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# 1 Introduction

This feature lead (FL) summary (FLS) concerns the Rel-18 study item (SI) on further NR RedCap UE complexity reduction [1, 2, 3]. This Rel-18 study item was preceded by a Rel-17 study item [4] and a Rel-17 work item [5].

This document captures the email discussion for the TR skeleton for the new study item:

|  |
| --- |
| [109-e-R18-RedCap-01] Email discussion and approval of TR skeleton for Rel-18 SI on further NR RedCap (reduced capability) UE complexity reduction by May 13 – Johan (Ericsson) |

The issues in this document are tagged and color coded with High Priority or Medium Priority. The issues that are in the focus of this round of the discussion are furthermore tagged FL1.

Follow the naming convention in this example:

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

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

* Assume CompanyC wants to update *eRedCapSkeletonFLS -v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*.
* CompanyC uploads an empty file named *eRedCapSkeletonFLS -v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.checkout*
* CompanyC checks that no one else has created a checkout file simultaneously, and if there is a collision, CompanyC tries to coordinate with the company who made the other checkout (see, e.g., contact list below).
* CompanyC then has 30 minutes to upload *eRedCapSkeletonFLS -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 16 in [R1-2203012](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_109-e/Docs/R1-2203012.zip)), otherwise the sorting of the files will be messed up (which can only be fixed by the RAN1 secretary).

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

**FL1 Question 1-1a: Please consider entering contact info below for the points of contact for this email discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point of contact** | **Email address** |
| FUTUREWEI | Vip Desai | vipul.desai@futurewei.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 2 Discussion

A draft skeleton for TR 38.865 (“Study on further NR RedCap UE complexity reduction”) has been provided in [3]. To a large extent, the structure of the draft TR skeleton follows the structure of TR 38.875 [4].

**FL1 High Priority Question 2-1a: Can the draft TR skeleton be approved? Please provide any comments you might have on the TR skeleton in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | N | Though we appreciate the rapporteur efforts to add explanatory notes, any aspects that don’t have consensus should be removed for now. For example, network capacity and spectral efficiency are not part of the SID and should be removed (6.3, 9). For coverage aspects, there is no *recovery* objective in the SID, so if RAN1 decides in 9.6.1 or 9.6.2 to do a link budget for say 5MHz RF devices, relevant sections should use a term like analysis rather than recovery. For performance aspects, at this point the subheadings should all be removed. Finally, we would suggest that the “Analysis of coexistence with legacy UEs” subsections be updated to “Analysis of network and coexistence aspects” to better align with the SID. |
| Spreadtrum |  | **Comments 1:** Share the similar views as FUTUREWEI, it seems that “coverage recovery” is out of SID scope. For coverage part, we just need to identify the performance loss for each solution, and compare the advantages and disadvantages, and then make decisions (specify it or not in WI) for the solution.  **Question 1:** If the impact of memory cost can be captured in the TR (e.g., qualitative description, without any update for the current methodology), which chapter is suitable to collect the information, e.g., 7.x.2 Analysis of UE complexity reduction? |
|  |  |  |
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