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# Introduction

This document summarizes contributions [1] – [26] submitted to agenda item 8.6.2 and relevant parts of contributions [27] – [34] submitted to agenda item 8.6.3 and captures the following email discussion for the RedCap WI.

|  |
| --- |
| [106-e-NR-R17-RedCap-05] Email discussion regarding RAN1 aspects for RAN2-led features – Shinya (DoCoMo)   * 1st check point: August 19 * 2nd check point: August 24 * Final check: August 27 |

The issues in this document are tagged and colour coded with High priority, Medium priority, or Low priority.

In this round of the discussion, companies are requested to provide comments on the proposals and questions tagged FL8.

Follow the naming convention in this example:

* *RedCapBwFLS1-v000.docx*
* *RedCapBwFLS1-v001-CompanyA.docx*
* *RedCapBwFLS1-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*
* *RedCapBwFLS1-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx*

If needed, you may “lock” a spreadsheet file for 30 minutes by creating a checkout file, as in this example:

* Assume CompanyC wants to update *RedCapR2ledFLS1-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*.
* CompanyC uploads an empty file named *RedCapR2ledFLS1-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.checkout*
* CompanyC then has 30 minutes to upload *RedCapR2ledFLS1-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx*
* If no update is uploaded in 30 minutes, other companies can ignore the checkout file.
* Note that the file timestamps on the server are in UTC time.

In file names, please use the hyphen character (not the underline character) and include ‘v’ in front of the version number, as in the examples above and in line with the general recommendation (see slide 10 in [R1-2106403](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106403.zip)), otherwise the sorting of the files will be messed up (which can only be fixed by the RAN1 secretary).

To avoid excessive email load on the RAN1 email reflector, please note that there is NO need to send an info email to the reflector just to inform that you have uploaded a new version of this document. Companies are invited to enter the contact info into the Annex.

# Definition of RedCap UE type

The WID [35] has the following objective on the definition of RedCap UE type:

|  |
| --- |
| * Specify definition of one RedCap UE type including capabilities for RedCap UE identification and for constraining the use of those RedCap capabilities only for RedCap UEs, and preventing RedCap UEs from using capabilities not intended for RedCap UEs including at least carrier aggregation, dual connectivity and wider bandwidths. [RAN2, RAN1]   + The existing UE capability framework is used; changes to capability signalling are specified only if necessary. |

Following working assumption/conclusion related to the definition of RedCap UE type were made at RAN1#105-e:

|  |
| --- |
| **Working assumption:**   * RedCap UE type is defined based on one of the following options   + Option 2: Only include the reduced capabilities that the network needs to know during initial access, if any.   + Option 4: The corresponding minimum set of the reduced capabilities that one RedCap UE type shall mandatorily support   + FFS: details of the set of reduced capabilities   **Conclusion:**   * RAN1 postpones the discussion on constraining of reduced capabilities, and if deemed necessary, RAN1 can come back |

Many contributions [2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25] discuss the above working assumption. A few contributions such as [3] support Option 2 because Option 4 may cause underestimation on some RedCap UE capabilities. On the other hand, many of others [2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25] support Option 4 because it shows ‘what a RedCap UE should be’ and includes Option 2, while Option 2 may vary depending on the configuration and deployment. One contribution [4] suggests clarification is needed for these options. One contribution [11] suggests focusing on the basic FG structure. Another contribution [13] suggests waiting for RAN2 discussion. In addition, one contribution [15] propose another alternative that it includes the minimum set of mandatory UE capabilities that the NW can assume during initial access. Some contributions [1, 14, 18, 19] suggest directly defining the RedCap UE type by the maximum UE bandwidth (i.e., 20MHz for FR1 and 100MHz for FR2) which would fulfil both option 2 and option 4. One contribution [3] proposes relative criterion(s) compared between the UE capability and cell operating parameters; at least the comparison on maximum channel bandwidth for a UE can support and a cell can operate (e.g. as specified in Table 5.3.5-1 for FR1 in TS 38.101-1 and Table 5.3.5-1 for FR2 in TS 38.101-2) should be used as one criterion. One contribution [3] suggest that UE declaration of RedCap/non-RedCap is band-specific. Note that following agreement was made RAN1#103-e and hence, maximum UE bandwidth is already included without any further agreements.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * If early identification during initial access is supported, at least maximum supported UE BW during initial access is included in the set of L1 capabilities of the device type for RedCap early identification   + Note: 20 MHz for FR1 and 100 MHz for FR2   + ~~Identification of UEs optionally supporting bandwidths larger than 20 MHz in FR1 or larger than 100 MHz in FR2 after initial access, if supported, is not supported by early identification during initial access~~   + FFS other L1 capabilities   + Note: This does not preclude the case where the early indication only indicates whether it is a Redcap UE or which type of the Redcap UEs if multiple UE types are defined |

Given the situation, we can try to down-select to Option 4 having majority support with a note clarifying at least maximum supported UE BW is included. Whether/which other L1 capabilities are included is still FFS, and to be further discussed in Proposal 2-2 (i.e., no other L1 capabilities may be included).

**FL2 Medium Priority Proposal 2-1:**

* RedCap UE type is defined based on
  + Option 4: The corresponding minimum set of the reduced capabilities that one RedCap UE type shall mandatorily support
  + Note: At least maximum supported UE BW (20 MHz for FR1 and 100 MHz for FR2) is included
  + FFS whether/which other L1 capabilities are included

