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# 1 Introduction

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Complexity/cost reduction*** Further reduced UE complexity in FR1 [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]
	+ UE BB bandwidth reduction
		- 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for PDSCH (for both unicast and broadcast) and PUSCH, with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL
		- The other physical channels and signals are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF+BB bandwidth.
		- Support additional separate early indication(s) [RAN1, RAN2]
	+ UE peak data rate reduction
		- Relaxation of the constraint (*vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4) for peak data rate reduction
		- The relaxed constraint is, e.g., 1 (instead of 4).
		- The parameters (*vLayers*, *Qm*, *f*) can be as in Rel-17 RedCap.
	+ Both 15 kHz SCS and 30 kHz SCS are supported.
	+ Aim to define at most one Rel-18 RedCap UE type for further UE complexity reduction.
	+ The existing UE capability framework is used, and changes to capability signalling are specified only if necessary. By default, all UE capabilities applicable to a Rel-17 RedCap UE are applicable unless otherwise specified.

Notes:* The work defined as part of this WI is not to overlap with LPWA use cases.
* Coexistence with non-RedCap UEs and Rel-17 RedCap UEs should be ensured.
* This WI considers all applicable duplex modes unless otherwise specified.

Check in RAN#99 regarding:* Whether UE peak data rate reduction for UE is limited only with UE BB bandwidth reduction or standalone
 |

RAN#99 discussed whether UE peak data rate reduction (“PR1”) should be supported as a standalone feature or only in combination with UE BB bandwidth reduction (“BW3/PR3”) and endorsed the following proposal [8], where the different nicknames for the UE complexity reduction features (“PR1” and “BW3/PR3”) originate from TR 38.865 [9].

|  |
| --- |
| **Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 and Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1 are designed/targeted to same peak data rate, i.e., 10Mbps**Note 1: Peak data rate of “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of 20MHz + PR1” and “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1” is same including unicast and broadcast respectively.Note 2: PRB processing capability of “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of 20MHz + PR1” is not limited to “25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS” and it corresponds to PRB size corresponding to 20 MHz.Note 3: The only difference between “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of 20MHz + PR1” and “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1” is Note 2 and *vLayers·Qm·f* in order to have the same peak rate.Note 4: The initial access procedure of Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 is realized by following:* Same as Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1
 |

This document summarizes contributions [10] – [38] submitted to agenda item 9.6.1 and the following email discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| [112bis-e-R18-RedCap-01] Email discussion on UE complexity reduction by April 26 – Johan (Ericsson)* Check points: April 21, April 26
 |

The issues in this document are tagged and color coded with High Priority or Medium Priority. The FLSs for the initial discussion rounds can be found in [40, 41, 42]. Issues that are in the focus of this discussion round are tagged FL9.

Follow the naming convention in this example:

* *eRedCapFLS4-v000.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS4-v001-CompanyA.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS4-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*
* *eRedCapFLS4-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx*

If needed, you may “lock” a discussion document for 30 minutes by creating a checkout file, as in this example:

* Assume CompanyC wants to update *eRedCapFLS4-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*.
* CompanyC uploads an empty file named *eRedCapFLS4-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.checkout*
* CompanyC checks that no one else has created a checkout file simultaneously, and if there is a collision, CompanyC tries to coordinate with the company who made the other checkout (see, e.g., contact list below).
* CompanyC then has 30 minutes to upload *eRedCapFLS4-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx*
* If no update is uploaded in 30 minutes, other companies can ignore the checkout file.
* Note that the file timestamps on the server are in UTC time.

In file names, please use the hyphen character (not the underline character) and include ‘v’ in front of the version number, as in the examples above and in line with the general recommendation (see slide 16 in [R1-2302258](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302258.zip)), otherwise the sorting of the files will be messed up (which can only be fixed by the RAN1 secretary).

To avoid excessive email load on the RAN1 email reflector, please note that there is NO need to send an info email to the reflector just to inform that you have uploaded a new version of this document. Companies are invited to enter the contact info in the table below.

**FL9 Question 1-1a: Please consider entering contact info below for the points of contact for this email discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point(s) of contact** | **Email address(es)** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Mayuko Okano | mayuko.okano.ca@nttdocomo.com |
| vivo | Lihui Wang | wanglihui@vivo.com |
| Nordic Semiconductor | Karol Schober | karol.schober@nordicsemi.no |
| CMCC | Jiazhen Zhang | zhangjiazhen@chinamobile.com |
| SONY | Martin Beale | martin.beale@sony.com |
| LG Electronics | Seungjin Ahn | Seungjin.ahn@lge.com |
| CATT | Yongqiang Fei | feiyongqiang@catt.cn |
| FUTUREWEI | Vip Desai | vipul.desai@futurewei.com |
| Ericsson | Sandeep Narayanan Kadan Veedu | sandeep.narayanan.kadan.veedu@ericsson.com |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Youjun Hu | hu.youjun1@zte.com.cn |
| Nokia, NSB | Rapeepat Ratasuk | rapeepat.ratasuk@nokia.com |
| Qualcomm | Yongjun Kwak | yongkwak@qti.qualcomm.com |
| MediaTek | Chiou-Wei Tsai | cw.tsai@mediatek.com |
| Sharp | Xiaojun Ma | xiaojun.ma@cn.sharp-world.com |
| Spreadtrum | Sicong Zhao | Sicong.zhao@unisoc.com |
| Panasonic | Shotaro Maki | maki.shotaro@jp.panasonic.com |
| Sierra Wireless | Serkan Dost | sdost@sierrawireless.com |
| NEC | Takahiro Sasaki | takahiro.sasaki@nec.com |
| OPPO | Zhisong Zuo | zuozhisong@oppo.com |
| DENSO | Takahiro Furuyama | takahiro.furuyama.j6k@jp.denso.com |
| Xiaomi | Qiao Xuemei | qiaoxuemei@xiaomi.com |
| Lenovo | Yuantao Zhang | zhangyt18@lenovo.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Frank Long | frank.longyi@huawei.com |
| Transsion | Sha Wang | sha.wang@transsion.com |
| Intel | Yingyang Li | yingyang.li@intel.com |

# 2 UE BB bandwidth reduction

2.0 Earlier agreements

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

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

Conclusion:There is no consensus to continue discussion on “whether additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap UEs is allowed to be configured by the SIB in the cell”.**Number of PRBs**Agreement:For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for PUSCH, select the following option for the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can transmit per slot or per hop, if applicable:* Option 3: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS

For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for PDSCH (for both unicast and broadcast), select the following option for the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can process per slot:* Option 3: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS

Note: No intention to change the RAN4 RF specifications about maximum transmission PRB number**PUSCH bandwidth**Agreement:For UE BB bandwidth reduction, a UE is not expected to receive an UL grant in a DCI with a PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.Agreement:For UE BB bandwidth reduction, a UE is not expected to be configured with a CG grant with a PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.Agreement:For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to receive an UL grant in a RAR or in a DCI scrambled with TC-RNTI with a Msg3 PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.Agreement:For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to perform 2-step RACH with a MsgA PUSCH resource spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.**UE post-FFT buffer size**Conclusion:For UE BB complexity reduction, for broadcast and unicast PDSCH, RAN1 does not assume that the UE post-FFT buffer size per slot is smaller than 20 MHz**Unicast PDSCH bandwidth**Agreement:* For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a DL assignment in a DCI with a unicast PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.
* The number of PRB scheduled in DCI is not larger than the maximum number of PRB agreed in previous agreement from 110b-e

**SIB1/OSI transmission**Agreement:For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for SIB1 (PDSCH),* Allow the scheduling of SIB1 to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation)

Agreement:For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for broadcast OSI (PDSCH),* Allow the scheduling of broadcast OSI (PDSCH) to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation)

 Conclusion:For UE BB complexity reduction, broadcast of separate SIB1/OSI (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs is not supported.**Paging bandwidth**Agreement:From RAN1 perspective, for UE BB complexity reduction, for paging channel (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, allow the scheduling of paging channel to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). The scheduling of paging PDSCH is allowed to be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**RAR bandwidth**Agreement:For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for RAR (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot.* When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is within the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot, the legacy time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission (not smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 ms) is applied.
* When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot,
	+ The UE receives the RAR and correspondingly transmits Msg3 if the TDRA for Msg3 in UL grant in RAR indicates that the time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission is NOT smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms.
		- FFS: value(s) of X
	+ Otherwise, the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation.
* Note: it does not mean early indication is needed
* Note: it will not be used as example for unicast PDSCH

For the “FFS: value(s) of X”* X = [0.5/0.25 or 1/0.5 or 2/1] ms for 15/30kHz SCS
* Note: Single Value pair for X is to selected for SCSs

**Msg4 bandwidth**Working assumption:* For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.
	+ The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.

**Simultaneous reception**Conclusion:For UE BB complexity reduction, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions for SIB1/OSI/paging/RAR. |

2.1 Max number of PRBs

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

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for PUSCH, select the following option for the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can transmit per slot or per hop, if applicable:* Option 3: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS

For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for PDSCH (for both unicast and broadcast), select the following option for the maximum number of PRBs that the UE can process per slot:* Option 3: 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS

Note: No intention to change the RAN4 RF specifications about maximum transmission PRB number |

Contribution [37] proposes to revise the agreement by reducing the 25 PRBs to 24 PRBs, so that the same bandwidth is achieved for 15 and 30 kHz SCS, which may simplify the peak rate constraint discussion in Section 3.

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.1-1a: Should the maximum number of PRBs be changed from 25 to 24 PRBs?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO |  | We don’t see the strong need to revise the agreement. |
| Vivo |  | No serious issue found in the agreements for 25PRBs |
| Nordic  | Y | We this as a good idea, it also helps with FDM multiplexing with legacy UEs |
| CMCC |  | Fine to keep current agreement. |
| Samsung |  | Needn’t revise the agreement. |
| LG | N | We didn’t find the reason why to revise the agreement is necessary. |
| CATT |  | The motivation is not strong enough to revert the previous agreement. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Fine with current agreement |
| Intel | N |  |
| Ericsson |  | No strong view — we would be fine with the change. However, we should decide on this before we discuss the value of ‘X’ (the constraint value). |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Not necessary. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We don’t see the need to revise the agreement. |
| Qualcomm | N | No strong motivation to change it  |
| FL2 | There does not seem to be much support for changing the maximum number of PRBs. |

Contribution [10] proposes to make a similar agreement for 60 kHz SCS as for 15/30 kHz SCS. The WID [1] says that “both 15 kHz SCS and 30 kHz SCS are supported” but does not say anything explicit about 60 kHz SCS. The contribution proposes to select 6 PRBs as the maximum number of PRBs for 60 kHz SCS.

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 2.1-2a: Should UE BB bandwidth reduction be supported for 60 kHz SCS? How?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | N |  |
| CATT |  | It seems out of scope and lack of study during SI phase. But if the specification impact is marginal, we can accept. |
| Intel |  | We are open for SCS 60kHz |
| Ericsson | Y (preferred) | We do not think there is any strong reason to preclude 60 kHz SCS.  |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Given that bandwidth limitation is only in the baseband for unicast PDSCH/PUSCH, we think 60 kHz SCS can be supported since impact is small. |
| Qualcomm |  | We are open for 60KHz SCS but this is not an urgent issue in this meeting. We may come back next meeting after further checking. |
| Samsung | N | 60kHz is not in the scope of WID. |
| OPPO | N | We think 60kHz is optional feature and not well implemented from Rel-15. This late stage is even harder to catch up. |
| Xiaomi |  | We are open for SCS 60kHZ, but it is out of the current scope. It should be discussed in RAN meeting at first to update the WID if necessary.  |
| DOCOMO |  | We are open to support 60 kHz SCS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N |  |
| LG | N | “Both 15 kHz SCS and 30 kHz SCS are supported.” is only in the scope of WID |
| FL8 | Based on these initial received responses regarding UE BB bandwidth reduction support for 60 kHz SCS, it seems that it would require a WID update to include it as an explicit objective. Interested companies can for example propose such a WID update in RAN#100. |

2.2 Random access timeline

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

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

For the “FFS: value(s) of X”* X = [0.5/0.25 or 1/0.5 or 2/1] ms for 15/30kHz SCS
* Note: Single Value pair for X is to selected for SCSs
 |

The contributions express the following preferences regarding the value for X:

* Contributions [10, 13, 16, 21, 30, 33] propose X=0.5/0.25.
* Contributions [11, 13, 16, 24] propose X=0.5/0.25 or X=1/0.5.
* Contributions [15, 18, 19, 22, 29, 31] propose X=1/0.5.
* Contributions [20, 32] propose X=1/0.5 or X=2/1.
* Contributions [12, 15, 17, 26, 36, 38] propose X=2/1.
* Contribution [27] proposes X=0.5/0.25 if Msg1 indication is supported, otherwise X=1/0.5 or X=2/1.

Other proposals expressed in the contributions:

* Contribution [11] proposes to adopt the timing relaxation also for PR1-only UEs.
* Contribution [21] proposes to clarify what X should be used if DL and UL use different SCS.
* Contributions [12, 13, 26, 30] propose to introduce similar timing relaxation for similar cases.
* Contributions [10, 18, 21] propose to support PUSCH TDRA configuration specific to Rel-18 eRedCap UEs.
* Contributions [21, 29] propose to consider larger Δ value(s) in case RAR PDSCH bandwidth is larger than 5 MHz

Companies are invited to reply to the following questions.

**FL1 High Priority** **Question 2.2-1a: Please indicate a preferred option for X [ms] for 15/30 kHz SCS:**

* **Option 1: X = 0.5/0.25**
* **Option 2: Either X = 0.5/0.25 or X=1/0.5, with a preference for X=0.5/0.25**
* **Option 3: Either X = 0.5/0.25 or X=1/0.5, with no preference between them**
* **Option 4: Either X = 0.5/0.25 or X=1/0.5, with a preference for X=1/0.5**
* **Option 5: X = 1/0.5**
* **Option 6: Either X = 1/0.5 or X=2/1, with a preference for X=1/0.5**
* **Option 7: Either X = 1/0.5 or X=2/1, with no preference between them**
* **Option 8: Either X = 1/0.5 or X=2/1, with a preference for X=2/1**
* **Option 9: X = 2/1**
* **Option 10: Other (elaborate in comment field)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option (1-10)** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | 1 | Considering the number of valid entries on default PUSCH TDRA table, smaller value is preferred for X to ensure the flexibility on TDRA configuration. |
| Vivo | 1 | Change/enhance default TDRA table is not preferred, so smaller values can have less limitations on the usable TDRA table entries.  |
| Nordic  | 4 |  |
| CMCC | 1 | Considering the impact of larger X on the flexibility of PUSCH TDRA configuration and the access latency of other kinds of UEs, comparatively small X is preferred. |
| SONY | 5 | We think that the processing timeline for X=0.5/0.25 is too short, especially when considering the channel estimation processing requirements. We would not assume that the channel estimation processing requirements are much much less than the LDPC processing requirements. |
| Samsung | 8 |  |
| LG | 9 | Among the propose candidate values for X, option 9 seems to be more accommodating than the other aggressive values considering the perspectives of many companies designing modem solutions. |
| CATT | 1 | Option 1 is our first preference. The most time-consuming procedure should be PDCCH blind detection, not PDSCH processing. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | EI needs to be available regardless of the answer to this question. Currently our preference after reading the contributions is Option 5, but we are willing to hear more arguments |
| Intel | 9 or 8 | We prefer to leave more freedom for implementation. X=2/1 is preferred, but we are fine with X=1/0.5 if majority supports it.  |
| Ericsson | 1 | As discussed in our contribution [R1-2302298](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302298.zip), larger values for X would lead to fewer valid entries in the default TDRA table, and consequently, limiting the network scheduling flexibility. Specifying the smallest value, i.e., Option 1, would help to minimize this impact. Also, specifying Option 1 would help to minimize the impact to other RedCap UEs (e.g., Rel-17 RedCap UEs and PR1-only UEs) if the additional separate indication is not configured (or supported) and/or if the additional indication is common for both BW/PR3+PR1 UEs and PR1-only UEs |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 4 | A slight preference on X=1/0.5.Additionally, it is needed to be clarified that without msg1 early indication, the specified value X is meaningless, since the gNB is not aware of the timeline relaxing and msg3 scheduling would not be impacted any. |
| Nokia, NSB | 4 |  |
| Qualcomm | 1 | Based on our analysis in [R1-2303898](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2303898.zip), half-slot length is sufficient for Msg2-Msg3 timeline relaxation. This Tdoc shows that channel estimation and demodulation block is only affected by the larger number of PRBs and LDPC decoding block does not need any additional processing time. Assuming that channel estimation and demodulation block takes much smaller portion (about 20%) of total processing time compared to LDPC block, we calculated the required timeline relaxation as 7 symbols (X = 0.5/0.25) for both 15 and 30 KHz SCS.Moreover, if other candidate (X = 1/0.5 or X=2/1) is chosen for X, there would be larger restrictions on Msg3 scheduling flexibility because there would be fewer valid entries in default TDRA table as mentioned by multiple companies. |

Among the responses received so far to Question 2.2-1a,

* 43% express that they prefer X=0.5/0.25 ms
	+ 64% express that they are ok with X=0.5/0.25 ms
* 29% express that they prefer X=1/0.5 ms
	+ 43% express that they are ok with X=1/0.5 ms
* 7% express that they prefer X=2/1 ms
	+ 21% express that they are ok with X=2/1 ms

Based on the responses received so far, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL2 High Priority Proposal 2.2-1b:**

* **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”**
	+ **X = [0.5/0.25 or 1/0.5] ms for 15/30kHz SCS**
	+ **X = 2/1 ms for 15/30kHz SCS is no longer considered**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| FL3 | Based on discussion in the online (GTW) session on Monday 17th April, the following question can be considered.**High Priority Question 2.2-1c: Please indicate your preferred option.*** **Option 1:**
	+ **X = 0.5/0.25 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
	+ **A network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 is not supported.**
* **Option 2:**
	+ **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
	+ **A network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 is supported.**
* **Option 3:**
	+ **X = 2/1 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
	+ **A network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 is supported.**
* **Option 4:**
	+ **Other (please elaborate in the comment field).**
 |
| **Company** | **Option (1-4)** | **Comments** |
| Sharp | Option 4 | We cannot see the need of binding the selection for X with the msg1 early indication. And for Question 2.2-1a, we prefer option2. |
| CATT2 | Option 1 or 4 | Thanks FL for the update. Larger X may require new TDRA table/manner which become essential demand for additional early indication in Msg1, we admit. The key point is that different TDRA tables/manners must be applied to Rel-18 and Rel-17 RedCap UE, which gNB cannot handle without separate Msg1.But after further checking, for the default legacy TDRA table, if RAR>5 MHz:* X=0.5/0.25 ms, at least *j+1,* *j+2*, *j+3* entries are usable;
* X=1/0.5 ms, at least *j+2*, *j+3* entries are usable;
* X=2/1 ms, at least *j+3* entries are usable.

So regardless early indication in Msg1 is supported or not, all X values can be supported by legacy TDRA table. But current proposal seems implying that X=1/0.5 ms or X=2/1 ms will always have to introduce new default TDRA table/manner (?), which is not valid we doubt.Our suggestion is proceed step by step: (S1) determine value of X; (S2) determine whether to introduce new default TDRA table/manner based on S1; (3) determine whether to support Msg1 early indication based on S2. |
| Vivo | Option 1 or 4 | Our view is if large X values like X=2/1 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS request to enhance the default TDRA table or enhance the Δ values, so that the legacy/R17 RedCap UE and Rel-18 RedCap UE use different default TDRA table or Δ values, then the additional early indication in Msg1 is needed; If no enhancement on the default TDRA table or the Δ values, no additional early indication in Msg1 is needed. Because NW still has the flexibility to use any entry in the current default TDRA table, if the scheduling timing K2 of the selected entry cannot meet the timeline for R18 “BW3/PR3+PR1” UE, the R18 “BW3/PR3+PR1” UE behavior is up to implementation. Alternatively, NW can decide either not to allocate MSG2 with the BW larger than 5MHz or use the limited entry in the current TDRA table for MSG2 with the BW larger than 5MHz, so that all UE types can meet the timeline requirement. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 3 | Sorry for missing the feedback in the last roundFor X, our preference is 2/1 ms. Considering the worst case (20MHz PRB), at least the option [0.5/0.25 ms] is too short and cannot accept for us. As mentioned by some companies online, allowing the R18 5MHz RedCap to process 20Mhz broadcast is actually increased the complexity. If such a short time is also introduced, the complexity reduction for R18 RedCap is smaller. For early indication, we are fine with FL proposal that a network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 is supported. But for this sub-bullet, it reads like the Msg1 early indication only apply to BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs. To avoid ambiguity, we propose to combine this proposal and Question 2.3-3a, like:* **Option 2:**
	+ **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
	+ **A network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 is supported.**
		- **FFS: whether the separate initial early indications for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (as discussed in the previous questions) would apply to BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs only or also to PR1-only UEs**
* **Option 3:**
	+ **X = 2/1 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
	+ **A network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 is supported.**
		- **FFS: whether the separate initial early indications for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (as discussed in the previous questions) would apply to BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs only or also to PR1-only UEs**
 |
| Ericsson | Option 2 | We are fine to accept Option 2 as a compromise. The rationale behind the necessity of specifying smaller values of X has been clarified in our response to Question 2.2-1a and the necessity of specifying configurable Msg1 indication has been clarified in Question 2.3-1a. @CATT Although all X values can be supported by the default TDRA table, higher values of X would significantly impact the NW scheduling flexibility. For example, for X = 2 ms (for 15 kHz SCS), only j+3 entries, i.e., only 2 out 16 entries, in the table are valid. However, with smaller values of X, most of the entries in the table would be valid, and so, there is no strong motivation to introduce a new default TDRA table. This would also be our preference. |
| Panasonic | Option 2 | Although we can accept any value among the candidates at the end, following is our analysis. The PDSCH processing time is mainly composed by the channel estimation, demodulation, rate-matching, LDPC decoding and higher layer processing:* Channel estimation and demodulation: No additional complexity because since these are also required for PDCCH up to 20 MHz.
* Rate-matching: Because of larger number of PRBs, the number of bits after demodulation is increased compared with the unicast PDSCH capability.
* LDPC decoding and higher layer processing: Using RAR-specific scaling factor, the lower coding rate is used. UE peak rate of [10] Mbps does not take account of 20 MHz of PRB allocation but only 5MHz corresponding capability (as section 2.2). Therefore, the number of bits after rate matching is no difference compared with the unicast PDSCH capability.

Based on above analysis, which only increased part is rate matching, our thinking is option 1 would be feasible. On the other hand, with the consideration of the view to see the need of option 3, we think the most reasonable choice would be option 2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | New default TDRA table or other approaches to introduce larger Msg3 scheduling delay are not needed based on the following agreement: * When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot,
* The UE receives the RAR and correspondingly transmits Msg3 if the TDRA for Msg3 in UL grant in RAR indicates that the time between RAR reception and Msg3 transmission is NOT smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms. FFS: value(s) of X
* Otherwise, the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation.

Additionally, as we commented online, without msg1 early indication, it is meaningless to discuss value X, since the gNB would not care what’s UE implementation and what’s the processing time of RAR. Therefore, for all the options, msg1 indication is needed. Also, without msg1 early indication, even we do not have further agreement on value X, it would be fine to leave it to UE implementation. |
| Samsung | Option 2 or 3 |  |
| MediaTek2 (replaced by MediaTek3) | Option 3 or 2 | Our preference remains Option 3 but we can compromise to Option 2.  |
| Intel | Option 3 or 2 | The issue of X is related to ‘FL1 High Priority Question 2.5-1a on simultaneous reception’. The relaxed decoding of RAR may overlap with reception of unicast PDSCH. With a larger X, UE has more room to arrange decoding of the RAR and unicast PDSCH. Hopefully, the UE may satisfy both PDSCHs within the respective timeline.  |
| FUTUREWEI | Option 2 | This option is a compromise that still allows substantial use of the default TDRA tables while allowing the network to use Msg1 EI as needed. |
| Sierra Wireless | Option 2 |  |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | We have a strong concern if we need to modify default TDRA table for eRedCap UEs. X=0.5/0.25 ms option gives smallest impact to NW scheduling and specification compared to other options given the current TDRA table. |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 2 | We think 1/0.5ms is a good compromise between complexity reduction and network scheduling flexibility. In this case, we can still use the default TDRA table with sufficient PUSCH time domain resource allocation options. In addition, since we don’t expect Msg2 to be significantly larger than 5MHz based on our analysis, we think this is a good compromise. Furthermore, if Msg1 early indication is support, there will not be an impact to legacy UE.We are also OK with Option 1. |
| NEC | Option 2 | Prefer as a compromise. |
| CMCC | Option 1 | We prefer smaller X to remain more scheduling flexibility of PUSCH for R18 RedCap UEs and reduce the impact of random access timeline NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms on access latency of R17 RedCap UEs. Option 2 does not mean new PUSCH TDRA table must be needed. With existing table, if scheduled K2 cannot satisfy timeline requirement, UE behavior is up to the UE implementation and R18 Redcap UEs may retry random access, the access latency may increase but it is acceptable to R18 Redcap UEs. If scheduled K2 can satisfy timeline requirement, Msg3 is sent normally.Network configuration of early indication provides sufficient flexibility, but flexibility should depend on whether it is useful. From the perspective of RAR reception and Msg3 size (4 or 6 RB in practical network), there is no need to distinguish R17 RedCap and R18 RedCap UEs. From the perspective of random access timeline, if scheduled K2 is smaller than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms, access latency of R18 RedCap UEs may increase, if NW aim to reduce access latency of R18 RedCap UEs, NW can schedule K2 larger than NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X, there is still no strong need to distinguish R17 RedCap and R18 RedCap UEs. Thus, additional early indication in Msg1 is not needed for R18 RedCap UEs. |
| LG | Option 3 | Since each company has one’s own BB solution which can be different. It may be safer to set the UE processing time with accommodating various BB’s cases based on the views from companies potentially.Early indication for eRedCap in Msg1 is needed and can be configured by NW on whether it is shared with Rel-17 RedCap or not. It can be considered to take into account limited usage under a special case due to reduce complication of RO/Preamble partitioning. |
| OPPO | Option 1 | This X is smaller than we preferred. This is considering the too much restriction by large value, e.g. potentially less useful default TDRA entries. |
| DENSO | Option 2 | We prefer Option 2, which balances scheduling flexibility and complexity reduction. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer Option 3 and can live with Option 2 | Different UE vendor has different implementation. For example, some implantations may spend a longer processing time for channel estimation than the others, which depends on the complexity of the channel estimation algorithm. Besides, in order to simplify the implementation, the multiple PDSCH processing procedure may just follow PDSCH repetitions, which may perform LDPC decoding for several times within PDSCH repetitions, which also depends on UE implementation. So, we recommend a lager value to cover more cases for this handling. Besides, no matter which option is chosen, we think separate early indication via Msg1 can be configured by the network for the proper time domain and frequency domain resource allocation of Msg3.  |
| SONY | Option 2 | We think option 2 is a reasonable compromise. Option 3 would be our absolute preference though.Since the goal of Redcap is to reduce UE complexity and since the goal of the “X” parameter is to allow the UE longer time to process more bandwidth than it would really want to process (20MHz decoding rather than 5MHz decoding), we think it is important to allow sufficient time for the UE to decode RAR-PDSCH. We think that option 2 is a good compromise between UE complexity reduction and network impacts. |
| DOCOMO | Option 4 | We share the same comment as Sharp. Even if we select the smallest value of X as 0.5/0.25 ms, significant impact on Msg3 TDRA restriction is observed, and hence we see the strong need for Msg1 separate early indication. Therefore, the value for X and Msg1 separate early indication should be separately discussed.For us, whether the larger value of X can be acceptable may depend on whether we can introduce a new default TDRA table specific to Rel-18 eRedCap which can improve the scheduling flexibility on Msg3, thus it can be clarified first.In our view, based on the Note 4 in the agreement at the last RAN plenary meeting, BW3+PR1 UE and PR1 standalone UE share the same early indication. Accordingly, if new default TDRA table, which is a part of BB BW reduction feature, is introduced, TDRA misalignment for Msg3 may happen since gNB cannot distinguish BW3+PR1 UE and PR1 standalone UE via Msg1. Therefore, we think new default TDRA table cannot be introduced, but we are fine to discuss it further. |
| Lenovo | Option 2 | We are also fine with option 3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | For the sake of progress on early identification, we could be OK with a modified option 1 for the following reasons,* It should be clear that the configurable Rel-17 Msg1-based early indication can be used by Rel-18 RedCap UE.
* With the small X, the bottleneck to the earliest schedulable slot for Msg3 is still subject to the default TDRA table. Therefore, it seems no ambiguity for gNB to schedule the Rel-18 RedCap UE in the way as a Rel-17 RedCap UE.
* Rel-17 Msg1-based early indication can be used by gNBs to differentiate Rel-17/18 RedCap UE from non-RedCap UE at the earliest stage. If Rel-18 RedCap UE ignores Rel-17 Msg1-based EI, then the gNBs may consider it as a non-RedCap UE, which seems not a good design.
* **Option 1:**
	+ **X = 0.5/0.25 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
	+ **A network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 is not supported.**
	+ **If Rel-17 early indication for RedCap is configured, it is applied to Rel-18 RedCap UEs as well.**
 |
| MediaTek3 | Option 2 but without additional early indication via Msg1 | After further checking TDRA details, we think X=1/0.5ms is a good tradeoff between the number applicable TDRA entries and UE processing capability. As to early indication, our view has been that RAR and Msg3 sizes are normally small and hence an additional early indication via Msg1 is not necessary. We agree with CMCC’s comments above and don’t think early indication is needed even with Option 2. |
| Nordic | Option 2 | We do not need to modify TDRA table at ALL, we just need to new table for j . Specification effort is not too big.But doing so, eRedCap UE cannot share initial access with legacy UEs.Dropping “j+1” entries is an option, as well.Again, we would like to put on the table, possibility to restrict RAR TBS for RedCap UE. It would be clearly a better solution at hand. |

