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# 1 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], and a RAN1 agreement summary is available in [4].

The core part of the WI [1] has the following objective and notes related to further reduced UE complexity:

|  |
| --- |
| **Complexity/cost reduction**   * Further reduced UE complexity in FR1 [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]   + UE BB bandwidth reduction     - 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for PDSCH (for both unicast and broadcast) and PUSCH, with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL     - The other physical channels and signals are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF+BB bandwidth.     - Support additional separate early indication(s) [RAN1, RAN2]   + UE peak data rate reduction     - Relaxation of the constraint (*vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4) for peak data rate reduction     - The relaxed constraint is, e.g., 1 (instead of 4).     - The parameters (*vLayers*, *Qm*, *f*) can be as in Rel-17 RedCap.   + Both 15 kHz SCS and 30 kHz SCS are supported.   + Aim to define at most one Rel-18 RedCap UE type for further UE complexity reduction.   + The existing UE capability framework is used, and changes to capability signalling are specified only if necessary. By default, all UE capabilities applicable to a Rel-17 RedCap UE are applicable unless otherwise specified.   Notes:   * The work defined as part of this WI is not to overlap with LPWA use cases. * Coexistence with non-RedCap UEs and Rel-17 RedCap UEs should be ensured. * This WI considers all applicable duplex modes unless otherwise specified.   Check in RAN#99 regarding:   * Whether UE peak data rate reduction for UE is limited only with UE BB bandwidth reduction or standalone |

RAN#99 discussed whether UE peak data rate reduction (“PR1”) should be supported as a standalone feature or only in combination with UE BB bandwidth reduction (“BW3/PR3”) and endorsed the following proposal [5], where the different nicknames for the UE complexity reduction features (“PR1” and “BW3/PR3”) originate from TR 38.865 [6].

|  |
| --- |
| **Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 and Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1 are designed/targeted to same peak data rate, i.e., 10Mbps**  Note 1: Peak data rate of “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of 20MHz + PR1” and “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1” is same including unicast and broadcast respectively.  Note 2: PRB processing capability of “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of 20MHz + PR1” is not limited to “25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS” and it corresponds to PRB size corresponding to 20 MHz.  Note 3: The only difference between “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of 20MHz + PR1” and “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1” is Note 2 and *vLayers·Qm·f* in order to have the same peak rate.  Note 4: The initial access procedure of Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 is realized by following:   * Same as Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1 |

This document summarizes contributions [7] – [36] submitted to agenda items 9.6 and 9.6.1, and contributions [37-39] submitted to another agenda item, and the following email discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| [113-R18-RedCap] Email discussion on eRedCap – Johan (Ericsson)   * 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 |

The issues in this document are tagged and color coded with High Priority or Medium Priority. The issues that are in the focus of this discussion round are furthermore tagged FL7. The FLSs from the earlier rounds can be found in [41, 42, 43].

Follow the naming convention in this example:

* *eRedCapFLS4-v000.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS4-v001-CompanyA.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS4-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS4-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 *eRedCapFLS4-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*.
* CompanyC uploads an empty file named *eRedCapFLS4-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 *eRedCapFLS4-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 11 in [R1-2304302](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_113/Docs/R1-2304302.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.

**FL7 Question 1-1a: Please consider entering contact info below for the points of contact for this email discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point(s) of contact** | **Email address(es)** |
| FUTUREWEI | Vip Desai | vipul.desai@futurewei.con |
| Panasonic | Shotaro Maki | maki.shotaro@jp.panasonic.com |
| NTT DOCOMO | Mayuko Okano | mayuko.okano.ca@nttdocomo.com |
| Spreadtrum | Sicong Zhao | Sicong.zhao@unisoc.com |
| CATT | Yongqiang FEI | feiyongqiang@catt.cn |
| Vivo | Lihui Wang | wanglihui@vivo.com |
| LG Electronics | Seungjin Ahn | Seungjin.ahn@lge.com |
| MediaTek | Chiou-Wei Tsai | cw.tsai@mediatek.com |
| Nokia, NSB | Rapeepat Ratasuk | rapeepat.ratasuk@nokia.com |
| Qualcomm | Yongjun Kwak | yongkwak@qualcomm.com |
| NEC | Takahiro Sasaki | takahiro.sasaki@nec.com |
| Sierra Wireless | Serkan Dost | sdost@sierrawireless.com |
| Ericsson | Sandeep Narayanan Kadan Veedu | sandeep.narayanan.kadan.veedu@ericsson.com |
| CMCC | Tuo Yang, Lijie Hu | [yangtuo@chinamobile.com;](mailto:yangtuo@chinamobile.com;) hulijie@chinamobile.com |
| OPPO | Zhisong Zuo | zuozhisong@oppo.com |
| Xiaomi | Xuemei Qiao | qiaoxuemei@xiaomi.com |
| China Telecom | Nuoya Zhang | zhangnuoy@chinatelecom.cn |
| DENSO | Takahiro Furuyam | takahiro.furuyama.j6k@jp.denso.com |
| SONY | Martin Beale | martin.beale@sony.com |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Youjun Hu | hu.youjun1@zte.com.cn |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Frank LONG | frank.longyi@huawei.com |

# 2 UE BB bandwidth reduction

2.0 Earlier agreements

RAN1 has made the following agreements for UE BB bandwidth reduction [4]:

|  |
| --- |
| **Initial BWP**  Agreement:  For a cell supporting both Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UEs,   * The Rel-18 RedCap UEs can share the same separate initial DL/UL BWP as the Rel-17 RedCap UEs. * FFS: whether to support an additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap UEs   Conclusion:  There is no consensus to continue discussion on “whether additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap UEs is allowed to be configured by the SIB in the cell”.  **Number of PRBs**  Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for PUSCH, select the following option for the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can transmit per slot or per hop, if applicable:   * Option 3: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS   For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for PDSCH (for both unicast and broadcast), select the following option for the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can process per slot:   * Option 3: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS   Note: No intention to change the RAN4 RF specifications about maximum transmission PRB number  **PUSCH bandwidth**  Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, a UE is not expected to receive an UL grant in a DCI with a PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.  Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, a UE is not expected to be configured with a CG grant with a PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.  Agreement:  For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to receive an UL grant in a RAR or in a DCI scrambled with TC-RNTI with a Msg3 PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.  Agreement:  For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to perform 2-step RACH with a MsgA PUSCH resource spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.  **UE post-FFT buffer size**  Conclusion:  For UE BB complexity reduction, for broadcast and unicast PDSCH, RAN1 does not assume that the UE post-FFT buffer size per slot is smaller than 20 MHz  **Unicast PDSCH bandwidth**  Agreement:   * For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a DL assignment in a DCI with a unicast PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot. * The number of PRB scheduled in DCI is not larger than the maximum number of PRB agreed in previous agreement from 110b-e   **SIB1/OSI transmission**  Conclusion:  For UE BB complexity reduction, broadcast of separate SIB1/OSI (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs is not supported.  Agreement:   * For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for SIB1 (PDSCH),   + Allow the scheduling of SIB1 to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). The scheduling of SIB1 PDSCH is allowed to be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS. * For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for broadcast OSI (PDSCH),   + Allow the scheduling of broadcast OSI (PDSCH) to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). The scheduling of OSI PDSCH is allowed to be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.   **Paging bandwidth**  Agreement:  From RAN1 perspective, for UE BB complexity reduction, for paging channel (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, allow the scheduling of paging channel to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). The scheduling of paging PDSCH is allowed to be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.  **RAR bandwidth, random access timeline, and early indication**  Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for RAR (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot.   * When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is within the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot, the legacy time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission (not smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 ms) is applied. * When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot,   + The UE receives the RAR and correspondingly transmits Msg3 if the TDRA for Msg3 in UL grant in RAR indicates that the time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission is NOT smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms.     - FFS: value(s) of X   + Otherwise, the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation. * Note: it does not mean early indication is needed * Note: it will not be used as example for unicast PDSCH   For the “FFS: value(s) of X”   * X = [0.5/0.25 or 1/0.5 or 2/1] ms for 15/30kHz SCS * Note: Single Value pair for X is to selected for SCSs   Agreement:  Down-select one among the following options in RAN1#113:   * Option 1:   + For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,     - X = 0.5/0.25 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS     - Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.   + A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not supported.     - When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction). * Option 2:   + For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,     - X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS     - Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.   + A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not supported.     - When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction). * Option 3:   + For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,     - X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS     - FFS: Whether legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.   + A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.     - When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction). * Option 4:   + For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,     - X = 0.5/0.25 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS     - Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.   + A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.     - When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).   Agreement:  The potential timeline relaxations for the following cases are FFS:   * For 2-step RACH:   + Case 2a: Between reception of fallbackRAR and transmission of Msg3   + Case 2b: Between reception of successRAR and transmission of corresponding HARQ-ACK * For 4-step RACH:   + Case 4a: Between reception of RAR PDSCH in which UE does not correctly receive the transport block and upcoming transmission of PRACH   + Case 4b: Between reception of RAR with RAPID which is not associated with the corresponding PRACH transmission and upcoming transmission of PRACH   **Msg4 bandwidth**  Agreement:  Confirm the following working assumption by assuming that Msg3 indication is available:   * For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.   + The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.   Agreement:  Final LS [R1-2304262](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2304262.zip) is endorsed  **Simultaneous reception**  Conclusion:  For UE BB complexity reduction, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions for SIB1/OSI/paging/RAR.  Conclusion:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for autonomous SI acquisition, the following paragraph in TS 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies:   * “The UE is expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI during a process of autonomous SI acquisition.” * FFS: Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI case |

2.1 Random access timeline and early indication

### 2.1.1 Msg2-Msg3 timeline and Msg1 indication

RAN1#112bis-e [4] agreed that a down-selection between four options related to Msg2-Msg3 timeline relaxation and potential separate early indication in Msg1 should take place in RAN1#113.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for RAR (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot.   * When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is within the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot, the legacy time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission (not smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 ms) is applied. * When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot,   + The UE receives the RAR and correspondingly transmits Msg3 if the TDRA for Msg3 in UL grant in RAR indicates that the time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission is NOT smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms.     - FFS: value(s) of X   + Otherwise, the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation. * Note: it does not mean early indication is needed * Note: it will not be used as example for unicast PDSCH   Agreement:  Down-select one among the following options in RAN1#113:   * Option 1:   + For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,     - X = 0.5/0.25 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS     - Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.   + A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not supported.     - When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction). * Option 2:   + For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,     - X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS     - Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.   + A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not supported.     - When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction). * Option 3:   + For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,     - X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS     - FFS: Whether legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.   + A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.     - When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction). * Option 4:   + For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,     - X = 0.5/0.25 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS     - Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.   + A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.     - When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction). |

Among the submitted contributions, most contributions [8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36] express support for Option 3 or some slightly modified version of it. However, the contributions express different views on how to resolve the FFS on whether legacy default TDRA table Δ are reused or not.

Furthermore, a significant number of contributions [8, 9, 14, 20, 22, 24, 27, 28, 32, 36] support Option 4, a few contributions [8, 10, 22, 31] support Option 1, and a couple of contributions [17, 33] support Option 2.

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.1.1-1a: Companies are invited to give each one of the following options a grade:**

* **Option 1**
* **Option 2**
* **Option 3a = Option 3, and legacy default TDRA table** **and Δ are reused**
* **Option 3b = Option 3, and legacy default TDRA table** **and Δ are not reused (use comment field if needed)**
* **Option 4**

**Please use the following grade scale (where there is no restriction on the number of times a grade can be used).**

* **+1 = preferred**
* **0 = neutral/ok**
* **-1 = not preferred**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Grade (+1/0/-1) for each one of Options 1/2/3a/3b/4** | | | | | **Comments** |
| **1** | **2** | **3a** | **3b** | **4** |
| Nordic | -1 | -1 | 1 | 0 | -1 |  |
| FUTUREWEI | -1 | -1 | +1 | 0 | +1 | We are open to supporting option 3b |
| Panasonic | -1 | -1 | +1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| DOCOMO | -1 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +1 | Especially for option 3a/3b, to enable Rel-18 eRedCap specific TDRA configuration for Msg3 other than the expansion of legacy default TDRA table and Δ, we suggest to introduce new RRC parameter in pusch-CofingCommon which is specific to Rel-18 eRedCap. |
| Spreadtrum | -1 | -1 | +1 | 0 | -1 |  |
| CATT | +1 | 0 | -1 | -1 | -1 | We may reconsider Msg1 early indication but MsgA PRACH early indication should not be supported. This should be a package. |
| Lenovo | -1 | -1 | +1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Vivo | +1 | 0 | -1 | -1 | -1 |  |
| LG | -1 | -1 | 0 | +1 | -1 | Besides default TDRA Table and Δ updated**,** as an alternative, various solutions can be discussed to transmit Message 3 successfully. |
| MediaTek | -1 | +1 | 0 | 0 | -1 | We have provided analysis on why X=1 slot is needed. Option 1 and Option 4, both with X=0.5 slot, are unacceptable to us. |
| Nokia, NSB | 0 | -1 | +1 | +1 | 0 | We think that TDRA extension or separate table can be considered if Msg1 early indication is supported |
| Qualcomm | +1 | 0 | 0 | -1 | +1 | We do not see any motivation to consider the modification of TDRA table or Δ |
| Sharp | -1 | -1 | +1 | +1 | 0 | It can be discussed how to extend the timing for some cases that all rows in default TDRA table cannot meet the minimal timing requirement. |
| NEC | -1 | -1 | +1 | 0 | +1 |  |
| Sierra Wireless | -1 | -1 | +1 | 0 | +1 |  |
| Xiaomi | -1 | -1 | +1 | -1 | +1 | Even with X=1/0.5ms for 15/30 kHz SCS, there is no need to enhance the legacy TDRA table. |
| Ericsson | 0 | -1 | 0 | -1 | +1 | Although our preference is Option 4, Option 1 or Option 3a could be a good compromise.  We support introducing PUSCH TDRA in *pusch-ConfigCommon* that is specific to Rel-18 eRedCap UEs, as also suggested by DOCOMO. |
| SONY | -1 | -1 | +1 | 0 | -1 |  |
| CMCC | +1 | 0 | -1 | -1 | 0 | Our preference is no EI. That is option 1, and option 2 is also OK, we can compromise to option4, don’t support option 3x. |
| OPPO | +1 | +1 | -1 | -1 | -1 |  |

The following late response was not included in the initial FLS in [41]:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ZTE, Sanechips | -1 | -1 | +1 | -1 | 0 |  |

The responses received for Question 2.1.1-1a (except the above late response) are summarized in the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Option 1** | **Option 2** | **Option 3a** | **Option 3b** | **Option 4** |
| Preferred | 5 | 2 | 11 | 4 | 7 |
| Neutral/ok | 2 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 5 |
| Not preferred | 13 | 14 | 4 | 7 | 8 |
| Sum of grades | -8 | -12 | 7 | -3 | -1 |

Based on the above, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL2 High Priority Proposal 2.1.1-1b:**

**Down-select one among the following options in RAN1#113:**

* **Option 1:**
  + **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
    - **X = 0.5/0.25 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
    - **Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.**
  + **A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not supported.**
    - **When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**
* **~~Option 2:~~**
  + **~~For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,~~**
    - **~~X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS~~**
    - **~~Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.~~**
  + **~~A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not supported.~~**
    - **~~When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).~~**
* **Option 3:**
  + **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
    - **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
    - **FFS: Whether legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.**
  + **A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.**
    - **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**
* **Option 4:**
  + **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
    - **X = 0.5/0.25 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
    - **Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.**
  + **A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.**
    - **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**

In the online session on Monday 22nd May, the following proposal seemed to be acceptable as a compromise, except for the fourth main bullet and its sub-bullet (regarding the case when additional separate early indication in Msg1 is not configured for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs), so the proposal can be considered again. Companies are invited to provide constructive comments on how to update the fourth main bullet and its sub-bullet so it can also be acceptable to everyone.

