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# 1 Introduction

This feature lead (FL) summary (FLS) concerns the Rel-18 work item (WI) on enhanced support of reduced capability (RedCap) NR devices [1, 2]. FLSs from the previous RAN1 meeting can be found in [3, 4, 5, 6], and a RAN1 agreement summary is available in [7].

The core part of the WI [1] has the following objective and notes related to further reduced UE complexity:

|  |
| --- |
| **Complexity/cost reduction**   * Further reduced UE complexity in FR1 [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]   + UE BB bandwidth reduction     - 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for PDSCH (for both unicast and broadcast) and PUSCH, with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL     - The other physical channels and signals are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF+BB bandwidth.     - Support additional separate early indication(s) [RAN1, RAN2]   + UE peak data rate reduction     - Relaxation of the constraint (*vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4) for peak data rate reduction     - The relaxed constraint is, e.g., 1 (instead of 4).     - The parameters (*vLayers*, *Qm*, *f*) can be as in Rel-17 RedCap.   + Both 15 kHz SCS and 30 kHz SCS are supported.   + Aim to define at most one Rel-18 RedCap UE type for further UE complexity reduction.   + The existing UE capability framework is used, and changes to capability signalling are specified only if necessary. By default, all UE capabilities applicable to a Rel-17 RedCap UE are applicable unless otherwise specified.   Notes:   * The work defined as part of this WI is not to overlap with LPWA use cases. * Coexistence with non-RedCap UEs and Rel-17 RedCap UEs should be ensured. * This WI considers all applicable duplex modes unless otherwise specified.   Check in RAN#99 regarding:   * Whether UE peak data rate reduction for UE is limited only with UE BB bandwidth reduction or standalone |

This document summarizes contributions [9] – [35] submitted to agenda item 9.6.1 and the following email discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| [112-R18-RedCap] To be used for sharing updates on online/offline schedule, details on what is to be discussed in online/offline sessions, Tdoc number of the moderator summary for online session, etc – 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 discussion round are furthermore tagged FL9. The FLSs for previous rounds can be found in [37, 38, 39].

Follow the naming convention in this example:

* *eRedCapFLS4-v000.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS4-v001-CompanyA.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS4-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS4-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 *eRedCapFLS4-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*.
* CompanyC uploads an empty file named *eRedCapFLS4-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 *eRedCapFLS4-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 12 in [R1-2300003](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112/Docs/R1-2300003.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.  
 **FL9 Question 1-1a: Please consider entering contact info below for the points of contact for this email discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point(s) of contact** | **Email address(es)** |
| vivo | Lihui Wang | wanglihui@vivo.com |
| CATT | Yongqiang Fei | feiyongqiang@catt.cn |
| Intel | Yingyang Li | yingyang.li@intel.com |
| Nordic | Karol Schober | karol.schober@nordicsemi.no |
| FUTUREWEI | Vipul Desai | vipul.desai@futurewei.com |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Youjun Hu | hu.youjun1@zte.com.cn |
| Spreadtrum | Sicong Zhao | Sicong.zhao@unisoc.com |
| Nokia, NSB | Rapeepat Ratasuk | rapeepat.ratasuk@nokia.com |
| Panasonic | Shotaro Maki | maki.shotaro@jp.panasonic.com |
| Qualcomm | Yongjun Kwak | yongkwak@qti.qualcomm.com |
| NEC | Takahiro Sasaki | takahiro.sasaki@nec.com |
| NTT DOCOMO | Mayuko Okano | mayuko.okano.ca@nttdocomo.com |
| Sierra Wireless | Serkan Dost | sdost@sierrawireless.com |
| CMCC | Lijie Hu | hulijie@chinamobile.com |
| LG Electronics | Seungjin Ahn | seungjin.ahn@lge.com |
| Xiaomi | Xuemei Qiao | qiaoxuemei@xiaomi.com |
| Ericsson | Sandeep Narayanan Kadan Veedu | sandeep.narayanan.kadan.veedu@ericsson.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Frank LONG | frank.longyi@huawei.com |
| MediaTek | Chiou-Wei Tsai | cw.tsai@mediatek.com |
| Sequans | Efstathios Katranaras | ekatranaras@sequans.com |
| Lenovo | Yuantao Zhang | zhangyt18@lenovo.com |
| OPPO | Zhisong Zuo | zuozhisong@oppo.com |

# 2 UE BB bandwidth reduction

2.0 Earlier agreements

RAN1 has made the following agreements for UE BB bandwidth reduction [7]:

|  |
| --- |
| **Initial BWP**  Agreement:  For a cell supporting both Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UEs,   * The Rel-18 RedCap UEs can share the same separate initial DL/UL BWP as the Rel-17 RedCap UEs. * FFS: whether to support an additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap UEs   **Number of PRBs**  Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for PUSCH, down-select between the following options for the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can transmit per slot or per hop, if applicable:   * Option 3: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS * Option 4: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 11 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS   For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for PDSCH (for both unicast and broadcast), down-select between the following options for the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can process per slot:   * Option 3: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS * Option 4: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 11 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS   Same option will be selected for both PDSCH and PUSCH.  **PUSCH bandwidth**  Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, a UE is not expected to receive an UL grant in a DCI with a PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.  Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, a UE is not expected to be configured with a CG grant with a PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.  Agreement:  For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to receive an UL grant in a RAR or in a DCI scrambled with TC-RNTI with a Msg3 PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.  **UE post-FFT buffer size**  Conclusion:  For UE BB complexity reduction, for broadcast and unicast PDSCH, RAN1 does not assume that the UE post-FFT buffer size per slot is smaller than 20 MHz  **Unicast PDSCH bandwidth**  Agreement:   * For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a DL assignment in a DCI with a unicast PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot. * The number of PRB scheduled in DCI is not larger than the maximum number of PRB agreed in previous agreement from 110b-e   **SIB1/OSI transmission**  Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for SIB1 (PDSCH),   * Allow the scheduling of SIB1 to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation)   Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for broadcast OSI (PDSCH),   * Allow the scheduling of broadcast OSI (PDSCH) to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation)     Conclusion:  For UE BB complexity reduction, broadcast of separate SIB1/OSI (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs is not supported.  **Paging bandwidth**  Agreement:  From RAN1 perspective, for UE BB complexity reduction, for paging channel (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, allow the scheduling of paging channel to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation).  **RAR bandwidth**  Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for RAR (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot.   * When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is within the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot, the legacy time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission (not smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 ms) is applied. * When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot,   + The UE receives the RAR and correspondingly transmits Msg3 if the TDRA for Msg3 in UL grant in RAR indicates that the time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission is NOT smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms.     - FFS: value(s) of X   + Otherwise, the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation. * Note: it does not mean early indication is needed * Note: it will not be used as example for unicast PDSCH |

2.1 Max number of PRBs

RAN1 has made the following agreement regarding the maximum number of PRBs for PUSCH and PDSCH [7]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for PUSCH, down-select between the following options for the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can transmit per slot or per hop, if applicable:   * Option 3: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS * Option 4: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 11 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS   For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for PDSCH (for both unicast and broadcast), down-select between the following options for the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can process per slot:   * Option 3: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS * Option 4: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 11 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS   Same option will be selected for both PDSCH and PUSCH. |

Contributions [9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 30, 33, 34, 35] express support for Option 3, whereas contributions [11, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32] express support for Option 4. Furthermore, contribution [11] expresses that an LS needs to be sent to RAN4 to check the feasibility before some other option than Option 4 is selected.

Contribution [28] proposes to express the scheduling restriction for unicast in RB symbol units instead of PRBs.

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.1-1a: Companies are invited to indicate their preference between Options 3 and 4 on a scale from 3.0 to 4.0, where e.g.:**

* **The value 3.0 indicates a strong preference for Option 3.**
* **Values between 3.0 and 3.5 indicate a preference for Option 3 (but can live with Option 4).**
* **The value 3.5 indicates no preference between the two options.**
* **Values between 3.5 and 4.0 indicate a preference for Option 4 (but can live with Option 3).**
* **The value 4.0 indicates a strong preference for Option 4.**

**As usual, other comments are also welcome in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Value between 3.0 and 4.0** | **Comments** |
| vivo | 3.2 |  |
| Sharp | 3.9 |  |
| CATT | 3.1 |  |
| Intel | 3.0 | We have one general comments. The possible product can only takes   * 3, which is 1 layer, Qm=4 and scaling factor 0.75 * 3.2, which is 1 layer, Qm=4 and scaling factor 0.8   Do we need to consider a value other than 3 or 3.2? |
| Nordic | 4 |  |
| FUTUREWEI | 3.1 | There are many benefits of using 12 RBs (data rates for 30 kHz SCS and 15 kHz SCS become similar), support for TB scaling factor of 2 and 4 (which can help the timeline between Msg2 and Msg3). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 3.0 |  |
| Spreadtrum | 3.5 |  |
| Nokia, NSB | 3.8 |  |
| Panasonic | 3.2 |  |
| Qualcomm | 3.75 |  |
| DOCOMO | 3.2 |  |
| Sierra Wireless | 3.6 |  |
| LGE | 3.4 | Considering both 30 kHz SCS and 15 kHz SCS, support 3.4 if Option 4 is agreed and 3.2 if Option 3 is agreed. |
| CMCC | 3.2 |  |
| Xiaomi1 | 3 or 3.2 |  |
| Ericsson | 3.2 | We have a preference for Option 3. The main reason is that TBS scaling for Msg2 (PDSCH) might not be as straightforward with Option 4 as with Option 3. For example, in some cases, at least 12 PRBs are needed to apply a TBS scaling factor of 0.25. TBS scaling is important for Msg2 as it is typically one of the coverage limiting channels.  Also, Option 3 enables the UE to complete the processing of broadcast channels earlier than Option 4. Note that there is not much difference in terms of UE complexity reduction between Options 3 and 4. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 3.2 | Option 3 (12 PRBs@30kHz) is preferred because the peak of 11 PRBs can never be applicable to DFT-s-OFDM waveform. |
| MediaTek | 3.4 | We slightly prefer Option 3 for a bit better DL coverage and DFT-s-OFDM PRB allocation, but we can also accept Option 4. |
| Sequans | 3.6 |  |
| FL2 | The average of the responses is around 3.37, which expresses a stronger preference for Option 3 than Option 4. Based on this, the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 2.1-1b:**  **For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for PUSCH, select the following option for the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can transmit per slot or per hop, if applicable:**   * **Option 3: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS**   **For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for PDSCH (for both unicast and broadcast), select the following option for the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can process per slot:**   * **Option 3: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS**   **Same option will be selected for both PDSCH and PUSCH.** | |
| FL3 | The following agreement was made in the Tuesday session:  Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for PUSCH, select the following option for the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can transmit per slot or per hop, if applicable:   * Option 3: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS   For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for PDSCH (for both unicast and broadcast), select the following option for the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can process per slot:   * Option 3: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS   Note: No intention to change the RAN4 RF specifications about maximum transmission PRB number | |

2.2 Random access timeline

RAN1 has made the following agreement regarding the RAR bandwidth and Msg3 timeline [7]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for RAR (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot.   * When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is within the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot, the legacy time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission (not smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 ms) is applied. * When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot,   + The UE receives the RAR and correspondingly transmits Msg3 if the TDRA for Msg3 in UL grant in RAR indicates that the time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission is NOT smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms.     - FFS: value(s) of X   + Otherwise, the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation. * Note: it does not mean early indication is needed * Note: it will not be used as example for unicast PDSCH |

In the above agreement, the value(s) for X is FFS. The contributions discuss the following main approaches:

* **Approach 1: X is dependent on the RAR PDSCH bandwidth:** Several contributions [9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 23, 25, 33, 35] express that the value of X can depend on whether the RAR PDSCH bandwidth. For example, it could be up to 3 slots (i.e., up to 3 ms for 15 kHz SCS, and up to 1.5 ms for 30 kHz SCS) depending on whether the bandwidth is in the range 5-10 MHz, 10-15 MHz, or 15-20 MHz.
* **Approach 2: X is not dependent on the RAR PDSCH bandwidth:** Several contributions [10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 25, 32, 33] express that the value of X could be fixed if it is sufficiently large in all cases. For example, it can be fixed to 1 slot or 1 ms. One contribution [32] proposes an as low value as a half slot (i.e., 0.5 ms for 15 kHz SCS, and 0.25 ms for 30 kHz SCS).
* **Approach 3: X may be zero even when RAR PDSCH is wider than 5 MHz:** One contribution [28] expresses that X can be 0 not only for the case when the RAR PDSCH bandwidth is less than 5 MHz but also when the RAR PDSCH TBS is smaller than, e.g., 1280 bits. A few other contributions [18, 33] also express that X=0 can be considered.
* **Approach 4: X is configurable by the network:** One contribution [26] proposes that X should be configurable by the network, e.g., in SIB1.
* **Approach 5: X is up to the UE implementation:** Another contribution [29] argues that the UE behavior can be up to the UE implementation and that there is no need to define X.

Contributions [14, 15] indicate that the usable number of row indices in the default PUSCH TDRA table (38.214 Table 6.1.2.1.1-2) may become too low. Contribution [14] proposes to consider larger *Δ* value(s) in case the RAR PDSCH bandwidth is larger than 5 MHz, and contribution [15] proposes to support PUSCH TDRA configuration specific to Rel-18 eRedCap UEs.

Contributions [24, 25, 32] express that the timeline for several other cases may also need to be similarly relaxed, e.g., between Msg4 and its associated HARQ feedback, between RAR and potential Msg1 retransmission, etc.

The following five questions invite companies to express preferences and comments on the five approaches listed above.

