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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]. The final FLS from the previous RAN1 meeting can be found in [3], and a RAN1 agreement summary is available in [4].

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.
	+ 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.
	+ Relation between ‘UE BB bandwidth reduction’ and ‘UE peak data rate reduction’
		- A UE can support ‘UE peak data rate reduction’ with or without ‘UE BB bandwidth reduction’.
		- The initial access procedure for ‘UE peak data rate reduction’ without ‘UE BB bandwidth reduction’ is the same as for ‘UE peak data rate reduction’ with ‘UE BB bandwidth reduction’.
	+ The peak rate target is 10 Mbps regardless of what optional features the UE may support.
	+ Support additional separate early indication(s) [RAN1, RAN2]
	+ 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.
 |

This document summarizes contributions [5] – [28] submitted to agenda item 9.4.1, contribution [29] submitted to agenda item 5, and the following email discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| [114bis-R18-RedCap] Email discussion on eRedCap – Johan (Ericsson)* 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.
 |

Issues in this document are tagged and color coded with High Priority, Medium Priority, and Low Priority, and the issues that are in the focus of this discussion round are furthermore tagged FL6. The FLSs from previous rounds are in [34, 35].

Follow the naming convention in this example:

* *eRedCapFLS3-v000.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS3-v001-CompanyA.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS3-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS3-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 *eRedCapFLS3-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*.
* CompanyC uploads an empty file named *eRedCapFLS3-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 *eRedCapFLS3-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 11 in [R1-2308803](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_114b/Docs/R1-2308803.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.

**FL5 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 |
| Spreadtrum | Sicong Zhao | sicong.zhao@unisoc.com |
| Nordic | Karol Schober | karol.schober@nordicsemi.no |
| CATT | Yongqiang Fei | feiyongqiang@catt.cn |
| FUTUREWEI | Vip Desai | vipul.desai@futurewei.com |
| Sharp | Xiaojun Ma | xiaojun.ma@cn.sharp-world.com |
| CMCC | Jiazhen Zhang | zhangjiazhen@chinamobile.com |
| LG Electronics  | Seungjin Ahn | seungjin.ahn@lge.com |
| Nokia, NSB | Rapeepat Ratasuk | rapeepat.ratasuk@nokia.com |
| MediaTek | Chiou-Wei Tsai | cw.tsai@mediatek.com |
| SONY | Martin Beale | martin.beale@sony.com |
| NTT DOCOMO | Mayuko Okano | mayuko.okano.ca@nttdocomo.com |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Youjun Hu | hu.youjun1@zte.com.cn |
| Ericsson | Sandeep Veedu | sandeep.narayanan.kadan.veedu@ericsson.com |
| NEC | Takahiro Sasaki | takahiro.sasaki@nec.com |
| Xiaomi | Xuemei Qiao | qiaoxuemei@xiaomi.com |

# 2 UE BB bandwidth reduction

2.0 Earlier agreements

RAN1 has made the following agreements for UE BB bandwidth reduction [4]:

|  |
| --- |
| **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

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”.**Number of PRBs**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**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.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.**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**Conclusion:For UE BB complexity reduction, broadcast of separate SIB1/OSI (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs is not supported.Agreement:* For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for SIB1 (PDSCH),
	+ Allow the scheduling of SIB1 to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). The scheduling of SIB1 PDSCH is allowed to be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.
* 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). The scheduling of OSI PDSCH is allowed to be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.

**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). The scheduling of paging PDSCH is allowed to be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**Msg2 bandwidth, Msg2-Msg3 timeline, and Msg1 indication**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”* 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

Agreement:* For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,
	+ X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS
* Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.
* A network-configurable additional separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.
	+ When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).
* When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not configured while Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, Rel-18 eRedCap UEs shall share the PRACH that is configured for Rel-17 RedCap UEs.
	+ Note: Rel-18 eRedCap UEs will be differentiated from Rel-17 RedCap UEs based on Msg3 of Rel-18 eRedCap UEs.
* Additional early indication in MsgA PRACH is not supported.

Agreement:* For UE BB bandwidth reduction, the same timeline relaxation as for the Msg2-Msg3 timeline applies at least for the following cases:
	+ Case 4a: Between reception of RAR PDSCH in which UE does not correctly receive the transport block and upcoming transmission of PRACH
	+ Case 4b: Between reception of RAR with RAPID which is not associated with the corresponding PRACH transmission and upcoming transmission of PRACH

**Msg4 bandwidth**Agreement:Confirm the following working assumption by assuming that Msg3 indication is available:* 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.

Agreement:Final LS [R1-2304262](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2304262.zip) is endorsed.**MsgB bandwidth and 2-step RACH timeline**Agreement:For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for 2-step RACH, assuming that MsgA PUSCH indication is transmitted:* The bandwidth of a MsgB scheduled with MSGB-RNTI should be limited in a similar way as Msg2.
	+ The same timeline relaxation as for the Msg2-Msg3 timeline (i.e., 1 slot for Msg2 PDSCH larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS) applies at least for the following cases:
		- Case 2a: Between reception of fallbackRAR and transmission of Msg3
		- Case 2b: Between reception of successRAR and transmission of corresponding HARQ-ACK
* The bandwidth of a MsgB scheduled with C-RNTI should be limited in a similar way as Msg4.

Agreement:For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for 2-step RACH, assuming that MsgA PUSCH indication is transmitted:* The same timeline relaxation as for the Msg2-Msg3 timeline (i.e., 1 slot for Msg2 PDSCH larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS) applies at least for the following cases:
	+ Case 2c: Between reception of MsgB PDSCH scheduled by MSGB-RNTI in which UE does not correctly receive the transport block in the corresponding PDSCH within the window and transmission of only PRACH according to Type-1 random access procedure or to transmit both PRACH and PUSCH according to Type-2 random access procedure.
	+ Case 2d: Between reception of MsgB PDSCH scheduled by MSGB-RNTI with RAPID which is not associated with the corresponding PRACH transmission from the UE and transmission of only PRACH according to Type-1 random access procedure or to transmit both PRACH and PUSCH according to Type-2 random access procedure.

**MBS bandwidth**Agreement:* For UE BB bandwidth reduction, the number of PRBs scheduled in DCI can be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS for:
	+ Broadcast MBS PDSCH without any PDSCH in next slot
	+ Broadcast MBS PDSCH without MBS PDSCH repetition

**Simultaneous reception**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.Conclusion:For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for autonomous SI acquisition, the following paragraph in TS 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies:* “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.”
* FFS: Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI case

Agreement:* For UE BB complexity reduction, for RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two PDSCH transmissions for SIB1 / OSI / paging / RAR / Msg4 scheduled by TC-RNTI for the case when Msg4 PDSCH is not larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.
* Note: This means that the following paragraph in TS 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies for the case when Msg4 PDSCH is not larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS:
	+ “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.”

Conclusion:For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI during a process of autonomous SI acquisition, no specification change.Agreement:* For handling of multiple reception in a slot during P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition when the total number of PRBs for the PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI and the PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI scheduled in the slot is larger than the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can process per slot, the UE may skip decoding of the scheduled PDSCH with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI.

Agreement:* For UE BB bandwidth reduction, when PDSCH scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI is not greater than 25/12 PRBs with 15/30kHz SCS, 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies, i.e.:
	+ “The UE is not expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, G-RNTI for multicast or broadcast, MCCH-RNTI, G-CS-RNTI or CS-RNTI if another PDSCH in the same cell scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time.”

Agreement:* For UE BB bandwidth reduction, when PDSCH scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI is greater than 25/12 PRBs with 15/30kHz SCS, support the following UE behavior:
	+ UE behavior 2: Relaxed random access processing timeline in connected mode:
		- The UE is not expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, G-RNTI for multicast or broadcast, MCCH-RNTI, G-CS-RNTI or CS-RNTI in the same or next slot if another PDSCH in the same cell is scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI.
 |

2.1 Random access timeline

Contribution [7] expresses that the following paragraph in 38.213 [31] clause 17.1A does not consider that in 2-step RACH, higher layers can indicate to the physical layer to transmit both PRACH and PUSCH (not just PRACH).

|  |
| --- |
| When - a UE receives a PDSCH scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a RA-RNTI or a MsgB-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, and - the UE does not correctly receive the transport block provided by the PDSCH, or if the higher layers at the UE do not identify a RAPID associated with a corresponding PRACH transmission from the UEthe UE shall be ready to transmit a PRACH no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.75$ msec for 15 kHz SCS, or no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.25$ msec for 30 kHz SCS, after the last symbol of the PDSCH reception, or after the last symbol of the window as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A. |

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.1-1a: Is there a need to update the above 38.213 paragraph to consider that in 2-step RACH, higher layers can indicate to the physical layer to transmit both PRACH and PUSCH (not just PRACH)? Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| QC | No | The paragraph mentioned in [7] seems not the above. The paragraph that [7] targets to modify is the following. But anyway, we don’t need the need to update the below neither.When - a UE receives a PDSCH scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a RA-RNTI or a MsgB-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, and - the UE does not correctly receive the transport block provided by the PDSCH, or if the higher layers at the UE do not identify a RAPID associated with a corresponding PRACH transmission from the UEthe UE shall be ready to transmit a PRACH no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.75$ msec for 15 kHz SCS, or no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.25$ msec for 30 kHz SCS, after the last symbol of the PDSCH reception, or after the last symbol of the window as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A. |
| FL |  | Thanks for spotting this. I have updated the text snippet above the question, so that it shows the right paragraph. Sorry for any confusion this might have caused. |
| vivo |  | We think it is beneficial to have such correction. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | Thanks Qualcomm for correcting and thanks FL for updating, the modification (red part) is for PRACH transmission, i.e., the following

|  |
| --- |
| TS 38.21317.1A Second procedures for RedCap UE=================Unchanged parts are omitted=================When - a UE receives a PDSCH scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a RA-RNTI or a MsgB-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, and - the UE does not correctly receive the transport block provided by the PDSCH, or if the higher layers at the UE do not identify a RAPID associated with a corresponding PRACH transmission from the UEFor Type-1 random access procedure, the higher layers can indicate to the physical layer to transmit a PRACH. For Type-2 random access procedure, the higher layers can indicate to the physical layer to transmit only PRACH according to Type-1 random access procedure or to transmit both PRACH and PUSCH according to Type-2 random access procedure. If requested by higher layers, t~~T~~he UE shall be ready to transmit a PRACH no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.75$ msec for 15 kHz SCS, or no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.25$ msec for 30 kHz SCS, after the last symbol of the PDSCH reception, or after the last symbol of the window as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A. =============== Unchanged parts are omitted=================== |

The current spec reads like only PRACH can be transmitted, but for 2-Step RACH, the higher layers can indicate to the physical layer to transmit only PRACH according to Type-1 random access procedure or to transmit both PRACH and PUSCH according to Type-2 random access procedure. Therefore, we add the red part (as above) to make it clear.We need to notice that in section 8.2(4-step RACH) and 8.2A(2-setp RACH), there are also clarifications(listed below) for RACH or RACH+PUSCH transmission to avoid ambiguity. Therefore, we suggest to align with the descriptions in 8.2 and 8.2A.

|  |
| --- |
| **38.213** **8.2 Random access response - Type-1 random access procedure**“the higher layers can indicate to the physical layer to transmit a PRACH. If requested by higher layers, the UE shall be ready to transmit…”**8.2A Random access response - Type-2 random access procedure**“the higher layers can indicate to the physical layer to transmit only PRACH according to Type-1 random access procedure or to transmit both PRACH and PUSCH according to Type-2 random access procedure [11, TS 38.321]. If requested by higher layers, the UE shall be ready to transmit” |

 |
| Nordic | No | There should not be a need. If PRACH is associated with PUSCH then higher layer instruct UE to send PUSCH after PRACH. |
| OPPO |  | We do not read the text in 8.2a will restrict UE only transmit for 4-step RACH. It is not convinced that the change is necessary.  |
| CATT | Y | OK. This follows the spirit of previous agreement. |
| Sharp | N | There is no need to change for PUSCH for the reason of that the PUSCH is always associated with PRACH preamble with preconfigured mapping. |
| CMCC |  | Current wording seems ok. If majority agrees to supply the higher layer indication to make it more clear, we are also fine with the correction.  |
| LG | N | We think that Any changed is not needed |
| Nokia, NSB | No | Agree with other companies that the PUSCH is already associated with the PRACH for 2-step random access and there is no need to clarify the specification. |
| DOCOMO | N | We don’t see the strong need for the updates especially for eRedCap UE. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We are open to consider it, which can make it clearer. |
| Ericsson | N | We don’t think there is a need to update 38.213 to capture the PUSCH case, as commented by many other companies above.  |
| Xiaomi | Y | Fine with the TP proposed by Spreadtrum, which could make previous achieved agreements on MsgB bandwidth and 2-step RACH timelineclearer. Furthermore, the TP is just similar with the clarification in TS 38.213 Clause 8.2A for 2-step RACH. |
| Samsung | N | There is no need to update the above 38.213 paragraph. |
| FL2/FL3 | Most received responses do not see a need for a specification update. Companies can provide further comments below if needed. |
| Spreadtrum | Thanks for the discussion and views from companies.We would like to further clarify that **we just want to make the spec align with the agreements and the legacy procedure descriptions**, and we are not going to add something new.First of all, we captured both cases in the last RAN1 agreements (as below), while the current spec didn’t reflect these two cases. We think the spec should align with what we agreed.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for 2-step RACH, assuming that MsgA PUSCH indication is transmitted:* The same timeline relaxation as for the Msg2-Msg3 timeline (i.e., 1 slot for Msg2 PDSCH larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS) applies at least for the following cases:
	+ Case 2c: Between reception of MsgB PDSCH scheduled by MSGB-RNTI in which UE does not correctly receive the transport block in the corresponding PDSCH within the window and transmission of only PRACH according to Type-1 random access procedure or to transmit both PRACH and PUSCH according to Type-2 random access procedure.
	+ Case 2d: Between reception of MsgB PDSCH scheduled by MSGB-RNTI with RAPID which is not associated with the corresponding PRACH transmission from the UE and transmission of only PRACH according to Type-1 random access procedure or to transmit both PRACH and PUSCH according to Type-2 random access procedure.
 |

