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# Introduction

This document summarizes the contributions [3] – [31] made under the “Aspects related to reduced number of Rx branches” agenda item of the Rel-17 work item on support of reduced capability NR devices [1].

Earlier RAN1 agreements for this work item are summarized in [2].

The revised Redcap WID [1] contains the following objectives related to this agenda item:

|  |
| --- |
| * Specify support for the following UE complexity reduction features [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]:   […]   * + Reduced minimum number of Rx branches:     - For frequency bands where a legacy NR UE is required to be equipped with a minimum of 2 Rx antenna ports, the minimum number of Rx branches supported by specification for a RedCap UE is 1. The specification also supports 2 Rx branches for a RedCap UE in these bands.     - For frequency bands where a legacy NR UE (other than 2-Rx vehicular UE) is required to be equipped with a minimum of 4 Rx antenna ports, the minimum number of Rx branches supported by specification for a RedCap UE is 1. The specification also supports 2 Rx branches for a RedCap UE in these bands.     - A means shall be specified by which the gNB can know the number of Rx branches of the UE.   + Maximum number of DL MIMO layers:     - For a RedCap UE with 1 Rx branch, 1 DL MIMO layer is supported.     - For a RedCap UE with 2 Rx branches, 2 DL MIMO layers are supported.   […]   * Specify a system information indication to indicate whether a RedCap UE can camp on the cell/frequency or not; it shall be possible for the indication to be specific to the number of Rx branches of the UE. [RAN2, RAN1] |

Follow the naming convention in this example:

* RedCapRxFLS1-v000.docx
* RedCapRxFLS1-v001-CompanyA.docx
* RedCapRxFLS1-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx
* RedCapRxFLS1-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx

Please search for ‘Discussion #3’ to find the questions that are the focus for the discussion round.

# Reporting of Number of Rx branches

RAN1#104e made the following agreements related to initial DL BWP:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * For reduced minimum number of Rx branches in FR1 and FR2 frequency bands where a legacy NR UE is required to be equipped with a minimum of 2 Rx antenna ports:   + FFS: need for solutions to reduced PDCCH blocking   + FFS: need for reporting of UE antenna related information to gNB (e.g., # of panels, polarization, etc.)   + Information related to the reduction of the number of antenna branches is assumed to be known at the gNB (either implicitly or explicitly, to be FFS) |

In addition, a new objective was added in the revised WID [1] to specify a means by which the gNB can know the number of Rx branches of the Redcap UE. This issue was widely discussed in contributions [3][4][6][7][8][9] [10][11][12][13][14][15][16][18][19][21][23][24][27]

Table 1 summarized the proposed options to indicate the number of Rx branches of the Redcap UE:

**Table 1: Options to indicate the number of Rx branches at least for FR1**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Index | Description | Companies | Motivations | Num. of Companies |
| Opt.1 | Using UE capability report explicitly or implicitly | Huawei [3], Vivo [6], CATT [7], MediaTek [9], Futurewei [11], Intel [15], Apple [16], Sharp [23],  Ericsson [10]/ Samsung [18]: (Using the capability parameter maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH) | * Msg2/Msg4 coverage is not an essential issue for 1 Rx/2 Rx with TB scaling [3][6][7]. * Coverage for 1Rx/2Rx for wearable maybe simliar [3]. * No DL coverage enhancements are agreed for RedCap with minimum 1 Rx branch. For initial access, conservative scheduling, power boosting, TB scaling and/or HARQ-based retransmission for Msg.4 are all available to enhance the DL channel performance [6]. * The cost for supporting early identification during Msg1 transmission is in terms of increased PRACH OH in the cell due to partitioning of ROs, RACH resources, [15] * To reduce reporting overhead and to avoid unnecessary specification work [10] [16] | 10 |
| Opt.2 | Using Msg1 and/or Msg3, and MsgA | OPPO [4],  ZTE [12]  Nordic Semiconductor ASA [27] | * Improve the performane of Msg2/4 [4][12]. * If the number of Rx branches is not part of this early indication, the network would have to assume the UE has 1 Rx branch. In addition, the network would not be able reject connection from 1Rx UE during initial access [8]. * Support load balancing of RACH resources between REDCAP and non-REDCAP devices [8]. | 3 |
| Opt.3 | Configuration between Opt.1 and Opt.2 via SIB1 | CMCC [13],  LGe [19],  Nokia [8] (optionally configured) | * The need of differentiate 1 Rx/2 Rx UE maybe frequency and deployment scenario dependent [8] | 3 |

**Discussion #1**

Based on the Table 1 above, clearly Opt.1 is the preferred approach by major companies. Hence, Question 1 was asked to address this open issue:

**Question 2-1: Can we agree the following proposal? If not, which modifications are needed?**

* **Using UE capability report (i.e., Opt.1) as baseline to indicate the number of Rx branches?** 
  + **FFS: Using earlier indication by Msg1 and/or Msg3, and MsgA (Opt.2)**
  + **FFS: The need of selection by SIB1 between earlier indication and UE capability report (Opt.3)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Existing mechanism capability reporting is, of course, reused and default when early identification is not configured / not applicable for that UE. With the potential degradation in performance of Msg2/Msg4 resulting from using 1Rx branch, the network can configure early identification for those RedCap UEs or those which are experiencing poor conditions so that the appropriate amount compensation can be applied. Another FFS can be added to configure/enable early identification. |
| NordicSemi | N | Assuming that MSG1 would be supported for early indication of RedCap UEs (optionally) by gNB, restricting that RedCap-MSG1 to only 1Rx RedCap UEs could be easily supported by SIB1 signalling. In other words, 2Rx UE could follow legacy ROs and 1Rx UE could follow RedCap ROs. Therefore, we would see that there should not be an issue for UE to support both Option 1 and Option 2. |
| Sierra Wireless | N | It is too early to take this agreement before RAN2 concludes and may possibly be within RAN2’s responsibility. As Futurewei points out, the agreement is stating the obvious support for UE capabilities. But based on the RAN PL discussion it is clear that blocking or redirection 1RX RedCAP UEs based on UE capability alone was no sufficient which is why Sierra supports Opt3 as it has the most flexibility. |
| NEC | N | Capability reporting and access control specific to the number of Rx branches of the UE should be led by RAN2. |
| Qualcomm | Y | From RAN1 perspective, Opt. 1 is preferred. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We think that both Options 1 & 2 should be supported. |
| CMCC |  | We think this is related to the early identification of Rx number. If the necessity of early dentification is not justified, then option 1 can be used. However, early identification can bring benefit for network efficiency in some cases, for example, when the number of RedCap devices is large, and both 1Rx and 2Rx device coexisted in the same network. In this case, if the coverage performance gap is obvious for 1Rx and 2Rx, awlays peform conservative scheduling of RedCap UEs will result in waste of network resource, so we think option 3 is better, that is to let gNB deciding. |
| DOCOMO | N | We agree with the proposal in principle from RAN1 perspective, but as pointed out by Sierra Wireless and NEC, this issue should be led by RAN2 |
| vivo | Y | We think the FL proposals is reasonable and support it.  Option 1 can be agreed as the baseline, while possibility to use early indication to distinguish 1Rx and 2Rx UEs can be further discussed |
| OPPO | N | Earlier identification of RedCap UE with 1 Rx can improve performance of Msg2/Msg4. Capability report is existing mechanism. It can be performed during or after initial access, but it is not for earlier indication. In our view, the essential issue is whether RedCap UE with 1 Rx should be earlier identified from RAN1 perspective. If yes, option 2 should be supported. |
| China Telecom | N | We think both option 1 and option 2 should be further studied. If early identification is supported, the number of antenna branches can be assumed to be known at the gNB via early identification either explicitly or implicitly for all bands. After initial access, if the number of Rx branches is still not known at gNB, UE capability report can be used to indicate the number of Rx branches. |
| Xiaomi |  | We think Opt1 can be a baseline, however, it might not be parallel options with Opt2/3, which means beyond capability report, Opt2 or 3 can still be supported, of course, we can FFS in next RAN1 meeting. |
| Sharp | Y | We agree with FL proposal. FFS does not preclude the option 2 and option 3. They can be discussed later if we have further outcome on early identification. |
| Samsung | Y with modification | The two FFS points are not needed. The fundamental function of early indication is not for Rx branches indication, but to differentiate RedCap UEs and non-RedCap UEs. It may not work when RedCap UEs support both 1 Rx branch or 2 RX branches. |
| ZTE,sanechips | N | Considering the impact on the network efficiency from antenna reduction, Option2 should be considered. |
| CATT | Y | From RAN1’s perspective, there is no strong motivation to identify the Rx number during the access since coverage is not a problem no matter for 1 Rx or 2 Rx UE. |
| Intel | Y, but | We prefer to agree to the main bullet without the FFS bullets.  **Option 1** certainly should be the baseline mechanism.  Regarding early identification, it should be used to identify RedCap vs. non-RedCap UEs, mainly to avoid conservative scheduling of a (lot of) non-RedCap UEs (4Rx assumed as 1Rx UEs).  However, further distinction between 1Rx and 2Rx for RedCap UEs is not may not be worth the cost of early identification since it would only benefit in terms of avoiding 2Rx RedCap UEs being assumed as 1Rx RedCap UEs for PDCCH/PDSCH related to Msg2 and PDCCH for Msg3 reTx as the overall impact would be rather limited.  Lastly, for Option 3, while we understand the motivation is to mainly have configurability of UE indicating # of Rx branches via early indication, we do not think it would appropriate for RAN1 to conclude that the Rx branches-related information will NOT be conveyed as part of UE capability reporting. |
| Ericsson | N | Our preference is Option 1. The WID mandates to specify only one RedCap UE type, and that the early indication be used to indicate whether the UE is RedCap or not. Indication of the number of Rx branches in Msg1 and/or Msg3, and MsgA would to our understanding mean that there is more than one RedCap UE type. Other cons of using early indication to report number of Rx branches is already listed in the FL’s summary. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | We are fine with the main bullet and suggest removing the sub-bullets, since early identification might not to be discussed in this meeting (according to conclusion 7-1). |
| Huawei |  | Option 1 is sufficient from WID perspective. |
| LG | Y | We are fine with the main bullet. For Option 2, we see that the information that can be carried in Msg1 is very limited, so practically early indication of any additional information other than RedCap or not is very difficult. But we are okay to leave it as FFS. The FFS for Option 3 should include the network configurability on whether any additional information, e.g., including number of Rx branches, for early indication is allowed/supported in Msg1 for the network that has concerns on the introduction of 1 Rx UEs in e.g., NR 4 Rx bands. |
| Panasonic |  | We don't think that the different scheduling/treatment between 1Rx and 2Rx RedCap devices of Msg2/4 is so beneficial as DL coverage recovery is not in the scope according to the RAN plenary discussion. Therefore, we support only option 1 from RAN1 perspective.  On the other hand, whether to utilize UE capability report or Msg3 should be discussed in RAN2, and RAN1 should focus on whether Msg1 is utilized or not. Therefore, we propose the following working assumption which could be revisited after RAN2 decision:  Working assumption: Msg1 is not used to indicate the number of Rx branches. |

