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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 FL3.

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.

**FL3 Question 1-1: Please consider entering contact info below for the points of contact for this email discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point of contact** | **Email address** |
| vivo | Xueming Pan | panxueming@vivo.com |
| ZTE | Youjun Hu | hu.youjun1@zte.com.cn |
| MediaTek | Mohammed Al-Imari | Mohammed.Al-Imari@mediatek.com |
| Intel Corporation | Debdeep Chatterjee | debdeep.chatterjee@intel.com |
| Ericsson | Sandeep Narayanan Kadan Veedu | sandeep.narayanan.kadan.veedu@ericsson.com |
| FUTUREWEI | Vip Desai | vipul.desai@futurewei.com |
| Qualcomm | Jing Lei | leijing@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Nokia, NSB | Cassio Ribeiro | cassio.ribeiro@nokia.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 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** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | From RAN1 perspective, measurement related capabilities are applicable for RedCap UE except those affected by CA/DC, e.g., FG 1-11. |
| FUTUREWEI | N |  |
| Nokia, NSB | N | RAN2 agreements are clear. |
| LGE | N | No need. |
| FL2 | **High Priority Question 2-1a: Should RAN1 provide the feedback that from RAN1 perspective, measurement related capabilities are applicable for RedCap UE except those affected by CA/DC (e.g., FG 1-11)?** |
| FUTUREWEI2 | N | Not necessary because item #3 is clear. |
| Intel | N | Not necessary. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We can accept we do not need the separate feedback to RAN2. At least this FG 1-11 also should be discussed in section 3. |
| Samsung | N |  |
| FL3 | There appears to be no need to provide feedback on the RAN2 agreements. L1 FG 1-11 can be discussed in section 3 of this document. |
|  |  |  |

# 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** |
| vivo | Y | We identified following two existing FGs (mandatory with capability signaling), which are not applicable to RedCap UEs, as they are related to >1 ports in UL and >4 layers in DL, respectively.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | FG 4-12 is applicable to UE supporting more than 4 layers, which exceeds the RedCap UE capability. |
| MediaTek | Y | FG2-16b is not applicable to RedCap UEs. |
| Intel | Y | Aside from those related to CA/DC, FG 2-16b and FG #4-12 should not be applicable for RedCap UEs. |
| Ericsson |  | It is not clear to us why features that require support for more than > 1 UL port should be forbidden for RedCap UEs. This issue should be further discussed. In our view, these features may be optional for RedCap UEs. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | For FG4-12, we think it may not be applicable to RedCap UEs.In our understanding, the WID does not preclude RedCap UEs from supporting more than one uplink antenna port. |
| Qualcomm | Y | Agree with the comments of Vivo, ZTE and MediaTek. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | The following Rel-15 UE feature groups are related to carrier aggregation and dual connectivity, and hence should not be supported by the RedCap UE.1-10 Support of SCell without SS/PBCH block6-13 Case 1 Single Tx UL LTE-NR DC8-1 Dynamic power sharing for LTE-NR DC8-2 Operation A with single UL Tx case 1 |
| LGE | Y | Layer-1 UE features 4-12 (HARQ-ACK spatial bundling for PUCCH or PUSCH per PUCCH group)We also prefer the FG2-16b (Support 1+2 DMRS (uplink)) to be not applicable to RedCap as commented by many companies. |
| FL2 | **High Priority Question 3-1a: Which ones (if any) of the following are mandatory features for non-RedCap UEs that should not be applicable for RedCap UEs?*** 1-10
* 2-16b
* 4-12
* 6-13
* 8-1
* 8-2
 |
| FUTUREWEI2 | Not applicable to RedCap UEs* FG 4-12 (see our reasons)
* Falls under CA/DC category (we can identify but RAN2’s decisions should automatically exclude them).
	+ FG 1-10
	+ FG 6-13
	+ FG 8-1 (along with dependency 6-24)
	+ FG 8-2

Our views on the remaining features in the FL list: Applicable to RedCap UEs* 2-16b: no restriction for supporting more than 1 UL port in WID
 |
| Intel | The following should not be applicable for RedCap UEs:* 2-16b
* 4-12

