand Qualcomm concern. |
| InterDigital | Fine with the proposal 3.1 |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. We also do not think QCL assumption is linked to CSS or USS. |
| Apple | Ok with the proposal. |

## L1 feedback

Companies’ views from the submitted contributions are collected in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2108752](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108752.zip) Huawei[1] | ***Observation 2:*** *Implicit ACK mechanism for CG-SDT suffers from the risk of degraded reliability due to inaccurate TA/channel state information in INACTIVE state, and the subsequent data transmission may be resumed after a relatively long time, which is against UE power saving motivation.*  ***Observation 3:*** *Explicit ACK helps UE’s power saving by reduced PDCCH monitoring.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Support**explicit L1-ACK for CG-SDT considering both channel state achievement and UE’s power saving in RRC\_INACTIVE. The existing L1 feedback mechanism in LTE PUR and NR R15/16 CG specification can be referred to, including HARQ-ACK indication, TPC command and TA adjustment for subsequent CG-SDT.* |
| [R1-2108950](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108950.zip) vivo [3] | **Proposal 9: For CG-SDT, UL grant scheduling subsequent transmission can be used for the feedback response to CG-SDT transmission, i.e. Option 1B.** |
| [R1-2109026](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109026.zip) ZTE [4] | ***Proposal 7: From RAN1’s perspective, the existing DFI mechanism can be reused for the feedback of CG-SDT in subsequent transmission.*** |
| [R1-2109377](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109377.zip) Xiaomi [5] | **Proposal 6: Don’t support any additional explicit L1 feedback signaling for CG-SDT.** |
| [R1-2109590](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109590.zip) Intel [7] | **Proposal 10**   * *RAN1 to confirm that existing L1 mechanism can be reused for feedback of CG-PUSCH transmission during CG-SDT.* |
| [R1-2109727](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109727.zip) Sierra Wireless [8] | 1. L1 ACK is more spectrally efficient and lowers UE power consumption vs L2 ACK 2. L1 UL grant for retransmission is more spectrally efficient and lowers UE power consumption 3. L1 NACK lowers UE power consumption and reduces latency when a failure to detect occurs 4. When the CG-SDT is decoded, an explicit HARQ-ACK including TPC command and additional TA adjustments is supported as feedback 5. When the CG-SDT is not decoded, an explicit HARQ-NACK including TPC command and additional TA adjustments is supported as feedback 6. When the CG-SDT is detected but failed to be decoded, an UL grant is used to schedule retransmissions. 7. RAN1 confirms the support of L1 feedback (ACK/NACK/UL Grant) for CG-SDT to RAN2 |
| [R1-2109771](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109771.zip) Sony [10] | **Proposal 3: RAN1 to discuss whether L1 feedback for CG-PUSCH is implicit based on *configuredGrantTimer* or explicit HARQ-ACK mechanism.**  **Proposal 4: RAN1 to discuss the following options for the resource of UL HARQ-ACK feedback:**   1. PUCCH resource is configured for the UE just before moving to Inactive state, that is RRC Release messge. 2. CG-PUSCH is used for carrying the HARQ-ACK for the DL SDT. |
| [R1-2109911](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109911.zip) Interdigital [11] | ***Observation: RAN2 already agreed on retransmission by dynamic grant and CS-RNTI-based retransmission for CG-SDT.***  ***Proposal 3: Confirm RAN2 assumption that existing L1 mechanism (DFI) can be used for CG-SDT.*** |

### 3.2.1 First round discussion

8 companies[1][3][4][5][7][8][10][11] mentioned the L1 feedback issue, and companies’ views are quite split. The following options are copied from last meeting:

-        **Option 1**: Support explicit L1 feedback for CG-SDT.

   **Option 1A**: Reuse DFI based mechanism as introduced in Rel-16 NR-U [1][4][7][8][11]

  **Option 1B:** Use UL grant scheduling DG-PUSCH with same HARQ process ID as CG-SDT PUSCH[3]

-       **Option 2**: Explicit ACK is not supported for CG-SDT. Reuse Rel-15 CG re-transmission for CG-SDT[5]

One company[11] observes that retransmission based on dynamic grant has already been agreed in RAN2, and the only issue left is whether DFI mechanism can be used for CG-SDT.

***Discussion point #3.2***

* Confirm RAN2 assumption that existing L1 mechanism can be used for CG-SDT.
* Whether CG-DFI mechanism can be reused for CG-SDT retransmission.
  + Whether additional TA adjustments can be included

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | OK to discuss |
| Nokia, NSB | The meaning of “existing” seems somewhat debatable. Importing features specified for NR-U only cannot be considered as “existing” for licensed operation. RAN1 should confirm the RAN2 WA with the clarification that features existing to NR-U only are not considered existing in licensed operation context.  CG-DFI cannot be reused as it doesn’t “exist” for licensed operation. It would be possible to discuss introducing it, but we don’t see the need. |
| InterDigital | RAN2 already agreed on retransmission by dynamic grant. Clearly, RAN2 considers that “existing mechanism” includes DFI and is only asking RAN1 if there is any issue with their assumption that it can be reused for CG-SDT. So far, it does not look anyone in RAN1 identified a real issue. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| Intel | We are fine to confirm RAN2 assumption that existing L1 mechanism can be used for CG-SDT  We are okay to support CG-DFT as HARQ-ACK feedback.  We also support to use UL grant scheduling DG-PUSCH with same HARQ process ID. |
| Ericsson1 | Existing HARQ feedback for CG Type 1 PUSCH for operation in licensed spectrum is enough. |
| Sierra Wireless | We are Ok to discuss. As mentioned above, RAN2 has already agreed to support retransmissions based on dynamic grant, now RAN1 can discuss introducing the CG-DFI to licensed operation. |
| Xiaomi | We don’t see the need to introduce additional explicit L1 feedback signaling for CG-SDT. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with first bullet.  For the second bullet, CG-DFI mechanism can be reused and additional TA adjustments can be included. The CG-DFI mechanism should also be considered as an ‘existing’ mechanism although it is for NR-U for the CG in RRC\_CONNECTED. Companies who are not sure on this may check with RAN2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree to confirm RAN2 assumption that CG-DFI mechanism can be reused for CG-SDT. |
| Vivo | We prefer Option 1B |
| CATT | We share the same view as Nokia and Ericsson that CG-DFI is not needed. |
|  |  |

### 3.2.2 Second round discussion

As some companies mentioned, RAN2 has already agreed to support retransmissions based on dynamic grant.

As discussed in RAN2, even with dynamic grant based retransmission, there would be a case that the gNB does not receive initial CG transmission, then after the *configuredGrantTimer* exceeds, the UE will regard the transmission as successful, it will cause ambiguity between UE and gNB. The necessity can be discussed in RAN2, we should focus on whether there is an feasibility issue in RAN1 to reuse CG-DFI mechanism for CG-SDT.

