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# 1 Introduction

This document summarizes contributions [1] – [30] which were submitted to AI 8.6.1 plus a few relevant contributions [31] – [35] that were submitted to other agenda items under AI 8.6.

This document also captures this RAN1#102-e email discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| [102-e-NR-RedCap-01] Email discussion/approval – Johan (Ericsson)   * By 8/20 – high priority * By 8/26 – medium * By 8/28 – last check |

FL summary #1 was provided in [R1-2007090](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2007090.zip). The following agreements were made in an online (GTW) session:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * For cost/complexity reduction analysis, the RF-to-baseband cost ratio for an FR1 UE is assumed to be 40:60. * For cost/complexity reduction analysis, the RF-to-baseband cost ratio for an FR2 UE is assumed to be approximately 50:50.   **Conclusion:**   * The study of reduced number of UE (physical) antenna elements and panels in FR2 is not prioritized in the RedCap study item.   Agreements:   * For RedCap UEs in FR1,   + The baseline UE bandwidth capability is 20 MHz, which can be assumed during the initial access procedure.   + Discuss further by email whether there is an issue or a necessity in achieving up to 150Mbps assuming a 20MHz and rank 1 transmission. |

FL summary #2 was provided in [R1-2007177](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2007177.zip). The following agreements were made via email:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * For the purpose of evaluation, the UE processing time in terms of N1/N2 can be assumed to be doubled compared to those of capability #1, i.e.,   + N1 = 16, 20, 34, and 40 symbols for 15, 30, 60, and 120 kHz SCS (assuming only front-loaded DMRS)   + N2 = 20, 24, 46, and 72 symbols for 15, 30, 60, and 120 kHz SCS   Agreements:   * Study of relaxed UE processing time related to CSI computation is not prioritized in the RedCap study item. |

FL summary #3 was provided in [R1-2007269](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2007269.zip). The following agreements were made in an online (GTW) session:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * For FR1 DL, study relaxation of maximum mandatory modulation to 64QAM instead of 256QAM. * For FR1 UL, study relaxation of maximum mandatory modulation to 16QAM instead of 64QAM. * For FR2 DL, study relaxation of maximum mandatory modulation to 16QAM instead of 64QAM. * For FR2 UL, study relaxation of maximum mandatory modulation to 16QAM instead of 64QAM. * Restriction to 1 or 2 MIMO layers in DL can be studied. * No TBS restriction is considered in this SI beyond the implicit TBS restrictions resulting from reduced UE bandwidth or reduced number of MIMO layers. |

In the fourth round of the email discussion, captured in this document, the following agreements were made via email:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agreements:   * Assume the detailed cost breakdown for FR1 FDD/TDD and FR2 in the table below:  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Functional block** | **FR1 FDD (2Rx)** | **FR1 TDD (4Rx)** | **FR2** | | **RF** | | | | | Antenna array for FR2 |  |  | ~33% | | Power amplifier | ~25% | ~25% | ~18% | | Filters | ~10% | ~15% | ~8% | | RF transceiver (including LNAs, mixer, and local oscillator) | ~45% | ~55% | ~41% | | Duplexer / Switch | ~20% | ~5% | ~0% | | **Baseband** | | | | | ADC / DAC | ~10% | ~9% | ~4% | | FFT/IFFT | ~4% | ~4% | ~4% | | Post-FFT data buffering | ~10% | ~10% | ~11% | | Receiver processing block | ~24% | ~29% | ~24% | | LDPC decoding | ~10% | ~9% | ~9% | | HARQ buffer | ~14% | ~12% | ~11% | | DL control processing & decoder | ~5% | ~4% | ~5% | | Synchronization / cell search block | ~9% | ~9% | ~7% | | UL processing block | ~5% | ~5% | ~7% | | MIMO specific processing blocks | ~9% | ~9% | ~18% |   Agreements:   * In potential cost evaluations for a UE, it is assumed that the multi-band support affects the RF cost but not the baseband cost significantly. * In the TR, at least include a qualitative statement; relevant numerical results can also be considered. |

The issues in this document are color coded like this:

1. High priority
2. Medium priority
3. Low priority

This version of the document contains updated FL proposals tagged FL5.

# 6 Evaluation methodology

## 6.1 Evaluation methodology for UE complexity reduction

One contribution [3] proposes to add a disclaimer to the TR that the cost/complexity estimates are very rough, simplified and subjective, and that they do not account for design costs or economies of scale, and do not account many components present in real devices such as multiple band support, displays, cameras, microphones, etc., and cannot be used to guarantee low-cost in the market.

Another contribution [8] makes an observation that the methodology does not take into account economies of scale (vs. market fragmentation) amongst the cost drivers, and that this fact should be stated explicitly in Section 7.7 of TR 38.875, where combinations of reduction features are selected and assessed.

**Q 6.1-1: Can the above disclaimer from [3] and the above observation from [8] be captured in the TR?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | The disclaimer needs to be captured before the cost/complexity estimates are included in the TR. The observation from [8] is one aspect from the disclaimer from [3]. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| ZTE,Sanechips |  | Usually in the TR there will be a note saying the cost reduction from the tdocs are the estimates of each individual company and not the consensus of RAN1. This should address any concern in this aspects.  Anyway further elaboration will need discussion which is not necessary. |
| Panasonic | Y | We are OK to capture above. |
| vivo |  | We think it should be further discussed. This is not critical for this meeting. |
| Samsung | N | We had similar discussion in Rel-11 MTC SI. But in TS 36.888, there is no such description or observations. There is no need to capture it TR either. |
| Xiaomi | N | Actually, we don’t understand the motivation or purpose to capture the disclaimer or observation in the TR. In the MTC project, we conducted similar UE complexity analysis by using similar evaluation methodology. But there is no such disclaimer in MTC TR, why we need to capture this disclaimer in Redcap TR. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | This disclaimer and observation from [3][8] are actually pointing out an important aspect that needs to be looked at during the design of RedCap, which are also mentioned in several other contributions. In some sense or after years of commercialization, the effect of cost reduction from economies of scale can be even larger than the aspects contributed from e.g. # of Rx reduction, thus it should be our responsbility to also take this into accout when designing RedCap. This in our view is also the main motivation to have the explicity objective in SID to consider to define a UE type for RedCap.  On the other hand, it may be also benefical to capture, if possible, the effect of e.g. economies of scale based on some economics models. We are positive if this can also be done in the study phase of RedCap. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are OK to capture the disclaimer and observation |
| MediaTek | Y | We feel necessary to emphasize in the disclaimer that RedCap feature combinations targeting a niche market may benefit less from economies of scale and can potentially contribute to a general fragmentation of the whole RedCap UE hardware market.  Otherwise we are fine with Futurewei’s proposal to capture the broader [3] disclaimer before the cost/complexity estimates are included in the TR. |
| Qualcomm | N | Whether or not we need to include this disclaimer in TR can be discussed at next meeting. |
| CATT | Y | We are fine to capture the disclaimer and observation. That is something we need to take into account when we make decisions. |
| LG | Y | Proposals from [3] and [8] can be captured as a single disclaimer, maybe in a more general manner. |
| SONY | N | We should be prioritizing discussion of other aspects of this 83 page document, rather than this. If we were to spend time discussing these things, can we also mention the cost of the battery? At least the battery impacts the design of a Redcap UE. |

Contribution [13] proposes that the number of RedCap UE hardware variants should be limited as much as possible (i.e. ideally one) to provide economies of scale, whereas contribution [15] proposes that more than one UE type should be defined to support different peak rates for different use cases. One contribution discusses whether there is any need to define explicit RedCap UE types [19]. Other contributions propose to study this further [16, 33].

One contribution [33] proposes to update the reference NR device definition to capture CA capability to evaluate reduction from actual NR devices deployed today. However, the feature lead’s understanding that the reference NR device ought to correspond to the simplest NR device that can be built today to address the targeted use cases, not necessarily the simplest actually deployed NR device.

The following agreements were made in a RAN1#102-e online (GTW) session:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * For cost/complexity reduction analysis, the RF-to-baseband cost ratio for an FR1 UE is assumed to be 40:60. * For cost/complexity reduction analysis, the RF-to-baseband cost ratio for an FR2 UE is assumed to be approximately 50:50. |

Several contributions discuss the detailed cost breakdown for the reference NR devices either qualitatively [1, 12] or quantitatively [6, 17, 30]. For more detailed information, see the respective contributions. The values tagged [FL] are suggestions based on an attempt to take the midpoint values of the provided values and adjusting the values so that the total cost for RF is 100% and the total for baseband is 100%.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Functional block** | **FR1 FDD (2Rx)** | **FR1 TDD (4Rx)** | **FR2** |
| **RF** | | | |
| Antenna array for FR2 |  |  | 30%~35% [17]  33% [FL]  ~33% [FL2]  ~33% [FL4] |
| Power amplifier | 25%-30% [17]  25% [6]  25% [20]  NA [30]  25% [FL]  ~25% [FL2]  ~25% [FL4] | 28%-35% [17]  16% [6]  25% [20]  NA [30]  25% [FL]  ~25% [FL2]  ~25% [FL4] | 15%~20% [17]  18% [FL]  ~18% [FL2]  ~18% [FL4] |
| Filters | 5-10% [17]  10% [6]  10% [20]  NA [30]  10% [FL]  ~10% [FL2]  ~10% [FL4] | 5%-10% [17]  13% [6]  10% [20]  NA [30]  10% [FL]  ~15% [FL2]  ~15% [FL4] | 5%-10% [17]  8% [FL]  ~8% [FL2]  ~8% [FL4] |
| RF transceiver (including LNAs, mixer, and local oscillator) | 40%-50% [17]  45% [6]  40% [20]  NA [30]  45% [FL]  ~45% [FL2]  ~45% [FL4] | 45%-55% [17]  58% [6]  40% [20]  NA [30]  50% [FL]  ~55% [FL2]  ~55% [FL4] | 40% [17]  41% [FL]  ~41% [FL2]  ~41% [FL4] |
| Duplexer / Switch | 10-20% [17]  20% [6]  25% [20]  NA [30]  20% [FL]  ~20% [FL2]  ~20% [FL4] | 2-3% [17]  13% [6]  25% [20]  NA [30]  15% [FL]  ~5% [FL2]  ~5% [FL4] | 0% [17]  0% [FL]  ~0% [FL2]  ~0% [FL4] |
| **Baseband** | | | |
| ADC / DAC | 5% [17]  10% [6]  9% [20]  NA [30]  10% [FL]  ~10% [FL2]  ~10% [FL4] | 5% [17]  10% [6]  9% [20]  NA [30]  9% [FL]  ~9% [FL2]  ~9% [FL4] | 5% [17]  4% [FL]  ~4% [FL2]  ~4% [FL4] |
| FFT/IFFT | 5% [17]  5% [6]  2% [20]  ~5% [30]  5% [FL]  ~5% [FL2]  ~4% [FL4] | 5% [17]  6% [6]  2% [20]  ~5% [30]  5% [FL]  ~5% [FL2]  ~4% [FL4] | 5% [17]  4% [FL]  ~4% [FL2]  ~4% [FL4] |
| Post-FFT data buffering | 10%-15% [17]  10% [6]  9% [20]  ~10% [30]  10% [FL]  ~10% [FL2]  ~10% [FL4] | 10%-15% [17]  12% [6]  9% [20]  ~10% [30]  10% [FL]  ~10% [FL2]  ~10% [FL4] | 10%-15% [17]  11% [FL]  ~11% [FL2]  ~11% [FL4] |
| Receiver processing block | 20%-35% [17]  25% [6]  27% [20]  ~35% [30]  25% [FL]  ~25% [FL2]  ~24% [FL4] | 20%-35% [17]  30% [6]  27% [20]  ~35% [30]  30% [FL]  ~30% [FL2]  ~29% [FL4] | 20%-35% [17]  24% [FL]  ~24% [FL2]  ~24% [FL4] |
| LDPC decoding | 5%-15% [17]  10% [6]  9% [20]  ~15% [30]  10% [FL]  ~10% [FL2]  ~10% [FL4] | 5%-15% [17]  6% [6]  9% [20]  ~15% [30]  9% [FL]  ~9% [FL2]  ~9% [FL4] | 5%-15% [17]  9% [FL]  ~9% [FL2]  ~9% [FL4] |
| HARQ buffer | 10%-15% [17]  10% [6]  27% [20]  ~15% [30]  15% [FL]  ~15% [FL2]  ~14% [FL4] | 10%-15% [17]  6% [6]  27% [20]  ~15% [30]  13% [FL]  ~13% [FL2]  ~12% [FL4] | 10%-15% [17]  11% [FL]  ~11% [FL2]  ~11% [FL4] |
| DL control processing & decoder | 5% [17]  5% [6]  4% [20]  NA (included in Receiver processing block) [30]  5% [FL]  ~5% [FL2]  ~5% [FL4] | 5% [17]  3% [6]  4% [20]  NA (included in Receiver processing block) [30]  4% [FL]  ~4% [FL2]  ~4% [FL4] | 5% [17]  5% [FL]  ~5% [FL2]  ~5% [FL4] |
| Synchronization / cell search block | 5%-10% [17]  10% [6]  9% [20]  ~10% [30]  10% [FL]  ~10% [FL2]  ~9% [FL4] | 5%-10% [17]  12% [6]  9% [20]  ~10% [30]  10% [FL]  ~10% [FL2]  ~9% [FL4] | 5%-10% [17]  7% [FL]  ~7% [FL2]  ~7% [FL4] |
| UL processing block | 5%-10% [17]  5% [6]  4% [20]  ~10% [30]  5% [FL]  ~5% [FL2]  ~5% [FL4] | 5%-10% [17]  3% [6]  4% [20]  ~10% [30]  5% [FL]  ~5% [FL2]  ~5% [FL4] | 5%-10% [17]  7% [FL]  ~7% [FL2]  ~7% [FL4] |
| MIMO specific processing blocks | 10%-20% [17]  10% [6]  NA [20]  NA (included in Receiver processing block) [30]  5% [FL]  ~5% [FL2]  ~9% [FL4] | 10%-20% [17]  12% [6]  NA [20]  NA (included in Receiver processing block) [30]  5% [FL]  ~5% [FL2]  ~9% [FL4] | 15%-25% [17]  18% [FL]  ~18% [FL2]  ~18% [FL4] |

**Q 6.1-3: Is there a need to define a detailed cost breakdown for the reference NR devices, or is it enough to define the RF-to-baseband cost ratios for the reference NR devices? Is the answer the same or different for FR1 and FR2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | We agreed to 888 as a starting point, so the question should probably be reversed to see if we have consensus NOT to have detailed breakdowns. The breakdowns are useful to see how companies arrived at their estimates and avoid just stating a big number for a preferred technique and e.g. 1% for a technique that a company doesn’t like for some reason.  That said, the exact breakdowns used are not that important. 888 is the starting point, is there a very strong need to change any of the values? In fact, 888 had a range for each, it could simplify things to take a midpoint of the ranges, or slightly higher or lower such that we add to 100%. The estimates we produce can all have a “~” in front of them, and there will need to be an overall disclaimer (see 6.1-1) before we include the % number in the TR anyway. |
| SONY | Detailed cost breakdown would be useful. This can be based on the values in TR36.888 (the numbers in the table above are consistent with (or the same as) the cost breakdown in TR36.888. We think that some of the numbers in the TDD columns of the above tables need re-visiting (TDD has 4RX and so we would expect a greater proportion of cost attributed to functions such as LNAs and receiver processing / channel estimation). We also think that some of the FR2 numbers need more consideration: we expect different breakdowns between FR1 and FR2. |
| Ericsson | If agreements can be reached during RAN1#102e, having detailed cost breakdown would be beneficial to better understand cost saving impacts from certain techniques where double counting may occur. Furthermore, it would be easier to identify which components have larger complexity and thus may assist in decision-making.  However, if agreements cannot be reached during RAN1#102e, given the limited time remaining in the SI, in order to avoid spending too much time, it might be enough to define the RF-to-baseband cost ratios for the reference NR devices and other than that just rely on the existing detailed cost breakdown in 36.888 in order to ensure the study item can be finalized in Q4 2020. |
| Sierra Wireless | There is no need to have the detailed cost breakdown for the reference NR device, in either FR1 or FR2. |
| InterDigital | Agree that detailed cost breakdown would be beneficial. |
| Spreadtrum | We share the same view with Ericsson, that detailed cost breakdown would be beneficial. Maybe we can try to discuss the change of values. If we can’t reach any agreements, we can just define the RF-to-baseband cost ratios for the reference NR devices. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | It is enough to define the RF-to-baseband cost ratios for the reference NR devices for both FR1 and FR2. No further breakdown is need as in anyway they are estimate and not of much value. |
| Panasonic | We agree Ericsson’s view. |
| vivo | It will be good if at least the cost breakdown for some of the above component can be provided, for example Post-FFT data buffering, DL control processing & decoder and HARQ buffer, so that we can quantify the cost reduction benefit for reduced BW, reduced PDCCH monitoring and HARQ processes, etc. |
| Samsung | If possible, it is better to provide similar cost breakdown similar as for LTE.  Based on the agreement we made “Include antenna parts at least in the cost/complexity breakdown for FR2.”. It might be better to at least separate RF part for FR1 and FR 2. |
| LG | Cost breakdown will be useful for our discussion on the complexity reduction features for both FR1 and FR2. Given the limited time left for the study, we agree to rely on TR36.888 for the detailed cost breakdown for FR1 perhaps with some NR-specific updates such as 4Rx cases, larger bandwidth, etc. For FR2, looking at the summary in the Table above, a slight increase of the RF portion is expected, but we may still rely on the TR36.888 for the cost breakdowns within the baseband portion. If we cannot converge on cost breakdowns within the RF for FR2, then we can leave it for further study until next meeting. |
| OPPO | Share similar view as Ericsson. In addition, we don’t have clear cost reduction target, not too much time shall be spent on the cost evaluation. |
| Xiaomi | We think the cost breakdown is beneficial. And different breakdown in FR1 and FR2 is expected. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If there is a need to define a detailed cost breakdown for UE modem, follow the evaluation in TR36.888. FR2 should follow FR1. |
| TIM | detailed cost breakdown would be beneficial. |
| Sequans | For both FR1 and FR2, a commonly agreed reference cost breakdown, even if it is about rough ranges, will be useful for evaluating overall cost reduction from each proposed technique. Some suggestions for improving the table:   * ADC/DAC could be also considered as part of RFIC, depending on implementation * Measurement procedures and CSI feedback have significant share in complexity of BBIC and could be consider to be added as a new line (or at least, companies should mention if it is considered either in MIMO blocks or in receiver processing block) |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | If time allows, prefer detailed cost breakdown to better understand the cost saving impacts from different features. |
| Intel | Agree with the general sentiment shared in comments above. We could aim to refine the cost breakdown in 36.888, at least for FR2. For FR1, we may be able to reuse 888 for the most part. In the event of difficult convergence, relying on 36.888 and only approximating the RF:BB ratio may be a reasonable fallback for our analyses. |
| Nokia, NSB | It would be beneficial to define a detailed cost breakdown for the reference NR devices for evaluation purpose |
| MediaTek | We agree with previous views that advocate having a detailed break-down but not over-emphasizing their importance or spending too much time on a consensus. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the comments/suggestions of Ericsson.  Due to the differences in UE implementation, there are variations in the quantities/estimates reported by companies for cost breakdown. Therefore, we think qualitative analysis should be used to identify the key/common enablers for UE complexity reduction. |
| CATT | We think it beneficial to define detailed cost breakdown to better understand the complexity reduction for each technique. |
| FL | The values tagged [FL] in the cost breakdown table above are suggestions based on an attempt to take the midpoint values of the provided values and adjusting the values so that the total cost for RF is 100% and the total for baseband is 100%.  Proposal 6.1-3a:   * Assume the detailed cost breakdown for FR1 FDD tagged [FL] in the table above.   Proposal 6.1-3b:   * Assume the detailed cost breakdown for FR1 TDD tagged [FL] in the table above.   Proposal 6.1-3c:   * Assume the detailed cost breakdown for FR2 tagged [FL] in the table above. |
| FUTUREWEI | Thank you for the effort, in particular we applaud having a single number that adds to 100 to avoid having ranges on top of ranges. We expect (a) that any estimate in the TR will have a “~” in front of it, and that (b) we will have the disclaimer that the estimates are rough. (Q 6.1-1).  For FR1 proposals ab, we can accept them for progress, though of course our numbers are different, and these tend to overestimate the complexity reduction. In particular, we feel the HARQ buffer is too high, we feel should be at most 10%. The difference could be added back to either synch (more complex than LTE) or UL processing (which includes polar). We do not feel the others should increase more, with receiver processing already on the high end.  For FR2 proposal c, need more time to think about the cost breakdown is much different than what we had in mind. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for the hard efforts of FL! The cost breakdown suggested by the FL can be used as a reference for UE complexity reduction.in FR1. |
| MediaTek | We are fine with the FL proposal, but worth highlighting that these are rough estimations for evaluation purposes. |
| Samsung | For FR1 TDD, Duplexer / Switch should be quite cheap, we think at most 5% should be enough and the rest can be increased accordingly. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the FL proposal, this can be used as a reference breakdown in the cost estimation. |
| LG | We are okay with this proposal. Thanks. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | This proposal is good with us. Thanks. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For RF, need to have one row of “Other” with 10% percentage, and the breakdown values for RF transceiver and duplexer/switch can be equally reduced with 5%. |
| CATT | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Maybe it’s better to note that the FR2 estimates are from one single source.  Another issue is for MIMO specific processing blocks, originally FR2’s cost percentage is about 1.5 times the cost percentage for FR1, now with the averaging, the ratio becomes almost 3.5 times. This seems not realistic and may cause unnecessary confusion. |
| SONY | We are fine with the proposal as is.  If a company wants an ”others” row in the RF section, it would be helpful for common understanding what sorts of things that go into “others”. That would help companies work out how to scale “others” in a complexity analysis.  If there are concerns on the FR2 cost breakdown, we hope that we can at least agree on the FR1 cost breakdowns in proposals 6.1-3a, 6.1-3b |
| Sequans | We are fine with the proposal to use these numbers as reference breakdown. Thanks FL for the effort |
| Sierra Wireless | We agree with Samsung. The FR1 TDD Switch should be quite cheap, at around 5%. |
| Intel | We are mostly fine with the proposal as such. However, we also share similar observation as Samsung on duplexer/switch cost for FR1 TDD and would be supportive of their proposed modification. |
| InterDigital | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL2 | The values tagged [FL2] in the cost breakdown table above are suggestions based on an attempt to take the midpoint values of the provided values and adjusting the values so that the total cost for RF is 100% and the total for baseband is 100%.  Compared to the earlier proposals tagged [FL], the FR1 TDD duplexer cost estimate has been reduced to 5% as proposed in three responses and other FR1 TDD RF costs have been increased correspondingly. Furthermore, a “~” sign has been inserted in front of all estimates as proposed in one response. Finally, since the FR2 numbers are only based on a single source, the FR2 proposal below has been changed into a proposed working assumption that can be confirmed or not in the next meeting.  Proposal 6.1-3a-v2:   * Assume the detailed cost breakdown for FR1 FDD tagged [FL2] in the table above.   Proposal 6.1-3b-v2:   * Assume the detailed cost breakdown for FR1 TDD tagged [FL2] in the table above.   Proposal 6.1-3c-v2:   * Assume the detailed cost breakdown for FR2 tagged [FL2] in the table above as a working assumption. |
| FUTUREWEI | OK. This is the highest priority agreement/working assumption to make. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Thanks for SONY’s interaction on our previous comment about “Other”: this comes from 36.888 and there is a persistent ~10% cost breakdown as ‘other’ shown in many of the RF cost breakdown tables, without changing per BW reduction, transmit power reduction, # of RF chain reduction or Duplex mode operation. The value of ‘other’ for baseband is a persistent 0%. From the tables in 36.888 I guess it could be a non-scaling value for analysis. |
| SONY | Huawei / HiSi> Thanks for the clarification on what “others” means. We would be OK with having a 10% “persistent” cost for “others”. What we understand by “persistent” is: if the FR cost of the reference UE is 100 units, then “others” costs 10 units in the reference UE. After some complexity reductions, we could get sum(cost(RF transceiver, PA, filters, duplexer)) = 50 units, for example. The cost of others in the Redcap UE would still be 10 units. The overall cost of the redcap UE would then be 10 + 50 = 60.  We are OK with either the FL2 table, or a table accounting for “others” in RF. Given the stage of the discussion, our preference would be the FL2 table. |
| Sierra Wireless | We agree with FL2 table as is. We prefer to not add the “others” row in the RF section because we will need to redo the other functional blocks which we do not have time for and this ”Other” row, will negatively bias the efficiency of all the proposed RF cost reduction techniques. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | For MIMO specific processing blocks, originally the cost percentage is about 1.5 times the cost percentage for FR1, now with the averaging, the ratio becomes almost 3.5 times. This seems not realistic and may cause unnecessary confusion. The reason of this strange value is from the 0% value given from one source for FR1. We suggest to remove this value . Then FR1 value is around 9%, FR2 value can keep the current 18%. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the FL’s proposals. In our view there is no need to add the “Other” in the RF section. |
| Qualcomm | In FR1 TDD bands, we noticed the cost ratio of duplexer/switch is reduced from 15% to 5% in FL2 proposal. It is necessary to clarify if 5% counts the switch only and excludes the duplexer. |
| Intel | Similar view as SONY. The observation from ZTE regarding MIMO processing blocks seems to be valid – perhaps the 0% from reference [20] should be interpreted as “N/A”? |
| FL3 | It would be good if the companies who provided the results can comment on the questions/comments above. |
| Samsung | We are fine with FL2 table. We are also open for more input for FR 2 breakdown in next meeting. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposals. |
| OPPO | We are fine with FL2 table. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for the suggestions of FL.  To make our question more clear, let’s look at the case that UE operates in TDD bands and supports SUL as well. Based on TS 38.101-1-g40, SUL is part of the FDD band. If UE supports SUL, it is expected to support FDD bands as well. Therefore, such UE will have a duplexer as well, and we cannot assume its switch/duplexer is cheaper than the UE supporting FDD bands only. |
| SONY | Fine with FL2 proposal.  In our TDoc, [R1-2005580](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005580.zip), we used a cost breakdown for FR1 FDD that is pretty similar to the FL2 table.  My understanding of the Qualcomm comment is that if they want to study an SUL UE, they would be considering the FR1 FDD column of the FL2 table. That is OK. What we would like to avoid is having more columns to the table to cover every possible case. If companies want to provide results for other cases (including SUL UEs and any other combinations), then they can include a table of their assumed cost breakdown(s) for those other case(s). It would seem to be possible to make a reasonable estimate of the cost breakdown by an interpolation between values in the current FL2 table.  **Summary**: Fine with FL2 proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Intel > thanks for the comments. 0% means “N/A” in our document, we can change the “0%” to “N/A”.  In our reference model, MIMO specific processing blocks is contained in receiver processing block, so the “MIMO specific processing blocks” is “N/A”. But in order to use the automatic calculation of Excel, we need to fill a number in that cell, so 0% is used. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not sure about the impact if we drop the component of ‘others’ that has been persistently shown in TR 36.888 for RF part. We would appreciate a reason why for NR it is not needed anymore so that it does not sacrifice the FL/companies efforts to make the analysis useful in future releases. As companies have been checked FL2 proposals and may not be ready/sure about further update, we could be OK to put all numbers in [ ] without ‘others’ for the time being. |
| Ericsson | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL4 | The values tagged [FL4] in the cost breakdown table above are suggestions based on an attempt to take the midpoint values of the provided values and adjusting the values so that the total cost for RF is 100% and the total for baseband is 100%.  Compared to the earlier proposals tagged [FL2], the cost estimates for the MIMO specific processing blocks for FR1 have been adjusted from 5% to 9% in line with received responses and other parts have been adjusted so that the total FR1 baseband cost is 100%.  Proposal 6.1-3a-v3:   * Assume the detailed cost breakdown for FR1 FDD tagged [FL4] in the table above.   Proposal 6.1-3b-v3:   * Assume the detailed cost breakdown for FR1 TDD tagged [FL4] in the table above.   Proposal 6.1-3c-v3:   * Assume the detailed cost breakdown for FR2 tagged [FL4] in the table above as a working assumption. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Agree with version FL4. Thanks for the efforts. |

RAN1#101-e noted that “The study will consider impacts on the cost/complexity reduction from support of multiple RF bands within FR1 or FR2”.

* [1] has stated that the cost, complexity and the size of a RedCap device would scale up, although not linearly, with the number of supported RF bands within FR1 or FR2. In [1], it has also been stated that the overall relative cost/complexity reduction due to reducing number of Rx branches in a multi-band case can be expected be of the similar order as in the single-band case.
* [2] has proposed that SUL defined in Rel-15 and Rel-16 can be utilized for Rel-17 RedCap to achieve better uplink coverage, while UL CA is not proper for RedCap. The contribution has also noted that support of SUL does not directly increase the UE baseband cost, as the UE only work on one band at a given time.
* [3] has stated that the complexity reduction due to reduced number of UE Rx/Tx antennas will accumulate over multiple bands.
* [4] has stated that a wearable device supports a wide range of frequency bands, and separate antenna and Rx chain is required for bands that has large frequency separations. This will further complicate the product design with form factor limitation.
* [7] has noted that the RF complexity saving may multiply across bands when the bands are spaced sufficiently far apart that different LNAs and Pas are required. The contribution also notes that the baseband complexity saving does not replicate across multiple bands.
* [22] and [30] have estimated that a UE that has ‘support of only low-band, mid-band and high-band’ with 1 Rx antenna and 1 RF chain would provide a saving of 34% relative to a reference NR device with 8 Rx antenna and 4 RF chain.
* [33] has proposed that the reference NR device for evaluation of cost/complexity reduction should be updated to capture at least CA capability to evaluate reduction from actual NR devices deployed today.

