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# **Introduction**

This contribution summarizes the following email discussion in AI 6.2.5.1 regarding UE features for additional MTC enhancements.

[100b-e-LTE-UEFeatures-eMTC-01] Email discussion/approval on feature group structure for both additional MTC enhancements and additional enhancements for NB-IoT (20th-24th April) – (DCM, Hiroki)

* Discuss whether FG[1-2] is a separate FG (i.e., remove bracket) or FG[1-2] is removed and added as a component in FG1-1
  + This issue is jointly discussed with FG[2-2]
* Discuss whether FG[1-7] is a separate FG (i.e., remove bracket) or FG[1-7] is removed and added as a component in FG1-3/1-4/1-5/1-6
  + This issue is jointly discussed with FG[2-4]
* Discuss whether FG1-9 is kept as a separate FG or FG1-9 is removed and added as a component in FG1-3/1-4/1-5/1-6
  + This issue is jointly discussed with FG2-5
* Discuss whether or not to introduce separate FGs for slot/symbol level resource reservation for FG1-23 to 1-26
  + This issue is jointly discussed with FG2-12 and 2-13

# **[1-2]: Group WUS with group resource alternation and [2-2]: UE-group WUS with group resource alternation**

In [1], FG1-2 is captured as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Features** | **Index** | **Feature group** | **Components** | **Prerequisite feature groups** | **Need for the eNB to know if the feature is supported** | **Need for the UE to know if the feature is supported (only for V2X WI, where the PC5-RRC capability signalling is delivered between the UEs)** | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | **Need of FDD/TDD differentiation** | **Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD** | **Note** | **Mandatory/Optional** |
| 1. LTE\_eMTC5 | [1-2] | Group WUS with group resource alternation | 1. Group WUS with group resource alternation | 1-1 | Yes | N/A | If UE does not support group resource alternation and the eNB enables group resource alternation, UE falls back to Rel-15 MWUS when Rel-15 MWUS is configured or no MWUS when Rel-15 MWUS is not configured. | Per UE | Yes | N/A | FFS: whether to keep this feature group 1-2 separately or put it as a component of FG 1-1 | Optional with capability signalling |

Following feedbacks are provided in contributions for the RAN1#100bis-e meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [3] | Qualcomm | We propose to make this a separate feature, mainly because of IODT (it is expected that this resource alternation will not be deployed initially). |
| [4] | Ericsson | **Proposal 1 Keep GWUS with/without group resource alternation as two separate FGs.** |
| [5] | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: FG 1-2 (Group resource alternation) is a component in feature 1-1. |

In [1], FG2-2 is captured as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Features** | **Index** | **Feature group** | **Components** | **Prerequisite feature groups** | **Need for the eNB to know if the feature is supported** | **Need for the UE to know if the feature is supported (only for V2X WI, where the PC5-RRC capability signalling is delivered between the UEs)** | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | **Need of FDD/TDD differentiation** | **Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD** | **Note** | **Mandatory/Optional** |
| 2. NB\_IOTenh3 | [2-2] | UE-group WUS with a wake-up time before the first associated PO (with group resource alternation) |  | 2-1 | Yes | N/A | The network cannot wake-up a group of users with one wake-up signal | Per UE | FDD only | N/A | If UE does not support group resource alternation and the eNB enables group resource alternation, UE falls back to Rel-15 NWUS when Rel-15 NWUS is configured or no NWUS when Rel-15 NWUS is not configured.  FFS: whether to keep this feature group 2-2 separately or put it as a component of FG 2-1 | Optional with capability signalling |

Following feedbacks are provided in contributions for the RAN1#100bis-e meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [7] | Qualcomm | Remove brackets for FG2-2 and Keep FG2-1/2-2 as separate FGs. |
| [8] | Ericsson | **Proposal 1 Keep GWUS with/without group resource alternation as two separate FGs.** |
| [9] | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: FG 2-2 (group resource alternation) is a component of FG 2-1. |

## 2.1 (Finished) Discussion 1

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether the bracket for FG1-2/2-2 are removed or FG1-2/2-2 are removed.**

