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# Introduction

This is the summary of below offline discussion:

**\* [AT111e][109][REDCAP] Reduced capability signalling framework (Intel)**

Scope: Discuss the proposals in [R2-2006751](file:///C:\Data\3GPP\Extracts\R2-2006751-redcap-capabilty-framework.docx), [R2-2006911](file:///C:\Data\3GPP\Extracts\R2-2006911%20Framework%20and%20Principles%20for%20Reduced%20Capability.docx) and [R2-2006605](file:///C:\Data\3GPP\Extracts\R2-2006605_Defining%20and%20constraining%20UEs%20with%20reduced%20capabilities.docx). The intention is to identify design alternatives, collect company views and, whenever possible, also narrow down the proposals.

Initial intended outcome: summary of the offline discussion with e.g.:

§  List of agreeable proposals (if any)

§  List of proposals that require online discussions

Initial deadline (for companies' feedback): **Monday 2020-08-24 22:00 UTC**

Initial deadline (for rapporteur's summary in R2-2008191):  Tuesday 2020-08-25 02:00 UTC

Status: Ongoing

# Discussion

To make it easier to find the correct contact delegate in each company for potential follow-up questions, the rapporteur encourages the delegates who provide input to provide their contact information in this table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Delegate contact |
| COMPANY\_NAME | NAME ([email@address.com](mailto:email@address.com)) |
| Intel | yi.guo@intel.com |
| Qualcomm | Linhai He, linhaihe@qti.qualcomm.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

As indicated by chairman, following contributions are considered in this offline discussion:

[1] R2-2006751 Reduced capability signalling framework Intel Corporation discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_redcap

[2] R2-2006911 Framework and Principles for Reduced Capability Ericsson discussion FS\_NR\_redcap

[3] R2-2006605 Defining and constraining UEs with reduced capabilities Qualcomm Inc discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_redcap

Based on the study item scope as below, two aspects need to be discussed, i.e. how to define the reduced capabilities, and how to ensure reduced capabilities are only used for intended use cases.

*Study standardization framework and principles for how to define and constrain such reduced capabilities – considering definition of a limited set of one or more device types and considering how to ensure those device types are only used for the intended use cases [RAN2, RAN1].*

## **How to define the reduced capabilities**

**Question 2.1-1 The need of device type**

As mentioned in the SID “considering definition of a limited set of one or more device types”;

[3] mentioned “*Since the SID requires RedCap UEs to be explicitly identifiable, we think they should be explicitly defined too*.”;

[1] mentioned “*defining device types can make it easier for access restrictions and check device use. It is also conceptually simpler, especially as an industry, to define certain device types for certain applications such as wearables, video surveillance and the device capability reduction that is allowed for these device types. Care should be taken though to minimise the number of device types that need to be defined to avoid long discussions as with LTE UE categories.*”

[2] mentioned “*Although these are strictly market-related strategies and discussions, 3GPP can facilitate the market development by defining specific device types with limited range of possible configurations.*

*3GPP could introduce a definition of a RedCap UE with certain capabilities (or certain combinations of capabilities) or the standard can allow any combination taking into account the minimum requirements and further leave it for markets to avoid the production of RedCap chipsets with multiple combinations of capabilities.*”

**Summary**, [1] [2] [3] all considered to have device type concept. Device type can be used:

* access restriction;
* check the intended use cases;
* avoid fragmented market by limited number of device type;

**Potential conclusion 1:** **Device types concept is introduced for RedCap devices.**

**Question 2.1-1: Companies are invited to provide view on potential conclusion 1.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree or disagree** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | Agree | We agree with all the arguments cited above. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 2.1-2 The relationship between device type and capabilities**

[1], *This gives two options on how device types are used and signalled.*

*Option 1) Certain UE capabilities are only captured in the device type definition*

*Option 2) UE capabilities are always signalled explicitly and device type is an additional concept*

*There is no fundamental reason to move away from the legacy NR method of explicitly signalling UE capability. The main motivation for using device type is to make it easier to control access and for industry classification. If device types are used to define UE capabilities, it becomes similar to UE categories of LTE and can quickly result in increasing number of types and fragmentation. However, there is no need to define a device type for every UEs – it only needs to be done where there is a need to identify or restrict UE access based on some limited reduced capabilities and only a small number of device types need to be defined.*

