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# Introduction

This is the report of following offline discussion:

* [AT116bis-e][105][RedCap] Capabilities (Intel)

Initial scope: Continue the discussion on open issues for RedCap capabilities, based on e.g. [R2-2200286](file:///C:/Data/3GPP/Extracts/R2-2200286%20Open%20issues%20on%20RedCap%20capabilities.docx) and [R2-2200553](file:///C:/Data/3GPP/Extracts/R2-2200553%20Definition%20and%20reduced%20capabilities%20for%20RedCap%20UE.doc)

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

* + - List of proposals for agreement (if any)
    - List of proposals that require online discussions
    - List of proposals that should not be pursued (if any)

Initial deadline (for companies' feedback): Wednesday 2022-01-19 1300 UTC

Initial deadline (for rapporteur's summary in R2-2201737): Wednesday 2022-01-19 1500 UTC

Updated scope: Continue the discussion on open issues for RedCap capabilities based on [R2-2201737](file:///C:/Data/3GPP/RAN2/Inbox/R2-2201737.zip)

Updated intended outcome: Summary of the offline discussion with e.g.:

* + - List of proposals for agreement (if any)
    - List of proposals that require online discussions
    - List of proposals that should not be pursued (if any)

Updated deadline (for companies' feedback): Friday 2022-01-21 1400 UTC

Updated deadline (for rapporteur's summary in R2-2201750): Friday 2022-01-21 1600 UTC

Proposals marked "for agreement" in R2-2201750 not challenged until Monday 2022-01-24 1000 UTC will be declared as agreed via email by the session chair (for the rest the discussion might continue in the GTW session).

# Annex: companies’ point of contact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point of contact** | **Email address** |
| Intel Corporation | Yi Guo | Yi.guo@intel.com |
| Samsung | Jaehyuk JANG | jack.jang@samsung.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yulong Shi | shiyulong5@huawei.com |
| MediaTek | Pradeep Jose | pradeep dot jose at mediatek dot com |
| Apple | Naveen Palle | naveen.palle@apple.com |
| Sequans | Noam Cayron | noam.cayron@sequans.com |
| Futurewei | Yunsong Yang | yyang1@futurewei.com |
| CATT | Xiangdong Zhang | zhangxiangdong@catt.cn |
| OPPO | Haitao Li | lihaitao@oppo.com |
| LGE | HyunJung Choe | stella.choe@lge.com |
| ZTE | LiuJing | liu.jing30@zte.com.cn |
| Spreadtrum | Min Xu | Ellen.Xu@unisoc.com |
| Ericsson | Tuomas Tirronen | Tuomas.tirronen@ericsson.com |
| vivo | Chenli | Chenli5g@vivo.com |
| Interdigital | Keiichi Kubota | keiichi.kubota@interdigital.com |
| Qualcomm | Linhai He | linhaihe@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Nordic Semiconductor | Jouni Korhonen | [Jouni.korhonen@nordicsemi.no](mailto:Jouni.korhonen@nordicsemi.no) |
| BT | Salva Diaz | salva.diazsendra@bt.com |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Jussi Koskinen | [Jussi-pekka.koskinen@nokia.com](mailto:Jussi-pekka.koskinen@nokia.com) |

# Discussion

## 3.1 Support of ANR

As discuss in [3]:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ANR is mandatory with capability signalling. The discussion in email discussion 105 was for RedCap UE whether it should be optional instead of mandatory with capability signalling.   |  | | --- | | **Summary on the Phase 2-Discussion point 2.1: Should ANR feature be optional for RedCap UE (instead of mandatory with capability signalling as for non-RedCap)?**  21 companies provided inputs to this discussion point:   * **ANR is optional for RedCap UE** is supported by 19 companies (Intel, ZTE, Apple, Huawei, OPPO, Spreadtrum, Qualcomm, Sierra Wireless, Futurewei, Samsung, Lenovo, KDDI, vivo, Sharp, Xiaomi, CATT, Sequans, ChinaTelecom, MediaTek) * **ANR is mandatory for RedCap UE** is supported by 2 companies (Ericsson, LGE)   **Rapporteur**: There is clear majority on this 19/21.  **Proposal 9.** **[To agree] [19/21] ANR feature is optional for RedCap UE; FFS on how to capture this in specification;** |   In offline 109, RAN2 continued the discussion on this:   |  | | --- | | **Summary on the Discussion point 2.1.3 on ANR: Should ANR feature be optional for RedCap UE (instead of mandatory with capability signalling as for non-RedCap)?**  23 companies provided inputs to this discussion point:   * **ANR is optional for RedCap UE** is supported by 13 companies (Intel, Sierra Wireless, Huawei, Spreadtrum, Qualcomm, Apple, CMCC, Futurewei, vivo, Sequans, MediaTek, LG, OPPO)   Huawei commented that “*There will be always non-RedCap UE to support ANR, since there is no RedCap only cell. ANR feature causes significant complexity for RedCap, which is not essential in the typical deployment.*”   * **ANR is mandatory for RedCap UE** is supported by 7 companies (BT, Ericsson, Turkcell, Telecom Italia, Nokia, Deutsche Telekom, Vodafone)   BT mentioned that *ANR is a key feature for operators since it is required to deploy, to maintain and to optimize the network*. Ericsson is considering the scenario that NPN based RedCap only cell.   * **No strong opinion:** 3 companies **(ZTE, CATT, NEC)**   **Rapporteur**: There is no clear majority on this.  **Proposal 4, [To discuss] [13/23]** ANR feature is optional for RedCap UE; FFS on how to capture this in specification; |   We do not see the need to support RedCap only cell. The operator can use non-RedCap UE to get sufficient information on ANR.  **Proposal 1:** **ANR feature is optional for RedCap UE;** |

**Discussion point 3.1-1: Companies are invited to provide view on whether ANR feature should be optional for RedCap UE?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Optional/Still mandatory with capability signalling?** | **Comments, if any** |
| Samsung | Optional | - |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Optional | Operator can use legacy UE and RedCap UE supporting ANR in the cell, while gives some complexity reduction to RedCap UE. |
| MediaTek | Optional | For the same reasons as Huawei |
| Apple | Optional | We hope to get a consensus on this in this meeting. |
| Sequans | Optional |  |
| Futurewei | Optional |  |
| CATT | Optional |  |
| OPPO | Optional | ANR function can be aided by multiple UEs (including eMBB UEs and RedCap UEs) that are capable of ANR reporting. |
| LGE | Optional |  |
| ZTE | Optional |  |
| Spreadtrum | Optional |  |
| Ericsson | Mandatory | We support the operators’ view on that ANR is a key feature in NR and should be supported by all UEs. This will avoid future issues due to UEs not supporting ANR and make it easier to deploy RedCap without considering any changes related to managing NCRTs in any type of deployment (e.g. NPN which could contain only/a lot of RedCap UEs). |
| vivo | Optional |  |
| Interdigital | Optional |  |
| Intel | Optional |  |
| Qualcomm | Optional |  |
| Nordic | Optional |  |
| BT | Mandatory | As Ericsson mention, there are environments where it is expected that mostly RedCap UEs are deployed.  Companies refer that operators can rely on legacy UEs but it is worth to remember that not all UEs on field support such feature even it is mandatory with signaling. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Optional |  |

**Summary: 19 companies provided the inputs;**

16 companies would like to make ANR as optional feature for RedCap UE considering operator can use legacy UE and RedCap UE who support this feature. This can reduce additional complexity to RedCap UE;

3 companies would like to keep it as mandatory with capability signalling since ANR is a key feature in NR. 1 company also mentioned that not all UEs on field support such feature even it is mandatory with signalling.