So far, moderator hasn’t seen any technical issues to reuse CG-DFI mechanism for CG-SDT.

***Conclusion 3.2***

* It is RAN1’s common understanding that dynamic grant based retransmission has already been supported.

***Proposal 3.2***

* From RAN1’s perspective, it’s feasible to reuse CG-DFI mechanism for CG-SDT.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | OK with the conclusion.  No strong view on the FL proposal. |
| Sony | Fine to have an explicit feedback |
| CATT | We do not think CG-DFI is needed. Our understanding of proposal 3.2 is that no additional information is assumed to be added in the CG-DFI in Rel-16. |
| Ericsson2 | There’s no need to support DFI for SDT. Retransmission mechanism for CG Type 1 in NR Rel-16 for operation in licensed spectrum is enough. |
| LG | We do not support proposal 3.2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with the Conclusion 3.2 and Proposal 3.2 |
| Nokia, NSB | OK with the conclusion 3.2  Not OK with proposal 3.2, we don’t think we need to take this agreement as we don’t see the need for DFI for SDT. |
| InterDigital | Fine with the Conclusion 3.2 and Proposal 3.2.  Please note that RAN2 did not ask RAN1 if they see the need, but only if a technical issue exists. |
| Intel | We are fine with conclusion and proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Don’t support proposal 3.2. |
| Apple | Ok with the conclusion and proposal. Wording update on conclusion,  It is RAN1’s common understanding that dynamic grant based retransmission for CG-SDT has already been supported. |

### 3.2.3 Final round discussion

Moderator thinks the wording update from Apple on the conclusion should be fine, so I think it’s stable for email approval.

Companies still cannot reach a consensus on whether CG-DFI is needed, but no one has raised a technical issue. So the following alternative proposal is provided to address companies’ concern on the necessity.

***Proposal 3.2a***

* From RAN1’s perspective, it’s feasible to reuse CG-DFI mechanism for CG-SDT, but no consensus on whether CG-DFI is needed.

If you don’t agree with the proposal, please indicate your technical concern on the feasibility to reuse the CG-DFI.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Noki, NSB | We’d be OK with proposal 3.2a in principle, but would suggest a reformulation   * From RAN1’s perspective, it’s feasible to reuse CG-DFI mechanism for CG-SDT, but RAN1 did not agree to support CG-DFI for CG-SDT. |
| Ericsson3 | We do not support CG DFI for licensed operation. For SDT in unlicensed operation should be triggered by RAN2. |
| InterDigital | Agree with proposal. The reformulation proposed by Nokia does not seem OK considering what RAN2 asked. |
| Intel | We are fine with the FL’s Proposal 3.2a, but not the update from Nokia. |
| Apple | Ok with the proposal 3.2a. |
| Xiaomi | Don’t support CG DFI for SDT in license band. |
| Moderator | Considering that some companies support to reuse CG-DFI while some companies do not agree, it’s fair to say “no consensus” rather than “not agree”. |

## Separate BWP

Q4: Do RAN1 have any concerns to support RA-SDT on the non-initial BWP?

Companies’ views from the submitted contributions are collected in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2108752](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108752.zip) Huawei[1] | ***Proposal 5:*** *CG-SDT and RA-SDT resources can be configured on either separate UL BWP in FDD bands or initial UL BWP in TDD/FDD bands. In addition, the network can configure CG-SDT resource on separate UL BWP in TDD band according to UE’s bandwidth and RF capability report.* |
| [R1-2108950](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108950.zip) vivo [3] | **Proposal 7: RAN1 confirms that CG-SDT resources can be configured on non-initial BWP.**  **A4:** RAN1 don’t see the need to support RA-SDT on the non-initial BWP |
| [R1-2109026](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109026.zip) ZTE [4] | ***Proposal 8: From RAN1’s perspective, CG-SDT resource can be configured on a separate SDT BWP. For TDD mode, define a restriction that the separate BWP is linked to the DL BWP containing the SSB associated to the initial DL BWP.***  ***Proposal 9: From RAN1’s perspective, RA-SDT can be configured on non-initial BWP, and the RA-SDT related configuration on non-initial BWP is provided via system information.***  ***Proposal 10: When RA-SDT is configured on non-initial BWP, for TDD mode, similar to separate BWP for CG-SDT, define a restriction, i.e. the non-initial BWP is linked to the DL BWP containing the SSB associated to the initial DL BWP.*** |
| [R1-2109377](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109377.zip) Xiaomi [5] | **Proposal 4: Do NOT support configuring CG-SDT resource on separate SDT BWP** |
| [R1-2109465](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109465.zip) Samsung [6] | ***Proposal 8: the support RA-SDT on the non-initial BWP is NOT confirmed.*** |
| [R1-2109590](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109590.zip) Intel [7] | **Proposal 4**   * *For RA-SDT, non-initial UL BWP may not be needed.*   **Proposal 9**   * *RAN1 to confirm the working assumption that UE-specific search space is configured for UEs performing CG-SDT.* * *RAN1 to confirm that CG-SDT resource can be configured on either initial BWP or separate SDT BWP.* |
| [R1-2109762](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109762.zip) Ericsson [9] | 1. It’s enough to use initial active BWP for both RA SDT and CG SDT, no optimization is necessary. |
| [R1-2109771](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109771.zip) Sony [10] | **Proposal 1: Confirm the RAN2 agreement: CG-SDT resource can be configured on either initial BWP or separate SDT BWP.**  **Observation 1: The motivation to promote an additional “configurable” BWP for RA-SDT is to reduce the congestion of the initial BWP (both DL and UL) since there are several services that require to be received or transmitted when a UE in Inactive state such as Positioning and MBS in addition to SDT.**  **Proposal 5: BWP for RA-SDT can be configured to be either initial BWP or separate SDT BWP.**   * + - **Develop a common framework for RA-SDT and CG-SDT BWPs** |
| [R1-2109911](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109911.zip) Interdigital [11] | ***Proposal 2: Confirm RAN2 agreement that CG-SDT resource can be configured on either initial BWP or separate SDT BWP.*** |
| [R1-2109960](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109960.zip) LGE [12] | ***Observation 1: RAN2 agreed that CG-SDT resource can be configured on either initial BWP or separate SDT BWP and asked RAN1 to confirm this agreement.***  ***Proposal 1: RAN1 can confirm that CG-SDT resource can be configured on either initial BWP or separate SDT BWP.***  ***Proposal 2: The separate SDT BWP can be configured for both UL and DL.*** |
| [R1-2110164](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2110164.zip) Qualcomm [14] | ***Proposal 4: RA-SDT and CG-SDT are not supported on non-initial BWP of the RRC inactive UE performing SDT.*** |
| [R1-2110297](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2110297.zip) Nokia [15] | Proposed A4: RAN1 has not identified any obvious need for supporting RA-SDT in non-initial BWP. |

### 3.3.1 First round discussion

In RAN1#106-e meeting, RAN1 has discussed whether CG-SDT can be configured on separate BWP, and in this meeting, RAN2 has asked a question on whether there is concern to support RA-SDT on separate BWP.