[2] “*Observation 4 The existing UE capabilities framework can be reused to enable, beside the minimum set of capabilities RedCap UEs, more advanced features in RRC\_CONNECTED.”*

[3] also mentioned “*We think this verification can be done by performing a capability match between UE’s reported radio capability and the set of radio capabilities used in defining UE’s RedCap type. The rationale behind this check is that even if a UE falsely reports its UE type, it is less likely that it would falsely report its radio capabilities to gNB.*”

**Summary**, [1] [2] [3] proposed the similar way on the relationship between device type and the UE capabilities, i.e.the existing UE capabilities framework can be reused,  UE capabilities on redcap are always signalled explicitly and device type is an additional concept.

**Potential conclusion 2:** **The existing UE capabilities framework can be reused, UE capabilities on redcap are always signalled explicitly and device type is an additional concept.**

**Question 2.1-2: Companies are invited to provide view on potential conclusion 2.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree or disagree** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | Agree | We agree with all the arguments cited above. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 2.1-3 How to define the device type**

[1] “*However, there is no need to define a device type for every UEs – it only needs to be done where there is a need to identify or restrict UE access based on some limited reduced capabilities and only a small number of device types need to be defined.*

*Proposal #3: The number of device types should be minimised and* ***introduced only where essential to control UE accesses and industry classification*.**”

[2] “*It is possible that the definition of RedCap UEs will diverge in terms of features, capabilities and constraints regarding FR1 and FR2. For this reason, we believe two device types should be defined, one for each Frequency Range.*

*Proposal 1 One RedCap device type is defined per frequency range,* ***corresponding to minimum set of capabilities addressing the RedCap use cases****.”*

[3]” *One approach is to define them in specifications based on a set of radio capabilities that differentiate them from legacy R15/16 UEs, e.g. number of Tx/Rx antennas, maximum supportable BW, etc. The exact composition of this set can be discussed by RAN1.*

*For example, if only a single RedCap type is defined, we may define its feature set targeting a high-end use case (e.g. smart watch) and have low-end UEs (e.g. sensors) use radio capabilities to omit features that they do not support. That would enable a single UE implementation supporting wide range of use cases. If two RedCap types are defined, we can define one type targeting high-end UEs (e.g. smart watch) and the other for low end UEs (e.g. sensors).*

*Proposal 1. Only one, or at most two, RedCap type(s) needs to be defined in Rel-17,* ***based on a set of radio capabilities that differentiate them from legacy R15/16 UEs****.”*

**Summary**: [1] [2] [3] proposed similar way, i.e.

* The number of device types should be minimised and introduced only where essential to control UE accesses and industry classification, e,g, differentiate them from legacy R15/16 UEs, ( number of Tx/Rx antennas, maximum supportable BW, etc.). The exact composition of this set can be discussed by RAN1.

**Potential conclusion 3:** **The number of device types should be minimised and introduced only where essential to control UE accesses and industry classification, e,g, differentiate them from legacy R15/16 UEs, ( number of Tx/Rx antennas, maximum supportable BW, etc. ). The exact composition of this set can be discussed by RAN1.**

**Question 2.1-3: Companies are invited to provide view on potential conclusion 3.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree or disagree** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | Agree | As to the number of UE types, we think what goes into the definition of a UE type can depend on frequency range, but the number of UE types does not have to depend on how many FRs we have. Because the main use of UE type is for access restriction and access control. For that purpose, a serving cell never has to deal with two FRs at the same time. So one UE type is enough.  As to the defining capabilities, we think the general guideline is that they should define the **envelop** of capabilities that differentiate RedCap from legacy R15/15 UEs. Hence within this set, we may need to include some “minimum capabilities” too. For example, we need to define the minimum bandwidth that RedCap UEs need to support so that they can reuse Rel-15 SSB bandwidth and share the same network with legacy UEs. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 2.1-4 How to capture the device type**

[1] “*Further, there has to be an unambiguous understanding of the capability associated with the device type when used to control access to the network. Only the capabilities that are reduced for this device types should be captured. It is proposed:*

*Proposal #4:* ***Device type and its associated capabilities (the reduced set of capabilities) is captured in specifications****.”*

[2] “ *As a final remark, the exact details of how to capture such device types in the specifications can be left for normative phase after the study item has completed. The study should focus on discussion of the possible number of different device types and whether there is need to (normatively) restrict the number of possible capability combinations, as discussed in Section 2.1.*