The responses received to Question 2.2-1b express the following preferences regarding the options:

* **Option 1 (X=0.5/0.25 ms without Msg1)**
	+ 12% express that they prefer Option 1 (over Options 2 and 3)
	+ 20% express that they are ok with Option 1
* **Option 2 (X=1/0.5 ms with Msg1)**
	+ 44% express that they prefer Option 2 (over Options 1 and 3)
	+ 52% express that they are ok with Option 2
* **Option 3 (X=2/1 ms with Msg1)**
	+ 16% express that they prefer Option 3 (over Options 1 and 2)
	+ 20% express that they are ok with Option 3
* **Option 4 (other options)**
	+ 12% express that Msg1 may be needed regardless of the value of X
	+ 12% express that Msg1 may not be needed regardless of the value of X
	+ 4% express that they would be ok with Option 1 if it is clarified that Rel-17 Msg1 applies to Rel-18

Based on the responses received so far, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL4/FL5 High Priority Proposal 2.2-1d:**

**Agree the following as a way-forward package:**

* **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
	+ **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS.**
* **A network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 is supported.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | OK | FFS: whether update to Δ value specific to the PUSCH subcarrier spacing *μPUSCH*  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Transsion | Y |  |
| vivo | N | We prefer smaller X value, but we can compromise to X=1/0.5ms for 15/30 kHz SCS. We cannot agree to support separate additional early indication in Msg1. Even X=1/0.5ms, legacy default TDRA table and delta values can be reused. We do not believe the one slot additional delay for random access would cause serious impacts for Rel-17 RedCap UE. If it is, then we have concern on Rel-18 ‘20MHz + PR1’RedCap UE since all Rel-18 RedCap UEs share the same initial access, the separate additional early indication will not bring any benefits but degraded the Rel-18 ‘20MHz + PR1’RedCap UE’s performance. In addition, NW already has the flexibility to either schedule the RAR BW within 5MHz, or larger than 5MHz with/without relaxing the timeline. If the timeline is not met when BW for RAR is larger than 5MHz, for BW3/PR3 + PR1 Rel-18 eRedCap UE, the UE behaviour is up to implementation. It also implies that NW prioritize more for Rel-17 RedCap and Rel-18 RedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1. Otherwise, NW will schedule the RAR BW within 5MHz or select appropriate K2 value to satisfy the timeline. We share CMCC’s views on flexibility should be based on usefulness and necessity. During SI, Msg2 size was assumed to be 72 bits and Msg3 size is 56bits, it is sufficient to use 25/11 PRBs for 15/30 kHz SCS.If the package proposal to be agreed, we suggest following change: **Agree the following as a way-forward package:*** **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
	+ **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS.**
* **A network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 is not supported for Rel-18 RedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 and Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1.**
* **If Rel-17 early indication in Msg1 for RedCap UEs is configured, it is applied to Rel-18 RedCap UEs as well.**
 |
| Intel | OK |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | For the X, as we commented online, according to our implementation, larger value is required as our LDPC decoding time is relatively large. Even we still prefer 2/1ms, but we can follow the majority (1/0.5) for porgress.For the early indication, we think it should be applied to both BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs and PR1 UEs. As we replied in the last round, in order to make the early indication more clear here, we suggest to combine this proposal and question Question 2.3-3a, like：**Agree the following as a way-forward package:*** **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
	+ **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS.**
* **A network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 is supported.**
	+ **The early indications for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs would apply to** **both BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs and PR1-only UEs.**
 |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y in principle | Support this FL proposal in principle.Regardless of the value pair of X, network-configurable early indication in Msg1 specific to eRedCap is **necessary**. If not supported, the network cannot distinguish whether the RAR-receiving UE is eRedCap or not. Even for the X=0.5/0.25 ms, there is still 8 invalid entries in the default PUSCH TDRA table which would result in the RAR reception failure for the eRedCap UE.The restriction that "the early indication in Msg1 specific to Rel-18 eRedCap can be configured ONLY when the early indication in Msg1 specific to Rel-17 is NOT configured" can result in the same amount of Msg 1 resource usage compared with the case of Rel-17 RedCap has early indication. In order to clarify the proposal related to RAN plenary decision, we propose to revise the last bullet as following.* **A network-configurable early indication in Msg1 commonly for BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs and PR1-only UEs is supported, which can be configured only when early indication in Msg1 specific to Rel-17 Redcap UE is NOT configured.**
 |
| LG | Y | It can be discussed whether update TDRA table or Δ modification is needed for Messag3 transmission or not, if a network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 is supported. |
| CATT | N | (1) After the discussion, the connection between value X and early indication in Msg1 is too ambiguous. Some companies argue that new TDRA table/manner (e.g. new Δ) is introduced and some companies do not think so. And some companies argue that even if no new TDRA table/manner is introduced, early indication in Msg1 should still be support. **If there is no direct causality between value X and early indication in Msg1, why do we still bundle them together**?(2) X = 0.5/0.25 ms should be reasonable since (1) there is no time consuming PDCCH blind decoding for scheduling info in RAR PDSCH (2) current timeline includes PDCCH blind decoding part but in fact this does not exist for RAR PDSCH to Msg3 PUSCH, so it is already redundant and ample. (3) Even if we can compromise to 1/0.5 ms, we see that legacy TDRA table can still be used (8 entries for 30 kHZ SCS, 5 entries for 15 kHz SCS) without any change. This cannot justify early indication in Msg1.Also, in addition to vivo’s comment, we encourage companies to think about the messy RACH partitioning after Rel-17. We should only agree on RACH partitioning feature only if it is really ‘essential’, but not fuzzy ‘flexibility’. |
| DOCOMO |  | While this X values are not our preference, we can accept this proposal if the 2nd bullet is kept as it is.However, it is more comfortable for us to discuss first whether we can introduce a new default PUSCH TDRA table for Rel-18 eRedCap UE supporting BW3/PR3 + PR1, i.e., whether Msg1-basaed early indication is distinguished between BW3/PR3 + PR1 and PR1-only UEs.If BW3/PR3 + PR1 and PR1-only UEs are distinguished by Msg1 early indication, we can introduce a new default PUSCH TDRA table for BW3/PR3 + PR1 UEs which can ensure the scheduling flexibility on Msg3. Then, we are fine to support X = 1/0.5 ms or larger one. |
| OPPO | N | We prefer a small value of X ms as the larger one would every impact the default TDRA stronger.And seems the on line session companies expressed the earlier indication would not be bond to the X extra delay. Especially considering the 20MHz RedCap UE + PR1 is included, the msg1 earlier indication is not very attractive now. |
| CMCC | N | We can accept X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS as a compromise, but similar as our comment in prior round, X = 1/0.5 ms does not mean new PUSCH TDRA table must be needed. In 3rd round discussion, about 8 companies express that, with X = 1/0.5 ms, applicable entries in default PUSCH TDRA table can provide sufficient PUSCH time domain resource allocation flexibility and do not want to introduce new PUSCH TDRA table. With default TDRA table and without EI in msg1 for R18 RedCap UEs, network can satisfy timeline requirement of R18 RedCap UEs through schedule multiple RAR within 5MHz in RAR window, or schedule RAR>5MHz in suitable location in RAR window and K2 with applicable entries of default PUSCH TDRA table. Although scheduling based on timeline requirement of R18 RedCap UEs may increase access latency of R17 RedCap UEs, this is fine to delay-insensitive R17 RedCap UEs. There is no strong necessity to introduce additional EI in Msg1 for R18 RedCap UEs from the perspective of timeline requirement.Apparently there is also no motivation to introduce additional EI in msg1 for R18 RedCap UEs from the perspective of RAR and Msg3 transmission, thus we do not support additional early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 RedCap UEs. |
| Ericsson | Y | We are fine to accept this as a compromise. The rationale behind the necessity of specifying a small value of X has been clarified in our response to Question 2.2-1a and the necessity of specifying a configurable Msg1 indication has been clarified in Question 2.3-1a. |
| SONY | Y | X = 1.0 / 0.5ms is a compromise solution, which is good. This value seems to work for a variety of potential implementations.A large number of [traditionally] network vendors seem to be OK with any potential limitations due to the TDRA table, so we think that issues about TDRA tables should not get in the way of agreeing this. We do not understand why [traditionally] UE vendors would have a problem with network scheduling flexibility.We don’t want to have to exercise the “the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation” part of previous agreements. If we end up having to exercise that line of a previous agreement, the consequences are either that initial access operation would be unreliable or the UE implementation would need to implement the faster processing time of RAR-PDSCH, just in case the network scheduled PUSCH with a delay that is shorter then NT,1 + NT,2 + 0.5 + X ms. |
| MediaTek |  | We can accept X=1/0.5ms as compromise considering TDRA entries. But we still don’t see the need for separate early indication via Msg1.  |
| Xiaomi2 | Y | We are fine with X=1/0.5 ms for compromise. We don’t think it is necessary to change the default TDRA table in the current specification by adding a delta value or other solutions. Anyway, larger K2 values can be configured by the gNB via SIB1 or RRC signaling if K2 values in the default table are not sufficient enough for Msg3 scheduling.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We think 1/0.5ms is a good compromise between complexity reduction and network scheduling flexibility. In this case, we can still use the default TDRA table with sufficient PUSCH time domain resource allocation options. In addition, since we don’t expect Msg2 to be significantly larger than 5MHz based on our analysis, we think this is a good compromise as typically we might not need to schedule UE using limited TDRA options. Furthermore, since Msg1 early indication is supported, we can support legacy UE without any impact. |
| Samsung | Y | We are OK for this. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | **Regarding msg1 early indication**With msg1 early indication, the gNB can take care Rel-18 RedCap UE’s RAR and msg3 scheduling. Also the partitioning issue can be avoided by gNB configuration.Without msg1 early indication, the gNB does not know whether Rel-18 RedCap UE exist, which causes:1. The RAR scheduling may exceed 5MHz, and the time duration between RAR and msg3 may be not enough.
2. The msg3 based on SDT has the risk to schedule a TBS larger than UE’s maximum capability

|  |
| --- |
| sdt-DataVolumeThreshold-r17 ENUMERATED {byte32, byte100, byte200, byte400, byte600, byte800, byte1000, byte2000, byte4000, byte8000, byte9000, byte10000, byte12000, byte24000, byte48000, byte96000}, |

1. The RAR timeline relaxing value X=1/0.5ms is not known by the gNB. It is meaningless to define this value without msg1 early indication.

**Regarding X value**We are fine with X=1/0.5 and 0.5/0.25. If companies do not want to discuss this as a package or we can not make progress on the package, we suggest to discuss the two issues separately. |
| Qualcomm | N | We do not agree on the proposal. It is meaningful to discuss X value only when we have sufficient analysis. As guided by chairman during Wednesday GTW, I suggest to come back to this issue if we have data/analysis from sufficient number of companies. |
| Nordic  | Y | We could keep X=0 or X=0.5/0.25 and restrict TBS similarly as applicable to SIBs.This would give enough processing time for UE, and very little restriction to gNB. And it would avoid impact to TDRA offsets. |

Among the received responses to Proposal 2.2-1d, 15 responses have indicated that they are fine with the package way-forward as is or with minor updates, while 5 responses have expressed concerns with the package. Based on the responses, the following updated package can be considered.

**FL6 High Priority Proposal 2.2-1e:**

**Agree the following as a working assumption:**

* **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
	+ **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS.**
* **A network-configurable ~~additional~~ early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.**
	+ **This indication is specific for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs only when Msg1 indication specific for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is NOT configured.**
	+ **When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs as well.**
	+ **The indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs applies to all UEs supporting UE peak data rate reduction (i.e., with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | We are fine for agreement or just a working assumption for the 1/0.5 ms bullet to allow companies time for additional checking. This middle value (1/0.5 ms) is reasonable to be able to cover multiple vendor's implementation concerns without too much significant impact on the TDRA table usage.The EI covers some important cases while addressing the concern on RACH fragmentation, while we believe it should be up to the network operator to decide.Minor editorial suggestion (in the sub-bullets, add “early” before “indication” (4 times) |
| LG | N | If the last sub-bullet is removed, we can live with the proposal. It would be good to have the last sub-bullet open for further discussion as there are still some companies including us that see the benefit of configuring the separate Msg1 early indication only to BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs. |
| DOCOMO | N | We cannot accept this proposal especially for the 2nd bullet. As pointed by companies many times, we cannot guarantee that RAR PDSCH (and also Msg3 PUSCH) is always smaller PRBs than 5MHz and there is some scenario they can be larger than 5MHz. If the allocated PRBs are larger than 5MHz, the valid TDRA option would is restricted (at least half of default TDRA configuration is not available) as X is getting larger.We see the impacts on the scheduling if we support 1 ms for X, and hence Msg1-based separate early indication should be supported. This is not a fancy functionality, but it is essential for NW operation to know whether UE can process Msg2 PDSCH with or without processing timeline extension. It is unfair for legacy UE to restrict the scheduling considering eRedCap operation.While we extensively discussed whether to support Msg1-based separate early indication, no technical drawbacks are observed from RAN1 perspective. As ZTE commented, while the details should be discussed in RAN2, the concern on the PRACH partitioning is addressed by NW configuration and cannot be the reason to preclude from specification. |
| Qualcomm | N | We disagree that the proposed X value is the compromised solution. If there are any sufficient argument or comprehensive analysis that X has to be 2ms, then we can accept that 1ms can be the compromised value but this is not the case. We cannot accept the proposed X value only based on companies’ preferences without sufficient technical analysis. For now, we can have X=0.5/0.25 ms for 15/30KHz SCS as a working assumption and we can revisit it next meeting if there is any comprehensive analysis that 0.5/0.25 ms is not sufficient.Again, we believe that larger X value brings larger impact to Msg3 scheduling given the current default TDRA table. We have strong concern to modify the current default TDRA table. |
| Panasonic | Y | Just a minor update on the first sub-sub-bullet:**This indication is specific for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs and can be configured only when Msg1 indication specific for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is NOT configured.** |
| vivo | N | About X value, we can accept as compromise.About early indication specific for Rel-18 RedCap UE, the second main bullet, we do not support it. Thanks Panasonic, DCM, Ericsson and ZTE for explanation of the necessity. Based on our observation, for X=0.5/0.25ms, all entries in current default TDRA table are useable; for X=1/0.5ms, all entries are useable for 30KHz SCS and 8 entries are available for 15KHz SCS. If you look at the TDRA table entries, for the available 8 entries, the most important TDRA configurations: (starting symbol S, transmission length L) = (0, 14), (0,12), (0,10) are covered. The RAR scheduling typically will not exceed 5MHz given the small TBS, and even it is, no restriction at gNB side, R18 BB BW reduction UE behavior is left to implementation. For SDT, if such large TBS as highlighted by ZTE will be used by NW, how to ensure the UL coverage? In addition, NW can identify the R18 eRedCap by MSG3, the large payload can be transmitted/scheduled by subsequent SDT PUSCH. We do not think above reasons justify the necessity for the separate EI for Rel-18 RedCap UE. Rel-18 RedCap UE capable of “20MHz + PR1” has no difference with Rel-17 RedCap UE during the initial access, if the companies concern about the Rel-17 RedCap UE performance and want REl-18 RedCap UE to be differentiated, then the separate EI will impact Rel-18 RedCap UE capable of “20MHz + PR1”. About following: * **This indication is specific for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs only when Msg1 indication specific for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is NOT configured.**

We would like to understand, how to implement this condition into the spec? Who/How to validate the condition is met or not, will it cause Rel-18 RedCap implementation complexity to behave differently based on the whether the condition is met or not. Still, our suggestion is  **Agree the following as a way-forward package:*** **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
	+ **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS.**
	+ **Legacy default TDRA table and Δ is reused**
* **A network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 is not supported for Rel-18 RedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 and Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1.**
* **If Rel-17 early indication in Msg1 for RedCap UEs is configured, it is applied to Rel-18 RedCap UEs as well.**
 |
| CATT | N | Another serious issue arises. In Rel-17, when R17 separate initial BWP is configured, R17 RedCap UE will use this BWP (and so as the Msg1 configuration in its IE). But the update below:* **This indication is specific for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs only when Msg1 indication specific for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is NOT configured.**

In this case, there is no Msg1 indication for Rel-17, so there is no R17 separate initial BWP (please correct me if I made mistake). As a result, it seems implying that possibly a R18 dedicated separate initial BWP is introduced and Rel-18 RedCap UE will use the PRACH resource in its IE. This is even worse.If this is not the intention to introduce Rel-18 dedicated separate initial BWP, (i.e. in this case, Rel-18 RedCap UE share the same legacy initial BWP with Rel-17 RedCap UE and non-RedCap UE?), we should make it clear: ‘This does not intend to introduce separate initial BWP dedicated for Rel-18 RedCap UE that cannot be used for Rel-17 RedCap UE’. |
| MediaTek |  | We can accept X=1/0.5ms as a compromise. As a separate early indication via Msg1, we share a similar view with vivo. Msg2 and Msg3 are typically small. As to SDT, we raised the case when companies tried to limit Msg3 BW to 5MHz, but no companies seemed care. We wonder what has changed. We support vivo’s proposal with minor changes.**Agree the following as a way-forward package:*** **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
	+ **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS.**
	+ **Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused**
* **A network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 is not supported for “Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1” and “Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1”.**
* **If Rel-17 early indication in Msg1 for RedCap UEs is configured, it is applied to both “Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1” and “Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1” as well.**
 |
| Spreadtrum |  | OK for the X part. X=0.5/0.25 ms is no doubt not sufficient, the BB capability for PDSCH processing is reduced to 25/12 PRBs per slot, not 20MHz capability anymore. The timeline analyzation should be based on what we have agreed capability for BB BW reduction UE. For 20MHz PDSCH, at least additional 3 times LDPC decoding time (~30 symbols, ~2ms) are required for 5MHz BB capability. As we mentioned in the last round, we have made big concession to accept X=1/0.5ms. For early indication, the case that both Rel-17 RedCap Msg1 indication and Rel-18 RedCap Msg1 early indication are configured in a cell is precluded. Then, there is not any chance to differentiate R17 RedCap and R18 RedCap. However, the intention of combining Msg1 early indication and X value in this proposal package is to differentiate R17 and R18 RedCap for the timeline issue. Therefore, we should at least let this case FFS, and further check the necessity.Our suggestion is (modification parts are marked in blue) as follows:**Agree the following as a working assumption:*** **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
	+ **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS.**
* **A network-configurable ~~additional~~ early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.**
	+ **This indication is specific for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs ~~only~~ when Msg1 indication specific for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is NOT configured.**
	+ **When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs as well.**
	+ **The indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs applies to all UEs supporting UE peak data rate reduction (i.e., with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**
	+ **FFS: When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, whether early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs can also be configured.**
 |
| CMCC |  | We can accept X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS.When Msg1 indication for R17 RedCap UEs is not configured, R17 RedCap UEs share iBWP<=20MHz with legacy UEs. In this case, the motivation to introduce EI in Msg1 for R18 eRedCap UEs can be avoid enlarging access latency of legacy UEs if NW schedules all UEs based on timeline of R18 eRedCap UEs. However, NW can also choose to schedule all UEs based on timeline of legacy UEs with the result of increasing access latency of R18 eRedCap UEs. Thus, there seems no strong motivation to introduce EI in Msg1 for R18 eRedCap UEs. We have discussed whether new TDRA table is needed in prior round, but it is not covered by the proposal, we prefer to express default PUSCH TDRA table is reused clear in the proposal. Vivo’s version is fine to us. |
| NEC | N | We don’t understand why the network is not allowed to schedule each UE type with Msg2 and Msg3 properly. In our understanding, RAN2 is open to support an additional separate early indication of Rel-18 RedCap UE in Msg1.Question for clarification of the proposal. A separate initial UL BWP and separate PRACH resources for Rel-17 RedCap UE, if configured, would work as early indication of Rel-17 RedCap UE in Msg1. In this case, is a separate early indication of Rel-18 RedCap UE not allowed? |
| OPPO | N | We still think the 0.5/0.25 ms would be sufficient. And this also avoid TDRA table problemBetter to separate earlier indication. We actually can accept the updated bullet about when R17 separated earlier indication is not configured and this may be easier to be agreed in the separated discussion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | I guess the situation now becomes worse. We would suggest to discuss X value, msg1 early indication separately.Without msg1 early indication, I’d like to summary the drawbacks as following:1. Different bandwidths for RAR PDSCH, i.e., larger than 5 MHz for Rel-17 RedCap UEs and equal to or smaller than 5 MHz for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is impossible. NW is not allowed to schedule each UE type with Msg2 and Msg3 properly.
2. The RAR scheduling may exceed 5MHz, and the time duration between RAR and msg3 may be not enough. Otherwise, the RAR scheduling for Rel-17 RedCap UE would be impacted.
3. The msg3 based on SDT has the risk to schedule a TBS larger than UE’s maximum capability. Otherwise, the msg3 scheduling for Rel-17 RedCap UE would be impacted.
4. The RAR processing timeline relaxing is meaningless, since the gNB does not aware of the Rel-18 RedCap UE.

As for the partitioning issue with msg1 early indication, which is actually up to the NW configuration. We also hope more pros and cons can be summarized for reference.Additionally, if there is no Rel-17 RedCap UE early indication, it is nature that there is no separate initial BWP for Rel-17 RedCap UE. Then the following subbullet implies an additional separate initial BWP for Rel-18 RedCap UE is supported.* + **When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs as well.**

If supporting additional separate initial BWP for Rel-18 RedCap UE is not the intention, then we want to understand, in which scenarios, the msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UE is not configured, but for Rel-18 RedCap UE can be configured. At least currently, no such a scenario is identified by companies. Therefore, we do not think this subbullet is valid currently. We should directly discuss whether Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported or not.Therefore, we suggest the following:**Agree the following as a working assumption:*** **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
	+ **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS.**

**Agree the following as a working assumption:*** **A network-configurable ~~additional~~ early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.**
	+ **~~This indication is specific for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs only when Msg1 indication specific for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is NOT configured.~~**
	+ **When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, it ~~is~~ can be used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs as well.**
	+ **The indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs applies to all UEs supporting UE peak data rate reduction (i.e., with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**
 |
| Samsung |  | We can accept X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS.Regarding early indication in Msg1, we think separate Msg1 indication for Rel-17 Redcap UEs and Rel-18 eRedCap UEs should be supported to help network to distinguish Rel-17 Redcap UEs and Rel-18 eRedCap UEs in Msg1. If Msg1 indication for Rel-17 Redcap UEs is configured and Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not configured, the Msg1 indication for Rel-17 Redcap UEs can also be used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs. The Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs should be applied only for BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs, and it needn’t be applied for PR1 UEs.  |
| Intel |  | We are OK for X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCSFor the first two sub-bullets of second bullet, it is better to clarify if some all of following 4 cases are considered* Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UE are in the legacy initial BWP.
	+ Case 1: Rel-17 RedCap shares the legacy RO with non-RedCap UE. Dedicated RO/preamble can be configured for Rel-18 RedCap UE for early identification
	+ Case 2: Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UE can share the RO/preamble which is different from non-RedCap UE
	+ Case 3: Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UE are in the same separate initial BWP, Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UE must share the RO/preamble
	+ Case 4: Rel-17 RedCap UE is in legacy initial BWP, Rel-18 RedCap UE has its dedicated separate initial BWP
 |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We are OK with 1/0.5ms.For the Msg1 early indication, we agree there should not be separate early indication between 20MHz + PR1 and BW3 + PR1. However, we think it would be better that if Msg1 early indication is supported, we can configure it separately for Rel-17 and Rel-18 UE. Therefore we’d prefer either independent configuration of Msg1 early indication or no separate Msg1 early indication for Rel-18 UE (e.g. vivo’s proposal). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | OK for progress |
| Ericsson | Y | We can accept this as a compromise. (Otherwise, our preference would be a smaller value of X and/or more unconditional support for an additional early indication in Msg1.) |

Based on the responses to Proposal 2.2-1e, perhaps the following updated package can be considered.

**FL7 High Priority Proposal 2.2-1f:**

**Down-select between the following options in RAN1#113:**

* **Option 1:**
	+ **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
		- **X = 0.5/0.25 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
	+ **A network-configurable early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not supported.**
		- **When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**
* **Option 2:**
	+ **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
		- **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
	+ **A network-configurable early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.**
		- **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**

Based on the responses to Proposal 2.2-1e and the discussion on Proposal 2.2-1f during the online (GTW) session on Friday 21st April, perhaps the following updated package can be considered.

**FL8 High Priority Proposal 2.2-1g:**

**Down-select between the following options in RAN1#112bis-e or RAN1#113:**

* **Option 1:**
	+ **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
		- **X = 0.5/0.25 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
		- **Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.**
	+ **A network-configurable early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not supported.**
		- **When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**
* **Option 2:**
	+ **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
		- **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
		- **Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.**
	+ **A network-configurable early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not supported.**
		- **When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**
* **Option 3:**
	+ **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
		- **X = 1/0.5 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
		- **Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.**
	+ **A network-configurable early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.**
		- **When Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Most preferred option (1/2/3)** | **Least preferred option (1/2/3)** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | Option 3 |  | Both options 1 and 2 have drawbacks including that the size of Msg3 may be limited. Option 2 may necessitate the network to use a larger delay for Msg3. |
| Sharp |  | Option 3 |  | We think early indication should be supported for msg2 and msg3 scheduling at least for the case of the bandwidth of initial DL/UL BWP is larger than 5MHz to avoid uncertain of UE processing.For the X value in the first bullet, we can accept 1/0.5ms and the note can be remained for FFS. |
| vivo | Y | Option 1 (1st preference)Option 2 (2nd preference) | Option 3 | For option 3, following case is not covered* when Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is NOT configured, but Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured

Since Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused and the MSG1 Early indication (EI) is applied to R18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction), we are not convinced on the necessity and essentialness of the separate EI in MSG1 for R18 RedCap. Besides, our concern on Option3 (PRACH fragmentation, potential separate initial UL BWP for R18 eRedCap, additional UE procedure to check R17 EI in MSG1 in case R18 EI in MSG1 is not configured etc.) are not addressed.  |
| DOCOMO |  | Option 3 without note | Option 2 | In our view, if we go with X=0.5/1 mas, the impact on restriction for Msg3 TDRA is critical and Msg1 separate early indication is essential. Thus, we cannot accept option 2 in this Proposal 2.2-1g and we prefer previous Proposal 2.2-1f by moderator. This option 2 cannot resolve the concerns for significant restriction on Msg3 TDRA.Similarly, for option 3, the note “Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.” should be removed or FFS. It is not discussed well how many entries in the default TDRA table in the current spec would be invalid depending on the X value and how much critical it would be. Therefore, whether/how to address this reduced TDRA configurability should be FFS. |
| Panasonic | Y | Option 3 | Option 2 | The FL proposal for down-selection is fine to us.For Option 1, we now understand that all the TDRA entries are valid for X=0.5/0.25 ms case. For Option 2, there are still invalid entries for 30 kHz SCS. If those entries are not allowed to be indicated by the network, there would be the Msg3 scheduling flexibility loss for the non-eRedCap UEs (co-existence issue):* When a Rel-17 separate initial UL BWP or RO is not configured, all the non-eRedCap UEs in the cell would be influenced.
* When a Rel-17 separate initial UL BWP or RO is configured, all the non-eRedCap UEs sharing the RO would be influenced.