Rapporteur would suggest to go for majority:

**Proposal 3.1-1: [For agreement] [16/19] ANR feature is optional for RedCap UE;**

## 3.2 Support of CHO

As discussed in [3]:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The issue was discussed in email discussion 105:   |  | | --- | | **Summary on the Phase 2-Discussion point 2.8: whether the features introduced by Rel-16 mobility, DAPS handover and Conditional Pscell change are supported by RedCap UE?**  20 companies provided inputs to this discussion point.   * All companies agreed that DAPS and CAPC cannot be supported. * But 8 companies (ZTE, Huawei, Spreadtrum, Futurewei, Lenovo, vivo, Xiaomi, MediaTek) do not see the problem to support CHO for RedCap UEs.   **Proposal 15 [To agree] [20/20] DAPS and CAPC related capabilities are not applicable for RedCap UE; [8/20] FFS on CHO. FFS on how to capture this in the specification;** |   During the email discussion, one company commented that “*considering the motivation of CHO (i.e. robustness especially for high frequency), we do not see the actual need for RedCap UE*”. To our understanding, CHO is anyway an optional feature. If it is complex to some RedCap UEs, then those RedCap UEs do not need to support it. But we do not see any technical reason on why we need to forbid the RedCap UE to support this.  **Proposal 2: CHO related capabilities are applicable for RedCap UEs (understanding that CHO is already defined as an optional feature). “FFS on CHO” can be removed.** |

**Discussion point 3.2-1: Companies are invited to provide view on whether CHO related capabilities are applicable for RedCap UEs?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Applied/Not supported?** | **Comments, if any** |
| Samsung | Applied | - |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Applied |  |
| MediaTek | Applicable | CHO remains an optional feature, just as for non RedCap UEs |
| Apple | applicable |  |
| Sequans | Applicable | and optional, as legacy |
| Futurewei | Applicable | And optional. |
| CATT | Applicable |  |
| OPPO | Applied | No need to have any restrictions on supporting CHO for RedCap UEs as mobility needs to handled. |
| LGE | Applicable |  |
| ZTE | Applicable |  |
| Spreadtrum | Applicable |  |
| Ericsson | Applied |  |
| vivo | Applicable |  |
| Interdigital | Applicable |  |
| Intel | Applied | No change is needed, just remove the FFS. |
| Qualcomm | Applicable |  |
| Nordic | Applicable |  |
| BT | Applicable |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Applicable |  |

**Summary: 19 companies provided the inputs;**

All companies agreed that the CHO is applicable for RedCap UEs.

Rapporteur would suggest to go for majority:

**Proposal 3.2-1: [For agreement] [19/19] CHO related capabilities are applicable for RedCap UEs (understanding that CHO is already defined as an optional feature). “FFS on CHO” can be removed. ;**

## 3.3 How can network identify RedCap UE based on capability

As discussed in [3]:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RAN1 also discussed this issue and has agreed to introduce an explicit capability bit to indicate the support of RedCap [7] as   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Features | Index | Feature group | Components | Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported | Mandatory/Optional | | 28. NR\_redcap | 28-1 | RedCap UE | 1. Maximum FR1 RedCap UE bandwidth is 20 MHz.  2. Maximum FR2 RedCap UE bandwidth is 100 MHz.  3. Early indication of RedCap UE in Msg.1 for 4-step RACH  FFS whether to add any other basic features for RedCap UE | Yes | Optional with capability signaling  RedCap UE must indicate this FG is supported |   Therefore RAN2 can confirm RAN1 agreements, and the capability can be captured in capability Rapporteur’s CRs.  **Proposal 5: RAN2 confirms RAN1 agreement to introduce explicit bit to indicate the support of RedCap. The capability will be captured in Capability Rapporteur’s Mega CRs;** |

**Discussion point 3.3-1: Companies are invited to provide view on whether RAN2 can confirm RAN1 agreement to introduce explicit bit to indicate the support of RedCap. The capability will be captured in Capability Rapporteur’s Mega CRs?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Confirm RAN1 agreements/do not agree?** | **Comments, if any** |
| Samsung | Agree | - |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | This explicit bit is useful in case one RedCap UE does not support any RedCap specific optional feature. In HO, this bit can help target gNB determine whether it can support this type of UE (i.e. RedCap UE). |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Sequans | Confirm | Agree with HW |
| Futurewei | Agree |  |
| CATT | No | Considering gNB can be aware of the UE type based on Msg1 or Msg 3 early identification always, so an explicit redcap type indication is not necessary for this case. As for HO case, the source gNB can always get the UE type based on Msg1 or Msg3 early identification, and then sends the UE type information to target gNB.  Unless the early identification can be disabled entirely by network, but we have no agreement on this. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Agree | Note we have also similar RAN2 agreement: “The network needs to unambiguously know whether the UE is a RedCap or a non-RedCap UE from its reported UE capability information.” Explicit capability bit is the most fool-proof mechanism to implement also this RAN2 agreement. |
| Vivo | Yes | We agree to confirm RAN1 agreement to introduce explicit bit to indicate the support of RedCap. Besides, we think this capability should be per-band/BC basis. Otherwise, as mentioned by CATT, this per-UE indication is not needed. |
| Interdigital | Confirm |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Confirm |  |
| Nordic | Agree |  |
| BT | Confirm |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No | This seems not needed, because MSG1 and MSG3 indications are already agreed. We would like to understand why capability bit would be necessary? |

**Summary: 19 companies provided the inputs;**

17 companies would like to confirm RAN1 agreements, i.e. introduce explicit bit to indicate the support of RedCap considering RedCap may not support any RedCap specific optional feature and it can help targt gNB determine UE type.

2 company would like to rely on msg1/msg3 identification to detect the UE type, and for HO case, the source gNB should send the UE type information to the target gNB.

1 company would like to make the capability as per band/BC basis. Rapporteur considers this is related to fallback discussion which has been excluded on Monday. Therefore would suggest to confirm RAN1 agreements:

**Proposal 3.3-1a: [For agreement] [17/19] RAN2 confirms RAN1 agreements, i.e. introduce explicit bit to indicate the support of RedCap; To be captured in Mega CR;**

**Proposal 3.3-1b: [For agreement] [16/17] RAN2 confirms RAN1 agreements, i.e. the RedCap UE capability is per UE;**

As discussed in [3]:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| It is also related to the description in TS38.306 running CR [8] where the mandatory reduced capabilities for a RedCap UE is defined’, i.e. “Early indication of RedCap UE in Msg.1 for 4-step RACH” should be added.   |  | | --- | | RedCap UE is the UE with reduced capability:   * The maximum bandwidth is 20 MHz for FR1, and is 100 MHz for FR2; * The maximum mandatory supported DRB number is 8; * The mandatory supported PDCP SN length is 12 bits while 18 bits being optional; * The mandatory supported RLC AM SN length is 12 bits while 18 bits being optional; * 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported; * Support of early indication of RedCap UE in Msg.1 for 4-step RACH; * CA, MR-DC, DAPS, CPAC and IAB ( i.e., the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node) related UE features and corresponding capabilities are not supported by RedCap Ues. All other feature groups or components of the feature groups as captured in TR 38.822 [24] as well as capabilities specified in this specification remain applicable for RedCap Ues same as non-RedCap Ues, unless indicated otherwise. |   **Proposal 6: To add “Support of early indication of RedCap UE in Msg.1 for 4-step RACH” ‘as part of the basic component of RedCap UE in 4.2.xx** **RedCap Parameters of TS38.306 running CR;** |

**Discussion point 3.3-2: Companies are invited to provide view on whether “-Support of early indication of RedCap UE in Msg.1 for 4-step RACH;” should be captured in 4.2.xx RedCap Parameters of TS38.306 running CR as one of the basic component of RedCap UE? i.e.**

RedCap UE is the UE with reduced capability:

* The maximum bandwidth is 20 MHz for FR1, and is 100 MHz for FR2;
* The maximum mandatory supported DRB number is 8;
* The mandatory supported PDCP SN length is 12 bits while 18 bits being optional;
* The mandatory supported RLC AM SN length is 12 bits while 18 bits being optional;
* 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported;
* Support of early indication of RedCap UE in Msg.1 for 4-step RACH;
* CA, MR-DC, DAPS, CPAC and IAB ( i.e., the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node) related UE features and corresponding capabilities are not supported by RedCap Ues. All other feature groups or components of the feature groups as captured in TR 38.822 [24] as well as capabilities specified in this specification remain applicable for RedCap Ues same as non-RedCap Ues, unless indicated otherwise.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree the TP/Do not agree?** | **Comments, if any** |
| Samsung | - | We understand the intention, but to capture it in MAC would be sufficient. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | It seems based on the R1 LS for the feature list, which is fine.  Minor wording update: (because Msg1 already indicates it is 4-step RA)  - Mandatory support Msg1 early indication; |
| MediaTek |  | We do not see a need to capture this here as part of the ‘list’ of reduced capabilities of a RedCap UE, as this is not really related to capability reduction.  This is a feature that is mandatory for RedCap Ues, which can be captured in the associated capability definition. |
| Sequans | Not agree | This is not a reduced capability, but a requirement that can be captured in 38.306 |
| Futurewei | - | The preamble part of this paragraph seems to define RedCap UE as a UE with a list of “reduced capability” (at least that was the case before), which would make this added bullet unsuitable. If the intent is to define RedCap UE as a UE with a list of mandatory features or “basic components” for RedCap, then this added bullet would be fine but the language in the preamble needs to be modified. |
| CATT | Not agree | Have the same view with Sequans. |
| OPPO |  | Agree with MediaTek |
| LGE | Not agree | Support of early indication doesn’t need to be captured in 4.2.xx. The section presents what a RedCap UE is, not what a RedCap UE does. |
| ZTE | - | Agree with others that this is not part of reduced capabilities. We suggest to describe the mandatory feature in an independent paragraph in section 4.2.xx. See below example:  4.2.xx RedCap Parameters  RedCap UE is the UE with reduced capability:   * The maximum… * … * …   RedCap UE shall support following capabilities (i.e. mandatory features):   * Msg1 and MsgA based early identification; * Msg3 based early identification (if agreed in RAN2) |
| Spreadtrum |  | If this section is used to describe the reduced capability for Redcap UE, then early identification feature is not suitable to be captured here. It can be added in a description where basic Redcap UE features are captured. |
| Ericsson | Agree but | Also support for early Msg3 indication should be mandatory for RedCap Ues. Why only Msg1 indication would be mandatory? We therefore propose to generalize the above to include also Msg3 and MsgA early indication:   * Support of RedCap early indication for RACH; |
| Vivo |  | We also don’t think it is a reduced capability. It is fine to capture it in the capability definition or just capture it in MAC specification is enough. |
| Interdigital | Agree | Agree with the lists of he proposed mandatory feature list and not applicable features. Support ZTE’s proposal above. |
| Intel | Agree with comments | Tend to agree with others that this is not reduced capability, and could be good to capture what is mandatory support for RedCap, e.g. together RedCap UE capability.  In addition, agree “4 step RACH” should be removed;  Msg3 identify may be added if RAN2 agree this. |
| Qualcomm | Not agree | Agree with MediaTek’s comment. It is optional but not a capability |
| Nordic |  | Tend to agree with Sequans. |
| BT | Agree with condition | Msg1 only is not enough as Msg3 or MsgA can be used.  We support Ericsson amendment. A more explicit alternative can be:  - Support of early indication of RedCap UE in Msg.1 and Msg3 for 4-step RACH. Support of early indication of RedCap UE in MsgA for 2-step RACH; |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Not agree | Both MSG1 and MSG3 redcap indications should be mandatory for RedCap |

**Summary: 18 companies provided the inputs;**

Companies have different view on whether to capture it, and how to capture it.

* Some companies think it is component of RedCap UE and should be captured in the field description of RedCap UE capability (proposed in **Proposal 3.3-1a**)
* Some companies are ok to capture it under 4.2.xx, but:
  + “4 step RACH” should be removed;
  + Msg 3/MsgA should be added if agreed in separate email discussion;

Rapporteur would suggest to capture it in the field description of RedCap UE capability.

**Proposal 3.3-2: [Online discussion] RAN2 to discuss whether “Support of RedCap early indication for RACH” should be captured in the field description of RedCap UE capability (proposed in Proposal 3.3-1a);**

## 3.4 Half-duplex FDD capability

As discussed in [3]:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RAN1 also discussed this issue and has agreed to introduce a capability bit to indicate the support of Half-duplex FDD operation type A [7] as   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 28. NR\_redcap | 28-3 | Half-duplex FDD operation type A for RedCap UE | 1. Half-duplex FDD operation (instead of full-duplex FDD operation) type A for RedCap UE | Yes | Optional with capability signaling |   Therefore RAN2 can confirm RAN1 agreements, and the capability can be captured in capability Rapporteur’s CRs based on RAN2 agreements:  **For Rel17 NR UE caps:**   * Aim to Work on mega CRs (one mega CR for TS38.306 and one for TS38.331) to incorporate all RAN1/RAN4 feature groups. ​There could be exceptions, case by case. * RAN2 should only implement the feature groups from the RAN1 and 4 feature list without any FFS (no highlighted yellow, [] and marked as FFS/TBD) into the CRs. Also Caps that are dependent on FFS Caps should not be implemented.   **Proposal 7: RAN2 confirms RAN1 agreement to introduce capability bit to indicate the support of Half-duplex FDD operation type A. The capability will be captured in Capability Rapporteur’s Mega CRs;** |

**Discussion point 3.4-1: Companies are invited to provide view on whether RAN2 can confirm RAN1 agreement to introduce capability bit to indicate the support of Half-duplex FDD operation type A. The capability will be captured in Capability Rapporteur’s Mega CRs; ?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Confirm RAN1 agreements/Do not agree?** | **Comments, if any** |
| Samsung | Agree | - |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Apple | Ok |  |
| Sequans | Confirm |  |
| Futurewei | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| Vivo | Agree |  |
| Interdigital | Confirm |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Nordic | Agree |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Agree |  |

**Summary: 18 companies provided the inputs;**

All companies agreed to confirm RAN1 agreements to introduce capability bit on Half-duplex FDD operation type A.

**Proposal 3.4-1: [For agreement] [18/18] RAN2 confirms RAN1 agreements, i.e. introduce capability bit on Half-duplex FDD operation type A for RedCap UEs; To be captured in Mega CR.**

## 3.5 Support 1 DL MIMO layer

As discussed in [3]:

|  |
| --- |
| In [3], Huawei, ZTE discussed whether “support 1 DL MIMO layer” is same as “not supporting DL MIMO”. To our understanding, the confusion came from the wording “If absent, the UE does not support MIMO on this carrier”. The UE should at least support 1 MIMO layer to receive PDSCH. Then we may clarify this in TS38.306, i.e. “If absent, the UE ~~does not~~ support 1 MIMO layer on this carrier.”.  **Proposal 8: Change the field description of “*maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH*” from “If absent, the UE does not support MIMO on this carrier” to “If absent, the UE supports 1 MIMO layer on this carrier.”** |

[4] also discussed the issue as

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| One leftover from last RAN2 meeting on how to report the DL MIMO layer for RedCap is on the legacy field maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH.   | ***MaxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH***  Defines the maximum number of spatial multiplexing layer(s) supported by the UE for DL reception. For single CC standalone NR, it is mandatory with capability signaling to support at least 4 MIMO layers in the bands where 4Rx is specified as mandatory for the given UE and at least 2 MIMO layers in FR2. If absent, the UE does not support MIMO on this carrier. | FSPC | CY | N/A | N/A | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |   Based on the current ASN.1 design, One MIMO layer seems different with the case of not supporting MIMO, since the UL MIMO layer IE has the value of “oneLayer” while can be absent.  MIMO-LayersDL ::=   ENUMERATED {twoLayers, fourLayers, eightLayers}  MIMO-LayersUL ::=   ENUMERATED {oneLayer, twoLayers, fourLayers}  In addition, there is no RAN1 agreement to state that 1RX is mandatory but 2RX is optional. It means, in the RAN2 speciciation, there should be no implication on RedCap UE will support one layer by default.  **Observation 2: It is not clear in the current specification on whether “supporting one DL MIMO layer” is same as “not supporting DL MIMO”.**  **Observation 3: Even if the statement “*If absent, the UE does not support MIMO on this carrier*” causes some ambiguity on the *oneLayer* supporting, it is better not to further change/clarify the R15 and R16 specification anymore.**  **Observation 4: As endorsed in running CR, by copying the WID, capture “RedCap UE supports 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported” in the RedCap specific section in TS 38.306.**  To avoid any clarification to R15/16 speciation, we should directly add “oneLayer” for RedCap. However, it is not backward compatible to add one value to the legacy IE MIMO-LayersDL, since there is no spare value left. In that case, add one new R17 IE for RedCap will be the clean design.  **Proposal 4: Introduce new value “*oneLayer*” for RedCap DL MIMO layer reporting in R17, to avoid any clarification which may impact on R15 and R16 specification.** |