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.2-1a: Please indicate your preferences and comments on this approach:**

* **Approach 1: X is dependent on the RAR PDSCH bandwidth:** Several contributions [9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 23, 25, 33, 35] express that the value of X can depend on whether the RAR PDSCH bandwidth. For example, it could be up to 3 slots (i.e., up to 3 ms for 15 kHz SCS, and up to 1.5 ms for 30 kHz SCS) depending on whether the bandwidth is in the range 5-10 MHz, 10-15 MHz, or 15-20 MHz.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Vivo | Y | Different UE implementations should be accommodated for. So, we think the maximum value of X can be 3 slots. |
| CATT |  | We think the processing time does not grow linearly with the RAR PDSCH bandwidth. Hence it is difficult to set up a clear relationship between RAR BW and X. A single value of X is still preferred. |
| Intel | N | BW dependent X is NOT our preference. We prefer a single value for simplicity. For example, considering the worst case, X can be fixed to 3 ms for 15 kHz SCS and 1.5 ms for 30 kHz SCS. |
| Nordic | N | unnecessary complex at UE side, particularly if then scheduling offsets |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We indicated support for approach 1 but are open to support tighter values of X (approach 2) based on the observations there is reduced processing |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | For a Rel-18 RedCap UE, different RAR PDSCH bandwidth ranges (5-10 MHz, 10-15 MHz, or 15-20 MHz) require different processing time, so X should be dependent on the RAR PDSCH bandwidth and the maximum value is smaller than 3NT,1. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | Fine with this approach. Furthermore, even for this approach, the X should be sufficiently large for different BW ranges, e.g., for 15-20 MHz, the X can be 3 slots or 3N1, for 10-15 MHz, the X can be 2 slots or 2N1, etc. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We prefer to have only one value for X, but that value can be configured by the network based on its preference (e.g. to balance latency vs RAR PDSCH bandwidth limitation). |
| Panasonic | N | We think that having a fixed value (per numerology) considering the 20 MHz RAR is sufficient and beneficial for the lower complexity. The latency, which can be improved by the variable values, is not so urgent for the eRedCap UE. |
| Qualcomm | N | The RAR PDSCH processing timeline consists of BW dependent processing blocks and BW non-dependent processing blocks as given below.   * BW dependent processing blocks: channel estimation, demodulation * BW non-dependent processing blocks: LDPC decoding.   From processing time perspective, LDPC decoding is dominant over other processing blocks and it takes about 80% of the total PDSCH processing time (N1) assuming 5MHz BW resource allocation. If the BW becomes larger than 5MHz, we need to increase the processing time only for BW dependent processing blocks which take comparatively small portion of PDSCH processing time (N1). Based on this, the required time to be relaxed would not be so large even with the largest possible BW, 20MHz (just a half slot is sufficient based on our analysis) so there is little motivation to have different X values based on BW size. Furthermore, if X value changes depending on scheduled BW, there would be unnecessary complexity increase for the NW scheduling. |
| DOCOMO | Y with comments | If X can be different depending on the RAR PDSCH BW and X can be large as multiple slots, we can live with this proposal with the condition that separate early indication via Msg1 is supported. |
| LGE | Y | As up to 5MHz BW PRBs can be processed per slot by the previous agreement, it seems that the multiple values (based on slots) dependent on bandwidth is appropriate. Additionally, the effect of SCS can also be considered on the values X(s) |
| Xiaomi1 | N | Share the similar view with Intel that introducing a single value to accommodate the worst case is more preferred by us. That is, the maximum bandwidth for RAR PDSCH is 20MHz, thus additional 3 times of baseband processing except for PDCCH decoding and LDPC decoding is introduced. Thus, the X can be 3\*(NT,1-Δ), where Δ including both PDCCH decoding time and LDPC decoding time. For simplicity, 3\*Δ can be assumed equal to NT,1, thus X is equal to 2NT,1. |
| Ericsson | Y | It is fine with us that the value of X depends on the RAR bandwidth. The exact value of X can be discussed further. We would also be fine with a fixed half-slot length for X, as proposed by Qualcomm. |
| MediaTek | Y | For simplicity, we think X can be determined purely by RAR bandwidth. |
| Sequans | N | Prefer single value for simplicity at UE |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses to Questions 2.2-1a and 2.2-2b, there seems to be larger support for Approach 2 (where X is not dependent on the RAR PDSCH bandwidth) than Approach 1 (where X is dependent on the RAR PDSCH bandwidth). See new Proposal 2.2-6a further down. | |

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.2-2a: Please indicate your preferences and comments on this approach:**

* **Approach 2: X is not dependent on the RAR PDSCH bandwidth:** Several contributions [10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 25, 32, 33] express that the value of X could be fixed if it is sufficiently large in all cases. For example, it can be fixed to 1 slot or 1 ms. One contribution [32] proposes an as low value as a half slot (i.e., 0.5 ms for 15 kHz SCS, and 0.25 ms for 30 kHz SCS).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | Depends on eRedCap UE implementation whether faster process not dependent on the RAR PDSCH bandwidth is possible. |
| Sharp |  | 2nd preference |
| CATT | Y | A single value of X is simpler and considerable. We also support X=1(ms). |
| Intel | Y | Considering the worst case, X can be fixed to 3 ms for 15 kHz SCS and 1.5 ms for 30 kHz SCS. |
| Nordic | Y | we prefer fixed X, in addition to X=0, if RAR is within 5MHz |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We are open to discuss a single (tight) value of X |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | If a fixed value is defined, the maximum value for X needs to be provided, which increase the scheduling delay and decrease the time or room for RACH contention resolution. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | Also fine with this approach. Compared to approach 1, this approach may lead to a higher delay for small RAR PDSCH bandwidth cases (e.g., 10MHz) as the X should be large enough to cover larger BW case. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We prefer to have only one value for X, but that value can be configured by the network based on its preference (e.g. to balance latency vs RAR PDSCH bandwidth limitation). |
| Panasonic | Y | As commented in the Question 2.2-1a and 2.2-4a, we propose a fixed value per numerology. |
| Qualcomm | Y | As explained in **Question 2.2-1a,** we support X value not dependent on RAR PDSCH BW and proposed value is **half slot length** which can cover processing time for the BW dependent processing time (channel estimation, demodulation) if scheduled BW is up to 20MHz. |
| DOCOMO | Y with comments | If X can be large as multiple slots, we can live with this proposal with the condition that separate early indication via Msg1 is supported. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | Single value of X should be sufficient |
| LGE |  | The sufficient large value should give longest delay to UEs considering the worst case. |
| Xiaomi1 |  | We prefer a fixed value X in the specification. We propose to adopt X=2\*NT,1 to accommodate the sufficient number of RBs for RAR PDSCH. |
| Ericsson | Y | Please see our response to Q2.2-1a. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Preferred. |
| MediaTek |  | We prefer X to be dependent on RAR bandwidth but can also accept a single non-zero X value for the case when RAR bandwidth is larger than 5MHz. |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses to Questions 2.2-1a and 2.2-2b, there seems to be larger support for Approach 2 (where X is not dependent on the RAR PDSCH bandwidth) than Approach 1 (where X is dependent on the RAR PDSCH bandwidth). See new Proposal 2.2-6a further down. | |

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.2-3a: Please indicate your preferences and comments on this approach:**

* **Approach 3: X may be zero even when RAR PDSCH is wider than 5 MHz:** One contribution [28] expresses that X can be 0 not only for the case when the RAR PDSCH bandwidth is less than 5 MHz but also when the RAR PDSCH TBS is smaller than, e.g., 1280 bits. A few other contributions [18, 33] also express that X=0 can be considered.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Vivo |  | Depends on eRedCap UE implementation and whether we would like to introduce other restriction like smaller TBS. |
| Sharp | Y | Since we have agreed that some common PDSCHs (e.g. SIB1, paging PDSCH) can have bandwidths greater than 5MHz without additional handling, and that the maximum data rate of RAR PDSCH is always below 10Mbps, we believe that the processing time for RAR PDSCH does not need to be relaxed in all cases, which is beneficial for some cases, e.g.no need for additional early indication in msg1. |
| CATT | Y | We agree that the current timeline is a loose one. We are supportive if X can be 0. |
| Intel | N | We prefer to not discuss again X=0 which essentially means no processing time relaxation, which conflicts with the assumption that UE is only capable of processing up to 25 or 11(12) PRBs in a slot. |
| Nordic | Y | but as we contributed, subject to TBS reduction |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We need to consider the lowest coding rate (MCS=0, spectral efficiency of 0.2344) and the possibility of TB scaling before considering X=0 |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | If X depends on bandwidth, then X can be 0 for smaller RAR bandwidth.  If X is a fixed value, X should not be 0. |
| Spreadtrum | N | Not preferred. RAR PDSCH is a broadcast, it seems that the limitation on RAR TBS will lead to some restriction on legacy UE. X=0 without TBS restriction is not acceptable, since it requires a higher capability for PDSCH processing. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We prefer to have X that is configurable by the network, and X can be 0. |
| Panasonic | N | When RAR is larger than 5 MHz PRBs, the processing time required for the rate matching would be influenced even if the TBS is small. X should be a non-zero value. |
| Qualcomm |  | Do not support X is dependent on TBS.  But we can live with that X is always zero. Current RAR-Msg3 timeline already includes 0.5ms margin for MAC processing and another margin inside NT,2 for PDCCH decoding which is not actually needed for this case. Those margins can be used for additional processing for BW larger than 5MHz rather than explicitly increasing processing timeline. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LGE |  | The approach 3 is not preferable because most companies agreed on an additional X at the last meeting when Message 2 PDSCH is scheduled over 5MHz BW. It is thought that additional considerations of TBS size or 0 in all cases are not needed. |
| Xiaomi1 |  | X should be a fixed value in any cases. A tight timeline for Rel-18 RedCap with X=0 can also be accepted us. In this case, we recommend choosing one value for X from the set {0, m\*NT,1 (e.g., m=2)}. |
| Ericsson | Y | We support X being dependent on TBS, if this means that legacy timeline can be used in more cases (minimizing the initial gNB implementation impact) without increasing UE complexity.  Regarding whether X can be always zero, we would like to hear more views from UE/chipset vendors. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | More UE processing time is necessary because the Rel-18 RedCap UE has reduced complexity for 5MHz processing capacity per slot. |
| MediaTek | N | For RAR bandwidth larger than 5MHz, we don’t support X=0. This complicates the discussion. |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses, there are mixed views regarding Approach 3 (where X may be zero even when RAR PDSCH is wider than 5 MHz). See new Proposal 2.2-6a further down. | |

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.2-4a: Please indicate your preferences and comments on this approach:**

* **Approach 4: X is configurable by the network:** One contribution [26] proposes that X should be configurable by the network, e.g., in SIB1.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | We can discuss whether it is beneficial to have X configurable after the decision made that there are more than one values for X. |
| CATT |  | We think X is more related to UE processing capability but not NW configuration. |
| Intel | N | X is related to UE capability and is used before gNB knows the UE capability. As a result, even if X can be configured from multiple values, a UE has to implement based on the smallest X, otherwise the UE may fail in RAR PDSCH reception when a smaller X is configured. Therefore, X should be predefined. |
| Nordic |  | Hopefully there is not more than single X=0 and one non-zero value of X, |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We can defer the discussion until agreements about the value(s) of X are made |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Before gNB acquiring the UE capability, it is impossible to configure it for the UE. |
| Spreadtrum |  | We understand that the X is more related to UE implementation and capability, the NW may not be able to configure a value for UE implementation. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We prefer to have only one value for X, but that value can be configured by the network based on its preference (e.g. to balance latency vs RAR PDSCH bandwidth). |
| Panasonic |  | We have a similar concern as Intel. UE is required to support the smallest X value as UE implementation. By knowing relaxed information, operating clock frequency or operating voltage may be reduced for the power consumption, but we don't expect so big gain for this specific operation only. |
| Qualcomm | N | X value is defining a UE implementation requirement for RAR PDSCH decoding time, so we do not think X can be configured by NW. NW can flexibly choose detailed scheduling time by using FDRA field in RAR UL grant. |
| DOCOMO |  | The benefit is unclear for us. A UE needs to be implemented that the UE can process RAR PDSCH whatever the X value is, i.e., the UE has to be capable with the smallest X. Then, we don’t see the big difference from approach 1/2/3. |
| LGE |  | The discussion seems to be too early. Whether there is a need to make the X configurable can be discussed after X value(s) is (are) decided. |
| Xiaomi1 | N | Share the similar view with CATT. |
| Ericsson | N | Similar view as Intel, Panasonic, and Qualcomm. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | Similar view as Intel and Qualcomm. |
| MediaTek | N | The UE processing timeline should be defined in spec. |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses, there does not seem to be much support for Approach 4 (where X is configurable by the network) at this point, but it can potentially be revisited once the value(s) of X have been decided. | |

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.2-5a: Please indicate your preferences and comments on this approach:**

* **Approach 5: X is up to the UE implementation:** Another contribution [29] argues that the UE behavior can be up to the UE implementation and that there is no need to define X.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Vivo | N | If X is not defined, NW will have no reference on the timing setting when scheduling RAR with BW larger than 5MHz for eRedCap UEs. |
| CATT |  | We think Approach 5 is the same as X=0 (i.e. no additional X is defined) |
| Intel | N | Without an assumption on value X, gNB cannot know which row in the TDRA table is applicable for msg3 scheduling. In extreme case, if X is longer than 3 slots, there maybe no schedulable row in the TDRA table for msg3 which results in broken of the RACH procedure. |
| Nordic | N |  |
| FUTUREWEI | N | The network has no expectations when the UE can transmit Msg3 |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Does it mean we need to revert the agreement in last meeting? |
| Spreadtrum | N | This will lead to “no baseline” for UE implementations, and the UE performance varies widely in random access procedure. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We should not revert previous agreement to extend processing time. |
| Panasonic | N | This approach is impossible as companies commented. |
| Qualcomm |  | This requires some clarification. If X is not defined, then does it mean X = 0 regardless of RAR PDSCH BW? |
| DOCOMO | N | We share the same view as vivo. |
| LGE | N | If X is up to UE implementation, it is not clear to us what the proposed X value is as a result of this. |
| Xiaomi1 |  | Share the similar view with CATT. |
| Ericsson | N | The NW must know the value of X supported by the UE so that it can schedule the UE with appropriate Msg3 PUSCH TDRA. Otherwise, the NW must always schedule with Msg3 PUSCH TDRA corresponding to the worst UE implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | Similar view as FUTUREWEI and Ericsson |
| MediaTek | N | We cannot support this. This in principle reverts previous RAN1 agreements. |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses, there does not seem to be much support for Approach 5 (where X is up to the UE implementation). | |