Moderator Summary of Discussion #1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Alternatives | Yes | Num. of Companies |
| 1 | Opt.1 with FFS on Opt.2/Opt.3 | Qualcomm, Vivo, Sharp, CATT, LG, [Xiaomi] | 6 |
| 2 | Opt.1 only without FFS on Opt.2/Opt.3 | Samsung, Intel, Ericsson, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Huawei, Panasonic, | 7 |
| 3 | Opt.1+Opt.2  (Essentially Opt.3) | NordicSemi, Sierra Wireless, Nokia, CMCC, ZTE, Futurewei, OPPO | 7 |
| 4 | Wait for RAN2 to Progress on this issue | Sierra Wireless, NEC, DCM | 3 |
| 5 | FFS on both Opt.1 and Opt.2 | China Telecom | 1 |

**Whether earlier identification of 1 Rx needs to be supported during initial access procedure?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Companies | Num. of Companies |
| Yes | Futurewei, NordicSemi, Sierra Wireless, Nokia, CMCC, OPPO, ZTE | 7 |
| No | Samsung, Intel, Ericsson, Huawei, Panasonic, | 5 |
| FFS | Vivo, Xiaomi, Sharp, Qualcomm, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, | 6 |

It is moderator Understanding That the number of supported Rx branches maybe varied across different frequency bands like what is allowed for supported Maximum MIMO layers in Rel-15/16. Even assuming Opt.2/Opt.3 would be supported, the number of Rx branches that is earlier identified in initial access procedure is expected to be applied to the band where UE is performing RACH procedure, instead of all bands or band combination that UE supports. In other words, UE capability report is anyway needed to signal the number of Rx branches explicitly or implicitly (e.g., reusing the capability parameter maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH as proposed in [10][18]) for each supported band.

**Moderator Proposal #2-1:**

* **Using UE capability report (i.e., Opt.1) as baseline to indicate the number of Rx branches?** 
  + **FFS: Using earlier indication by Msg1 and/or Msg3, and MsgA (Opt.2)**
  + **FFS: The need of selection by SIB1 between earlier indication and UE capability report (Opt.3)**

**Discussion #2**

The following was almost agreed in GTW session. Please share your views on it.

**Moderator Proposal #2-2-1:**

* **At least using UE capability report to indicate (Implicitly or explicitly) the number of Rx branches** 
  + **FFS: Using earlier indication of the number of Rx branches by Msg1 and/or Msg3, and MsgA**
  + **FFS: The need of selection by SIB1 between earlier indication and UE capability report**