Secondly, we understand the comments from companies that “If PRACH is associated with PUSCH then higher layer instruct UE to send PUSCH after PRACH.”, but the issue here is that we are not sure whether the higher layer can indicate the physical layer to transmit both PRACH and PUSCH for R18 RedCap. The current can be interpreted as the higher layer can only indicate the physical layer to transmit PRACH only for R18 RedCap.Thirdly, the current spec has risk to change the procedure of PRACH retransmission. If we look at the 2/4 step RACH description (taking 8.2A as example),

|  |
| --- |
| **8.2A Random access response - Type-2 random access procedure**“**if the UE does not correctly receive** the transport block in the corresponding PDSCH within the window, or if the higher layers do not identify the RAPID associated with the PRACH transmission from the UE, **the higher layers can indicate** to the physical layer to transmit only PRACH according to Type-1 random access procedure or to transmit both PRACH and PUSCH according to Type-2 random access procedure [11, TS 38.321]. **If requested by higher layers**, **the UE shall be ready to transmit…**” |

the procedure for legacy UE is: Step 1: if the UE does not correctly receive …Step 2: the higher layers can indicate to the physical layer to transmit…Step 3: If requested by higher layers….Step 4: the UE shall be ready to transmit…But the current spec text only includes:Step 1: if the UE does not correctly receive …~~Step 2: the higher layers can indicate to the physical layer to transmit…~~~~Step 3:. If requested by higher layers….~~Step 4: the UE shall be ready to transmit…Obviously, the procedure for PRACH transmission has been changed. We don’t think we had such an agreements to change the procedure.We see the need to make it more clear, and if companies dislike a huge TP, maybe we can try the following one:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| TS 38.21317.1A Second procedures for RedCap UE=================Unchanged parts are omitted=================When - a UE receives a PDSCH scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a RA-RNTI or a MsgB-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, and - the UE does not correctly receive the transport block provided by the PDSCH, or if the higher layers at the UE do not identify a RAPID associated with a corresponding PRACH transmission from the UEIf requested by higher layers (as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A.), t~~T~~he UE shall be ready to transmit a PRACH no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.75$ msec for 15 kHz SCS, or no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.25$ msec for 30 kHz SCS, after the last symbol of the PDSCH reception, or after the last symbol of the window as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A. =============== Unchanged parts are omitted=================== |  |

 |
| FL4 | As mentioned in a Tuesday offline session, companies are invited to comment on the TP in Spreadtrum’s comment above. |
| vivo | We are fine with Spreadtrum’s TP to make it clear that in case of 2-step RACH, both Msg.A PRACH and Msg.A PUSCH will be re-transmitted.  |
| OPPO | For the new proposal, just wander if the last “as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A.”，existing text. I wonder if that already serve the purpose?  |
| DOCOMO | We share the similar understanding with OPPO. The generic sentence is already there, then we don’t see the strong need. |
| Spreadtrum | @OPPO@DCM, thanks for the question and views.Our understanding for the “as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A.” at the end of the paragraph is just to explain the window definition. The red “as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A” in the bracket is to explain how higher layer can indicate to the physical layer to transmit PRACH-only or transmit both PRACH and PUSCH. This also means, the procedure is the same as the legacy. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with Spreadtrum’s updated TP.  |
| NEC | OK with the short version of TP. |
| Nordic  | Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A are mention, all clear |
| LG2 | OK |
| CMCC | Fine with the TP. |
| MediaTek | OK |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.**High Priority Proposal 2.1-1b: Adopt the following TP for 38.213 clause 17.1A:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| When - a UE receives a PDSCH scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a RA-RNTI or a MsgB-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, and - the UE does not correctly receive the transport block provided by the PDSCH, or if the higher layers at the UE do not identify a RAPID associated with a corresponding PRACH transmission from the UEIf requested by higher layers (as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A), t~~T~~he UE shall be ready to transmit a PRACH no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.75$ msec for 15 kHz SCS, or no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.25$ msec for 30 kHz SCS, after the last symbol of the PDSCH reception, or after the last symbol of the window as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A. |  |

  |
| FL6 | The following agreement was made in the Wednesday online session:Agreement:Adopt the following TP for 38.213 clause 17.1A:

|  |
| --- |
| When - a UE receives a PDSCH scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a RA-RNTI or a MsgB-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, and - the UE does not correctly receive the transport block provided by the PDSCH, or if the higher layers at the UE do not identify a RAPID associated with a corresponding PRACH transmission from the UEif requested by higher layers, ~~T~~the UE shall be ready to transmit a PRACH no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.75$ msec for 15 kHz SCS, or no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.25$ msec for 30 kHz SCS, after the last symbol of the PDSCH reception, or after the last symbol of the window as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A. |

  |

Contribution [26] proposes to interpret initial access as random access in RRC\_IDLE, meaning that the random access procedure for UEs supporting FG 48-2 and UEs not supporting FG 48-2 should be the same in RRC\_IDLE but can be different in RRC\_INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED.

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.1-2a: Can the “same initial access procedure” (for UEs supporting FG 48-2 and UEs not supporting FG 48-2) be interpreted as “random access in RRC\_IDLE”? Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| QC | Yes | To facilitate a PR1 UE access NW as smooth as a regular UE, the time relaxation and BB restriction should not be applied to the PR1 UE. Therefore, whenever it is possible, the timeline relaxation and BB restriction should not be applied to PR1 UE. With the above, we think “same initial access procedure” means “random access in RRC\_IDLE”. |
| Vivo |  | We are not sure about the intention of the question. From our understanding, for random access for eRedCap UE in idle and inactive modes, and for contention based random access for eRedCap UE in connected mode, NW cannot differentiate FG48-1 eRedCap and FG48-2 eRedCap UEs, so the same random access procedure should be applied.  |
| Spreadtrum |  | In our understanding, we cannot simply say “the random access procedure for UEs supporting FG 48-2 and UEs not supporting FG 48-2 can be different in RRC\_INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED.” * In connected mode, if CBRA is performed, the gNB still cannot distinguish which type of eRedCap it is (PR1 UE or BW3/PR3 UE), then the random access procedure should also be the same. However, for CFRA, as the gNB knows the type of UE, the time relaxation and BB restriction may not need to be applied to the UEs not supporting FG 48-2.
* In idle mode, it is clear that the gNB cannot know UE’s capability. Therefore the random access procedure for UEs supporting FG 48-2 and UEs not supporting FG 48-2 should be the same.

In addition, we doubt the benefits and necessity. For UEs supporting FG 48-2, the relaxed time is actually “optional” at UE side, 1) For Msg3 transmission, the otherwise case is based on UE implementation, the 48-2 UEs can handle larger RAR PDSCH and transmit Msg3 in a short time. 2) For PRACH transmission, the timeline is “no later than”, the 48-2 UE can transmit PRACH as early as possible. 3) For PUCCH HARQ-ACK transmission, the otherwise case is also based on UE implementation, the UE behavior is similar to 1).  |
| Nordic  | No | Our understanding has been initial access = CBRA random access. i.e. when gNB cannot recognize UE from PRACH, the same initial access applies.  |
| OPPO | N | The proposal is trying to optimize FG 48-2 UE in latency. But those benefit is quite small as the whole procedure was considered mainly for FG 48-2. Differentiate UEs’ behavior in different RRC mode would not help too much for the issue. Would be better to consider if it is CBRA or CFRA. But it is difficult to re-discuss at this stage. |
| CATT |  | We agree with the analysis of Spreadtrum. Maybe only ‘CFRA in RRC\_CONNECTED’ case can be different. For other cases, including RACH in RRC\_IDLE or CBRA in RRC\_CONNECTED, same random access procedure is needed. But we do not foresee this makes huge change or brings huge benefit if CFRA of FG48-2 UE does not apply relaxed timeline. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | The question is unclear. Whenever a FG 48-2 UE needs to perform a contention based random access, the network is unable to distinguish a FG 48-2 UE from a FG 48-1 UE until at least after Msg3 is transmitted (for initial access it is after capability exchange). The same random access procedure applies until the networks stops scheduling using the TC-RNTI. |
| CMCC |  | For CBRA in all RRC mode, RB restriction and timeline relaxation is the same for UE supporting 48-1 or 48-2. For CFRA in RRC connected mode, RB restriction and timeline relaxation should not apply for UE supporting 48-2 to facilitate deployment of eRedCap UE supporting 48-2. |
| LG | Y | We are open to discuss it  |
| Nokia, NSB | No | We agree that for CBRA, timeline relaxation should apply to both FG 48-1 and 48-2 UEs. For CFRA, our preference is that FG 48-2 would also observe timeline relaxation to keep the specification simple. We don’t really see significant benefits to having a different timeline for FG 48-2 UE in CFRA.  |
| MediaTek | N | We share a similar understanding with Nordic and some other companies. |
| SONY |  | We understand that “initial access procedure” means CBRA random access in general. |
| DOCOMO |  | The context of “same initial access procedure” was captured in the note of RANP agreement is that NW cannot differentiate UEs supporting/not supporting FG48-2 without separate early indication in Msg1. Therefore, we don’t see the need to share the same random access procedure in RRC CONNECTED in general. However, as commented by companies, CBRA in RRC CONNECTED may need to be shared between UEs supporting/not supporting FG48-2, and hence the “same initial access procedure” can be interpreted at least as random access in RRC IDLE. It can be further discussed whether CBRA for RRC CONNECTED should be included as the “initial access procedure”. In other words, CFRA in RRC CONNECTED is not included as the “initial access procedure”. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | For a CBRA, how to differentiate it is initial access or not? How gNB differentiate it is for FG48-1 or FG48-2 UE? How gNB differentiate it is in idle mode/inactive mode or connected mode?If we can not differentiate, then this proposal is not valid. Additionally, we want proponents to clarify the spec changes, since now it is in the maintenance stage.  |
| Ericsson | Yes | A scenario where the above interpretation would be useful is for adapting the Msg4 bandwidth in RRC\_INACTIVE/RRC\_CONNECTED. In more detail, based on the current spec, the Msg4 bandwidth must be limited to be within 5 MHz for both FG 48-1 UEs and FG 48-2 UEs, in all RRC states. However, in RRC\_INACTIVE/RRC\_CONNECTED, upon reception of I-RNTI/C-RNTI in Msg3, the network can know whether the UE is an FG 48-1 UE or an FG 48-2 UE. Based on this knowledge, the network can adapt the Msg4 bandwidth based on their capabilities.In addition to the above scenario, the network knows the capabilities of the UE in scenarios where the FG 48-1 and FG 48-2 UEs are provided with separate RACH resources and during CFRA procedure in RRC\_CONNECTED. In these scenarios, the network can adapt the messages after Msg1 based on the capabilities of the UEs.Therefore, the interpretation, as in the question above, provides additional flexibility for the network to schedule the UEs once their capabilities are known (i.e., whether they support UE BB bandwidth reduction or not). |
| NEC |  | As mentioned by other companies, only CFRA could be different. Open to discuss. |
| Xiaomi |  | Actually, we have one question on how to understand the term of “during initial access”. For example, for a UE which hasn’t been turned on for a long time, it will perform cell selection, initial access and come to the RRC\_CONNECTED state at first once it is turned on. While, if there is no MO and MT data to transmit or receive, it will be switched to the RRC\_IDLE state. In this case, we just wonder that whether this kind of RRC\_IDLE state is also called as “during initial access procedure”.  |
| Samsung | N | Since network cannot distinguish the UEs supporting FG 48-2 and the UEs not supporting FG 48-G for CBRA case, the random access procedure should the same for RRC Idle mode and RRC Inactive/Connected mode. |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses to Questions 2.1-1a and 2.1-2a, the following proposal can be considered.**High Priority Proposal 2.1-2b:*** **The following do not apply to FG 48-2 UEs for CFRA:**
	+ **Random access timeline relaxation**
	+ **Bandwidth restriction for Msg3/MsgA PUSCH**
	+ **Bandwidth restriction for Msg4/MsgB PDSCH**
* **The following does not apply to FG 48-2 UEs for CBRA in RRC\_INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED:**
	+ **Bandwidth restriction for Msg4/MsgB PDSCH**
 |
| FL3 | The following agreement was made in the Monday online session:Agreement:* The following does not apply to FG 48-2 UEs for CFRA:
	+ RAR PDSCH timeline relaxation

