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1. Introduction

This document is to report the outcome of the following offline discussion at RAN2#116bis-e Meeting:

* [AT116bis-e][111][CovEnh] Coverage enhancements (Qualcomm)

Initial scope: Continue the discussion on the remaining proposals in the submitted contributions

Initial intended outcome: Summary of the offline discussion with e.g.:

  List of proposals for agreement (if any)

  List of proposals that require online discussions

  List of proposals that should not be pursued (if any)

Initial deadline (for companies' feedback): Thursday 2022-01-20 2200 UTC

Initial deadline (for rapporteur's summary in R2-2201747): Friday 2022-01-21 0200 UTC

**Note:**

*Proposals in [2] and [10] do not appear to be related to coverage enhancements and hence are not included in this discussion.*

2. Contact Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | louchong@huawei.com |
| Ericsson | Jonas.sedin@ericsson.com |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | samuli.turtinen@nokia.com |
| Qualcomm | Linhai He (linhaihe@qti.qualcomm.com) |
| Samsung | Anil Agiwal (anilag@samsung.com) |
| Xiaomi | Xiaowei jiang (jiangxiaowei@xiaomi.com) |
| OPPO | Haitao Li (lihaitao@oppo.com) |
| China Telecom | Jing Wang (wangj08@chinatelecom.cn) |
| CATT | Haocheng Wang(wanghaocheng@catt.cn) |
| LG Electroncis | Gyeong-Cheol LEE (gyeongcheol.lee@lge.com) |
| NEC | Zonghui Xie (xie\_zonghui@nec.cn) |
| ZTE | LiuJing (liu.jing30@zte.com.cn) |
| InterDigital | Faris Alfarhan (faris.alfarhan@interdigital.com) |
| vivo | Yitao Mo (yitao.mo@vivo.com) |
| Intel | Candy.yiu@intel.com |
|  |  |

3. Discussion

## 3.1 Msg3 repetition for CFRA

In [12] it is proposed that Msg3 (PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant) repetition is also supported for CFRA, based on a working assumption made by RAN1:

**Working assumption**

* support repetition for a PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant, including both Msg3 PUSCH and CFRA PUSCH.
  + Use the same mechanism of Msg3 PUSCH repetition, when applicable, for CFRA PUSCH with repetitions.
  + No separate CFRA preamble/RO for repetition of CFRA PUSCH is introduced.
  + No additional optimization specific for CFRA PUSCH is considered for CFRA PUSCH with repetition.
  + No additional RAN1 specification impact

On the other hand, in [13] it is argued that from RAN2’s perspective Msg3 repetition is not applicable to CFRA.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R2-2201598 | On Type A PUSCH repetitions for Msg3 | Ericsson | Proposal 3 CFRA for Msg3 (PUSCH scheduled by RAR) is only applicable to reconfiguration with sync.  Proposal 4 CFRA for Msg3 (PUSCH scheduled by RAR) can be enabled by the network signalling how the UE shall interpret RAR in the CFRA/RACH-ConfigDedicated configuration.  Proposal 5 Introduce a flag in CFRA configuration on how RAR shall be interpreted for CFRA.  Proposal 6 Take the RRC excerpt as a baseline for introducing Msg3 repetitions for CFRA. |
| R2-2201617 | Remaining issues on RAN2 support of Msg3 PUSCH repetition | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: From RAN2 perspective, Msg3 repetition is not applicable to 4-step CFRA. |