Please state explicitly what modification is needed in ‘comment’ column, if you see any.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y, mostly | In addition, we think the 2nd FFS is based on the assumption of the 1st FFS. So it should be the sub-bullet of the 1st FFS.  [Moderator]Make sense to me. Will update and please check the updated Moderator proposal #2-2-2. |
| Panasonic |  | Regarding the first sub-bullet, we are ok to Msg 1 aspect as FFS in RAN1, but we have concern to discuss Msg3 aspect in RAN1. The bit field usage of Msg.3 used for RRC\_IDLE to RRC\_CONNECTED is well optimized since Rel.15 in RAN2. In order to have the discussion to signal Rx branch aspect in Msg3/MsgA, whether/how "reserved field" in payload of Msg3/A is used or not need discussion. Other solution is also available but such signalling design discussion is necessary. These would not be RAN1 expertise. Therefore, we propose to clarify that "FFS of Msg.3/A" should be RAN2 discussion.  [Moderator]Although it is true that the Msg3/MsgA is sort of joint topic for RAN1/RAN2, the current formation is still ok because the entire first sub-bullet is FFS. We can further discuss whether involves RAN2 when discuss the feasibility of first FFS, especially Msg3/A part. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum |  | In our view, Option 1 (UE capability report) and Option 2 (early indication) may be exclusive, from RAN2 perspective (signaling design). If early indication on reduce Rx number is designed, perhaps UE capability report on reduced Rx number is not necessary to be designed to save signaling overhead. But from the proposal, it seems Option 1 and Option 2 are inclusive. Whether they are exclusive or inclusive may be up to RAN2 signaling design.  Anyway, if it is the majority view that RAN1 can provide the decision, we can accept it.  [Moderator]Thanks for being flexible. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | The second FFS is a little bit unclear to us, so we’d like to confirm our understanding. We understand this to mean that SIB1 can configure UE to report the number of Rx branches via early indication. If it’s not configured by SIB1, then UE capability report will be used. But we are not sure if “**The need of selection**” is about this point, or is it more about if early indication is configured, UE will always report the number of Rx branches.  [Moderator]Will update the proposal to delete the ‘need’ words. The 2nd FFS point is to discuss whether or not support ‘earlier identification’ of 1-Rx mechanism that is enabled by SIB1 signaling. |
| FUTUREWEI2 | Y | The number of RX must be informed to the gNB and will be in the UE capability report when a UE is not using early identification. It is also possible that the #RX is known from early identification, depending on how the early identification is configured. Such discussion is not only in the scope of the WID, but fully in the spirit of the discussion during the last RAN ... early identification was included in the WID as part of the discussion to allow 1RX, and operators have expressed a desire to be able to configure functionality specific to the number of RX antennas.  The example we have given before is a configuration where 2RX RedCap UEs can share the non-RedCap UE RACH occasions and the 1RX RedCap UEs use a new RACH occasion. The resources used throughout the initial access are then more appropriate to that UE’s performance as the 1RX are identified early. For bands that the non-RedCap UEs use 2RX also, the number of RX are known to be 2 from using the non-RedCap UE RACH occasions.  Note that designing the configuration that allows the possibility that a RedCap UE can be identified early or during the normal capability exchange does not introduce additional UE types or categories. We already have the possibility of network control specific to the number of RX. There is no market fragmentation. The 1RX and 2RX UEs are still just 'RedCap'. |
| Ericsson | N | We would like to remove both FFSs from the proposal. According to the WID, the early indication is used to report RedCap UE type.   |  | | --- | | * Specify functionality that will enable RedCap UEs to be explicitly identifiable to networks through an early indication in Msg1 and/or Msg3, and Msg A if supported, including the ability for the early indication to be configurable by the network. [RAN2, RAN1] |   Furthermore, according to the WID only one RedCap UE type will be specified.   |  | | --- | | * Specify definition of one RedCap UE type including capabilities for RedCap UE identification and for constraining the use of those RedCap capabilities only for RedCap UEs, and preventing RedCap UEs from using capabilities not intended for RedCap UEs including at least carrier aggregation, dual connectivity and wider bandwidths. [RAN2, RAN1]   + The existing UE capability framework is used; changes to capability signalling are specified only if necessary. |   Therefore, early indication is used to identify whether the UE is RedCap UE or not, and not for identifying whether the UE is 1 or 2 Rx.  We suggest the following update:   * **~~At least using~~ Use UE capability report to indicate (Implicitly or explicitly) the number of Rx branches.**    + **~~FFS: Using earlier indication of the number of Rx branches by Msg1 and/or Msg3, and MsgA~~**   + **~~FFS: The need of selection by SIB1 between earlier indication and UE capability report~~**   [Moderator]The FFS points are simply used as ‘placeholder’ to remind the fact that there were proposals to support ‘earlier identification’ of 1 Rx by SIB1 signaling and no consensus was reached. This is normal practice and usual business to handle the case when the proposal come from several companies, instead of a single company.  This may be helpful for next meeting contribution preparation and make discussions more focus. Likely, removing FFS points were NOT acceptable for the proponents. It is moderator view that making agreement with main bullet and keep others as FFS are the best we can do for this meeting to make progress. Let’s continue discussing the FFSs in next meeting, including the feasibility based on the WID context. |
| Huawei |  | Ok with Ericsson suggestion |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| ZTE,Saneships | Y,mostly | We are generally fine with the FL’s proposal  Obviously, 1Rx branch or 2Rx branch has an impact on the PHY layer transmission performance. Whether it is a issue or not and whether this issue should be addressed or not, should be discussed by RAN1.  Additionally, according to the WID description, just the RedCap UEs should be explicitly identifiable to networks, which does not mean the earlier identification has to be based on the UE type. Therefore, identification for RX branches (or others) and one UE type kept, are still in the WID scope.  last, the second FFS seems to be based on the first FFS. The suggestion from CATT is OK or just remove the second FFS.  [Moderator]As reponsed to CATT above, it is make sense and will modify correspondingly. |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Intel | Y, w/o the FFSs | We support the updated version from Ericsson and agree with them on the interpretation of the RAN discussions and WID objectives.  Even from a technical perspective, we do not quite see a motivation to distinguish 1 Rx and 2Rx via early identification.  The benefit of early identification of RedCap UEs (from non-RedCap) is in avoiding conservative scheduling of PDCCH/PDSCH for Msg2/Msg4 and PDCCH of Msg3 reTx for non-RedCap UEs, the impact of which could be significant in many cases.  The significance can be attributed to: (1) desirable to minimize impact on non-RedCap UEs; (2) can lead to non-negligible impact to system performance due to relatively higher density of non-RedCap UEs expected in many deployments. These factors do not quite apply for distinguishing 1Rx and 2Rx RedCap UEs.  The cost of supporting early identification of Rx branches for RedCap UEs is in terms of one or more of: increased RACH/UL OH, lower multiplexing capacity in a RO, increased random access latency, etc. depending on exact mechanisms. We should consider potentially other “early identification” use-cases/features as well that may be configured in a cell, and the effects from RACH/RO partitioning for such purposes add to the above.  [Moderator]See comment to Ericsson. Let’s keep FFS points and make some progress. |
| Samsung | Y with minor modification | Unlike UE capability report, earlier indication is not completed yet. The word “using” in the first FFS is a little confusing as earlier indication is still under development and cannot be used directly.  So we suggest to move the word “using”, to keep things open.  **FFS: ~~using~~ earlier indication of the number of Rx branches by Msg1 and/or Msg3, and MsgA**  Moderator]Make sense. Will modify. |
| Xiaomi | Y | For the FFS bullet, we are OK to keep it. As commented by CATT and other companies, the second FFS depends on the first FFS. We slightly prefer to remove the third one. We can further discuss it when the second FFS is clear.  [Moderator]As reponsed to CATT above, it makes sense and will modify accordingly. |
| NEC |  | We support suggestion by Ericsson.  [Moderator]See comment to Ericsson. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | We are basically fine with the proposal.  For the 1st sub-bullet, we suggest following update,   * + **FFS: Using earlier indication of RedCap UEs with 1Rx branch ~~the number of Rx branches~~ by Msg1 and/or Msg3, and MsgA**   Moderator]Will modify. |
| China Telecom | Y | We are fine with FL proposal for sake of progress. |
| OPPO | Y with suggested update | In the revised WID, the one RedCap UE type including capabilities is specified for RedCap UE identification, as follows:   * *Specify definition of one RedCap UE type including capabilities for RedCap UE identification and for constraining the use of those RedCap capabilities only for RedCap UEs, and preventing RedCap UEs from using capabilities not intended for RedCap UEs including at least carrier aggregation, dual connectivity and wider bandwidths. [RAN2, RAN1]*   + *The existing UE capability framework is used; changes to capability signalling are specified only if necessary.*   The existing UE capability framework is used. However, it is for regular UE capability report, not only for the indication of number of Rx branches of RedCap UE.  It was also agreed in WID to specify earlier indication of RedCap UEs in Msg1 and /or Msg3, as follows:   * *Specify functionality that will enable RedCap Ues to be explicitly identifiable to networks through an early indication in Msg1 and/or Msg3, and Msg A if supported, including the ability for the early indication to be configurable by the network. [RAN2, RAN1]*   In our view, UE capability report and earlier indication of Rx branches number are two separate issues. UE capability report is always needed for RedCap UE capability report, including the number of Rx branches and other capability. But for earlier indication by Msg1 and/or Msg3, it is not restricted to RedCap UE type indication, since it is mentioned in WID that the existing UE capability framework is used. Earlier indication seems not an existing UE capability framework.  For the number of Rx branches indication, earlier indication is needed. It aims for improving performance and efficiency of Msg2/Msg4 transmission.  Therefore, we suggest to update the FL proposal accordingly to reflect our understanding. For the 1st sub-bullet, we suggest it should be a main bullet. The 2nd sub-bullet is changed to configure earlier indication by SIB1. We suggest following update:   * **At least using UE capability report to indicate (Implicitly or explicitly) the number of Rx branches** * **FFS: Using earlier indication of the number of Rx branches by Msg1 and/or Msg3, and MsgA**   + **FFS: The need of earlier indication by SIB1**   Moderator]Please check modification. |
| China Unicom | Y | We are generally fine with the FL’s proposal.  Additionally, we think the early indication can bring benefit for network efficiency, which is used to report not only RedCap UE type, but also the number of Rx branches. |
| NordicSemi | Y |  |
| LG |  | We have the same understanding on the early indication of RedCap UEs with Ericsson and Qualcomm, and therefore we could agree with the modification from Ericsson. In addition to that, we can further discuss whether other information such as the number of Rx branches of RedCap UEs can be reported or not, which is not clearly in the WID objectives. We also see that there is no need for early differentiation b/w 1 Rx and 2 Rx UEs especially for smart wearables with a compact form factor given the difficulty of adding additional information in Msg1 and also as we expect there wouldn’t be enough performance differences b/w the two as many UE vendors commented during the RAN plenary discussion. With that understanding, our interpretation on the network configurability via SIB is to configure the early indication of the number of Rx branches. So, it is up to the network and can be applied if it is proven it is needed. If it is configured, then of course the RedCap UEs has to follow it as Nokia explained. So, we would like to change the wording for the second FFS as follows:  **FFS: ~~The need of selection by SIB1 between earlier indication and UE capability report~~ Network configurability of early indication of the number of Rx branches via SIB1, if supported**  Moderator] Please check modification. |
| Moderator | Companies’ views on moderator proposal #2-2-1 can be briefly categorized as follows:   * Minor modification or Yes (21 Companies):   + Vivo, CATT, Panasonic, DOCOMO, Spreadtrum, Nokia, NSB, Futurewei, Sharp, ZTE, Saneships, Qualcomm, Samsung, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, China Telecom, OPPO, China Unicom, NordicSemi, LG. * Remove both FFS bullets (4 Companies).   + Ericsson, Huawei, Intel, NEC   Please check the individual response.  It is Moderator recommendation to keep two FFS aspects, which anyhow for further discussions. It is fairly fact that no consensus on these two and interests raised by a few companies.  With that being said, please check the Moderator Proposal #2-2-2. | |

**Moderator Proposal #2-2-1:**

* **At least using UE capability report to indicate (implicitly or explicitly) the number of Rx branches**
* **FFS: earlier indication of Redcap UEs with 1 Rx branch by Msg1 and/or Msg3, and MsgA** 
  + **FFS: Network configurability of early indication of the number of Rx branches via SIB1, if supported**

**GTW Agreement**

The following was agreed in the GTW session:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements**:**   * At least using UE capability report according the existing framework to indicate (implicitly or explicitly) the number of Rx branches * FFS: whether/how to support earlier indication of Redcap UEs with # Rx branches by Msg1 and/or Msg3, and MsgA   + FFS: Network configurability of early indication of the number of Rx branches via SIB1, if supported |

# 3. Potential PDCCH Enhancement

Reducing the number of Rx branches degrades the link performance and coverage. Therefore, for a given PDCCH BLER-performance target, higher ALs may be needed for RedCap Ues to compensate for the coverage loss. Generally, the PDCCH blocking rate increases when higher Als are used. Hence, reducing the number of Rx branches may result in a higher PDCCH blocking rate. In general, the impact on PDCCH blocking performance from RedCap Ues would depend on various factors such as the number of Ues which need to be scheduled (may depend on the traffic), CORESET size (i.e., number of CCEs), number of PDCCH candidates, and PDCCH link performance/coverage (which affects the required aggregation level, AL), and relative fraction of RedCap Ues with reduced capability on number of Rx branches.

In contributions [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [20] [23] [25] [26] [28], views on the necessity of PDCCH enhancement have been presented to enhance the PDCCH blocking rate. A few alternatives were proposed as listed in Table 2, mainly motivated by the use case where has a relatively larger fraction of Ues that are RedCap Ues with reduced capability for number of Rx branches or PDCCH capacity shortage due to the reduced BW and demanding CCE Als for Redcap devices.

On the other hand, athough SNR gap could be as large as 5~6 dB, e.g., between a 1Rx RedCap UE and a 4Rx non-RedCap UE, whether the overall PDCCH user blocking performance is impacted would be a function of the deployment and relative number for such RedCap Ues within all Ues in the cell. It was observed in [10] [8] that the number of simultaneously scheduled Ues is expected to be between 1 and 5 and the impact of reducing the number of Rx branches on PDCCH blocking probability is small. Hence, no solution of reducing PDCCH blocking rate enhance was proposed in [4] [6] [7] [8] [10] [15] [18] and [25].