Based on the received responses to above Questions 2.2-1a through 2.2-5a, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL2 High Priority Proposal 2.2-6a: Revise the earlier RAN1 agreement as follows:**

**For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for RAR (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot.**

* **When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is within the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot, the legacy time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission (not smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 ms) is applied.**
* **When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot,**
  + **The UE receives the RAR and correspondingly transmits Msg3 if the TDRA for Msg3 in UL grant in RAR indicates that the time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission is NOT smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms.**
    - **~~FFS: value(s) of X~~**
    - **Working assumption: X = 1 ms for 15 kHz SCS, and 0.5 ms for 30 kHz SCS**
    - **FFS: whether X=0 is applied in some cases, e.g., for small TBS values**
  + **Otherwise, the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation.**
* **Note: it does not mean early indication is needed**
* **Note: it will not be used as example for unicast PDSCH**

Based on discussion in the Tuesday online session, the following proposal was discussed in the Tuesday offline session:

**FL3 High Priority Proposal 2.2-6b:**

**For the following RAN1#111 agreement,**

|  |
| --- |
| **For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for RAR (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot.**   * **When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is within the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot, the legacy time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission (not smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 ms) is applied.** * **When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot,**   + **The UE receives the RAR and correspondingly transmits Msg3 if the TDRA for Msg3 in UL grant in RAR indicates that the time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission is NOT smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms.**     - **FFS: value(s) of X**   + **Otherwise, the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation.** * **Note: it does not mean early indication is needed** * **Note: it will not be used as example for unicast PDSCH** |

**For the “FFS: value(s) of X”**

* **Working assumption: X = 1 ms for 15 kHz SCS, and 0.5 ms for 30 kHz SCS**
* **FFS: whether X=0 is applied in some cases, e.g., for small TBS values**

Based on discussion in the Tuesday offline session, the following updated proposal can be considered:

**FL4 High Priority Proposal 2.2-6c:**

**For the following RAN1#111 agreement,**

|  |
| --- |
| **For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for RAR (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot.**   * **When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is within the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot, the legacy time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission (not smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 ms) is applied.** * **When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot,**   + **The UE receives the RAR and correspondingly transmits Msg3 if the TDRA for Msg3 in UL grant in RAR indicates that the time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission is NOT smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms.**     - **FFS: value(s) of X**   + **Otherwise, the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation.** * **Note: it does not mean early indication is needed** * **Note: it will not be used as example for unicast PDSCH** |

**For the “FFS: value(s) of X”**

* **~~Working assumption:~~ X = [0.5 or 1 or 2] ms for 15 kHz SCS, and [0.25 or 0.5 or 1] ms for 30 kHz SCS**
* **~~FFS: whether X=0 is applied in some cases, e.g., for small TBS values~~**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y | Our preference is 1ms for 15 kHz and 0.5 ms for 30 kHz. |
| Sharp |  | We still believe X=0 should be support for all cases, and it can solve the controversy on supporting for msg1 early indication. |
| Qualcomm | Y | We are fine with the FL proposal for this meeting, and we suggest to down-select a single value next meeting based on more detailed analysis provided by companies. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | Originally, we think there is no need to differentiate X for different SCS... For example, the ‘0.5’ in legacy timeline restriction is not SCS-specific. But we can live with this for progress. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | Our preference is 2ms for 15 kHz and 1ms for 30 kHz, as the processing time should be large enough to cover all the cases and avoid negative impacts to the UE complexity. |
| SONY | Y | We can down-select at the next meeting after further consideration. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | According to this proposal, a fixed value X now is defined based on a maximum value of processing relaxing by considering the worst case for UE processing. However, the RAR is configured within 15MHz, why the UE use the maximum value to process? It would lead to unnecessary access delay for RAR bandwidth less than 15MHz.if the gNB will take care of the UE. |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses, it seems that the proposal may be acceptable.  **High Priority Proposal 2.2-6c:**  **For the following RAN1#111 agreement,**   |  | | --- | | **For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for RAR (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot.**   * **When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is within the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot, the legacy time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission (not smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 ms) is applied.** * **When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot,**   + **The UE receives the RAR and correspondingly transmits Msg3 if the TDRA for Msg3 in UL grant in RAR indicates that the time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission is NOT smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms.**     - **FFS: value(s) of X**   + **Otherwise, the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation.** * **Note: it does not mean early indication is needed** * **Note: it will not be used as example for unicast PDSCH** |   **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”**   * **~~Working assumption:~~ X = [0.5 or 1 or 2] ms for 15 kHz SCS, and [0.25 or 0.5 or 1] ms for 30 kHz SCS** * **~~FFS: whether X=0 is applied in some cases, e.g., for small TBS values~~** | |
| FL6 | The following agreement was made in the Wednesday online session:  Agreement:  For the earlier RAN1 agreement achieved in RAN1#111 as following,  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for RAR (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot.   * When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is within the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot, the legacy time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission (not smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 ms) is applied. * When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot,   + The UE receives the RAR and correspondingly transmits Msg3 if the TDRA for Msg3 in UL grant in RAR indicates that the time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission is NOT smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms.     - FFS: value(s) of X   + Otherwise, the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation. * Note: it does not mean early indication is needed * Note: it will not be used as example for unicast PDSCH   For the “FFS: value(s) of X”   * X = [0.5/0.25 or 1/0.5 or 2/1] ms for 15/30kHz SCS * Note: Single Value pair for X is to selected for SCSs | |

2.3 Separate early indication

RAN#98e added an objective to support additional separate early indication(s) for UE BB bandwidth reduction [1]:

|  |
| --- |
| * Further reduced UE complexity in FR1 [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]   + UE BB bandwidth reduction     - 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for PDSCH (for both unicast and broadcast) and PUSCH, with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL     - The other physical channels and signals are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF+BB bandwidth.     - Support additional separate early indication(s) [RAN1, RAN2] |

In the above objective, it is still open whether to support additional separate early indication(s) in Msg1 only, or in Msg3 only, or in both Msg1 and Msg3, when it comes to 4-step RACH. The contributions express the following preferences:

* **At least Msg1:** Contributions [21, 25, 31] propose to support additional separate early indication in Msg1.
* **Both Msg1 and Msg3:** Contributions [9, 15, 16, 19, 23, 24, 27, 29, 32, 33] propose to support additional separate early indications in both Msg1 and Msg3. Contributions [19, 21] propose to clarify that it should also be possible to configure a Msg1 indication that is shared between Rel-17 RedCap and Rel-18 eRedCap UEs.
* **At least Msg3:** Contribution [22] proposes to support additional separate early indication at least in Msg3, possibly also in Msg1 (configurable).
* **Only Msg3, not Msg1:** Contributions [12, 13, 14, 26, 34, 35] propose to support additional separate early indication in Msg3 only.
* **Msg1 and/or Msg3:** Contributions [10, 11] express that additional separate early indications can be delivered by Msg1 and/or Msg3. Contribution [11] expresses that the down-selection should be made by RAN1, whereas contributions [10, 17, 20] express that it is up to RAN2.

Several contributions also mention that beside the 4-step RACH case (with Msg1 and Msg3), the 2-step RACH case (with MsgA PRACH and MsgA PUSCH) should be addressed.

Based on the above considerations, perhaps the following proposal can be considered.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 2.3-1a: From RAN1 perspective, support additional separate early indications in:**