The following should already be precluded by RAN2 based on the relation to CA/DC:* 1-10
* 6-13
* 8-1
* ~~8-2~~8-1a
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | At least 4-14 should not be supported. As for 2-16b, it is suggested to firstly discuss whether more than one uplink antenna port can be applied for RedCap UE and then decide related UE capabilities.From our understanding, uplink antenna port for RedCap UE is no more than one and 2-16b should not be supported for RedCap UE, since more uplink antenna ports brings more cost and complexity for RedCap.As for the other FGs, they are not supported since they are CA/DC related. It is suggested to include them in the LS for RAN2 reference. |
| Samsung | For the FGs related to CA/DC, since it is clear in the WID, those should not be supported by RedCap.For UL antenna port, we’d like to FFS.4-12, we wonder whether spec change is needed or not with the note.  |
| MediaTek | *(Due to some copy&paste errors, we put answers to wrong questions in v015-Samsung-MediaTek. In this version, we replace the wrong ones with the correct ones. Sorry for the mistake.)*In our view, the following mandatory feature groups should not be applicable to RedCap UE. * FGs 1-10, 6-13, 8-1, and 8-2
	+ Per WID and RAN2 LS, the above CA/DC-related FGs should be excluded to RedCap UEs.
* FG 4-12
	+ This FG applies to UE supporting at least four layers. Hence it is not applicable to RedCap UE.
 |
| vivo | 2-16b,4-121-10, 6-13, 8-1, 8-1a should be excluded as they are related to CA or DC.  |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the list in FL2 except for 2-16b. Since 2RX UEs are optionally supported by RedCap UEs, 2-port uplink is in principle possible as well. Hence 2-16b should be optional for RedCap UEs instead.  |
| FL3 | Several FGs are already precluded based on the relation to CA/DC and to support of more than 2 DL MIMO layers.Apart from this, there appears to be no consensus at this point that any mandatory features for non-RedCap UEs should not be applicable for RedCap UEs.Based on the discussion so far, the draft LS reply in Proposal 3-6 can be considered. |
|  |  |  |

**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** |
| vivo | Y | We have identified following existing FGs (mandatory with capability signaling), which can be made optional for RedCap UEs, with the reasons provided below. For RedCap, UE can always perform radio link monitoring procedure based on measurement of SSB if it is agreed in AI 8.6.1.1 that SSB is always available in the RRC configured BWP. If so, the necessity of RedCap UE mandatorily support the CSI-RS based RLM is unclear. For RedCap, it can be considered that the control and data channel can always use the same TCI state/spatial relation for complexity reduction. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | DL 256QAM is optional for RedCap UE. |
| MediaTek | Y | In our view, FG 1-7 should be optional for RedCap UEs. |
| Intel |  | Decision on FG 1-7 can follow after progress on related discussions in AI 8.6.1.1. |
| Ericsson |  | Same view as Intel |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Per the agreement WID objective “The existing UE capability framework is used; changes to capability signalling are specified only if necessary”, we have not identified any necessary changes |
| Qualcomm | Y | 256QAM for PDSCH, FG 1-7. FFS 2-61, FG 2-55 and FG 2-4a  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | 2-3 PDSCH MIMO layers(RF) 1-4 256QAM for PDSCH |
| LGE |  | RF and RRM features 1-4 (256QAM for PDSCH).Others including the Layer-1 UE features 1-7 (CSI-RS based RRM measurement with associated SS-block) can be added depending on the progress in RedCap WI. |
| FL2 | **High Priority Question 3-2a: Which ones (if any) of the following are mandatory features for non-RedCap UEs that should be optional for RedCap UEs?*** **1-4**
* **1-7**
* **2-4a**
* **2-55**
* **2-61**
 |
| FUTUREWEI2 | mandatory features for non-RedCap UEs that should be optional for RedCap UEs* RF/RRM FG 1-4: this is being discussed in feature discussions

