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# Introduction

This feature lead (FL) summary (FLS) concerns the Rel-18 work item (WI) on enhanced support of reduced capability (RedCap) NR devices [1, 2]. The final FLS from the previous RAN1 meeting can be found in [3]. The RAN1 agreement summary from the previous RAN1 meeting is available in [4].

This document summarizes contributions [5] – [10] submitted to agenda item 8.1 and this email discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| [117-R18-Maintenance] To be used for sharing updates on online/offline schedule, details on what is to be discussed in online/offline sessions, Tdoc number of the moderator summary for online session, etc – Chair.  **RedCap**  ***To be moderated by Rel-18 FLs. Following tdocs will be treated in adhoc session #1 – Xiaodong:***  R1-2404598 Draft CR on MBS PDSCH CBW definition for Rel-18 RedCap Xiaomi  R1-2404922 Draft CR on multicast transmissions for Rel-18 RedCap in INACTIVE mode Nokia  R1-2405192 Discussion on R18 (e)RedCap UE remaining issues ZTE, Sanechips  R1-2405193 Draft CR for eRedCap UE supporting enhanced positioning ZTE, Sanechips  R1-2405194 Draft CR for eRedCap UE supporting MBS in inactive state ZTE, Sanechips  R1-2405195 Draft CR for Rel-18 RedCap UE supporting MBS in inactive state ZTE, Sanechips |

The issues covered in this document are tagged and color coded with High Priority, Medium Priority or Low Priority, and those that are in focus in the initial discussion round are furthermore tagged FL1.

Follow the naming convention in this example:

* *eRedCapFLS1-v000-FL.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS1-v001-FL-CompanyA.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS1-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS1-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx*

If needed, you may “lock” a discussion document for 30 minutes by creating a checkout file, as in this example:

* Assume CompanyC wants to update *eRedCapFLS1-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*.
* CompanyC uploads an empty file named *eRedCapFLS1-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.checkout*.
* CompanyC checks that no one else has created a checkout file simultaneously, and if there is a collision, CompanyC tries to coordinate with the company who made the other checkout (see, e.g., contact list below).
* CompanyC then has 30 minutes to upload *eRedCapFLS1-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx*.
* If no update is uploaded in 30 minutes, other companies can ignore the checkout file.
* Note that the file timestamps on the server are in UTC time.

In file names, please use the hyphen character (not the underline character) and include ‘v’ in front of the version number, as in the examples above and in line with the general recommendation (see slide 12 in [R1-2403822](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_117/Docs/R1-2403822.zip)), otherwise the sorting of the files will be messed up (which can only be fixed by the RAN1 secretary).

To avoid excessive email load on the RAN1 email reflector, please note that there is NO need to send an info email to the reflector just to inform that you have uploaded a new version of this document. Companies are invited to enter the contact info in the table below.

**FL1 Question 0-1a: Please consider entering contact info below for the points of contact for this email discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point(s) of contact** | **Email address(es)** |
| vivo | Lihui Wang | wanglihui@vivo.com |
| Spreadtrum | Sicong Zhao | Sicong.zhao@unisoc.com |
|  |  |  |

# 1 MBS PDSCH bandwidth

The following contributions discuss MBS PDSCH bandwidth for eRedCap UEs:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [5] | [R1-2404598](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_117/Docs/R1-2404598.zip) (38.213 CR) | Draft CR on MBS PDSCH CBW definition for Rel-18 RedCap | Xiaomi |
| [6] | [R1-2404922](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_117/Docs/R1-2404922.zip) (38.213 CR) | Draft CR on multicast transmissions for Rel-18 RedCap in INACTIVE mode | Nokia |
| [7] | [R1-2405192](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_117/Docs/R1-2405192.zip) (Section 2.1) | Discussion on R18 (e)RedCap UE remaining issues | ZTE, Sanechips |
| [9] | [R1-2405194](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_117/Docs/R1-2405194.zip) (38.214 CR) | Draft CR for eRedCap UE supporting MBS in inactive state | ZTE, Sanechips |
| [10] | [R1-2405195](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_117/Docs/R1-2405195.zip) (38.214 CR) | Draft CR for Rel-18 RedCap UE supporting MBS in inactive state | ZTE, Sanechips |

RAN1 has made the following earlier agreements [4] related to MBS PDSCH bandwidth for eRedCap UEs:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Agreement:   * For UE BB bandwidth reduction, the number of PRBs scheduled in DCI can be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS for:   + Broadcast MBS PDSCH without any PDSCH in next slot   + Broadcast MBS PDSCH without MBS PDSCH repetition   Agreement:   * For a UE with BB bandwidth reduction, for multicast MBS specified in Rel-17, the number of PRBs scheduled in DCI is not larger than 25/15 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS (irrespective of whether HARQ feedback is enabled or disabled).   Agreement:  Adopt the following TP for 38.213 clause 17.1A:   |  | | --- | | A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2 is not required to process a PDSCH reception in slot that is scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a G-RNTI for broadcast or a MCCH-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, when the PDSCH reception is with repetitions or when the UE receives another PDSCH in slot . |   Agreement:  For a UE with BB bandwidth reduction, for multicast MBS for inactive state specified in Rel-18, UE is not required to decode the PDSCH if the number of PRBs scheduled in DCI scrambled with G-RNTI or MCCH-RNTI is larger than 25/15 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS. |

The last agreement above was made in RAN1#116bis, but no corresponding specification change has yet been agreed.