* **For 4-step RACH: Msg1 and Msg3**
* **For 2-step RACH: MsgA PRACH and MsgA PUSCH**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** | |
| Vivo | N | We should first discuss the necessity for MSG1 as additional separate early indication. | |
| Sharp |  | For 4-step RA, it is OK. For 2-step RA, it can wait for the discussion of 2.8 | |
| CATT |  | From RAN1’s view we do not find strong motivation to support early indication in Msg1. But RAN2 starts discussion on R18 RedCap early indication in this meeting. This can be left to RAN2, just as RACH partitioning in R17. If RAN1 finds reasons why early indication in Msg1/MsgA PRACH is necessary/essential, RAN1 can help RAN2 facilitate the discussion. | |
| Intel | Y | Since the timeline on processing time relaxation for RAR PDSCH was agreed, it is advantageable to let gNB knows the UE type before transmission of RAR PDSCH. EI by msg1 is useful reference for msg3 scheduling too. | |
| Nordic | Y | MSG1 is mandatory for UE already in R17, we do not see a reason why gNB should be precluded to use MSG1 EI, optionally. | |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | RAN1 left R17 EI up to RAN2 (separate preamble/RO in RAN1#106-e). We can do the same here for R18, and it is up to the network. If the ROs for R17 and R18 UEs are different, that means an additional separate Msg1 EI for R18 RedCap. | |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We are OK with Msg3/MsgA identification. For Msg1 identification, we can further discuss. | |
| Spreadtrum |  | For 4-step RACH, we see some potential benefit with only support Msg.1, e.g. limit the BW for RAR or the timing for Msg3, which will be simplified design on X.  For 2-step RACH, is the common understanding that R18 RedCap should support 2-step RACH? If not, prefer to add an FFS in front of the second sub-bullet.  Modification on Proposal 2.3-1a as below.  **High Priority Proposal 2.3-1a: From RAN1 perspective, support additional separate early indications in:**   * **For 4-step RACH: Msg1 and/or Msg3** * **FFS ~~F~~for 2-step RACH: MsgA PRACH and MsgA PUSCH** | |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We are OK to support separate early indication in Msg3. For Msg1 separate early indication, we are not sure if that is necessary. Similar comment to 2-step RACH – OK for MsgA PUSCH but perhaps not needed for MsgA PRACH. | |
| Panasonic |  | For the early indication via Msg1/A PRACH, we think it should be clarified that there are two ways of realization:   * Rel-17 early indication via Msg1 is allowed to be shared between Rel-18 eRedCap and Rel-17 RedCap. * Rel-18 eRedCap-specific early indication via Msg1/A PRACH is configured.   In our view, both should be supported, and it should up to the NW which way is used. | |
| Qualcomm | Y | We can start the discussion for 4-step RACH case first. And configuration of additional separate early indication is totally up to NW. | |
| NEC |  | It will be good to clarify this proposal does not imply mandatory support of EI in Msg1/MsgA PRACH. We are fine with reusing Rel-17 EI framework. PRACH preamble partitioning may be supported optionally. No RAN1 specification impact is expected. Details can be up to RAN2. | |
| DOCOMO | Y | If separate early indication by Msg1 is not supported, NW have to configure Msg2/3 resources considering the restriction on eRedCap UE for all the UEs including legacy UEs. This may have impacts on the current deployment and also the scheduling flexibility would be largely restricted. | |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | Similar view Intel, it would be useful to the gNB to know the UE type early. | |
| LGE | Y | Msg1/MsgA PRACH early indication may be useful for gNB to set the proper X value(s). We support this proposal with the network configurability. | |
| CMCC | N | By checking the motivation of early indication by Msg.1, there is no coexistence issue for R18 and R17 RedCap UEs. On one hand, Msg.2 BW can be scheduled within or larger than 5MHz depending on the time gap between RAR PDSCH and corresponding Msg.3, and Msg.3 scheduling is most likely to be within 5MHz. On the other hand, RACH resource is already fragmented by several features. So we don’t think additional early indication by Msg.1 is needed. Sharing the same Msg.1 early indication as R17 RedCap UEs is enough. | |
| Xiaomi1 |  | Share the similar view with Sharp. For 2-step RACH, for example, if separate MsgA PUSCH resources are configured, separate MsgA PRACH based EI is not needed anymore. | |
| Ericsson | Y | 4-step RACH early indication can be discussed first.  Msg1 indication provides NW the flexibility to use different bandwidths for RAR PDSCH, i.e., larger than 5 MHz for Rel-17 RedCap UEs and equal to or smaller than 5 MHz for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs.  Additionally, if X > 0 (as discussed in 2.2-1a to 2.2-5a), it may be desired by the NW to apply timing relaxation for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs alone, i.e., if a common timing relaxation for both Rel-17 RedCap and Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not desired, then a separate Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is needed.  A potential separate Msg1 indication would be configurable by the network. Therefore, support for a separate Msg3 indication might also be useful for the cases when separate Msg1 indication is not configured (e.g., to minimize PRACH fragmentation), and Msg4 and Msg5 is to be scheduled with larger than 5 MHz for Rel-17 RedCap UEs coming from RRC Idle state. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  | |
| MediaTek |  | We think the separate early indication via Msg3/MsgA PUSCH should be supported and enabled so that the scheduling restriction (<=5MHz PRBs) on Msg4 would not impact on R17 RedCap UEs.  Regarding separate early indication via PRACH/MsgA PRACH, we don’t see it is deemed necessary. | |
| Sequans | Y | Support. Without separate eRedCap Msg1 indication, we may have to always delay RAR or limit Msg3 PUSCH bandwidth to ensure eRedCap UEs can access. If Msg1 indication is not used (not supported or not configured), Msg3 eRedCap indication is required so as the scheduler does not always have to constraint the Msg4 to be within 5MHz. | |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 2.3-1b: From RAN1 perspective, support additional separate early indications in:**   * **For 4-step RACH: Msg1 and Msg3**   + **Msg1 indication is configurable by the network. If configured, it can be configured to be either shared or not shared with Rel-17 RedCap UEs.** * **For 2-step RACH: ~~MsgA PRACH and MsgA PUSCH~~ FFS** | | |
| FL3 | Based on discussion in the Tuesday online session, the following proposal was discussed in the Tuesday offline session:  **High Priority Proposal 2.3-1c: From RAN1 perspective, support additional separate early indications from Rel-17 RedCap in:**   * **For 4-step RACH: Msg1 and Msg3**   + **Msg1 indication is configurable by the network.**   + **If Msg1 indication is not configured by the network, Msg3 indication can be used from RAN1 perspective.** * **For 2-step RACH: FFS** | | |
| FL4 | Based on discussion in the Tuesday offline session, the following proposal can be considered:  **High Priority Proposal 2.3-1d: From RAN1 perspective, support additional separate early indications from Rel-17 RedCap in:**   * **For 4-step RACH: Msg1 and Msg3**   + **Msg1 indication specific for Rel-18 RedCap UEs can be configured by the network (otherwise the Rel-17 RedCap UE behavior is used).**   + **Msg3 indication specific for Rel-18 RedCap UEs is expected to always be provided.**   + **~~If Msg1 indication is not configured by the network, Msg3 indication can be used from RAN1 perspective.~~** * **For 2-step RACH: FFS** | | |
| Ericsson | Y | |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | | We need a Msg1 early indication to apply different handling between non-RedCap and RedCap/eRedCap UE considering the coverage difference. In addition, we need another Msg1 early indication to apply different handling between Rel-17 RedCap and Rel-18 eRedCap UE considering different RAR-Msg3 timeline/BW restriction. Also, as NW operator, we would like to consider the potential coverage degradation for Rel-18 eRedCap when DL PSD is 24dBm/MHz. in that sense, we need separate early indication to differentiate non-RedCap/RedCap/eRedCap.  Whether to use is up to NW. |
| Panasonic | Y | |  |
| Sharp | Y | |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | | We are fine with the agreement. We also suggest to send an LS to RAN2 regarding RAN1 agreement as it is closely related to RAN2 discussions. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | | Ok with suggestion from Qualcomm |
| LGE | Y | | The same principle can be adopted for 2-step RACH as well. |
| CATT | N | | Early indication in Msg3 is useful, we agree.  But not for Msg1 indication. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | |  |
| Vivo | N | | We are fine to support additional separate early indication by MSG3. But not MSG1. |
| NEC | Y | | We are OK whether PRACH preamble partitioning is introduced for Rel-18 RedCap is up to RAN2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | | We are OK with the proposal to make progress. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | | With Msg1 early indication, the scheduling of RAR and Msg3 can be adjusted based on UE type. The gNB can limit the RAR PDSCH within 5MHz or always indicate a larger time gap between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission to guarantee the random access for Rel-18 RedCap.  From our perspective, Msg1 only (i.e., Msg1 based early indication is introduced as a mandatory feature) is our first preference, since we think R18 RedCap should be identified as early as possible. But for progress, we can live with the current version. |
| Nordic | Y | | MSG1 is beneficial.  the only drawback we agree with is specification effort in RAN2, therefore we could leave the final decision to RAN2. |
| SONY | Y | |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | |  |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses, it seems that the proposal may be acceptable.  **High Priority Proposal 2.3-1d: From RAN1 perspective, support additional separate early indications from Rel-17 RedCap in:**   * **For 4-step RACH: Msg1 and Msg3**   + **Msg1 indication specific for Rel-18 RedCap UEs can be configured by the network (otherwise the Rel-17 RedCap UE behavior is used).**   + **Msg3 indication specific for Rel-18 RedCap UEs is expected to always be provided.**   + **~~If Msg1 indication is not configured by the network, Msg3 indication can be used from RAN1 perspective.~~** * **For 2-step RACH: FFS** | | |
| FL6 | The proposal was discussed in the Wednesday online session. To progress the discussion further, companies are invited to express their preference between the following options:   * Option 1: Support additional separate early indication in Msg3 only. * Option 2: Support additional separate early indications in Msg1 and Msg3.   **High Priority Question 2.3-1e: Companies are invited to indicate their preference between Options 1 and 2 on a scale from 1.0 to 2.0, where e.g.:**   * **The value 1.0 indicates a strong preference for Option 1 (Msg3 only).** * **Values between 1.0 and 1.5 indicate a preference for Option 1 (Msg3 only) but can live with Option 2 (Msg1 and Msg3).** * **The value 1.5 indicates no preference between the two options.** * **Values between 1.5 and 2.0 indicate a preference for Option 2 (Msg1 and Msg3) but can live with Option 1 (Msg3 only).** * **The value 2.0 indicates a strong preference for Option 2 (Msg1 and Msg3).**   **As usual, other comments are also welcome in the comment field.** | | |
| **Company** | **Value between 1.0 and 2.0** | | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | 2.0 | | We have strong preference for Option 2. The need for Msg1 indication has already been discussed several times during the meeting, but we repeat the arguments below.  Due to the relaxed minimum time between Msg2 and Msg3 for Rel-18 RedCap UEs, i.e., X > 0 for larger than 5 MHz, the Rel-18 RedCap UEs might not be able to handle Msg3 transmission if the NW assumes legacy minimum time for all RedCap UEs. The alternative is that the NW assumes relaxed minimum time for all RedCap UEs. One consequence of this is that Rel-17 RedCap UEs would need to incur additional random-access delay due to the introduction of Rel-18 RedCap UEs. Another consequence is that the existing TDRA that the scheduler assumes for Rel-17 RedCap UEs would need to be updated resulting in additional gNB implementation impact. Note that the RAR bandwidth can in many cases be larger than 5 MHz, e.g., if TB scaling needs to be applied to recover coverage or if multiple RARs needs to be multiplexed in the same PDSCH.  Furthermore, Msg1 indication would not incur any additional UE complexity, but provide additional flexibility for the NW to schedule RAR for Rel-18 RedCap UEs. |
| Nokia, NSB | 1.2 | |  |
| Nordic | 1.8 | |  |
| Sequans | 2.0 | | We don't really see any drawback to support additional separate early indications in Msg1. No additional complexity is introduced for R18 RedCap UE, the NW may just not configure Msg1, and it's nearly free (the framework is already there in RAN2). On the other hand, we can benefit from no impact to R17 RedCap UE as mentioned before (no delayed RAR or limited Msg3 bandwidth) |
| Sharp | 1.9 | | The separate msg1 configuration can extend the feature combination rules in R17 for R18 redcap easily.  - If separate indication for eRedCap is configured, R18 RedCap UE should use the configuration for RA;  - if no separate indication for eRedCap and no barring flag for eRedCap, R18 RedCap UE should use the same resources used for R17 RedCap RA.  - Otherwise, the R18 UE cannot camp on the cell |
| Lenovo | 2.0 | |  |
| vivo | 1 | |  |
| Qualcomm | 2.0 | | Share the view of Ericsson and Sequans that there is no drawback to introduce Msg-1 based separate early indication but we have higher NW scheduling flexibility. |
| Sierra Wireless | 2.0 | | Additional separate early indication in Msg1 is beneficial and would not require much work in RAN2. RAN2 already has the general framework in place, that was added in Rel-17. The can network choose to use it or not, depending on the deployment needs. |
| DOCOMO | 2.0 | | As we explained in the previous round, separate early indication is clearly beneficial. |
| Panasonic | 2.0 for 4-step RA  FFS for 2-step RA | | The following is our view on the 4-step RA case.  As commented by the companies, the gNB needs to know whether a UE accessing to the cell is eRedCap or not at the timing of the Msg1 reception. Otherwise, the gNB cannot properly schedule the timing of the RAR (> 5MHz) and Msg3.  We understand that the network complexity and test effort are increased when the Msg1 early indication can be configured for both RedCap and eRedCap. To resolve the issue, one possibility is to prohibit the simultaneous configuration for RedCap and eRedCap. Consequently, the cell situation can be the following case A or B:   * Case A: The configuration of Msg1 early indication is configured in the Rel-18 part of SIB. RedCap UEs do not perform early indication via Msg1 (no separation between RedCap and non-RedCap). Only eRedCap UEs perform early indication. * Case B: The configuration of Msg1 early indication is configured in the Rel-17 part of SIB. Both RedCap UEs and eRedCap UEs perform early indication via Msg1 using the legacy Rel-17 configuration (no separation between RedCap and eRedCap).   The 2-step RA discussion can be differed until 4-step RA is stable. |
| Spreadtrum | 2.0 | |  |
| FUTUREWEI | 2.0 | |  |
| Intel | 1.8 | |  |
| CATT | 1.0 | | RAR larger than 5 MHz is unusual. From SI outcome, even without TB scaling, there is 6~10 dB margin in most scenarios. Even if RAR larger than 5 MHz happens, the NW can just take X into account. Such delay only happens once and is acceptable for a cost reduction UE. We don’t think TDRA table need to be updated if X is small, e.g. less than 1 slot.  Maybe no need to repeat other concerns for Msg1 indication in detail, such as RACH partitioning. |
| NEC | 1.8 | |  |
| LGE | 2.0 | | We prefer option2. |
| Xiaomi2 | 2.0 | |  |
| MediaTek | 1.1 | | PRACH segmentation is already severe and we are doubtful that gNB would actually enable both R17 and R18 early indications in order to optimize RAR and Msg3 scheduling. |
| OPPO | 1.0 | | We think Msg3 is sufficient.  Note the Rel-17 and 18 RedCap UE can be response together. And the UE can be concentrated with power to ensure coverage. So, 5MHz can be generally used in most of cases. |
| FL7 | Based on the discussion in the Thursday offline session, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 2.3-1f:**   * **From RAN1 perspective, support additional separate early indications from Rel-17 RedCap in:**   + **For 4-step RACH: Msg1 and Msg3**     - **Msg1 indication specific for Rel-18 RedCap UEs can be configured by the network (otherwise the Rel-17 RedCap UE behavior is used).**     - **Msg3 indication specific for Rel-18 RedCap UEs is expected to always be provided.**   + **For 2-step RACH: FFS** * **Send LS to RAN2 (cc RAN4) to communicate this week’s relevant agreements and conclusions and ask for their feedback, if any.** | | |
| FL8/FL9 | Based on the discussion in the Thursday online session, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 2.3-1g:**   * **From RAN1 perspective, support ~~additional~~ separate early indication~~s~~ from Rel-17 RedCap in Msg1, at least when separate early indication for Rel-17 RedCap is not configured:**   + **Msg1 indication specific for Rel-18 RedCap UEs can be configured by the network (otherwise the Rel-17 RedCap UE behavior is used).** * **From RAN1 perspective, support additional separate early indication~~s~~ from Rel-17 RedCap in Msg3:**   + **Msg3 indication specific for Rel-18 RedCap UEs is expected to always be provided.** * **Send LS to RAN2 (cc RAN4) to communicate this week’s relevant agreements and conclusions and ask for their feedback, if any.**   + **Detailed signaling solution is up to RAN2.** * **For 2-step RACH: FFS** | | |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | |  |
| CMCC | N | | We appreciate the compromise. But we don’t support to add “at least” in this proposal. Since it will keep the discussion of separate early indication from Rel-17 RedCap in Msg1 open for the case that separate early indication for Rel-17 RedCap is configured. Then the compromise will be meaningless.  And for the condition “**when separate early indication for Rel-17 RedCap is not configured**”, we think Msg.1 should be added, since separate early indication in Msg.3 is always there, and the condition will never be satisfied.  And considering the compromise, we think it is already allow configuring additional separate early indication in Msg.1 for R18 RedCap UEs in some cases, while for these cases, the RACH fragment concern is reduced.  We list the possibility of SIB1 configuration, considering whether separate initial BWP for R17 is configured or not, and supposing up to one separate initial BWP is configured for R17 and R18 RedCap. As shown in the following figure.  The green highlighted cases mean separate early indication for R18 in Msg.1 is supported.    And for the case with “\*”, if supported, the condition should change to “**when separate early indication for Rel-17 RedCap is not configured in the same BWP”**, we are OK to support or not support this case, since separate iBWP is another topic.  And at last, we would like to add “For this case” for the subbullet of the first bullet, to avoid misunderstanding of RAN2 when designing signalling.  So the compromise proposal is suggested to the following,   * **From RAN1 perspective, support ~~additional~~ separate early indication~~s~~ from Rel-17 RedCap in Msg1, ~~at least~~ when separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-17 RedCap is not configured [in the same BWP]:**   + **For this case, Msg1 indication specific for Rel-18 RedCap UEs can be configured by the network (otherwise the Rel-17 RedCap UE behavior is used).** * **From RAN1 perspective, support additional separate early indication~~s~~ from Rel-17 RedCap in Msg3:**   + **Msg3 indication specific for Rel-18 RedCap UEs is expected to always be provided.** * **Send LS to RAN2 (cc RAN4) to communicate this week’s relevant agreements and conclusions and ask for their feedback, if any.**   + **Detailed signaling solution is up to RAN2.** * **For 2-step RACH: FFS** |
| CATT |  | | From NW point of view, the concern of ‘handling R18 and R17 RedCap UE in different initial BWP’ is higher than introducing early indication in Msg1. They should be operate in the same initial BWP due to (1) the same assumption in RX antenna number, (2) same small form factor assumption, (3) the same capability on BWP configuration, (4) the same need of NCD-SSB, etc.  The current version may lead to a strange case that: Rel-17 RedCap UE and normal UE share the same initial legacy BWP, but Rel-18 RedCap UE uses Rel-18 specific separate initial BWP. We only see additional negative impact to normal UE and no additional benefit for anyone.  We suggest the following blue sub-bullet, and possibly, remove the condition of ‘at least…’ if blue part is adopted:   * **From RAN1 perspective, support ~~additional~~ separate early indication~~s~~ from Rel-17 RedCap in Msg1, at least when separate early indication for Rel-17 RedCap is not configured:**   + **For initial access, Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UE share the same initial BWP.**   + **Msg1 indication specific for Rel-18 RedCap UEs can be configured by the network (otherwise the Rel-17 RedCap UE behavior is used).** |
| DOCOMO | Y | | Given the situation, this proposal is quite fair, and we support in principle but some suggestion for clarification.  Early indication in Msg3 for Rel-17 RedCap is used regardless of whether Msg1 early indication is configured or not. In addition, just wording but early indication for Rel-17 RedCap is early indication not “separate” early indication.  Thus, we propose to update as follows;   * **From RAN1 perspective, support ~~additional~~ separate early indication~~s~~ from Rel-17 RedCap in Msg1, at least when ~~separate~~ early indication for Rel-17 RedCap in Msg1 is not configured:**   + **Msg1 indication specific for Rel-18 RedCap UEs can be configured by the network (otherwise the Rel-17 RedCap UE behavior is used).** |
| vivo | N | | RAN2 eRedCap session made the following agreements (<http://10.10.10.10/ftp/RAN/RAN2/Inbox/Chairs_Notes/R2_121%20eRedCap%20(Mattias)%2020230301_1630.docx>)   * Introduce Msg3/MsgA PUSCH based early indication for Rel-18 eRedCap. FFS how to implement this in the spec (e.g., new LCIDs or not). * We will wait for RAN1 progress to see if there is a need for a Msg1 early indication for eRedCap.   RAN2 already support to introduce Msg3/MsgA PUSCH based early indication for Rel-18 eRedCap. So, we may not need to make the agreement for Msg3/MsgA PUSCH based early indication for Rel-18 eRedCap.  Come back to MSG1, during the discussion, many companies said about the motivation to differentiate Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UE is due to the timeline relaxation for MSG3 transmission, related to the X value. But majority companies think smaller value of X should be defined like 0.5ms, 1ms. We did not think such small latency only for MSG3 transmission only for Rel-17 is a big issue to deserve further partitioning the PRACH resources and complex the specification. We do not agree with adding at least can be compromise here. Same discussion will repeat again for the case when Rel-17 RedCap in Msg1 is configured. |
| LGE | Y | | We support FL8/FL9 proposal. |