**Q 6.1-4: Should the cost/complexity reduction from support of multiple RF bands within FR1 or FR2 be evaluated based on properly scaling up single-band evaluation results?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | The lead in “potential benefits in terms of reduced device size can be mentioned where applicable in the TR (e.g. in the section on reduced number of antennas), but the SI will not aim to quantify such benefits” is not relevant to the proposal. For that statement, as a low priority some time before the end of the study, a statement can be added in the antenna reduction section that reducing antennas may reduce size, such as in low bands (e.g 700MHz).  For the proposal, we already agreed to:  Note: The study will consider impacts on the cost/complexity reduction from support of multiple RF bands within FR1 or FR2.  We do not agree to reverse that agreement. A statement as to whether the gains are mostly RF or baseband and whether gains accumulate is sufficient. No need to include examples of a scaled up value, though if helpful and others want to do that no objection. |
| SONY | The evaluation results should account for multiple RF bands. The scaling needs to be applied to individual items in the complexity breakdown table (i.e. the table in “Q 6.1-3”). E.g. if a UE support 2 bands, it might require 2 Pas, but it doesn’t require 2 LDPC blocks, hence the scaling for 2 bands would scale the PA complexity, but not the LDPC complexity. |
| Ericsson | Ues supporting multiple RF bands are expected to have approximately the same baseband cost/complexity as a single-band UE, as long as operation in a single band is taking place at a given time. Regarding RF, cost/complexity scaling depends on frequency separation, complexity-performance trade-off, and whether additional components for enabling multiband operation.  A note capturing the above points might be included in the TR. |
| Sierra Wireless | Yes, we can scale up the single-band evaluation results for multiple RF bands. |
| InterDigital | Yes. We agree that scaling needs to be applied to individual items in the complexity breakdown table. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | For simplify the evaluation we can take this assumption. |
| Panasonic | We agree Ericsson’s view. |
| Vivo | As discussed in [4], instead of device cost, we are more concerned about the form factor issue due to the requirement of supporting multiple frequency bands for smart wearables. |
| Samsung | The cost reduction from support of multiple RF bands can be mentioned in genera but no need to provide quantized analysis. |
| LG | Yes, but the scaling up is applied only where applicable. Agree with Sony and Ericsson in that mostly the RF is affected from the support of multiple RF bands. It would be good to reach a consensus within this meeting on which parts are relevant for scaling up from the support of multiple RF bands. |
| OPPO | May be the RF part can be scaled with the number of supported Bands, while the baseband part is not. |
| Xiaomi | We share the same view with vivo |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For support of multi-band, it needs firstly clarify which aspect(s) may be shared across different bands. So it is not a linear scaling up but may be estimated based on “proper” scaling (for some factors). This nevertheless needs to be proceeded based on the analysis of single-band. In summary the reduction needs to be considered based on: 1) cost reduction of single-band and 2) with considerations of resource sharing across bands. |
| TIM | On one side, time can be gained for SI, on the other side FR1 and FR2 have very different RF components and complexity so it is not so clear and linear to proceed in the proposed way. |
| Sequans | Scaling may be accurate assumption for RFIC, but for BBIC reducing the number of supported bands may not directly impact the cost. |
| Intel | Agree with Ericsson that a qualitative characterization for the expect impact on device cost in supporting multiple bands should be sufficient. |
| Nokia, NSB | We think scaling can be applied for the RF part, while the baseband part may not need scaling |
| MediaTek | We agree with Futurewei’s and Ericsson’s views. |
| Qualcomm | It was agreed in RAN1#101 that the NR reference UE supports single RF band operation, FDD (in FR1) and TDD (in FR1 and FR2). For RedCap UE, we think its BW capability should be reduced w.r.t. that of reference UE. Therefore, RedCap UE is expected to support single RF band only in both FR1 and FR2. The capability to support CA/SUL/SDL should be excluded for a RedCap UE. |
| FL | Proposal 6.1-4:   * In potential cost evaluations for a UE that supports multiple bands but operates in a single band at a time, it is assumed that the multi-band support affects the RF cost but not the baseband cost significantly. * In the TR, at least include a qualitative statement; relevant numerical results can also be considered |
| Qualcomm | We don’t agree with the assumption above. Potentially, the UE “supporting multiple bands but operating in a single band at a time” might be required to transmit and receive simultaneously and operates in full-duplex mode. It is unclear to us why such features are considered for RedCap UE. |
| MediaTek | Fin with the proposal. However, the definition of “supports multiple bands but operates in a single band at a time” may need be further clarified to avoid any confusions. |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal |
| LG | We don’t support this proposal, but as there are a few companies that are interested in the study of the multi-band support case, we can live with this proposal. |
| SONY | Our understanding of the status of “multi-band analysis” is that companies can just state whether a complexity reduction technique scales with the number of bands supported. We do not envisage a lot of additional work associated with consideration of multi-band support, just some qualitative observations for each / some complexity reduction techniques.  It isn’t exactly clear what the second bullet means. Is it saying:   * (1) that there will be a generic statement in section 6.1 of the TR: “a UE that supports multiple bands but operates in a single band at a time, it is assumed that the multi-band support affects the RF cost but not the baseband cost significantly”; or * (2) In each of sections 7.x.2, there will be / can be qualitative statements about complexity reductions based on the understanding that “multi-band support affects the RF cost but not the baseband cost significantly”. Alternatively, “relevant numerical results can also be” provided by companies for sections 7.x.2 |
| Sequans | We are fine with the proposal |
| FL2 | Compared to the earlier version of the proposal above, the phase “that supports multiple bands but operates in a single band at a time” has been removed since it seemed to cause some confusion. The formulation was borrowed from the agreed definition of the reference NR device which uses similar formulations, but it is probably not needed here.  Proposal 6.1-4-v2:   * In potential cost evaluations for a UE, it is assumed that the multi-band support affects the RF cost but not the baseband cost significantly. * In the TR, at least include a qualitative statement; relevant numerical results can also be considered |
| FUTUREWEI | OK |
| SONY | We are basically OK with the FL2 proposal. We would still like clarification of whether the second bullet is a generic statement for section 6.1 or for each of sections 7.x.2. |
| Sierra Wireless | We agree with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the proposal |
| Intel | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL3 | In response to Sony’s question, I don’t think that Proposal 6.1-4-v2 says anything about in what TR section(s) we will insert the statement and/or results. |
| Samsung | OK with FL’s proposal 6.1-4-v2 |
| Panasonic | Fine with the proposal v2. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposal |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal 6.1-4-v2 |
| Qualcomm | We don’t agree with FL2 proposal.  If UE supports multiple RF bands, and the SCS of the corresponding basebands are different, UE needs to change SCS when it switches between different basebands. Obviously, such complexity is not accounted for in the proposal above. |
| SONY | We’re still a bit mystified about whether the statement about RF / baseband cost is generic or specific to a complexity reduction technique. However, we are OK with the second bullet and trust that that sort of statement ends up in the right place in the TR.  Regarding the Qualcomm comment: can’t a UE be required to switch between SCS even when there is basically a single band? In that case, wouldn’t the same “SCS switching complexity” apply to both multi-band and single-band UEs?  **Summary**: we are OK with proposal 6.1-4-v2 |
| Ericsson | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL4 | The following (unchanged) proposal can be considered.  Proposal 6.1-4-v2:   * In potential cost evaluations for a UE, it is assumed that the multi-band support affects the RF cost but not the baseband cost significantly. * In the TR, at least include a qualitative statement; relevant numerical results can also be considered. |
|  |  |

# 7 UE complexity reduction features

## 7.2 Reduced number of UE Rx/Tx antennas

### 7.2.1 Description of feature

In RAN1#101-e, the following agreements were made with regards to the study on UE complexity reduction through reduced number of UE Rx/Tx antennas.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * For FR1, study two antenna configurations for RedCap UEs, namely 1Rx/1Tx and 2Rx/1Tx. * For FR2, study two antenna configurations for RedCap Ues, namely 1Rx/1Tx and 2Rx/1Tx.   Agreements:   * [...] * Cost/complexity breakdowns can be separate for FR1 and FR2 if found beneficial. * Include antenna parts at least in the cost/complexity breakdown for FR2. * Potential benefits in terms of reduced device size can be mentioned where applicable in the TR (e.g. in the section on reduced number of antennas), but the SI will not aim to quantify such benefits.   Agreements:  The reference NR device for evaluation of cost/complexity reduction supports the following:   * [...] * Operation in a single band at a time * Antennas:   + For FR1 FDD: 2Rx/1Tx   + For FR1 TDD: 4Rx/1Tx   + For FR2: 2Rx/1Tx * [...]   Note: The study will consider impacts on the cost/complexity reduction from support of multiple RF bands within FR1 or FR2. |

### 7.2.2 Analysis of UE complexity reduction

The following conclusion was made in a RAN1#102-e online (GTW) session:

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion:**   * The study of reduced number of UE (physical) antenna elements and panels in FR2 is not prioritized in the RedCap study item. |

Most contributions have pointed out that a reduced number of Rx antennas compared to a Rel-15 reference UE enables reduced complexity, e.g. in terms of the required number of RF components and a relaxation of the baseband receiver complexity. The cost/complexity reduction analysis has been done either quantitatively or qualitatively.

For FR1, the quantitative cost reductions reported in different contributions are provided in Table 1.

**Table 1: Estimation of overall relative cost saving from reduced number of UE Rx antennas in FR1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Contribution** | **FR1 FDD**  **2 Rx  1 Rx** | **FR1 TDD**  **(4 Rx  2 Rx)** | **FR1 TDD**  **(4 Rx  1 Rx)** |
| [1] | 15-38% | 15-38% | 22.5-57% |
| [2] | ~20% in RF ~30% in baseband | Complexity reduction for individual RF and baseband components has been provided in Table 3 of [2] | - |
| [3] | ~30% | ~30% | - |
| [5] | Up to 50% in many baseband components/process  Reduction in RF cost | Up to 50% in many baseband components/processes  Reduction in RF cost | - |
| [6] | 31%` | 38% | 57% |
| [9] | 15-38% | - | - |
| [16] | 20%~30% | - | - |
| [17] | 33.2% | 37.5% | 56.2% |
| [20] | - | 26.8% | 37.8% |
| [22, 30] | - | 23% | 34% |
| [25] | - | 25-39% | 37-59% |
| [27] | - | factor of 2 in related parts (antennas, RF/baseband receiver chains) | - |
| [29] | 50% in RF 50% in many baseband components | 50% in RF 50% in many baseband components | - |

For FR1, the contributions [7, 8, 18, 23] have provided a qualitative analysis of cost/complexity reduction associated with different components of the RF part (e.g., Filters, RF transceiver, Duplexer /Switch, etc.) and the baseband part (e.g., ADC, FFT, Receiver processing block, decoding, buffers, Synchronization / cell search blocks, MIMO specific processing blocks, etc.). These contributions have indicated that there will be reduction in the UE complexity/cost when reducing the number of antennas. The contribution [8] have further emphasized that the complexity of transmit RF path, duplexer, frequency synthesizer, DAC, uplink baseband, initial cell search and control channel decoding are unaffected when reducing the number of receive chain, and complexity is reduced in quasi-linear proportion to the number of receiver chains in the receiver RF path.

Additionally, [19] has noted that going from 2 Rx to 1 Rx will have less impact on cost saving. The contribution [13] has stated that reducing the number of antennas will save chipset/module cost but especially if HD-FDD is supported, the cost reduction will not be significant, and that it is more economical to have one hardware variant.

For FR2, relatively fewer companies have provided cost/complexity reduction analysis, either quantitatively or qualitatively.

* [1] has stated that reducing only the Rx branches from 2 to 1 in FR2 will have limited impact on the overall cost and complexity reduction.
* [7] has stated that in FR2 reducing the number of antennas leads to complexity reduction through reduced number of antenna packages.
* [12] has noted that unlike in FR1, where ratio of RF to baseband cost was 40: 60, in FR2 the contribution of RF components to the overall cost/complexity of the reference NR UE modem is higher than 40%, closer to 50% or above.
* [17] has reported 49.64% reduction in complexity when going from for 2 Rx to 1 Rx. This is based on a 60:40 ratio of RF to baseband cost.

**Device size:**

In addition to reduction in cost/complexity benefits, the contributions [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 15, 16, 17, 21, 25] have also highlighted that the reduction in number of UE Rx antennas is also beneficial in terms of reducing the size/form factor for devices, such as wearables in FR1.

The contribution [27] has indicated that form factor consideration does not justify 1 Rx for RedCap, especially in FR2. It is mentioned in [1] that reducing only the Rx (branches) has limited impact on reducing the device size in FR2. In [29], it is mentioned that in FR2 depending on the power, complexity, and form factor of the RedCap UE, 1Rx or 2 Rx may be selected.

**Q 7.2.2-1: Most companies agree that the reduced number of Rx antennas is beneficial in terms of reducing the device size. Should this benefit be captured in TR 38.875?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | As commented in 6.1-4, this is OK but is low priority. The lower carrier frequencies should be in the statement. |
| Ericsson | FR1: Yes, we agree that benefit in terms of reduced device size can be captured in the TR.  FR2: No. In our view, reducing only the Rx antennas (i.e., branches) will have limited impact on reducing the device size. We are also, however, open to receiving and take into consideration more input from UE vendors on this aspect. |
| Sierra Wireless | Yes. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Yes. For both FR1 and FR2 it should be beneficial. |
| Panasonic | Yes. On FR2, as there are different views, these views can be captured. |
| Vivo | Yes. |
| Samsung | Yes. |
| OPPO | Yes. For both FR1 and FR2 it should be beneficial. |
| Xiaomi | Yes. The benefit of device size should be captured in the TR for both FR1 and FR2. For wearable device, the device size is one crucial factor. |
| CMCC | Yes |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As device size reduction is not the target, this shall not be used to justify the reduction of RedCap to e.g. 1Rx as indicated in a few contributions and is also not critically needed to be captured. It can be captured but the above information would then also be necessary to be captured together.  Also, it needs to clarify that reduction of baseband MIMO layers does not reduce the device size. |
| TIM | It is a very delicate issue. We are more worried by performance loss, even if we understand that size reduction can be used for portable and Iot devices. |
| Sequans | Agree with Huawei – can be captured but with necessary clarifications. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |
| Intel | Yes, certainly for FR1, not necessarily for FR2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes |
| Qualcomm | The benefit of device size reduction should be captured in TR for RedCap UE, for both FR1 and FR2 (if any). |
| CATT | Yes for FR1, FFS for FR2. |
| DOCOMO | Yes for FR1. FFS for FR2 due to a few observations so far and the conclusion made in a RAN1#102-e online (GTW) session |
| LG | Yes. Can be refined for FR2 with further inputs in the follow-up discussions/meetings. |
| SONY | Yes. |
| InterDigital | Yes. |
| FL3 | All responses agree to capture this in the TR for FR1. Most but not all responses also agree to capture this for FR2. A few responses want to capture that device size reduction is not an objective in the RedCap SI and that this benefit should not be used to justify reduction to e.g. 1 Rx.  Proposal 7.2.2-1:   * Capture in TR 38.875 that reduced number of UE Rx antennas is beneficial in terms of reducing the device size in FR1.   + Study further if the reduced number of Rx antennas is beneficial in terms of reducing the device size in FR2. * Capture in TR 38.875 that device size reduction is not an objective for the RedCap SI. |
| vivo | Fine with the 1st bullet but do not agree with the 2nd bullet. We all know that for wearables the device size is an critical aspect, and we have the following statement in the SID justification. This is an design requirement in our view, and the complexity reduction schemes shall be available to achieve this requirement.  *Finally, wearables use case includes smart watches, rings, eHealth related devices, and medical monitoring devices etc. One characteristic for the use case is that the device is small in size.* |
| Samsung | OK with the first bullet.  We don’t agree with second bullet. |
| Panasonic | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | OK with the first bullet.  We don’t agree with second bullet. |
| Qualcomm | We would like to second the opinion of Vivo. The SID explicitly mentions “Device size” in the generic requirements for RedCap UE, which is copied below:  ***Device size: Requirement for most use cases is that the standard enables a device design with compact form factor.***  If we agree on the 2nd bullet in FL3 proposal, it means the solutions we plan to study will miss the generic requirements for NR Rel-17 RedCap UE. Furthermore, one consequence of missing the requirements/objective of “compact form factor” is the de-prioritization of the wearables supporting FDD bands with 1 RX antenna. |
| SONY | Support opinion of vivo and Qualcomm.  We also had this agreement from RAN1#101e:   * *Use the TR 36.888 methodology for UE cost/complexity evaluation as a starting point and determine what major updates are needed.* * *Cost/complexity breakdowns can be separate for FR1 and FR2 if found beneficial.* * *Include antenna parts at least in the cost/complexity breakdown for FR2.* * *Potential benefits in terms of reduced device size can be mentioned where applicable in the TR (e.g. in the section on reduced number of antennas), but the SI will not aim to quantify such benefits.*   We think it would be worth mentioning the reduced device size benefits of reduced antennas based on the agreement above and the comments from vivo and Qualcomm |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the first bullet.  Don’t agree the second bullet.  From the perspective of product, compact device size is a real need. In addition, “relatively low-end services with the requirement of small device form factors” is mentioned in the Justification of the SID, hence the objective of Reduced number of UE RX/TX antennas from our understanding includes at least part of the small device size reduction. |
| Sequans | Fine with the proposal as is.  Compact form factor is indeed a requirement for some of the targeted use cases as stated in SID and we understand that first bullet intention is to capture observations regarding this aspect. However, size reduction compared to legacy NR UE is not an objective in RedCap SI like cost/complexity reduction, power saving and coverage recovery. Second bullet makes sure to clarify this. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Sierra Wireless | We are Ok with 1st bullet.  We don’t’ agree with 2nd bullet. |
| LG | Fine with the first bullet and do not agree with the second bullet.  The device size itself may not be an objective of the SI, however, the compact form factor is one of generic requirements that should apply to all use cases. |
| FL5 | Most companies agree to capture the first bullet of Proposal 7.2.2-1 in the TR. There are also many companies that do not agree to the second bullet. Perhaps the following updated version can be considered.  Proposal 7.2.2-1-v2:   * Capture in TR 38.875 in the next meeting that reduced number of UE Rx antennas is beneficial in terms of reducing the device size in FR1.   + Study further if the reduced number of Rx antennas is beneficial in terms of reducing the device size in FR2. * ~~Capture in TR 38.875 that device size reduction is not an objective for the RedCap SI.~~ |

### 7.2.3 Analysis of performance impacts

Concerning the impact on performance, several contributions observe that a reduced number of antennas impacts coverage, spectral efficiency, power consumption, data rate, PDCCH blocking probability, latency, reliability, and number of users supported.

The downlink coverage loss reported in the contributions are summarized in Table 2. Some contributions (e.g., [22, 23, 29]) have cited their companion paper under AI 8.6.3 for the quantitative values of coverage loss and have not included them as part of their complexity reduction paper under AI 8.6.1. Those values are, however, not included in Table 2.

**Table 1: Estimation of downlink coverage loss from reduced number of UE Rx antennas in FR1**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Contribution** | **FR1 FDD**  **2 Rx  1 Rx** | **FR1 TDD**  **(4 Rx  2 Rx)** | **FR1 TDD**  **(4 Rx  1 Rx)** | **FR2**  **(2 Rx  1 Rx)** |
| [1] | SSB: 4.7 dB  PDCCH (AL16): 3.7 dB  PDSCH: 4.0 dB | SSB: 3.0 dB  PDCCH (AL16): 3.2 dB  PDSCH: 3.0 dB | SSB: 6.9 dB  PDCCH (AL16): 6.2 dB  PDSCH: 6.2 dB | SSB: 3.7 dB  PDCCH (AL16): 3.9 dB  PDSCH: 3.8 dB |
| [2] | PDCCH (AL16): 3.08 dB  PDSCH (5 Mbps): 4.34 dB  PDSCH (10 Mbps): 5.07 dB | - | - | - |
| [3] | 3-6 dB | 3-6 dB | - | - |
| [5] | - | 3 dB\* (AWGN)  \* loss in fading channels may be larger | 5.5 dB-6 dB\* (AWGN)  \* loss in fading channels may be larger | - |
| [6] | PDSCH: 4.0 dB  PDCCH (AL16): ~4.0 dB | PDSCH: 3.2 dB  PDCCH (AL16): ~3.2 dB | PDSCH: 7.2 dB  PDCCH (AL16): ~7.2 dB | - |
| [8] | PDCCH (AL16): 2.6 dB | PDCCH (AL16): 2.3 dB | PDCCH (AL16): 5.6 dB | - |
| [9] | - | SSB: 2.44 dB  PDCCH: 6.48 dB (AL1); 5.52 dB (AL2); 5.32 dB (AL4); 3.47 dB (AL8); 2.59 dB (AL6)  PDSCH: 3.85dB | SSB: 5.51 dB  PDCCH: 13.83 dB (AL1); 12.12 dB (AL2); 9.58 dB (AL4); 7.28 dB (AL8); 6.09 dB (AL6)  PDSCH: 9.83dB | - |
| [15] | - | - | >6 dB | - |
| [17] | PDCCH (AL16): ~4 dB  PDSCH: ~4dB | - | PDCCH (AL16): ~10dB  PDSCH: ~4dB | PDCCH: ~4 dB |
| [19] | PDCCH: 3.63 dB (AL=16); 4.59 dB (AL=4) | PDCCH: 2.9 dB (AL=16); 3.93 dB (AL=4) | PDCCH: 6.56 dB (AL=16); 8.52dB (AL=4) | - |
| [27] | - | - | ~7dB | - |

The above values for performance loss depend on the exact simulation assumptions used by different companies, including on channel conditions, performance requirement for different channels, etc. These are either provided in the above cited papers, or in their respective companion papers on coverage recovery. In [7, 18, 22, 23, 25], it has also been stated qualitatively that there will be coverage loss due to reduction in Rx antennas. In [4], it is noted that the impact of coverage is limited due to reduced Rx as it is shown in the coverage study that NR is UL coverage limited. In [17], it is also noted that longer acquisition time for SSB detection is expected, and that no coverage impact is expected for PUSCH due to reduction in number of Rx antennas.

Several contributions have also identified other impacts when reducing the number of Rx antennas:

**Data rate/throughput:**

* P1: [1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 18] have indicated that there will be negative impact on DL data rate/throughput when reducing the number of Rx antennas. The main reason is that reducing the number of Rx antennas will also reduce the number of transmission layers that can be transmitted in the DL.

**Latency and reliability:**

* P2: In [29], it is observed that for FR2, support of 1 Rx antenna at the UE can satisfy the latency requirements for industrial wireless sensors and video surveillance cameras (with 100 MHz).
* P3: In [7], it is observed that reducing the number of receive antennas does not affect latency and reliability.

**Power consumption:**

* P4: [19] has indicated that there is less contribution to power saving for 2 Rx****1 Rx
* P5: [2] and [16] have noted that power consumption is also saved by fewer RF chains and by less complexity of multi-antenna processing
* P6: [1, 5, 6, 7, 20, 23] have noted that although the reduction in Rx antenna can reduce power consumption in the RF and the baseband modules, due to longer reception time needed for downlink channels, the power consumption will be increased.

**Spectral efficiency/network capacity loss:**

* P7: [1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 13, 17, 19, 20, 23, 25], especially [2], report a loss in spectral efficiency of ~30% for 2 Rx****1 Rx.
* P8: In [6], it has been reported that loss is spectral efficiency (sector/cell edge) is 23-33% for 2 Rx****1 Rx, 39-41% for 2 Rx****2 Rx, and 53-60% for 4 Rx****1 Rx.
* P9: In [4], it is also noted that the impact can be managed by network by access control mechanism.

**PDCCH blocking probability:**

* P10: [7] and [20] have noted that there will be increase in PDCCH blocking probability. This is due to use of higher Als in order to compensate for the performance degradation from a reduced number of Rx antennas.

**Number of users supported:**

* P11: In [29], it is observed that for FR2, the number of users that can be supported is impacted by almost 50% if the number of UE Rx antennas is reduced from 2 to 1. It is also observed that 1 Rx antenna at the UE may be able to support a high number of users.

The discussion on bottleneck channels and coverage recovery techniques to compensate for the performance loss can be taken under AI 8.6.3, and are left out of the discussion in this section. Some contributions have also noted the impact of device size limitations on potential reduced antenna efficiency. The resulting performance impact can also be studied under AI 8.6.3, and has not been considered in this section.

**Q 7.2.3-1: Does the list (P1, P2, …, P11) above capture the most important performance impacts that need to be considered for UE antenna reduction? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | N | The most important observation is the very large number of dB loss, especially from 4 to 1 RX. Perhaps some range in [ ] can be agreed for now, and can be revised by next meeting. Note that the table 2 is incorrect in that it says COVERAGE LOSS, which is not correct. These are performance degradations, but since the system is both UL limited and not designed to exactly match the MCL of the UL limited channel, there may not be coverage loss.  A minor point: it would be helpful, in addition to the numbers in P7/8, to say why the loss occurs. I.e., spectral efficiency will be reduced from having to use more robust MCS, repetitions, etc. |
| Ericsson | Y | Yes, beside coverage impacts and coverage recovery aspects, which are treated under the AI 8.6.3 according to the meeting agenda. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| ZTE,Sanechips | N | It seems the above list does not include impact for coverage, it is strange. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| vivo | N | We DO NOT agree with the following   * P4: From FR2 power model in TR38.840, there is 30% power saving gain from 2Rx to 1Rx, which is significant. In FR1, such power scaling model is missing and should be developed. There is no evidences in fact shown in [19] that reducing from 2Rx to 1Rx has no big contribute to power saving and cost reduction. * P6: This has to be evaluated with proper power model developed for RedCap Ues with realistic traffic model * P7/P8/P11: This has to be evaluated with realistic evaluation assumptions, in [4] we proposed the following factors to be considered for a fair comparison. We hope that in this meeting we can align the evaluation methodologies and assumptions so that companies can bring results to the next meeting. We see same discusion point is caputred in the summary of [102-e-NR-RedCap-03] section 2.3, suggest we have this discussion only in one place. * Ratio between Redcap and normal UE is not higher than 1:1 * Different traffic models for Redcap (IM traffic for wearables) and normal Ues (FTP traffic)      * Performance metrics:   + UPT to measure the performance impact to normal Ues   + Cell served throughput to measure the system capacity |
| Samsung | N | P1 (data rate) we can focus on whether the data rate can be achieved rather than provide negative impact.  We don’t think the P11 needs to be captured separated from network capability. In P11, “It is also observed that 1 Rx antenna at the UE may be able to support a high number of users.” Should be removed.  P4 and P5 need to be merged and be consistent.  Coverage analysis can be added |
| OPPO | N | Share similar view as vivo |
| Xiaomi | N | Share similar view with vivo |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Partially Y | The questions (same issue for “performance impact” in other sections) may be misleading.  The aspects (KPIs) mentioned above can be considered while whether the observations drawn from each proponent can be directly captured in the TR or not may need further discussion. Some observations are conflicting with each other. So if the question is “to be considered”, Y; but some of the ‘P’ from list (P1, P2…) including the numbers/results/observations may need more verification. Hereafter, we take the ‘P’ that are agreeable to us. |
| TIM | N | We tend to share vivo, Samsung, zte, OPPO, XIAOMI views |
| Sequans | Y | In addition to coverage impact of course.  For P1, final focus should be on whether target data rates can be achieved considering combination of parameters (UE antennas, MIMO, etc) – but exact impact of UE antenna reduction should be considered and analysed also independently. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | In terms capturing the impact, the list covers all fundamental effects.  However, it is not clear if the proposal intends to capture these points directly in TR. We assume not, but it’d be good to get a clarification. We would have concerns with capturing some of the quantitative evaluation results that may need further verifications or subject to updates to assumptions, etc. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LG | Y | Minor questions for clarification:  Question for P8: Is it 4Rx🡪2Rx instead of 2Rx🡪2Rx?  Question for P6: Does this mean the overall or net power consumption increase? Further clarification would be helpful. |
| SONY | Partial Y | In terms of capturing the impact, we support P1🡪P11. We agree with the sentiment from Intel. The list covers the fundamental aspects. At a later time, we need to agree on some quantitative / qualitative text for the TR.  We understand that capturing P1->P11 would still leave the door open to capturing other impacts. Use of a single antenna will impact polarisation diversity when receiving SSB. This will lead to deterioration in SSB performance and either impact SSB coverage or acquisition time. We want to be able to capture evaluation results related to these issues in a future meeting.  So, we support capturing impacts P1-P11, capturing other impacts is not precluded. |
| InterDigital | Y | In addition to the impact on coverage. |
|  |  |  |

**Q 7.2.3-2: Which of the identified performance impacts in the list above (P1, P2, …, P11) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for UE antenna reduction?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | P1, P2 |
| FUTUREWEI | Should capture:P1,P6,P7,P8,P11 (only first sentence)  No strong feeling: P4, P10  Should not capture:  P2 and P3, these are misleading as it misses the main point that latency is increased and reliability is at risk. In some cases maybe can still meet for a single RedCap UE, but in a system with many RedCap and legacy UE not clear.  P5 is part of P6  P9 is more relevant for coexistence, but not really needed in the RAN1 led part of the TR.  P11 second sentence “high number” should not be included |
| Ericsson | P1, P6, P7 (only the first part) and P10 are in our view critical to capture in the TR, and there may already be enough inputs to draft a text proposal for the TR.  Regarding P8 and P11, in our view spectral efficiency/network capacity loss is an important impact that need to be captured in the TR, but this can be quantified after evaluations have been carried out for AI 8.6.3.  Regarding P2 and P3, although important to capture latency and reliability in the TR, more inputs/evaluations are needed to identify the degree of impact. |
| Sierra Wireless | P1, P6, P7, P8, P11 |
| Spreadtrum | P1, P7, P10 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Coverage, P1, P6, P7 |
| Panasonic | P1, P6, P7 |
| vivo | As commented in the previous question, in this meeting we suggest to discuss the SLS evaluation methodologies and assumptions so that companies can bring results to the next meeting for a fair comparison. Then we decide which are the important observations to be captured in the TR. |
| Samsung | P1, P3, P7 or P8, P9, P10 |
| OPPO | P3,P5 |
| Xiaomi | P3, P7, P9  For P1, we agree with the data rate is one metric for performance analysis. But when judging whether there is positive or negative impact, we should consider whether the requirement of data rate is fulfilled or not rather than considering whether there is data rate reduction. |
| CMCC | P1,P4,P7,P6,P10 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | P1, P7/P8 as general requirements (data rate, SE, capacity) required in the SID; P10 can be considered for this specific aspect (as agreed can be considered for specific technique).   * Latency and reliability is important to be captured while the current observation from P2 and P3 needs further verification; * P11 is also related to capacity however the two observations it includes seems unclear. The first part is agreeable.   P4~P6 is not critical to be captured, since power consumption can also be achieved by MIMO layer adaptation as adopted in R16 power saving. |
| TIM | We tend to share VIVO view. SLS are of utmost importance to understand many of the impacts on coverage and capacity losses. |
| Sequans | P1, P6, P7/P8, P10, P11 and coverage of course |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | P1, P7, P8 |
| Intel | P1, P7 or P8, P10. For latency/reliability and power consumption related observations, it may be better to have more data-points.  Also, at least for P1, P2/P3, P6, P10, appropriate clarifications or caveats need to be added w.r.t. whether the apparent degradation in performance may be acceptable with sufficient margin for the prioritized use-cases. |
| Nokia, NSB | P1, P6, P7, P8, P10, and link-level degradation (i.e. coverage loss) |
| Mediatek | P1, P6, P8, P10 |
| Qualcomm | P2, P3 and P9.  P1 and P7 can be captured, together with the performance requirements for RedCap devices. It is worth noting that the use cases of RedCap device target reduced peak data rates (and reduced spectral efficiency). How to support reduced peak rate (throughput) with reduced cost is one of the design goals of RedCap UE. For wearable devices deployed in FR1 FDD bands, reduced number of RX antennas is mandated by the device size constraint. |
| CATT | P1, P7, P8, P11 |
| DOCOMO | P1, P7, P8, P10, P11 |
| LG | P1~P9 are critical. Those are trade-offs to be captured in the TR in a well-balanced manner. Okay to capture all the performance impacts as well. |
| SONY | We don’t really see the need to downselect which performance impacts are captured. In future meetings, other performance impacts could be identified. |
| InterDigital | P1, P6, P7, P10 |
|  |  |