Regarding Option 3, our intention of the following proposal was to avoid the further RO fragmentation and to mitigate the network complexity and test effort (the network can be implemented and tested with considering this). And then it is true that the complexity or behavior of the UE side would not be affected. We are now fine to make a progress without the bullet (or hopefully it can be added as FFS to Option 3).**This indication is specific for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs and can be configured only when Msg1 indication specific for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is NOT configured.** |
| LG | N |  |  | Down-selection b/w 0.5/0.25 and 1/0.5ms is fine, but we think “Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused” should be removed. It can be discussed as a next step. And we would like to leave **FFS**: whether to apply the Msg1 early indication to all eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction)  |
| CMCC | Y | Option 1 | Option 3 | Option1 with smaller X is our most preference, which enable to reuse existing PUSCH TDRA table and flexible scheduling of Msg3 for legacy UEs, R17 RedCap UEs and R18 RedCap UEs, and avoid additional EI in Msg1 for R18 RedCap UEs. As mentioned by QC, if there is not technical analysis proving that X=0.5/0.25 ms is not sufficient, option1 is the best way to go forward.If technical analysis can prove that X=0.5/0.25 ms is not sufficient, option2 is our preference. As we comment in prior round, when Msg1 indication for R17 RedCap UEs is not configured, R17 RedCap UEs share iBWP<=20MHz with legacy UEs. As agreed by RAN2, there is no need to configure separate iBWP for R18 eRedCap UEs, so R18 eRedCap UEs also share iBWP<=20MHz with legacy UEs. In this case, the motivation to introduce EI in Msg1 for R18 eRedCap UEs can be avoid enlarging access latency of legacy UEs if NW schedules all UEs based on timeline of R18 eRedCap UEs. However, NW can also choose to schedule all UEs based on timeline of legacy UEs with the result of possibly increasing access latency of R18 eRedCap UEs. There seems no strong motivation to introduce EI in Msg1 for R18 eRedCap UEs.  |
| CATT | Y | Option 1 | Option 3 | On relaxed X value, we still doubt that X>0.25/0.5 ms is needed. As we explained several timies, current timeline is ample and redundant in fact, which unnecessarily counts the PDCCH decoding time that not applied to scheduling Msg3.On early indication, don’t think Msg3 size is a critical issue and not essential justification for Msg1 early indication. This is about Reduced Capability UE, with clear targeting low-middle requirement use cases. If in all cases, the legacy default TDRA table and Δ are always reused, can we just make it a common note? |
| Spreadtrum | Y | Option 3 | Option 1 | For Option1, we cannot accept X=0.5/0.25ms. As we commented in the previous round, we have strong concern on such a tight timing for 5MHz BB capability.For option2, we see the necessity on Msg1 based early indication. As the early indication is configurable, the issue on the PRACH partitioning is not serious. |
| Intel | Y | Option 3 | Option 1 | There are multiple arguments to support a lower or higher X values. X=1/0.5 ms could be a good compromise.We are OK to keep the Legacy default TDRA table and Δ, since anyway the longest SLIV (10 or 14 symbols) are still available which is good from coverage point of view. Early identification should be supported, otherwise gNB encounter a risk for aggressive or conservative scheduling.  |
| Samsung | Y | Option 3 |  | We are OK for X=1/0.5.Early indication in Msg1 should be supported. |
| Xiaomi3 |  | Option 3 | Not support Option 1 | 1. We are fine with X=1/0.5 ms for comprise though we still prefer X=2/1 ms to accommodate different UE implementations. For example, some UE implantations may spend a longer processing time for channel estimation than the others, which depends on the complexity of the channel estimation algorithm. Besides, in order to simplify chip design, multiple PDSCH processing procedure may just follow the same design PDSCH repetitions, which may perform multiple LDPC decodings within PDSCH repetitions, also depending on UE implementation.
2. We don’t support any modifications to both legacy default TDRA table and SIB1/RRC configured TDRA table.
3. For the second bullet, “A network-configurable early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported”, does it mean separate Msg1 based early indication is supported? If so, we suggest to modify it as follows:

**A network-configurable separate early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.** |
| MediaTek |  | Option 2 | Option 1 | We think X=1.0/0.5 ms is a good compromise taking different UE capabilities into account. As to early indication, we still think it is not deemed necessary and may not be configured by gNB as PRACH is expensive resource.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | Option 3 |  | Without msg 1 early indication, it is meaningless to define X. |
| NEC |  | Option 3 |  | The specification should allow the network to be able to schedule each UE with Msg2 and Msg3 properly based on the UE type, instead of enforcing specific gNB implementation. |
| Ericsson |  | Option 3 | Option 2 | Option 2 is unacceptable to us. Option 2 would cause significant impact to Rel-17 RedCap UEs (if Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured) and to all UEs in the cell (if Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is not configured). |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Option 3 | Option 2 | We are OK with 1/0.5ms.Our preference is Option 3. We are also OK with Option 2. We don’t prefer Option 2 as we think there would be impact to network scheduling flexibility.For the Msg1 early indication, we agree there should not be separate early indication between 20MHz + PR1 and BW3 + PR1. |
| SONY | Y | Option 3 | Option 1 | We are OK with 1/0.5ms.Option 3 supports 1/0.5ms timing and allows for early indication of R18 UEs, which we think would be useful for network operation.The issue we have with option 1 is the peak physical channel processing requirement (channel estimate etc 20MHz channel in 0.5ms when the goal of eRedCap is to reduce UE complexity). |
| Nordic  | Y | Option 3 | Option 2 | Option 3 low spec effort but will result in scheduling restrictions, gNB should have right to configure early identification if wants. |
| Qualcomm | Y | Option 1 | Option 2 | We are OK to agree on the proposal for now as it is (prefer to keep the note “Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused”).Among 3 options, we still prefer option 1 because:* X = 0.5/0.25 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS is sufficient based on our analysis as given in [R1-2303898](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2303898.zip)
* Larger X value limits the Msg3 scheduling flexibility given the legacy default TDRA table
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Option 3 | Option 2 |  |

Based on the received responses to Proposal 2.2-1g, the proposal to down-select between the listed options has quite good support. The following preferences are expressed among the listed options:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Most preferred by** | **Least preferred by** | **‘Most preferred’ minus ‘Least preferred’** |
| Option 1 | 4 responses | 5 responses | 4 – 5 = -1 |
| Option 2 | 1 response | 7 responses | 1 – 7 = -6 |
| Option 3 | 15 responses | 3 responses | 15 – 3 = +12 |

Based on the responses to Proposal 2.2-1g, companies are invited to comment on the following new Questions 2.2-1-1a and 2.2-1-2a. (The responses to these new questions will be considered in a potential updated version of Proposal 2.2-1g in the next round of this discussion.)

### **FL9 High Priority Question 2.2-1-1a:**

**Given the responses to Proposal 2.2-1g (summarized in the table above), should Option 2 be eliminated already in this meeting (meaning that the down-selection in the next meeting will be between Option 1 and Option 3)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi4 | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| MediaTek | N | For X=0.5/0.25ms, the numbers of applicable TDRA entries are 8/8 for 15/30 kHz SCS. For X=1/0.5ms, the numbers of applicable TDRA entries are 5/8 for 15/30kHz. Note: most TypeA PDSCH entries are still applicable. The difference between X=0.5/0.25ms and X=1/0.5ms in term of the numbers of applicable TDRA entries is **3/0**. If Msg1 early indication is not needed for X=0.5/0.25ms, we don’t see why Msg1 early indication is needed for X=1/0.5ms. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | Once X is defined, Msg1 early indication is needed, regardless of the number of applicable TypeA PDSCH entries. Without msg1 early indication, we do not see the necessity to define processing timeline relaxing X, since the gNB does not aware of the existence of Rel-18 RedCap UE.  |
| LG | Y | We are okay remove Option 2. |
| CMCC |  | Out most preference is still not to configure EI in Msg1 for R18 RedCap when EI in Msg1 is not configured for R17 RedCap. According to RAN2's conclusion, separate initial BWP for R18 RedCap is not supported, so with EI in Msg1, R18 RedCap UEs can only be distinguished by RO or preamble. The segmentation of RO results in reduced PRACH resources for both legacy and R18 RedCap UEs, which cause that:* No matter for legacy or R18 RedCap UE, the possibility of RACH contention increases, the size of RAR increases, coverage of RAR may decrease. For R18 RedCap UE without EI in Msg1, RAR size is probably less than 5MHz so that it is not necessary to consider X-value when scheduling Msg3. But now with EI in Msg1, the segmentation of RACH resources increases the contention for RACH resources, RAR size may be larger than 5MHz, resulting in more cases to consider X-value when scheduling Msg3.
* In addition, the increasing probability of RACH collision also affects the access performance of legacy and R18 RedCap UEs.

As also questioned by some companies, it is difficult to find a scenario where EI in Msg1 is not configured for R17 RedCap, but EI in Msg1 is needed for R18 RedCap. Actually, it is more necessary to distinguish legacy and R17 RedCap than distinguishing R17 RedCap and R18 RedCap.Thus, we do not support EI in Msg1 for R18 RedCap when EI in Msg1 is not configured for R17 RedCap.To make progress, if EI in Msg1 for R18 RedCap has to be accepted, we propose following option4 as a compromise.* **Option 4:**
	+ **For the “FFS: value(s) of X”,**
		- **X = 0.5/0.25 ms for 15/30 kHz SCS**
		- **Note: Legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused.**
	+ **A network-configurable early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is supported.**
		- **When Msg1 indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is configured, it is used by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with or without UE BB bandwidth reduction).**
 |
| CATT | N | Option 2 is our second preference (though not the first) which leaves some room for further discussion or compromise, after vendors further check and possibly reconsider the processing timeline.  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | We are fine with removing Option 2 or keeping Option 2 and Option 4 (as proposed by CMCC).  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are fine to remove Option 2. This should help with the down-selection. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | N | Removing option 2 means we are going back to **Proposal 2.2-1f**, which may not be agreed. We prefer to keep it or add option 4 as CMCC suggested and continue discussion for down-selection next meeting. |

### **FL9 High Priority Question 2.2-1-2a:**

**Proposal 2.2-1g has a note stating that legacy default TDRA table and Δ are reused. Please express your preference among the following options:**

* **Option A: The note should be kept.**
* **Option B: The note should be removed.**
* **Option C: The note should be an FFS.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option (A/B/C)** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | A | We prefer to keep the note but can live with keeping it as FFS if necessary for progress |
| Sharp | Either B or C for all options in Proposal 2.2-1g | We can see that most of rows with type A mapping and all rows with type B mapping in default TDRA table cannot satisfy the minimal timing when UL/DL SCS is different even with the selection of X equals 0.5/0.25ms. So we think for all options in Proposal 2.2-1g, the note should be removed or kept as FFS to wait for next step discussion. |
| DOCOMO | B/C | It has not been discussed well how much Msg3 TDRA is affected by X=0.5/0.25 or 1/0.5ms, and hence it is premature to decide TDRA enhancement is not necessary. We are fine to keep it as FFS. |
| Xiaomi4 | Option A | We can’t see the necessity to enhance the default TDRA table or Δ to introduce the value X.  |
| vivo | A | For X=0.5/0.25ms, all entries in current default TDRA table are useable; for X=1/0.5ms, all entries are useable for 30KHz SCS and 8 entries are available for 15KHz SCS. Look at the TDRA table entries, for the available 8 entries, the longest SLIVs: (starting symbol S, transmission length L) = (0, 14), (0,12), (0,10) Can still be reused. We do not support to make many optimizations for initial access.  |
| Spreadtrum | A | We prefer to reuse the legacy default TDRA table and Δ. But we can also live with keeping it as FFS. |
| MediaTek |  | Most PDSCH TypeA are still applicable even with X=1.0/0.5ms. We think Option A is fine and optimization is needed. But, we are also OK with FFS for this meeting to make progress.  |
| Samsung | A |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | A |  |
| LG | Option B | But, we also can live with Option C for companies to have more time to check. |
| CMCC | A |  |
| CATT | A (?) | We prefer no new default TDRA table so far. However, **on a question ‘how many entries are still usable for a specific X and a specific SCS by default TDRA table’, we at least observe 2 or 3 different understanding** (E.g. [10][13][30]). **It is a risk if we make this decision based on different understanding on the question above**, and perhaps also impact the question of 2.2-1-1a.  |
| Intel | A |  |
| Ericsson | Option C |  |
| Nokia, NSB | C | We think it’s better to keep the note as FFS so companies can study further and that we don’t drop this from the discussion. |
| Panasonic | C |  |
| NEC | A |  |
| Qualcomm | A |  |

**FL1/FL8 Medium Priority Question 2.2-2a:**

**What other cases are there that also need a similar timing relaxation? (Contributions [12, 13, 26, 30] mention several such potential cases.)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | The following cases can be considered:* The time within which the UE shall be ready to retransmit a PRACH when it has not received a response within the RAR window for the previous PRACH attempt, as described in TS 38.213 Clause 8.2.
* Random access procedure for 2-step RACH (the X and Y values for 2-step RACH can be the same as that for 4-step RACH).
 |
| Qualcomm | Same value of X is also applied to the following cases:* Between reception of fallbackRAR and transmission of Msg3 (2-step RACH)
* Between reception of successRAR and transmission of corresponding HARQ-ACK (2-step RACH)
* Between reception of RAR PDSCH in which UE does not correctly receive the transport block and upcoming transmission of PRACH (4-step RACH)
* Between reception of RAR with RAPID which is not associated with the corresponding PRACH transmission and upcoming transmission of PRACH (4-step RACH)
 |
| CATT2 | Open to consider the cases when broadcasting channel can be larger than 5 MHz but requires any kinds of feedback (e.g. Msg3 scheduled by fallbackRAR>5MHz) |
| vivo | At least the case of random access procedure for 2-step RACH needs a similar timing relaxation. We are open to discuss the other cases as QC mentioned. |
| LG  | 2-step RACH also needs the time relaxation; Message B can be multiplexed with different UEs with successRAR or fallbackRAR. The X value can be the same with the time relaxation for decoding Messageb2 to be scheduled over 5MHz BW PRBsThe time relaxation can be also adapted in Message 1 retransmission after decoding RAR, when Message 2 is scheduled more than the number of the 5MHz BW PRBs for unicast. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine to consider the cases listed by Ericsson and Qualcomm, i.e., N1+N2+0.5+Xms, N1+0.75+X’ms and N1+X’’ms. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | At least the following case should be discussed:Similar as RAR and Msg3, the timeline between RAR reception and PRACH retransmission specified in TS38.213 Clause8.2 needs to be relaxed. As specified in TS38.213 Clause8.2, the UE shall be ready to transmit a PRACH no later than $N\_{T,1}+0.75$ msec after the last symbol of the window, or the last symbol of the PDSCH reception. When the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot, additional PDSCH processing time Y is needed for UE to first buffer then process RAR PDSCH without RAR PDSCH performance loss.  |
| Xiaomi2 | Support to apply the Same value of X for the following cases proposed by QC:* Between reception of RAR PDSCH in which UE does not correctly receive the transport block and upcoming transmission of PRACH (4-step RACH)
* Between reception of RAR with RAPID which is not associated with the corresponding PRACH transmission and upcoming transmission of PRACH (4-step RACH)

For the discussion of successRAR and fallbackRAR, it can be deferred until reaching the conclusion on whether the number of PRBs for MsgB PDSCH can be larger than 25/12 RBs for 15/30 kHz SCS. |
| Intel | For 4-step RACH, we share views from multiple companies, * Between reception of RAR PDSCH in which UE does not correctly receive the transport block and upcoming transmission of PRACH (4-step RACH)
* Between reception of RAR with RAPID which is not associated with the corresponding PRACH transmission and upcoming transmission of PRACH (4-step RACH)

For 2-step RACH, we can wait for clarification whether msgB PDSCH is considered similar to msg2 or msg4 firstly.  |
| MediaTek | 4-step RACH: Msg1 retransmission when RAR decoding fails 2-step RACH: agree with Intel that it is better to discuss MsgB PDSCH BW first.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For 4-step RACH, the value of X is also applied to the following cases:* Between reception of PDCCH/PDSCH for RAR in which UE does not correctly receive it and upcoming transmission of PRACH
* Between reception of RAR with RAPID which is not associated with the corresponding PRACH transmission and upcoming transmission of PRACH

For 2-step RACH, the following Proposal 2.9-1b needs a decision first.**Assuming that MsgA indication is available,*** + - **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a MsgB PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.**
			* **The UE is not required to process a MsgB PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**

If the maximum MsgB bandwidth is restricted to 25 PRBs, the value of X does not be applied to 2-step RACH. Otherwise, the following cases should add the value of X.* Between reception of successRAR and transmission of corresponding HARQ-ACK
* Between reception of PDCCH/PDSCH for MsgB in which UE does not correctly receive it and upcoming transmission of PRACH
* Between reception of MsgB with RAPID which is not associated with the corresponding PRACH transmission and upcoming transmission of PRACH
 |
| NEC | We are fine to discuss the cases by Qualcomm. |
| Nokia, NSB | We share similar views on Qualcomm. |

Based on the received responses to Question 2.2-2a, perhaps the following proposal can be considered.

### **FL9 Medium Priority Proposal 2.2-2b:**

**The potential timeline relaxations for the following cases are FFS until RAN1#113:**

* **For 2-step RACH:**
	+ **Case 2a: Between reception of fallbackRAR and transmission of Msg3**
	+ **Case 2b: Between reception of successRAR and transmission of corresponding HARQ-ACK**
* **For 4-step RACH:**
	+ **Case 4a: Between reception of RAR PDSCH in which UE does not correctly receive the transport block and upcoming transmission of PRACH**
	+ **Case 4b: Between reception of RAR with RAPID which is not associated with the corresponding PRACH transmission and upcoming transmission of PRACH**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi4 | Y in general | For Case 2a and Case 2b, it should wait until there is an agreement on MsgB PDSCH channel bandwidth.  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N for 2step RACHY for 4 step RACH | For 2-step RACH, the timeline relaxation should wait for the conclusion of MsgB bandwidth. |
| LG | Y | The potential timeline relaxations be considered in the same way as for Msg 2 in 4-step RACH. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |

2.3 Separate early indication

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

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

RAN2#121 made the following agreements regarding support of additional separate early indication(s) [39]:

|  |
| --- |
| * Introduce Msg3/MsgA PUSCH based early indication for Rel-18 eRedCap. FFS how to implement this in the spec (e.g., new LCIDs or not).
* We will wait for RAN1 progress to see if there is a need for a Msg1 early indication for eRedCap.
 |

So, additional early indication in Msg3 will be supported, but it remains to decide whether to also support it in Msg1.

* Contributions [10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36] propose to support additional early indication in Msg1.
* Contribution [29] proposes to support early indication in Msg1 at least when the corresponding early indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is not configured.
* Contributions [24, 31] propose to support early indication in Msg1 only when the corresponding early indication for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is not configured.
* Contribution [13] proposes to support early indication in Msg1 only when the cell does not support Rel-17 RedCap UEs.
* Contributions [16, 38] express that additional early indication in Msg1 should not be supported.

Other proposals expressed in the contributions:

* Contributions [10, 12, 21, 33] propose to support additional early indication in MsgA PRACH, whereas contributions [16, 38] express that additional early indication in MsgA PRACH should not be supported.
* Contribution [26] proposes to discuss whether the early indication can be different for PR1-only UEs and BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs. Contributions [10, 26, 27] express that they can be different, whereas contribution [11] expresses that they cannot be different.

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

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.3-1a: For 4-step RACH, should a network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 be supported?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | Y | As summarized by moderator, clear majority see the necessity/benefit to support the Msg1-based separate early indication. Whichever the X value for the timeline extension between RAR PDSCH and Msg3 PUSCH is selected, the available TDRA configuration is significantly impacted. If additional separate early indication using Msg1 is not supported, Msg3 PUSCH TDRA is largely restricted even for legacy UEs which is not desired from efficiency and flexibility perspective.No drawback has been identified from RAN1 perspective, and hence there is no reason not to support Msg1-based additional early indication at least from RAN1 perspective. |
| Vivo | N | Many companies discussed about the benefits for network-configurable additional early indication specific for Rel-18 eRedCap UE. But less companies discussed about the necessity. gNB is given enough flexibility from both scheduling timing and resource allocation perspective. And there is no restriction for NW to schedule RAR larger than 5MHz with legacy timing. For such case, R18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3+PR1 behavior is left to UE implementation. In addition, based on RAN#99 conclusion that the initial access procedure of Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 is realized the same as Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1. For 18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1, the additional early indication would not bring any benefits and even results in such RedCap UE performance loss. So, introducing additional MSG1 based early indication is not only non-necessary, but also have drawbacks.  |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| CMCC | N | Our first preference is no additional early indication in Msg1 for R18 RedCap UEs. For R18 RedCap UEs, the scheduling of RAR PDSCH is allowed to be larger than the maximum number of unicast PRBs that the UE can process per slot, For uplink transmission of Msg3, R18 RedCap UE does not expect Msg3 PUSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop. Since Msg.3 usually has a smaller TBS such as 56 or 72 bits, the scheduling of Msg3 is likely to be within 11RB/12RB. Besides, although R18 RedCap UEs require larger timeline between RAR and Msg3 and have more restriction on K2 value configuration, legacy UEs are not impacted when R18 RedCap share the same early indication in Msg1 with R17 RedCap UEs. Thus, there is no need to distinguish R17 RedCap and R18 RedCap UEs for RAR and Msg3 scheduling. And also considering that RACH indication has been used by quit a few features, it will be further fragmented if early indication is introduced for R18 RedCap by Msg1, and the PRACH collision will be increased. So we think early indication of R18 RedCap by Msg.1 is not needed for R18 RedCap.  |
| SONY | Y | Msg1 early indication allows the RAR – Msg3 timeline for R18 UEs to be properly accounted for. PRACH fragmentation should not be an issue when this early indication is configurable. |
| Samsung | Y | Early indication in Msg1 should be supported. |
| LG | Y | Early indication in Msg1 for eRedCap should be supported to schedule the proper TDRA value for Message 3 transmission. |
| CATT | N | The gNB scheduling can address BW restrictions/TDRA for Msg2 and/or Msg3.BTW, we do not want separate early indication in Msg1 becomes an excuse of introducing Rel-18 specific separate initial BWP. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | No good reason to rob the network of the flexibility to use this when it wants to. |
| Intel | Y | If early identification by msg1 is not supported, gNB cannot know proper scheduling for RAR & msg3. If gNB tries to be conservative, it hurts the performance of legacy UEs.  |
| Ericsson | Y | As we discuss in our contribution [R1-2302298](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302298.zip), for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (with UE BB bandwidth reduction) the need for separate early indication in Msg1 can be motivated by the following reasons:1. If the PDSCH conveying RAR messages to Rel-17 RedCap and Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is wider than 5 MHz, the Rel-18 eRedCap UEs might be unable to handle the legacy minimum time between RAR PDSCH and Msg3 PUSCH (as discussed in previous section). If it is desired to apply timing relaxation for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs alone, i.e., if a common timing relaxation for both Rel-17 RedCap and Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is not desired, then a separate Msg1 indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is needed.
2. If it is desired to use different bandwidths for RAR PDSCH, i.e., larger than 5 MHz for Rel-17 RedCap UEs and equal to or smaller than 5 MHz for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (so that the legacy minimum time is followed), then a separate Msg1 indication is needed. This might happen if there are many Rel-17 RedCap UEs attempting random access (and hence, larger RAR bandwidth due to RAR multiplexing of RARs) and TBS scaling is used to recover coverage of (1-Rx) Rel-17 RedCap UEs.
3. If Msg3 PUSCH is to be scheduled with a wider bandwidth than 5 MHz for Rel-17 RedCap UEs (e.g., for RA-SDT) but with a smaller bandwidth than 5 MHz for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs, then a separate Msg1 indication is needed.

A potential separate Msg1 indication would be configurable by the network. Therefore, support of a separate Msg3 indication might also be useful for the cases when separate Msg1 indication is not configured (e.g., to minimize PRACH fragmentation), and Msg4 or Msg5 is to be scheduled with larger bandwidth than 5 MHz for Rel-17 RedCap UEs coming from RRC idle state. Note that it is not possible to schedule Msg3, Msg4, and Msg5 with larger than 5 MHz for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | 1. Whether fragmentation is an issue depends on the network. Therefore, configurable is needed.
2. Without msg1 early indication, the timeline relaxing for RAR processing is meaningless. UE implementation is more convenient.
3. Without msg1 early indication, msg3 in RA-Based SDT would be impacted, since the msg3 TBS in SDT is as large as tens of thousands bits according to the current spec.
 |
| Nokia, NSB |  | No strong view but we are OK to have separate Msg1 early indication. |
| Qualcomm | Y | Introduction of Msg1 based early indication gives configuration flexibility to the NW. The configuration of Msg1 based separate early indication is up to NW so if not configured, Rel-18 eRedCap UE should follow configuration for Rel-17 RedCap UE |

Among the responses received so far to Question 2.3-1a, 71% say yes and 21% say no. Based on the responses, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL2 High Priority Proposal 2.3-1b:**

* **For Rel-18 eRedCap UEs, a network-configurable additional early indication in Msg1 is supported.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| FL3 | See new Question 2.2-1c above, which was added based on discussion in the online (GTW) session on Monday 17th April. |

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 2.3-2a: For 2-step RACH, should a network-configurable additional early indication in MsgA PRACH be supported?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | N | Use LCID in PUSCH part is enough |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| CATT2 | N | As long as MsgA PUSCH will always carry dedicated LCID for Rel-18 LCID, the network does not need other information to do proper scheduling of MsgB and so on. |
| Vivo | N | Same views as Nordic and CATT |
| MediaTek | N | Similar views with Nordic and CATT |
| LG | Y | We think that 2-step RACH should be treated in the same way as for 4-setp RACH and if Msg1 early indication is introduced in 4-step RACH, MsgA early indication is also supported obviously in 2-step RACH.  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |

**FL1/FL4/FL5 Medium Priority Question 2.3-3a:**

**Companies are invited to comment on whether potential separate initial early indications for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (as discussed in the previous questions) would apply to BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs only or also to PR1-only UEs.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | BW3/PR3+PR1 + PR1 share the initial access, based on RAN guidance. So answer is Yes. |
| Ericsson | As we discuss in our contribution [R1-2302298](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302298.zip), the additional separate early indication(s) are only really needed for UEs support UE BB bandwidth reduction (BW3/PR3), which is the reason why the objective on additional separate early indication(s) has been listed under UE BB bandwidth reduction in the WID. If the additional separate early indication(s) are used also for UEs that only support UE peak data rate reduction (PR1), then this may increase the implementation and testing burden on the network side. For a network to implement support for UEs supporting UE peak data rate reduction, the network implementation of the initial access procedure may now need to be updated to consider that the accessing UE might be a UE that supports not only UE peak data rate reduction but also UE BB bandwidth reduction.Some simple means should be considered that will enable a phased approach in the network implementation. If the network can distinguish early on whether the UE is a UE that supports both UE BB bandwidth reduction and UE peak data rate reduction, or a UE that only supports UE peak data rate reduction, the initial burden for network implementation and testing will be significantly smaller – this can be achieved by specifying that the additional separate early indication in Msg1 only concerns those UEs that support UE BB bandwidth reduction. However, if this would not be desired, an alternative approach is to specify that access control/barring is separate for UEs that support UE BB bandwidth reduction and UEs that only support UE peak data rate reduction – this will ensure that the network implementation only allows access to UEs for which full support has been implemented on the network side. Adopting one of these options also helps from IODT point of view. In our contribution, we have the following proposal:**Proposal: Support at least one of the following options to ensure that gNB knows whether to expect access by UEs supporting UE BB bandwidth reduction:*** **Option 1: Additional separate early indication in Msg1 only concerns UEs that support UE BB bandwidth reduction.**
* **Option 2: Access control/barring is separate for UEs that support UE BB bandwidth reduction and UEs that only support UE peak data rate reduction.**

The discussion and decision about the above proposal can potentially also be left up to RAN2. |
| Qualcomm | We are open for discussion on whether UE early indication is only applicable to UE BB BW reduction or both UE options. As Ericsson mentions, the objective on additional separate early indication(s) is only listed under UE BB bandwidth reduction in the WID. We may also need to discuss benefits and drawbacks from both NW and UE perspectives.  |
| CATT2 | From RANP conclusion, they should share the same RACH procedure:

|  |
| --- |
| Note 4: The initial access procedure of Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 is realized by following:* Same as Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1
 |

Although all restrictions designed for BW3/PR3 seem redundant to ’20 MHz + PR1’, it should be easy for ’20 MHz + PR1’ to support restricted behavior of BW3/PR3. |
| Vivo | Same views as Nordic and CATT. The guidance in the later RAN plenary should override the objective in the previous WID description.  |
| Samsung | In the latest WID, separate initial early indication is supported only for BW3/PR3 UE or BW3/PR3+PR1 UE. |
| MediaTek | Per RAN agreements, PR1 UE should follow the same initial access as BW3/PR3 UEs. Hence, we don’t agree that a potential separate early indication only applies to BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs. Note: WID objectives should be modified accordingly to align with RAN#99 agreements. *[RP-230778]**Note 4: The initial access procedure of Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 is realized by following:**Same as Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1* |
| Sierra Wireless | Agree with Ericsson that for phased network deployments it would be desirable for the network to identify or allow eRedCap BW3/PR3+PR1 vs PR1-only devices. Our preference would be to have separate access control/barring for eRedCap BW/PR3+PR1 devices vs PR1-only devices. The same initial access procedure can still be used for eRedCap BW/PR3+PR1 devices vs PR1-only devices.  |
| LG | PR1-only eRedCap UEs are different from BW3/PR3+PR1 eRedCap UEs in terms of UE supported PDSCH/PUSCH bandwidth. We can discuss whether the same early indication can be used for both PR1-only UEs and the BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine to discuss it further while our understanding based on the last RAN plenary meeting is that BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs and PR1 standalone UEs share the initial access procedure, i.e., the same separate early indication would be applied to both of them.As we commented in **High Priority Question 2.2-1c**, this may have a relation with the values on X for RAR-Msg3 timeline extension, thus we suggest to clarify this question first. |
| FUTUREWEI | Based on RAN#99 decision, BW3/PR3+PR1 and PR1 share the initial access. So EI applies to both BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs and PR1 UEs |
| Transsion | The difference between PR1 and BW3/PR3+PR1 is that PR1-only Ues can process the number of PRBs with a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz. Therefore, PR1 can reuse the initial early indications for R17 Redcap Ues. Further, the separate initial early indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs may only apply to BW3/PR3+PR1 Ues. |
| Intel | We prefer to follow RAN#99 guideline that BW3/PR3+PR1 and standalone PR1 share same procedure for the initial access.  |
| Spreadtrum | Similar views as several companies that based on RAN#99, the early indication should apply to both BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs and PR1 UEs.This question can be discussed together with proposal Proposal 2.2-1d. |
| NEC | We would like to follow RAN#99 agreements. |
| Panasonic | As companies commented, the EI should not be separated for “BW3/PR3 + PR1” and “20 MHz + PR1” as per the RAN agreement note 4. |
| LG2 | We can discuss the pros and cons of each feature from both UE perspective and NW perspective for better management and more efficient operation. For instance, PR1+20MHz may not need relaxation X or restriction on Message 3 (within the number of PRBs 5MHz). PR1+20MHz can share early indication for Rel-17 RedCap or Rel-18 BW3/PR3+PR1 or network-configurable in any situation. It also seems to be helpful in the aspect of efficient scheduling for NW to be informed of which feature the UE supports as early as possible. It can be discussed for now whether PR1+20MHz needs to hide its capability until NW is informed by itself later or not.It can be considered to choose one out of 4 options below for PR1+20MHz * Option 1: share early indication in Msg1 for Rel-17 RedCap
* Option 2: share early indication in Msg1 for Rel-18 eRedCap(BW3/PR3+PR1)
* Option 3: network-configurable in any situation
* Option 4: other
 |
| OPPO | We also think the RAN#99 clearly define they share the same earlier indication and not issue with that. |
| CMCC | According to RAN#99 guideline, BW3/PR3+PR1 and PR1 standalone UEs share the initial access procedure, thus there is no need to distinguish them during initial access. |
| SONY | The RANP#99 decision says that BW3/PR3+PR1 and PR1 have the same initial access procedure, as commented above by CATT and FW.Hence, there should be no separate EI between BW3/PR3+PR1 and PR1.  |
| MediaTek | RAN#99 agreements clearly say PR1 UE follows the same initial access as BW3/PR3+PR1 UE which include they share the early indication if provided. This kind of questions should not be re-discussed in RAN1.  |
| Xiaomi2 | According to the proposal endorsed in the RAN meeting, BW3/PR3+PR1 and PR1 only share the initial access, so the common separate early indication can be applied for both BW3/PR3+PR1 and PR only. |
| Nokia, NSB | We share similar views as other companies that BW3/PR3 + PR1 and 20MHz + PR1 have the same initial access procedure based on RAN plenary decision. So early indication should apply to both UEs. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We should follow RAN#99 guideline, which is a compromise. If separate early indication for BW3+PR1 and standalone PR1 especially in msg1 is supported, it causes different UE types, which is also not aligned with the WID and also would revert the RANP’s conclusion. |
| Nordic | It was FL suggesting in RAN#99 that we do not do WID update to RAN#99 agreement, it is very comic to argue with WID which is outdated and not updated to latest decision in RAN#99. 😊 |
| FL6 | This issue has been addressed in Proposal 2.2-1e. |

2.4 Separate initial BWP

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

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

Conclusion:There is no consensus to continue discussion on “whether additional separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 RedCap UEs is allowed to be configured by the SIB in the cell”. |

The contributions express the following views regarding separate initial BWP:

* Contributions [11, 16, 18] express that there is no need for additional separate initial BWP.
* Contribution [26] expresses that RAN1 should not discuss it further unless RAN2 asks for RAN1 input.
* Contribution [13] proposes to support separate initial BWP for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs only when the cell does not support Rel-17 RedCap UEs.
* Contributions [31, 33] propose to support separate initial BWP for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs for the case when the separate initial BWP introduced for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is not configured, and/or for the case when Rel-17 RedCap UEs are barred in the cell.