Our views on the remaining features in the FL list: FFS with the default no change* FG 1-7
* FG 2-4a (Additional active TCI state for PDCCH)
* FG 2-61 (Additional active spatial relation for PUCCH)

No change* FG 2-55: the number of allowable candidates may change for component 1, components 2 and 3 do not apply for band combination reasons. It is assumed RAN2 will make the appropriate changes
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | It is better to tag the 1-4 as RF/RRM FG 1-4.For 2-55, we are OK to discuss it in RAN2. For the other FGs, we are positive to keep them optional. |
| Samsung | Some of them are overlapped with the discussion in the other email thread, e.g., 1-4, FG 1-7 may depends on the outcome of AI 8.6.1.1FG 2-4a/FG 2-61 may not need spec change/FG 2-55, to discuss in RAN 2.  |
| MediaTek | *(Due to some copy&paste errors, we put answers to wrong questions in v015-Samsung-MediaTek. In this version, we replace the wrong ones with the correct ones. Sorry for the mistake.)*In our view, the following mandatory features for non-Red UEs should be optional for RedCap UEs. * Layer-1:
	+ FG 1-7
	+ FG 2-4a: Additional active TCI state for PDCCH - Support one additional active TCI state for control in addition to the supported number of active TCI states for PDSCH
	+ FG 2-16b: Support 1+2 DMRS (uplink) - Support 1 symbol FL DMRS and 2 additional DMRS symbols for more than one port
	+ FG 2-55: SRS Tx switch
		- 1) Support SRS Tx port switch,
		- 2) Report whether the uplink TX switching impact to downlink receiving in a band,
		- 3) Report whether the UL Tx is switched together with UL Tx in another band
	+ FG 2-61: Additional active spatial relation for PUCCH
* RF/RRM:
	+ FG 1-4: 256QAM for PDSCH
 |
| vivo | RAN4 1-4 (PDSCH 256QAM) has already been agreed as optional.FFS the following* 1-7
* 2-4a
* 2-55
* 2-61
 |
| Nokia, NSB | It is important to identify 1-4 properly, as it is not a RAN1 FG: “1-4 in RF and RRM features”.We do not agree with the following FGs: 1-7, 2-4a, 2-61. |
| FL3 | Several FGs are already precluded based on the relation to CA/DC and to support of DL 256QAM.Apart from this, there appears to be no consensus at this point that any mandatory features for non-RedCap UEs should be optional for RedCap UEs.Based on the discussion so far, the draft LS reply in Proposal 3-6 can be considered. |
|  |  |  |

**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** |
| vivo | Y | We identified the following FGs. The highlighted components are related to CA thus are not applicable to RedCap UEs, and the components related to per CC limit are still valid and can be reported by RedCap UEs.  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | It is not so clear what RAN2 intends to do for FGs which are applicable to RedCap UEs and there is at least one value that a RedCap UE could legitimately report. In this case our view is we probably do not need any clarification. We suggest to focus on cases where the value range to be reported or the description needs a modification for RedCap. One example is FG 5-5b (UE PDSCH processing capability #2 with scheduling limitation for 30kHz-SCS) where the maximum PDSCH BW of 136 RBs exceeds 20 MHz. The values within FG can be modified to use fewer RBs for RedCap UEs. |
| FL2 | **High Priority Question 3-3a: Which ones (if any) of the following are mandatory features for non-RedCap UEs that should be supported for RedCap UEs but with different value?*** **2-33**
* **2-35**
* **2-51**
* **5-5b**
 |
| FUTUREWEI2 | mandatory features for non-RedCap UEs that should be supported for RedCap UEs but with different value* FG 5-5b