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | It would be anyway necessary to review which exact capability is included, i.e. the FFS would be the next discussion point (i.e. Q2-2). Thus, we suggest to take Q 2-2 as next step of discussion prior to agreeing on Option 4. |
| OPPO | Y | The minimum set of the reduced capabilities that one RedCap UE type shall mandatorily support is FFS in Q2-2. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| CMCC |  | We think the Note and FFS are sub bullet of option4, that is the reduced capabilities that one RedCap UE type shall mandatorily support at least including maximum supported UE BW, and others as FFS. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | RAN1 can start to design the basic feature group for FR1 and FR2 UEs |
| LG | Y |  |
| Xiaomi |  | We are OK with option 4. But Before we go to the conclusion, we should figure out the exact capability included. So we think **Question 2-2** should have high priority**.** |
| China Telecom | Y | We think RedCap UE type can be based on Option 4. And the details of the set of reduced capabilities and other L1 capabilities need further discussion. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| SPRD | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Apple | Y | As other companies commented, we would like to first discuss Q2-2 to better understand the rationale of adding other components than BW. |
| vivo | Y | We are fine to take option 4 based on the majority view. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| FL3 |  | Based on the comments provided so far, most companies support this proposal, and no companies show clear objection to this proposal while some companies (Huawei/HiSilicon, Xiaomi, Apple) suggest discussing FFS part (i.e. Question 2-2) before making decision on this proposal. Moderator thinks we can try to agree on this proposal as the FFS part is being discussed in Question 2-2, and any reduced capabilities are not precluded at this stage.  Note that, based on the comment from CMCC, 2nd and 3rd sub-bullet are moved to the sub-bullets of Option 4 as follows:  **Medium Priority Proposal 2-1:**   * RedCap UE type is defined based on   + Option 4: The corresponding minimum set of the reduced capabilities that one RedCap UE type shall mandatorily support     - Note: At least maximum supported UE BW (20 MHz for FR1 and 100 MHz for FR2) is included     - FFS whether/which other L1 capabilities are included |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | OK if this proposal can be discussed together with 2-2 |
| CATT | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Considering the Proposed conclusion 2-2 by FL, we think the motivation of defining RedCap UE type need clarification. For example, to differentiate RedCap UE or non-RedCap UE or to provide basic assumption for gNB scheduling.  If we focus on the mandatory capabilities for option 4, besides the bandwidth, the Rx number at least should be considered. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI3 | Y | In addition to the BW, the number of Rx branches should be included |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| FL |  | @ZTE/Saneships: the motivation to define the RedCap UE type is as follows which is stated in the WID:   * for RedCap UE identification * for constraining the use of those RedCap capabilities only for RedCap UEs * for preventing RedCap UEs from using capabilities not intended for RedCap UEs including at least carrier aggregation, dual connectivity and wider bandwidths   Given that most companies are fine with the proposal, let’s try to agree on the proposal in the GTW session on 20th August |
| FL4 |  | This proposal couldn’t be discussed in the GTW session on 20th August due to lack of time.  If not provided yet, companies are invited to provide their view on the proposal (same as FL3) copied below.  **Medium Priority Proposal 2-1:**   * RedCap UE type is defined based on   + Option 4: The corresponding minimum set of the reduced capabilities that one RedCap UE type shall mandatorily support     - Note: At least maximum supported UE BW (20 MHz for FR1 and 100 MHz for FR2) is included     - FFS whether/which other L1 capabilities are included |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y with clarification | the “minimum set of” could be a subset of the capabilities that RedCap UE mandatorily to support. We assume the FFS is trying to cover this as well. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | For the FFS, since we believe one of the primary aims of the RedCap UE Type, is to provide a basic assumption for gNB scheduling, we believe that the Rx number should also be considered in addition to the Bandwidth. |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Xiaomi |  | * We think further discussion on which L1 capabilities are included in the definition is more important. But We are OK if the majority can accept this proposal * As summarized by the FL, the motivation of defining RedCap UE type includes” *constraining the use of those RedCap capabilities only for RedCap UEs and preventing RedCap UEs from using capabilities not intended for RedCap UEs including at least carrier aggregation, dual connectivity and wider bandwidths”*. It implies RedCap are NOT constrained to use the capabilities not included the UE type definition. For example, if reduced Rx is not included in the RedCap definition, the consequence will become that the RedCap may use the same number of Rx with non-RedCap. To avoid such situation, all the reduced capability RedCap mandatorily supported should be included in the definition. |
| Nordic | Y, in general | Note is a note or agreement? Not clear, should it be more like   * + - e.g. maximum supported UE BW (20 MHz for FR1 and 100 MHz for FR2) is included |
| SPRD | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI4 | Y | In addition to the BW, the maximum of 2RX branches should be included. But more importantly the discussion of the basic FG needed to begin |
| Intel | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| FL5 |  | **@Huawei/Hisilicon**: Your understanding is correct. The “minimum set of” could be a subset of the capabilities that RedCap UE mandatorily to support. Thus the FFS includes “whether to include other L1 capabilities”, which will be further discussed in **Question 2-2**.  **@Xiaomi**: Thank you for your flexibility. Let’s further discuss the FFS part in **Question 2-2**.  **@Nordic:** The note is note because it was already agreed and captured in TR38.875 that at least maximum supported UE BW is included in the RedCap UE type as follows:  *If early identification during initial access is supported, at least maximum supported UE BW during initial access is included in the set of L1 capabilities of the device type for RedCap early identification*  Given no strong objection has been received yet, let’s try to agree this proposal (same as FL3/4) at the 2nd check point on 24th August. If you have **strong concern** on agreeing this proposal, please indicate asap.  **Medium Priority Proposal 2-1:**   * RedCap UE type is defined based on   + Option 4: The corresponding minimum set of the reduced capabilities that one RedCap UE type shall mandatorily support     - Note: At least maximum supported UE BW (20 MHz for FR1 and 100 MHz for FR2) is included     - FFS whether/which other L1 capabilities are included |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LG | Y | Note can be removed in P2-1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Based on option4, and the motivation clarification for RedCap UE type definition by the FL, if the UE type definition can be used for constraining the use of those RedCap capabilities only for RedCap UEs, we think only bandwidth is not enough in case that some future IoT device or other UEs may be equipped with the same bandwidth. Therefore, it is better to include RX number and bandwidth for RedCap EU type definition at least.  Additionally, if this proposal is agreed, and there is no consensus to include Rx number for UE type definition, is that means the RedCap UE definition only include the bandwidth?  If yes, from the gNB side, if a UE is equipped with the same bandwidth and 4Rx, does the gNB would view this UE as the RedCap UE? |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Intel |  | As discussed over email, we prefer **Alternative Medium Priority Proposal 2-1.** However, can accept this version for progress.  Technical reasoning copied from email thread:  To respond to Karol’s question regarding handling of reduced # of Rx branches, our reasoning is that even though the requirements are relaxed, there are many configurations for which the # of Rx branches do not uniquely define a RedCap UE (e.g., RedCap UEs supporting 2Rx in “Rel-15 2-Rx bands”).  We acknowledge that there is a distinction between RedCap and non-RedCap UEs in the “Rel-15 4-Rx bands” (RedCap cannot support 4-Rx), but this is band-specific.  By that logic, the option of HD-FDD should also be included, and max modulation orders. However, as can be appreciated, capturing all of these (and perhaps some more from RAN2/RAN4) would only make the definition cumbersome with mainly redundant layers of information.  As captured below by Shinya, the reduced BW characteristic is the necessary and sufficient feature to distinguish RedCap UE type, while adding any further characteristics does not add anything of significance in terms of defining the UE type.  In this regard, (now that the discussion here brought it to our attention; *sorry Shinya for late comment!)* the “Alternative” version of Proposal 2-1 would indeed be more appropriate and much preferred. *However, we can accept the original version as well, based on prior-indicated preference 😊.*  **Alternative Medium Priority Proposal 2-1:**   * The definition of one RedCap UE type includes at least maximum supported UE BW (20 MHz for FR1 and 100 MHz for FR2)   + FFS whether/which other L1 reduced capabilities that one RedCap UE type shall mandatorily support are included |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| SPRD | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| FL |  | The proposal is updated based on the discussion over RAN1 reflector.  **Medium Priority Proposal 2-1:**   * RedCap UE type is defined based on   + Option 4: The corresponding minimum set of the reduced capabilities that one RedCap UE type shall mandatorily support     - ~~[Note:]~~At least maximum supported UE BW (20 MHz for FR1 and 100 MHz for FR2) is included     - FFS whether/which other L1 capabilities are included |
| FL6 |  | This proposal couldn’t be discussed in the GTW session on 24th August due to lack of time.  Based on the discussion over RAN1 reflector and the comments provided so far, only one company (Nordic) still has strong concern, but they can live with the proposal if companies have common understanding that 1Rx performance requirement is applied to only the RedCap UEs supporting 1Rx capability and the RedCap UEs supporting 2Rx capability don’t have to support it. I guess similar assumption can be applied to HD-FDD/FD-FDD capabilities. This comes from the different understanding of “reduced capabilities that one RedCap UE type shall mandatorily support” as follows:   * Understanding 1:   + RedCap UEs supporting 2Rx operation support 1Rx operation, i.e., 1Rx is the mandatory capability for all RedCap UEs in Rel-17.   + RedCap UEs supporting FD-FDD operation support Type A HD-FDD operation, i.e., Type A HD-FDD is the mandatory capability for all RedCap UEs supporting the operation in FR1 FDD bands in Rel-17. * Understanding 2:   + RedCap UEs supporting 2Rx operation do not have to support 1Rx operation, i.e., neither 1Rx nor 2 Rx is the mandatory capability for all RedCap UEs in Rel-17.   + RedCap UEs supporting FD-FDD operation do not have to support Type A HD-FDD operation, i.e., neither Type A HD-FDD nor FD-FDD is the mandatory capability for all RedCap UEs supporting the operation in FR1 FDD bands in Rel-17.   Therefore, it would be better to clarify at first which understanding we should adopt. Companies are invited to provide their view on the following question.  **Medium Priority Question 2-1a:**   * Which understanding do you assume for the reduced capabilities that one RedCap UE type shall mandatorily support? |
| Example | Understanding 1 / Understanding 2 | Any comments for clarification of companies’ view |
| Nokia, NSB | Understanding 2 | During initial access, due to unknown UE capability (1Rx, 2Rx), a gNB may perform conservative scheduling. For these gNBs with conservative 1Rx scheduling, 2Rx RedCap devices can still be expected to operate successfully without the need to mimic 1Rx devices or pass the 1Rx specific performance testing requirements. |
| FUTUREWEI6 | Not understanding 1 | For FR1, a RedCap UE will have either 1 or 2 Rx branches. We do not expect to see 4 Rx RedCap devices. Thus, “not 4Rx” should be part of the basic type. If only 1 Rx is included, then Rx should not be part of basic type.  For HD, we do not want HD as part of the basic type and full duplex as optional. |
| Qualcomm | Mixed views for 1 RX and Type-A HD-FDD | * 1 RX   + We think RedCap UEs supporting 2Rx operation will support 1Rx operation as well, since R17 will not pursue any RedCap-specific DL coverage recovery scheme and RAN1#105 made the following conclusion for RedCap UE:     - *“For a RedCap UE, when motivated by reduced max number of DL MIMO layers modifications to CSI measurement and/or reporting mechanisms are not pursued in Rel-17.”*   + **Therefore, 1Rx can be treated as the mandatory capability for all R17 RedCap UEs operating on TDD and FDD bands.** * Type-A HD-FDD   + If a RedCap UE does not have a duplexer, it cannot support simultaneous transmission and reception on paired spectrum. Therefore, FD-FDD cannot be assumed as the mandatory capability of all RedCap UEs.   + On the other hand, if a RedCap UE has a duplexer, it does not need to handle the collision between DL and UL on paired spectrum.   + **If a FD-FDD capable RedCap UE is mandated to support collision handling procedure of Type-A HD-FDD, Type-A HD-FDD can be treated as a mandatory capability of R17 RedCap UEs operating on paired spectrum.** |
| Nordic | Understanding 1 | * UE can have as many Rx as it wants, what UE declares is number of supported layers, if not mistaken. And if UE can indicate only one layer with 2Rx then 1Rx requirements apply. Therefore, we think that each UE having 2Rx can support also 1Rx/layer requirements just by indicating 1layer instead of 2layers. Furthermore, 4Rx/4layers of legacy is not even allowed, as pointed out by FW. * Regarding HD-FDD I agree with QC, perhaps this could FFS, just in case collision handling is mandated to all RedCap UEs |
| CATT | Understanding 2 | Thanks FL for the digging.  Regarding to the Rx, we understand that UE vendors may focus on the difference between 1Rx and 2Rx. We agree that 2Rx UE and 1Rx UE have different (RAN4) performance requirement, so using 1Rx to represent RedCap UE type may not be suitable, at least from view of RAN4 test case. But from network’s view, the difference between {1Rx, 2Rx} and 4Rx is also important (even if we do not include small form factor loss here). That is a point why we think {1Rx or 2Rx} can be part of the type definition.  Regarding to the HD-FDD, the difference mainly comes from the hardware, i.e. HD-FDD uses a switch, but FD-FDD uses a duplexer. This is more like a binary choice, rather than a ‘capability extension’ thing. We do not think there is any benefit if FD-FDD pretends to be HD-FDD, which leads to lower data rate, more scheduling restriction, but in return no cost reduction. So using HD-FDD to represent RedCap UE may not be suitable, either. Still, HD-FDD is a significant difference between normal UE and RedCap UE. That is a point why we think {HD-FDD or FDD, TDD} can be part of the type definition. |
| NEC | Understanding 2 | Regarding MIMO layers, WID states as follows:   * + *Maximum number of DL MIMO layers:*     - *For a RedCap UE with 1 Rx branch, 1 DL MIMO layer is supported.*     - *For a RedCap UE with 2 Rx branches, 2 DL MIMO layers are supported.*   In our understanding, a RedCap UE with 2 Rx branches is mandated to support 2 DL MIMO layers.  And we assume a RedCap UE with 2Rx branches needs to comply with performance requirement for 2Rx antenna ports. |
| vivo | Understanding 2 | @Nodic, “indicate only one layer with 2Rx” is not allowed by the WID as quoted by NEC above. |
| CMCC | Understanding 2 | To our understanding, 1Rx is adopted due to its low cost and compact former size of some devices. If a RedCap device has chosen to equip with 2Rx, it doesn’t make sense to support 1Rx. Similarly, for FD-FDD case, there is no benefit for a FD-FDD device to act as an HD-FDD case.  As to the device type definition, since the WID states that “Specify definition of one RedCap UE type including capabilities for RedCap UE identification and for constraining the use of those RedCap capabilities only for RedCap UEs”, to constrain the use of those RedCap capabilities only for RedCap UEs, it should be clear enough that what RedCap capabilities they are supposed to use for distinguishing RedCap with non-RedCap devices, just as option4 says—minimum set of the reduced capabilities that one RedCap UE type shall mandatorily support, such as the BWP, RX, modulation order,…, it is fine to define more than one values for each mandatorily supported capability. |
| Sierra Wireless | Understanding 2 | A simple definition could be:  A FR1 RedCap UE type has a bandwidth of 20MHz   * May have 1 or 2 RX Antenna * May be FD-FDD or HD-FDD * May support DL 64 QAM or 256 QAM   It’s not that the UE needs to support 1 RX (or HD-FDD), it’s that the network needs to treat the RedCap UE in a manner that it may support RedCap devices with either 1 RX or 2 RX, HD or FD (i.e., any RedCap UE). |
| LG | Understanding 2 | We assume that the number of RX and FD/HD can be part of RedCap UE capability. On one hand, if UE capability is known to gNB, gNB could properly support the UE based on UE capability. On the other hand, if UE capability is unknown to gNB i.e. during initial access, gNB would conservatively support the UE e.g. based on early indication, but RedCap UEs supporting 2Rx and/or FD-FDD would not need to downgrade their operation. We wonder why such RedCap UEs should downgrade their operation e.g. for initial access. |
| Intel | Understanding 2 | Agree with NEC, vivo, and others on # of Rx branches.  Agree with Qualcomm and others on optional support of HD-FDD.  Agree with Sierra Wireless on the overall characterization. |
| SPRD | Understanding 2 | Regarding #Rx, 2Rx RedCap UE is mandatory to support both 1 DL MIMO layer and 2 DL MIMO layers from RAN1’s point. But we agree with CATT that 2Rx UE and 1Rx UE have different performance requirement from the view of RAN4 test case.  Regarding HD-FDD, we share the similar view with QC and CATT. It is not reasonable to demand a FD-FDD capable RedCap UE to support collision handling procedure of Type-A HD-FDD mandatorily. |
| Xiaomi | Understanding 2 |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Understanding 2 | It seems not appropriate to have {1Rx, HD-FDD} for RedCap UE type definition.  Similar with CATT/CMCC/SW, etc., we are also fine to have multiple values for a capability. |
| Ericsson | Understanding 2 | It is up to RAN4 to decide what RAN4 requirements and test cases to define, so RAN1 does not need to comment on that.  As touched upon in Nokia’s comment above, before the UE capabilities are fully known by gNB, gNB may use conservative scheduling which may mean that all RedCap UEs initially get treated as the least capable RedCap UEs, i.e., 1-Rx HD-FDD UEs. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Understanding 2 | Up to RAN4 to decide the test and requirements. |
| Panasonic |  | Our understanding of the need of RedCap UE type definition is "for constraining the use of those RedCap capabilities only for RedCap UEs, and preventing RedCap UEs from using capabilities not intended for RedCap UEs." If RAN1 needs to identify the minimum set of mandatory support, something functionality to prevent other than RedCap UE usage should be identified. Then as said by Sierra Wireless, "a RedCap UE may have 1 or 2 Rx" would be enough. What is going to be tested for 1 Rx or 2 Rx is RAN4 decision, and we think it is not related to preventing other than RedCap UE usage. For HD-FDD aspect, we don't think it is the functionality to prevent other usage as it has been supported in Rel.15. Therefore, our thinking is no need to describe it. |
| FL7 |  | Based on the comments provided so far, majority companies assume Understanding 2. Some of companies not assuming Understanding 2 seem have the same understanding that the definition of RedCap UE type can be expressed as following formula:   * A FR1 FDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz   + May support 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers   + May support FD-FDD or HD-FDD operation   + May support DL 64 QAM or 256 QAM * A FR1 TDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz   + May support 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers   + May support DL 64 QAM or 256 QAM * A FR2 RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 100MHz   + May support 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers   Therefore, instead of trying to agree on the original proposal 2-1, following alternative proposal is made, which seems aligned with WID description. Note that square brackets are added to the capabilities to align with the FFS in the original proposal 2-1.  **Alternative Medium Priority Proposal 2-1a:**   * A FR1 FDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz   + [May support 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers]   + [May support FD-FDD or HD-FDD operation]   + [May support DL 64 QAM or 256 QAM] * A FR1 TDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz   + [May support 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers]   + [May support DL 64 QAM or 256 QAM] * A FR2 RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 100MHz   + [May support 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers] * FFS whether the capabilities in square brackets are included or not. |
| vivo |  | Fine in general, some suggested revision for modulation order, since what matters is the maximum supported modulation order, which is different from Rx and duplex.  **Alternative Medium Priority Proposal 2-1a:**   * A FR1 FDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz   + [May support 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers]   + [May support FD-FDD or HD-FDD operation]   + [May support DL up to 64 QAM or up to 256 QAM] * A FR1 TDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz   + [May support 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers]   + [May support DL up to 64 QAM or up to 256 QAM] * A FR2 RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 100MHz   + [May support 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers] * FFS whether the capabilities in square brackets are included or not. |
| Qualcomm | Support | * We agree with the suggestion of Vivo by including “up to”, which clarifies the max modulation order on DL for R17 RedCap UE. * We are also open to discuss the inclusion of “do not support CA/DC”. * A minor suggestion to the description of HD-FDD. Shall we clarify it as “Type A HD-FDD” ? |
| Nokia, NSB | Support | In addition to the suggestions made by Vivo and Qualcomm. we wonder if it is more accurate to state "supports either" rather than "may support", see text below:  **Alternative Medium Priority Proposal 2-1a:**   * A FR1 FDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz   + [Supports either 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers]   + [Supports either or both FD-FDD or HD-FDD operation]   + [Supports either DL up to 64 QAM or up to 256 QAM] * A FR1 TDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz   + [Supports either 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers]   + [Supports either DL up to 64 QAM or up to 256 QAM] * A FR2 RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 100MHz   + [Supports either 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers] * FFS whether the capabilities in square brackets are included or not. |
| Nordic | Support | @Vivo why it is not possible to declare 1Rx/1 layer while having 2Rx physically? |
| FUTUREWEI7 | Support | The revision proposed by Nokia is preferable. |
| Sierra Wireless | Support | We also support Nokia’s revision |
| CATT | Support | Support in general. Almost fine with Nokia’s version, but we do not think a RedCap UE equip with a duplexer should follow/fallback to HD-FDD operation (no agreement in RAN1), which cannot achieve cost reduction, but reduce performance and complicate network scheduling. RAN1 will have to discuss whether a FD-FDD UE is allowed to report HD-FDD first, if we try to add ‘both’.  **Alternative Medium Priority Proposal 2-1a:**   * A FR1 FDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz   + [Supports either 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers]   + [Supports either ~~or both~~ FD-FDD or HD-FDD operation]   + [Supports either DL up to 64 QAM or up to 256 QAM] * A FR1 TDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz   + [Supports either 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers]   + [Supports either DL up to 64 QAM or up to 256 QAM] * A FR2 RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 100MHz   + [Supports either 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers] * FFS whether the capabilities in square brackets are included or not. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support | We are generally fine this this kind of structure.  1. the Rx number is seems correspond to the maximum MIMO layer according to the WID. So, shall we need clarify DL MIMO layers as maximum DL MIMO layers as following.  2. Regarding the HD-FDD UE, from our understanding, there exist the case that the FD-FDD UE can report the UE capability as the HD-FDD UE. So both FD-FDD or HD-FDD operation are fine with us.  **Alternative Medium Priority Proposal 2-1a:**   * A FR1 FDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz   + [Supports either 1 or 2 Rx branches /Maximum DL MIMO layers]   + [Supports either or both FD-FDD or HD-FDD operation]   + [Supports either DL up to 64 QAM or up to 256 QAM] * A FR1 TDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz   + [Supports either 1 or 2 Rx branches /Maximum DL MIMO layers]   + [Supports either DL up to 64 QAM or up to 256 QAM] * A FR2 RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 100MHz   + [Supports either 1 or 2 Rx branches /Maximum DL MIMO layers] * FFS whether the capabilities in square brackets are included or not.   FFS whether the capabilities in square brackets are included or not. |
| CMCC | Support | Base on CATT’s suggestion, the Rx and DL MIMO layer part can be modified to reflect the relation od Rx number and MIMO layers.  **Alternative Medium Priority Proposal 2-1a:**   * A FR1 FDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz   + [Supports either minimum 1Rx branch/maximum 1 DL MIMO layer or minimum 2Rx branches/maximum 2 DL MIMO layers~~1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers~~]   + [Supports either ~~or both~~ FD-FDD or HD-FDD operation]   + [Supports either DL up to 64 QAM or up to 256 QAM] * A FR1 TDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz   + [Supports either minimum 1Rx branch/maximum 1 DL MIMO layer or minimum 2Rx branches/ maximum 2 DL MIMO layers ~~/ DL MIMO layers~~]   + [Supports either DL up to 64 QAM or up to 256 QAM] * A FR2 RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 100MHz   + [Supports either 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers] * FFS whether the capabilities in square brackets are included or not. |
| Intel | Support | We prefer the latest version from CATT that updates the suggestions from Nokia on the duplex aspect. We agree with CATT that for a UE with a duplexer, it doesn’t make much sense to indicate HD-FDD capability and reduce operational efficiency. The potential power consumption reduction benefit is rather limited to justify such operation and incur the scheduling restrictions. |
| Apple |  | In our view, the Redcap UE device definition is used for differentiating the Redcap device vs. non-Redcap device. More importantly, there is only one Redcap UE device type to be defined per the WID. It is unclear how the proposal above can be utilized for future progress as so many combinations and only one Redcap device type can be introduced.  On the other hand, we appreciate FL’s great efforts. For progress, we can accept Nokia’s or CATT’s proposal. |
| NEC | Support | Fine with Nokia’s version for further discussion. Considering CATT’s comment on HD-FDD, the case “both” would need “FFS”.  We are also fine to discuss inclusion of support of neither CA nor DC.  “Support either 1 or 2 Rx branches and corresponding maximum DL MIMO layers” may be clearer. |
| vivo2 |  | @Nordic, A UE with 2Rx physically is allowed to indicate its support of only 1Rx/1layer, this is UE implementation. But UE does not have the monivation to indicate its support of both 1Rx and 2Rx.  And we cannot agree to Nokia’s proposal which allows a UE to indicate both FD-FDD and HD-FDD for a give band, we do not see the value for such case from both UE and gNB side |
| Sharp | Support | We also prefer Nokia’s version. And we agree with CATT on removal of ‘or both’. There should be no necessity to require an FD-FDD RedCap UE to do DL/UL collison handling and switching timing handling. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support | The understanding#2 after discussion and view collection can be concluded and inform RAN2/RAN4. It is more useful to help their signaling and test discussion.  We do not support the latest proposal, which read as we have 3 types (FR1 FDD, FR1 FDD, FR2) already and with much more inclusions in brackets (understood as working assumption or FFS?). The previous version is much simpler and more understandable, e.g. Alternative Medium Priority Proposal 2-1. The newly adds-on even conflict with the previous proposal in terms of “FFS other capabities that a RedCap UE mandatorily support” - many of the capabilities in [ ] will obviously be optional. |
| China Telecom |  | There are too much brackets in FL proposal. It is hard to achieve concensus. |
| SPRD | Support | We are fine with CATT’s or CMCC’s version. |
| Panasonic |  | Although we agree to describe the number of MIMO layers are more accurate, its usage is "for constraining the use of those RedCap capabilities only for RedCap UEs, and preventing RedCap UEs from using capabilities not intended for RedCap UEs." Therefore, we think just "[Supports either minimum 1Rx branch or minimum 2Rx branches]" can be sufficient for sub-bullets of Rx. |
| LG |  | We concern many brackets in the alternative FL proposal. We prefer to keep the previous proposal:  **Medium Priority Proposal 2-1:**   * RedCap UE type is defined based on   + Option 4: The corresponding minimum set of the reduced capabilities that one RedCap UE type shall mandatorily support     - ~~[Note:]~~At least maximum supported UE BW (20 MHz for FR1 and 100 MHz for FR2) is included     - FFS whether/which other L1 capabilities are included |
| Ericsson | Support | We are also fine with CATT’s or CMCC’s version.  If the proposal can be agreed quickly as a working assumption, that might be good. However, if it is not easily agreed as a working assumption, perhaps RAN1 can prioritize spending time on other topics/AIs. Since the WI objective about RedCap UE type definition is RAN2-led, RAN2 has not asked RAN1 for input, and the proposal does not say much beyond what RAN2 can read themselves in the WID, there may in practice not be a large need for this proposed working assumption. |
| FL |  | Based on the comments provided so far, majority companies support the alternative proposal 2-1, while some others prefer original proposal 2-1. The main concern on alternative proposal 2-1 is that it includes a number of sub-bulets with square brackets. However, moderator thinks it has more meaning than just having one general FFS sub-bullet. The potential capabilities are written based on the discussion on Understanding 1 vs Understanding 2. Based on the comments from Huawei/HiSilicon, I tried to merge the 3 scenarios into 1 general formula as well as reflecting the modification from companies as follows. One additional sub-bullet for “[Does not support CA/DC]” is also included for further discussion.  **Alternative Medium Priority Proposal 2-1a:**   * A ~~FR1 FDD~~ RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz for FR1 and 100MHz for FR2   + [Supports either 1 or 2 Rx branches and corresponding maximum DL MIMO layers]   + [Supports either FD-FDD or Type A HD-FDD operation for FR1 FDD bands]   + [Supports either DL up to 64 QAM or up to 256 QAM for FR1]   + [does not support CA/DC] * ~~A FR1 TDD RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz~~    + ~~[May support 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers]~~   + ~~[May support DL 64 QAM or 256 QAM]~~ * ~~A FR2 RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 100MHz~~   + ~~[May support 1 or 2 Rx branches / DL MIMO layers]~~ * FFS whether the capabilities in square brackets are included or not. |
| FL8 |  | This proposal couldn’t be discussed in the GTW session on 26th August due to lack of time.  Companies are invited to check whether the above Proposal 2-1a is acceptable or not. If it is not acceptable, it would be very appreciated if you can provide compromised proposal which is acceptable to all companies. |
| FL |  | Nordic suggested following modification over the reflector. Companies are invited whether the following proposal is acceptable or not.  **Alternative Medium Priority Proposal 2-1a:**   * A RedCap UE type supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz for FR1 and 100MHz for FR2 * Further discuss whether to capture also one or more of the following reduced capabilities to UE type description   + Supports either 1 or 2 Rx branches and corresponding maximum DL MIMO layers   + Supports either FD-FDD or Type A HD-FDD operation for FR1 FDD bands   + Supports either DL up to 64 QAM or up to 256 QAM for FR1   + Does not support CA/DC |
| FUTUREWEI8 | Y | Okay with Nordic’s revision for the sake of progress. |
| Intel | Y (almost) | Support the version suggested by vivo on the reflector – changing to “following ~~reduced~~ capabilities to RedCap UE type description” in the second main bullet. |
| Ericsson | Y | Also OK with Vivo’s version on the reflector (see Intel’s comment above) |
| Panasonic | Y | Support vivo’s version on the reflector as mentioned by Intel. |