2.4 Separate initial BWP

RAN1 has made the following agreement regarding separate initial BWP(s) [7]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For a cell supporting both Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UEs,   * The Rel-18 RedCap Ues can share the same separate initial DL/UL BWP as the Rel-17 RedCap Ues. * FFS: whether to support an additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap Ues |

The above agreement has an FFS regarding whether to support an additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap Ues. The last related FL proposal discussed in the previous RAN1 meeting was the following one [6]:

|  |
| --- |
| RAN1#111 Medium Priority Proposal 2.4-3b:   * For a cell supporting Rel-17 and/or Rel-18 RedCap Ues,   + Up to one separate (RedCap-specific) initial DL/UL BWP can be configured ~~for the following cases:~~     1. ~~Only Rel-17 RedCap Ues~~     2. ~~Only Rel-18 RedCap Ues~~     3. ~~Both Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap Ues~~   + ~~Note: Here, “Rel-18 RedCap UE” means a UE implementing the UE complexity reductions introduced by the Rel-18 RedCap WI.~~ |

Contribution [33] proposes to support an additional separate initial BWP specific to Rel-18 eRedCap Ues, whereas contributions [9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 26, 32, 34, 35] express that they see no need for it. However, contribution [11] proposes to add an FFS for the dedicated (NPN) network case.

Contributions [14, 33] propose to support both the case that the (single) separate initial BWP is configured only for Rel-18 eRedCap Ues and the case that the separate initial BWP is configured for both Rel-17 RedCap Ues and Rel-18 eRedCap Ues, where the detailed signaling solution would be up to RAN2. Contribution [15] also expresses that this approach should be considered.

Based on the above considerations, perhaps the following proposal can be considered.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 2.4-1a:**

* **No additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap Ues is introduced.**
  + **Whether it should be supported that Rel-18 RedCap Ues use a separate initial DL/UL BWP while Rel-17 RedCap Ues and non-RedCap Ues use the normal initial DL/UL BWP is up to RAN2.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** | |
| vivo | Y with comments | We support the intention with the proposal. But still it is not clear theNo additional separate initial DL/UL BWP is from UE perspective or “cell” perspective. To correctly reflect the intention, we suggest following modification”   * **No additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap Ues is ~~introduced~~ configured by the same SIB1 message.** | |
| Sharp | Y |  | |
| CATT | Y, but | 1) This should be cell perspective. Fine with vivo’s update if it helps clarifying.  2) The sub-bullet seems weird. We do not see the benefit to make such division. | |
| Intel | Y | Fine to leave the issue to RAN2 | |
| Nordic | Y | **No additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap Ues is ~~introduced~~ configured by the SIB1 in the cell.** | |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  | |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | The main bullet is conflicting with the subbullet. We suggest to remove the subbullet and keep it open. | |
| Spreadtrum |  | OK with the main bullet, but what’s the intention on the sub-bullet?  In our understanding, the main bullet means no R18 BWP IE will be introduced for R18 RedCap. Then, the R18 RedCap will determine the initial BWP based on R17 BWP-IE. But if R17 BWP-IE is configured, R17 RedCap will also determine the initial BWP according to R17 BWP-IE, then the R18 RedCap and R17 RedCap share the same initial BWP configured by R17 BWP-IE. Therefore, if no R18 BWP IE is introduced, then the case in the sub-bullet cannot be achieve. So the main bullet is somewhat contradictory to the sub-bullet. | |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We are OK with the main bullet. For the sub-bullet, we don’t think this should be supported. | |
| Panasonic | Y | Vivo’s update is also acceptable. | |
| Qualcomm | Y | We are OK with the proposal. | |
| NEC | Y |  | |
| DOCOMO | N | Regarding the first bullet, in our understanding, the following deployment can be one example if separate initial BWP specific to Rel-18 eRedCap is supported:    For this case, NW configures two separate initial BWPs, i.e., one separate initial BWP for Rel-17 RedCap and another separate initial BWP for Rel-18 eRedCap via SIB1 (it has been already supported in the current specification that multiple BWPs can be configured correspond to different SSB from NW perspective). However, it should be noted that from UE perspective, only one separate initial BWP is configured via SIB1 same as Rel-17 RedCap operation. Therefore, we don’t see the significant impacts from Rel-17 RedCap while there is benefit from random access offloading and potential power saving perspective. Thus, we prefer to support separate initial BWP specific to Rel-18 eRedCap.  Regarding the sub-bullet of FL proposal, we prefer to discuss on RAN1 whether to support such operation while the signaling details should be left to RAN2.    In addition, we would like to clarify that separate initial BWP specific to Rel-18 eRedCap UE can be configured when a cell supports Rel-18 eRedCap but not support Rel-17 RedCap. | |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  | |
| LGE | Y | We are okay to NOT support the additional separate initial BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap Ues as suggested by the main bullet. Other than that, we prefer to leave the further details up to RAN2 as suggested by the sub-bullet. So we support this proposal. | |
| CMCC | Y | For the subbullet, we wonder that when Rel-17 RedCap Ues and non-RedCap Ues use the normal initial DL/UL BWP, how Rel-18 RedCap Ues can use a separate initial DL/UL BWP when the mail bullet is true? | |
| Xiaomi1 |  | Only support the main bullet. For the case when Rel-17 RedCap Ues shares the same initial BWP with non-RedCap Ues, we don’t support to configure a separate initial BWP for Rel-18 RedCap Ues. | |
| Ericsson | Y |  | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  | |
| MediaTek | Y |  | |
| Sequans | Y | Agree with vivo or Nordic modification | |
| FL2/FL3 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 2.4-1b:**   * **No additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap Ues is ~~introduced~~ configured by the SIB1 in the cell.**   + **Whether it should be supported that Rel-18 RedCap Ues use a separate initial DL/UL BWP while Rel-17 RedCap Ues and non-RedCap Ues use the normal initial DL/UL BWP is up to RAN2.** | | |
| FL4 | Based on discussion in the Tuesday online session, companies are invited to comment on the following question:  **High Priority Question 2.4-1c: Can RAN1 conclude that there is no significant RAN1 impact from supporting additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap Ues, and that the decision can be left up to RAN2?** | | |
| Ericsson | Y | | We do not see a need to support three different initial BWPs for non-RedCap, Rel-17 RedCap, and Rel-18 RedCap, but we are fine with leaving that decision to RAN2. Furthermore, we think that there could potentially be scenarios where it may be desired to use the normal initial BWP for non-RedCap and Rel-17 RedCap Ues, and a separate initial BWP for Rel-18 RedCap Ues, for example in the scenario where the gNB cell carrier bandwidth is 20 MHz. |
| DOCOMO | Y | | While we don’t see any significant impact from RAN1 perspective, whether to configure another separate initial BWP specific to Rel-18 eRedCap is up to NW similar to discussion on separate early indication, and hence NW can deploy without separate initial BWP specific to Rel-18 eRedCap if there is any concern for such BWP operation. In addition, from UE perspective, still only one separate initial BWP is configured even if separate initial BWP specific to Rel-18 eRedCap is configured. This is exactly the same operation as Rel-17 RedCap.  We think similar conclusion is necessary for the case where Rel-18 RedCap Ues use a separate initial DL/UL BWP while Rel-17 RedCap Ues and non-RedCap Ues use the normal initial DL/UL BWP, i.e., conclude that there is no significant impact to support from RAN1 perspective and that decision can be left up to RAN2. |
| Panasonic | Y with update | | The test and corresponding effort in RAN4 are also related. Therefore, we propose to conclude that “the decision can be left up to RAN2 and RAN4”. |
| Sharp | Y | | We agree with Panasonic’s update, it is also related to RAN4. |
| Qualcomm |  | | We prefer the original proposal: Proposal 2.4-1b. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | | We have similar comments as Ericsson |
| LGE | Y | | Yes, we think the decision can be left up to RAN2. |
| CATT | N | | Agree with Qualcomm.  From RAN1’s view, at least the following impact/drawback is foreseen: more resource fragmentation, higher risk of NCD-SSB burden, higher risk to exceed max SIB1 payload, increasing gNB complexity at least for RACH procedure…. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | |  |
| vivo | N | | Same view with QC. |
| NEC | Y or N | | This may introduce further UL fragmentation. But we are OK just to have such a conclusion. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | | Same view with Qualcomm. We don’t really see the need to support additional BWP for Rel-18 RedCap. At least from RAN1 perspective we do see impact to complexity and overhead, so we do not want to leave this decision to RAN2. |
| Spreadtrum | N | | It is almost a common understanding in RAN1 that ” **No additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap Ues is configured by the SIB1 in the cell.**”. Therefore, we can at least conclude this in RAN1 and leave the detailed signal design to RAN2. |
| Nordic |  | | we prefer previous version of proposal |
| MediaTek | N | | While the signaling aspect can be left to RAN2, we think the decision should be made by RAN1 about the following discussion points:   * (1) how many separate initial BWPs at most can be configured; * (2) from cell or from UE’s perspective; and * (3) whether R18 eRedCap Ues always share the same initial BWPs as R17 RedCap Ues in a cell that support both types of Redcap Ues.   Our answers to the above questions are: (1) at most one; (2) from the cell perspective; and (3) yes, R18 eRedCap always shares the same initial BWPs as R17 RedCap. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | | This proposal means that RAN1 may support a separate Rel-17 RedCap initial BWP and an additional separate Rel-17 RedCap initial BWP. We don’t think it is true that there is no significant RAN1 impact from supporting additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap Ues. If an additional separate initial BWP is configured for Rel-18 RedCap Ues, all the RAN1 procedures and some parameters related to separate initial BWP need to be considered.  More importantly, there is no case to only support R18 RedCap but not support R17 RedCap UE. An additional separate initial BWP is unnecessary for Rel-18 RedCap Ues. And we don’t want to make the conclusion and give the RAN2 impression that RAN1 wants to support this. |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered:  **High Priority Proposal 2.4-1d:** **Down-select between the following alternatives:**   * **Alt. 1:**   + **No additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap Ues is configured by the SIB1 in the cell.**     - **Whether it should be supported that Rel-18 RedCap Ues use a separate initial DL/UL BWP while Rel-17 RedCap Ues and non-RedCap Ues use the normal initial DL/UL BWP is up to RAN2.** * **Alt. 2:**   + **RAN1 concludes that there is no significant RAN1 impact from supporting additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap Ues, and that the decision can be left up to RAN2/RAN4.** | | |
| FL6 | The following conclusion was made in the Wednesday online session:  Conclusion:  There is no consensus to continue discussion on “whether additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap Ues is allowed to be configured by the SIB in the cell”. | | |

2.5 Simultaneous reception

For simultaneous reception of multiple broadcast channels, 38.214 clause 5.1 specifies the following:

|  |
| --- |
| The UE in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE modes shall be able to decode two PDSCHs each scheduled with SI-RNTI, P-RNTI, RA-RNTI or TC-RNTI, with the two PDSCHs partially or fully overlapping in time in non-overlapping PRBs. |

For simultaneous reception of a unicast channel and a broadcast channel, 38.214 clause 5.1 specifies the following:

|  |
| --- |
| On a frequency range 1 cell, the UE shall be able to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI and, during a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI that partially or fully overlap in time in non-overlapping PRBs, unless the PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI requires Capability 2 processing time according to clause 5.3 in which case the UE may skip decoding of the scheduled PDSCH with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI.  On a frequency range 2 cell, the UE is not expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI if in the same cell, during a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time.  The UE is expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI during a process of autonomous SI acquisition. |

Contributions [14, 23] propose that an eRedCap UE should not be required to support reception of any two PDSCHs multiplexed in an FDM manner in a slot if the two PDSCHs span more than 5 MHz.

Contributions [15, 19] propose to reuse the existing FR2 specification, meaning that the UE should not be expected to simultaneously receive a unicast PDSCH and a broadcast PDSCH, whereas contribution [32] expresses that there is no need to define any additional UE behavior at all.

Contributions [15, 18, 26, 32] propose that simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCHs can follow the same principle as the reception of a single broadcast PDSCH, i.e., the UE may process them over multiple slots if their combined bandwidth exceeds 5 MHz.

Contributions [9, 13, 14, 33] propose to discuss whether there is a need to specify a PDSCH processing order when two PDSCHs are scheduled in the same slot.

Furthermore, contribution [26] proposes to support simultaneous reception of PDSCH and SSB/PDCCH/CSI-RS as well as simultaneous transmission of PUSCH and PUCCH.