**Q1**: From RAN2’s perspective, do you think Msg3 repetition for CFRA should be supported? Please note that only those cases of CFRA with RAR are considered for this question (For example, CFRA BFR is excluded).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | From our understandings, it doesn’t make much sense to support CFRA for “Msg3 repetition“ since CFRA can be only triggered when RSRP is above a threshold, which is contradictory with the condition of requesting Msg3 repetition. In addition, we are concerned it will also involve more standard efforts, e.g. to align the UE and NW understanding on how to interpret RAR (as in Q2). So it can be seen as optimization and thus should not be pursued for now. |
| Ericsson | Yes | From our understanding, the same reason for introducing msg3 repetitions and increased amount of repetitions for PUSCH that is being introduced is valid for CFRA scheduled by PUSCH, i.e to increase reliability and we do not think it is only true that CFRA is perfomed only in good conditions. Msg3/PUSCH scheduled by RAR is still the weakest link of the random access procedure, regardless of CBRA or CFRA.  RAN1 has a working assumption, where in the latest feature summary seems to indicate that it will be made into an agreement and the latest RAN1 feature list, “PUSCH scheduled by RAR“ is mentioned rather than msg3 repetitions.  Regarding implementation challenges, we have a proposal below that can achieve what RAN1 has been discussing, but RAN1 has also been discussing other alternatives. Aligning network and UE understanding is not difficult as in CFRA it is the network the decides on the understanding of RAR and does not require a lot of standard changes, nor procedural changes as the difference is the does not have to select by itself. |
| Nokia | No | CFRA usage is subject to the beam being above a threshold level which the NW can control. |
| Qualcomm | See comment | Technically, we assume the selection between CFRA, CFRA with repetition, CBRA and CBRA with repetition would be based on RSRP thresholds. If RSRP threshold for CFRA with repetition is configured between those for CFRA and CBRA, then CFRA with repetition can cover the case where UE’s RSRP is not strong enough to use legacy CFRA but can take advantage of CFRA with the help of Msg3 repetition.  However, selection based on RRC configuration, as proposed in [12], seems quite inefficient. For example, P4 & 5 in [12] require that if network includes a repetition indication in dedicated RACH configuration, then Msg3 always uses repetition, regardless of UE’s link quality. |
| Samsung | Yes | Follow RAN1 decision |
| Xiaomi |  | We would like to clarify that there is no different SSB RSRP threshould requirement for selecting CFRA and CBRA. The SSB selection RSRP threshold is the same. The current RSRP threshold condition for CFRA selection is to address the case that there is no SSB satisfying RSRP threshold. For this case, the principle is that UE can select any SSB. But for CFRA, its resource may only be configured on some SSB not all SSBs. Thus, UE may end up with choosing either a SSB with or without CFRA resources. To simplify the procedure, RAN2 agrees to use CBRA if no SSB satisfying RSRP threshold.  The SSB RSRP threshold should be lower than CE selection threshould. Otherwise, there will no SSB above threshould. Thus, network cannot prevent UE choosing CFRA when there is SSB above RSRP threshould.  But given the additional complexity to support CFRA repetition, and it is not within the objective of CE WI, and we don’t have time to discuss the solutions, we suggest not to enhance it in this release. |
| OPPO |  | It is still a working assumption in RAN1. We can follow RAN1’s conclusion. |
| ChinaTelecom | Yes | RAN1 has made the work assumption to support repetition for a CFRA PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant. And the work assumption is more likely to be confirmed in the end. Thus we think it’s better not to exclude it now in RAN2. |
| CATT | No | We think there are many spec impacts.  Firstly, the typical scenario of Msg3 repetion for CFRA is RRC CONNECTED. And if the network wants to configure Msg3 repetion for CFRA, the UE needs to report the corresponding capability.  Secondly, one separate threshold for CFRA should be defined. This will impact SSB selection procedure. And we agree with HW if the legacy RSRP threhold is used for Msg3 repertion in CFRA, it is unlikely the UE will select to Msg3 repetiton.  Besides, when the UE performs CFRA, the UE does not konw whether Msg3 repetitoin will be performed or not for PUSCH scheduled in RAR. Then, the UE behaviour for how to comprehend the fied for Msg3 repetiton should be defined in RAN1 or predefined by RRC. |
| LGE | No | Same view as Huawei and it would be good to start discusssion about this issue after RAN1 confirm this working assumption as agreements. |
| NEC | No | CFRA can be only triggered when RSRP is above a threshold so we don’t see much benefit to support this. |
| ZTE | Yes | The working assumption is made in RAN1, and RAN1 did not ask RAN2 to confirm the necessity.  On the other hand, it seems some companies misunderstood its working mechanism. In fact, supporting “Msg3” repetition for CFRA (or better to call it PUSCH type A repetition for CFRA) does not require separate RSRP thresholds, because it is triggered by network, which means after receiving Msg1, the network can decide whether to trigger PUSCH repetition by indicating a repetition number in RAR. There is nothing specific the UE needs to do when triggering CFRA, the open issue is how UE interprets the field in RAR (as Ericsson pointed out). |
| Interdigital | Yes | RAN1 has made the working assumption, it should be left for RAN1 to confirm it unless a problem is identified. We can follow RAN1’s conclusion. It seems the RAN2 impact is mostly on RRC signaling and some text in MAC to support how the UE reads the RAR for CFRA. |
| vivo | Yes | For CBRA, we had already agreed that a new separate SSB threshold can be configured. Then, if CFRA with Msg3 repetition can be supported, then that SSB threshold can be used for CFRA. We don’t see any difference between the triggering of CFRA and CBRA in terms of measured RSRP (i.e. if CFRA with Msg3 repetition is allowed, the UE can trigger CFRA even if the radio quality is not good enough). There are some use cases (e.g. supporting CFRA within a larger coverage range). |
| Intel | Not sure | RAN1 has a working assumption, however, it is paused during discussion. I wonder if there will be RAN1 spec impact. May be we should wait for RAN1 confirmation. |

**Summary:**

7 companies supported CFRA with Msg3 repetition, because RAN1 has a working assumption to support it. 5 companies did not support the proposal. Some thought it would have too much impact on the spec; while others thought it would not work because CFRA can’t be triggered unless UE’s RSRP is above a threshold. 3 companies suggested to wait for RAN1’s final agreement.

Given the split view, the rapporteur would like to suggest further discussion online whether CFRA with repetition should be supported:

**Proposal 1. (7/15) Discuss further whether CFRA with Msg3 repetition should be supported from RAN2’s perspective.**

---------

If Msg3 repetition for CFRA is supported, then UE needs to know if it is enabled in order to properly decode the UL grant provided in RAR. Since RAN1 did not discuss this issue, it would have to be implemented by upper-layer methods.