Regarding the FFS in the above working assumption, several contributions [1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 22, 24] discuss the reduced capabilities included in the definition of the RedCap UE type. As mentioned above, maximum supported UE BW, which is suggested to be included in the definition by many of them [1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 11, 14, 16, 22, 24], is already agreed. Some contributions [2, 6, 16, 22, 24] suggest that the capabilities of minimum number of Rx branches (1 Rx branches) and maximum number of DL MIMO layers (1 layer) are included, while some others [8, 11] suggest that reduced number of Rx branches (either 1 or 2 Rx branches) and maximum number of DL MIMO layers (1 or 2 layers) are included. Some contributions [2, 6, 16, 22, 24] suggest that maximum DL modulation order (64QAM) is included. Some contributions [2, 6, 8, 22] suggest that duplex operation (HD-FDD and TDD) are also included. One contribution [9] suggests that following capabilities are included:

* Reduced baseline capability FG5-1 to max 8 HARQ processes
* No support of supplemental uplink and CBG
* Mandatory support of dynamic repetition for PDSCH, PUCCH and PUSCH

Another contribution [12] suggests waiting for RAN2 discussion.

Given the situation, there would be no common understanding whether/which other L1 capabilities are included. Moderator suggests coming back to the following question 2-2 after **Medium Priority Proposal 2-1** is converged.

**FL2 Low Priority Question 2-2:**

* Which reduced capabilities other than maximum supported UE BW should be included in the definition of RedCap UE type?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Do not see strong need to include other items. | |
| Nokia, NSB | The definition of the “RedCap Type”, should provide sufficient information to enable the network to configure itself for the worst case RedCap device it can expect to handle before receipt of full UE capability information.  In our view, this would include in addition to maximum BW support:   * The minimum number of Rx branches/DL MIMO layers supported * The minimum DL modulation order supported | |
| LG | The reduced number of Rx branches, the maximum number of DL MIMO layers, the maximum DL modulation order and duplex operation could be additionally included in the definition of RedCap UE type. Other reduced capabilities than those reduced capabilities seem not essential to be considered in definition of RedCap UE type. | |
| Xiaomi | We think the following capability should be included for the RedCap UE definition   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **UE capability** | **RedCap UE** | | Maximum UE bandwidth | 20MHz in FR1  100MHz in FR2 | | Minimum number of Rx branches / MIMO layers | 1/1 | | Maximum modulation order | 64QAM | | Duplex mode | HD-FDD in FDD frequency bands  TDD in TDD frequency bands | | |
| China Telecom | We have the same view with LG and xiaomi. | |
| SPRD | Can be left to RAN2 to get the whole picture of the reduced capabilities of RedCap UE type. | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | RedCap UE definition refer to the characters of RedCap UE which are used for differentiating with other UEs. From our perspective, the Rx (MIMO layer) and 64QAM should be viewed as the another characters of RedCap at least. | |
| Intel | None, since, for all the other features/capabilities, they do not uniquely identify a RedCap UE since these are all optional for RedCap Ues. | |
| Apple | We do not see the need of adding any as part of ‘Redcap Type’ definition.  Note that the other components are NOT ‘real’ UE capability, instead of minimum requirements that are mandated to be supported by all Ues. This can be assumed by gNB anyway regardless it is included in device type or not. | |
| Vivo | Agree with Huawei, Intel, Apple, no additional capability is included. | |
| Nordic | all that differ from eMBB UE | |
| Ericsson | We do not see a need for further RAN1 agreements on this in this meeting. We can await RAN2 progress, including running CRs for 38.306 and 38.331. | |
| FUTUREWEI2 | In addition to the maximum BW, all RedCap UE should be either 1RX or 2RX | |
| Qualcomm | In addition to max UE BW, the UE capabilities that need to be supported as mandatory UE features (before capability signaling of R17 RedCap devices) should be considered. | |
| Sierra Wireless | If the above proposal 2-1 is agreed where a Redcap UE type is defined by the set of mandatory features, then no additional capabilities need to be included as only 20MHz is mandatory to be supported. | |
| CATT | Our view is to include the ‘mandatory difference from non-RedCap UE’ from RAN1 perspective, as defined in WID. Prefer to include Rx number (&MIMO layer), maximum modulation order, and duplex mode.  But we would like to point out that Option 4 is to include the ‘minimum set of the reduced capabilities’, not the ‘set of minimum reduced capabilities’. Hence we think ‘1Rx and 2Rx’, ‘1 layer and 2 layers’, ‘HD-FDD, FDD, TDD’ shall be included. | |
| NEC | No other reduced capabilities would be needed. Regarding number of Rx antennas, 2Rx is also supported for RedCap UE on bands where UE is mandated to be equipped with 2Rx, i.e. no reduced capability is also supported. | |
| Sharp | Reduced L1 capabilities included in the definition of RedCap Ues should contribute to identify RedCap Ues from non-RedCap UE. Basic features such as{1Rx,1DL MIMO layer, 64 DL QAM}, which are totally different from those for non-RedCap Ues, can be considered to be included in the definition of RedCap Ues. | |
| CMCC | Same view as Sharp. | |
| FL3 | Based on the comments provided so far, companies view is divergent. Following reduced capabilities are proposed to be included in the definition of RedCap UE type:   * Reduced number of Rx branches/maximum number of DL MIMO layers: Nokia/NSB, LG, Xiaomi, ZTE/Sanechips, FUTUREWEI, CATT, Sharp, CMCC * maximum DL modulation order: Nokia/NSB, LG, Xiaomi, China Telecom, ZTE/Sanechips, CATT, Sharp, CMCC * duplex operation: LG, Xiaomi, China Telecom, CATT * All that differ from eMBB UE (Clarification may be needed): Nordic * That need to be supported as mandatory UE features (Clarification may be needed): Qualcomm * None: Huawei/HiSilicon, Intel, Apple, vivo, Sierra Wireless, NEC, * Wait for RAN2 progress: SPRD, Ericsson   Given the situation, it would be difficult to find a reasonable middle-ground among companies. Can we conclude as follows?  **Low Priority Proposed conclusion 2-2:**   * No consensus in RAN1 which reduced capabilities other than maximum supported UE BW are included in the definition of RedCap UE type in Rel-17. | |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| CATT |  | At least from gNB’s view, the difference between normal UE and RedCap UE should be more than maximum UE BW. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | A clarification is needed if UE type definition is only based on bandwidth.  From our understanding, RedCap UE should satisfy all the constraining of UE capabilities defined by RAN1 and RAN2, e.g., Rx number is no more than 2. If UE type definition only includes the bandwidth, for those 4 RX Ues configured with 20M, can we view them as the RedCap UE?  So from the perspective of RAN1, the least capability for UE type definition should include the Rx number besides the bandwidth. Other reduced capabilities used for RedCap UE definition can be determined by RAN2. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Similar view to CATT, for example a network needs to provision for the worst case RedCap device, as implied by the definition of RedCap UE type, which in our opinion at least includes BW and #rx antennas. |
| Qualcomm |  | Agree with CATT and Nokia. No need to discuss this proposal/conclusion further. Let’s focus on the discussion of Proposal 2-1. |
| Apple |  | The key discussion point in our view is how the Redcap UE types are used. When it becomes clear, we already know the answer about which components need to be included. Note that the actual UE capability can be reported to gNB as early as in Msg3. In between, we do not see any motivation to report some ‘virtual capability’ that gNB already can assume even without any report, except the supported UE BW. BW is needed for Msg2/Mg3 resource allocation.  Regarding antenna port indication, if only 1 Rx antenna port is included in redcap device type definition and can be reported, how it can help gNB scheduling if what gNB can know is 1 Rx always and there is no way to report 2 Rx to differentiate with 1 Rx? Why we need to explicitly report it? Instead, gNB can derive this if identifying the UE as a Redcap UE by Msg1.  Regarding ZTE comment, if a UE is claimed as Redcap and later reports ‘4Rx’ in UE capability report, network can simply bar the UE from camping on the CC as it violates the reduced capabilities for Redcap captured in WID. On the other hand, I am not sure the concern can be addressed by adding ‘1Rx’ into the Redcap Device definition. The reason is that even assuming ‘1Rx+20MHz’ is defined as Redcap device type, UE should allow to report real number of Rx branches e.g., 2 Rx in UE capability report. Then, how UE can prohibit reporting 4 Rx if it can report ‘2’ Rx in real UE capability report, even Redcap device type includes 1 Rx? |
| FUTUREWEI3 |  | Suggest we stop trying to make such conclusions and start to focus on the FG definitions for RedCap. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Ericsson |  | We do not see a need for further RAN1 agreements on this in this meeting. We can await RAN2 progress, including running CRs for 38.306 and 38.331. |
| Sharp |  | Considering the FFS (whether/which other L1 capabilities are included) in the above Medium Priority Proposal 2-1, there is no hurry to make the proposed conclusion now. |
| NEC |  | We are OK further to discuss under proposal 2-1 |
| FL |  | Given that companies’ view is still divergent, this proposal will not be treated in the GTW session on 20th August and let’s focus on Proposal 2-1 for now. |
| FL4 |  | If not provided yet, companies are invited to provide their view on the proposal (same as FL3) copied below.  **Low Priority Proposed conclusion 2-2:**   * No consensus in RAN1 which reduced capabilities other than maximum supported UE BW are included in the definition of RedCap UE type in Rel-17. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Believe it is too early to come to this conclusion. Prefer to discuss under 2-1, where we have the FFS whether/which other L1 capabilities are included. |
| Vivo |  | We are fine with either making the conclusion above, or come back until more RAN2 progress is available. |
| Xiaomi | N | More discussion is needed. We are OK to discuss it with Proposal 2-1 |
| Nordic | N | We prefer to keep this open, because at this point we do not know what other reduced capabilities could be agreed, feature discussion have not even started. |
| SPRD | Y |  |
| Ericsson | N | Perhaps this can be replaced with a note that RAN1 will await RAN2 progress before further discussion in RAN1. |
| FUTUREWEI4 | N | We are repeating our comment that we need to stop trying to make such conclusions and start to focus on the FG definitions for RedCap.  No conclusion is necessary. |
| Intel | Y | Support the conclusion as it reflects the current status and we do not expect new decisions that could change the definition of RedCap UE type in the last two meetings of the WI. However, we would be fine to leave it open as requested by other companies as well. |
| CATT |  | Such conclusion may not need to be drawn, at least for now. Whether additional features should be included is still under Proposal 2-1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | We also think it is too early to have this conclusion. |
| FL5 |  | Given not a few companies want to keep the door open and UE feature discussion will start from next RAN1 meeting, moderator suggests stopping this discussion in this RAN1 meeting and let’s come back in the next RAN1 meeting, which is aligned with the last FFS in **Proposal 2-1**. |
|  |  |  |