For CG-SDT, 7 companies[1][3][4][7][10][11][12] tend to confirm that CG-SDT can be configured on separate BWP while 3 companies[5][9][14] don’t agree on that.

For RA-SDT, 2 companies[4][10] think that RA-SDT can be configured on separate BWP, one company[1] thinks RA-SDT can be configured on separate BWP in FDD mode, 6 companies[3][6][7][9][14][15] don’t see the need to support that.

According to the majority’s views, moderator would like to check if companies can reach a consensus on whether CG-SDT and RA-SDT can be configured on separate BWP.

***Discussion point#3.3***

* Confirm RAN2 agreement that CG-SDT resource can be configured on separate SDT BWP.
  + In TDD mode, whether to restrict that the separate BWP is linked to the DL BWP containing the SSB associated to the initial DL BWP.
* From RAN1’s perspective, RA-SDT resource is not supported to be configured on non-initial BWP at least in TDD mode.
  + In FDD mode, whether RA-SDT resource can be configured on non-initial BWP.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | It is not necessary to define a separate SDT BWP for CG-SDT. CG-SDT UE can re-use the initial BWP (Configuration Option 1 or Option 2 for BWP#0 in TS 38.331), which includes SSB and CORESET#0. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with Qualcomm |
| InterDigital | We support confirming RAN2 agreement that CG-SDT resource can be configured on separate SDT BWP. This is useful to enable offloading for uplink resources. |
| Samsung | A separate SDT BWP is not needed for either CG-SDT or RA-SDT.  SDT is used in RRC inactive when UE may not need to switch to connected mode. It targets a quick and relatively short period transmission. And we think if a gNB decides to support SDT, it should configure a relative large bwp for better accommodation. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with QC |
| Intel | We are fine to support separate SDT BWP for CG-SDT  For RA-SDT, we do not think non-initial BWP is necessary. |
| Ericsson1 | Initial BWP is enough at least for RA SDT unless RAN2 can provide reasonable justification of using separate BWP for SDT. |
| Xiaomi | Don’t support to define a separate BWP for both RA-SDT and CG-SDT. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think separate SDT BWP can be configured for CG-SDT by RRCReleease message but not for RA-SDT. |
| Vivo | We are fine to support separate SDT BWP for CG-SDT  For RA-SDT, we do not think non-initial BWP is necessary. |
| CATT | We do not see the need for separate BWP. |

### 3.3.2 Second round discussion

Companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* CG-SDT can be configured on separate BWP
  + Support: Interdigital, Intel, Huawei, vivo, ZTE, Sony
  + Not support: Qualcomm, Nokia, Samsung, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, CATT
* RA-SDT can be configured on non-initial BWP
  + Support:
  + Not support: Samsung, Intel, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Huawei, vivo, CATT

Companies has reached a consensus on RA-SDT, so the following Conclusion 3.3 is provided.

However, views are still split on CG-SDT. It should be noticed it is RAN2’s agreement that CG-SDT can be configured on separate BWP, so the necessity is already confirmed by RAN2, and RAN1 should discuss the technical feasibility of the agreement.

***Conclusion 3.3:***

* RA-SDT resource cannot be configured on non-initial BWP.

***Proposal 3.3:***

* CG-SDT resource can be configured on separate BWP.

Moderator suggests companies to continue to discuss the technical pros and cons for CG-SDT to be configured on separate BWP and try to reach a consensus. If finally no consensus can be made, the technical reasons for why the agreement cannot be confirmed should also be included in the LS to RAN2.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We support Conclusion 3.3  We don’t agree with Proposal 3.3 |
| Sony | We support the proposal in 3.3 |
| CATT | Support SDT in a separate BWP would complicate the RAN1 design which is not necessary. |
| Samsung | We did not support to have separate BWP. Our reason is already pasted in first round.  It is not necessary for SDT and over complicated the operation and UE/gNB implementation. |
| Ericsson2 | Initial BWP in our understanding should be enough and this will simply the SDT discussions and avoid additional workload of RAN1 on this topic as CATT and Samsung also commented. |
| LG | We support Proposal 3.3. Considering the agreement in RedCap WI, RedCap UE supporting SDT could use a separate BWP for SDT (as well as RedCap specific RACH as agreed). In addition, we support a separate BWP for non-RedCap UE supporting SDT. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine to Conclusion 3.3 and Proposal 3.3 |
| Nokia, NSB | OK with the conclusion 3.3  Proposal 3.3: Agree with CATT, Samsung and Ericsson that this is not necessary. |
| InterDigital | Fine with Conclusion 3.3 and Proposal 3.3. |
| Intel | We are fine with both conclusion and proposal. |
| Xiaomi | We don’t support to configure separate BWP for SDT, which will introduce much more additional work for RAN1. |
| Apple | For proposal 3.3, what is the relationship between separate BWP and initial UL BWP? One contains another or not relations. This is related to Proposal 3.4, PUCCH will transmit on initial UL BWP. |

### 3.3.3 Final round discussion

Conclusion 3.3 seems stable, I will ask for email approval.

Companies still cannot reach a consensus on Proposal 3.3, since it has been discussed for 2 meetings, Moderator suggests to tell RAN2 about the current situation rather than continue the discussion in the next meeting. So the following conclusion is provided:

***Conclusion 3.3a:***

* RAN1 cannot reach a consensus on whether to confirm RAN2 agreement that CG-SDT resource can be configured on separate SDT BWP.
* Capture the following in the LS: the concern is on the necessity.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia, NSB | Support conclusion 3.3a |
| Huawei, HiSi | It is not clear to us what is the complicated work in RAN1 if support CG-SDT on separate BWP. |
| Ericsson3 | Fine. |
| InterDigital | OK to conclude that there is no consensus, but “concern is on the necessity” is not a valid reason given that RAN2 had determined that there is benefit. If the concern is “RAN1 workload” then the response should state more specifically what are the additional issues that RAN1 would need to deal with. It is not productive to reverse decisions taken in another WG without providing technical justification. |
| Intel | We support separate SDT BWP. but for the sake of progress, we are fine with the first bullet in conclusion, but we do not think second bullet is needed. |
| Apple | Ok with the conlusion. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the first bullet and share the same view as InterDigital for the second bullet. |
| Moderator | It’s Moderator’s understanding if we want to revert RAN2 agreement, we need to tell them what is the concern.  ***Conclusion 3.3a:***   * RAN1 cannot reach a consensus on whether to confirm RAN2 agreement that CG-SDT resource can be configured on separate SDT BWP. * Capture the following in the LS: the concern is on the [necessity].   Let’s wait for other companies’ comments. |

## PUCCH resource

Q1: For both RA-SDT and CG-SDT, RAN2 assumes that common PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT UEs) can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions. Can RAN1 confirm this?