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.5-1a: Is there a need to relax the mentioned requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCHs? Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** | |
| vivo | Y | At least for PDSCH scheduled with RA-RNTI and TC-RNTI. | |
| Sharp | N | Ues can handle broadcast PDSCH with no requirement of strict timing constraints in multiple slots, and processing priority can be up to UE implementations. | |
| CATT | N | For broadcast channels that do not require feedback, we think no need to relax. | |
| Intel | Y | A UE anyway only has the capability to decode up to 25 or 11 (12) PRBs in a slot. If the total number of two PDSCHs are more than 25 or 11 (12), the UE cannot decode both PDSCHs | |
| Nordic | Y | Similar opinion as VIVO, particularly for the case when PDSCH have HARQ-ACK/MSG3-grant and they span more than 5MHz | |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We are open to discussing whether there is an issue especially for RAR | |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | What does the ‘relax’ mean?  Which two broadcast PDSCHs also needs clarification. | |
| Spreadtrum | N | For broadcast, we already agreed that the BW can be larger than 5MHz, then the UE can process them over multiple slots. | |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We do not see the need to relax the requirements for simultaneous reception of two broadcast channels. | |
| Panasonic | Y | In our view, broadcast PDSCH utilize 20 MHz in many cases to keep the sufficient transmission power and maintain the coverage. To reduce the complexity, FDM of those PDSCH can be precluded for the eRedCap Ues. | |
| Qualcomm | N | We do not support any new relaxation considering what we have discussed and agreed in RAN1. RAN1 previously agreed that broadcast PDSCH is allowed to be larger than 5MHz because broadcast PDSCH can be decoded without tight time budget (except RAR). According to the same logic, if two broadcast PDSCHs are received simultaneously, the eRedCap UE may decode RAR PDSCH first with the new required timeline discussed in section 2.2 above and can decode the other broadcast PDSCH without tight time budget requirement. So there is no motivation to further relax the UE behavior. Not defining any further relaxation is more inline with the logic how the previous RAN1 agreement (broadcast PDSCH larger than 5MHz) was made. | |
| DOCOMO | N | We believe that a UE can process two broadcast PDSCH without any specification impacts. If the FDMed broadcast PDSCH is RAR PDSCH, it may need a clarification on the X value of timeline between RAR PDSCH and Msg3 PUSCH whether different handling from one RAR PDSCH reception is required. | |
| LGE | N | We think that no additional UE behaviour is needed for decoding 2 PDSCHs. | |
| CMCC | N | Considering the loose timeline of broadcast PDSCH, relaxing may not be necessary. UE can buffer both of them and process them in order based on its implementation. | |
| Xiaomi1 | N | For RAR PDSCH, the processing time requirement has already been relaxed with an additional X. For paging, SIB1 and OSI, there is no feedback behind them, thus there is no need to relax the processing timeline for the simultaneous receptions of two broadcast PDSCHs. | |
| Ericsson | N | To our understanding, the combined bandwidth of both broadcast PDSCHs would not be larger than 20 MHz (or CORESET#0 BW), and therefore, handling of two simultaneous broadcast PDSCHs can be similar to that of a single broadcast (at least SIB/OSI/paging) PDSCH. | |
| Sequans | N | Same understanding as Qualcomm. Probably no need for additional UE behaviour change. | |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 2.5-1b:**   * **Conclusion: For UE BB complexity reduction, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions for SIB/OSI/paging (FFS: RAR).** | | |
| FL3/FL4 | Based on the discussion in the Tuesday session, the following updated proposal can be considered:  **High Priority Proposal 2.5-1c:**   * **Conclusion: For UE BB complexity reduction, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions for SIB/OSI/paging/RAR.** | | |
| Ericsson |  | | We prefer Proposal 2.5-1b over Proposal 2.5-1c until the random access timeline discussion (in Section 2.2) has been resolved. |
| DOCOMO | Y | | We may need a clarification for Msg4 PDSCH which is scheduled by TC-RNTI. |
| Panasonic | Y | | Although to have special handling for RAR is attractive from UE complexity reduction, from the network perspective, if some relaxation is carried out for RAR, it can impact Rel15 deployment when SIB/OSI/paging/RAR are shared among non-RedCap Ues and Rel-18 RedCap Ues. In order not to require the modification of current deployment on SIB/OSI/paging/RAR, we propose to conclude as proposed. |
| Sharp | Y | | We prefer that it is also no need to relax the requirements for TC-RNTI scrambled PDSCH. |
| Qualcomm | Y | | We share view from Panasonic. WID clearly describes that “Coexistence with non-RedCap Ues and Rel-17 RedCap Ues should be ensured.” In order to address this coexistence issue, RAN1 has reached the agreement that broadcast PDSCH can be scheduled with larger than 5MHz. Using the same logic, it is also required that eRedCap Ues support the existing NW scheduling for up to 2 broadcast PDSCHs at the same time, which can avoid any impacts to non-RedCap Ues or Rel-17 RedCap Ues. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | |  |
| LG | Y | | We think that there is no need the relaxation for the simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions for SIB/OSI/paging/RAR. |
| CATT | Y | | Although we still think it is debatable whether RAR is a ‘broadcast PDSCH’, we can support this proposal. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | |  |
| vivo |  | | One clarification, with this conclusion, do we plan to define some processing priority if one the broadcast PDSCH is RAR? Otherwise, timeline requirement may not met. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | | We do not see the need to relax the requirements for simultaneous reception of two broadcast channels. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | |  |
| Nordic | Y | | The specification treats MSG4 and RAR as “broadcast”, but they are not broadcast per se |
| MediaTek |  | | Since it has been clarified that this is simultaneous “reception” instead of simultaneous “processing,” we are fine with this conclusion in principle. To make this aspect more, we suggest add a note under the conclusion as follows.  **Conclusion: For UE BB complexity reduction, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions for SIB/OSI/paging/RAR.**   * **Note: Which PDSCH to be prioritized for processing is up to UE implementation.** |
| SONY |  | | Can we assume that the broadcast SIB/OSI/paging/RAR are within the 20MHz UE RF bandwidth? |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | | For the case of SIB and paging PDSCH, since there is no timeline restriction for paging and SIB, it is OK to say no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception for SIB and paging.  For the case of SIB and RAR, the introduction of X value for RAR processing can support the timeline with up to 20MHz bandwidth. Therefore, no additional relaxation is needed. However, a Rel-18 RedCap UE should be expected to decode RAR PDSCH first to reduce Msg3 scheduling delay. So we recommend to specify this UE behaviour. |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered:  **High Priority Proposal 2.5-1d:**  **Conclusion: For UE BB complexity reduction, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions for SIB/OSI/paging/RAR.**   * **Note: Which PDSCH to be prioritized for processing is up to UE implementation.** | | |
| FL6 | The following conclusion was made in the Wednesday online session:  Conclusion:  For UE BB complexity reduction, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions for SIB1/OSI/paging/RAR. | | |

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.5-2a: Is there a need to relax the mentioned requirements on simultaneous reception of one unicast PDSCH and one broadcast PDSCH? Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** | |
| Vivo | Y | For unicast PDSCH, it may be scheduled in consecutive slots, for such case, eRedCap UE may not be able to process the broadcast PDSCH. | |
| Sharp | N | Ues can handle broadcast PDSCH with no requirement of strict timing constraints in multiple slots, and processing priority can be up to UE implementations. | |
| CATT |  | We agree that the decoding of broadcast PDSCH may be delayed, but since the broadcast PDSCH does not require feedback, is there any spec impact? | |
| Intel | Y | A UE anyway only has the capability to decode up to 25 or 11 (12) PRBs in a slot. If the total number of two PDSCHs are more than 25 or 11 (12), the UE cannot decode both PDSCHs | |
| Nordic | Y | Connected mode paging and SI update can be done also via dedicated signaling. We do not see need for Reduced Capability UE to support those in Connected mode at all | |
| FUTUREWEI |  | If the network can avoid scheduling unicast PDSCH and broadcast PDSCH in the same slot, this may not be an issue | |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | What does the ‘relax’ mean?  We think there is a need to discuss this case and which channels are involved should be clarified. | |
| Spreadtrum |  | Prefer to reuse the existing FR2 specification, meaning that the UE should not be expected to simultaneously receive a unicast PDSCH and a broadcast PDSCH. | |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We can discuss further whether requirements should be relaxed. | |
| Panasonic | Y | Same comment as one for the Question 2.5-1a. | |
| Qualcomm | N | Same comment and logic as **Question 2.5-1a.** An eRedCap UE may decode unicast PDSCH first within the required time budget (N1) and still can broadcast PDSCH for SIBs with sufficient time budget even when the BW is larger than 5MHz just like what we have assumed for RAN1 discussions/agreements so far. No additional relaxation or new UE behavior is needed. | |
| DOCOMO | N | There is no timeline requirement on broadcast PDSCH and the number of PRB for unicast PDSCH is agreed that it is within 5MHz so that a UE can proceed without timeline extension, thus we don’t see the need to relax the support of this case.  When the unicast PDSCH is FDMed with RAR PDSCH, need a clarification same as two broadcast PDSCH case whether special handling on the timeline between RAR and Msg3. | |
| LGE | N | We think that no additional UE behaviour is needed for decoding 2 PDSCHs | |
| CMCC |  | Open to discuss if find necessary. | |
| Xiaomi1 | N | Share the similar view with Sharp. For example, if the SIB1 and a unicast PDSCH are simultaneously received, the Rel-18 RedCap can totally process unicast PDSCH at first, which is up to UE implementation. In this way, no spec impact is needed, and it is not necessary to relax the processing time requirement. | |
| Ericsson |  | We recognize that some update in the spec may be needed for the UE to handle this case. What updates are needed can be further discussed. | |
| MediaTek |  | It is a valid case that when UE still processes a broadcast/multicast PDSCH larger than 5MHz (e.g. RAR, SIBs), a unicast PDSCH is transmitted by gNB. We need to discuss how UE should handle such simultaneous reception. | |
| FL2/FL3/FL4 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 2.5-2b:**   * **For UE BB complexity reduction, it is FFS whether some specification changes are needed for simultaneous reception of unicast and broadcast PDSCH transmissions.** | | |
| Ericsson | Y | |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | | We don’t see the need of any specification change but fine with FFS for now. |
| Panasonic | Y | |  |
| Sharp | Y | |  |
| Qualcomm |  | | As discussed above, we do not think any spec changes are needed for this case as well. No need to have FFS for this case. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | |  |
| LGE |  | | Okay to discuss, but we don’t think some specification changes are needed for now. |
| CATT |  | | So far we don’t see the potential spec impact, but OK to further discuss. |
| Vivo | Y | |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | |  |
| Nordic | Y | |  |
| MediaTek | Y | | Similar comment as previous, which one should be prioritized for processing/decoding should be discussed.  **Proposal: For UE BB complexity reduction, it is FFS whether some specification changes are needed for simultaneous reception of unicast and broadcast PDSCH transmissions.**   * **FFS: which one UE should prioritize for processing and decoding** |
| SONY |  | | It is OK for this to be FFS. We are concerned about how the UE is meant to be able to decode 2 PDSCH when it has a capability of decoding 25PRBs (at 15kHz SCS). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | | On simultaneous reception of two PDSCHs for SIB/Msg4/UE-specific, Msg4 and UE-specific PDSCH have timeline requirements. Thus, the priority of PDSCH decoding needs to be specified for a UE. |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 2.5-2c:**   * **For UE BB complexity reduction, it is FFS whether some specification changes (e.g., regarding prioritization for processing and decoding) are needed for simultaneous reception of unicast and broadcast PDSCH transmissions.** | | |
| FL6 | The proposal was discussed in the Wednesday online session without reaching agreement. This topic can be revisited in the next meeting if needed. | | |

2.6 Paging PDSCH bandwidth

RAN1 has made the following agreement regarding the PDSCH bandwidth for paging [7]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  From RAN1 perspective, for UE BB complexity reduction, for paging channel (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap Ues, allow the scheduling of paging channel to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). |

Contribution [19] proposes to clarify that this means that the number of scheduled PRBs in the PDSCH resource allocation for paging can be larger than the maximum number of PRBs supported for unicast PDSCH.

**FL1 Medium Priority Proposal 2.6-1a: Update the agreement for PDSCH paging with the clarification as follows:**

* **From RAN1 perspective, for UE BB complexity reduction, for paging channel (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap Ues, allow the scheduling of paging channel to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). It means the scheduling of paging PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** | |
| vivo | Y |  | |
| Sharp | Y |  | |
| CATT | Y |  | |
| Intel |  | We agree with the intention of the proposal. However, it may not necessary require an update. If the updated proposal is necessary, we prefer to clarify it for all kinds of broadcast PDSCH. | |
| Nordic | Y |  | |
| FUTUREWEI |  | From discussions, it was clear that the number of RBs that can be processed per slot applies. It seems unnecessary to update the agreement | |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  | |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  | |
| Panasonic | Y | The sentence to be added has already been clarified in the following agreement for the RAR. It is natural that those agreements are aligned.  Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for RAR (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap Ues, the scheduling of RAR PDSCH **is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot**. | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  | |
| NEC |  | Agree with Intel. | |
| DOCOMO | Y |  | |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  | |
| LGE | Y |  | |
| CMCC | Y |  | |
| Xiaomi1 | Y |  | |
| Ericsson | Y |  | |
| Sequans | Y |  | |
| FL2/FL3/FL4 | Based on the received responses, the proposal seems acceptable.  **Medium Priority Proposal 2.6-1a: Update the agreement for PDSCH paging with the clarification as follows:**   * **From RAN1 perspective, for UE BB complexity reduction, for paging channel (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap Ues, allow the scheduling of paging channel to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). It means the scheduling of paging PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot.** | | |
| Ericsson | Y | |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | |  |
| Panasonic | Y | |  |
| Sharp | Y | |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | | This seems more like a note. An editorial suggestion  ~~It means t~~The scheduling of paging PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot. |
| LGE | Y | |  |
| CATT | Y | |  |
| vivo | Y | |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | |  |
| Nordic | Y | |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | |  |
| FL5 | Based on received responses, the following update (from Futurewei) can be considered:  **Medium Priority Proposal 2.6-1b: Update the agreement for PDSCH paging with the clarification as follows:**   * **From RAN1 perspective, for UE BB complexity reduction, for paging channel (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap Ues, allow the scheduling of paging channel to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). The scheduling of paging PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot.** | | |
| FL6 | The following agreement was made in the Wednesday online session:  Agreement:  Update the agreement for PDSCH paging with the clarification as follows:   * From RAN1 perspective, for UE BB complexity reduction, for paging channel (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap Ues, allow the scheduling of paging channel to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). The scheduling of paging PDSCH is allowed to be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS. | | |

2.7 Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth

RAN1 has made the following agreement regarding the unicast PDSCH bandwidth [7]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a DL assignment in a DCI with a unicast PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot. * The number of PRB scheduled in DCI is not larger than the maximum number of PRB agreed in previous agreement from 110b-e |

Contribution [29] proposes to restrict the PDSCH bandwidth for Msg4 in a similar way as in the above agreement.