Based on the discussion in the Monday online session, perhaps the following updated proposal can be considered:**High Priority Proposal 2.1-2c:*** **The following does not apply to FG 48-2 UEs ~~for CBRA in RRC\_INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED~~ if C-RNTI or I-RNTI was signaled in Msg3/MsgA:**
	+ **Bandwidth restriction for Msg4/MsgB PDSCH**
 |
| CATT |  | If C-RNTI is carried in Msg3/MsgB, we agree that network shall be aware of the UE capability and perhaps no need to restrict the bandwidth of Msg4/MsgB.But can proponent clarify what I-RNTI means? A new defined RNTI in Rel-18? |
| Nordic | Do not support | We prefer simple spec, this is a small optimization for FG 48-2 UE. It is not an essential correction. |
| vivo | N for now | For an inactive UE, even if the I-RNTI is signalled in Msg.3/Msg.A, it is still possible that the gNB failed to fetch the UE context and cannot identify the UE type.For contention- based RACH for connected UEs, if C-RNTI MAC CE is sent in Msg.3, if gNB receives Msg.3 successfully, gNB will send the PDCCH transmission that is addressed to the C-RNTI and there seems no PDSCH. [even if, there is, it is more like unicast PDSCH, not sure it can be called “Msg.4”] **321:** 1> if notification of a reception of a PDCCH transmission of the SpCell is received from lower layers: 2> **if the C-RNTI MAC CE was included in Msg3**: 3> if the Random Access procedure was initiated for SpCell beam failure recovery or for beam failure recovery of both BFD-RS sets of SpCell (as specified in clause 5.17) and the **PDCCH transmission is addressed to the C-RNTI**; or 3> if the Random Access procedure was initiated by a PDCCH order and the PDCCH transmission is addressed to the C-RNTI; or 3> if the Random Access procedure was initiated by the MAC sublayer itself or by the RRC sublayer and the **PDCCH transmission is addressed to the C-RNTI and contains a UL grant for a new transmission**: 4> consider this Contention Resolution successful; 4> stop *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer*; 4> discard the *TEMPORARY\_C-RNTI*; 4> consider this Random Access procedure successfully completed.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | If C-RNTI is carried via Msg3, why the gNB would schedule a PDSCH larger than 5MHz? We do not think it is a valid case need to be addressed. |
| CMCC | Y | When inactive mode UE initiate resume request, I-RNTI is included in Msg3, gNB can know UE capability based on I-RNTI. When connected mode UE perform CBRA, if C-RNTI is included in Msg3, gNB can also know UE capability. Thus, bandwidth restriction for Msg4/MsgB PDSCH is not necessary for FG 48-2 UEs in inactive mode and conected mode. |
| FUTUREWEI | Not needed | The current specification statesA UE that indicated FG 48-2 does not expect to transmit a PUSCH over a bandwidth that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, per hop in a slot, where the PUSCH is scheduled by RAR UL grant or by a DCI scrambled by a TC-RNTI, or is configured for a Type-2 random access procedure.The standard already supports scheduling 20 MHz PDSCH when C-RNTI / I-RNTI is used to scramble the DCI for a FG 48-2 |
| LG | N | This proposal can require a lot of spec impact for minor optimization in the maintenance season. I-RNTI is in RRC message and is not the parameter to be handled by MAC, RACH procedure is managed in MAC. In order to conduct the proposal, I-RNTI should be decoded in RRC. We think that This is up to gNodeB implementation.  |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We think this is a small optimization and not essential |
| FL4/FL6 | The following TP for 38.213 clause 17.1A was discussed in a Tuesday offline session without reaching offline consensus. Companies are invited to provide further comments.**High Priority Proposal 2.1-2d: Adopt the following TP for 38.213 clause 17.1A:**

|  |
| --- |
| A UE not supporting FG 48-2, or a UE in RRC\_IDLE supporting FG 48-2, is not required to process a PDSCH reception that is scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a TC-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, in a slot. |

 |
| vivo | N | It is not essential to optimize the inactive case, anyway NW needs to handle the idle case. Unified behaviour is simper both from NW side and UE side.  |
| OPPO | N | We somehow think this modification is not justified as commented in the offline.It seems to optimize case of FG48-2 UE, when gNB know, that the wider band is possible to be allocated. |
| DOCOMO |  | **For Proposal 2.1-2d**We are fine with the proposal.**For Proposal 2.1-2c**It was pointed at the offline session that gNB may be failed to fetch the UE context even if UE transmit C-RNTI/I-RNTI in Msg3/A. Actually, gNB may be failed to fetch early indication in Msg3, but separate procedure is allowed among non-RedCap/RedCap/eRedCap UEs. Then, we are not sure why different procedure is not allowed between UE supporting FG48-2 and not supporting FG48-2.In addition, we prefer to clarify whether to apply other BB BW reduction features (i.e., Msg3/A PUSCH BW and/or relaxed timeline for RAR) to FG48-2 is FFS and this proposal does not mean that other BB BW reduction features not listed here applied to FG48-2 automatically. Following updates can address our concern if we discuss this proposal further.“**At least** The following does not apply to FG 48-2 UEs…” |
| Ericsson | Y | As we commented during Tuesday’s offline session, since the gNB may know the capability of the UE from the I-RNTI in Msg3 in RRC\_INACTIVE, we think there is no need to artificially restrict the NW from using this information to schedule FG 48-2 UEs with a larger BW than 5 MHz for Msg4. Scheduling Msg4 with larger than 5 MHz is useful for many cases, e.g., for Rel-17 RA-SDT and Rel-18 MT-SDT (and when gNB uses SDT for a UE, then gNB knows the UE capabilities). |
| NEC | OK |  |
| Nordic | N | Nothing is broken with current specification, we do not support optimization.Clarification for “has indicated FG 48-2” -> “supporting FG 48-2” is OK |
| LG2 | N | It is preferred that “not supporting FG 48-2, or a UE in RRC\_IDLE supporting FG 48-2” should be deleted, If we don’t approach one decision on msg4 BW for FG 48-2, No spec change will be applied. |
| CMCC |  | We want to know what is the remaining scenario use TC-RNTI to scramble CRC.As we discussed during offline, for inactive UEs, if I-RNTI is reported and gNB fetch the UE context correctly, there will be no msg.4 scramble by TC-RNTI. And if gNB failed to fetch the UE context, then it may use TC-RNTI for Msg4 scheduling, in this case, the bandwidth may be limited to 5MHz, since gNB does not know UE capability.For connected UEs, when Msg3 report C-RNTI MAC-CE, there will also no TC-RNTI scrambled Msg.4.So it seems for TC-RNTI scrambled DCI format for PDSCH scheduling, bandwidth will always be limited to 5MHz. If this is the case, the red part seems not necessary. |
| MediaTek | N | 1. This is not an essential issue and should not be regarded as a high priority issue in the maintenance phase.
2. Again, in case people have forgotten, the RAN#99 agreement was a compromise from companies who did not support FG 48-2 UEs in the first place. Our understanding of Note 4 was proposed so that NW would have to do some upgrades by treating a FG48-2 UE same as a FG 48-1 UE during initial access (and hence during RACH). If companies have a different understanding, we can bring the issue back to RAN plenary.
 |
| FUTUREWEI | N | This represents an optimization and is not essential. As Mediatek indicated in #2, FG48-2 UEs follow the same initial access procedures as FG48-1 UEs. Furthermore, we should strive the make the specifications simple, without all these exceptions |
| CATT |  | Tend to agree that this is trying to optimize only one channel, i.e. Msg4 (scrambled by TC-RNTI) of FG 48-2 UE. Not essential. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | Different processing procedure in initial access should be avoided. |

Contribution [17] expresses that the following paragraphs in 38.213 [31] clause 17.1A do not consider that after initial access, the random access timeline does not need to be relaxed for FG 48-2 UEs.

|  |
| --- |
| When - a UE receives a PDSCH scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a RA-RNTI or a MsgB-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, and - the PDSCH includes a RAR message with an RAR UL grant scheduling a Msg3 PUSCH transmission from the UE, as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A the UE transmits the Msg3 PUSCH if a time between the last symbol of a PDSCH reception conveying the RAR message and the first symbol of the Msg3 PUSCH transmission is not smaller than $N\_{T,1}+N\_{T,2}+1.5$ msec for 15 kHz SCS or $N\_{T,1}+N\_{T,2}+1.0$ msec for 30 kHz SCS where $N\_{T,1}$ and $N\_{T,2}$ are defined in clause 8.3; otherwise, the UE behaviour is based on UE implementation.When - a UE receives a PDSCH scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a RA-RNTI or a MsgB-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, and - the UE does not correctly receive the transport block provided by the PDSCH, or if the higher layers at the UE do not identify a RAPID associated with a corresponding PRACH transmission from the UEthe UE shall be ready to transmit a PRACH no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.75$ msec for 15 kHz SCS, or no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.25$ msec for 30 kHz SCS, after the last symbol of the PDSCH reception, or after the last symbol of the window as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A.When - a UE receives a PDSCH scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by MsgB-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, and - the PDSCH includes a RAR message that is for successRAR for the UE as described in Clause 8.2A the UE transmits a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information if a time between the last symbol of the PDSCH reception conveying the RAR message and the first symbol of the PUCCH transmission is not smaller than $N\_{T,1}+1.5$ msec for 15 kHz SCS or $N\_{T,1}+1.0$ msec for 30 kHz SCS; otherwise, the UE behaviour is based on UE implementation. |

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.1-3a: Is there a need to update the above 38.213 paragraphs to consider that after initial access, the random access timeline does not need to be relaxed for FG 48-2 UEs? Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| QC | Yes | Similar answer as the one for previous question: We agree that after initial access (i.e., RRC connected or inactive states), the random access timeline does not need to be relaxed for FG 48-2 UEs.  |
| vivo | Yes for CFRANo for CBRA | For contention based random access for eRedCap UE in connected mode, NW cannot differentiate FG48-1 eRedCap and FG48-2 eRedCap UEs, so the same random access procedure should be applied.  |
| Spreadtrum |  | Similar views as our comments for Question 2.1-2a. We are not sure about the benefits and necessity.In addition, Our understanding for the original version is that these time relaxations are for both idle and connected mode. The TP proposed in [17] reads like for connected mode only, it makes the timeline relaxations for idle mode unclear. |
| Nordic | No | But we fine to clarify that RAR to MSG3 relaxation is applicable to CBRA RA |
| CATT |  | Same view as previous comment. Maybe Y for CFRA. But we do not foresee this makes huge change or brings huge benefit even if CFRA of FG48-2 UE does not apply relaxed timeline. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Our reply in FL proposal 2.1-2a is applicable. |
| CMCC |  | Yes for CFRA |
| LG | Y | It is similar with the comment in FL proposal 2.1-2a . |
| Nokia, NSB | No | While we can understand the rationale, we prefer to keep the same behavior for all cases for implementation simplicity since we do not think that this differentiation will bring significant benefits. |
| MediaTek | N |  |
| SONY | No | Agree with the comment from Nordic: we can clarify that the RAR to MSG3 relaxation is applicable to CBRA RA. |
| DOCOMO | Depends on RAN2 discussion | In our view, when both UE supporting/not supporting FG48-2 is allowed to access to the NW, the NW should schedule/expect RAR and corresponding UL transmission considering that the UE transmitted PRACH can be a UE not supporting FG48-2. However, UE supporting FG48-2 does not have to expect RAR and corresponding UL transmission with relaxed timeline while this depends on whether RAN2 WA is confirmed or not. Therefore, this question should be discussed based on the RAN2 progress. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | ‘no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.75$ msec’ means FG48-2 eRedCap UEs can also send PRACH earlier. I think there is no harm for FG48-2 eRedCap UEs. Also the same initial access procedure should be perused, we do not think correction is needed. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Similar comment as for Q2.1-2a. |
| NEC |  | Same comment as to Proposal 2.1-2a |
| Xiaomi |  | Share the similar view as vivo. From gNB scheduling perspective, the gNB can’t recognize whether the UE supports FG 48-1, or it supports FG 48-2, so the same limitation should be used for both FG 48-1 and FG 48-2 for the CBRA case. The same logic should be used for both FG 48-1 and FG 48-2 for CBRA during all RRC states.  |
| Samsung | No | For CBRA case, there is no need to update the above 38.213 paragraphs. For CFRA case, it can be considered. |
| FL2 | See Proposal 2.1-2b above. |
| FL3/FL4 | The following agreement was made in the Monday online session:Agreement:* The following does not apply to FG 48-2 UEs for CFRA:
	+ RAR PDSCH timeline relaxation