**Table 2: View on PDCCH enhancement for Redcap**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Index | Description | Companies | # of Companies |
| Alt.1 | Reuse the existing DCI format, including Rel-16 DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 | OPPO [4], Vivo [6], CATT [7], Nokia [8], Ericsson [10], Intel [15], Qualcomm [17], Samsung [18], Panasonic [25] | 8 |
| Alt.2 | Introducing new Compact DCI(s) | Huawei [3], Futurewei [11], Qualcomm [17], Samsung [18], CEWiT [20], | 5 |
| Alt.3 | Introducing a group-wise DCI that can be used to schedule multiple Ues. | Huawei [3], CMCC [13], CEWiT [20], | 3 |
| Alt.4 | Support PDCCH link adaptation (e.g., RS resource for CSI measurement associated with CORESET) | Samsung [18] | 1 |
| Alt.5 | Multi-TB scheduling | Samsung [18], Intel [15], CEWiT [20], | 3 |
| Alt.6 | Configuring eparate CORESETs or Initial DL BWP for Redcap Ues | Spreadtrum [5], ZTE [12], Intel [15], ASUSTeK [28], Sharp [23] | 5 |
| Alt.7 | Joint optimization of RV cycling order and number of repetitions | Qualcomm [17], | 1 |
| Alt.8 | SPS-based and CG-based transmission in RRC connected state | Qualcomm [17], | 1 |
| Alt.9 | RACH-based or CG-based SDT in RRC inactive state | Qualcomm [17] | 1 |

**Discussion #1**

**Question 3-1: Which alterative(s) among these listed in Table 1 are preferred and Why? Please share your views including any further modification on the listed options.**

* Note that the feedback is intended to be used to down select Alternatives (e.g., excluding alternative(s) that are only interested by one or two companies), such that in a next step during RAN1 104-bis e-meeting, RAN1 to focus on selected alternatives including establishing feasibility and identifying pros and cons to make progress:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments/Reasoning** |
| FUTUREWEI | PDCCH blocking is in the scope of discussion as per the FFS. Compact DCI (format 1\_2) is an optional feature that is available to RedCap Ues. Compact DCI feature is least optional and could be mandatory for RedCap Ues. We are okay to discuss whether we need to modify the existing format or to create a new format. We lean towards making small modifications to the existing format, in the same spirit as rel. 17 UL coverage enhancement. |
| NordicSemi | We would focus discussion on the following techniques:  Alt1: Compact DCI x\_2 could be used by default by RedCap Ues   * FFS further RedCap-specific simplifications to DCI x\_2   Alt 5: Could be optionally supported by RedCap UE, if designed in 60GHz AI in R17  Alt 6: One dedicated CORESET can be supported in RRC Connected and dedicated BWP could be somewhere else than CORESET#0. However, during initial access all Ues of a 100MHz cell are packed to first 2-3symbols of a slot and 20MHz (with 30kHz it is 16-24CCE). Therefore, proposal should be focused on initial access and CORESETs in frequency domain. |
| Sierra Wireless | None of the solutions are essential functionality and may overly complicate the Redcap UE for little benefit. |
| NEC | PDCCH enhancement is not in the WID. |
| Qualcomm | As we commented earlier in the GTW session, Alt 1 is our preference. Alt 7 is a sub-topic of Alt 1, and the RV sequence selection (i.e. [0 3] vs [0 2]) was discussed in R16 CR for compact DCI formats (0\_2, 1\_2).  Alt. 8 and Alt. 9 aim to reduce the signaling overhead of PDCCH, which are applicable to RedCap Ues as appropriate. |
| Nokia, NSB | Existing solutions can be used to mitigate potential PDCCH blocking so we don’t think any new solution needs to be specified. Furthermore, based on our analysis, PDCCH blocking does not seem to be an issue with RedCap UE. |
| CMCC | Alt.6 is an effective method if separate initial DL BWP is adopted.  Compact DCI(Alt.1 or 2 can be further studied) can be considered, since it is supported by the spec already.  And alt.3 and 5 can also be considered. |
| DOCOMO | As mentioned in the beginning of this section, PDCCH blocking rate increases when higher Als are used, which comes from the reduced number of Rx branches for RedCap Ues. Therefore, we think it is in the scope, similar to the potential BWP enhancement for the reduced UE BW discussed in AI8.6.1.1.  We think whether existing features (e.g. compact DCI) are enough or not should be discussed at first, and if deemed necessary, we are open to discuss any enhancements for reducing the PDCCH blocking rate. |
| Vivo | It is debatable whether PDCCH enhancement for blocking reduction is in scope or not as the WID does not include this objective.  Technically, during the study item, we studied the reduced blind decodes and there was no consensus about its impact to PDCCH blocking rate. However, we did not have an recommendation to solve the PDCCH blocking rate issue purely due to reduced Rx but not the reduced blind decodes.  From the list of alternatives that FL has summarized, we think alt1 can be supported as the baseline as there is no good reason to not allow Redcap Ues to implement the existing solutions. |
| OPPO | PDCCH enhancement is out of scope in the WID. We do not think it is necessary to introduce new solutions addressing PDCCH blocking rate, since some existing solutions can be used, e.g. BWP, search space, CORESET configuration. |
| Xiaomi | We share the same reason with DOCOMO and some other companies that handling of the PDCCH blocking is within the scope.  As for the detailed solutions, we are OK to discuss Opt.1, Opt.5, Opt.8 and Opt.9. |
| Sharp | The proposal aims to find some solutions to mitigate PDCCH blocking which is an FFS of the agreement in RAN1#104e. Therefore, in our view, it is in the RAN1’s discussion scope.  Alt.1 and Alt.6 can be discussed. Alt.6 needs to be focused on initial access. As one Rel-15 basic feature, type 1 CSS without dedicated RRC configuration and other CSS expect type 3 can be any OFDM symbols of a slot. Therefore, CORESETs in time domain (i.e separate search spaces) should be taken into consideration to address the PDCCH blocking issue. |
| Samsung | We think increased PDCCH blocking rate due to reduced Rx branches is an issue for RedCap UEs. We suggest to agree on the need for PDCCH blocking rate reduction first in this meeting. The details, such as alternatives including whether or not existing methods are sufficient can be FFS. In addition to the need for higher CCE AL, large number of connectivity and low spectrum efficiency due to increased PDCCH overhead are additional reasons cause the PDCCH blocking issue. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Alt.6. For serious blocking scenarios, separate CORESET or search space can be configured to reduce impact on non-RedCap NR UEs.  Additionally, the Table2 should be used in Question 3-1 instead of Table1. |
| CATT | Alt.1.  We think PDCCH blocking is not a serious issue, and PDCCH enhancement is not essential to support RedCap (out of scope, more precisely). Adopting current Rel-15/16methods should be enough. |
| Intel | We may need to first converge on whether there exists an issue with PDCCH blocking that need to be addressed. In our view, this would be mainly relevant if assuming a relatively high connection density of RedCap UEs.  If the group agrees to pursue designs to address such scenarios, solutions to address PDCCH blocking may be necessary; of those in Table 2, we prefer **Alt. 1, Alt. 5, and Alt. 6.**  For the other two DCI format-related enhancements (Alt. 2 and Alt. 3),   * we do not think there is need to define new DCI formats; any adjustments to existing formats can be made for RedCap, if necessary; and   “group-wise scheduling DCI” as an effective means for unicast scheduling; scheduling multiple TBs for a single UE (Alt. 5) can be a more practical approach. |
| Ericsson | Our simulation results in [R1-2102723](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104b-e/Docs/R1-2102723.zip) show that impact of Rx reduction on PDCCH blocking is small. Therefore, PDCCH enhancements for the purpose of reducing the PDCCH blocking that would entail specification impacts is not needed in the Rel-17 RedCap WI. Therefore, our preference is the following:  Preferred: Alt 1 (optional) and Alt. 8 (optional) which are existing solutions may be considered. We are also fine with Alt. 9 if it is introduced in Rel-17.  Not preferred: Alt. 2, Alt. 3, Alt. 4, Alt. 5, and Alt. 7 due to specification impacts and unclear benefits.  Regarding Alt. 6, this is already being discussed under AI 8.6.1.1. Therefore, this should not be considered under AI 8.6.1.2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We prefer to further discuss Alt.1, Alt.5, Alt.6 and Alt.8. |
| Spreadtrum | Our preference is Alt 6, to reduce the PDCCH blocking for coexistence between RedCap UE and non-RedCap UE, as a straightforward way, the separate initial DL BWP can be configured to RedCap UE, further, it is better that gNB configure the separate CORESET or search space set for RedCap UE.  As we mentioned in Monday’s GTW, we think PDCCH enhancement is in the WI scope, since it’s one of the potential specification impacts on reduced minimum number of Rx branches. |
| Huawei | Suggest to change the title to “Potential improvement on reducing PDCCH blocking rate” to avoid the impression of large impact is being proposed/discussed.  Alt 6 needs to be removed here as it is being discussed in RedCap-01 thread as well. |
| LG | These are not essential for introduction of RedCap. Solution wise, we think this is somehow related to configuring separate initial DL BWP/CORESET#0 for offloading. Therefore Alt.6 may be relevant. Alt.1 may also be relevant as it is existing techniques that can be applied by default. |
| Panasonic | Alt.1 is preferred. We think it is enough to use proper configuration with DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 (Rel-16) because DCI payload size can flexibly be controlled. If the contents are not aligned with RedCap UE at the end of WI, it should be corrected as essential correction, but we should not have "optimization". |