Companies are invited to reply to the following question. Note that the question concerns the potential need for a separate initial BWP rather than an additional separate initial BWP in the sense that a separate initial BWP for Rel-17 RedCap UEs and an additional separate initial BWP for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs are not configured simultaneously.

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 2.4-1a: Companies are invited to comment on the potential need for a separate initial BWP for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs in case a separate initial BWP for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is not configured, and/or Rel-17 RedCap UEs are not supported in the cell, and/or Rel-17 RedCap UEs are barred in the cell.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | “initial BWP for Rel-17 RedCap UEs is not configured”should be sufficient the only criteria here. |
| CATT | The same as Rel-17 case: If Rel-18 RedCap UE is not barred, and Rel-17 separate initial BWP is not configured, then Rel-18 RedCap UE use legacy initial BWP. |
| Vivo | Same view as CATT, if Rel-17 separate initial BWP is not configured, then Rel-18 RedCap UE use legacy initial BWP.About whether/how Rel-18 eRedCap read the Ies related to Rel-17 RedCap UE bar, it should be up to RAN2 to discuss and decide.  |
| Panasonic | For a cell supporting both Rel-17 RedCap and Rel-18 eRedCap UEs, separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-18 eRedCap UEs can be configured only when the separate initial DL/UL BWP specific to Rel-17 RedCap UEs is NOT configured. Allowing the case is beneficial for scheduling flexibility while the NW complexity or test effort would not increase so much. The detail of the configuration is up to RAN2. |
| Samsung | Separate initial BWP is not needed. However, separate barring indication is needed. If Rel-18 eRedCap UE is not barred, it can use legacy initial BWP. |
| LG | It is OK up to one separate initial BWP regardless of Rel-17 RedCap or Rel-18 eRedCap. For example, the scenario is open that the initial BWP is for non-RedCap and Rel-17 RedCap and the separate initial BWP is for Rel-18 eRedCap. Without the configuration for the separate initial BWP, RedCap and eRedCap will be similarly operated in the initial BWP with non-RedCap. This case can give more flexibility to NW for scheduling and help load-balancing. How one separate initial BWP is configured to only Rel-18 eRedCap except to Rel-17 RedCap is up to RAN2 decision on signaling or configuration.  |
| DOCOMO | We see the need for a separate initial BWP for Rel-18 eRedCap at least for the following cases;* For the case where Rel-17 RedCap UEs and non-RedCap UE share the same initial BWP and one separate initial BWP is configured for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs. We see the valid scenario for this case. For example, non-RedCap/Rel-17 RedCap/Rel-18 eRedCap UEs are operate in FDD band which has 20 MHz CBW and is configured 15 kHz SCS, and initial BWP is configured with 20MHz for non-RedCap/Rel-17 RedCap UEs and a separate initial BWP is configured for Rel-18 eRedCap with smaller BW than 20 MHz, e.g., 5MHz, which can provide offloading of random access resources and potential power saving gain.
* For the case where Rel-17 RedCap is not supported in the cell and one separate initial BWP is configured for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs. Same as Rel-17 RedCap, a separate initial BWP must be configured for this case. This deployment is one candidate for NW operator and hence we should consider this case.

Note that both of two cases, no additional impact from Rel-17 is expected in RAN1 and only potential impact is new RRC parameter for Rel-18 in RAN2. |

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 2.4-2a: Companies are invited to comment on whether a potential separate initial BWP for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (as discussed in the previous question) would apply to BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs only or also to PR1-only UEs.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | Same initial access, same initial BW for both. |
| CATT2 | As RANP guidance, they should share the same RACH procedure. So same initial BWP, as mentioned by Nordic. |
| Vivo | Same views as Nordic and CATT |
| LG | PR1-only eRedCap UEs are different from BW3/PR3+PR1 eRedCap UEs in terms of UE supported PDSCH/PUSCH bandwidth. We can discuss whether the same initial BWP can be applied to both PR1-only UEs and the BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs. It is thought that considering various possibilities openly will help the discussion. |
| DOCOMO | As per our understanding, BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs and PR1-only UEs share the same initial access, then they share the same initial BWP. But we are open to discuss it further. |

2.5 Simultaneous reception

RAN1 has made the following conclusion regarding simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions [7]:

|  |
| --- |
| Conclusion:For UE BB complexity reduction, there is no need to relax the requirements on simultaneous reception of two broadcast PDSCH transmissions for SIB1/OSI/paging/RAR. |

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

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

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

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

The contributions express the following views regarding simultaneous reception of unicast and broadcast channels:

* Contributions [16, 21, 26, 30, 33, 36] express that there is no need to relax the current requirements.
* Contributions [12, 13] express that no relaxation is needed if the total bandwidth is <5 MHz, otherwise one of the transmissions may be prioritized (e.g., unicast prioritized over broadcast).
* Contributions [10, 15, 31] express that SI can be prioritized over unicast (as in FR2).
* Contributions [17, 38] express that RAR should be prioritized over unicast and unicast over SI/paging.
* Contribution [18] expresses that unicast should be prioritized if needed.
* Contribution [11] expresses that the UE may skip unicast if needed.

Companies are invited to reply to the following question.

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.5-1a: Is there a need for some specification changes (e.g., regarding prioritization for processing and decoding) for simultaneous reception of unicast and broadcast PDSCH transmissions? Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | N | There is no timeline requirement on reception of broadcast PDSCH for SI, thus the broadcast PDSCH can be proceeded across multiple slots. Therefore, it should be up to UE implementation how to proceed the two PDSCHs, i.e., there is no issue if a UE is implemented to be able to proceed both PDSCHs within the processing timeline for HARQ-ACK transmission for the unicast PDSCH, otherwise, a UE should be implemented to proceed the unicast PDSCH first. |
| Vivo | FFS | We see many companies proposed “no additional UE behaviour or relaxation of the requirement is needed”. But we wondered whether they have the same understanding. Currently, there seems three interpretations for “no additional UE behaviour or relaxation of the requirement is needed”.* Interpretation 1: Reasonable UE implementation should prioritize the reception of unicast PDSCH, reception of broadcast PDSCH can be skipped.
* Interpretation 2: Reasonable UE implementation should prioritize the reception of unicast PDSCH, whether to receive the broadcast PDSCH is up to UE implementation.
* Interpretation 3: Reasonable UE implementation should prioritize the reception of unicast PDSCH firstly, use remaining BB capability for the decoding of broadcast PDSCH for SI acquisition, which enables simultaneous reception of both PDSCHs.

So, which one is the correct understanding? |
| Nordic  | Y | We prefer to leave this up to implementation, for the case when total scheduled number of PRBs is >5MHz. So UE can prioritize what to receive. This would be typically in this orderRAR (UL may be out of synch) > unicast > Paging (typically not configured in RRC connected) |
| CMCC | N | Based on spec mentioned by FL, broadcast here means PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI. Then it can be up to UE implementation, unicast can be prioritized over PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI if HARQ feedback is required. If broadcast also includes PDSCH scheduled with RA-RNTI, prioritizing PDSCH scheduled with RA-RNTI over unicast can still up to UE implementation. |
| SONY | Y | Our preference is that the priority of channels for decoding is clear, which suggests that it is defined in the spec. |
| Samsung | Y | We think unicast PDSCH should be prioritized. |
| LG | N | We agree DOCOMO |
| CATT | N | Same understanding as DOCOMO.  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We can support something to be done after considering other views |
| Intel | Y | The behavior should be clarified which may result in spec changes. At least the following two case should be discussed* The relaxed decoding of RAR may overlap with a unicast PDSCH. Both PDSCHs have defined timelines.

Further, since the unicast PDSCHs may be frequently scheduled, the decoding of a broadcast PDSCH may consistently collide with unicast PDSCHs and end up with rather long delay, which may lead unexpected performance impacts. |
| Ericsson |  | We would be fine with specifying some prioritization order, e.g., as for FR2. We would also be fine with no relaxation (i.e., the existing procedure applies). If there is no relaxation, it is our understanding that the UE may first decode unicast PDSCH and then broadcast PDSCH (so as to meet the unicast timeline and as SI acquisition is not subject to any specified timeline). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | If gNB does not know how the UE process unicast and broadcast, e.g., RAR, at the same time, then the subsequent scheduling would be impacted. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We think there is no need for specification changes as UE needs to process unicast transmission to meet the timeline. For broadcast transmission, there is no timeline so it can be processed later.  |
| Qualcomm | N | The case is only when UE receives unicast PDSCH with SIB1/OSI PDSCH (for SI acquisition) simultaneously. In this case, an eRedCap UE can still receive both PDSCHs given that there is sufficient processing time budget for SIB1/OSI so any additional relaxation or any prioritization is not needed. This is more aligned with what we have agreed on for broadcast PDSCH (except RAR PDSCH).Note that this scenario does not include the case that RAR PDSCH and unicast PDSCH are received at the same time. The broadcast PDSCH is only for SI acquisition (SIB1/OSI) as clearly described in the spec. |
| FL2/FL3 | Different views are expressed in the responses received so far. Companies are encouraged to check and comment on the responses from other companies. |
| Sharp | N | the processing priority can be up to UE implementation, and does not need to be specificized. |
| CATT2 | N | Regarding the case (simultaneous RAR and unicast PDSCH) raised by Intel and Qualcomm, we think it is a corner case (if not totally impossible):* NW can allocate unicase PDSCH only after RACH procedure is finished, i.e. UE ID is provided by Msg3, and C-RNTI is allocated by Msg4.
* Therefore, it seems impossible for NW to transmit another unicast PDSCH to the UE before its Msg3 is received. So simultaneous reception between RAR and a unicast PDSCH is unlikely to happen, at least for initial access.
 |
| Vivo | Y | Based on companies’ comments, it seems the common preference is UE should prioritize the unicast PDSCH; About the broadcast PDSCH, still there are different views, like broadcast PDSCH can be decoded afterwards (if there is no subsequent unicast PDSCH scheduling?), or up to UE implementation.  |
| Spreadtrum | N | Same understanding as DOCOMO, i.e., up to UE implementation. |
| Ericsson |  | Same view as in the previous round.It seems that many companies have the understanding that a reasonable UE implementation would prioritize unicast PDSCH, if no prioritization rule is specified. But we have similar concern as expressed by Vivo above — if there is continuous scheduling of unicast PDSCH in subsequent slots, would the UE skip decoding of SIB?Also, to our understanding, the broadcast PDSCH referred to in the question concerns only those scheduled with SI-RNTI (and not those scheduled with RA-RNTI or P-RNTI, as commented by some companies above). |
| Panasonic | Y for SI,N for RAR, paging | **Unicast vs. P-RNTI triggered SI**The current spec (w/o change) for FR1 is interpreted as:* When unicast decoding is based on the capability 2 processing time, the SI shall be able to be decoded while unicast may be skipped. Otherwise, the simultaneous reception of both unicast and SI is required. (It is not up to the UE implementation which channel(s) are decoded)

Our view is, similar to capability 2 processing is applied. i.e. the P-RNTI triggered SI is decoded while unicast may be skipped. As the network is able to manage the case of capability 2 processing, precluding such simultaneous reception should be possible and it is beneficial for complexity reduction. **Unicast vs. SI other than P-RNTI triggered SI (=autonomous SI acquisition)**The current spec (38.214 clause 5.1):

|  |
| --- |
| The UE is expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI during a process of autonomous SI acquisition. |

“During a process of autonomous SI acquisition” is intentionally vague without describing exact SI reception slot while unicast is expected to be decoded. The reason of such description is that the autonomous SI acquisition is lower priority than unicast because the urgency to receive SI is relaxed compared with P-RNTI triggered SI. P-RNTI triggered SI need to be received priority as the system operation will be changed after SI are received.So, our interpretation of the spec (w/o change) is:* At the time of the autonomous SI acquisition, unicast is decoded while it is not described whether the SI should simultaneously be decoded or not (It may be up to the UE implementation whether to decode the SI).

We propose to clarify precluding the potential simultaneous reception. But unlike the P-RNTI triggered SI case, the unicast should only be decoded while the autonomous SI acquisition, whose urgency is lower, is not expected. So the current wording can be acceptable but clarification of not mandating the simultaneous SI reception would be useful. Note that the autonomous SI acquisition by delaying the reception or HARQ combining and so on are still required.**Unicast vs. RAR**The current spec (38.214 clause 5.1):

|  |
| --- |
| The UE is not expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, G-RNTI for multicast or broadcast, MCCH-RNTI, G-CS-RNTI or CS-RNTI if another PDSCH in the same cell scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time. |

We think no enhancement is needed on the current spec i.e., RAR is only decoded while the unicast decoding is not expected. The required processing time for RAR can be same as the case of no simultaneous reception of unicast. **Unicast vs. paging PDSCH**UE is not required to have simultaneous reception between unicast PDSCH and paging PDSCH in RRC\_CONNECTED as the indications of SI modifications and/or PWS notifications are using Short Message transmitted with P-RNTI over DCI. Therefore, PDCCH with P-RNTI is required but not required to receive paging PDSCH.**Summary of our proposal**:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| unicast vs. P-RNTI triggered SI | unicast vs. autonomous SI acquisition | unicast vs. RAR | Unicast vs. paging |
| The SI is only decoded while unicast decoding is not expected.(Need spec change) | Unicast is only decoded while the SI acquisition is not expected or not described.(Clarification is useful but keeping the current wording is also possible) | RAR is only decoded while the unicast decoding is not expected.(No spec change) | For SI modification and PWS, unicast is decoded while the paging PDSCH is not decoded by the RRC\_CONNECTED UE(No spec change. Paging PDCCH is decoded) |

 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | In connected mode, broadcast channel and unicast PDSCH may be received at the same time. If it is up to UE implementation, in order to avoid invalid scheduling, gNB cannot schedule any PDSCH before PUCCH of the unicast PDSCH, which would be quite limited for the gNB.If the gNB keep scheduling before PUCCH of the unicast PDSCH, the UE actually is unable to process. Consequently, the resource would be wasted, and the chain reactions by accumulated invalid scheduling can have serious performance impacts.Therefore, to avoid the invalid scheduling and negative impacts, the gNB actually should schedule after the PUCCH feedback, which actually require the timeline relaxing for the gNB. |
| MediaTek | Y for RAR vs unicast | 1. **Unicast vs RAR**: from the clause 5.1 from 38.214 (cited by Panasonic in the above), our understanding is that Msg2/MsgB is prioritized over unicast PDSCH. Both RAR PDSCH and unicast PDSCH have process timeline requirements. Hence, we should specify which to be prioritized for processing. Per legacy operation, RAR should be prioritized.
2. **Unicast vs broadcast with SI-RNTI**, we are open for discussion.
 |
| Intel2 | Y | For the case that broadcast PDSCH (other than RAR) is overlapped in time with unicast PDSCH, we share the views from vivo and E//, the behavior should be defined, otherwise, it is not clear what is the expected behavior on broadcast PDSCH if there are unicast PDSCH in consecutive slots. For the case of RAR, thanks for the comments from CATT. However, the comments are for initial access. On the other hand, we are considering connected mode operation. It is possible a unicast PDSCH is scheduled in the next slot of RAR. A simple way is to define the priority order to decode the different PDSCHs  |
| Qualcomm | N | There are two different cases for unicast + broadcast PDSCHs in the spec so need to differentiate the discussions like below:1: Unicast PDSCH and broadcast PDSCH with SI-RNTI:

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

2: Unicast PDSCH and broadcast PDSCH with RA-RNTI/MSGB-RNTI

|  |
| --- |
| The UE is not expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, G-RNTI for multicast or broadcast, MCCH-RNTI, G-CS-RNTI or CS-RNTI if another PDSCH in the same cell scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time. |

For the case 1 (SI-RNTI), as commented above, an eRedCap UE can still receive both PDSCHs given that there is sufficient processing time budget for SIB1/OSI so any additional relaxation or any prioritization is not needed. For the case 2 (RA-RNTI/MSGB-RNTI), current spec already defines prioritization between two PDSCHs. We believe that same behavior is sufficient for eRedCap UEs. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | In case of unicast + broadcast with SI-RNTI, we believe that no specification change is needed. This case should be supported and UE needs to process unicast transmission to meet the timeline. However, if companies would like to specify priority, we are open.In case of unicast + RAR, it already states in 38.214 that UE should prioritize RAR. We don’t think modification is needed.Also, since Rel-18 RedCap is only in FR1, the specification text related to FR2 does not apply. |
| CMCC | N | If broadcast here means PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI, it can be up to UE implementation, unicast can be prioritized over PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI. Meanwhile NW can avoid schedule continuous unicast PDSCH overlapping with SI in connected mode. |
| LG | N | Even if unicast PDSCH is processed first and then the other channel is done, there seems to be no major operational issue. Even considering the case that RAR and Unicast PDSCH are processed simultaneously, it seems good to choose the longest X ms for relaxation time due to give enough processing time to a UE. |
| OPPO | N | From the above comments, we see no issue have to be addressed for RedCap UE to receiving unicast and broadcast simultaneously. The case for processing capability 2 would be different, as it is mainly due to the stringent processing time requirement of low latency traffic. |
| Xiaomi | N | The NR normal UE share the similar situation as eRedCap. For NR normal UE, it should have the capability to receive a unicast PDSCH and a broadcast PDSCH at the same time, with the HARQ feedback behind the unicast PDSCH. And, the time gap between the unicast PDSCH and the HARQ feedback should meet the processing time requirement corresponding to PDSCH processing capability 1 without any relaxation. So, the NR normal UE may process the unicast PDSCH at first for the timely feedback. But, there is no processing priority specified for NR normal UE for this case.So, the current spec on simultaneous reception of a unicast PDSCH and a broadcast PDSCH in FR1 can be reused for eRedCap capable of BW3.The only difference for eRedCap capable of BW3 is: the channel BW of unicast PDSCH plus the broadcast PDSCH may span 5MHz. However, since the unicast PDSCH channel BW is restricted in 5MHz, there is no need to relax the processing time of Capability 1 for eRedCap.  |
| SONY | Y | We’d like the spec to be clear on this issue. It seems that a consensus is that a reasonable UE implementation would prioritise unicast PDSCH over broadcast PDSCH. Our preference is that this would be written in the spec for the sake of clarity. |
| DOCOMO | N | We still don’t see the need for any specification change.As stated by Qualcomm, one thing we would like to note is that simultaneous reception between RAR PDSCH and unicast PDSCH is not included even for legacy UEs and the same behavior excerpted below should be applied and no further discussion is needed.

|  |
| --- |
| The UE is not expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI if another PDSCH in the same cell scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time. |

Again, there is no timeline requirement on SI acquisition, it is up to UE implementation even if the total number of PRBs for overlapped unicast PDSCH and PDSCH with SIB1/OSI exceeds 5MHz. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | To guarantee the consensus between gNB and UE, an agreement for the prioritization of unicast PDSCH processing should be achieved. A note could be FFS: whether any RAN1 spec impact. |
| Panasonic |  | Please see the update on our comment above; The unicast vs. paging issue is added. |

The received responses to Question 2.5-1a are split about evenly regarding the potential need for some specification changes for simultaneous reception of unicast and broadcast PDSCH transmissions. Several responses suggest that the prioritization between unicast and SI may need to be clarified.

**FL4/FL5 High Priority Question 2.5-1b:**

**How should the UE prioritize between reception of unicast PDSCH and SI PDSCH?**

* **Option 1: The UE prioritizes reception of unicast PDSCH over SI PDSCH.**
* **Option 2: The UE may skip decoding of unicast PDSCH but decodes SI PDSCH.**
* **Option 3: The prioritization between reception of unicast and SI PDSCH is up to the UE implementation.**
* **Option 4: Other (please elaborate in the comment field).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option (1-4)** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | Option 3 |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Option 1 or 2 | Should not be left UE implementation |
| Transsion | Option1 | SI may not be latency-critical service. |
| vivo | Option 1  | Further clarification for option 1, in our view, if SI PDSCH is deprioritized, how to handle the SI PDSCH is up to UE implementation, e.g. if there is no subsequent unicast PDSCH transmission, UE can decode the SI PDSCH; otherwise, UE may drop is SI PDSCH.  |
| Intel | Option 1 | Prioritization here doesn’t mean SI PDSCH is dropped. SI PDSCH can still be received with relaxed decoding timeline |
| Sharp | Option3 |  |
| Spreadtrum | Option 3 |  |
| NEC | Option 1 |  |
| Panasonic | Option 2 for P-RNTI triggered SI,Option 1 for the autonomous SI acquisition | As commented in the previous round.Additionally, regarding the P-RNTI triggered SI, we would again like to emphasize that the “no spec change” does NOT corresponding to the Option 3 (UE implementation). The current spec says that “the UE **shall be able** to decode” the unicast and P-RNTI triggered SI which are overlapping in time in FR1 except Capability 2 processing time. It means, the network would expect that the UE does the simultaneous reception of those PDSCHs.Furthermore, TS38.302 has following description in Table 6.2-2: Downlink "Reception Type" combinations. It is aligned with TS38.213 description in FR1.Note 2: For PCell, UE is not required to decode SI-RNTI PDSCH simultaneously with C-RNTI PDSCH, unless in FR1. |
| LG | Option 3  | Prioritization of reception can be different on a lot of situations. Spec can be complicated with various descriptions for of prioritizing the channels dependent on each case, So, it looks good that the prioritization between reception of unicast and SI PDSCH is up to the UE implementation without spec change. |
| CATT | Option 1 or 3 | Eventually 1 and 3 will be the same. If UE strictly follows spec requirement on feedback, i.e. provide HARQ-ACK in time, it should prioritize unicast PDSCH reasonably. No need for spec to tell it.So no additional spec change, for either 1 or 3.On the other hand, we think Option 2 will lead to additional spec impact. We share the view with Intel that prioritization A does not mean drop B, especially the R18 RedCap UE is able to buffer 20 MHz data. |
| DOCOMO | Option 3 |  |
| OPPO | Option3 |  |
| CMCC | Option 1 | UE can process SI later without decoding timeline requirement. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 and 2 (see comment) | In line with the existing specification text for Capability 2 and FR2, respectively, UE behavior can be according to Option 1 for autonomous SI acquisition and according to Option 2 for P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition. |
| SONY | Option 1 or 2 | Should not be left to UE implementation. We would just like the specs to be clear on what the UE should do in this case. |
| MediaTek | Option 1 or 2 | As far as we understand, there is a timing requirement for UE to respond ACK/NACK for unicast PDSCH. Therefore, in typical case, we think unicast PDSCH should be prioritized over broadcast SI PDSCH. In some corner case, UE may want to prioritize SI PDSCH decoding.  |
| Xiaomi2 | Option 3 | Just follows the legacy UE behavior and no spec change is needed.If no consensus is reached after several rounds of discussions, we recommend to make the following conclusion:**There is no consensus on whether to define the priority rule on the support of simultaneous reception of a unicast PDSCH and the SI PDSCH.** |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 3 or 1 | Same comment as before that we believe that no specification change is needed, as UE needs to process unicast transmission to meet the timeline. However, if companies would like to specify priority, we can also accept Option 1. |
| Huawei,Hisilicon | Option 1 | Should not be left to UE implementation. |
| Samsung | Option 1 |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option 1 | The UE prioritizes decoding of unicast PDSCH due to HARQ-ACK timeline and whether to decode SI PDSCH is up to UE implementation at least for autonomous SI.If it is left to UE implementation, the gNB scheduling would be serious impacted. Since before the PUCCH of unicast PDSCH feedback, the gNB probably can not schedule any other DL transmission, otherwise, the continuous scheduling of unicast PDSCH in subsequent slots would cause the serious decoding problem and negative impacts on gNB scheduling.  |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 but | We think no relaxation is needed for this case as the 2 broadcast PDSCH case. No prioritization is needed so UE will be able to receive both PDSCHs. No spec change is needed either. |
| Intel | Y | Regarding how to handle unicast PDSCH overlap with SI PDSCH, we see different favorites from companies. Someone say unicast PDSCH is prioritized, while others think to prioritize SI PDSCH. In such situation, if the prioritization is up to UE implementation, gNB cannot predict the UE behavior. Therefore, we think it is necessary to define a clear priority order.  |

Most of the received responses to Question 2.5-1b prefer to clarify the prioritization between reception of unicast PDSCH and SI PDSCH. Based on the responses the following proposal can be considered.

