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# Introduction

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

This document summarizes contributions [3] – [33] submitted to agenda item 8.6.2, agenda item 8.6.3 and captures this email discussion on RAN1 aspects for RAN2-led features for RedCap:

|  |
| --- |
| [106bis-e-NR-R17-RedCap-04] Email discussion regarding RAN1 aspects for RAN2-led features (except those related to UE features which will be handled under 8.17.6) – Hong (Apple)* 1st check point: October 14
* Final check point: October 19
 |

The issues in this document are tagged and color coded with High Priority or Medium Priority.

In this round of the email discussion, please comment on the issues tagged ‘FL2’ before Tuesday 12th October 05:00 (AM) UTC.

Follow the naming convention in this example:

* *RedCapR2ledFLS1-v000.docx*
* *RedCapR2ledFLS1-v001-CompanyA.docx*
* *RedCapR2ledFLS1-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*
* *RedCapR2ledFLS1-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx*

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

* Assume CompanyC wants to update *RedCapBwFLS1-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*.
* CompanyC uploads an empty file named *RedCapBwFLS1-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 in Annex).
* CompanyC then has 30 minutes to upload *RedCapBwFLS1-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 [R1-2106403](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106403.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.

The following is an outline of the summary:
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# Early indication of RedCap UEs

## Early indication in 2-step RACH

### Issue 1: Early indication for Redcap by MsgA PRACH in 2-Step RACH

The following was agreed in RAN1 105 e-meeting that 2-step RACH [2]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* Support 2-step RACH for RedCap UEs as an optional feature
	+ FFS details of early indication in MsgA, e.g.:
		- Separation of 2-step RACH resources or MsgA preambles
		- Separation of initial UL BWP
		- Using a new indication in MsgA PUSCH part
	+ Note: Discussion on 4-step RACH for early indication should be prioritised
 |

In addition, the following was agreed in RAN1 106-e meeting to enable early indication of Redcap UEs in 4-step RACH procedure [2]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:Confirm the following working assumption with the modifications in red:* For 4-step RACH, support the early indication of RedCap UEs at least in Msg1.
	+ The early indication in Msg1 can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB
	+ From RAN1 perspective, the following methods can be used for early indication both for shared initial UL BWP and separate initial UL BWP (if supported)
		- separate PRACH resource
		- PRACH preamble partitioning

Whether/how to support early indication of RedCap UEs in Msg3 in Rel-17 is up to RAN2. |

Many contributions [5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 29] discussed the details of early indication for Redcap UEs for 2-step RACH. Companies’ positions are briefly summarized in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Early indication of RedCap UEs in PRACH resource of 2-step RACH**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Description | Yes | No |
| Companies | Num. of companies | Companies | Num. of companies |
| * Separate PRACH resource in Msg.A
* PRACH preamble Partitioning in Msg.A
 | Ericsson [5], Spreadtrum [6], CATT [9], China Telecom [10], CMCC [11], ZTE [14], Samsung [16], Intel [17], IDC [22], LGe [23], Sharp [24], Lenovo [29]  | 12 | Nokia ([12], less useful, only 4-step RACH fallback case) | 1 |

Contribution [5,10,14, 24] additionally propose that the early indication in MsgA preamble should be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB, as handled for 4-step RACH. The rationale in [5] is that the indication in MsgA PUSCH is enough for early indication of Redcap in most cases. The indication in MsgA preamble is needed only to Case 4 where coverage recovery of MsgB PDSCH carrying fallback RAR when MsgA preamble is detected but MsgA PUSCH is not decoded correctly (or if MsgA PUSCH is not transmitted).

* <1st Round Comments>

Given the almost unanimously proposals for 2-step RACH and the configurability can address the concern of usefulness in [12], FL therefore proposes the following for PRACH in 2-step RACH, which is aligned with the agreements made for 4-Step RACH

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

* **For 2-step RACH, support the early indication of RedCap UEs at least in MsgA PRACH.**
	+ **The early indication in MsgA PRACH can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB**
	+ **From RAN1 perspective, the following methods can be used for early indication both for shared initial UL BWP and separate initial UL BWP (if supported)**
		- **separate MsgA PRACH resource**
		- **MsgA PRACH preamble partitioning**

Companies are invited to provide feedback with briefly justification if change is needed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| vivo |  | For early indication based in 2-Step RACH, either using PRACH or PUSCH part are possible for gNB to perform proper MSG B scheduling. However, the cost of using PRACH part is significantly higher than using the PUSCH part, therefore we prefer to discuss the early indication by PUSCH part first (including the confirmation by RAN2), and using PRACH part is supported only when there is extra gain/use case on top of using PUSCH part for early indication.  |
| CATT | Y | Though early indication in MsgA PUSCH is possible, the gNB may fail to decode MsgA PUSCH and use fallback scheduling of Msg3. In this case, early indication in MsgA PRACH is more robust.  |
| OPPO | Y | Early indication in MsgA PRACH can be configurable. Since further PRACH partitioning is required, gNB can configure it or not according to the PRACH resource utilization. If it is not configured, MsgA PUSCH can be used for earlier indication.  |
| DOCOMO | Y | We are fine with the proposal while we prefer to prioritize the discussion on indication in MsgA PUSCH. As pointed out by some companies, the indication in MsgA preamble is needed only when MsgA preamble is detected but MsgA PUSCH is not decoded correctly.Also, based on the following agreement in RAN1#106-e, “(if supported)” in the proposal can be deleted.Agreements:Confirm the following working assumption from RAN1#105-e regarding RACH occasions.* For enabling/supporting that the RACH occasion (RO) associated with the best SSB falls within the RedCap UE bandwidth, support separate initial UL BWP for RedCap UEs (which is not expected to exceed the maximum RedCap UE bandwidth), and this separate initial UL BWP for RedCap includes ROs for RedCap UEs.
	+ Note: these ROs can be dedicated for RedCap UEs or shared with non-RedCap UEs.
 |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y, with modification | We are fine with the proposal with the following note:* Whether/how to support early indication of RedCap UEs in MsgA PUSCH part in Rel-17 is up to RAN2.