Q2: For RA-SDT and CG-SDT, for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions, does RAN1 think there is a need for any other PUCCH resources than the above and if needed, can RAN1 define these?

Companies’ views from the submitted contributions are collected in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2108752](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108752.zip) Huawei[1] | ***Proposal 6:*** *RAN1 confirms common PUCCH resources those shared with non-SDT Ues can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions, if in the initial UL BWP. For CG-SDT, the dedicated PUCCH resource can be also configured for DL feedback in non-initial UL BWP.* |
| [R1-2108950](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108950.zip) vivo [3] | **A1:** RAN1 confirms that common PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT Ues) can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions.  **A2:** RAN1 thinks there is no need for any other PUCCH resources for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions. |
| [R1-2109026](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109026.zip) ZTE [4] | ***Proposal 11: RAN1 should confirm that the common PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT Ues) can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4/MsgB and subsequent SDT transmission.***  ***Proposal 12: SDT specific PUCCH resources can be considered for RA-SDT and CG-SDT if needed.*** |
| [R1-2109377](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109377.zip) Xiaomi [5] | **Proposal 7: Share the common PUCCH resources configured in the initial uplink BWP to the feedback of RA-SDT and CG-SDT.**  **Proposal 8: Configure one or more sets of additional common PUCCH resources for the feedback of SDT.** |
| [R1-2109465](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109465.zip) Samsung [6] | ***Proposal 7: the PUCCH resource pool for msg4/B could be reused for RA-SDT and CG-SDT.***  **There is no need for new PUCCH resource unless serious issue found.** |
| [R1-2109590](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109590.zip) Intel [7] | **Proposal 1**   * *RAN1 to confirm that cell specific PUCCH resource set, which is configured by pucch-ResourceCommon is used for HARQ-ACK feedback of Msg4/MsgB and subsequent data transmission.*   **Proposal 2**   * *UE specific PUCCH resource set is not needed for HARQ-ACK feedback of Msg4/MsgB and subsequent data transmissions during SDT.* |
| [R1-2109762](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109762.zip) Ericsson [9] | 1. Common PUCCH resource is enough for HARQ feedback in SDT, there’s no need of separate PUCCH configuration specific for SDT in RRC inactive state. |
| [R1-2109771](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109771.zip) Sony [10] | **Proposal 4: RAN1 to discuss the following options for the resource of UL HARQ-ACK feedback:**   1. PUCCH resource is configured for the UE just before moving to Inactive state, that is RRC Release messge. 2. CG-PUSCH is used for carrying the HARQ-ACK for the DL SDT.   **Proposal 9: The PUCCH resource for RA-SDT should be specified as follows:**   1. During initial access, the existing “common” PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT Ues) should be reused for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB. 2. During subsequent SDT DL messages (i.e., after initial access), a new separate PUCCH resource should be configured for HARQ-ACK feedbacks. |
| [R1-2110164](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2110164.zip) Qualcomm [14] | ***Proposal 1: In RA-SDT and CG-SDT, HARQ-ACK feedback to PDSCH is transmitted on pucch-ResourceCommon configured in the initial UL BWP of inactive UE.***  ***Proposal 2: For a non-RedCap SDT UE, PUCCH frequency hopping is enabled for HARQ-ACK transmission in the initial UL BWP, if* the UE is not provided *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* in *BWP-UplinkCommon***.  ***Proposal 3: For a RedCap SDT UE configured with a separate initial UL BWP, PUCCH frequency hopping can be enabled/disabled by NW via SI or RRC signalling.*** |
| [R1-2110297](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2110297.zip) Nokia [15] | Proposed A1: The use of common PUCCH resources for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4/MsgB is already the specified ehavior. Subsequent DL SDT transmissions can also use common PUCCH resources. Therefore, RAN1 does not see any issue with this.  Proposed A2: The only motivation to introduce dedicated SDT PUCCH resources would be to address capacity problems related to subsequent DL SDT. However, there is no clear evidence that this is a problem for SDT and there is few remaining time in the WI. Therefore, RAN1 sees no obvious need for additional PUCCH resource definitions, and would see defining such it problematic given the remaining time for the WI. |

### First round discussion

For Q1, all 10 companies agree to confirm that common PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT Ues) can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions.

For Q2, 4 companies[1][4][5][10] support to consider SDT specific PUCCH resource while 5 companies[3][6][7][9][15] think there is no need to consider that. Given the split views and limited meeting time in RAN1, it’s recommended to not consider other PUCCH resources in Rel-17.

One company[14] mentions the frequency hopping issue, it might be also related to RedCap, moderator suggests to down-prioritize this issue.

***Discussion point#3.4***

* RAN1 confirms that common PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT Ues) can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions.
* RAN1 thinks there is no need for any other PUCCH resources than common PUCCH resources shared with non-SDT Ues.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Agree with the FL proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with the FL proposal |
| InterDigital | Agree with the FL proposal |
| Samsung | ok |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | Agree with the FL proposal |
| Ericsson1 | Agree. |
| Xiaomi | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For RA-SDT, we are fine. But for CG-SDT, we think dedicated PUCCH resources for subsequent DL transmission can be provided by RRCReleaese message together with CG-SDT resources. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree |
| vivo | Agree with the FL proposal |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |

### Second round discussion

It seems all companies except Huawei agree on the above discussion point. Moderator thinks that dedicated PUCCH resources for CG-SDT can be regarded as optimization issue, given the clear majority’s view and limited meeting time in RAN1, can we agree on the following proposal?