**FL6 High Priority Proposal 2.5-1c:**

**When the combined bandwidth of unicast PDSCH and SI PDSCH is larger than 5 MHz,**

* **During a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition,**
	+ **The UE may skip decoding of unicast PDSCH.**
* **During a process of autonomous SI acquisition,**
	+ **The UE prioritizes reception of unicast PDSCH over SI PDSCH.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| LG | N | In the case where the combined bandwidth of unicast PDSCH and SI PDSCH is larger than 5 MHz, we don’t see a critical issue for an eRedCap UE to follow the legacy behaviour in FR1. So, it can be left up to UE implementation.  |
| DOCOMO | N | A UE is required to prepare HARQ-ACK transmission for the unicast PDSCH with satisfying the processing timeline. However, decoding order of unicast PDSCH and SI PDSCH is completely up to UE as long as the UE can prepare HARQ-ACK for the unicast PDSCH. gNB expects the HARQ-ACK information reception for the unicast PDSCH but does not need to know which PDSCH is decoded first. We still don’t see the need to define prioritization rule of decoding. Again, why we need to preclude the possibility that a UE can be implemented to be able to decode both unicast PDSCH and SI PDSCH within the processing timeline for HARQ-ACK transmission for the unicast PDSCH.As we agreed, a UE can buffer up to 20MHz, then no need to skip the reception of either unicast PDSCH or SI PDSCH even if the total PRBs is larger than 5MHz.To summarize, a UE shall be able to decode unicast PDSCH FDMed with SI PDSCH and* decode unicast PDSCH within the processing timeline requirement for HARQ-ACK transmission.
* decode SI PDSCH (across multiple slots).
 |
| Qualcomm | N | We still do not see any motivation to define any new behavior or any prioritization. RAN1 already agreed that an eRedCap UE will be able to receive SI PDSCH which is larger than 5MHz based on the argument that the UE can still process the PDSCH within sufficiently large processing time budget. If the unicast PDSCH is simultaneously scheduled with SI PDSCH, there can be just one slot delay for SI PDSCH processing, but this will be still within the time budget. The new behavior or prioritization is not aligned with the logic that we used for the previous agreement on SI PDSCH. We do not see any technical reason to define this proposed behavior. |
| Panasonic | Y in principle | We can accept the condition in the main bullet. But if the condition is related to 5 MHz BB BW, the potential agreement should be applied only to BW3/PR3+PR1 UE, not to 20 MHz + PR1 UE.Then we propose to update as follows, with minor-update to align with the other agreements:**For UE BB bandwidth reduction, when the combined bandwidth of unicast PDSCH and SI PDSCH is larger than the UE can process per slot,** |
| vivo |  | Thanks a lot Panasonic’s explanation on the difference and priority for P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition and autonomous SI acquisition. We understand, but given for connected mode, gNB knows about the eRedCap BB BW capability, it would be simpler and less complex for such P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition case to adopt the same handling as for FR2. We propose another option below* **During a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, the UE is not expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI if in the same cell, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time.**

We are fine with **During a process of autonomous SI acquisition, The UE prioritizes reception of unicast PDSCH over SI PDSCH.** |
| CATT | N | As Qualcomm already mention and quoted, current spec is sufficient.Assuming all the current specifications are valid for R18 RedCap UE as follows:1. UE does not expect RAR PDSCH overlaps with unicast PDSCH

|  |
| --- |
| The UE is not expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, G-RNTI for multicast or broadcast, MCCH-RNTI, G-CS-RNTI or CS-RNTI if another PDSCH in the same cell scheduled with RA-RNTI or MSGB-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time.  |

2. UE has to transmit HARQ-ACK in time for unicast PDSCH as required3. UE shall be able to decode unicast PDSCH and SI PDSCH during P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition period in FR1There is nothing additionally required. If a UE does not prioritize unicast PDSCH over SI PDSCH, but still able to provide HARQ-ACK in time and decode SI PDSCH, then it does not matter. |
| MediaTek |  | We support the sub-second bullet. For the first sub-bullet, we need some time to think.  |
| Spreadtrum | N | For the first case, we are fine, as the UE may be able to process the SIB and also meet the unicast feedback timeline, it is not necessary to restrict the UE behaviours as always skip.For the second case, we still think “up to UE implementation” is reasonable.  In general, the UE should meet the HARQ-ACK timeline for unicast first, but if the UE prioritizes reception of SI PDSCH over unicast PDSCH, retransmission can be performed.Based on the above, we prefer to leave the behavior up to UE implementation for this issue. |
| CMCC | N | There seems no problem to follow the legacy behaviour in FR1. It is fine to be left up to UE implementation. |
| NEC | N | Common handling is preferred. |
| OPPO | N | No new behavior. It seems it even controversial to have what new behavior.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y generally | Let me copy our technical concern from gNB sideIf it is left to UE implementation, the gNB scheduling would be serious impacted. Since before the PUCCH of unicast PDSCH feedback, the gNB probably cannot schedule any other DL transmission, otherwise, the continuous scheduling of unicast PDSCH in subsequent slots would cause the serious decoding problem and negative impacts on gNB scheduling. In another word, to guarantee the UE’s scheduling performance, the gNB has to change its scheduling implementation method, which is actually kind of timeline relaxing. |
| Samsung |  | We think prioritizing unicast PDSCH decoding can be considered for above both cases. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | For autonomous SI acquisition, the current spec states –The UE is expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI during a process of autonomous SI acquisition.We think this already means UE prioritizes unicast PDSCH over SI PDSCH. So I’m not sure why we need this agreement.For P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, our understanding of current spec is that RedCap UE should be able to process both unicast and SI PDSCH. This is similar to the above for autonomous SI acquisition. So we think the current specification is OK and there is no need to define anything.However, if a behavior needs to be defined, then we prefer same behavior in both cases i.e. UE prioritizes unicast. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | We are also fine with Panasonic’s update. |
| Nordic  | Y | The difference between RRC connected and Idle mode is that in IDLE mode UE does not need to receive continuous stream of DL unicast along with SIB. And agree with Panasonic, this is only issue of PR3 UE |

Based on the responses to Proposal 2.5-1c, perhaps the following updated proposal can be considered.

**FL7 High Priority Proposal 2.5-1d:**

**For UE BB bandwidth reduction, when the combined bandwidth of unicast PDSCH and SI PDSCH is larger than the UE can process per slot,**

* **During a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition,**
	+ **The UE follows legacy FR2 behavior (i.e., it is not expected to decode unicast PDSCH if it overlaps with SI PDSCH during a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition).**
* **During a process of autonomous SI acquisition,**
	+ **The UE follows legacy behavior (i.e., it decodes unicast PDSCH during a process of autonomous SI acquisition), and no spec impact is expected.**

Based on the discussion regarding Proposal 2.5-1d in the online (GTW) session on Friday 21st April, the following proposed conclusion regarding autonomous SI acquisition case can be considered (before revisiting the P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition case in this or the next meeting).

**FL8 High Priority Proposal 2.5-1e:**

* **Conclusion: For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for autonomous SI acquisition, the following paragraph in TS 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies:**
	+ **“The UE is expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI during a process of autonomous SI acquisition.”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y | OK |
| vivo | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| LG | Y | We support it |
| CMCC |  | Prefer the wording as in prior version, where Msg4 can seen as unicast PDSCH and should be processed separately. When the combined bandwidth of unicast PDSCH other than Msg4 and SI PDSCH is larger than the UE can process per slot, the UE follows legacy behavior during a process of P-RNTI triggered or autonomous SI acquisition. When the combined bandwidth of Msg4 and SI PDSCH is larger than the UE can process per slot, * if bandwidth of Msg4 is no more than the UE can process per slot, the UE follows legacy behavior during a process of P-RNTI triggered or autonomous SI acquisition.
* if bandwidth of Msg4 is larger than the UE can process per slot, the UE decodes SI PDSCH.
 |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | We prefer to add a note, it is up to UE implementation to decode or not decode the PDSCH of autonomous SI acquisition |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Xiaomi3 | Y | Besides, for P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition case, we propose the following conclusion:* **Conclusion: For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, the following paragraph in TS 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies:**
	+ **“On a frequency range 1 cell, the UE shall be able to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI and, during a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition…”**

That is, during a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, both unicast PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI and broadcast PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI should be decoded.  |
| MediaTek |  | In principle, we are fine with the proposal. Meanwhile, we agree with CMCC’s comments about Msg4: (1) Msg4 is unicast PDSCH, and (2) Msg4 should be prioritized over autonomous SI acquisition if Msg4 PDSCH is not larger than 25/12 PRBs for 15/30kHz. The only exception is when Msg4 PDSCH is larger than 25/12 PRBs and is not intended for an R18 eRedCap UE, the UE should prioritize autonomous SI acquisition instead. We can add a second sub-bullet “FFS: Msg4 with TC-RNTI vs autonomous SI acquisition” to the current proposal but we expect some specification change is needed and hence the whole proposal may not be a conclusion. Alternatively, we can discuss the FL’s previous proposal as suggested by CMCC and work on detailed wording to take care of the exception case.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| NECC | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | For the Msg4 case, as brought up by CMCC, we think it might be good to have a separate FFS.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| SONY | ? | Just be clear, which parts of the following spec snippet then apply: “On a frequency range 1 cell, the UE shall be able to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI and, during a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI that partially or fully overlap in time in non-overlapping PRBs, unless the PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI requires Capability 2 processing time according to clause 5.3 in which case the UE may skip decoding of the scheduled PDSCH with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI.”In the broadest sense, are we being asked to agree that the R18-eRedCap UE is able to simultaneously decode unicast PDSCH and SI-PDSCH? |
| Nordic  | Y | also prefer FFS for MSG4, how MSG4 collision with SI is treated in legacy, if not part of current spec text. |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |

Based on the responses to Proposal 2.5-1e, perhaps the following Proposals 2.5-1f and 2.5-2a can be considered.

### **FL9 High Priority Proposal 2.5-1f:**

* **Conclusion: For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for autonomous SI acquisition, the following paragraph in TS 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies:**
	+ **“The UE is expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI during a process of autonomous SI acquisition.”**
	+ **FFS: the Msg4 PDSCH case**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi4 | Y | We are OK for the FFS with the modification as follows: * + **FFS: the Msg4 PDSCH scheduled with TC-RNTI or C-RNTI**

For Msg4 scheduled with C-RNTI, it has impact on the specification as statement in the FL9 High Priority Proposal 2.5-1f.While, for Msg4 schedule with TC-RNTI, in fact it affects the following specification in TS 38.214 clause 5.1:

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

 |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y, but | When Msg4 is scheduled by C-RNTI, assuming Msg3 early indication is available, then Msg4 targeting to R18 eRedCap in connected mode should be confined within 5MHz PRBs. Then it is covered by the case “PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI” in the original proposal. Hence, in our view, the FFS is only for Msg4 scheduled by TC-RNTI.FFS: Msg4 PDSCH scheduled by TC-RNTI caseAlternatively, we can leave the FFS unchanged but need to take out the Msg4 scheduled by C-RNTI case from the first sub-bullet to avoid confusion.  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| LG | Y | But, We’d not like that FFS cause spec change probably.  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | Current form is OK. Agree with MTK if we want to make it more precise. PDSCH scheduled by C-RNTI is unicast and already covered by first sub-bullet. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | We are also fine with MediaTek’s update. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Agree with MediaTek’s update. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |

### **FL9 High Priority Proposal 2.5-2a:**

* **Conclusion: For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, the following paragraph in TS 38.214 clause 5.1 still applies:**
	+ **“On a frequency range 1 cell, the UE shall be able to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI and, during a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI that partially or fully overlap in time in non-overlapping PRBs, unless the PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI requires Capability 2 processing time according to clause 5.3 in which case the UE may skip decoding of the scheduled PDSCH with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI.”**
	+ **FFS: the Msg4 PDSCH case**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi4 | Y in general | For the FFS, same comments as for FL9 High Priority Proposal 2.5-1f. |
| vivo | N | For P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition vs unicast PDSCH case, the NW expects the UE to decode both. But for Rel-18 eRedCap UE with BB BW reduction, if there is no subsequent unicast PDSCH scheduling, it may be possible; But if there is back-to-back unicast PDSCH scheduling after the slot where there is FDMed unicast PDSCH and SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI with BW>5MHz, we do not think eRedCap can decode both. Following options can be considered to clarify the UE behavior:* Option 1: The UE prioritizes reception of unicast PDSCH over SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI.
* Option 2: The UE may skip decoding of unicast PDSCH but decodes SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI.
* Option 3: The prioritization between reception of unicast and SI PDSCH triggered by P-RNTI is up to the UE implementation.
* Option 4: During a process of P-RNTI triggered SI acquisition, the UE is not expected to decode a PDSCH scheduled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI if in the same cell, another PDSCH scheduled with SI-RNTI partially or fully overlap in time.
 |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| MediaTek | N | The current spec (with partially or fully overlap in time…) does not cover the R18 eRedCap case (combined BW > 5MHz). Hence, it cannot be a conclusion and spec changes are expected.Anyway, we need more time to check this case. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | FFS | This case requires more time to check. |
| LG | Y | But, We’d not like that FFS cause spec change probably. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| CATT |  | Although the conclusion is in line with our view, we are OK to wait a bit and do some further check. |
| Intel | N | For the case if total number of PRBs for unicast PDSCH and SI PDSCH is more than 5MHz, UE doesn’t have the capability to decode both PDSCHs. Further, as listed by vivo, there can be multiple options that can be possible for UE if there is no specified behavior. Consequently, gNB cannot have an assumption on UE operation which impact subsequent scheduling.  |
| Ericsson | N | This can be FFS until the next meeting. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Panasonic | N | Share the view with vivo. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |

2.6 SI PDSCH bandwidth

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

|  |
| --- |
| **SIB1/OSI transmission**Agreement:For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for SIB1 (PDSCH),* Allow the scheduling of SIB1 to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation)

Agreement:For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for broadcast OSI (PDSCH),* Allow the scheduling of broadcast OSI (PDSCH) to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation)

 Conclusion:For UE BB complexity reduction, broadcast of separate SIB1/OSI (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs is not supported.**Paging bandwidth**Agreement:From RAN1 perspective, for UE BB complexity reduction, for paging channel (PDSCH) to Rel-18 RedCap UEs, allow the scheduling of paging channel to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). The scheduling of paging PDSCH is allowed to be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS. |

Contribution [31] proposes to clarify the agreements for SI PDSCH in a similar way as the agreement for paging.

**FL1/FL4 Medium Priority Proposal 2.6-1a:**

**Update the agreements for SI PDSCH with the clarification as follows:**

* **For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for SIB1 (PDSCH),**
	+ **Allow the scheduling of SIB1 to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). The scheduling of SIB1 PDSCH is allowed to be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**
* **For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for broadcast OSI (PDSCH),**
	+ **Allow the scheduling of broadcast OSI (PDSCH) to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). The scheduling of OSI PDSCH is allowed to be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | OK |  |
| LG | Y  | The update is OK  |
| CATT | Y | OK |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | OK |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| FL5 | RAN1 made the following agreement in the online (GTW) session on Wednesday 19th April:Agreement:Update the agreements for SI PDSCH with the clarification as follows:* For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for SIB1 (PDSCH),
	+ Allow the scheduling of SIB1 to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). The scheduling of SIB1 PDSCH is allowed to be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.
* For UE BB bandwidth reduction, for broadcast OSI (PDSCH),
	+ Allow the scheduling of broadcast OSI (PDSCH) to be larger than 5 MHz (as in legacy operation). The scheduling of OSI PDSCH is allowed to be larger than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.
 |

2.7 Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth

RAN1 has made the following agreement regarding the Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth [7]:

|  |
| --- |
| Working assumption:* For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.
	+ The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.
 |

The contributions express the following views regarding the above working assumption on Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth:

* Contributions [10, 11, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 32, 33, 37] propose to confirm the working assumption.
* Contributions [12, 15] propose to confirm the working assumption with a minor modification (replacing “required to process” with “required to receive” or “expected to process”, respectively).
* Contribution [31] proposes to await further RAN2 progress on additional early indication in Msg3/MsgA PUSCH (to see whether the indication is always present as for Rel-17 RedCap) before confirming the working assumption.

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

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 2.7-1a:**

**Confirm the following working assumption:**

* **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.**
	+ **The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | Y | The UE behavior after receiving DCI scheduling Msg4 which indicates larger number of PRBs than 25/12 for 15/30 kHz SCS can be further clarified. |
| Vivo | Y  |  |
| Nordic  | OK to confirm |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| LG | Y  | We prefer to confirm the working assumption on Message 4 bandwidth  |
| CATT | Y | We also think ‘not expected to’ is a better wording than ‘not required to’. But the current form is also acceptable, since it is not wrong anyway. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | Unless an issue is identified |
| Intel | Y | We are fine to confirm the WA. Since msg4 with >25 or 12PRBs are not for the UE, UE could know the failure of its RACH procedure. Therefore, RACH retransmission can be triggered.  |
| Ericsson | Y | We can also be fine with the proposed modifications (replacing “required to process” with “required to receive” or “expected to process”). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| FL3 | RAN1 made the following agreement in the online (GTW) session on Monday 17th April:Agreement:Confirm the following working assumption by assuming that Msg3 indication is available:* For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.
	+ The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.
 |

Contributions [10, 17, 37] discuss the UE behavior for the potential case when a UE detects a DCI scheduling a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process.

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.7-2a: Is there a need to specify some UE behavior for the potential case when a UE detects a DCI scheduling a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process? Please elaborate in the comment field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | N | In our view, if a UE cannot receive the DCI scheduling Msg4 PDSCH which indicates no larger PRBs than 25/12 for 15/30 kHz SCS before the contention resolution timer expires, the same procedure as legacy UE for the case where the timer expired should be applied. |
| Vivo | FFS | Even if early indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UE is always included in MSG3, gNB cannot distinguish the Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz+PR1 and Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3+PR1. Considering the Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz+PR1, NW may schedule bandwidth larger than 5MHz for MSG4. Then for Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz+PR1, it can process; But for Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3+PR1, we think UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.  |
| Nordic  |  | We would be fine with having agreed conclusion on behavior, e.g. that UE is not providing ACK/NACK.  |
| CMCC | N | The UE does not process Msg4 PDSCH with a larger bandwidth than it can receive, and following behaviour is the same as legacy UE. |
| Samsung | N | It can be up to UE implementation. |
| LG | N  | We don’t think that further clarification on UE behavior is needed for the potential case. |
| CATT | N | This is equivalent to ‘contention resolution failed’, no matter it is due to failure of PDCCH detection, or failure PDSCH reception, or incorrect FDRA indication. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Ok with a conclusion on behavior |
| Intel | Y | If UE decoding a PDCCH scheduling msg4 with >25 or 12 PRBs, UE could know the failure of its RACH procedure. UE can restart RACH procedure and doesn’t need to wait for the expire of contention resolution timer. It helps to reduce latency of random access. Further, we see a more problematic case for msg3 scheduling if the RAR schedules a msg3 with >25 or 12 PRBs. Note: The contention resolution timer is not started yet since the UE will not transmit the msg3 with >25 or 12 PRBs. The existing spec for RACH procedure does not specify any UE behaviour for such case. To avoid uncontrollable RACH procedure, e.g., up to UE implementation, UE behavior for such case should be defined.  |
| Ericsson |  | In one of the RAN1#112 sessions, contention resolution was discussed. As we discuss in our contribution [R1-2302298](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302298.zip), in case of contention between random access attempts from different UEs, the Msg4 PDSCH transmission that a UE tries to receive may in fact be intended for another UE. So, if the network makes a Msg4 PDSCH transmission to a Rel-17 RedCap UE or a non-RedCap UE, there is a risk that a Rel-18 eRedCap UE tries to receive it. If the scheduled Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth is too wide for the Rel-18 eRedCap UE to receive or process, it will detect this already when it receives the DCI scheduling the Msg4 PDSCH, but it may not be obvious how the Rel-18 eRedCap UE ought to react in this situation, assuming that this situation is allowed to happen. A few different approaches were discussed in the RAN1#112 session, and RAN1 could select one of these approaches.The following proposal (similar as in our contribution but with some minor tweaks) can be considered:**Proposal: For UE BB complexity reduction, for the case when the UE detects a DCI scheduling a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process, RAN1 selects one of the following options:*** **Option 1: The UE considers the contention resolution as not successful.**
* **Option 2: The UE discards the DCI (as if the DCI was never received) and continues monitoring the DCI until *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* expires.**
* **Option 3: The UE behaviour is undefined (as if the event is not expected).**

Our preference is Option 1 or Option 2. We may also be fine with other (simple, robust) approaches. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | If a UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs, why we still need to define the UE behavior? |
| Nokia, NSB | N |  |
| Qualcomm | N | We don’t think any further UE behavior is needed for this case.  |
| FL2/FL3 | Different views are expressed in the responses received so far. Companies are encouraged to check and comment on the responses from other companies. |
| CATT2 | N | In current NR, a UE may also detect a Msg4 for another UE, using the same RNTI. The only difference is that legacy UE can only judge based on the UE ID in Msg4 PDSCH, while Rel-18 RedCap UE may judge a little faster, i.e. based on FDRA in DCI. Many other cases can lead to similar result, e.g. fail to detect PDCCH, fail to decode PDSCH… But all should be as contention resolution failure. No difference as ‘fail to receive Msg4 successfully’. |
| Vivo |  | We are fine with the UE behavior is interpreted as Option 1 the UE considers the contention resolution as not successful. We are open for discussing whether there is any specification impact. |
| Spreadtrum | N | But maybe we can have a conclusion for this case, e.g.,Conclusion: It is up to UE implementation for the potential case when a UE detects a DCI scheduling a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process. |
| Ericsson |  | We think RAN1 can down-select between one of the options in the following proposal in the next meeting:**Proposal:** **For UE BB complexity reduction, for the case when the UE detects a DCI scheduling a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process, RAN1 selects one of the following options:*** **Option 1: The UE considers the contention resolution as not successful.**
* **Option 2: The UE discards the DCI (as if the DCI was never received) and continues monitoring the DCI until *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* expires.**
* **Option 3: The UE behaviour is undefined (as if the event is not expected).**
 |
| Panasonic | Y | We think using the potential UE behavior options in this case raised by Ericsson is a good starting point.We are not sure no spec change means the Option 3. To avoid any unexpected behavior by the UE in this case, the UE behavior should be specified. The UE should take either of the Option 1 or 2 since neither Option 1 nor 2 has a severe problem. |
| MediaTek | Y | We support Option 1 in Ericsson’s proposal. An LS should be sent to RAN2 for implementing to 38.321 so that R18 eRedCap has a clear understanding that in this case contention resolution has failed.  |
| Intel | Y, issue of msg3 is more severe | As we commented in last round, the issue is not limited to msg4. It is even more severe for msg3 scheduled with >25 or 12 PRBs. The contention resolution timer is only started after UE’s transmission of msg3, so RACH retransmission cannot be triggered by the expire of contention resolution timer. There is no specified behavior for this situation in any specification.  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | The conclusion proposed by Spreadtrum seems reasonable. |
| Qualcomm | N | We share the view from Spreadtrum that it can be up to UE implementation.  |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We don’t think there is a need to specify UE behavior in this case as this would be similar to e.g. when UE detects the DCI but cannot decode the PDSCH. So we think existing specification can already handle this.If any behavior is to be specified, then we are fine with Option 1 in the Ericsson’s response. |
| NEC | N | Ericsson’s option 2 would be in line with the existing specification “If a UE detects a DCI format with inconsistent information, the UE discards all the information in the DCI format.” |
| CMCC | N | In our understanding, UE behavior is option 1: The UE considers the contention resolution as not successful. |
| LG | N | Rel-18 eRedCap UEs should be treated in the same as for the legacy UEs in the case.  |
| OPPO | N | Usually this should not be defined as error cases results in no standardized behavior.Even it may have benefit for RAR, we don’t see this strong enough to have some special cases. |
| DENSO | N | We think that UE behavior is the same as Option 1. |
| Xiaomi | N | Share the same view as NEC that the secluding DCI will be discarded if the allocated number of RBs is larger than 25/12 RBs for 15/30 kHz, and the current RAN1 specification is sufficient without any modification. For the further modification of RACH procedure, as mentioned in Ericsson’s option 1, i.e., directly taking the contention resolution as not successful for this case, we think it has MAC spec impact in TS 38.321 which should be discussed in RAN2 and the related LS can be sent if necessary.  |
| DOCOMO | N | We still don’t see the need for specifying a new UE behavior.For the case where Msg3 PUSCH is scheduled with larger BW than 5MHz as Intel commented, in our view, a UE can aware that contention happens when the UE receive UL grant in RAR which schedules Msg3 PUSCH larger BW than 5MHz, then the UE retransmit PRACH if the UE cannot receive any RAR which schedules Msg3 PUSCH within 5MHz within the RAR window same as legacy UEs. Thus, we don’t see the additional rule even for this case. |
| Lenovo | N | We have similar view with NEC (and others) |
| Intel2 | Y | For Msg4, we found some companies says ‘N’ but actually also have the understanding of Option 1 that is proposed by E//, i.e., contention resolution as not successful. We are fine to send LS to RAN2 for potential changes in TS 38.321 if RAN1 spec change is not desired. For Msg3, thanks confirmation from DoCoMo that the contention happens in this case and UE should retransmit PRACH. In section 8.2 in TS 38.213, the following behavior are specified. So, the logic of existing spec is to list the cases that triggers PRACH retransmission. We prefer to include the new condition (msg3 > 5MHz) in the list.

|  |
| --- |
| If the UE does not detect the DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by the corresponding RA-RNTI within the window, or if the UE detects the DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by the corresponding RA-RNTI within the window and LSBs of a SFN field in the DCI format 1\_0, if included and applicable, are not same as corresponding LSBs of the SFN where the UE transmitted PRACH, or if the UE does not correctly receive the transport block in the corresponding PDSCH within the window, or if the higher layers do not identify the RAPID associated with the PRACH transmission from the UE, the higher layers can indicate to the physical layer to transmit a PRACH. |

In fact, most companies are making comments for the issue of msg4. It may be helpful if a separate discussion/proposal can be triggered for msg3 (>5MHz)  |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Y | The following is the descriptions about UE’s consideration on unsuccessful contention resolution in TS 38.321.5.1.5 Contention ResolutionOnce Msg3 is transmitted the MAC entity shall:1> if the Msg3 transmission (i.e. initial transmission or HARQ retransmission) is scheduled with Type A PUSCH repetition:…1> else:2> start or restart the *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* in the first symbol after the end of the Msg3 transmission.1> monitor the PDCCH while the *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* is running regardless of the possible occurrence of a measurement gap;…4> if the UE Contention Resolution Identity in the MAC CE matches the CCCH SDU transmitted in Msg3:…4> else:5> discard the *TEMPORARY\_C-RNTI*;5> consider this Contention Resolution not successful and discard the successfully decoded MAC PDU.1> if *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* expires:2> if Msg3 transmission was transmitted on a non-terrestrial network:…2> else:3> discard the *TEMPORARY\_C-RNTI*;3> consider the Contention Resolution not successful.According to the specification, UE can only consider the Contention Resolution not successful in the two cases (marked in yellow color above):**Case 1**: if the UE Contention Resolution Identity in the MAC CE NOT matches the CCCH SDU transmitted in Msg3**Case 2**: if *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* expiresFor case1, based on the agreement made on Monday, since the UE will not process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than it can process the condition in case 1 is not triggered. For case2, the UE starts the *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* once it transmits Msg3, the duration of the timer is configured by gNB:ra-ContentionResolutionTimer ENUMERATED { sf8, sf16, sf24, sf32, sf40, sf48, sf56, sf64},which can be up to 64 subframes. Since the condition in case 1 is not triggered, the UE cannot consider the contention resolution is failed until the timer in case 2 expires, even if it has already known that the contention resolution is failed based on FDRA in Msg4 PDCCH. As a result, the UE has to keep monitoring Msg4 PDCCH (marked in blue color above) within significant slots till the ra-ContentionResolutionTimer expires, which will cause meaningless extra power consumption and increase access delay of UE.Therefore, the existing mechanism is not enough/reasonable for UE’s behavior. The clarification on UE’s behavior is necessary, and the simplest way is option 1 (provided by Ericsson). |

Most of the received responses to Question 2.7-2a express that they do not see a need to specify some UE behavior for the potential case when a UE detects a DCI scheduling a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process. However, it is not clear that everyone has the same understanding of what UE behavior would apply for this case (if it is even specified). Therefore, companies are invited to comment on the following question.