We would also be fine with early indication in the MsgA PUSCH part only, i.e., no early indication in the MsgA PRACH part, since our understanding is that the early indication in the MsgA PRACH part might only be beneficial in the special case when MsgA PRACH has been received but MsgA PUSCH has not been successfully received, and in this case, we believe that it may be enough to do fallback to 4-step RACH. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | But as suggested during the GTW session, with the additional comment below. *Whether/how to support early indication of RedCap UEs in MsgA PUSCH in Rel-17 is up to RAN2.* |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We are OK with 2-step RACH being optional (as per agreement) but not clear that 2-step RACH has to be supported with early indication, which would result in more RACH partitions etc. Our preference would be to allow RedCap UEs to support 2-step RACH but handle RedCap and non-RedCap UEs together; RedCap UEs, in this case, are identified during the normal capability exchange. However, we can live with the proposal if the intent is to leave it to RAN2 and "from the RAN1 perspective" means one or both of the subbullets (up to RAN2). |
| Nordic |  | We ACK that FFS part talks about early identification, but main bullet does NOT Agreement:* Support 2-step RACH for RedCap UEs as an optional feature
	+ FFS details of early indication in MsgA, e.g.:
		- Separation of 2-step RACH resources or MsgA preambles
		- Separation of initial UL BWP
		- Using a new indication in MsgA PUSCH part
	+ Note: Discussion on 4-step RACH for early indication should be prioritised

2-step RACH is used for HO and with CFRA, in this case no Early identification is needed. But if RAN2 sees benefit and wants to support, so be it. |
| Intel | Y | We agree with CATT and others that indication via MsgA PUSCH part cannot always address the early identification needs for scheduling of Msg2 when 2-step RACH falls back to 4-step RACH due to, e.g., cancelation of MsgA PUSCH part for various reasons. Thus, specs should allow the gNB to configure early identification via MsgA PRACH part, that can be disabled based on gNB choice. We would also be fine to add the note suggested by some regarding leaving the support of indication via MsgA PUSCH up to RAN2. |
| Panasonic | N | Although it can be beneficial depending on the usage case, as only two meetings are available for RAN1 to finalize the design, our preference is to prioritize/finalize the other item. Besides, using MsgA PUSCH (if supported) would be sufficient. But If RAN1 time is available, we are supportive to study MsgA PRACH. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| SPRD | Y | If only early indication in Msg1 for 4-step RACH is configured, early indication in MsgA PRACH is needed for 2-step RACH considering UE may fall back to 4-step RACH. |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | According to agreements in RAN2#115e, solution for early identification for 2-step RACH will be specified. To so keep commonality with 4-step RACH, we can support the proposal. And we are also OK with the note suggested by Ericsson and Nokia.Agreements:1. Msg1 identification which can be configured to be enabled/disabled can be specified from RAN2 point of view.
2. Solution for early identification for 2-step RACH will be specified.
3. Specify separate indications in SIB1 for barring RedCap UEs with 1 Rx chain and 2 Rx chains.
4. Specify a RedCap specific IFRI in SIB1.
 |

* <1st Round Summary>

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Companies  | Num. of Companies |
| Supportive  | Qualcomm, CATT, OPPO, DOCOMO, Sharp, Huawei, HiSilicon, LG, ZTE, Sanechips, Xiaomi, Ericsson (With Modification), Nokia, NSB, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, SPRD, China Telecom, NEC, Sierra Wireless, CMCC  | 23 |
| Negative  | Vivo, Nordic, Panasonic  | 3 |
| Neutral  | Futurewei | 1 |

At least three companies (Ericsson, Nokia, and Intel) suggest adding a note for using MsgA PUSCH of 2-step RACH for Redcap early indication. It was also pointed out by many companies that using MsgA PRACH resource is beneficial for the 4-step RACH procedure fallback case. One company cited RAN2 agreement, which states that 2-step RACH for early identification will be specified.

* <2nd Round Comments>

**FL2 High Priority Proposal 1-2:**

* **Alt.1: For 2-step RACH, support the early indication of RedCap UEs at least in MsgA PRACH.**
	+ **The early indication in MsgA PRACH can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB**
	+ **From RAN1 perspective, the following methods can be used for early indication both for shared initial UL BWP and separate initial UL BWP ~~(if supported)~~**
		- **separate MsgA PRACH resource**
		- **MsgA PRACH preamble partitioning**
* **Alt.2: Early indication of RedCap UEs in MsgA PRACH is NOT supported.**
* **Whether/how to support early indication of RedCap UEs in MsgA PUSCH in Rel-17 is up to RAN2.**

Companies are invited to provide feedback. Please provide modification. If not, company was asked to provide what changes(s) are needed to make it acceptable. Please consider the feedback in the 1st round regarding the use case of MsgA PRACH for early indication.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Y | We don’t think Alt 2 is needed if Alt 1 is agreed, since early indication by msgA PRACH can be enabled/disabled by SIB |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | And agree with QC |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | Alt.1 is supported and Alt.2 should be removed. |
| Xiaomi | Y | Generally, we are OK with this proposal for progress. Our preference is Alt.1. According to the discussion in the 1st round, the concern on the Alt.1 is the PRACH resource fragment issue. As stated in the Alt.1, the early indication via Msg.A PRACH can be enabled or disabled, if there are too many features requiring PRACH partition, then NW can decide to disable this feature or not. While on the other hand, when there is no critical issue on the PRACH resource partition, the flexibility of enabling the early indication via Msg.A PRACH should be kept. For Alt.2, as discussed in the 1st round, we see some problems. For example, how to handle the case when Msg.A PUSCH is not correctly detected should be addressed, which would involve some standardization effort  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| vivo |  | We agree that “support early indication of RedCap UEs in MsgA PUSCH in Rel-17 is up to RAN2.” We have concern on supporting both MSG A PRACH and MSG A PUSCH for early indication purpose which is redundant in our view. We think MSG A PUSCH is more feasible and practical in the real deployment. MSG A PRACH will require additional PRACH resource partition on top of 4-step RACH with early indication. Using MSG A PUSCH can serve the same purpose and can avoid the additional PRACH resource partition. UE selection of 2-step RACH and 4-step RACH can be based on NW configured RSRP threshold, which means that 2-step RACH will be selected for UE with good channel quality. It is possible that gNB detects MSG A PRACH but not PUSCH, but the probability of such event should be low if proper RSRP threshold is set, otherwise, the whole 2-step RACH feature seems problematic. Therefore, it is not worthwhile to additionally consider the MSGA PRACH for early indication if MSG A PUSCH will be supported. In summary, we suggest to come back to MSG A PRACH (i.e. alt 1 and alt 2) after RAN2 decision on the support of MSG A PUSCH for early indication.  |
| Nokia, NSB. | Y | Agree with QC – remove Alt. 2  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | Agree with QC and others that Alt 2 should be removed. |

### Issue 2: Early indication for Redcap by MsgA PUSCH in 2-Step RACH

On early indication of Redcap using MsgA PUSCH, companies views are captured in Table 2. One contribution [5] stated that there is no need to have a “configurable” MsgA PUSCH indication, i.e., RedCap Ues should always indicate CCCH using the RedCap-specific LCID.

**Table 2: Early indication of RedCap Ues in MsgA PUSCH of 2-step RACH**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Description | Companies | # Of Companies |
| Alt.1:  | Up to RAN2 | Ericsson [5], China Telecom [10], Nokia [12], ZTE [14], | 4 |
| Alt.2 | Support | Spreadtrum [6], CATT ([9], same as Msg3 of 4-step RACH), Intel [17], IDC [22], Sharp [24, Same dedicated LCID],  | 6 |

* <1st Round Comments>

For early indication of Redcap in 4-step RACH procedure, it was agreed to leave for RAN2 to decide whether and how to use Msg3. It is moderator’s understanding that similarly MsgA PUSCH for early indication can leave for RAN2 for the consistency. .