Moderator Summary of Discussion #1

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Description | Companies | Num. of Companies | Moderator comments |
| Alt.1 | Reuse the existing DCI format, including Rel-16 DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 | NordicSemi, Sierra Wireless, NEC, Qualcomm, Nokia, CMCC, Vivo, OPPO, Xiaomi, Sharp, CATT, Intel, Ericsson, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, LG, Panasonic, Futurewei | 18 | Existing spec?  Redcap UEs can indicate support of DCI 0\_2/1\_2 already |
| Alt.2 | Introducing new Compact DCI(s) | CMCC | 1 |  |
| Alt.3 | Introducing a group-wise DCI that can be used to schedule multiple Ues. | CMCC | 1 |  |
| Alt.5 | Multi-TB scheduling | NordicSemi, CMCC, Xiaomi, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, | 6 | Being discussed in >52.6GHz WIs.  Multi-PUSCH scheduling was already introduced for Rel-16 NRU. |
| Alt.6 | Configuring separate CORESETs or Initial DL BWP for Redcap UEs | NordicSemi, CMCC, Sharp, ZTE, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Spreadtrum, LG | 9 | Ongoing discussing in ‘Reduced BW’ agenda 8.6.1.1 for Redcap. |
| Alt.8 | SPS-based and CG-based transmission in RRC connected state | Qualcomm, Xiaomi, Ericsson, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 5 | Is it existing specification? |

**Whether there exists an issue with PDCCH blocking that need to be addressed? (e.g., high connection density of Redcap UEs)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Companies | Num. of Companies |
| Yes | Futurewei, CMCC, DCM, Xiaomi, Sharp, Samsung, ZTE, Intel, Spreadtrum, Huawei, | 10 |
| No | Sierra Wireless, NEC, Nokia, OPPO, CATT, Ericsson, LG, Panasonic. | 8 |

**Discussion #2**

**Moderator Proposal #3-1:**

* **Reuse the existing DCI formats for Redcap devices, including Rel-16 DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 as a starting point.** 
  + **FFS on potential modification on fields of existing DCI formats.**

Please state explicitly what modification is needed in ‘comment’ column, if you see any.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y, mostly | We understand the motivation to reduce the potential PDCCH blocking by using the existing compact DCI.  However, we would like to clarify that DCI format 0\_0/1\_0 is fundamental at least during the initial access. They should also be assumed to be mandatory supported by RedCap UE. Otherwise, if the operator prefers no early identification for the RedCap UE, the gNB may not be able to send proper DCI formats since the UE type is known. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum |  | In our view, configuring a separate initial DL BWP is more efficient. But this may be decided in AI 8.6.1.1 |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We do not see PDCCH blocking issue with RedCap and prefer not to have the FFS. |
| FUTUREWEI2 | Y | Note to the moderator about the summary, we favored Alt 1, not Alt 2, |
| Ericsson | Y, with modifications | The FFS should be removed. As we have mentioned in our earlier response, our simulation results in [R1-2102723](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104b-e/Docs/R1-2102723.zip) show that impact on PDCCH blocking due to Rx reduction is small. Moreover, reducing the DCI size is helpful for reducing PDCCH blocking only if it enables smaller ALs. If that is to happen, the DCI size must be reduced significantly, and not by just few bits. We don’t see the potential in RedCap to reduce the DCI size by a significant amount.  Therefore, we propose the following update:   * **Reuse the existing DCI formats for Redcap devices, including Rel-16 DCI format 0\_2/1\_2, as a starting point.**    + **FFS: Which DCI formats are mandatory for the RedCap UEs to support.**   + **~~FFS on potential modification on fields of existing DCI formats.~~**   Concerns regarding detailed DCI design (e.g., due to BW reduction) can be dealt with later in the RedCap WI. |
| Huawei | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y | Agree with the proposal and also support with adding the FFS proposed by Ericsson.  The existing DCI formats includes DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2. Monitoring DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1 is mandatory for Rel-15 UEs. Whether DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1 is mandatory or not for RedCap UEs can be discussed later in Rel-17 UE features for RedCap. Likewise, whether DCI formats 0\_2/1\_2 is mandatory or optional for RedCap UEs can be also discussed later. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | N | We think the motivation of this proposal need to be clarified.  If this proposal is based on the PDCCH blocking issue, we should confirm what is the conclusion here firstly. The conclusion should at least indicates whether we have the blocking issue, and the PDCCH blocking issue happens in the RRC\_CONNECTED and/or RACH procedure. After we totally confirm this issue, we then can discuss the specific methods including the compact DCI to address it.  If this proposal is independent on the blocking issue, we do not need to discuss this issue right now, since the DCI formats and DCI fields for Redcap devices are based on UE feature discussion. After the UE feature discussion, we can further confirm the DCI formats and DCI fields. |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| China Unicom | Y |  |
| NordicSemi | Y |  |
| LG | Y, with modifications | We don’t agree with the motivations for the FFS here, but if there is an issue then we also prefer configuring a separate initial DL BWP. We can live with the modifications from Ericsson to make a progress. |

Moderator Summary of Discussion #2

**Moderator Proposal #3-1:**

* **Reuse the existing DCI formats for Redcap devices, including Rel-16 DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 as a starting point.** 
  + **FFS on potential modification on fields of existing DCI formats.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Companies | Num. of Companies |
| Yes, or with modification | Vivo, CATT, Panasonic, DOCOMO, Spreadtrum, Nokia, Ericsson (adding new FFS, deleting the proposed FFS), Huawei, Sharp (adding FFS), Qualcomm, Intel, Samsung, Xiaomi, NEC, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, China Telecom, OPPO, China Unicom, NordicSemi, LG | 21 |
| No | ZTE | 1 |

**Discussion #3**

**Moderator Proposal #3-2-1:**

* **Reuse the existing DCI formats (including Rel-16 DCI format 0\_2/1\_2) for Redcap devices as a starting point.** 
  + **FFS on potential modification on fields of existing DCI formats.**
  + **FFS: Which DCI formats are mandatory for the RedCap UEs to support.**

Please state explicitly what modification is needed in ‘comment’ column, if you see any.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | We understand that mandatory support here does not mean default DCI format. As early identification is configurable, RedCap devices should be able to reuse the initial access procedure of R15/16 UEs, so the default DCI format same as legacy UEs needs to be kept. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y, with some modification. | We are fine to FFS about compact DCI based on existing DCI formats for PDCCH blocking reduction. But we have concern that compact DCI may not be enough or efficient to resolve the PDCCH blocking issue. So we suggest to clarify the FFS as follows.  o   **FFS whether and how ~~on~~ potential modification on fields of existing DCI formats is considered to reduce PDCCH blocking**  For the second FFS about DCI formats, we are generally fine with it. But we are also OK to consider it in later stage regarding UE features of RedCap. |
| CATT | Y, partially | The ‘existing DCI formats’ is a little too broad. For example, is DCI format 2\_0/2\_1/2\_2/2\_3 counted in this case? In our view, they are NOT the attempt to have this proposal (for tackling PDCCH blocking issue). And if we cannot reach consensus on the FFS sub-bullets, we’d better remove them. Suggest the following modification:  **Reuse the existing DCI format 0\_x/1\_x (including Rel-15 and Rel-16 DCI formats) for Redcap devices as a starting point.**   * **FFS details.** |
| NordicSemi | Y | We think CATT has a good point, but perhaps we could improve wording  **Reuse at least the existing DCI format 0\_x/1\_x (including Rel-15 and Rel-16 DCI formats) for Redcap devices as a starting point.**  We also support both FFS, and prefer Samsung wording of FFS. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | For the second FFS, we have the following question for clarification? Thanks.  For now, DCI format 0\_0/1\_0/0\_1/1\_1 are all mandatory for R15/R16 UE. If DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 are mandatory for RedCap UE, does it mean that DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 are not mandatory for RedCap UE any more, or there are two addional mandatory DCI formats for RedCap UE? |
| NEC | Y | Maybe “DCI formats (including Rel-16 DCI format 0\_2/1\_2) for Redcap devices” can be updated to “DCI formats (including Rel-16 DCI format 0\_2/1\_2) applicable to Redcap devices” |

# 4. MCS and CQI Tables

RAN1#104e made the following agreements related to MCS and CQI table for Redcap devices:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * The MCS tables currently defined are re-used for RedCap Ues   + FFS which MCS table is the default one for RedCap (i.e., the default one for non-RedCap Ues or the one with low SE entries)   + FFS mandatory/optional of the MCS tables   + Note: there is no new MCS table to be introduced for RedCap Ues   Agreements:   * The CQI tables currently defined are re-used for RedCap Ues.   + FFS mandatory/optional of the CQI tables   + There is no new CQI table to be introduced for RedCap Ues |
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Figure 1: MCS Tables

In contribution [5] [8] [11] [18], views on MCS and CQI tables support for Redcap devices have been presented. Companies’ positions were summarized in Table 3:

**Table 3: View on MCS table support**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Index | Description | Companies | # of Companies |
| Opt.1 | Low-SE MCS table is mandatory for Redcap UE | Spreadtrum [5], Futurewei [11] (at least for 1 Rx capable UE), | 2 |
| Opt.2 | Keep same as normal UE (i.e., MCS table 1 is the default Table and MCS Table 3 is optionally supported.) | Nokia [8], Samsung [18] | 2 |

In [11], differences between low-SE MCS table (i.e., MCS Table 3) and MCS table 1 were analyzed. It was observed that there are six more indices available below 0.12 (lowest code rate of the normal MCS table). The ratio between the lowest code rates in each table is 4. While TB scaling and the lower SE table each provide a maximum factor of 4 decrease in code rate, the lower SE table provides four additional levels; allowing the network more control to fine tune the coding rate. In addition, TB scaling and the lower SE table can be coupled; providing up to a factor of 16 decrease in code rate. This benefit in network flexibility was further motivates to make the lower SE table the default MCS table for RedCap Ues to address performance for initial access. It also pointed out in [11] that for certain network configurations, a RedCap UE and legacy UE can be scheduled with the same DCI for Msg2. As one consequence, a RedCap UE is required to translate the signaled MCS index to an index to the lower SE table.