Based on the responses in this section, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | For reduced number of antennas, the following performance impacts (which have been slightly rephrased compared to above in some cases for improved clarity) should be captured in the TR according to at least half of the 24 responses to Q 7.2.3-2.   * P1: There will be negative impact on DL data rate/throughput when reducing the number of Rx antennas. The main reason is that reducing the number of Rx antennas will also reduce the number of transmission layers that can be transmitted in the DL. * P6: Although the reduction in Rx antenna can reduce power consumption in the RF and the baseband modules, due to longer reception time needed for downlink channels, the power consumption will be increased. * P7/P8: Loss in spectral efficiency * P10: There will be increase in PDCCH blocking probability. This is due to use of higher ALs in order to compensate for the performance degradation from a reduced number of Rx antennas.   Furthermore, the following additional potential performance impact was identified in several responses to Q 7.2.3-1.   * P12: DL link performance degradation   Proposal 7.2.3-1:   * For reduced number of antennas, at least the following performance impacts can be captured in the TR.   + P1: There will be negative impact on DL data rate/throughput when reducing the number of Rx antennas. The main reason is that reducing the number of Rx antennas will also reduce the number of transmission layers that can be transmitted in the DL.   + P6: Although the reduction in Rx antenna can reduce power consumption in the RF and the baseband modules, due to longer reception time needed for downlink channels, the power consumption will be increased.   + P7/P8: Loss in spectral efficiency   + P10: There will be increase in PDCCH blocking probability. This is due to use of higher ALs in order to compensate for the performance degradation from a reduced number of Rx antennas.   + P12: DL link performance degradation |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | We do not agree any of above at this stage.  We should agree on a set of common evaluation assumptions so that the system impact due to introduction of complexity reduction features for RedCap can be properly evaluated. There is on-going discussion in 8.6.3 for a set of SLS assumptions, we should prioritize the evaluation assumption discussion in this meeting so that companies can bring results to the next meeting and the corresponding observation can be drawn in the next meeting. |
| Samsung | For P6, we like to have following update:   * P6: Although the reduction in Rx antenna can reduce power consumption in the RF and the baseband modules, due to longer reception time needed for downlink channels, the power consumption ~~will~~ may or may not be increased.   We think whether the power consumption will be increase or not depends also on the traffic, and many other configuration, e.g. PDCCH SS. |
| OPPO | Don’t agree with P6. Before quantitative analysis, we can’t get such observation. |
| Qualcomm | We do not agree with FL3 proposals as above.  In theory, reducing the number of RX antennas will reduce the spatial multiplexing gain and spatial diversity gain, which is obvious to us. However, when we investigate the performance impacts of reduced number of RX antennas, it is necessary to define a performance target first. On the other hand, the potential loss in spatial multiplexing/diversity gain can be compensated for in frequency domain, e.g. by considering a wider BWP subject to the constraint of max UE BW.  As mentioned before in Q 7.2.2-1, reducing the number of RX antennas can reduce the device size at least in FR1. On the other hand, the SID explicitly mentions “Device size” in the generic requirements for RedCap UE  ***Device size: Requirement for most use cases is that the standard enables a device design with compact form factor.***  Therefore, we need to study solutions that enable “compact form factor” and meet the target data rates/latency requirements. To this end, we need to discuss the assumptions for SLS and how to draw reasonable conclusions from the SLS results. |
| Spreadtrum | We tend to agree with Samsung.  Regarding the power consumption (P6), even though we have the antenna scaling method in TR 38.840 for power saving, it is hard to evaluate the impact of power consumption for antenna reduction considering the “longer reception time” based on the scaling methods. On the other hand, MIMO layer reduction is more related to the “longer reception time”. But scaling for MIMO layer reduction may be absent in the scaling methods. Anyway, we think the current P6 is general, and we are fine for it. |
| Xiaomi | We tend to agree with vivo’s comments.  For progress, we can accept P7/P8 and P12. For the other items, further evaluation is needed |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok with FL proposal except for the first part of P6, “Although the reduction in Rx antenna can reduce power consumption in the RF and the baseband modules,” which is not always correct, since power consumption can also be achieved by MIMO layer adaptation as adopted in R16 power saving. |
| SONY3 | We see this list (and corresponding lists in other sections) as being a list of things that we will capture in the TR in RAN1#103e (or more generally, at a future meeting). i.e. we see this list as being a list of aspects (KPIs) [ref: Huawei comment 7.2.3-1] that can be captured in the TR.  The merit of having this list is that companies can perform a more thorough analysis of the impacts identified in this list between now and RAN1#103e. It would also be helpful if companies could think about structuring their Tdocs to directly propose numbers / observations for items P1, P6, P7/8, P10, P12.  We are OK if the TR does finally capture P1, P6, P7/8, P10, P12. |
| Ericsson | Fine with the proposal. |
| Sierra Wireless | We are Ok with the proposal. |
| FUTUREWEI\* | The very first performance impact needs to be a sentence on the dB losses for 4 to 2, 2 to 1, and 4 to 1. It can be with [] and updated next meeting. Others are OK.  It is not OK to only include positive statements on technique. If a balanced view is not achieved now then should wait till next meeting. Samsung revision “may or may not” could be a way to go. |
| ZTE,Sanechips\* | It seems P12 includes P1, maybe can move P1 into one sub-bullet of P12. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal except for P6. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In general fine with the proposal. For P6, prefer to use the wording as Samsung proposed. |
| Intel | Fine with the proposal except for P6 and P12. Effectively, P1 and P12 should be combined, and in fact, even P7/P8 are strongly correlated observations to P1/P12. These need to be resolved/combined.  For P6, we can accept it with the intention of the modification from Samsung; we would suggest to rephrase it a bit as below:  P6: Although the reduction in Rx antenna can reduce power consumption in the RF and the baseband modules, due to longer reception time needed for downlink channels, the power consumption ~~will be increased~~ may increase for certain combinations of traffic and channel conditions.”. |
| LG | We are OK with the proposal in general. But, we are open to revise P6 or FFS. |
| FL5 | Many companies do not agree to capture P6. A few companies proposed update to P6. For the other bullets, there were fewer concerns. Perhaps the following updated proposal can be considered.  Proposal 7.2.3-1-v2:   * For reduced number of antennas, at least the following performance impacts can be captured in the TR in the next meeting.   + P1: There will be negative impact on DL data rate/throughput when reducing the number of Rx antennas. The main reason is that reducing the number of Rx antennas will also reduce the number of transmission layers that can be transmitted in the DL.   + ~~P6: Although the reduction in Rx antenna can reduce power consumption in the RF and the baseband modules, due to longer reception time needed for downlink channels, the power consumption will be increased.~~   + P7/P8: Loss in spectral efficiency   + P10: There will be increase in PDCCH blocking probability. This is due to use of higher ALs in order to compensate for the performance degradation from a reduced number of Rx antennas.   + P12: DL link performance degradation |

### 7.2.4 Analysis of coexistence with legacy Ues

Several contributions [1, 3, 5, 7, 17] have analyzed coexistence issues with legacy Ues. The finding can be listed as follows:

* C1: there will be coexistence impact depending on the coverage recovery solutions and other enhancements (e.g., early RedCap indication in RACH) adopted for RedCap during the initial access stage [1, 3, 17]
* C2: blocking impacts if RedCap UE need to use higher aggregation levels for PDCCH reception [3].
* C3: there will be coexistence issues if common physical channel is used for both legacy Ues and RedCap Ues [5]
* C4: No coexistence impact [7]

**Q 7.2.4-1: Does the list above (C1, C2, C3, C4) capture the most important coexistence impacts that need to be considered for UE antenna reduction? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | No. C1 is misleading in that it implies that there is COVERAGE LOSS and that solutions and enhancements will be agreed. It also implies that these solutions themselves will eliminate the coexistence issue which is not correct.  Something like statement C3 should be a first one, that states the system treating the Ues the same will mean conservative handling of all Ues. Then a replacement for C1 can state that early identification can reduce this conservative handling, but the enhancements themselves would also have coexistence impacts (such as from partitioning the PRACH preamble space).  C2 is fine.  ‘no impact’ (C4) should not be considered in the list of impacts. |
| Ericsson | Yes |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Yes |
| Panasonic | Our contribution [18] mentioned RAN4 RRM performance impact. The network deployment (cell planning) corresponds to Rel.15 and 16 UE would assumes RAN4 performance of RRM, which is based on 2 Rx. If RedCap Ues would not have similar to Rel.15/16 Ues on RRM, the network deployment may be required to be adjusted. |
| Vivo | We think C1 and C3 are talking about the same thing. C2 already covered in previous section, it should not be captured twice. |
| Samsung | Yes for C1,C2,  C3 should be further clarified on which common channel(s) |
| OPPO | yes |
| Xiaomi | Yes, but we think the coexistence impact could be solved |
| CMCC | Yes |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Similar issue exists: the observations are not aligned with each other, e.g. C4 wrt others.  C1 may be too general and it actually applies to every case (whenever an enhancement is applied there may be impact to legacy.)  In general:   * with reduction of UE antenna, the system spectrum efficiency is reduced and total resource available for legacy Ues can be impacted, and * C3 |
| TIM | Detailed coexistence analysis should be perfomed. C4 is almost impossible😊 |
| Sequans | Yes |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |
| Intel | It seems aspects like cell spectral efficiency, user capacity, system OH aspects are combined into coexistence issues. In this regard, we tend to agree with C4.  Certainly, as in discussed in previous questions related to (P1, …P11), there would be impact to system spectral efficiency and related metrics, but these should not be seen as “coexistence issues”. Legacy and RedCap Ues with fewer antennas can still coexist just fine, just with possibly lower system spectral efficiency. Otherwise, we are capturing same effects multiple times. |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes |
| MediaTek | Not C4.  Yes for C3, C2 and C1 with some modifications as proposed by FUTUREWEI. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |
| CATT | Yes |
| DOCOMO | Yes |
| LG | Yes |
| SONY | Our view was that C1, C2, C3 are not coexistence impacts. The system can be configured such that C1, C2, C3 do not happen. Hence we observed C4 in our contribution.  We do agree with other companies that we cannot capture C4 and {C1,C2,C3} together: that isn’t logical.  If we view coexistence as including issues that cause the system to be configured differently, then we are OK to capture C1, C2, C3. |
| InterDigital | Yes. |
|  |  |

**Q 7.2.4-2: Which of the identified coexistence impacts in the list above (C1, C2, C3, C4) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for UE antenna reduction?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | C1, C2 |
| FUTUREWEI | Revised C3, replacement of C1, and C2 need to be included. |
| Ericsson | C2.  Depending on potential solutions, e.g., for UE identification and coverage recovery, C1 and C3 might be coexistence issues to consider. |
| Spreadtrum | C1, C2, C3 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | C1, C2,C 3. |
| Panasonic | Our view is RRM impact and the corresponding network planning can be the largest impact. |
| Vivo | C1 |
| Samsung | C1,C2, |
| OPPO | C1 C3 |
| Xiaomi | C1, but what is the “coverage recovery solutions and other enhancements” is not clear to us now. |
| CMCC | C1,C2,C3 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Assuming SE will anyway be captured, C3 is probably the clearest one so far that needs to be considered. |
| TIM | C4 for sure is very improbable. See also previous table. |
| Sequans | C1, C2, C3 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | C1, C3. |
| Intel | None at this point (see response to previous question). |
| Nokia, NSB | C1, C2, C3 |
| MediaTek | C3, C2 and C1 |
| Qualcomm | C1 and C3 can be considered.  C2 needs further study, especially when compact DCI is supported for RedCap UE. |
| CATT | C1, C2 |
| DOCOMO | C1, C2, C3 |
| LG | C1, C3 |
| SONY | C1, C2, C3 |
| InterDigital | C1, C2, C3. |
|  |  |

Based on the responses in this section, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | For reduced number of antennas, the following coexistence impacts (which have been slightly rephrased compared to above in some cases for improved clarity) should be captured in the TR according to at least half of the 24 responses to Q 7.2.3-2.   * C1: There can be coexistence impact depending on the coverage recovery solutions and other enhancements (e.g., early RedCap indication in RACH) that may be adopted for RedCap during the initial access stage. Note that depending on the outcome of discussions taking place under AI 8.6.3, no coverage recovery may be needed to compensate for the performance loss due to reduced number of UE Rx antennas. In this case, C1 need not be captured in TR 38.875. * C2: Blocking impacts if RedCap UE need to use higher aggregation levels for PDCCH reception. * C3: There will be coexistence issues if common downlink physical channels are used for both legacy UEs and RedCap Ues. This is because the system treating the Ues the same will mean conservative handling of all Ues.   Proposal 7.2.4-1:   * For reduced number of antennas, at least the following coexistence impacts can be captured in the TR.   + C1: There can be coexistence impact depending on the coverage recovery solutions and other enhancements (e.g., early RedCap indication in RACH) that may be adopted for RedCap during the initial access stage. Note that depending on the outcome of discussions taking place under AI 8.6.3, no coverage recovery may be needed to compensate for the performance loss due to reduced number of UE Rx antennas. In this case, C1 need not be captured in TR 38.875.   + C2: Blocking impacts if RedCap UE need to use higher aggregation levels for PDCCH reception.   + C3: There will be coexistence issues if common downlink physical channels are used for both legacy Ues and RedCap Ues. This is because the system treating the Ues the same will mean conservative handling of all Ues. |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | C1/C2/C3 are not agreeable, we should identify the coverage problem first and before drawing any conclusion. And this discussion seems to be more suitable for 8.6.3. |
| Samsung | For C3, because even DL common channels are shared, whether it will have coexistence issues depends on gNB scheduling and deployment choice. We don’t think it will have any problem of coexistence. As compromise, we like to directly state what the issues are as below:  C3: The system needs to treat the Ues the same and it may require conservative handling of all Ues for common downlink physical channels. |
| Qualcomm | We do not need to agree on C1, C2 and C3 at this meeting. Further evaluation/analysis are needed before we make conclusions. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Since C1,C2,C3 highly depend on the coverage recovery solution or additional design, before we have clear view on these potential coverage recovery solutions or additional design, it is too early to draw such conclusion in the TR |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In general Ok with FL proposal. We are not in favour of Samsung’s version of C3, since it directly imposes limitation on network which we consider is actually a coexistence impact. |
| SONY3 | We see this list (and corresponding lists in other sections) as being a list of things that we will capture in the TR in RAN1#103e (or more generally, at a future meeting). The merit of having this list is that companies can perform a more thorough analysis of the impacts identified in this list between now and RAN1#103e. It would also be helpful if companies could think about structuring their Tdocs to directly propose numbers / observations for items C1, C2, C3.  We are OK with capturing C1 / C2 / C3. However we think these are “limitations on configuration” issues, not coexistence issues. Adopting a 10kHz SCS for Redcap would be a coexistence issue, but choosing a lower MCS for common downlink physical channels (C3) is not a coexistence issue. |
| Ericsson | C1, C2 are fine. C3 is also fine. But certain clarifications might be good. For example, in our view “common downlink physical channels” only include “PDCCH/PDSCH”, not SS/PBCH. And it helps adding to the end of the sentence “before the UE capabilities are known to the network”. |
| FUTUREWEI\* | Disagree with Sony’s interpretation more “binary” view of coexistence impacts. As brought up both meetings so far in discussion on the skeleton of the TR, impacts from supporting redcap and legacy NR in the system need to be captured. If there are both redcap and legacy UEs in the system and the redcap makes scheduling more complicated, more conservative, more crowded, etc, then it should be included. The coexistence subsection is the best place.  OK with C2 and C3. C1 can probably wait, it is conditional anyway. |
| CATT | Fine with C1 and C2. For C3, we do not see the coexistence issue but just a potential spectral efficiency issue. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with C1, C2. For C3, we have similar view with Ericsson that the common channels only include “PDCCH/PDSCH”. |
| Intel | Agree with SONY and as mentioned also in our response to Q 7.2.4-1, C1, C2, C3 should not be treated as coexistence issues – they relate to performance, and already covered in the “performance impact”-related proposal (specifically, P1, P7/P8, and P10). So, we cannot agree to classifying the |
| LG | We are OK with C1, C2, and C3. |
| FL5 | No clear consensus in this meeting |

Furthermore, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | The following additional potential coexistence impacts were identified in the responses to Q 7.2.4-1.   * C5: Due to the RAN4 RRM performance impact, the network deployment (cell planning) may be required to be adjusted. * C6: The system spectrum efficiency is reduced and the total resource available for legacy Ues can be impacted.   Question 7.2.4-3:   * Which ones, if any, of C5 and C6 should be captured in the TR as coexistence impacts for reduced number of antennas? |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | C5 should be evaluated, did not see any simulation results. And this is again related to the bottleneck channel identification, from our results, there is no issue to be solved for SSB so there should be no impact to RRM. Furthermore, C5 is more suitable to be discussed in 8.6.3  C6 is related to Q 7.2.3-2, again, a common evaluation assumption should be agreed first. |
| Samsung | We think coverage recovery is to recovery the coverage similar as regular Ues. So, we don’t agree on C5.  We think C6 already captured in P7/8, we don’t think this is coexistence impact.  In all, we don’t think either C5 or C6 need to be captured in TR. |
| Panasonic | Capture C5 with the modification: Due to the RAN4 RRM performance impact, the network deployment (cell planning) may be required to be adjusted **if number of RX antenna is reduced to one**. |
| OPPO | Don’t agree with C5. Coverage recovery can solve the coverage issue. |
| Spreadtrum | We think both C5 and C6 should be captured in the TR. |
| Xiaomi | For C5, maybe we can leave this issue to RAN4 discussion  For C6: The total resource available for legacy Ues may or may not be impacted, so we suggest to keep the wording, “The system spectrum efficiency is reduced” only. On the other hand, the impact on the spectral efficiency is already mentioned in P7/P8, we don’t need to repeat this problem in C6. In summary, we don’t think C6 is needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Both can be acceptable. |
| SONY3 | We don’t see these as coexistence issues. |
| Ericsson | C6 |
| Sierra Wireless | We agree with C6.  For C5, based on CovEnh results so far, the UL is by far the limiting coverage factor so until we do the link budget which we should not make any agreements  that cell planning may be required to be adjusted. |
| FUTUREWEI\* | OK. C5 can be identified and earmarked for RAN4. C6 here would relate to sims with a certain percentage of redcap and legacy UEs so ok to capture now or after more results. It should be obvious that including redcap Ues may disproportionally reduce the capacity for legacy Ues as the redcap Ues consume more resources for the same traffic as legacy Ues. |
| ZTE,Sanechips\* | Agree with Samsung on C6. We also think C6 already captured in P7/8, we don’t think this is coexistence impact. |
| CATT | We don’t agree with C5. |
| Intel | We do not agree with either C5 or C6 as coexistence issues. C5 relates to spec-efforts, not a technical issue; while C6 is yet another variation of repeating P1/P12/P7/P8, which do not need to be repeated again. |
| LG | We think C6 can be captured. |
| FL5 | No clear consensus in this meeting |

### 7.2.5 Analysis of specification impacts

Several contributions [1, 3, 5, 7, 17, 18, 20, 27] also point out the specification impacts from reducing the number of UE Rx antennas. These contributions have mainly highlighted potential RAN4 specification impacts, including RRM, demodulation performance requirements, CSI reporting requirements, RF, receiver sensitivity requirements, and procedure requirements (e.g., cell change, radio link management, beam management, etc.) in all RRC states. It is also mentioned in [5] that RAN4 needs to evaluate and specify the new minimum number of Rx antennas for different bands. In [5], it also suggested that UL transmit antenna gain should be evaluated in RAN4 for size-limited RedCap Ues, e.g. some wearables. In [1], it is noted that the impact is more significant, in both FR1 and FR2, when reducing the number of receiver branches to 1.

Potential RAN1 impacts depend on the techniques that may be used to compensate for the coverage and spectral efficiency loss. Some techniques highlighted in different contributions that will have RAN1 specification impacts are:

* S1: PDCCH repetition: [8, 17, 22]
* S2: Additional repetitions for PDSCH: [8, 23]
* S3: AL greater than 16: [6]
* S4: Compact DCI: [17]
* S5: CSI enhancement to improve spectral efficiency: [17]
* S6: Early indication of RedCap UE in random access: [17, 22, 25]

In addition, [7] has indicated that there would be potential RAN2 impact due to signalling of reduced antenna capability.

The discussion on bottleneck channels and coverage recovery techniques is treated under AI 8.6.3.

**Q 7.2.5-1: Does the list above (S1, S2, …, S6) capture the most important specifications impacts that need to be considered for UE antenna reduction? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | N | The important part to be listed here are the expected RAN4 impacts.  S1 to S6 should not be listed here. First, there may not be COVERAGE LOSS. Second, mitigating performance degradation is a different section of the TR and should not be discussed here. |
| Ericsson | Y | We do not see RAN1 specification impacts beyond potential associated coverage recovery and reduction of number of MIMO layers. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| ZTE,Sanechips | N | Not sure the list is complete, the most important specification impact is coverage recovery , which may include other channel/signals beside those listed here, for example, Msg2/3/4 etc |
| Panasonic | Y | We interpreted above list as the candidate techniques. If so, it covers major candidates.  We agree FUTUREWEI that the most impact would be RAN4. |
| Vivo | N/A | Most of above (S1/S2/S3/S4) are coverage recovery solutions and should be discussed in the other email thread. Suggest that we avoid duplicated discussion. |
| Samsung |  | Some observations need to be further discussed.  We suggest to identify the issue first and then categorize the solutions for the issues. Some solutions can be combined. For example, S1, S3, S4 can be combined as PDCCH coverage recovery. S7 (can be combined with PDCCH coverage recovery): Longer duration CORESET.  Alternatively, we can only point to a level that “PDCCH coverage needs recovery” and point to the potential solutions in coverage recovery section in the TR. |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | N | S1-S6 are coverage recovery solutions, it is not the direct spec impact resulted by Rx reduction |
| CMCC | Y | We support all the candidate techniques, but we think this can be discussed in the coverage recovery email thread. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | 1) As peak data rate calculation is also captured in specifications, the reduced data rate due to reduced mandatory # of antennas/MIMO layers also has direct specification impact.  2) It may also need to be understood that, if the Rx number is reduced to 2 and the DL coverage does not need to be compensated, there may be no specification impact from S1~S2 for coverage.  3) other techniques for improvement on SE can be considered, e.g. BWP switching  4) The other potential specification impact would be the definition of UE type and the use for that in e.g. S6, as well as the reduced peak data rate. |
| TIM | N | We tend to share some of the comments of Huawei and FutureWei, e..g including ran4 impacts that are going to be relevant. |
| Sequans | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Intel | N | Similar views as Samsung – the current list is “too detailed” in terms of specific candidate enhancements, which may not be prudent to get into at this stage. Better to abstract/level-up on the detailed candidates. Otherwise, we would need a much longer list that may not be helpful/insightful. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | N | RAN4 impacts are expected for reduced number of RX antennas.  As discussed in [29], the coverage recovery solutions for FR2 also include beam refinement, frequency hopping enhancement and compact L1 measurement report, which are expected to have spec impacts in RAN1.  On the other hand, there is no need to duplicate the candidate solutions for coverage recovery in “spec impacts of reduced number of UE RX antennas.” |
| CATT | N | Whether there is a need to enhance coverage should be determined first based on evaluation results. There are other potential techniques for coverage recovery if necessary. |
| LG | N | S1-S4 are regarding to coverage recovery. |
| SONY | N | RAN4 specification impacts are more significant.  S1-S4 (and maybe S5,S6) seem to be related to coverage recovery and not directly to reducing the number of antennas. |
| InterDigital | N | Agree that the biggest impact will be on coverage and RAN4. |

**Q 7.2.5-2: Which of the identified specification impacts in the list above (S1, S2, …, S6) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for UE antenna reduction?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | S1, S5 |
| FUTUREWEI | NONE |
| Ericsson | We do not see RAN1 specification impacts beyond potential associated coverage recovery and reduction of number of MIMO layers. |
| Sierra Wireless | S6 |
| Spreadtrum | S1, S2, S3, S4 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | S1,S3,S6 and other channel/signal related to coverage recovery |
| vivo | Same comment as above. |
| Samsung | S1, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7(Longer duration CORESET.) |
| OPPO | S1,S2,S3,S6 |
| Xiaomi | None.  S1-S5 should be discussed in the coverage recovery section  S6 should be discussed in the access control and UE capability indication section |
| CMCC | S1,S2,S4,S6 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | S6 and peak data rate at this stage. For whether to capture the others, it depends on the output of coverage/SE evaluations. |
| Sequans | Potential coverage recovery solution(s) and S5, S6 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | S1, S6 |
| Intel | In general, coverage recovery and impact to max # of MIMO layers.  Beyond that, identification is not meaningful at this stage since we do not know if every individual channel needs to be “enhanced” irrespective of their final impact to overall performance against technical requirements for corresponding use-cases. |
| Nokia, NSB | This depends on the coverage recovery analysis. If coverage recovery is needed, we see S1, S2, S3, S4 as potential solutions |
| Qualcomm | S1-S6 are the candidate solutions that should be discussed for coverage recovery. |
| CATT | Whether there is a need to enhance coverage should be determined first based on evaluation results. There are other potential techniques for coverage recovery if necessary. |
| LG | S1-S4 (in agenda 8.6.3) and S6 |
| SONY | S1-S6 can be considered in the coverage recovery work. |
| InterDigital | S1-S6 can be considered in the coverage recovery work. |

### 7.2.6 Conclusions

Based on the analysis summarized in previous sections, several companies have explicitly indicated/proposed their preference on the number of UE Rx antennas as baseline support for RedCap. We summarize these preferences below. Superscript is used to indicate the notes.

**FR1:**

* **1 Rx:** [41, 15, 17, 21, 292, 3111]
* **2 Rx:** [2, 33, 18, 194, 274]
* **Both 1 Rx and 2 Rx:** [15, 56, 67, 85,8, 125, 165,9, 255]

**FR2:**

* **2 Rx:** [1, 6, 15, 18, 274]
* **Both 1 Rx and 2 Rx:** [56, 2910]

Notes:

* Note 1: 1 Rx for wearables. For devices types that are not very restricted by form factor, 2 Rx can be considered.
* Note 2: [29] has indicated that 2 Rx can be an optional feature in FR1.
* Note 3: FFS if 1Rx/1Tx should be recommended for some low frequency deployment for size considerations, or for scenarios where range is not an issue (e.g., wearables).
* Note 4: 2 Rx has higher priority than 1 Rx
* Note 5: 1 Rx in lower frequency bands in FR1, and 2 Rx in others.
* Note 6: Capability signaling shall be defined to indicate the number of Rx antennas
* Note 7: Does not recommend going from 4 Rx to 1 Rx in FR1. Reduced capability feature set 1 needs 2 Rx; Reduced capability feature set 2 can have either 2 Rx or 1 Rx (depending on band)
* Note 8: FFS: whether to support RedCap UE’s with 1 Rx in all FR1 bands
* Note 9: When operating in bands n7, n38, n41, n77, n78, n79, the number of Rx can be reduced from 4 to 2 or 1.
* Note 10: Consider two antenna configurations for UE capability, namely 1Rx/1Tx and 2Rx/1Tx
* Note 11: The support of 2 Rx is optional

Contribution [13] states that support for a 1 Rx should be the exception and should be an optional UE capability.

Contribution [28] indicates a preference for 2 MIMO layers (which requires 2 Rx) or 40 MHz in FR1

Contribution [32] mentions that the number of receive antenna for a RedCap UE need to be reported as a UE capability.

## 7.3 UE bandwidth reduction

### 7.3.1 Description of feature

For FR1, most of the contributions under AI 8.6.1 [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31] consider 20 MHz maximum UE bandwidth in FR1. Contributions [5, 15, 16, 28] consider maximum UE bandwidth larger than 20 MHz as additional options in FR1.

For FR2, contributions [1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 35] discuss 50 MHz and/or 100 MHz maximum UE bandwidth options in FR2. Contributions [4, 5, 8, 12, 16, 29] prefer maximum RedCap UE bandwidth 100 MHz, whereas contributions [1, 6, 11] prefer 50 MHz. Contribution [3] points out it might be desirable to preserve the economy of scale for the “normal” 200 MHz NR UE.”

Contribution [1, 3, 15, 22, 30] explicitly states that same bandwidth is considered for DL and UL. Contribution [1, 5, 20, 22, 30] also consider the same BW for RF and baseband. Contribution [22, 30] further states the same bandwidth for data and control channels. Contribution [8, 15] discusses whether asymmetric DL/UL bandwidth might be considered for certain use cases.