**FL1 High Priority Question 2-1:** **Which one of the following alternatives do you support for early indication by MsgA PUSCH in 2-step RACH?**

* **Alt.1: It is up to RAN2 regarding whether/how to support early indication of RedCap Ues in MsgA PUSCH in Rel-17**
* **Alt.2: Early indication of RedCap Ues in MsgA PUSCH is supported by indicating CCCH using the RedCap-specific LCID.**

Please provide brief justification for the preferred alternative.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alternative** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Alt. 1 | gNB may not receive msgA PUSCH when msgA PRACH is detected. CCCH and LCID are not relevant to RAN1 discussion. |
| Vivo | Alt1 |   |
| CATT | Alt.2 | Alt.2 should be workable and consistent with 4-step RACH. Also fine to leave it to RAN2. |
| OPPO | Alt 2, slightly | RAN2 has agreed the early indication in Msg3 by indicating CCCH using the RedCap-specific LCID. The same mechanism can also allow the early indication in MsgA PUSCH. We think it is more desirable to alleviate PRACH partitioning in 2-step RACH case than in 4-step RACH case. Since early indication in Msg3 is accepted, it is feasible that early indication in MsgA PUSCH is also supported. RAN1 can discuss whether early indication in MsgA PUSCH is supported. If supported, LS can be sent to RAN2 for some feedback. |
| DOCOMO | Alt.1 | For the consistency with 4-step RACH, RAN1 can defer to RAN2 |
| Sharp | Fine with either one | In our view, solution for Msg3 PUSCH early indication by using RedCap-specific LCID can be naturally and automatically applied to MsgA PUSCH early indication. It is also fine to leave to RAN2 to make a formal confirmation. |
| MediaTek | Alt.1 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt 1 |  |
| LG | Alt. 1 | As RAN1 agreed for 4-step RACH, we can leave the issue on MsgA PUSCH for RAN2 decision. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Alt1. |  Similar as msg3 identification, it is up to RAN2. |
| Xiaomi | Alt.1 |  |
| Ericsson | Alt. 1 or 2 | We would be fine with either alternative, with a slight preference for Alt. 1 since we think that such discussion should be left for RAN2. |
| Nokia, NSB | - | Alt.1 but added as a note to the previous proposal/agreement. |
| FUTUREWEI | - | Again our preference is not to support 2 step RACH *and* early indication of RedCap but also OK to leave it to RAN2 |
| Nordic  | Alt 1 |  |
| Intel | Alt 1 | * Also, it seems we (Intel) have been miscategorized under Alt 2 – our view is that “*For 2-step RACH, new LCID-based indication of RedCap UE via MsgA PUSCH* ***cannot*** *be an equivalent alternative to early identification via MsgA Preamble since there can be scenarios wherein the UE may not transmit the MsgA PUSCH and only transmit the MsgA Preamble, and the RA procedure falls back to 4-step RACH.*”

However, we can accept leaving this to RAN2. Thus, would request moving Intel to under Alt 1. |
| Panasonic | Alt.1  |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt.1 |  |
| SPRD | Alt.2 | If early indication in Msg3 for 4-step RACH is configured, it is better to use early indication in MsgA PUSCH for 2-step RACH. We are also fine to leave it to RAN2. |
| China Telecom | Alt.1 | It is up to RAN2, which is similar to early identification in Msg3.  |
| NEC | Alt. 1 |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Alt. 1 | This can be up to RAN2 as in the case of 4-step. |
| CMCC | Alt.1 |  |
| IDCC | Alt 1 |  |

## Early indication in 4-step RACH

In RAN1 106 e-Meeting, the following was agreed:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:Confirm the following working assumption with the modifications in red:* For 4-step RACH, support the early indication of RedCap UEs at least in Msg1.
	+ The early indication in Msg1 can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB
	+ From RAN1 perspective, the following methods can be used for early indication both for shared initial UL BWP and separate initial UL BWP (if supported)
		- separate PRACH resource
		- PRACH preamble partitioning

Whether/how to support early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg3 in Rel-17 is up to RAN2. |

RAN2 #115-e Meeting made the following agreement for Msg1-based and Msg3-based early identification:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* Msg1 identification which can be configured to be enabled/disabled can be specified from RAN2 point of view.

Agreements online:1. A Msg3 early identification based on dedicated LCID is supported (if SA3 confirms there is no problem) |

### Issue 3: Configuration of Msg1-based and Msg3-based early indication

UE behavior regarding early indication of Redcap Ues using Msg-1 and/or Msg-3 are discussed by a few contributions [9, 13, 19]. Companies’ views can be summarized as follows

* P1 [CATT, 9]: For 4-step RACH,
	+ If RedCap-dedicated RO/preambles are configured, the RedCap UE shall indicate RedCap UE type during Msg1. In this case, the RedCap UE will not indicate RedCap UE type during Msg3.
	+ If RedCap-dedicated RO/preambles are NOT configured and if separate initial UL BWP is configured, the RedCap UE shall indicate RedCap UE type during Msg3.
	+ For 4-step RACH, if RedCap-dedicated RO/preambles are NOT configured and if separate initial UL BWP is NOT configured, the RedCap UE does not indicate RedCap UE type during Msg3
* P2 [Lenovo,13] [Lge, 23]:
	+ The enable/disable of early identification of RedCap Ues in Msg1 is implicitly signalen by whether separate RACH resource is configured for RedCap Ues.
* P3 [Sierra Wireless, 19]:
	+ Msg3 early RedCap UE indication can be configured to be enabled/disabled via SIB
	+ SIB can indicate which RedCap devices will use Msg1 or Msg3 early indication based on UE capabilities. UE Capabilities at least include
		- 1 RX or 2 RX Antenna
		- FD-FDD or HD-FDD
		- FFS: Other capabilities
	+ One example was provided in [19] regarding the SIB indication approach as shown in Table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SIB Configurations** | **Interpretation** |
| Msg 1 and Msg3 are not used  | Network does not need to know RedCap early indication b/c system BW is 20MHz and coverage is not an issue |
| Msg 1 – 1 RX RedCap UesNothing – All Other Redcap Ues | Network needs to apply additional coverage for 1 RX devices but not for 2 RX device. No issue with scheduling all devices within 20MHz. |
| Msg 1 – 1 RX RedCap UesMsg 3 – All Other Redcap Ues | Network needs to apply additional coverage for 1 RX devices but not for 2 RX device. Network wants to schedule RedCap devices differently than legacy Ues.  |
| Msg 1 – 1 RX RedCap UesMsg 3 – HD-FDD RedCap Ues | Network needs to apply additional coverage for 1 RX devices but not for 2 RX device. Network wants to schedule HD-FDD differently than FD-FDD RedCap Ues and legacy Ues |