# Early indication of RedCap Ues

The WID [35] has the following objective on early indication of RedCap Ues:

|  |
| --- |
| * Specify functionality that will enable RedCap Ues to be explicitly identifiable to networks through an early indication in Msg1 and/or Msg3, and Msg A if supported, including the ability for the early indication to be configurable by the network. [RAN2, RAN1] |

Following agreements/working assumption related to the definition of RedCap UE type were made at RAN1#105-e:

|  |
| --- |
| Working assumption:   * For 4-step RACH, support the early indication of RedCap Ues at least in Msg1.   + The early indication in Msg1 can be configured to be enabled/disabled     - FFS How to support enable/disable the early indication   + FFS details e.g.:     - separate initial UL BWP     - separate PRACH resource     - PRACH preamble partitioning   + FFS the possibility of supporting Msg3 for the early indication   Agreement: (if the above working assumption is confirmed)   * Early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg1 can be enabled/disabled via SIB   Agreement:   * Support 2-step RACH for RedCap Ues as an optional feature   + FFS details of early indication in MsgA, e.g.:     - Separation of 2-step RACH resources or MsgA preambles     - Separation of initial UL BWP     - Using a new indication in MsgA PUSCH part   + Note: Discussion on 4-step RACH for early indication should be prioritised |

Regarding early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg1, many contributions [1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26] suggest confirming the working assumption to support the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg1. For the details, several companies support the indication through separate initial BWP, which is being discussed in AI8.6.1.1. However, as pointed out by some contributions such as [1], separate initial BWP itself cannot be used to indicate whether the UE is RedCap or not if PRACH resource is shared by initial UL BWP for non-RedCap Ues and separate initial UL BWP for RedCap Ues. Many contributions support separate RO [1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26] either for separate initial UL [2, 6, 8, 9, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24] and/or shared initial UL BWP [4, 8, 9, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24]. Similarly, many contributions support separate PRACH preamble [1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25] either for separate initial UL [2, 16, 24] and/or shared initial UL BWP [2, 4, 6, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24]. Therefore, as many contributions suggest, both of separate RO and separate PRACH preamble can be supported for Msg1 early indication from RAN1 perspective. Note that, as some contributions pointed out, RAN2 will discuss RACH indication and partitioning aspects common for multiple Wis such as SDT, CovEnh, RedCap, and RAN slicing in this RAN2 meeting. Therefore, moderator expects the relationship of early indication during initial access between RedCap and other features, which is raised by some contributions [2, 6, 8, 10], will be discussed in RAN2. In addition, a few contributions [2, 26] point out that it is necessary to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue caused by RO time/frequency configurations (see details in their contributions).

|  |
| --- |
| **8.18 RACH indication and partitioning**  *Time budget: Equivalent to 0.5-1 TU*  *Tdoc Limitation: 1 tdocs*  *Expected to cover Wis SDT, CovEnh, RedCap, RAN slicing .. Initial discussion on what should be treated in common and what design could be common.* |

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 3-1:**

Confirm the following working assumption with the modifications in red:

* For 4-step RACH, support the early indication of RedCap Ues at least in Msg1.
  + The early indication in Msg1 can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB
    - ~~FFS how to support enable/disable the early indication~~
  + ~~FFS details e.g.:~~ From RAN1 perspective, followings can be used for early indication
    - Both for shared initial UL BWP and separate initial UL BWP (if supported)
      * separate PRACH resource
      * PRACH preamble partitioning
      * FFS: how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue
  + FFS the possibility of supporting Msg3 for the early indication

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | For “separate initial UL BWP” case, the following may not be needed?   * separate PRACH resource * PRACH preamble partitioning   For “FFS: how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue”, we prefer to leave it to RAN2 for further study as there are multiple other use cases requiring PRACH resource partitioning currently under RAN2 discussion, a unified solution would be desirable, if justified. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y | The necessities of these issues can be identified in RAN1, and LS is sent to RAN2 for information. We are fine with the revised working assumptions. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Slight wording improvement suggested:    From the RAN1 perspective, the following methods can be used for early indication  ♣ Both for shared initial UL BWP and for separate initial UL BWP (if supported)   * separate PRACH resource * PRACH preamble partitioning * FFS: how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | For this bullet “The early indication in Msg1 can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB.”, we don’t think there should be an explicit signalling to enable/disable the early identification. The early identification is enabled if there are separate preambles configured for RedCap Ues. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | We think “separate PRACH resource” is general enough for msg1-based early indication of RedCap UE, since it can include separate PRACH configuration index, separate Ros in separately configured initial UL BWP, or PRACH preamble partitioning on shared RO.  Besides, we are open to discuss in RAN1/2 how to address the RA-RNTI overlapping issues (if any). |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | Editorial: can the bullets be combined (using Nokia’s proposed revision)?  “From the RAN1 perspective, the following methods can be used for early indication for shared initial UL BWP and for separate initial UL BWP (if supported)” |
| LG |  | We understand that separate PRACH resource or PRACH preamble partitioning can be used even for separate initial UL BWP. However, it could be also possible for gNB to configure separate initial UL BWP without separate PRACH resource and PRACH preamble partitioning. How to configure those options could be up to gNB implementation. |
| Xiaomi | Y | * We share the same view with Lenovo that the enable/disable can be carried out in implicit way. There is no need for explicit indication * As for the RA-RNTI issue, in our view, RAN1 could continue discuss this case. Whether there is collision issue, it depends on the CSS configuration. For example, if separate CSS is defined for RedCap and non-RedCap, then there is no collision problem. If RAN1 confirm that this problem can’t be avoided by RAN1 solution, then we can send LS to RAN2 |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| Samsung |  | Support of PRACH separate resources/preamble partitioning can be for shared BW only.  We suggest to address the FFS’s before confirming the WA:   * Whether to support Msg3 for early indication, and if supported whether disabling Msg1 early indication means relying on Msg3 indication or no early indication * RA-RNTI overlapping issue can be discussed in RAN1/2. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| SPRD | Y | We share the same view with Lenovo. Early indication in Msg1 can be implicitly enabled or disabled by whether separate PRACH resource or preamble for RedCap is configured or not. |
| Nordic |  | Add FFS on how to handle/accommodate with partitioning for other purposes, such as MSG3 repetitions |
| Ericsson | OK as WA | We prefer to keep it as the working assumption until the potential PRACH fragmentation issue due to the many legacy and Rel-17 features and their combinations that need to use Msg1 indication has been addressed probably. But we are OK with the updated wording.  In the case of separate initial UL BWP, separate PRACH resource/preamble partitioning is needed only when the Ros are overlapped. We suggest clarifying this.  Regarding “FFS: how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue”, we are fine with leaving this to RAN2, as some companies above have suggested. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | Before we have the conclusion to address the RA-RNTI overlapping issue, we should confirm whether this issue exists. Therefore, it is suggested to use the following wording:  FFS: Whether/how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue  Additionally, it is worth to point out that if the separate initial UL BWP is configured, separate PRACH occasions or separate preamble should be configured for identification, otherwise, the gNB still can not identify the RedCap UE. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | For the “FFS: how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue“, we think it should be left up to RAN2, hence the FFS could be removed. |
| Apple | Y |  |
| FL | * Regarding the separate PRACH resource and PRACH preamble partitioning in a separate initial UL BWP for RedCap, here the intention is that even if gNB configures separate initial UL BWP for RedCap, corresponding Ros may be overlapped with those for non-RedCap Ues. Therefore, to identify RedCap Ues, at least one of separate Ros or separate PRACH preambles in shared Ros is necessary for separate initial UL BWP for RedCap. How to configure those options would be up to RAN2 discussion, and hence, the proposal says “followings **can be used** for early indication”.   @Lenovo/Motorola Mobility: regarding the sub-bullet “The early indication in Msg1 can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB”, it is based on the following agreement in the last RAN1 meeting. Moderator thinks RAN2 can discuss whether explicit or implicit indication is adopted for enabling/disabling since it is detail design of SIB contents.  Agreement: (if the above working assumption is confirmed)   * Early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg1 can be enabled/disabled via SIB * Regarding FFS on RA-RNTI overlapping issue, “whether” is added based on the comments from some companies * Some editorial updates are applied based on the comments from Nokia/NSB, FUTUREWEI   **High Priority Proposal 3-1:**  Confirm the following working assumption with the modifications in red:   * For 4-step RACH, support the early indication of RedCap Ues at least in Msg1.   + The early indication in Msg1 can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB     - ~~FFS how to support enable/disable the early indication~~   + ~~FFS details e.g.:~~ From RAN1 perspective, the following methods can be used for early indication both for shared initial UL BWP and separate initial UL BWP (if supported)     - separate PRACH resource     - PRACH preamble partitioning     - FFS: whether/how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue   + FFS the possibility of supporting Msg3 for the early indication | |
| FL2 | Following agreement was achieved in the GTW session on 18th August:  **Agreement:**  Confirm the following working assumption with the modifications in red:   * For 4-step RACH, support the early indication of RedCap Ues at least in Msg1.   + The early indication in Msg1 can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB     - ~~FFS how to support enable/disable the early indication~~   + ~~FFS details e.g.:~~ From RAN1 perspective, the following methods can be used for early indication both for shared initial UL BWP and separate initial UL BWP (if supported)     - separate PRACH resource     - PRACH preamble partitioning     - ~~FFS: whether/how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue~~   + ~~FFS the possibility of supporting Msg3 for the early indication~~   Whether/how to support early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 in Rel-17 is up to RAN2  The sub-bullet “FFS: whether/how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue” was deleted in the GTW session as we need more time to have common understanding on this potential issue. Therefore, companies are invited to provide their views on the following new question:  **High Priority Question 3-1a:**   * Does RAN1 need to further study how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue for the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg1? If yes, please provide potential solutions which RAN1 need to further study.   Note that whether to send an LS to RAN2 to inform the above agreement will be discussed in **Proposal 7-1**. Also, remaining discussion point for Msg3 early indication whether to send an LS to RAN2 to inform potential RAN1 observations, which was proposed by some companies in the GTW session, will be discussed in **Question 3-2a**. | |
| vivo | N | The RA-RNTI overlapping issue, if any, is purely RAN2 topic. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | RAN2 issue |
| Nordic | N | RAN1 issue |
| Ericsson |  | We are fine with discussing the RA-RNTI overlapping issue in RAN2. |
| FUTUREWEI2 |  | RAN2 issue |
| Qualcomm | N | We can leave the RA-RNTI discussion to RAN2, unless there is any additional request/LS from RAN2. |
| Sierra Wireless | N | This is a RAN2 topic |
| Intel | N | Agree with vivo that it is a topic for RAN2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | RAN1 could identify if the issue is valid, and up to RAN2 to resolve the issue. |
| CATT | N | May or may not be an issue, but anyway should be up to RAN2. |
| China Telecom | N | The RA-RNTI overlapping issue is up to RAN2. |
| NEC | N | RAN2 issue |
| Sharp | N | RAN2 issue. |
| SPRD | N | It is up to RAN2. |
| CMCC | N | RAN2 issue |
| FL3 |  | Most companies think whether/how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue is up to RAN2. Can we conclude as follows?  **High Priority Proposed conclusion 3-1a:**   * RAN1 defers to RAN2 whether/how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue in the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg1 in Rel-17. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | If separate CSS for RAR is configured for RedCap UE, the RA-RNTI overlapping issue does not exist. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI3 | Y | Perhaps a rewording  ~~RAN1 defers to RAN2~~ whether/how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue in the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg1 in Rel-17 is up to RAN2. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| NEC | Y | Fine with FUTUREWEI’s revision |
| LG | Y | We are fine to defer this issue to RAN2. |
| FL |  | All companies are generally fine with the proposal. Based on the comment from FUTUREWEI, wording is modified as follows and let’s try to agree on this proposal in the GTW session on 20th August:  **High Priority Proposed conclusion 3-1a:**   * ~~RAN1 defers to RAN2~~ Whether/how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue in the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg1 in Rel-17 is up to RAN2. |
| FL4 |  | Following agreement was achieved in the GTW session on 20th August:  Conclusion   * Whether there is RA-RNTI overlapping issue and how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue in the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg1 in Rel-17 is up to RAN2.   Therefore, the discussion on this topic is closed in this RAN1 meeting. |
|  |  |  |

Regarding the FFS on the possibility of supporting Msg3 for the early indication, a number of contributions [1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 13] support the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 to avoid PRACH capacity reduction, which can be configured to be enabled/disabled by SIB [13], and suggest to send an LS to RAN2 [10], while some others [3, 5, 8, 12, 14, 18, 23, 25] do not support it because RedCap-specific handling cannot be applied before Msg3 and it is not necessary to specify duplicated functions. Given the situation and the detail of Msg3 indication would be mainly RAN2 matter, moderator suggests discussing whether/which scenarios the early indication in Msg 3 is worth specifying from RAN1 perspective and trying to send an LS to ask RAN2 to decide whether to support or not.