*Observation 6* ***The exact definition of device types and how they are captured in the standard is determined in the normative phase****.*

**Question 2.1-4: companies are invited to provide view on how to capture the device type:**

* **Option 1: Device type and its associated capabilities (the reduced set of capabilities) is captured in specifications.;**
* **Option 2: Discuss in normative phase;**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1 or option 2** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | We are not sure if these two options are exclusive. We think device type and its associated capabilities have to be defined in specs. We don’t expect how other means (e.g. dynamic signaling?) would work.  We also tend to agree with the assessment in [2] that the study phase can focus on discussion on possible number of device types and general guideline on how to define them. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 2.1-5 How to indicate the device type**

[1] “*On the other hand, signalling device type explicitly can help with verification of device type and its capability. As it is only a few bits, it is proposed:*

*Proposal #5:* *Device type is signalled as part of UE capability in addition to the full UE capabilities*.”

**Question 2.1-5: companies are invited to provide view on whether device type is signalled as part of UE capability in addition to the full UE capabilities:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or no** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | No | In our view, the main purpose of device type indication is for access restriction and access control. So UE signals its RedCap type during connection setup with core network, which then verifies it against UE’s subscription information. This core network entity typically does not need to know details of UE’s radio capabilities (e.g. # of antennas, max number of HARQ processes, etc). Therefore, device type is not signalled as a part of the legacy UE radio capability. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## **How to ensure those device types are only used for the intended use cases**

[1] “*As the UE signals its capabilities to the network irrespective of the solution chosen, it is possible for the network to check the device capability or type against intended use cases. This check could be by means of QoS of the bearers used by the device, checking against subscription parameters or PDU session types. The actual details of the checking can be handled by the network.*

*The SI objective of “checking device is used only as intended” can be met using existing capabilities or a device type.* “

[2] “*RAN can already reject an RRC connection establishment attempt e.g. based on the establishment cause provided in Msg3 or through higher layer mechanisms. Further access attempts can be delayed if rejected and it can be discussed whether these mechanisms should be updated or extended.*

*Observation 7 If UE requires a service which is not intended for RedCap UEs, the request can be rejected. RAN2 should further study whether the existing mechanisms should be extended*.”

[3] “*Proposal 2. Network should validate a UE’s RedCap indication against UE’s subscription to ensure it does not receive services unintended for RedCap UEs.*

*Proposal 3. Network can additionally perform capability match procedure between UE’s reported radio capabilities and the set of capability criteria associated with UE’s RedCap type, to prevent a hacked or misconfigured UE from falsely reporting as a RedCap UE.* ”

**Summary**: Based on [1], [2] and [3], checking device is used only as intended can be met by using existing capabilities or a device type or cause value, etc., E.g: the network to check the device capability, device type or cause value against intended use cases based on subscription checking, rejection access requests etc..

**Potential conclusion 4:** The SI objective of “**checking device is used only as intended” can be met by using existing capabilities or a device type or cause value, etc.. Solution details need further discussion.**

**Question 2.2-1: Companies are invited to provide view on potential conclusion 4.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree or disagree** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Potential solutions on how to ensure** **redCap device types are only used for the intended use cases:**

**Option 1**: RAN can already reject an RRC connection establishment attempt e.g. based on the establishment cause provided in Msg3 or through higher layer mechanisms.

**Option 2:** Network to validate a UE’s RedCap indication against UE’s subscription to ensure it does not receive services unintended for RedCap UEs.

**Option 2a**. Network can additionally perform capability match procedure between UE’s reported radio capabilities and the set of capability criteria associated with UE’s RedCap type, to prevent a hacked or misconfigured UE from falsely reporting as a RedCap UE. ”

**Option x**:

**Question 2.2-2: companies are invited to provide view on solutions ensure redCap device types are only used for the intended use cases:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views on potential solutions** |
| Qualcomm | We think both Option 2 and 2a are necessary. Option 1 alone is not sufficient.  If we understood correctly how Option 1 works, it may meet the requirement in a robust way – for example, a hacked RedCap UE may not report itself as RedCap in establishment cause and then get services that it is not intended for. Therefore, in addition to some type of indication by UE itself, network has to perform capability match procedure to ensure UE is telling the truth. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Summary

To be added: