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# 1 Introduction

This feature lead (FL) summary (FLS) concerns the following email discussion for the Rel-17 work item (WI) for support of reduced capability (RedCap) NR devices [1]. The RAN1 agreements made so far for this WI are summarized in [2].

|  |
| --- |
| [106bis-e-R17-UE-features-REDCAP-02] Discuss incoming LS on capability related RAN2 agreements for REDCAP for a possible reply LS by October 18 – Johan (Ericsson) |

This email discussion concerns the questions raised by RAN2 in the LS in [3]. This FLS considers the input provided on this topic in contributions [7] – [19]. The issues in focus in this round of the discussion in this meeting are tagged FL1.

Follow the naming convention in this example:

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

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

* Assume CompanyC wants to update *RedCapCapabilityLsFLS-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*.
* CompanyC uploads an empty file named *RedCapCapabilityLsFLS-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 *RedCapCapabilityLsFLS-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 10 in [R1-2108693](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106b-e/Docs/R1-2108693.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.

**FL1 Question 1-1: Please consider entering contact info below for the points of contact for this email discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point of contact** | **Email address** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 2 Feedback on RAN2 agreements

The LS from RAN2 [3] informs about the following RAN2 agreements and asks RAN1 and RAN4 to provide feedback, if any, on the agreements.

RAN2#114-e:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements online: 1. RAN2 Working Assumption: by default, all non-RedCap UE capabilities are applicable for RedCap UE, and therefore only for non-RedCap capabilities that are not appliable for RedCap UE, we clarify in the definitions for parameters in TS38.306, the value or feature is not applicable for RedCap UE |

RAN2#115-e:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:1. The number of DRBs supported by RedCap UEs is less than legacy value (which is 16). There will be a single mandatory value (FFS if 4 or 8). FFS if it will be possible to have an optional capability2. “RRC processing delay” is not relaxed for RedCap UE3. PDCP/RLC AM 12 bits SN is mandatory for RedCap UE, and PDCP/RLC AM 18bits SN is optional supported by RedCap UE; FFS on how to capture this in specification4. NE-DC, and (NG)EN-DC are not supported by RedCap UE; FFS on how to capture it in the specification5. DAPS and CAPC related capabilities are not applicable for RedCap UE; [8/20] FFS on CHO. FFS on how to capture this in the specificationAgreements via email - from offline 109:1. Maximum 8 DRBs is mandatory supported by RedCap UEs.2. From RAN2 perspective, inter RAT mobility related capabilities are applicable for RedCap UE3. From RAN2 perspective, measurement related capabilities are applicable for RedCap UE4. From RAN2 perspective, URLLC related capabilities are applicable for RedCap UE except those affected by CA/DC5. From RAN2 perspective, IAB related capabilities are not applicable for RedCap UE, i.e., the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node6. Do not introduce capability signalling on the supported Rx number for RedCap UE since the number of Rx branches for RedCap is implicitly indicated by the corresponding capability parameter maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH in the existing UE capability framework; |

**FL1 High Priority Question 2-1: Is there a need for RAN1 to provide feedback on the above RAN2 agreements? If yes, please elaborate in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Rel-15/16 features not applicable for RedCap UEs

The LS from RAN2 [3] asks RAN1 and RAN4 whether there are any Rel-15/16 UE features or capabilities which should not be applicable for RedCap UEs.

The WID [1] indicates that the following capabilities are not applicable for RedCap UEs:

* Carrier aggregation
* Dual connectivity
* UE bandwidths wider than 20 MHz in FR1 or wider than 100 MHz in FR2
* More than 2 UE Rx branches or more than 2 DL MIMO layers

Furthermore, RAN#93-e has made the following agreements [4] which may be relevant for the RAN1 response to RAN2:

* In Rel-17, there will be no work on any RedCap specific specification update for any of the following:
	+ RedCap UEs also supporting V2X/PC5 on n47
	+ RedCap UEs operating in unlicensed bands
	+ RedCap UEs supporting SUL
* The specification will not contain any explicit restriction to prevent implementation of RedCap UEs with these features.
* Note: The consequence of this agreement would be:
	+ If any spec change/addition is found necessary in order to enable one of the options above then it will not happen in Rel-17.

The RAN2 agreements listed in the LS [3] indicate that the following capabilities are not applicable for RedCap UEs:

* More than [4 or 8] DRBs
* NE-DC and (NG)EN-DC
* DAPS and CAPC related capabilities
* IAB related capabilities

The FL’s understanding is that CAPC in the above list may have been intended to say CPAC, not CAPC, which could be clarified by a new agreement in the next RAN2 meeting in that case.

The FL questions below use the following categorization (according to Alternative 1 in clause 10.1 in RedCap SI TR [6]) of RedCap UE capability requirements that are different from those for non-RedCap UEs:

1. Mandatory features for non-RedCap UEs that are not applicable for RedCap UEs
2. Mandatory features for non-RedCap UEs that are optional for RedCap UEs
3. Mandatory features for non-RedCap UEs that are supported for RedCap UEs but with different value
4. Optional features for non-RedCap UE that are not applicable for RedCap UE
5. Optional features for non-RedCap UE that are mandatorily supported for RedCap UE

In the next rounds of this email discussion, the FL intention is to discuss what FGs from the Rel-16 UE feature list [5] that might not be applicable to RedCap UEs in the light of the above agreements and potential additional agreements made in this meeting. If deemed necessary, the relevant FG lists can be provided for information in the reply LS to RAN2.

However, in the following FL questions, the intention is to capture views on whether there (from RAN1 perspective) should be any other differences between the RedCap and non-RedCap UE capability requirements than what follows from the already agreed differences listed above in this section of this document. That is, in responses to the questions below, please do not enter, e.g., any capabilities related to CA or DC, since they are already listed above.

**FL1 High Priority Question 3-1: Are there any mandatory features for non-RedCap UEs that should not be applicable for RedCap UEs, beyond the capabilities related to the features already listed in this section of this document? If yes, please elaborate in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**FL1 High Priority Question 3-2: Are there any mandatory features for non-RedCap UEs that should be optional for RedCap UEs, beyond the capabilities related to the features already listed in this section of this document? If yes, please elaborate in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**FL1 High Priority Question 3-3: Are there any mandatory features for non-RedCap UEs that should be supported for RedCap UEs but with different value, beyond the capabilities related to the features already listed in this section of this document? If yes, please elaborate in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**FL1 High Priority Question 3-4: Are there any optional features for non-RedCap UE that should not be applicable for RedCap UEs, beyond the capabilities related to the features already listed in this section of this document? If yes, please elaborate in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**FL1 High Priority Question 3-5: Are there any optional features for non-RedCap UE that should be mandatorily supported for RedCap UEs, beyond the capabilities related to the features already listed in this section of this document? If yes, please elaborate in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 4 Rel-17 features not applicable for RedCap UEs

Some contributions [7][12][14][17] discuss RedCap UE support for features developed in other Rel-17 work items. The FL recommendation is to postpone that discussion until the Rel-17 work items and Rel-17 UE feature list discussions have progressed a bit further.
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