**FL3 High Priority Proposal 2.1.1-1c:**

* **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
  + **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
* **Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.**
* **A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.**
  + **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**
* **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not configured while Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, Rel-18 eRedCap UEs will share the PRACH that is configured for Rel-17 RedCap UEs.**
  + **Note: Rel-18 eRedCap UEs will be differentiated from Rel-17 RedCap UEs based on Msg3 of Rel-18 eRedCap UEs.**
* **Additional early indication in MsgA PRACH is not supported.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| CATT2 | Y | The fourth bullet should be kept. Otherwise:  1) It may cause a strange case when R17 RedCap UE uses separate initial BWP, but R18 RedCap UE uses legacy initial BWP, which is against RAN2’s agreement.  2) If R18 RedCap UE does not use R17 RedCap PRACH, but use PRACH of normal UE instead, then the scheduling of normal UE is seriously impacted – gNB need to consider R18 RedCap UE when scheduling Msg2 and Msg3 for normal UE (DL coverage, BW, timeline of X, …) This is even worse. |
| DOCOMO |  | Considering that at most non-RedCap, Rel-17 RedCap and Rel-18 eRedCap UEs can be supported in a same cell, we should discuss at least the following cases;   * Case 1: Neither Rel-17 RedCap specific Msg1 early indication or Rel-18 eRedCap specific Msg1 separate early indications is not configured   + All of non-RedCap, Rel-17 RedCap and Rel-18 eRedCap UEs share the same PRACH configuration. * Case 2: Rel-17 RedCap specific Msg1 early indication is configured but Rel-18 eRedCap specific Msg1 separate early indication is not configured   + At least Rel-17 RedCap and Rel-18 eRedCap can share PRACH configuration   + FFS whether non-RedCap and Rel-18 eRedCap can share the same PRACH configuration * Case 3 (FFS): Rel-17 RedCap specific Msg1 early indication is not configured but Rel-18 eRedCap specific separate early indication is configured   + non-RedCap and Rel-17 RedCap can share the same PRACH configuration * Case 4: Both Rel-17 RedCap specific Msg1 early indication and Rel-18 eRedCap specific Msg1 separate early indications are configured   + Separate PRACH configuration is indicated for each non-RedCap, Rel-17 RedCap and Rel-18 eRedCap UE   In our understanding, at least the above cases other than FFS cases are agreeable, thus we suggest to agree on them. The FFS cases are not discussed well so far, thus we are open to discuss them further or also fine to add as FFS in the proposal. |
| Samsung | Y | We are OK for the proposal **2.1.1-1c**. |
| vivo | Y | We share CATT’s views on the Red Bullets.  For the cases listed by DCM, our understanding for Case 3, it is supported based on the **High Priority Proposal 2.1.1-1c**, the subbullet of the third bullet.   * + **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).** |
| FUTUREWEI |  | For the 4th bullet, we can accept "can" for flexibility. Also, OK for either “can” or “will” as a working assumption based on majority view. In any case, the detailed signaling is up to RAN2. |
| Qualcomm | Y | We support the proposal as it is. If not aggregable, we can have the 4th bullet as working assumption. |
| Xiaomi2 | Y, but | We think MsgA PRACH based early indication is needed for a unified framework with Msg1 and for proper scheduling of fallbackRAR, but we can live with this proposal.  Another one question: For the following agreements, whether it means that when the separate initial DL/UL BWP for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, the Rel-18 RedCap UEs can also not share the same separate initial DL/UL BWP as for the Rel-17 RedCap UEs? Or, the Rel-18 RedCap UEs must share the same separate initial DL/UL BWP as for the Rel-17 RedCap UEs? We believe that maybe the second direction is most companies understanding.   |  | | --- | | Agreement:  For a cell supporting both Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UEs,   * The Rel-18 RedCap UEs can share the same separate initial DL/UL BWP as the Rel-17 RedCap UEs. * FFS: whether to support an additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap UEs | |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We support also the 4th bullet as we think there may be issues if Rel-18 RedCap UE doesn’t use the same PRACH as Rel-17 RedCap UE in this scenario. |
| China Telecom | Y | We support the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| DENSO | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y | We support the proposal **2.1.1-1c** as is.  On the other hand, we are also open to discuss the cases raised by DOCOMO. Actually, we would like to put “FFS” on the Case 4 which would complicate the network complexity and test effort.  For Xiaomi’s question, the “second direction” would align with the RAN2 #121bis-e agreement as follows:   |  | | --- | | * From RAN2 perspective, there is no need to introduce eRedCap UE specific initial BWP configuration (i.e. no R18 new field and at most one specific initial UL/DL BWP can be configured). * If the R17 RedCap specific initial BWP is configured, eRedCap UEs always use it as its specific initial BWP (assuming no eRedCap UE specific initial BWP configuration field introduced). | |
| Spreadtrum | Y | We support the proposal **2.1.1-1c**.  We share the similar concerns as CATT. Letting R18 eRedCap to use R15/16 PRACH resourced will lead to several issues and discussions, e.g., how to configure initial BWP for R15/16 UE? When R15/16 UL BWP is larger than 20MHz, should the R18 eRedCap use a part of PRACH within R15/16 UL BWP? How to align with RAN2’s agreements?  For case 3 listed by DCM, we also think the UE hebaviour is clear and is agreeable, i.e., Rel-17 RedCap should share the same PRACH configuration with non-RedCap, while R18 eRedCap should use the configured Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap.  In addition, when Msg1 indication for Rel-17 eRedCap UEs is not configured Msg1 indication for Rel-18 RedCap UEs should be configured. This will help to reduce the possible impacts (scheduling restrictions during RACH procedure) to R15/16 UEs. |
| CMCC | Y | Support the proposal and the wording “will share”.  If R18 RedCap UE does not use R17 RedCap PRACH, but use PRACH of legacy UE, the congestion of PRACH for legacy UEs becomes severe, the access latency of legacy UEs will increase considering timeline relaxation of R18 RedCap UEs.  To deal with the concern of capacity/congestion of R17 RedCap PRACH resources, gNB can configure more PRACH resources for R17 RedCap. |
| LG | Y | We are OK. |
| NEC | Y | Our preference is to concentrate on additional separate early indication of Rel-18 RedCap UE in Msg1 which is important for RAN2 progress and is in line with WID scope, and to discuss the fourth bullet as a separate proposal. Given said that, we are fine with the proposal as is. |
| MediaTek | Y …  but change “will share” to “shall share” | We fully share with CATT’s views/concerns.  @DCM, thank you for providing the detailed cases for discussion.  For Case3, Rel-17 RedCap UE behavior should not be impacted. Otherwise, it induces a non-backward compatible (NBC) issue which is unacceptable. Hence, we agree with DCM’s assessment that “*non-RedCap and Rel-17 RedCap can share the same PRACH configuration*” is assumed for this Case 3.  The FFS in Case 2, in our understanding, is the case Huawei has concern with. For this FFS, we don’t think Rel-18 eRedCap UEs should share the same PRACH configuration as non-RedCap UEs.  The reasons include at least the following: (not even before considering the complication on the spec impact/issues raised by CATT in the above)   1. R18 eRedCap’s capability is not greater (if not worse) than R17 RedCap. If NW thinks R17 RedCap needs to identify itself via Msg1 PRACH, it means NW would like to take this information into account for some differentiation in *Msg2* handling between normal eMBB UEs and R17 RedCap UEs. Then we don’t why NW does not need different Msg2 handling between normal eMBB UEs and R18 eRedCap UEs. 2. If RACH resources for R17 RedCap is a concern, NW can    * (1) configure for RACH resources for (R17/R18) RedCap UEs’ EI. The specification has provided sufficient flexibility, or    * (2) NW can configure additional separate Msg1 EI for R18 eRedCap, or    * (3) NW can disable Msg1 EI for R17 RedCap. If NW does not see need for R18 eRedCap UEs for Msg1 EI, the need for R17 RedCap UEs for Msg1 EI is very questionable.    * We don’t think making R18 RedCap UEs to share the RACH resources with eMBB UEs can resolve the overall (for all purposes from the NW) RACH resource concern.   We cannot accept “can share” as proposed by Futurewei. “Can share” means some flexibility which leaves the door for introducing a new RRC parameter (in RAN2) for gNB to control whether it allows R18 eRedCap UEs to share the same Msg1 EI with R17 RedCap UEs or not. We are *not* convinced with the use case to support such NW flexibility. (Please do not abusively use “NW flexibility” for something that is not justified technically.) We should not just hand over the discussion to RAN2 and make RAN2 repeat the same discussion RAN1 is having.  With the above analysis, we propose to change “will share” to “shall share” because it should not up to R18 eRedCap to choose whether it wants to early identify itself in Msg1 when R17 (and/or R18) EI is configured. NW *needs* to know UE’s identity early when it enables Msg1 EI.   * **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not configured while Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, Rel-18 eRedCap UEs ~~will~~ shall share the PRACH that is configured for Rel-17 RedCap UEs.**   + **Note: Rel-18 eRedCap UEs will be differentiated from Rel-17 RedCap UEs based on Msg3 of Rel-18 eRedCap UEs.** |
| Ericsson | Y | We can accept this as a compromise, although we think that the last bullet could be removed. The necessity of MsgA PRACH indication depends on the BW of *fallback* RAR (i.e.., < 5 MHz like Msg4 or > 5 MHz like Msg2) in cases where MsgA PRACH was detected but MsgA PUSCH was not decoded correctly. We think it is worth discussing the BW of *fallback* RAR first (i.e., the last bullet could be removed). |
| SONY | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y | As said, this is RAN2 aspect to be discussed, how they design configuration. We ask for functionality.  **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not configured while Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, Rel-18 eRedCap UEs can share the PRACH for Rel-17 RedCap UEs, if configured.** |

Based on the responses received to Proposal 2.1.1-1c, the following updated proposal can be considered.

**FL4 High Priority Proposal 2.1.1-1d:**

* **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
  + **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
* **Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.**
* **A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.**
  + **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**
* **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not configured while Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, Rel-18 eRedCap UEs ~~will~~ shall share the PRACH that is configured for Rel-17 RedCap UEs.**
  + **Note: Rel-18 eRedCap UEs will be differentiated from Rel-17 RedCap UEs based on Msg3 of Rel-18 eRedCap UEs.**
* **Additional early indication in MsgA PRACH is not supported.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | For progress |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y | The update is OK. |
| LG | N | We prefer to keep it without changing |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | We are fine with this proposal itself with the understanding that Rel-18 specific PRACH is configured whenever Rel-18 separate early indication is configured regardless of whether Rel-17 RedCap early indication is configured.  We are also fine to put 4th bullet as working assumption. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| MTK | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y | We can accept this proposal, while assuming all Rel-18 RedCap UE share the same earlier indication for clear differentiation to Rel-17. |
| Xiaomi3 | Y, but | OK for progress. But, when Msg3 is scheduled by fallbackRAR, since the UE type can’t recognized by the gNB, the MsgB PDSCH carrying fallbackRAR may be larger than 5MHz. Furthermore, another question is: whether additional X is reused for the processing timeline between fallbackRAR and Msg3 for both Rel-18 eRedCap UEs and non-eRedCap UEs? Or, reusing the legacy processing time NT,1+NT,2+0.5ms for these two kinds of UEs? |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Because the Rel-18 PRACH configuration for Msg1 early identification and the configured resources can be the same as the PRACH resources as Rel-17 PRACH configuration, therefore, we suggest to remove the fourth bullet and add a note to clarify it.  With these changes, whether Rel-18 RedCap is accessible to the allocated PRACH resources for Rel-17 RedCap is still up to network configuration. **High Priority Proposal 2.1.1-1d:**  * **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**   + **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS** * **Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.** * **A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.**   + **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**   + **Note: With the existing mechanism, the PRACH resources can be configured as the same PRACH resources as those for Rel-17 Msg1 early identification of RedCap, if configured.** * **~~When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not configured while Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, Rel-18 eRedCap UEs shall share the PRACH that is configured for Rel-17 RedCap UEs.~~**   + **~~Note: Rel-18 eRedCap UEs will be differentiated from Rel-17 RedCap UEs based on Msg3 of Rel-18 eRedCap UEs.~~** * **Additional early indication in MsgA PRACH is not supported.** |

Based on the responses received to Proposal 2.1.1-1d, the following two alternative proposals can be considered.

**FL5 High Priority Proposal 2.1.1-1e:**

* **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
  + **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
* **Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.**
* **A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.**
  + **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**
* **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not configured while Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, Rel-18 eRedCap UEs ~~will~~ shall share the PRACH that is configured for Rel-17 RedCap UEs.**
  + **Note: Rel-18 eRedCap UEs will be differentiated from Rel-17 RedCap UEs based on Msg3 of Rel-18 eRedCap UEs.**
* **Additional early indication in MsgA PRACH is not supported.**

**FL5 High Priority Proposal 2.1.1-1f:**

* **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
  + **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
* **Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.**
* **A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.**
  + **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**
  + **Note: With the existing mechanism, the PRACH resources can be configured as the same PRACH resources as those for Rel-17 Msg1 early identification of RedCap, if configured.**
* **~~When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not configured while Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, Rel-18 eRedCap UEs will share the PRACH that is configured for Rel-17 RedCap UEs.~~**
  + **~~Note: Rel-18 eRedCap UEs will be differentiated from Rel-17 RedCap UEs based on Msg3 of Rel-18 eRedCap UEs.~~**
* **Additional early indication in MsgA PRACH is not supported.**

The Wednesday online session made the following agreement:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,   + X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS * Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused. * A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.   + When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction). * When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not configured while Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, Rel-18 eRedCap UEs shall share the PRACH that is configured for Rel-17 RedCap UEs.   + Note: Rel-18 eRedCap UEs will be differentiated from Rel-17 RedCap UEs based on Msg3 of Rel-18 eRedCap UEs. * Additional early indication in MsgA PRACH is not supported. |

### 2.1.2 UE behavior in the ‘otherwise’ case

Contribution [8] proposes to revise the highlighted bullet in the following earlier RAN1 agreement [4]-

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for RAR (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot.   * When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is within the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot, the legacy time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission (not smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 ms) is applied. * When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot,   + The UE receives the RAR and correspondingly transmits Msg3 if the TDRA for Msg3 in UL grant in RAR indicates that the time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission is NOT smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms.     - FFS: value(s) of X   + Otherwise, the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation. * Note: it does not mean early indication is needed * Note: it will not be used as example for unicast PDSCH |

The contribution proposes that the highlighted case can be treated in the same way as the other cases described in the following paragraph in clause 8.2 in TS 38.213:

|  |
| --- |
| If the UE does not detect the DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by the corresponding RA-RNTI within the window, or if the UE detects the DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by the corresponding RA-RNTI within the window and LSBs of a SFN field in the DCI format 1\_0, if included and applicable, are not same as corresponding LSBs of the SFN where the UE transmitted PRACH, or if the UE does not correctly receive the transport block in the corresponding PDSCH within the window, or if the higher layers do not identify the RAPID associated with the PRACH transmission from the UE, the higher layers can indicate to the physical layer to transmit a PRACH. If requested by higher layers, the UE shall be ready to transmit a PRACH no later than msec after the last symbol of the window, or the last symbol of the PDSCH reception, where is a time duration of symbols corresponding to a PDSCH processing time for UE processing capability 1 assuming  corresponds to the smallest SCS configuration among the SCS configurations for the PDCCH carrying the DCI format 1\_0, the corresponding PDSCH when additional PDSCH DM-RS is configured, and the corresponding PRACH. For , the UE assumes [6, TS 38.214]. For a PRACH transmission using 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz SCS, the UE determines assuming SCS configuration . |

Companies are invited to comment on the following question.