**Q 7.3.1-1: Can TR 38.875 focus on the scenario where the same maximum UE bandwidth applies to both DL and UL, both RF and baseband, and both data and control channels?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | Including this main case is already agreed. No need to spend time on bandwidth proposals between 20 and 100 MHz for FR1. The target is “up to” and various combinations of modulation and MIMO layers can hit the peak data rate. Other proposals may have been considered in the “888” days but are not so promising for NR. Given the limited time unless most companies want to include we should work on completing other aspects of the study. |
| SONY | N | UL bandwidth could be larger than DL bandwidth as UL bandwidth is not a significant cost driver.  Having a wider RF bandwidth than baseband bandwidth could lead to better coexistence, so we would like this to be further studied.  There could be coexistence benefits for having a different control bandwidth to data bandwidth, so we would like to consider this. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y. |  |
| Spreadtrum | Partially Yes | UE BW of data and control channel can be different. Data BW reduction can reduce cost further. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| vivo |  | In FR1 we agree that UE should support 20MHz, however some RedCap Ues may also support larger BW at least in DL to achieve a higher data rate, e.g. 40MHz in DL but 20MHz in UL can also be considered. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| LG | Y | The focus should be set to the case where the max UE bandwidth applies to all. |
| OPPO | N | Share similar view as Sony. For some use case, such as video surveillance, UL bandwidth can be large than DL, this can help to reduce the UE’s cost. |
| Xiaomi | Y for FR and baselined, data and control  N for DL and UL | We are OK with same maximum bandwidth for RF and baseband, both data and control. But considering asymmetric DL/UL bandwidth was already supported in NR, we don’t see very strong motivation to preclude it. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | It is important to have a baseline assumption for BW as 20Mhz for FR1 for further study on other related aspects. |
| TIM |  | Asymmetric DL/UL bandwidth might be considered for certain use cases. |
| Sequans | Y | Primary focus should be on same maximum UE bandwidth. Going into asymmetric may lead to too detailed analysis (e.g. splitting cost of UL and DL in the processing) which may be counterproductive, depending on the accuracy of the cost breakdown (if agreed). |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| FL |  | All responses except for one agree that the SI should only focus on the scenario where the same maximum UE bandwidth applies to both RF and baseband. One response indicates that wider RF bandwidth than baseband bandwidth could lead to better coexistence, so they would like this to be further studied.  All responses except for two ones agree that the SI should only focus on the scenario where the same maximum UE bandwidth applies to both data and control channels. One response indicates that there could be coexistence benefits for having a different control bandwidth to data bandwidth. Another response indicates that there is a cost benefit in reducing the data channels bandwidth further.  All responses except for three ones agree that the SI should only focus on the scenario where the same maximum UE bandwidth applies to both DL and UL. Three responses indicate that asymmetric DL and UL maximum bandwidth can also be considered.  Proposal 7.3.1-1:   * For RedCap Ues, the same maximum UE bandwidth in a band applies to both RF and baseband.   + This maximum UE bandwidth applies to both data and control channels.   + This maximum UE bandwidth is assumed for both DL and UL as a baseline for complexity analysis. |
| Qualcomm |  | We are ok to support the proposal of FL. |
| MediaTek |  | Fine with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum |  | We think UE BW of data and control channel can be different. Data BW reduction can reduce cost further. As a compromise, we can accept this proposal, but we suggest changing the wording “UE bandwidth” to “UE channel bandwidth”. |
| Xiaomi |  | We would like to update the second bullet a bit. We suggest to add the sentence ”Asymmetric DL and UL maximum UE bandwidth is not precluded ” |
| OPPO |  | The 2nd sub-bullet shall be removed. For some scenario/use case, larger UL-bandwidth than DL can be studied. |
| LG |  | We are okay with this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | Fine with the proposal. |
| CATT |  | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We are fine with the proposal |
| SONY |  | Since this is a study item, we think that it would be reasonable to *study* issues such as (1) whether UE BW of data / control can be different, (2) whether UL BW can be different to DL BW, (3) whether initial access phase BW can be different to the connected mode bandwidth. If there are significant advantages to any of these, we might then want to note those advantages in the TR.  The current proposal makes it sound like we are making some decision on what a Redcap UE is rather than how it is studied.  Our proposed proposal is:   * For the baseline complexity analysis of RedCap Ues, the same maximum UE bandwidth in a band applies to both RF and baseband.   + This maximum UE bandwidth applies to both data and control channels.   + This maximum UE bandwidth is assumed for both DL and UL.   + Complexity analyses with other mixes of bandwidths are not precluded |
| Sequans |  | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Intel |  | We are fine with the proposal with the understanding that this is only as baseline for complexity analysis and does not restrict further considerations on different BWs between DL and UL. |
| FL2 |  | Since some responses expressed a wish to study other bandwidth combinations, the proposal has been updated in the following way.  Proposal 7.3.1-1-v2:   * For the baseline complexity analysis of RedCap Ues, the same maximum UE bandwidth in a band applies to both RF and baseband.   + This maximum UE bandwidth applies to both data and control channels.   + This maximum UE bandwidth is assumed for both DL and UL.   + Complexity analyses with other mixes of bandwidths are not precluded |
| FUTUREWEI | ? | We prefer the previous proposal. If this proposal means non-baseline will be included in the TR, we don’t agree. If this proposal means there is no agreement one way or another on including non-baseline, we can accept. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | We also prefer the previous proposal, or at least given the agreements of ‘baseline UE bandwidth capability’, the tone does not need to backwards to a complexity-analysis level. So suggest to revise the head to “For the baseline UE bandwidth capability”. We can live with the last sub-bullet of cases that are not precluded, since there is a wish to study. |
| SONY |  | We are OK with the updated proposal. In response to Futurewei: our understanding is that the proposal doesn’t imply agreement / non-agreement on including non-baseline complexity analyses. |
| Sierra Wireless |  | We agree with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We are fine with the proposal |
| Qualcomm |  | We are fine with FL2 proposal. |
| Intel |  | Fine with the proposal |
| FL3 |  | The FL understanding is the same as the one expressed by Sony, i.e. that Proposal 7.3.1-1-v2 does not imply any agreement or non-agreement on including non-baseline complexity analyses. |
| vivo |  | Fine with the proposal |
| Samsung |  | Fine with FL2. More prefer original proposal. |
| Panasonic |  | Fine with the proposal v2. |
| LG |  | We are fine with the proposal |
| OPPO |  | Fine with the proposal v2. |
| Spreadtrum |  | It is fine that the maximum UE BW assumption in the FL2 is used for baseline complexity analysis. In our view, here the maximum UE BW may only mean the maximum UE channel BW as defined in 38.101. We still think reducing the data BW, i.e. the number of PRB allocated to PDSCH/PUSCH, is beneficial to cost reduction. |
| Xiaomi |  | We are OK FL2 proposal |
| Ericsson |  | We are fine with the proposal. |
| FL4 |  | The first part of the first sentence in the proposal has been updated in line with one of the responses.  Proposal 7.3.1-1-v3:   * For the baseline UE bandwidth capability of RedCap UEs, the same maximum UE bandwidth in a band applies to both RF and baseband.   + This maximum UE bandwidth applies to both data and control channels.   + This maximum UE bandwidth is assumed for both DL and UL.   + Complexity analyses with other mixes of bandwidths are not precluded. |
| SONY |  | This is a study item and we should be agreeing on what is studied. We don’t want to agree on what the bandwidth capability of a Redcap UE is at this stage: that can be done in the work item. Hence we prefer the FL3 proposal (Proposal 7.3.1-1-v2).  We understand that the FL4 update was made based on the comment from Huawei / HiSi, where it was stated that “*at least given the agreements of ‘baseline UE bandwidth capability’, the tone does not need to backwards to a complexity-analysis level*”. There is presumably a typo in that text. In any case, we don’t understand what that text means and don’t see it as a reason to change the FL3 proposal that 11 companies agree with.  If the problem is the phrase “complexity analysis” in the proposal, then as a compromise, could we adopt the following proposal?  Proposal 7.3.1-1-v3.1:   * For the ~~baseline UE~~ bandwidth capability of the baseline RedCap UE~~s~~ that is studied, the same maximum UE bandwidth in a band applies to both RF and baseband.   + This maximum UE bandwidth applies to both data and control channels.   + This maximum UE bandwidth is assumed for both DL and UL.   + ~~Complexity analyses with~~ Studies of other mixes of bandwidths are not precluded. |

The following agreements were made in a RAN1#102-e online (GTW) session:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * For RedCap Ues in FR1,   + The baseline UE bandwidth capability is 20 MHz, which can be assumed during the initial access procedure.   + Discuss further by email whether there is an issue or a necessity in achieving up to 150Mbps assuming a 20MHz and rank 1 transmission. |

**Q 7.3.1-2a: For RedCap Ues in FR1, is there an issue or a necessity in achieving up to 150Mbps assuming a 20MHz and rank 1 transmission?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | N | This was already addressed at RAN, the target is a soft one with the addition of “up to”. RAN1 should absolutely not spend time trying to revert the RAN decision to make this a hard target. In the RAN discussion it was even clarified, twice, for this exact example, that the TR can simply report the data rate that the 20MHz rank 1 case supports.  Since discussing further is counter to the decision in RAN, we disagree that this is even a medium priority question.  Technically, we do not feel that 150Mbps is needed, good performance for wearables can be achieved with half that peak data rate. Average data rates in any case will be much lower.  Commercially, as was already also discussed at length in previous ran and ran1 meetings, more native (single) carrier bandwidths means more RedCap device types and more fragmentation of the market. 20MHz is sufficient for FR1. An intermediate bandwidth will also not provide much cost reduction.  Finally, we do not expect RedCap Ues to be prohibited or restricted from implementing other NR features, even if these other features are not the focus of the study. So if for whatever reason higher peak data rates are desired, there are several optional features which can be supported that increase data rate. |
| DOCOMO | N | It is obvious that 150Mbps cannot be achieved assuming a 20MHz and rank 1 transmission. Optional capability to achieve the data rate (e.g., 2 MIMO layer or 40 MHz BW) can be reported after the initial access and that should be separated from the definition of RedCap UE type. |
| Panasonic | N | We don’t see an issue nor a necessity to achieve up to 150MHz assuming a 20MHz and rank 1 transmission. Two MIMO layers can be used to achieve 150 Mbps if 2 RX antenna and rank 2 transmission are supported by the UE. |
| LG | N | There is actually an issue in achieving up to 150Mbps assuming a 20MHz and rank 1 transmission because it cannot be achieved.  For the necessity in achieving up to 150Mbps, from our perspective, it seems to be an overkill and we don’t see a problem with the peak bit rate being reduced e.g., by half. Unless there is a consensus on the support of 150Mbps, we don’t think we need to further consider/study the UE bandwidth larger than 20MHz for FR1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | No conclusion needed for the question (we objected this during GTW but was not taken into account, nevertheless, the agreement does not necessarily lead to a conclusion). In addition to the comment from e.g. FUTUREWEI that clearly 20Mhz\*1Rank is not designated for the hard peak data rate, the SID has requirements not only on data rate, but also on latency, SE, coverage etc and they need to be further studied together. |
| Ericsson | N | In our view, the baseline RedCap UE in FR1 does not need to reach 150 Mbps. Additional optional features beyond the RedCap UE baseline capabilities can be added if one wishes to reach 150 Mbps. The SI should only focus on baseline RedCap UE capabilities. |
| Sequans | Y/N | On issue, we don’t see any if 2 RX antennas can be supported by the UE.  On necessity, we think RAN is more appropriate to decide and we have already in SID the necessity in achieving up to 150 Mbps for wearables. SID states “*the intention is to study a UE feature and parameter list with lower end capabilities … to serve the three use cases*” while the “*up to 150 Mbps for downlink*” is provided “*as a baseline*” within wearables “*Use case specific requirements*” |
| SONY | N | 150Mbps doesn’t need to be achieved in the DL for all Redcap devices. As Ericsson state, features to support 150Mbps can be optional. |
| InterDigital | N | Agree that additional features can be supported to achieve 150 Mbps and baseline RedCap UE does not have to achieve it. |
| FL3 |  | The general view in the responses seems to be that it is not a showstopper for 20 MHz with single layer that it cannot reach 150 Mbps. The SID says “up to 150 Mbps” and it can be expected that the targeted use cases can usually be adequately served with a lower peak rate. Optional support of peak rate enhancements on top of the basic RedCap capabilities is not precluded.  Proposal 7.3.1-2a:   * Conclusion: For RedCap UEs in FR1, there is no issue if the UEs do not achieve 150Mbps. |
| vivo |  | Our understanding of “up to 150Mbps” is that not all RedCap UEs are mandated to support 150Mbps, however, the spec should provide a solution so that some “Hign-end” RedCap UE can reach 150Mbps.  The current FL3 proposal seems to imply that 150Mbps is not a target anymore for the whole SI, which seems to change the scope of SI. |
| Samsung |  | Better to state the conclusion in the other way, as:  It is not required all the RedCap UEs in FR1 achieve 150Mbps peak data rate for DL. |
| Panasonic |  | Regarding 7.3.1-2a, we share the view with vivo. To achieve 150 Mbps or such order peak data rate is required. |
| OPPO |  | Share similar view as vivo and samsung |
| Qualcomm |  | We think it might not be necessary for wearable UE with 1 RX antenna and max UE BW of 20 MHz to support 150 Mbps on DL. However, the conclusion is too strong and conflicts with the wording in the SID. |
| Sequans |  | Updated proposal might not be in line with SI scope. We don’t think RAN1 is appropriate to decide on if there is issue (necessity) if RedCap UEs do not achieve 150Mbps – what we can decide is if there is issue (problem) achieving this target given a set of possible features.  Since the original question leading to this proposal had to do with study or not of additional BW option for FR1, larger than 20MHz, (supported by only 4 companies as seen in summary above), we think that it is more fitting to provide a conclusion that no problem is seen to achieve up to 150Mbps on DL with 20MHz max BW, because increased (possibly optional) capability, e.g. 2RX antennas / rank 2 MIMO, can be used. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | We still don’t think any conclusion is needed but…suggest  There is issue but it is not required for 20MHz with 1Rx UE in FR1 to achieve 150Mbps peak data rate for DL. |
| SONY3 |  | Similar views to those generally expressed above. Some “type” of Redcap UE should support 150Mbps (e.g. 2RX, rank 2 MIMO), but not all “types” of Redcap UE need to support 150Mbps.  Please don’t read too much into our use of the word “type”…. |
| Ericsson |  | We are fine with the conclusion. Also fine with Samsung’s suggestion. |
| Sierra Wireless |  | We strongly agree with the proposal. We do prefer Samsung’s rewording of the conclusion. |
| FUTUREWEI\* |  | This is not a priority, already discussed at RAN. No issue. Could possibly be reworded per Qualcomm concern to say “some UEs”. But in any case in the updated SID it is a soft and not hard target.  Will not read too much into Sony’s use of type 😊 |
| CATT |  | Fine with Samsung’s suggestion. |
| Intel |  | We would be fine with the suggested version from Samsung. |
| LG |  | We are okay with the FL’s proposal. We are also okay to leave the optional support of 150Mbps FFS? |
| FL5 |  | No clear consensus in the meeting |

**Q 7.3.1-3: Should TR 38.875 include more bandwidth options in FR2 in addition to 50 MHz and 100 MHz? If yes, what additional bandwidth options?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | N | Including 50MHz is a sufficient example for the long list of impacts and issues, no need to include another similar value. We had proposed last meeting to include a value just large enough (say in 70-80MHz) to avoid all of the issues with 50MHz, but 100MHz also avoids those issues.  As part of the TR analysis for 50 and 100 MHz we should say something like “a value of X MHz in FR2 will avoid these issues with 50MHz, but would require effort in RAN4 to define a new bandwidth.” (same comment we made in the May meeting GTW when accepting 50 and 100MHz) |
| SONY | Y | We are basically OK with considering 50MHz / 100MHz bandwidth. However, as per the answer to Q7.3.1-1 / Q7.3.1-2, we would like to consider wider RF bandwidths and / or control channels having a bandwidth of greater than 50MHz / 100MHz. |
| Ericsson | N |  |
| Sierra Wireless | N |  |
| DOCOMO | N |  |
| InterDigital | N. |  |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| ZTE,Sanechips | No | BTW, only support 100Mhz option |
| Sharp | N | As commended by FUTUREWEI, additional bandwidth options would require RAN4’s effort on defining a new one, considering current RAN4 specification only define the transmission bandwidth configuration as 50M, 100M, 200M, and 400M. |
| Panasonic | N |  |
| Samsung | N | No need. |
| LG | N | Considering supported channel bandwidths in FR2, the next bandwidth to consider will be 200MHz. Supporting larger than 100MHz will only bring a minor cost/complexity reduction from normal NR devices. We prefer not to consider the UE max bandwidth wider than 100MHz for redcap Ues for FR2. |
| OPPO | N |  |
| Xiaomi | N |  |
| CMCC | N |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Partially Y | Our preference is 100Mhz only for FR2. A new channel bandwidth as e.g. 80Mhz as FUTUREWEI proposed can also be considered if RAN4 is willing to do such efforts. Overall, the main motivation is to minimize the specification impact. |
| TIM | Y |  |
| Sequans | N |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | N | No need to have more bandwidth options, but UE could be configured with smaller size BWP. |
| Intel | N | In fact, we suggest to focus on 100 MHz case (similar views as Futurewei here). Note that operation with smaller active BWPs in connected mode is always possible by NW configuration and not precluded. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We believe the requirements can be satisfied with 50MHz / 100MHz BW |
| MediaTek | N |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | We can consider smaller bandwidths for active BWP (e.g., 20 MHz). The UE may be able to switch to smaller BW after initial across to save power. For example, data rates for industrial wireless sensors may not need the full 100MHz BW used for initial access and can choose to limit its BW to conserve power. |
| CATT | N |  |
| FL |  | Most responses indicate the 50 MHz and 100 MHz options are enough. Two responses suggest focussing only on the 100 MHz option.  One response indicates that they are fine with considering the 50 MHz and 100 MHz options but indicates interests in considering wider RF bandwidths and/or control channels having a bandwidth of greater than 50MHz / 100MHz.  Two responses indicate an interest in a bandwidth smaller than 100 MHz but larger than 50 MHz to avoid some of the issues with 50MHz. One of these responses proposes a note to capture this aspect: “A value of X MHz in FR2 will avoid these issues with 50MHz but would require effort in RAN4 to define a new bandwidth” (there is a similar suggestion in response to Q7.3.4-3 which is captured as a new coexistence aspect).  One response indicates that there is a power-saving benefit in allowing the UE to switch to a smaller BW after initial access.  Since RAN1#101-e, we have the following agreement:   * For FR2, study 50MHz and 100 MHz maximum UE bandwidth at least for initial access   + Other bandwidths FFS   Based on the received responses, perhaps it would be possible to remove the FFS from the previous agreement.  Proposal 7.3.1-3:   * For FR2, study 50MHz and 100 MHz maximum UE bandwidth at least for initial access.   + Other bandwidths are not studied further within this SI. |
| Qualcomm |  | We are fine with this proposal as long as the common understanding is that the “*Other bandwidths are not studied further within this SI*” applies to initial access only, i.e., other “post initial access” BW can be studied. Otherwise, the FL proposal needs further discussion. |
| MediaTek |  | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO |  | Fine with the proposal. |
| LG |  | We are okay with this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | Fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | To minimize the specification impact, our preference is still 100Mhz only for FR2. |
| CATT |  | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We are fine with the proposal |
| ZTE,Sanechips |  | We are OK to keep the door open for 50Mhz, but it’s better to prioritize 100Mhz , given the meeting time left. |
| Sequans |  | Fine with the proposal, but we also believe that as next step, as done for FR1, we should also conclude soon and prioritize one option for FR2. |
| Intel | N | We prefer to focus on 100 MHz for FR2. From complexity analysis so far (in following section), the benefit from 50 MHz compared to 100 MHz is practically non-existent:   * “Based on these estimates, the cost saving from reducing the UE bandwidth from 200 MHz to 100 MHz is no greater than 23%” * “Based on these estimates, the cost saving from reducing the UE bandwidth from 200 MHz to 50 MHz is in the range of 15%-32% The middle of this range is 23.5%”   On the other hand, it is clear that the impact to spec efforts, performance impact, and scheduling/network operation are significant.  Thus, given the timeline at hand, we do not think it is appropriate to spend time on the 50 MHz option for FR2. Further justification to motivate continuing study of 50 MHz is necessary. |
| InterDigital | Y | Agree with the proposal. |
| FL2 |  | Compared to the earlier version of the proposal, in the following versions of the proposal, it is clarified that the sub-bullet concerns initial access, as proposed in one response.  There are two versions of the proposal, one version that continues to consider both 50 MHz and 100 MHz (“v2”) and another version that down-selects to 100 MHz (“v3”). Only one of the two versions of the proposal can be agreed.  Proposal 7.3.1-3-v2:   * For FR2, study 50 MHz and 100 MHz maximum UE bandwidth at least for initial access.   + Other bandwidths for initial access are not studied further within this SI.   Proposal 7.3.1-3-v3:   * For FR2, study 100 MHz maximum UE bandwidth at least for initial access.   + Other bandwidths for initial access are not studied further within this SI. |
| FUTUREWEI | ? | We support v3. As Intel pointed out, there are a number of issues and little gain for 50MHz, doing the full analysis for 100MHz would save time.  Seems no need for v2 compared to the previous agreement. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | V3 as commented previously. |
| Sierra Wireless |  | We feel strongly that we need to choose one BW to provide economies of scale. 100MHz will provide a higher data rate without a significant cost impact. Also, 50MHz will need more specification work which is challenging given our limited time/online meetings. Thus, we strongly support V3 as it gets us much farther, but we can accept V2 if that is all we can agree to this meeting. |
| ZTE,Sanechips |  | Support V3. Considering the available meeting time, it’s better to narrow down this time. |
| Ericsson |  | We support v2.  Both 50 MHz and 100 MHz should be studied, and the TR should capture the pros and cons of these two bandwidth options. A few companies have pointed out that the 50 MHz bandwidth option may have RAN1 specifications impact or cannot support some of the existing SSB/CORESET#0 configurations. However, we see it as a performance degradation issue, rather than specs or coexistence issue. As we show in our contribution [1], the network can still configure 57.6 MHz SSB bandwidth and 69.12 MHz CORESET#0 bandwidth, but there is a performance degradation in PDCCH, which is less than 1.7 dB for AL 16. An important question to answer during the SI is whether the benefit in UE cost/complexity reduction can justify the loss in link performance. We hope that the TR can capture pains versus gains so that a recommendation at the end of the SI can be made on solid foundation. For the WI, we do support that only one bandwidth option is specified. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We support v2  We should first do the study using the proposed complexity breakdown to see the difference. Then we can see whether the additional specification impact and performance degradation would justify 50 MHz. |
| Qualcomm |  | We support v3  As explained in our paper, 50 MHz may have many issues in terms of performance (PBCH, PDCCH, etc…), coverage (AL16 support), UE implementation (mux patterns 2 and 3), PDCCH blocking, etc… However, the gain in going from 100 to 50 MHz BW is not significant, hence the above mentioned issues with 50 MHz cannot be justified. |
| DOCOMO |  | We support v2  While our preference is supporting 100 MHz only, as agreed previously, we should study both 50MHz and 100MHz at least for initial access. After that we can down-select one of them in WI phase. |
| Intel |  | We are supportive of v3 as we do not see the “pain vs. gain” margin low enough to justify pursuing the 50 MHz option – as discussed before, the cost/complexity benefits would be rather limited while requiring significant spec impact, and still cause performance losses and quite severe scheduler restrictions. |
| NEC |  | We support v3  As RAN4 spec for 50 MHz with 240 kHz SCS is not available, additional RAN4 study/work is required and feasibility is unknown for 50 MHz CBW. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | We support v2. Same view with Nokia, needs to study the cost breakdown at first. Besides, it is unclear to us if there will be much standard impact caused by 50MHz. It might be handled by implementation, or it might be related with how we address coexistence issues during initial access. |
| vivo |  | We support v3. |
| Samsung |  | We support v2. We already had agreement in previous meeting. We don’t see the need to remove one of BW. We should focus on study for both BW for FR2. We are ok to exclude other BW for this meeting, i.e., update for FFS part only.  Agreements:   * For FR2, study 50MHz and 100 MHz maximum UE bandwidth at least for initial access   + Other bandwidths FFS |
| Panasonic |  | We support v2. Same view as Nokia and Lenovo. |
| LG |  | We support v2.  Even though we have doubt that 50MHz BW can support SSB/CORESET 0 configurations smoothly, we need to study both 50 MHz and 100 MHz at least now that it is the SI phase. |
| OPPO |  | Slightly prefer to support V2 to study 50MHz in FR2. |
| FL4 |  | The responses are split 50/50 between Proposal 7.3.1-3-v2 and Proposal 7.3.1-3-v3, so the FL recommendation is to continue working in line with the RAN1#101e agreement, i.e.:   * For FR2, study 50MHz and 100 MHz maximum UE bandwidth at least for initial access   + Other bandwidths FFS |
| FUTUREWEI\* |  | We (still) support v3, as there are a number of issues and little gain for 50MHz, and doing the full analysis for 100MHz would save time. One compromise would be to capture the qualitative aspects but then do no more analysis/simulation.  No need to spend GTW for v2 compared to the previous agreement. |

### 7.3.2 Analysis of UE complexity reduction

Contributions [1, 4, 7, 8, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 30] specifically indicate that UE bandwidth reduction has impact on the functional blocks listed below.

* Power amplifier: [1, 8, 18]
* ADC/DAC [1, 7, 8, 16, 17, 18]
* Frontend buffering [8]
* FFT/IFFT [1, 4, 7, 8, 16, 22, 23, 30]
* Post-FFT processing or data buffering [1, 4, 7, 16, 22, 30]
* Channel estimation [7, 8, 23]
* HARQ or decoder buffer [1, 4, 8, 16, 22, 23, 30]
* Decoder [1, 8, 16, 22, 23, 30]
* UL processing block, although some contributions also indicate the benefit is minor [1, 7, 8, 22, 30]

Contributions [1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 17, 20, 22, 30] provide quantitative analysis and contributions [3, 5, 12] provide qualitative analysis on UE cost saving.

The estimates in cost reduction achieved by reducing the maximum UE bandwidth from 100 MHz to 20 MHz in FR1 are:

* Contribution [3]: 20%-30%
* Contribution [17]: 27.6% (FDD), 23.8% (TDD)
* Contribution [20]: 34.5%
* Contribution [1]: 15%-39%
* Contribution [6]: 38%
* Contribution [22, 30]: 67% in baseband cost; with 40:60 RF:baseband cost ratio, this translate to 40.2% cost reduction
* Contribution [7]: 51.4% for baseband processing; with a 40:60 RF:baseband cost ratio, this translate to 29% cost reduction
* Contribution [5]: significant

Based on these estimates, the cost saving from reducing the UE bandwidth from 100 MHz to 20 MHz is in the range of 15%-40.2% The middle of this range is 27.6%

The estimates in cost reduction achieved by reducing the maximum UE bandwidth from 200 MHz to 100 MHz in FR2 are:

* Contribution [3]: Less benefit compared to that achievable in FR1
* Contribution [17]: 10.5%
* Contribution [1]: <10%
* Contribution [6]: 23%
* Contribution [5]: significant

Based on these estimates, the cost saving from reducing the UE bandwidth from 200 MHz to 100 MHz is no greater than 23%

The estimates in cost reduction achieved by reducing the maximum UE bandwidth from 200 MHz to 50 MHz in FR2 are:

* Contribution [17]: 16.5%
* Contribution [1]: 15%
* Contribution [6]: 32%
* Contribution [3]: Less benefit compared to that achievable in FR1
* Contribution [12]: Complexity reduction benefits from 50 MHz compared to 100 MHz in FR2 may be rather limited

Based on these estimates, the cost saving from reducing the UE bandwidth from 200 MHz to 50 MHz is in the range of 15%-32% The middle of this range is 23.5%

### 7.3.3 Analysis of performance impacts

Contributions [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 27, 28, 29] analyze the performance impact in FR1 due to bandwidth reduction from 100 MHz to 20 MHz.

**Data rate:**

* P1: There is peak data rate reduction due to bandwidth reduction [7, 18]
* P2: 20 MHz bandwidth can either achieve or sufficiently close to achieve data rate requirements for all targeted use cases [2, 3, 6, 8, 21, 27]
* P3: 64QAM without MIMO achieves greater than 80 Mbps in DL [5, 13, 29, 13]
* P4: 64QAM without MIMO achieves greater than 50 Mbps in UL [13, 29]
* P5: 16QAM without MIMO achieves greater than 40 Mbps in UL [13, 29]
* P6: A UE bandwidth of 20MHz without MIMO cannot achieve DL peak bit rate of 150Mbps. To achieve 150 Mbps in DL, either MIMO, CA, or larger bandwidth than 20 MHz is needed. [3, 5, 9, 12, 15, 16, 27, 28, 29]
* P7: A DL peak rate of 150Mbps is not possible with TDD, 20MHz UE BW, and 64 QAM [13]

**Latency:**

* P8: The latency can be increased if the large messages need to be segmented into multiple transport blocks and sent over multiple slots. But, for the use cases that are considered in this study, the latency associated with increased transmission time (due to the reduced bandwidth) is likely to be insignificant compared to the latency associated with the DRX functionality. [7]

**Reliability:**

* P9: Reliability should not be impacted as it is envisaged that BLER targets can still be achieved at a reduced bandwidth. [7]

**Power consumption:**

* P10: Power saving benefit: [4, 5, 6, 15, 20,]

**Spectral Efficiency:**

* P11: Minimal spectral efficiency degradation [6, 7, 17]
* P12: CORESET#0 capacity before RRC connection setup and impact as such on spectral efficiency [17, 20]

**PDCCH blocking probability**

* P13: PDCCH blocking probability may increase [20]

**Coverage:**

* P14: PDSCH performance degradation (based on the same data rate target) [9]
* P15: Minor or no coverage loss [1, 6, 7, 17]

Some of performance impact identified above can be expected also in FR2

Contributions [1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29] identify the performance impact due to UE bandwidth reduction in FR2.

Impacts common to 50 MHz and 100 MHz

* P16: In FR2, both maximum UE bandwidth 50 MHz and 100 MHz can meet the peak data rate requirement. [5, 6]
* P17: SSB/CORESET acquisition time can be impacted if the UE bandwidth is reduced [28]
* P18: Misalignment between Redcap UE’s receiving bandwidth and PDSCH scheduling bandwidth [16]
* P19: Severely limiting the gNB scheduler in managing load on the initial DL BWP [12]

Impacts identified specific to 50 MHz UE bandwidth

* P20: UE may not be able to receive AL 8 or 16 for certain CORESET#0 configurations [26, 29]
* P21: PDCCH blocking probability [4, 5, 9, 16, 18, 27, 28, 29]
* P22: Reduce the number of users that can be supported by almost 50% if the maximum UE BW is reduced from 100 MHz to 50 MHz [29]
* P23: Lower mean SINR compared to the 100 MHz case [29]
* P24 Regarding PBCH performance degradation, contributions [1, 6, 23] analyze the loss.
  + very modest [1]
  + < 1 dB [23]
  + 0.6 dB [6]
* P25: Regarding PDCCH performance degradation when CORESET#0 is configured to 69.12 MHz, contributions [1, 6] analyze the loss.
  + 1.5-1.7 dB [1]
  + Not expected to have a significant impact to system performance [6]

**Q 7.3.3-1: Does the list (P1, P2, …, P15) above capture the most important performance impacts that need to be considered for bandwidth reduction in FR1? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | Was the intent to stop at P15? |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| vivo |  | FR1  For data rate: we think P1/2/6/7 are important ones.  For latency: fine with P8  For reliability: fine with P9  For power consumption: fine with P10  For spectrum efficiency: fine with P11. P12 is conditional, the issue may happen if the RedCap UEs cannot be offloaded to other BWPs  For PDCCH blocking: P13 is conditional, the block may increase if the RedCap Ues cannot be offloaded to other BWPs.  For coverage: P14 and P15 seems contradictive to each other? |
| Samsung |  | To align with other feature on whether to add coverage analysis  Some observations needs to be further discussed and revisited. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | One little comment about P21, we don’t analyse the PDCCH blocking probability in our contribution, and the contribution index [19] can be removed as the following  • P21: PDCCH blocking probability [4, 5, 9, 16, 18, 27, 28, 29] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| TIM |  | Detailed simulations should be performed in order to understand impacts on system capacity, spectral efficiency, coverage loss, latency and reliability losses |
| Sequans | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT |  |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q 7.3.3-2: Which of the identified performance impacts or aspects in the list above (P1, P2, …, P15) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for bandwidth reduction in FR1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | P1, P2 |
| FUTUREWEI | Should capture:  P1, P2, P4, P11/14/15 should probably be combined into a small performance loss statement (no mention of COVERAGE LOSS)  No strong feeling:  P8,9  Should not capture:  P3, 5 as related to another technique which, if included, should be analysed on top of bandwidth reduction  P6,7: The requirements are “up to”, saying “cannot achieve” or “is not possible” may give the impression that it is a hard requirement. CA and BW larger than 20MHz should not be mentioned. P7 belongs in modulation restriction if that technique is included.  P12 seems not a spectral efficiency argument but more a coexistence or system impact  P13 no need to discuss for FR1 |
| Ericsson | P1, P2, P3, P6, P8, P9, P10, P11, P15  Regarding P12 and P13, we agree these performance aspects are important. But further studies are needed. |
| Sierra Wireless | P1-P7, P9, P10 |
| Spreadtrum | P1, P10, P13, P14 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | P6, P10, P11 |
| Panasonic | P1, P6, P7 |
| vivo | For FR1: P1/2/6/7/8/9/10 |
| Samsung | P2, P10, P11, P12, P13, P15 |
| OPPO | P2/P10/P11/P15 |
| Xiaomi | P3,P4,P5,P6,P7,P11,P15 |
| CMCC | P1-P7,P10,P11,P12,P13,P17 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | P1, P2, P4, P6, P7, P8, P9, P11, P15 are critical.  P3 is unclear why 80Mbps is chosen as a target and why MIMO layers is not preferred in such observation. P5 has a similar issue.  P10 is not critically needed as BW reduction is not aimed for achieving power saving benefit. P13/P14 also seems to be looking at a non-targeted aspects but can be further studied.  P12 needs further study, as our view that 20MHz BW is the same as legacy so for initial access it does not affect the SE. |
| TIM | See previous table |
| Sequans | P1-P6, P10-P13, P15 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | P1, P2, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P15 |
| Intel | P1, P2, P6, P9, P10. |
| Nokia, NSB | P1, P2, P9, P10, P11, P15 |
| MediaTek | P1, P2 (may be combined with P6 P7), P4, P8, P9, P11, P15  P3, P5 could be mentioned in the section where restriction on maximum modulation order is discussed. |
| Qualcomm | P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P8, P9, P10, P11, P15 |
| CATT | P1, P3, P4, P5, P6, P8, P9, P10, P11, P15 |
| DOCOMO | P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P8, P9, P10, P11, P15 |
| LG | P1, P2, P6, P10, P11, P15 |
| SONY | P1, P8, P9, P11, P13  Also, we should capture P14 or P15 (they seem to be mutually exclusive)  We would also like the capture something about power consumption, but would like to study further whether there is a power consumption benefit (P10). If the UE is “on” for longer due to reduced bandwidth, we see a mechanism for the power consumption to increase, not decrease. |
| InterDigital | P2, P10, P11, P12, P13, P15 |
|  |  |