***Proposal 3.4:***

* RAN1 confirms that common PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT Ues) can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions.
* RAN1 thinks there is no need for any other PUCCH resources than common PUCCH resources shared with non-SDT Ues.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal of FL |
| Sony | We think the PUCCH configuration is dependent on the outcome of section 3.3.  In our understanding, if separate BWP for CG-BWP is agreed, the PUCCH resource should be configured on that separate BWP, not the initial BWP where common PUCCH resources locates.  Modified proposal:   * RAN1 confirms that common PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT Ues) can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions if CG-SDT BWP is in the initial BWP |
| Samsung | Ok for FL proposal. |
| Ericsson2 | Fine. |
| LG | OK |
| Moderator | According to Sony’s suggestion, the alternative proposal is provided:  ***Proposal 3.4a:***   * RAN1 confirms that common PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT Ues) can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions if CG-SDT BWP is in the initial BWP. * RAN1 thinks there is no need for any other PUCCH resources than common PUCCH resources shared with non-SDT Ues.   Companies are encouraged to comment on Proposal 3.4 and 3.4a. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are OK with both versions 3.4 and 3.4a. Prefer 3.4a |
| InterDigital | OK with Proposal 3.4a with second bullet modified as follows:  RAN1 thinks there is no need for any other PUCCH resources in the initial BWP than common PUCCH resources shared with non-SDT Ues. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal 3.4, but not okay for 3.4a.  Even for separate BWP case, common PUCCH resource can still be used. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| Apple | OK. |

### Final round discussion

It seems some companies have concern on the updated Proposal 3.4a, Moderator suggests we go back to the original version, since it is directly copied from the RAN2 question and seems most companies agree with Proposal 3.4 in the 1st round.

Q1: For both RA-SDT and CG-SDT, RAN2 assumes that common PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT UEs) can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions. Can RAN1 confirm this?

Q2: For RA-SDT and CG-SDT, for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions, does RAN1 think there is a need for any other PUCCH resources than the above and if needed, can RAN1 define these?

***Proposal 3.4:***

* RAN1 confirms that common PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT Ues) can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions.
* RAN1 thinks there is no need for any other PUCCH resources than common PUCCH resources shared with non-SDT Ues.

Can we agree on the original Proposal 3.4?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia, NSB | Support proposal 3.4 |
| Huawei, HiSi | Can live with it. |
| Ericsson3 | Fine. |
| InterDigital | OK |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | OK |

## BFD/BFR procedure

Q5: Does RAN1 think that BFD/BFR procedure is required for SDT and if needed, can RAN1 define the necessary procedure to support this?

Companies’ views from the submitted contributions are collected in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2108752](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108752.zip) Huawei[1] | ***Proposal 7:*** *BFR/BFD can be introduced in the procedure of subsequent CG/RA-SDT, including CG-PUSCH based BFR in addition to PRACH-based.* |
| [R1-2108950](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108950.zip) vivo [3] | **A5:** RAN1 don’t think BFD/BFR procedure is required for SDT. |
| [R1-2109026](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109026.zip) ZTE [4] | ***Proposal 13: BFD/BFR procedure for SDT is not required for Rel-17 and it can be considered in Rel-18.*** |
| [R1-2109377](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109377.zip) Xiaomi [5] | **Proposal 5: Support to further study beam failure recovery procedure for SDT.** |
| [R1-2109465](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109465.zip) Samsung [6] | ***Observation 2: reuse similar manner as legacy BFD and BFR is possible but the introduced signalling overhead and power consumption (or complex) is considerable.***  ***Observation 3: RA-SDT can already support DL beam change during RACH procedure.***  ***Proposal 9: UCI piggybacked in PUSCH is supported to indicate the preferred DL beam (e.g., SSB index) for PUSCH after msg4 in RA-SDT and CG-SDT.***  ***Proposal 10: for RA-SDT, the UL tx beam for PUSCH after msg4/B could be same as that one for last msg3 transmission, or last PUCCH transmission.***  ***Proposal 11: for CG-SDT, the first UL transmission could be also up to UE implementation*** |
| [R1-2109590](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109590.zip) Intel [7] | **Proposal 5**   * *BFD/BFR procedure is not needed for SDT operation.* |
| [R1-2109762](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109762.zip) Ericsson [9] | 1. BFR is not supported for SDT in RRC inactive state. |
| [R1-2109771](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109771.zip) Sony [10] | **Proposal 8: RAN1 should discuss and specify BFD and BFR procedures during subsequent SDT transmissions.** |
| [R1-2110164](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2110164.zip) Qualcomm [14] | ***Observation 1: If suitable SSB beam cannot be found or the SSB-based TA validation fails, the RRC inactive UE configured with CG-SDT resources can switch to RA-SDT without triggering BFD/BFR, if RA-SDT is configured in the initial BWP of UE.***  ***Observation 2: If beam failure is detected by a RA-SDT UE, the RRC inactive UE can re-attempt RACH procedure in the initial BWP without triggering BFR.***  ***Proposal 5: The complexity/overhead impacts of BFD/BFR in SDT need to be studied and compared with the fallback procedure based on RA-SDT.*** |
| [R1-2110297](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2110297.zip) Nokia [15] | Proposed A5: If the initial beam selection was incorrect, or the SDT transaction takes a longer time, there could be a benefit from BFD/BFR. |

### 3.5.1 First round discussion

3 companies[1][10][15] think that BFD/BFR procedure is beneficial for SDT, while 4 companies[3][4][7][9] think it’s not needed and 3 companies[5][6][14] think it should be further studied. Given the split views and the limited meeting time in RAN1, moderator suggests to down-prioritize this issue in Rel-17.

***Discussion point#3.5***

* BFD/BFR procedure is not required for SDT in Rel-17.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Agree with the FL proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | Even though we would be somewhat interested in supporting BFD/BFR for SDT, we can accept the FL proposal for quick progress. |
| InterDigital | Agree with the FL proposal |
| Samsung | As we discussed in the tdoc, a full legacy BFD/BFR may not be needed. But the feature to report the beam change to gNB should be discussed.  Thus ,we are fine with the main bullet, but suggest to add:   * BFD/BFR procedure is not required for SDT in Rel-17.   + FFS: support reporting the beam change to gNB. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | Agree with the FL proposal |
| Ericsson1 | Agree. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposal for the sake of meeting progress, although we believe BFD/BFR procedure is worthy of being studied for SDT. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree |
| vivo | Agree with the FL proposal |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |
|  |  |

### 3.5.2 Second round discussion

According to the comments received so far, it seems companies are fine with the BFD/BFR proposal, one company propose an FFS in addition to original proposal, moderator would like to check if companies can accept the FFS part as well.