Table 3: Example SIB configurations for Msg1 and Msg3 early indication [19]

* P4 [Sierra Wireless, 19]:
	+ If more than one LCID is available for signaling of RedCap, then it can be used to inform the network of other capabilities, such as FD-HDD.
* P5: [Sharp, 24]
	+ For 4-step RACH, RedCap UEs shall indicate CCCH using the dedicated LCID in Msg3 PUSCH, regardless of whether the RedCap UEs perform early indication in Msg 1 or not.
* <1st Round Comments>

**FL1 High Priority Question 3-1: Which one(s) among the listed P1/P2/P3/P4/P5 above should be discussed and decided in RAN1, instead of RAN2?**

Please provide justification for your preference.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | P2 can be further discussed in RAN1.  |
| Vivo | P1 should be discussed in RAN2.P2 can be discussed either in RAN1 or RAN2..P3 (#Rx part) have been excluded already by the following conclusion**Conclusion:*** + No consensus to support early identification of the number of Rx branches in Msg1/Msg3/MsgA for Redcap UE in Rel-17

P4 is beyond the WID scope for early indication. P5 can be discussed either in RAN1 or RAN2, our view is that simultaneously enabling MSG1 and MSG3 based early indication is not well justified.  |
| CATT | P1/2/5 can be further discussed. Better in RAN1, or leave it to RAN2 if no enough time or no consensus in RAN1. Anyway, a clear conclusion on the early indication phase is needed, due to 2 different early indication methods are supported in 4-step RACH. P3 is against the conclusion and P4 seems out of scope. |
| OPPO | P1, P2, P3 are acceptable for us. For P4, it is another issue to be discussed whether other capabilities of RedCap UE should be further early indicated, e.g. in Msg3. We are open for this issue. For P5, same early indication in both Msg1 and Msg3 should be justified. If it is reasonable, we are fine with P5, since it has no impacts on RAN1.  |
| DOCOMO | None of them should be discussed in RAN1. If RAN2 needs RAN1 input, it can be communicated via LS |
| Sharp | P1 and P5 can be further discussed in RAN1. Msg 1 early indication is involved in P1 and P5. RAN1 can discuss them and provide some information at least from RAN1 perspective to RAN2, if necessary.P2, P3(first bullet) and P4 can be left to RAN2. On P2, in last RAN2 meeting, they have a following agreement to specify how to enable/disable Msg 1 identification.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* Msg1 identification which can be configured to be enabled/disabled can be specified from RAN2 point of view.
 |

P3(first bullet) is related to Msg 3 early indication configuration and should be better discussed in RAN2. Remaining bullets of P3 are against RAN1 conclusion made in RAN1 105-e, as pointed out by vivo/CATT.On P4, LCID design belongs to RAN2’s scope. |
| MediaTek | The listed issues are best discussed in RAN2. |
| LG | Considering which WG makes decision on Msg1/Msg3 based early indication, how to enable Msg1 should be discussed in RAN1 while how to enable Msg3 should be discussed in RAN2. Thus, we think that P2 can be further discussed in RAN1.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | P2 can be discussed in RAN1. Others are RAN2 issues. |
| Xiaomi | P1 shall be discussed in RAN1, especially for the following subbullet* + If RedCap-dedicated RO/preambles are NOT configured and if separate initial UL BWP is configured, the RedCap UE shall indicate RedCap UE type during Msg3.

This subbullet would impact the reception of the PUCCH carrying HARQ feedback of Msg.4. RAN1 should provide such information to RAN2 |
| Ericsson | We agree with DOCOMO and others that none of them should be discussed in RAN1 unless RAN2 explicitly asks RAN1 for input. |
| Nokia, NSB | Share the same view as Ericsson and others.  |
| FUTUREWEI | There is no need to discuss any of these proposals in RAN1 now. RAN1 should focus on the capability discussion directly. Note that we agree P2 is in a sense true by default … if a resource is configured and can only be used by RedCap UEs then, it provides early identification. |
| Nordic  | We believe that all above issues are in RAN2 competence.  |
| Intel | Agree with DCM and others that all of these can (and should) be discussed first in RAN2 and RAN1 can pick up on any lower-layer relevant detail if asked by RAN2. |
| Panasonic | We think all proposals can be discussed in RAN2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | P2 can be discussed in RAN1 or RAN2. Others to be discussed in RAN2. |
| SPRD | P3 can be further discussed in RAN1. If early indication in both Msg1 and Msg3 is enabled simultaneously, and just indicate that a UE is RedCap, early indication in Msg3 only works as a duplicated function. It is kind of a waste. We prefer that in addition to “RedCap UE” additional information should be carried by early indications in both Msg1 and Msg3. |
| China Telecom | We think the above issues can be up to RAN2. |
| NEC | We share view with DOCOMO. |
| Sierra Wireless | RAN1 can indicate to RAN2 when to use Msg1 and Msg3 indication, from a RAN1 perspective. This discussion is clearly within the WID and includes RAN1: * *Specify functionality that will enable RedCap Ues to be explicitly identifiable to networks through an early indication in Msg1 and/or Msg3, and Msg A if supported,* ***including the ability for the early indication to be configurable by the network****. [RAN2, RAN1]*

E.g. using Msg3 indication requires no new physical layer resources where as Msg1 does require new physical layer resources so if additional coverage is only needed for 1 RX devices but not for 2 RX device, then less PRACH resources are needed. Thus P1, P2, P3, P5 can be discussed in RAN1 with respect to how Msg1 and Msg3 early indication can be configured by the network from a RAN1 perspective.P4 can be consider by RAN2.WRT P3, we feel this is NOT contradicting this conclusion: ***Conclusion:**** + *No consensus to support early identification of the number of Rx branches in Msg1/Msg3/MsgA for Redcap UE in Rel-17*

P3 does not propose adding indications of the Number RX of branches into Msg1/3/A but simply proposes a “***ability for the early indication to be configurable by the network”*** (as per the WID). |
| CMCC | P1,P2 and P3(first sub-bullet) are all about explicit or implicit enable and disable of Msg1 or Msg3 based early indication. The detail signaling is up to RAN2, RAN1 can discuss this and make some information for RAN2.From our understanding, enable of early indication will be based on explicit signaling, no matter for Msg1 and Msg3 based solution. While disable of early indication can be either a explicit or an implicit way.P4 and P5 is up to RAN2. |

* <1st Round Summary>

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 |
| RAN1 | CATT, OPPO, Sharp, Xiaomi, Sierra Wireless, CMCC | Vivo, OPPO, Lge, ZTE, Lenovo, Sierra Wireless, CMCC | Qualcomm, OPPO, SPRD, Sierra Wireless, CMCC |  | Vivo, Sharp, Sierra Wireless |
| RAN2 | Vivo, CATT, ZTE, Lenovo, SPRD | Vivo, Sharp, SPRD, | Sharp, ZTE, Lenovo,  | Sharp, ZTE, Lenovo, SPRD, Sierra Wireless, CMCC | Vivo, ZTE, Lenovo, SPRD, CMCC |
| All in RAN2 | DCM, MediaTek, Ericsson, Futurewei, Nordic, Intel, Panasonic, China Telecom, NEC |
| Others |  |  | Vivo (Not #Rx part), CATT (against conclusion),  | Vivo (beyond scope), CATT (out of scope),  |  |
| Num. of Companies | RAN1: 6RAN2: 15 | RAN1: 7RAN2: 13 | RAN1: 5RAN2: 14 | RAN1: 0RAN2: 17 | RAN1: 3RAN2: 15 |

Based on 1st round inputs, it is clear that major companies think these proposals should be discussed in RAN2 first. RAN1 discussion can be triggered by RAN2 LS.