**Q 7.3.3-3: Does the list (P1, P2, …, P25) above capture the most important performance impacts that need to be considered for bandwidth reduction in FR2? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| vivo |  | FR2  For impacts common to 50 MHz and 100 MHz: P16 is fine. If UE can support 100MHz, not sure if P17/18 are still valid. P19 is conditional if the RedCap cannot be offloaded to other BWPs  For impacts identified specific to 50 MHz UE bandwidth: P20/24/25 are fine |
| Samsung |  | To align with other feature on whether to add coverage analysis  Some observations needs to be further discussed and revisited. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| TIM |  | See previous table |
| Sequans | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Intel | N | Propose adding a P26 (specific to 50 MHz): “Precludes FDM-based multiplexing patterns between SSB and CORESET #0.”  For FR2, we think this is a serious scheduling constraint to scheduling that heavily relies on analogue beamforming. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | Please add [29] to P20 |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q 7.3.3-4: Which of the identified performance impacts or aspects in the list above (P1, P2, …, P25) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for bandwidth reduction in FR2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | P1, P2 |
| FUTUREWEI | Should capture: P16,P17 (where more impact is expected for 50MHz), P20-22, P24-25 (need to be rewritten to emphasize that there is a degradation, then the dB range (so far).  No strong feeling: P23  Should not capture:  P18 issue not clear  P19 more a coexistence issue |
| Ericsson | P1, P9, P10, P11, P15, P16, P17, P23, P24, P25  Regarding P12, P13, P19, and P21, we agree these performance aspects are important. But further studies are needed. |
| Sierra Wireless | P17 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | P20,P22,P23 |
| Panasonic | P17, P24, P25 |
| vivo | For FR2: P16/24/25 |
| Samsung | P11, P12, P13, for both FR1 and FR2  P16, P20, P21 for FR 2 |
| OPPO | P18  Since PDSCH for SIBx and other common messages are scheduled by the gNB with DCI, the PDSCH may not occupy the whole initial DL BWP. Redcap UE’s receiving bandwidth may not fully overlap with the PDSCH scheduling bandwidth, as shown in Figure 1. In this case, the PDSCH decoding performance will deteriorate. Therefore, method to avoid such mis-alignment between Redcap UE’s receiving bandwidth and PDSCH scheduling bandwidth shall be further studied.    Figure 1 Mis-alignment between Redcap UE’s receiving bandwidth and PDSCH scheduling bandwidth |
| CMCC | P20,P21,P24,P25 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | P1, P2, P4, P6, P7, P8, P9, P11, P15, P16, P17, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, P25 |
| TIM | See previous table |
| Sequans | P16, P17, P20, P21, P25 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | P1, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P15, P16, P17, P20, P21 |
| Intel | P9, P10, P16, P19, P20, P22, P26 (proposed to be added in response to Q 7.3.3-1). |
| Nokia, NSB | P16, P20, P21, P24, P25 |
| MediaTek | P1, P2 (may be combined with P6 P7), P4, P8, P9, P11, P15, P16, P17  P20, P21, P23  Agree with qualitatively stating the degradation in P22. |
| Qualcomm | P1, P8, P13, P14, P16, P17, P20, P21, P24, P25 |
| CATT | P6, P13, P20, P24, P25 |
| DOCOMO | P1, P9, P10, P11, P16, P17, P20, P21, P24, P25 |
| LG | P1, P10, P11, P15, P16, P17, P21, P23, P24, P25 |
| Ericsson 2 | Regarding P20, we disagree. AL 8 and 16 can be used for 50 MHz Ues. There is however a link performance degradation. We show the loss is up to 1.7 dB for AL 16 in [1]. |
| InterDigital | P1, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P15, P16, P17, P23, P24, P25 |
|  |  |

Based on the responses in this section, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | For UE bandwidth reduction in FR1, the following performance impacts (which have been slightly rephrased compared to above in some cases for improved clarity) should be captured in the TR according to at least half of the 23 responses to Q 7.3.3-2.   * P1: There is peak data rate reduction due to bandwidth reduction. * P2: 20 MHz bandwidth can either achieve or sufficiently close to achieve data rate requirements for all targeted use cases. * P6: A UE bandwidth of 20MHz without MIMO cannot achieve DL peak bit rate of 150Mbps. To achieve 150 Mbps in DL, either MIMO, CA, or larger bandwidth than 20 MHz is needed. * P9: Reliability should not be impacted by bandwidth reduction as it is envisaged that BLER targets can still be achieved at a reduced bandwidth. * P10: Bandwidth reduction achieves a power saving benefit. * P11: Bandwidth reduction results in minimal spectral efficiency degradation. * P15: Bandwidth reduction results in minor or no coverage loss.   Proposal 7.3.3-1:   * For UE bandwidth reduction in FR1, at least the following performance impacts can be captured in the TR.   + P1: There is peak data rate reduction due to bandwidth reduction.   + P2: 20 MHz bandwidth can either achieve or sufficiently close to achieve data rate requirements for all targeted use cases.   + P6: A UE bandwidth of 20MHz without MIMO cannot achieve DL peak bit rate of 150Mbps. To achieve 150 Mbps in DL, either MIMO, CA, or larger bandwidth than 20 MHz is needed.   + P9: Reliability should not be impacted by bandwidth reduction as it is envisaged that BLER targets can still be achieved at a reduced bandwidth.   + P10: Bandwidth reduction achieves a power saving benefit.   + P11: Bandwidth reduction results in minimal spectral efficiency degradation.   + P15: Bandwidth reduction results in minor or no coverage loss. |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | P1/P6/P9/P10/P11/P15 are fine.  P2 is related to the previous question, whether 150Mbps is still the target for the SI. |
| Samsung | For P10, we prefer similar wording as for antenna reduction, since it will also reduce bitrate in general.  Besides, we think P12 is also need to be captured for FR 1. |
| Qualcomm | P1/P6/P9/P10/P11 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Except for P9/P10/P11. Reliability/SE are critical aspects that needs to be considered; but the observations need more verification.  P6 is discussed in a previous question, no need to mention it.  The discussion a bit difficult to us, since we understood the question is to ask which ‘aspects’ (i.e. which KPIs) are important, as we explained in Q 7.2.3-1. |
| SONY3 | We are OK with capturing the list in the proposal.  Agree with Huawei, that the list is basically a set of aspects (KPIs) that are important, as per Q 7.2.3-1 comment. |
| Ericsson | Fine with FL proposal. |
| Sierra Wireless | We agree with P1, P6, P9, P10, P11, P15 |
| FUTUREWEI\* | Mostly OK. If P6 is a bit touchy, ok to skip for now. If want to for P10/15 we can wait for results from next time to confirm. |
| ZTE,Sanechips\* | P2 is related to previous question. We have concern for P2. We need to capture that in order for 20Mhz to achieve data rate requirement Redcap UE needs to use 2 layer MIMO. |
| CATT | We agree with P1, P6, P9, P10, P11, P15 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal |
| Intel | Fine with the proposal. |
| LG | We are OK with the proposal. |
| FL5 | Several responses expressed concerns with P2. For the other bullets, only one or two responses expressed concerns.  Proposal 7.3.3-1-v2:   * For UE bandwidth reduction in FR1, at least the following performance impacts can be captured in the TR in the next meeting.   + P1: There is peak data rate reduction due to bandwidth reduction.   + ~~P2: 20 MHz bandwidth can either achieve or sufficiently close to achieve data rate requirements for all targeted use cases.~~   + P6: A UE bandwidth of 20MHz without MIMO cannot achieve DL peak bit rate of 150Mbps. To achieve 150 Mbps in DL, either MIMO, CA, or larger bandwidth than 20 MHz is needed.   + P9: Reliability should not be impacted by bandwidth reduction as it is envisaged that BLER targets can still be achieved at a reduced bandwidth.   + P10: Bandwidth reduction achieves a power saving benefit.   + P11: Bandwidth reduction results in minimal spectral efficiency degradation.   + P15: Bandwidth reduction results in minor or no coverage loss. |

Furthermore, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | For UE bandwidth reduction in FR2, the following performance impacts (which have been slightly rephrased compared to above in some cases for improved clarity) should be captured in the TR according to at least half of the 22 responses to Q 7.3.3-4.   * P16: In FR2, both maximum UE bandwidth 50 MHz and 100 MHz can meet the peak data rate requirement. * P17: SSB/CORESET acquisition time can be impacted if the UE bandwidth is reduced.   For the 50 MHz UE bandwidth option for FR2, the following should be captured according to at least half of the 22 responses to Q 7.3.3-4.   * P20: The UE may not be able to receive AL 8 or 16 for certain CORESET#0 configurations. * P21: PDCCH blocking probability * P24: Regarding PBCH performance degradation, the findings are:   + very modest   + < 1 dB   + 0.6 dB * P25: Regarding PDCCH performance degradation when CORESET#0 is configured to 69.12 MHz, the findings are:   + 1.5-1.7 dB   + Not expected to have a significant impact to system performance   Proposal 7.3.3-3:   * For UE bandwidth reduction in FR2, at least the following performance impacts can be captured in the TR.   + P16: In FR2, both maximum UE bandwidth 50 MHz and 100 MHz can meet the peak data rate requirement.   + P17: SSB/CORESET acquisition time can be impacted if the UE bandwidth is reduced. * For the 50 MHz bandwidth option for FR2, at least the following performance impacts can be captured in the TR.   + P20: The UE may not be able to receive AL 8 or 16 for certain CORESET#0 configurations.   + P21: PDCCH blocking probability   + P24: Regarding PBCH performance degradation, the findings are:     - very modest     - < 1 dB     - 0.6 dB   + P25: Regarding PDCCH performance degradation when CORESET#0 is configured to 69.12 MHz, the findings are:     - 1.5-1.7 dB     - Not expected to have a significant impact to system performance |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We think P12 is also very important for FR2 and apply for both 100MHz and 50MHz.  P12: CORESET#0 capacity before RRC connection setup and impact as such on spectral efficiency. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with P16, P17, P20 and P21. For P24 and P25, more evaluations are needed. |
| Qualcomm | P20: fine  P21: need to be more specific about the impacts, i.e., may increase PDCCH blocking probability  P24: fine  P25: we are not fine with this:  - 1.5-1.7 dB loss is based on 1 company’s results (we cannot take as general observation)  - ”Not expected to have a significant impact to system performance”, we cannot accept this observation as this sentence is very subjective without technical justification  - ”Regarding PDCCH performance degradation when CORESET#0 is configured to 69.12 MHz”, not very clear on this. The main proposal is talking about 50 MHz BW, how can CORESET0 be > 50?  - We recommend capturing the following: “PDDCH performance degradation is expected to impact the system performance, this impact may be studied further” |
| Ericsson | We don’t agree with P20. A RedCap UE limited to 50 MHz maximum BW can be designed to receive AL 8 and 16, although there is a performance reduction. |
| FUTUREWEI\* | Mostly OK. Prefer for P17 to mention that 50 will have more impact than 100 (or wait for next time). For P25 the “Not expected to have a …” needs to be removed, too much promotion. For P24 prefer to have a dB number and not “very modest” as that is subjective.  P12 seems more a coexistence impact. If captured should indicate more impact for 50 than 100. |
| CATT | Agree with Futurewei that P17 should differentiate 100MHz and 50MHz. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | P24, P25 need more evaluations, fine with others. |
| Intel | At least P19, P20, P22 need to be added to the list. |
| FL5 | A couple of responses wanted P17 to capture that the 50 MHz option will have more impact than the 100 MHz option. A few responses suggested revisions of P24 and P25. One response regarded P20 as incorrect. For the other bullets, only one or two responses expressed concerns. Perhaps the following updated proposal can be considered.  Proposal 7.3.3-3-v2:   * For UE bandwidth reduction in FR2, at least the following performance impacts can be captured in the TR in the next meeting.   + P16: In FR2, both maximum UE bandwidth 50 MHz and 100 MHz can meet the peak data rate requirement.   + P17: SSB/CORESET acquisition time can be impacted if the UE bandwidth is reduced. The 50 MHz option will have more impact than the 100 MHz option. * For the 50 MHz bandwidth option for FR2, at least the following performance impacts can be captured in the TR in the next meeting.   + P20: The UE may or may not be able to receive AL 8 or 16 for certain CORESET#0 configurations.   + P21: PDCCH blocking probability   + P24: ~~Regarding~~ PBCH performance degradation~~, the findings are:~~     - ~~very modest~~     - ~~< 1 dB~~     - ~~0.6 dB~~   + P25: ~~Regarding~~ PDCCH performance degradation when CORESET#0 is configured to 69.12 MHz~~, the findings are:~~     - ~~1.5-1.7 dB~~     - ~~Not expected to have a significant impact to system performance~~ |

Finally, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | Many responses did not explicitly indicate which ones of (P1, P2, …, P15) that also apply to FR2, but it seems reasonable to capture the performance impacts for FR1 that are relevant for FR2. Furthermore, the following additional potential performance impact was identified in the responses to Q 7.3.3-3.   * P26 (specific to 50 MHz): Precludes FDM-based multiplexing patterns between SSB and CORESET #0.   Question 7.3.3-5:   * Which ones of (P1, P2, ..., P15) and P26 should be captured in the TR as performance impacts for UE bandwidth reduction for FR2? |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | For P26, we think UE can retune to CORESET #0 after acquire SSB.  P11 and P12 should be captured for FR2.   * P11: Minimal spectral efficiency degradation [6, 7, 17]   P12: CORESET#0 capacity before RRC connection setup and impact as such on spectral efficiency [17, 20] |
| Qualcomm | P1, P8, P13, P14, and P26 |
| Ericsson | P1, P9, P10, P11, P15  Regarding P12 and P13, we agree these performance aspects are important. But further studies are needed.  Regarding P26, in our view, the FDM-based multiplexing patterns between SSB and CORESET #0 can be supported by a UE limited to maximum BW of 50 MHz. The UE needs frequency retuning to detect SSB and SIB1 in sequential manner. |
| ZTE,Sanechips\* | Regarding P26, without specification change, FDM-based multiplexing patterns between SSB and CORESET #0 cannot be supported by 50Mhz UE bandwidth. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | P1, P8, P10, P11, P12.  For P26, we have same view with Samsung and Ericsson. |
| Intel | P1, P9, P10, and P26.  For P26, as ZTE mentioned, this is not possible with current specifications and even if UE were to retune to another BWP to receive CORESET #0, there would be adverse impact on sync reference and time/freq tracking, potentially require dynamic retuning, etc.  To take into account observations from Samsung and Ericsson, we could rephrase P26 to say:  P26 (specific to 50 MHz): Precludes FDM-based multiplexing patterns between SSB and CORESET #0, per Rel-15 initial access design and procedure. |
| LG | We would like to note that P26 somehow overlaps with C7. |
| FL5 | There were not many responses to this question. For P26, the answers are mixed (~50/50).  The FL recommendation is to come back to this question later, e.g. once the TR has been populated according to P1-P15 for FR1 and see what impacts that also apply to FR2. |

### 7.3.4 Analysis of coexistence with legacy Ues

Contributions [1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 20] analyze the coexistence issues with legacy Ues. The findings are:

* C1: Small overall impact [1, 20]
* C2: Fully reusing the legacy procedure for RedCap Ues will potentially impact the performance of legacy Ues during initial access and increase the load of the initial BWP [4, 11]
* C3: Longer processing time for PRS is needed [7]
* C4: Paging capacity may be a concern [5]
* C5: Resource fragmentation and reduced peak data rates available for non-RedCap Ues [3]
* C6: Coexistence with URLLC Ues [11]

**Q 7.3.4-1: Does the list above (C1, C2, …, C6) capture the most important coexistence impacts and findings that need to be considered for bandwidth reduction in FR1? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| vivo |  | We think C2 and C4 are important aspects that should be addressed for high load scenario. If the cell load is not a concern, i.e. no massive RedCap Ues, the overall impact should be small, i.e. C1. |
| Samsung |  | C3: PRS is not a part of the study focus.  Some observations need to be further discussed, e.g, C5. |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| TIM |  | Detailed coexistence analysis should be perfomed |
| Sequans | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LG | Y | Considering the FDMed RO issue, initial access procedures or RACH configurations of RedCap Ues should be clarified first. |
| SONY | Partially Y | C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6 can be captured, but C3 text should be modified to “Redcap UE unable to receive wider bandwidth PRS”  For C3, the issue is not that a longer processing time for PRS is needed, it is that only a narrower bandwidth PRS can be received, which would impact positioning accuracy. In [7], we observed that if the RF BW is greater than the baseband BW, then that wider BW (and hence more accurate) PRS could be received, but the baseband processing would need to be spread over more than one slot. We think that observing that there is an impact on positioning accuracy is within the scope of the SI (why would it not be?). |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q 7.3.4-2: Which of the identified coexistence impacts in the list above (C1, C2, …, C6) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for bandwidth reduction in FR1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | C1, C2 |
| FUTUREWEI | Should capture:  C5. We had a similar statement in 888.  No strong feeling:  Should not capture:  C1: This is not compatible with the other statements. Better to list the impacts. Also, not applicable to FR2.  C2: This seems more an issue for FR2. |
| Ericsson | C1, C3.  Regarding C2, C4, C5, and C6, further discussions are needed. |
| Sierra Wireless | C5 |
| Spreadtrum | C1 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | C1 |
| Panasonic | C1 |
| vivo | For high load scenario, C2, C4, otherwise C1. |
| Samsung | C2, C4, |
| OPPO | C1,C2,C4 |
| Xiaomi | C1,C2 |
| CMCC | C2, C4 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | C2, C5 |
| TIM | See previous table |
| Sequans | At least C1, C2, C5 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | C2 |
| Intel | C1 |
| Nokia, NSB | C1 |
| MediaTek | C1,C2, C5 |
| Qualcomm | C1, C2 |
| CATT | C1 |
| DOCOMO | C1 |
| LG | C1, C2. Basically, we don’t think the overall impact is small. Among the listed impacts, C2 seems to be a bit more important than others considering the FDMed RO issue. The initial access procedures or RACH configurations of RedCap Ues needs to address this issue. |
| SONY | C1, C3 |
| InterDigital | C2, C4, C5 |
|  |  |

Some of the coexistence impacts identified for FR1 above might be relevant for FR2.

Concerning 50 MHz UE bandwidth in FR2, contributions [3, 5, 17, 29] highlight the following issues.

* C7: Restrictions on SSB/CORESET#0 configurations or Type0-PDCCH monitoring [3, 17, 5]
* C8: PDCCH blocking probability increases [29]
* C9: Half capacity compared to 100 MHz with a TDM scheduler [29]
* C10: Reduced SIR compared to 100 MHz [29]

**Q 7.3.4-3: Does the list above (C1, C2, …, C10) capture the most important coexistence impacts and findings that need to be considered for bandwidth reduction in FR2? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | N | As above, should have a statement like “a value of X MHz in FR2 will avoid these issues with 50MHz, but would require effort in RAN4 to define a new bandwidth.” |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| ZTE,Sanechips | N | Seems not a complete lists. PDCCH performance …UE retuning complexity |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| vivo |  | We think C7 is more important. |
| Samsung | Yes | Some observations need to be further discussed |
| OPPO | N | C11, Misalignment between Redcap UE’s receiving bandwidth and PDSCH scheduling bandwidth shall also be considered |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| TIM |  | See previous table |
| Sequans | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Intel | N | Propose to add a C11: “Higher system information acquisition delay due to infeasibility of frequency division multiplexing between SSB and CORESET 0 for 50 MHz”. FDM-based SSB-CORESET0 multiplexing patterns are not possible even for 120 kHz SCS (both SSB and control/data) for 50 MHz max BW. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| MediaTek | N |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q 7.3.4-4: Which of the identified coexistence impacts in the list above (C1, C2, …, C10) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for bandwidth reduction in FR2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | C1, C2 |
| FUTUREWEI | Should capture: C7  C2 should be rewritten: For 50MHz, two initial access procedures will have to coexist: one for ‘regular’ Ues, one for RedCap Ues  No strong feeling:C8,C9,C10  Should not capture:  C1 (for at least 50MHz) |
| Ericsson | C3, C7.  Regarding C7: we agree this aspect should be captured in the TR. However, our view is that all the currently defined SSB/CORESET#0 configurations can be reused. One restriction we see is that the UE needs to detect SSB and SIB1 in a sequential manner for certain SSB/CORESET#0 configurations.  All the other coexistence impacts need to be discussed further. |
| Sierra Wireless | C7 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | If 100MHz are adopted then there is no concern. For 50MHz most in the list are all critical issues need to be resolved |
| Panasonic | C7 |
| vivo | C1 |
| Samsung | C7 C8 |
| OPPO | For 50MHz case, Misalignment between Redcap UE’s receiving bandwidth and PDSCH scheduling bandwidth shall also be considered |
| CMCC | C7,C8 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | C2, C5, C7, C8, C9, C10 |
| Sequans | At least C7 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | C2, C7, C8 |
| Intel | C2, C11 (proposed to be added as in response to **Q 7.3.4-3**) |
| Nokia, NSB | C7 |
| MediaTek | C5, C7, C8 |
| Qualcomm | C4, C7, C8, C9 |
| CATT | C1, C7, C8 |
| DOCOMO | C7, C8 |
| LG | C7.  When RedCap Ues with maximum 50 MHz bandwidth coexist with legacy NR Ues in FR2, FDMed SSB/CORESET0 (i.e. multiplexing pattern 2 and 3) cannot be configured, which means restriction on the legacy UE configurations. We need to study/discuss whether this restriction is acceptable. |
| SONY | C3, C7 |
| InterDigital | C7, C8, C9 |
| FL5 | No clear consensus in this meeting |

Furthermore, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | For UE bandwidth reduction in FR1, the following coexistence impacts should be captured in the TR according to at least half of the 22 responses to Q 7.3.4-2.   * C1: Small overall impact * C2: Fully reusing the legacy procedure for RedCap Ues will potentially impact the performance of legacy Ues during initial access and increase the load of the initial BWP.   Proposal 7.3.4-1:   * For UE bandwidth reduction in FR1, at least the following coexistence impacts can be captured in the TR.   + C1: Small overall impact   + C2: Fully reusing the legacy procedure for RedCap Ues will potentially impact the performance of legacy Ues during initial access and increase the load of the initial BWP. |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | C1 is fine.  C2 maybe true but prefer to discuss the severity of the issue and if so what are the potential solutions. Based on such discussion, C2 (with necessary updates) could be captured. |
| Samsung | OK in general. |
| OPPO | Fine with proposal |
| Qualcomm | OK for C1 and C2 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Prefer to check if C1 is proper later after looking into more aspects. |
| SONY3 | The list seems to be so incomplete that we think it is not worth making a proposal here at the moment. |
| Ericsson | Fine with the proposal |
| FUTUREWEI\* | Not OK with either of these as written.  C1 OK if add “, at least for 100MHz”.  C2 still needs to be clarified and rewritten. More of an issue for 50MHz again.  In general, we think there is too strong a promotion effort for 50MHz to imply that 50 and 100 will have the exact same impact when coexisting with legacy UEs. |
| ZTE,Sanechips\* | Agree that for C1 we need to add “at least for 100Mhz”. |
| CATT | Agree with C1, C2 needs further study. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with C2.  For C1, we agree with Huawei’s view that we need to check it later. |
| Intel | Fine with C1, but we do not think C2 is well-substantiated at this point. |
| FL5 | No clear consensus in this meeting |

Based on the responses in this section, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | For the 50 MHz UE bandwidth option for FR2, the following coexistence impact should be captured in the TR according to at least half of the 22 responses to Q 7.3.4-4.   * C7: Restrictions on SSB/CORESET#0 configurations or Type0-PDCCH monitoring   Proposal 7.3.4-3:   * For the 50 MHz bandwidth option for FR2, at least the following coexistence impact can be captured in the TR.   + C7: Restrictions on SSB/CORESET#0 configurations or Type0-PDCCH monitoring |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Agree |
| Samsung | OK in general. |
| SONY3 | As stated for previous questions related to coexistence, we don’t really see a “restriction on configuration” to be a coexistence issue: it is a “restriction on configuration issue”. If a suitable configuration of SSB / CORESET#0 is chosen, then a Redcap UE can coexist with a legacy UE. |
| Qualcomm | Should also capture C8 and C9 |
| Ericsson | This problem can be addressed through UE implementation solutions. So, we can accept this statement as long as we also capture that “However, with UE implementation-based solutions, all SSB/CORESET#0 configurations and Type0-PDCCH monitoring options can be preserved.” |
| Sierra Wireless | Agree with proposal |
| FUTUREWEI\* | Disagree with Sony, this is an issue when both redcap and legacy UEs coexist in the system so should be captured. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with this proposal. |
| Intel | Following comment from Sony, we are fine to capture this as a performance issue if P19 is added in previous discussion point, else we need to add C7. |
| LG | We are OK with the proposal. |
| FL5 | Two responses do not agree with C7, and one of them proposes to add a clarification in order to accept the bullet.  Proposal 7.3.4-3-v2:   * For the 50 MHz bandwidth option for FR2, at least the following coexistence impact can be captured in the TR in the next meeting.   + C7: Restrictions on SSB/CORESET#0 configurations or Type0-PDCCH monitoring. However, with UE implementation-based solutions, all SSB/CORESET#0 configurations and Type0-PDCCH monitoring options can be preserved. |

Finally, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | Many responses did not explicitly indicate which ones of (C1, C2, …, C6) that also apply to FR2, but it seems reasonable to capture the coexistence impacts for FR1 that are relevant for FR2. Furthermore, the following additional potential coexistence impact was identified in the responses to Q 7.3.4-3.   * C11: Misalignment between Redcap UE’s receiving bandwidth and PDSCH scheduling bandwidth shall also be considered. * C12: “A value of X MHz in FR2 will avoid these issues with 50MHz, but would require effort in RAN4 to define a new bandwidth.” * C13: PDCCH performance * C14: UE retuning complexity * C15: Higher system information acquisition delay due to infeasibility of frequency division multiplexing between SSB and CORESET 0 for 50 MHz   Question 7.3.4-5:   * Which ones of (C1, C2, …, C6) and (C11, C12, ..., C15) should be captured in the TR as coexistence impacts for UE bandwidth reduction for FR2? |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | C4 can be considered to captured, but can update C2 to include it as part of load of initial BWP increase.  We think C11, C14 is part of solution other than impact. No need to capture in TR as coexistence impacts. None of the rest of C11-C15 need to be captured. |
| OPPO | C11 shall be captured. Redap UE with 50MHz maximum bandwidth and legacy UE have different receiving bandwidth therefore the misalignment issue exists. |
| SONY3 | These do not seem to be coexistence issues, rather these seem to be a list of performance issues. |
| Qualcomm | C4, C13, C14, C15 |
| Ericsson | None |
| FUTUREWEI\* | Assuming we properly include the issues with 50MHz, C12 is appropriate and in line with the discussion in GTW last meeting. |
| ZTE,Sanechips\* | Agree that for some item it depends on the UE bandwidth for FR2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | C2, C4, C11 |
| Intel | C13, C14, C15 are performance issues and agree that these should be captured – but they are not really coexistence issues. |
| LG | C2, C14, C15 |
| FL5 | No clear consensus in this meeting  The FL recommendation is to come back to this question later, e.g. once the TR has been populated according to C1-C6 for FR1 and see what impacts that also apply to FR2. |

### 7.3.5 Analysis of specification impacts

Contributions [1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25, 28] identify problem mitigating or performance enhancing solutions which have specification impacts in FR1.

* S1: Dedicated iBWP for RedCap [15, 16, 19]
* S2: Extending the CORESET duration in time domain to enhance the CORESET capacity [15]
* S3: UE behavior (not expecting resource allocations exceeding the number of PRBs corresponding to the maximum UE bandwidth [3]
* S4: FDMed RACH Occasions: [1, 5, 21, 28,]
* S5: Multiple initial BWPs [17, 19]
* S6: CSI report enhancement [17]
* S7: CORESET#0 enhancement [17]
* S8: Capability signaling defining reduced bandwidth or UE type identification [5, 7]
* S9: Minor performance impacts to be reflected in RAN4 specifications [7]
* S10: DCI optimization [5]
* S11: Dedicated PO configuration [5]
* S12: PUCCH frequency hopping during initial access [1]
* S13: Msg3 frequency hopping [5]
* S14: define RedCap narrowband [24]

Contributions [1, 6, 25] conclude that overall specification impact is minimal.

**Q 7.3.5-1: Does the list above (S1, S2, …, S14) capture the most important specifications impacts that need to be considered for bandwidth reduction in FR1? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | N | Most of these should not be listed here. The SID is clear that L1 changes should be minimized. Mitigating performance degradation is a different section of the TR and should not be discussed here |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| vivo |  | We think S1/4/5/8/ are more important ones.  In addition, as in [4] we proposed to consider multiple BWPs in frequency domain for RedCap Ues, in this case, it is preferable that UE can assume SSB transmission in its active BWP, which means network needs to transmit multiple SSBs in frequency domain. |
| Samsung | Y | Some observations need to be further discussed.  We suggest to identify the issue first and then categorize the solutions for the issues. Some solution can be combined. |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | In our contribution [19], we propose different initial BWPs can be used to serve the RedCap UE to realize traffic offload, so the contribution index [19] are added to S1 and S5. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| TIM |  | Simulation results, both LLS both SLS may be beneficial |
| Sequans | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Intel |  | Prefer not to aim for a “laundry list” here if the intention is to capture in TR. At this stage, should be sufficient to level-up to descriptions like “solutions to harvest sufficient frequency diversity”, “solutions for DL coverage”, etc.  On the other hand, if the intention is to consider this as a “down-selected list”, then we think such an attempt is too pre-mature at this stage given lack of proper analyses of exactly what would need to be done, and which schemes would actually have a net positive benefit. Thus, it would be good to first get some clarification on how to interpret the question/proposal for our future work. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |

**Q 7.3.5-2: Which of the identified specification impacts in the list above (S1, S2, …, S14) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for bandwidth reduction in FR1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | S1, S2 |
| FUTUREWEI | Should capture: S3, S9  No strong feeling:  Should not capture:  All others |
| Ericsson | S4, S8, S12 |
| Sierra Wireless | S8, S9 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Most of the item in the list are enhancement that should be put in low priority. S8 may be considered since it has to be implemented anyway. |
| Vivo | S1/4/5/8 and the “multiple SSB transmission in frequency domain” as mentioned above. |
| Samsung | We suggest to identify the issue first and then category the solutions for the issues. Some solution can be combined.  S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7, S8, S12, S13, S14 |
| OPPO | S4/5/11 |
| Xiaomi | S1,S2,S3,S4 |
| CMCC | S1, S5,S7,S8  Regarding S1 and S5, we think network should have the capability to decide whether to offload RedCap UE to separate initial BWP(s). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | S8/S9 may be direct specification impact that can be considered;  the others are related to coverage/capability study thus can be further considered later. |
| Sequans | S4, S5, S8 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | S2, S3, S8 |
| Intel | Too early to prioritize as “most critical” since we do not exactly know the challenges to overall operation or the net impact from each “enhancement”. At present, only S3, S8, S9 can be anticipated. |
| Nokia, NSB | S4, S8, S12 |
| Qualcomm | S3, S8, S10 |
| CATT | S3, S8 |
| LG | S1, S2, S4, S5, S8 |
| SONY | S8, S9 |
| InterDigital | S1, S7 |

Some of the identified specification impacts listed above might be relevant to FR2 as well.

Specification impacts required for supporting 50 MHz maximum UE bandwidth in FR2 are identified in contributions [3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 35].