Therefore we could see 3 options:

**Option 1:** **Change the field description of “*maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH*” from “If absent, the UE does not support MIMO on this carrier” to “If absent, the UE supports 1 MIMO layer on this carrier.”**

**Option 2:** **Introduce new value “*oneLayer*” for RedCap DL MIMO layer reporting in R17, to avoid any clarification which may impact on R15 and R16 specification.**

**Option 3: Do nothing;**

**Discussion point 3.5-1: Companies are invited to provide view on which option should be adopted in Rel-17 on how to indicate oneLayer for DL MIMO?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Option 1, Option 2, Option 3** | **Comments, if any** |
| Samsung | Option 2 | This option removes any ambiguity. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Prefer Opt2,  fine with Opt3,  Opt1 is not acceptable | The wording captured in the RedCap section “*- 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported;*” seems sufficient to clarify. We should not change the R15/16 description anymore.  If we really want to clarify something, then adding “*oneLayer*” is the good way to not impact the R15/16 spec and also aligned with the “*1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported*”. |
| MediaTek | Option 3 |  |
| Apple | Option 2 |  |
| Sequans | Option 3 | We are fine to go with majority, but:  There is no difference between no MIMO and 1 MIMO layer.  If anything, the discrepancy in MIMO-LayersDL/UL stems from them not always being separately optional, for example in the UAI message:  reducedMaxMIMO-LayersFR1 SEQUENCE {  reducedMIMO-LayersFR1-DL MIMO-LayersDL,  reducedMIMO-LayersFR1-UL MIMO-LayersUL  } OPTIONAL,  For us both other options are more confusing in some way, option 2 more so than option 1, |
| Futurewei | Option 3 |  |
| CATT | Option 3 |  |
| OPPO |  | Shouldn’t this be confirmed by RAN1 first? |
| LGE | Option 3 |  |
| ZTE | Option 3 | Same view as Sequans, there is no difference between “no MIMO” and “1 MIMO layer”.  We are fine to do nothing. We cannot accept Option 2 unless we get the confirmation from RAN1. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 3 |  |
| Ericsson | Option 3 |  |
| vivo | Option 3 | Option 2 is acceptable is majority companies think some clarification is needed. |
| Interdigital | Option 3 | Agree with Sequans |
| Intel |  | We are fine to do nothing. The reason we do not like option 2 because it looks like one MIMO layer is not supported if MIMOLayer is absent which will impact legacy behavior. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 |  |
| Nordic | Option 2 | Agree with Samsung, |
| BT | Option 3 | We prefer to minimize changes. 1 DL MIMO means no MIMO. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Option 3 |  |

**Summary: 19 companies provided the inputs;**

Option 2: 5 companies;

Option 3: 15 companies

1 company would like to check RAN1.

**Proposal 3.5-1: [Online discussion] [15/19] RAN2 confirms 1 DL MIMO means no MIMO, no specification impact.**

## 3.6 Impact due to RAN1 LS

As discussed in [3]:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| In RAN1 LS, RAN1 mentioned   |  | | --- | | The following Rel-15/16 UE features or capabilities are not applicable for Rel-17 RedCap UEs:   1. Capabilities related to carrier aggregation (CA) 2. Capabilities related to dual connectivity (DC) 3. Capabilities related to UE bandwidths wider than 20 MHz in FR1 or wider than 100 MHz in FR2 4. Capabilities related to more than 2 UE Rx branches or more than 2 DL MIMO layers 5. Capabilities related to more than 2 UE Tx branches or more than 2 UL MIMO layers |   1-2 have been captured in TS38.306 running CR as   * CA, MR-DC, DAPS, CPAC and IAB ( i.e., the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node) related UE features and corresponding capabilities are not supported by RedCap Ues. All other feature groups or components of the feature groups as captured in TR 38.822 [24] as well as capabilities specified in this specification remain applicable for RedCap Ues same as non-RedCap Ues, unless indicated otherwise.   However 3-5 are missing, and should be captured.  **Proposal 9: To add capability limitation on BW, Rx/Tx branches and UL/DL MIMO layers as part of the basic component of RedCap UE in 4.2.xx** **RedCap Parameters of TS38.306 running CR, e.g.**   * UE features and corresponding capabilities related to UE bandwidths wider than 20 MHz in FR1 or wider than 100 MHz in FR2, more than 2 UE Rx branches or more than 2 DL MIMO layers, more than 2 UE Tx branches or more than 2 UL MIMO layers, CA, MR-DC, DAPS, CPAC and IAB ( i.e., the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node) ~~related UE features and corresponding capabilities~~ are not supported by RedCap Ues. All other feature groups or components of the feature groups as captured in TR 38.822 [24] as well as capabilities specified in this specification remain applicable for RedCap Ues same as non-RedCap Ues, unless indicated otherwise. |

**Discussion point 3.6-1: Companies are invited to provide view on whether to add capability limitation on BW, Rx/Tx branches and UL/DL MIMO layers as part of the basic component of RedCap UE in 4.2.xx RedCap Parameters of TS38.306 running CR: as**

* UE features and corresponding capabilities related to UE bandwidths wider than 20 MHz in FR1 or wider than 100 MHz in FR2, more than 2 UE Rx branches or more than 2 DL MIMO layers, more than 2 UE Tx branches or more than 2 UL MIMO layers, CA, MR-DC, DAPS, CPAC and IAB ( i.e., the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node) ~~related UE features and corresponding capabilities~~ are not supported by RedCap Ues. All other feature groups or components of the feature groups as captured in TR 38.822 [24] as well as capabilities specified in this specification remain applicable for RedCap Ues same as non-RedCap Ues, unless indicated otherwise.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree the TP/Do not agree?** | **Comments, if any** |
| Samsung | Agree | - |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No strong view | The description in the beginning of this section is sufficient:   * “The maximum bandwidth is 20 MHz for FR1, and is 100 MHz for FR2; * 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported;”   This seems just further explanation. If majority want this, we can use another paragraph rather than mixed with the “CA/MR-DC…..”. |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Apple | Ok |  |
| Sequans | Not Agree | Agree with HW, this is already captured.  If eventually it is agreed to be captured again, then a separate bullet or a clarification to the existing bullets are preferable. |
| Futurewei | Not agree | There are some redundancy with two of the bullets above it. |
| CATT | No strong view. | Prefer to agreeing with Huawei. |
| OPPO | OK |  |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| ZTE | See comments | Bullet 3 is already covered by current running CR;  For bullet 4 and 5, we think they are not captured in current running CR, the existing sentence only mentions the features that RedCap UE can support, it does not emphasize the features that RedCap UE cannot support.  So we suggest to make following change:   * 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported. Capabilities related to more than 2 UE Rx branches and more than 2 DL MIMO layers, as well as capabilities related to more than 2 UE Tx branches and more than 2 UL MIMO layers are not supported by RedCap Ues; |
| Spreadtrum | No strong view | Prefer to agree with ZTE. |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| vivo | No strong view | Tend to agree with Huawei. |
| Interdigital | Not strong view | We are fine to go with majority. |
| Intel |  | The intention from us is to make the specification clear. Seems companies who reply “Not agree” can accept to capture the clarifications in the bullets on BW and RX/MIMO, i.e. ZTE’s proposal. We are also fine with it.  We updated it as below:   * The maximum bandwidth is 20 MHz for FR1, and is 100 MHz for FR2; - UE features and corresponding capabilities related to UE bandwidths wider than 20 MHz in FR1 or wider than 100 MHz in FR2 are not supported by RedCap UEs; * 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported. UE features and corresponding capabilities related to more than 2 UE Rx branches and more than 2 DL MIMO layers, as well as UE features and capabilities related to more than 2 UE Tx branches and more than 2 UL MIMO layers are not supported by RedCap UEs; |
| Qualcomm | Agree | We are also fine with Intel’s TP above |
| Nordic | Agree |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No strong view |  |

**Summary: 18 companies provided the inputs on “to add capability limitation on BW, Rx/Tx branches and UL/DL MIMO layers as part of the basic component of RedCap UE in 4.2.xx RedCap Parameters of TS38.306 running CR”**

Agree: 8 companies;

Do not agree: 2 companies

No strong opinion: 6 companies

ZTE suggested to capture it under existing bullets for BW and Rx/MIMO.

