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# 1 Introduction

This contribution is aimed at reporting the discussion and results of the following email discussion:

* [AT116bis-e][025][MBS] CFR Case E (vivo)

 Scope: Address support of CFR Case E (and other case of needed). Treat at least the proposals in R2-2201260. Can also take into account proposals from other papers.

 Intended outcome: Report

 Deadline: Thursday W1 for online CB

The discussion scope is to gather companies’ views on the Common Frequency Resource (CFR) related issues, taking the associated proposals in contributions [1]-[8] into account. Companies are invited to provide their views by January 19th (Wednesday), 2022, 12:00 UTC.

The detailed definition of CFR Case A/B/C/D/E by RAN1 can be accessed in Appendix 7.

# 2 Participants

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Participant name | E-mail |
| Yitao Mo (Stephen) | yitao.mo@vivo.com |
| Zhenzhen Cao | caozhenzhen@huawei.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 Supporting CFR Case E from configuration aspect

In the previous RAN#94-e meeting, a warm discussion regarding the support of CFR Case E had been launched. The corresponding assumption and final agreement are given as follows [9],

|  |
| --- |
| **Assumptions for RAN2 Reasonable impact: At least the following may be assumed for the support of Case E (and possibly other cases). These assumptions may need to be confirmed in the WG.**1. The resources and their configuration, needed for camping, e.g. reception of CD SSB, paging etc (e.g. CORESET0), shall be the same regardless if the UE uses a MBS Broadcast CFR configuration or not, for Idle and/or Inactive mode. (i.e. no change)
2. The resources and their configuration for the access procedure including up to at least the exchange of the first two RRC messages (UL + DL) shall be the same regardless if the UE uses a MBS Broadcast CFR configuration or not. (i.e. no change)
3. If the UE needs to, the UE may indicate at transition to Connected, the need for a certain MBS Broadcast CFR configuration or equivalent indication, to assist gNB configuration for Connected mode. This is assumed supported by the already agreed MBS interest indication.
4. The Configuration restrictions / UE capabilities that determines which configuration(s) in Connected mode that allows a UE to receive MBS broadcast by CFR, is in principle not affected by additionally supporting Case E, e.g. shall not bring the the requirement of additional active BWP etc. Rather, network ensures the active BWP for RRC CONNECTED UE has the same SCS/CP as CFR and includes all RBs of the CFR so that UE can receive unicast and broadcast without BWP switching.

**Agreement:**Support case E, under the assumption that configuration work is driven by RAN2 and RAN2 impact is reasonable (i.e. RAN2 may decide to not support it if issues surface during WG discussions) and it is expected to have zero RAN1 impact. |

In contributions [1]-[8], some detailed solutions to support CFR Case E (where the bandwidth of MBS broadcast CFR is larger than that of initial DL configured by *locationAndBandwidth* within SIB1) are proposed. For example, on one hand, contributions [1][3][6][7] propose that an MBS configured BWP/CFR should be defined by explicit bandwidth and location configuration (without reconfiguring the initial BWP nor defining a configured BWP). On the other hand, contribution [2] provides a different solution. Specifically, it is proposed that the SIBx can reconfigure the initial BWP with MBS broadcast CFR, with which the MBS broadcast UE would use the reconfigured initial BWP and supersede the original SIB1 configured initial BWP.

Based on the input from contributions, the rapporteur generally thinks RAN2 should make a down-selection between the following two options,

* **Opt 1:** Configuring a BWP (including MBS broadcast CFR configuration) or a CFR for MBS broadcast, which fully contains the CORESET#0 in the frequency domain.
* **Opt 2:** Configuring SIBx indicated initial BWP (containing MBS broadcast CFR) for MBS broadcast, which supersedes the SIB1 indicated initial BWP.

**Q1: Which option do companies prefer for the support of CFR Case E?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Detailed comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Opt 1, but only support configuring a CFR, i.e. no additional BWP needed | Only an additional CFR bandwidth configuration is needed, and other aspects (e.g. how the UE adapts its receiver to the CFR) can be left to UE implementation, i.e. no more specification impacts expected.This concept would be similar to the multicast CFR which is associated with a dedicated BWP. For this case E, the additional configured CFR is associated with the initial BWP.  |
| MediaTek | Opt 1, but only support configuring a CFR, i.e. no additional BWP needed | We have the same understanding as Huawei |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

## 3.2 Supporting other CFR cases from configuration aspect

The next question that comes to us is whether the down-selected option can be also applied for the other CFR cases (e.g. CFR Case C), which is raised in contributions [5][7].