* S15: Initial access due to {SSB, CORESET#0} together or PBCH or CORESET#0 alone spanning a bandwidth larger than 50 MHz [3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 17, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31]
* S16: Limiting the supported SCS combinations for {SSB, CORESET#0} [19]
* S17: Dedicated initial BWP [26]
* S18: RMSI acquisition or initial access procedure for RedCap [3, 11, 25]
* S19: Mechanism for dealing with misalignment between UE receiving bandwidth and PDSCH scheduling bandwidth [16, 25]
* S20: Cell barring [25]
* S21: The minimum guardband of SCS 240 kHz SSB is not defined for 50 MHz bandwidth in the RAN4 spec [35]

Contribution [25] mentions that mechanism for allowing omitting reception of channel/signal outside of UE supportable maximum bandwidth is also needed for supporting maximum 100 MHz UE bandwidth.

Contribution [28] mentions that a special SSB/CORESET#0 configuration might also be considered for supporting 100 MHz UE bandwidth.

Contribution [6] states that specification impact for supporting 50 MHz or 100 MHz maximum UE bandwidth is small.

**Q 7.3.5-3: Does the list above (S1, S2, …, S21) capture the most important specifications impacts that need to be considered for bandwidth reduction in FR2? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | N | Many of these should not be listed here. The SID is clear that L1 changes should be minimized. Mitigating performance degradation is a different section of the TR and should not be discussed here. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| vivo |  | We think S15/16/17 are important ones |
| Samsung | Y | Some observations need to be further discussed. |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| Sequans | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Intel |  | Prefer not to aim for a “laundry list” here if the intention is to capture in TR. At this stage, should be sufficient to level-up to descriptions like “solutions to harvest sufficient frequency diversity”, “solutions for DL coverage”, etc.  On the other hand, if the intention is to consider this as a “down-selected list”, then we think such an attempt is too pre-mature at this stage given lack of proper analyses of exactly what would need to be done, and which schemes would actually have a net positive benefit. Thus, it would be good to first get some clarification on how to interpret the question/proposal for our future work. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | - BWP hopping: to reduce the NB interference effects and achieving frequency diversity gains  - Optimizing measurements and procedures (e.g., paging, RLM/RRM/BM/BFD/BFR) and reducing the need for additional resource overhead or increased UE BW switching  - Reusing resources between eMBB and RedCap  - Recovering the tracking quality loss due to smaller BW operation  - L1 measurement report optimizations |
| CATT | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |

**Q 7.3.5-4: Which of the identified specification impacts in the list above (S1, S2, …, S21) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for bandwidth reduction in FR2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | S1, S2 |
| FUTUREWEI | Should capture: S3, S9  S15+S19 may be OK if clarified or rewritten  Should not capture:  All others  Restrictions on supported SCS S16/21 is a big restriction for NR systems, we should be extremely hesitant to go down this path especially for a small potential complexity gain that is not significant compared to economies of scale. |
| Ericsson | S4, S8, S12, S19, S21 |
| Sierra Wireless | S8, S9, S15 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | S15, S9 |
| Panasonic | S15 |
| vivo | S15/16/17 |
| Samsung | S15, S17 |
| OPPO | S18/19 |
| CMCC | S1, S5,S7,S8,S15,S16,S17 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | S8/S9, S15, S16 |
| Sequans | At least S15 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | S15, S17, S18 |
| Intel | Too early to prioritize as “most critical” since we do not exactly know the challenges to overall operation or the net impact from each “enhancement”. At present, only S3, S8, S15, S16, S17 can be anticipated. |
| Nokia, NSB | S4, S8, S12, S15 |
| Qualcomm | S14, S15, S16, others (please see QC’s comments for Q 7.3.5-3) |
| CATT | S3, S8 |
| LG | S1, S2, S4, S5, S8, S17, S18 |
| SONY | S8, S9, S15 |
| InterDigital | S15, S17, S18 |

## 7.4 Half-duplex FDD operation

### 7.4.1 Description of feature

With half-duplex FDD (HD-FDD) operation, the device does not need to simultaneously transmit and receive at the same time. This allows the device to use a switch in place of one or more duplexers, typically one per frequency band. As of NR Rel-16, since the FDD bands are all in FR1, i.e. all FR2 bands use TDD, HD-FDD is only pertinent to FR1.

In LTE, two types of HD-FDD operation are specified:

* **Type A:** a DL-to-UL guard period is created by the UE by not receiving the last part of a DL subframe immediately preceding an UL subframe from the same UE, and no UL-to-DL guard period is defined (but can potentially be created by the eNB implementation by proper TA adjustment).
* **Type B:** a DL-to-UL guard period is created by not requiring the UE to receive a DL subframe immediately preceding an UL subframe from the same UE, and an UL-to-DL guard period is created by not requiring the UE to receive a DL subframe immediately following an UL subframe from the same UE.

HD-FDD operation type A is defined for normal LTE, whereas type B is defined for LTE-MTC and NB-IoT. The intention of type B is to facilitate UE implementations with a single oscillator for Tx and Rx frequency generation by introducing significantly longer DL-to-UL and UL-to-DL guard periods.

Contributions [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31] discuss HD-FDD for UE complexity reduction. Contributions [5, 8, 13, 17, 21, 26, 29] explicitly indicate supportive of introducing or considering HD-FD for RedCap. Contribution [21] suggests to study both Type A and Type B, whereas contributions [1, 4, 6, 8, 13] either suggest no need to study type B further or indicate a preference of type A. Contributions [2, 15] indicate not supportive of introducing HD-FDD or mandating the support of HD-FDD for RedCap, although contribution [15] indicates that HD-FDD can be an optional feature for RedCap.

**Q 7.4.1-1: Regarding HD-FDD, which of the below way-forwards shall be adopted?**

* **A: Both Type A and Type B are studied**
* **B: Only study Type A**
* **C: No need to study HD-FDD further, neither Type A nor Type B**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | We already agreed to study, with type A as a priority. Do you mean whether to include in the TR or not?  B or C are OK. A increases the priority of Type B so not OK.  Overall the antenna reduction and BW reduction are the most important, and this technique is not applicable to TDD. So we can accept not studying further if the group wants to go that way. We are also OK to spend a little time to include the benefits and impacts in the TR, which could (perhaps) help avoid spending time in the WI or in a future release.  Note: there is an outlier 19%, which would be misleading if in the TR. If we state that “most companies see ~5-10%” then should be OK. |
| SONY | A: At this stage, we should study both Type A and Type B, but we think that the eventual conclusion is likely to be that Type A is supported. |
| Ericsson | B |
| Sierra Wireless | B. The study should include HD-FDD. |
| DOCOMO | Support Option B. As the complexity reduction benefit by HD-FDD is not so significant, we think studying Type A is sufficient considering the performance impact of Type B. |
| InterDigital | A: Both type A and type B. |
| Spreadtrum | A |
| ZTE,Sanechips | B |
| Sharp | B.  HD-FDD type B would mainly require RAN4’s effort on specifying the guard time. The cost reduction by reducing one oscillator is marginal for whole cost of UE. |
| Panasonic | B. Because of the time limitation, we are ok to study only type A. |
| vivo | B or C |
| Samsung | A  We suggest to capture analysis and observations for both Type A and Type B in the TR. We can further discuss on the recommendation in the end of SI. |
| LG | A. Agree with Sony. Furthermore, we don’t expect the work load to become much larger when we work on both of them compared to working Type A only. |
| OPPO | B or C |
| Xiaomi | A or B. We are supportive to study HD-FDD further. From our understanding, the benefit of reducing oscillator on cost reduction may be marginal, and thus type A should be prioritized over type B. But we are open on whether to study Type B further. |
| CMCC | B |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | C, or HD-FDD is an optional feature, similar to [15] (in case the spec impact can be minimized). HF-FDD is not widely implemented even in LTE based on our observation. Given the negative performance impact it would bring to the network and the potential specification impact identified above, we suggest it is not further pursued in Rel-17 RedCap. |
| TIM | A |
| Sequans | C: The benefit does not seem to be significant enough for the effort needed, and we should also consider that most of NR bands are TDD; in FDD bands, LTE will be operated for long. We are also fine with the suggestion from Futurewei to spend little time to include observations on benefits and impacts in the TR, so as to help saving time in a future release |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | B |
| Intel | Option B (focus on Type A only). |
| Nokia, NSB | B: Only study Type A |
| MediaTek | B (because Type A operation allows sparing the duplexer per each band.) |
| Qualcomm | B |
| CATT | B. In addition, we would like to clarify whether it includes Tx-Rx switching time only or includes the HD-FDD operation as well. |
| FL | A vast majority of the responses prefers Option B, i.e. to only study Type A. There are also a few responses who want to study both Type A and B, and a few responses who do not want to study HD-FDD at all. All in all, there does not appear to be a clear consensus to revise the RAN1#101e agreement.  Recommendation 7.4.1-1: Continue in line with the RAN1#101e agreement, i.e.:   * Study HD-FDD operation Type A and Type B (as defined in LTE) in RAN1, where study of Type A is prioritized. |
| LG | We are okay with the FL recommendation. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the recommendation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The comments from chipset vendors are almost half-half in terms of the benefits of HD-FDD on cost reduction. Other companies which support HD-FDD didn’t give a clear analyses on the benefit of HD-FDD. Specification impact for NR is also a concern. The practical use of HD-FDD is not popular even in LTE Cat.1/Cat.4, given the marginal cost reduction it can provide and significant impact on network it leads to.  Thus we don’t see any reason to further pursue this study, and propose  The study of HD-FDD operation is not prioritized. |
| CATT | We would like to clarify what “HD-FDD operation Type A and Type B (as defined in LTE)” exactly mean in this context. Is it the Tx-Rx/Rx-Tx switching time e.g. symbol-level for Type A while slot-level for Type B, or how to create the switching time as defined in LTE, or dynamic Tx/Rx switching based on UL scheduling/configurations as in LTE, or a combination. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the recommendation |
| Sequans | Agree with Huawei’s suggestion. However, if majority is not ready to down-prioritize yet, we are OK with the recommendation. |
| Intel | It would have been good to down-select at this meeting to Type A only, but fine to conclude as proposed above for now. |
| SONY | Fine with recommendation.  We certainly do not want to de-prioritise HD-FDD. It has been seen to be an important feature for eMTC. It is also explicitly listed in the SID as one of the techniques to be included in the study. |
| InterDigital | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL2 | In the light of the received responses, it seems to the feature lead that it is highly unlikely that HD-FDD operation Type B will be recommended in the end, so in order to reduce the work load, it may be worth checking whether the following can be accepted already at this point.  Proposal 7.4.1-1:   * Do not consider HD-FDD operation Type B further in this SI. |
| FUTUREWEI | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Appreciate FL efforts on seeking for progress in different ways, although not our preference. |
| Sierra Wireless | We feel HD-FDD is a very important cost reduction technique but realize the cost reduction between Type A and B is likely small, so to reduce work load we are Ok with proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the proposal |
| Qualcomm | We support FL2 proposal as above. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal |
| Samsung | We support previous proposal. We don’t support FL2 since we think we should study first then make recommendation based on the output. |
| Panasonic | Fine with the proposal. |
| LG | We are not okay with this proposal. Our estimation on the additional work load for studying Type B in addition to Type A is minor as the approach should be not much different.  Anyway, we are supposed to make a decision in the end based on the study and also base on a consensus, so we don’t see a good reason to preclude it now without a study. |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal |
| Sequans | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL4 | There does not seem to be a clear consensus for changing the RAN1101e agreement, so the FL recommendation is to continue working in line with the RAN1#101e agreement, i.e.:   * Study HD-FDD operation Type A and Type B (as defined in LTE) in RAN1, where study of Type A is prioritized. |
| Qualcomm | In terms of cost saving, there is little difference between Type A and Type B HD-FDD. In terms of spec impacts, Type-B HD-FDD is much larger, which requires significantly more workload.  Still, FL2 proposal is preferred by us. |

### 7.4.2 Analysis of UE complexity reduction

Contributions [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 17, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 30] analyze the UE complexity or cost reduction benefits achieved by HD-FDD quantitatively. The findings are:

* 4%-19% [1]
* 4.5% and 8.1% for Type A/B respectively [17]
* 4%-8% [5, 25]
* 5-10% [3]
* 6% [6]
* 8% [20]
* <10% [2]
* 50% saving on RF part [22, 30]

Thus, the range of UE cost saving is from 4% to 19%.

### 7.4.3 Analysis of performance impacts

Contributions [1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 17, 20, 21, 22, 25, 27, 29, 30] analyze the performance impact if HD-FDD is introduced for RedCap UEs. The findings are listed below. Some of the items were identified to be studied further.

* P1: no coverage loss [1, 3, 6, 17, 20, 21, 22, 25, 29, 30]
* P2: lower power consumption, lower maximum power peaks, lower power state, or lower insertion loss [3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 20, 21, 29]
* P3: lower noise figure [1, 6, 7, 17, 29]
* P4: lower (peak) data rates or throughput [2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 15, 27, 29]
* P5: increase PUSCH/PDSCH SINR requirements [2, 21]
* P6: larger number of HARQ processes may be required, which increases the UE buffer occupation and processing complexity [2]
* P7: no impact on spectral efficiency or capacity [3, 6, 7, 17, 20]
* P8: coverage impact for delay sensitive services [27]
* P9: negative impact on latency [2, 7, 15, 27, 29]
* P10: more complicated scheduling at the gNB, more scheduling constraints, or significant impact on network [2, 3, 21, 27]
* P11: Scheduling effectiveness is not jeopardized by supporting Type-A half-duplex UE’s in paired spectrum [8]
* P12: Contributions [1, 5] analyze latency and conclude that an HD-FDD device in RRC\_CON14TED can meet the 5-10 ms latency requirement for safety related sensors.

These performance impacts can be classified as follows:

* Peak data rate: P4
* Latency: P8, P9, P12
* Power consumption: P2, P3,
* Spectral efficiency: P3, P5, P7
* PDCCH blocking probability
* Coverage: P3, P5, P8
* UE buffer and processing complexity: P6
* Scheduling and network: P10, P11

**Q 7.4.3-1: Does the list (P1, P2, …, P12) above capture the most important performance impacts that need to be considered for HD-FDD? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y | Some observations need to be further discussed. |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We agree on FL’s summary.  A correction: P1 is missing in classified performance impact on Coverage. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| TIM |  | Simulations both SLS both LLS are considered beneficial. |
| Sequans | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | With the disclaimer than many of the items in the list may not be relevant unless the switching times are significantly long compared to typical scheduling durations (e.g., slot). |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q 7.4.3-2: Which of the identified performance impacts in the list above (P1, P2, …, P12) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for HD-FDD?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | P1, P2 |
| FUTUREWEI | Should include:P1,P2,P4, P6,P7,P8,P9,P10,P11  No strong feeling: P3, P5, P12  Should not include:  P11 |
| Ericsson | P1, P3, P7, P12 |
| Sierra Wireless | P1, P2, P3, P4, P7 |
| Spreadtrum | P2, P4 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | P1,P2,P7 |
| Samsung | P1, P2, P3, P7, P9, P11, P12 |
| Xiaomi | P2, P4, P9, P12 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Except for P2, P3 and P12.  HD-FDD is studied for cost reduction and associated impact on e.g. data rate, as stated in SID. Thus, P2 and P3 are not critical. P12 may need further verification as not clear about the reliability aspect. |
| Sequans | P2-P6, P7 for Type A, P8-P11, FFS for P12 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | P1, P3, P7 |
| Intel | P1, P2, P3, P4, P11 (under the assumption that switching gaps are not significantly long compared to typical scheduling time granularity) |
| Nokia, NSB | P1, P2, P3, P4, P7, P9 |
| MediaTek | P1, P2, P4, P7, P9, P11 |
| Qualcomm | P1, P2, P3, P7, P11, P12 |
| CATT | P1, P2, P4, P7, P9, P10 |
| DOCOMO | P1, P4, P7, P9, P10 |
| LG | P1, P2, P4, P5, P7, P9, P10 |
| SONY | P1, P2, P3, P4, P7, P10, P12 |
|  |  |

Based on the responses in this section, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | For HD-FDD, the following performance impacts should be captured in the TR according to at least half of the 18 responses to Q 7.4.3-2.   * P1: No coverage loss * P2: Lower power consumption, lower maximum power peaks, lower power state, or lower insertion loss * P3: Lower noise figure * P4: Lower (peak) data rates or throughput * P7: No impact on spectral efficiency or capacity * P9: Negative impact on latency   Proposal 7.4.3-1:   * For HD-FDD, at least the following performance impacts can be captured in the TR.   + P1: No coverage loss   + P2: Lower power consumption, lower maximum power peaks, lower power state, or lower insertion loss   + P3: Lower noise figure   + P4: Lower (peak) data rates or throughput   + P7: No impact on spectral efficiency or capacity   + P9: Negative impact on latency |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | We are wondering whether P7 is true? HD-FDD will have scheduling restriction to gNB which likely cause some system performance loss. |
| Samsung | We don’t agree on P4. It depends on the traffic and how to define（peak）data rates and throughput. |
| OPPO | We don’t agree on P7. HD-FDD will have impact on system efficiency. |
| Qualcomm | When Type-A HD-FDD is supported, we agree with P1/P2/P3/P7. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with FL proposal, but hope P12 can be additionally captured to complete the analysis of impact on latency. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Except for P1, P2, P3, P7.  There would be coverage loss for HD-FDD compared with FD-FDD.  Seems different aspects are covered in P2/P3. There is also different view on whether there is power consumption benefits due to short/long transmission time as discussed in P6 in 7.5.3 and P10 in Q 7.5.3-2.  P7 concerning SE/capacity is important aspect that need to be captured in the TR but the observation in P7 needs more verification (similar to vivo analysis). |
| SONY3 | This seems to be reasonable set of aspects (KPIs) to capture in the TR, but there needs to more analysis of most of these points. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| Sierra Wireless | We agree with P1,P2,P3,P7.  P2 the “or” should be an “and”.  P4 should not be included. In bidirectional traffic use cases HD-FDD would have a lower peak data rate compared to FD-HDD but it would have similar peak rates compared to TDD.  P9 is not true for type A HD-FDD UEs since latency measurements (e.g. Ping) have no need for bi-directional traffic. |
| FUTUREWEI\* | We cannot only include perceived benefits (~5-10% cost reduction) without the drawbacks. Compared to FDD, there will some latency and peak data rate impacts (P4,P9). P1 and P7 we can see next time if people want to check. |
| Intel | Fine with the proposal, but we think P11 would be more appropriate compared to P7, under the assumption that switching gaps are not significantly long compared to typical scheduling time granularity for Type A HD-FDD UEs. |
| FL5 | Several responses express concerns with P7. For the other bullets, only one or two responses have concerns.  Proposal 7.4.3-1-v2:   * For HD-FDD, at least the following performance impacts can be captured in the TR in the next meeting.   + P1: No coverage loss   + P2: Lower power consumption, lower maximum power peaks, lower power state, or lower insertion loss   + P3: Lower noise figure   + P4: Lower (peak) data rates or throughput   + ~~P7: No impact on spectral efficiency or capacity~~   + P9: Negative impact on latency |

### 7.4.4 Analysis of coexistence with legacy Ues

Contributions [1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 17, 25] analyze coexistence impacts. The identified issues are listed below.

* C1: significant impact on network [2]
* C2: make scheduler more complex [3]
* C3: need to monitor PI/CI to ensure coexistence with URLLC Ues [7]

Contributions [1, 5, 17, 25] conclude that the impact can be minimal or do not raise a concern.

**Q 7.4.4-1: Does the list above (C1, C2, C3) capture the most important coexistence impacts that need to be considered for HD-FDD? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| ZTE,Sanechips | N | C4= ‘no significant impact’ |
| Samsung | N | May have co-existence issue with legacy UE due to switching time from PRACH to Msg2, depending on the configuration and gap.  C1 to C3 need to be further discussed |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| TIM |  | Coexistence is of utmost importance. Simulations results may be beneficial. |
| Sequans | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | N | None is well justified. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LG | N | We don’t think there are important coexistence impacts related to HD-FDD support. Scheduling issues may be further clarified after switching times of HD-FDD type A (or type B) are defined. |
| SONY | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q 7.4.4-2: Which of the identified coexistence impacts in the list above (C1, C2, C3) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for HD-FDD?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | C1, C2 |
| FUTUREWEI | C1, C2 should be included. Not sure about C3. |
| Ericsson | Possibly C2. However, if it is done properly, the impact on scheduler might be minor. |
| Sierra Wireless | C2 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | C2 |
| Xiaomi | None |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | All |
| Sequans | C1, C2, FFS for C3 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Possibly C2. |
| Intel | None (under the assumption that switching gaps are not significantly long compared to typical scheduling time granularity) |
| Nokia, NSB | C2 |
| MediaTek | Agree with Ericsson. |
| Qualcomm | Minor impacts on scheduler |
| CATT | C2 |
| DOCOMO | C1, C2 |
| LG | C2 |
| SONY | C3. In order to be able to coexist with a URLLC UE, the Redcap UE needs to be able to cancel its ongoing UL transmission. |
| InterDigital | Minor impact on scheduler. |
|  |  |

Based on the responses in this section, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | For HD-FDD, the following coexistence impact should be captured in the TR according to at least half of the 17 responses to Q 7.4.4-2.   * C2: Makes scheduler more complex   Proposal 7.4.4-1:   * For HD-FDD, at least the following coexistence impact can be captured in the TR.   + C2: Makes scheduler more complex |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We don't see much negative impact for scheduler. In Rel-15 design, we think RAN 1 spec can almost support HD-FDD, as well as for LTE. |
| OPPO | ok |
| Qualcomm | OK in general |
| Xiaomi | As commented earlier, we do not think the coexistence impacts need to be captured in the TR. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine. |
| SONY3 | We don’t support this proposal. This is a coexistence section and what we are saying is that scheduler implementation will be more complex, which isn’t a coexistence issue in the first place. The proposal then ignores some issues that are actual coexistence issues, e,g, that an HD-FDD UE cannot coexist with a URLLC UE because the HD-FDD UE cannot cancel its UL transmission as it cannot receive UL CI (cancelation indicator).  Our view is that the coexistence section should prioritise description of any coexistence issues. If there is any additional text on implementation complexity / restriction on configuration, then that’s a bonus. But let’s describe coexistence issues first. |
| Ericsson | Fine |
| Sierra Wireless | Do not support the proposal for reasons Samsung mentions. |
| CATT | Agree with the proposal. |
| Intel | Fine with the proposal |
| LG | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL5 | No clear consensus in this meeting |

Furthermore, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | The following additional potential coexistence impact was identified in the responses to Q 7.4.4-1.   * C4: Potential coexistence issue due to switching time from PRACH to Msg2   Question 7.4.4-3:   * Should C4 be captured in the TR as a coexistence impact for HD-FDD? |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Support to capture this as least for HD-FDD type B. |
| Qualcomm | NO for Type-A HD-FDD |
| Xiaomi | We prefer to first identifying the value of the switching time from RAN4. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine. |
| SONY3 | Not a priority since we think this is only an issue for Type B and we think that Type B won’t be supported anyway (FFS). |
| Ericsson | Agree with Samsung |
| Sierra Wireless | No for Type-A HD-FDD. |
| CATT | Agree with Samsung. |
| LG | NO, why should the “potential” impact be captured? We need a further study. |
| FL5 | No clear consensus in this meeting |

### 7.4.5 Analysis of specification impacts

Contributions [1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30] identify specification impacts listed below.

* S1: DL-to-UL and/or UL-to-DL switching time [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22, 29, 30]
* S2: rule for handling DL/UL collision [1, 12, 26]
* S3: applicable bands and perf requirements [1, 3, 17]
* S4: capability signaling [5, 7, 25]
* S5: DL pre-emption and UL cancellation; Prioritization between eMBB traffic and URLLC traffic [7]
* S6: definition of HD-FDD operation type [20]
* S7: impact of BWP adaptation [10]
* S8: Type B HD-FDD may result in some necessary changes in the L1 design [23]
* S9: HARQ ACK/NACK bundling [29]
* S10: RRC configuration of UL and DL slots/symbols similar to NR TDD [29]

Regarding DL-to-UL and/or UL-to-DL switching time, contributions [1, 4] state that the transition time and the scheduling restriction defined for a UE not capable of full duplex in Rel-15 can be used as a baseline, whereas contribution [12] suggests that more relaxed switching time may be considered.

Contributions [9, 22, 30] suggest a DL-to-UL switching time may be created by not receiving symbols at the end of the DL slot immediately preceding the uplink transmission slot. Contributions [9, 20, 22, 30] suggest the switching time of uplink-to-downlink transition can be created by properly setting TA value by gNB scheduler for the RedCap devices without the need of special handing. Contribution [26] suggests symbol-level switching time.

Contributions [6, 7, 25] conclude that the overall specification impact is small.

**Q 7.4.5-1: Does the list above (S1, S2, …, S10) capture the most important specifications impacts that need to be considered for HD-FDD? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Y |  |
| Samsung |  | Some of the above list needs to be further discussed.  We suggest to identify the issue first and then categorize the solutions for the issues. Some solutions can be combined. |
| Xiaomi | Y | We agree on FL’s summary. In our contribution [15] we also propose that gNB should be able to configure UL/DL slots/symbols for HD-FDD UE. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | Not pursued |
| Sequans | Yes | As a list of possible impact when introduced |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |

**Q 7.4.5-2: Which of the identified specification impacts in the list above (S1, S2, …, S10) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for HD-FDD?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | S1, S5 |
| FUTUREWEI | Should include: S1,S3,S4  No strong feeling:S6,S10  Should not include:S2,S5 (not sure), S7, S9  S8 will depend on Type B being included in the TR |
| Ericsson | S1, S2, S3, S4, S6  S8 if Type B is adopted.  S5 deserves further discussion |
| Sierra Wireless | S1, S3, S4 |
| Spreadtrum | S1, S6 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | S1, S3, S6 |
| Samsung | We suggest to identify the issue first and then categorize the solutions for the issues. Some solutions can be combined.  S1, S2, S8 |
| Xiaomi | S1, S2, S4, S10 |
| Sequans | At least S1-S4 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | S1, S3, S4, S6 |
| Intel | At this point, only S1, S2, S3, S4, S6 |
| Nokia, NSB | S1, S2, S3, S4 |
| MediaTek | S1, S2, S4, S6 |
| Qualcomm | S1, S2, S4, S6, S9, S10 |
| CATT | S1, S2, S4 |
| LG | S1, S2, S3, S4, S6, S8 |
| SONY | S1, S2, S4, S5, S6 |
| InterDigital | S1, S2, S3, S4, S6, S8 |

## 7.5 Relaxed UE processing time

### 7.5.1 Description of feature

In RAN1#101-e, the agreement was made to study UE complexity reduction through a more relaxed UE processing time in terms of N1/N2.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * For UE complexity reduction through relaxed UE processing time, study a more relaxed UE processing time in terms of N1/N2 compared to capability #1. |

Many contributions [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 27, 29, 31] discuss relaxed UE processing time in terms of N1/N2 and provide analyses on different aspects as summarized in the next subsections. For the continued evaluation, it might be useful to agree on what values of N1 and N2 to assume. For example, contribution [6] assumed that N1 and N2 were doubled.

Some contributions [2, 12, 17, 27, 29] also mention that CSI computation time can be included as part of the study on relaxed UE processing time.

In RAN1#102-e, the following agreements were made via email:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * For the purpose of evaluation, the UE processing time in terms of N1/N2 can be assumed to be doubled compared to those of capability #1, i.e.,   + N1 = 16, 20, 34, and 40 symbols for 15, 30, 60, and 120 kHz SCS (assuming only front-loaded DMRS)   + N2 = 20, 24, 46, and 72 symbols for 15, 30, 60, and 120 kHz SCS   Agreements:   * Study of relaxed UE processing time related to CSI computation is not prioritized in the RedCap study item. |

### 7.5.2 Analysis of UE complexity reduction

Many contributions [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 27, 29, 31] discuss potential UE complexity reduction from relaxed UE processing time in terms of N1/N2. Some arguments are based on possible slower processor with reduced clock frequency, possible distribution of computation load over time, possible reduced demands on parallel processing and chip area, and possible less complex channel decoder.

Some contributions also provide analysis of the cost reduction based on estimate of the cost breakdown of different processing components [6, 17, 20]. Contributions [1, 6, 17, 20, 27] identify that the cost reduction may come from reduced baseband processing, especially from receiver processing block including LDPC decoding and DL control processing & decoder, and UL processing block.

Some cost reduction estimates for relaxed UE processing time are shown in the table below. As can be seen in the rightmost column, the overall estimated cost reduction is 5% according to [3], around 2% according to [6], 1.5-2.6% for relaxed N2 (doubled) and 6.42-9.63% for relaxed N1 (doubled) according to [17], and up to 7% according to [20]. Contribution [3] further notes that the complexity reduction will not accumulate over multiple bands.

Table 2: Estimate cost/complexity reduction from a more relaxed N1/N2 compared to Capability #1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Contribution** | **Cost reduction in baseband parts** | | | | **Total of Baseband relative cost reduction[[1]](#footnote-2)** | **Overall relative cost reduction[[2]](#footnote-3)** |
| **Receiver processing block** | **LDPC decoding** | **DL control processing & decoder** | **UL processing block** |
| **[3]** |  |  |  |  |  | **<5%** |
| **[6]** | 0% | 20% | 0% | 20% | 3% | **2%** |
| **[17]** | ~50%? | ~50%? | 0% | ~50%? | (19.75%) | **FR1 (FDD): N1: 9.63%, N2: 2.6%**  **FR1 (TDD): N1: 8%, N2: 1.88%**  **FR2 (TDD): N1: 6.42%, N2: 1.5%** |
| **[20]** | 25% | 20% | 40% | 25% | 11.15% | **6.69%** |

Contributions [1, 5, 27] note that the actual complexity/cost reduction may not be clear as it depends on the specific implementation. Some contributions [6, 8] suggest that the complexity/cost reduction might be rather small compared to the required standardization efforts and impacts described in the following sections.

Contributions [1, 8, 17, 27] emphasize that the cost/complexity reduction would be limited or reduced significantly when it is considered on top of other UE complexity reduction features.

### 7.5.3 Analysis of performance impacts

Contributions [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 16, 17, 20, 27, 29, 31] analyze the performance impact if relaxed UE processing time is introduced for RedCap Ues. The findings are listed below.

**Latency:**

* P1: Contributions [1, 2, 5, 8, 11, 13, 20, 27] mentioned the impact of relaxed UE processing time capability on latency, where [1, 5] provide some numerical examples of the impact on UL and DL latency for the initial transmission and different number of retransmissions.
* P2: Contributions [1, 2, 4, 16, 20, 27, 29, 31] observe that many RedCap use cases have rather relaxed latency requirements of up to 100 ms or 500 ms and thus can afford to have more relaxed UE processing time if the trade-off between cost reduction benefits and impacts is justified.
* P3: It is mentioned in several contributions [1, 2, 3, 8, 20, 27] that for some use cases such as safety-related sensors, rather strict latency may be required, and a more relaxed UE processing may not be feasible.
* P4: Contribution [13] discusses an implication of relaxed UE processing time on latency which can lead to having different hardware variants for RedCap Ues.

**Scheduling flexibility/complexity:**

* P5: Contributions [1, 2, 8, 17] observe negative impacts of relaxed UE processing time on scheduling complexity, especially when taking into account different scheduling timing requirements related to N1/N2 and the fact that there already exist two UE processing time capabilities in NR.