Open to consider changes in listed values due to not supporting CA. As we commented, it is not so clear what RAN2 intends to do for FGs which are applicable to RedCap UEs and there is at least one value that a RedCap UE could legitimately report.* FG 2-33, FG 2-35, FG 2-51
 |
| Intel | None. The adaptations to FG 2-33/2-35/2-51 w.r.t. CA configurations can be implemented by RAN2 following from the lack of CA/DC support. FG 5-5b is not a mandatory feature for non-RedCap UEs, and no adaptations are necessary for Cap 2 for RedCap. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 5-5b is not supposed to be discussed here, since it is an optional capability. As for the other FGs, they are CA/DC related and can be dealt together in RAN2. |
| Samsung | CA related, we think some modification might be needed.No need to change on FG5-5b |
| vivo | 5-5b is not mandatory feature so not relavent here. 2-33/2-35/2-51 are highly RAN1 centric capabilities, better to have a consensus in RAN1 then inform RAN2 to update.  |
| Nokia, NSB | RAN1 should first agree on desired modified values for those FGs, if any, before communicating anything to RAN2 on this matter. FG5-5b is optional and hence it does not belong to this discussion. |
| MediaTek | *(Due to some copy&paste errors, we put answers to wrong questions in v015-Samsung-MediaTek. In this version, we replace the wrong ones with the correct ones. Sorry for the mistake.)*For FG 2-33, 2-35, and 2-51, we think components for “across all CCs” in the following FGs are not applicable to RedCap UEs.* 2-33: CSI-RS and CSI-IM reception for CSI feedback
	+ Components 4) and 6) are not applicable to RedCap UEs.
* 2-35: CSI report framework
	+ Component 9) is not applicable.
* 2-51: TRS (CSI-RS for tracking)
	+ Component 4) is not applicable.
 |
| FL3 | Several FGs are already precluded based on the relation to CA/DC.There appears to be no consensus at this point that any mandatory features for non-RedCap UEs should be supported for RedCap UEs but with different value.Based on the discussion so far, the draft LS reply in Proposal 3-6 can be considered. |
|  |  |  |

**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** |
| vivo |  | Not identified.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | • FG 10-20, FG 10-20a, and FG 10-29 are not needed due to the RedCap UE bandwidth limitation.• FGs exceeding RX and 1 Tx are not supported, including 2-13, 2-14,15-18, 15-19, 16-3a-3, 16-3b-2 |
| Ericsson |  | Same comment as for Q3-1. It is not clear to us why features that require support for more than > 1 UL port should be forbidden for RedCap UEs. This issue should be further discussed. In our view, these features may be optional for RedCap UEs. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | * For FG 10-x, several NR-U FGs have text related to the scenarios as listed in Appendix B.3 of 38.300. Based on the RAN2 LS, it appears that Scenario A (NR licensed / NR shared), Scenario B (LTE licensed / NR shared), and Scenario E (NR licensed / NR shared)] can be excluded. We should let RAN2 decide whether to update 38.300 or capture the scenarios in some other way
* In our understanding, the WID does not preclude RedCap UEs from supporting more than one uplink antenna port. We should be careful about removing features with more than one Tx port
 |
| Qualcomm |  | UE features related to DAPS and IAB should not be supported by RedCap UEFG 2-56, FG 4-25/26/27SFI should not be supported by HD-FDD and FD-FDD RedCap UE |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Many optional features have features that are not supported for RedCap as pre-requisites, and we understand those features would not be supported for RedCap UE either, but perhaps it is not needed to list every single one.  |
| FL2 | **High Priority Question 3-4a: Which ones (if any) of the following are optional features for non-RedCap UE that should not be applicable for RedCap UEs?*** **2-13**
* **2-14**
* **2-56**
* **4-25**
* **4-26**
* **4-27**
* **10-20**
* **10-20a**
* **10-29**
* **10-x**
* **15-18**
* **15-19**
* **16-3a-3**
* **16-3b-2**
 |
| FUTUREWEI2 | optional features for non-RedCap UE that should not be applicable for RedCap* FG4-25 and 4-26 and 2-56 (Falls under CA/DC category (we can identify but RAN2’s decisions should automatically exclude them).

Informative statement to RAN2* FG 10-x – as we commented, some scenario descriptions for some NR-U features may need to change for RedCap UEs. We just suggest informing RAN2 of this potential modifications for NR-U scenarios.