Contribution [5] proposes to adopt the following changes in 38.213 clause 17.1A:

* Add channel bandwidth definition for Rel-18 multicast MBS PDSCH in inactive state.
* Relocate “or a MCCH-RNTI” from behind “for broadcast” to after “for broadcast”.
* Change “A UE that has not indicated” to “A UE not indicating” in the broadcast paragraph.

|  |
| --- |
| A UE that has not indicated *eRedCapNotReducedBB-BW* does not expect to process a PDSCH reception that is scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, G-RNTI or MCCH-RNTI for multicast, or G-CS-RNTI, or is associated with a SPS PDSCH configuration activated by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by CS-RNTI or G-CS-RNTI, over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, in a slot.  A UE ~~that has not indicated~~ not indicating *eRedCapNotReducedBB-BW* is not required to process a PDSCH reception in slot that is scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a G-RNTI or a MCCH-RNTI for broadcast ~~or a MCCH-RNTI~~ over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, when the PDSCH reception is with repetitions or when the UE receives another PDSCH in slot . |

Contribution [6] proposes a similar change in the multicast paragraph (adding the MCCH-RNTI case) as above.

Contribution [7] proposes to adopt one of the following changes in 38.214 clause 5.1:

* Draft CR [9] capturing the RAN1#116bis agreement for eRedCap UEs:

|  |
| --- |
| A UE indicating *supportOfERedCap* capability but not indicating *eRedCapNotReducedBB-BW* is not required to decode a PDSCH scheduled with MCCH-RNTI, G-RNTI for multicast in RRC\_INACTIVE state if the number of PRBs scheduled in DCI scrambled with G-RNTI or MCCH-RNTI is larger than 25/15 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS. |

* Draft CR [10] capturing the RAN1#116bis agreement for eRedCap UEs and extending it to RedCap UEs:

|  |
| --- |
| A UE indicating *supportOfRedCap* or *supportOfERedCap* capability but not indicating *eRedCapNotReducedBB-BW* is not required to decode a PDSCH scheduled with MCCH-RNTI, G-RNTI for multicast in RRC\_INACTIVE state if the number of PRBs scheduled in DCI scrambled with G-RNTI or MCCH-RNTI is larger than the maximum DL bandwidth that the UE supports. |

The motivations for the proposed changes can be found in the contributions.  
  
**FL1 High Priority Question 1-1a: Companies are invited to comment on the proposed RAN1 specification changes related to MBS PDSCH bandwidth in contributions [5, 6, 7, 9, 10]. Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Based on the agreement made in RAN1 116bis agreement for eRedCap UEs, we prefer CR [9]. |
| QC | Among CR [5], [6], and [9], we prefer CR [5] for eRedcap.  CR [10] is a correction for Rel-17 Redcap UE. We think it should be discussed under agenda 7, while not 8.1. Plus we are not sure if it is a critical change for Rel-17 Redcap, assuming multi-cast for RRC\_inactive normally does not need wideband >20Mhz. |
| Spreadtrum | we prefer CR [9]. |

# 2 Positioning support

The following contributions discuss positioning support for eRedCap UEs:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [7] | [R1-2405192](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_117/Docs/R1-2405192.zip) (Section 2.2) | Discussion on R18 (e)RedCap UE remaining issues | ZTE, Sanechips |
| [8] | [R1-2405193](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_117/Docs/R1-2405193.zip) (38.213 CR) | Draft CR for eRedCap UE supporting enhanced positioning | ZTE, Sanechips |

The contributions propose to clarify that Swith the following change in 38.213 clause 17:

|  |
| --- |
| A UE with reduced capabilities (RedCap UE) that indicates *supportOfRedCap* or *supportOfERedCap* in this document or[6, TS 38.214] supports all Layer-1 UE features that are mandatory without capability signalling, unless stated otherwise. Procedures for a RedCap UE are same as described for a UE in all other clauses of this document unless stated otherwise. |

**FL1 High Priority Question 2-1a: Is the proposed change needed? Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | We are fine to clarify, but we are not sure spec update is needed.  Our understanding is “A UE with reduced capabilities (RedCap UE)”include both R17 RedCap and R18 eRedCap UEs based on following spec 17 UE with reduced capabilities A UE with reduced capabilities (RedCap UE) supports all Layer-1 UE features that are mandatory without capability signalling, unless stated otherwise. Procedures for a RedCap UE are same as described for a UE in all other clauses of this document unless stated otherwise. 17.1 First procedures for RedCap UE In this clause, the term 'UE' refers to a RedCap UE that indicates *supportOfRedCap* or *supportOfRedCap-r18*. 17.1A Second procedures for RedCap UE In this clause, the term 'UE' refers to a RedCap UE that indicates *supportOfRedCap-r18*.  For procedures only applicable to R18 eRedCap UEs, basically it is captured in 38.213 clause 17.1A Second procedures for RedCap UE, “In this clause, the term 'UE' refers to a RedCap UE that indicates *supportOfRedCap-r18*.” Or sentences in the 214 spec like following  “for a reduced capability UE that indicates *supportOfRedCap-r18*”or “a UE indicating supportOfRedCap-r18 capability but not indicating FG 48-2” |
| QC | N | We understand the intention to clarify positioning procedure for Redcap & eRedcap UE. But the proposal is too generic. Given the intention if only for positioning procedure, the TP can be more specific targeting positioning procedure only. |
| Spreadtrum |  | We understand that based on the UE feature discussion, it is clear that eRedCap can support Rel-18 positioning enhancements based on frequency hopping. It seems that further clarify in other spec is not necessary... |
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