**Keeping the FG1-2/2-2 (removing brackets) supported by: Ericsson, Qualcomm, ZTE, Sanechips**

**Objected (i.e., support removing FG1-2/2-2 and adding them as component of FG1-1/2-1) by: Huawei, HiSilicon, Sony**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Ericsson | Keep 1-2/2-2 (removing brackets). |
| Qualcomm | Keep 1-2/2-2 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Keep 1-2/2-2 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | support removing FG1-2/2-2 and adding them as component of FG1-1/2-1  The fairness between WUS resources is import for power consumption, therefore it should be mandatory for group WUS. |
| SONY | Agree with the view of Huawei, based on power consumption / fairness arguments. Hence:  support removing FG1-2/2-2 and adding them as component of FG1-1/2-1. FG1-1 would then have to be re-named as simply “Group WUS”. |

**FL proposal:**

* Remove FG[1-2] and add GWUS with group resource alternation as a component of FG1-1.
* Remove FG[2-2] and add GWUS with group resource alternation as a component of FG2-1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Let us explain a bit better the reasoning. It is very likely that, when implementing this feature initially, eNBs will not implement the resource alternation (note that this feature is configurable). Then, a UE is initially deployed, but it doesn’t have any IODT opportunity for this. If there is any bug at the UE, this UE will be completely unreachable, since it may be monitoring the wrong WUS. So, we would rather keep the two FG. |
| Ericsson | We have a similar view as Qualcomm. Note that the IODT argument is stronger for IoT (LTE-MTC/NB-IoT) devices than for normal (LTE/NR) devices, since the longevity is quite different for IoT devices compared to normal devices, and the possibility for firmware updates may be limited, and therefore extra precaution is motivated. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | We have similar view that two FGs are needed. Our intention of having few FG is for the case of combination of legacy feature and new rel-16 feature.  But for this case, both features are new rel-16.  Technically it is not that fairness will lead to less power consumption. In fact, quite contrary, in many instances for achieving fairness the system aggregated performance will be affected and UE power consumption will increase. |

**Updated FL proposal:**

* FG1-2 is kept for GWUS with group resource alternation.
* FG2-2 is kept for GWUS with group resource alternation.

# **[1-7] PUR serving cell RSRP TA validation and [2-4]: PUR with serving cell RSRP for TA validation**

In [1], FG1-7 is captured as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Features** | **Index** | **Feature group** | **Components** | **Prerequisite feature groups** | **Need for the eNB to know if the feature is supported** | **Need for the UE to know if the feature is supported (only for V2X WI, where the PC5-RRC capability signalling is delivered between the UEs)** | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | **Need of FDD/TDD differentiation** | **Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD** | **Note** | **Mandatory/Optional** |
| 1. LTE\_eMTC5 | [1-7] | PUR serving cell RSRP TA validation | 1. Serving cell RSRP for TA validation for PUR | 1-3 or 1-4 | Yes | N/A | PUR will not use serving cell RSRP for TA validation. | Per UE | Yes | N/A | TA validation mechanisms based on ‘Serving cell changes’ and ‘TA timer for idle mode’ (and ‘TA always valid’) are mandatory for PUR UEs.  FFS: whether to keep this feature group 1-7 separately or put it as a component of FG 1-3//1-4/1-5/1-6 | Optional with capability signalling |

Following feedbacks are provided in contributions for the RAN1#100bis-e meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [3] | Qualcomm | We propose to make it separate |
| [4] | Ericsson | **Proposal 4 Discuss whether there is enough reason from IODT point of view to keep PUR serving cell RSRP TA validation as a separate feature group.** |
| [5] | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 2: FG 1-7 (Serving cell RSRP for TA validation) is a component of FG 1-3/1-4/1-5/1-6. |