**FL1/FL3 Medium Priority Question 2.1.2-1a:**

**Should the highlighted bullet in the above agreement be revised to:**

* **Otherwise, the UE behavior is the same as if the UE does not detect the DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by the corresponding RA-RNTI within the window (as specified in clause 8.2 in TS 38.213).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | N | Up to UE implementation is just fine. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | In our understanding of the clause, there are 4 cases (two deal with DCI, one deals with incorrectly decoded PDSCH, and one deals with RAPID identification). The otherwise bullet in the agreement deals with processing. It seems to be unclear how the clause applies except possibly for the incorrectly decoded PDSCH. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We support to discuss the clarification on the highlighted case. |
| Spreadtrum | N | Up to UE implementation |
| CATT | N | Not urgent discussion. |
| vivo | N | No significant issue is found from earlier agreements. Hence no need to revise previous agreement. |
| LG | N | We think it is not needed |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We think it should be left to UE implementation as some UE might be able to still meet the timeline |
| Qualcomm | N | RAN1 already agreed that it is up to UE implementation. We prefer to keep the current agreement. |
| NEC | N |  |
| Xiaomi | N |  |
| Ericsson | Y | We think it is good to have a well-defined UE behavior for the case when Msg2-Msg3 timing is less than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms. Otherwise, some Ues may follow same behavior as when the UE does not detect the RAR DCI, whereas other Ues may go ahead and transmit Msg3 anyway (if capable to do so). Also, the Ues that follow the former behavior is not required to follow the eRedCap “ready to transmit” timeline. We think such ambiguities can be avoided by having a well-defined UE behavior for the case above. |
| CMCC | N | Prefer original wording, which allows more flexibility of UE behavior. For example, if UE has enough capability and can process RAR with delay less than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms and before scheduling of Msg3, UE can still transmit Msg3 and the random access may success. If it is changed to wording in clause 8.2 in TS 38.213, UE always need to transmit a PRACH, resulting in large access latency. |
| OPPO | N | They could be same meaning. May not need to clarify. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | The eRedCap UE may achieve RAR processing and transmit Msg3 even if the Msg3 scheduling delay is less than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms, e.g., for RAR bandwidth slightly more than 25/12 PRBs, or for Msg3 scheduling delay slightly larger than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms. |
| China Telecom | N | We consider we need to give more flexibility to the UE. |
| DENSO | N | We prefer to keep the current agreement for UE flexibility. |
| FL4 | From the received responses, there does not seem to be much support for revising the ‘otherwise’ bullet. | |

### 2.1.3 Timeline in similar cases

RAN1#112bis-e made the following agreement [4] regarding timeline relation for other similar cases as the Msg2-Msg3 case described in previous sections.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  The potential timeline relaxations for the following cases are FFS:   * For 2-step RACH:   + Case 2a: Between reception of fallbackRAR and transmission of Msg3   + Case 2b: Between reception of successRAR and transmission of corresponding HARQ-ACK * For 4-step RACH:   + Case 4a: Between reception of RAR PDSCH in which UE does not correctly receive the transport gblock and upcoming transmission of PRACH   + Case 4b: Between reception of RAR with RAPID which is not associated with the corresponding PRACH transmission and upcoming transmission of PRACH |

Contributions [8, 15, 17, 22, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32] express that the same timeline relaxation should be used for these cases as in the Msg2-Msg3 case described in earlier sections.

Contributions [11, 14, 18, 35] express that the same timeline relaxation should be used for Case 2a/4a/4b as in the Msg2-Msg3 the case described in earlier sections. Contributions [14, 35] express that timeline relaxation does not apply to Case 2b.

Contributions [10, 13, 16, 33] express that the same timeline relaxation should be used for Case 4a/4b as in the Msg2-Msg3 case described in earlier sections. Contributions [10, 13, 16, 23, 33] express that Case 2a/2b depends on the outcome of the MsgB PDSCH bandwidth discussion. This is addressed by Proposal 2.5-1d in Section 2.5.

**FL1/FL2/FL3/FL4/FL5 Medium Priority Proposal 2.1.3-1a:**

* **For UE BB bandwidth reduction, the same timeline relaxation as for the Msg2-Msg3 timeline applies at least for the following cases:**
  + **Case 4a: Between reception of RAR PDSCH in which UE does not correctly receive the transport block and upcoming transmission of PRACH**
  + **Case 4b: Between reception of RAR with RAPID which is not associated with the corresponding PRACH transmission and upcoming transmission of PRACH**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| LG | Y | 2 cases should be considered. |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| DENSO | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |

The Wednesday online session made the following agreement:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * For UE BB bandwidth reduction, the same timeline relaxation as for the Msg2-Msg3 timeline applies at least for the following cases:   + Case 4a: Between reception of RAR PDSCH in which UE does not correctly receive the transport block and upcoming transmission of PRACH   + Case 4b: Between reception of RAR with RAPID which is not associated with the corresponding PRACH transmission and upcoming transmission of PRACH |

Contribution [23] expresses that there are some additional similar cases to consider.

**FL1/FL3 Medium Priority Question 2.1.3-2a:**

**What (if any) other similar cases should be considered?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | Similar timeline relaxation to case 4a/4 should be applied between MsgB PDSCH and PRACH or MsgA retransmission for 2-step RACH corresponds to the following case in 38.213 section 8.2A.   |  | | --- | | If the UE does not detect the DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by the corresponding MsgB-RNTI within the window, or if the UE detects the DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by the corresponding MsgB-RNTI within the window and LSBs of a SFN field in the DCI format 1\_0, if applicable, are not same as corresponding LSBs of the SFN where the UE transmitted the PRACH, or if the UE does not correctly receive the transport block in the corresponding PDSCH within the window, or if the higher layers do not identify the RAPID associated with the PRACH transmission from the UE, the higher layers can indicate to the physical layer to transmit only PRACH according to Type-1 random access procedure or to transmit both PRACH and PUSCH according to Type-2 random access procedure [11, TS 38.321]. | |
| CATT | N |
| LG | If MsgB PDSCH BW can be allocated over 25 PRBs for 15KHz SCS or 12 PRBs for 30KHz, similar cases can be also applied to 2-step RACH procedure. |
| MediaTek | For 4-step RACH, we don’t identify other cases.  For 2-step RACH, the following cases should be considered, if MsgB PDSCH is larger than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS,   * Between reception of fallbackRAR and transmission of Msg3 * Between reception of successRAR and transmission of corresponding HARQ-ACK * Msg1 PRACH or MsgA (PRACH and PUSCH) retransmission after the failure of MsgB reception or decoding |
| QC | Share the view of MediaTek |
| Xiaomi | For 2-step RACH, it is up to the MsgB PDSCH BW. So, we can wait until MsgB PDSCH bandwidth has a conclusion. |
| CATT2 | Regarding 2-step RACH, we should determine MsgB PDSCH BW first. |
| Vivo | For case 2a and 2b, it can be discussed after determining the MsgB PDSCH BW. |
| Ericsson | Similar view as Xiaomi - we think 2-step RACH cases can be discussed after concluding on the MsgB bandwidth. |
| FL4 | This issue can be addressed once the MsgB PDSCH bandwidth question has been resolved. This is addressed by Proposal 2.5-1d in Section 2.5. |

### 2.1.4 Early indication in MsgA PRACH

A few contributions [8, 18, 31] propose to support additional separate early indication in MsgA PRACH (at least if it is also supported in Msg1), whereas a couple of other contributions [15, 33] express that it is not needed. This question can be treated with low priority until the Msg1 case has been resolved.

**FL1 Low Priority Question 2.1.4-1a: Should additional separate early indication in MsgA PRACH be supported?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | N |  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Can wait until Msg1 case is resolved |
| DOCOMO | Y | But we are fine to differ the discussion until the progress on Msg1-based separate early indication. |
| CATT | N |  |
| Lenovo | Y | Same view with DOCOMO |
| vivo | N |  |
| Nokia, NSB | N | Even if separate Msg1 early indication is supported, we do not see the need for MsgA PRACH given PUSCH early indication is already supported |
| Xiaomi | Y | Same view with DOCOMO. |
| CMCC | N |  |
| OPPO | N | Does that earlier indication duplicate PUSCH part, which already have earlier indication? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | If MsgA PRACH indication is not supported for eRedCap UE and the gNB does not decode MsgA PUSCH correctly, the corresponding fallbackRAR and Msg3 scheduling will be impacted. |
| FL | Early indication in Msg3 PRACH is handled in Proposal 2.1.1-1c/d/e/f. | |

2.2 Simultaneous reception

For simultaneous reception of multiple broadcast channels, 38.214 clause 5.1 specifies the following:

|  |
| --- |
| The UE in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE modes shall be able to decode two PDSCHs each scheduled with SI-RNTI, P-RNTI, RA-RNTI or TC-RNTI, with the two PDSCHs partially or fully overlapping in time in non-overlapping PRBs. |

For simultaneous reception of a unicast channel and a broadcast channel, 38.214 clause 5.1 specifies the following:

|  |
| --- |
| On a frequency range 1 cell, the UE shall be able to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI and, during a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI that partially or fully overlap in time in non-overlapping PRBs, unless the PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI requires Capability 2 processing time according to clause 5.3 in which case the UE may skip decoding of the scheduled PDSCH with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI.  On a frequency range 2 cell, the UE is not expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI if in the same cell, during a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time.  The UE is expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI during a process of autonomous SI acquisition. |

RAN1 has made the following conclusions [4]:

|  |
| --- |
| Conclusion:  For UE BB complexity reduction, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions for SIB1/OSI/paging/RAR.  Conclusion:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for autonomous SI acquisition, the following paragraph in TS 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies:   * “The UE is expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI during a process of autonomous SI acquisition.” * FFS: Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI case |

### 2.2.1 Autonomous SI acquisition

The contributions express the following views regarding the FFS for Msg4 during autonomous SI acquisition.

* Contributions [8, 11, 14, 15, 18] propose that Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI should be treated in the same say as unicast PDSCH (i.e., “The UE is expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, or TC-RNTI during a process of autonomous SI acquisition”).
* Contributions [11, 13, 22, 33] propose that the UE should decode the Msg4 PDSCH in this case, but that the decoding priority should be specified if the Msg4 PDSCH is scheduled with more than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz or more than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.
* Contribution [10] proposes that for autonomous SI acquisition, the UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH scheduled with more than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or more than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.
* Contribution [12] argues that according to the previous agreement, if Msg4 is wider than 5MHz, the UE is not required to process Msg4 and that no further agreement is needed.
* Contribution [32] proposes to extend the earlier RAN1 conclusion to say that “For UE BB complexity reduction, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions for SIB1/OSI/paging/RAR/PDSCH is scheduled with TC-RNTI”.
* Contributions [9, 26, 28] propose to leave this case up to UE implementation.
* Contribution [20] propose to wait for RAN2’s reply to the LS in [40].

Companies are invited to provide further comments below.

**FL1/FL3 Medium Priority Question 2.2.1-1a:**

**Companies are invited to express their preference regarding the UE behavior in case of Msg4 PDSCH decoding during a process of autonomous SI acquisition (considering the arguments provided in the contributions listed above).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | We support also: Contributions [8, 11, 14, 15, 18] propose that Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI should be treated in the same say as unicast PDSCH |
| Panasonic | No spec change would be needed. It means that the reception of Msg4 is up to UE implementation.as well as the legacy UE behavior. We do not see the reason why only eRedCap UE with BB BW reduction is mandated to receive Msg4 in this case. |
| CATT | Buffer SI and decode Msg4, and provide HARQ-ACK feedback for Msg4. No spec change. |
| Vivo | We do not think additional agreement is needed given following already made agreement:  Agreement:  Confirm the following working assumption by assuming that Msg3 indication is available:   * For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.   + The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS. |
| LG | We think that no spec change is needed including Msg4 with TC-RNTI. |
| MediaTek | For Rel-18 eRedCap during a process of autonomous SI acquisition, when Msg4 PDSCH with TC-RNTI is scheduled with another PDSCH with SI-RNTI,   * If Msg4 PDSCH is not greater than 25/12 PRBs in 15/30kHz SCS, UE is expected to decode the Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI. * Otherwise, UE is expected to decode the PDSCH scheduled by SI-RNTI. |
| Nokia, NSB | We agree Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI should be treated in the same say as unicast PDSCH and no specification change is needed |
| Qualcomm | In the current spec, there is nothing defined for Msg4 PDSCH decoding during a process of autonomous SI acquisition. There is no big motivation to have different behavior only for Rel-18 eRedCap UE. We propose to remove the FFS from the agreement and just reuse the behavior defined in the current spec. |
| NEC | Share view with Nordic. |
| Xiaomi | Share view with Nordic. |
| Ericsson | Same behavior as for unicast PDSCH should be applied for Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI |
| CMCC | The handling of Msg4 PDSCH generally follows legacy behavior except when Msg4 is larger than 5MHz. If bandwidth of Msg4 is larger than the UE can process per slot, according to previous agreement, UE is not required to process Msg4, the UE decodes SI PDSCH. |
| OPPO | We think no specification needed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For UE BB bandwidth reduction, the UE is expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, or TC-RNTI during a process of autonomous SI acquisition. |
| DOCOMO | We tend to agree with Qualcomm that Msg4 PDSCH scheduled with TC-RNTI and autonomous SI acquisition is not expected to be overlapped in time domain for legacy Ues. In that sense, we didn’t get the motivation to treat this case only for Rel-18 eRedCap. Thus, we are fine to just remove FFS. |
| Lenovo | We have similar view with vivo. |
| Spreadtrum | No specification needed.  If Msg4 PDSCH is no more than 5MHz, the UE follows legacy behavior during a process of autonomous SI acquisition. If Msg4 PDSCH is larger than 5MHz, the UE can assume that this Msg4 is not intended to it. According to the previous agreement, the UE is not required to process this kind of Msg4. Then combine the current spec and the agreements, no new UE behavior and agreements are needed for Msg4. |

Based on the responses received for Question 2.2.1-1a, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL4 Medium Priority Proposal 2.2.1-1b:**

* **Conclusion:**
  + **For UE BB complexity reduction, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions for SIB1 / OSI / paging / RAR / Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI.**
  + **Note: This means that the following paragraph in TS 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies:**
    - **“The UE in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE modes shall be able to decode two PDSCHs each scheduled with SI-RNTI, P-RNTI, RA-RNTI or TC-RNTI, with the two PDSCHs partially or fully overlapping in time in non-overlapping PRBs.”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | This is only for idle/inactive mode, for RRC connected mode, we still need a agreement. Therefore, we think the current spec can not cover all the cases. |
| Panasonic | Y | We now understand that “no spec change” corresponds to “the eRedCap UE shall support simultaneous reception of SI (including autonomous) and Msg4 with TC-RNTI.” As agreed in the previous RAN1, the UE is only required to decode the Msg4 with no larger than 25/12 PRBs. Therefore, such simultaneous reception is not problematic considering the processing capability of eRedCap UE with BB bandwidth reduction. |
| LG | Y | OK |
| Qualcomm |  | The proposal has conflict in it because it says “**there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions”** butwe cannot say **“**Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI” is a broadcast PDSCH. We prefer to keep the current conclusion or we need to remove “broadcast” from the conclusion if we add “Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI” |
| vivo |  | We do not think above agreements is needed for Msg.4. We agree with QC that current spec does not capture the handling between the Msg.4 scheduled by TC-RNTI and autonomous SI acquisition, so this case can be handled by either gNB or UE implementation. For the case that Msg.4 scheduled by C-RNTI, previous agreements + current spec applies  “On a frequency range 1 cell, the UE shall be able to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI and, during a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI that partially or fully overlap in time in non-overlapping PRBs, unless the PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI requires Capability 2 processing time according to clause 5.3 in which case the UE may skip decoding of the scheduled PDSCH with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI.”  Agreement:  Confirm the following working assumption by assuming that Msg3 indication is available:   * For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.   + The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| MediaTek | N | The conclusion says simultaneous “reception” which we had clarified before it was agreed that it meant “reception” instead of “processing” or “decoding.” However, the specification says “decoding.” The UE is not able to decode two (broadcast/multicast/RACH) PDSCHs since it is likely the combined bandwidth of two PDSCHs will be larger than 5MHz and hence UE cannot process/decoding in a slot. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | @ZTE, note that the only paragraph in 38.214 clause 5.1 that mentions TC-RNTI is the paragraph (for idle/inactive mode) quoted in Proposal 2.2.1-1b.  We are fine with removing the word “broadcast” as suggested by Qualcomm. |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi3 | Y | We are fine with this conclusion.  In our understanding, the Msg4 PDCCH is scrambled by C-RNTI for all CBRA cases during the RRC\_CONNECTED mode. Besides, for autonomous SI acquisition, we have already reached the following conclusion:   |  | | --- | | Conclusion:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for autonomous SI acquisition, the following paragraph in TS 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies:   * “The UE is expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI during a process of autonomous SI acquisition.” * FFS: Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI case | | So, we think further discuss Msg4 scheduled by TC-RNTI in Section 2.2.1 is not needed anymore. | |
| NEC | Y | “**/ Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI**” could be revised to “**and Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI**” considering Qualcomm’s comment and “PDSCH transmission for Msg4 PDSCH” is redundant. |
| CMCC |  | We understand simultaneous reception of Msg4 and autonomous SI can be tackled with previous agreement about Msg4 and current spec, but this case belongs to simultaneous reception of unicast and broadcast instead of two broadcast. |

Based on the responses received for Proposal 2.2.1-1b, the following updated proposal can be considered.