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 2.7-1a: Should the Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth be limited in the same way as in the above agreement for unicast PDSCH transmissions?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** | |
| vivo | Y |  | |
| Sharp | Y |  | |
| CATT | Y | Seems natural since Msg4 is UE-specific. | |
| Intel | Y | In our understanding, msg4 is already covered by the existing agreement | |
| Nordic | Y |  | |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  | |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  | |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  | |
| Panasonic | Y |  | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  | |
| NEC | Y |  | |
| DOCOMO | Y |  | |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  | |
| LGE | Y |  | |
| CMCC | Y |  | |
| Xiaomi1 | Y |  | |
| Ericsson | Y |  | |
| Sequans | Y |  | |
| FL2/FL3/FL4 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **Medium Priority Proposal 2.7-1b:**   * **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.** * **The number of PRB scheduled in DCI is not larger than the maximum number of PRB agreed in previous agreement from 110b-e.** | | |
| Ericsson | Y | | The proposal could be updated as follows considering the agreement made in Tuesday’s online session.   * **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.** * **The number of PRB scheduled in DCI is not larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS ~~the maximum number of PRB agreed in previous agreement from 110b-e~~.** |
| DOCOMO | Y | |  |
| Panasonic | Y | | Ericsson’s update is also fine. |
| Sharp | Y | |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | |  |
| LGE | Y | | Ericsson’s update is also fine for us too. |
| CATT | Y, almost | | For the 2nd bullet, we think Ericsson’s update is better. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | | Also agree with Ericsson’s update |
| vivo | Y | |  |
| NEC | Y | |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | |  |
| Nordic | Y | | prefer update from /// |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | |  |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **Medium Priority Proposal 2.7-1c:**   * **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.** * **The number of PRB scheduled in DCI is not larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS ~~the maximum number of PRB agreed in previous agreement from 110b-e~~.** | | |
| FL6 | Based on the discussion in the Wednesday online session, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **Medium Priority Proposal 2.7-1d:**   * **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.**   + **The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**   + **FFS: the UE behavior when the number scheduled PRBs is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS** | | |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** | |
| Ericsson | Y |  | |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are fine with the first sub-bullet. For the second sub-bullet, we don’t think FFS is necessary. UE behavior can be left to UE implementation. | |
| Nordic | Y | If UE is not required to process PDSCH, it may drop it and no HARQ-ACK is transmitted. | |
| Sequans | Y |  | |
| Sharp |  | We are fine with the fist sub-bullet.  Msg4 should follow the same rules for dedicated PDSCH. So the main bullet is not needed.  Second sub-bullet is also not necessary, it is an error case because EI has been included in msg3/msg1. | |
| Lenovo |  | Same view with Nokia | |
| vivo |  | Since the UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, the whole “**FFS**” in the 2nd subbullet" can be removed. | |
| Qualcomm |  | We do not prefer to have second sub-bullet with FFS as it contradicts with first sub-bullet. Msg4 PDSCH processing is not required if larger than 5MHz as first sub-bullet says, then why do we define additional UE behavior? | |
| DOCOMO | Y | In our understanding, eRedCap UE just send a NACK if scheduled RAR PDSCH is larger than 5 MHz and the UE cannot decode the PDSCH. Therefore, we don’t see any impact from legacy behavior.  But fine with this proposal for now while we don’t see the need for FFS. | |
| Panasonic | Y |  | |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  | |
| Intel | Y | Though we think more reasonable UE behavior is to drop PDSCH, since UE knows this Msg4 PDSCH (>5MHz) must be for other UE, we are also fine to leave to UE implementation. In our understanding, there is no impact on PUCCH. According to existing UE behavior in the spec, UE transmits PUCCH for HARQ-ACK (only for ACK) only if the PDSCH is decoded and the PDSCH is for this UE. The same PUCCH operation is assumed for eRedcap UE. | |
| CATT | Y | Share similar view with Nokia.  When RedCap UE fails to process Msg4 (due to >5 MHz or any other reason), it means contention resolution is failed. The UE may restart RACH procedure, just as legacy behavior. | |
| NEC | Y | On FFS, Rel-18 RedCap UE may discard Msg4 DCI if it allocates PRBs larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS. It may assume the DCI is intended for another non-Rel-18 RedCap UE. | |
| LGE | Y | We think that the second sub-bullet may be removed. | |
| Xiaomi2 | N | We think msg4 PDSCH can be taken as a kind of unicast PDSCH, thus the **Medium Priority Proposal 2.7-1c** is more preferred by us. | |
| MediaTek | Y |  | |
| OPPO | Y |  | |
| FL7 | Based on the discussion in the Thursday offline session, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **Medium Priority Proposal 2.7-1e:**   * **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.**   + **The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**   + **~~FFS: the UE behavior when the number scheduled PRBs is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS~~** | | |
| FL8 | The following working assumption was made in the Thursday online session:  Working assumption:   * For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.   + The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS. | | |

2.8 MsgA PUSCH bandwidth

RAN1 has made the following agreement regarding the PUSCH bandwidth [7]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, a UE is not expected to receive an UL grant in a DCI with a PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.  Agreement:  For UE BB bandwidth reduction, a UE is not expected to be configured with a CG grant with a PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.  Agreement:  For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to receive an UL grant in a RAR or in a DCI scrambled with TC-RNTI with a Msg3 PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable. |

Contributions [16, 18] discuss the MsgA PUSCH bandwidth (in case of 2-step RACH). Contribution [16] proposes to restrict the PUSCH bandwidth for MsgA in a similar way as in the above agreement, and to consider different options for coexistence with MsgA PUSCH transmissions from legacy UEs.

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 2.8-1a: Should the MsgA PUSCH bandwidth be limited in the same way as in the above agreements for other PUSCH transmissions?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** | |
| Vivo | Y |  | |
| Sharp | N | It can depend on network configuration. if a separate MsgA resource is configured for eRedCap, the MsgA PUSCH bandwidth should be limited within 5MHz, otherwise, eRedCap UE can share the msgA resource with RedCap UE. | |
| CATT | Y |  | |
| Intel | Y | We prefer unified design for all PUSCHs | |
| Nordic | Y |  | |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  | |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  | |
| Panasonic | Y |  | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  | |
| NEC | Y |  | |
| DOCOMO | Y |  | |
| LGE | Y |  | |
| CMCC | Y |  | |
| Xiaomi1 | Y |  | |
| Ericsson | Y |  | |
| Sequans | Y |  | |
| FL2/FL3/FL4 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **Medium Priority Proposal 2.8-1b: For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to receive a MsgA PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.** | | |
| Ericsson | Y | |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | |  |
| Panasonic | Y | |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | |  |
| LGE | Y | |  |
| CATT | Y | |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | |  |
| vivo | Y | |  |
| NEC | Y but prefer rewording. | | Following update is suggested: **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to perform 2-step RACH with ~~receive~~ a MsgA PUSCH resource ~~allocation~~ spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.**  MsgA PUSCH resources are pre-configured by SIB1. Therefore, we wonder if the “receive” is appropriate.  If MsgA PUSCH resource is shared with non-RedCap / Rel-17 RedCap, it would be possible that at least MsgA PUSCH resources of a group are no more than ~5Mhz but MsgA PUSCH resources of the other group may be more than ~5MHz.  But we can live with the current wording. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | |  |
| Nordic | Y | |  |
| SONY | Y | |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | | If the network does not recognize the UE, how the UE not expect to receive a MsgA larger than 5MHz? |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **Medium Priority Proposal 2.8-1c: For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to perform 2-step RACH with ~~receive~~ a MsgA PUSCH resource ~~allocation~~ spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.** | | |
| FL6 | The following agreement was made in the Wednesday online session:  Agreement:  For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to perform 2-step RACH with a MsgA PUSCH resource spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable. | | |

2.9 MsgB PDSCH bandwidth

Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth and MsgA PUSCH bandwidth have been discussed in Sections 2.7 and 2.8, respectively.

**FL6 Medium Priority Question 2.9-1a: Should the MsgB PDSCH bandwidth be limited in the same way as for Msg2 or Msg4?**

* **Option 0: No.**
* **Option 2: Yes, limit the MsgB PDSCH bandwidth in the same way as for Msg2 PDSCH.**
* **Option 4: Yes, limit the MsgB PDSCH bandwidth in the same way as for Msg4 PDSCH.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option (0/2/4)** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson |  | We propose to postpone this issue till next RAN1 meeting. |
| Nokia, NSB | 4 | MsgB should be treated like Msg4. In our understanding, the gNB should already know of RedCap UE type from MsgA. In case of contention resolution, the same principle as Msg4 should be applied (i.e. same as Proposal 2.7-1d) |
| Nordic | 4 | We should follow the worst case which is MSG4 |
| vivo | 4 |  |
| Qualcomm | 4 | The main difference between Msg2 and Msg4 is that Msg2 can be for multiple UEs (broadcast) and Msg4 is for a single UE (unicast). MsgB is always for a single UE like Msg4. |
| DOCOMO | 4 | same operation as Msg4 should be applied. |
| Spreadtrum |  | We also prefer to postpone this issue till next RAN1 meeting. |
| Intel | 4 | Since early identification can be available by MsgA PRACH and/or MsgA PUSCH, MsgB PDSCH for contention resolution is similar to Msg4. |
| CATT | 4 | Based on the assumption that MsgA PUSCH shall, similar to Msg3, already do early indication, MsgB bandwidth shall be able to restricted within 5 MHz. |
| NEC | 4 |  |
| LGE |  | We think that this issue will be postponed till next RAN1 meeting. |
| Xiaomi2 | 4 | Share the similar view with Qualcomm. |
| MediaTek |  | We agree with Ericsson that we don’t need to rush into conclusion. Come back next time. |
| OPPO | 4 | Yes, it would be needed, even with limitation on MsgA. |
| FL7 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **Medium Priority Proposal 2.9-1b: The MsgB PDSCH bandwidth and number of PRBs are limited in the same way as for Msg4 PDSCH.** | |
| FL8 | Based on the discussion in the Thursday online session, the above proposal is not discussed further in this meeting but can be expected to be revisited in the next meeting. | |

2.10 SRS bandwidth

Contribution [28] proposes to restrict the SRS bandwidth to 5 MHz, as for other uplink transmissions.

**FL6 Medium Priority Question 2.10-1a: Should the SRS bandwidth be limited to 5 MHz as for other uplink transmissions?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson |  | We propose to postpone this issue till next RAN1 meeting. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We should not limit SRS bandwidth to 5 MHz as the UE can be scheduled anywhere within BWP up to 20 MHz. |
| Nordic | Y | SRS can be still transmitted anywhere within 20MHz, but proposal is limit its BW to 5MHz. Because it seems SRS is the only UL channel/signal that remained larger than 5MHz. |
| vivo |  | We are fine to postpone this issue till next RAN1 meeting. |
| Qualcomm | N | Share the view from Nokia. SRS has to cover 20MHz in order to support flexible scheduling within BWP both for UL and DL.  We are also fine to postpone this issue until next RAN1. |
| DOCOMO | N | It is not captured in WID, and also the additional complexity reduction gain is marginal since at least PUCCH BW is allowed to be larger than 5MHz. Hence we don’t see the necessity. |
| Panasonic | N | For the better channel state estimation and better consequent scheduling, SRS should be able to be transmitted in any PRB sets > 5MHz in the active 20 MHz BWP. |
| Spreadtrum | N | We think R18 eRedCap can optionally support R18 RedCap positioning feature to meet the positioning requirements for some use case. With 20MHz SRS BW capability, the R18 RedCap positioning feature can be easily and naturally supported. If we further limited the SRS with 5MHz for R18 eRedCap, the situation will be completely different. |
| FUTUREWEI | N | The WID allows up to 20MHz signals |
| Intel | N | We don’t see any benefit to complexity reduction by limiting SRS BW. |
| CATT |  | This will change WID, which should be discussed in RANP:   * 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for PDSCH (for both unicast and broadcast) and PUSCH, with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL * **The other physical channels and signals** are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF+BB bandwidth. |
| NEC | N | It will be beneficial from network point of view for proper resource allocation of DL and UL. |
| LGE | N |  |
| Xiaomi2 | N | Out of scope. |
| MediaTek |  | Agree with Ericsson. |
| OPPO | N | We recognize this restriction on SRS is not needed. And seems this does not require much complexity. Further, seems no spec change needed if we don’t consider the restriction. |
| FL7 | There seems to be very little support for limiting the SRS bandwidth. | |

# 3 UE peak data rate reduction

3.0 Earlier agreements

RAN1 has made the following agreements for UE peak data rate reduction [7]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * UE peak data rate reduction is supported at least as an add-on to UE BB bandwidth reduction,   + The constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 is relaxed to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ X.   + FFS: the value of X * If UE peak data rate reduction is supported as a standalone feature,   + The constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 is relaxed to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ Y.   + FFS: the value of Y   + Note: Whether this option is supported will be decided in RAN plenary.   Agreement:   * The minimum DL peak rate target (for FD-FDD) is [10] Mbps based on peak data rate calculation according to 38.306. * The same value for X is used for DL and UL |

3.1 Target data rate

RAN#98e made the following decision [36], as noted by several contributions [17, 22, 26, 27, 34].

|  |
| --- |
| Issue 4: Minimum target (downlink) peak data rate:  Proposal: Keep the minimum target peak rate as 10Mbps  […]  Conclusion: proposals for issue 3 and issue 4 are agreed |

Based on the above decision, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 3.1-1a: Revise the earlier agreement by removing the square brackets like this:**

* **The minimum DL peak rate target (for FD-FDD) is ~~[~~10~~]~~ Mbps based on peak data rate calculation according to 38.306.**
* **The same value for X is used for DL and UL**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Xiaomi1 | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Sequans | Y |  |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses, the proposal seems acceptable.  **High Priority Proposal 3.1-1a: Revise the earlier agreement by removing the square brackets like this:**   * **The minimum DL peak rate target (for FD-FDD) is ~~[~~10~~]~~ Mbps based on peak data rate calculation according to 38.306.** * **The same value for X is used for DL and UL** | |
| FL3 | The following agreement was made in the Tuesday session:  Agreement:  Revise the earlier agreement by removing the square brackets like this:   * The minimum DL peak rate target (for FD-FDD) is ~~[~~10~~]~~ Mbps based on peak data rate calculation according to 38.306. * The same value for X is used for DL and UL | |

3.2 Add-on feature

For the case when UE peak data rate reduction is an add-on to UE BB bandwidth reduction, most contributions [9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34] propose to adopt a value of X in the range between 3.0 and 3.4. A couple of contributions [12, 16] propose to adopt a lower value (1 and 2, respectively). One contribution [27] notes that 3.2 would reach the target peak rate but anyway proposes to adopt value 4, i.e., no relaxation.

