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# Introduction

This documents is to collect comments for the RRC parameters of Rel-17 WI: Additional enhancements for NB-IoT and LTE-MTC.

The draft RRC parameter list has been uploaded in the same folder: [Post\_RAN1#106-e\_Rel-17\_RRC\_NB-IoT\_eMTC\_v0.1.xlsx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Inbox/drafts/8.9/RRC/Post_RAN1%23106-e_Rel-17_RRC_NB-IoT_eMTC_v0.1.xlsx).

# Comments

## Support of 16-QAM for unicast in UL and DL for NB-IoT

Please input your comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Ericsson | * For column “M”: What is motivation for having both “Per UE” and “NB-IoT carrier”? It seems that “Per UE” should be enough as a NB-IoT UE is only capable to transmit/receive on one carrier.
* For column “K”: When the intention is to enable/disable the feature (e.g., row #2, column K), I’m under the impression that in previous releases “Enabled” has been used as “Value range”, however in this draft “Enable, disable” has been used. We are commenting on this because the new wording may give the impression that the disabling needs to be explicitly indicated, and I would like to know if that was the intention or not. I believe it will up to RAN2 to decide whether the disabling is explicit or if it can be implicitly indicated if the new IE is absent.
 |
| Qualcomm | Column M should be changed to “Per UE” in all cases.In Row 7, we should refer to the existing parameter. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | * In Column A, why do we have several WI codes? E.g., [NB\_IOTenh4\_LTE\_eMTC7]
* In Row 7 column 9, I am wondering for PUR MCS in PUR configuration. the TBS index for NPUSCH for PUR when 16QAM is configured. If only indicate the TBS index, how does the UE know the modulation type, for example, TBS index =17, do we need additional IE to indicate the modulation type? If not, we should use the MCS index🡪 indicate both the TBS and modulation
* In Column G, we hope we can correct some parameter names, although the detail will be confirmed by RAN2, the proposed parameter names in the list will appear in the first version of coming spec. E.g., HARQ-ACK-delay
 |

## Support additional PDSCH scheduling delay for introduction of 14-HARQ processes in DL for eMTC

Please input your comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Ericsson | * Same comment about column “M”.
* Same comment about column “K”.
* For this feature, it seems that as in legacy the name of the parameters should start with the prefix "ce". Although RAN2 will anyway decide on the final parameter names, perhaps is good to add the prefix as to do not give the impression that is not there for a reason.
 |
| Qualcomm | Column N should be “per UE” |
|  |  |

## Support a maximum DL TBS of 1736 bits as a Rel-17 optional UE capability

Please input your comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Ericsson | * Same comment about column “M”.
* Same comment about column “K”.
 |
| Qualcomm | Same comment as above. |
|  |  |

## Others

Please input your comments for any other issues related to RRC parameters:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Summary