**FL5 Medium Priority Proposal 2.2.1-1c:**

* **Conclusion:**
  + **For UE BB complexity reduction, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two ~~broadcast~~ PDSCH transmissions for SIB1 / OSI / paging / RAR / Msg4 scheduled by TC-RNTI.**
  + **Note: This means that the following paragraph in TS 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies:**
    - **“The UE in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE modes shall be able to decode two PDSCHs each scheduled with SI-RNTI, P-RNTI, RA-RNTI or TC-RNTI, with the two PDSCHs partially or fully overlapping in time in non-overlapping PRBs.”**

Based on discussion in the Wednesday online and offline sessions, the following updated conclusion can be considered.

### **FL6/FL7 Medium Priority Proposal 2.2.1-1d:**

* **Conclusion:**
  + **For UE BB complexity reduction, for RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two PDSCH transmissions for SIB1 / OSI / paging / RAR / Msg4 scheduled by TC-RNTI for the case when Msg4 PDSCH is not larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**
  + **Note: This means that the following paragraph in TS 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies for the case when Msg4 PDSCH is not larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS:**
    - **“The UE in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE modes shall be able to decode two PDSCHs each scheduled with SI-RNTI, P-RNTI, RA-RNTI or TC-RNTI, with the two PDSCHs partially or fully overlapping in time in non-overlapping PRBs.”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Xiaomi4 | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | We are fine with the update.  Just want to ask the proponents in what case a UE in RRC\_CONNECTED state will use TC-RNTI (e.g. for Msg4). In our understanding in RRC\_CONNECTED state, C-RNTI will be used as the unique identifier. For RACH in RRC\_CONNECTED state, UE will carry its C-RNTI in Msg3 so that Msg4 PDSCH is scheduled with C-RNTI.  If so, we do not need to discuss TC-RNTI related issue n RRC\_CONNECTED in the next meeting. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | We support this proposal as it is.  We tend to agree with CATT. Msg4 PDSCH scheduled with TC-RNTI and autonomous SI acquisition overlapping in time domain seems not expected for legacy UEs in the current specification. Thus, unless the case using TC-RNTI for RRC CONNECTED state is clarified by proponent, we can just remove FFS from the conclusion at the last RAN1 meeting to reduce discussion points towards next RAN1 meeting. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y | If our understanding is correct, the following conclusion applicable to RRC\_CONNECTED UE is still a RAN1 consensus and is NOT to be replaced with the **Proposal 2.2.1-1d**.   |  | | --- | | Conclusion:  For UE BB complexity reduction, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions for SIB1/OSI/paging/RAR. |   Therefore, no need to further discuss the RRC\_CONNECTED UE for which Msg4 with TC-RNTI is not scheduled (as commented by CATT).  We agree DOCOMO that the last bullet can be removed from the conclusion below:   |  | | --- | | Conclusion:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for autonomous SI acquisition, the following paragraph in TS 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies:   * “The UE is expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI during a process of autonomous SI acquisition.” * FFS: Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI case | |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| LG | Y | Same view as CATT, DOCOMO and Panasonic |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y with a question | We are fine with this.  In our initial understanding, in connected mode, the UE may do the RRC resume/re-connection via CBRA and the msg4 is scheduled via TC-RNTI. Some time may be needed for us to further check for connected mode. If necessary, we can discuss it in next meeting.  We hope the FFS mentioned by Panasonic can be kept currently in case we may need some further consideration for connected mode. Anyway, we have agreed on idle/inactive mode, the FFS is no harm.  Additionally, we have a question, why it is a conclusion? We actually have some conditions to apply the existing spec. How to capture it is up to the editor. It is more like an agreement. |
| vivo2 |  | We share the similar views as ZTE on this should be an agreement rather than a conclusion. |

### 2.2.2 P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition

RAN1#112bis-e discussed this proposal for P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition without reaching a conclusion [3]:

|  |
| --- |
| High Priority Proposal 2.5-2a:   * Conclusion: For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, the following paragraph in TS 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies:   + “On a frequency range 1 cell, the UE shall be able to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI and, during a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI that partially or fully overlap in time in non-overlapping PRBs, unless the PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI requires Capability 2 processing time according to clause 5.3 in which case the UE may skip decoding of the scheduled PDSCH with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI.”   + FFS: the Msg4 PDSCH case |

Contributions [8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 23, 26, 28, 32, 33, 34, 35] present their views on simultaneous reception during P-RNTI SI acquisition. Contribution [10] proposes to consider the following options:

* Option 1: The UE prioritizes reception of unicast PDSCH over SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI.
* Option 2: The UE may skip decoding of unicast PDSCH but decodes SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI.
* Option 3: The prioritization between reception of unicast and SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI is up to the UE implementation.
* Option 4: During a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, the UE is not expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI if in the same cell, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time.

Companies are invited to comment on the above list of options.

**FL1/FL3 Medium Priority Question 2.2.2-1a:**

**Can the above list of options be used as a basis for further discussion and down-selection? If you think the list should be updated somehow, please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | Option 5 | *For PR3 UE****,*** *when UE is scheduled to receive in RRC connected mode a non-overlapping SI and unicast PDSCH (if any) spanning more than 5MHz in a slot n, UE is not required to receive in slot n+1.* |
| Panasonic | Y in principle | For options 1-3, “unicast PDSCH” should be replaced with “the scheduled PDSCH with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI” as in the TS 38.214. For example, Option 2 can be updated as follows:  • Updated Option 2: The UE may skip decoding of the scheduled ~~unicast~~ PDSCH with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI but decodes SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI.  Among 4 options, we prefer (updated) Option 2. |
| CATT |  | One clarification question, does ‘prioritize A’ mean ‘drop B’ in the proposal?  We think the UE shall be able to decode both, by proper implementation, e.g. buffer SI but decode unicast PDSCH + provide HARQ-ACK at first. |
| vivo | Y | It is good to align companies understanding on above case **when the total number of PRBs for the PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI and the PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI is larger than the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can process per slot.**  Reply to CATT: my understanding is ‘prioritize A’ means ‘B may or may not be dropped’ |
| LG | N | Our preference is that P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition and autonomous SI acquisition should not be handled differently. |
| MediaTek |  | At least P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition for PWS/CMAS notification should be prioritized. |
| Qualcomm | Y but | Share the view of CATT on option 1. What would be the expected spec impact by option 1. Assuming that SI PDSCH has sufficient decoding time budget, prioritizing unicast PDSCH can be done by UE implementation meaning no spec impact. If it has different intention as vivo mentioned, the option has to be clarified further. |
| NEC |  | Share view with LG |
| Xiaomi |  | Same view as CATT |
| Ericsson | Y | Option 2 is preferred. |
| CMCC | Y | Fine to down-selection. |
| OPPO | N | Autonomous SI acquisition not specifically treated. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | The UE should prioritizes reception of SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI, and the other PDSCH reception is up to UE implementation. So we propose that:  Option 5: The UE shall decode the SI PDSCH between reception of unicast and SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI.  Moreover, if the PDSCH(s) with more than 25/12 PRBs is scheduled in Slot n and a unicast PDSCH is scheduled in Slot n+1, there is an overlap in time domain between unicast PDSCH and broadcast PDSCH processing, which leads to a larger number of PRBs than that the UE can process in a slot. So we recommend to add the following Note:  Note: If the PDSCH(s) with more than 25/12 PRBs is scheduled in Slot n and unicast PDSCH is scheduled in Slot n+1, the prioritization between reception of unicast and SI PDSCH follows the above descriptions. |
| CATT2 |  | Thanks @vivo for feedback. If UE may or may not do something for the deprioritized behavior, do we need to capture the deprioritized behavior in the specification? It seems equal to ‘up to UE implementation’ and no spec impact? |
| DOCOMO |  | We share the same view with CATT that another option UE can decode both a unicast PDSCH and a SI-PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI should be taken into account. |
| vivo2 |  | Reply to CATT: For R18 eRedCap, in our view, it is needed since current spec requires the UE to decode both P-RNTI triggered SI PDSCH and PDSCH scheduled by C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI. |
| Intel | Y | Option 2 is preferred. We share vivo’s view the discussion could focus on the case that the total number of PRBs for the SI PDSCH and the unicast PDSCH is larger than 5MHz. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Our preference is to that we can follow the current specification and no change is needed. The options listed above do not seem to capture this option. |

Based on the responses received for Question 2.2.2-1a, companies are invited to reply to the following question, where Options 1-4 are rephrased, and Options 5-7 are new.

**FL4/FL6 Medium Priority Question 2.2.2-1b:**

**Which option is preferred for handling of simultaneous reception during P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition when the total number of PRBs for the PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI and the PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI is larger than the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can process per slot?**

* **Option 1: The UE prioritizes reception of PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI/CS-RNTI over SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI.**
* **Option 2: The UE may skip decoding of PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI/CS-RNTI but decodes SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI.**
* **Option 3: The prioritization between reception of PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI/CS-RNTI and SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI is up to the UE implementation.**
* **Option 4: During a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, the UE is not expected to PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI/CS-RNTI if in the same cell, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time.**
* **Option 5: For PR3 UE, when UE is scheduled to receive in RRC connected mode a non-overlapping SI and unicast PDSCH (if any) spanning more than 5MHz in a slot n, UE is not required to receive in slot n+1.**
* **Option 6: Same behavior as for autonomous SI acquisition**
* **Option 7: No specification change**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option(s)** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | For option 5, actually the main bullet indicates ‘**the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can process per slot**’, I guess it is not for PR3, but for BW3. additionally, it is a little bit unclear what is the channel that UE is not required to receive. So we would suggest the following modification for option 5 to make it clearer.   * **Option 5: ~~For PR3 UE,~~ when UE is scheduled to receive in RRC connected mode a non-overlapping SI and unicast PDSCH (if any) spanning more than 5MHz in a slot n, UE is not required to receive unicast PDSCH in slot n+1.**   Both option 3 and option 7 are not preferred for us, since it may cause serious system impacts when continuous unicast PDSCHs are scheduled. |
| Panasonic | Option 2 | We support Option 2 or 4 since the P-RNTI triggered SI has more important information for the network system operation.  Option 4 is also acceptable, but we slightly prefer Option 2 which would have smaller impact to the gNB. |
| LG | Option 7 | But, we can live with Option 6. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3/7 | Option 3 is basically same as option 7 |
| vivo | Option 4 (1st preference), Option 2 (2nd preference) | Same views as ZTE, we do not prefer option 3 and option 7. |
| DOCOMO | Option 7 | We still believe that there is no processing timeline requirement for SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI, and hence Rel-18 eRedCap can decode both a unicast PDSCH and a PDSCH scheduled with P-RNTI, and no spec change is required.  Actually, we have already agreed that “The UE in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE modes shall be able to decode two PDSCHs each scheduled with SI-RNTI, P-RNTI and RA-RNTI” is still applied to Rel-18 eRedCap UE. This means that Rel-18 eRedCap can decode that two PDSCHs which are overlapped in time domain even when the total number of PRBs exceeds 5MHz. More specifically, Rel-18 eRedCap UE can proceed both a PDSCH scheduled with P-RNTI and a PDSCH scheduled with RA-RNTI which have a processing timeline requirement for corresponding UL transmission, i.e., Msg3. In that sense, it is unclear why special handling is necessary for the case when P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition and unicast PDSCH are overlapped in time domain.  We also understand the possibility of back-to-back processing for unicast PDSCH, thus we are fine to discuss, e.g., option 1 or option 2 if it is really concerned. |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 7 |  |
| Ericsson | Option 2 | Option 4 (as for FR2) is also fine with us. |
| OPPO | Option 7 | We understand the SI acquisition still have some margin to process and seems not need the specifically redefine the behavior. |
| Xiaomi3 | Option 7 |  |
| NEC | Option 7 | Share view with DOCOMO. |
| CMCC | Option 4 or 2 | Recall that RAN1 has made agreement that does not relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions for SIB1/OSI/paging/RAR for RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE modes R18 RedCap UEs. One reason is to ensure coexistence with non-RedCap UEs and R17 RedCap UEs. If R18 RedCap UEs support NW scheduling for up to 2 broadcast PDSCHs at the same time, the impact to non-RedCap UEs or R17 RedCap UEs is avoided.  But this proposal is related to RRC connected mode UEs. As in option 4, NW can avoid simultaneous reception of unicast and SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI by scheduling. If less restriction on NW scheduling is preferred, option 2 is a good way to go forward. |
| Nordic | Option 5 | RRC IDLE is different than connected. |
| CATT | Option 7/3 | For SI triggered by P-RNTI, the HARQ-ACK feedback is not required either. And hence we don’t see much difference. The UE should be able to buffer and decode both, by buffering SI and decode unicast PDSCH first.  If back-to-back case is concerned we can further discuss Option 2. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 7 |  |
| Sharp | Option 7 |  |
| OPPO2 | Option 7 | The agreement may not need further update. Further, Option7 may also means 3, but 7 is clear. |
| SONY | Option 2 or 4 | Our preference is that the prioritization is clear. Hence we do not really like options 3/7.  We think that the text for option 4 should be updated as follows (editorial):   * **Option 4: During a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, the UE is not expected to decode PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI/CS-RNTI if in the same cell~~,~~ another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time.**   [we would be OK with replacing “decode” with “receive” or some other word, as appropriate]. |

The options in Question 2.2.2-1b received the following numbers of supporting responses:

* Option 1: 0
* Option 2: 5
* Option 3: 2
* Option 4: 5
* Option 5: 2
* Option 6: 1
* Option 7: 11

The following proposal can be considered:

### **FL7 Medium Priority Proposal 2.2.1-1c:**

**Down-select between these options for handling of simultaneous reception during P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition when the total number of PRBs for the PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI and the PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI is larger than the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can process per slot.**