Companies are invited to comment on the following question:**High Priority Question 2.1-3b: Is there a need to update the above 38.213 paragraphs to reflect the RAN1 agreement that RAR PDSCH timeline relaxation does not apply to FG 48-2 UEs for CFRA? Please elaborate in the comment field.** |
| CATT | Y | Current wording does not treat FG 48-1 and FG 48-2 UE or CBRA/CFRA differently. We should exclude the case of ‘A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2, in CFRA’. Better wording can be considered to describe CFRA.  |
| Nordic  | No | There is no MSG3 in CFRA, per se. Also spec says “otherwise it is based on UE implementation”. Initial access procedures should be the same for R18 UE type.  |
| vivo | No? | For RAR PDSCH timeline relaxation does not apply to FG 48-2 UEs for CFRA, we do not find any spec update is needed.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Maybe more time is needed to check whether there is a spec change. |
| CMCC | Y | Fine to correct current CR to exclude the case of ‘A UE that has indicated FG 48-2 in CFRA”. |
| LG | N | We don’t think so, after RRC\_Connected, gNodeB can distinguish two FG 48-1/or 2 UEs and such UEs won’t be scheduled, based on BB reduction. This is close to conclusion to FG 48-2 UEs |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We do not think specification update is needed |
| OPPO | Y | We kind of agree that the text in 38.213 is actually impacted by the agreement.I cited here “When - a UE receives a PDSCH scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a RA-RNTI or a MsgB-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, and - the PDSCH includes a RAR message with an RAR UL grant scheduling a Msg3 PUSCH transmission from the UE, as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A the UE transmits the Msg3 PUSCH if a time between the last symbol of a PDSCH reception conveying the RAR message and the first symbol of the Msg3 PUSCH transmission is not smaller than $N\_{T,1}+N\_{T,2}+1.5$ msec for 15 kHz SCS or $N\_{T,1}+N\_{T,2}+1.0$ msec for 30 kHz SCS where $N\_{T,1}$ and $N\_{T,2}$ are defined in clause 8.3; otherwise, the UE behaviour is based on UE implementation.” |
| DOCOMO | Y | Whether other random access related restriction than timeline relaxation for CFRA is applied/not applied to FG48-2 is under the discussed in Question 2.1-3b. In addition, whether relaxed timeline is applied or not depends on whether to introduce cell barring bit which is now discussed in RAN2.In our understanding, whether/how to update the corresponding spec would be different depending on the outcome of these discussion, and hence we prefer to defer the discussion. |
| Ericsson | Y | An updated is not needed for the 4-step RACH case. However, it may be needed for the 2-step RACH case. |
| SONY | N | The text in 38.213 is about Msg3 and we think it is not applicable to CFRA. |
| NEC | N | Current spec text on timeline relaxation does not seem applicable for CFRA. |
| CMCC2 | Y | We think at least for the following two cases, CFRA case needs to be considered, since for CFRA, UE may also need the retransmission, then the timeline relax does not apply. --------------------------------When - a UE receives a PDSCH scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a RA-RNTI or a MsgB-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, and - the UE does not correctly receive the transport block provided by the PDSCH, or if the higher layers at the UE do not identify a RAPID associated with a corresponding PRACH transmission from the UEthe UE shall be ready to transmit a PRACH no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.75$ msec for 15 kHz SCS, or no later than $N\_{T,1}+1.25$ msec for 30 kHz SCS, after the last symbol of the PDSCH reception, or after the last symbol of the window as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A.When - a UE receives a PDSCH scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by MsgB-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, and - the PDSCH includes a RAR message that is for successRAR for the UE as described in Clause 8.2A the UE transmits a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information if a time between the last symbol of the PDSCH reception conveying the RAR message and the first symbol of the PUCCH transmission is not smaller than $N\_{T,1}+1.5$ msec for 15 kHz SCS or $N\_{T,1}+1.0$ msec for 30 kHz SCS; otherwise, the UE behaviour is based on UE implementation. |
| MediaTek | N | 1. The paragraph with Msg3 is not applicable to CFRA.
2. The PRACH re-Tx timing says “**no later than**” which does not prevent FG 48-2 UE to re-tx PRACH sooner than that.

*“the UE shall be ready to transmit a PRACH no later than* $N\_{T,1}+1.75$ *msec for 15 kHz SCS, or* ***no later than***$N\_{T,1}+1.25$ *msec for 30 kHz SCS, after the last symbol of the PDSCH reception, or after the last symbol of the window as described in Clauses 8.2 and 8.2A.”*1. The paragraph about PUCCH with ACK to MsgB timing says “otherwise, the UE behavior is based on UE implementation.” Then again, this paragraph does not prevent gNB to schedule an early grant and does not prevent the FG 48-2 UE to transmit PUCCH on it.

*“the UE transmits a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information if a time between the last symbol of the PDSCH reception conveying the RAR message and the first symbol of the PUCCH transmission is not smaller than* $N\_{T,1}+1.5$ *msec for 15 kHz SCS or* $N\_{T,1}+1.0$ *msec for 30 kHz SCS;* ***otherwise, the UE behaviour is based on UE implementation.”*** |
| FL6 | Based on the received responses, companies are invited to comment on the following question:**High Priority Question 2.1-3c: For which (if any) of the following 2-step RACH cases is there a need to update the specifications to reflect the RAN1 agreement that RAR PDSCH timeline relaxation does not apply to FG 48-2 UEs for CFRA? Please elaborate in the comment field.*** **Case 2a: Between reception of fallbackRAR and transmission of Msg3**
* **Case 2b: Between reception of successRAR and transmission of corresponding HARQ-ACK**
* **Case 2c: Between reception of MsgB PDSCH scheduled by MSGB-RNTI in which UE does not correctly receive the transport block in the corresponding PDSCH within the window and transmission of only PRACH according to Type-1 random access procedure or to transmit both PRACH and PUSCH according to Type-2 random access procedure.**
* **Case 2d: Between reception of MsgB PDSCH scheduled by MSGB-RNTI with RAPID which is not associated with the corresponding PRACH transmission from the UE and transmission of only PRACH according to Type-1 random access procedure or to transmit both PRACH and PUSCH according to Type-2 random access procedure.**
 |
| **Company** | **Case(s)** | **Comments** |
| CMCC | 2a，2b，2c，2d |  |
| CATT |  | We think all cases may be impacted but need more time to check whether current specification already mean this by natural (just like we conclude that in CFRA the so-called Msg3 will not exist, just become ordinary PUSCH) |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We do not need to discuss the need for updating spec. In maintenance stage, if there is a necessary correction or text proposal, just bring it out and let’s discuss. |

2.2 Msg3/MsgA PUSCH bandwidth

TS 38.213 [31] clause 17.1A specifies the following regarding the PUSCH bandwidth for eRedCap UEs:

|  |
| --- |
| A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2 does not expect to transmit a PUSCH over a bandwidth that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, per hop in a slot.[…]A UE that indicated FG 48-2 does not expect to transmit a PUSCH over a bandwidth that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, per hop in a slot, where the PUSCH is scheduled by RAR UL grant or by a DCI scrambled by a TC-RNTI, or is configured for a Type-2 random access procedure. |

Several contributions discuss the latter of the two above paragraphs, i.e., the paragraph about Msg3/MsgA PUSCH.

* Contributions [5, 8, 13, 23, 28] propose to remove “that indicated FG 48-2” in the paragraph to ensure the same initial access procedure for all eRedCap UEs.
* Contribution [16], on the other hand, proposes to replace “that indicated FG 48-2” with “that has not indicated FG 48-2”.
* Contribution [17] proposes to add “during CBRA” in the end of the paragraph, so that the bandwidth is only restricted for the CBRA case (not the CFRA case) for UEs supporting FG 48-2.
* Contribution [21] proposes to remove both paragraphs and rely on the eRedCap UE definition in TS 38.306.
* Contributions [6, 19] propose to keep the current wording of the paragraph.

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.2-1a: For the above 38.213 paragraph, companies are invited to indicate which (if any) of the following proposals that they prefer. Please elaborate in the comment field.**

* **Proposal 1: Remove “that indicated FG 48-2”.**
* **Proposal 2: Replace “that indicated FG 48-2” with “that has not indicated FG 48-2”.**
* **Proposal 3: Add “during CBRA” in the end of the paragraph.**
* **Proposal 4: Remove both paragraphs and rely on the eRedCap UE definition in TS 38.306.**
* **Proposal 5: No change.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal(s)** | **Comments** |
| QC |  | We support proposal 4. Or we can take a softened version of proposal 4, which is removing the second paragraph: “A UE that indicated FG 48-2 does not expect to transmit a PUSCH over a bandwidth that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, per hop in a slot, where the PUSCH is scheduled by RAR UL grant or by a DCI scrambled by a TC-RNTI, or is configured for a Type-2 random access procedure.”If we are not mistaken, there was no RAN1 agreement to support the second paragraph, which was suggested by a company during CR review phase and there was no consensus to add this paragraph as it is. From technical point of view, this paragraph does not make much sense. A UE indicated FG 48-2 (which means the UE is in connect or inactive state) does not need BB bandwidth restriction to do either CFRA or CBRA RACH. The argument from proponents of adding this paragraph is a vague note in a RAN-P agreement. The note said same **initial access procedure** of PR1 and PR3 UEs are the same. Our understanding of the note is just about same RACH procedure. It does enforce same timeline relaxation and same BB bandwidth restriction in initial access. Plus, our understanding about the note is only regarding RRC\_IDLE. By the way, we are also fine with option 2.  |
| vivo | Proposal 1 | Following are the reasons for removing the unnecessary sentence of “that indicated FG 48-2”1. Same initial access procedure as for FG48-1 eRedCap UE should be applied for FG48-2 eRedCap UEs in RRC\_idle/inactive modes (in addition, same contention based random access should also be applied for FG48-2 eRedCap UEs in RRC\_connected mode since NW cannot differentiate the two eRedCap UEs). With “that indicated FG48-2”, it only means the same CBRA is only for FG48-2 eRedCap UEs in RRC\_connected mode.
2. Removing “that indicated FG 48-2” to apply the text for both FG48-1 and FG48-2 eRedCap UEs is clearer and straightforward.
* We understand the text of “A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2 does not expect to transmit a PUSCH over a bandwidth that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, per hop in a slot.” in the first paragraph is for the FG 48-1 eRedCap UEs, and “a PUSCH” in the text covers all kinds of PUSCH. However, in specification, the description for unicast PUSCH and the Msg.3 PUSCH initial/re-transmission is usually separated since they have different procedures and UE behaviors.

About Proposal 3, we do not think we need to add “during CBRA” in the end of the paragraph since Msg.3 is only applicable for CBRS. For CFRA, there is no Msg.3.  |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 1 | Similar views as [5, 8, 13, 23, 28], to ensure the same initial access procedure for all eRedCap UEs.We can also accept Proposal 4. |
| Nordic  |  | We support P1 and P3 |
| OPPO |  | The second sentence is very confusion and would have no base from any agreements. We though that restriction (even with the cited first sentence may be duplicated), can only be applied for 48-2. Although 48-1 and 48-2 share same procedure, it didn’t say same restriction.Having it has no means for simplification, 48-1 and 48-2 implemented differently. We can also consider the Option 4. And the 38.306 will describe the UE capabilities. |
| CATT | Proposal 1 [+ 3 if Question 2.1-3 agrees CFRA] | This issue is coupled with Question 2.1-1~3.Proposal 1 is our preference.If we agree that in Question 2.1-3, CFRA of FG 48-2 UE does not apply relaxed timeline, we should additionally add ‘for CBRA’ as suggested by proposal 3. |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 5 | The clause is directed towards a FG 48-2 UE when the RACH does not indicate that a FG 48-2 is transmitting. The clause simplifies the standards specification in that there is no distinction for the size of Msg3 |
| CMCC | Proposal 3  | First paragraph has restricted bandwidth of PUSCH of FG 48-1 UE in all RRC mode and FG 48-2 UE during initial access.In our understanding, second paragraph aims to restrict bandwidth of Msg3/MsgA PUSCH of FG 48-2 UE after initial access. After initial access, for CFRA, Msg3 does not exist, bandwidth of MsgA PUSCH of FG 48-2 UE should not be restricted since gNB know UE capability. With proposal 3 below, “PUSCH is scheduled by RAR UL grant or by a DCI scrambled by a TC-RNTI” restrict Msg3 bandwidth for 4 step RACH during CBRA, “Type-2 random access procedure during CBRA” restrict MsgA PUSCH bandwidth for 2 step RACH during CBRA.A UE that indicated FG 48-2 does not expect to transmit a PUSCH over a bandwidth that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, per hop in a slot, where the PUSCH is scheduled by RAR UL grant or by a DCI scrambled by a TC-RNTI, or is configured for a Type-2 random access procedure during CBRA. |
| LG | Proposal 4 | Or prefer to delete all the second paragraph. |
| Nokia, NSB | Proposal 5 | PUSCH restriction for FG 48-1 UE is already addressed earlier, so this paragraph should be applied to FG 48-2 UE only. However, we have no strong view on this one and can be flexible to go with majority view. |
| MediaTek | Proposal 1 or Proposal 3 | Proposal 2 does not make sense because the revised 2nd paragraph will become a subset of the 1st paragraph. Proposal 4 is not acceptable to us. In our opinion, the RAN#99 agreements on physical scheduling restriction for FG 48-2 UEs should be implemented in RAN1 specifications. Deleting the 2nd paragraph is not acceptable to us.  |
| SONY | Proposal 1 or proposal 3 | Either proposal 1 or proposal 3 are OK, given that both UE types need to follow the same initial access procedure. |
| DOCOMO |  | Prefer to discuss after the progress on Question 2.1-2a/3a. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 1 | Also fine with proposal 4. |
| Ericsson |  | We prefer to wait till there are clarifications for questions in Q2.1-2a and Q2.1-3a. |
| NEC | Proposal 4 | We are also fine to remove only the 2nd one. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1 |  |
| Samsung | Proposal 1 or proposal 3 | Either proposal 1 or proposal 3 is OK. |
| FL2 | This topic can be revisited once Proposal 2.1-2b has been discussed. |
| FL3/FL4 | The following agreement was made in the Monday online session:Agreement:* The following does not apply to FG 48-2 UEs for CFRA:
	+ RAR PDSCH timeline relaxation

Companies are invited to comment on the following question:**High Priority Question 2.2-1b: In the light of the new RAN1 agreement that RAR PDSCH timeline relaxation does not apply to FG 48-2 UEs for CFRA, companies are invited to provide any additional comments they might have on Question 2.2-1a.** |
| CATT | Somehow, since we just agree that the relaxed timeline does not apply to FG 48-2 in CFRA:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Apply relaxed timeline? | CBRA | CFRA |
| FG 48-1 | Y | Y |
| FG 48-2 | Y | N |

We feel that Proposal 3 (keep ‘**that indicated FG 48-2’** and add ‘**in CBRA (maybe need better wording)**’) is the only correct modification. Proposal 1 (removing ‘**that indicated FG 48-2’**) cannot fit the new agreement anymore. |
| Nordic  | This agreement is not relevant to the specification text under discussion  |
| vivo | The issue here is about Msg.3 transmission bandwidth, it may have no tight relation to the processing timeline made for RAR PDSCH for CFRA?  |
| CMCC | Based on the current agreement, timeline is relaxed only for ‘A UE that has indicated FG 48-2 in CFRA”.Similarly, regarding MsgA PUSCH bandwidth, the only case that can exclude bandwidth restriction is ‘A UE that has indicated FG 48-2 in CFRA”, proposal 3 match with this. |
| FUTUREWEI3 | If there is no agreement, then the default should be proposal 5 |
| LG | We think that it can depends on 2.1-3b |
| Nokia, NSB | We don’t see strong relevancy to the agreement on RAR PDSCH timeline relaxation to the PUSCH BW |
| OPPO | The agreements seem not connected with the mentioned spec. text. |
| DOCOMO | Similar comment as Question 2.1-3b. |
| SONY | Agree with Nordic. The agreement is not relevant to the text. |

Contributions [10, 22] propose to specify UE behavior for cases when the UE is configured or scheduled with a Msg3/MsgA PUSCH bandwidth that is larger than it can transmit (when no Msg1 early indication is configured), whereas contributions [24, 25] express that there is no need to do so.