Our views on the remaining features in the FL list: No change* FGs 2-13, 2-14, 15-18, 16-3a-3, 16-3b-2: no restriction for supporting more than 1 UL port in WID
* FG 15-19 (Support of rank 2 reception): If a SL UE has two Rx branches, it may support this feature

FFS* FG 4-27 (More than one group of overlapping channels for control multiplexing)
* FG 10-20, 10-20a, 10-29: if the number of 20 MHz NR-U carriers is 1, then the FGs are applicable
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are supportive to remove these optional FGs listed by the FL.Additionally, FG 1-11 should be included if no feedback is provided in Question 2-1. |
| Samsung | We don’t think optional supported features should be excluded for RedCap by default. Following the guidance from RAN, we don’t need to do optimization of optional features, on the other hand, we don’t declare they cannot be supported as well.  |
| MediaTek | Among the list of FL2 Question 3-4a, we support the following optional FGs should not be applicable to RedCap UEs. * 1. (CA related) 2-56: SRS carrier switch (Report inter-cell switching time capability)
	2. 4-25: Parallel SRS and PUCCH/PUSCH transmission across CCs in inter-band CA
		+ CA related
	3. 4-26: Parallel PRACH and SRS/PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions across CCs in inter-band CA
		+ CA related
	4. (CA related) 4-27: More than one group of overlapping channels for control multiplexing
	5. (Wideband related) 10-20: Support search space set configuration with freqMonitorLocation-r16
		+ In FR1, the maximum BW of RedCap is 20MHz and therefore RedCap UE can only support the value “1” among the listed applicable numbers {1, 2, 3, 4, 5}. We hence support this FG is not applicable to RedCap. Or the applicable maximum numbers should be changed from {1, 2, 3, 4, 5} to {1} only.
	6. 16-3a-3: Support of rank 3,4 in Regular eType-II
	7. 16-3b-2: Support of rank 3,4 in Port selection eType-II
 |
| vivo | 2-13 and 2-14 can be excluded for RedCap as they are related to UL MIMO. 2-56, 4-25, 4-26, 4-27 are related to CA thus excluded10-20, 10-20a, 10-29 are related to wide bandwidth operation thus can be excluded15-18 is related to SL rank2 transmission thus can be excluded. 15-19 (SL rank 2 reception) can be supported by RedCap UEs supporting SL 2Rx16-3a-3, 16-3b-2 are for DL MIMO rank3/4, can be excluded for RedCap.  |
| Nokia, NSB | We do not agree with the following FGs: 2-13, 2-14, 10-20, 10-20a, 10-29, 10-x (too general), 15-18, 15-19. The main reason is that we understand RedCap UEs are not limited to 1TX port only.  |
| FL3 | Several FGs are already precluded based on the relation to CA/DC.Apart from this, there appears to be no consensus at this point that any optional features for non-RedCap UE should not be applicable for RedCap UEs.Note that RAN#93-e agreed that there will be no work on any RedCap specific specification update for RedCap UEs operating in unlicensed bands in Rel-17.Based on the discussion so far, the draft LS reply in Proposal 3-6 can be considered. |
|  |  |  |

**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** |
| vivo |  | Suggest to discuss whether some or all the Rel-16 UE power saving features are mandatory for RedCap UEs, i.e. RAN1 features

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 19-1 | DRX Adaptation  |
| 19-2 | Cross Slot Scheduling |
| 19-3 | Maximum MIMO Layer Adaptation |
| 19-4a | UE assistance information |

RAN2 features

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 19-1 | UE assistance information for power saving – DRX preference |
| 19-2 | UE assistance information for power saving – Maximum aggregated bandwidth preference |
| 19-3 | UE assistance information for power saving – Maximum number of secondary component carrier preference |
| 19-4 | UE assistance information for power saving – Maximum number of MIMO layers preference |
| 19-5 | UE assistance information for power saving – preference to transition out of RRC\_CONNECTED |
| 19-6 | Relaxed measurement |