Rapporteur would suggest:

.

**Proposal 3.6-1: [Online discussion] RAN2 to discuss whether to capture the limitation on BW, Rx and MIMO as**

* The maximum bandwidth is 20 MHz for FR1, and is 100 MHz for FR2; - UE features and corresponding capabilities related to UE bandwidths wider than 20 MHz in FR1 or wider than 100 MHz in FR2 are not supported by RedCap UEs;
* 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported. UE features and corresponding capabilities related to more than 2 UE Rx branches and more than 2 DL MIMO layers, as well as UE features and capabilities related to more than 2 UE Tx branches and more than 2 UL MIMO layers are not supported by RedCap UEs;

As discussed in [3]:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Regarding PDSCH MIMO layer, RAN2 has agreed to reuse existing *maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH* and therefore nothing to be changed, i.e. still per FSPC.   |  | | --- | | Agreement:   * Inform RAN2 that “From RAN1 perspective, it would be enough to indicate the maximum number of PDSCH MIMO layers per band for RedCap UEs, but RAN1 notes that the type of FG2-3 (*maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH*) is currently per FSPC and that it is up to RAN2 whether to signal per band or per FSPC” |   **Proposal 10: Existing field “maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH ” is reused, i.e. it is still per FSPC for RedCap UE;** |

**Discussion point 3.6-2: Companies are invited to provide view on whether existing field “maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH ” is reused for RedCap Ues, i.e. it is still per FSPC for RedCap UE;**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **No change, i.e. FSPC/change it as per band for RedCap Ues?** | **Comments, if any** |
| Samsung | FSPC | The legacy fields can be reused even if it is sufficient to indicate per band. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No change, i.e. FSPC | Per FSPC seems more flexible. |
| MediaTek | No change | Reuse legacy fields where possible |
| Apple | No change is Ok |  |
| Sequans | No change | No reason to limit flexibility and introduce a change from legacy (assuming this was not intended instead as a limitation, which does not seem to be the case) |
| CATT | No change |  |
| OPPO | No change |  |
| LGE | No change |  |
| ZTE | No change |  |
| Spreadtrum | No change |  |
| Ericsson | No change |  |
| vivo | No change |  |
| Interdigital | No change |  |
| Intel | No change |  |
| Qualcomm | No change |  |
| Nordic | No change |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No Change |  |

**Summary: 17 companies provided the inputs.**

All companies agreed that existing field “maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH ” is reused for RedCap Ues, i.e. it is still per FSPC for RedCap UE

Rapporteur would suggest:

**Proposal 3.6-2: [For agreement] [17/17] RAN2 confirms that for RedCap UEs, “maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH ” is still per FSPC although per band is enough.**

## 3.7 shortSN and am-WithShortSN for RedCap UEs

As discussed in [4]:

|  |
| --- |
| In RAN2#115-e meeting, it is already agreed that PDCP/RLC AM 12 bits SN is mandatory for RedCap UE, to further clarify, we propose to add some supplementary descriptions under the field *horts* and am-*WithShortSN* in the 38.306 Running CR as follows:  In the email discussion [Post115-e][108][RedCap] 38.306 Running CR (Intel), the running CR was endorsed with some leftover details. We propose to do further updates on the running CR as below proposals.  **Proposal 5: To clarify in the field description of *horts* and *am-WithShortSN* that, RedCap UE should always report ”1” in TS 38.306 section 4.2.4 and 4.2.5.** |

**Discussion point 3.7-1: Companies are invited to provide view on whether to clarify in the field description of horts and am-WithShortSN that, RedCap UE should always report ”1” in TS 38.306 section 4.2.4 and 4.2.5.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree the clarification/Do not agree the change?** | **Comments, if any** |
| Samsung | Agree | - |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Apple | Ok |  |
| Sequans | Agree |  |
| Futurewei | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| Vivo | Agree |  |
| Interdigital | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Nordic | Agree |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Agree |  |

**Summary: 18 companies provided the inputs.**

All companies agreed to clarify in the field description of horts and am-WithShortSN that, RedCap UE should always report ”1” in TS 38.306 section 4.2.4 and 4.2.5.

Rapporteur would suggest:

**Proposal 3.7-1: [For agreement] [18/18] Clarify in the field description of *shortSN* and *am-WithShortSN* that, RedCap UE should always report ”1” in TS 38.306 section 4.2.4 and 4.2.5.**

## 3.8 Inter-RAT mobility management

As discussed in [4]:

|  |
| --- |
| **Observation 5: The LTE coverage is an important backup for RedCap UEs considering the limitation of NR Redcap service coverage and NR coverage during the early deployment stage.**  **Observation 6: For the inter-RAT mobility from NR to LTE, the current cell reselection and handover mechanisms can be reused for RedCap Ues paired with LTE module.**  **Observation 7: For the inter-RAT mobility from LTE to NR, the source LTE cell** **cannot identify whether a UE is the RedCap type and does not have information on the RedCap-supporting of target NR cells.**   * **Option 1**   If some information on whether the target NR cell supports RedCap can be provided to the RedCap UE before it starts to access the target cell, the incorrect handover procedure can be terminated as early as possible. Afterwards, the RedCap UE can perform e.g. RRC re-establishment in a RedCap-supporting NR cell or a LTE cell.  A specific solution is that the target NR cell which supports RedCap adds a new indication in the RRC reconfiguration message sent to the UE during the handover procedure. Then after receiving the configuration generated by the target NR cell, the RedCap UE checks whether the new indication is included:   * If the new indication is included, the target NR cell supports RedCap and the UE can continue the handover procedure as legacy; * Else, the target NR cell is actually a legacy cell which does not support RedCap, thus the UE does not need to access the target cell and instead performs RRC re-establishment in a RedCap-supporting NR cell or a LTE cell. * **Option 2**   The RedCap UE first performs handover as legacy without knowledge on the type of the target NR cell. Then the RedCap UE checks whether the target NR cell supports RedCap after synchronizing with the target cell and receiving the SIB1 of the target cell. A possible way is:   * If the SIB1 broadcast by the target cell contains RedCap specific IFRI, the target NR cell supports RedCap and the UE can work in this cell later; * Else, the target NR cell is actually a legacy cell which does not support RedCap, thus the UE can perform RRC re-establishment in a RedCap-supporting NR cell or a LTE cell.   Comparing the two options, Option 1 can prevent the RedCap UE from performing incorrect handover access to legacy NR cells but has certain spec impact; Option 2 has less spec impact but the RedCap UE can only determine whether the handover target is appropriate after synchronizing with the target NR cell.  **Proposal 7: For the LTE to NR handover, if the RedCap UE finds the target NR cell is a legacy cell, the UE should trigger RRC re-establishment procedure. FFS on the spec impact.** |

**Rapporteur comments**: For handover scenario, the target gNB should check the UE capability before provides the configuration (accept handover ). However the legacy gNB cannot identify the RedCap UE, and therefore cannot reject the handover. But the configuration configured by the legacy gNB will very likely exceed the RedCap UE capability, and cannot be supported by the RedCap UE. Therefore the RedCap UE will trigger the reestablishment procedure as specified in TS36.331:

#### 5.4.3.5 Mobility from E-UTRA failure

The UE shall:

* + - * 1. if T304 configured in the *MobilityFromEUTRACommand* message expires (mobility from E-UTRA failure); or
        2. if the UE does not succeed in establishing the connection to the target radio access technology; or
        3. if the UE is unable to comply with (part of) the configuration included in the *MobilityFromEUTRACommand* message; or
        4. if there is a protocol error in the inter RAT information included in the *MobilityFromEUTRACommand* message, causing the UE to fail the procedure according to the specifications applicable for the target RAT (i.e. according to subclause 5.3.5.6 if the *targetRAT-Type* in the received *MobilityFromEUTRACommand* is set to *eutra*):

2> stop T304, if running;

2> if the *cs-FallbackIndicator* in the *MobilityFromEUTRACommand* message was set to *TRUE* or *e-CSFB* was present:

*3>* indicate to upper layers that the CS fallback procedure has failed;

2> revert back to the configuration used in the source Pcell, excluding the configuration configured by the *physicalConfigDedicated*, *mac-MainConfig* and *sps-Config*;

2> if *MobilityFromEUTRACommand* concerned a failed inter-RAT handover from E-UTRA to NR and if the UE supports Radio Link Failure Report for Inter-RAT MRO NR:

3> store handover failure information in *VarRLF-Report* according to 5.3.5.6;

2> initiate the connection re-establishment procedure as specified in 5.3.7;

So question is, whether the issue can be addressed by existing approach? If not, how to handle this case?