**FL4/FL5 High Priority Question 2.7-2b:**

**For UE BB complexity reduction, for the case when the UE detects a DCI scheduling a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process, what is the desired UE behavior?**

* **Option 1: The UE considers the contention resolution as not successful.**
* **Option 2: The UE discards the DCI and continues monitoring the DCI until *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* expires.**
* **Option 3: The UE behavior is up to the UE implementation.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option (1/2/3)** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | Option 2 or Option 3 |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Option 3, option 1 (2nd) | We can support option 3 (no changes to standard) or option 1 (second preference). Option 1 optimizes declaring an unsuccessful Contention Resolution based on PDSCH size |
| Transsion | Option1 |  |
| vivo | Option 1 or Option 3 | Option 1 is more aligned with the RACH procedure from our understanding. We are also fine with Option 3. |
| Intel | Option 1 | After UE receives a PDCCH scheduling >5MHz for msg4, the RACH procedure for the UE is essentially already failed, it is not wise to ask UE to still monitor DCI for msg4 which causes unnecessary power consumption for nothing. Again, we prefer to also discuss the similar or more severe issue of handing msg3 >5MHz.  |
| Sharp | Option2 | No specification impact is expected, it can be viewed as MAC PDU is not successfully decoded. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 3 |  |
| NEC | Option 2 | Same comment as **FL1 High Priority Question 2.7-2a.** |
| Panasonic | Option 1 or 2 | We think the case of “Even if an eRedCap UE succeeds in decoding the PDCCH, the UE does not decode PDSCH when #RB is larger than a specific value” is a new behavior for the UE, which is not expected in the legacy spec. Therefore, in order to avoid any unexpected behavior by the UE, some kind of rule in the spec should be described for this case.Which to take Option 1 or 2 can be up to the UE implementation. But we do not like the situation the UE can take any other unidentified behavior. |
| LG | Option 3  | We still support Option 3 and think that no spec change is needed. If the DCI of Message 4 indicates that FDRA is not within the number of PRBs(5MHz), it is up to UE implementation like option 3 whether Message 4 PDSCH is received or not. If Option 2 means “no spec change”, it can also be acceptable. |
| CATT | Option 2 or 3 |  |
| DOCOMO | Option 1 or Option 2 | We share the similar view with sharp but also fine with option 1. |
| OPPO | Option 3 |  |
| CMCC | Option1 |  |
| Ericsson | Option 1 or 2 | Like Panasonic, we prefer a well-defined behavior, i.e., Option 1 or 2 rather than Option 3. |
| MediaTek | Option 1 | Similar to Panasonic, we think this new UE behavior for this new case should be specified. We prefer Option 1 over Option 2 so that UE does not need to waste more time trying to receive contention resolution.  |
| Xiaomi2 | Option 2 or 3 | At first, both option 1 and option 2 can be implemented by the UE without any spec impact from our point of view. That is, option 3 can work.If option 1 aims to change the MAC layer specification to make the UE behavior more clear, it should be discussed in RAN2. If companies supporting option 1 thinking it can be implemented without any spec impact, we suggest to change option 1 as follows:**Option 1: The UE considers the contention resolution as not successful, and there is no spec impact.**At last, option 2 could also work based on the current specification.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 3 or 1 | We don’t think there is a need to specify UE behavior in this case as this would be similar to e.g. when UE detects the DCI but cannot decode the PDSCH.If any behavior is to be specified, then we are fine with Option 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 | Firstly, it is beneficial to align the understanding of UE’s behavior under the existing specification. In our understanding, according to the descriptions in TS 38.321, UE has to wait and continue monitoring the DCI until ra-ContentionResolutionTimer expires, which is the option 2. It is worthy noting that the timer lasts more than 8 subframes according to 38.331.*ra-ContentionResolutionTimer ENUMERATED { sf8, sf16, sf24, sf32, sf40, sf48, sf56, sf64},*Secondly, as commented before, such long waiting duration is meaningless and the drawback is clear (cause UE’s unnecessary detection on control channel detection, increase UE’s power consumption and access latency). For companies supporting option 2, it is very appreciated to explain a bit on the benefits for UE.Since option 2 has no benefit for either UE or gNB, leaving it to UE implementation is not a good practice and could cause unnecessary consequence. For example, since the UE is still monitoring and will react to any Msg4 DCI scrambled with its TC-RNTI during the long timer duration of multiple subframes, it puts an unnecessary restriction for a gNB to recycle the TC-RNTI for the other UE’s initial access procedure during the multiple subframes. Therefore, “continues monitoring the DCI until ra-ContentionResolutionTimer expires” should not be regarded as a valid/appropriate candidate for UE’s implementation.In shorts, option 1 is of technical rationality. |
| Samsung | Option 3 |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option 3 | We do not think option1 and option2 should be considered in RAN1. At least, in RAN1, there is no need to define other UE behaviors. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 |  |

Most of the received responses to Question 2.7-2b indicate that they prefer Option 1 or Option 3 over Option 2, with an even split in preference between Option 1 and Option 3. The following proposal can be considered.

**FL6 High Priority Proposal 2.7-2c:**

**For UE BB complexity reduction, for the case when the UE detects a DCI scheduling a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process, the UE considers the contention resolution as not successful.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| LG | N | We think this is kind of optimization which is not essential. We still prefer Option 3, or Option 2 if it is meant for legacy behavior. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We tend to agree with ZTE that no spec impact is expected from RAN1 perspective. |
| Qualcomm |  | We prefer to leave the behavior up to UE implementation. If any option has to be chosen, then we’d be open for option 1 rather than option 2.  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | N | There is no difference than the case that the PDCCH is not correctly decoded. |
| MediaTek | Y with LS to RAN2 | Suggest add “Send LS to RAN2.” This proposal, if agreed, should be implemented to 38.321 by RAN2.  |
| Spreadtrum | N | We also prefer to leave this up to UE implementation. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| NEC | N | But, OK if majority supports the proposal.This would be a new UE behavior which is not described anywhere in the specifications, perhaps can be captured by MAC spec. Rel-18 RedCap UE is required to handle the DCI as unsuccessful contention resolution instead of discarding the DCI according to the existing specification.With current specification, in our understanding, Rel-18 RedCap UE discards the DCI as it contains unicast PDSCH PRB allocation more than Rel-18 RedCap UE is expected to process. The UE behavior is the same as the DCI is not received. To support the proposal, specification change would be needed so that Rel-18 RedCap UE is not allowed to discard the DCI scheduling Msg4 PDSCH and assumes it as unsuccessful contention resolution. |
| OPPO | N | We also prefer to leave this up to UE implementation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | This should be decided by RAN2. if needed, we can send an LS to RAN2 indicating we have the following agreement. Whether to define new behaviors is up to RAN2.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:Confirm the following working assumption by assuming that Msg3 indication is available:* For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a Msg4 PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.

The UE is not required to process a Msg4 PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS. |

 |
| Samsung | N | It can be up to UE implementation. |
| Intel | Y | We support the proposal. If RAN1 spec changes is not desired, LS can be sent to ask RAN2 to capture it in 38.321 |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We don’t think there is a need to specify UE behavior in this case but we are fine with this proposal if that’s the majority view. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | It is very unclear why the UE behaviour cannot be deterministic but up to UE implementation. Between option 1 and option 2, the option 1 is clearly better. |
| Ericsson | Y | We are also fine with the proposals to ask RAN2 to confirm or decide on this. |
| Nordic  | N | Up to UE implementation should be fine. This means.Smart UE figures out that R17 RedCap was addressed instead. And will perform PRACH re-tx. Not so smart UE monitors until the end of resolution window and then does the same.There is no technical issue with this solution. |

Based on the responses to Proposal 2.7-2c, perhaps the following updated proposal can be considered.

**FL7/FL8 High Priority Proposal 2.7-2d:**

* **Send an LS to RAN2 to ask them to address the UE behavior for the following case in their specifications, if needed:**
	+ **For UE BB complexity reduction, the case when the UE detects a DCI scheduling a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process**
* **Capture the RAN1 agreement on the Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth in the LS.**
* **Capture in the LS that RAN1 does not expect any RAN1 specification impact from the above case.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y | OK |
| vivo | Y (in principle) | We agree with companies that this issue is also related to RAN2 and support to send the LS to RAN2 and fine to ask RAN2 to decide (it seems difficult for RAN1 to converge). We propose to delete the last bullet of “**Capture in the LS that RAN1 does not expect any RAN1 specification impact from the above case**”. It is not clear at this stage whether the decision made by RAN2 will have RAN1 impact or not.  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y | Share the view with vivo to remove the very last bullet. |
| LG | Y  | We think RAN1 can discuss this issue. But with the understanding that the potential spec impact is on RAN2 domain, we are okay with this proposal. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| CATT | N | Don’t think a RAN1-specific FDRA issue will create difference to RAN2 spec. In 38.321, only high-level description will be included, e.g:

|  |
| --- |
| 1> if notification of a reception of a PDCCH transmission of the SpCell is received from lower layers:2> if the C-RNTI MAC CE was included in Msg3:… |

Thus, the current case is the same with ‘no notification of a reception of a PDCCH from lower layers’ |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Intel |  | We prefer to delete ‘if needed’ in the first main bullet. The case that msg4 is scheduled with >5MHz is not covered by existing contention resolution. We agreed that such PDCCH can happen, so it is not inconsistence of PDCCH. UE is not required to process the msg4 so existing checking msg4 content to know contention resolution failure doesn’t apply.  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Xiaomi3 | Y |  |
| MediaTek |  | We are fine with concluding the issue in RAN1 that the contention resolution has failed in this case and then send an LS to RAN2 to inform them and ask them to implement to 38.321. Alternatively, we are also fine with the current proposal without “*, if needed*” as suggested by Intel and let RAN2 make the decision. However, we share a similar view with vivo that we are not sure if the last sub-bullet is needed. Maybe too early to say no RAN1 specification impact is expected.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | We are fine to have the LS. If RAN1 can have a decision, e.g., leave it to UE implementation, this also would be fine. |
| NEC | Y | We are fine with vivo’s suggestion. |
| Ericsson | Y | We would also be fine with Vivo’s suggestion to remove the last bullet. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are OK to send the LS. |
| SONY | Y | OK to send LS |
| Nordic  |  | We should at least list options we discussed in RAN1. It has not been clarified by FL why up to implementation could not resolve the issue at hand. In our opinion “up to implementation” is baseline, if nothing is agreed. |
| Qualcomm | Y | We are OK to send the LS. We prefer to keep “if needed” as it is up to RAN2 whether to define a new behavior or not. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Also OK with vivo revision. |

Based on the responses to Proposal 2.7-2d, perhaps the following updated proposal can be considered.

### **FL9 High Priority Proposal 2.7-2e:**

* **Send an LS to RAN2 to ask them ~~to address~~ for their input on the UE behavior for the following case ~~in their specifications~~, if ~~needed~~ any:**
	+ **For UE BB complexity reduction, the case when the UE detects a DCI scheduling a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process**
* **Capture the RAN1 agreement on the Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth in the LS.**
* **~~Capture in the LS that RAN1 does not expect any RAN1 specification impact from the above case.~~**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Since specific inputs are requested from RAN1, suggest to make it clear what kind of inputs are targeted. * **Send an LS to RAN2 to ask them ~~to address~~ for their input on the UE behavior discussed in Question 2.7-2b of summary R1-23xxxxx for the following case ~~in their specifications~~, if ~~needed~~ any:**
 |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi4 |  | We suggest to keep the “if needed” as in **FL7/FL8 High Priority Proposal 2.7-2d**. According to the current TS 38.321, if notification of a reception of a PDCCH transmission of the SpCell is not received from lower layers until the *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* expires, the Contention Resolution is considered as not successful. That is, if the DCI schedules Msg4 PDSCH more than 25/12 RBs, the DCI will be discarded according to RAN1 specification, and no notification of a reception of PDCCH will be sent to the MAC layer. So, the case that msg4 is scheduled with >5MHz is already covered by existing contention resolution. The LS only aims to ask RAN2 whether any further enhancement on the current contention resolution procedure is needed.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. if the Msg3 transmission (i.e. initial transmission or HARQ retransmission) is scheduled with Type A PUSCH repetition:

…1. else if Msg3 transmission (i.e. initial transmission or HARQ retransmission) is transmitted on a non-terrestrial network:

…1> else:2> start or restart the *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* in the first symbol after the end of the Msg3 transmission.1> monitor the PDCCH while the *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* is running regardless of the possible occurrence of a measurement gap;1> if notification of a reception of a PDCCH transmission of the SpCell is received from lower layers:…1> if *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* expires:2> if Msg3 transmission was transmitted on a non-terrestrial network:…2> else:3> discard the *TEMPORARY\_C-RNTI*;3> consider the Contention Resolution not successful. |

 |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | We don’t want to give an impression that RAN1 is asking RAN2 to specify the UE behavior. The main bullet should neutral, for example, * **Send an LS to RAN2 to inform ~~ask~~ them ~~to address for their input on the UE behavior for~~ the following case ~~in their specifications, if needed any~~:**
	+ **For UE BB complexity reduction, the case when the UE detects a DCI scheduling a Msg4 PDSCH transmission with a larger bandwidth than it can receive or process**
* **Capture the RAN1 agreement on the Msg4 PDSCH bandwidth in the LS.**
* **Capture in the LS that RAN1 does not expect any RAN1 specification impact from the above case and whether RAN2 specification impacts are needed is up to RAN2.**
 |
| LG | Y | OK with the revision |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| CATT | N | We still think this is not different with ‘no notification of a reception of a PDCCH from lower layers’ as Xiaomi also point out. If majority really wants to send LS, ZTE’s version is preferred. Important to tell that RAN1 is not asking RAN2 to specify something. It is up to RAN2. |
| Intel | Y | We understand the intention is to ask RAN2 to make a decision. RAN1 will further discuss potential RAN1 impacts based on RAN2’s decision. Therefore, suggest changing the main bullet to ‘**Send an LS to RAN2 to ask them ~~to address~~ for their decision&input on …**’ |
| Ericsson | Y | We are also fine with Huawei’s proposed update, or with ZTE’s proposed update if “RAN1 does not expect any RAN1 specification impact” is removed, since we are not sure of that yet. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | N | We tend to agree with ZTE’s suggestion. |

2.8 MsgA PUSCH bandwidth

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

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to perform 2-step RACH with a MsgA PUSCH resource spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable. |

Contribution [36] proposes to consider the following options for the support of the 5-MHz MsgA PUSCH bandwidth:

* Option 1: Occupy a portion of PRBs within one legacy PO (larger than 5MHz) by Rel-18 eRedCap UEs
* Option 2: Separate MsgA PUSCH frequency domain resources configuration for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs.

Companies are invited to reply to the following question.

**FL1/FL8 Medium Priority Question 2.8-1a:**

**Companies are invited to express a preference (if any) between the two options listed above or propose some other option (if needed).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option (1/2/other)** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | Option 2 | which can achieve Option 1 in our opinion |
| CATT2 |  | Open to both options. Although we do not introduce separate PO in 2-step RACH for Rel-17 RedCap in R17.Another possible way is purely by implementation, i.e. NW configure legacy PO <= 5 MHz if it allows Rel-18 RedCap UE to perform 2-step RACH. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Open to consider both options |
| Sharp |  | Both Option1 and option2 can work for the case of bandwidth of msgA PUSCH resource for R17 RedCap UE is larger than 25/12 PRB. |
| vivo |  | Both options can be left to gNB implementation. The agreement below seems sufficient. “For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is not expected to perform 2-step RACH with a MsgA PUSCH resource spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot or per hop, if applicable.”  |
| DOCOMO |  | We share the similar view with vivo but fine to discuss it further. |
| LG |  | We agree vivo‘s comment and CATT’s comment. We think that is enough only with the agreement. |
| CMCC |  | Agree to up to gNB implementation. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Our understanding on the agreements regarding the MsgA PUSCH bandwidth is: if MsgA PUSCH resource is shared between Rel-18 RedCap and non-Rel-18 RedCap, at least some of the MsgA PUSCH resources are limited within 5MHz while other MsgA PUSCH resources may be more than 5MHz.So, we share the similar views with vivo that this can up to gNB configuration, and no more discussion and clarification is needed. |
| Intel |  | This question is essentially regarding what is TBS for msgA PUSCH. If the TBS is small, it can be fine to limit MsgA PUSCH for all UEs to be up to 5MHz. Input on the typical TBS from RAN2 is needed. |
| Xiaomi3 | Support both option 1 and option 2 | In some cases, more than 25/12 PRBs are required, for example, MsgA PUSCH Group B, or 2-step RACH based SDT. Therefore, in order to avoid the impact on legacy UE, more than 25/12 PRB MsgA PUSCH can be configured for non-eRedCap.  nrofPRBs-PerMsgA-PO-r16 INTEGER (1..32),We recommend supporting both option 1 and option 2. Also, which option to use depends on the gNB configuration. |
| NEC |  | It can be up to gNB implementation. Rel-18 RedCap UE without BB bandwidth reduction may use MsgA PUSCH resource >= 5MHz, while Rel-18 RedCap UE with BB bandwidth reduction may only use MsgA PUSCH resource <= 5MHz. |
| Ericsson |  | We think the RAN1 agreement copied above by the FL is enough (and no need to down-select between the two options), as also suggested by many companies above.  |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We think the current agreement is sufficient and this can be left to gNB implementation. |
| Qualcomm |  | This can be up to gNB implementation based on current agreement without further discussion. |
| FL9 | From the received responses, there does not seem to be much support for specifying new UE behavior for this aspect of the MsgA PUSCH resource allocation. |
| Xiaomi4 | For MsgA PUSCH, a larger TBS will be carried, e.g., for 2-step RACH based SDT. So, more than 25/12 RBs is needed for the legacy UEs. But, the MsgA PUSCH of eRedCap is limited within 25/12 RBs, so separate configuration based on option 1 or option 2 is needed. For option 1, the starting point and/or the ending point of partial PO resources occupied by eRedCap should be specified, as illustrated in Figure 1. For option 2, additional RRC signaling for separate configuration will be introduced and the related LS should be sent to RAN2. C:\Users\qiaoxuemei\Pictures\issutra.pngFigure 1 Partial RBs occupied by the eRedCap in one legacy PO |

2.9 MsgB PDSCH bandwidth

The contributions express the following views regarding how to restrict the MsgB PDSCH bandwidth:

* Contributions [10, 13, 15, 16, 20, 21, 25, 32] propose to restrict the MsgB PDSCH bandwidth in a similar way as for Msg4 PDSCH.
* Contributions [18, 26, 30, 37] propose to restrict the MsgB PDSCH bandwidth in a similar way as for Msg2 PDSCH, since MsgB has a similar multiplexing of messages to different UEs as Msg2.

Companies are invited to reply to the following question.

**FL1/FL4/FL5 Medium Priority Question 2.9-1a:**

**Should the MsgB PDSCH bandwidth be limited in the same way as for Msg2 or Msg4?**

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option (0/2/4)** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | MSG4 Option 4 | This, because HARQ-ACK is provided for MSG-B. In case MSG-A -> Fallback RAR. MSG2 BW rule would apply on relaxation of timeline. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | MsgB can multiplex messages to more than one UEs so MsgB needs to be considered as broadcast PDSCH. Then we have to handle MsgB PDSCH in the same way as the other broadcast PDSCH, i.e., Msg2 PDSCH. |
| Sharp | Option4 |  |
| CATT2 | Option 4 | gNB should be able to identify Rel-18 RedCap UE by MsgA PUSCH anyway. If so, it should be able to restrict the PRB number of MsgB within 5 MHz for Rel-18 RedCap UEs.If multiple messages for multiple UE are to transmit, there are some ways to address this issue by implementation. For example, the gNB can send multiple *fallbackRAR* in multiple MsgBs (within 5 MHz) within the *msgB-ResponseWindow*. |
| Vivo |  | Option 4 is first preference, but we can accept option 2 given Msg.B actually is kind of broadcast message and NW may want to prioritize 20MHz+PR1 R18 eRedCap UE.  |
| Samsung | Option 4 |  |
| LG | Option 2 | MsgB-RNTI is different from C-RNTI or TC-RNTI (CS-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI) which is scheduled for one UE of unicast PDSCH and is almost same with P-RNTI or RA-RNIT which can be scheduled for multiple UEs. Multiple UE’s MAC Control PDU contents can be multiplexed into a Message B according to TS 38.321. |
| DOCOMO | Option 2 | We tend to agree with Qualcomm. |
| FUTUREWEI | Option 2 | Multiple MsgB may be multiplexed like Msg2 |
| Transsion | Option 4 |  |
| Intel | Option 2 | Same comments as Qualcomm |
| Spreadtrum | Option 4 |  |
| NEC | Option 2 | A MsgB may convey multiple successful RAR for any type of UE. And MsgB-RNTI is calculated in similar way as RA-RNTI.In case a MsgB is intended for a single Rel-18 RedCap UE, its BW may be limited. |
| OPPO | Option 4 |  |
| CMCC | Option 4 | Since RAN2 introduces MsgA PUSCH based early indication for Rel-18 RedCap, MsgB should be within 5 MHz. |
| Ericsson | Option 4 (at least for *successRAR*) | While it is true that MsgB is a broadcast channel in a similar way as Msg2, there are some differences between MsgB and Msg2:First, as CATT points out, gNB can always use the early indication in MsgA to guide the scheduling decision for MsgB, whereas for Msg2 this early indication might not be available (unless Msg1 indication is supported and configured).Second, as Nordic points out, MsgB supports HARQ retransmission, like Msg4 but unlike Msg2, and the timeline for MsgB is more like that of Msg4 than that of Msg2.However, in the case of *fallbackRAR*, as suggested by Nordic, perhaps the Msg2 bandwidth/timeline relaxation rule should apply. This may require some further discussion. |
| Xiaomi2 | Option 4 | Considering the eRedCap can be identified by separate early indication at least via MsgA PUSCH, separate scheduling between eRedCap and non-eRedCap can be implemented by the gNB. So, Option 4 is more preferred by us. |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 2 | We have similar view as other companies that Msg2 can be to multiple UEs and that several UEs can be monitoring the same MsgB-RNTI. So we think it should be treated like Msg2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | For option2, does it mean UE’s processing timeline is relaxed? We do not understand how we limit the MsgB PDSCH bandwidth .For option4, does it mean if the bandwidth is larger than 5MHz, the UE is not required to receive msgB? We also do not understand how we limit the bandwidth?Since for msg2 and msg4, the bandwidth actually is not limited, which can be up to 20MHz. To be more specific, we suggest to describe the option 2 and option4 more directly, instead of using the wording of ‘same way as’ |

Most of the received responses to Question 2.9-1a indicate that they prefer Option 4. Based on the responses, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL6 Medium Priority Proposal 2.9-1b:**

**Assuming that MsgA indication is available,**

* **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a MsgB PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.**
	+ **The UE is not required to process a MsgB PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | N | MsgB PDSCH should be processed even if it takes longer to process. Because MsgA EI is available, the network can accommodate the longer processing time needed by eRedCap UEs when scheduling the uplink |
| LG | N | UE needs to process the MsgB PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS regardless of the MsgA early indication being available or not |
| DOCOMO | N | As commented by companies, multiple MAC PDU for multiple UEs can be multiplexed in a MsgB PDSCH with the same MsgB-RNTI same as Msg2. If the same handling as Msg2 is applied for MsgB, some timeline extension between MsgB PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK needs to be considered. |
| Qualcomm |  | We understand that MsgA always includes the early indication for Rel-18 eRedCap UE. Then my question is * option 4: gNB always strictly follows the UE’s BB capability indication for the scheduling of MsgB
* option 2: we allow gNB to perform scheduling of MsgB for all UEs including eRedCap UEs as in legacy operation (by allowing larger than 5MHz)

If option 4 is the right way to go, we can agree on the proposal. If option 2 is more preferable, we handle MsgB as Msg2 and need to change the proposal. We prefer the option 2 for maximizing gNB scheduling flexibility, which seems more aligned with what we have agreed on in the past. But we can be flexible if majority companies agree on option 4. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| vivo |  | @QC, my understanding of the proposal is option 2 that allow gNB to perform scheduling of MsgB for all UEs including eRedCap UEs as in legacy operation (by allowing larger than 5MHz). But not sure my understanding is aligned with other companies or not.  |
| CATT | Y | We do not want to abuse relax processing time. This should hold at least for *successRAR* case.As long as MsgA indication is available, why does gNB still schedule a large bandwidth MsgB for Rel-18 RedCap UE, but not send multiple small bandwidth MsgBs within *msgB-ResponseWindow.* |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| NEC |  | Share view with LG, DOCOMO, Qualcomm.With the proposal, it is unclear for us how a MsgB can be handled in a similar way as Msg4. Is a MsgB restricted to include a single successRAR for a Rel-18 RedCap UE? Or, is a MsgB restricted to include multiple successRAR for Rel-18 RedCap UEs only? In case a Rel-18 RedCap UE receives a DCI scheduling more PRBs than maximum number of PRBs, does it consider e.g. contention resolution is unsuccessful? Is a MsgB intended for other than Rel-18 RedCap UE also not allowed scheduled with more PRBs than maximum number of PRBs? |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | With early indication in msgA, gNB would has the following implementation1. Schedule msgB within 5MHz
2. Schedule msg4 larger than 5MHz and the timeline between PUCCH feedback and msgB is sufficient.

Therefore, there is no need to have limit on UE and gNB. The following is suggested.**Assuming that MsgA indication is available,*** **For UE BB complexity reduction, a UE is able to receive a MsgB PDSCH resource allocation spanning a bandwidth of more than ~5 MHz per slot.**
	+ **~~The UE is not required to process a MsgB PDSCH with a larger number of PRBs than 25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS.~~**
 |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Intel |  | Our preference is to treat MsgB as if Msg2. MsgB can carry RAR for multiple UEs, so it is essentially broadcast PDSCH as msg2. Further, since EI is anyway available by msgA PUSCH, gNB can do proper scheduling for msgB PDSCH of > or <= 5MHz, which allows better gNB flexibility. We can be flexible if majority companies agree with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | In our understanding, MsgB can include for multiple messages for UEs which can be a mixed of Rel-18 RedCap and legacy UEs. Therefore, this proposal would restrict what the network can do. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nordic  | N | UE provides ACK/NACK for MSGB. Also gNB knows from MSGA which UE it R18. |
| FL7 | RAN1 can revisit the MsgA PDSCH bandwidth in the next meeting. |

2.10 MBS PDSCH bandwidth

Contribution [36] proposes that broadcast MBS PDSCH transmissions can be wider than 5 MHz whereas multicast MBS PDSCH transmissions should not be larger than the maximum number of PRBs for unicast.

Companies are invited to reply to the following questions.

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 2.10-1a: Should broadcast MBS PDSCH bandwidth be restricted? How?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | Y | Even if HARQ-ACK not provided, MBS PDSCH can be scheduled continuously over continuous slots.  |
| CATT2 | N | Same as other broadcasting channel. |
| Panasonic | N | Whether MBS PDSCH is capable or not is able to be known to the network for IDLE mode as which UE support broadcast MBS PDSCH is not informed. Therefore, if the RedCap UE support MBS PDSCH, it should be same as non-RedCap UE. . |
| LG | N | It should be regarded as SIB broadcasting channel. |

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 2.10-2a: Should multicast MBS PDSCH bandwidth be restricted? How?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| CATT2 |  | Open to further consider putting restriction to the allocable PRBs<5 MHz. |
| Panasonic | Y | Should be restricted as the unicast. The multicast retransmission is UE-specific and it should be limited to the capability. |
| LG | Y | Open to discuss whether it is restricted or not. |

# 3 UE peak data rate reduction

3.0 Earlier agreements

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

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:* UE peak data rate reduction is supported at least as an add-on to UE BB bandwidth reduction,
	+ The constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 is relaxed to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ X.
	+ FFS: the value of X
* If UE peak data rate reduction is supported as a standalone feature,
	+ The constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 is relaxed to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ Y.
	+ FFS: the value of Y
	+ Note: Whether this option is supported will be decided in RAN plenary.

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

Agreement:For the relaxed constraint X in the following earlier RAN1 agreement, down-select between X = 3 and X = 3.2. |

RAN#99 discussed whether UE peak data rate reduction (“PR1”) should be supported as a standalone feature or only in combination with UE BB bandwidth reduction (“BW3/PR3”) and endorsed the following proposal [8], where the different nicknames for the UE complexity reduction features (“PR1” and “BW3/PR3”) originate from TR 38.865 [9].

|  |
| --- |
| **Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 and Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1 are designed/targeted to same peak data rate, i.e., 10Mbps**Note 1: Peak data rate of “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of 20MHz + PR1” and “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1” is same including unicast and broadcast respectively.Note 2: PRB processing capability of “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of 20MHz + PR1” is not limited to “25 PRBs for 15 kHz SCS and 12 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS” and it corresponds to PRB size corresponding to 20 MHz.Note 3: The only difference between “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of 20MHz + PR1” and “Rel-18 eRedCap: UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1” is Note 2 and *vLayers·Qm·f* in order to have the same peak rate.Note 4: The initial access procedure of Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 is realized by following:* Same as Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1
 |

3.1 Target data rate

The contributions express the following views regarding clarifications of the target data rate (10 Mbps):

* Contribution [37] proposes to confirm that 10 Mbps is a minimum requirement.
* Contribution [35] proposes to constrain PR1-only UE to similar peak rate as BW3/PR3+PR1 UE.
* Contributions [13, 38] propose to clarify that BW3/PR3 is not supported as a standalone feature.
* Contributions [15, 36] propose to clarify whether ‘≥’ or ‘=’ applies to the relaxed constraint.

Companies are invited to reply to the following question.