**Q2:** If Msg3 repetition for CFRA is supported, in your view how Msg3 repetition for CFRA may be enabled?

* Option 1. By RRC configuration, as in Proposal 4 and 5 in [12];
* Option 2. Other methods.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option 1/2 | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | None or Option 2 | See comments to Q1. We also notice RAN1 is discussing the similar issue, so we should avoid redudant discussion (if Msg3 rep for CFRA is supported) |
| Ericsson | 1 | We think that proposal 1 is a clean method, but we should discuss and evaluate other methods. |
| Nokia | None (if agreed, then Option 1) |  |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | Network can configure a RSRP threshold for CFRA Msg3 repetition and two dedicated preambles for a UE. One of the preamble is for UE to indicate its RSRP requires Msg3 repetition, and the other is for legacy CFRA |
| Samsung | See comments | Wait for RAN1 |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 |  |
| OPPO | See comments | RAN1 is discussing this issue now. We should avoid redundant discussion and wait for RAN1. |
| China Telecom | See comment | Since RAN1 are also discussing this issue, we can postone this and wait for RAN1. |
| CATT | See comment | We can wait for RAN1. |
| LGE | See comment | It would be good to start discusssion about this issue after RAN1 confirm this working assumption as agreements. |
| NEC | See comments | Agree to wait for RAN1. |
| ZTE | Option 1 | We are fine with Option1, we can also wait for RAN1 if companies want. |
| InterDigital | Option 1 |  |
| vivo | Option 1 with comments | It seems Option 1 is the only feasible solution considering the following RAN1 agreement:  support repetition for a PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant, including both Msg3 PUSCH and CFRA PUSCH.   * Use the same mechanism of Msg3 PUSCH repetition, when applicable, for CFRA PUSCH with repetitions. * No separate CFRA preamble/RO for repetition of CFRA PUSCH is introduced. * No additional optimization specific for CFRA PUSCH is considered for CFRA PUSCH with repetition. * No additional RAN1 specification impact   Moreover, considering that CFRA resource is indicated based on per beam level, we think this indication can be also indicated on per beam level (associating with SSB/CSI-RS, similarly to CFRA preamble). |
| Intel | See comments | Wait for RAN1 |

**Summary:**

Under the assumption that if CFRA with Msg3 repetition is supported, 6 companies supported Option 1 (i.e. RRC configured indication), 3 companies preferred different methods, and 7 companies preferred to wait for RAN1’s solution.

Given the split view, the rapporteur would like to suggest postpone the discussion on how to enable CFRA with Msg3 repetition.

**Proposal 2. (7/14) Postpone discussion on method(s) for enabling CFRA with Msg3 repetition.**

## 3.2 Order between RA-type selection and CE selection

In [5] and [8] it is discussed that whether UE should select CE before selecting RA type, as captured in the proposals listed below. Please note that this issue is discussed in the common RACH session as well. In this offline discussion, please comment from only CE’s perspective, i.e. no other RACH features are involved.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R2-2200272 | Remaining issues related to coverage enhancement | Xiaomi | Proposal 1 CE selection is performed after RA type selection and when 4-step RA type is selected. |
| R2-2201177 | Further Discussion on RAN2 Impacts of Msg3 Repetition | vivo | Proposal 1: From CovEnh perspective, Msg3 repetition request validation is performed ahead of RA type selection. |

**Q3**: From purely CE’s perspective, which of the following order between RA type and CE do you think UE should follow when initiating a RACH procedure?

* Option 1: CE selection is performed **after** RA type selection;
* Option 2: CE selection is performed **before** RA type selection;
* Option 3: other views (Please clarify in your comment).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option 1/2/3 | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 | Both works and will have the same results, and we prefer to have a unified framework, so Option 2 seems more aligned with common RACH agreements. |
| Ericsson |  | To my understanding we already brought this up online and no one had any objections:  Note: Agreements from RACH indication and partitioning session:   1. CE will also be considered as part of the feature combination for each RACH partition. The eligibility criteria for CE will be determined before the RACH partition selection is performed. [CB need to confirm that it is compatible with the CE agreements]   I assume it is up to RACH Indication and Partitioning (RIP) to implement this now in a manner that makes their procedures consistent. |
| Nokia | Option 2 | It seems unlikely the UE would anyway end up to 2-step RACH if CE required. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 | We should leave this to common RACH discussion. It does not make sense to look at this issue in isolation. |
| Samsung | - | RSRP threshold for 2 step RA selection will be higher than the RSRP threshold for 4 step RA with Msg3 repetition. So in our view both options will have same result. We can follow the agreements in common RACH discussion. |
| Xiaomi |  | Both works, we are ok with either option. |
| OPPO | Option 3 | We think CE is only required for 4-step RACH, so the RSRP threshould for RACH type selection will be higher than that for CE/non-CE selection. Both option 1 and option 2 will have the same results. We can leave this issue to common RACH discussion. |
| China Telecom | - | Agree with above companies that this is up to the common RACH session. |
| CATT | Option 3 | It has been agreed in RA partitioning that CE will be treated as part of the feature combination for each partition. And the procedure will be further discussed in RA partitoning. We think we can leave this to RA partitioning discussion. |
| LGE | Option 2 | Considering discussion in commen RACH session, we prefer option 2. |
| NEC | Option 3 | We should leave this to common RACH discussion. |
| ZTE | Option 2 | As Ericsson pointed out, RACH paritioning session has already agreed that CE selection will be performed ahead of RA-type selection. |
| Interdigital | Option 2 | Just like any other partitioning feature, the UE selects the partition before it selects 2-step vs. 4-step RA type. This dicussion can be left for the common RACH session. |
| vivo | Option 2 | It had been agreed in the common RACH session. |
| Intel | Option 2 |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary:**

7 companies prefer Option 2, i.e. CE selection should be performed before RA type selection. 8 companies think that this issue should be left to common RACH session to decide. 2 company thinks it does not matter because Option 1 and 2 would always leave to the same result.