**Discussion point 3.8-1: Companies are invited to provide view on whether handover from LTE to a legacy gNB for RedCap UE could be addressed by existing solution? If new solution is needed, please elaborate how it works.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **New solution is needed/existing way is sufficient?** | **Comments, if any** |
| Samsung | The existing way is sufficient | A new indication does not have to be introduced since both options result RRC reestablishment anyway. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | New solution is needed | Not sure about statement on “*But the configuration configured by the legacy gNB will very likely exceed the RedCap UE capability, and cannot be supported by the RedCap UE.*”  It seems that rapporteur assumes “**target NR cell is a legacy cell**” is equal to “the UE is **unable to comply with (part of) the configuration** from the target NR legacy cell”. If RAN2 can confirm this assumption, we are fine.  In our understanding, UE implementation can check the SIB1 to find whether the target cell support RedCap or not, which is more accurate.  BTW, we believe anyway the updated proposal can be acceptable: “**Proposal 7’: For the LTE to NR handover, in case the target NR cell is a legacy cell, the RedCap UE should trigger RRC re-establishment procedure.**”  [Rapp]My understanding is that RedCap UE only support 1Rx or 2Rx, 20M BW, therefore it is very unlikely that the legacy gNB can provide such reduced configuration to UE. |
| MediaTek | Existing way is sufficient | Agree with Samsung |
| Apple | Existing is ok | We also wonder if it’s valid for the LTE to handover to NR when the target NR (which actually creates the NR message) does not inform the LTE that it does not support NR Redcap. |
| Sequans | Existing way is sufficient | This seems like an optimization for the case where a legacy gNB provides configuration that may be acceptable to the RedCap UE.  Fine to go with majority. |
| CATT | Existing is ok |  |
| OPPO | Existing is sufficient |  |
| LGE | Existing is sufficient |  |
| ZTE | Existing is sufficient | Perhaps it is better to add RedCap indication in E-UTRAN capability, so LTE eNB can choose RedCap capable NR cells for RRM measurements and to trigger handover. This also needs changes to X2 interface (e.g. NR gNB informs LTE eNB whether the served NR cells support RedCap or not).  But these can be considered as optimization that are not essential at this stage. |
| Spreadtrum | Existing is sufficient |  |
| Ericsson | Existing is sufficient |  |
| vivo | Existing way is sufficient |  |
| Interdigital | Existing is sufficient | That’s not essential. |
| Intel | Existing ways is sufficient |  |
| Qualcomm | Existing way is sufficient |  |
| Nordic | Existing way is sufficient |  |
| BT | New solution | It seems more logical that RedCap UE does not even try a HO from LTE to a NR non-RedCap cell but at this stage, this solution is difficult as it has several impacts. Other solution is that RedCap UEs in LTE try to decode RedCap-specific IFRI but that will have a severe impact.  It seems that everyone agree that at the end, a RedCap UE trying to access to a legacy gNB will execute RRC re-establishment procedure so, why should we delay it? Huawei proposal looks reasonable.  On the other hand, the consequence to follow existing mechanism is that a RedCap UE can do the attachment into a legacy gNB and that may cause multiple problems including billing which is not under RAN2 domain. Therefore, this problem is not just an optimization. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Existing ways is sufficient |  |

**Summary: 18 companies provided the inputs.**

16 companies agreed to rely on existing solution.

2 companies would like to introduce solution.

3 companies assume that the RedCap UE will trigger the reestablishment upon handover from LTE to legacy gNB.

Rapporteur would suggest:

**Proposal 3.8-1: [For agreement] [16/18] For the LTE to NR handover, in case the target NR cell is a legacy cell, rely on existing solution, the RedCap UE should trigger RRC re-establishment procedure. No specification impact;**

# Phase 1-Summary report and proposals

**For agreement:**

**Proposal 3.1-1: [For agreement] [16/19] ANR feature is optional for RedCap UE;**

**Proposal 3.2-1: [For agreement] [19/19] CHO related capabilities are applicable for RedCap UEs (understanding that CHO is already defined as an optional feature). “FFS on CHO” can be removed. ;**

**Proposal 3.3-1a: [For agreement] [17/19] RAN2 confirms RAN1 agreements, i.e. introduce explicit bit to indicate the support of RedCap; To be captured in Mega CR;**

**Proposal 3.3-1b: [For agreement] [16/17] RAN2 confirms RAN1 agreements, i.e. the RedCap UE capability is per UE;**

**Proposal 3.4-1: [For agreement] [18/18] RAN2 confirms RAN1 agreements, i.e. introduce capability bit on Half-duplex FDD operation type A for RedCap UEs; To be captured in Mega CR.**

**Proposal 3.6-2: [For agreement] [17/17] RAN2 confirms that for RedCap UEs, “maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH ” is still per FSPC although per band is enough.**

**Proposal 3.7-1: [For agreement] [18/18] Clarify in the field description of *shortSN* and *am-WithShortSN* that, RedCap UE should always report ”1” in TS 38.306 section 4.2.4 and 4.2.5.**

**Proposal 3.8-1: [For agreement] [16/18] For the LTE to NR handover, in case the target NR cell is a legacy cell, rely on existing solution, the RedCap UE should trigger RRC re-establishment procedure. No specification impact;**

**Online discussion:**

**Proposal 3.3-2: [Online discussion] RAN2 to discuss whether “Support of RedCap early indication for RACH” should be captured in the field description of RedCap UE capability (proposed in Proposal 3.3-1a);**

**Proposal 3.5-1: [Online discussion] [15/19] RAN2 confirms 1 DL MIMO means no MIMO, no specification impact.**

**Proposal 3.6-1: [Online discussion] RAN2 to discuss whether to capture the limitation on BW, Rx and MIMO as**

* The maximum bandwidth is 20 MHz for FR1, and is 100 MHz for FR2; - UE features and corresponding capabilities related to UE bandwidths wider than 20 MHz in FR1 or wider than 100 MHz in FR2 are not supported by RedCap UEs;
* 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported. UE features and corresponding capabilities related to more than 2 UE Rx branches and more than 2 DL MIMO layers, as well as UE features and capabilities related to more than 2 UE Tx branches and more than 2 UL MIMO layers are not supported by RedCap UEs;

# Phase 2 discussion

During phase 1 discussion, following issues have been concluded:

Agreements via email - from offline 105:

1. ANR feature is optional for RedCap UE;
2. CHO related capabilities are applicable for RedCap UEs (understanding that CHO is already defined as an optional feature). “FFS on CHO” can be removed.
3. RAN2 confirms RAN1 agreements, i.e. introduce explicit bit to indicate the support of RedCap; To be captured in Mega CR;
4. RAN2 confirms RAN1 agreements, i.e. introduce capability bit on Half-duplex FDD operation type A for RedCap UEs; To be captured in Mega CR.
5. RAN2 confirms that for RedCap UEs, “maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH ” is still per FSPC although per band is enough.
6. Clarify in the field description of shortSN and am-WithShortSN that, RedCap UE should always report "1" in TS 38.306 section 4.2.4 and 4.2.5.