**FL1 High Priority Question 3.1-1a: Which option should apply for the relaxed constraints (X and Y)?**

* **Option 1: *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ X and *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ Y, respectively**
* **Option 2: *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* = X and *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* = Y, respectively**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option (1/2)** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | 1 | Depending on the UE capabilities which are supported by the eRedCap UE, *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* can be larger than X or Y. |
| vivo | 2 | For UE complexity reduction, the 10Mbps target data rate is the peak data rate.  |
| Nordic  | 1 | WID is clear on this Relaxation of the constraint (*vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4) for peak data rate reduction |
| CMCC | 1 |  |
| SONY | 2 | The thing that defines an R18 RedCap UE seems to be the data rate of 10Mbps. We hence think that there shouldn’t be multiple options for the constraint.  |
| Samsung | 1 | Follow WID description. |
| LG | 1 | WID is descripted as below.Relaxation of the constraint (*vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4) for peak data rate reduction |
| CATT | 1 |  |
| FUTUREWEI | 1 |  |
| Intel | 1 | It is up to UE capability report the values of *vLayers*, *Qm*, *f* . X/Y is the minimum value of *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* |
| Ericsson | 1 | The WID states that “By default, all UE capabilities applicable to a Rel-17 RedCap UE are applicable unless otherwise specified”. If the UE indicates support for MIMO and/or 256QAM and/or high scaling factors, then it seems reasonable that the peak rate is correspondingly higher, i.e., the 10-Mbps peak rate target is a target for the least capable Rel-18 eRedCap UE. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 1 | 10Mbps target data rate is the **minimum** peak data rate. |
| Nokia, NSB | 1 |  |
| Qualcomm | 1 |  |
| FL2 | Based on the responses received so far, the dominant view seems to be according to Option 1. |
| FL3 | In the online (GTW) session on Monday 17th April, it became clear that different interpretations are possible regarding the RAN#99 agreement on the 10-Mbps peak rate target.**High Priority Question 3.1-1b: What is your interpretation of the RAN#99 agreement?*** **Interpretation 1: All Rel-18 eRedCap UEs should have the same 10-Mbps peak rate target regardless of what optional capabilities (e.g., MIMO) it might support.**
* **Interpretation 2: “BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs” and “PR1-only UEs” should have the same 10-Mbps peak rate target, but Rel-18 eRedCap UEs that support optional capabilities (e.g., MIMO) might support higher peak rates.**
* **Interpretation 3: Other (please elaborate in the comment field).**
 |
| **Company** | **Interpretation (1/2/3)** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | 1 | 1. The agreement at RP#99 is the following:
	* Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 and Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1 are designed/targeted to **same peak data rate**, **i.e., 10Mbps.** [RP-230778]
2. The whole point of the WI was to define a device type of lower complexity than RedCap. Enabling the peak data rate to be higher than 10Mbps and approaching R17 RedCap data rates is completely unnecessary when we note that there is no further segment in between LTE Cat1/1bis (10Mbps) and LTE Cat2 (50Mbps). How many different peak data rates do we need to introduce in between 10Mbps and 50Mbps (already supported by R17 RedCap)?
3. If we allow Interpretation 2, **where is the boundary between R18 eRedCap and R17 RedCap**, especially considering the fact that “standalone PR1” has been agreed?
4. Interpretation 2 leads to the market fragmentation that is required to be avoided to really achieve reduction in device “complexity”, so we object to Interpretation 2.
 |
| CATT2 | 2 | We think RANP agreement provides a lower bound (or say minimum requirement) defined by 10 Mbps, which allows UE vendors to reduce complexity/cost as much as possible, but not infinitely low. But this does not prohibit UE vendors implementing MIMO and/or 256QAM if they are interested in. This is the same as Rel-17 RedCap UE (only CA/DC is precluded). |
| Vivo | 1 | We share the concern expressed by MediaTek. About the companies’ interpretation about the peak data rate is minimum peak data rate, isn’t the ‘minimum’ and ‘peak’ contradicts each other? If companies have concern on the fixed modulation order and scaling factor, we are open to introduce the new scaling factor.  |
| Spreadtrum | 1 | We prefer interpretation 1, we think MTK’s comments make sense.If majority prefer interpretation 2, we think we should at least define an upper bound for R18 RedCap, especially for SA PR1 RedCap. The supported peak data rate for BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs can be [~10Mbps, ~20Mbps] by reporting different SF and modulation orders. There is a data rate gap between R17 and R18 RedCap. Also as a R18 RedCap, PR1-only UEs should also follow the same peak data rate range [~10Mbps, ~20Mbps], otherwise, PR1-only UEs is meaningless as the complexity reduction will no longer exist if the achieved peak data rate close to or even same to R17 RedCap. |
| Ericsson |  | We have some sympathy for MediaTek’s concerns, although our understanding/ preference would be Interpretation 2. In order to avoid gridlock, we think that the following could be a possible way forward in RAN1:* **Interpretation 3: At least baseline “BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs” and “PR1-only UEs” should have the same 10-Mbps peak rate target. Whether or not Rel-18 eRedCap UEs would support optional capabilities, such as MIMO, can be further discussed during UE capabilities discussion.**

The above interpretation might, however, necessitate a WID update as the current WID states that “By default, all UE capabilities applicable to a Rel-17 RedCap UE are applicable unless otherwise specified”.Alternatively, the interpretation of the RAN#99 agreement can be clarified in RAN#100.  |
| Panasonic | 1 | To avoid the market fragmentation and confliction with Rel-17 RedCap, peak rate much higher than 10 Mbps is not needed for any Rel-18 eRedCap UEs. Peak rate higher than 10 Mbps should be managed by Rel-17 RedCap UEs.For the question 3.1-1a, we preferOption 2: *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* = X and *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* = Y, respectively. Option 2 reduces the number of allowed combination of *vLayers* and *Qm*, which would avoid the complexity increase at the network side. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 2 | The RANP conclusion is talking about the peak data rate, which does not indicate the optional capabilities, 2Rx or 256QAM can not be supported. Moreover, we have agreement in RAN1 as following:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:Revise the earlier agreement by removing the square brackets like this:* The minimum DL peak rate target (for FD-FDD) is ~~[~~10~~]~~ Mbps based on peak data rate calculation according to 38.306.
* The same value for X is used for DL and UL
 |

Further, in RAN1 111 meeting, if we check the FL summary R1-2212536, it is found that the original proposal for this issue is :

|  |
| --- |
| **High Priority Proposal 3-1a: The peak rate target is 10 Mbps based on peak data rate calculation according to 38.306 assuming FD-FDD with 1Rx without 256QAM.** |

After discussion and decision, we agree that using the minimum peak data rate is more correct. Therefore, there is no doubt that Interpretation 2 is true. If we go with Interpretation 1, some serveal RAN1 agreement would be reverted. For example, the ‘>=’ should be changed as ‘’=

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Agreement:For the relaxed constraint X in the following earlier RAN1 agreement, down-select between X = 3 and X = 3.2.

|  |
| --- |
| * UE peak data rate reduction is supported at least as an add-on to UE BB bandwidth reduction,
	+ The constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 is relaxed to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ X.
	+ FFS: the value of X
 |

 |

  |
| Samsung | 1 | Share the same view as MTK. |
| Intel | 2 | We share view of other companies that 10Mbps is the minimum peak data rate which allows maximum UE complexity reduction. Then, it is not precluded if a UE vendor wants to implement a powerful UE capability.  |
| FUTUREWEI | 2 | 256QAM and other data rate increasing optional capabilities are available by default as noted in the WID“The existing UE capability framework is used, and changes to capability signalling are specified only if necessary. By default, all UE capabilities applicable to a Rel-17 RedCap UE are applicable unless otherwise specified.” |
| Sierra Wireless | 1 | We prefer to have the same peak data rate for all Rel-18 eRedCap devices, regardless of which features the device supports, similar to LTE Cat1/1bis. This will reduce market fragmentation and confusion as to what is eRedCap. Customers identify devices based on peak data rate, so having a single value for eRedCap (regardless optional feature support), would be clear similar to the way LTE categories have done. |
| Qualcomm | 2 | Our interpretation and preference is to set the minimum peak data rate as 10Mbps for both BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs and PR1-only UEs. This may mean that some eRedCap UEs may support data rate higher than 10Mbps depending on the implementation. Interpretation 1 brings too much restriction to UE implementation because with this restriction, some UE may need to unnecessarily disable some high capability functions even though they are supported, e.g., 2Rx or 256QAM. I also share the same view with Futurewei that eRedCap UE needs to follow the NR UE capability framework not the LTE UE capability method.  |
| Nokia, NSB | 2 | We agree with other companies that 10Mbps is the minimum peak data rate. It is also our understanding that Rel-18 RedCap UE can support optional MIMO and 256QAM capabilities as specified in the WID. Rel-18 RedCap UE supporting optional MIMO and 256QAM capabilities should have higher data rates (same as for Rel-17 RedCap) as anyway these UEs are considered higher capability. |
| NEC | 2 | 10Mbps should be the minimum requirement. It is up to UE vendor whether peak data rate of a device corresponds to =X or >X, but not <X. |
| CMCC | 2 | R18 RedCap UEs with basic feature like “BW3/PR3+PR1 UEs” and “PR1-only UEs” have the same 10-Mbps peak rate, but Rel-18 eRedCap UEs that support optional capabilities (e.g., MIMO) might support higher peak rates.Similarly, R17 RedCap UEs with basic feature have the same 20Mbps peak rate, but Rel-17 eRedCap UEs that support optional capabilities might support higher peak rates. |
| OPPO | 2 | The data rate is clear for low bond.We think the UE vLayers·Qm·f ≥ X should not be used to restrict RedCap UE further. Instead, we can further consider to restrict the Rel-18 5MHz RedCap UE’s MIMO layers and scaling factors. |
| Xiaomi |  | From our point of view, we think the UE can report the product of (*vLayers*, *Qm*, *f* ) larger than or equal to X to meet different data rate requirement, just as the legacy behavior performed by NR normal UE. And, 10Mbps is the minimum requirement.Based on above, for the better understanding the UE capability of eRedCap capable of BW3+PR1 or PR1 only, we should further discuss whether the product value can be larger than 4. |
| SONY | 1 | Our understanding of the simple text that was written in RANP#99 is that interpretation 1 applies.Beyond that simple interpretation of that text, the reasoning from MTK and Sierra Wireless makes a lot of sense to us.  |
| DOCOMO | 2 | As clearly stated in the agreement, 10 Mbps is minimum peak rate and this minimum peak rate is same between BW3/PR3 + PR1 and PR1-only UEs. Therefore, peak rate can be larger than 10 Mbps depending on the UE capability for supporting max. MIMO layer, modulation order and scaling factor. In fact, the peak rate can be different depending on the UE capability even for Rel-17 RedCap. |
| Nordic  | 1 | Of course, UE supporting two layers should be able to indicate support of 10Mbits. |

Among the received responses to Question 3.1-1b, 40% have Interpretation 1, and 50-60% have Interpretation 2. Perhaps the following proposal can be considered as a potential compromise.

**FL4/FL5 High Priority Proposal 3.1-1c:**

**For UEs supporting UE BB bandwidth reduction or UE peak data rate reduction,**

* **The UE can optionally support the following features:**
	+ **DL 256QAM transmission**
	+ **DL 2-layer transmission**
	+ **2 Rx antenna branches**
* **A UE supporting 2 Rx antenna branches does not have to support DL 2-layer transmission.**
	+ **Note: This is different from Rel-17 RedCap.**
* **The DL peak rate target is:**
	+ **10 Mbps if the UE does not support DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission**
	+ **>10 Mbps if the UE supports DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic  | N | This could be good compromise solution. But UE indicating optional capabilities, should ALSO be able to indicate minimum peak rate. This can be * **The DL peak rate target is:**
	+ **10 Mbps if the UE does not support DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission**
	+ **>=10 Mbps if the UE supports DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission**

Question to FL, below text is agreed somewhere already, or new proposal? * **A UE supporting 2 Rx antenna branches does not have to support DL 2-layer transmission.**
	+ **Note: This is different from Rel-17 RedCap.**
 |
| FL |  | Reply to Nordic’s question above:It is a new proposal, intended to allow 2-Rx UEs with 10-Mbps peak rate. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y, after deleting 2nd bullet | The first bullet is by default from the WID. We would like to avoid restricting Rel-17 RedCap features in Rel-18.We agreed that the *minimum* peak data rate is 10 Mbps for Rel-18 RedCap in RAN1#112.No reason to agree with the 2nd bullet. |
| vivo | N | To avoid market fragmentation, we think an upper bound of the peak data rate for R18 RedCap should be defined.  |
| Intel | Y, after deleting 2nd bullet | For the second bullet, we would like to maintain same principle since our discussion will be applied to standalone PR1 too. If a UE vendor choose to implement extra feature for eRedCap UEs, it is not necessary to worry about complexity |
| Spreadtrum | N | As we commented in the last round, we do have concerns on the overlap between R17 RedCap and R18 RedCap. With the current proposal, there is no upper bound on peak rate for PR1-only UE. If the UE supports DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission, the achieved peak data rate for R18 RedCap can be the same to that of R17 RedCap. This is not align with the targets of R18 RedCap, i.e., (from the WID justification part) **Rel-18 RedCap should provide NR support for low-tier devices between existing LPWA UEs and the capabilities of Rel-17 RedCap UEs.** According to the description, the upper bound for R18 RedCap chould be ~50Mbps. But we are open to other values. We can also accept MTK’s views for only one value (i.e., 10Mbps), or we can define an upper bound for R18 RedCap.* **The DL peak rate target is:**
	+ **10 Mbps if the UE does not support DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission**
	+ **>10 Mbps and <X Mbps, if the UE supports DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission**
		- **FFS: X**
 |
| NEC |  | Fine with the first bullet.FFS for the second bullet. It could be a discussion on a UE capability.For the third bullet, according to TS 38.306, “the approximate maximum data rate” is computed using the formula in 4.1.2 of TS 38.306 with parameters $v\_{Layers}^{(j)}$, $Q\_{m}^{\left(j\right)}$ and $f\_{}^{\left(j\right)}$ which the UE has reported. “≥” does not mean greater value than a Rel-18 RedCap UE reported is used for computing the data rate. In case the product $v\_{Layers}^{(j)}⋅Q\_{m}^{\left(j\right)}⋅f\_{}^{\left(j\right)}=X$, using “≥” or “=” does not cause any difference on computing the approximate maximum data rate which shall be no less than 10 Mbps.Using “=” means to change the description “For single carrier NR SA operation, the UE shall support a data rate for the carrier that is no smaller than the data rate computed using the above formula, with $J=1 CC$ and component $v\_{Layers}^{(j)}⋅Q\_{m}^{\left(j\right)}⋅f\_{}^{\left(j\right)}$ is no smaller than 4.” in TS 38.306. We don’t see the need to change. The underlined “no smaller than” is not necessary to change to “equal to” of the description. Only change needed will be just to capture [3.2] or [0.75] for Rel-18 RedCap.In our view, a Rel-18 RedCap UE with higher capabilities may report $v\_{Layers}^{(j)}$, $Q\_{m}^{\left(j\right)}$ and $f\_{}^{\left(j\right)}$so that the maximum data rate computed with these parameters results in either =10Mbps or >10Mbps. Such a UE also has to support 10 Mbps with a single layer and/or lower modulation order than 256QAM. |
| Panasonic |  | It is true that the formulation of *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ X had been agreed in RAN1. But it does not mean ANY combination of the modulation order and transmission rank can be supported. We think some restriction is needed as discussed below.We summarized the peak rate achieved by each potential combination of modulation order and transmission rank reported by eRedCap UEs. Based on the calculation, our concern is follows:Concern 1: The capability to achieve 20 Mbps order or more peak rate may not be needed for eRedCap UEs. Some of the capability is more than Rel-17 RedCap UE.* According to the RAN plenary agreement, 10 Mbps order peak rate is clearly targeted by the eRedCap UEs while it is unclear whether higher peak rate is required. If higher peak rate is required than 10 Mbps, why “20MHz+PR1” UE needs to support just 10 Mbps despite having BW wider than “BW3/PR3 + PR1”? The 20MHz+PR1 UE can have 20 Mbps or 40 Mbps order peak rate using wider BW. Our understanding is the reason of the 20MHz+PR1 UE supports 10 Mbps is to avoid potential market fragmentation.

Concern 2: If the concern 1 is valid, the capability for rank 2 transmission may not be needed for eRedCap UEs.* Based on the calculation below, rank 1 is enough to achieve 10 Mbps order peak rate. If higher rank is supported, multiple RF and more MIMO processing is required. If such complexity increase is acceptable, simply to design Rel-17 RedCap would be more reasonable.

We think to limit the combination would be useful instead of just to support any of the combinations.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *vLayers* | *Qm* | BW3/PR3+PR1 peak rate*vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 3.2 | 20MHz+PR1 peak rate*vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 0.75 | Rel-17 RedCap min. peak rate*vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 |
| Rel-18eRedCap:Potential capability report | 1 | 2 | *N/A* | 10 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) | - |
| 1 | 4 | 10 Mbps order (*f*=0.8) | 20 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) |  |
| 1 | 6 | 10 Mbps order (*f*=0.75) | 30 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) | - |
| 2 | 4 | 10 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) | 40 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) | - |
| 2 | 6 | 10 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) | 60 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) | - |
| 2 | 8 | 20 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) | 80-90 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) | - |
| Rel-17RedCap:Min. capability report | 1 | 6 | - | - | 60 Mbps order (*f*=0.75) |

 |
| LG | Y on only first bullet | There is no reason to be different from Rel-17 RedCap on the second bullet, we have not agreed the second bullet and there is no objective on the 2nd bullet on WID.In our view, according to the previous agreement, >=10Mbps seems to be correct. The conditions on DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission are not needed. |
| CATT | Y, without 2nd bullet | In R17 RedCap, we agree to reuse DL MIMO layer# to indicate Rx# in FR1. And, in SIB1, gNB will provide Rx-specific cell barring for RedCap UE.If we keep 2nd bullet, it is problematic for a gNB if it bar 1 Rx RedCap UE, but find that a RedCap UE cannot support 2 DL MIMO layer.Fine with the other part. No need to repeat, as Futurewei and Intel already explained well. |
| DOCOMO | Y, after deleting 2nd bullet | We support this proposal in principle but prefer not to include the , 2nd bullet.In addition, we have a small suggestion for update;* **The DL peak rate target is:**
	+ **10 Mbps if the UE does not support DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission**
	+ **>10 Mbps if the UE supports DL 256QAM transmission and/or DL 2-layer transmission**
 |
| OPPO |  | For the first bullet the scaling factor should be also included in the sub-bullet. * **The UE can optionally support the following features:**
	+ **DL 256QAM transmission**
	+ **DL 2-layer transmission**
	+ **2 Rx antenna branches**
	+ **Existing scalingFactors**

The second bullet is to be FFS. More like the UE capability issue as NEC commented.We comment earlier the formular is clear to be >=. And, “DL peak rate target” here is not helpful as the “target” itself is unclear. How to implement the target in 38.306?  |
| CMCC | N | According to WID of R17 RedCap, a RedCap UE supporting 2 Rx antenna branches has the capability to support DL 2-layer transmission, but it does not have to use 2 layer for transmission. So we suggest to remove 2nd bullet.Regarding the DL peak rate target, we suggest to remove 2nd subbullet:~~o>10 Mbps if the UE supports DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission~~The minimum peak data rate is defined for R18 RedCap UEs with basic capability, R18 RedCap UEs supporting optional capability naturally can have higher data rate, there is no need to define peak rate target for UEs supporting optional capability. |
| Ericsson | Y | Our assumption is that the 10-Mbps peak rate target applies to the most basic Rel-18 eRedCap UE without any optional features. According to the RAN#99 decision, the same 10 Mbps applies to both “BW3/PR3+PR1” and “PR1-only” UEs. UEs that support optional features such as MIMO or 256QAM can support higher peak rates. |
| SONY |  | The first two bullets are OK. We don’t agree with the 3rd bullet. RANP#99 has agreed that the peak data rate is 10Mbps and we should just implement this decision.We don’t see why support of 2 layers or 256QAM would mean that the UE would support a higher data rate. For example, couldn’t a UE that supported 2 layers support 10Mbps in half the physical resource of a UE that supported only 1 layer? Couldn’t a UE that supported 256QAM support 10Mbps in just 75% of the resource required for a UE that only supported 64QAM?The support of optional features does not change the peak data rate that is supported for a Rel-18 eRedcap device. |
| MediaTek | N | This 3rd bullet in the proposal conflicts with the RAN plenary agreement at RAN#99, as stated MANY times. We will not accept any proposal that attempts to define a UE capability that has a targeted peak data rate different to the 10Mbps target agreed. The upper and lower target peak data rate is approximately10Mbps, that is already clear. We respectfully request the rapporteur again to refrain from inviting discussions that go against the latest RAN plenary agreements. |
| Xiaomi2 | Y on only first bullet | For the second bullet, we can’t see the necessity to introduce a new relationship between 2RX and 2 DL MIMO layers which is different from Rel-17 RedCap. For the third bullet, we can’t see the necessity to bundle the minimum target data rate with the supported modulation order together. We suggest to follow the legacy way for (Q, v, f) reporting, which is the product value can be larger than X.Besides, in order to clarify the UE feature of BW3/PR3+PR1 or PR1 only, we suggest to further discuss whether the product value can be larger than 4. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y, after deleting 2nd bullet | We think it’s not good to support 2Rx UE without DL MIMO as that would introduce another variant which would introduce additional implementation complexity.We also think it’s reasonable for UE supporting 256QAM and DL MIMO to support higher data rate. |
| Samsung | N | We share the similar view as Panasonic. We are OK for the first bullet to support these optional features. However, it doesn’t mean all of the combinations of these optional features can be supported. To differentiate Rel-17 Redcap and Rel-18 eRedcap, limit the supported combinations can be considered as commented by Panasonic. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y for the 1st subbulletN for the 2nd subbulletModification for the 3rd subbullet | For the third subbullet:On modulation, the DL peak data rate depends on the UE capability parameter *supportedModulationOrderDL* which indicates the maximum modulation order (1,2,4,6,8) applied for peak data rate calculation, but not depends on *pdsch-256QAM-FR1* which indicates whether the UE supports 256QAM.On number of layers, 10Mbps can be achieved by $v\_{Layers}^{(j)},Q\_{m}^{\left(j\right)},f\_{}^{\left(j\right)}$= {2, 2, 0.8/0.75}, {4,1,0.8/0.75}, {4,2,0.4} and {8,1,0.4} for add-on PR1. So for 2-layer transmission, the UE can still support the DL peak data rate of 10Mbps.Therefore, the DL peak data rate can be restricted to 10Mbps if the UE supports DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission. The third subbullet should be modified as following:* **The DL peak rate target is >= 10Mbs depending on** $v\_{Layers}^{(j)}$**,** $Q\_{m}^{\left(j\right)}$ **and** $f\_{}^{\left(j\right)}$ **reported by UE.**

For the second subbullet, there is no need to have this change, as above indicated, with 2Rx 2layers, 10Mbps still can be achieved. |
| Qualcomm |  | We are OK with 1st bullet but 2nd bullet is not needed. We prefer to modify the 3rd bullet as suggested by ZTE. |
| Nordic |  | We could live with below as compromise.* **The DL peak rate target is:**
	+ **10 Mbps if the UE does not support DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission**
	+ **>=10 Mbps if the UE supports DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission**

But preference is that minimum peak rate is not function of capabilities. This is no LTE, this is NR. So similar view as QC and ZTE. |

Based on the discussion in the online (GTW) session on Wednesday 19th April and the received responses to Questions 3.1-1c, 3.2-1c and 3.3-1c, the following proposal can be considered.

The value 0.75 in the previous (FL1-FL5) proposals in Section 3.3 has now been replaced with 0.8, which supports more combinations of {*vLayers*, *Qm*, *f*}, including *vLayers* = 1 or 2.

The intention with the proposal is to be able to agree values for the relaxed constraints (e.g., 3.2 and 0.8) without saying anything in this specific proposal about whether the 10-Mbps peak rate target is a minimum peak rate or a fixed peak rate.

**FL6 High Priority Proposal 3.1-1d:**

**For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,**

* **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 3.2**

**For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,**

* **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 0.8**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | We are fine with X=3.2 and Y=0.8, but we do not want to imply that the existing equation “>=” is changed to a “=”. From that perspective, it is better to use the existing X and Y in our agreements and not mention the data rate at all.**For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,** * **X= 3.2**

**For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,** * **Y= 0.8**

We suggest to have a separate question to discuss whether eRedCap should only support 1RX based on the comments online, for example, Proposal: Should eRedCap be limited to only 1Rx? Assuming that this is OK, then this limitation will be captured in the features, with no need for changing the equation.  |
| LG | N  | We think we should stick to the original formulation with X and Y and “>=” instead of “=” for the same reason as mentioned by FUTUREWEI. |
| DOCOMO |  | We can live with the value 3.2 and 0.8.We still prefer to agree on the constraints as we agreed, i.e., “The constraint vLayers·Qm·f ≥ 4 is relaxed to vLayers·Qm·f **≥** 3.2/0.8”. But if really need to agree only on the exact value of relaxed constraints first for progress, we can accept with adding FFS as moderator’s comment in red, e.g.,**For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,*** **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 3.2**

**For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,*** **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 0.8**

**FFS: Whether the 10-Mbps peak rate target is a minimum peak rate or a fixed peak rate.** |
| Qualcomm |  | We are fine with the value itself: X=3.2 and Y=0.8 (instead of 0.75). Regarding the UE capability and corresponding UE peak rate, we support keeping the current UE capability framework and eRedCap UEs can support 10Mbps or higher depending on their reported capacity signaling.  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT |  | Fine with the value. As we point out in [16], Y=0.8 is in fact a good choice. But we prefer Futurewei’s version. We have previous agreement with ‘FFS: the value of X’ to address.RANP#98 agreement: Keep the minimum target peak rate as 10Mbps. We think this agreement is still valid. |
| MediaTek | Y | Again, companies proposing to allow higher rates are conflicting with the RAN#99 agreement. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | Fine with the value. For the supported UE peak data rate, we want to remainder that overlap with R17 RedCap should be avoided, as descripted in the WID: Rel-18 RedCap should provide NR support for low-tier devices between existing LPWA UEs and the capabilities of Rel-17 RedCap UEs.  |
| CMCC |  | We are fine with X=3.2 and Y=0.8, but we want to remain “>=” instead of “=”, just as the *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f>=4* limitation for R17 RedCap UEs. |
| NEC | Y | We are fine with the proposal assuming it is intended to agree “=X” and “=Y” is used to derive maximum data rate of a Rel-18 RedCap UE.At the same time, in our understanding, the framework of TS 38.306 copied below (except the value '4') is not subject to change (out of scope of RAN1 discussion). We understand the proposal does not violate the framework.“For single carrier NR SA operation, the UE shall support a data rate for the carrier that is no smaller than the data rate computed using the above formula, with $J=1 CC$ and component $v\_{Layers}^{(j)}⋅Q\_{m}^{\left(j\right)}⋅f\_{}^{\left(j\right)}$ is no smaller than” |
| OPPO |  | We are fine with X=3.2 and Y=0.75, but we want to remain “>=” instead of “=”,We support keeping the current UE capability framework and eRedCap UEs can support 10Mbps or higher depending on their reported capacity signaling. That is: the current proposal may have some ambiguity. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We could make compromise to X=3.2, but “>=” should be kept. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Intel |  | We prefer FutureWei’s version. So, 10Mbps is the minimum peak data rate, which can be further discussed.  |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We are fine with X=3.2 and Y=0.8.We also understand this proposal is only for setting the 10 Mbps data rate. However, the proposal might lead to mis-understanding that we now have “=” instead of “>=”. So I suggest to change to either Futurewei’s proposal or something like below**For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,*** **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to X = 3.2**

**For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,*** **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to Y = 0.8**
 |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nordic  | OK with change | **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,*** **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 3.2**

**For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,*** **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 0.75**
* **NOTE: For UE supporting two layers, minimum value of X is 0.8**
 |

The received responses generally express support for the proposed values (3.2 and 0.8, respectively). However, a slight majority of the responses express (referring to RAN#98e agreement) that it should be clear that these values correspond to a minimum peak rate, while several other responses express (referring to a RAN#99 agreement) that it should be clear that these values correspond to a fixed peak rate. Perhaps the following updated proposal can be considered.

**FL7 High Priority Proposal 3.1-1e:**

* **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
	+ **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 3.2**
* **For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
	+ **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 0.8**
	+ **This is assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression.**
* **Ask RAN#100 to clarify whether the peak rate target is a fixed peak rate or a minimum peak rate.**

The above proposal was discussed briefly in the online (GTW) session on Friday 21st April. At this point it seems difficult to reach RAN1 consensus on an agreement about the numbers (e.g., 3.2 and 0.8), since there are different views regarding what the numbers are supposed to mean (i.e., whether they correspond to a fixed peak rate or a minimum peak rate), and some companies also want to avoid a RAN1 agreement that in any way acknowledges that there may be different legitimate interpretations of the RAN#99 decision. Therefore, the following question can be considered.