**Data rate:**

* P6: Contributions [2, 3] mention that sustained data rate may be impacted due to longer HARQ RTT because of the relaxed UE processing time.

**Coverage:**

* P7: Contributions [3, 6, 17] note that no significant coverage impact is expected from a more relaxed UE processing time.

**Spectral efficiency/network capacity:**

* P8: Contributions [6, 17] note that no impact on spectral efficiency or network capacity is expected since gNB can schedule other Ues during the UE processing time.

**Power consumption:**

* P9: Contributions [2, 4, 16, 29, 31] mentioned that power saving benefit can be obtained from relaxed UE processing time, particularly from cross-slot scheduling which may lower UE’s working voltage and avoiding unnecessary data buffering.
* P10: Contributions [1, 5, 6, 20, 27] noted that the UE power saving gain may not be clear or may even be degraded as UE may need to stay active longer due to more relaxed UE processing time, and that it may also depend on specific implementation.
* P11: Contribution [1] notes that cross-slot scheduling can be supported by gNB implementation without the need to introduce a more relaxed UE processing time capability.

**Q 7.5.3-1: Does the list (P1, P2, …, P11) above capture the most important performance impacts that need to be considered for relaxed UE processing time? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | N | For cross-slot scheduling, need to state there is no real impact to latency, scheduling, data rate, coverage, spectral efficiency. Plus P9,11 |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Y |  |
| vivo |  | For latency: the latency requirement is use case dependent, so both P2 and P3 can be true in different scenarios  For scheduling: we think gNB should be able to manage different scheduling timelines.  For data rate: there should be no problem if we do not consider lower than the LTE processing capability  Coverage: agree with P7  Spectrum efficiency/capacity: agree with P8  Power consumption: agree with P9  In addition to above, another possibility is that we do not lower the UE capability, i.e. UE still capable of Cap#1 timeline, but network can configure the UE with slower timeline to achieve power saving gain. |
| Samsung |  | To align whether to add coverage analysis with other features.  Some in the above list need to be further discussed. |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| TIM |  | LLS and SLS may be beneficial to understand impacts on the above parameters/KPI |
| Sequans | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | N |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q 7.5.3-2: Which of the identified performance impacts in the list above (P1, P2, …, P11) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for relaxed UE processing time?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | P1, P2 |
| FUTUREWEI | For e.g. doubling N1/N2:  Should include: P3, P4, P5, P6, P10  No strong feeling:P1, P2, P7  Should not include:P8 (scheduling may need to be more conservative), P9 (as P10 is correct)  For cross-slot scheduling: P9, P11 |
| Ericsson | P1-P11 |
| Sierra Wireless | P1, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P10 |
| Spreadtrum | P1, P2, P3, P10 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | P1, P2, P3, P5, P9,P10 |
| vivo | P2/7/8/9 |
| Samsung | P1, P3, P5, P8, P10 |
| OPPO | P2/7/8/9 |
| CMCC | P1, P2, P3, P5 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Can be further studied. |
| Sequans | P1-P6, P10 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | P2, P6, P7, P8, P10, P11 |
| Intel | P2, P3, P6, P7, P9, P11.  On P5: The additional scheduler complexity compared to all the different minimum processing times and various conditions and margins we have is negligible.  On P10: To properly evaluate the net effect, potential updates to the power consumption model would be necessary to factor lower power consumption from reduced demands on parallelization, working voltage, and chip area. |
| Nokia, NSB | P1-P4, P6, P7, P8, P10 |
| MediaTek | P1-P6 |
| Qualcomm | P2, P3, P6, P7, P9, P10, P11 |
| CATT | P1, P7, P8 |
| DOCOMO | P1, P2, P3, P5, P6, P7, P8 |
| LG | P1, P2, P7, P8, P9 |
|  |  |

Based on the responses in this section, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | For relaxed UE processing time, the following performance impacts should be captured in the TR according to at least half of the 19 responses to Q 7.5.3-2.   * P1: Impact of relaxed UE processing time capability on latency, e.g. for the initial transmission and different number of retransmissions. * P2: Many RedCap use cases have rather relaxed latency requirements of up to 100 ms or 500 ms and thus can afford to have more relaxed UE processing time if the trade-off between cost reduction benefits and impacts is justified. * P3: For some use cases such as safety-related sensors, rather strict latency may be required, and a more relaxed UE processing may not be feasible. * P6: Sustained data rate may be impacted due to longer HARQ RTT because of the relaxed UE processing time. * P7: No significant coverage impact is expected from a more relaxed UE processing time. * P9: Power saving benefit can be obtained from relaxed UE processing time, particularly from cross-slot scheduling which may lower UE’s working voltage and avoiding unnecessary data buffering. * P10: The UE power saving gain may not be clear or may even be degraded as UE may need to stay active longer due to more relaxed UE processing time, and that it may also depend on specific implementation.   Proposal 7.5.3-1:   * For relaxed UE processing time, at least the following performance impacts can be captured in the TR.   + P1: Impact of relaxed UE processing time capability on latency, e.g. for the initial transmission and different number of retransmissions.   + P2: Many RedCap use cases have rather relaxed latency requirements of up to 100 ms or 500 ms and thus can afford to have more relaxed UE processing time if the trade-off between cost reduction benefits and impacts is justified.   + P3: For some use cases such as safety-related sensors, rather strict latency may be required, and a more relaxed UE processing may not be feasible.   + P6: Sustained data rate may be impacted due to longer HARQ RTT because of the relaxed UE processing time.   + P7: No significant coverage impact is expected from a more relaxed UE processing time.   + P9: Power saving benefit can be obtained from relaxed UE processing time, particularly from cross-slot scheduling which may lower UE’s working voltage and avoiding unnecessary data buffering.   + P10: The UE power saving gain may not be clear or may even be degraded as UE may need to stay active longer due to more relaxed UE processing time, and that it may also depend on specific implementation. |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | We doubt whether P6 is true in all the cases, some detailed analysis is necessary before capturing P6.  P9 and P10 are contradictive to each other, we need more discussion. |
| Samsung | We don’t agree with P2, we think the processing time can be relaxed after initial access by, e.g., cross slot scheduling or by configure a larger feedback time. There is no need to introduced relaxed process time capability to achieve it.  For P9, we don’t think cost reduction and UE power saving can be achieved in the same time. We think P9 can be only achieved with same process capability but relax the processing time by gNB for power saving.  In addition, we like to capture P5 in the TR,  P5: Contributions [1, 2, 8, 17] observe negative impacts of relaxed UE processing time on scheduling complexity, especially when taking into account different scheduling timing requirements related to N1/N2 and the fact that there already exist two UE processing time capabilities in NR. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with P7 in general, with the understanding that observations can be updated later under the agreed assumption of doubling the timeline requirement, if needed. |
| SONY3 | The list is OK. Again, we see this as a list of aspects (KPIs) that can eventually be captured in the TR: see comment to question 7.2.3-2 |
| Ericsson | P1, P2, P3, P6, P7, and P10 are fine. Agree with Samsung on P9. |
| Sierra Wireless | Agree with P1, P6, P7, P10  P2/P3 is not a performance impact – it’s a  use case requirement.  P9 is describing the benefit from Cross slot, not the benefit of relaxed UE processing. |
| FUTUREWEI\* | P9 and 10 are contradictory.  We agree with Samsung on P5. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal except for P9. Cross-slot scheduling can be achieved w/o relaxed UE processing time. |
| Intel | Fine with all except P9 and P10 – these, as pointed out by vivo, sound contradictory, and more fine-tuning would be needed. Also, for P10, we do not agree we need to highlight cross-slot scheduling part, there could be power savings by appropriate trade-off between processing demands (clock rate, parallelization, etc.) and processing latency (time spent in processing). So, in this regard, Samsung’s comment is not entirely accurate that complexity and power consumption reduction cannot both be realized. |
| FL5 | Most responses expressed concerns with P9. For other bullets, only one or two responses had concerns.  Proposal 7.5.3-1-v2:   * For relaxed UE processing time, at least the following performance impacts can be captured in the TR in the next meeting.   + P1: Impact of relaxed UE processing time capability on latency, e.g. for the initial transmission and different number of retransmissions.   + P2: Many RedCap use cases have rather relaxed latency requirements of up to 100 ms or 500 ms and thus can afford to have more relaxed UE processing time if the trade-off between cost reduction benefits and impacts is justified.   + P3: For some use cases such as safety-related sensors, rather strict latency may be required, and a more relaxed UE processing may not be feasible.   + P6: Sustained data rate may be impacted due to longer HARQ RTT because of the relaxed UE processing time.   + P7: No significant coverage impact is expected from a more relaxed UE processing time.   + ~~P9: Power saving benefit can be obtained from relaxed UE processing time, particularly from cross-slot scheduling which may lower UE’s working voltage and avoiding unnecessary data buffering.~~   + P10: The UE power saving gain may not be clear or may even be degraded as UE may need to stay active longer due to more relaxed UE processing time, and that it may also depend on specific implementation. |

Furthermore, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | The following additional potential performance impacts were identified in the responses to Q 7.5.3-1.   * P12: The NW can configure RedCap UEs to achieve power saving gain even if no relaxed UE processing time capability is defined. * P13: There is no real impact on latency, scheduling, data rate, coverage, and spectral efficiency from cross-slot scheduling.   Question 7.5.3-2:   * Which ones, if any, of P12 and P13 should be captured in the TR as performance impacts for relaxed UE processing time? |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Not sure what is the intention of P12, we can have multiple ways to achieve power saving, but in most cases they are not mutually exclusive. |
| Samsung | We support P12 more than P9.  We don’t support p13 since we think there will have some impact on latency, at least for initial access. But we wonder, is P13 for relaxed UE processing capability or for cross-slot scheduling? |
| OPPO | Support P13 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | FFS |
| SONY3 | Neither to be captured.  P12: agree with the vivo comment. Isn’t P12 a fairly obvious statement?  P13: not sure we agree that cross-slot scheduling has no real impact on latency and scheduling. If PDCCH in slot ‘n’ schedules PDSCH in slot ‘n + 1’, then hasn’t the latency increased by 1 slot compared to same-slot scheduling? |
| Ericsson | Support P12. |
| Sierra Wireless | Do not support P13 for reasons Sony mentioned. |
| FUTUREWEI\* | P13 is OK, the point was that cross-slot scheduling is also related to processing time so can analyse it. Will anyway be considered in the power saving. |
| CATT | We support P12. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support P12. |
| Intel | We agree with Vivo – P12 is not a clear observation; certainly there can be other PS features, that does not seem like a relevant observation at all. |
| FL5 | Only a few responses expressed support for including P12 or P13. |

### 7.5.4 Analysis of coexistence with legacy Ues

Some contributions [1, 5, 17, 21] observe that there can be potential coexistence issues with legacy Ues during initial access/random access if a new, more relaxed UE processing time capability is introduced. For example, there exist the timing requirement for scheduling of Msg3 which depends on N1 and N2 values of UE processing time capability #1. If gNB schedules according to legacy Ues, RedCap Ues with relaxed N1/N2, if supported, may not be able to access the cell. On the other hand, if gNB considers potential presence of Ues with relaxed processing time in a cell, it would schedule according to the worst-case timing which would degrade the performance of legacy Ues. Contribution [3] notes that multiple timelines can be very complicated to specify and handle to ensure coexistence with legacy Ues.

In order to support relaxed UE processing time capability during initial access, contributions [5, 12, 21] mention that methods for identifying RedCap Ues, e.g., before Msg3 scheduling may need to be studied.

These identified issues are listed below.

* C1: makes scheduler more complex [1, 5, 17, 21]
* C2: complicated to specify and handle to ensure coexistence with legacy Ues [3]
* C3: identification of RedCap Ues before Msg3 may be needed [5, 12, 21]

**Q 7.5.4-1: Is the list of identified coexistence issues to study for relaxed UE processing time in terms of N1/N2 correct and complete? If not, what changes to the list are needed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | OK |
| Ericsson | Yes |
| Sierra Wireless | Yes |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Y |
| vivo | We agree that C3 would need to be discussed if lower processing capability UE is introduced. |
| Samsung | OK. |
| OPPO | Y |
| CMCC | Yes |
| TIM | Coexistence analysis is of utmost importance and simulation results may also be beneficial. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |
| Sequans | Yes |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |
| Intel | Yes to C1 and C3. Do not agree to C2 in general.  Also, this statement is misleading “On the other hand, if gNB considers potential presence of Ues with relaxed processing time in a cell, it would schedule according to the worst-case timing which would degrade the performance of legacy Ues.” By this logic, Cap #2 is a useless feature as long as there is a single Cap #1-only UE in the system. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |
| MediaTek | Y |
| Qualcomm | Yes |
| CATT | Y |
| DOCOMO | Y |
| LG | Yes |
|  |  |

**Q 7.5.4-2: Which of the identified coexistence issues in the list above (C1, C2, C3) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for relaxed UE processing time in terms of N1/N2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | C1 |
| FUTUREWEI | Should include C1 and C2. C3 may be ok, FFS. |
| Ericsson | C1-C3 |
| Sierra Wireless | C1, C2, C3 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | C1, C3 |
| vivo | C3 |
| Samsung | C1, C3 |
| OPPO | C3 |
| CMCC | C1,C3 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | all |
| Sequans | C1-C3 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | C1, C3 |
| Intel | C1, C3 |
| Nokia, NSB | C1, C2, C3 |
| MediaTek | C1,C2,C3 |
| Qualcomm | C1, C3. FFS C2. |
| CATT | C1, C3 |
| DOCOMO | C1, C3 |
| LG | C3 |
|  |  |

Based on the responses in this section, the following can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL3 | For relaxed UE processing time, the following coexistence impact should be captured in the TR according to at least half of the 18 responses to Q 7.5.4-2.   * C1: Makes scheduler more complex * C3: Identification of RedCap UEs before Msg3 may be needed   Proposal 7.5.4-1:   * For relaxed UE processing time, at least the following coexistence impacts can be captured in the TR.   + C1: Makes scheduler more complex   + C3: Identification of RedCap UEs before Msg3 may be needed |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | C1 maybe true but gNB should already be able to handle the case when both Cap#1 and Cap#2 UEs exist in an cell, this is not a new situation.  C3 is dependent on the detailed discussion on how UE processing timeline is relaxed, one possibility is that UE operates Cap#1 timeline during initial access since the amount of data to be processed during the initial access is small. Even though we allow the UE to relax processing timeline already during initial access, network can use a slower scheduling timeline for all the UEs so that no need for early identification. |
| Samsung | OK. |
| OPPO | ok |
| Qualcomm | Agree |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok with C1 with adding a “May” |
| SONY3 | We don’t see C1 as a coexistence issue |
| Ericsson | Support capturing only C1 |
| Sierra Wireless | We agree with the proposal |
| FUTUREWEI\* | C1 is a coex issue, handling multiple processing makes scheduler more complex.  Not sure yet with C3, prefer to think about it more. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal. |
| LG | We are OK with the proposal. |
| FL5 | Only one or two responses expressed concerns with C1 or C3. One response proposed to add “may” in C1.  Proposal 7.5.4-1-v2:   * For relaxed UE processing time, at least the following coexistence impacts can be captured in the TR in the next meeting.   + C1: May make scheduler more complex   + C3: Identification of RedCap UEs before Msg3 may be needed |

### 7.5.5 Analysis of specification impacts

Contributions [1, 2, 3, 6, 17, 20] mention the specification impact of defining a new relaxed UE processing time capability and new values of N1/N2. Contributions [3, 8] note that the standardization effort can be high as it requires inputs and agreement from all UE manufacturers.

Other potential impacts on scheduling timing related to the existing default TDRA tables and HARQ-ACK timing range are mentioned by contributions [5, 17, 19]. On the other hand, contribution [1] notes that no specification impacts on scheduling timing and HARQ-ACK timing are expected unless the relaxation of N1/N2 values is too excessive.

These identified impacts are listed below.

* S1: definition of relaxed UE processing time capability and N1/N2 values [1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 17, 20]
* S2: scheduling time related to default TDRA tables and HARQ-ACK timing range [5, 17, 19]

**Q 7.5.5-1: Is the list of identified specification impacts to study for relaxed UE processing time in terms of N1/N2 correct and complete? If not, what changes to the list are needed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | There are likely other impacts that these related to coexistence and handling multiple timelines |
| Ericsson | In addition, some timing aspects during the random access procedure may need to be clarified. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Y |
| vivo | We think S1 is more important. Regarding S2, we do not expect the relaxation of N1/N2 would require additional value range for K1/K2 as the existing value range is already wide enough. |
| Samsung | Some of the above list needs to be further discussed.  We suggest to identify the issue first and then categorize the solutions for the issues. Some solutions can be combined |
| OPPO | Y |
| CMCC | Y |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A bit early to conclude but open to discuss. |
| TIM | Similar view as HUAWEI. Ran4 impacts to be considered too. |
| Sequans | Yes |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |
| MediaTek | FFS |
| Qualcomm | Yes |
| CATT | Y |
| LG | Perhaps, S1 will be enough. We think Scheduling/HARQ-ACK timing offset in the current specification is already large enough. |

**Q 7.5.5-2: Which of the identified specification impacts in the list above (S1, S2) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875 for relaxed UE processing time in terms of N1/N2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | S1 |
| FUTUREWEI | S1. S2 (FFS). |
| Ericsson | S1  Regarding S2, TDRA values in the specs can already accommodate relaxed N1/N2. |
| Spreadtrum | S1, S2 |
| ZTE,Sanechips | S1 |
| vivo | S1 |
| Samsung | S1 |
| OPPO | S1 |
| CMCC | S1,S2 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Open to further discuss. |
| Sequans | S1, FFS S2 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | S1, S2. |
| Intel | S1. |
| Nokia, NSB | S1 |
| MediaTek | FFS |
| Qualcomm | S1. FFS S2 |
| CATT | S1 |
| LG | S1 |

## 7.6 Relaxed UE processing capability

### 7.6.1 Description of feature

In RAN1#101-e, consensus could not be reached whether relaxed UE processing capability should be studied and which techniques to study. Several techniques are discussed and proposed again. The main discussions are mostly on restricting the maximum modulation orders, the maximum number of MIMO layers, TB sizes and reducing the maximum number of HARQ processes.

***General***

A few contributions [1, 17] indicate that after bandwidth and antenna reductions, significant cost saving gains would not be expected via other complexity reduction techniques. One contribution [3] notes there will only be little benefit in cost/complexity reduction for reduced TBS or HARQ after bandwidth reduction and modulation order restriction. Another contribution [17] further indicates studies on the four techniques for complexity reduction are not necessary.

Contributions [1, 8, 17] indicate cost saving from bandwidth reduction and antenna reductions should not be double counted in cost saving by restricting the maximum TB sizes and the maximum number of MIMO layers.

A few contributions [13, 19, 27] indicates peak rate impacts due to different TDD patterns.

One contribution [27] proposes to agree on whether peak rates less than 150MHz DL and 50MHz UL can be considered. One contribution [5] states that the maximum modulation order and the maximum number of MIMO layers should be specified based on the requirements of peak data rate.

***Maximum modulation order and maximum number of MIMO layers***

Many contributions [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 20, 23, 27, 29, 30] indicate reducing restricted modulation order can provide complexity reduction or can be studied. One contribution [3] further notes that the gains from restricting the maximum modulation order would accumulate over the multiple RF bands typically present in a device, in contrast to the other baseband-oriented techniques.

Several contributions [1, 3, 5, 11, 12, 16, 20, 23, 27, 30] also indicate MIMO reductions can be studied.

One contribution [3] further indicates only either restricting the maximum number of MIMO layers or modulation order should be studied, while another contribution [23] notes that both techniques should be studied together to understand the trade-offs between both techniques.

***Restricting the TB sizes***

A few contributions [1, 3, 17, 18] indicate that TBS in NR are calculation based and would be reduced significantly after reduction in bandwidth, antenna and modulation order. Therefore, it is not necessary to study restricting the maximum TB sizes.

Some contributions [2, 12, 16, 23, 29, 30] however indicates TBS reduction can be studied.

***Reducing the maximum number of HARQ processes***

A few contributions [1, 2, 3, 17] indicate soft buffer size saving via reducing the number of HARQ processes are insignificant or the gain is unclear as the HARQ process partition is up to UE implementation in NR. Furthermore, a few contributions [1, 2, 8] argue that reducing the number of HARQ processes will impact sustainable peak rates and the number of HARQ processes should not be reduced for RedCap devices.

One contribution [8] indicate it can be beneficial to cap the maximum soft channel bits without reducing the maximum number of HARQ processes.

Some contributions [4, 11, 16, 20, 29, 30] note that reducing the number of HARQ processes is beneficial for low cost devices and can be studied.

***Other techniques***

Two contributions [12, 27] indicate maximum number of DL CC could be limited and one contribution [27] notes that at least intra-band carrier aggregation shall be studied. One contribution [19] indicate UL MIMO, UL CA or SUL can be studied to achieve higher peak data rate. Contribution [2, 27] note that SUL can be studied to achieve larger coverage and UL CA shall not be supported. One contribution [27] notes that CA/SUL shall be considered together with the maximum BW study. However, contribution [29] highlights certain issues with SUL.

Some other contributions [4, 23, 29] indicate support of carrier aggregation are not required or restricted for RedCap devices or shall be single carrier support only.

A few contributions [5, 12, 16, 27, 29, 30] further indicate other techniques listed below can be studied:

* OFDM as an optional waveform for RedCap devices [12, 30]
* Simplification of CSI measurements/feedback [5, 27, 29]
* Simplified beam management framework [27, 29]
* Simplified BWP switching delay [16]
* Reduced HARQ ACK/NACK bundling [29]
* Reduced PDCCH monitoring capability (i.e. relaxed maximum number of BDs and/or CCEs) [16, 27, 29]
* Reducing the number of PRBs allocated for PDSCH/PUSCH [29] [20]
* Restricting the maximum code rate [29]
* Simplified TA validation for stationary or low-mobility UE [29]
* Simplified RLM/RRM measurements [29]
* Simplified BWP operation [12]
* No support of simultaneous reception [12]
* No support of prioritization of dynamically scheduled PDSCH/PUSCH over SPS/CG PUSCH occasions respectively [12]
* PDSCH reception with receiver side puncturing on configured reserved resources [12]
* Reduced number of CSI-RS antenna ports and number of parallel CSI report processing compared to Rel-15 [12]
* No dynamic indication of TCI state for PDCCH and PDSCH [12]

**Q 7.6.1-1: What, if any, modulation scheme restrictions should be considered?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Either none, or optional 256QAM in DL and 64QAM in UL for FR1 |
| SONY | Max modulation = 64QAM. Modulation scheme restrictions are not a priority item for us. |
| Ericsson | FR1& FR2: Both UL and DL restricted to QPSK, 16QAM, and 64QAM  Further restriction to QPSK and 16QAM in FR2 might be considered. |
| Sierra Wireless | Can consider reducing modulation scheme to 64QAM DL and 16QAM UL for FR1 |
| DOCOMO | As the complexity reduction by modulation scheme restriction is not significant while the impact on performance is not negligible, we don’t think modulation scheme restriction is prioritized. |
| InterDigital | 64 QAM can be considered as max. modulation for FR1. For FR2, further restriction to max. 16 QAM can be considered. |
| Spreadtrum | 256QAM should be optional for DL. 64QAM should be optional for UL. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | DL : only 16QAM and 64QAM; UL: 16QAM |
| Sharp | Maximum 64QAM for DL and UL. |
| Panasonic | FR1 DL: Up to 64QAM  FR1 UL: Up to 16QAM  FR2 DL: Up to 64QAM. Up to QPSK or 16QAM can be considered.  FR2 UL: Up to QPSK. Only BPSK can also be considered. |
| Vivo | 256QAM in DL and 64QAM in UL should be optional for Redcap Ues. |
| Samsung | Based on the analysis, there is no need to restrict the modulation scheme. |
| LG | 64QAM for high-end wearables and 16QAM for low-end devices (sensors, surveillance camera, low-end wearables etc.). The restrictions can be defined per device type, if supported. |
| OPPO | 256QAM in DL and 64QAM in UL should be optional for Redcap Ues. |
| CMCC | 256QAM in DL and 64QAM in UL to achieve peak data rate in TDD. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Max 64QAM for both UL and DL for FR1. |
| Sequans | No strong view |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For FR1, 64QAM for both DL and UL  For FR2, 64QAM for DL, 16QAM for UL |
| Intel | FR1& FR2: Both UL and DL restricted to QPSK, 16QAM, and 64QAM |
| Nokia, NSB | 64-QAM for the DL, 16-QAM for the UL |
| MediaTek | None. 256qam/64qam DL/UL can improve efficiency and are necessary for throughput in high-end scenarios. |
| Qualcomm | For FR1, 64QAM on DL/UL.  FFS: for FR2, 16-QAM or 64-QAM on DL/UL |
| CATT | 64QAM for DL/UL in FR1 |
| FL | Most of the responses want to consider restricting the FR1 DL modulation to max 64QAM. Almost half of the responses want to consider restricting the FR1 UL modulation to 16QAM. Most of the responses did not mention FR2, but those who did mention FR2 expressed an interest in considering restriction of the modulation to 16QAM in DL and/or UL. A few responses do not want to consider any restriction of the modulation.  Proposal 7.6.1-1a:   * For FR1 DL, study restriction of modulation scheme to max 64QAM.   Proposal 7.6.1-1b:   * For FR1 UL, study restriction of modulation scheme to max 16QAM.   Proposal 7.6.1-1c:   * For FR2 DL, study restriction of modulation scheme to max 16QAM.   Proposal 7.6.1-1d:   * For FR2 UL, study restriction of modulation scheme to max 16QAM. |
| FUTUREWEI | We do not expect that the RedCap devices will not be allowed to optionally support whatever modulation. So these proposals should be rewritten to indicate e.g, that the maximum mandatory modulation is changed from 256QAM to 64QAM.  Overall, the processing capability needs to be accepted in a package. We prefer only one technique, but can accept modulation and MIMO as long as the ones with less support are clearly decided not to be studied. |
| Qualcomm | We have a concern about “Proposal 7.6.1-1c” (FR2 DL). We think it is too early to converge on 16QAM as the maximum modulation order, without any analysis. We propose to keep this feature open, and further study both 16QAM and 64QAM as the maximum modulation order.  Proposals 7.6.1-1a and 1b look good to us. |
| MediaTek | We don’t see a restriction on the modulation is priority compared to the other complexity reduction features. |
| Spreadtrum | We share the same view with FUTUREWEI that the maximum mandatory modulation is changed from 256QAM to 64QAM, i.e. 256QAM is optional for DL and 64QAM is optional for UL. |
| Samsung | We don’t see much gain from modulation order restriction. If this is for study purpose, we’d like to open the modulation schemes to for both 64QAM, 16QAM. |
| LG | We are okay with FL proposal. Even if we don’t see a clear motivation for supporting 64QAM for FR2 when the combination of larger SCS and wider bandwidth can already provide larger peak data rate compared to FR1, we can live with QC’s proposal as well. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We prefer to keep proposal 7.6.1-1c (FR2 DL) open for both 16QAM and 64QAM. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Almost all above (after FL) companies consider the cost reduction from modulation is marginal. While for FR1, UL 64QAM is important to improve UL spectrum efficiency.  Proposal:   * For FR1 DL, the restriction of modulation scheme is max 64QAM. * For FR1 UL, the restriction of modulation scheme is max 64QAM.   No strong view on FR2. We don’t see practical use of RedCap on FR2. |
| CATT | For FR1, we shall the similar view with Huawei that UL 64QAM should be supported. For FR2, we prefer to study both 16QAM and 64QAM. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with 7.6.1-1a, 7.6.1-1b, 7.6.1-1d.  For 7.6.1-1c, we prefer to keep 64QAM option open. |
| SONY | We are OK with the proposals. The proposals talk about “studying” restriction of modulation. We think it is preferable to talk about “study” rather than saying what a mandatory feature of a Redcap UE is.  I.e. we are happy with the proposals verbatim. |
| Sequans | We also believe that decisions on processing capability relaxation have to be accepted in a package. If we move to shortlisting of techniques for progressing further with investigations, we prefer MIMO layer restrictions. But if modulation is also chosen to be further studied, we are fine with this proposal. We can live with both Qualcomm’s and Huawei’s suggestions. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| FL2 | One received response expressed that the decisions on the proposals on relaxed UE processing capability are taken together in order to endure that the total amount of techniques to be studied is kept low.  These versions of the proposals are slightly rephrased compared to the earlier versions of the proposals in line with one of the received responses. The proposals concern study of the impacts from not requiring the UE to support the currently maximum mandatory modulation scheme.  Proposal 7.6.1-1a-v2:   * For FR1 DL, study relaxation of maximum mandatory modulation to 64QAM.   Proposal 7.6.1-1b-v2:   * For FR1 UL, study relaxation of maximum mandatory modulation to 16QAM.   Proposal 7.6.1-1c-v2:   * For FR2 DL, study relaxation of maximum mandatory modulation to 16QAM.   Proposal 7.6.1-1d-v2:   * For FR2 UL, study relaxation of maximum mandatory modulation to 16QAM. |
| FUTUREWEI | Thanks to reformulate. We can accept these, but also see the points of Huawei and Qualcomm so ok not to relax so much other than FR1 DL. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t think it is reasonable to preclude UL 64QAM for FR1. If the aim is to keep study then UL 64QAM should be kept as well, given the SID requires to study cost reduction techniques considering network spectrum efficiency. So far no evidential benefits shown for cost reduction from 64QAM to 16QAM while we consider the SE would be reduced. |
| Sierra Wireless | We agree with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | As previously discussed, we’d like to keep 64QAM for FR2 DL. However, we are fine to study 16QAM. |
| Qualcomm | We have the same concern as before regarding FR2 DL. We think it is too early to converge on 16QAM as the maximum modulation order. We propose to keep this feature open, and further study both 16QAM and 64QAM as the maximum modulation order for FR2 DL. |
| FL3 | In response to some of the comments, Proposals 7.6.1-1a-v2 to Proposal 7.6.1-1d-v2 are not intended to preclude e.g. UL 64QAM for FR1 or DL 64QAM in FR2. The proposal is to study what the potential cost reductions and other impacts might be if the UE is not required to support the highest modulation. Based on the results of the study, RAN1 can decide whether to recommend it or not. If not, then the default is that the RedCap UE supports the same modulations as a normal NR UE. |
| vivo | Fine in principle. We are open to consider 64QAM in DL for FR2. |
| Samsung | We are OK to study relax modulation order. And we think it is better to clarify in the proposal on FL3’s comment, e.g.,  Proposal 7.6.1-1c-v2:   * For FR2 DL, study relaxation of maximum mandatory modulation to 16QAM or 64QAM. |
| Panasonic | Support the proposals v2 as is. Relaxation to max 16QAM on FR2 DL can be studied. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposals. |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. We are open to consider 64QAM in DL for FR2. |
| Qualcomm | We think it is necessary to include “DL 64QAM is not excluded for FR2” in Proposal 7.6.1-1c-v2. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal FL2 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Understand FL intention now, but there is a risk that no conclusion to recommend restriction to UL 16QAM then also no output to justify any recommendation for UL 64QAM. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| FL4 | The proposals have been updated to clarify that the current maximum mandatory modulation is 256QAM for FR1 DL and 64QAM for all other cases (according to TS 36.306). Again, I would like to clarify that these proposals only concern study of potential relaxation of the maximum mandatory modulation. Keeping the current maximum mandatory modulation is the default, so it does not need to be explicitly mentioned in the proposals.  Proposal 7.6.1-1a-v3:   * For FR1 DL, study relaxation of maximum mandatory modulation to 64QAM instead of 256QAM.   Proposal 7.6.1-1b-v3:   * For FR1 UL, study relaxation of maximum mandatory modulation to 16QAM instead of 64QAM.   Proposal 7.6.1-1c-v3:   * For FR2 DL, study relaxation of maximum mandatory modulation to 16QAM instead of 64QAM.   Proposal 7.6.1-1d-v3:   * For FR2 UL, study relaxation of maximum mandatory modulation to 16QAM instead of 64QAM. |
|  |  |