**FL1 High Priority Question 3-2:**

* For 4-step RACH, which scenarios is the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 applicable from RAN1 perspective?
  + Note: This question is aiming to identify the scenarios where early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 is applicable, and if identified, to send an LS to ask RAN2 to decide whether to support the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 or not

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** | |
| vivo | We do not see much benefit by specifying MSG 3 based early indication in addition to MSG1 based solution, and duplicated spec effort should be avoided as much as possible.  We think the question should be aiming to identify the scenario where where early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 is applicable in addition to Msg 1…. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | There has been several cases identified during the study phase and, e.g. when PARCH capacity is concerned. From our perspective Msg3 is also one of the options that specification shall support and up to network to configure. The detailed solution can be up to RAN2. | |
| OPPO | Share the same view with Huawei. RAN2 is discussing how to support the indication of UE with multiple UE features through PRACH. The partitioning of PRACH resource and PRACH capacity are main concerned issues. For the early indication in Msg1, it is working assumption that it can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB. Network may disable early indication in Msg1 if the PRACH capacity is limited. In this case Msg3 can be configured to support early indication during initial access. | |
| CATT | We do not think identifying RedCap UE in Msg3 is very useful in 4-step RACH.  It seems only happens when the PRACH resources and preambles are fully shared. But this also means that the gNB does not rely on early indication of RedCap for scheduling of Msg2 and Msg3 for RedCap, e.g. the initial DL/UL BWP are shared, and are both no larger than the maximum RedCap UE BW. It is natural that the gNB does not rely on early indication of RedCap for scheduling of Msg4, either. This, again, makes early indication in Msg3 unnecessary. | |
| CMCC | When Msg.1 identification is disabled due to capacity consideration, gNB can configure early identification by Msg.3 for access control or proper scheduling. | |
| Nokia, NSB | Early identification of RedCap with Msg3 could help improve Msg4 feedback in the absence of Msg1 early identification.   We do not support a combined Msg1 and Msg3 early capability indication scheme.  If the majority of RAN1 do not see sufficient benefit in supporting Msg3 early indication, we support a LS to RAN2, seeking their opinion on Msg3 early indication. | |
| Sharp | For scenario where both UL and DL initial BWPs are shared between RedCap UE and non-RedCap Ues, early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 can be applicable. In this scenario, there is no different scheduling handling of Msg2 unless gNB separates Type 1 CSS for RedCap UE from that for non-RedCap UE. Early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 can help to avoid additional PRACH resource configuration for RedCap if PRACH capacity is concerned. | |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | From RAN1 point of view, we don’t see strong motivation to have early identification in Msg3. | |
| NEC | In case msg3 is used for early indication, gNB cannot take into account of RedCap type until msg3 is successfully received. SO, in our opinion, early indication via msg3 is not so useful. A separate initial UL BWP/separate RACH resources, e.g. can also be used to mitigate over PRACH resource partitioning. | |
| Qualcomm | We don’t see much benefit to support early indication of RedCap UE type based on msg3 only, or by both msg1 and msg3.  We think msg1-based early indication should be supported for RedCap UE at least when:   1. initial DL/UL BWPs are separately configured for RedCap UE   and/or   1. DL/UL coverage recovery are needed for msg2/msg3.   If msg1-based early indication is not supported but msg3-based early indication is supported, it suggests:   1. initial DL/UL BWPs are NOT separately configured for RedCap UE   and   1. DL/UL coverage recovery are not needed for msg2/msg3   However, if RedCap UE is not configured with a separate initial UL BWP (msg1-based early indication is not supported), it is not necessary to disable the FH of PUCCH carrying HARQ feedback for msg4. Therefore, msg3-based early indication is not much useful for disabling FH of PUCCH during initial access. | |
| FUTUREWEI | While Msg1 is preferable for early identification (BW and/or whether to address DL performance), Msg3 provides an alternative when RACH resources are limited for Msg1. We also note that RAN2 should understand that Msg3 is up to them, we could just leave to them unless asked. | |
| Xiaomi | When Msg.1-based early indication is disabled, it implies there is no need to handle the restriction from reduced UE bandwidth. Then in this case, the purpose to ultilize Msg.3-based solution is to enable gNB to know the channel status of RedCap, for that point, we think it can be handled by coverage enhancement project. | |
| China Telecom | If early identification for RedCap Ues is supported, Msg1 is preferred. However, if early identification via Msg1 is not configured, gNB can optionally configure early identification via Msg3 for better performance of initial access. | |
| Samsung | The main reason for identification in Msg3 is to avoid an overhead increase that is needed for a RedCap UE identification in Msg1. Early identification in Msg1 can be disabled and identification can be done in Msg3. Also, some RedCap UE capabilities can be identified in Msg1 and some others in Msg3, although it is not clear there is a need for early indication of several capabilities. | |
| Panasonic | For the purpose of coverage recovery, it is more beneficial that early indication is via Msg1 than via Msg3. Therefore, the only scenario to use Msg3 has the benefit in our view is the situation that PRACH resource/preamble cannot be separated due to the resource/preamble limitation. Whether a RedCap UE can camp on the cell under such a congested scenario may need to be considered by RAN2. | |
| SPRD | We share the view with vivo.  In addition, the additional benefit is marginal. From RAN1’s perspective, early indication is introduced for two reasons. One is for coverage recovery. But it is Msg2 which needs coverage compensation most. The other reason is to enable the scheduling of non-RedCap UE in an UL BWP larger than the maximum RedCap UE BW. In this scenario, we think NW should identify the UE type before Msg3, otherwise the scheduling of Msg3 will be an issue as RedCap and non-RedCap Ues configured with different initial UL BWPs will have different understanding on the UL grant for Msg3 and DCI for Msg3 retransmission. In summary, early indication in Msg3 is unnecessary from the point of RAN1. | |
| Nordic | MSG3 identification allows gNB to provide RedCap UE with a specific configuration. In scenarios where coverage is not an issue, MSG3 is an efficient way for gNB to operate. | |
| Ericsson | In many scenarios, it may not be suitable to enable Msg1 indication, for example, due to concerns on significant reduction in PRACH capacity or increase in UL overhead. Note that there are legacy features (2-step RACH, preamble group A/B) and many Rel-17 features (SDT, CovEnh, RAN slicing, and their different combinations) and that also require Msg1 indication via separation of PRACH resources/preamble partitioning. This will fragment the PRACH resources/preambles among many different features, which is not desired. Therefore, the network will enable Msg1 indication only when it is absolutely needed. For example, in deployments where Msg2 is not coverage limiting, indication in Msg1 will not be enabled.  In such scenarios, Msg3 indication of RedCap Ues can still be useful. For example, to properly scheduled the RedCap Ues after Msg3 and until specific UE capabilities are known, to enable the network to disable PUCCH frequency hopping for Msg4 feedback, to enable RRC connection rejection of RedCap Ues for access restriction, and to enable prioritization of non-RedCap Ues over RedCap Ues during contention resolution.  We would also like to highlight that Msg3 indication may not cost any extra bits to be transmitted in Msg3 if, for example, RedCap-specific LCID for CCCH is used (similar solution was also adopted in LTE for indication of Cat-0 Ues in Msg3). To this end, RAN1 can ask RAN2 to specify solutions for Msg3 indication that would not lead to additional overhead in Msg3. | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The benefits for msg3 identification may including the following:   1. If the msg1 identification is disabled, msg3 based identification is the only way to identify the RedCap UE earlier, which help gNB to adjust the scheduling strategy, e.g.,msg4 scheduling. 2. Msg1 identification for RedCap UE , CE UE and other features requiring msg1 identification may cause serious PRACH performance degradation. Msg3 based identification can help compensate the performance loss caused by congestion.   If the overhead for msg3 identification is not an issue, then msg3 identification can be considered for the above benefits. It is suggested to send an LS to ask RAN2 to decide whether to support the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 or not, based on the summarized scenarios by RAN1. | |
| Intel | We do not see the need to support RedCap UE identification via Msg3.  Companies are citing PRACH capacity impact to justify RedCap UE identification via Msg3. However, as elaborated by QC and others, there is hardly any benefit in UE identification at the stage of Msg3 transmission if identification is not available during Msg1 – it would be a small optimization as against relying on UE capability reporting.   * Limited help to DL scheduling as Ues cannot be distinguished for Msg2 scheduling. Msg4 PDCCH and PDSCH can be scheduled the same way as for Msg2 scheduling. * Not necessary towards disabling PUCCH FH for Msg4 feedback, etc., as disabling PUCCH FH should be applicable only when configured with separate initial UL BWP and not when initial UL BWP is shared between RedCap and non-RedCap Ues (no issue with max RedCap UE BW) * The benefit in providing “appropriate RRC configuration” to the UE before UE capability reporting is negligible. In any case, the RRC configuration would most likely need to be updated depending on reported UE capabilities, and the time period from after Msg4 scheduling until UE capability reporting is rather short for any perceptible impact from this “early RRC configuration”.   Thus, at this point we do not see a need for RedCap UE identification via Msg3 that goes beyond minor optimization. If identification via Msg1 is not possible due to PRACH capacity/UL resource OH considerations and the RA procedure can function until Msg3 transmission, the gNB can simply wait until two more messages are exchanged until the UE capability report is received. | |
| Sierra Wireless | As mentioned above, there are benefits to early indication of RedCap with Msg3 (including reducing PRACH partitioning and Msg4 feedback), when Msg1 early indication is not configured. The early indication in Msg3 should be specified and available for the network to use. The network can select either Msg1 or Msg3, but not both. | |
| Apple | We prefer to leave Msg3 related to RAN2, which is the working group handling Msg-3 related discussion in general and more familiar the usage of Msg3. Also, as commented by other companies, whether/how to use Msg3 is being discussed in RAN2. Duplicated discussion should be avoided. | |
| FL | Based on the comments from companies, following scenarios can be considered where the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 is applicable:   * None: vivo, CATT, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, NEC, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, SPRD, Intel * When PRACH capacity is concerned due to the indication of UE with multiple UE features through PRACH: Huawei/HiSilicon, OPPO, CMCC, Sharp, Samsung, Panasonic, Ericsson, ZTE/Sanechips, Sierra Wireless   + Objected because gNB does not rely on early indication of RedCap for scheduling of Msg4 and its HARQ-ACK feedback in this case, i.e., shared initial DL/UL BWP: CATT, Qualcomm, Intel   + Objected because separate initial UL BWP/separate RACH resources can be used in this case: NEC * Proper scheduling for Msg 4 and its HARQ-ACK feedback: Nokia/NSB, China Telecom, Ericsson, ZTE/Sanechips¸ * When coverage is not an issue: Nordic   Given the situation, it may not be possible to identify the scenarios where early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 is applicable. Therefore, following conclusion is proposed. The intention is that no more discussion is expected in RAN1 in Rel-17 but RAN2 can decide whether to support early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3.  **Proposed conclusion 3-2:**   * No consensus in RAN1 to support early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 in Rel-17 | |
| FL2 | Following agreement was achieved in the GTW session on 18th August:  **Agreement:**  Confirm the following working assumption with the modifications in red:   * For 4-step RACH, support the early indication of RedCap Ues at least in Msg1.   + The early indication in Msg1 can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB     - ~~FFS how to support enable/disable the early indication~~   + ~~FFS details e.g.:~~ From RAN1 perspective, the following methods can be used for early indication both for shared initial UL BWP and separate initial UL BWP (if supported)     - separate PRACH resource     - PRACH preamble partitioning     - ~~FFS: whether/how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue~~   + ~~FFS the possibility of supporting Msg3 for the early indication~~   Whether/how to support early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 in Rel-17 is up to RAN2  Remaining discussion point for Msg3 early indication is whether to send an LS to RAN2 to inform potential RAN1 observations for the scenarios where the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 is applicable, which was proposed by some companies in the GTW session. Based on companies input to **Question 3-2**, companies are invited to provide their views on the following new question:  **High priority Question 3-2a:**   * Q1: Should RAN1 send an LS to RAN2 to inform RAN1 observations for the scenarios where the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 is applicable? * Q2: If yes, which of the following scenarios should be included in the LS?   + S1: When PRACH capacity is concerned due to the indication of UE with multiple UE features through PRACH   + S2: When proper scheduling for Msg 4 and its HARQ-ACK feedback are necessary   + S3: When coverage is not an issue   + S4: Any others   Note that Pros and cons for early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 was discussed in SI phase, as captured in Table 11.1.1-2 in TR38.875. | |
| Example | Q1: Y/N  Q2: S1/S2/S3/S4 | If S4 is included, please provide details |
| vivo | N | These questions should not be discussed now. It was explicitly clarified already by the Chair that MSG3 based early identification will not be treated in RAN1 until further progress in RAN2. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | Assuming **Medium Priority Proposal 7-1:** is agreed and the agreement for 4-step RACH is included in the LS sent to RAN2. Since that agreement states:  *Whether/how to support early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 in Rel-17 is up to RAN2*  We feel that the above statement is sufficient to:  (1) Indicate to RAN2, the lack of consensus in RAN1 for msg3 support.  (2) Encourage RAN2 to respond if they have further justification for msg3 support. |
| Nordic |  | No strong view, but of course people can share todays agreement with RAN2 colleagues |
| Ericsson | Q1: Y  Q2: S1/S2/S3 | S3 could be updated to say “When Msg2 coverage is not an issue”. |
| FUTUREWEI2 |  | No further discussion in RAN1 is needed now |
| Qualcomm | N | Agree with the comments of Nokia.  There is no consensus in RAN1 regarding the benefits of msg3-based early indication.  There is no consensus in RAN1 to support msg3-based early indication in both SI and WI phases. |
| Sierra Wireless | N | Although several scenarios were identified in RAN1 where early indication in Msg3 is beneficial, these are also defined within the TR38.875 which RAN2 can review thus no LS is needed. |
| Intel | N | Share the views from vivo and Nokia. Plus, most details were already covered in the RedCap TR and RAN2 is well-aware of these. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | N |  |
| CATT | N | We do not think S1/S2/S3 are fully convincing yet. If we have to raise them to RAN2, some opposite views shall also be included. Thus prefer to leave the situation simple. |
| China Telecom | N | We see no need to send LS for RAN2. The pros and cons of Msg1 and Msg3 for early identification have been fully discussed in SI. It is a tough for both RAN1 and RAN2 to make the final decision. |
| NEC | N |  |
| Xiaomi | N | No need for further discussion in RAN1 based on current agreement |
| Sharp |  | Fine with either. If LS is agreed to be sent, we can further add Msg3 in the proposed modification from Ericsson, i.e. “When Msg2/Msg3 coverage is not an issue”. |
| SPRD | N | We share the same opinion with vivo and Nokia. Including the agreement “*Whether/how to support early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 in Rel-17 is up to RAN2*” is sufficient. |
| CMCC | N | All the scenarios have been captured in TR38.875. |
| FL3 |  | As discussed over RAN1 reflector, moderator does not plan to discuss this topic any more in this meeting if companies do not have sufficient interest for sending an LS to RAN2.  Based on the comments provided so far, most companies do not see the need to send an LS to RAN2. Therefore, no additional discussion is expected on this topic in this RAN1 meeting. |
|  |  |  |