Agreements online:

1. For the LTE to NR handover, in case the target NR cell is a legacy cell, the RedCap UE should trigger RRC re-establishment procedure. FFS any specification impact or purely leave to implementation
2. "1 DL MIMO" vs "no MIMO" will no longer be discussed in RAN2

Further discussion is needed for following issues:

Proposal 3.3-1b: [For agreement] [16/17] RAN2 confirms RAN1 agreements, i.e. the RedCap UE capability is per UE;

* vivo would like to keep this open for now and wait for RAN1
* Intel suggest to revise as "RAN2 confirms to follow RAN1 agreements on UE feature granularity for ~~, i.e.~~ the RedCap UE capability ~~is per UE;~~"
* Continue online
* Vivo thinks it is up to RAN1 to decide. Mediatek/E/// are not happy with stating this, wonder what this really means
* QC is fine with the rewording.
* Mediatek suggests to put this as a Working assumption: the RedCap UE capability is per UE. Can come back to this based on RAN1 decisions
* Continue offline

Online discussion:

Proposal 3.3-2: [Online discussion] RAN2 to discuss whether “Support of RedCap early indication for RACH” should be captured in the field description of RedCap UE capability (proposed in Proposal 3.3-1a);

Proposal 3.6-1: [Online discussion] RAN2 to discuss whether to capture the limitation on BW, Rx and MIMO as

- The maximum bandwidth is 20 MHz for FR1, and is 100 MHz for FR2; - UE features and corresponding capabilities related to UE bandwidths wider than 20 MHz in FR1 or wider than 100 MHz in FR2 are not supported by RedCap UEs;

- 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported. UE features and corresponding capabilities related to more than 2 UE Rx branches and more than 2 DL MIMO layers, as well as UE features and capabilities related to more than 2 UE Tx branches and more than 2 UL MIMO layers are not supported by RedCap UEs;

## 5.1 How can network identify RedCap UE based on capability

The open issue is

Proposal 3.3-1b: [For agreement] [16/17] RAN2 confirms RAN1 agreements, i.e. the RedCap UE capability is per UE;

* vivo would like to keep this open for now and wait for RAN1
* Intel suggest to revise as "RAN2 confirms to follow RAN1 agreements on UE feature granularity for ~~, i.e.~~ the RedCap UE capability ~~is per UE;~~"
* Continue online
* Vivo thinks it is up to RAN1 to decide. Mediatek/E/// are not happy with stating this, wonder what this really means
* QC is fine with the rewording.
* Mediatek suggests to put this as a Working assumption: the RedCap UE capability is per UE. Can come back to this based on RAN1 decisions
* Continue offline

During phase 1 discussion, 1 company would like to make the capability as per band/BC basis. Rapporteur considers this is related to fallback discussion which has been excluded on Monday. Therefore do not see the reason to make it as per band/BC basis.

Therefore Rapporteur would like to check companies’ view again.

1. RAN2 confirms RAN1 agreements, i.e. introduce explicit bit to indicate the support of RedCap; To be captured in Mega CR;

**Discussion point 5.1-1: Do you agree the RedCap UE capability (as agreed in bullet 3 above ) is per UE?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Yes/No** | **Comments, if any** |
| OPPO | Yes | We can always come back if RAN1 introduces per band/BC capability. |
| Intel | Yes | We can conclude that from RAN2 perspective, per UE is sufficient since so far we do not see the motivation to have per band/BC capability. |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Sequans | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | - |
| Qualcomm | No | If a RedCap UE can operate as a fully spec-compliant non-RedCap UE in band, then it is beneficial for it to indicate as a non-RedCap, to expand its service coverage. |
| ZTE | Yes | Agree with Intel, we can agree as “from RAN2 perspective”. |
| vivo | No | We assume it has not been decided in RAN1 as it is highlighted in the feature list.  Besides, this per-band basis capability is not only related fallback issue, but also could avoid the case some RedCap UEs with the same hardware capabilities with normal UEs will be bar on some bands.  Normally, RAN1 will provide our feature list with granularity for all WIs. In this way, we prefer to keep this open by now, and wait for RAN1 decision. |
| CATT | Yes | Agree with OPPO and Intel. |
| Ericsson | Yes | We would like to clarify that RAN1 is still discussing the exact details of the referred feature group (as seen above in the document for Round 1). From RAN2 perspective we should agree that there is an explicit capability bit though – we can discuss the details of how to capture and the exact definition further in context of running 306 discussion.  Also agree with OPPO and Intel. |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | Agree with Intel and Oppo above. The case of fallback operation has been excluded in the GTW on Monday, and this UE capability discussion should not be used as a backdoor to introduce such a feature.  We can come back to this if RAN1 indicate otherwise. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes |  |

Regarding whether to add “**Support of RedCap early indication for RACH**” in the field description of RedCap UE capability, the discussed in phase 1 was:

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary: 18 companies provided the inputs;**  Companies have different view on whether to capture it, and how to capture it.   * Some companies think it is component of RedCap UE and should be captured in the field description of RedCap UE capability (proposed in **Proposal 3.3-1a**) * Some companies are ok to capture it under 4.2.xx, but:   + “4 step RACH” should be removed;   + Msg 3/MsgA should be added if agreed in separate email discussion;   Rapporteur would suggest to capture it in the field description of RedCap UE capability.  **Proposal 3.3-2: [Online discussion] RAN2 to discuss whether “Support of RedCap early indication for RACH” should be captured in the field description of RedCap UE capability (proposed in Proposal 3.3-1a);** |

In addition, RAN2 agreed:

Agreements via email – from offline 103:

1. In MAC perspective, a RedCap UE uses MsgA PRACH early identification when it transmits preamble for CBRA if MsgA PRACH early identification is configured for RedCap by NW.
2. For MsgA PRACH early identification, RAN2 confirms both dedicated Ros and dedicated PRACH preamble can be supported from signalling point of view.
3. For RedCap, MsgA PRACH early identification is enabled/disabled implicitly by the presence of dedicated RACH configuration for MsgA PRACH early identification.
4. As in legacy, in case the cell is barred due to being unable to acquire the MIB, intra-frequency cell reselection is considered by RedCap UE as “allowed”.

Agreements online:

1. In MAC perspective, RedCap UE uses the dedicated LCID for Msg3 early identification, when the Msg3 includes the CCCH data (no other precondition)
2. Also when msg1 early identification is configured, new dedicated LCID is used for CCCH identification

Working assumption:

1. Msg3 early identification is mandatorily supported by RedCap UE

Therefore it should be ok to have this general statement in order to cover Msg 1, Msg 3 and Msg A based early identification.

**Discussion point 5.1-2: Do you agree proposal as following?**

**Proposal: Capture “Support of RedCap early indication for RACH” in the field description of RedCap UE capability (as agreed in bullet 3 above );**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Yes/No** | **Comments, if any** |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Sequans | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Based on the above agreements, maybe we can clarify further (no strong view) “Support of RedCap Msg1/MsgA/Msg3 early indication for RACH”.  One clarification is “filed description” means filed description of the 1 bit capability, rather than the RedCap section of 38.306. |
| Samsung | Yes | We are fine to capture it in the field description of RedCap UE capability if majority wants. (We indicated previously that the description in MAC would be sufficient but have no strong view.) |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | We slight prefer to revise it into: (to highlight the three solutions are supported simultaneously)  Support of RedCap early indication based on Msg1, MsgA and Msg3. |
| vivo | Yes | We are fine with it majority companies prefer it. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | Agree with inclusion of Msg1/A/3 as proposed by HW and ZTE |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | With the same assumption as Huawei that this is not part of the ‘reduced capability’ list in section 4.2.xx as indicated in the previous round. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes |  |

## 5.2 Impact due to RAN1 LS

The discussion in phase 1 was:

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary: 18 companies provided the inputs on “to add capability limitation on BW, Rx/Tx branches and UL/DL MIMO layers as part of the basic component of RedCap UE in 4.2.xx RedCap Parameters of TS38.306 running CR”**  Agree: 8 companies;  Do not agree: 2 companies  No strong opinion: 6 companies  ZTE suggested to capture it under existing bullets for BW and Rx/MIMO.  Rapporteur would suggest:  .  **Proposal 3.6-1: [Online discussion] RAN2 to discuss whether to capture the limitation on BW, Rx and MIMO as**   * The maximum bandwidth is 20 MHz for FR1, and is 100 MHz for FR2; - UE features and corresponding capabilities related to UE bandwidths wider than 20 MHz in FR1 or wider than 100 MHz in FR2 are not supported by RedCap UEs; * 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported. UE features and corresponding capabilities related to more than 2 UE Rx branches and more than 2 DL MIMO layers, as well as UE features and capabilities related to more than 2 UE Tx branches and more than 2 UL MIMO layers are not supported by RedCap Ues; |

