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# Introduction

This paper summarizes the contributions submitted to A.I 8.6.3 (Study on Support of Reduced Capability NR Devices: coverage recovery and capacity impact).

The paper is organized as following. In section 2, the evaluation methodology for coverage recovery and capacity impact is summarized, including the target for coverage recovery, link and system level evaluation assumption. Section 3 summarizes potential techniques for coverage recovery, which are expected to be discussed in the following meeting but some of them can also be discussed in this meeting upon the evaluation methodology issues are concluded.

In this section, a set of questions are proposed for discussion. These questions are highlighted with different colors representing different priorities. According to the online discussion, we have different schedules for different priorities.

* [H]: high priority aiming at the discussion/approval on 8/20
  + May be controversial or have impact on other discussion
* [M]: Medium priority aiming at the discussion/approval on 8/26
  + Important for simulation but have isolated impact to other topics.
* [L]: For last check on 8/28
  + Less controversial.

# Evaluation methodology

## Coverage recovery target

Many contributions discuss the coverage recovery target for reduced capability NR devices [3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 29, 30]. Some contributions propose to discuss and decide the target of coverage recovery before studying various candidate techniques for coverage recovery [12, 20]. Some contributions also propose to align the coverage target with the Rel-17 coverage enhancement SI considering that a NW will support both RedCap and eMBB UEs with a same deployment [19].

In general, there are two approaches that could be considered for the coverage recovery due to the device complexity reduction. The first alternative is to consider compensating the coverage loss in each channel of the RedCap UE caused by UE complexity capability reduction. Another alternative is to enhance only the bottleneck channel(s) of the RedCap UE to reach a same target performance as the reference NR UE.

The objective in the SI is to only compensate for potential coverage loss due to UE complexity reduction. However, some companies think it is unnecessary to enhance the coverage of all the channels affected by UE complexity reduction. If the second alternative is adopted, it is required to understand the impact of complexity reduction on the coverage and identify the bottleneck channels for RedCap UEs based on link budget evaluation.

Based on the above summary, a possible way forward is to agree the target of coverage recovery to recover the coverage of bottleneck channel(s) and further discuss the target performance for coverage recovery.

**Question 1: Should the target of coverage recovery be aimed to compensate the coverage loss for the bottleneck channels(s) of the RedCap UE to achieve the same target performance as the reference NR UE?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes, we should identify the bottleneck channel(s) and try to improve the coverage performance targeting same/similar performance as reference NR UE. This target is applicable to most of the PHY channels. But for data channels, PDSCH/PUSCH, the cell-edge target data rate is likely to be lower than normal UEs, which should be discussed separately. |
| Xiaomi | NO, if we go with compensating the bottleneck channels which can’t satisfy certain coverage requirement, that may go beyond the scope of the Redcap SI. For example, some bottleneck channels may not be resulted by the complexity reduction. In Rel-18, we could further consider compensate the bottleneck channel by using solutions identified by the coverage enhancement project |
| Futurewei | Yes and No. Yes, we should look at bottleneck channels and not all channels, as compensating for every degradation goes beyond the Redcap SI. No because we may not need to exactly match a reference NR UE, as “typical” network deployments may have MCL targets different than the stress point of the bottleneck channel. So, reference deployment rather than UE in Question 1. |
| SONY | Coverage recovery should be targeted at restoring the coverage of channels to the coverage they had before a complexity reduction technique. While bottleneck channels are the most important, other channels should also be considered for coverage recovery. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Yes.  To be clear, we are compensate the coverage loss as result of redcap cost/complexity reduction. The key for this is to find the target MCL. The following two alternatives can be used to find the target   1. Find the limiting channel of legacy NR via link budget, then for each redcap’s channel’s MCL , compare with the target mcl to find the recovery value   Find the target MCL based on redcap’s requirement for each deployment scenario and compare that to find out the recovery value |
| Ericsson | Yes. The bottleneck channels are determined based on assessing both DL and UL coverage performance. In general, achieving the same target performance as the reference NR UE is a good goal to have. However, we would like to understand the tradeoff between a small coverage loss (e.g. 1-2 dB) versus UE complexity/cost reduction. |
| Panasonic | Yes |
| Convida | We prefer to compensate the coverage loss in each channel of the RedCap UE caused by UE complexity capability reduction rather than just compensate the coverage loss for the bottleneck channel(s). This is more aligned with SID. |
| Samsung | While the bottleneck channel(s) for coverage can be affected by the complexity reduction techniques, the coverage recovery should focus on improving the performance loss due to the complexity reduction schemes rather than the imbalance between different channels.  Besides, for data channel, the target data rate should be decided first. |
| InterDigital | We prefer to compensate the loss in coverage of all channels impacted by complexity reduction. |
| OPPO | The coverage loss in each channel due to the device complexity reduction should be compensated targeting similar performance as reference NR UE. This is the objective of RedCap SI. However, the coverage recovery of bottleneck channels could be prioritized. The other channels could be treated as second priority. |
| DOCOMO | Yes |
| Sharp | At least same coverage with reference NR UE should be guaranteed for all channels. Then if guaranteed, bottle neck channels should be prioritized for the recovery. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Prefer to compensate the coverage loss for all channels, if the coverage is impacted by complexity reduction. |
| Qualcomm | According to the SID, the objective of the coverage recovery is to only compensate for potential coverage loss due to UE complexity reduction. Therefore, all the downlink and uplink channels affected by complexity reduction should be considered and compensated for the potential coverage loss resulting from reduced UE capability. For the second alternative, we have some concerns on the determination of the bottleneck channel(s) since it is highly dependent on the scenarios and the target performance. If we cannot reach any agreement, it would be straightforward to compensate the coverage loss in each channel of the RedCap UE. |
| Sequans | The target of coverage recovery should be aimed on channels impacted by shortlisted complexity reduction techniques. Bottleneck channel(s) should be prioritized. |
| CMCC | For the second alternative, the methodology is first distinguish the bottleneck channel for reference UE as the target coverage, and then compare each channel for RedCap UE which can not satisfy the target coverage of reference UE. But the target coverage of reference UE may be different in different deployment scenarios, e.g., different carrier frequency, different TDD frame structure, and the gap(s) between bottleneck channel(s) of RedCap UE and target coverage of reference UE even the bottleneck channels may also be different in different deployment scenarios. For the first alternative, it is simpler to distinguish which channels need coverage recovery and the target enhancement dB.  Therefore, to accelerate the discussion of this issue, the first alternative is better. The second alternative can reflect the real deployment of network but is more complicated and need more work effort. |
| LG | Yes. To support stable performance for target scenarios, it should be aimed to focus on the performance of the bottleneck channel(s) |

**Question 2: Should the target performance for coverage recovery be based on the link budget of the bottleneck channel for the reference NR UE?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | It should be based on the bottleneck channel(s) identified for RedCap UEs. |
| Xiaomi | NO. We think this way just postpone solving the problem to the future release.  The final target is to achieve the same coverage with the normal NR UE. In rel-17, coverage enhancement project aims to compensate the bottleneck channel (e.g., PUCCH, PUSCH) of reference NR UE. In future release, Redcap could reuse the solutions identified in coverage enhancement project to improve the same bottleneck channel of Redcap (e.g., PUCCH, PUSCH). But it is highly possible that other additional solutions to improve the coverage of other channels such as PDSCH, PDCCH is still needed in. |
| Futurewei | The target should be to introduce RedCap UEs in typical NR networks. As such a reasonable deployment may be defined and within the deployment a target performance for Redcap UEs may be identified such as target MCLs and target data rates (may start with the CE rates) |
| SONY | After coverage recovery, the link budget for each channel of the Redcap UE should be the same as the link budget for the reference NR UE. While the link budget of the bottleneck channel is most important, the link budgets of the other channels should also be considered for coverage recovery. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | We would like to prioritize the link budget of the bottleneck channel.  Then for some special scenario, for example CORESET0, even if it is not the limiting channel, because of its importance, if the coverage reduction is severe, it may still need some recovery. This is because to enable acceptable decoding rate, the eNB may have to configure higher AL level for redcap, this will have impact on the capacity. This will also limit the use case of redcap UE to high AL level such as AL=16. Therefore there is a need for coverage recovery for such channels. |
| Ericsson | Yes |
| Panasonic | Yes |
| Samsung | For the channel(s) affected by complexity reduction schemes, the target performance for coverage recovery can be further discussed considering the link budget of such channels for the reference NR UE. In addition, regarding the reference NR UE, it should be clarified whether the reference NR UE is Rel-16 UE without CE or Rel-17 UE with CE. |
| InterDigital | We share similar views as Sony and ZTE. |
| OPPO | Yes. The coverage loss of channels due to the device complexity reduction should be identified based on link budget evaluation. |
| DOCOMO | Yes, target for the coverage recovery of the RedCap UE is to achieve the same link budget performance of bottleneck channel for the reference NR UE. |
| Sharp | Yes |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Prefer to have similar coverage performance with reference UEs. |
| Qualcomm | We are okay to determine the target performance based on the bottleneck channels of the reference UE. Considering both RedCap and eMBB UEs are in a same deployment, the cell coverage is determined by the reference UE with basic NR features. Therefore, it is reasonable to set the target performance for RedCap to be same as the worst channel of the reference UE. |
| Sequans | We agree with Samsung’s view. In addition, for the discussion on the performance for coverage recovery, we think that bottleneck channel(s) could be prioritized. |
| CMCC | Yes. In addition, we think the target performance is using target MCL, target MPL or target hardware link budget should also be discussed. |
| LG | Yes. Link budget should be used to investigate target coverage |

## Link level coverage evaluation

The simulation assumptions and performance metrics for coverage evaluations have been discussed in last RAN1 meeting with the following agreements.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:  If/when coverage evaluations outside the CE SI are needed,   * The basic evaluation methodology is based on link-level simulation for FR1.   ­       Step 1: Obtain the required SINR for the physical channels under target scenarios and service/reliability requirements.  ­       Step 2: Obtain the baseline performance based on required SINR and link budget template.  ­       Note: aspects related to identifying target performance and coverage bottlenecks based on target performance metric is to be handled separately   * The evaluation methodology for FR2 is the same as FR1. |

Agreements:

If/when link-level coverage evaluations outside the CE SI are needed,

* The CE SI link-level simulation assumptions can be used as a starting point
* For calibration purposes, the following settings can be used:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **FR1 values** | **FR2 values** |
| Scenario and frequency | Urban:  2.6 GHz (TDD) (primary choice)  4 GHz (TDD) (secondary choice)  Rural:  700 MHz (FDD) | Indoor: 28 GHz (TDD) |
| Frame structure for TDD | For 2.6 GHz:  DDDDDDDSUU (S: 6D:4G:4U)  For 4 GHz:  DDDSUDDSUU (S: 10D:2G:2U) | DDDSU (S: 10D:2G:2U) |
| Channel model | TDL-C | TDL-A |
| UE velocity | 3 km/h | 3 km/h |

***Scenario and frequency for coverage evaluation***

Based on contributions, many companies have submitted the coverage evaluation results for three different scenarios:

* FR1, Rural with the carrier frequency of 0.7 GHz
* FR1, Urban with the carrier frequency of 2.6 GHz
* FR2, Indoor with the carrier frequency of 28 GHz

Some companies also submitted the evaluation results for 4GHz Uban scenario [4, 6], which was agreed to be a second choice according to the RAN1-101e agreements for the RedCap study. One company proposed to consider also some FDD bands, e.g. 2GHz and 700MHz for Urban scenario [4], although they are not included in the Rel-17 coverage enhancement SI. Considering majority view is to align the evaluation assumption with the Rel-17 CE SI to reduce the simulation effort, the FL proposal is not to consider any additional scenario and frequency for link level coverage evaluation for the RedCap study.

**Question 3: Should the link level coverage evaluation for the RedCap study consider only the scenario and frequency agreed in the RAN1-101e?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | The scenarios and frequency agreed in RAN1-101e should be considered as baseline.  Besides, although 4GHz frequency has lower priority than 2.6GHz to reduce simulation effort, if some additional coverage issues are identified in 4GHz in addition to 2.6GHz (e.g. more channels become the bottleneck), they should also be discussed. |
| Xiaomi | Yes. Considering the limited left time, it is better to focus on the scenario and frequency agreed in the last meeting. |
| Futurewei | Yes that should be sufficient |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Yes. At least these should be prioritized and further addition should be based on the TU available. |
| Ericsson | Yes |
| Panasonic | To consider only the scenario and frequency agreed in the RAN1-101e can be sufficient. |
| Samsung | Yes. |
| InterDigital | Yes. |
| OPPO | Yes, we are fine with the agreed scenarios and frequency. |
| DOCOMO | Agree with vivo. The scenario and frequency agreed in the RAN1-101e should be the baseline, while 4 GHz carrier frequency can be further considered. |
| Sharp | Yes. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |
| Qualcomm | Yes. We think the scenario and frequency agreed in the RAN1-101e are sufficient for RedCap coverage evaluation. There is no need to consider any additional scenario. |
| Sequans | Yes |
| CMCC | Yes |
| LG | Yes |

***Physical channels, signals and messages***

The concerned channels, signals and messages for link level coverage evaluation will determine the limiting channels for coverage recovery. Based on preliminary results submitted by the companies, there are quite different views. Some contributions indicate that PUSCH is coverage limited for most scenarios [4, 5, 6, 7, 19]. Some contributions also observed that broadcast PDSCH, i.e. PDSCH of Msg2 and Msg4 can be the limiting channels for some scenarios [3, 6, 7, 30]. Some contributions mentioned that RedCap techniques will affect DL coverage rather than UL coverage and propose to de-prioritize or not consider coverage compensation for NR UL channels [9, 11]. Several contributions propose to further discuss the need of evaluation for initial access related channels since the mechanism “*keep trying*” can be used to compensate the coverage loss [4, 10].

According to the agreements in RAN1-101e for the CE SI, the link level evaluation will include PRACH, PUCCH, PUSCH, Msg3 in the uplink and PDCCH, PDSCH, SSB, PDCCH of Msg2 and PDSCH of Msg4 in the downlink. Therefore, it is desirable to align with the CE SI to consider all the physical channels, signals and messages for the RedCap study.

**Question 4: For link level coverage evaluation, should the RedCap study include PUCCH, PUSCH, PDCCH and PDSCH? If not, what modifications are needed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes |
| Xiaomi | It highly depends on the target. Different target results in different impacted channels.  But we think considering the impact of Rx reduction, the evaluation should include PDCCH and PDSCH at least. |
| Futurewei | Depends on the particular scenario considered and also depends on what the Study group decides on Question 1 and 2. Our initial thinking is that the uplink channels are least impacted by the complexity reduction techniques and therefore the focus should be on the downlink channels. |
| SONY | No.  Complexity reduction schemes clearly affect the downlink. Hence PDCCH and PDSCH coverage needs to be studied. If complexity reduction schemes impacted the uplink, we would want to study PUCCH and PUSCH coverage, but we think that current Redcap proposals do not affect UL coverage, so there is no need to study PUSCH and PUCCH coverage. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Yes |
| Ericsson | Yes |
| Panasonic | Yes |
| Samsung | Yes. We think PUCCH/PUSCH/PDCCH/PDSCH are to be studied for RedCap. |
| InterDigital | Yes. |
| OPPO | Yes, at least PDCCH and PDSCH. |
| DOCOMO | Yes |
| Sharp | For coverage evaluation, these channels should be studied. Considering to reuse the techniques for coverage enhancement, PDCCH and PDSCH should be prioritized since the impact of complexity reduction (esp. Rx antenna number reduction) is larger than PUCCH and PUSCH. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |
| Qualcomm | Yes |
| Sequans | We think yes, but it also actually depends on evaluated effect of shortlisted complexity reduction techniques and what is finally decided for Q1/Q2. |
| CMCC | Yes |
| LG | Yes, we need to study both DL and UL channels to identify the bottleneck channel(s) |

**Question 5: For link level coverage evaluation, should the RedCap study include also the initial access related channels, i.e. PRACH, Msg3, SSB, SIB1, Msg2 and Msg4? If not, what modifications are needed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes |
| Xiaomi | It highly depends on the target. Different target results in different impacted channels.  But we think considering the impact of Rx reduction, the evaluation on Msg.2, Msg4, SIB1 and SSB can be included. |
| Futurewei | May focus on Msg2, Msg4 and Msg3. |
| SONY | Yes. The performance of SSB is expected to be impacted by reduction in the number of UE RX antennas and should be studied. SIB1, Msg2 and Msg4 are also expected to be impacted and should be studied. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | We’d like to prioritize Msg2,Msg3,Msg4 and PDCCH scheduling msg2/3/4. |
| Ericsson | Yes (our preliminary results show that Msg 2 and Msg 4 can be the coverage limiting channels) |
| Panasonic | The need of the evaluation for initial access related channels should depend on whether UE complexity reduction is applied to initial access channels. |
| Samsung | We think DL channels should be given priority because they can be affected by the complexity reduction solutions. On the other hand, for DL broadcast related channel, i.e., SSB, SIB 1 coverage is not an issue with relaxing on acquisition time by “keep trying”. There is no need to evaluate for these channels.  Also, if coverage of Msg 2/4 are agreed to be evaluated, the TBS need to be discussed and potentially reduced compared to NR UE, especially for Msg 4. |
| InterDigital | Yes. |
| OPPO | Yes |
| DOCOMO | Yes |
| Sharp | Yes. For SSB, it is not clear whether enough gain can be obtained by “keep trying” with the combination of multiple SSBs with different MIB (i.e. different SFN). |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |
| Qualcomm | Based on our preliminary evaluation results, broadcast PDCCH and PDSCH, e.g. msg2 and msg4 can be the bottleneck channel in some scenarios. This may be same for SIB1. Therefore, we prefer to consider also the initial access related channels such as broadcast PDCCH and PDSCH for RedCap coverage evaluation. |
| Sequans | We think yes, but it also actually depends on what is finally decided for Q1/Q2, on evaluated effect of shortlisted complexity reduction techniques and on assessment of the gain from “keep trying” for broadcast channels/messages coverage recovery. |
| CMCC | Yes |
| LG | Yes, PDCCH related to paging and RAR, and PDSCH related to Msg2 and Msg4 are affected by reduction in the number of Rx antennas and therefore should be included in the study. |

***Target data rate for coverage evaluation***

The evaluation methodology for PDSCH and PUSCH is based on obtaining the required SINR for which a target data rate is achieved. For control channels the methodology is based on obtaining the required SINR for which a target BLER is achieved.

For target data rates of PDSCH and PUSCH, one company [4] propose to consider the reference bitrate (e.g. 5Mbps for PDSCH and 2Mbps for PUSCH) given in the revised SID [2] in addition to the target data rates discussed in the Rel-17 CE SI. Some contributions [3, 7, 30] indicate the data rate for a physical channel of the RedCap should be adjusted lower to reflect the bandwidth constraint. It was proposed in [16] to define a limited number of target data rates considering the prioritized use cases for RedCap that need to be satisfied at the edge of coverage, e.g. 1Mbps for both DL and UL in Urban scenario.

Since the RedCap SI includes study of techniques such as reduced UE bandwidth, it seems reasonable to adjust the target data rates used in the CE SI to reflect the BW constraint.

**Question 6: For target data rates, can the RedCap study reuse the same assumption in the CE study? If not, what modifications are needed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | The reference data rate for RedCap UE is significantly lower than normal UEs, correspondingly, a lower target data rate should be assumed for RedCap UEs.  We suggest to consider 1Mbps in DL and 0.5Mbps in UL. |
| Xiaomi | Some modification is needed considering the BW reduction and the different traffic characteristics for Redcap. At least the target data rate should be set lower than that in the CE SI |
| Futurewei | OK with the CE defined target data rates. A modification for Redcap UE may be OK if it is a *single* target for all of FR1 and FR2. We are not OK with multiple different targets to be evaluated. |
| SONY | We are OK with the vivo proposal of studying 1Mbps in DL and 0.5Mbps in UL. We are also OK with scaling data rates according to UE bandwidth capability. We also have sympathy with the view expressed in [4], since the reference data rates are [supposedly] meant to indicate the application data rates (in which case there would be little point in supporting less than the application data rate). |
| ZTE,Sanechips | No. To be clear, the UL data rate may reuse the same assumption. However, the DL data is different since the bandwidth is different. Using CE’s assumption will cause very high MCS and make redcap coverage look incorrectly terrible. |
| Ericsson | Yes. And as said in the paragraph above the question, the target data rates used in the CE SI needs to be adjusted at least in the DL to reflect the BW constraint. In our view, the network coverage is driven by eMBB use cases, not by RedCap use cases. Thus, the data channels spectral efficiency achievable for RedCap is capped by that for eMBB. |
| Panasonic | It would be reasonable to adjust the target data rates used in the CE SI to reflect the potential BW constraint, MIMO layer reduction, and modulation order restriction. |
| Samsung | We think DL coverage is related to the occupied BW and then target bit rate for PDSCH for the RedCap should be reduced according to the reduced BW. However, for uplink, the same (or lower) target bit rate for PUSCH can be considered. |
| InterDigital | The target data rates need to be adjusted at least in the DL. |
| OPPO | The target data rate for RedCap UE is lower than that for normal UE. Some modification is needed in RedCap SI. |
| DOCOMO | We are OK to adjust the target data rates used in the CE SI to reflect the BW constraint |
| Sharp | In CE SI, for a PDSCH with 50 RBs (assuming FDD with 10 MHz DL with SCS = 15 kHz), 16QAM is required to meet the target data rate of 10 Mbps. We think it’s not realistic assumption for RedCap SI. Therefore, the reduced data rate such as 1 Mbps should be preferred for RedCap DL. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We also think target bit rate for both DL and UL could be reduced. |
| Qualcomm | As discussed in our paper, the reference bitrate given in the SID is a measure of median value across the entire cell thus not for cell edge UE. Therefore, the target data rates for RedCap coverage evaluation should be adjusted considering UE bandwidth reduction. One simple way is to scale the target data rates used in the CE SI by the reduced UE bandwidth. Also, we need to discuss whether to have a different (or additional) set of data rates for higher percentile users (e.g., median or cell center) since the 1Rx and low BW UEs at cell center still need to support the max tputs. |
| Sequans | Some modification is needed to adjust to reduced BW but single target may need to be considered for FR1/FR2 as mentioned by Futurewei. |
| CMCC | We are OK to adjust the target data rates according to the RedCap bandwidth which is smaller than the target data rates used in the CE SI. But the scaled target data rates for RedCap will not satisfy the reference bitrate, which may need further enhancement to improve the data rate. |
| LG | Due to the difference in characteristics of Redcap UEs, some modification on target data rate may be required |

***Other LLS parameters***

According to the agreements in RAN1-101e, the CE SI link-level simulation assumptions can be used as a starting point for the RedCap study. In the RAN1 NR e-mail reflector, a set of link-level simulation assumptions and parameters were proposed for calibration purpose, for which most of the parameters are same as the CE SI link-level assumption. Based on the companies’ contributions, it can be seen that the majority prefer to reuse the CE SI LLS assumptions and performance metrics as much as possible in order to avoid duplicate works. It is also discussed in some contributions [3, 4, 7, 16, 30] that some LLS assumptions agreed in the CE SI may not be suitable for RedCap, such as number of antennas, UE BW, and should be adjusted accordingly considering the reduced UE capability.

**Question 7: For the common LLS parameters, can the RedCap study adopt the CE agreement on the number of gNB TX and RX chains, channel model, delay spread and antenna correlation? If not, what modifications are needed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Vivo | Yes |
| Futurewei | yes |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Yes. Antenna configuration for gNB maybe reuse CE SI’s assumptions. For channel model we would like to use TDL model . |
| Ericsson | Yes, we are okay with the CE agreements on gNB antenna configuration, channel model and delay spread. In general, we should align with the CE assumptions wherever applicable.  Regarding antenna correlation, the CE SI agreements haven’t explicitly included antenna correlation assumption. Our preference is to consider low antenna correlation.  There are a few additional assumptions not explicitly covered in the CE agreements. The set of link-level simulation assumptions and parameters proposed in the RAN1 NR e-mail reflector can be adopted. ([link](https://list.etsi.org/scripts/wa.exe?A2=ind2007C&L=3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG1_NR&O=D&P=49341)) |
| Panasonic | The number of antennas and UE BW should be adapted. |
| Samsung | Yes. We can reuse CE agreement for the RedCap study. |
| InterDigital | Yes. |
| OPPO | Yes |
| DOCOMO | Yes |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |
| Qualcomm | Yes for FR1.  For FR2, we want to adding the following:   * CDL-A channel model for indoor * Outdoor scenario (3km/h) with TDL-C/CDL-C channel model |
| Sequans | Yes |
| CMCC | Yes. |
| LG | Yes, the antenna configuration of gNB and the channel models adopted in CE SI can be reused. |

**Question 8: For the channel specific LLS parameters other than target data rates, can the RedCap study reuse the link-level simulation assumptions adopted by the Rel-17 CE SI? If not, what modifications are needed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Vivo | Yes |
| Futurewei | Yes |
| ZTE,Sanechips | For antenna configuration for UE, redcap need to have its own configuration. For example, , since the data rate is different, MCS/PRBs number need to be updated. Also for UE speed, for rural scenario, it is 3km/h for redcap. |
| Ericsson | Yes |
| Panasonic | Yes |
| Samsung | Yes. We can reuse CE agreement for the RedCap study in general with some changes on occupied BW and number of UE Rx, TBS, MCS, and MIMO layer as needed. |
| InterDigital | Yes. |
| OPPO | Yes |
| DOCOMO | Yes |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |
| Qualcomm | Yes |
| Sequans | Yes, but may be needed to adjust BW, UE Rx antennas, TBS, MCS, MIMO layers accordingly to shortlisted complexity reduction techniques. |
| CMCC | Yes. |
| LG | Yes |

***Link Budget Template***

A reference link budget is needed to determine potential coverage loss resulting from complexity reduction. One company [3] proposed to use an adapted version of the IMT-2020 link budget template, and one company [30] proposed to consider the simplified template in TR 36.824 for the RedCap study. According to the offline discussion in last RAN1 meeting, it seems the majority want to align with the output of the CE SI on the link budget template, for which a down-selection is required in RAN1-102e according to the following agreement.

Agreement:

Down selection on the following options for the link budget template for FR1 in next meeting.

* Option 1: Adopt single link budget template based on IMT-2020 self-evaluation with necessary revisions, including adding/removing/revising some parameters.
* FFS: The template provided by FL in Tdoc [R1-2005005](file:///C:\Users\gokuls\AppData\Local\Docs\R1-2005005.zip).
* Option 2: Adopt both templates, i.e. link budget template in IMT-2020 self-evaluation and link budget template in TR 36.824.
* Option 3: Adopt single link budget template in TR 36.824 with necessary revisions, including adding/revising some parameters.

**Question 9: For link budget template, should the RedCap study reuse/align the link budget template with the CE SI? If not, what modifications are needed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes, we should align the link budget template. We prefer option 1. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer Option 1 |
| Futurewei | Prefer to see the arguments for and against before deciding on options |
| ZTE,Sanechips | We need to take a further look here since even for CE SI so far there is no consensus for these template. For redcap, we need to take into account the following two issues. 1. The power density of each DL channel should be same. 2. Antenna array gain should be reflected in the link budget, note we also need to evaluate if the array gain for all DL channel are same, and if we need to consider different equations. |
| Ericsson | Yes |
| Panasonic | Yes |
| Samsung | Yes. Although our preference is option 1, it can be aligned with the link budget template with the CE SI. |
| InterDigital | Yes. |
| OPPO | Option 1 is OK |
| DOCOMO | Yes, we should align with CE SI. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |
| Qualcomm | Yes. We are okay to reuse/align the link budget template with the CE SI. |
| Sequans | Yes, it is preferable to align with CE SI. |
| CMCC | Yes. We prefer Alt 1. |
| LG | Yes |

***Modelling of reduced antenna efficiency***

In the revised SID [2], the potential reduced antenna efficiency of wearables is identified as one issue for study. The extent of additional recovery loss due to reduced antenna efficiency is to be limited to 3dB. In the [6, 18], it was proposed that the reduced antenna efficiency for wearables can be modelled as part of the UE antenna gain for all uplink and downlink channels, and in the [9] it is indicated that the impact of reduced antenna efficiency can be compensated by increasing the PA power and keeping the radiated transmit power unchanged thus no impact on UL coverage.

**Question 10: For the impact of small form factor antenna on coverage, should the RedCap study consider the loss of antenna gain for all the uplink and downlink channels or only for the downlink channels?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Yes | This applies to all DL and UL channels. |
| Futurewei | Downlink only, FFS uplink |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Applies to both. |
| Ericsson | All UL and DL channels |
| Panasonic | Both uplink and downlink are considered. |
| Samsung | We think the loss of antenna gain for all channels should be considered for the RedCap study. The loss can be added into the link budget directly. |
| InterDigital | Both DL and UL channels. |
| OPPO | The loss of antenna gain is considered for all the DL and UL channels. |
| DOCOMO | This applies to all DL and UL channels |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Consider the small factor for all the uplink and downlink channels. |
| Qualcomm | We are okay to consider the impact of the reduced antenna efficiency for all the downlink and uplink channels. |
| Sequans | The loss of antenna gain for all the uplink and downlink channels should be considered. |
| CMCC | Both |
| LG | The impact of small form factor should be considered on both UL and DL channels |

## System level capacity evaluation

The revised SID in [2] requires also to study the impact to network capacity and spectral efficiency resulting from UE complexity reduction. In [3], the assumption for baseline system level evaluation was discussed based on an adapted version of assumptions from TR 38.802, Table A.2.1-1. In the [4], the preliminary results were provided with an observation of a loss of downlink SE from 30%-50% for RedCap. In the [18, 32], it was proposed to discuss and decide the percentage of RedCap UE for system level evaluation. In the [09], it was proposed to prioritize the impact of RedCap techniques on DL network capacity for wearable devices by considering both the impact of a single RedCap technique and a collection of multiple RedCap techniques.

**Question 11: For evaluating the impact of network capacity and spectrum efficiency, can the RedCap study use the assumption in TR 38.802, Table A.2.1-1 as the starting point?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | The assumptions in TR 38.802, Table A.2.1-1 can be considered as the starting point, it is beneficial to down-select the scenarios such that the results from different companies can be comparable, for example urban macro can be selected.  In addition to the above basic assumptions, we think the following are important and should be discussed and concluded before carrying on the evaluation (details in our paper R1-2005383 section 2.6)   * System parameters  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Parameters** | **FR1 values** | **FR2 values** | | Scenario and frequency | Urban:  2.6 GHz (TDD) (primary choice)  4 GHz (TDD) (secondary choice) | Indoor: 28 GHz (TDD) | | Frame structure for TDD | For 2.6 GHz:  DDDDDDDSUU (S: 6D:4G:4U)  For 4 GHz:  DDDSUDDSUU (S: 10D:2G:2U) | DDDSU (S: 10D:2G:2U) |  * 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), reuse the parameters from TR38.840  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | FTP traffic | Instant messaging | | Model | FTP model 3 | FTP model 3 | | Packet size | 0.5 Mbytes | 0.1 Mbytes | | Mean inter-arrival time | 200 ms | 2 sec | | DRX setting | Period = 160 ms  Inactivity timer = 100 ms | Period = 320 ms  Inactivity timer = 80 ms |  * Performance metrics:   + UPT to measure the performance impact to normal UEs   + Cell served throughput to measure the system capacity |
| ZTE,sanechips | We suggest deprioritize SLS for now. |
| Ericsson | Yes. The scenarios and frequency bands agreed for LLS might be reused for SLS. |
| Panasonic | Yes |
| Samsung | Yes. Traffic model and percentage of Redcap UE need to be clarified, as well as the total number of UE. |
| InterDigital | Yes. |
| OPPO | Yes |
| DOCOMO | Yes |
| Qualcomm | We are okay to use the evaluation assumption in TR38.802, Table A.2.1-1 as a starting point. Some parameters, such as ISD and EIRP may need to be further discussed. For example, for dense urban, an ISD of 100m may need to be added. Some other parameters, such as the ratio of RedCap UE and traffic model can be further discussed. |
| CMCC | Both |
| LG | Yes |

**Question 12: Can the system level evaluation focus on the downlink capacity and down-prioritization of the uplink capacity?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes |
| Xiaomi | Yes, downlink capacity should have higher priority. But UL capacity analysis should be encouraged as well. |
| Futurewei | Yes |
| ZTE,Sanechips | We suggest deprioritize SLS for now. |
| Ericsson | No, both DL and UL should be evaluated, considering reduced antenna efficiency has impact on both DL and UL performance. |
| Panasonic | Yes |
| Samsung | Yes. |
| InterDigital | Yes. |
| OPPO | Yes |
| DOCOMO | Yes in principle. DL capacity has high priority but UL capacity is not precluded. |
| Qualcomm | May be true for Rx reduction study. However, for others (e.g., BW reduction), discuss whether to study UL as well, since from the SID, 2 out of the 3 use cases (namely, industrial wireless sensors and video surveillance cameras) have UL heavy traffic models. |
| CMCC | Both |
| LG | We have similar view with ZTE. If needed, both DL and UL should be considered. |

# Potential techniques for coverage recovery

The section summarizes the potential techniques for coverage recovery based on all the contributions. This can be discussed once the coverage evaluation are concluded or in the next meeting. Note some contributions [5] indicate that the existing NR coverage recover techniques can be reused for RedCap, and therefore the solution not requiring specification change is also included here.

***SSB coverage recovery***

Based on companies’ contributions, two coverage recovery mechanisms have been proposed for SSB illustrated in the following table, including “keep-trying” and a shorter SSB period. It is a majority view that UE can compensate for potential coverage loss by combining SSB within a longer time interval when the requirement on system acquisition time is relaxed for the RedCap UE.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Coverage recovery mechanisms** | **Companies** |
| Keep-trying | Ericsson, Huawei, ZTE, ITL |
| Shorter SSB period, e.g. 5 or 10ms | MTK, Spreadtrum |

***PDCCH coverage recovery***

For PDCCH coverage recovery, there are a lot of proposals summarized in the following table, among which the techniques of the compact DCI and PDCCH repetition have got more supports than the others.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Coverage recovery mechanisms** | **Companies** |
| Reduce DCI size | Ericsson, Huawei, Sony, NEC, Intel, LGE, ITL, InterDigital, DCM, Sequans, WILUS (DCI size reduction by splitting), Convida |
| Increase largest aggregation level beyond 16 | Ericsson, ZTE, Xiaomi, Sharp, WILUS |
| Repetition | Ericsson, vivo, ZTE, Nokia, MTK, TCL, Lenovo, OPPO, Spreadtrum, LGE, ITL, InterDigital, Sequans, WILUS, QC, Convida, Sharp |
| Frequency hopping | Ericsson, ZTE, Sony, Lenovo, ITL, InterDigital, Convida |
| Longer duration CORESET | vivo, MTK, TCL, Lenovo, LGE |
| CORESET bundling | vivo |
| PDCCH link adaptation | Samsung |
| Multiplex RedCap and non-RedCap CORESET | Lenovo |
| DMRS enhancement | InterDigital, QC |

***PDSCH coverage recovery***

For PDSCH coverage recovery, there are more supports for studying repetition, frequency hopping and DMRS enhancement. For the other proposed solutions, there is only one or two supporters.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Coverage recovery mechanisms** | **Companies** |
| Frequency hopping across a larger BW | Ericsson, Huawei, ZTE, Sony, Xiaomi, Apple, Convida, DCM, QC |
| Repetition | Ericsson, vivo (support for broadcast PDSCH), ZTE, Nokia (larger number of repetitions), Intel (lager number of repetitions), Xiaomi, OPPO, Spreadtrum, ITL, Apple, Sequans, Futurewei, Convida, Sharp |
| DMRS enhancement | Huawei (overhead reduction), ZTE, Xiaomi, ITL (DMRS bundling), QC (DMRS bundling) |
| Lower MCS table 5.1.3.1-3 | FutureWei, Sequans, Convida |
| Time interleaving | Sony |
| TBS scaling for small data | NEC, QC |
| Inter-beam combining | CMCC |
| Beam refinement | QC |

***PRACH coverage recovery***

Similar to SSB, the coverage recovery for PRACH can be implementation specific by using “keep trying” mechanism or a longer PRACH preamble. One company also proposed to consider frequency hopping per one PRACH transmission instance to achieve frequency diversity gain.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Coverage recovery mechanisms** | **Companies** |
| Repeat random access attempts (keep trying) | Ericsson, ZTE, Lenovo (enhancement on the mapping), Convida |
| Use longer PRACH preambles | Ericsson |
| Frequency hopping | ITL |

***PUCCH coverage recovery***

For PUCCH coverage recovery, the majority view is to enhance the repetition scheme, e.g. using a larger number of repetitions. Several contributions also propose to enhance frequency hopping across a larger BW for PUCCH.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Coverage recovery mechanisms** | **Companies** |
| Use a longer format | Ericsson, ITL |
| Repetition | Ericsson, ZTE, Intel (lager number of repetitions), ITL, Apple, DCM (sub-slot based) |
| Frequency hopping | ZTE, ITL, DCM |
| Payload reduction (L1 measurement payload reduction) | Qualcomm |

***PUSCH coverage recovery***

For PUSCH coverage recovery, one company [vivo06] indicate the solutions for UL channels in the CE SI can be reused for RedCap to avoid the duplicate work. Two companies [Sony09] [MTK11] do not support compensating for the PUSCH coverage loss. For the proposed techniques for PUSCH coverage recovery, repetition and frequency hopping are supported by most of the companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Coverage recovery mechanisms** | **Companies** |
| Repetition | Ericsson, ZTE, OPPO, ITL, Apple, Convida |
| Frequency hopping across a larger BW | Ericsson, Huawei, ZTE, Nokia (larger number of repetitions), Intel (lager number of repetitions), ITL, Apple, DCM, QC, Convida |
| SUL | Huawei |
| DMRS enhancement | Huawei, ZTE, QC |
| Payload reduction (L1 measurement payload reduction) | QC |

Based on the above summary, the FL proposal is to further study the potential techniques for coverage recovery, with more focus on the PDCCH and PDSCH, considering UL coverage enhancement will be mainly considered in the Rel-17 CI SI and the solutions can be tailored or reused for the RedCap.

**Question 13: For studying potential techniques for coverage recovery, can the RedCap study focus on the PDCCH and PDSCH, and down-prioritize the other channels?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes. Based on our evaluation, depending on the selection of coverage target, in DL there would be some issues for PDCCH and PDSCH, especially the broadcast ones. |
| Xiaomi | It depends on the target of the coverage recovery. But at current stage, potential solutions on PDCCH and PDSCH should be investigated. |
| Futurewei | Yes, seems reasonable.  The lists of techniques should separate existing techniques and new techniques. All existing techniques should be considered before new ones developed. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | We need to consider all channels/signals as coverage is affected by all channels. We oppose prioritization at this early stages since we don’t even know the bottleneck. |
| Ericsson | It is not clear that PDCCH and PDSCH are the bottleneck channels. We first need to identify coverage limiting physical channel(s) or system message(s) and quantify the level of coverage recovery needed. |
| Panasonic | Since UL coverage enhancement will be mainly considered in the Rel-17 coverage enhancement SI, if there is no impact on performance of initial access procedure due to UE feature reductions, RedCap SI can focus on PDCCH and PDSCH. |
| Convida | We agree, but we need to consider PDCCH and PDSCH for different purposes for UEs in RRC-connected state or RRC-idle/inactive state such as RMSI-PDCCH, RMSI-PDSCH, Msg2, Msg4, MsgB and paging |
| Samsung | We think DL channels should be the focus for coverage recovery because performance degradation for DL channels was observed in the simulation results. However, we need further study on the target bit rate for PDSCH and whether coverage needs to be recovered. For UL channels, it can be discussed in CE SI. |
| InterDigital | We agree that PDCCH and PDSCH should be prioritized, including broadcast channels. |
| WILUS | Agree. PDCCH and PDSCH coverage during initial-access/random-access should be studied first and then PDCCH and PDSCH coverage for an RRC-connected UE can be followed. |
| OPPO | Yes. The coverage of downlink channels has loss with 1Rx, antenna gain loss and reduced UE bandwidth. Potential solutions should be studied. PDCCH and PDSCH can be focused on. |
| DOCOMO | Yes in principle. DL enhancements for PDCCH and broadcast/unicast PDSCH are mainly discussed in RedCap and UL enhancements for PUCCH and PUSCH are mainly discussed in CE SI. For SSB, while keep-trying would be enough from coverage perspective, shorter periodicity can be further studied as it can reduce the time for SSB acquisition. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes, agree. |
| Qualcomm | Although most of the techniques in the CE SI may be reused for RedCap, there may be some aspects that may be specifically related to RedCap. For example, there may be a motivation to study different recovery techniques motivated by the stationary conditions and large latency requirements for RedCap.  Hence, we propose to reuse CE SI techniques and study any other techniques specifically related to RedCap use cases (if applicable). |
| Sequans | We think yes, but it also actually depends on what group decides on fundamental questions of section 2. |
| CMCC | Yes, we think SSB can also be considered, which the coverage is also impacted by the reduction of number of receive antenna. |
| LG | Yes. Since the enhancement of PUSCH and PUCCH will be discussed in CE SI with high priority, we can deprioritized UL channels in RedCap SI. If necessary, depending on the evaluation result, focusing on potential techniques for the PDCCH and PDSCH is preferred. |

**Question 14: For studying potential techniques for coverage recovery, can the RedCap study focus on the PUCCH and PUSCH, and down-prioritize the other channels?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | We do observe PUSCH is the bottleneck channel for RedCap UEs, which is the same situation for coverage enhancement SI. We think the UL coverage enhancements study should be studied in the coverage enhancement SI considering both normal UE and RedCap UEs and solutions that are applicable for both UE types should be preferred. To avoid duplicated discussion, we think in RedCap SI we should focus on the DL coverage recovery and leave the UL coverage study to the coverage enhancement SI. |
| Xiaomi | It depends on the target of the coverage recovery. But at current stage, potential solutions on PDCCH and PDSCH should be investigated. |
| Futurwei | Focus mostly on the downlink channels. This also highly depends on how the study group defines the target and compensation mechanism. For example, if the compensation is due to only complexity reduction techniques, uplink channels may not be impacted due to having 1 Tx in UL and therefore may be downprioritized.  Note however that all existing techniques for recovering performance losses due to complexity reduction that might impact coverage should be listed in the TR and recommended, even if they are not evaluated. So, the question needs to be rephrased for evaluation, not for including in the study or TR. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | We need to consider all channels/signals as coverage is affected by all channels. We oppose prioritization at this early stages since we don’t even know the bottleneck. |
| Ericsson | It is not clear that PUCCH and PUSCH are the bottleneck channels. We first need to identify coverage limiting physical channel(s) or system message(s) and quantify the level of coverage recovery needed. |
| Panasonic | Since UL coverage enhancement will be mainly considered in the Rel-17 CI SI, it would not be necessary to prioritize to study PUCCH and PUSCH in this SI. |
| Convida | We are okay to consider PUCCH and PUSCH for UEs in RRC-connected state and RRC-idle/inactive state such as Msg3 and MsgA. But, we also may study if any enhancement is needed for Msg1 and the preamble part of MsgA. |
| Samsung | We think UL channels can be discussed in CE SI. |
| InterDigital | We think UL channels can be addressed in the CE SI. |
| WILUS | Focus on coverage enhancements for DL channels and further consider whether or not to use UL coverage enhancements techniques in Rel-17 CE SI. |
| OPPO | PUCCH and PUSCH are bottleneck channels identified in coverage enhancement SI. Considering the different use cases and UE categories that the two SI addressed, we think we should figure out which solutions are common for the two SI, and which solutions should be specific in RedCap SI.  For the UL channels, coverage loss due to antenna gain loss should also be taken into consideration. |
| DOCOMO | We think UL enhancements for PUCCH and PUSCH are mainly discussed in CE SI and we can reuse the enhancements in RedCap. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No, PUCCH/PUSCH are not the focus. |
| Qualcomm | Although most of the techniques in the CE SI may be reused for RedCap, there may be some aspects that may be specifically related to RedCap. For example, due to stationary conditions of RedCap, there may be a motivation to study coverage recovery for UL channels by optimizing/reducing their payloads (L1 measurement report for example).  Hence, we propose to reuse CE SI techniques and study any other techniques specifically related to RedCap use cases (if applicable). |
| Sequans | See answer at Q13. |
| CMCC | We think UL channels can be discussed in CE SI. |
| LG | Since the enhancement of PUSCH and PUCCH will be discussed in CE SI with high priority, we can deprioritized UL channels in RedCap SI |
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