**FL1 Low Priority Question 2.2-2a: Should the UE behavior be specified for cases when the UE is configured or scheduled with a Msg3/MsgA PUSCH bandwidth that is larger than it can transmit? Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| QC | No |  |
| vivo | No |  |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| Nordic  | No | we do not need to specify error cases |
| OPPO | No | Those cases are unexpected as the specification current reads. |
| CATT | N | It should already be covered by the following paragraph, which means this is an error case and UE behavior is unspecified.

|  |
| --- |
| A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2 does not expect to transmit a PUSCH over a bandwidth that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, per hop in a slot. |

 |
| Sharp |  | it need to clarify whether only PRACH transmisson is allowed for 2-step RA when eRedCap and RedCap share the featurecombination and the number of PRB is larger than 25/12 |
| CMCC | No |  |
| Nokia, NSB | No |  |
| MediaTek |  | Don’t see the need when there is already PUSCH scheduling/configuration in the specification.  |
| DOCOMO | No |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | No |  |
| Ericsson | N |  |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| Samsung | No |  |
| FL3 | Based on the above received responses, there does not seem to be much support for specifying the UE behavior for cases when the UE is configured or scheduled with a Msg3/MsgA PUSCH bandwidth that is larger than it can transmit. |

2.3 Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth

RAN1 sent the following LS to RAN2 in [29]:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 Overall descriptionRAN1 discussed Msg4 PDSCH transmission to Rel-18 eRedCap UEs and made the following agreement:

|  |
| --- |
| AgreementConfirm the following working assumption by assuming that Msg3 indication is availableWorking 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.
 |

RAN1 would like to inform RAN2 about the following case, to consider, if needed, the UE behavior in the RAN2 specifications, and ask RAN2 for feedback if any:* For UE BB complexity reduction, the case when the UE detects a DCI scheduling a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process

The case was also discussed in RAN1 in Question 2.7-2b of summary [R1-2303936](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2303936.zip).2 Actions**To RAN2:****ACTION:** RAN1 respectfully requests RAN2 to take the above into account in their future work and to provide feedback to RAN1 if any. |

RAN1 has received the following LS reply from RAN2 in [30]:

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Overall Description:**RAN2 would like to thank RAN1 on the LS on Msg4 PDSCH transmission to Rel-18 eRedCap UEs. RAN2 had some discussion on the issue mentioned in the LS, and achieved the following agreement:* **An eRedCap UE considers the contention resolution not successful and stop the *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer*, when the UE detects a PDCCH transmission addressed to its TEMPORARY\_C-RNTI with a DCI that schedules a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process, i.e. option 1 is adopted.**

**2. Actions:****To RAN WG1:**RAN2 kindly request RAN1 to take the above information into account, and provide feedback, if any. |

Contributions [6, 8, 10, 12, 19, 22] discuss the above reply from RAN2.

* Contribution [6] proposes to clarify in 38.213 [31] clauses 8.4 (‘PDSCH with UE contention resolution identity’) and 17.1A (‘Second procedures for RedCap UE’) that a Rel-18 RedCap UE, for the case when the UE detects a DCI scheduling a Msg4 PDSCH transmission over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, considers the contention resolution as not successful.
* Contributions [8, 12, 19] propose to specify that the physical layer notifies higher layers when it detects a DCI that schedules a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than the UE can receive or process.

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.3-1a: Is a RAN1 specification change needed for the case discussed in the reply from RAN2? Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| QC | No | For the “physical layer notifies higher layers”, this can be done by UE implementation without any specification impact.  |
| vivo | Yes | From our understanding, it is beneficial to define the signaling for the cross-layer interaction since MAC layer cannot aware of the FDRA field in the DCI indicating a larger number of PRBs. This is similar to the cross-layer signaling already defined for other functions.  |
| Spreadtrum | No | Similar understanding as QC. |
| Nordic  | Yes | We support “physical layer notifies higher layers”. |
| OPPO | No | It is not function for RAN1 spec to stop the ra-ContentionResolutionTimer. We can ask RAN2 to support that behavior. Or it can be by implementation. |
| CATT | N | We think it is should be addressed by RAN2 spec (stop the timer). |
| FUTUREWEI | Yes | We can also be fine with letting the spec editor determine whether / how a specification change is needed |
| Sharp | N | we share the similar comment as QC |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LG | Y | We think that it seems to be necessary to inform to MAC that FDRA field is allocated over 5MHz BW, if RAN2 need it, the part can be specified in RAN1  |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes | Our preference is to add text stating something like - physical layer notifies higher layers when UE receives DCI that schedules a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process. |
| MediaTek | Y | We think it is reasonable to have such an indication from physical layer to higher layers and make UE behaviour clear.  |
| DOCOMO | N | We don’t see the strong need for RAN1 impacts. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | Whether we have the spec change, the UE would consider the contention resolution as not successful. We are also open to leave it to editor. |
| Ericsson |  | We think that specifying the behavior in RAN2 specifications might be enough. We also fine with Futurewei’s suggestion.  |
| NEC | N | Agree with Qualcomm. RAN1 specification does not specify indication of PDCCH detection intended for the UE. |
| Xiaomi | Y | Share the similar view with vivo. |
| Samsung | No | RAN1 specification change is not needed. |
| FL2 | Based on the above received responses, the following proposal can be considered.**High Priority Proposal 2.3-1b: It is up to the 38.213 editor whether to capture in 38.213 that the physical layer notifies higher layers when it detects a DCI that schedules a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than the UE can receive or process.** |
| FL3/FL4 | The above proposal was discussed in the Monday online session without reaching a conclusion. Companies are invited to comment on the following updated proposal, which reflects the latest version that was shown on the screen during the session.**High Priority Proposal 2.3-1c:*** Conclusion: It is up to UE implementation about how the physical layer notifies higher layers when it detects a DCI that schedules a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than the UE can receive or process.
 |
| CATT | ~~Y in general~~ | ~~But somehow this issue is coupled with~~ **~~High Priority Proposal 2.1-2c:~~*** **~~The following does not apply to FG 48-2 UEs for CBRA in RRC\_INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED if C-RNTI or I-RNTI was signaled in Msg3/MsgA:~~**
	+ **~~Bandwidth restriction for Msg4/MsgB PDSCH~~**

~~If 2.1-2c is agreed, we need to consider how to exclude ‘FG 48-2 UE with C-RNTI and [I-RNTI] in Msg3/MsgA’ in this proposal?~~(updated) |
| Nordic  | Can live with this conclusion |  |
| vivo | N | The issue is still under discussion in RAN2. The decision can be made by RAN2 and RAN1 can take actions if request by RAN2. No conclusion needs to be made in RAN1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | If necessary, RAN2 can ask RAN1 to specify something, instead of just informing RAN1. Currently, no any conclusion or agreement is also fine, which also means up to implementation. |
| CMCC | ok |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI3 |  | In the FL-4/FL-5 high priority question 2.7-2b (RAN1#112bis), the three options presented to RAN2 were* Option 1: The UE considers the contention resolution as not successful.
* Option 2: The UE discards the DCI and continues monitoring the DCI until *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* expires.
* Option 3: The UE behavior is up to the UE implementation.

RAN2 informed RAN1 that its decision is option 1. With this proposal, it seems RAN1 is disregarding the RAN2 decision and selecting option 3. Since RAN2’s action is “RAN2 kindly request RAN1 to take the above information into account, and provide feedback, if any”, maybe the best course of action is to do nothing instead of using option 3. |
| CATT2 | N for C-RNTIFFS for I-RNTI | After further checking:1) if C-RNTI is sent in Msg3, there is no so called Msg4. So it is already cover by current spec2) For I-RNTI, it cannot be found in PHY spec. Though it is true that in this case FG 48-2 UE may expect to receive >5 MHz PDSCH, it seems risky to introduce such new RNTI type. |
| LG | N | The specific UE behaviour is being discussed in RAN2 now, we don’t want to approach any conclusion and agreement on it rapidly.  |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We are OK with the conclusion. Also fine to leave it to RAN2. |
| OPPO | N | We suggest not to ask RAN2 do the decision. If RAN2 concluded, they can initial some request to RAN1..  |
| DOCOMO |  | We share the similar view with ZTE/FUTUREWEI. Any conclusion/agreement may cause misunderstanding, thus we prefer not to have any conclusion/agreement for now. |
| Ericsson |  | We prefer to wait till RAN2 captures text corresponding to the RAN2 agreement (as in the LS) in their specification. Based on the RAN2 specification, RAN1 can decide whether or not to capture some aspect also in RAN1 specification. For example, if RAN2 specification indicates reliance of signalling from physical layer, RAN1 specification can be updated accordingly, and otherwise, not.  |
| NEC | Y | MAC spec would be enough. |
| MediaTek | N | We prefer to have such indication specified to make not only the UE behavior but also the cross-WG specifications clear. |

2.4 MBS PDSCH bandwidth

The previous RAN1 meeting discussed the MBS PDSCH bandwidth for the following potential cases [3]:

* Case 1a: Broadcast MBS PDSCH without PDSCH in consecutive slots and without PDSCH repetition
* Case 1b: Broadcast MBS PDSCH with PDSCH in consecutive slots and/or with PDSCH repetition
* Case 2a: Multicast MBS PDSCH without HARQ feedback
	+ Case 2a1: Multicast MBS PDSCH without HARQ feedback and without PDSCH repetition
	+ Case 2a2: Multicast MBS PDSCH without HARQ feedback but with PDSCH repetition
* Case 2b: Multicast MBS PDSCH with HARQ feedback

The previous RAN1 meeting made the following agreement [4] about the MBS PDSCH bandwidth:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:* For UE BB bandwidth reduction, the number of PRBs scheduled in DCI can be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS for:
	+ Broadcast MBS PDSCH without any PDSCH in next slot
	+ Broadcast MBS PDSCH without MBS PDSCH repetition
 |

The related paragraph in TS 38.213 [31] clause 17.1A looks like this:

|  |
| --- |
| A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2 is not required to process a PDSCH reception in slot $n$ that is scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a G-RNTI for broadcast over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, when the PDSCH reception is with repetitions or when the UE receives another PDSCH in slot $n+1$. |

Contributions [5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28] discuss MBS PDSCH bandwidth.

For broadcast MBS, the following views are expressed in the contributions:

* Contributions [5, 8, 12, 22, 25] propose to consider MCCH-RNTI in the 38.213 paragraph quoted above.
* Contributions [13, 17, 24] express that the MBS PDSCH can be wider than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS even if MBS PDSCH repetition is used, whereas contributions [20, 25] express that the MBS PDSCH cannot be wider than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS if MBS PDSCH repetition is used.
* Contributions [8, 17] propose that the PRB restriction should only apply to UEs that do not support FG 48-2.
* Contribution [5] proposes to refer to slots *n-1* and *n* instead of *n* and *n+1* in the 38.213 paragraph quoted above.
* Contribution [10] proposes that the UE decides whether to receive an MBS PDSCH wider than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS in slot *n* based on the priority of the other PDSCH in slot *n+1*.
* Contribution [14] proposes to clarify the wording from “any PDSCH in next slot” to “any PDSCH reception in next slot”.
* Contribution [27] proposes to clarify that the MBS PDSCH can only be wider than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS if both conditions are fulfilled (i.e., no PDSCH in next slot, and no MBS PDSCH repetition).

For multicast MBS, the following views are expressed in the contributions:

* Contributions [6, 8, 9, 13, 17, 19, 22, 24, 28] propose that the number of PRBs scheduled in DCI is not larger than 25/15 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS, irrespective of whether HARQ feedback is enabled or disabled.
* Contributions [10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 25] propose that the number of PRBs can be larger than 25/15 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS when HARQ feedback is disabled, but not when it is enabled.