### Issue 4: PRACH preamble partitioning for Msg1-based early indication

PRACH partitioning for 4-step and 2-step RACH procedure was discussed by several contributions [4,12,13,23,26,28,29, 30]. Contribution [12,13,23,30] indicates that PRACH resource handling across multiple new features was discussed in RAN2 115 Meeting under AI ‘8.18 RACH indication and partitioning’ and the following was concluded by RAN2 [34].

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreements:**1. Preamble partitioning is defined on a feature and/or feature combination basis. FFS on signalling. 2step RA and CE is excluded, if RAN1 decided to exclude2. Preambles associated with a Rel-17 feature should never be chosen by legacy UEs in the case of RO sharing. 3. New feature and/ feature combination specific preambles can be defined in a) Separate time-frequency resources, not defined through legacy RRC signalling, b) Within the Contention free preamble resources (i.e. within the preambles not used for contention based) defined through legacy RRC signalling. FFS on c) Within the “not available” preambles defined at the end of a RO through the legacy totalNumberOfRA-Preambles4. A common RRC CR capturing the signalling framework for RACH resource configuration across all the Wis should be used and this CR should be maintained as part of the common RACH agenda item. Each WI is expected to provide the necessary parameters to include in the signalling.5. A common MAC CR capturing the changes to sections 5.1.1 and section 5.1.1a of the MAC spec can also be considered and if agreeable, this CR should also be maintained as part of the common RACH agenda item.6. As a baseline, the RA procedure design for Rel-17 should adhere to the following general principles: a: Carrier selection (between NUL/SUL) should happen ahead of the initial RACH resource selection (i.e. feature combination is not considered in carrier selection). B: Initial RACH resource should be selected based on the selected carrier for the selected feature combination (i.e., selected slice, SDT or not, REDCAP or not etc). Only the RACH resource matching the feature and/or feature combination of current RACH procedure will be considered as available in the RACH resource selection.C: As a general rule, all RACH retransmissions (if any are needed, until RACH failure happens) shall be performed over the same RACH resources (and same carrier – NUL/SUL) as the one selected for initial RACH resource. However, we can discuss fallback on a case by case basis if there is a strong motivation and discuss them together in this AI. |

Given the RAN2 conclusion and ongoing discussion, contributions [12,13,23,28] further suggest deferring the discussion of PRACH preamble partitioning to RAN2, including support of Redcap early indication. One contribution [26] proposes to explicitly configure offset and number of consecutive preambles for the RedCap UE early identification irrespective of Ros are shared with non-RedCap UEs or not. However, one contribution [30] proposed to at least support the following PRACH resource configuration: 1) “RedCap UE with CE’, ‘RedCap UE without CE”, ‘non-RedCap UE with CE’ and ‘non-RedCap UE without CE’ to have different PRACH resources; 2) ‘RedCap UE without CE’ and ‘non-RedCap UE with CE’ to have different PRACH resources.

* <1st Round Comments>

**FL2 High Priority Proposal 4-1:**

* **It is up to RAN2 for PRACH preamble partitioning for Msg1-based early indication**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| LG | Y | The issue on PRACH preamble partitioning suddenly became related to other features. Considering RAN2 started to discuss PRACH preamble partitioning across multiple features, RAN1 could defer such discussion to RAN2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | In order to avoid the signalling wasting and duplicated work, which cases are supported or excluded should be discussed in RAN1.From RAN1 perspective, we already have decided the following cases for PRACH resource configuration are supported:Case 1: For RedCap UE with CE and RedCap UE without CE, non-RedCap UE with CE and non-RedCap UE without CE, they have different PRACH resources.Case 4: RedCap UE with CE and non-RedCap UE with CE share PRACH resources, RedCap UE without CE and non-RedCap UE with CE have different PRACH resources.We can further discuss whether the following cases for PRACH resource configuration are supported:Case 2: RedCap UE with CE and non-RedCap UE with CE share PRACH resources, RedCap UE without CE and non-RedCap UE with CE have different PRACH resourcesCase 3: RedCap UE with CE and non-RedCap UE with CE have different PRACH resources, RedCap UE without CE and non-RedCap UE with CE share the PRACH resources.The details can be found in [30]. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We support the proposal, given the ongoing RAN2 discussions regarding a unified RACH configuration principle, for features, such as, two-step RACH, RedCap, small data transfer (SDT), slicing, and coverage enhancement.  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y | RAN2 has email discussion on this aspect |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| Xiaomi |  | Generally, we are OK leave the RRC signalling design to RAN2. But before that, RAN1 at least need to discuss whether to support partial RO sharing by the configuration of PRACH Mask. In our understanding the support of PRACH mask is beneficial since it offers flexibility for the NW for RACH resource allocation depends on the number of RedCap Ues . And the PRACH Mask is already supported for the RO sharing between 2-step RACH and 4-step RACH. Although common signalling design depends on common PRACH partitioning in RAN2, RAN2 also requested each WI to provide the necessary parameters to be included in the signalling as stated in the following RAN2 agreement 1. *A common RRC CR capturing the signalling framework for RACH resource configuration across all the Wis should be used and this CR should be maintained as part of the common RACH agenda item. Each WI is expected to provide the necessary parameters to include in the signalling.*

Therefore, we need to discuss whether to include the parameter of PRACH mask in RAN1 |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |

One contribution [6] states that the configuration of early indication in 2-step RACH should be in line with 4-step RACH, which is motivated by the operation that a UE may fall back to 4-step RACH. One example provided in [6] is that if early indication in Msg1 is configured, for 2-step RACH early indication in MsgA preamble part is also configured.

# Definition of Redcap UE Type

## Issue 5: Redcap UE Type Definition

The WID stipulates that only one RedCap UE type should be specified [1]. Moreover, the following agreement was also made by RAN2 during RAN2#114-e [3].