**FL8 High Priority Question 3.1-1f:**

* **Is it meaningful to continue to try to agree the numbers (e.g., 3.2 and 0.8) in this meeting?**
	+ **If the answer is yes, feel free to suggest a proposal formulation that might reach consensus.**
	+ **If the answer is no, feel free to suggest how to proceed (e.g., ask for guidance from RAN#100).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | Support X=3.2 and Y=0.8 with whatever FFS is needed to move forward |
| vivo |  | We do not think ask the guidance from RAN is a good idea given only one RAN1 meeting left for finish the WI after June RAN#100 meeting. We share other companies concern that if R18 RedCap UE can support 2 layers or 256QAM without upper bound limitation, there will be some overlapping with R17 RedCap. Large range of the peak data rate can be supported especially for R18 eRedCap capable of PR1+20MHz.We support MTK’s views for only one value (i.e., 10Mbps). But we can be open to discuss the upper bound. We think Spectrum’s proposal below can be a starting point * **The DL peak rate target is:**
	+ **10 Mbps if the UE does not support DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission**
	+ **>10 Mbps and <X Mbps, if the UE supports DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission**
		- **FFS: X**
 |
| DOCOMO | Y | To make some progress, we support to agree on the relaxed constraint value with clearly stated that it is FFS whether the 10-Mbps peak rate target is a minimum peak rate or a fixed peak rate (it would be clarified in RAN1#113 or RAN#100). |
| Panasonic | N | To make a process in RAN1, the following is needed at least:**Ask RAN#100 to clarify whether the peak rate target is a fixed peak rate or a minimum peak rate.** |
| LG | N | It is our view that what we are discussing is clearly the minimum peak rate. But if it is not the case for some other companies, then we are fine to ask clarification questions to RAN plenary |
| CMCC | Y | We suggest to try to agree the numbers (e.g., 3.2 and 0.8) in RAN1. In our understanding, the point of wording “Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 and Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1 are designed/targeted to same peak data rate, i.e., 10Mbps” is that peak rate requirement of two kinds of UEs is the same instead of peak rate is a fixed value. As the peak data rate requirement for R17 RedCap UEs or legacy UEs, 10Mbps here is the minimum peak data rate. Keeping fixed peak data rate is difficult to realize. |
| CATT | Y | 3.2 and 0.8 are just addressing the value issue. We need to give answers to the FFS in previous agreements, right?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agreement (from RAN1#110bis-e)*** **UE peak data rate reduction is supported at least as an add-on to UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
	+ **The constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 is relaxed to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ X.**
	+ **FFS: the value of X**
* **If UE peak data rate reduction is supported as a standalone feature,**
	+ **The constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 is relaxed to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ Y.**
	+ **FFS: the value of Y**
	+ **Note: Whether this option is supported will be decided in RAN plenary.**

**Agreement (from RAN1#112)****For the relaxed constraint X in the following earlier RAN1 agreement, down-select between X = 3 and X = 3.2.**

|  |
| --- |
| * UE peak data rate reduction is supported at least as an add-on to UE BB bandwidth reduction,
	+ The constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 4 is relaxed to *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ X.
	+ FFS: the value of X
 |

 |

The group can leave ‘whether the value is the minimum one or the absolute only one’ into RAN plenary, although we think this is unnecessary. Hope to maintain Rel-17 RedCap principle. |
| Spreadtrum |  | We share the similar concern as vivo that only one RAN1 meeting left after next RAN, and we are fine with these two values for X and Y.Regarding what the numbers are supposed to mean (i.e., whether they correspond to a fixed peak rate or a minimum peak rate), as we commented for priority proposal 3.1-1c, we can accept MTK’s views for only one value (i.e., 10Mbps), or we can define an upper bound X for R18 RedCap and further check it in the next meeting, e.g.,* **The DL peak rate target is:**
	+ **10 Mbps if the UE does not support DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission**
	+ **>10 Mbps and <X Mbps, if the UE supports DL 256QAM transmission or DL 2-layer transmission**
		- **FFS: X**
 |
| Intel | Y | The most controversial point is either ‘>=X’ or ‘=X’ is configured for target 10Mbps peak data rate which can be clarified in next RAN meeting. The view on value X itself seems quite converged now. We are fine to delay decision to next RAN meeting if majority companies prefer.  |
| MediaTek |  | We can accept:* **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
	+ **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 3.2**
* **For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
	+ **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 0.8**

The above fulfils the work item scope/objectives as set out in the WI and according to RAN#99 agreement.We will not accept any FFS or request from RAN1 for RAN plenary to clarify because the RAN#99 agreement is clear.  |
| Samsung |  | In our understanding, the conclusion in RAN plenary is clear, i.e., 10Mbps peak data rate is the design target for R18 Redcap. We think we can make some progress to have agreements as* **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
	+ **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 3.2**
* **For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
	+ **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 0.8**
 |
| Xiaomi3 | N | We propose to ask RAN#100 to clarify whether the peak rate target is a fixed peak rate or a minimum peak rate at first, and then discuss the specific value X and Y. If it is not a fixed value, X=3 and Y=0.75 are preferred by us. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | We should not bring this issue on the RANP discussion, which is totally RAN1 aspects.In the WID, we use >= for constrain relaxingIn the RAN1 agreement, we have the agreement indicating this is the minimum peak data rate.Regarding the market fragmentation, as we commented, the upper bound of R18 RedCap peak data is lower than lower bound of Rel-17 RedCap UE. There is no fragmentation issue. On the other hand, if the Rel-18 RedCap UE has the fixed peak data rate 10Mbps, there would be a large gap between Rel-17 RedCap UE and Rel-18 RedCap UE.Therefore, we would be strongly against using ‘=’, cause it reverts the RAN conclusion and RAN1 agreements, which should be strictly avoided.In this meeting, we would suggest a Working assumption. |
| NEC | Y | We are not open to discuss the framework of UE data rate specified in TS 38.306.We don’t see the need to distinguish Rel-18 RedCap UE with its capabilities of number of layers and maximum modulation order.**Proposal:*** **For Rel-18 RecCap UE, its peak data rate (supported max data rate in TS 38.306) is calculated as described in 4.1 Supported max data rate in TS 38.306 with *J*=1 CC using** $v\_{Layers}^{(j)}$**,** $Q\_{m}^{\left(j\right)}$ **and** $f\_{}^{\left(j\right)}$ **reported by the UE**
	+ **Rel-18 RedCap UE is allowed to report** $v\_{Layers}^{(j)}⋅Q\_{m}^{\left(j\right)}⋅f\_{}^{\left(j\right)}=3.2 or 0.8$**, for BW reduction or no BW reduction, respectively, which corresponds to data rate of 10 Mbps**
	+ **(It is not required but) UE may report** $v\_{Layers}^{(j)}$**,** $Q\_{m}^{\left(j\right)}$ **and** $f\_{}^{\left(j\right)}$ **where** $v\_{Layers}^{(j)}⋅Q\_{m}^{\left(j\right)}⋅f\_{}^{\left(j\right)}>3.2 or 0.8$
	+ **Rel-18 RedCap UE is not allowed to report** $v\_{Layers}^{(j)}⋅Q\_{m}^{\left(j\right)}⋅f\_{}^{\left(j\right)}<3.2 or 0.8$**, for BW reduction or no BW reduction**
 |
| Ericsson | Y | Similar view as Futurewei.We would also be open having an upper-bound on the peak data rate for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs (assuming 10 Mbps is minimum peak rate).  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are OK with X=3.2 and Y=0.8. We are OK with setting this as the peak data rates for UE with mandatory capability. For UE supporting 256QAM and/or 2-layer DL MIMO, we think the UE can have higher peak data rates. We would be fine with something similar to vivo’s proposal. |
| SONY | Y | Agree with the proposal from Mediatek.* **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
	+ **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 3.2**
* **For UE peak data rate reduction without UE BB bandwidth reduction,**
	+ **The 10-Mbps peak rate target corresponds to** *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* **= 0.8**

We do not agree with RAN1 seeking clarification on what RANP meant when they stated: “Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 and Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1 are designed/targeted to same peak data rate, i.e., 10Mbps”. The statement from RANP is quite clear that the peak rate is 10Mbps (what other interpretation could there be?).If other companies wish to submit contributions to RANP asking whether “peak rate = 10Mbps” means “peak rate = 10Mbps”, that is up to them. These is no consensus that RAN1 does not understand the meaning of RP-230778. |
| Nordic  | N | We will formally object unlessX=3.2 and Y=0.75 0.75 satisfies 10Mbits peak rate for both SCS, full-stop, and we have compromised already more than enough. |
| Qualcomm | Y | We are fine to agree on X=3.2 and Y=0.8.Regarding whether X is minimum or the only value, we strongly support keeping the current UE capability framework by defining X as minimum. We are also fine to ask RAN#100 for the clarification. |

Most received responses to Question 3.1-1f express that it would be meaningful to try to agree the numbers (e.g., 3.2 and 0.8) in this RAN1 meeting or the next RAN1 meeting rather than waiting for further RAN plenary guidance regarding whether the 10-Mbps peak rate target is a minimum target or a fixed target.

A few responses express that they prefer the 10-Mbps peak rate target to be a fixed peak rate, but that they might be ok with having the 10-Mbps peak rate target as a minimum peak rate if the peak rate is limited by some agreed maximum peak rate (which could be FFS till the next RAN1 meeting).

Considering that there are opposing views regarding the correct interpretation of the RAN#99 decision but also a general hesitance to ask for further RAN plenary guidance, companies are requested to provide input on the following potential compromise proposal.

### **FL9 High Priority Question 3.1-1g:**

* **If the minimum supported peak rate for Rel-18 eRedCap UEs is 10 Mbps, can any of the following options be accepted as the maximum supported peak rate?**
	+ **Option 1: ~15 Mbps**
	+ **Option 2: ~20 Mbps**
	+ **Option 3: ~25 Mbps**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Option(s)** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | N |  | We don't think it is appropriate to discuss the maximum data rate now. We should be discussing the MIMO layer and 256QAM features directly. In addition, just as it is difficult to translate the minimum target data rate of "10" to specification language, it will be similarly difficult to translate another number. So, we are opposed to introduce a new feature of a maximum data rate cap. |
| DOCOMO |  |  | In our understanding, 10 Mbps is minimum peak rate as we agreed in the previous RAN/RAN1 meeting and peak rate can be larger depending on the reported UE capability same as Rel-17 RedCap.We are open to define the upper bound of peak rate, however, this discussion is related to the target scope of Rel-18 eRedCap, thus it should be discussed in RAN plenary as we discussed minimum target peak rate in RAN#98-e. |
| Xiaomi4 |  |  | Before discussing these three options, we have a concern: whether the maximum supported peak rate for BW3/PR3+PR1 and PR1 only are the same, which may affect the maximum value of the product of the three factors for these two features. |
| vivo | Y |  | There is deadlock between “>=” vs “=”. We prefer =, but we are fine with the proposal as compromise to avoid the market fragmentation. For the maximum value for supported peak rate, we can continue discussing in May meeting.  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | Option1,2,3 | Based on the guidance of WID (justification part: Rel-18 RedCap should provide NR support for low-tier devices between existing LPWA UEs and the capabilities of Rel-17 RedCap UEs), an upper bound for R18 RedCap is needed. The intention of this proposal is align with the WID.We are fine with these three values, and open to other values. |
| MediaTek | N |  | For R18 eRedCap, the target peak data rate is 10Mbps, as confirmed at RAN#99. Any discussion on further peak data rates beyond that it out of scope of the R18 work on that basis, and such discussion should not be encouraged or pursued. |
| Samsung | N |  | We share the same view as MTK. 10Mbps should be the target peak data rate, which has been agreed in RAN Plenary. We should not revert the conclusion made in last RAN plenary. We suggest to stop the discussion in RAN 1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N |  | The upper bound data rate should be ~50Mbps, which is the lower bound of Rel-17 RedCap UE.Actually, we do not need to discuss what’s the maximum data rate, which make situation more complicated.Instead, we should directly discuss whether 2 MIMO layer and 256QAM is supported or not. |
| CMCC | N |  | The motivation to define the maximum data rate is not clear. When we discuss peak rate requirement of R17 RedCap UEs, maximum data rate is not defined, so why do we discuss it for R18 RedCap UEs? In our understanding, R18 RedCap UEs aim to further reduce complexity of UEs, so the minimum peak rate of R18 RedCap UEs with basic feature reduces to 10Mbps. If complexity of R18 RedCap UEs is not reduced so much, R18 RedCap UEs with optional feature can support higher peak rate, while maximum peak rate does not need to be defined. |
| CATT |  |  | If a value is needed, Option 3 (~25 Mbps) is suitable in our view, incorporating 2 layers and 256QAM. But I do not quite understand how it works as a compromise. Comparing to the minimum peak data rate of Rel-17 RedCap UE? |
| Intel | N |  | RAN plenary guideline is needed on whether an upper bound is to be specified |
| Ericsson | Y | FFS |  |
| LG | N |  | We think that it should be discussed in RAN plenary whether the maximum supported peak rate is needed |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  | We are fine to limit the peak data rate. We think the peak data rate can scale accordingly with DL MIMO and/or 256QAM capabilities. |
| Panasonic | Y |  | As said by Sony, RAN plenary agreement was "Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of 20MHz + PR1 and Rel-18 eRedCap UE capable of BW3/PR3 + PR1 are designed/targeted to same peak data rate, i.e., 10Mbps". It was peak rate.On the other hand, if some middle bit rate is introduced, as FUTUREWEI and ZTE commented, it is more straight-forward to directly discuss how much the capability features i.e., *vLayers* and *Qm* are supported for each type of eRedCap UE BW3/PR3+PR1 and 20MHz+PR1, considering the peak rate summarized in the table below. In other words, which cases in the following table to be supported should be discussed:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *vLayers* | *Qm* | BW3/PR3+PR1 peak rate*vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ 3.2 | 20MHz+PR1 peak rate*vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ [0.75 or 0.8] |
| 1 | 2 | *N/A* | 10 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) |
| 1 | 4 | 10 Mbps order (*f*=0.8) | 20 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) |
| 1 | 6 | 10 Mbps order (*f*=0.75) | 30 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) |
| 2 | 4 | 10 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) | 40 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) |
| 2 | 6 | 10 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) | 60 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) |
| 2 | 8 | 20 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) | 80-90 Mbps order (*f*=0.4) |

 |
| NEC | N |  | RAN1 is tasked to identify the constraint value for Rel-18 RedCap UE. It has been almost done, i.e. X=3.2 and Y=[0.75 or 0.8]. This proposal is out of scope of WID. RAN decision will be needed for introduction of upper bound. |
| Qualcomm | N |  | We do not think maximum peak rate needs to be defined and even if it is needed, RAN1 is not the right group to decide the max peak rate.If RAN1 does not reach to an agreement/conclusion on whether X is the minimum or the only value, asking RAN plenary guidance would be the most efficient way under the current circumstance. |

3.2 Add-on feature

The contributions express the following views regarding the relaxed peak rate constraint X:

* Contributions [10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 35, 37, 38] propose X=3.2.
* Contributions [11, 16, 31, 33] propose X=3 or X=3.2.
* Contributions [14, 16, 19, 34, 36] propose X=3.
* Contribution [29] proposes X=3.1.
* Contribution [11] proposes X=4Y.
* Contribution [33] proposes new scaling factors (*f*).

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

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 3.2-1a: X=3.2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | Y | While our first preference is 3, we can live with 3.2. |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Nordic  | N | We proposed to apply 3.1 as default compromise value, when parameter Scaling factor is not configured.This means that no new scaling factors are needed.In fact, if Option 2 in **Question 3.1-1a** would be agreed, then scaling factors are not applicable at all. 😉 |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| SONY | Y | We are OK with this for the sake of progress. Our preference would have been X = 3, as noted by FL. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| LG | Y | We support X= 3.2 as it can satisfy the 10 Mbps peak rate target for both 15 kHz and 30 kHz SCS. |
| CATT | Y | Our first preference is 3, we can live with 3.2. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Can accept |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | 15KHz or 30KHz is up to gNB configuration, which is not related to the UE’s peak data rate. Therefore, X=3 is enough to satisfy the peak data rate requirement.If the 10Mbps should be always provided for both 15KHz and 30KHz, based on this logic, the BWP size configuration also should be provided to meet the peak data requirement. What we discuss here is a UE capability and is not related to gNB configuration. Therefore, we do not need to keep peak data rate satisfying 10Mbps at any gNB configuration. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | In our analysis, there is marginal complexity difference between 3.2 to 3, therefore we prefer 3.2. |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |

Based on responses received so far to Question 3.1-1a and Proposal 3.2-1a, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL2 High Priority Proposal 3.2-1b:**

* **For the relaxed constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ X,**
	+ **X=3.2**

Based on discussion in the online (GTW) session on Monday 17th April, the following updated proposal can be considered.

**FL3/FL4/FL5 High Priority Proposal 3.2-1c:**

* **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction, for the relaxed constraint,**
	+ **X=3.2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek |  | As we commented, we don’t have a strong concern with the exact value. In fact, we are totally fine with Nordic’s proposal for X=3.1. In our view, only 10Mbps peak data rate is supported by all R18 eRedCap and therefore NO reporting on scaling factor/max mod order/max mimo layer is needed at all. gNB can immediately figure out the peak data rate supported by the UE once it receives its early indication during RACH.  |
| CATT2 | Y | The difference on complexity/cost should be marginal for 3.0~3.2. That’s why we can compromise to 3.2. And anyway we need to capture this in TS 38.306.  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | The BWP size and the SCS are the two factors to calculate the peak data rate. The gNB would not always configure the maximum BWP size and 30KHz for a Rel-18 RedCap UE. That means when we calculate the peak data rate, we cannot assume that all the cases satisfy the 10Mbps under different gNB configuration.The peak data rate is based on the UE capability. The UE supports 30KHz and 11PRBs PDSCH, and the peak data rate can be achieved. That is enough. A larger X only can bring more complexity and is more far away the peak data rate target. Therefore, we still prefer X=3.0.Compared with 3.0, if proponents can provide the benefits of X=3.2, we also would consider to compromise. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Can accept |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| OPPO |  | 3 vs. 3.2 does not change much data rate. 3 only have less than 10Mbps in a case of 30kHz SCS. We still prefer 3 but can live with other values. |
| Xiaomi |  | We prefer X=3 to obtain more reporting combinations, e.g., (1, 4, 0.75) or (2, 4, 0.4) for (*vLayers*, *Qm*, *f*), with the assumption that the product value of (*vLayers*, *Qm*, *f*) can be larger than X. Of course, if the product value must equal to X, both X=3 and X=3.2 are OK for us. So, we suggest to combine **High Priority Proposal 3.2-1c** with **High Priority Question 3.1-1a** as following**:****Which option should apply for the relaxed constraints (X and Y)?*** **Option 1: *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ X and *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ Y, respectively**
* **X=3, Y=0.75**
* **Option 2: *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* = X and *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* = Y, respectively**
* **X=3.2, Y=0.75**
 |
| SONY | Y | We also agree with this statement from MTK: “only 10Mbps peak data rate is supported by all R18 eRedCap and *therefore NO reporting on scaling factor/max mod order/max mimo layer is needed at all*” |
| DOCOMO | Y | We are also fine with 3.0. |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| Nordic  |  | X=3 or 3.1 (for compromise)As we commented in Tohru on Tue, 3.1 can be assumed to be default peak rate, no need to define new scalers for that. |
| Transsion | Y |  |
| DOCOMO2 |  | One clarification question; now we are discussing whether to support 60 kHz SCS, then if we support 60 kHz SCS, 10 Mbps peak rate should be achieved even for 60 kHz SCS? |
| SONY |  | Our preference is that **relaxed constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* = X.** This means that there is a single peak data rate for Rel-18 eRedCap, which is consistent with the decision in RANP#99.We’d also be happy with just a statement that the peak data rate is 10Mbps and not bother with equations, subscripts and Greek letters that say the same thing: peak data rate = 10Mbps |
| MediaTek | N | We propose to modify the proposal as follows:* **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction, for the relaxed constraint,**
	+ **~~X~~ *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* =3.2**
 |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Nordic  | Y | * **For UE peak data rate reduction with UE BB bandwidth reduction, for the relaxed constraint,**
	+ **X=3.2 for UE supporting 1 or 2 layers**
 |
| FL6 | This issue has been addressed in Proposal 3.1-1d. |

3.3 Standalone feature

The contributions express the following views regarding the relaxed peak rate constraint Y:

* Contributions [10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 35, 36, 38] propose Y=0.75.
* Contributions [11, 16] propose Y=0.75 or Y=0.8.
* Contribution [33] proposes Y=0.7 or Y=0.75.
* Contribution [34] proposes Y=0.7.
* Contribution [29] proposes Y=0.725.
* Contribution [25] proposes Y=0.8.
* Contribution [11] proposes Y=X/4.
* Contributions [16, 33] propose new scaling factors (*f*).
* Contribution [10] proposes to always assume 20 MHz bandwidth in the peak rate calculation to avoid that the resulting peak rate and TBS become too small.

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

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 3.3-1a: Y=0.75 assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Nordic | N | 0.75 cannot be configured when RedCap UE supports two layers. Therefore, 0.75 is not technically feasible solution. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| SONY | Y | We are OK with Y = 0.75 for the sake of progress. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| LG | Y | We support Y=0.75 as it can satisfy the 10 Mbps peak rate target for both 15 kHz and 30 kHz SCS. The same reason that we support X=3.2. |
| CATT | Y | OK. A new scaling factor should also be introduced. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | As we discuss in our contribution [R1-2302298](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2302298.zip), it is imperative that the UE-supported maximum bandwidth of 20 MHz is always applied when calculating the maximum peak rate, even when the channel/carrier bandwidth is less than 20 MHz. Otherwise, if Y=0.75 is applied when the channel/carrier bandwidth is less than 20 MHz, this may be problematic due to the following reasons:Firstly, the data rate supported by the PR1-only UEs would become too low. For example, a bandwidth of 10 MHz would correspond to 5.2/5.6 Mbps and 4.8/5.2 Mbps in DL/UL with 15 and 30 kHz SCSs, respectively. And a bandwidth of 5 MHz would correspond to 2.5/2.7 Mbps and 2.2/2.4 Mbps in DL/UL with 15 and 30 kHz SCSs, respectively.Secondly, the maximum TBS values corresponding to the above peak rate values would be too small to receive initial access messages. For example, based on TS 38.213/38.331, the maximum TBS for SIB is 2976 bits. That is, a peak rate of at least 3 Mbps with 15 kHz SCS and 6 Mbps with 30 kHz are needed to properly receive the SIB. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Xiaomi  | Y |  |

Based on responses received so far to Question 3.1-1a and Proposal 3.3-1a, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL2 High Priority Proposal 3.3-1b:**

* **For the relaxed constraint *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* ≥ Y,**
	+ **Y=0.75 assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression**

Based on discussion in the online (GTW) session on Monday 17th April, the following updated proposal can be considered.

**FL3/FL4/FL5 High Priority Proposal 3.3-1c:**

* **For UE peak data rate reduction as a standalone feature, for the relaxed constraint,**
	+ **Y=0.75 assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek |  | We are fine with the value of 0.75. However, we do have a strong concern with the greater sign > being specified, especially for this standalone PR1 case where UE is capable of receiving and processing 20MHz as legacy R17 RedCap. If “>=” instead of “=” is agreed, then where is the boundary between R18 and R17 RedCap? As for reporting maximum peak data in 38.306, we think there is no need to Rel-18 RedCap to do the reporting. Once gNB realizes it is an R18 eRedCap UE from early indication in RACH, gNB will realize 10Mbps is the peak rate of the UE.  |
| CATT2 | Y | Similar comment as the one for X. |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| SONY | Y | Also agree with the comments from MTK. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Lenovo  | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| Nordic  | N | As we explained in our contribution, number of layers in ***vLayers*·*Qm*·*f***is what UE supports, it is not the same as for Q, where MO is imaginary.Table 2 R17 support values of X

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **f** | **v** | **Q=1** | **Q=2** | **Q=4** | **Q=6** | **Q=8** |
| **1** | **1** | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| **1** | **2** | 2 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 |
| **0.8** | **1** | 0,8 | 1,6 | 3,2 | 4,8 | 6,4 |
| **0.8** | **2** | 1,6 | 3,2 | 6,4 | 9,6 | 12,8 |
| **0.75** | **1** | 0,75 | 1,5 | 3 | 4,5 | 6 |
| **0.75** | **2** | 1,5 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 |
| **0.4** | **1** | 0,4 | 0,8 | 1,6 | 2,4 | 3,2 |
| **0.4** | **2** | 0,8 | 1,6 | 3,2 | 4,8 | 6,4 |

UE supporting 2 Rx should be able to indicate 10Mbits peak reduction as well. |
| Transsion | Y |  |
| CATT |  | To Nordic, maybe good to exchange some view. Not sure why 2 Rx is attractive... Understand that vendors have freedom on implementation, but (1) 2 Rx is obviously expensive than 1 Rx since it affects both RF and BB part according to SI outcome. (2) In Rel-17, the group already agrees that all FR1 bands allow RedCap UE to equip 1 Rx. Seems vendors are not forced to equipped 2 Rx. If it really equips 2 Rx, it is already expensive (even expensive than simplest Rel-17 RedCap UE) by choice, is it really matters the data rate?Having say this, introducing a new *f* (can be very small) seems can solve your concern? |
| DOCOMO2 |  | Same question as for X. |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | We would also be fine with Y=0.8, which matches more *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* combinations. Alternatively, we keep Y=0.75. A UE supporting 2 MIMO layers may report 0.8 (*vLayers* = 2, *Qm* = 1, *f* = 0.4). The difference in peak rates for Y=0.75 and Y=0.8 is only minor.  |
| SONY |  | OK with 0.75. We would prefer an “=” instead of “>=”. Even better, we could just say that the peak data rate is 10Mbps in TS38.306 |
| MediaTek | N | We propose to modify as follows:* **For UE peak data rate reduction as a standalone feature, for the relaxed constraint,**
	+ **~~Y~~ *vLayers*·*Qm*·*f* =0.75 assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression**
 |
| Xiaomi2 | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We think Y=0.75 is fine as this is for the UE with 1Rx. For UE supporting MIM, it can report 0.8 if it wishes to support similar peak data rate as 1Rx.We are also fine with Y=0.8. |
| Nordic  | Y, with update | * **For UE peak data rate reduction as a standalone feature, for the relaxed constraint,**
	+ **Y=0.75 assuming 20 MHz bandwidth in the 38.306 peak rate expression for UE supporting 1 or 2 layers**
 |
| FL6 | This issue has been addressed in Proposal 3.1-1d. |

# 4 Other aspects

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

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

* Proposals on UE capabilities and UE type definitions are brought up in some contributions [13, 18, 36]. These aspects are expected to be discussed in the next RAN1 meeting.

**FDRA optimization**

* There is no need to consider potential optimization of FDRA indications [18, 21].
* Consider potential optimizations of FDRA indication for PUSCH but not for PDSCH [19].
* Consider potential optimizations of FDRA indications in case of large RBG size [26].
* Discuss whether/how to use potential spare bits in FDRA field in RAR UL grant [12, 26].
* For unicast, the FDRA indications and RBG sizes can be based on 5-MHz sub-bands [23].

**Other functionality**

* Consider enhancements of user multiplexing capacity for common PUCCH [26, 33].
* Restrict the SRS bandwidth to 5 MHz, like the other UL bandwidths [29, 31].
* Do not restrict the SRS bandwidth to 5 MHz [13, 18, 20].
* A half-duplex UE should be capable of processing one additional UL DCI per slot [29].
* Introduce a new cell barring indication and an IFRI field in SIB1 [36].

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

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| SONY |  | **SRS bandwidth**We think that restricting the SRS bandwidth to 5MHz could have a beneficial impact on UE complexity (a greater impact than reported in the TR). While we do not expect progress on this issue at this meeting, we think that this issue should still be on the table for the upcoming RAN1#113 F2F meeting. This will allow companies to further check the implications of supporting 20MHz bandwidth for SRS. |
| CATT | N |  |
| Samsung | N |  |
| LG | Y | **FDRA optimization and RBG size**For FDRA optimization, RBG size 16 can be difficult to constrain FDRA assignment up to 25 PRBs for 15KHs SCS in RA Type 0. So UEs which are allocated only 16 PRBs with RBG size 16 cannot reach peak date rate. Some large RBG sizes may be discussed on Configuration 1 dependent on BWP size. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | **Potential spare bits in FDRA field in RAR UL grant**As analyzed in our contribution [12], the current resource allocation mechanism in RAR UL grant has unnecessary restrictions on supportable L, which leads to inflexibility on efficient resource utilization. Therefore, analyses and discussions on resource allocation in RAR UL grant are necessary. |
| FL8 | Companies are welcome to comment further on the issues listed in this section of this document (even though they are not likely to be treated further in this meeting due to lack of time). |
| DOCOMO | **Common PUCCH capacity**We prefer to consider enhancement on common PUCCH capacity. As we proposed separate initial BWP specific to Rel-18 eRedCap, given that the number of UEs is expected to be largely increased if NW accommodate both Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap, we have a concern on capacity on random access. Thus, we prefer to make it cure common PUCCH would not be a bottleneck for random access. |
| LG2 | We think that the discussion on **Common PUCCH capacity** can also be needed as DOCOMO referred to. Enhancements of user multiplexing capacity for common PUCCH can be discussed considering the situation that people who carry not only smartphones but only simultaneously wear additional smart watches and VR glasses will demand explosive connections toward gNodeB with a lot of mobile devices at the same time. |
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