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 2.4-1a: For broadcast MBS, should MCCH-RNTI be considered in the 38.213 paragraph quoted above? Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| QC |  | We don’t have strong view. But we think MCCH-RNTI can be added. |
| vivo | Y | PDSCH scheduled by DCI with CRC scrambled by MCCH-RNTI is also broadcast MBS.  |
| Nordic  | Y | It should be since broadcast RNTIs are MCCH-RNTI and G-RNTI |
| OPPO | Y | We are OK for that. |
| CATT | Y | This has been discussed in previous CR review phase.  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LG | Y | The PDSCH by MCCH-RNTI or G-RNTI is Broadcast MBS PDSCH  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| FL2/FL3/FL4/FL5 | Based on the above received responses, the following proposal can be considered.**Medium Priority Proposal 2.4-1b: Adopt the following TP for 38.213 clause 17.1A:**

|  |
| --- |
| A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2 is not required to process a PDSCH reception in slot $n$ that is scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a G-RNTI for broadcast or MCCH-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, when the PDSCH reception is with repetitions or when the UE receives another PDSCH in slot $n+1$. |

 |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| DOCOMO |  | If option 2 in Question 2.4-2a is supported, this TP would not be necessary. But we are not sure it is concluded that option 1 is supported as for Question 2.4-2a.But we can live with this proposal. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| FL6 | The following agreement was made in the Wednesday online session:Agreement:Adopt the following TP for 38.213 clause 17.1A:

|  |
| --- |
| A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2 is not required to process a PDSCH reception in slot $n$ that is scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a G-RNTI for broadcast or a MCCH-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, when the PDSCH reception is with repetitions or when the UE receives another PDSCH in slot $n+1$. |

  |

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 2.4-2a: For broadcast MBS, which option is preferred?**

* **Option 1: The number of PRBs scheduled in DCI is not larger than 25/15 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS when MBS PDSCH repetition is used.**
* **Option 2: The number of PRBs can be larger than 25/15 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS when MBS PDSCH repetition is used.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option (1/2)** | **Comments** |
| QC | Option 1 | PR3 UE cannot handle back-to-back PDSCH decoding larger than 25/15 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS, just following the logic we used to settle down many similar scenarios in previous meetings.  |
| vivo | Option 2 | FG48-1 eRedCap should not impact the broadcast MBS for legacy UEs. We prefer option 2 and for such case, the UE is not required to process the MBS PDSCH repetition in the following slots.  |
| Spreadtrum | Option 1 | We don’t think UE has capability to process the case in option2. |
| Nordic | Option 1 | However, if it is clarified that UE may skip every other repetition, we OK as well with Option 2. Proposal should have, “For BB limited UE”? |
| OPPO | Option 1 |  |
| CATT | Option 2 | When broadcast MBS PDSCH is repeated, the content of MBS PDSCH is the same (though RV can be different). FG 48-1 UE is free to receive only one of the repetitions to decode MBS PDSCH. The UE is NOT required to receive or process all repetitions (or say, MBS in next/following slot) to decode this MBS PDSCH. |
| FUTUREWEI | Option 1 | Prefer to keep specifications simple |
| Sharp |  | only MBS PDSCH addressed to G-RNTI can support repetition, we think PDSCH carried MCCH and MTCH for broadcast can be considered separately. |
| CMCC | Option 2 | Consider coexistence of eRedCap UE and legacy UE, it is better to avoid additional scheduling restriction of broadcast. Besides, as mentioned by companies, UE can receive one repetition, broadcast MBS can be larger than maximum RB number. |
| LG | Option 2 | Option 2 has no impact to legacy UEs and Rel-17 RedCap UEs, UE does not need to receive and decode MBS Broadcast PDSCH every slot in the repetition case.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 1 | We prefer to keep it specification simple in this case. |
| DOCOMO | Option 2 | We share the similar view with vivo and CATT that impacts on MBS for legacy UEs should be avoided. For UE supporting only FG48-1, it is up to UE whether to receive all the repetitions which is configured for legacy UEs. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option 2 | For Option1, does it mean it may impact Rel-17 RedCap UE when they share the broadcast? If Rel-18 RedCap UE also introduce a separate CFR, it would be fine to limit the broadcast within 5MHz, otherwise, we do not think we should introduce restriction on Rel-17 RedCap UE.For option2, it can be up to UE implementation how to receive the repetition, anyway there is no ACK/NACK. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 (preferred) | Option 2 is also fine with us. |
| NEC |  | If it would be a common understanding that a UE is not required to receive all the transmissions of the repetition according to the current spec, it would be worth to discuss Option 2. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | There is no coexistence issue between eRedCap UEs and legacy UEs when it comes to Rel-17 multicast MBS, which the UE capability has already been reported and the gNB can schedule these two kinds of UEs separately by different UE groups. |
| Samsung | Option 1 | Option 2 may need additional UE capability. |
| FL2/FL3/FL4 | Based on the above received responses, Option 1 seems to have somewhat more support than Option 2. Since the current specification text is in line with Option 1, there does not seem to be support for a specification change. |
| LG | It is needed to discuss further before reaching conclusion |
| OPPO | Support FL observation. |
| CMCC | Option 1 will put restriction on gNB when broadcast MBS is shared by R17 and R18 RedCap UEs, we prefer option2. |
| Panasonic | We still prefer Option 2 to avoid impact to the legacy UEs.If Option 1 is taken, it is unclear how/when the broadcast PDSCH larger than 25/12 PRBs is available. It could be a limited case e.g., only when the eRedCap UEs’ access to a cell is barred? |

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 2.4-3a: For broadcast MBS, should the PRB restriction only apply for FG 48-1 UEs that do not support FG 48-2? Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| QC | Yes | PR1 UE (with FG 48-2) does not need PRB restriction. |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum |  | Logically speaking, the PRB restriction should only apply for FG 48-1 UEs that do not support FG 48-2. However, whether we need spec change to reflect this? |
| Nordic | Yes | R17 MBS applies to connected mode, if not mistaken. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LG | Y | Same view as QC |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Samsung  | Yes |  |
| FL2/FL3 | All above received responses agree that the PRB restriction should only apply to UEs that have not indicated support for FG 48-2, which is in line with the current specification text. |

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 2.4-4a: For broadcast MBS, companies are invited to indicate which (if any) of the following proposals that they think should be prioritized in this meeting.**

* **Proposal 1: Contribution [5] proposes to refer to slots *n-1* and *n* instead of *n* and *n+1* in the 38.213 paragraph quoted above.**
* **Proposal 2: Contribution [10] proposes that the UE decides whether or not to receive a MBS PDSCH wider than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS in slot *n* based on the priority of the other PDSCH in slot *n+1*.**
* **Proposal 3: Contribution [14] proposes to clarify the wording from “any PDSCH in next slot” to “any PDSCH reception in next slot”.**
* **Proposal 4: Contribution [27] proposes to clarify that the MBS PDSCH can only be wider than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS if both conditions are fulfilled (i.e., no PDSCH in next slot, and no MBS PDSCH repetition).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal(s)** | **Comments** |
| QC | Proposal 4 | Although we think proposal 4 is aligned with the interpretation of the existing agreement, if companies think there is ambiguity, this should be clarified.  |
| Vivo | Proposal 1  | We think proposal 1 can relax the UE complexity since the UE is not required to wait for the look-ahead check.  |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 4 | We think proposal 4 is the correct understanding for the agreements achieved in the last RAN1 meeting. |
| Nordic | P3, P4 |  |
| OPPO | Proposal 4 | We actually try to clarify this in the last meeting. We think the both condition should be applied (i.e., no PDSCH in next slot, and no MBS PDSCH repetition). |
| CATT |  | Maybe OK to proposal 1 if consensus is reached.For Proposal 4, in our understanding, current wording in 213 already mean this (UE is NOT required…when the PDSCH reception is with repetitions OR when the UE receives another PDSCH in slot $n+1$) |
| FUTUREWEI |  | A slight preference to proposal 1 – as its behavior in the current slot is based on the previous slot |
| Sharp | P4 |  |
| CMCC |  | Fine with proposal 1. |
| LG | Proposal 2 | We think that it is impossible to decode two sequential PDSCH when a MBS PDSCH wider 25/12 PRBs for 15/30KHz SCS in slot n and other PDSCH in slot n+1 are received.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Proposal 4 |  |
| SONY | P4 | Based on the comments above, we now think that the current spec implements the proposal 4 agreement. Our understanding of the current spec is that if the UE receives a PDSCH in slot *n*+1, the UE can abandon the processing of the >5MHz broadcast MBS PDSCH that it received in slot *n*.  |
| DOCOMO |  | We should discuss it after the progress on Question 2.4-2a. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 2 | For proposal 4, the discussion is a little bit overlapped with Question 2.4-2a. the key for this issue is whether/how the UE process the MBS PDSCH if it is larger than 5MHz. We think this case can be allowed, and how the UE process the repetition case can be up to implementation.For proposal 3, we did not see much benefits or necessity.For proposal 2, we are OK to discuss.For proposal 1, it is not preferred.* In the original spec, unicast PDSCH in slot n+1 is prioritized. After change, the unicast PDSCH in slot n may be dropped due to the PRB number of MBS PDSCH in slot n-1.
* The case that the total PRB number is larger than 25RBs is missed in the correction.
* If we have a complete version based on proposal 1, the correction may require large changes. The current wording should be kept.

From our understanding, at least proposal 2 can be deprioritized. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 4 | We are also open to consider Proposals 1 and 3. |
| Xiaomi | P4 |  |
| Samsung  | Proposal 4 |  |
| FL2/FL3/FL4 | Based on the above received responses, the following proposal (corresponding to Proposal 4 in Question 2.4-4a) can be considered.**Medium Priority Proposal 2.4-4b:*** **Conclusion: For a UE with BB bandwidth reduction, when the number of PRBs scheduled in DCI for a broadcast MBS PDSCH is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, the UE does not need to receive a PDSCH in the next slot. No specification change is needed.**

Below, the ‘Y/N’ column concerns Proposal 2.4-4b, whereas the ‘Comments’ field can be used for comments on both Proposal 2.4-4b and Question 2.4-4a. |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| CATT |  | Maybe right in general. However, ‘**does not need to**’ seems a little ambiguous. Does it mean ‘**is not required to**’? |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| vivo | FFS | We have one question on following spec, **does it mean the UE should prioritize the PDSCH in the slot n+1**? From our reading, it just says, the UE is not required to process a PDSCH reception in slot $n$, it does not necessarily mean UE will prioritize the **PDSCH in the slot n+1, it is strange the UE prioritize the PDSCH repetition in slot n+1 but deprioritize the PDSCH repetition in slot n…** “A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2 is not required to process a PDSCH reception in slot $n$ that is scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a G-RNTI for broadcast over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, when the PDSCH reception is with repetitions or when the UE receives another PDSCH in slot $n+1$.” |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Seems ‘**UE does not need to receive a PDSCH in the next slot**’ is not so aligned with the following spec text.

|  |
| --- |
| A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2 is not required to process a PDSCH reception in slot $n$ that is scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a G-RNTI for broadcast over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, when the PDSCH reception is with repetitions or when the UE receives another PDSCH in slot $n+1$. |

But we are OK to not have a spec change. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Sharp | N | we support no specification change, but in our understanding, no spec change means when UE receive a PDSCH in the slot n+1, the UE will not require to continue decoding the broadcast MBS PDSCH with PRBs larger than 25/12 in slot n. |
| LG | FFS | We can’t find the reason why the proposal is conclusion; the proposal seems to different from the previous agreement in the respect of UE behavior. In the case, we can need the prioritization of the PDSCH in slot n+1 compared to MBS Broadcast PDSCH (5MHz BW PRBs) in slot n, we need to discuss it. |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| DOCOMO |  | If we agree on Proposal 2.4-1b, no spec change is required as proposed by moderator. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| SONY | N | Agree with concern from vivo. Our understanding of the current spec is that a redcap UE that has to decode a >5MHz PDSCH would do so over slots *n* and *n*+1. If the UE received a PDSCH in slot *n*+1, it would (could) abandon the part-processed MBS PDSCH from slot *n*. Current spec: MBS PDSCH in slot n dropped.The proposed conclusion says that the PDSCH in slot n+1 would not be received by the UE. Proposed conclusion: PDSCH in slot n+1 is dropped.While we think that the current spec is more inline with the RAN1#114 agreement, we prefer the proposed conclusion. The proposed conclusion would require a spec change. |
| Panasonic |  | We prefer no spec change, but “no spec change” should mean dropping MBS PDSCH in slot n when the PDSCH reception is with repetitions or when the UE receives another PDSCH in slot n+1. |

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 2.4-5a: For multicast MBS, which option is preferred?**