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:1. […]
2. At least for early identification there will be only one RedCap UE (no need to define separate RedCap UE types for FR1 and FR2)
3. […]
 |

With regards to the definition of the RedCap UE type, the following agreement was made by RAN1 during RAN1#106-e [4]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* A RedCap UE type from RAN1 point of view supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz for FR1 and 100MHz for FR2
* Further discuss whether to capture also one or more of the following capabilities to RedCap UE type description
	+ Supports either 1 or 2 Rx branches and corresponding maximum DL MIMO layers
	+ Supports either FD-FDD or Type A HD-FDD operation for FR1 FDD bands
	+ Supports either DL up to 64 QAM or up to 256 QAM for FR1
	+ Does not support CA/DC
 |

Table 3 summarized companies’ preference on Redcap UE type definition with brief notes:

**Table 3: Definition of Redcap UE Type**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Proposal | ‘Yes’, or Partially ‘Yes’ | ‘No’ | Others |
| Adding the following components for Redcap device type definition: * Supports either 1 or 2 Rx branches and corresponding maximum DL MIMO layers
* Supports either FD-FDD or Type A HD-FDD operation for FR1 FDD bands
* Supports either DL up to 64 QAM or up to 256 QAM for FR1
* Does not support CA/DC
 | Ericsson [5], CATT [9, no need CA/DC], China Telecom [10], CMCC [11], Nokia [12], Lenovo [13], ZTE [14, no need HD-FDD, no need DL Modulation order], Xiaomi [15], Sierra Wireless [19], Panasonic ([21], No need of HD-FDD/FD-FDD); Sharp [24], Nordic [26] (capture *“Supports reduced number of Rx branches in bands where 4Rx branches are required*) | Only capabilities related to initial access procedure need to be included in the minimum capability set for RedCap Ues: * Huawei [3], vivo [7], Intel [17], DCM [18, defined by FG 28-1 in R1-2108679], NEC [20]
 | * Samsung [16]: Discuss in UE feature AI.
 |

It was observed by moderator that preferences from companies were almost no change compared to RAN1 #106 e-Meeting. Instead continue debating here, it seems more efficient to discuss this under ‘UE features for Redcap’ AI as recommended by [16] as well. It is moderator’s understanding that any components that agreed as part of ‘basic feature groups’ for Redcap device are essentially part of ‘Redcap device type’ as it can be assumed by network once UE claims to be ‘Redcap device’.

* <1st Round Comments>

**FL1 High Priority Question 3-1: Which Alternative is preferred by**

* + **Alt.1: Add support reduced number of Rx branches (i.e., 1 Rx/2 Rx branches) in addition to reduced BW**
	+ **Alt.2: Leave ‘Redcap Device Type’ definition to UE features of Redcap AI.**
		- **Note that: UE features that are defined as part of ‘Basic feature group’ for Redcap are included in the ‘Redcap Device Type’ definition.**
	+ **Alt.3: No additional component to be added for ‘Redcap Device Type’ definition.**

Moderator strongly recommends companies to compromise as much as possible on this issue, given the fact of lengthy and extensive discussions in past and only two meetings were left. Sticking to own preference is really no way to progress and move forward.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Alt 3 | A RedCap UE type from RAN1 point of view supports a maximum bandwidth of 20MHz for FR1 and 100MHz for FR2 |
| vivo | Alt3 | BW is enough to identify RedCap UE type, other features (e.g. #Rx, duplexing) can be optionally signaled by UE capability.  |
| CATT | Alt.1 or 2 |  |
| OPPO | Alt 2 | Besides BW, HD-FDD capability is also relevant to the initial access procedure. Also, the assumption of Rx branches can be used for optimization during initial access procedure. The performance will benefit from the ‘Basic feature group’ for Redcap.  |
| DOCOMO | Alt.2 or Alt.3 | RedCap UE type can be defined by FG 28-1 in R1-2108679. We are fine to further discuss in UE features of Redcap AI |
| Sharp | Alt.2 |  |
| MediaTek | Alt.2 is acceptable | Alt.3 is not acceptable. As an example, #Rx can’t be optional for RedCap UEs as suggested by some companies, what the gNB should assume if the UE doesn’t report it? There must be some “basic” support for this features, e.g. RedCap UE supports at least 1Rx, (and then 2Rx can be optional in this case). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt. 3 or leave to RAN2 | The issue mentioned by MTK is a signaling issue that RAN2 can handle. Also, there was a similar discussion regarding capturing URLLC related features of R15 in recent RAN e-meeting, and it was concluded that some texts can be summarized and captured for informative in TR instead of TS. This approach could be referred to by RAN2 if they need. From RAN1 perspective, there is no need to further discuss this. |
| LG | Alt 3 | Since we agree to support only one RedCap UE type, we prefer to avoid having multiple choices (e.g. 1 RX or 2 RX) for the RedCap UE type. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Alt. 1 or alt 2. | Alt. 1 is preferred. As the WID description, the motivation of RedCap type definition is to identify a RedCap UE or preclude a non-RedCap UE.Only bandwidth is not enough to declare itself a RedCap UE. For example, a UE with 20M bandwidth also reports 4Rx capability. Therefore, Rx also should be included.‘Not support CA/DC’ can determine a UE is not RedCap UE, therefore, it also can be considered for the RedCap type definition. |
| Xiaomi | 1st priority: Alt.12nd priority: Alt.2  | In our view, only including the maximum UE bandwidth is not sufficient considering the motivation to define RedCap UE type as described in the WID *  For RedCap UE identification
*  For constraining the use of those RedCap capabilities only for RedCap Ues
*  For preventing RedCap Ues from using capabilities not intended for RedCap Ues including at least carrier aggregation, dual connectivity and wider bandwidths

In our understanding, the second bullet implies that non-RedCap could use the capabilities not included in the RedCap’s definition and the third bullet implies RedCap are not constrained in the capabilities not included the RedCap definition. For example, if reduced Rx is not included in the RedCap definition, the consequence may become that the RedCap may use the same number of Rx with non-RedCap e.g., 20MHz+4Rx in TDD band or the non-RedCap devices may support reduced number of Rx e.g., 100MHz+1Rx in TDD band. On the other hand, we are also OK with Alt.2 for progress |
| Ericsson | Alt. 2 | This discussion can be handled in the Rel-17 RedCap UE feature list discussion. |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt 1 or Alt 2 | Prefer Alt 1, for reasons quoted by ZTE and Xiaomi.However, will consider Alt 2. |
| FUTUREWEI | Alt.2 or Alt.1 | The discussion belongs to AI 8.17.6 but it is important to note that without the reduced number of branches, it is then possible for RedCap Ues to support Reduced Bandwidth but NOT Reduced RX branches. |
| Nordic  | Alt 1 | We do not understand why we could not capture aspects/features agreed by Plenary for the RedCap UEs. At least Rx branches should captured since there is reduction from mandatory eMBB requirement in some bands. |
| Intel | Alt 3 (no CA/DC can be added) | No information, including constraints or support/prohibiting support for certain features/capabilities, is going to be lost with proper characterization of related UE features. Thus, for the basic definition itself, there does not seem to be much motivation to add further qualifiers beyond * **max single carrier BW**
* **no support of CA/DC**
* Additionally, to be very precise and fair, one could consider capturing that **RedCap UEs do not support more than 2Rx branches (i.e., max of 2 DL MIMO layers) in bands that require minimum of up to 4 DL MIMO layers for non-RedCap UEs**.