Regarding 2-step RACH, a number of contributions [1, 4, 8, 13, 18, 19, 34] support early indication in MsgA. Some of them [4, 8, 13, 18, 34] suggest Msg1/Msg3 indication for 4-step RACH is reused where applicable, such as Separate 2-step RACH resources, MsgA preambles or initial UL BWP. Some contributions [8, 13] support the indication in Msg A PUSCH part while one contribution [18] does not support it because it is infeasible when MsgA PUSCH may not be transmitted by the UE under certain conditions (e.g., when the MsgA PUSCH may be cancelled). In addition, some companies [2, 7] suggest postponing the discussion until 4-step RACH discussion is completed. Given the situation and based on the agreement in the last RAN1 meeting to prioritize 4-step RACH case, moderator suggests coming back to 2-step RACH case when further progress is made for 4-step RACH case.

**[Updated]** Based on the agreement for 4-step RACH, we can try similar proposal for 2-step RACH follows:

**FL2 Medium priority Proposal 3-3:**

* For 2-step RACH, support the early indication of RedCap Ues at least in MsgA preamble part.
  + The early indication in MsgA preamble part can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB
  + From RAN1 perspective, the following methods can be used for early indication both for shared initial UL BWP and separate initial UL BWP (if supported)
    - separate PRACH resource
    - PRACH preamble partitioning
* Whether/how to support early indication of RedCap Ues in MsgA PUSCH part in Rel-17 is up to RAN2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | N | The consideration for 2-step RACH here is quite different from 4-step RACH. In 2-step RACH, what is the motivation to potentially consider early indication in both preamble part and PUSCH part from specification perspective? |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Nordic | N | We do not think that 4-step RACH early identification is done yet.  Agreement:   * Support 2-step RACH for RedCap Ues as an optional feature   + FFS details of early indication in MsgA, e.g.:     - Separation of 2-step RACH resources or MsgA preambles     - Separation of initial UL BWP     - Using a new indication in MsgA PUSCH part   + Note: Discussion on 4-step RACH for early indication should be prioritized |
| Ericsson | N | In our understanding, the only reason to have indication in the preamble part (instead of the PUSCH part) of MsgA is to enable coverage recovery of MsgB PDSCH, when MsgA preamble is detected but MsgA PUSCH is not decoded correctly (i.e., fallback RAR). However, coverage evaluations for this scenario were not carried out during the RedCap SI phase. Nevertheless, coverage recovery may be needed if MsgB (fallback RAR) and Msg2 have similar payload size. Therefore, we can come back to this proposal after coverage recovery needs for MsgB is understood.  We also wonder if it is not unnecessary complexity and optimization to support this corner case. It might be easier to let the UE fallback to 4-step RA if this becomes a problem. The only thing that would be achieved by early indication in MsgA preamble part is that if Msg PUSCH part is not received by gNB, it could see that the UE is RedCap, conclude that the MsgA PUSCH-part coverage might not be good enough where the UE is located, and accordingly send a fallback RAR in MsgB. However, if gNB does nothing, the UE would reach max attempts and fallback to 4-step anyway eventually. |
| FUTUREWEI2 | N | 4-step RACH should be completed first |
| Qualcomm |  | Early indication of RedCap UE type based on msg1 of 4-step RACH should be prioritized.  If 2-step RACH based early indication is supported, msgA preamble is preferred since the link budget of msgA PUSCH is much worse and the reliability of reporting is questionable. |
| Sierra Wireless | N | Adding the indication within the PUSCH of MsgA would be preferred as this doesn’t require additional PRACH partitioning. |
| Intel | Almost Y | We can agree to the first part of the proposal on using MsgA Preamble, but not the last part. In our view, indication in MsgA preamble part is aligned with that for 4-step and is the method that works.  In addition to duplicated functionality, in our understanding, the indication in MsgA PUSCH does not work whenever the PUSCH may be dropped (from TS 38.213: “*A UE can transmit a PRACH preamble in a valid PRACH occasion if the PRACH preamble is not mapped to a valid PUSCH occasion.*”) or just not received correctly at the gNB and the RA procedure falls back to 4-step (for that same RACH attempt). Thus, there is a lack of robustness for the option of using MsgA PUSCH for indication of RedCap UE.  In case gNB receives only the MsgA preamble (UE transmits only the MsgA preamble or transmitted MsgA PUSCH is not received correctly), the gNB would not know that this UE is RedCap, and may schedule a Msg2 (as it falls back to 4-step) with an UL grant in RAR that is not feasible for a RedCap UE. This results in a failed RA attempt and associated resource wastage in the UL and DL. Thus, the impact may not be negligible and possibly worse compared to if the gNB “does nothing” as suggested by Ericsson, due to improper fallback to 4-step RACH.  This aspect can be observed from RAN1 perspective, and thus, RAN1 should not be neutral and leave it entirely to RAN2 on this issue. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| CATT |  | Fine to wait for the progress in early indication in Msg3.  Since the MsgA PUSCH in 2-step RACH is functionally similar to Msg3 in 4-step RACH, if early indication in Msg3 is supported, we can further consider similar method can be applied to MsgA PUSCH. |
| China Telecom |  | The 2-step RACH early identification can be further checked and followed the similar handling in the 4-step RACH agreement. |
| NEC |  | Prefer to wait for completion of 4-step RACH |
| Sharp | Y | RAN2 already agreed to specify solution for early identification for 2-step RACH. Details on MsgA preamble and/or MsgA PUSCH can be discussed later if we have further progress on 4-step from RAN2 . |
| SPRD | N | Suggest to wait until 4-step RACH early indication has completed. |
| FL3 |  | Based on the comments provided so far, not a few companies prefer to wait for the progress in early indication for 4-step RACH. Therefore, discussion on 2-step RACH for early indication is postponed until further progress is made for 4-step RACH (maybe it depends on RAN2 progress). |
|  |  |  |

# System information indication

The WID [35] has the following objective on system information indication:

|  |
| --- |
| * Specify a system information indication to indicate whether a RedCap UE can camp on the cell/frequency or not; it shall be possible for the indication to be specific to the number of Rx branches of the UE. [RAN2, RAN1] |

A few contributions [2, 8, 12] suggest that this topic is not considered further in RAN1 or RAN1 should wait for RAN2’s further progress. As discussed in the last RAN1 meeting, a number of contributions [1, 6, 12 (can be studied), 16, 17, 23] support the access control specific to RedCap Ues with 1Rx or 2Rx via DCI associated with SIB1 based on the following RAN2 agreement, which would obtain power saving benefits by skipping SIB1 reading, while a few contributions [2, 18] do not support it because it would not lead to substantial power saving benefits but would require separate treatment from all other features for RedCap and may incur large specification impact in RAN2.

Agreements:

1. SIB1 (not MIB) indicates cell barring for 1 Rx branch and 2 Rx branches separately for RedCap Ues. Further details of the solution are FFS

Given the situation, moderator suggests trying to make conclusion on the following proposal which was discussed in the last RAN1 meeting.

**FL2 Medium Priority Proposal 4-1:**

* For system information indication of access control for RedCap Ues,
  + FFS: Whether it is needed to have the indication in DCI scheduling SIB1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Given RAN2 discussion/progress, RAN1 input seems necessary for this issue. |
| OPPO | Y | For DCI based indication of access control for RedCap Ues, RAN1 can discuss and make some decision on it. |
| CATT | N | As RAN2 is the leading group in cell access/barring, we think RAN1 should wait for RAN2’s progress until the design/signaling is clear. If RAN2 needs RAN1s assistance, it can trigger LS to RAN1. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We support the intention, however in our opinion the following wording is clearer    Access control information for RedCap Ues is supported using System Information.  FFS    Whether the DCI scheduling SIB1 is used to support RedCap Access information. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | N | Up to RAN2 decision. |
| NEC | N | We share the view of CATT and Lenovo/Motorola Mobility. |
| FUTUREWEI | N | Up to RAN2 |
| LG | Y | The indication in DCI scheduling SIB1 seems beneficial for UE power saving. |
| Xiaomi | Y | SIB DCI-based indication is enefi RAN1 scope. At least RAN1 could discuss the feasibility of this option. In our view, SIB1 DCI based indication is eneficial for UE power saving |
| China Telecom | N | We have the same view with CATT. |
| Samsung |  | Discuss in RAN2. |
| Ericsson | N | Access barring is a RAN2 issue. RAN1 does not need to discuss this further.  In our understanding, having the barring indication in the DCI scheduling SIB1 (instead of SIB1) would only have very limited power saving benefits. Moreover, RedCap should reuse functionalities as much as possible with non-RedCap and should not introduce separate behaviours for RedCap/non-RedCap when it is not strictly required.  By keeping the FFS, RAN1 is simply delaying the progress in RAN2.  Therefore, we propose the following conclusion:  **Conclusion: There is no consensus in RAN1 to have the access barring indication in DCI scheduling SIB1.** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | We share the similar view with Xiaomi. |
| Intel | N | Share the same view as expressed by Ericsson. |
| Apple |  | Leave to RAN2. After the FFS aspects are addressed in RAN2, we can further discucss the need of DCI-based, if necessary. |
| Vivo | N | Agree with Ericsson on the proposed conclusion. |
| Nordic | N | Barring design is in RAN2 competence |
| Qualcomm |  | Access control belongs to the scope of RAN2’s work |
| Sierra Wireless | N | Agree with Ericsson |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | N | And this should be up to RAN2 design. |
| CATT2 | N | As far as we know, RAN2 made the following agreement in yesterday GTW:   |  | | --- | | Agreements:  1. Msg1 identification which can be configured to be enabled/disabled can be specified from RAN2 point of view.  2. Solution for early identification for 2-step RACH will be specified.  3. Specify separate indications in SIB1 for barring RedCap Ues with 1 Rx chain and 2 Rx chains.  4. Specify a RedCap specific IFRI in SIB1. | |
| NEC | N | Agree with Ericsson |
| Sharp | N | As mentioned by CATT2, RAN2 agreed to specify separate indications in SIB1 for access control. There is no need to further discuss a solution different from RAN2. |
| FL3 |  | Based on the comments provided so far, companies view is still devergent:   * Support: Huawei/HiSilicon, OPPO, CMCC, Nokia/NSB, LG, Xiaomi, ZTE/Sanechips * Not support: CATT, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, NEC, FUTUREWEI, China Telecom, Samsung, Ericsson, Intel, Apple, vivo, Nordic, Qualcomm, Sierra Wireless, Sharp   Therefore, as proposed by Ericsson, can we conclude as follows?  **Medium Priority proposed conclusion 4-1:**   * There is no consensus in RAN1 to have the access barring indication in DCI scheduling SIB1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | There is no need to make conclusion. Although this is led by Ran2, if in future RAN2 make decision that it is in DCI, then RAN2 will need to ask RAN1 input for the design and the conclusion, if made now, will be invalidated. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | No need to make such conclusion. We can wait for the RAN2 progress. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Similar view to ZTE/Huawei - we can wait for RAN2 progress. |
| Qualcomm | Y | The conclusion reflects the status of RAN1 discussion |
| FUTUREWEI3 |  | No need for a conclusion. We can wait for RAN2 progress. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| LG |  | RAN1 could discuss this issue later, possibly after more progress in RAN2. |
| FL |  | It seems some companies want to keep the door open until RAN2 makes some progress. Therefore, the proposal is modified as follows and can be checked whether it is acceptable for all at the GTW session on 20th August.  **Medium Priority proposed conclusion 4-1:**   * ~~There is no consensus in~~ RAN1 postpones the discussion whether to have the access barring indication in DCI scheduling SIB1, and if deemed necessary, RAN1 can come back. |
| FL4 |  | Following agreement was achieved in the GTW session on 20th August:  Conclusion:   * There is no consensus in RAN1 on whether to have the access barring indication in DCI scheduling SIB1, and RAN1 can come back if triggered by RAN2.   Therefore, the discussion on this topic is closed in this RAN1 meeting. |
|  |  |  |

A number of contributions discuss what kind of system information indication is necessary, which would be discussed in RAN2. One contribution [1] suggests the indication whether NW supports RedCap Ues accessing or not is necessary, and different cell selection/reselection time for 1Rx or 2Rx can be configured by gNB. Some other contributions [16, 17] propose the access control specific to RedCap Ues with 1Rx or 2Rx. Another contribution [31] suggests that gNB can deprioritize RedCap Ues e.g. with 1-Rx capability by configuring lower RACH opportunity.

# Necessary updates of UE capabilities and RRC parameters

The WID [35] has the following objective on the necessary updates of UE capabilities and RRC parameters:

|  |
| --- |
| * Specify necessary updates of UE capabilities (38.306) and RRC parameters (38.331). [RAN2] |

One contribution [6] suggests RAN1 starts the email discussion on the UE features for RedCap Ues after RAN1#106e-meeting considering that only a few meetings are left before the end of Rle-17 and we do not have enough Tus to discuss the massive features. It is moderator’s understanding that Rel-17 UE feature discussion will start from RAN1#106bis-e meeting while the applicability of existing UE features to RedCap Ues can be discussed even before that, as we have done for some parts of them, such as basic BWP operation FG6-1, compact DCI, MCS/CQI tables, 2-step RACH, etc.

