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# 1 Introduction

Repeaters are an integral part of cellular deployments. NR deployments tapping on new spectrum at higher bands in FR1 and FR2 pose coverage challenges that Repeaters could efficiently address. This is the main reason why we believe that having a Rel-17 NR Repeater project is of paramount importance.

In this document, we will provide a summary for the email discussion on RAN4 NR Repeaters WI scope during RAN#90-e.

The Tdocs input to the discussion are:

[1] RP-202748, “Summary of email discussions on NR Repeaters”

[2] RP-202750, “Motivation paper for NR Repeaters”

[3] RP-202749, “New WID proposal for NR Repeaters”

[4] RP-202813, “New WID proposal for NR Repeaters r1”

Note that [1] captures the email discussions which took place after RAN#89-e (a reference to the email discussions before RAN#89-e is available in the same Tdoc as an Annex). The items that were discussed after RAN#89-e were the following:

* Topic 0: Overall interest on NR repeaters RAN4 project in Rel-17
* Topic 1: Frequency range and duplexing of interest for NR repeaters (e.g., FR1 FDD/TDD, FR2)
* Topic 2: Objectives of candidate WID (e.g., RF/EMC requirements, assess benefits of smart repeaters, etc)
* Topic 3: Other WG involvement
* Topic 4: Other issues

The following Proposals were made in [1]:

**Proposal 1**: Approve RAN4 project on NR repeaters in Rel-17.

**Proposal 2**: Consider FR1 (FDD and TDD) and FR2 bands.

Note that IAB has defined RF requirements for FR1 TDD bands (n41, n77, n78, n79) and FR2 bands (n257, n258, n259, n260, and n261) in Rel-16.

**Proposal 3**: Have WI objective for RF repeaters RF and EMC requirements, as we all, assessment of coverage/performance advantages from having knowledge on UL/DL configuration and/or spatial (beam) information.

In addition, a WID proposal was put forth in [3]. The proposal in [3] was slightly modified taking into account some comments made offline by supporting companies leading to the WID proposal in [4].

Given the two rounds of email discussions that we already had for this project proposal, we would not want to replicate those discussions yet one more time. Instead, we would like to focus this discussion on the actual Objectives in [4].

# 2 WI Objectives

[4] supported by Qualcomm, Commscope, MediaTek Inc., Verizon Wireless, CMCC, Telstra, Telecom Italia, Deutsche Telekom, Orange, Charter Communications Inc, T-Mobile USA, KT Corp., AT&T, British Telecom, China Telecom, KDDI, CableLabs, CHTTL proposes the following Objectives for the Rel-17 WI on NR Repeaters:

Normative work phase objective [RAN4]

* Specify RF(1) and EMC requirements for NR repeaters
* Consider FR1 (FDD and TDD) and FR2 (TDD) bands

Study phase objective [RAN4]

* Assess the coverage/performance advantages of smart repeaters over RF repeaters offered by having side control information to selectively apply amplify-and-forward relay operation assuming availability of the following [RAN4]:
	+ Timing information, i.e., slot and symbol UL/DL configuration
	+ Transmitter and receiver spatial information, i.e., beam information
* Checkpoint at RAN#93 to task RAN1 and RAN2 as necessary to determine the specification impact and assess complexity level versus IAB to support smart repeaters and decision on how to proceed with normative work

For all of the above objectives, the leveraging of RF specifications for LTE repeater and IAB should be sought while targeting a substantial simplification of the overall specification and associated cost and implementation.

(1) These requirements would include (but not be limited to):

* Operating bands and channel arrangement
* Output power
* Frequency stability
* Out of band gain
* Operating band unwanted emissions
* Protection of the BS receiver in the operating band
* Spurious emissions
* Co-existence
* Error Vector Magnitude
* Input Intermodulation
* Output intermodulation
* Adjacent Channel Rejection Ratio

## Feedback on WID Objectives

**Q1**: Are these Objectives agreeable?

**Q2**: If Objectives are not agreeable, please provide the reason and state which Objective(s) would be agreeable.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Q1: Agreeable?** | **Q2: Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | -- |
| CommScope | Yes | -- |
| T-Mobile USA | Yes | -- |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| Verizon | Yes | -- |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| CHTTL | Yes |  |
| Telstra | Yes | -- |
| KT | Yes |  |
| Deutsche Telekom | Yes | We clearly see focus on the normative objectives part as this is the baseline for any other enhancement and is missing for NR already since Rel-15 (see also my comment sent on this email tread before this table was created). |
| MediaTek | Yes | -- |
| Ericsson | No | Regarding the Study Phase objectives, as commented in the e-mail discussions we think that a study on smart repeaters involves other WGs and goes beyond the scope of RAN4. It also necessitates a large amount of TUs.Regarding the normative phase:For FDD, creating an NR repeater spec based on the E-UTRA specification is straightforward.For TDD, there are some potential complexities. It is not clear whether a repeater will do some kind of beamforming on a proprietary basis or what power level (power and EIRP) it will have. If it does not behave like a defined UE power class in uplink slots then it does not fit the co-existence analysis done in RAN4 and will not guarantee co-existence between operators. If we would attempt to capture some description of what repeaters may/may not do and do co-existence analysis in RAN4 this would need a lot of TU. Also, if the repeater synchronizes to the TDD pattern it is not clear how it should behave with respect to timing advance and whether this impacts co-existence.Regarding emissions, to avoid co-existence issues the repeater would need to meet BS requirements in DL slots and UE requirements in UL slots. If the repeater would adapt its emissions behavior between DL and UL slots, then testing would need to establish that the repeater correctly synchronizes and knows the TDD pattern. This would necessitate a potentially complex discussion on how to define the requirements and testing. Potentially some RAN1 input may be needed in relation to how the repeater synchronizes, does timing advance, impacts the MIMO operation etc.So we think that TDD repeaters need some more consideration, and it is better to start with FDD. |
| Nokia | This is not the right question for the present discussion! As stated by the Chairman, “the goal is to identify a small core set of functions that brings the most added value with reasonable work effort.” | In principle, these objectives are interesting, but for now we have to identify a small core set. As highlighted already by DT, this should comprise the first objective, which is also the most needed: Normative work phase objective [RAN4] Specify RF(1) and EMC requirements for NR repeaters  Consider FR1 (FDD and TDD) and FR2 (TDD) bandsThe “study phase objective”, “assess the coverage/performance advantages of smart repeaters over RF repeaters”, cannot be done until the above is done, and it cannot be done by RAN4 alone – it needs RAN1 and RAN2 input from the start. This aspect should be considered separately later, when the proper comparison can be done in all relevant groups between RF repeaters and IAB nodes. Regarding “while targeting a substantial simplification of the overall specification and associated cost and implementation”, it is not clear what the reference point is for the substantial simplification. It would be better to say “while targeting specification and implementation simplicity.”Finally, RAN#94 would be a more realistic completion target for the normative work.  |