It can also be discussed if some or all Rel-17 UE power saving features are mandatory for RedCap UEs, but this can be discussed later until the Rel-17 UE power saving FGs becomes stable.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Not identified. |
| MediaTek | No | We don’t see a need to mandate RedCap UEs to support optional features. |
| Ericsson |  | This would depend on the outcome of the discussion in AI 8.6.1.1, e.g., related to whether FG 6-1a should be mandatory or not. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We are open to discuss making some Rel-16 PS features mandatory (e.g., FG 19-2 cross slot scheduling)Suggest to discuss FG 5-17a (PDSCH repetitions over multiple slots). In order to fit within the bandwidth limits of RedCap UEs, a code rate higher than the target code rate may be used. The low target code rate may result from having fewer Rx branches. While HARQ can achieve a low code rate, there is an increase in delay and overhead. With repetitions over multiple slots, there is less delay. In addition, there is an improvement in power savings and flexibility in scheduling. |
| Qualcomm |  | R17 RA-SDT and CG-SDT |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | 6-1a, BWP operation without restriction on BW of BWP(s) |
| LGE | Y | Same view with Ericsson. No other feature that shall be mandatory has been identified. |
| FL2 | **High Priority Question 3-5a: Which ones (if any) of the following are optional features for non-RedCap UE that should be mandatorily supported for RedCap UEs?*** **5-17a**
* **6-1a**
* **19-1**
* **19-2**
* **19-3**
* **19-4**
* **19-4a**
* **19-5**
* **19-6**
 |
| FUTUREWEI2 | Optional features for non-RedCap UE that should be mandatorily supported for RedCap UEs* 5-17a

Our views on the remaining features in the FL list: Pending outcome of discussions* 6-1a

Open for discussion* 19-1, 19-2, 19-3, 19-4, 19-4a, 19-5, 19-6
 |
| Intel | * Open to mandating the following for RedCap UEs considering lower capabilities in terms of DL coverage/reliability for RedCap UEs:
	+ 5-17a
* FG 6-1a should be resolved as part of discussions in 8.6.1.1.
* Rel-16 UE PS features or R17 SDT features should be available for optional support by RedCap UEs. We do not see a justification to mandate RedCap UEs to implement these features – if they are relevant to certain use-cases and implementations, such UEs may support these features.
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | FG 6-1a can be revisited after the outcome of 8.6.1.1 discussion.For FG 5-17a, since DL coverage enhancement is not identified, also this FG does not need to be mandated.As for the power saving related FGs in RAN1, there is no need to mandate them. |
| Samsung | We don’ see optional features have to be mandatory. If so, we should discuss them in AI 8.6 instead.  |
| MediaTek | We don’t see a need to mandate RedCap UEs to support optional features. |
| vivo | We are fine to keep all of them as optional feature for RedCap UEs.  |
| Nokia, NSB | There is a mixture of RAN1 and RAN2 features in the list above for 19-1/…/6, this needs to be fixed. In any case we think more discussion is needed on those power saving features, though it might make sense to consider making at least some of them mandatory for RedCap UEs.  |
| FL3 | Question 3-5a unfortunately contained a mixture of L1 FGs and L2/L3 FGs. Companies are invited to provide additional comments on the L1 FGs (19-1, 19-2, 19-3, 19-4a) and the L2/L3 FGs (19-1, 19-2, 19-3, 19-4, 19-5, 19-6) listed in Vivo’s comment to Question 3-5. Currently there appears to be no consensus at this point that any optional features for non-RedCap UE should be mandatorily supported for RedCap UEs, but the status can be revised depending on the comments on these L1 FGs and L2/L3 FGs.Based on the discussion so far, the draft LS reply in Proposal 3-6 can be considered. |
|  |  |  |

**FL3 High Priority Proposal 3-6: Reply to RAN2 that RAN1 has so far not agreed on any Rel-15/16 UE features or capabilities that should not be applicable for RedCap UEs, beyond the ones that are precluded by the WID, the RAN#93-e agreement, and the RAN2 agreements made so far, but that there may be additional agreements in the next RAN1 meeting.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | It is good to let RAN2 know where RAN1 is now with regards to features. It is ok to discuss several FGs in the next meeting. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 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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