As discussed in the last RAN1 meeting, some contributions [11, 22] suggest agreeing on the following proposal, while some others [18, 29, 30] suggest further discussion on what features are applicable to RedCap Ues is necessary term by term. Another contribution [28] suggests all UE capabilities other than those related to carrier aggregation, dual connectivity and wider bandwidths can be supported by RedCap UE either as mandatory or as optional unless precluded by a specific RedCap feature. Some contributions [27, 29] also suggest RedCap Ues do not support the capabilities related to the carrier aggregation, dual connectivity, and wider bandwidths.

|  |
| --- |
| **Medium Priority Proposal 5-1:**   * For the necessary updates of UE capabilities, current definition of mandatory/optional support of L1 UE capabilities in TS38.306 is reused for RedCap Ues by default unless any update is identified   + Note: UE capabilities related to CA, DC and wider max UE bandwidth are not applicable to RedCap Ues |

In addition, some contributions [27, 28, 29] suggest at least for the features that are mandatory without capability signalling for non-RedCap Ues, the RedCap Ues should support mandatorily with the same value. Following features are also discussed:

* maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH: Optional [27, 28]
* pdsch-256QAM-FR1: Optional [27, 28]
* csi-RS-RLM, additionalActiveTCI-StatePDCCH/additionalActiveSpatialRelationPUCCH: Optional [27]
* oneFL-DMRS-TwoAdditionalDMRS-UL, spatialBundlingHARQ-ACK: Not necessary [27]
* Capabilities related to power saving: FFS whether RedCap Ues mandatorily support [27]
* Capabilities related to the processing timeline: Use the same value as the one for non-RedCap Ues [27]
* Capabilities related to the SUL: Not necessary [28], further discuss whether there are any additional issues in order to optionally support SUL for RedCap, e.g. switching time to be discussed in RAN4 [32]
* Rel-16 UE capabilities: FFS [28]
* FG 6-1a (BWP operation without restriction on BW of BWP(s)): mandatory [28]

Given the situation, we can try to agree on the following proposal modifying Proposal 5-1 in the last RAN1 meeting:

**FL2 Medium Priority Proposal 5-1:**

* For the necessary updates of UE capabilities, current definition of L1 UE capabilities mandatory without capability signaling in TS38.306 is reused for RedCap Ues by default unless any update is identified
  + Note: UE capabilities related to CA, DC and wider max UE bandwidth are not applicable to RedCap Ues
  + FFS: applicability of L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability signaling to RedCap Ues

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Y in principle | It may be important to avoid duplicated work with RAN2.  For information, RAN2 have the following agreements in the last meeting:   |  | | --- | | Agreements online:  1. RAN2 Working Assumption: by default, all non-RedCap UE capabilities are applicable for RedCap UE, and therefore only for non-RedCap capabilities that are not ignalling for RedCap UE, we clarify in the definitions for parameters in TS38.306, the value or feature is not applicable for RedCap UE  2. We will have an email discussion until the next meeting to discuss which higher layer capabilities are not applicable for RedCap Ues (it could result in a draft 38.306 CR) and how to reflect the handling of RedCap specific capabilities (e.g. Maximum BW, Max Rx, MIMO-Layer, 256QAM, CA/DC, HD-FDD, etc) | |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We support the better approach following what RAN2 is doing, which provides a default to avoid checking hundreds of capabilities one by one |
| LG | Y | We could also add:  ‘FFS: any update is needed in the current definition of L1 UE capabilities mandatory without capability signaling in TS38.306’. |
| SPRD | Y | We suggest to discuss this topic in RAN2, as mentioned by CATT. RAN1 can focus on L1 UE capabilities that need updates and leave the signaling issues to RAN2. |
| Ericsson |  | We have similar views as CATT, FUTUREWEI, and SPRD. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | We are fine with the proposal. For the mandatory feature with capability signaling and optional features, they should be discussed cases by case. |
| Intel | Y | While it would be important to avoid duplicated work across WGs, in our understanding, the L1 capabilities need to be decided by RAN1. RAN2 is only looking at the higher layer capabilities as well as some of the capabilities related to RedCap UE complexity reduction as identified in the WID.  However, RAN1 can take a similar approach as RAN2 as suggested by the proposal. |
| Vivo |  | As mentioned by CATT and others, RAN2 already has the plan to discuss the issue, we could wait a bit to avoid duplicated discussion. |
| Nordic | N | 1. RAN1 should be competent to decide how to handle own designed capabilities 2. We prefer that all the capabilities are applicable unless consensus to change.   For the necessary updates of UE capabilities, current definition of L1 UE capabilities ~~mandatory without capability signaling~~ in TS38.306 is reused for RedCap Ues by default unless any update is identified   * 1. Note: UE capabilities related to CA, DC and wider max UE bandwidth are not applicable to RedCap Ues |
| Qualcomm | Y | @FL, thanks for the summary. A minor comment on our side:   * In terms of “current definition”, does it refer to NR R15/16 only ? Or, NR R17 is also included ? |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y | We generally support FL proposal. |
| NEC |  | Agree with CATT, FUTUREWEI, SPRD and Ericsson. Fine with proposal from Nordic. |
| Xiaomi | Y | Same view with Intel |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| FL3 |  | Based on the comments provided so far, some companies (CATT, SPRD, Ericsson, vivo, NEC) think it’s better to wait RAN2 progress. However, as pointed out by Intel and Xiaomi, RAN2 is discussing only higher layer capabilities as well as some of the capabilities related to RedCap UE complexity reduction as identified in the WID. L1 capabilities should be discussed in RAN1.  Some companies (FUTUREWEI, Nordic, NEC) prefer original proposal in the last RAN1 meeting (including all L1 UE capabilities), but it was not agreed due to strong concern from some companies. Moderator thinks current proposal is reasonable middle-ground among companies for now, and FFS part can be discussed further.  @LG: The proposed FFS would be included in “unless any update is identified” in the main bullet  @Qualcomm: “current definition” refers to NR R15/16 only because there is no “current definition” for Rel-17 UE capabilities in TS38.306  Therefore, we can try following proposal with some update based on the comment from companies:  **Medium Priority Proposal 5-1:**   * For the necessary updates of UE capabilities, current definition of Rel-15/16 L1 UE capabilities mandatory without capability signaling in TS38.306 is reused for RedCap Ues by default unless any update is identified   + Note: UE capabilities related to CA, DC and wider max UE bandwidth are not applicable to RedCap Ues   + FFS: applicability of L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability signaling to RedCap Ues |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK |  |
| CATT | Y | OK if it helps progress. Suggest minor revision:  **Medium Priority Proposal 5-1:**   * For the ~~necessary updates of~~  RedCap UE capabilities, current definition of Rel-15/16 L1 UE capabilities mandatory without capability signaling in TS38.306 is reused ~~for RedCap Ues~~ by default, unless any necessary update is identified   + Note: UE capabilities related to CA, DC and wider max UE bandwidth are not applicable to RedCap Ues   + FFS: applicability of L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability signaling to RedCap Ues   PS: Another question, though not related to the proposal and may be discuss later, does SUL precluded by the Note (WID)? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK with modification | From our understanding, TS38.306 mainly refers to those capabilities with capability ignallin. It is suggested that TS38.306 can be changed as TS38.822. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | OK | Agree but with ZTE suggestion. |
| FUTUREWEI3 |  | The same type of edits should be applied to the FFS  FFS: whether any ~~applicability of~~ L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability signaling are not applicable to RedCap Ues |
| Ericsson | Y, as WA | This can be a working assumption, pending RAN2 confirmation. |
| NEC |  | Ok if this proposal helps the progress. Our preference would be RAN1 takes the same approach as RAN2 regarding other L1 capabilities. |
| FL |  | Thank you very much for the flexibility of so many companies!  Then, can we try to agree on the proposal as working assumption with some modification?  **Medium Priority Proposed working assumption 5-1:**   * For the ~~necessary updates of~~ RedCap UE capabilities, current definition of Rel-15/16 L1 UE capabilities mandatory without capability signaling in ~~TS38.306~~TR38.822 is reused ~~for RedCap Ues~~ by default, unless any necessary update is identified   + Note: UE capabilities related to CA, DC and wider max UE bandwidth are not applicable to RedCap Ues   + FFS: whether any ~~applicability of~~ L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability signaling are not applicable to RedCap Ues   P.S. @CATT: Maybe companies have different understanding but FL thinks it is not explicitly precluded by the note in WID ”This WI focuses on SA mode and single connectivity with operation in a single band at a time”, as UL/SUL do not operate simultaneously. For your reference, some contributions discuss this aspect:   * Capabilities related to the SUL: Not necessary [28], further discuss whether there are any additional issues in order to optionally support SUL for RedCap, e.g. switching time to be discussed in RAN4 [32] |
| FL4 |  | This proposal couldn’t be discussed in the GTW session on 20th August due to lack of time.  If not provided yet, companies are invited to provide their view on the proposal (same as FL3) copied below.  **Medium Priority Proposed working assumption 5-1:**   * For the ~~necessary updates of~~ RedCap UE capabilities, current definition of Rel-15/16 L1 UE capabilities mandatory without capability signaling in ~~TS38.306~~TR38.822 is reused ~~for RedCap Ues~~ by default, unless any necessary update is identified   + Note: UE capabilities related to CA, DC and wider max UE bandwidth are not applicable to RedCap Ues   + FFS: whether any ~~applicability of~~ L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability signaling are not applicable to RedCap Ues |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK |  |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |  |
| vivo | Y | We are fine to make a WA |
| Nordic | N | our concern/comment was not addressed we still cannot support. |
| SPRD | Y in principle | Regarding the FFS, we prefer the previous version   * + FFS: applicability of L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability signaling to RedCap Ues |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI4 | Y | Our preference is captured in Nordic’s earlier comments  For the necessary updates of UE capabilities, current definition of L1 UE capabilities ~~mandatory without capability signaling~~ in TS38.306 is reused for RedCap Ues by default unless any update is identified |
| Intel | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| FL5 |  | **@Nordic, (FUTUREWEI):** Let me copy previous moderator’s comment here. Can you live with current proposal as working assumption?  *Some companies (FUTUREWEI, Nordic, NEC) prefer original proposal in the last RAN1 meeting (including all L1 UE capabilities), but it was not agreed due to strong concern from some companies. Moderator thinks current proposal is reasonable middle-ground among companies for now, and FFS part can be discussed further.*  **@SPRD:** Is your intention to include the possibility that RedCap Ues may support existing L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability signaling with different value(s)? If so, moderator agrees that previous version seems better to clarify the intention.  Given most of companies are generally fine with the proposal, let’s try to agree the following proposal at the 2nd check point on 24th August (FFS part is revised to previous version based on the comment from SPRD). If you have **strong concern** on agreeing this proposal as working ssumption, please indicate asap  **Medium Priority Proposed working assumption 5-1:**   * For the RedCap UE capabilities, current definition of Rel-15/16 L1 UE capabilities mandatory without capability signaling in TR38.822 is reused by default, unless any necessary update is identified   + Note: UE capabilities related to CA, DC and wider max UE bandwidth are not applicable to RedCap Ues   + FFS: applicability of L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability signaling to RedCap Ues |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | We are fine with the FL’s proposal. Mandatory capabilities without capability signaling can be supported firstly.  Regarding mandatory/optional with capability signaling capabilities, not all the capabilities should be supported by default, since there are lots of RAN1 impacts or RAN4 impacts needed to be confirmed.  Considering the limited Tus in release 17 and massive efforts for confirming the capabilities for RedCap online, it is suggested to discuss mandatory/optional with capability signaling capabilities by email case by case after this meeting. |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| SPRD | Y | @FL, yes, that is our intention.  We are fine with the proposal and also support ZTE’s suggestion to discuss mandatory/optional capabilities with ignalling by email. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| FL |  | The proposal is updated based on the discussion over RAN1 reflector.  **Medium Priority Proposed working assumption 5-1:**   * For the RedCap UE capabilities, current definition of Rel-15/16 L1 UE capabilities mandatory without capability ignalling in TR38.822 is reused by default, unless any necessary update is identified   + Note: UE capabilities related to CA, DC and wider max UE bandwidth are not applicable to RedCap Ues   + FFS: whether any L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability ignalling are not applicable to RedCap Ues |
| FL6 |  | This proposal couldn’t be discussed in the GTW session on 24th August due to lack of time.  Based on the discussion over RAN1 reflector and the comments provided so far, only one company (Nordic) still has strong concern but can live with the proposal if following modification is applied. I guess the intention would be kept even if the text is modified accordingly. Let’s check whether it is OK for companies.  **Medium Priority Proposed working assumption 5-1:**   * For the RedCap UE capabilities, current definition of Rel-15/16 L1 UE capabilities mandatory without capability ignalling in TR38.822 is reused by default, ~~unless any necessary update is identified~~ unless any update is agreed   + Note: UE capabilities related to CA, DC and wider max UE bandwidth are not applicable to RedCap Ues   + FFS: whether any L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability ignalling are not applicable to RedCap Ues |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI6 | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| SPRD | Y | We understand the concern of Futurewei. To make progress we are OK with this version. |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | All these aspects are being discussed in RAN2, and this proposed working assumption matches the baseline assumption in RAN2.  If the proposed working assumption can be agreed quickly as a working assumption, that might be good. However, if it is not easily agreed as a working assumption, perhaps RAN1 can prioritize spending time on other topics/Ais. Since the WI objective about RedCap UE type definition is RAN2-led, and RAN2 has not asked RAN1 for input, there may in practice not be a large need for this proposed working assumption.  If RAN1 has some input on what features cannot be supported (e.g., in the next meeting), that will be good input to RAN2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y AND | On one hand, agree with Ericsson.  On the other hand, would like to emphasize that even with the proposal agreed/concluded, it is not expected to be used as a tool for barring further discussion aiming to fix technical issues. By default is by default.  (given discussion occurred in the GTW our concern arises e.g. for the discussion of FG6-1 or FG6-1a ) |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| FL7 |  | **@SPRD:** Thank you very much for your flexibility!  All companies agree with the proposal, and thus, the proposal can be agreed in the next GTW session quickly. No further comments are required unless any critical issue is found.  **Medium Priority Proposed working assumption 5-1:**   * For the RedCap UE capabilities, current definition of Rel-15/16 L1 UE capabilities mandatory without capability ignalling in TR38.822 is reused by default, unless any update is agreed   + Note: UE capabilities related to CA, DC and wider max UE bandwidth are not applicable to RedCap Ues   + FFS: whether any L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability ignalling are not applicable to RedCap Ues |
| Qualcomm | Y | Support FL7 proposal |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI7 | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | Some L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability ignalling may need some modification, such as candidate value change. It is hoped that this proposal is open to this kind of discussion.  @FL, considering the limited Tus in release 17 and massive efforts for confirming the capabilities for RedCap online, **it is suggested to discuss mandatory/optional with capability signaling capabilities by email case by case after this meeting**. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| SPRD | Y |  |
| LG | Y | Editorial correction on 44 is needed. |
| Ericsson | Y | All these aspects are being discussed in RAN2, and this proposed working assumption matches the baseline assumption in RAN2.  If the proposed working assumption can be agreed quickly as a working assumption, that might be good. However, if it is not easily agreed as a working assumption, perhaps RAN1 can prioritize spending time on other topics/Ais. Since the WI objective about RedCap UE type definition is RAN2-led, and RAN2 has not asked RAN1 for input, there may in practice not be a large need for this proposed working assumption.  If RAN1 has some input on what features cannot be supported (e.g., in the next meeting), that will be good input to RAN2. |
|  |  | No strong concern has been received for more than 24 hours. Therefore, following proposal can be quickly agreed in the GTW session.  **Medium Priority Proposed working assumption 5-1:**   * For the RedCap UE capabilities, current definition of Rel-15/16 L1 UE capabilities mandatory without capability signalling in TR38.822 is reused by default, unless any update is agreed   + Note: UE capabilities related to CA, DC and wider max UE bandwidth are not applicable to RedCap UEs   + FFS: whether any L1 UE capabilities mandatory/optional with capability signalling are not applicable to RedCap UEs |
|  |  |  |