Given that an related agreement has been made in the common RACH session:

1. CE will also be considered as part of the feature combination for each RACH partition. The eligibility criteria for CE will be determined before the RACH partition selection is performed. [CB need to confirm that it is compatible with the CE agreements]

and no company supported Option 1, the rapporteur hence would like to suggest that we confirm the agreement made in the common RACH session, as follows:

**Proposal 3. (14/14) From CE perspective, it is confirmed that the eligibility criteria for CE is determined before the RACH partition selection is performed.**

## 3.3 CE-specific carrier selection threshold

In [3] and [13], it is proposed that a new RSRP threshold should be introduced for CE-capable UEs in its selection of UL carrier for RACH.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R2-2200251 | Discussion on CE’s impact on UL carrier selection | OPPO | Proposal 2 Introduce a CE-specific rsrp-ThresholdSSB-SUL parameter for CE-capable UEs to select SUL/NUL carrier.  Proposal 3 The CE-specific rsrp-ThresholdSSB-SUL parameter has a lower value than the existing rsrp-ThresholdSSB-SUL parameter. |
| R2-2201617 | Remaining issues on RAN2 support of Msg3 PUSCH repetition | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 6: A new RSRP threshold is needed for the Msg3 repetition capable UE to perform carrier selection when NUL supports Msg3 repetition.  Proposal 7: The new RSRP threshold for the Msg3 repetition capable UE to perform carrier selection is configured per BWP, but the value applies to all the BWPs. |

**Q4**: Do you think a new RSRP threshold should be introduced for CE-capable UEs in its selection of UL carrier for RACH? If you do, please indicate in your comment what granularity this new RSRP threshold should be configured at (e.g. per BWP as proposed in [13] or something else).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Proponent. Without having a new RSRP threshold, the UE will only be able to select SUL even if NUL with CE can provide better coverage, which is not desirable. So it is reasonable to introduce a new RSRP threshold to better distribute the UEs considering NUL is configured with CE. Regarding the configuration in RRC, we don’t see much difference from the legacy carrier selection threshold, i.e. configured per BWP, but the value applies to all the BWPs of this UL carrier. |
| Ericsson | No | We can see the problem, and similar problems exist for instance for 2-step random access, where there could be a scenario where 2-step is configured for SUL, but may not be selected. Similar cases exist for other random access configurations where the coverage is affected. In the end nothing was done about this.  The problem is that with coverage enhancement being a part of feature indication group as per RIP WI it becomes a lot more complicated. Our understanding is that current procedures in RIP is that UE first performs carrier selection, then BWP selection and then the selections related to RACH partition is selected. If we now introduce a specific carrier selection threhold for CE UEs, the UE has still not evaluated whether CE is possible to select given that the RACH partitions may contain other features that the UE may not support. Thus for this to work, UE somehow have to select/evaluate RACH partition before UL carrier selection, which has separate problems.  The consequence of not introducing this is probably not that severe as SUL is already a feature introduced to increase coverage. I think since we already have so many thresholds introduced, it is very challenging to support every single case and this is something RAN2 has to live with. Note that CE is still possible both for SUL and NUL and we are in no conflict with any agreements. |
| Nokia | No | Configuration issue. |
| Qualcomm | No | We do not think CE-capable UE needs a separate threshold for UL carrier selection. Repetition gives the same improvement in link budget on both NUL and SUL. |
| Samsung | No | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Xiaomi | No | As agreed by RAN2, CE selection is performed after carrier selection. Thus before UE perform CE selection, UE can not decide whether to use CE SUL RSRP or not. |
| OPPO | Yes | Reusing the existing rsrp-ThresholdSSB-SUL parameter for CE-capable UEs will always prevent these UEs from using CE on NUL carrier as the existing rsrp-ThresholdSSB-SUL parameter is meant to be used for legacy UEs. To achieve better flexibility in using SUL CE and NUL CE, we need to introduce a new RSRP threshold for CE-capable UEs to use, and this new RSRP threshold has a lower value than the existing rsrp-ThresholdSSB-SUL. With this, CE-capable UEs may select SUL carrier or NUL carrier and then apply CE or non-CE, depending on its coverage situation.  For the granularity of this new RSRP threshold, it can be configured in the same manner as the the existing rsrp-ThresholdSSB-SUL, i.e. can be configured per BWP. |
| China Telecom | No | Agree with Nokia |
| CATT | No | It has been agreed that Msg3 repetition is supported on both NUL and SUL, and network can configure different RSRP thresholds for requesting Msg3 repetition on NUL and SUL.  If we introduce one separate threshold for SUL selection, the UE does not know which threshold will be used at this stage. Because based on the previous agreement, Msg3 repetition selection is done on the selected SUL i.e. Msg3 repetition is performed after SUL selection. |
| LGE | No | Accroding to the agreements in common RACH session, Carrier selection happens ahead of the initial RACH resource selection (i.e., feature combination is not considered in carrier selection).  However, if CE-specific new RSRP threshold is introduced, the UE have to check two different RSRP thresholds, i.e., one is legacy threshold and another is CE-specific threshold, to select a carrier. In this condition, we have following concerns. If legacy threshold indicates to use SUL but CE-specific threshold indicates to NUL, which carrier should be selected based on this results. If another feature specific RSRP threshold is introduced, the situation should be more complicated to select a carrier. We think that this is not aligned with agreements in common RACH session because it seems like the UE have to consider feature combinations in carrier selection. This proposal can make common RACH session difficult to design a unified common RACH procedure. |
| NEC | No | Agree with Qualcomm. Either SUL or NUL is seletcted, msg3 repetitions can further improve the coverage and network can configure different RSRP thresholds for requesting Msg3 repetitions on NUL and SUL. |
| ZTE | Yes, but | We proposed this in the first CE meeting, because we think CE can provide better coverage. But seems most companies had different views.  We want to highlight that, if this is supported, then (for the same reason) separate cell selection thresholds for CE-capable UEs should also be supported. |
| Interdigital | No | If the RSRP is lower than the already existing SUL threshold, then the UE should select the SUL; this is the intended design and there is no reason to change this legacy behaviour. Agree with Nokia that everything works as intended with proper NW configuration of SUL and msg3 repetition RSRP thresholds. Further, for CE, just like any other feature, UE first performs carrier selection, then BWP selection, then the RACH partition selection. |
| vivo | No | It looks strange to us. For example, originally, based on the legacy threshold, the UE might choose SUL for RACH without repetition, but if a separate threshold is used, then the UE might still camp on the NUL but perform the RACH with msg3 repetition, just because the UE is CovEnh capable UE, and it has less chance to select SUL. |
| Intel | No | We don’t see it is needed o have a seperate threshold. |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**:

Only 3 companies supported the proposal to introduce a new RSRP threshold for CE-capable UEs in its selection of UL carrier. They argued that if the existing RSRP threshold is used, then UE will never be able to select CE resources configured on NUL. The opponents argued that would be just a configuration issue. Therefore, the rapporteur would like to suggest the following proposal:

**Proposal 4. (12/15) CE-capable UEs use the legacy threshold, rsrp-ThresholdSSB-SUL, in its selection of UL carrier for RACH.**

## 3.4 BWP with only CE RACH configuration

In [7] and [13] it is discussed whether a dedicated UL BWP can be configured with only CE RACH resources.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R2-2200603 | Remaining issues on Msg3 repetition in CE | ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 3: RAN2 to select one of following options for CE RACH configuration: • Option 1: Dedicated BWP with only CE RACH resources is not supported. When configures RACH resources in dedicated BWP, it must include RACH resources for non-CE.  • Option 2: Dedicated BWP with only CE RACH resources is supported, in this case, Msg3 repetition RSRP threshold is not configured, and UE should always trigger CE RACH when this BWP is activated. |
| R2-2201617 | Remaining issues on RAN2 support of Msg3 PUSCH repetition | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 3: RAN2 confirms that it is feasible to configure either CE RACH resources only or non-CE RACH resources only on the selected UL BWP.  Proposal 4: In case only the CE RACH resource is configured on the selected UL BWP, the UE shall perform CE RA without evaluating RSRP.  Proposal 8: The RSRP threshold for requesting Msg3 repetition should be configured per BWP, and is only present if both CE RACH resources and non-CE RACH resources are configured for the BWP. |

**Q5:** Do you think a dedicated UL BWP can be configured with only CE RACH resources?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We don’t see a need to restrict NW flexibility, similar to 2-step RA configured only case. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Agree with Huawei |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | No | This proposal is against the current RAN1 agreement, which requires CE RACH to share preambles and/or ROs with other RACH configurations. CE RACH cannot have its own dedicated RACH resources. |
| Samsung | No | Same view as Qualcomm |
| Xiaomi | Discuss in RACH common design | RAN1 only addressed separate preamble with shared RO case. And leave separate RO case to RAN2 RACH common design. Thus, it should be RACH common design to decide whether to support separate RO CE RACH configuration. |
| OPPO | Yes | Agree with Huawei. |
| China Telecom | Yes | Agree with Huawei |
| CATT | Yes | This is more flexible. |
| LGE | Yes | There should be no restriction to configure RACH resource by the network. |
| ZTE | Yes | We prefer to allow this flexibility, regarding QC’s comments, we understand that RAN1 agreement does not preclude network to configure spearate ROs for CE RACH and legacy RACH, and most likely separate RO will be supported in RACH common session. |
| InterDigital | Yes | Agree with Huawei |
| vivo | No | We agree with Qualcomm. It is still FFS to support separate RO for Msg3-repetition.   * + FFS: Whether or not to additionally support one (and only one) more option.     - E.g., Option 2; Use separate RO configured by a separate PRACH configuration index from legacy UE.     - E.g., Option 3: Use separate RO, which include       * The separate RO configured by a separate RACH configuration index from legacy UE, and       * The remaining RO (if any) configured, by the same PRACH configuration index with legacy UEs, that cannot be used by legacy rules for PRACH transmission. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**:

10 companies support to allow a dedicated UL BWP to be configured with only CE RACH resources. 3 companies opposed because they were concerned that such a configuration is against the current RAN1 agreement. The rapporteur hence would like to propose the following proposal:

**Proposal 5. (11/14) Working assumption: From RAN2’s perspective, a dedicted UL BWP can be configured with only CE RACH resources. Its feasibility is to be confirmed by RAN1.**

## 3.5 Beam specific CE RACH

In [6] it is proposed that Msg3 repetition can be configured on a per-SSB basis for better utilization of RACH resources, when different SSBs have different channel conditions. Otherwise, it may result in uneven cell coverage or inefficient use of RACH resources.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R2-2200421 | Consideration on RAN2 impacts of Msg3 repetition | CATT | Proposal 3: In order to reduce the impact on legacy UEs, Msg3 repetition can occur on some specified RACH resource, e.g. partials SSBs.  Proposal 4: By introducing an indication parameter, e.g. bitmap, to indicate which SSB can be used for Msg3 repetition. |