* **~~Option 1: The UE prioritizes reception of PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI/CS-RNTI over SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI.~~**
* **Option 2: The UE may skip decoding of PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI/CS-RNTI but decodes SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI.**
* **~~Option 3: The prioritization between reception of PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI/CS-RNTI and SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI is up to the UE implementation.~~**
* **Option 4: During a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, the UE is not expected to decode PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI/CS-RNTI if in the same cell, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time.**
* **~~Option 5: For PR3 UE, When UE is scheduled to receive in RRC connected mode a non-overlapping SI and unicast PDSCH (if any) spanning more than 5MHz in a slot n, UE is not required to receive in slot n+1.~~**
* **~~Option 6: Same behavior as for autonomous SI acquisition~~**
* **Option 7: No specification change**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Some update for option2 and 4. Option2 is preferred, and could live with option4, | Thanks FL for the converging.  For option2, assuming that SI PDSCH is in slot n, after UE prioritizing SI PDSCH to decode, if the gNB still schedule in slot n+1, the SI PDSCH decoding still may be impacted, which may cause the chain reaction when continuous monitoring is performed(for eRedCap UE, due to the packet size limit, the continuous monitoring would happen frequently when a large packet arrives.) So, we hope to add a FFS to further discuss skipping operation can be applied for slot n and slot n+1.   * **Option 2: The UE may skip decoding of PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI/CS-RNTI but decodes SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI.**   + **FFS: the skipping decoding is applied in slot n of SI PDSCH or also applied in slot n+1.**   For option4, ‘UE is not expected to decode PDSCH’ means the gNB can not schedule, which is kind of restriction on the gNB. For example, if the gNB knows there is no continuous scheduling, then actually the scheduling in the same slot may happen. Additionally, similar as option2, similar issue is observed. Therefore,   * **Option 4: During a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, the UE is not expected to decode PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI/CS-RNTI if in the same cell, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time.**   + **FFS: that the UE is not expected to decode the PDSCH is applied in slot n of SI PDSCH or also applied in slot n+1.**   Compare Option2 and option4, option2 provide a little bit more flexibility for gNB side and also provide more freedom for UE decoding. Therefore, we slghtly prefer Option2, and could live with option4.  For option7, we understand no spec change may mean the existing spec, i.e. decoding both, can be reused. Actually it is out of UE’s capability especially when continuous monitoring happen. Also, the system impacts including continuous unsuccessful scheduling, large delay may be observed. Therefore, Option7 is not a good option. |
| vivo | Y | Option 7, to our understanding is similar as Option 3 if he R18 eRedCap UE cannot decode both PDSCHs if the scheduled total number of PRBs beyond UE’s processing capability. |
|  |  |  |

### 2.2.3 Unicast transmission and RAR

Contributions [16, 33] propose that decoding of RAR PDSCH should be prioritized over unicast PDSCH. The following proposal from contribution [33] can be considered.

**FL1/FL3/FL4/FL6 Medium Priority Proposal 2.2.3-1a:**

**If a PDSCH is scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI in slot n, UE is not expected to decode another PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, SI-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, G-RNTI for multicast or broadcast, MCCH-RNTI, G-CS-RNTI or CS-RNTI,**

* in the same slot (i.e. slot n) if the PDSCH scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI is not greater than 25/12 PRBs with 15/30kHz SCS;
* in slots n and n+1 if the PDSCH scheduled with RA-RANTI or MSGB-RNTI is greater than 25/12 PRBs with 15/30kHz SCS.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | Y | Similar should apply in our opinion also for SI + unicast |
| CATT |  | This is a very corner case, if not completely impossible:  For contention based RACH, the UE receiving RAR does not access the cell so no UE-specific RNTI is allocated to the UE.  For contention free RACH, typically the UE is adjusting TA or HO to another cell. In either case it seems no unicast PDSCH will be sent to this UE. |
| Vivo |  | There may be issues and we are open to discuss. |
| LG | N | We think that gNodeB can schedule it in order to evade this situation and it seems to be UE implementation. It is reasonable that SI and RAR should be handled similarly. They were not regarded differently in the past. |
| MediaTek | Y | Decoding of RACH messages should be prioritized as per legacy operation.  @CATT, RACH can be triggered for a connected UE under multiple events (See TS38.300 for details.). One example that counters your argument is: Gnb sends DL via unicast PDSCH to UE while UE has triggered RACH for UL grant request. |
| Qualcomm | N | Too much restriction on NW scheduling if the restriction is given to (n+1) slot |
| Xiaomi |  | We are open to discuss it. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | According to the existing specifications, we propose to modify the first subbullet as below:  **If a PDSCH is scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI in slot n, UE is not expected to decode another PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, SI-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, G-RNTI for multicast or broadcast, MCCH-RNTI, G-CS-RNTI or CS-RNTI,**   * if the PDSCH in the same cell scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time. * in slots n and n+1 if the PDSCH scheduled with RA-RANTI or MSGB-RNTI is greater than 25/12 PRBs with 15/30kHz SCS. |
| CATT2 |  | Thanks @MTK for clarification, but current spec seems enough?   |  | | --- | | The UE is not expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, G-RNTI for multicast or broadcast, MCCH-RNTI, G-CS-RNTI or CS-RNTI if another PDSCH in the same cell scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time. |   The current spec already precludes overlapping in the same slot n. Or the intension is to discuss slot n+1 only? |
| DOCOMO | N | We share the view with Qualcomm. Regardless of whether RAR/MsgB PDSCH BW is larger or smaller than 5MHz, the following prioritization/dropping rule in the current spec is sufficient.   |  | | --- | | The UE is not expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI if another PDSCH in the same cell scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time. | |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We don’t think UE behavior needs to be defined as this is not expected by the UE. |
| Spreadtrum | N | Similar understanding as DCM. |
| NEC | N | Agree with CATT and DOCOMO. |
| MediaTek | Y | @ CATT, the text you cited says ”**partially or fully overlap in time**” which does not address the eRedCap case. And of course, slot n+1 is another issue. |
| Ericsson | FFS |  |
| Panasonic |  | We are not so sure whether the scheduling restriction is needed for slot n+1. |
| OPPO | N |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| CATT |  | @MTK, the point is that the case of overlapping between PDSCH of **RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI** vs. PDSCH of **other RNTI** in time domain (in a slot) does not exist, according to current spec. If this case does not exist, why doesn’t it address eRedCap case of same slot (i.e. slot n)? The first bullet is already addressed.  Slot n+1 case is not in current spec and may need further discussion, we agree. |
| CMCC |  | Based on spec cited by CATT and DOCOMO, the overlapping case of PDSCH of RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI vs. PDSCH of other RNTI is not expected.  Slot n+1 case belongs to non-overlapping case of PDSCH of RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI vs. PDSCH of other RNTI, we think this can be dealt with NW scheduling based on X value. |
| China Telecom |  | We consider the slot n+1 case need further discussion. |
| SONY | Y |  |
| FL7 | The received responses express mixed views regarding this proposal. We can come back to it in the next meeting if needed. | |

### 2.2.4 Unicast transmission in HD-FDD

Contribution [39] proposes that a Rel-18 eRedCap HD-FDD UE should be capable of processing one additional unicast DCI scheduling PUSCH (as in TDD).

**FL1 Low Priority Question 2.2.4-1a: Should a Rel-18 eRedCap HD-FDD UE be able to process one additional unicast DCI scheduling PUSCH (as in TDD)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | Y | There is a clear benefit for network spectral efficiency |
| Xiaomi | N |  |
| OPPO | N | Not see the requirement for it. |
| DOCOMO | N | This is not supported for Rel-17 RedCap, hence we don’t see the necessity to introduce only for Rel-18 eRedCap. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | There is a benefit |
| Nordic |  | “This is not supported for Rel-17 RedCap, hence we don’t see the necessity to introduce only for Rel-18 eRedCap.” Not sure why R17 Redcap could indicate R18 HD instead. |
| LG | N | Almost same as DOCOMO |

2.3 Msg3 PUSCH bandwidth

Contribution [16] proposes that the UE can restart the PRACH procedure if Msg3 is scheduled with more than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or more than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.

**FL1/FL3/FL4 Medium Priority Proposal 2.3-1a:**

* **For UE BB bandwidth reduction, if Msg3 PUSCH is scheduled with more than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz or more than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz, the UE can restart the PRACH procedure.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Perhaps this question seems be part of the clause cited in question 2.1.2-1a (related to RAPID identification) |
| CATT |  | We already agree that the UE is not expected to be scheduled with >5MHz Msg3. Sounds like a natural outcome. It seems just like a natural result without further conclusion. |
| Vivo | N | The proposal contradicts with following agreements:  Agreement:  For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to receive an UL grant in a RAR or in a DCI scrambled with TC-RNTI with a Msg3 PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.  In addition, we recall that when above agreements for Msg.3 BW was made, all companies seem sharing the understanding that the TBS for Msg.3 is typically small, e.g. 56bits, the number of PRBs corresponding to 5MHz is sufficient even for non-RedCap Ues. |
| LG | Y | In the only case of no configuration on separate early indication for eRedCap, this behavior can be discussed. |
| MediaTek |  | If this is supported, it should apply to both R18 eRedCap Ues, i.e. UE BB bandwidth reduction and UE peak rate reduction, per Note4 in RAN#99 agreements, copied below for reference:  *Note 4:* ***The initial access procedure of Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 is*** *realized by following:*  *•* ***Same as Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1*** |
| Qualcomm | N | Not required to be specified in the spec. |
| Sharp | Y | We share similar view with LG. |
| NEC |  | In an initial BWP where Rel-18 RedCap UE is supported, it would be an error case. |
| Xiaomi | N | The network scheduling is restricted by the following agreement:  Agreement:  For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to receive an UL grant in a RAR or in a DCI scrambled with TC-RNTI with a Msg3 PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.  So, it is an error case for eRedCap to be allocated with more than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30kHz SCS. |
| Ericsson |  | Wouldn’t similar case also exist for Rel-17 RedCap (i.e., Msg3 PUSCH for Rel-17 RedCap scheduled with larger than 20 MHz)? Since we haven’t specified any such behavior for Rel-17 RedCap, there might not be a need to specify the behavior for Rel-18 eRedCap. However, we are open to hearing more views from other companies. |
| CMCC |  | If Msg3 PUSCH is scheduled with more than 5MHz, R18 RedCap UE consider that it fails in access and can follow legacy behavior. |
| OPPO | Y | The behavior is OK, check further if the spec. should take care of it. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We support the proposal.  We suggest to clarify whether such case can be happened first. In our view, legacy UE and Rel-18 eRedCap can share the same RA-RNTI and the Rel-18 eRedCap UE may receive RAR which schedules Msg3 PUSCH with larger BW than 5MHz for legacy UE. Thus, we support to clarify the UE behavior for this case, i.e., when the Msg3 PUSCH is scheduled with larger BW than 5MHz. |
| Intel | Y | We support the proposal.  This issue is essentially same as msg4. I.e., due to the collision of selected PRACH preamble, it can happen that an eRedCap UE receives a RAR/UL grant that schedules Msg3 with >5MHz, since the Msg3 is targeting a Rel-17 RedCap UE or non-RedCap UE. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We don’t think UE behavior needs to be defined as this is not expected by the UE. |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| Lenovo | N | Same view with vivo. |
| NEC2 |  | If additional separate early indication of Rel-18 RedCap UE in Msg1 is supported, this case will happen. The UE may consider it does not receive the UL grant in RAR. After that, it should follow the existing specifications. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Why it can not be up to UE implementation? The motivation for this proposal is not so clear. |
| Spreadtrum | N | According to the previous agreements, this is an error case, no further agreement is needed. |
| MediaTek | Y but | • ~~For UE BB bandwidth reduction,~~ if Msg3 PUSCH is scheduled with more than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz or more than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz, the UE can restart the PRACH procedure |
| OPPO | N |  |

The above proposal was discussed in the Wednesday offline session without reaching offline consensus on some updated version of the proposal.

2.4 Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth

Contribution [18] proposes to revise the earlier RAN1 agreement [4] on Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth to distinguish Msg4 PDSCH transmissions scheduled by different RNTIs.

**FL1/FL2/FL3 Medium Priority Proposal 2.4-1a:**

* **Revise the following RAN1 agreement:**
  + **Confirm the following working assumption by assuming that Msg3 indication is available:**
    - **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.**
      * **The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**
* **to:**
  + **Confirm the following working assumption by assuming that Msg3 indication is available:**
    - **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI with resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.**
      * **The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**
      * **For Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by C-RNTI, limit its bandwidth in the same way as for unicast PDSCH.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | While the intent seems clear, the sub-bullets should be revised as shown in blue (the second bullet deals with TC-RNTI while the lowest bullet deals with C-RNTI)   * + **Confirm the following working assumption by assuming that Msg3 indication is available:**     - **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI with resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.**       * **The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**       * **For UE BB complexity reduction, for Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by C-RNTI, limit its bandwidth in the same way as for unicast PDSCH.** |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| CATT |  | Seems not urgent but OK. |
| LG | N | We think that any modification is not needed on the previous agreement. |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | N | Similar view as LG |
| Qualcomm | N | Not needed |
| NEC | N | To revise the agreement does not seem essential. |
| Xiaomi | Y | For Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by C-RNTI, its bandwidth is limited in the same way as for unicast PDSCH, so we think further modification is needed. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | **It is suggested to put the last subbullet one level forward.**   * + **Confirm the following working assumption by assuming that Msg3 indication is available:**     - **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI with resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.**       * **The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**     - **For UE BB complexity reduction, for Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by C-RNTI, limit its bandwidth in the same way as for unicast PDSCH.** |
| DOCOMO | N | We don’t see the need. |
| Vivo | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | N | Not needed. |

Based on the responses received for Proposal 2.4-1a, the following updated proposal can be considered.

**FL4/FL5 Medium Priority Proposal 2.4-1b:**

* **Revise the following RAN1 agreement:**
  + **Confirm the following working assumption by assuming that Msg3 indication is available:**
    - **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.**
      * **The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**
* **to:**
  + **Confirm the following working assumption by assuming that Msg3 indication is available:**
    - **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI with resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.**
      * **The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**
    - **For UE BB complexity reduction, for Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by C-RNTI, limit its bandwidth in the same way as for unicast PDSCH.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| LG | N | We prefer to keep the previous agreement. |
| Qualcomm | N | The current agreement is already clear as it is |
| vivo | OK |  |
| DOCOMO | OK | We can support this proposal. |
| MTK | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We don’t think this is needed. However, we can accept this if it is the majority view. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| OPPO | N | See no problem for the current WA. May just confirm it without change. |
| Xiaomi3 | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| NEC | N | We are OK if majority supports it. |
| CMCC | Y |  |

The above proposal was discussed in the Wednesday offline session without reaching offline consensus on some updated version of the proposal.

2.5 MsgB PDSCH bandwidth

RAN1#112bis-e made the following agreement regarding the Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth [4]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  Confirm the following working assumption by assuming that Msg3 indication is available:   * For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.   + The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS. |

RAN1#112bis-e also sent an LS in [40] to inform RAN2 about the following case, to consider, if needed, the UE behavior in the RAN2 specifications, and ask RAN2 for feedback if any:

* For UE BB complexity reduction, the case when the UE detects a DCI scheduling a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process

RAN1#112bis-e also discussed this proposal on MsgB PDSCH bandwidth without reaching a conclusion [3]:

|  |
| --- |
| Medium Priority Proposal 2.9-1b:  Assuming that MsgA indication is available,   * For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a MsgB PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.   + The UE is not required to process a MsgB PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS. |

The contributions express the following views regarding the MsgB bandwidth:

* Contributions [8, 11, 12, 13, 34] express that the MsgB bandwidth should be limited in a similar way as Msg4 (i.e., as in the above RAN1#112bis-e Proposal 2.9-1b).
* Contributions [9, 10, 15, 16, 20, 28, 32] express that the MsgB bandwidth should instead be limited in a similar way as Msg2 (i.e., allowing a larger number of PRBs).
* Contributions [14, 18] express that the MsgB successRAR bandwidth should be limited in a similar way as Msg4 but that the MsgB fallbackRAR bandwidth should be limited in a similar way as Msg2.
* Contribution [33] expresses that the bandwidth of a MsgB scheduled with MSGB-RNTI should be limited in a similar way as Msg2 but that the bandwidth of a MsgB scheduled with C-RNTI should be limited in a similar way as Msg4.
* Contribution [17] argues that the MsgB bandwidth requires further consideration due to its difference compared to both Msg2 and Msg4.