**Q 7.6.1-2: What, if any, MIMO layer restrictions should be considered?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Either none, or single layer in a 2RX RedCap UE |
| SONY | Max MIMO layers = number of antennas. |
| Ericsson | 1 or 2 MIMO layers in DL might be considered |
| Sierra Wireless | None. |
| DOCOMO | We think MIMO layer restriction resulting from reduced number of Tx/Rx is sufficient. |
| InterDigital | 1 or 2 layers. |
| Spreadtrum | Only up to 2 MIMO layers can be supported. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | 1 or 2 layer depending on UE capability |
| Sharp | One or two MIMO layers can be considered. At least two layers is necessary to meet the 150M peak data rate for FR1 if the maximum modulation scheme is limited to 64QAM. |
| Panasonic | Up to 2 MIMO layers for FR1 DL, 1 MIMO layer for FR1 UL and FR2 |
| vivo | We think MIMO layer restriction can be supported for 2Rx capable RedCap Ues. |
| Samsung | No need to further restrict MIMO layer if the number of antenna is reduced. |
| LG | Two layers for high-end wearables and one layer for low-end devices (sensors, surveillance camera, low-end wearables etc.). The restrictions can be defined per device type, if supported. |
| OPPO | 1 or 2 layer depending on UE capability |
| CMCC | Yes, 2 layers for 2Rx RedCap Ues |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 2 for DL and 1 for UL.  Should clarify that MIMO-layers may be more about a baseband capability that reflects chipset design, while with 2-layers in BB, 1Rx can be implemented. Whether to support 1Rx is not equivalent to whether to agree on single MIMO layer from hardware perspective. |
| Sequans | 1 or 2 MIMO layers |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 1 or 2 MIMO layer in DL with 2Rx antennas. |
| Intel | 1 MIMO layer as baseline.  FFS: 2 MIMO layers as optional capability. |
| Nokia, NSB | 1 or 2 layers, depending on number of Rx antennas |
| MediaTek | 2 for DL and 1 for UL. Agree with Huawei’s point that “Whether to support 1Rx is not equivalent to whether to agree on single MIMO layer from hardware perspective.” |
| Qualcomm | UL: single MIMO layer only.  DL:  • Single MIMO layer in FDD bands of FR1.  • Single MIMO layer for RedCap UE with device size limitation.  • One or two MIMO layers for RedCap UE with 2 RX antennas. |
| CATT | FFS 1 or 2 MIMO layers |
| FL | Most of the responses express an interest in considering 1 or 2 MIMO layers in DL for both FR1 and FR2.  Proposal 7.6.1-2:   * Restriction to 1 or 2 MIMO layers in DL can be studied. |
| FUTUREWEI | We prefer only modulation or this, given the responses we would then prefer only the modulation and not this or any other.  Overall, the processing capability needs to be accepted in a package. We prefer only one technique, but can accept modulation and MIMO as long as the ones with less support are clearly decided not to be studied. |
| MediaTek | We don’t see it essential to have a limit on the MIMO layers beyond the restriction that coming from the #Rx antennas. |
| Xiaomi | Before we get conclusion on the number of Rx, it is too early to discussion the number of MIMO layer. |
| OPPO | We share same view with other companies we shall discuss Rx antenna reduction first. |
| LG | We are okay with this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with this proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not Ok with the proposal.  For UL, single MIMO layer for UL for FR1 seems to be a consensus.  For DL, as clarified from hardware point of view the BB MIMO layers are not the same issue as the Rx. To avoid market segmentation the suggested proposal is  Proposal:   * Restriction is max 2 MIMO layers in baseband in DL for FR1. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the proposal |
| SONY | We like the way the proposal talks about “study” and we do not want to talk about what the Redcap UE is restricted to at this stage. i.e. we do not support the update from HW/HiSi |
| Sequans | Fine with this proposal to progress with further study on the two options. |
| Intel | We support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| FL2 | One received response expressed that the decisions on the proposals on relaxed UE processing capability are taken together in order to endure that the total amount of techniques to be studied is kept low.  Proposal 7.6.1-2:   * Restriction to 1 or 2 MIMO layers in DL can be studied. |
| FUTUREWEI | OK with this and modulation if the next two proposals are also agreed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We could accept the FL proposal as it is for study. Seeing company’s preference we feel worthwhile clarifying again that the number of baseband MIMO layer is different from the number of Rx in RF front-end. For example a 2-MIMO layer in BB can be implemented with 1 Rx antenna. Although the 1Rx can be achieved with single MIMO layer in BB as well, the single layer BB will essentially lead to a different chipset design, which is not really cost-reduced due to loss of economies of scale. |
| Sierra Wireless | We feel reducing from 2 to 1 MIMO will NOT have a large cost reduction impact for UEs with 2 Rx antenna devices, thus we are not supportive of this proposal. But since this proposal is only to “Study” and if there is a clear majority to support it, then we can accept this proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with this proposal |
| Qualcomm | FL2 proposal looks good to us. |
| Intel | Fine with the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We don’t think this really needed if we focus on antenna reduction first. But OK for it as part of study. |
| Panasonic | Fine with the proposal. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with the proposal |
| Xiaomi | From the perspective of user terminal, we still think in the real scenario, the number of MIMO layer depends on the number of Rx. So, we think it is too early to touch this issue before we get the conclusion on the number of Rx |
| Sequans | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL4 | The following (unchanged) proposal can be considered.  Proposal 7.6.1-2:   * Restriction to 1 or 2 MIMO layers in DL can be studied. |
|  |  |

**Q 7.6.1-3: Should any explicit TBS restrictions be considered beyond the implicit TBS restrictions resulting from reduced UE bandwidth and reduced number of antennas?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | No |
| SONY | Yes. We would like to consider a fixed max TBS (rather than one worked out through equations). However, we think that some of the complexity reduction techniques will lead to a TBS that is less than the “fixed max TBS” in any case. |
| Ericsson | No |
| Sierra Wireless | No |
| DOCOMO | Not necessary to consider explicit TBS restriction. That resulting from reduced UE BW and reduced number of Tx/Rx is sufficient. |
| InterDigital | No. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Cam be low priority |
| Sharp | No. Implicit TBS restriction is sufficient. |
| Panasonic | No need to study it. On the other hand, in work item phase, the discussion to introduce new scaling factor should not be precluded. |
| Vivo | No strong view. |
| Samsung | No. |
| LG | No. |
| OPPO | Can be considered |
| CMCC | No |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N |
| Sequans | Can be considered, as second priority after MIMO layer restriction considerations |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No |
| Intel | TBS reduction (on top of BW, modulation order, # of MIMO layers) can be beneficial for Ues with low data rate requirements since 20 MHz and 64QAM already leads to rather large TB sizes compared to peak rate requirements for some of the identified RedCap use-cases. Such TBS reduction could be defined as optional feature instead of baseline. |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes, for low-end RedCap UE type if such type is defined |
| MediaTek | Could be considered for 100 MHz BW option in FR2. |
| Qualcomm | No |
| CATT | N |
| FL | Most of the responses express that explicit TBS restriction beyond the implicit TBS restrictions resulting from reduced UE bandwidth and reduced number of antennas should not be studied.  Proposal 7.6.1-3:   * No TBS restriction is considered beyond the implicit TBS restrictions resulting from reduced UE bandwidth, reduced number of antennas and reduced number of MIMO layers. |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| MediaTek | Support |
| LG | We are okay with this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with this proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As clarified, the number of Rx antennas is not exactly equivalent to the number of MIMO layers, so we propose to change the ‘and’ to ‘/’ at this moment:   * No TBS restriction is considered beyond the implicit TBS restrictions resulting from reduced UE bandwidth, reduced number of antennas/reduced number of MIMO layers. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | While we would like to study TBS restriction for low-end type, we see that the majority view is not to study TBS restriction.  So while we don’t agree with the proposal, we can accept the majority view. |
| SONY | Same view as Nokia / NSB |
| Sequans | Prefer to down-prioritize modulation order and HARQ processes instead, but we can live with this one if majority agrees. |
| Intel | There are many cases (low data rate requirements) and those in FR2 that clearly do not need the peak rates based on the “implicit limitation”. Such devices would now need to be significantly over-designed with respect to their QoS requirements. Thus, while it may be fine to not consider additional restrictions for the baseline study, we suggest to still consider UE optionality in having additional restriction. Thus, suggest to modify as:   * No TBS restriction is considered beyond the implicit TBS restrictions resulting from reduced UE bandwidth, reduced number of antennas and reduced number of MIMO layers for baseline complexity analysis.   + Optional support of reduced max TBS can be considered further |
| InterDigital | We are ok with the proposal. |
| FL2 | Compared to the earlier version of the proposal, “reduced number of antennas” has been removed from the sentence in line with one of the received responses. Furthermore, the words “in this SI” were inserted as to not preclude that TBS restriction is considered in the future in some other SI/WI.  Proposal 7.6.1-3-v2:   * No TBS restriction is considered in this SI beyond the implicit TBS restrictions resulting from reduced UE bandwidth or reduced number of MIMO layers. |
| FUTUREWEI | OK |
| Sierra Wireless | We agree with the proposal |
| Qualcomm | FL2 proposal looks good to us. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal |
| Samsung | OK for FL2 |
| Panasonic | Fine with the proposal v2. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal v2. |
| Ericsson | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL4 | The following (unchanged) proposal can be considered.  Proposal 7.6.1-3-v2:   * No TBS restriction is considered in this SI beyond the implicit TBS restrictions resulting from reduced UE bandwidth or reduced number of MIMO layers. |
|  |  |

**Q 7.6.1-4: What, if any, HARQ restrictions should be considered?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | None |
| SONY | Number of HARQ processes should not be reduced. Can consider reduction of soft buffer sizes. |
| Ericsson | No |
| DOCOMO | As the complexity reduction by HARQ restriction is not significant while the impact on performance is not negligible, we don’t think any HARQ restriction is necessary. |
| InterDigital | None. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | No |
| Sharp | No |
| Panasonic | No |
| vivo | We think RedCap UEs should be allowed to support less HARQ processes. |
| Samsung | If this is UE implementation, no need to reduce the HARQ process number. If supported, 8 HARQ processes can be considered. |
| LG | No. |
| OPPO | NO |
| CMCC | No |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N |
| Sequans | We think no, but not strong view. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No |
| Nokia, NSB | N |
| MediaTek | None |
| Qualcomm | Reduced number of HARQ processes with relaxation on HARQ RTT. |
| CATT | N |
| FL | All responses except for two express that no HARQ restrictions should be considered.  Proposal 7.6.1-4:   * No HARQ restrictions are considered further in the study. |
| Qualcomm | We cannot accept the proposal of FL.  In the Tdocs submitted to RAN1#102, more than two companies showed the cost saving resulted from reduced number of HARQ processes. A few companies also mentioned the impacts of HARQ process restriction on scheduler are negligible/minor. Furthermore, the HARQ buffer is also modelled in the cost break down suggested by the FL, which provides a reference for further study.  Considering LTE Cat4 and Cat1 UEs provide the performance bounds for RedCap devices, we think it is necessary to study the HARQ process restriction for RedCap device, to determine the gain/loss of reducing the max number of HARQ processes to 8 or less, especially in TDD and HD-FDD modes. |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Based on the detailed values for the reference NR devices adjusted by FL in section 6.1, we evaluated the cost reduction of HARQ restriction again. When the number of HARQ processes is reduced from 16 to 8, the cost can be reduced by nearly 6%.  We still think HARQ restrictions are considerable, but we can accept this proposal for progress. |
| OPPO | OK |
| LG | We are okay with this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with this proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |
| CAT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the proposal |
| Sequans | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | Agree. |
| FL2 | All responses except for two express that no HARQ restrictions should be considered.  Proposal 7.6.1-4:   * No HARQ restrictions are considered further in the study. |
| FUTUREWEI | OK |
| Sierra Wireless | We agree with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the proposal |
| Qualcomm | We don’t agree with the proposal.  As indicated by the FL2 proposal of cost break down, HARQ buffer is more than 10% of the BB block of the reference UE. Reducing the HARQ buffer size has more significant impacts than other solutions under discussion. Reducing the max number of HARQ processes helps with HARQ buffer size reduction, and it is a common solution desirable for RedCap UE, which should not be left to UE implementation.  Due to the reduced BW and MIMO layer, the DL peak data rate of RedCap UE is significantly lower than that of the NR reference UE. It is not necessary for RedCap UE to support the same max number of HARQ processes as premium UE.  Therefore, we think it is necessary to study the reduced number of HARQ processes. As a compromise, we can support the following alternative proposal:   * HARQ buffer size reduction is considered for RedCap UE. |
| Intel | Fine with the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal |
| vivo | We agree with Qualcomm, HARQ reduction is beneficial for RedCap UEs. |
| Samsung | ok |
| Panasonic | Fine with the proposal |
| LG | We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL4 | Based on the responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  Proposal 7.6.1-4-v2:   * Reduced number of HARQ processes is not considered further in the study. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t agree with FL4 proposal, due to the considerations mentioned above. As a compromise, we can agree on the following proposal:  *Alternative for Proposal 7.6.1-4-v2:*  *• HARQ buffer size reduction is considered for the study of RedCap UE in NR Rel-17.* |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Similar view with QC. Also we are not sure the baseline type RedCap UE needs to have the same number of HARQ as legacy UEs. |

**Q 7.6.1-5: Among all the items mentioned under the heading of “Other techniques”, which ones (if any) should be considered?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | None |
| Ericsson | None |
| Sierra Wireless | None |
| Spreadtrum | Reducing the number of PRBs allocated for PDSCH/PUSCH. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | None |
| Samsung | None |
| CMCC | UL MIMO, UL CA or SUL can be studied to achieve higher peak data rate in TDD. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N |
| Sequans | CSI measurements/feedback simplification. We think that the measurement procedures and CSI feedback may have significant share in the complexity on the BBIC side and worth some further study.  Also CA/SUL (at least intra-band) |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | None |
| Intel | At least the following should be considered further:   * DL intra-band CA should be considered as an optional capability targeting high DL peak rate requirements. * Simplification of CSI measurements/feedback |
| Nokia, NSB | None |
| MediaTek | None |
| Qualcomm | We think the following techniques can be further studied: simplified beam management framework, simplified BWP switching with reduced delay, simplified BFR/BFD/RLM/RRM measurements. |
| CATT | None |
| DOCOMO | None |
| LG | None |
| Huawei, HiSilicon02 | Ok with Qualcomm suggestion. |
| FL3 | There does not seem to be much support for studying other techniques for relaxed UE processing capability beside the ones mentioned in the earlier proposals in this section. Twelve responses express that they do not want any other techniques to be studied. Other proposals are mentioned by 1-2 companies each. |
| Spreadtrum | In our evaluation, reducing the number of PRBs allocated for PDSCH/PUSCH is beneficial to cost reduction. It is better to be open for other techniques for relaxed UE processing capability for benefits, e.g. cost reduction, in SI stage. We suggest leaving it open for further study. |
| Qualcomm | Beam management has major implementation impact especially for FR2, and we think it should be studied as part of complexity reduction.  Also, procedures like BFR/BFD/RLM/RRM may take advantage of the stationary condition of the UE and may also be either simplified or customised to RedCap use cases and we think they should be studied.  BWP switching is very time consuming in NR, and if active BW is reduced, some sort of hopping may be needed and a study of reducing the impact of BWP switching may be needed. |

### 7.6.2 Analysis of UE complexity reduction

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Techniques** | **Impacted components** | **Cost saving** |
| Reduced maximum number of MIMO layers | Baseband:  FFT/IFFT [17, 30]  Post-FFT data buffering [30]  Receiver processing block [1, 17, 20, 30]  LDPC decoding [1, 5, 17, 20]  HARQ buffer [1, 17, 20]  Synchronization / cell search block [17, 30]  MIMO specific processing blocks: [1, 5, 17]  DMRS channel estimation [5]  Demodulation with less MIMO layers [5]  No layer de-mapping [5] | Form 2 -> 1 MIMO layer, 4 -> 2MIMO layers  Source 1 [1]: marginal total cost saving  Source 2 [17]: 14% ~21% of complexity reduction  Source 3 [20]: 18.9% total cost saving  Source 5 [30]: 22% baseband cost saving  From 4 -> 1 MMIO layer:  Source 1 [1]: medium to significant total gain.  Source 2 [17]: ~26.3% of gain complexity reduction  Source 3 [20]: 28.35% total cost saving |
| Restricted maximum modulation order | RF components:  PA: [1, 6, 17, 20]  RF transceiver [1, 17, 20]  Baseband components:  ADC: [1, 6]  Post-FFT data buffering: [1]  LDCP decoding: [6, 30]  HARQ buffer: [6]  UL processing block: [6] | 256QAM->64QAM:  Source 1 [1]: 0-5% RF cost saving gain and 3-4% baseband cost saving gain  xQAM -> yQAM:  Source 2 [17]: ~1% total cost saving  Source 3 [20]: 9.6% total cost saving  Source 5 [30]: 5% baseband cost saving  256QAM->64QAM in DL and 64QAM->16QAM in UL  Source 4 [6]: 6% total cost saving |
| Reduced number of HARQ process | Baseband components:  HARQ buffer: [1, 17, 20, 30]  UL processing block: [20] | Source 2 [17]: unclear UE implementation  16 -> 8 HARQ processes  Source 1 [1]: ~3-4.5% total cost saving or less due to UE implementation and possibly dynamic buffer sharing  16->4 HARQ processes  Source 3 [20]: 13.95% total cost saving  Source 5 [30]: 6% baseband cost saving |
| Restricted max TBS | Baseband:  LDPC decoding [1, 6, 17, 20, 30]  HARQ buffer [1, 6, 17, 20, 30]  UL processing block [1, 6, 17, 20, 30]  DL processing block [30] | Reducing Max TBS by 10-fold for both UL and DL:  Source 1 [1]: ~90% cost saving in LDPC decoding, HARQ buffer size and UL processing block.  Reducing Max TBS to 1/5 for both UL and DL:  Source 2 [17]: 10~15% total complexity gain but should not be double counted if BW is reduced.  Reducing Max TBS from 10000 bits in DL to 1000 bits and 5000 bits in UL to 1000 bits  Source 5 [30]: up to 16% in DL and 5% in UL total cost saving (based on 36.888)  Reducing maximum TBS by reducing BW from 100 MHz -> 5 MHz  Source 3 [20]: 22.8% total cost saving  Reducing maximum TBS by reducing BW from 100 MHz -> 20 MHz  Source 3 [20]: 19.2% total cost saving  150 Mbps DL -> 10 Mbps DL and 50 Mbps UL-> 5 Mbps UL  Source 4 [6]: 13% total cost saving |

### 7.6.3 Analysis of performance impacts

Contributions [1, 5, 6, 17, 30] analyze the performance impact if the reduced maximum number of MIMO layers, restricted maximum modulation order, restricted maximum TB sizes or reduced maximum number of HARQ processes is introduced for RedCap UEs. The findings are listed below.

***Reduced maximum number of MIMO layers***

* Data rates:
  + P1.1: Reduced maximum data rates [1, 5]
* Coverage:
  + P1.2: No coverage impacts [17, 30]
* Cell spectrum efficiency:
  + P1.3: Reduced cell spectrum efficiency [17]
* Power consumption:
  + P1.4: Power consumption of higher data rate seems larger than that of lower data rate [20]

***Restricted maximum modulation order***

* Data rates:
  + P2.1: Reduced maximum data rates [1, 5]
* Coverage:
  + P2.2: No coverage impacts [17, 30]
* Cell spectrum efficiency:
  + P2.3: Reduced cell spectrum efficiency [6, 17]
* Power consumption:
  + P2.4: Power consumption of higher data rate seems larger than that of lower data rate [20]
  + P2.5: Small reduction in power consumption [6]

***Restricted maximum TB sizes***

* Data rates:
  + P3.1: Reduced maximum data rates [1, 17]
* Coverage:
  + P3.2: Reduced / limited impact on coverage due to loss of channel coding gain [6, 17]
  + P3.3: No coverage impacts [30]
* Cell spectrum efficiency:
  + P3.4: Reduced / limited impact on spectral efficiency due to loss of channel coding gain [6, 17]
* Power consumption:
  + P3.5: Increase slightly for a UE with good SNR due to longer Tx/Rx times [6]

***Reduced maximum number of HARQ processes***

* Data rates:
  + P4.1: Sustainable data rates may not be achieved [1]
* Coverage:
  + P4.2: No coverage impacts [30]

**Q 7.6.3-1: Does the list (P1.1, P1.2, …, P4.2) above capture the most important performance impacts that need to be considered for reduced maximum number of MIMO layers, restricted maximum modulation orders, restricted TB sizes and reduced maximum number of HARQ processes? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | TBD after agree what to study |
| Ericsson | TBD, depending on the exact scope |
| Sierra Wireless | Yes |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Yes |
| Panasonic | Yes |
| vivo | ***Reduced maximum number of MIMO layers :*** fine with all points  ***Restricted maximum modulation order:*** fine with all points  ***Restricted maximum TB sizes:*** fine with all points  ***Reduced maximum number of HARQ processes:*** P4.1 is conditional and related to HARQ turn-around time, P4.2 is fine |
| Samsung | To align whether to add coverage analysis with other features.  Some of the above list needs to be further discussed. |
| OPPO | ***Yes*** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |
| TIM | Tend to share Ericsson view. |
| Sequans | Yes |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | TBD |
| Intel | FFS |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |
| Qualcomm | TBD |
| CATT | Y |

**Q 7.4.3-2: Which of the identified performance impacts in the list above (P1.1, P1.2, …, P4.2) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | P1.1, P2.2 |
| FUTUREWEI | TBD after agree what to study |
| Ericsson | TBD, depending on the exact scope |
| Sierra Wireless | P1.1, P1.2, P1.3, P2.1, P2.2, P2.3, P3.1, P3.5, |
| Spreadtrum | TBD. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | P1.x and P2.x |
| Panasonic | P1.1, P1.3, P2.1, P2.3 |
| vivo | The same comment as above |
| Example | P1.1, P2.2 |
| OPPO | P1/P2/P3 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | P1.1, P1.3;  P2.1, P2.3;  P4.1 |
| TIM | Same as above |
| Sequans | FFS |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | TBD |
| Intel | FFS |
| Nokia, NSB | TBD |
| Qualcomm | TBD |
| CATT | P1.1, P1.3, P2.1, P2.3 |

### 7.6.4 Analysis of coexistence with legacy UEs

Five contributions [1, 6, 17, 20, 30] provide coexistence analysis on restricting the maximum modulation orders, the maximum number of MIMO layers, the maximum modulation orders, the TB sizes or reducing the maximum number of HARQ process. Two contributions [1, 17] explicitly indicate there will be no coexistence issues if the four techniques are employed for RedCap UEs. Hence, the identified issues are:

* C1: No identified issues

**Q 7.6.4-1: Does the list above (C1) capture the most important coexistence impacts that need to be considered for reduced maximum number of MIMO layers, restricted maximum modulation orders, restricted TB sizes and reduced maximum number of HARQ processes? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | TBD after agree what to study |
| Ericsson | TBD, depending on the exact scope |
| Sierra Wireless | Yes |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Yes |
| Panasonic | Yes |
| vivo | OK |
| Samsung | Maybe not.  Further discussion on whether restricted TB will impact on Msg 4 and potentially TB for SIB/paging, might need to further discussed. It will depends on the max TB size. |
| OPPO | Yes |
| CMCC | Yes |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The reduced data rate and SE will effectively result in reduced total available resources for legacy UEs, due to reduction of max MIMO layers, modulation orders. |
| TIM | Coexistence analysis of utmost importance after defining exact scope |
| Sequans | Yes |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | TBD |
| Intel | FFS |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |
| Qualcomm | TBD |
| CATT | Yes |

**Q 7.6.4-2: Shall the identified coexistence impacts in the list above (C1) be captured in TR 38.875?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | TBD after agree what to study |
| Ericsson | TBD, depending on the exact scope |
| Sierra Wireless | Yes |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Yes |
| Panasonic | Yes |
| vivo | OK |
| Samsung | See the common above |
| OPPO | Yes |
| CMCC | Yes |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A bit early to conclude. |
| Sequans | FFS |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | TBD |
| Intel | FFS |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |
| Qualcomm | TBD |
| CATT | Yes |

### 7.6.5 Analysis of specification impacts

Contributions [1, 6, 17, 20, 30] indicate that there may be limited specification impacts. Identified specification impacts are listed below:

* S1: DCI optimization [6]
  + due to restricted maximum modulation order
* S2: optimized CQI table
  + due to restricted maximum modulation order [1, 5]
  + due to restricted maximum TBS [1]
* S3: optimized MCS table
  + due to restricted maximum modulation order [1, 5]
  + due to restricted maximum TBS [1]
* S4: UE capability indication to notify the network of UE’s reduced capabilities
  + due to reduced maximum number of HARQ processes, restricted maximum modulation order, maximum number of MIMO layers, TB sizes [1, 20]
* S6: RAN4 demodulation requirements
  + due to reduced maximum number of HARQ processes [1]

One contribution [30] further indicates that restricting the maximum TBS and reducing the maximum number of HARQ processes have least or smaller specification impact compared to other techniques.

**Q 7.6.5-1: Does the list above (S1, S2, …, S6) capture the most important specifications impacts that need to be considered for reduced maximum number of MIMO layers, restricted maximum modulation orders, restricted TB sizes and reduced maximum number of HARQ processes? If not, what other aspects need to be added?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | N | TBD after agree what to study. Likely none of these included, as L1 changes should be minimized, and reuse of existing DCI/CQI/MCS etc is possible. |
| Ericsson | N | TBD, depending on the exact scope |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | N | Plus reducing the number of PRBs allocated for PDSCH/PUSCH |
| ZTE,Sanechips | N | Seems there are impacts missing , for example RAN4 CSI performance requirements due to optimized CQI table |
| vivo |  | The list is fine. S1/2/3 are optimizations thus not critical. S4 and S6 should be addressed by the spec. |
| Samsung |  | Some of the above list needs to be further discussed. |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | TBD.  Overall, for capturing specification impact, our suggestion is to clarify the scope and strictly follow that. Once one impact is confirmed then we capture that. Debate on a conclusion like “no other spec impact than the above identified” at this stage is not necessary. |
| TIM |  | Share E/// view. |
| Sequans | FFS |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | N | TBD, with low priority. |
| Intel |  | TBD, given currently unclear scope |
| Nokia, NSB | TBD |  |
| Qualcomm | N | TBD |
| CATT | TBD |  |

**Q 7.6.5-2: Which of the identified specification impacts in the list above (S1, S2, …, S6) are the most critical ones to be captured in TR 38.875?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Example | S1, S2 |
| FUTUREWEI | TBD after agree what to study. Likely none. |
| Ericsson | TBD, depending on the exact scope |
| Sierra Wireless | S4 |
| Spreadtrum | S4. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | S1,S2,S3, S4, S6 |
| vivo | S4, S6 |
| OPPO | S1/3/4/6 |
| CMCC | S2,S3,S4 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | None at this moment. |
| TIM | Share E/// VIEWS |
| Sequans | FFS |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | TBD |
| Intel | TBD, given currently unclear scope |
| Nokia, NSB | TBD |
| Qualcomm | At least S4 |
| CATT | TBD |

# References

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [1] | [R1-2005234](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005234.zip) | Potential UE complexity reduction features for RedCap | Ericsson |
| [2] | [R1-2005269](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005269.zip) | Potential UE complexity reduction features | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [3] | [R1-2005277](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005277.zip) | Complexity reduction features for RedCap UEs | FUTUREWEI |
| [4] | [R1-2005383](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005383.zip) | Discussion on complexity reduction for Reduced Capability NR devices | vivo, Guangdong Genius |
| [5] | [R1-2005474](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005474.zip) | Potential UE complexity reduction features | ZTE |
| [6] | [R1-2005525](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005525.zip) | UE complexity reduction features | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |
| [7] | [R1-2005580](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005580.zip) | On potential complexity reduction techniques for NR devices | Sony |
| [8] | [R1-2005637](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005637.zip) | On complexity reduction features for NR RedCap UEs | MediaTek Inc. |
| [9] | [R1-2005714](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005714.zip) | Discussion on potential UE complexity reduction features | CATT |
| [10] | [R1-2005770](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005770.zip) | Potential UE complexity reduction features | TCL Communication Ltd. |
| [11] | [R1-2005830](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005830.zip) | On UE complexity reduction features for RedCap | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |
| [12] | [R1-2005880](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005880.zip) | On complexity reduction for RedCap UEs | Intel Corporation |
| [13] | [R1-2005937](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005937.zip) | Reduced Capability UE Complexity Reduction Features | Sierra Wireless, S.A. |
| [14] | [R1-2005959](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005959.zip) | Rel-16 UE power saving features for RedCap | NEC |
| [15] | [R1-2005968](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005968.zip) | Discussion on the complexity reduction for reduced capability device | Beijing Xiaomi Software Tech |
| [16] | [R1-2006036](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006036.zip) | Discussion on UE complexity reduction | OPPO |
| [17] | [R1-2007031](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2007031.zip) | UE complexity reduction | Samsung |
| [18] | [R1-2006196](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006196.zip) | Discussion on potential UE complexity reduction features | Panasonic Corporation |
| [19] | [R1-2006217](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006217.zip) | Discussion on potential UE complexity reduction features | CMCC |
| [20] | [R1-2006272](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006272.zip) | Discussion on potential UE complexity reduction features | Spreadtrum Communications |
| [21] | [R1-2006306](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006306.zip) | Discussion on potential UE complexity reduction features | LG Electronics |
| [22] | [R1-2006524](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006524.zip) | UE Complexity Reduction Features for RedCap | Apple |
| [23] | [R1-2006538](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006538.zip) | Complexity reduction features for reduced capability NR devices | InterDigital, Inc. |
| [24] | [R1-2006542](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006542.zip) | On impacts of UE bandwidth reduction | Quectel |
| [25] | [R1-2006576](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006576.zip) | Discussion on Potential UE complexity reduction features | Sharp |
| [26] | [R1-2006644](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006644.zip) | Discussion on potential UE complexity reduction features | Asia Pacific Telecom co. Ltd |
| [27] | [R1-2006682](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006682.zip) | Complexity reduction features for RedCap UE | Sequans Communications |
| [28] | [R1-2006733](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006733.zip) | Discussion on potential UE complexity reduction features for RedCap | NTT DOCOMO, INC. |
| [29] | [R1-2006811](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006811.zip) | Complexity Reduction for RedCap Devices | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| [30] | [R1-2006988](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006988.zip) | UE Complexity Reduction Features for RedCap | Apple |
| [31] | [R1-2006039](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006039.zip) | Consideration on reduced UE capability | OPPO |
| [32] | [R1-2006155](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006155.zip) | Framework and Principles for Reduced Capability | Samsung |
| [33] | [R1-2006686](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2006686.zip) | Framework and principles for RedCap UE | Sequans Communications |
| [34] | [R1-2005934](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005934.zip) | Aspects related to bandwidth reduction | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |
| [35] | [R1-2005960](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_102-e/Docs/R1-2005960.zip) | CBW for RedCap | NEC |

1. **depends on cost breakdown for each baseband part** [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
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