**Q6:** Do you think Msg3 repetition can be configured on a per-SSB basis? If you do, please indicate in your comment how it may be signalled.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We don’t think it is essential and no much benefit can be seen. |
| Ericsson | No | Similar things were suggested for 2-step. In theory there can be benefits, but it is a big optimization that changes fundamental RACH configurations such as SSB to RO mapping etc and would probably have big impact on RIP implementation. |
| Nokia | No |  |
| Qualcomm | No | We have sympthy for the motivation behind the proposal but are afraid that it would have considerable impact on the RACH configuration, which is already quite compliciated with multiple RACH partitions |
| Samsung | No | Not essential. |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| OPPO | No |  |
| China Telecom | No | There are potential benefits with this. But as pointed out by other companies, it is not essential and brings additional complexity. We prefer to not consider it at this stage. |
| CATT | Yes | As Msg3 repetition procedure will take up more uplink resource. If the number of UEs in bad coverage is large, the uplink resource may be not enough for all UEs in the serving cell which may have impact on legacy UE’s RACH process. This optimization can reduce the impact on legacy UEs. |
| LGE | No |  |
| NEC | No | We don’t see much benefit to make a difference among SSBs, all SSBs in a cell should link to a feature combination for each RACH partition. |
| ZTE | See comments | We also proposed this in the first CE meeting. The motivation from our side is that reserving RACH resources(preambles) for CE for all SSBs is wasteful. So if network already knows the problematic beams (or bad coverage in specific direction), network can only configure CE RACH resources for those beams.  However, based on the design of RACH partition, probably it is hard to achieve such flexibility unless one RACH partition is only configured for CE. So we are fine with majority. |
| Interdigital | No | We recognize the benefit, but it may be complex to add this optimization at this point. |
| vivo | No | In the common RACH session, it had been agreed that:   * RAN2 baseline is that preambles for a particular feature combination shall be present in all SSBs (e.g., a feature combination cannot only have preambles in SSB0 but not SSB1)   Therefore, we don’t need to consider the per beam indication anymore for CBRA. |
| Intel | No |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**:

No companies except the proponent supported the proposal. A few companies acknowledged the potential benefits of the proposal, but they all were concern the impact it would have on RACH configurations. The rapporteur hence would like to suggest the chair minute the paper [6] is noted.

## 3.6 Prioritized RACH and CE

In [12] it is proposed that if a UE is eligible to use prioritized RACH, it is allowed to use CE-specific RACH resources, even if the UE does not meet the RSRP requirement for CE RACH. The motivation is that using CE-specific RACH resources can help prioritized RACH be more robust and faster.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R2-2201598 | On Type A PUSCH repetitions for Msg3 | Ericsson | Proposal 2 If the UE is prioritized, the UE can be configured to select msg3 PRACH resources. |

**Q7:** Do you think prioritized RACH should be allowed to use CE-specific RACH resources even if the UE does not meet the RSRP requirement for CE RACH?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Not aligned with previous agreements, and this proposal will affect other CE UE RACH performance. So we are not okay with this proposal. |
| Ericsson | Yes | We are the proponent and we think it can be beneficial for many use cases such as public safety, which was introduced in rel-16 for 4-step and 2-step random access. |
| Nokia | No |  |
| Qualcomm | No | In our view prioritization and repetition are two independent enhancements. Prioritization is applied based on type of RACH triggers and repetition is applied based RSRP. In the current framework, a prioritized RACH already can benefit from msg3 repetition when UE has poor RSRP. There is inefficient and unnecessary to always apply repetition even if a prioritized RACH has good RSRP. |
| Samsung | No |  |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| OPPO | No |  |
| China Telecom | No |  |
| CATT | No | There may be some potential benefit. But we should stick to the agreements in CE at this stage. |
| LGE | No | We don’t think that CE RACH is beneficial when the measured RSRP is high. |
| NEC | No |  |
| ZTE | No |  |
| Interdigital | No |  |
| vivo | No |  |
| Intel | No |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**:

No companies except the proponent supported the proposal. The rapporteur hence would like to suggest the chair minute the paper [12] is noted.

## 3.7 RAN1 related proposals

In [1] it is proposed that UE should re-/start DRX RTT or reTx timer at boundaries of time domain windows to better support joint channel estimation. The motivation is that during a joint domain window UE does not perform DL monitoring on PDCCH or DL reception on PDSCH (except certain DL slots). Therefore, DRX RTT timer or reTx timer should not be running within a time domain window, even after UE has performed the initial Tx of a repetition.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R2-2200192 | Issues on coverage enhancements | Qualcomm | Observation 1. Joint channel estimation (JCE) for PUSCH Tx, together with time domain window (TDW), is configured by RRC.  Observation 2. Network may configure multiple TDWs for a PUSCH repetition. Observation 3. Within a TDW, UE needs to maintain consistent Tx power level and phase continuity within TDWs of a PUSCH transmissions enabled with JCE.  Proposal 6. When UE in a TDD system is configured with JCE and TDW(s), UE applies the following behaviors for DRX RTT timer and DRX reTx timer: - UE starts DRX RTT timer only when a time domain window ends; - UE starts DRX reTx timer upon expiry of DRX RTT timer, only if no TDW is active; - UE stops DRX RTT timer or DRX reTx time, if running, when a TDW starts. |