Companies are invited to provide further comments below.

**FL1/FL3 Medium Priority Question 2.5-1a:**

**Companies are invited to express their preference regarding the MsgB PDSCH bandwidth (considering the arguments provided in the contributions listed above).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | 5MHz as all PUSCH so far. |
| FUTUREWEI | The proposal presumed that MsgA indication was available and also is related to section 2.1.4. It seems the behavior for MsgB PDSCH bandwidth when MsgA indication is not available needs to be examined first |
| Panasonic | As MsgB can contain the messages to multiple Ues and is support scaling factor of *Ninfo*, it would be reasonable that the MsgB is allowed to be scheduled larger than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS. |
| CATT | Still think it is reasonable to consider different handling methods for successRAR (as for Msg4) or fallbackRAR (as for Msg2), if we consider that MsgA PUSCH may fail.  Otherwise, Msg4-like handling directly – the Gnb shall be aware with the accessing UE is a Rel-18 RedCap UE. Just as other PDSCH. |
| Vivo | As shown in the following MsgB MAC PDU structure, MsgB bandwidth should instead be limited in a similar way as Msg2 (i.e., allowing a larger number of PRBs)    **MSGB MAC PDU with MAC SDU(s)** |
| LG | MsgB-RNTI is different from C-RNTI or TC-RNTI (CS-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI) which is scheduled for one UE of unicast PDSCH and is almost same with SI-RNTI, P-RNTI or RA-RNIT which can be scheduled for multiple Ues. Multiple Ues’ MAC Control PDU contents can be multiplexed into a Message B according to TS 38.321. Additionally, the proposal seems to be problematic that the number of PRBS for Msg B PDSCH is allocated within 5MHz PRBs for SuccessRAR and the number of PRBS for Msg B PDSCH can be allocated over 5MHz PRBs for FallbackRAR. Then, FallbackRAR and SuccessRAR are not multiplexed in one Message B and two MsgB PDSCHs (one is for SuccessRAR and the other is for FallbackRAR) are operated in the same cell. We don’t know why this overhead and restriction is needed in 2-step RACH process for Rel-18 eRedCap. |
| MediaTek | Similar to Msg2, MsgB PDSCH is multicast containing responses to multiples Ues. Similar to Msg2, MsgB should be allowed to be larger than 25/12 PRBs while not greater than 20MHz as per legacy operation. |
| Nokia, NSB | MsgB bandwidth should be treated in the same way as Msg2, so we support scheduling larger than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS |
| Qualcomm | MsgB PDSCH bandwidth should be limited in a similar way as Msg2 as multiple messages for more than one Ues can be multiplexed in the same channel. MsgB PDSCH has to be handled as other broadcast PDSCHs including Msg2.  Also successRAR and fallbackRAR can be multiplexed together so that no differentiation is needed between those two. |
| NEC | MsgB bandwidth should be handled as Msg2 as MsgB may contain MAC subPDUs for multiple UE. |
| Xiaomi | Share similar view with CATT. |
| CMCC | Since MsgA indication is available, MsgB of R18 RedCap can be scheduled separately, proposal 2.9-1b in RAN1#112bis-e is ok. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer the MsgB bandwidth is limited in a similar way as Msg4 due to MsgA early indication. |
| DOCOMO | At least MsgB PDSCH scheduled with MsgB-RNTI should be treated in the same way as Msg2 PDSCH. |
| FUTUREWEI | Got clarification that MsgA indication refers to MAC CE. Similar understanding as Nokia. |
| Ericsson | Similar view as CATT – *fallbackRAR* can be similar to Msg2 and *successRAR* can be similar to Msg4.  The fallback RAR case can occur when MsgA PRACH was detected but MsgA PUSCH was not decoded correctly. If there is no MsgA PRACH indication, the network has to restrict *fallbackRAR* for all Ues to be within 5 MHz.  However, the case where *fallbackRAR* and *successRAR* are multiplexed within the same MsgB (as brought up by LG) needs further discussion. |

Based on the responses received for Question 2.5-1a, companies are requested to respond to the following question.

**FL4 Medium Priority Question 2.5-1b:**

**For UE BB bandwidth reduction, which option is preferred (assuming that MsgA PUSCH indication but not MsgA PRACH indication is available)?**

* **Option 1: The MsgB bandwidth should be limited in a similar way as Msg4 (i.e., as in RAN1#112bis-e Proposal 2.9-1b).**
* **Option 2: The MsgB bandwidth should be limited in a similar way as Msg2 (i.e., allowing a larger number of PRBs).**
* **Option 3: The MsgB successRAR bandwidth should be limited in a similar way as Msg4 but the MsgB fallbackRAR bandwidth should be limited in a similar way as Msg2.**
* **Option 4: The bandwidth of a MsgB scheduled with MSGB-RNTI should be limited in a similar way as Msg2 but the bandwidth of a MsgB scheduled with C-RNTI should be limited in a similar way as Msg4.**
* **Option 5: Other (please explain in the comment field)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option(s)** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | 2 | Can consider option 4 for its similarity to option 2. Open to discuss option 3 |
| Sierra Wireless | 2 |  |
| Panasonic | 2 or 4 | As mentioned by the companies, Option 3 would not be reasonable since the MsgB can multiplex messages for multiple Ues, which may include both successRAR and fallbackRAR. |
| LG | Option 2 or 4 | We think that the MsgB PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI can be regarded as unicast PDSCH. But, we can live with Option 2 for progress, although Option 4 is more preferable. Same as Panasonic on Option 3. |
| Qualcomm | 2 |  |
| vivo | 2 |  |
| DOCOMO | Option 2 or option 4 | In general, we support option 2 in principle. Given that MsgB scheduled with C-RNTI can be regarded as unicast PDSCH while MsgB scheduled with MsgB-RNTI can be regarded as broadcast PDSCH, we are also fine to differentiate the handling based on the type of RNTI, i.e., option 4. |
| MTK | 4 | MsgB with MsgB-RNTI is multicast as Msg2 with RA-RNTI while MsgB with C-RNTI is unicast. |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 2 | We prefer Option 2 but could also be fine with Option 4. |
| Ericsson | 2 or 4 |  |
| OPPO | 1 |  |
| Xiaomi3 | 1, or 3(for compromise) for MsgB scheduled by MsgB-RNTI | For MsgB scheduled by C-RNTI, we recommend to limit its channel bandwidth in the same way as for unicast PDSCH, just as discussed in Section 2.4. |
| China Telecom | 4 | Open to discuss option 3. |
| NEC | 2 or 4 |  |
| CMCC | 1 | Since MsgA indication is available, MsgB of R18 RedCap can be multiplexed together. |
| Nordic | 3 or 4 |  |

Based on the responses received for Question 2.5-1b, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL5 Medium Priority Proposal 2.5-1c:**

**For UE BB bandwidth reduction, down-select between the following options (assuming that MsgA PUSCH indication but not MsgA PRACH indication is available):**

* **~~Option 1: The MsgB bandwidth should be limited in a similar way as Msg4 (i.e., as in RAN1#112bis-e Proposal 2.9-1b).~~**
* **Option 2: The MsgB bandwidth should be limited in a similar way as Msg2 ~~(i.e., allowing a larger number of PRBs)~~.**
* **~~Option 3: The MsgB successRAR bandwidth should be limited in a similar way as Msg4 but the MsgB fallbackRAR bandwidth should be limited in a similar way as Msg2.~~**
* **Option 4: The bandwidth of a MsgB scheduled with MSGB-RNTI should be limited in a similar way as Msg2 but the bandwidth of a MsgB scheduled with C-RNTI should be limited in a similar way as Msg4.**
* **~~Option 5: Other (please explain in the comment field)~~**

Based on discussion in the Wednesday offline session, the following updated proposal can be considered.

### **FL6/FL7 Medium Priority Proposal 2.5-1d:**

**For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for 2-step RACH, assuming that MsgA PUSCH indication is transmitted:**

* **The bandwidth of a MsgB scheduled with MSGB-RNTI should be limited in a similar way as Msg2.**
  + **The same timeline relaxation as for the Msg2-Msg3 timeline (i.e., 1 slot for Msg2 PDSCH larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS) applies at least for the following cases:**
    - **Case 2a: Between reception of fallbackRAR and transmission of Msg3**
    - **Case 2b: Between reception of successRAR and transmission of corresponding HARQ-ACK**
* **The bandwidth of a MsgB scheduled with C-RNTI should be limited in a similar way as Msg4.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Xiaomi4 | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | Although we have some concern on relaxing HARQ-ACK feedback timeline, we can accept for progress. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | Do we need to consider the case that msg1 is retransmitted, when msgB is failed. |

2.6 MBS PDSCH bandwidth

RAN1#112bis-e discussed potential restriction of the bandwidth for broadcast and multicast MBS PDSCH transmissions without reaching a conclusion [3]. Based on contributions [8, 18], the following proposals for broadcast and multicast, respectively, can be considered.

**FL1/FL2/FL3/FL4/FL5/FL6 Medium Priority Proposal 2.6-1a:**

**For broadcast MBS PDSCH, allow the scheduling to be larger than 5MHz (as in legacy operation). The PDSCH repetition case is FFS.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Y | Whether MBS PDSCH is capable or not is not able to be known to the network for IDLE mode as which UE support broadcast MBS PDSCH is not informed. Therefore, if the RedCap UE support MBS PDSCH, it should be same as non-RedCap UE. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| LG | Y | Broadcast MBS PDSCH should be regarded as broadcast SIB PDSCH. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | Basically we don’t see the need to discuss specific to MBS feature but fine with this proposal without any further optimization for MBS. |
| Vivo | Y |  |
| MTK |  | We need more time on this MBS. Can we come back next meeting? |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| SONY |  | Similar to Mediatek, we would like to come back to this at the next meeting. Does “For broadcast MBS PDSCH, allow the scheduling to be larger than 5MHz (as in legacy operation).” only apply to the non-repetition case? Can we be clearer what the “PDSCH repetition case” refers to? This seems to come from [8], but it is not clarified what it means. We would be concerned about having to receive back-to-back MBS PDSCH with a bandwidth of >25PRB (at 15kHz SCS) due to the processing requirements. |

**FL1/FL2/FL3/FL4/FL5/FL6 Medium Priority Proposal 2.6-2a:**

**For multicast MBS PDSCH, the number of PRBs scheduled in DCI is not larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Y | Should be restricted as the unicast. The multicast retransmission is UE specific and it should be limited to the capability. |
| CATT | FFS |  |
| LG | Optionally Y | For multicast MBS PDSCH, HARQ feedback for Multicast can be disabled by RRC configuration or DCI. Multicast PDSCH is same as unicast PDSCH with HARQ feedback (ACK/NACK or NACK-Only), but multicast PDSCH can be same as Broadcast PDSCH with disabling HARQ feedback. We think that the number of PRBs for multicast can be different whether HARQ feedback is disabled or not. With HARQ feedback disabled, multicast PDSCH is not needed to be processed within one slot in the same as for unicast PDSCH. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | Same comment as Proposal 2.6-1a. |
| MTK |  | We need more time on this MBS. Can we come back next meeting? |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| LG2 |  | We prefer to discuss it next meeting, Share view with MTK |
| SONY |  | We’d like more time on MBS too (similar to Mediatek). |

Based on the responses received for Proposals 2.6-1a and 2.6-2a, the following updated proposal can be considered.

### **FL7 Medium Priority Proposal 2.6-3a:**

* **For broadcast MBS PDSCH,**
  + **Allow the scheduling to be larger than 5MHz (as in legacy operation).**
  + **FFS: the PDSCH repetition case**
* **For multicast MBS PDSCH with HARQ feedback,**
  + **The number of PRBs scheduled in DCI is not larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**
* **For multicast MBS PDSCH without HARQ feedback,**
  + **FFS: whether to allow the scheduling to be larger than 5MHz**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | We are fine. |
| vivo |  | We are also fine to come back to this next meeting. |
|  |  |  |

# 3 UE peak data rate reduction

3.0 Earlier agreements

RAN1 has made the following agreements for UE peak data rate reduction [4]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * UE peak data rate reduction is supported at least as an add-on to UE BB bandwidth reduction,   + The constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 is relaxed to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ X.   + FFS: the value of X * If UE peak data rate reduction is supported as a standalone feature,   + The constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 is relaxed to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ Y.   + FFS: the value of Y   + Note: Whether this option is supported will be decided in RAN plenary.   Agreement:   * The minimum DL peak rate target (for FD-FDD) is 10 Mbps based on peak data rate calculation according to 38.306. * The same value for X is used for DL and UL   Agreement:  For the relaxed constraint X in the following earlier RAN1 agreement, down-select between X = 3 and X = 3.2. |

RAN#99 discussed whether UE peak data rate reduction (“PR1”) should be supported as a standalone feature or only in combination with UE BB bandwidth reduction (“BW3/PR3”) and endorsed the following proposal [5], where the different nicknames for the UE complexity reduction features (“PR1” and “BW3/PR3”) originate from TR 38.865 [6].

|  |
| --- |
| **Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 and Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1 are designed/targeted to same peak data rate, i.e., 10Mbps**  Note 1: Peak data rate of “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of 20MHz + PR1” and “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1” is same including unicast and broadcast respectively.  Note 2: PRB processing capability of “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of 20MHz + PR1” is not limited to “25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS” and it corresponds to PRB size corresponding to 20 MHz.  Note 3: The only difference between “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of 20MHz + PR1” and “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1” is Note 2 and *vLayers·Qm·f* in order to have the same peak rate.  Note 4: The initial access procedure of Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 is realized by following:   * Same as Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1 |

RAN1#112bis-e discussed this proposal on the values of X and Y without reaching a conclusion [3]:

|  |
| --- |
| High Priority Proposal 3.1-1h:   * For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,   + The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* = 3.2 * For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,   + The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* = 0.8   + This is assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression. * FFS: Whether the 10-Mbps peak rate target is a minimum peak rate or a fixed peak rate. |

The reason for the deadlock in RAN1#112bis-e was that companies had two different understandings of the RAN#99 decision listed in the introduction of this contribution. The question is whether the 10-Mbps peak rate target should be understood as a fixed peak rate target for all Rel-18 eRedCap Ues (regardless of what optional features they might support) or a minimum peak rate target (that might be exceeded by Ues that support optional features such as MIMO).

3.1 Relaxed constraints

As a potential way forward, companies are invited to consider the following updated proposal. Note that combinations with optional features is treated separately in the next section in this document.