The remaining are all additional optional characteristics of RedCap UEs that will be captured anyway and does not need to be part of the definition. In fact, they do not uniquely identify RedCap UEs (e.g., # of DL MIMO layers in bands requiring up to 2 DL MIMO layers for non-RedCap UEs, etc.) and should be avoided to prevent any possible confusion. |
| Panasonic | Alt.1 | We are also ok with Alt.2 as it can be similar in our view. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt.1 or Alt.2 |  |
| SPRD | Alt.2 |  |
| China Telecom | Alt.1 or Alt.2 | We support Alt.1 or Alt.2. The RedCap-specific capabilities should be added in RedCap UE type definition. |
| NEC | Alt.2 or Alt.3 |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Alt 3 | Bandwidth is enough to identify RedCap UE type. Can also add CA/DC is not supported. |
| CMCC | Alt 1 or alt.2 | To our understanding, the definition of RedCap UE type is to differentiate it from non-RedCap devices, and give a picture of key capabilities that RedCap devices support. As the WID describes, the motivation for RedCap UE type definition is ”*Specify definition of one RedCap UE type including capabilities for RedCap UE identification and for constraining the use of those RedCap capabilities only for RedCap UEs, and preventing RedCap UEs from using capabilities not intended for RedCap UEs including at least carrier aggregation, dual connectivity and wider bandwidths*.” To constrain the use of those RedCap capabilities only for RedCap UEs and prevent RedCap UEs from using capabilities not intented for them, it should be clear enough that what RedCap capabilities they are supposed to use for RedCap UEs.OK with alt.2 considering the Note. |

* <1st Round Summary>

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Companies | Num. of Companies |
| Alt.1 | CATT, ZTE, Xiaomi, Nokia, Futurewei, Nordic, Panasonic, Lenovo, China Telecom, CMCC | 10 |
| Alt.2 | CATT, OPPO, DCM, Sharp, MTK, ZTE, Xiaomi, Ericsson, Nokia, Futurewei, Lenovo, SPRD, China Telecom, NEC, CMCC, Panasonic  | 16 |
| Alt.3 | Qualcomm, vivo, DCM, Huawei, LG, Intel, NEC, Sierra Wireless | 8 |

Among three alternatives, Alt.2 gets more support. Since anyhow the ‘basic feature group’ needs to be discussed for Redcap UE and per definition, it would be assumed by gNB once UE is identified as Redcap device, it should be fine for Alt.3 proponent to go with Alt.2.

* <2nd Round Comments>

**FL2 High Priority Proposal 5-1:**

* + **Alt.2: Leave ‘Redcap Device Type’ definition to UE features of Redcap AI.**
		- **Note that: UE features that are defined as part of ‘Basic feature group’ for Redcap are included in the ‘Redcap Device Type’ definition.**

Companies are invited to provide feedback. Please provide modification. If not, company was asked to provide what changes(s) are needed to make it acceptable.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | No special conclusion needed. RAN2 will also proceed as they are leading group. The conclusion in RAN1 will unnecessary prolong their progress.UE feature discussion is aimed to form the functionality that a UE needs to implement. The UE type definition now is more about a singalling and informative (to market) purpose. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | More specifically, we can further discuss it in AI 8.17.6. |
| Xiaomi | Y | We can live with it for progress |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB. | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | Share similar views as Huawei, but we can also live with Alt 2 to close this from RAN1’s perspective. |
| Samsung | Y | We also think that no conclusion is necessary, but OK to close the discussion. |

# 5. Cell Access Restriction

## Issue 6: Cell Access Restriction

One of objectives for Redcap WI is to support to indicate through SIB information about cell camping for Redcap UE as follows [1]:

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

RAN1 106-e Meeting made the following conclusion related to cell camping indication for Redcap [2]:

|  |
| --- |
| Conclusion* There is no consensus in RAN1 on whether to have the access barring indication in DCI scheduling SIB1, and RAN1 can come back if triggered by RAN2.
 |

Contributions [3] discussed the cell access restriction with the following proposals:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Proposals | Motivations |
| P1 [3] | Consider to restrict the access of RedCap Ues via SIB1* Access control specific to RedCap Ues with 1Rx or 2Rx via DCI associated with SIB1
 | Beneficial for power saving of the Ues and control flexibility of the gNB.  |
| P2 [3] | Different cell selection/reselection time for 1Rx or 2Rx can be configured by gNB. |

* <1st Round Comments>

**FL2 High Priority Proposal 6-1:**

* **Can we agree ‘P1’ and/or ‘P2’ listed above?**

**Please separately indicate for P1/P2, e.g., Ok for P1, Ok for P2.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| LG |  | We agree P1. |
| Ericsson | N | RAN1 does not need to continue the discussion about cell access restriction unless requested by RAN2. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | No to P1, unless we have a clear request from RAN2, as per the quoted RAN2 conclusion. |
| Nordic  | N | In RAN2 competence |
| Qualcomm | N | Let’s leave it to RAN2 to decide. |
| DOCOMO | N | They should be discussed in RAN2, if necessary. |
| Panasonic |  | As RAN1 106-e conclusion, RAN1 can come back if triggered by RAN2 |
| vivo | N | Agree with Ericsson and others.  |
| IDCC | N | We can leave it to RAN2. |
| Intel | N | Agree with others that this should be left up to RAN2. |
| Samsung | N | RAN2 can discuss this if they so decide. |

# 6. Other aspects

## Issue 7: Need of separate SIB1 for Redcap

Contribution [31,32] discussed SIB1 for Redcap Ues. In [31], it prefers to reuse the existing SIB1 and incorporate the new system information for RedCap. It was also pointed out in [31] that some modifications on short message field ‘*systemInfoModification*’ in paging DCI need to be discussed to improve the power consumption for SIB update when only Redcap-specific SIB information is updated in the shared SIB1. Contribution [32] proposed to introduce a new SIB1 (e.g., SIB1-R) used by REDCAP Ues. Several advantages of separate SIB1 for Redcap were listed in [32] including SIB1 size limitation and SIB1 transmission optimization for Redcap Ues. Regarding the separate SIB1 scheduling, it was stated in [32] that DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI can be used to schedule both legacy SIB1 and new SIB1-R by using some reserved bits in DCI to differentiate between these two SIBs.