***Proposal 3.5:***

* BFD/BFR procedure is not required for SDT in Rel-17.
  + FFS: support reporting the beam change to gNB.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We can live with this proposal if it is the majority view. |
| Sony | We are ok with the main bullet without FFS part. RAN2 agreed timer to handle BFR, so we do not see the necessity of the FFS part. |
| CATT | We do not think the FFS is needed. |
| Samsung | If companies refused to study this, may I ask, what will happen if the beam changed during the SDT procedure, given BFD/BFR is not supported. |
| Ericsson2 | Fine with main bullet only.  SSBs are already associated with CG PUSCH occasions in CG SDT and associated with PRACH resources in RA SDT. Not sure why UE needs to report SSB beams. |
| LG | We are fine with FFS. It seems good to further discuss what will happen if the beam changed during the SDT procedure. |
| Nokia, NSB | We can agree with the proposal, including the FFS. |
| InterDigital | OK with proposal |
| Intel | We do not think the FFS is needed. Not clear why UE needs to report beam. |
| Samsung | To companies refusing the FFS, regarding my question, could you give some answer?  Imaging if a UE initiates the CG-SDT by selecting a SSB, and during the procedure, while UE is still on sequent transmission of one HARQ process. Then UE finds current beam becomes bad, and another SSB is qualified, what should UE do then?  Following the validation rule, such that UE abandon current procedure and switch to RA-SDT? Or  Continue with CG-SDT with new SSB, but pls not currently it is different from the SSB switch during RACH procedure in which gNB has no idea who the UE is. Now both gNB and UE knows each other. UE could easily switch to another SSB without telling gNB, that’s our intention to ask UE to tell gNB that the preferred SSB is switched. |
| Xiaomi | We share the same view as Ericsson. Since each time uplink CG-SDT transmission, the beam can be implicitly reported by the selected PO/DMRS resources, we think no additional beam change report is needed. |
| Apple | We support the main bullet. |

### 3.5.3 Final round discussion

It seems all companies agree on the main bullet, but companies’ views are split on the FFS. Given that the beam change may happen, can we agree on the following proposal?

***Proposal 3.5a:***

* BFD/BFR procedure is not required for SDT in Rel-17.
  + FFS: whether or not to support reporting the beam change to gNB.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia, NSB | Support proposal 3.5a |
| Huawei, HiSi | OK |
| Ericsson3 | Fine. |
| InterDigital | OK |
| Intel | We think sub-bullet is not needed, but we are okay to keep FFS for the sake of progress. |
| Apple | OK. |
| Xiaomi | Support the main bullet, and also fine with the sub-bullet just for the sake of meeting progress. |

## Other L1 configuration

Q3: Is there any other L1 configuration needed for both RA-SDT and CG-SDT to support the subsequent data transmissions from RAN1 perspective?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2109465](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109465.zip) Samsung [6] | For question 3, as discussed above, for RA-SDT, it seems sufficient. In addition, for CG-SDT, UE will be able to use the C-RNTI in previous connected mode as well as the CS-RNTI, as long as the CORESET/search space is determined, it seems sufficient as well. |
| [R1-2108950](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108950.zip) vivo [3] | **A3:** From RAN1 perspective, no any other L1 configuration to support the subsequent data transmissions is needed for RA-SDT or CG-SDT. |
| [R1-2109590](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109590.zip) Intel [7] | **Proposal 3**   * *Additional L1 configuration for subsequent data transmission during SDT may not be needed.* |
| [R1-2109762](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109762.zip) Ericsson [9] | For Q3, there seems no other configurations necessary for subsequent SDT given the search space configuration for scheduling subsequent data transmission is already agreed. |
| [R1-2110297](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2110297.zip) Nokia [15] | Proposed A3: No. |

### First round discussion

5 companies[3][6][7][9][15] think that there is no other L1 configuration to support subsequent data transmission, moderator would like to ask other companies to provide views on this Q3.

***Discussion point#3.6***

* From RAN1’s perspective, there is no other L1 configuration for RA-SDT and CG-SDT to support subsequent data transmission.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Agree with the FL proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with the FL proposal |
| InterDigital | Agree with the FL proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | Agree with the FL proposal |
| Ericsson1 | Fine. |
| Xiaomi | Agree. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree |
| vivo | Agree with the FL proposal |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |

### 3.6.2 Second round discussion

All companies reach a consensus on this issue, so the following conclusion can be made for email approval:

***Conclusion 3.6:***

* From RAN1’s perspective, there is no other L1 configuration for RA-SDT and CG-SDT to support subsequent data transmission.

Please provide comments only if you don’t agree with the conclusion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Nokia NSB | Support |
| Apple | Support |
|  |  |

## HARQ process id determination

Companies’ views from the submitted contributions are collected in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2109026](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109026.zip) ZTE [4] | ***Proposal 4: For CG-SDT in licensed band, if autonomous retransmission is supported, HARQ process id determination can reuse the mechanism in NR-U framework to reduce latency.*** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### First round discussion

One company[4] mentioned that if autonomous retransmission is supported, according to the SSB to CG PUSCH mapping defined in RAN1, when UE selects a qualified SSB, it’s probably that the associated CG PUSCH may not have the same HARQ process id as previous new transmission, so it’s better that HARQ process id determination can reuse the mechanism in NR-U framework.

It is noticed that autonomous retransmission and HARQ process id determination are being discussed in RAN2 email discussion, it may have RAN1 impact but considering that there is only 1 meeting left in RAN1, it might be too late to wait for RAN2 LS to trigger the discussion, so moderator suggests companies to provide views on this issue in this meeting.

***Discussion point#3.7***

* If autonomous retransmission is supported, whether to reuse the mechanism in NR-U framework for HARQ process id determination.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Ok to discuss |
| Nokia, NSB | Don’t see the need to discuss this. |
| Intel | Not sure whether we need to discuss this. |
| Ericsson1 | Seems not necessary. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine for unlicensed spectrum. But for licensed spectrum, we think HARQ process id determination for URLLC can be reused for CG-SDT. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If autonomous retransmission is supported in RAN2, it’s necessary to reuse NRU mechanism to report HARQ process id, otherwise, URLLC framework works fine. |
| Vivo | Not clear why need to discuss. |
| CATT | No need to discuss. |
| Apple | Seems not necessary to discuss it. The HARQ process ID for CG was defined in TS38.321. |

### Second round discussion

Companies do not show interest on this issue, no further discussion is needed unless RAN2 triggers the discussion.

## Power control

Companies’ views from the submitted contributions are collected in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2109762](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109762.zip) Ericsson [9] | 1. For power control of CG PUSCH in SDT, the RS (reference signal) for pathloss estimation should be the DL RS associated with the CG PUSCH transmission. 2. RAN1 to discuss the UE specific power control parameters for CG SDT in RRC inactive state. |
| [R1-2109377](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109377.zip) Xiaomi [5] | **Proposal 10: The pathloss for CG-SDT PUSCH power control can be determined by the measurement of the SSB associated with the selected PO.** |
|  |  |

### First round discussion

2 companies[5][9] propose that the pathloss for CG-SDT PUSCH power control can be determined by the measurement of SSB associated with the selected CG PUSCH. One company[9] suggests RAN1 to discuss UE specific power control parameters.

***Discussion point#3.8***

* The pathloss for CG-SDT PUSCH power control can be determined by the measurement of SSB associated with the selected CG PUSCH.