**FL1/FL2/FL3 High Priority Proposal 3.1-1a:**

**Agree the following (without any intention to indicate one way or the other whether the 10-Mbps peak rate target is a minimum peak rate or a fixed peak rate):**

* **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
  + **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 3.2**
* **For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
  + **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= [0.75 or 0.8]**
  + **This is assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression.**
* **~~FFS: Whether the 10-Mbps peak rate target is a minimum peak rate or a fixed peak rate.~~**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | Y | We can compromise to this |
| FUTUREWEI |  | While we are fine with the values of 3.2 and [0.75 or 0.8], due to a different understanding of the target, RAN will need to discuss |
| Panasonic | Y | We can accept the proposal for the progress.  If the value of X or Y cannot be agreed, another possibility is to directly discuss the combinations of {*vLayers*, *Qm*, *f*} considering the achievable peak rate as in the table below:   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | *vLayers* | *Qm* | BW3/PR3+PR1 peak rate [Mbps]  (Minimum *f* is selected to achieve 10 Mbps) | 20MHz+PR1 peak rate [Mbps]  (Minimum *f* is selected to achieve 10 Mbps) | Rel-17 RedCap min. peak rate [Mbps]  *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 | | Rel-18 eRedCap:  Potential capability report | 1 | 2 | *N/A*  (Cannot achieve 10 Mbps) | 11.3/10.9 (*f*=0.4) | - | | 1 | 4 | 10.7/10.3 (*f*=0.8) | 22.7/21.8 (*f*=0.4) | - | | 1 | 6 | 15.0/14.4 (*f*=0.75) | 34.0/34.7 (*f*=0.4) | - | | 1 | 8 | 10.7/10.3 (*f*=0.4) | 45.4/43.7 (*f*=0.4) | - | | 2 | 4 | 10.7/10.3 (*f*=0.4) | 45.4/43.7 (*f*=0.4) | - | | 2 | 6 | 16.1/15.4 (*f*=0.4) | 68.1/65.5 (*f*=0.4) | - | | 2 | 8 | 21.4/20.5 (*f*=0.4) | 90.7/87.3 (*f*=0.4) | - | | Rel-17 RedCap:  Min. capability report | 1 | 6 | - | - | 63.8/61.4 (*f*=0.75) | | Note: xx/yy [Mbps] corresponds to the peak rate for 15/30 kHz SCS | | | | | | |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum |  | Fine with the values here. In addition, according to RANP’s conclusion, the 10-Mbps peak rate target is a fixed peak rate. In order to avoid possible ambiguities, the FFS should be changed to the following note:  **Note: The 10-Mbps peak rate target is a fixed peak rate.** |
| CATT | Y | It is a good idea to leave ‘fixed’ or ‘minimum’ to RANP, if we really want RAN1 progress. |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| LG |  | *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* >= X or Y should be kept according to WID. |
| MediaTek |  | RAN#99 agreements are clear. We don’t agree to the text in the parentheses. In RAN1, we should focus on the supported v\*Q\*f values.  **Proposal:** **Agree the following ~~(without any intention to indicate one way or the other whether the 10-Mbps peak rate target is a minimum peak rate or a fixed peak rate)~~:**   * **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,**   + **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 3.2** * **For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,**   + **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= [0.75 or 0.8]**   + **This is assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression.** |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are fine to support the values and leave the discussion on minimum vs fixed peak data rate to RAN plenary |
| Qualcomm | Y | It is suggested that RAN1 decide X and Y to meet the 10bps target. We leave the discussion on whether it is minimum peak rate or fixed peak rate to RAN plenary. |
| NEC | Y | With understanding this is within the scope of WID and would not be intended to change frame work of TS 38.306. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | We are Ok with the values. Our preference is to remove the parentheses. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| SONY |  | We are OK to agree on the two bullets.  There is no need to agree to the red text as it would imply that RAN1 agrees that the 10Mbps target peak data rate (from RANP) could be interpreted as a minimum peak data rate. RAN1 doesn’t agree that there is that possible interpretation.  We would hence be OK with the updated text from MediaTek. |
| CMCC |  | Generally fine. Regarding minimum or fixed peak rate, we still incline that 10Mbps is a minimum value, there is no need to restrict peak rate of R18 RedCap Ues with optional capabilities.  According to the objective of the WID, the peak data rate target 10Mbps is a minimum value, this is aligned with the peak data rate defined for legacy and R17 RedCap Ues,.  According to conclusion of RAN#99 meeting, PR1 as standalone feature or PR1 as add on feature is targeted at the same peak date rate 10Mbps, which does not intend to change the WID objective, but only gives a target relaxed peak data rate value. So that for PR1 standalone R18 RedCap Ues, vLayers·Qm·f is also larger than a constraint value X corresponding to 10Mbps. |
| OPPO | N | We see the value 3 is also needed for 5MHz RedCap.  Also to soften the problem of pending RAN confirmation. The wording should be like this:   * **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,**   + **The vLayers·Qm·f target 3 or 3.2 for the 10-Mbps peak rate** * **For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,**   + **The vLayers·Qm·f target 0.75 or 0.8 for the 10-Mbps peak rate**   + **This is assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression.** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | For progress |
| Xiaomi2 |  | We prefer OPPO’s version. |

Based on the responses received for Proposal 3.1-1a, the following updated Proposal 3.1-1b can be considered. A new Question 3.1-3a has been added further down to address the “[3 or 3.2]”.

**FL4 High Priority Proposal 3.1-1b:**

**~~Agree the following (without any intention to indicate one way or the other whether the 10-Mbps peak rate target is a minimum peak rate or a fixed peak rate):~~**

* **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
  + **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to a** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **target of [3 or 3.2]**
* **For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
  + **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to a** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **target of [0.75 or 0.8]**
  + **This is assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | RANP’s conclusion does not indicate it is the minimum peak data rate or it is fixed one. 10Mbps is just a peak data target via PR1 or BW3 in RANP conclusion and WID. In RAN1, we already have the agreement that 10Mbps is the minimum peak data rate. We do not see the technical issue why the minimum peak data rate agreement should be reverted.  For progress, we would suggest the following to make this proposal clearer.   * **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,**   + **The minimum 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to a** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **target of [3 or 3.2]** * **For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,**   + **The minimum 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to a** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **target of [0.75 or 0.8]**   + **This is assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression.** * **Note: whether the maximum peak data rate is equal to minimum peak data rate is further discussed.**   Based on above, we don’t need to revert RAN1’s agreement, and also can further discuss whether the peak data rate is fixed or not. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | For progress |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y, and | The bullet for the one without UE BB bandwidth reduction can adopt [0.75] since the **Proposal 3.1-2b** is almost stable. |
| LG | N | We expect that agreeing on the values would be straightforward, once whether the target peak rate is minimum or fixed is clarified. As it is getting clearer that the core controversial issue (minimum vs. fixed) would not be resolved by the discussion around this proposal in RAN1, it would be more efficient to leave this controversial issue up to RAN plenary decision and comeback to the values after that. If the FL still wants to leave an agreement out of this discussion, the version that we can live with as a compromise would be High Priority Proposal 3.1-1a (that is, with the clarification on the main bullet and without the value of 3). |
| Qualcomm |  | We prefer the original proposal in High Priority Proposal 3.1-1a, but we can live with it for progress. |
| Vivo | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | For the values, we are ok. |
| MediaTek | N | We don’t see the justification for saying “target” after v\*Q\*f. We are specifying the exact values of supported v\*Q\*f. It is unclear what v\*Q\*f “target of ” means.  We propose to replace “target of” by “=”. Furthermore, we think 3.2 and 0.75 are quite acceptable to the group. In fact, High Priority Proposal 3.1-2b discussed in the previous round was quite stable and agreeable. We are supposed to move forward and do down-selection at this stage instead of moving backward by adding values back and introducing new proposals.  **Proposal:**   * **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,**   + **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 3.2.** * **For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,**   + **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 0.75.**   + **This is assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression.** |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We prefer the original proposal with the note, or at least to add a similar note to this proposal, but for the sake of progress we are OK with this proposal |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y | Looks good with the wording. Less contradict to other issues. |
| Xiaomi3 | Y | OK for progress. We are also fine with ZTE’s version. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| CMCC |  | We prefer the original proposal in High Priority Proposal 3.1-1a, which is clear about the intention to only agreeing on the values instead of minimum or fixed peak data rate. |
| Nordic | Y |  |

Based on the responses received for Proposal 3.1-1b, Proposal 3.1-2b and Question 3.1-3a, the following updated proposal can be considered.

**FL5 High Priority Proposal 3.1-1c:**

* **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
  + **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to a** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **target of 3.2**
* **For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
  + **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to a** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **target of 0.75**
  + **This is assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression.**

The Wednesday online session made the following agreement:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,   + The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to a *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* of 3.2 * For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,   + The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to a *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* of 0.75   + This is assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression. * Note: This does not imply that downlink MIMO and 256 QAM are not supported. |

For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction, for the *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* value corresponding to 10 Mbps peak rate, some contributions [12, 15, 18, 20, 25, 28, 29, 35] propose that the value should be 0.75, whereas other contributions [8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 21, 22, 34] propose that the value should be 0.8. A few contributions [16, 23, 26, 33, 36] express that it should be one of those two values.

**FL1 High Priority Question 3.1-2a: For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction, for the *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* value corresponding to 10 Mbps peak rate, should the value be 0.75 or 0.8?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Value (0.75 or 0.8)** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | 0.75 | because it does fulfil 10Mbits peak rate for both 15 and 30kHz SCS |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We can be ok with either value, as long as only one value as in agreements. Slight preference for 0.8 if two layers. |
| Panasonic |  | Either is fine. |
| DOCOMO | 0.75/0.8 | Given that the difference on complexity reduction is marginal, we are fine with either value. |
| Spreadtrum | 0.75 | 0.8 is also fine for us, if 2Rx is needed. |
| CATT |  | Tend to 0.8 which can avoid new scaling factor (even for 2Rx UE). But anyway either one should work. Difference on cost is marginal. |
| Vivo |  | Finer either value, but slightly prefer 0.8 since it can allow 2Rx/2 layer transmission. |
| LG | 0.75 | We support 0.75. but, we can live with 0.8 |
| MediaTek | 0.75 | As pointed out by Nordic, 0.75 can fulfill 10Mbps for both SCSs. |
| Nokia, NSB | 0.75 or 0.8 | Either value is OK with us |
| Qualcomm | 0.75 (or 0.8) | 0.75 meets 10Mbps more closely but we are also ok with 0.8. |
| NEC | Either would be fine | We slightly prefer 0.75 as it is enough for 10Mbps. |
| Xiaomi | 0.75 | We can live with 0.8. |
| Ericsson | 0.8 | We could also live with 0.75. |
| SONY | 0.75 | 0.75 is our preference as it fulfills 10Mbps. We would be OK with 0.8 as the complexity increase 0.8 is marginal wrt 0.75. |
| CMCC | 0.75 or 0.8 | Fine with 0.75 or 0.8. |
| OPPO | 0.75 | We can go with value supported by majority. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 0.8 |  |
| Lenovo | 0.75 | Live with 0.8 |

Based on the responses received for Question 3.1-2a, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL2/FL3/FL4 High Priority Proposal 3.1-2b:**

* **For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
  + **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* = 0.75**
  + **This is assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| CATT2 | Y | OK for progress. |
| Samsung | Y | OK for the proposal. |
| Vivo | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | Ok for progress |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Xiaomi2 | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LG | Y | We can accept it. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | It is overlapped with Proposal 3.1-1b |
| FUTUREWEI | See comment | Based on the amount of support for optional 2 layer MIMO in question 3.2-1a, the value of Y should not prevent its support. We can agree to Y=0.75 as a working assumption. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y | Can accept it as further step. |
| Nordic | Y |  |

The above responses are considered in Proposal 3.1-1c.

Based on the responses received for Proposal 3.1-1a, the following question can be considered.

**FL4 High Priority Question 3.1-3a: For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction, for the *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* value corresponding to 10 Mbps peak rate, should the value be 3 or 3.2?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Value (3 or 3.2)** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 3 | We think 3 is enough. We do not see a problem, but we could live with 3.2. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Either is fine |
| Sierra Wireless | 3.2 |  |
| Panasonic |  | Either is fine. |
| LG | 3.2 | The 10Mbps peak rate cannot be achieved with the value of 3 for 30KHz SCS. |
| Qualcomm | 3.2 |  |
| vivo |  | Either is fine |
| DOCOMO | 3 or 3.2 | We can be flexible to support either 3 or 3.2. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Either is fine |
| MediaTek | 3.2 |  |
| Nokia, NSB | 3.2 |  |
| Ericsson | 3.2 |  |
| OPPO | 3 |  |
| NEC | 3.2 |  |
| CMCC | 3.2 |  |
| Nordic | 3 |  |

The above responses are considered in Proposal 3.1-1c.

3.2 Combinations with optional features

Many contributions [8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 32, 33, 35, 36] discuss the peak rate target for Rel-18 eRedCap Ues that support optional features. Regardless of the peak rate target discussion, now is probably a good time to start discussing what combinations with optional features that Rel-18 eRedCap Ues should be able to support.

**FL1/FL3 High Priority Question 3.2-1a:**

**Which ones (if any) of the following features should Rel-18 eRedCap Ues be able to support as optional features?**

* **Potential optional feature 1: DL MIMO**
* **Potential optional feature 2: DL 256QAM**
* **Potential optional feature 3: Peak rate scaling factors (*f*) higher than the minimum value**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Potential optional feature(s)** | **Comments** |
| Nordic |  | F1 can be useful for coverage and spectral efficiency, F2 for improved spectral efficiency, and F3 is controversial 😊 |
| FUTUREWEI | 1,2 | Ues should have the options to support such features. For #3, it is unclear what values need to be supported |
| Panasonic |  | This discussion would strongly be related to the determination whether 10 Mbps is a fix peak rate or minimum peak rate. If 10 Mbps is a fixed peak rate, the motivation to support features 1-2 would be quite low.  For feature 3, we are not sure the meaning of “the minimum value” of the *f*. |
| DOCOMO |  | In principle, Rel-18 eRedCap UE can support these features depending on its UE capability same as legacy Ues. Thus, we don’t see the strong need to restrict the available optional capabilities so far. |
| Spreadtrum |  | This question is not very clear to us, especially we combine this question with proposal 3.1-1a. Is it means that the peak data rate can be higher than 10Mbps, if the features listed here are supported? |
| CATT | 1, 2, | Up to UE vendor’s interest. |
| Vivo |  | Share Panasonic’s views. |
| LG | All | By default, we think that all features on Rel-18 eRedCap Ues can be supported optionally. |
| MediaTek |  | We don’t see the value for a further reduced UE to support these capabilities. However, if they are supported, **they should not exceed the supported (v\*Q\*f) values from Proposal 3.1-1a.** |
| Nokia, NSB | 1,2,3 | DL MIMO and 256QAM can already be optionally supported as per WID. We think if DL MIMO and 256QAM are supported, UE should be able to support higher peak data rate and therefore larger scaling values. |
| Qualcomm | 1/2/3 |  |
| Sierra Wireless |  | We do not see a need for eRedCap to support any of these features. |
| Xiaomi | 1,2 | Share the same view as CATT. For option 3, it is not clear for us. |
| Ericsson | 1 or 2 (perhaps not both)  Defer discussion on 3 | We think it might also be worth discussing whether an eRedCap be able to support 2 Rx branches without supporting DL MIMO. The low peak rates for eRedCap Ues does not require DL MIMO support, but 2 Rx branches could still be beneficial to improve coverage and spectral efficiency.  Potential option feature 3 could be discussed once it is clear whether the 10-Mbps peak rate target is a minimum peak rate or a fixed peak rate. |
| SONY | 1,2 | OK with 1,2. Support of these optional features does not imply that the peak data rate is higher than 10Mbps (i.e. proposal 3.1-1a still applies).  For proposal 3, is scaling factor a “feature”? We don’t understand the point of this proposal when the peak data rate is 10Mbps in any case. |
| CMCC | 1,2,3 | Similar as legacy Ues, optional feature of R18 RedCap Ues is not restricted. |
| OPPO |  | We think by default they can be supported. Rel-17 works well and all those are not mandated to UE vendors. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 2 | For DL MIMO, the number of layers equals to the number of UE Rx antennas. The number of layers is not further relaxed for Rel-18 RedCap Ues.  For DL 256QAM, Rel-18 RedCap UE the same way as Rel-17 RedCap UE, i.e. DL 256QAM is an optional feature.  For scaling factors (*f*) higher than the minimum value, it is not necessary to introduce this enhancement. |
| Samsung |  | Share the same view as Panasonic. |
| Lenovo | 1,2,3 |  |
| NEC | Any | It could be up to UE implementation. It could be still up to UE of higher capability whether *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* is equal to or higher than 3.2 or 0.75. |

Based on responses received for Question 3.2-1a, the following question can be considered.