In [1], FG2-4 is captured as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Features** | **Index** | **Feature group** | **Components** | **Prerequisite feature groups** | **Need for the eNB to know if the feature is supported** | **Need for the UE to know if the feature is supported (only for V2X WI, where the PC5-RRC capability signalling is delivered between the UEs)** | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | **Need of FDD/TDD differentiation** | **Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD** | **Note** | **Mandatory/Optional** |
| 2. NB\_IOTenh3 | [2-4] | PUR with serving cell RSRP for TA validation |  | 2-3 | Yes | N/A | PUR will not use serving cell RSRP for TA validation | Per UE | FDD only | N/A | RAN2 has agreed that PUR with UP and CP solutions have separate indications, but this is not captured in this RAN1 UE feature list.  TA validation mechanisms based on ‘Serving cell changes’, ‘TA timer for idle mode’ and ‘TA always valid’ are mandatory for PUR UEs  FFS: whether to keep this feature group 2-4 separately or put it as a component of FG 2-3 | Optional with capability signalling |

Following feedbacks are provided in contributions for the RAN1#100bis-e meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [7] | Qualcomm | Remove brackets for FG2-4 and Keep FG2-3/2-4 as separate FGs. |
| [8] | Ericsson | **Proposal 2 Discuss whether there is reason from IODT point of view to keep PUR with serving cell RSRP for TA validation as a separate feature group.** |
| [9] | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 2: FG 2-4 (PUR with serving cell RSRP for TA validation) is a component to FG 2-3. |

## 3.1 (Finished) Discussion 2

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether the bracket for FG1-7/2-4 are removed or FG1-7/2-4 are removed.**

**Keeping the FG1-7/2-4 (removing brackets) supported by: Ericsson, Qualcomm, ZTE, Sanechips**

**Objected (i.e., support removing FG1-7/2-4 and adding them as component of FG1-3/4/5/6 and 2-3) by: Huawei, HiSilicon, Sony**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Ericsson | Keep 1-7/2-4 (removing brackets). |
| Qualcomm | Keep 1-7/2-4 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Keep 1-7/2-4 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | support removing FG1-7/2-4 and adding them as component of FG1-3/4/5/6 and 2-3  Without serving cell RSRP for TA validation, it would not be accurate enough for UE to validate TA. With the inaccurate TA, there will be uplink interference which result in waste of uplink resources and additional UE power consumption. |
| SONY | Agree with view of HW. Serving cell RSRP validation is required for TA validation and hence FG1-7 needs to be a component of FG1-3/4/5/6. Similarly for FG2-4 with respect to FG2-3. Hence:  support removing FG1-7/2-4 and adding them as component of FG1-3/4/5/6 and 2-3 |

**FL proposal:**

* Remove FG[1-7] and add serving cell RSRP for TA validation as a component of FG1-3/4/5/6.
* Remove FG[2-4] and add serving cell RSRP for TA validation as a component of FG2-3.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | The usage of RSRP for TA validation may not be deployed widely (e.g. networks may choose to implement only timer-based). If an operator doesn’t want to deploy RSRP-based, we would be forcing the UE to implement a feature that is not essential – if this was essential, it wouldn’t be configurable. |
| Ericsson | Similar comment as for Discussion 1. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Similar comment as for Discussion 1. |

**Updated FL proposal:**

* FG1-7 is kept for serving cell RSRP for TA validation.
* FG2-4 is kept for serving cell RSRP for TA validation.

# **1-9: PUR L1 ACK and 2-5: PUR with L1 ACK**

In [1], FG1-9 is captured as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Features** | **Index** | **Feature group** | **Components** | **Prerequisite feature groups** | **Need for the eNB to know if the feature is supported** | **Need for the UE to know if the feature is supported (only for V2X WI, where the PC5-RRC capability signalling is delivered between the UEs)** | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | **Need of FDD/TDD differentiation** | **Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD** | **Note** | **Mandatory/Optional** |
| 1. LTE\_eMTC5 | 1-9 | PUR L1 ACK | 1. L1 ACK for PUR | 1-3 or 1-4 | Yes | N/A | PUR will not use L1 ACK. | Per UE | Yes | N/A |  | Optional with capability signalling |

Following feedbacks are provided in contributions for the RAN1#100bis-e meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [5] | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 3: FG 1-9 (L1 ACK) is a component of FG 1-3/1-4/1-5/1-6. |