For CFR Case A (where the location and bandwidth of MBS broadcast CFR is the same as CORESET#0), the legacy NR framework is sufficient (i.e. the RRC IDLE and INACTIVE UE always assume the location and bandwidth of the initial DL BWP are the same as that of CORESET#0). No further enhancement is needed, as concluded in the RAN1 discussion.

For CFR case C (where the bandwidth of MBS broadcast CFR is the same as that of initial DL configured by *locationAndBandwidth* within SIB1, having a larger size than CORESET#0), frankly, it can be regarded as CFR case E if the bandwidth of MBS broadcast CFR is set to the same value as that of initial DL configured by SIB1. From the RAN2 configuration point of view, the rapporteur assumes that the signaling configuration and spec impacts for supporting CFR cases (e.g. case C and case E) are the same.

Companies are invited to provide their views on the following question.

**Q2: Do companies agree that the same mechanism (e.g. signaling configuration) can be used for both CFR Case E and CFR Case C?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Yes/No/Comments** | **Detailed comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not necessary | For Case C, the configuration of *locationAndBandwidth* for the initial BWP is already available in SIB1, but for Case E, this *locationAndBandwidth* configuration should be additionally configured and can be absent if Case A or C is selected by the network. |
| MediaTek | Unsure | We assume there should be additional configuration (e.g. *locationAndBandwidth*) within SIBx for case E in order to configure a bit large BW for this type of CFR |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

## 3.3 Other remaining issues

Last but not least, companies can provide their comments on the remaining issues for the support of CFR Case E/C for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, if they are not covered by this discussion.

**Q3: Are there any additional comments on the remaining issues?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Detailed comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

# 5 Conclusion

The contribution is summarized with proposals as follows,

**.**
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5. R2-2200759, MII and BWP related configuration, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility.
6. R2-2200818, Discussion on RRC parameters for MCCH and MTCH, Huawei, HiSilicon.
7. R2-2201260, Supporting CFR Case E for RRC IDLE and INACTIVE UE, vivo.
8. R2-2201413, RAN1 related issues in NR MBS, ZTE, Sanechips.
9. Draft RAN94-e Meeting Report EOM.

# 7 Appendix

For RRC\_IDLEand RRC\_INACTIVE UEs, for broadcast reception, further study the following cases of a configured/defined specific common frequency resource (CFR) for group-common PDCCH/PDSCH, and identify which case(s) will be supported:

* [Case E] the case where a CFR is defined based on a configured BWP.
	+ In particular, study the following:
		- whether a configured BWP for MBS is needed or not.
		- whether BWP switching is needed or not.
	+ In this study, the configured BWP has the following properties:
		- The configured BWP is different than the initial BWP where the frequency resources of this initial BWP are configured smaller than the full carrier bandwidth.
		- The CFR has the frequency resources identical to the configured BWP.
		- The configured BWP needs to fully contain the initial BWP in frequency domain and has the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
	+ Note: The configured BWP is not larger than the carrier bandwidth.
* the case where the initial BWP fully contains the CFR in the frequency domain.
	+ In this study the following sub-cases are considered:
		- [Case B] A CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
		- [Case D] A CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the frequency resources confined within the initial BWP and have the same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
	+ In particular, study the following:
		- Whether the considered two options with a CFR with smaller size than the initial BWP are needed or not for MBS.
* the case where the initial BWP has same size as the CFR in the frequency domain.
	+ In this study the following two sub-cases are considered:
		- [Case A] A CFR with the same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the same frequency resources as CORESET0. In this case the CFR has the same frequency resources and same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
		- [Case C] A CFR with same size as the initial BWP, where the initial BWP has the frequency resources configured by SIB1. In this case the CFR has the same frequency resources and same SCS and CP as the initial BWP.
	+ In particular, study the following:
		- Whether the considered two options with a CFR with the same size as the initial BWP are needed or not for MBS.