On the other hand, contribution [8] emphasized that from the coverage results in TR 38.875, it is seen that MCS Table 1 is sufficient. In addition, during initial access, legacy Ues would only use MCS Table 1. Therefore, if MCS Table 3 is the default table for RedCap UE, it would be necessary to differentiate RedCap UE starting from Msg1. This is against the WI objective that RedCap UE can be identified in Msg1 and/or Msg3, and Msg A if supported, including the ability for the early indication to be configurable by the network. In [8], it was additionally acknowledged that for some services (e.g., industrial sensor requires commercial service availability of 99.99% and video surveillance requires reliability of up to 99.9%), it would be beneficial to use MCS Table 3 to improve coverage. Therefore, support for MCS Table 3 would be beneficial for some RedCap use cases or Ues. However, there is no need to make Table 3 support mandatory for all RedCap Ues.

**Discussion #1**

**Question 4-1: Which one between Opt.1 and opt.2 in Table 3 is preferred? If none of them, please describe the preferred option in ‘comment’ column. As usual, please provide brief justification for your preference.**

* Opt.1: Low-SE MCS table is mandatory for Redcap UE
* Opt.2: Keep same as normal UE (i.e., MCS table 1 is the default Table and MCS Table 3 is optionally supported.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred Option** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI |  | As per Chair guidance, this will be discussed in a different agenda item. |
| NordicSemi | Opt 1 | But, we ACK that Opt 1 is feasible only if RedCap Ues are early identified by gNB. This means that in practice both Low-SE and Regular tables would be mandatory for REDCAP UE in practice. |
| Sierra Wireless | None | Although our view is option1 – as per comments online – this is a UE capability discussion and can be discussed much later in the work item. |
| NEC |  | Same comment as FUTUREWEI |
| Qualcomm |  | It can be discussed later in R17 UE features for RedCap. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Same view as Futurewei |
| CMCC | Option 2 | We agree that this can be discussed under the modulation order agenda |
| DOCOMO |  | Same comment as FUTUREWEI |
| vivo |  | Agree with QC |
| OPPO |  | Same view as Futurewei |
| China Telecom |  | Same view as FUTUREWEI. It would be discussed in relaxed maximum modulation order agenda in next meeting. |
| Xiaomi |  | Same consideration with Futurewei and other companies. This issue can be discussed later. |
| Sharp |  | Same view as FUTUREWEI. |
| Samsung | Opt.2 | As Chair’s guidance, this will not be discussed in this agenda. Technically, we think option 2 is sufficient. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Opt.2 | Low-SE MCS table is mainly used for URLLC with the BLER requirement of 10-5, so such low SE MCS is defined to guarantee reception reliability. Although reduced number of Rx branches lead to performance degradation, the amount of performance degradation is limited. High-SE MCS table has the MCS entries with sufficient low SE, which can be applicable for the reduced number of Rx branches. Hence the existing specifications can be reused for RedCap UEs and low-SE table can be optionally supported according to different use cases. |
| CATT |  | It can be discussed later (in another agenda), not in this meeting. |
| Intel | Opt. 2 | Opt. 2 is sufficient in our view; Low-SE MCS table may be supported optionally in addition to the default 64-QAM MCS table, with the latter being mandatory.  In any case, we can discuss further next meeting. |
| Ericsson |  | Same view as FUTUREWEI. That being said, we have a preference for Opt. 2. |
| Spreadtrum | Opt. 1 | Agree with FUTUREWEI. RAN1 should discuss this issue as earlier as possible, which can provide guidance to help RAN2 design on R17 UE feature group list for Redcap. |
| Huawei |  | Same view as FUTUREWEI and our preference is Opt2. |
| LG | Opt. 2 | Our preference is Option 2. Anyway, this should be deferred to a later stage. |
| Panasonic |  | Same view as FUTUREWEI |

In NR, there are 3 CQI tables defined with one-to-one correspondence to the configured MCS table. Similarly, Companies were invited to provide inputs regarding the CQI table support for Redcap UEs in the following question.

**Question 4-2: Which option is preferred regarding CQI table support for Redcap devices? If none of them, please describe the preferred option in ‘comment’ column. As usual, please provide brief justification for your preference.**

* Opt.1: CQI table corresponding to low-SE MCS table is mandatory for Redcap UE
* Opt.2: Keep the same as normal UE (i.e., CQI table one corresponding to MCS table 1 is the default Table and CQI table one corresponding to MCS Table 3 is optionally supported.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred Option** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI |  | As per Chair guidance, this will be discussed in a different agenda item. |
| NordicSemi | Opt 1 |  |
| Sierra Wireless | None | Although our view is option1 - as per comments online – this is a UE capability discussion and can be discussed much later in the work item. |
| NEC |  | Same comment as FUTUREWEI |
| Qualcomm |  | It can be discussed later in R17 UE features for RedCap. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Same view as Futurewei |
| CMCC | Option 2 | We agree that this can be discussed under the modulation order agenda |
| DOCOMO |  | Same comment as FUTUREWEI |
| vivo |  | Agree with QC |
| OPPO |  | Same view as Futurewei |
| China Telecom |  | Same view as FUTUREWEI. It would be discussed in relaxed maximum modulation order agenda in next meeting. |
| Xiaomi |  | Same consideration with Futurewei and other companies. This issue can be discussed later. |
| Sharp |  | Same view as FUTUREWEI. |
| Samsung | Opt.2 | This can be discussed in other agenda later. Technically, we think option 2 is sufficient. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Opt.2 | Same with Question 4-1 |
| CATT |  | It can be discussed later (in another agenda), not in this meeting. |
| Intel | Opt. 2 | Same view as for Question 4-1.  In any case, we can discuss further next meeting. |
| Ericsson |  | Same view as FUTUREWEI. That being said, we have a preference for Opt. 2. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Same comment as FUTUREWEI |
| Huawei |  | Same s FUTUREWEI |
| LG | Opt. 2 | Our preference is Option 2. Anyway, this should be deferred to a later stage. |
| Panasonic |  | Same comment as FUTUREWEI |

Moderator Summary of Discussion #1

* No further discussions per chairman guideline on MCS and CQI tables.

# 5. Need of DL Coverage Recovery

Based on the revised WID [1], the minimum number of Rx branches is 1 for Redcap device on all of the FR1 bands. In TR 38.875, the observation of coverage evaluation can be summarized in Table below [29].

|  |
| --- |
| * DL coverage recovery for RedCap UE is needed for FR1 only * For RedCap UE with 1 Rx branch and reduced antenna efficiency, the need for coverage recovery depends on the frequency bands and DL PSD: * For carrier frequency of 4 GHz with DL PSD 24 dBm/MHz, coverage recovery may be needed for the downlink channels of Msg2, Msg4 and PDCCH CSS. A small or moderate compensation can be considered, where the square brackets indicate that the exact amount will depend on the techniques, scenarios, etc.:   - [1 dB] for PDCCH CSS  - [2-3 dB] for Msg4  - [6 dB] for Msg2 without TBS scaling. It is noted that coverage loss for Msg2 can be compensated by using the existing TBS scaling technique.  - For other carrier frequencies or DL PSD of 33 dBm/MHz, coverage recovery is not needed for the downlink channels if the target for coverage recovery is based on the MIL of the bottleneck channel for the reference NR UE.   * For RedCap UE with 2 Rx branches and reduced antenna efficiency, the need for coverage recovery also depends on the frequency bands and DL PSD: * For carrier frequency of 4 GHz with DL PSD 24 dBm/MHz, coverage recovery may be needed for the downlink channels of Msg2. A small or moderate compensation can be considered, where the square brackets indicate that the exact amount will depend on the techniques, scenarios, etc.:   - [1 dB] for Msg2 without TBS scaling. It is noted that coverage loss for Msg2 can be compensated by using the existing TBS scaling technique.   * For other carrier frequencies or DL PSD of 33 dBm/MHz, coverage recovery is not needed for the downlink channels if the target for coverage recovery is based on the MIL of the bottleneck channel for the reference NR UE. |

This was further summarized in Table below [11]

**Table 4: Coverage recovery observations in [29]**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2 Rx branches | | 1 Rx branch | |
| Channel | 4GHz, and DL PSD 24 dBm/MHz | not at 4GHz or using DL PSD 33 dBm/MHz | 4GHz, and DL PSD 24 dBm/MHz | not at 4GHz or using DL PSD 33 dBm/MHz |
| PDCCH |  |  | [1 dB] needed |  |
| PDSCH | [1 dB] needed |  | [2-3 dB] Msg4, [6 dB] Msg2 |  |
| PUSCH | [~3 dB] needed | [~3 dB] needed | [~3 dB] needed | [~3 dB] needed |

A few contributions [11] [17] [21] [22] [24] [26] [28 discussed the necessity of DL coverage enhancements especially for 1 Rx capable Redcap devices with the following proposals:

* One contribution [11] proposed to make two optional UE features to be mandatory to improve the PDSCH coverage especially in initial access phase, one is Low-SE MCS table and the other is PDSCH repetition feature.
* In [17], it was observed that a sufficient number of solutions exist commonly for Redcap and non-Redcap UEs, including TB scaling for msg2 PDSCH or msgB PDSCH, Low MCS, PDSCH repetition, Power boosting of gNB, VRB-to-PRB mapping, large AL for PDCCH. DL coverage recovery can be triggered by earlier identification.
* One contribution [21] proposed to investigate the msg2, msg4, and PDCCH coverage enhancement. BLER results for Msg2 with and without TBS scaling were provided in [21] and it was observed that TBS scaling only may not be sufficient to compensate the observed 6 dB coverage gap.
* In [22], it was proposed that RAN1 to confirm the following:
  + Whether or not DL PSD = 24dBm/MHz should be considered in normative work.
  + Confirm if antenna loss up to 3dB in both DL and UL due to compact form factor should be considered and if DL coverage recovery for Msg2 and PDCCH CSS and UL coverage recovery for Msg3/PUSCH should be supported by the spec.
  + Discuss whether to adopt different level of coverage recovery (including no coverage recovery) for 1Rx and 2Rx RedCap UE, if DL coverage recovery is supported
* One contribution [26] proposed to clarify whether DL coverage recovery is in the scope of RedCap WI.
* One contribution [28] proposed to support repetition of CORESET#0/CommonCORESET in RB-sets of a single wide carrier/BWP was proposed.

**Discussion #1**

**Question 5-1: Whether or not DL coverage enhancement should be considered based on current WID scope? If yes, please also explain the justification and list the preferred solution in Comment column.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | N | Although RAN discussed DL coverage enhancement, they decided not include DL coverage enhancement in the WID scope. With the 1Rx branch feature, there will be substantial degradation in performance even when the UE is in coverage. The question is how RAN1 should compensate for this degradation in DL performance. |
| NordicSemi | Y, but | We are fine to discuss DL coverage enhancements, but discussion should be referred to RAN1#105, such that all companies have chance to contribute to the topic. |
| Sierra Wireless | N | This is very clearly not in the scope of the WI. |
| NEC | N | From discussion in RAN#91, it is clear that DL coverage *enhancement* is out of the scope of the WI. |
| Qualcomm | Y | The observations/conclusions of R17 RedCap SI indicated that DL coverage recovery is needed in FR1 (e.g. PDCCH and PDSCH during initial access) for 1 RX UE.  Since the minimum number of RX branches is 1 for R17 RedCap UE, it is necessary to study the DL coverage recovery/enhancement for 1 RX UE by identifying the solutions available for non-RedCap UE, which can be re-used by R17 RedCap UE in FR1. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | It would be good to discuss DL coverage recovery and whether this can be mitigated via implementation or additional compensation will be needed. |
| CMCC | N | Agree with FUTUREWEI. |
| DOCOMO | N | DL coverage recovery is out of the scope based on the discussion in RAN#91e |
| vivo | N | Agree with FUTUREWEI, Sierra Wireless, NEC, CMCC, DOCOMO,… |
| OPPO | Y | 1 Rx is confirmed in the revised WID for the frequency bands where a legacy NR UE is required to be equipped with a minimum of 4 Rx antenna ports. For the RedCap UE with 1 Rx in these frequency bands, DL coverage has higher loss. DL coverage loss should be addressed in some cases, since it is related to the introduction of 1 Rx of RedCap UE, which is one of main aspects of reduced capability. |
| China Telecom | N | Same view as FUTUREWEI. |
| Xiaomi | Y | Same view with QC.  In our view, identifying existing solutions to compensate the DL coverage loss due to Rx reduction is within the WID scope. In this issue, only existing coverage enhancement solutions are considered. No new or No Redcap-specific DL coverage enhancement will be introduced. |
| Samsung |  | We are open to discuss, especially to enhance the coverage of PDCCH CSS. But we think there is no issue for Msg 2 with TB scaling factor. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | N | It is out of the scope and the existing technologies can be applied if needed. |
| CATT | N | Not essential and out of scope. |
| Intel | N | It was brought up multiple times during the RAN #91E meeting (and RAN #90E meeting), and it coverage recovery was particularly not considered as part of the WI scope for RedCap. Based on this, there was a note from RAN #90E indicating “FFS” on coverage recovery that was deleted when updating the WID during RAN #91E.  So, we do not see any need to bring it up again now. |
| Ericsson | N | In our understanding, DL coverage recovery is not in the WID scope. Nevertheless, for the coverage limited channels identified during the RedCap SI phase, existing coverage recovery techniques can be used. For example, for Msg2, TBS scaling (e.g., w/ scaling factor of 0.25) can be used, for PDCCH, CSS keep trying method can be used, and for Msg 4, HARQ retransmissions can be used. Furthermore, coverage recovery for PDCCH and Msg4 will not be needed if relaxed antenna efficiency is not considered. In our understanding, relaxed antenna efficiency is not included in the WID scope.  Therefore, no further discussions on DL coverage recovery is needed in the Rel-17 RedCap WI. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | The simulation results show clear needs for DL coverage recovery for 1Rx, e.g., Msg4 and PDCCH CSS. We prefer to discuss how to address these issues. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | For smart watch, there were some LLS showing 1Rx may outperform 2Rx with low antenna efficiency, but in higher frequency bands within sub-6GHz, 4Rx is mandatory for coverage purpose, so smart watch with 1Rx without additional antenna gain may still suffer from coverage loss.  Although we only identify the Msg2/4 and PDCCH CSS under certain conditions with evaluation methodology Option 3, we still concern about the real deployment in macro cell for smart watch in 4Rx mandatory bands. We suggest revisiting the coverage recovery, e.g. evaluation methodology Option 1. |
| Huawei | N | Not in the scope although we admit the possibility to use existing features, which can be addressed later in UE feature discussion for DL coverage. |
| LG | N | Cleary not in the scope. We have not recommended the DL coverage recovery in our study report. And it was not conditioned on the number of Rx branches. So, there is no need to comeback to this issue with the introduction of 1-Rx RedCap UEs. |
| Panasonic | N | RAN plenary discussion on DL Coverage is following.  Current RedCap WID contains following. Originally, there was no "uplink" below. We asked whether DL compensation is within the scope or not is not clear. Then "uplink" was added because no coverage enhancement solution is necessary in this WID. Therefore, our understanding is DL coverage recovery is out of the scope.  *- Uplink coverage enhancement solutions specified in the NR Coverage Enhancement WI (NR\_cov\_enh) shall be assumed to be available also to RedCap UEs by default (with small modifications for RedCap UEs if found necessary).* |

Moderator Summary of Discussion #1

**Whether DL coverage enhancement should be considered?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Companies | Num. of Companies | Reasoning |
| Yes | NordicSemi (defer to next meeting), Qualcomm, Nokia, NSB, OPPO, Xiaomi, Samsung (e.g., PDCCH CSS), Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Spreadtrum | 10 | * The observations and evaluation results in TR indicate that DL coverage recovery is needed for 1 Rx UE. |
| No | FUTUREWEI, Sierra Wireless, NEC, CMCC, DCM, Vivo, China Telecom, ZTE, CATT, Intel, Ericsson, Huawei, LG, Panasonic | 14 | * Existing coverage recovery techniques can be used. |

# 6. Access Control for Redcap

In the updated WID, one objective was added to allow system information indicating whether a RedCap UE can camp on the cell/frequency, and the indication can specific to 1Rx or 2Rx.

|  |
| --- |
| * Specify a system information indication to indicate whether a RedCap UE can camp on the cell/frequency or not; it shall be possible for the indication to be specific to the number of Rx branches of the UE. [RAN2, RAN1] |

Contribution [3][13][19] discussed aspects realizing this objective of access control for Redcap UEs. In [3], different mechanisms were mentioned for the network to indicate whether the network allows the UE’s access, including indications in MIB or SIB1 or load balancing mechanism during the initial access procedure, or during paging procedure, use of 2 more spare bits in PBCH payload or using sparse bits in DCI that schedules SIB1. In [19], different alternatives were discussed depending on the bits number of signalling for access control, such as Bar RedCap UEs (regardless of the number of Rx branches), 1-Rx only, or 1-Rx only for bands requiring 4 Rx branches. Using sparse bits in DCI that schedules SIB1 is preferred by [3] [19] due to potential power saving benefit. It was proposed in [19] that access control signalling in SIB should provide the flexibility to indicate per band whether a RedCap UE with specific number of Rx branches of the UE can camp on the cell/frequency. In [13], it proposed that System information can indicate the conditions that RedCap UEs or RedCap UEs with specific number of Rx branches are allowed to camp on the cell/frequency.

On the other hand, it should be noted that the issue of access control is being discussed in RAN WG2 as leading work group on this objective. To avoid duplicate efforts and considering the fact that the objective is tasked to RAN2 as leading WG, it may be prudent to wait for RAN WG2 to make further progress first. In addition, the access and earlier identification were typically managed to be handled in dedicated Redcap agendas.

**Discussion #1**

**Conclusion 6-1: On the issue of access control for Redcap UEs, RAN1 waits for RAN2 further progress and continue discussion in other Redcap agendas starting from RAN1 105 meeting.**

* **If ’no’, please kindly explain which aspects you think RAN1 need to work on in this meeting and why?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI |  | As per Chair guidance, this will be discussed in a different agenda item. |
| NordicSemi | OK |  |
| Sierra Wireless | yes | As per Chair guidance, this will be discussed in a different agenda item. |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | Access control is discussed in RAN2 and other working groups. RAN1 should wait for their decisions/agreements. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| vivo | Y | Agree with QC |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Samsung |  | Access control should be discussed in AI 8.6.2 on RAN1 aspects for RAN2-led features for RedCap in next RAN1 meeting. It’s independent from reduced Rx branches. |
| ZTE,Sanechips |  | Whether the reserved bits in the DCI for SIB1 can be used for access control should be discussed by RAN1. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | As per Chair guidance, this will be discussed in a different agenda item. |
| Huawei | Y |  |
| LG |  | Okay to defer the discussion to the next meeting. But, as we commented in the GTW session, for the aspects that the access control is related to number of Rx branches for RedCap UEs, RAN1 needs to discuss how to control cell/frequency access of RedCap UEs based on the number of Rx branches taking into account the dependency on the frequency bands (e.g., whether the frequency band is 4 Rx mandatory or 2 Rx mandatory). As this is mainly related to the number of Rx branches for RedCap UEs, we think this agenda item should be the right place for this discussion as commented by Samsung. Whether the access control can be indicated in the DCI scheduling SIB1 can also be discussed in RAN1 in this agenda item. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |

Moderator Summary of Discussion #1

All companies agreed the conclusion proposed by FL based on the guideline from Chairman in GTW1.

**Moderator Proposal #5-1:**

* **Conclusion: On the issue of access control for Redcap UEs, RAN1 waits for RAN2 further progress and continue discussion in other Redcap agendas starting from RAN1 #105 meeting.**

# 7. Earlier Identification of Redcap Devices

The revised WID lists the following objectives

|  |
| --- |
| * Specify functionality that will enable RedCap UEs to be explicitly identifiable to networks through an early indication in Msg1 and/or Msg3, and Msg A if supported, including the ability for the early indication to be configurable by the network. [RAN2, RAN1] |

In contributions [3] [4] [6] [15] [19] [24] [27], views on redcap device type definition and realizing the earlier identification of RedCap Ues have been presented, as summarized in Table below:

Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| Huawei [3] | The one RedCap UE type has only maximum UE channel bandwidth including in the minimized set of basic capabilities |
| OPPO [4] | Using Msg1 and FFS on Msg3 |
| Intel [15] | Configurable between Msg1/Msg3 |
| Lge [19] | * Separate RO in time/frequency for Redcap devices, * Configurable by SIB1 on Msg1 or Msg3 or both and even inclusion of number of Rx branches |
| Nordic Semiconductor ASA [27] | * Using Msg1. * Support replicating Ros to multiple RB-sets based on configuration within one RB set. * Using Msg3 to indicate number of Rx branches if both 1 Rx and 2 Rx Redcap devices are allowed by network. |

Similar as ‘Access control’ topic, the ‘earlier identification’ was handled in another dedicated agenda (i.e., AI 8.6.2), which was void in this meeting. In addition, the issue of earlier identification control is being discussed in RAN WG2 as leading work group on this objective.

**Discussion #1**

**Conclusion 7-1: No further discussion on ‘earlier identification’ of Redcap device in RAN1 104 bis e-meeting.**

* **If the answer is ’no’, please kindly explain which aspects you think RAN1 need to discuss in this meeting and why?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| NordicSemi | OK |  |
| Sierra Wireless | yes | As per Chair guidance, this will be discussed in a different agenda item. |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | N | We think early indication by RedCap UE can be discussed in this meeting, since it is associated with the PHY designs that enable early identification of RedCap Ues by NW, which can be de-coupled from the access control and other upper layer aspects.  The necessity for early indication/identification can be justified (at least) by the following example, assuming RedCap UE is allowed to access the NW:  • When the initial UL BWP of non-RedCap UE is wider than the max BW of RedCap UE, early indication by msg1 is necessary during initial access, which can inform NW about the presence of RedCap UE.  • After NW knows the presence of RedCap UE, it can determine an appropriate UL grant for the msg3 transmission (or retransmission), which is aligned with the reduced capabilities (e.g. BW) of RedCap UE.  • Without PHY support for early indication/identification, RedCap UE is likely to experience constant failures during initial access, even though it is allowed to access the NW. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| CMCC | N | We think early identification is related to reporting of number of Rx branches, it can be discussed with section 2 together. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| vivo | Y | The relevant WID objective is the following and RAN2 led   * Specify functionality that will enable RedCap Ues to be explicitly identifiable to networks through an early indication in Msg1 and/or Msg3, and Msg A if supported, including the ability for the early indication to be configurable by the network. [RAN2, RAN1]   So it should belongs to the AI 8.6.2 “RAN1 aspects for RAN2-led features for RedCap” which is restricted for this meeting, no discussion expected. |
| OPPO | N | In the revised WID, the following are in the scope.   * *A means shall be specified by which the gNB can know the number of Rx branches of the UE.* * *Specify functionality that will enable RedCap Ues to be explicitly identifiable to networks through an early indication in Msg1 and/or Msg3, and Msg A if supported, including the ability for the early indication to be configurable by the network. [RAN2, RAN1]*   Discussions are needed in RAN1 for the issue of earlier identification of RedCap UE. It has impacts on performance of Msg2/4, which is related to the reduced 1 Rx branch. |
| China Telecom | N | We are fine to discuss the early identification in section 2 in this meeting. |
| Xiaomi |  | We think early identification is not the focus in this meeting. We can discuss this issue in later phase. But we are open to only discuss the need of early indication for Rx branch. |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y | Earlier identification should be discussed in AI 8.6.2 on RAN1 aspects for RAN2-led features for RedCap in next RAN1 meeting. It’s independent from reduced Rx branches. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | N | Earlier identification especially for msg1 should be discussed as soon as possible by RAN1, since RAN2 discussion is limited by the decision. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | It may be better that RAN1 provide preference to RAN2 from PHY perspective.  Smart watch with 1Rx without additional antenna gain may have risk of out of coverage in 4Rx mandatory bands in macro cell. So it is better that gNB can know the existence of 1Rx RedCap UE and using the proper AL and TB scaling to guarantee the coverage to the best effort. |
| Huawei |  | Can be discussed in e.g. thread-01, since it appears clearer that number of Rx branches is less relevant for early identification.  The issue can be discussed in thread-01 for differentiation of RedCap and non-RedCap UEs using BW only. |
| LG | N | We prefer not to defer the discussion on early indication of RedCap UEs especially in Msg1 to the next meeting. Taking into account the fact that early indication of CE/non-CE UEs is being discussed in CE WI, we think we need a parallel discussion from the perspective of RedCap, to come up with a harmonized solution for early indication for RedCap and non-RedCap UEs. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |

Moderator Summary of Discussion #1

**No further discussion on ‘earlier identification’ of Redcap device in RAN1 104 bis e-meeting?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Companies | Num. of Companies | Reasoning |
| Yes | NordicSemi, Sierra Wireless, NEC, Nokia, NSB, DCM, Vivo, Sharp, Samsung, CATT, Ericsson, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Spreadtrum, Panasonic. | 15 |  |
| No | Qualcomm, CMCC, OPPO, China Telecom, ZTE, LG, | 6 | * Discuss earlier-identification between 1RX and 2 Rx in section 2. |

**Moderator Proposal #6-1:**

* **Conclusion: No further discussion on ‘earlier identification’ between Redcap and non-Redcap device in RAN1 #104 bis e-meeting in AI 8.6.1.2.**

# Other aspects

**Cell selection**

* P1: One contribution proposed to introduce specific RSRP thresholds for Redcap device which are configured by gNB for SSB and UL carrier selection for performing random access

**DCI size reduction**

* P2: One contribution [16] proposed to consider capturing in physical specification TS 38.212 that Redcap UE always assumes MCS/NDI/RV of TB2 is not presence to avoid the need of RRC signaling of ‘*maxNrofCodeWordsScheduledByDCI’.*

**Access barring**

* P3: It was proposed in [24], that barring of RedCap UEs could be based on DL channel status, instead of simply based on number of Rx branches

**Question 8-1: Which of the proposals in the list above (P1, P2, P3) are important and need to be discussed in the RAN1 104-bis e-meeting to make progress? What other aspects/proposal need to be added for discussion?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | P2 can be discussed if time allows |
| vivo | P1/P3 are more RAN2 issues. P2 can be discussed in RAN1 but not urgent for this meeting. |
| OPPO | P1 is related to DL coverage loss due to reduced Rx branch. It can be discussed if time allows. |
| Samsung | DCI size reduction can be considered as an alternative for PDCCH blocking rate reduction. P1 and P3 are not relevant to reduced Rx branches for RedCap.  In addition, we addressed the FFS in previous meeting: “FFS: need for reporting of UE antenna related information to gNB (e.g., # of panels, polarization, etc.) ”. In our view, there is no need to report additional UE antenna related information to gNB. |
| Intel | None.  P1/P3 are out-of-scope for RAN1.  For P2, the only benefit seems to be one bit in RRC signaling, and not in terms of DCI format size (which anyway should not include the scheduling details of a second TB). |
| Ericsson | None in this meeting. P1 seems like a RAN2/RAN4 issue. P3 is also a RAN2 issue. P2 concerns detailed DCI/RRC design which can be dealt with later in the WI. |
| LG | None of them are urgent to make a progress. |
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