* <1st Round Comments>

**FL2 High Priority Proposal7-1:**

* **Alt.1: Reuse the existing SIB1 and incorporate the new system information for RedCap.**
* **Alt.2: Introduce a new SIB1 (e.g., SIB1-R) used by REDCAP UEs**
* **Alt.3: Whether to introduce new SIB1 for Redcap UE is left up to RAN2.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| LG | Alt 2 or 3 | In 38.214, it is specified that the UE is not expected to receive a PDSCH assigned by a PDCCH with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI with a TBS exceeding 2976 bits. Considering that RAN2 previously discussed this limitation of SIB1 for Rel-15 specification and RAN1 may introduce new RedCap specific parameters for UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE, we think that it is beneficial to introduce a new SIB1 used by RedCap UEs. We think that analysis of new RedCap specific parameters (e.g. new RACH configurations for early indication and a new initial BWP configuration) and the roughly expected size of new parameters is a prerequisite for introduction of a new SIB1. Thus, RAN1 could first inform RAN2 about roughly estimated size of new RedCap specific parameters. Then, RAN2 could make final decision on whether a new SIB1 is needed or not. |
| Ericsson | Alt. 1 or 3 | If some PHY related issue is found out by RAN1 then RAN2 should be made aware, but unless there is some clear issue in reusing SIB1, we should not design new procedures. |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt.1 or Alt.3 | Without clear justification, we do not see a need for Alt.2. |
| FUTUREWEI | Alt.3 | Because RAN2 understands the size of SIB1, it can determine whether to introduce a new SIB1 |
| Nordic | Alt.1 or Alt 3 | No need for separate REDCAP SIB1 in our opinion, and if it should be defined it should be decided by RAN2 |
| Qualcomm | Alt 1 or Alt 3 |  |
| DOCOMO | Alt 1 or Alt 3 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt 1 or Alt 3 |  |
| Xiaomi | Alt 1 or Alt 3 |  |
| Panasonic | Alt.3 |  |
| vivo | Alt3 | Should be decided by RAN2.  |
| IDCC | Alt3 |  |
| Intel | Alt 1 or Alt 3 |  |
| Samsung | Alt3 | RAN2 can further discuss whether to introduce a new SIB1 or reuse the existing SIB1. |

* P1 [7]: Relative criterion that the comparison on maximum channel bandwidth for a UE can support and the cell is operating (i.e. by locationAndBandwidth) should be used by the UE to determine whether it is a RedCap UE or not.

## Issue 8: Measurements for Redcap with reduced number of Rx branches

One contribution [8] suggest discussing measurement related issues caused by reduced numbrer of Rx branches with the following proposals:

* P1 [8]: A relaxed RSRP thresholds is used for RedCap Ues to select SSB for performing random access.
* P2 [8]: Other measurement related thresholds are configured specifically for RedCap Ues with reduced Rx branches number.
* <1st Round Comments>

**FL2 High Priority Question 5-2: Which of P1/P2 can be agreed for Redcap measurement? If none, please provide brief justification.**

* **P1 [8]: A relaxed RSRP thresholds is used for RedCap Ues to select SSB for performing random access.**
* **P2 [8]: Other measurement related thresholds are configured specifically for RedCap Ues with reduced Rx branches number.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Y, P1 and P2 | As we stated in our contribution, the reduced Rx branches number of RedCap UE causes some measurement related issues, if related thresholds are not relaxed for RedCap UE. Although it is mainly a RAN2 issue, RAN2 may not discuss the relaxed threshold without RAN1’s observation and information. We suggest to identify this issue in RAN1, and inform RAN2 for detailed RRC parameters standardization.  |
| LG | N | The benefit of P1 is not clear to us. P2 could be left for RAN2 and/or RAN4. |
| Ericsson | N | These proposals can be treated in RAN2 and RAN4. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | Same view as LG |
| FUTUREWEI | P1 and P2 | Similar view as oppo |
| Nordic  | N | This issues are RAN2 and RAN4 competence |
| China Telecom |  | We are open to relaxed RSRP thresholds for RedCap UEs, which needs RAN4 input. |
| Qualcomm | N | Measurements of RedCap UE are not in the scope of RAN1 objectives. They should be discussed/specified by RAN2 and RAN4. |
| DOCOMO | N | They should be discussed in RAN2 and RAN4, if necessary. |
| Panasonic |  | P1/P2 could be left for RAN2 and/or RAN4. |
| vivo | N | Same comment as many companies above.  |
| IDCC | None | Same view as LG. |
| Intel | None | Up to RAN2/RAN4. |
| Samsung | N | Overall we do not see a need for this type of optimization. Additionally, the network can always set a threshold that would allow also 1RX RedCap UE to receive an SSB with an RSRP about such threshold and be able to initiate the random access procedure. |

**SSB/CORESET#0 and initial UL/DL Configuration**

Contribution [25] discussed various aspects for Redcap device, including system information configuration (e.g., PUCCH resource), BWP Configuration (e.g., CORESET#0/SSB in a separate initial DL BWP and associated CSS for Redcap device) and L2 buffer size reduction. These topics have been handled in other Redcap agendas already (e.g., AI 8.6.1.1 and AI 8.6.1.3) and it is reasonable to continue discussing over there to avoid duplicated efforts.

**RA-RNTI Overlapping handling**

One contribution [27] provides different solutions to address the RA-RNTI collision issue. However, the following was agreed in RAN1 106-e meeting to leave this problem for RAN2 [2]:

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion:*** Whether there is RA-RNTI overlapping issue and how to address RA-RNTI overlapping issue in the early indication of RedCap Ues in Msg1 in Rel-17 is up to RAN2.
 |

# 7. Conclusion

# Annex: Companies’ point of contact

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point of contact** | **Email address** |
| Qualcomm | Jing Lei | leijing@qti.qualcomm.com |
| vivo | Xueming Pan | panxueming@vivo.com |
| CATT | Yongqiang FEI | feiyongqiang@catt.cn |
| DOCOMO | Shinya Kumagai | shinya.kumagai@docomo-lab.com |
| Sharp | Liqing Liu | liu.liqing@sharp.co.jp |
| MediaTek | Mohammed Al-Imari | Mohammed.Al-Imari@mediatek.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Wang Yi | wangyi6@huawei.com |
| LG Electronics | Youngdae Lee | youngdae.lee@lge.com |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Youjun Hu | hu.youjun1@zte.com.cn |
| Xiaomi | Qin MU | muqin@xiaomi.com |
| Ericsson | Johan Bergman | johan.bergman@ericsson.com |
| Futurewei | Vip Desai | enov.desai@futurewei.com |
| Nordic | Karol Schober | karol.schober@nordicsemi.no |
| Intel Corporation | Debdeep Chatterjee | debdeep.chatterjee@intel.com |
| Panasonic | Shotaro Maki | maki.shotaro@jp.panasonic.com |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yuantao Zhang | zhangyt18@lenovo.com |
| China Telecom | Jing Guo | guojing6@chinatelecom.cn |
| NEC | Takahiro Sasaki | takahiro.sasaki@nec.com |
| Sierra Wireless | Serkan Dost | sdost@sierrawireless.com |
| Samsung | Carmela Cozzo | carmela.c@samsung.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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