* **Option 1: The number of PRBs scheduled in DCI is not larger than 25/15 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS, irrespective of whether HARQ feedback is enabled or disabled.**
* **Option 2: The number of PRBs can be larger than 25/15 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS when HARQ feedback is disabled, but not when it is enabled.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option (1/2)** | **Comments** |
| QC |  | We disagree with both options. We think RAN1 should follow the existing formulations of different cases for multicast and discuss them case by case.* Case 2a: Multicast MBS PDSCH without HARQ feedback
	+ Case 2a1: Multicast MBS PDSCH without HARQ feedback and without PDSCH repetition
	+ Case 2a2: Multicast MBS PDSCH without HARQ feedback but with PDSCH repetition
* Case 2b: Multicast MBS PDSCH with HARQ feedback
 |
| FL |  | My thinking is that the answers to this question in combination with the answers to Question 2.4-2a (about the broadcast MBS repetition case) will probably give enough guidance when it is time to formulate the initial proposals.Note that Option 2 in this question does not say that the maximum bandwidth only depends on whether the HARQ feedback is enabled or disabled. |
| vivo | Option 1 | It simplifies a lot and no need to have different handling for different cases given the UE capability is already known by the NW.  |
| Spreadtrum | Option 1 | For simplify, we think multicast MBS should be limited within 25/15 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS, irrespective of whether HARQ feedback and/or repetition are enabled or disabled. |
| Nordic  | Option 1 for all cases | For simplicity. Multicast can be configured separately for R18 RedCap UEs, so there is no need to over-optimize. |
| OPPO | Option 2 |  |
| CATT | Option 1 | For MBS’s sake let’s make it simpler. |
| FUTUREWEI | Option 1 | It simplifies the specifications |
| Sharp | Option 1 |  |
| CMCC | Option 1 |  |
| LG | Option 2  | We think that The number of PRBs can be larger than 25/15 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS for any PDSCH channel (such as broadcasting channel) which does not need HARQ Feedback except Unicast PDSCH.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 1 | We prefer to keep specification simple. |
| SONY | Option 1 | We would like to keep the specification simple. Our view is that the decodability of a >5MHz multicast MBS PDSCH is not a function of the HARQ feedback enabling / disabling status. |
| DOCOMO | Option 1 | We don’t see the need to allow the scheduling larger BW than 5MHz for multicast MBS PDSCH for FG48-1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option 1 | It simplifies the discussion and unify the UE behavior. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |  |
| LG2 | Option 2 | RAN2 decided that Multicast PDSCH without HARQ Feedback was supported in RRC\_Inactive which is different from Rel-17 MBS not supporting Multicast PDSCH in RRC\_inactive. So the Bandwidth for Multicast MBS PDSCH without HARQ Feedback can depend on RRC states (RRC\_connected or RRC\_inactive) We’d like to add FFS to Option2 below, FFS: can depends on the RRC state (RRC\_Connected or RRC\_inactive)  |
| Xiaomi | Option 2  | We can live with Option 1. |
| Samsung | Option 1 |  |
| FL2/FL3/FL4/FL5 | Based on the above received responses, the following proposal can be considered.**Medium Priority Proposal 2.4-5b:*** **For a UE with BB bandwidth reduction, for multicast MBS, the number of PRBs scheduled in DCI is not larger than 25/15 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS (irrespective of whether HARQ feedback is enabled or disabled).**
 |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| OPPO |  | We can live with it, considering in the stage. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Panasonic |  | We can live with it. |
| FL6 | The following agreement was made in the Wednesday online session:Agreement:* For a UE with BB bandwidth reduction, for multicast MBS specified in Rel-17, the number of PRBs scheduled in DCI is not larger than 25/15 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS (irrespective of whether HARQ feedback is enabled or disabled).
 |

2.5 MBS simultaneous reception

Contributions [9, 10, 24, 25] discuss simultaneous reception or prioritization of MBS PDSCH and another PDSCH.

* Contributions [10, 24] note that UE features for FDM (and TDM) between unicast PDSCH and MBS PDSCH are already defined (see table below from TR 38.822 [33]) and that these can be reused for eRedCap.
* Contribution [9] proposes that a UE capable of FDM should be able to receive unicast PDSCH and MBS PDSCH simultaneously if the total bandwidth does not exceed 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS, otherwise the UE prioritizes unicast PDSCH over MBS PDSCH during two slots.
* Contribution [25] proposes that simultaneous reception should be supported conditioned on that the eRedCap UE capabilities are not exceeded. For broadcast, this would mean single-layer transmission with max 64QAM and max 10 Mbps in total. For multicast, it is proposed to introduce additional UE capabilities to indicate whether more than one layer and/or higher modulation order than 64QAM can be supported.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 33. NR\_MBS | 33-1-2 | FDM-ed unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH for broadcast | 1. Support FDM between one unicast PDSCH and one group-common PDSCH for broadcast in RRC CONNECTED mode in a slot. |
| 33. NR\_MBS | 33-3-2 | FDM-ed unicast PDSCH and one group-common PDSCH for multicast | 1. Support FDM between one dynamically scheduled unicast PDSCH and one dynamically scheduled group-common PDSCH for multicast in RRC CONNECTED mode in a slot. |
| 33. NR\_MBS | 33-3-3 | Intra-slot TDM-ed unicast PDSCH and group-common PDSCH | 1. Support TDM between one unicast PDSCH and one group-common PDSCH in a slot.2. Support TDM between M (M>1) TDMed unicast PDSCHs and one group-common PDSCH in a slot per CC3. Support TDM among N (N>1) group-common PDSCHs in a slot per CC4. Support TDM between K (K>1) TDMed unicast PDSCHs and L (L>1) TDMed group-common PDSCHs in a slot per CC5. The UE maximum number of TDMed PDSCH receptions capability in a slot per CC is kept as for Rel-15/Rel-16, i.e., {2/4/7} based on UE FG5-11/5-11a/5-11b.- Note:  Group-common PDSCH(s) are counted as unicast PDSCH(s).- Note: The max number of (M+1), N, (K+L) are determined based on the numbers reported by FG5-11 and/or FG5-11a and/or FG5-11b.6. up to one broadcast PDSCH is supported in a slot.7. For any two consecutive slots n and n+1, if there are more than 1 broadcast/multicast/unicast PDSCH in either slot, whether to require the minimum time separation between starting time of any two broadcast/multicast/unicast PDSCHs within the duration of these slots is 4 OFDM symbol for 30kHz and 7 OFDM symbol for 60kHz |

**FL1/FL3/FL4 Medium Priority Question 2.5-1a: Should the UE receive MBS PDSCH and another PDSCH simultaneously under some circumstances? If the answer is yes, please comment on those circumstances in the comment field. If the answer is no, please comment on how the UE should prioritize between the two PDSCHs.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| QC | Yes | Simultaneous MBS + unicast PDSCH is not much different than simultaneous SIB/paging/RAR + unicast PDSCH. So, on high level, this feature should be supported. The overall condition to allow simultaneous MBS PDSCH and another PDSCH is that the sum data rate of the FDMed MBS and another PDSCH does not exceed the peak data rate of 10Mbps. For PR1 UE, this sum data rate constraint is sufficient. For PR3 UE, maybe additional BW restriction can be considered. On low level, there are some minor differences between MBS + unicast PDSCH vs legacy SIB/paging/RAR + unicast PDSCH. The difference is that SIB/paging/RAR is capped with single layer and 64QAM. While, multicast MBS can have >1 layers and >64QAM. Therefore, a dedicated UE capability can be introduced to handle those scenarios of multicast MBS with >1 layers and >64QAM + unicast PDSCH. |
| vivo | Y | If the total number of PRBs for MBS PDSCH and another PDSCH does not exceed the UE processing capability.  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | E.g., the total bandwidth does not exceed 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS |
| Nordic  | OK | given condition by SPRD |
| OPPO | Y | If the overlapped part does not exceed 5MHz. |
| CATT | Y | If total bandwidth does not exceed 5 MHz. |
| CMCC | Y | If spanning bandwidth does not exceed 5 MHz. |
| LG | Yes  | Under the condition that total number of PRBs for MBS PDSCH and any PDSCH is not larger than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30KHz SCS in the same slot.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes | If bandwidth does not exceed 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS |
| SONY | OK | “certain circumstance” = “total bandwidth does not exceed 5MHz” |
| DOCOMO | Y | For broadcast MBS PDSCH, no restriction on total number of PRB is necessary.For multicast MBS PDSCH, the total number of PRBs should not be larger than 5MHz.Whether the UE can support it or not should be up to UE capability same as legacy UE. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes | For multicast, >64QAM would be configured for eRedCap UE. Additionally, from our understanding, when the the total number of PRBs scheduled for MBS PDSCH and unicast PDSCH in slot n is larger than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 KHz SCS, the UE is not required to process the MBS PDSCH reception in slot n when the UE receives another PDSCH in slot n+1, and the UE shall be able to process the MBS PDSCH reception after decoding of unicast PDSCH in slot n when no PDSCH is scheduled in slot n+1. |
| Ericsson | Y | If the total number of PRBs does not exceed 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS. |
| NEC | Y | The total number of PRBs overlapping is no larger than the maximum. |
| Xiaomi |  | For eRedCap with FG48-1, regarding the simultaneous reception between MBS and other channels, it can share the similar situations with non-eRedCap UEs under the condition that total number of PRBs for MBS PDSCH and other DL channels is not larger than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS in the same slot. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.**Medium Priority Proposal 2.5-1b:*** **An eRedCap UE shall be able to decode a PDSCH for MBS broadcast and a PDSCH for unicast with the two PDSCH partially or fully overlapping in time in non-overlapping PRBs, if the total number of PRBs does not exceed the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can receive or process per slot.**
	+ **FFS: UE capabilities**
 |
| FL6 | The following agreement was made in the Wednesday online session:Agreement:* An eRedCap UE with bandwidth reduction, depending on indicated UE capability, the UE can decode a PDSCH for MBS broadcast and a PDSCH for unicast with the two PDSCH partially or fully overlapping in time in non-overlapping PRBs, if the total number of PRBs does not exceed the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can receive or process per slot.

Regarding the “indicated UE capability” in the above agreement, RAN1 can come back to it in the next meeting.Related to the above agreement, companies are invited to comment on the following question.**Medium Priority Question 2.5-1c: How should the UE prioritize between simultaneous MBS broadcast and unicast when the total number of PRBs exceeds the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can receive or process per slot (if this is a valid case)?** |
| CMCC | If eRedCap UE has capability to process FDMed broadcast and unicast, since there is no timeline requirement for broadcast, UE can buffer broadcast and process it later, no need to define priority. |
| CATT | May need some time to check. One possible outcome is, as mentioned by CMCC, no spec impact: unicast PDSCH is received with corresponding HARQ-ACK, MBS is buffered and decoded without HARQ-ACK feedback. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | At least Unicast PDSCH should be decoded.From our understanding, when the the total number of PRBs scheduled for MBS PDSCH and unicast PDSCH in slot n is larger than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 KHz SCS, the UE is not required to process the MBS PDSCH reception in slot n when the UE receives another PDSCH in slot n+1, and the UE shall be able to process the MBS PDSCH reception after decoding of unicast PDSCH in slot n when no PDSCH is scheduled in slot n+1. |

Contribution [10] mentions that according to legacy behavior, the UE may be expected to decode PDSCH scheduled with MCCH-RNTI and PBCH that partially or fully overlap in time.

**FL1/FL3/FL4/FL6 Medium Priority Question 2.5-2a: Should the UE receive MCCH PDSCH and PBCH simultaneously under some circumstances? If the answer is yes, please comment on those circumstances in the comment field. If the answer is no, please comment on how the UE should prioritize between the two transmissions.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| QC | Yes | Given this feature is supported by legacy UE, eRedcap can support this feature, as long as the sum data rate of the FDMed MCCH PDSCH and PBCH does not exceed the peak data rate of 10Mbps. For PR1 UE, this sum data rate constraint is sufficient. For PR3 UE, maybe additional BW restriction can be considered. |
| vivo | Yes | We think may be no restriction/condition is needed for this case. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | E.g., the total bandwidth does not exceed 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS |
| Nordic  | Yes | condition same as SPRD |
| OPPO | Yes | It should satisfy date rate and bandwidth cap. |
| CATT | Y | PBCH will exceed 5 MHz (for 30kHz SCS) itself, but still Yes in our view.We already have the following conclusion. Broadcast MBS should also be counted.

|  |
| --- |
| 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. |

 |
| LG | Yes  | The total sum of PRBs is not larger than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes |  |
| SONY | Yes | Circumstance = “total bandwidth does not exceed 5MHz” |
| DOCOMO | Yes | We share the similar view with CATT. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | Open to consider this issue and strive to reuse the existing agreements. |
| Ericsson | Y | We do not expect any specification changes to capture this case.  |
| Xiaomi |  | Actually, PBCH may be processed as PDCCH in the baseband, this issue is just like that whether the total number of RBs for PDCCH and PDSCH overlapped in time can be larger than 12/25 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS. In our view, there is no restriction on this case. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |

2.6 MBS UE features

Contribution [24] discusses MBS UE features specific to Rel-18 eRedCap UEs. For example, the following feature groups in TR 38.822 [33] have components associated with decoding in consecutive slots or slot-level repetition, which might not be supported by UEs with UE BB bandwidth reduction.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 33. NR\_MBS | 33-1 | Broadcast | 1. Support of group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for broadcast with CRC scrambled by MCCH-RNTI.2. Support of group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for broadcast with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI(s) for MTCH.3. Support of CFR configuration for broadcast.4. Support of CORESET and common search space for broadcast.5. Support of DCI format 4\_0 with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI/MCCH-RNTI for broadcast.6. Support of inter-slot TDM between unicast PDSCH and MCCH group-common PDSCH or MTCH group-common PDSCH, or between MCCH group-common PDSCH and MTCH group-common PDSCH, or among unicast PDSCH and MCCH group-common PDSCH and MTCH group-common PDSCH in different slots.7. Support MCCH change notification indication via DCI.8. support of higher layer configured slot-level repetition up to 8 for MTCH9. One G-RNTI per UE is supported for broadcast reception10. Support of FDMed MCCH and PBCH11. Support of up to 64QAM for FR1/FR2 |
| 33. NR\_MBS | 33-2 | Dynamic scheduling for multicast for PCell | 1. Support of group-common PDCCH/PDSCH for multicast with CRC scrambled by G-RNTI for PCell.2. Support of CFR configuration for multicast.3. Support of CORESET and common search space configuration for multicast.4. Support of DCI format 4\_1 with CRC scrambled with G-RNTI for multicast.5. Support of inter-slot TDM between group-common PDSCH for multicast and other PDSCHs in different slots.6. Support {2, 4, 8} times semi-static slot-level repetition for group-common PDSCH for multicast |