Companies are also encouraged to provide views on whether to introduce UE specific power control parameters since it has RRC impact.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | OK with the FL proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with the FL proposal |
| InterDigital | Agree with the FL proposal |
| Samsung | Wondering, does this need a specific RAN1 agreement? |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal, although it is somehow implicitly agreed already. |
| Apple | OK with the FL proposal |
| Ericsson1 | Agree. |
| Xiaomi | Agree. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine |
| ZTE, Sanechip | Agree |
| vivo | Agree with the FL proposal |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |

### 3.8.2 Second round discussion

Companies have reached a consensus on the power control issue, regarding the question whether this needs a specific RAN1 agreement, it’s moderator’s understanding that in current spec, the pathloss in inactive state is determined by the measurement of SSB that UE reads MIB, it may not be appropriate. Other companies can also indicate whether the understanding is correct or not.

***Proposal 3.8:***

* The pathloss for CG-SDT PUSCH power control can be determined by the measurement of SSB associated with the selected CG PUSCH.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal of FL |
| Samsung | It causes another question, does UE allow to change SSB during one SDT procedure? Since RACH procedure, it is allowed. We assume it should be allowed as well. Right? If yes, we suggest:   * The pathloss for CG-SDT PUSCH power control can be determined by the measurement of latest selected SSB associated with the ~~selected~~ CG PUSCH. |
| Ericsson2 | Fine. |
| Moderator | The proposal suggested by Samsung is provided:  ***Proposal 3.8a:***   * The pathloss for CG-SDT PUSCH power control can be determined by the measurement of latest selected SSB associated with the ~~selected~~ CG PUSCH.   Companies are encouraged to comment on Proposal 3.8 and 3.8a |
| Nokia, NSB | OK with the proposal, the Samsung wording is a small improvement, so would be fine with that as well. |
| InterDigital | OK with proposal. Samsung wording is also ok except that “latest” may not be necessary. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal 3.8 or 3.8a. |
| Xiaomi | Support proposal 3.8. |
| Apple | Either proposal 3.8 or Proposal 3.8a is fine for us. |

### 3.8.3 Final round discussion

From Moderator’s understanding, there is no difference between ‘selected’ and “latest selected”, so the following Proposal 3.8a seems fine.

***Proposal 3.8a:***

* The pathloss for CG-SDT PUSCH power control can be determined by the measurement of latest selected SSB associated with the ~~selected~~ CG PUSCH.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia, NSB | Support proposal 3.8a |
| Ericsson3 | Do we need “latest”? There’s only one selected SSB per PUSCH resource unit in our understanding for one specific small data transmission. |
| InterDigital | Agree with Ericsson |
| Intel | Agree with Ericsson. Selected means the one that UE needs to use. |
| Apple | If SSB to CG PUSCH mapping ratio is larger than 1, If several SSBs are mapping to the same CG PUSCH, then select the latest one? |
| Xiaomi | Share the same view as Ericsson. |
| Moderator | It seems “latest” causes confusion, Moderator understands there would be only one selected SSB at the same time even with beam change, so the proposal is also clear without “latest”. Can we accept the following Proposal 3.8b?  ***Proposal 3.8b:***   * The pathloss for CG-SDT PUSCH power control can be determined by the measurement of ~~latest~~ selected SSB associated with the ~~selected~~ CG PUSCH. |

# Other physical layer issues

Companies’ views from the submitted contributions are collected in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tdocs | Proposals |
| [R1-2108950](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108950.zip) vivo [3] | **Proposal 5: For RA-SDT, when PRACH occasions are separate between SDT and non-SDT, the following parameters can be configured specifically**   * + **Number of SSBs associated with a valid RO,**   + **Number of contention-based preambles per SSB per valid RO,**   **Proposal 6: For RA-SDT, when PRACH occasions are separate between SDT and non-SDT, the following parameters can be configured specifically**   * + **RO configuration related parameters, i.e. time and frequency resources of PRACH resources.**   + **Preamble related parameters, e.g. totalNumberofRA-Preambles, prach-RootSequenceIndex.** |
| [R1-2109465](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109465.zip) Samsung [6] | ***Proposal 4: a PRACH mask index is supported for subset RO sharing for SDT purpose.***  ***Proposal 5: a RA Type (***4step RA, 2step RA,4step RA-SDT***) is supported to be indicated for subset RO sharing for SDT purpose.***  ***Proposal 6: only number of preamble for SDT in one RO for a SSB is necessary to be indicated. These preambles are counting from the end of the total preambles for one SSB in one RO.*** |
| [R1-2109762](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109762.zip) Ericsson [9] | 1. For shared RO case, mechanisms similar to what we’ve used for 2-step RACH can be reused for PRACH preamble grouping for indicating RA-SDT. Whether the preambles for indicating RA-SDT should be outside the total number of preambles configured for legacy RA in the shared RO should be discussed first. 2. For the separate RO case, PRACH configurations for SDT should be carefully designed to avoid RA-RNTI overlapping issues 3. The method to have ROs FDMed with common f\_id for RA-RNTI calculation, and that the f\_id is numbered together among all FDMed ROs for both Rel-15/16 and Rel-17 ROs introduced for RA SDT is used to avoid RA-RNTI overlapping issue. 4. RSRP change is the difference between RSRP calculated at the time when the UE receives the latest TAC from the network and the RSRP calculated at the time when UE determines TA validation for a CG PUSCH SDT. 5. Different RSRP variation thresholds and TAT configuations can be configured for different sets of SSBs configured within a set of SSBs configured per CG configuration 6. On top of the TA validation based on RSRP change, support TDOA based crieterial for TA validation in CG based SDT. 7. TA based on latest UL transmissions before RRC release message should be provided in the RRC release message as initial TA to be used by CG SDT in RRC inactive. 8. The TA for CG SDT should be relative to the subcarrier spacing of initial UL BWP or the separately configured for CG SDT. 9. TA offset is optionally configured in RRC release message for CG SDT and the default TA offset is used when absent. 10. SSB subset for the average RSRP calculation is within a set of SSBs per CG PUSCH configuration. |
| [R1-2109960](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109960.zip) LGE [12] | ***Proposal 4: For CG-SDT, the UE can assume the PDCCH carrying the DCI has the same DM-RS antenna port quasi co-location properties as for a SSB associated to the CG PUSCH transmission e.g. for detection of retransmission DCI in response to a CG PUSCH transmission.*** |
| [R1-2109026](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2109026.zip) ZTE [4] | ***Proposal 14: From RAN1’s perspective, if CG-SDT is supported for unlicensed band, the solutions for mapping can be reused for unlicensed band CG-SDT, and the CG configuration in unlicensed band can also be reused for unlicensed band CG-SDT.*** |
| [R1-2108752](file:///C:\\Users\\Docs\\R1-2108752.zip) Spreadtrum [2] | ***Proposal 1: The SSB subset for RSRP based TA validation is determined at least based on a configured absolute RSRP threshold, where the subset of SSBs is a set of SSBs configured per CG configuration.*** |

## First round discussion

According to the submitted contributions, the following issues may have RAN1 impact:

* 4.1 RO configuration[3][6][9]
* 4.2 TA validation[2][12]
* 4.3 CG-SDT for unlicensed band[4]
* 4.4 QCL relationship between PDCCH and SSB[12]

RO configuration issue is being discussed in RAN2 feature combination, so moderator thinks that RAN2 will make the decision based on the general consideration of different WIs.

