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# 1 Introduction

This document captures the discussion in RAN1#101e post-meeting email discussion [101-e-Post-NR-RedCap], which follows an email discussion [101-e-NR-RedCap-01] held during RAN1#101e for the study item “Study on support of reduced capability NR devices” [1]. Both these email discussions focus on high-level topics and evaluation assumptions necessary to facilitate next step’s more concrete analysis and evaluations. For further background, see email discussion summary for the first email discussion in [3].

In this post-meeting email discussion [101-e-Post-NR-RedCap], the initial focus is High priority proposals listed below:

* High priority:
	+ Proposals 7, 9, 22, 22a, 23, 26
* Medium priority:
	+ Proposals 14, 14a, 15, 21, 28, 30
* Medium priority, to be discussed after sufficient progress has been reached on Cov. Enh. SI assumptions:
	+ Proposals 16, 17, 18, 19, 20
* Low priority:
	+ Proposals 0, 1, 3, 6, 12, 13, 24a, 25a, 27, 29, 32

This document deals with the High priority proposals, which have been updated to address the concerns expressed in Section 9 in [3]. The full list of proposals can be found in [3]. The fact that a proposal is listed with lower priority in this email discussion should not be interpreted as a suggestion that it will have lower priority in future meetings.

# 6 Evaluation methodology

## 6.1 Evaluation methodology for UE complexity reduction

For Proposal 7, one of the comments in Section 9 in [3] suggested that the words “*only if obvious benefits observed*” are added at the end of Proposal 7. Here it is proposed to add “*if found beneficial*” as a compromise.

**Proposal 7:** Cost/complexity breakdowns can be separate for FR1 and FR2 if found beneficial.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

For Proposal 9, one comment in Section 9 in [3] requested that it is clarified that the purpose is to consider the simplest NR device defined in Rel-15/16 that can support the targeted use cases. This is also the understanding of the Rapporteur, and it is in line with how the reference LTE modem was defined in TR 36.888 for the LTE MTC SI (where Cat-1 was chosen as the reference LTE modem even though LTE devices available on the market at the time were typically significantly more advanced than Cat-1).

One comment proposed to clarify that the reference NR device is “*for evaluation of complexity reduction*”. The proposal has been updated accordingly.

Other comments concern to what extent the reference NR device needs to support all mandatory features, and whether it needs to support 4Rx in FR1 bands {n7, n38, n41, n77, n78, n79}. The Rapporteur suggests leaving the proposal as is.

Several comments concern multi-band support. Since the expressed views are opposite, and the current proposal tries to strike a balance between opposing views, the Rapporteur suggests trying again to agree the current proposal.

Three comments proposed to include not only FD-FDD but also TDD among the duplex bands for the FR1 reference NR device. TDD has been added below.

One comment suggests clarifying what MCS tables should be supported by the reference NR device. The proposal has been updated with proposed MCS tables.

**Proposal 9:** The reference NR device for evaluation of cost/complexity reduction supports the following:

* All mandatory Rel-15 features (with or without capability signaling)
* Single RAT
* Band support:
	+ FR1: Single band
	+ FR1: Multiple bands (optional, details FFS)
	+ FR2: Single band
* Maximum bandwidth:
	+ For FR1: 100 MHz for DL and UL
	+ For FR2: 200 MHz for DL and UL
* Duplex mode:
	+ For FR1: FD-FDD, TDD
	+ For FR2: TDD
* Antennas:
	+ For FR1 bands {n7, n38, n41, n77, n78, n79}: 4Rx/1Tx
	+ For all other FR1/FR2 bands: 2Rx/1Tx
* Power class: PC3
* Processing time: Capability 1
* Modulation:
	+ For FR1: QPSK to 256QAM for DL, and QPSK to 64QAM for UL
	+ For FR2: QPSK to 64QAM for DL, and QPSK to 64QAM for UL
* MCS table:
	+ For FR1: 38.214 Table 5.1.3.1-2 for DL, and 38.214 Table 6.1.4.1-1 for UL
	+ For FR2: 38.214 Table 5.1.3.1-1 for DL, and 38.214 Table 6.1.4.1-1 for UL
* Access: Direct DL/UL access between UE and gNB

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 7 UE complexity reduction features

## 7.2 Reduced number of UE Rx/Tx antennas

It seems from the concerns expressed in Section 9 in [3] that not all companies are comfortable giving different priorities to different antenna configurations, and that there may be a wish to align the wording in Proposals 22 and 23. Proposal 23 has been updated to take this into account.

**Proposal 22:** For FR1, study two antenna configurations for RedCap UEs, namely 1Rx/1Tx and 2Rx/1Tx.

**Proposal 23:** For FR2, study two antenna configurations for RedCap UEs, namely 1Rx/1Tx and 2Rx/1Tx.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

For Proposal 22a, some comments in Section 9 in [3] preferred to revert the wording to an earlier version of the proposal, and some comments suggested that there needs to be some limit to how large the reduced antenna efficiency can be allowed to be. The proposal has been updated to take this into account. Other comments proposed other wordings or argued that the proposal is out of the RedCap SI scope and that it e.g. better handled in the Cov. Enh. SI.

**Proposal 22a:** For FR1, potential reduced antenna efficiency due to device size limitations for wearables is assumed to be limited to [x] dB (where x is FFS) and can be reflected as part of the antenna gains in the coverage analysis.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 7.4 Half-duplex FDD operation

Based on some comments in Section 9 in [3], it seems that although some aspects of the guard times for HD-FDD operation should probably be discussed in RAN4, it should be possible for RAN1 to do some initial cost/complexity analysis, as was done in the LTE MTC SI for TR 36.888.

**Proposal 26:** Study HD-FDD operation Type A and Type B, where study of Type A is prioritized.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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