# Other aspects

**SI framework (other than system information indication in Section 4)**

* Study a mechanism for scheduling new SIB1 (e.g. SIB1-R) used by REDCAP Ues [17]
  + When CORESET0 is configured to be shared between RedCap Ues and non-RedCap Ues, the DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI can be used to schedule both legacy SIB1 and new SIB1-R.
* gNB may provide different configurations for transmissions of other SI for REDCAP Ues and non-REDCAP Ues. (e.g. AL or separate DL BWP) [17]
  + REDCAP specific RACH resources can be configured for gNB to transmit on-demand SI message
* Reuse existing SIB1 to incorporate the new system information for RedCap [33]
  + consider the following options to improve the power efficiency during system information updating
    - Option 1: Define separate systeminfoModification field in paging DCI.
    - Option 2: Paging messages of RedCap devices and non-RedCap devices are not multiplexed in the same paging resource

**Measurement related issues by reduced number of Rx branches [13]**

* RedCap Ues specific RSRP thresholds are configured by gNB for SSB and UL carrier selection for performing random access
* Measurement related thresholds are configured specifically for RedCap Ues with reduced Rx branches number
* Send an LS to RAN2 to inform the above measurement related issues

# LS to RAN2 informing RAN1 agreements

Since an agreement in AI8.6.2 was achieved in the GTW session on 18th August, an LS to RAN2 would be beneficial to inform them RAN2-related agreements, similar to RAN1#105-e.

|  |
| --- |
| Send an LS to RAN2 informing them the above working assumption and the agreement for early indication, possibly also RAN2-related agreements – Shinya (DCM)  [**R1-2106216**](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_105\Docs\R1-2106216.zip)          [Draft] LS on RAN1 agreements on RAN2-led features for RedCap NTT DOCOMO  Which is approved, with final LS in [R1-2106329](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_105\Docs\R1-2106329.zip). |

**FL2 Medium Priority Proposal 7-1:**

* Send an LS to RAN2 informing RAN2-related agreements in AI8.6.2 in RAN1#106-e
  + FFS details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | Generally fine with sending LS to RAN2, but prefer to determine the content of the LS in the next week. Ideally we can have an LS to RAN2 to include all the agreements with potential higher layer impact from different sub-agenda items. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Nordic |  | If LS should be send on Friday next week, then no need, RAN2 can read RAN1 agreements before next meeting. |
| Ericsson | Y | The LS can be sent towards the end of the meeting. |
| FUTUREWEI2 | Y | The LS can be sent at end of meeting |
| Qualcomm | Y | To improve the efficiency of team work, RAN1 agreements/conclusions for RAN2-led discussions can be sent to RAN2 when available. |
| Sierra Wireless |  | LS’s which only include copied RAN1 agreements are not needed. |
| CATT | Y | But can be sent at the end of the meeting, collecting all related RAN1 agreements. |
| China Telecom | Y | We are fine with sending an LS to RAN2 if indeed needed. |
| NEC | Y | LS would help RAN2 progress. |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| SPRD | Y | We are fine with sending an LS to RAN2. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| FL3 |  | Based on the comments provides so far, most companies fine with sending an LS to RAN2. Since we sent an LS to RAN2 at the end of the last RAN1 meeting to include all of the RAN2-related agreements, we can follow the same principle.  Therefore, can we agree on the following proposal? The contents in the LS will be decided at the end of this RAN1 meeting. Note that “in AI8.6.2” is modified to “in AI8.6” as all RAN2-related agreements under AI8.6 can be included similar to last time.  **Medium Priority Proposal 7-1:**   * Send an LS to RAN2 informing RAN2-related agreements in AI8.6~~.2~~ in RAN1#106-e   + FFS details |
| CATT | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI3 | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| LG | Y | If a majority of companies prefer to send an LS to RAN2, we are fine to send it. |
| FL |  | All companies are fine with the proposal. Let’s agree on this proposal in the GTW session on 20th August. |
| FL4 |  | Following agreement was achieved in the GTW session on 20th August:  Agreement   * Send an LS to RAN2 informing RAN2-related agreements in AI8.6~~.2~~ in RAN1#106-e   + FFS details   Let’s discuss the contents of LS in next week. |
|  |  |  |

Draft LS with the following LS text is provided in the following folder, which can be updated based on further agreements to be made in RAN1#106-e. Note that the LS text is exactly the same as that in the last RAN1 meeting except for the agreement/conclusions in this RAN1 meeting.

* <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Inbox/drafts/8.6.2/LS>

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Overall description   RAN1 discussed RAN1 aspects on RAN2-led features for RedCap and agreed to send RAN2-related agreements/working assumptions/conclusions to RAN2 to facilitate their work on RAN2-led features for RedCap. RAN1 respectfully asks RAN2 to take the agreements/working assumptions/conclusions into account in their further work on RAN2-led features for RedCap and provide feedback, if any.  Followings are the agreement/conclusions on RAN1 aspects on RAN2-led features for RedCap made in RAN1#106-e meeting:   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  Confirm the following working assumption with the modifications in red:   * For 4-step RACH, support the early indication of RedCap UEs at least in Msg1.   + The early indication in Msg1 can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB     - ~~FFS how to support enable/disable the early indication~~   + ~~FFS details e.g.:~~ From RAN1 perspective, the following methods can be used for early indication both for shared initial UL BWP and separate initial UL BWP (if supported)     - separate PRACH resource     - PRACH preamble partitioning     - ~~FFS: whether/how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue~~   + ~~FFS the possibility of supporting Msg3 for the early indication~~   Whether/how to support early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 in Rel-17 is up to RAN2.  Conclusion   * Whether there is RA-RNTI overlapping issue and how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue in the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg1 in Rel-17 is up to RAN2.   Conclusion   * There is no consensus in RAN1 on whether to have the access barring indication in DCI scheduling SIB1, and RAN1 can come back if triggered by RAN2. |   For reference, RAN1 also agreed following RAN2-related agreements in RAN1#106-e meeting:   |  | | --- | | TBD |   2 Actions  **To RAN2:**  **ACTION:** RAN1 respectfully asks RAN2 to take the above into account in their further work on RAN2-led features for RedCap and provide feedback, if any. |

**FL7 Medium Priority Question 7-2:**

* **Companies are invited to provide text proposals on potential updates of the above LS text (if necessary).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FL7 | The LS text is made based on the agreements which we had made in AI8.6.2. It can be updated based on further agreements to be made in this RAN1 meeting.  Also, any RAN2-related agreements which is worth informing them for their future work can be included in the draft LS. Companies are also invited to provide such agreements, if any. |
| Vivo | At least the following agreement should be included as it is related to SIB configuration  **Agreement**   * In case a separate initial UL BWP is configured for RedCap Ues, it is supported that the network can enable/disable intra-slot PUCCH frequency hopping within the separate initial UL BWP in the PUCCH resource for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB for RedCap Ues.   + Working assumption: The frequency hopping is enabled/disabled at least via SIB.     And there are several other pending proposals in 8.6.1.1 that may have RAN2 impact, we may need to wait until the end of this meeting. |
| Qualcomm | Support the draft LS.  We also agree with the suggestion of Vivo to include the RAN1 agreements related to SI/RRC signaling in the LS. The design of RedCap-specific Ies (if supported) is in the scope of RAN2. |
| Nordic | Y including VIVO proposal |
| FUTUREWEI7 | We are not opposed to it. We also have the SR to RAN plenary which will capture the agreements at nearly the same time the LS becomes available. |
| CATT | Fine to add the agreement in 8.6.1.1 as suggested by vivo. Also agree that we should wait till the end of this meeting.  Scaling factor for L2 buffer was discussed in 8.6.1.4, but no consensus or conclusion was reached. Therefore seems no need to include this part in the LS. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | UE type definition (Proposal 2-1a) and UE capability ( Proposed working assumption 5-1) are also need to be included if they are approved. |
| CMCC | OK to include vivo’s proposal, and agree with FL that further agreements to be made in this RAN1 meeting can be added later. |
| Apple | We should try to include all agreements made for Redcap if they have RAN2 impacts to avoid multiple LS. Therefore, suggest holding a bit on the LS content discussion. It should not be controversial and can be easily converged.  On Redcap device type definition, we do not see the necessity to add into LS to RAN2 due to FFS and brackets. We should complete the discussion and send a complete information to RAN2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Share the view with FUTUREWEI.  There would be many agreements that can be included –which seems easier to use SR.  Regarding the WA quoted by vivo, I’m not sure the early identification related WA in the last meeting was informed to RAN2 or not, but I think in general WA does not need to be send to RAN2 – as it may be changed later. |
| China Telecom | It would be better to make this LS until the end of the RAN1 meeting. Maybe SR is another easy way to inform to RAN2. |
| SPRD | Support the draft LS and agree with vivo to include other RAN1 agreements which have RAN2 impact. |
| Ericsson | The agreement on PUCCH frequency hopping mentioned by Vivo can be added. |
| FL8 | Based on the commnents provided so far, following agreement is included in the draft LS.  **Agreement**   * In case a separate initial UL BWP is configured for RedCap Ues, it is supported that the network can enable/disable intra-slot PUCCH frequency hopping within the separate initial UL BWP in the PUCCH resource for HARQ feedback for Msg4/MsgB for RedCap UEs.   + Working assumption: The frequency hopping is enabled/disabled at least via SIB.   The updated draft LS is provided in the following folder:   * <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Inbox/drafts/8.6.2/LS>   Note that moderator would ask chair and companies to approve the draft LS when all the related agreements are ready, i.e., end of this RAN1 meeting. Until that time, draft LS will be updated based on the comments from companies.  Companies are invited to provide any other agreements which should be included in the LS, if any. |
| Ericsson | This draft LS looks OK.  [R1-210xxxx LS on RAN1 agreements on RAN2-led features for RedCap-v001-moderator.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Inbox/drafts/8.6.2/LS/R1-210xxxx%20LS%20on%20RAN1%20agreements%20on%20RAN2-led%20features%20for%20RedCap-v001-moderator.docx) |

# Conclusions

[To be updated]

Following agreements/conclusions were made in [106-e-NR-R17-RedCap-05]:

**Agreement:**

Confirm the following working assumption with the modifications in red:

* For 4-step RACH, support the early indication of RedCap UEs at least in Msg1.
  + The early indication in Msg1 can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB
    - ~~FFS how to support enable/disable the early indication~~
  + ~~FFS details e.g.:~~ From RAN1 perspective, the following methods can be used for early indication both for shared initial UL BWP and separate initial UL BWP (if supported)
    - separate PRACH resource
    - PRACH preamble partitioning
    - ~~FFS: whether/how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue~~
  + ~~FFS the possibility of supporting Msg3 for the early indication~~

Whether/how to support early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 in Rel-17 is up to RAN2

Conclusion

* Whether there is RA-RNTI overlapping issue and how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue in the early indication of RedCap UEs in Msg1 in Rel-17 is up to RAN2.

Agreement

* Send an LS to RAN2 informing RAN2-related agreements in AI8.6~~.2~~ in RAN1#106-e
  + FFS details

Conclusion:

* There is no consensus in RAN1 on whether to have the access barring indication in DCI scheduling SIB1, and RAN1 can come back if triggered by RAN2.

# Annex: Companies’ point of contact

**FL1 Question: Please consider entering contact info below for the points of contact for this email discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point of contact** | **Email address** |
| vivo | Xueming Pan | [panxueming@vivo.com](mailto:panxueming@vivo.com) |
| CATT | Yongqiang FEI | [feiyongqiang@catt.cn](mailto:feiyongqiang@catt.cn) |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yuantao Zhang | [zhangyt18@lenovo.com](mailto:zhangyt18@lenovo.com) |
| Xiaomi | Qin MU | [muqin@xiaomi.com](mailto:muqin@xiaomi.com) |
| China Telecom | Jing Guo | [guojing6@chinatelecom.cn](mailto:guojing6@chinatelecom.cn) |
| Nordic | Karol Schober | [karol.schober@nordicsemi.no](mailto:karol.schober@nordicsemi.no) |
| Ericsson | Johan Bergman | [johan.bergman@ericsson.com](mailto:johan.bergman@ericsson.com) |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Youjun Hu | [hu.youjun1@zte.com.cn](mailto:hu.youjun1@zte.com.cn) |
| Intel | Debdeep Chatterjee | [debdeep.chatterjee@intel.com](mailto:debdeep.chatterjee@intel.com) |
| Sierra Wireless | Serkan Dost | [sdost@sierrawireless.com](mailto:sdost@sierrawireless.com) |
| CMCC | Lijie Hu | [hulijie@chinamobile.com](mailto:hulijie@chinamobile.com) |
| FUTUREWEI | Vip Desai | [vipul.desai@futurewei.com](mailto:vipul.desai@futurewei.com) |
| Sharp | Liqing Liu | [liu.liqing@sharp.co.jp](mailto:liu.liqing@sharp.co.jp) |
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