**FL4 High Priority Question 3.2-1b:**

**Should Rel-18 eRedCap Ues support the same range of peak rate scaling factors (*f*) as legacy Ues, i.e., {0.4, 0.75, 0.8, 1}? If the answer is no, please provide the desired range in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We are OK with the current range. If new values are considered, the ecessity should be clarified. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We are fine with the current set of values. We can consider fewer values if there is a need. |
| Panasonic | Y | Regardless of whether 10 Mbps is a fixed peak rate or minimum peak rate, the legacy range of *f* is enough. There would be no need to introduce any additional value. |
| LG | Y | According to WID, any limitation for scale factors is not needed, because of *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* >= X or Y |
| Qualcomm | Y | We prefer to keep the current range. |
| Vivo | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | FFS | If the 10Mbps peak rate is fixed peak rate, *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* cannot be 0.75, 0.8, 3 or 3.2 when scaling factor is 1. Thus, we suggest to postpone the discussion until whether the peak rate is minimum or fixed is clarified. |
| MediaTek |  | There is no need for introducing new values. The applicability of existing scaling factors depends on the final agreed values of v\*Q\*f being discussed in previous proposals. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We think the current range is fine. However, we are OK to consider new value(s) if necessary. |
| Ericsson |  | The default is to keep the current range, but we are open to discuss a restriction of the range to limit the maximum peak rate that can be supported.  Also, if 10 Mbps is the fixed rate, there is no need to report the peak rate scaling factor at all. The NW can infer the peak rate from the reporting of capabilities related to FG 48-1/48-2. |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi3 | Y | We can’t see any necessity to introduce a new scaling factor and don’t support it. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | Fine with current range. |
| Nordic |  | Range may not be even applicable to R18 RedCap 😊 |

# 4 Higher-layer parameters

Contribution [7] provides the initial rapporteur input on higher layer signaling for RAN1 aspects of Rel-18 eRedCap. The contribution expresses that the agreements made so far do not result in any new or modified configuration parameters, but that depending on the outcome of the discussion on additional separate early indication in Msg1/MsgA PRACH, there may or may not be a need for Rel-18 eRedCap specific PRACH configuration parameters. The contribution also expresses that it might be relevant to capture the following RAN1 agreements [4] in higher-layer parameter descriptions, either for configuration parameters or capability signaling:

* **Initial BWP:** For a cell supporting both Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap Ues, the Rel-18 RedCap Ues can share the same separate initial DL/UL BWP as the Rel-17 RedCap Ues.
* **Unicast PDSCH bandwidth:** For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a DL assignment in a DCI with a unicast PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot. The number of PRB scheduled in DCI is not larger than the maximum number of PRB agreed in previous agreement from 110b-e
* **Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth:** For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot. The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.
* **Msg3 PUSCH bandwidth:** For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to receive an UL grant in a RAR or in a DCI scrambled with TC-RNTI with a Msg3 PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.
* **MsgA PUSCH bandwidth:** For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to perform 2-step RACH with a MsgA PUSCH resource spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.
* **CG PUSCH bandwidth:** For UE BB bandwidth reduction, a UE is not expected to be configured with a CG grant with a PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.

Thus, it might be worth discussing in RAN1 whether and how to capture and communicate the above agreements.

**FL1/FL3 High Priority Question 4-1a:**

* **Do you agree that the RAN1 agreements made so far do not result in new or modified higher-layer parameters that need to be captured as part of the overall Rel-18 higher-layer parameter list from RAN1?**
* **If you think that some of the earlier RAN1 agreements need to be captured in the higher-layer parameter list from RAN1, please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | So far no new HL parameter is needed. |
| Vivo | Y |  |
| LG | Y | If Msg A PUSCH bandwidth is allocated more than 5MHz BW PRBs in SIB, Rel-18 eRedCap cannot utilize 2-step RACH procedure. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Xiaomi |  | Share the same view as LG that if the MsgA PUSCH bandwidth is configured more than 25/12 PRBs, the 2-step RACH couldn’t be performed by the Rel-18 RedCap. |
| Ericsson | Y | If the RAN1 agreements listed above are not captured in the UE feature list (e.g., as components there), it might be good to communicate the agreements in some other way to RAN2 (e.g., within the higher-layer parameter list activity). |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | For UE BB bandwidth reduction,  The configuration signaling for Msg1/MsgA PRACH indication in SIB1.  The signaling for Msg3/MsgA PUSCH indication transmitted by UE. |
| CATT2 |  | If the **Proposal 2.1.1-1c** on early indication in Msg1 is agreed, then we have impact since Rel-18 dedicated PRACH resource RRC configuration is expected. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | If Rel18 Msg1 early indication is agreed, then an RRC parameter is needed |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| FL4 | The need for higher-layer parameter chances can be followed up in the next discussion round. | |
| FL6 | A draft higher-layer parameter list capturing the Rel-18 eRedCap specific PRACH configuration parameters will be provided during Thursday. | |

The Wednesday online session made the following agreement:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,   + X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS * Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused. * A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.   + When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction). * When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not configured while Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, Rel-18 eRedCap UEs shall share the PRACH that is configured for Rel-17 RedCap UEs.   + Note: Rel-18 eRedCap UEs will be differentiated from Rel-17 RedCap UEs based on Msg3 of Rel-18 eRedCap UEs. * Additional early indication in MsgA PRACH is not supported. |

A draft higher-layer parameter list capturing the above agreement is provided in *eRedCapParam-v000.xlsx* ([local inbox](http://10.10.10.10/ftp/RAN/RAN1/Inbox/drafts/9.6(NR_redcap_enh)/RRC/eRedCapParam-v000.xlsx), [global sync folder](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Meetings_3GPP_SYNC/RAN1/Inbox/drafts/9.6(NR_redcap_enh)/RRC/eRedCapParam-v000.xlsx)). The spreadsheet uses terms such as ‘RedCap UEs with reduced peak data rate with or without reduced baseband bandwidth’ which is a mouthful. It would be useful to introduce some suitable terminology to at least distinguish between Rel-17 RedCap UEs and Rel-18 eRedCap UEs. (How to furthermore distinguish between Rel-18 eRedCap UEs with different capabilities can perhaps be discussed in a future meeting.)

### **FL7 Medium Priority Question 4-2a:**

**Can the following terminology be adopted to distinguish between Rel-17 RedCap UEs and Rel-18 eRedCap UEs?**

* **Type-A RedCap UE = Rel-17 RedCap UE**
* **Type-B RedCap UE = Rel-18 eRedCap UE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We do not have a strong view, we are not sure whether it is appropriate to define the Rel-17 RedCap UE currently. |
| vivo |  | For terminology purpose, we have no strong view. if just for discussion/information purpose, directly use **Rel-17 RedCap UE and Rel-18 eRedCap UE is also fine.** |
|  |  |  |

### **FL7 High Priority Question 4-3a:**

**Can the draft parameter list in *eRedCapParam-v000.xlsx* (**[**local inbox**](http://10.10.10.10/ftp/RAN/RAN1/Inbox/drafts/9.6(NR_redcap_enh)/RRC/eRedCapParam-v000.xlsx)**,** [**global sync folder**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Meetings_3GPP_SYNC/RAN1/Inbox/drafts/9.6(NR_redcap_enh)/RRC/eRedCapParam-v000.xlsx)**) be endorsed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Rel-17, did we define a PRACH related parameter? It seems kind of RAN2’s aspect. |
| vivo | Y |  |
|  |  |  |

# 5 Other aspects

The submitted contributions bring up the following other aspects which are not covered in any other section in this FLS.

**Initial BWP**

* Support an additional separate initial BWP [17, 26].
* Do not support an additional separate initial BWP [14, 15].

**FDRA optimization**

* In the case where the RBG size for FDRA is large (e.g., 16 RBs in 15 kHz SCS, 8 RBs in 30 kHz SCS), consider enhancements to increase the efficiency in terms of DL/UL frequency resource utilization [23].
* For unicast, the FDRA indications and RBG sizes can be based on 5-MHz sub-bands [30].
* Discuss whether/how to use potential spare bits in FDRA field in RAR UL grant [13].
* There is no need to consider potential optimization of FDRA indications [15].

**SRS bandwidth**

* The SRS bandwidth does not need to be limited to 5 MHz [15, 17]
* Continue to discuss SRS bandwidth reduction to 5 MHz [26].

**Other functionality**

* Support 60 kHz SCS [14, 15].
* Consider enhancements of user multiplexing capacity for common PUCCH [23, 32].
* Support frequency hopping at least for unicast PUSCH [30].
* Consider options for support of 5-MHz MsgA PUSCH resource allocation [18].
* Enable UE to buffer none or a partial bandwidth for potential PDSCH within the activated BWP depending on the UE capabilities or circumstances such as other channel scheduling [15].

To be able to focus on more pressing issues, the above aspects could be down-prioritized in this meeting.

**FL1/FL3 Medium Priority Question 5-1a:**

**Is there a need to treat any of the issues listed above in this meeting?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | Y | **Common PUCCH capacity**  We prefer to consider enhancement on common PUCCH capacity for Rel-18 eRedCap. Given that the number of Ues is expected to be largely increased if NW accommodate both Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap, we have a concern on capacity on random access. Thus, we prefer to make it sure common PUCCH would not be a bottleneck for random access. |
| LG | Y | **Common PUCCH capacity**  Enhancements of user multiplexing capacity for common PUCCH can be discussed considering the situation that people who carry not only smartphones but only simultaneously wear additional smart watches and VR glasses will demand explosive connections toward gNodeB with a lot of mobile devices at the same time. |
| Xiaomi | Y | **5-MHz MsgA PUSCH resource allocation**  We propose to further discuss the issue given by [18] for the MsgA resource allocation. How to deal with it if the MsgA PUSCH is more than 5MHz? |

Based on the responses received to Question 5-1a, the following two new Questions 5-2a and 5-3a have been added.

**FL4/FL6 Medium Priority Question 5-2a:**

**Is there a need to consider enhancements of user multiplexing capacity for common PUCCH in this meeting? If the answer is yes, elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| LG | Y | We think that enhancements of user multiplexing capacity for common PUCCH can be discussed. As LG and DOCOMO mentioned in Question 5-1a, a lot of wearable mobile devices will be carried by many people besides smartphones in the near future. A lot of simultaneous connection attempts of many mobile devices can result in the shortage of Common PUCCH resource in the worst case. |
| Ericsson |  | No strong need. |
| CATT |  | No strong need. |
| Spreadtrum |  | No strong need. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We don’t think this is needed. |
| CMCC |  | No strong need. |
| DOCOMO |  | We share the LG’s view.  For non-RedCap UE, common PUCCH capacity is ensured by FDM/TDM and CS.  For Rel-17 RedCap, when a separate initial BWP is configured and the PUCCH FH is disabled for RedCap, the common PUCCH resource for RedCap and that for non-RedCap **cannot** be multiplexed with CS in the same time/freq resource since the number of base sequence(s) for a PUCCH is different which causes the degradation on multiplexing capacity. Therefore, to address the concern for reduced multiplexing capacity, common PUCCH resource can be FDMed with additional PRB offset between RedCap and non-RedCap.  In Rel-18, at most non-RedCap, Rel-17 RedCap and Rel-18 eRedCap would be supported in a same cell. Considering that RedCap/eRedCap is targeting low-end devices, e.g., sensor, and the number of RedCap/eRedCap devices would be increasing. Therefore, to accommodate the increased number of UEs for Rel-18 eRedCap and to make it sure common PUCCH would not be a bottleneck for capacity, we should consider common PUCCH capacity enhancement similar to Rel-17 RedCap.  We are fine to discuss the details how to expand the common PUCCH capacity while one good solution is enabling multiplexing with CS between non-RedCap and eRedCap in the same time/freq resource for common PUCCH. |
| OPPO |  | Further justification. |
| FL7 | The received responses do not express a strong interest in considering enhancements of user multiplexing capacity for common PUCCH. However, if there is time in the Friday online session, perhaps some time can be spent on presentation and discussion of the contributions [23, 32]. | |

**FL4/FL6 Medium Priority Question 5-3a:**

**Is there a need to consider options for support of 5-MHz MsgA PUSCH resource allocation in this meeting? If the answer is yes, elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| LG |  | If we need to consider the case that MsgA PUSCH resource is allocated beyond 5MHz BW (25PRBs for 15KHz SCS or 12 PRBs for 30KHz SCS) by SIB configuration of gNodeB, our proposal is that Rel-18 eRedCap UEs should not access gNodeB by 2-step RACH procedure but they should only access it by 4-step RACH procedure for that exceptional case. |
| Ericsson | N |  |
| Xiaomi3 | Y | According to TS 38.321, the maximum number of RBs configured for one PUSCH occasion of MsgA PUSCH can be up to 32 RBs, so there must be some cases for the gNB to use the value 32. For the case when 2-step RACH is configured and both non-eRedCap and eRedCap UEs are allowed to be accessed, if limiting the configuration of MsgA PUSCH to be less than 25/12 RBs for both legacy UEs and eRedCap UEs, the scheduling flexibility of legacy UEs is highly impacted.  Besides, especially for 30 kHz SCS, where there is 20RBs gap between the maximum value of nrofPRBs-PerMsgA-PO-r16 for legacy UEs and the maximum channel BW of MsgA PUSCH for eRedCap UEs.  Of course, the configured number of RBs is mainly related to the TBS. For MsgA PUSCH group B, or for 2-step RACH based SDT, the TBS must be more than 56bits, which is also a typical case. So, we recommend to further study this issue.  nrofPRBs-PerMsgA-PO-r16 INTEGER (1..32),  And, as given in our contribution [18], at least two options can be considered:   * **Option 1: Occupy a portion of PRBs within one legacy PO (larger than 5MHz) by Rel-18 RedCap UEs.** * **Option 2: Separate MsgA PUSCH frequency domain resources configuration for Rel-18 RedCap UEs.**   Both above options have spec impact. For the first option, the start RB and/or the number of RBs occupied by the Rel-18 RedCap UE should be aligned between gNB and UE side for the enabling of gNB’s Msg3 PUSCH decoding. For the second option, additional RRC signalling may be introduced.  Also, another direction can be considered: If the frequency domain resources of MsgA PUSCH are configured more than 25/12 RBs, it means that 2-step RACH is disabled for eRedCap. Or, only MsgA PRACH is available and fall back to 4-step RACH by fallbackRAR is always utilized for 2-step RACH. |
| CATT |  | Need some time to check the typical TBS size of MsgA PUSCH. |
| Sharp | Y | We have similar concern as Xiaomi. As we has agreed separate EI for msgA PRACH is not supported, it is needed to clarify the UE action when the configured number of PRBs for msgA PUSCH is larger than 25/12. |
| DOCOMO |  | We don’t see the strong need. |
| NEC |  | We share LG’s view. |
| OPPO |  | We can discuss the issue further. Seems the problem is not considered in the previous agreements. |
| FL7 | The received responses do not express a strong interest in considering options for support of 5-MHz MsgA PUSCH resource allocation. However, if there is time in the Friday online session, perhaps some time can be spent on presentation and discussion of the contributions [18]. | |
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