Contributions [15, 17] express that this decision should be made after the down-selection between Options 3 and 4 in Section 2.1.

Furthermore, contributions [26, 28] propose to consider introducing a new peak rate scaling factor (*f*) value.

**FL1 High Priority Question 3.2-1a: What value of X should be adopted (assuming Option 3 or 4 in Section 2.1)?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Value of X assuming Option 3** | **Value of X assuming Option 4** | | **Comments** |
| vivo | 3 or 3.2 | 3 or 3.4 | |  |
| CATT | 3 or 3.2 | 3 or 3.2 | |  |
| Intel | 3 | 3 | | From the following calculation, the proper X for 10Mbps peak rate is always different for SCS 15kHz or 30kHz. The necessary X for 15kHz is always lower (either 11 or 12 PRBs). Therefore, we believe the proper way is to allow a lower X value based on SCS 15kHz. In such case, peak data rate is 10Mbps for 15kHz and is lower than 10Mbps for 30kHz. Then, it is up to UE capability to support higher X for larger data rate for SCS 30kHz.   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **SCS (kHz)** |  | **Peak DL rate** | | **Peak UL rate** | | | **If X=4** | **X for 10Mbps** | **If X=4** | **X for 10Mbps** | | 15 | 25 | 13.4 | 2.99 | 14.3 | 2.8 | | 30 | 11 | 11.8 | 3.39 | 12.6 | 3.17 | | 30 | 12 | 12.8 | 3.13 | 13.7 | 2.92 | |
| Nordic | 3 | 3 | |  |
| FUTUREWEI | 3, 3.1 | 3.2 | | In our view, the 10 Mbps value is not exact target value. A small variability in the value is acceptable |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 3 or 3.2 | 3 | |  |
| Spreadtrum | 3.2 | 3.2 | |  |
| Nokia, NSB | 3.2 | 3.4 | |  |
| Panasonic | 3 | 3 | | 10 Mbps can be achieved when the SCS is 15 kHz with X=3. We prefer as low complexity as possible. |
| Qualcomm | 3.2 | 3.2 for UL, 4 for DL | | We prefer to discuss it after the RAN plenary decision on peak rate reduction.  We do not want to introduce any new values for *scalingFactor* other than the values supported in existing spec 38.306. Currently possible values are 1, 0.8, 0.75, and 0.4. This has to be clarified first before deciding the value itself. |
| DOCOMO | 3 or 3.2 | 3.2 | |  |
| Sierra Wireless |  |  | | The cost savings from this would not be significant thus our preference would be to leave the value as legacy. We can also discuss this after RAN plenary decision on peak rate reduction. |
| LGE | 3.2 | 3.4 | | Considering both 30 kHz SCS and 15 kHz SCS, support 3.4 if Option 4 is agreed and 3.2 if Option 3 is agreed. |
| CMCC | 3.2 | 3.4 or 4 | | But considering v=1,2, Q=2,4,6,8 and f takes values 1, 0.8, 0.75, 0.4, it seems 3.4 is not a valid value for vLayers·Qm·f . The next value that larger than 3.2 is 4. |
| Xiaomi1 | 3 or 3.2 | Not support option 4 | |  |
| Ericsson | ≥ 3.1 | ≥ 3.4 | | We prefer to specify values that do not require new *scalingFactor* values. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 3.2 | 3.4 | |  |
| Sequans |  |  | | Fine to discuss after RAN plenary decision on peak rate reduction. |
| FL2/FL3/FL4 | The average of the received responses is around 3.1 for Option 3 and around 3.2 for Option 4. Assuming that no new *scalingFactor* values will be defined, X=3.2 may be adopted in both cases.  **High Priority Proposal 3.2-1b: Revise the earlier RAN1 agreement as follows:**   * **UE peak data rate reduction is supported at least as an add-on to UE BB bandwidth reduction with the constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 relaxed to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 3.2** | | | |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | | **Comments** | |
| Ericsson | Y | |  | |
| DOCOMO | Y | | We are supportive to support smaller value than 3.2. | |
| Panasonic |  | | Accept the proposal for the progress. | |
| Sharp | Y | |  | |
| Qualcomm | Y | |  | |
| FUTUREWEI |  | | We would prefer a value of X=3, but if a majority of companies want 3.2, we would be fine with that value. | |
| LGE | Y | |  | |
| CATT | Y | | OK for progress. | |
| Sierra Wireless |  | | Would have preferred to wait for RAN decision but Ok | |
| vivo | Y | |  | |
| NEC | Y | |  | |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | |  | |
| Spreadtrum | Y | |  | |
| Nordic | N | | for 3.2, peak rate is larger than 10.7Mbits, that is larger than 10 said by WID. We cannot support 3.2 for 15kHz SCS. | |
| SONY |  | | We can wait for any decision in RAN. We would prefer to achieve the data rate target of 10Mbps than adopt a value of 3.2 just because it aligns with a current scaling factor. | |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | | OK | |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 3.2-1c: For the relaxed constraint X in the following earlier RAN1 agreement, down-select between X = 3 and X = 3.2.**   |  | | --- | | * UE peak data rate reduction is supported at least as an add-on to UE BB bandwidth reduction,   + The constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 is relaxed to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ X.   + FFS: the value of X | | | | |
| FL6 | The following agreement was made in the Wednesday online session:  Agreement:  For the relaxed constraint X in the following earlier RAN1 agreement, down-select between X = 3 and X = 3.2.   |  | | --- | | * UE peak data rate reduction is supported at least as an add-on to UE BB bandwidth reduction,   + The constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 is relaxed to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ X.   + FFS: the value of X |   **High Priority Question 3.2-1d: Please express your preference between X = 3 and X = 3.2.** | | | |
| **Company** | **Preference (3 or 3.2)** | | **Comments** | |
| Ericsson | 3.2 | | We prefer X = 3.2 as it satisfies 10 Mbps peak rate for both 15 and 30 kHz SCS. | |
| Nokia, NSB | 3.2 | | Same view as Ericsson. Also, from network perspective, 3.2 is better than 3.0 since UE can support slightly higher peak data rates. We think from complexity reduction perspective there is very small difference between 3.2 and 3. | |
| Nordic | 3.0 | | X=3.2 exceeds target peak-rate which is 10Mbits. 3.0 satisfied the WID description as well as previous RAN1 agreements. For a UE, the peak rate is determined as the worst case configuration, which in this case is 15kHz SCS. | |
| Sequans |  | | 3.2 is an existing scaling factor, can achieve 10Mbps for DL 30kHz case as well, and 3.0 complexity gain should not be that huge in comparison. But no very strong preference | |
| vivo | 3 | |  | |
| Qualcomm | 3.2 | | Single value is preferred for both 15 and 30 KHz SCS. | |
| Sierra Wireless | 3.2 | |  | |
| DOCOMO | 3 | | We are also fine to support 3 only for 15 kHz SCS. | |
| Panasonic | 3 | | We slightly prefer X=3 for further complexity reduction. 10 Mbps can be achieved when the SCS is 15 kHz with X=3. But if majority companies want to support 10 Mbps with SCS 30 kHz as well, we would accept X=3.2. | |
| Spreadtrum | 3.2 | |  | |
| Intel | 3.0 | | We slightly prefer X=3.0 since the peak data rate requirement can be satisfied with SCS 15kHz. | |
| CATT | 3.0 | | Prefer 3 for simplicity, but can accept 3.2. | |
| LGE | 3.2 | | X=3.2 is OK in order to accommodate the peak rate for 30KHz and 15 KHz SCS. | |
| Xiaomi2 | 3.2 | | X=3.2 is more preferred by us to meet the minimum 10Mbps target data rate. Of course, both 3 and 3.2 wouldn’t introduce a new scaling factor. | |
| MediaTek | 3.2 | | Share a similar view with Ericsson. | |
| FL7 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 3.2-1e: For the relaxed constraint X in the following earlier RAN1 agreement, select X = 3.2.**   |  | | --- | | * UE peak data rate reduction is supported at least as an add-on to UE BB bandwidth reduction,   + The constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 is relaxed to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ X.   + FFS: the value of X | | | | |
| FL8 | Based on the discussion in the Thursday online session, down-selection between X=3 and X=3.2 can be expected to take place in the next meeting.  If companies think there is a need to clarify the 10-Mbps peak rate target (e.g., whether it should be met/exceeded for both 15 and 30 kHz SCS or only one of them), they could consider proposing a WID revision in RAN#99. | | | |

3.3 Standalone feature

For the case when UE peak data rate reduction is a standalone feature, if supported, some contributions [14, 17, 30] propose to adopt Y=1. A couple of contributions [22, 31] propose to adopt a lower value (0.7 and 0.75, respectively).

Whether to support UE peak data rate reduction as a standalone feature is expected to be discussed in RAN#99 [1].

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 3.3-1a: If UE peak data rate reduction would be supported as a standalone feature, what value of Y should be adopted?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Value of Y** | **Comments** |
| vivo | 1 |  |
| CATT | 1 |  |
| Intel |  | We prefer to wait for guideline from RAN plenary |
| Nordic |  | This feature should not be discussed in RAN#1, discussion on support of this feature is ongoing in plenary |
| Spreadtrum |  | According to RAN’s conclusion (RP-223551, copied below), it seems not necessary to discuss this issue in this meeting.   |  | | --- | | ***For Issue – 1 UE peak rate reduction as a standalone feature***   * ***Conclusion*** * *Revisit in RAN#99 (no additional discussion in RAN1 in 1Q’23)* | |
| Qualcomm |  | Suggest to discuss it after RAN plenary decision on peak rate reduction. |
| DOCOMO | 0.7 or 0.75 | We are also supportive to introduce smaller scaling factor value than existing values when the peak rate reduction is supported as standalone feature. |
| Sierra Wireless |  | This can be discussed after RAN plenary decision on peak data rate reduction |
| LGE |  | We prefer not to continue discussion on the issues related to the UE peak rate reduction as a standalone feature in RAN1. |
| CMCC |  | According to conclusion of RAN#98 meeting, there is no additional discussion in RAN1 in 1Q’23 for PR1 standalone discussion. We can discuss this in later meeting. |
| Xiaomi1 |  | Share the same view as Intel, Nordic, Qualcomm and etc... |
| Ericsson |  | Prefer to discuss after RAN#99. |
| Sequans |  | To discuss after RAN plenary decision |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses, this topic is postponed and revisited after RAN#99 if needed. | |

# 4 Other aspects

The submitted contributions bring up the following other aspects which are not covered in any other section in this FLS.

**Cell barring**

* Introduce a new cell barring indication and an IFRI field in SIB1 [16].
* The final decision on whether to introduce additional cell access/barring indication is up to RAN2 [17].

**Feature group / UE type / capability reporting**

* Define new and/or reuse existing RedCap-related UE feature groups [11].
* The new UE type is defined by its support of UE BB bandwidth reduction [16].
* The new UE type is defined by its support of the two UE complexity reduction features [26].

**FDRA optimization**

* There is no need to consider potential optimization of FDRA indications [17, 18, 28, 35].
* Consider potential optimizations of FDRA indication for PUSCH but not for PDSCH [13].
* Consider potential optimizations of FDRA indications in case of large RBG size [25].
* Discuss whether/how to use potential spare bits in FDRA field in RAR UL grant [25].
* For unicast, the FDRA indications and RBG sizes can be based on 5-MHz sub-bands [29].

**Other functionality**

* Consider enhancements of user multiplexing capacity for common PUCCH [25, 33].
* Restrict the SRS bandwidth to 5 MHz, like the other UL bandwidths [28].
* Support PRS- and SRS-based positioning methods [11].
* Support operation in dedicated spectrum <5 MHz at least optionally [11].
* Confirm whether and how to support MBS, SUL, V2X, and NR-U [11].

To be able to focus on more pressing issues, the above aspects could be down-prioritized in this meeting.

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 4-1a: Is there a need to treat any of the issues listed above in this meeting?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | N |  |
| CATT | N | We are open to comeback once most essential issues are addressed. |
| FUTUREWEI | N |  |
| Qualcomm | N | Not needed in this meeting. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We prefer to discuss user multiplexing capacity on common PUCCH.  Same as the discussion for separate initial BWP specific to Rel-18 eRedCap, we see the needs to ensure the capacity since the target device of Rel-18 eRedCap is low-end devices and the number of UE which NW has to accommodate is expected to be larger compared to Rel-17 RedCap. |
| LGE | Y | For FDRA optimization, RBG size 16 can be difficult to constrain FDRA assignment up to 25 PRBs for 15KHs SCS in RA Type 0. So UEs which are allocated only 16 PRBs with RBG size 16 cannot reach peak date rate. Some large RBG sizes may be discussed on Configuration 1 dependent on BWP size.  And enhancements of user multiplexing capacity for common PUCCH can be discussed considering the situation that people who carry not only smartphones but only simultaneously wear additional smart watches and VR glasses will demand explosive connections toward gNodeB with a lot of mobile devices at the same time. |
| Ericsson | N |  |
| MediaTek | N |  |
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