**FL1/FL3/FL4 Medium Priority Question 2.6-1a: Is there a need to introduce MBS UE feature groups specific to eRedCap UEs? Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| QC | Yes | It is not a good idea to reuse Rel-17 Redcap UE capabilities for Rel-18 eRedcap UE capabilities. This does not have any benefit (except saved a few pages in 38.306) but could create a lot of confusion to implementation. |
| vivo | FFS | We are open to discuss whether to introduce new FG or make some clarifications for existing MBS FGs for Rel-18 eRedCap.  |
| Nordic  | No | R17 capa can be indicated and R18 eRedCap differences specified |
| CATT | FFS | Let’s conclude issues in Section 2.4 and 2.5 first. |
| FUTUREWEI | FFS | Because there are over 40 FGs for Rel-17 MBS, we should consider if we can reuse the existing feature groups.  |
| CMCC |  | Open to discuss. |
| LG | FFS | We can discuss it  |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Open to discussion |
| DOCOMO | FFS | It can be discussed after the progress on section 2.4/2.5 whether eRedCap UE can report Rel-17 MBS basic capabilities as it is or not. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | This is up to UE feature discussion. Moreover, it is better to discuss this after we have a complete conclusion for MBS |
| Ericsson |  | Open to discuss |
| Xiaomi | FFS | Open to discuss it.  |
| Samsung |  | Same view as ZTE |
| OPPO | FFS |  |

# 3 UE peak data rate reduction

3.0 Earlier agreements

RAN1 has made the following agreements for UE peak data rate reduction [4]:

|  |
| --- |
| 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

Agreement:* For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,
	+ The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to a *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* of 3.2
* For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,
	+ The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to a *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* of 0.75
	+ This is assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression.
* Note: This does not imply that downlink MIMO and 256 QAM are not supported

Agreement:* The UE needs to signal peak data rate 10-Mbps related parameters corresponding to *vLayers*, *Qm* and *f*.
	+ No new values for the above parameters will be introduced for Rel-18 eRedCap.
	+ For FG 48-2, when *vLayers* = 2, the peak rate target corresponds to a *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* of 0.8 (instead of 0.75).

Conclusion:* For Rel-18 eRedCap UEs, the following features are still supported as optional features:
	+ 2 Rx branches with DL MIMO
	+ DL 256QAM

Agreement:* Send LS to RAN2 (cc RAN4) to inform about RAN1 agreements on peak rate reduction with 38.306 impact.

Agreement:Final LS [R1-2308610](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_114/Docs/R1-2308610.zip) is endorsed. |

3.1 Relaxed constraints

Contribution [12] expresses that the current default values of the peak rate related UE capability parameters are not suitable for eRedCap UEs and proposes to follow one of these directions:

* **Direction 1:** Specify that it is mandatory for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs to report UE capability related RRC parameters *scalingFactor*, *supportedModulationOrderDL* and *supportedModulationOrderUL* to the gNB.
* **Direction 2:** Introduce new default values for *scalingFactor*, *supportedModulationOrderDL* and *supportedModulationOrderUL*.

**FL1 High Priority Question 3.1-1a: Is there an issue with the current default values of the peak rate related UE capability parameters that needs to be addressed? Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Maybe | Similar issue is also discussed in section 2 of R1-2309422. Same handling can be adopted.  |
| Spreadtrum |  | According to 38.306, the default value for *scalingFactor* is 1. The default values for *supportedModulationOrderDL* and *supportedModulationOrderUL* are 256QAM (i.e., 8) and 64QAM (i.e., 6), respectively. The *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* calculated by the default values (e.g., 6, 8) cannot align to the value we agreed for R18 eRedCap (e.g., 3.2, 0.75, 0.8).However, we think this issue can be treated in RAN2. |
| Nordic  | Y | Redcap will always have to report values despite there is single value based on number of layer and FG48-1/2 … does not make sense. But RAN2 should make the spec change, we can only ask them to consider. |
| CATT | Y, but | Should be addressed by RAN2.  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Because the product is known for FG 48-1 and 48-2, there are already constraints on the possible values. For FG48-2, the product 0.75 has values of {1, 1, 0.75} for{vlayer, Qm, f}; and the values for the product 0.8 are {2, 1, 0.4}. |
| CMCC |  | Can be treated in RAN2. |
| LG |  | Decided by RAN2 |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We do not think there is an issue but open for more discussion or this can be left to RAN2 |
| DOCOMO |  | We share the same view with CATT. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We are open to consider and also OK to leave it to RAN2. |
| Ericsson |  | If there is no specification change, our understanding is that the Rel-18 eRedCap UEs will always report the capabilities corresponding to *Q* and *f*, i.e., Direction 1 may already be supported. With regards to Direction 2, although we are not against this direction, we prefer to leave this to RAN2. If needed, RAN1 can come back to this issue after RAN2 has updated 38.306 according to the LS in [R1-2308228](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_114/Docs/R1-2308228.zip) (where it says that “The UE signals peak data rate related parameters *vLayers*, *Qm* and *f* corresponding to 10 Mbps”). |
| Xiaomi | Y | We share the similar view with majority companies that it can be treated in RAN2, and the corresponding LS can be sent to RAN2 if necessary. |
| Samsung |  | It can be handled by RAN2. |
| FL2/FL3 | Based on the above received responses, this issue can be revisited if needed when it is clear how RAN2 will capture the RAN1 agreements listed in the LS in [R1-2308228](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_114/Docs/R1-2308228.zip) in their specifications. |

3.2 Combinations with optional features

Contribution [18] expresses that the optional feature DL 256QAM should not apply to UEs support FG 48-2.

**FL1/FL3/FL4 Low Priority Question 3.2-1a: Should support of DL 256QAM be precluded for UEs supporting FG 48-2?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| QC | No |  |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| Nordic | Somewhat support | If gNB does not limit BW, for PR1 UE then will not be able to schedule 256QAM anyway 😊. If gNB limits BW, then it is de-facto becomes PR1+PR3 feature. There seem to be good technical bases for the proposal. |
| CATT | No |  |
| FUTUREWEI | No |  |
| CMCC | No |  |
| LG | No | No reason for 48-2 not supporting DL 256QAM  |
| Nokia, NSB | No |  |
| DOCOMO | No |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | The motivation is not clear. |
| Ericsson | N |  |
| NEC | N |  |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| Samsung | No |  |
| OPPO | NO |  |

# 4 Detailed spec text proposals

The submitted contributions bring up some specification text aspects not covered elsewhere in this document.

**FL1/FL3/FL4 Low Priority Question 4-1a: Should the following proposal be treated in this meeting?**

* **Contribution [16] proposes to move the specification from 38.213 to 38.214 about that the maximum 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS for PUSCH and PDSCH allocated to an eRedCap UE should not be exceeded.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  |  | We somewhat agree, but as for now, all (e)RedCap has been in one section in 213. Perhaps better to keep it that way. |
| OPPO | Y | The key problem is that the 38.213 is the UE procedure for control. And the current text is about the data channel:Especially for PUSCH“A UE that has indicated FG 48-1 does not expect to transmit a PUSCH over a bandwidth that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, per hop in a slot.” It mentions no control. Put them into 38.214 would be consistent with other content.I trace back the introduction CRs and document. It seems they initially try to copy the “R1-2308228 RAN1 agreements for Rel-18 NR RedCap”, compiled at the last day of #114. Each agreements are marked with recommend spec.. Please note the spec. number are recommendation not agreements themselves. |
| Nokia, NSB | No | We think since most RedCap specification text is in one section in 38.213, it’s better to keep it as is. |
| Ericsson | N | Similar view as Nokia |
| Xiaomi |  | Share the similar view with Nordic.  |
| CATT |  | Understand that 213 is for control and 214 is for data in general. But Clause 17 of 213 should capture ‘RedCap UE procedures’ as much as possible. This can make reading and checking RedCap-related spec impact easier. |

**FL1/FL3/FL4 Low Priority Question 4-2a: Should the following proposal be treated in this meeting?**

* **Contribution [22] provides a 38.213 TP for clarification of the random access timeline relaxation’s (i.e., X’s) dependency on the SCS.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | N | UL and DL SCS should be always same for RedCap UE  |
| Sharp | Y | there are no agreement on the same or difference for UL and DL SCS for (e)RedCap UE, so we think it make spec more clear.  |
| Ericsson |  | It would be good to clarify this either in this or the next meeting. |
| Xiaomi |  | We are open to discuss it.  |
| CATT | N | We will anyway have + 0.5 ms in the legacy timeline. Current writing is not wrong but just combine the relaxed slot and 0.5 ms together. |

In a Tuesday offline session, it was discussed whether to replace “A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2” with “A UE not supporting FG 48-2” and replace “A UE that indicated FG 48-2” with “A UE supporting FG 48-2” in the following paragraphs in 38.213 clause 17.1A, to avoid some potential ambiguous interpretations of the specification.

|  |
| --- |
| A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2 does not expect to transmit a PUSCH over a bandwidth that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, per hop in a slot.A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2 does not expect to process a PDSCH reception that is scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a C-RNTI, CS-RNTI, or MCS-C-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, in a slot.A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2 is not required to process a PDSCH reception in slot $n$ that is scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a G-RNTI for broadcast over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, when the PDSCH reception is with repetitions or when the UE receives another PDSCH in slot $n+1$.A UE is not required to process a PDSCH reception that is scheduled by a DCI format with CRC scrambled by a TC-RNTI over a number of PRBs that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, in a slot.A UE that indicated FG 48-2 does not expect to transmit a PUSCH over a bandwidth that is larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS, or larger than 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, per hop in a slot, where the PUSCH is scheduled by RAR UL grant or by a DCI scrambled by a TC-RNTI, or is configured for a Type-2 random access procedure. |

**FL4/FL6 Medium Priority Question 4-3a: Should to “A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2” be replaced with “A UE not supporting FG 48-2” and “A UE that indicated FG 48-2” be replaced with “A UE supporting FG 48-2” in the above paragraphs in 38.213 clause 17.1A?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | N | We should be careful about what is changed because the language used in the specification refers to how note 4 in RAN#99 is implemented.  |
| CMCC |  | We need to check this carefully. For example, “A UE that has not indicated FG 48-2” does not equal to “A UE not supporting FG 48-2”, the former also include FG 48-2 UEs in idle mode. |
| CATT | FFS | Somehow there are minor difference between original wording and new wording:* A UE has not indicated FG 48-2: Including FG 48-1 UE in all RRC mode, and also FG 48-2 UE in RRC\_IDLE mode.
* A UE not supporting FG 48-2: Including FG 48-1 UE in all RRC modes only.

So…(1) For the first 3 paragraph: no much difference (since they are implying RRC\_CONNECTED mode, or at least have been in RRC\_CONNECTED mode with UE-dedicated RRC configuration). (2) For the last paragraph: Depending on the outcome of FL proposal 2.2-1. Possibly the ‘A UE that indicated FG 48-2’ may be removed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N for the first and second paragraph.Y for the third paragraph.Modification for the fifth paragraph. | We do not think spec change for the first paragraph and second paragraph are needed. The PDSCH/PUSCH there are not referring to idle mode.For the third paragraph, we are OK to change it as ‘**“A UE supporting FG 48-2”** since there is no need to follow the RAN conclusion for initial access.For the fifthparagraph, we agree with CATT and need to follow the RAN conclusion for initial access, then we would suggest to remove ‘that indicated FG 48-2’ |

# 5 Other aspects

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

**Common PUCCH**

* Consider enhancements of user multiplexing capacity for common PUCCH [15].
* Do not think PUCCH will become the bottleneck during random access [19].
* Impacts would need to be carefully considered before deciding to do this [25].

**FDRA optimization**

* Discuss whether/how to use potential spare bits in FDRA field in RAR UL grant [9].
* For unicast, the FDRA indications and RBG sizes can be based on 5-MHz sub-bands [11].

**Frequency hopping**

* Support frequency hopping at least for unicast PUSCH [11].
* Study how to improve Msg3 frequency hopping range [18].

**HD-FDD scheduling**

* HD-FDD UE is capable of processing one additional unicast DCI scheduling PUSCH, as in TDD [28].

Contribution [28] proposes to allocate time for discussion of these aspects, whereas contribution [13] argues that none of these aspects are essential for Rel-18 RedCap.

**FL1/FL3/FL4 Low Priority Question 5-1a: Is there a need to treat any of the issues listed above in this meeting?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | Y | At least for topics that were never discussed in offline. |
| LG | Y | We are open to discuss them  |
| Ericsson | N | We do not see these optimizations as essential for Rel-18 eRedCap. |
| Xiaomi | N | Share view as Ericsson.  |
| Nokia, NSB | N | Similar view as others that these optimizations are not essential |
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