TA validation is assumed to be finalized in RAN2, and there is no need for RAN1 to further discuss it.

CG-SDT for unlicensed band is being discussed in RAN2, moderator would like to check whether it requires RAN1 input.

QCL relationship between PDCCH and SSB is considered as low priority in the last meeting.

So the moderator suggests to first identify which issues are critical and need RAN1’s input, and for the low priority issues we can either treat them later or ask RAN2 to trigger the discussion if needed. Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | 4.4 can be further discussed in RAN1 |
| Nokia, NSB | 4.2 and 4.4 can be further discussed in RAN1 |
| Samsung | 4.4, but it seems a very straightforward way, there is no other option basically. |
| Ericsson1 | 4.2, 4.4 need discussions in RAN1. |
| Sierra Wireless | 4.2 can be further discussed in RAN1 |
| Xiaomi | 4.4 can be further discussed in RAN1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | None is strictly necessary. |
| vivo | Agree with the FL assessment |

## Second round discussion

It seems Issue 4.4 has more interest and it might be straightforward to make progress, so moderator provides the following proposal from contribution [12] as a starting point for further discussion.

***Proposal 4:***

* For CG-SDT, the UE can assume the PDCCH carrying the DCI has the same DM-RS antenna port quasi co-location properties as for a SSB associated to the CG PUSCH transmission e.g. for detection of retransmission DCI in response to a CG PUSCH transmission.

Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | A CG PUSCH occasion can be associated with multiple SSB index/beams. It is unclear to us which SSB will be the QCL source of PDCCH, if the PDCCH is transmitted in USS. |
| Samsung | To qc, we think it’s the selected SSB by UE.  This is same as RACH procedure, there is SSB-PUSCH association, UE selects a SSB based on rules, and find the corresponding PUSCH resource, and transmits. The corresponding feedback PDDCH is assumed to QCL with that SSB UE selected.  This is the whole point why such association is designed. |
| Ericsson2 | It is also our understanding that the SSB selected by UE for CG PUSCH resource selection is the one that can be assumed to be QCL-ed with the DMRS of the PDCCH. |
| LG | We support this proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Share similar view with Ericsson |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the proposal |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal.  Our understanding is that we also need to determine the Tx beam for PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK for subsequent DL transmission during CG-SDT, but we can discuss this later. |
| Xiaomi | Support. |

# Reply to LS R1-2108715

|  |
| --- |
| Q1: For both RA-SDT and CG-SDT, RAN2 assumes that common PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT UEs) can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions. Can RAN1 confirm this?  Q2: For RA-SDT and CG-SDT, for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions, does RAN1 think there is a need for any other PUCCH resources than the above and if needed, can RAN1 define these?  Q3: Is there any other L1 configuration needed for both RA-SDT and CG-SDT to support the subsequent data transmissions from RAN1 perspective?  Q4: Do RAN1 have any concerns to support RA-SDT on the non-initial BWP?  NOTE: It has already been agreed in RAN2 that *CG-SDT resource can be configured on either initial BWP or separate SDT BWP*, if confirmed by RAN1.  Q5: Does RAN1 think that BFD/BFR procedure is required for SDT and if needed, can RAN1 define the necessary procedure to support this? |

## First round discussion

The issues in these questions are separately discussed in different sections, the draft replies will be provided once we reach a consensus on section 3.3~3.6.

# Summary

The latest proposals:

***Proposal 2.1c:***

* Mapping ratio of SSB to CG PUSCH is configured per CG configuration.
  + FFS whether to restrict the same value for all CG configurations
* For the candidate value set of SSB to CG PUSCH mapping ratio, support at least {1, 2, 4, 8, 16}
  + FFS {1/8,1/4,1/2}

***Proposal 2.2:***

* Multi-layer PUSCH transmission is not supported for CG-SDT.

***Proposal 2.3b***:

* The repetitions are considered as a bundle of transmission occasions that are mapped to the same SSB(s), no additional specification rule is needed.

***Conclusion 2.4:***

* No need to define UL/DL pattern type of validation rule specific for paired spectrum at least for non-RedCap UEs.
  + FFS the case for RedCap UEs

***Proposal 2.4:***

* A CG PUSCH occasion is not valid if it overlaps with any valid PRACH occasion or valid MsgA PUSCH occasion.

***Proposal 2.6:***

* When SSB set indication is absent, UE assumes the SSB set includes all actually transmitted SSBs configured by SIB1.

***Proposal 3.1***

* RAN1 confirms the working assumption in RAN2 that UE-specific search space is configured for UEs performing CG-SDT.
* CORESET for UE performing RA-SDT should be a common CORESET.

***Proposal 3.2a***

* From RAN1’s perspective, it’s feasible to reuse CG-DFI mechanism for CG-SDT, but no consensus on whether CG-DFI is needed.

***Conclusion 3.3a:***

* RAN1 cannot reach a consensus on whether to confirm RAN2 agreement that CG-SDT resource can be configured on separate SDT BWP.
* Capture the following in the LS: the concern is on the [necessity].

***Proposal 3.4:***

* RAN1 confirms that common PUCCH resources (i.e. those that are shared with non-SDT UEs) can also be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4 /MsgB and subsequent SDT transmissions.
* RAN1 thinks there is no need for any other PUCCH resources than common PUCCH resources shared with non-SDT UEs.

***Proposal 3.5a:***

* BFD/BFR procedure is not required for SDT in Rel-17.
  + FFS: whether or not to support reporting the beam change to gNB.

***Conclusion 3.6:***

* From RAN1’s perspective, there is no other L1 configuration for RA-SDT and CG-SDT to support subsequent data transmission.

***Proposal 3.8b:***

* The pathloss for CG-SDT PUSCH power control can be determined by the measurement of ~~latest~~ selected SSB associated with the ~~selected~~ CG PUSCH.

***Proposal 4:***

* For CG-SDT, the UE can assume the PDCCH carrying the DCI has the same DM-RS antenna port quasi co-location properties as for a SSB associated to the CG PUSCH transmission e.g. for detection of retransmission DCI in response to a CG PUSCH transmission.
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