**Q8.** Do you think enhancements to DRX RTT timer and reTx timer are necessary when time domain window is configured? If you do, please indicate in your comment whether you support the enhancements proposed in [1] (see above).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | It seems not essential to optimize DRX for JCE and not in the WID scope. If the UE power is a concern, it can be up to NW to configure a proper RTT timer to cover the TDW. |
| Ericsson | Not sure | We are fine to discuss it further, but we tend to believe that DRX timers should have priority over JCE window, otherwise scheduling will be challenging. Also, it seems that the JCE window is very short (2, 4, 8 slots) and the DRX timers should be able to take this in to account. |
| Nokia | No |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Proponent. We expect typical TDWs have longer duration than DRX RTT timer. So we are concerned that RTT timer and reTx timer may expire before end of TDW, causing HARQ failure. We are not sure if the problem can be completely avoided by network configuration. |
| Samsung | No |  |
| Xiaomi | No | We can simply add a note that UE is not supposed to monitor PDCCH during JCE window in DRX active time. |
| OPPO | No | Agree with Huawei. |
| China Telecom | No strong view |  |
| CATT | No strong view |  |
| LGE | No | In the contribution [1], they said that “If JCE is configured and UE can’t switch between DL reception and UL Tx during a TDW, then UE can’t start DRX RTT timer until the end of a TDW.”.  However, according to my RAN1 colleague, if the UE needs to swich between DL reception and UL TX during a TDW, the UE should segment the TDW and can switch between DL reception and UL Tx during using the segmented TDW. So, we think that the current mechanism is sufficient and no enhancements to DRX RTT timer and reTx timer are necessary. |
| ZTE | No | We also think DRX timer has higher priority, so the UE is supposed to monitor PDCCH during TDW. |
| Interdigital | No |  |
| vivo | No | NW configuration can handle the potential issue. |
| Intel | No |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**:

No companies except the proponent supported the proposal. The rapporteur hence would like to suggest the chair minute the paper [1] is noted.

---------

In [13], it has been proposed that msg3 repetition can be modelled in the same way as dynamically scheduled bundles. A TP is provided the Appendix in [13] for reference.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R2-2201617 | Remaining issues on RAN2 support of Msg3 PUSCH repetition | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 10: The bundling operation is applicable to Msg3 repetition, and the repetition number is determined from lower layer, similar to bundling of dynamic grant and configured grant. |

**Q9.** Do you think Msg3 repetition should be modelled in the same way as dynamically scheduled bundles, as proposed in [13]?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Proponent. For Msg3 rep initial tx, the repetition number is indicated in the MCS field carried in RAR, and for Msg3 rep retx, the repetition number is indicated in PDCCH, which are both transparent to MAC. So we think the bundling operation should be aligned with DG and CG. The TP can be merged into MAC running CR for detailed review. |
| Ericsson | Yes | The TP seems reasonable |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Interdigital | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | It is straightforward. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**:

The proposal had unanimous support. The rapporteur hence would like to suggest the following proposal for agreement:

**Proposal 6. (13/13) Msg3 repetition is modelled in the same way as dynamically scheduled bundles in the MAC spec.**

## 3.8 Configuration granularity of RSRP thresholds

In [13] it was proposed that RSRP threshold for requesting Msg3 repetition should be configured per BWP, and is only present if both CE RACH resources and non-CE RACH resources are configured for the BWP.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R2-2201617 | Remaining issues on RAN2 support of Msg3 PUSCH repetition | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 8: The RSRP threshold for requesting Msg3 repetition should be configured per BWP, and is only present if both CE RACH resources and non-CE RACH resources are configured for the BWP. |

**Q10.** Do you agree with Proposal 8 in [13]?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Proponent. Note that the RSRP threshold for requesting Msg3 repetition per carrier has been confirmed in RAN1 and RAN2.  Agreements:   1. Confirm Msg3 repetition is supported on both NUL and SUL, and network can configure different RSRP thresholds for requesting Msg3 repetition on NUL and SUL.   Regarding the configuration of the thresholds, we don't see much difference from the RSRP threshold for 2-step RA, i.e. configured per BWP and only present if both CE RA and non-CE RA resources are configured for the BWP.  We understand this threshold is also relevant to the leftover from common RACH session as follows.   1. CE will also be considered as part of the feature combination for each RACH partition. The eligibility criteria for CE will be determined before the RACH partition selection is performed.  [CB need to confirm that it is compatible with the CE agreements]   We understand whether this WA is compatible with above CE agreements depends on whether it requires a UE-specific CE threshold, rather than carrier-specific CE threshold. If it should be UE-specific CE threshold, then we don’t see how it can be compatible since different thresholds will result in different results and also impact the gNB implementation on SUL and CE features (see the following figure, where UE specific CE threshold and carrier specific threshold are used in the upper and lower respectively). Given no technical reason is received on carrier-specific threshold, we think it is too late to revert CE agreements, which was from RAN1 who has better view of performances between SUL and Msg3 rep. So we are not okay to revert CE agreements and we think there can be solutions to have a unified RACH partition framework that can be further discussed in common RACH session. |
| Ericsson | Not sure | We agree with the intention as similar was pursued for 2-step RA. But taking RIP into consideration I assume that the rsrp threshold would be used to determine whether the UE shall select the preamble partition related to msg3 repetitions. Whether it is present or not if there are CE and non-CE resources might not be as simple as for 2-step RA. Should be further discussed with RIP configuration in mind. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | See comment | The threshold for requesting Msg3 repetition should be configured under RACH partition, not BWP configuration. In general, such configuration issues should be discussed in the common RACH session, which has a sub-agenda for signaling issues. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | See comment | We agree with QC that it should be configured within configuration of RACH partitioning, depending on RACH common design. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| CATT | Comments | According to the agreements in RA partitioning, CE is considered as part of feature combination. And it is under discussion whether carrier and BWP selection should be performed before or after the selection of RACH partitions. So we can wait for the progress in RA partitioning. |
| LGE | See comment | We are ok with the intention, but it may be related to discussion in common RACH session because this may be configured in RACH partition as indicated by other company. This signailing issue can be discussed later. |
| ZTE | Yes with comments | CE is a bit different from other RACH partition features, because CE RACH can also be triggered on dedicated BWP. While RACH partition is only needed for initial access (i.e. RACH on initial BWP).  In our view, it is obvious that all RACH configurations are per-BWP configured, so for dedicated BWPs, network can configure different Msg3 repetition RSRP thresholds on different BWPs;  But for initial BWP, since it relats to RACH partition, the question is whether the threshold can be further configured per-RACH partition, and that should be discussed in RACH common session. |
| Interdigital | comments | This can be discussed a bit later after some further progress is made on the signalling framework for RACH partition configurations. |
| vivo | Comments | It is possible that multiple feature combinations including CovEnh can be simultaneously configured on the same BWP. Then, in this case, there would be multiple RSRP thresholds (e.g. the threshold for only CovEnh and another threshold for CovEnh+SDT). |
| Intel | Not sure | We think that the threshold is not different per BWP and as long as configuration is correct, it should be an issue. |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**:

5 companies support the proposal, while other 8 companies think this issue should be discussed in the common RACH session (e.g. the threshold should be configured per partition, instead of per BWP). 1 company is not sure. The rapporteur hence would like to suggest the following proposal for agreement:

**Proposal 7. (8/14) Configuration granularity of the RSRP threshold for requesting Msg3 repetition should be discussed in the common RACH session.**

-----

In [13] it was proposed that the SSB selection threshold, *rsrp-ThresholdSSB*, should be configured per BWP and is only configured for the BWP with CE RACH resources.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R2-2201617 | Remaining issues on RAN2 support of Msg3 PUSCH repetition | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 9: The separate SSB selection threshold for the UE who decides to requesting Msg3 repetition should be configured per BWP and is only configured for the BWP with CE RACH resources. |

**Q11.** Do you agree with Proposal 9 in [13]?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Proponent. We think it is straightward to configure this SSB threshold per BWP as same as the current SSB threshold for non-CE CBRA SSB selection. |
| Ericsson | Not sure | The comment to this is similar to Q10, but we are not sure whether this would be configured per RACH partition.  Should be further discussed with RIP configuration in mind. |
| Nokia | Maybe | It is not clear if this would be needed or whether the CE-RACH is allowed with higher threshold level than the SSB threshold. |
| Qualcomm | See comment | We agree Msg3 repetition should have a separate SSB selection threshold. However, it should be configured under RACH partition, not BWP configuration. In general, such configuration issues should be discussed in the common RACH session, which has a sub-agenda for signaling issues. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | See comment | We agree with QC that a separate SSB selection threshold is needed but within configuration of RACH partitioning, depending on RACH common design. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| CATT | Comments | We think this question is similiar to Q10. We can wait for the progress in RA partitioning. |
| LGE | See comment | Similar comments as in Q10, This signailing issue can be discussed later after making more concrete conclusion in common RACH session. |
| ZTE | Yes with commments | Similar comment as in Q10.  We can make conclusion in CE session that CE specific SSB selection threshold is supported, but regarding the granularity of this threshold, it can be per-BWP configured for dedicated BWPs; While for initial BWP, it is up to RACH partition session to decide. |
| Interdigital | comments | Like Q10, this can be discussed a bit later after some further progress is made on the signalling framework for RACH partition configurations. |
| vivo | Comments | Same comment for Q10. |
| Intel | Not sure | See Q10 comment |
|  |  |  |

**Summary**:

Similar to the previous question, 4 companies supported the proposal, while 8 other companies thought this issue should be discussed in the common RACH sessions and 2 company was not sure. The rapporteur hence would like to suggest the following proposal:

**Proposal 8. (8/14) SSB selection threshold for UE to request Msg3 repetition should be discussed in the common RACH session.**

1. Conclusion

**Proposals for agreements:**

**Proposal 3. (14/14) From CE perspective, it is confirmed that the eligibility criteria for CE is determined before the RACH partition selection is performed.**

**Proposal 4. (12/15) CE-capable UEs use the legacy threshold, rsrp-ThresholdSSB-SUL, in its selection of UL carrier for RACH.**

**Proposal 5. (11/14) Working assumption: From RAN2’s perspective, a dedicted UL BWP can be configured with only CE RACH resources. Its feasibility is to be confirmed by RAN1.**

**Proposal 6. (13/13) Msg3 repetition is modelled in the same way as dynamically scheduled bundles in the MAC spec.**

**Proposals for further discussions:**

**Proposal 1. (7/15) Discuss further whether CFRA with Msg3 repetition should be supported from RAN2’s perspective.**

**Proposal 2. (7/14) Postpone discussion on method(s) for enabling CFRA with Msg3 repetition.**

**Proposal 7. (8/14) Configuration granularity of the RSRP threshold for requesting Msg3 repetition should be discussed in the common RACH session.**

**Proposal 8. (8/14) SSB selection threshold for UE to request Msg3 repetition should be discussed in the common RACH session.**
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