**Discussion point 5.2-1: Do you agree proposal as following?**

**Proposal: Capture the limitation on BW, Rx and MIMO in 4.2.xx RedCap Parameters of TS38.306 running CR as:**

* The maximum bandwidth is 20 MHz for FR1, and is 100 MHz for FR2; - UE features and corresponding capabilities related to UE bandwidths wider than 20 MHz in FR1 or wider than 100 MHz in FR2 are not supported by RedCap Ues;
* 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported. UE features and corresponding capabilities related to more than 2 UE Rx branches and more than 2 DL MIMO layers, as well as UE features and capabilities related to more than 2 UE Tx branches and more than 2 UL MIMO layers are not supported by RedCap Ues;

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Yes/No** | **Comments, if any** |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Sequans | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Maybe we can add bracket for the new sentences. |
| Samsung | Yes | - |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No strong view | The new additions provide little new information (only that >2 branches are not supported), they seem more like clarifications thus not necessary in our opinion. |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes |  |

## 5.3 Inter-RAT mobility management

The issue was discussed online, and RAN2 agreed

Agreements online:

1. For the LTE to NR handover, in case the target NR cell is a legacy cell, the RedCap UE should trigger RRC re-establishment procedure. FFS any specification impact or purely leave to implementation

But companies have different view on what impact should be: There are 4 options on the table:

**Option 1** (Huawei paper): The target NR cell which supports RedCap adds a new indication in the RRC reconfiguration message sent to the UE during the handover procedure. The UE should trigger reestablishment If the indication is absent.

**Option 2** (Huawei paper): The UE reads SI of target gNB during the handover procedure. The UE should trigger reestablishment If the cell cannot support RedCap;

**Option 3**: The configuration configured by the legacy gNB will very likely exceed the RedCap UE capability, and cannot be supported by the RedCap UE. Therefore the RedCap UE will trigger the reestablishment procedure as specified in TS36.331;

**Option 3.1**: In case the configuration exceeds the RedCap UE capability, ~~and cannot be supported by the RedCap UE. Therefore~~ the RedCap UE will trigger the reestablishment procedure as specified in TS36.331;

**Option 4**: Leave it to network implementation, i.e. the network shall avoid to handover a RedCap UE to non-RedCap cell (at least for handover within NR); And it is up to UE implementation on how to handle network error;

**Option 5**: check later to see whether there is Redcap specific configuration and the UE can check RedCap cell based on whether it is present or not.

**Option 6**: Other?

**Discussion point 5.3-1: Companies are invited to provide your view on which option do you prefer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Option 1-5** | **Comments, if any** |
| OPPO | Option 3 |  |
| Intel | Option 3 |  |
| BT | None | More time is required as there are several points to be discussed here.   1. How a legacy LTE cell knows about RedCap? 2. How a LTE cell knows the UE is a NR RedCap UE? 3. How a LTE cell knows which NR frequencies are supported by RedCap UEs? Have RAN2 agreed about this? 4. How the LTE cell knows target NR is a RedCap cell? 5. Option 3 says “*very likely”* which means, it is possible. Therefore, RedCap UEs are not allowed to do intra-RAT NR handovers if target is a non-RedCap cells, RedCap UEs are not allowed to do fallbacks due to all the problems that can cause but all of this is accepted if the handover comes from LTE. This cannot be accepted by BT. |
| Apple | Option 3.1 | Option 3 states that ‘it is very likely’ which is extreme and speculative, so we think op 3.1 is ok, and this is just following the current spec. |
| Sequans | Option 1 (preferred) or 2 | * Option 1 is simple and very fast, it’s our preferred solution.  No knowledge of the UE is needed – the indication is anyway added by a RedCap-supporting gNB in an NCE, thus ignored by a non-supporting UE. * Option 2 works too, requires a bit less specification effort, but is slower to fail * Not option 3, 3.1 or 4: Option 3.1 is just a better phrased option 3. These imply that if a legacy gNB configuration does not exceed by some chance the UE capabilities, then it may continue with the handover, a contradiction to the no-fallback understanding; however, since this understanding is not an agreement, it is basically option 4 – UE implementation * We think the specification already covers the case of a bad configuration, but we are open to clarifications if needed   We think LTE🡪NR is anyway a case more likely to fail than not; the best we can do is minimize the interruption time. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option2 | Clarification on option 2:  It can be UE implementation for “The UE reads SI of target gNB during the handover procedure.” Then the spec impact can be one NOTE like: “The UE should trigger reestablishment, if the cell cannot support RedCap;”  In option 3,”very likely” is not even a solution. Our specification should cover all cases, if the “very un-likely” case happens. Option 3.1 is same as option 3. The issue is what if the configuration does not exceed the RedCap UE capability.  Option 4 does not work, since legacy eNB cannot know whether a target NR cell support RedCap. |
| Samsung | Option 3 or 3.1 | We are fine to leave it to the legacy behavior for the case. |
| Qualcomm | See comment | Leave it to UE implementation.  We can accept Option 1 if it is supported by majority. |
| ZTE | Option 2 | Option 2 is simpler and straightforward. Moreover, if “dedicatedSIB1-Delivery” is included in HO command, UE can also check the contained RedCap specific IFRI field.  We are not sure if Option 3 or Option 3.1 can 100% work. If the target NR cell is 20MHz, it is possible the configuration can be compatible to RedCap UE unless network configures >8 DRBs or >12bits SN. For other capabilities (MIMO, CA/DC…) the network anyway will respect to UE’s reported capability. But if nothing is specified, then the UE will be able to access the legacy NR cell, and failure will happen when network reconfigures the UE, or hands over the UE to a 100MHz NR cell. |
| vivo | Option 3 or 3.1 | We think the legacy behaviour is enough. |
| CATT | Option 2 | But maybe it can be left to UE implementation.  For option 3 or 3.1, it seems like wanting to support the UE handovering to a legacy target gNB, if the configuration configured by the legacy gNB does not exceed the RedCap UE capability. But we will not discuss the fallback use case again in Rel 17, according to the discussion previously. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 or 2 | We have a slight on the agreement made online as it is not clear what are the exact UE actions and what would be the exact trigger for a re-establishment. In our understanding, the re-establishment in this case would be according to TS 36.331 (not clear in the agreement), but it is not clear when and how the handover would be considered as failed, beyond the existing case which seems to be the added Option 3.1.  In our view the UE should not initiate access / RA in the target cell in any case. Therefore, we think this need to be discussed further. We do not think this can be left purely up to UE implementation.  Option 1: This could be one acceptable option considering there are no changes to legacy nodes (either NW or UE).  Option 2: At the moment, checking for SI may not happen during the procedure, it is not clear when the UE would consider handover failed and do re-establishment according to TS 36.331. Something needs to be captured in the specification if this option is chosen.  Option 3: This is a possibility, and perhaps a common case. The problem is that there can be a case where the UE can interpret the provided configuration, but the target gNB does not support RedCap. Agree with the comments that this is not a full solution. This case can lead to number of issues. Opt 3.1 seems to be exactly the current behaviour.  Option 4: NW implementation cannot solve this case without updating legacy eNBs and gNBs and is therefore not acceptable.  Option 5: It is not clear what “later” here refers to – and what would be the UE actions at that point? If the UE starts the access procedure towards the cell this would lead to additional load / interference to target cell.  Option 6: Best would be to avoid this case from happening altogether (LTE HO towards gNB which doesn’t support RedCap) but this requires further discussion. |
| LGE | Option 3.1 (Option 3) | Legacy behaviour is enough. |
| MediaTek | Option 1 | Considering Ericsson’s arguments above, we are ok with Option 1. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | FFS |  |
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