In [1], FG2-5 is captured as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Features** | **Index** | **Feature group** | **Components** | **Prerequisite feature groups** | **Need for the eNB to know if the feature is supported** | **Need for the UE to know if the feature is supported (only for V2X WI, where the PC5-RRC capability signalling is delivered between the Ues)** | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | **Need of FDD/TDD differentiation** | **Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD** | **Note** | **Mandatory/Optional** |
| 2. NB\_IOTenh3 | 2-5 | PUR with L1 ACK |  | 2-3 | Yes | N/A | PUR will not use L1 ACK | Per UE | FDD only | N/A | RAN2 has agreed that PUR with UP and CP solutions have separate indications, but this is not captured in this RAN1 UE feature list. | Optional with capability signalling |

Following feedbacks are provided in contributions for the RAN1#100bis-e meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [9] | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 3: FG 2-5 (PUR with L1 ACK) is a component of FG 2-3. |

## 4.1 Discussion 3

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether FG1-9/2-5 are kept or FG1-9/2-5 are removed.**

**Keeping the FG1-9/2-5 supported by: Ericsson, Qualcomm**

**Objected (i.e., support removing FG1-9/2-5 and adding them as component of FG1-3/4/5/6 and 2-3) by: ZTE,Sanechips, Huawei, HiSilicon**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Ericsson | Keep 1-9/2-5 (removing brackets). |
| Qualcomm | Keep 1-9/2-5 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | FG 2-5 is a component of FG 2-3 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | support removing FG1-9/2-5 and adding them as component of FG1-3/4/5/6 and 2-3 |
| Nokia, NSB | Keep 1-9/2-5 |

**FL proposal:**

* FG1-9 is kept.
* FG2-5 is kept.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Not sure why the FL proposal is to keep 1-9 and 2-5. Since more companies have the opposition opinion.  Technically, supporting L1-ACK will lower UE power consumption, because it is the most efficient and fastest method to finish the PUR procedure. |
| Qualcomm | Let me try to provide some technical points here:  - For UP PUR, there is always a need for L3 message, so L1-ACK will not be used.  - RAN2 has defined the number of PUR occasions in the configuration between {one, infinity}. Even for CP case, if a network operates giving the PUR one by one, there is a need to reconfigure the next PUR after each transmission, so these networks will not operate with L1-ACK either. If initially all networks operate like this, there will be no testing opportunity for L1 ACK.  - It is true that L1 ACK provides some power consumption gains, no question about it (we supported this feature throughout the whole WID). Having said that, there are some clear drawbacks of the L1 ACK, such as reliability when updating the parameters. Depending on the QoS needed by the device/application, and also the sensitivity of the network to update of parameters, L1 ACK may not be used in some cases. |
| Ericsson | Ericsson supports the view of keeping 1-9/2-5, since in our understanding the L1-ACK wouldn’t even be used for UP-based solution but only with CP-based solution. Another technical argument is that the L1-ACK doesn’t not provide robust security/integrity protection. Finally, regarding “*it is the most efficient and fastest method to finish the PUR procedure*”, in RAN2 more than one company have questioned such an argument since the eNB has to wait to make sure that there is no pending data in the DL before sending any response, even if a L1-ACK were used as a response. |
| Nokia, NSB | We agree with the comments made by Ericsson and Qualcomm, i.e. we can envisage devices/PUR configurations, where PUR L1 ACK is not required/used. Hence, we’d like to keep 1-9/2-5 as they are. |

# **1-23 to 1-26: Subframe/slot/symbol-level resource reservation and 2-12 and 2-13: Subframe/slot/symbol-level resource reservation**

In [1], FG1-23 to FG1-26 are captured as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Features** | **Index** | **Feature group** | **Components** | **Prerequisite feature groups** | **Need for the eNB to know if the feature is supported** | **Need for the UE to know if the feature is supported (only for V2X WI, where the PC5-RRC capability signalling is delivered between the Ues)** | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | **Need of FDD/TDD differentiation** | **Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD** | **Note** | **Mandatory/Optional** |
| 1. LTE\_eMTC5 | 1-23 | Resource reservation for DL in CemodeA | 1. Subframe/slot/symbol-level time-domain resource reservation in DL in CemodeA  2. RBG-level frequency-domain resource reservation in DL in CemodeA | CemodeA | Yes | N/A | Whole DL subframe(s) may need to be configured as invalid in order to avoid NR collision. | Per UE | Yes | N/A | FFS: Whether to have separate indications for subframe/slot/symbol levels | Optional with capability signalling |
| 1-24 | Resource reservation for DL in CemodeB | 1. Subframe/slot/symbol-level time-domain resource reservation in DL in CemodeB  2. RBG-level frequency-domain resource reservation in DL in CemodeB | CemodeB | Yes | N/A | Whole DL subframe(s) may need to be configured as invalid in order to avoid NR collision. | Per UE | Yes | N/A | FFS: Whether to have separate indications for subframe/slot/symbol levels | Optional with capability signalling |
| 1-25 | Resource reservation for UL in CemodeA | 1. Subframe/slot/symbol-level time-domain resource reservation in UL in CemodeA | CemodeA | Yes | N/A | Whole UL subframe(s) may need to be configured as invalid in order to avoid NR collision. | Per UE | Yes | N/A | FFS: Whether to have separate indications for subframe/slot/symbol levels | Optional with capability signalling |
| 1-26 | Resource reservation for UL in CemodeB | 1. Subframe/slot/symbol-level time-domain resource reservation in UL in CemodeB | CemodeB | Yes | N/A | Whole UL subframe(s) may need to be configured as invalid in order to avoid NR collision. | Per UE | Yes | N/A | FFS: Whether to have separate indications for subframe/slot/symbol levels | Optional with capability signalling |

Following feedbacks are provided in contributions for the RAN1#100bis-e meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [2] | ZTE | ***Proposal 2: The capability signalling can be used to indicate support for slot/symbol level granularity in Rel-16 MTC enhancement. For subframe level, legacy indication can be used.*** |
| [4] | Ericsson | **Proposal 7 Introduce two separate indications for DL resource reservation in CE mode A with subframe-level and slot-/symbol-level granularity, respectively.**  **Proposal 8 Introduce two separate indications for DL resource reservation in CE mode B with subframe-level and slot-/symbol-level granularity, respectively.**  **Proposal 9 Introduce two separate indications for UL resource reservation in CE mode A with subframe-level and slot-/symbol-level granularity, respectively.**  **Proposal 10 Introduce two separate indications for UL resource reservation in CE mode B with subframe-level and slot-/symbol-level granularity, respectively.** |
| [5] | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 5：Separate indication to slot/symbol level resource reservation in feature groups from 1-23 to 1-26 is not supported.** |
| [3] | Qualcomm | We propose to have separate indication (for 1-23 to 26) |

In [1], FG12 and FG2-13 are captured as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Features** | **Index** | **Feature group** | **Components** | **Prerequisite feature groups** | **Need for the eNB to know if the feature is supported** | **Need for the UE to know if the feature is supported (only for V2X WI, where the PC5-RRC capability signalling is delivered between the Ues)** | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | **Need of FDD/TDD differentiation** | **Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD** | **Note** | **Mandatory/Optional** |
| 2. NB\_IOTenh3 | 2-12 | Resource reservation  DL resource reservation with subframe-level, slot-level and symbol-level granularity of NB-IoT non-anchor carriers. |  |  | Yes | N/A | NB-IoT transmission may collide with NR transmission | Per UE | Yes | N/A | FFS: Whether to introduce separate indications for subframe/slot/symbol levels | Optional with capability signalling |
| 2-13 | Resource reservation  UL resource reservation with subframe-level, slot-level and symbol(s)-level granularity of NB-IoT non-anchor carriers. |  |  | Yes | N/A | NB-IoT transmission may collide with NR transmission | Per UE | Yes | N/A | FFS: Whether to introduce separate indications for subframe/slot/symbol levels | Optional with capability signalling |

Following feedbacks are provided in contributions for the RAN1#100bis-e meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [6] | ZTE | ***Proposal 2: For Rel-16 NB-IoT enhancement, one indication for symbol-level/slot level and another separate indication for subframe level should be used for DL/UL resource reservation.*** |
| [7] | Qualcomm | We would like to have separate indications for all resource reservation FG. |
| [8] | Ericsson | **Proposal 3 Introduce two separate indications for DL resource reservation with subframe-level and slot-/symbol-level granularity, respectively.**  **Proposal 4 Introduce two separate indications for UL resource reservation with subframe-level and slot-/symbol-level granularity, respectively.** |
| [9] | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 4：Separate indication to slot/symbol level resource reservation is not supported in feature groups 2-12 and 2-13.** |

## 5.1 (Finished) Discussion 4

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether or not to introduce separate FGs for slot/symbol level resource reservation for FG1-23 to 1-26 and FG2-12/13.**

**Introducing separate FGs (one for subframe level, another for slot/symbol level) supported by: Ericsson, Qualcomm, Huawei, HiSilicon, Sony, Nokia, NSB, Futurewei, ZTE, Sanechips**

**Objected (i.e., only one FG) by:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Ericsson | Introduce separate FGs for subframe level and slot/symbol level (but keep the same FG for slot level and symbol level). |
| Qualcomm | We would like to have separate FG for slot/symbol/subframe, but we could accept Ericsson’s proposal as a compromise. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Same FG for slot level and symbol level. For subframe level, legacy indication signaling can be used. |
| Ericsson 2 | Regarding the ZTE/Sanechips comment above, probably “legacy indication signaling” refers to the Rel-13 valid/invalid subframe configuration, but it should be noted that although there are similarities, the Rel-13 valid/invalid subframe configuration and the Rel-16 subframe resource reservation are different features with different configuration parameters, so it cannot be assumed that a UE that implements one of them correctly also implements the other one correctly. |
| Qualcomm 2 | To add to Ericsson’s comment, we don’t think legacy subframe-level reservation has any capability (so, essentially if we follow ZTE’s proposal, this feature would be mandatory without capability signaling, which is not desirable) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support to have one FG for subframe/slot/symbol.  We can accept to have one single separate FG for slot/symbol, while the subframe FG is the prerequisite FG. |
| SONY | We are OK with separate FGs for subframe level and slot / symbol level (as per Ericsson), or the even more granular proposal from Qualcomm.  Taking the Ericsson approach and using FG1-23 as an example, we understand that Ericsson propose to have:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1-23a | Subframe level resource reservation for DL in CEmodeA | 1. Subframe-level time-domain resource reservation in DL in CEmodeA  2. RBG-level frequency-domain resource reservation in DL in CEmodeA | | 1-23b | Slot/symbol level resource reservation for DL in CEmodeA | 1. Slot/symbol-level time-domain resource reservation in DL in CEmodeA  2. RBG-level frequency-domain resource reservation in DL in CEmodeA |   If the above is not Ericsson’s proposal, could they please clarify? |
| Ericsson 3 | Regarding the Sony comment above: Yes, the example reflects our proposal well. |
| Futurewei | Can Ericsson clarify whether there is a dependency or not? In their comment “Introduce separate FGs for subframe level and slot/symbol level” does the slot/symbol level reservation FG have a subframe level FG as a prerequisite?  Our inclination is not to be a burden to test and make available all the levels of granularity. Companies can also consider - may be this is a case of excessive granularity. We are OK with 2 FGs, one for the subframe-level granularity and one for slot/symbol granularity. If it is a common understanding that subframe-level reservation always exists, then make it a prerequisite to the slot/symbol-level FG. (If answer to my question to Ericsson is yes, then, we see a convergence in this topic) |
| Ericsson 4 | Regarding the Futurewei comment above: Yes, we would like each subframe-level FG to be a prerequisite for the corresponding slot/symbol-level FG. |
| ZTE,Sanechips 2 | We think the Rel-13 valid/invalid subframe configuration and the Rel-16 subframe resource reservation are almost same. If there's any difference (so far, we cannot see) it should be very minor.  Since rel-13 this is a mandatary feature we think it's reasonable to continue set this mandatory (subframe level) as mandatary.  Then we only need one FG for symbol/slot level |
| Ericsson 5 | Regarding the ZTE comment above: Introduction of mandatory features is out of the question, since it would mean that a UE cannot implement a single one of the Rel-16 features without implement the resource reservation feature, even though the operator may not even be interested in coexistence of LTE-MTC/NB-IoT and NR in the band(s) in question. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | We suggest mandatory because we don't see any extra effort to go from rel-13 legacy feature to rel-16 subframe level granularity, and we envision lots of operator will be interested in the coexistence scenario.  Use subframe-level FG as a prerequisite for the slot/symbol-level FG can be a compromise to proceed. |
| Nokia, NSB | Our preference is to have one indication for the subframe level, and one indication for the slot/symbol level. |
| Ericsson 6 | Regarding the ZTE comment above: Remember that subframe-level resource reservation configuration involves various aspects that are different from Rel-13 valid/invalid subframe confirmation. For example, the application of the configuration is not to all transmissions but only to some UE-specific transmissions and this needs to be tested. Also, there are various new parameters such as periodicity and offset that we didn’t have before. And for LTE-MTC, there is the whole DL frequency-domain resource reservation functionality which we didn’t have before.  We agree it would be a good compromise to have subframe-level FG as prerequisite for slot/symbol-level FG. |
| SONY 2 | We agree with Ericsson that the Rel-16 subframe-level resource reservation scheme is different to the Rel-13 scheme.  We are OK to have a (1) subframe-level FG and a (2) slot/symbol level FG.  We don’t understand the rationale that the subframe level FG is a prerequisite for the slot/symbol level FG just because “subframe-level reservation always exists”. Our understanding of a FG1 being a prerequisite of a FG2 is that FG2 doesn’t work if FG1 isn’t implemented, at least that is what the rest of the FG table in R1-2001485 looks like to us.  So, we would rather the table were consistent and the subframe level FG is not a prerequisite for the slot/symbol level FG. |
| Ericsson 7 | Regarding the Sony comment above: Since the Rel-16 resource reservation needs to be able to “do everything” that the Rel-13 valid/invalid subframe configuration can do, we think it is quite important that a UE that supports slot/symbol-level resource reservation also supports subframe-level resource reservation, so that the network is not forced to create fully reserved subframes using slot/symbol-level resource reservation for these UEs. |

**FL proposal:**

* FG1-23 is kept for subframe level, and FG1-23a is introduced for slot/symbol level.
* FG1-24 is kept for subframe level, and FG1-24a is introduced for slot/symbol level.
* FG1-25 is kept for subframe level, and FG1-25a is introduced for slot/symbol level.
* FG1-26 is kept for subframe level, and FG1-26a is introduced for slot/symbol level.
* FG2-12 is kept for subframe level, and FG2-12a is introduced for slot/symbol level.
* FG2-13 is kept for subframe level, and FG2-13a is introduced for slot/symbol level.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| ZTE,Sanechips | We are still a little bit confused here. Just want to clarify, for example   * FG2-13 is kept for subframe level, and FG2-13a is introduced for slot/symbol level.   This means UE supporting FG2-13a supports FG2-13?  If this is the correct understanding, then we are OK for this. |
| Ericsson | Similar to ZTE, we would also like to see each subframe-level FG as prerequisite for the corresponding slot/symbol-level FG, but we assume this will be decided in the next phase of the work with the UE feature list. |

# **Conclusion**

Following agreements were made.

**Agreements:**

* FG1-2 is kept for GWUS with group resource alternation.
* FG2-2 is kept for GWUS with group resource alternation.
* FG1-7 is kept for serving cell RSRP for TA validation.
* FG2-4 is kept for serving cell RSRP for TA validation.
* FG1-23 is kept for subframe level, and FG1-23a is introduced for slot/symbol level.
* FG1-24 is kept for subframe level, and FG1-24a is introduced for slot/symbol level.
* FG1-25 is kept for subframe level, and FG1-25a is introduced for slot/symbol level.
* FG1-26 is kept for subframe level, and FG1-26a is introduced for slot/symbol level.
* FG2-12 is kept for subframe level, and FG2-12a is introduced for slot/symbol level.
* FG2-13 is kept for subframe level, and FG2-13a is introduced for slot/symbol level.

**FL proposal:**

* FG1-9 is kept.
* FG2-5 is kept.

TBD
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