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# 1 Introduction

This feature lead (FL) summary (FLS) concerns the Rel-18 study item (SI) on further NR RedCap UE complexity reduction [1, 2, 3]. This Rel-18 study item was preceded by a Rel-17 study item [4, 5] and a Rel-17 work item [6, 7, 8].

This document summarizes contributions [9] – [35] submitted to agenda item 9.6.1 and relevant parts of contributions [36] – [49] submitted to 9.6.2 and 9.6.3 and captures this email discussion on reduced maximum UE bandwidth:

|  |
| --- |
| [109-e-R18-RedCap-02] Email discussion on further UE complexity reduction by May 20 – Johan (Ericsson)   * Check points: May 18 |

The section numbering in this document follows the draft TR skeleton in [3]. The issues in this document are tagged and color coded with High Priority or Medium Priority. The issues that are in the focus of this round of the discussion are furthermore tagged FL5. The discussion in the previous round is captured in the FLS in [50].

Follow the naming convention in this example:

* *eRedCapComplexityFLS2-v000.docx*
* *eRedCapComplexityFLS2-v001-CompanyA.docx*
* *eRedCapComplexityFLS2-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*
* *eRedCapComplexityFLS2-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx*

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

* Assume CompanyC wants to update *eRedCapComplexityFLS2-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*.
* CompanyC uploads an empty file named *eRedCapComplexityFLS2-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 *eRedCapComplexityFLS2-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx*
* If no update is uploaded in 30 minutes, other companies can ignore the checkout file.
* Note that the file timestamps on the server are in UTC time.

In file names, please use the hyphen character (not the underline character) and include ‘v’ in front of the version number, as in the examples above and in line with the general recommendation (see slide 16 in [R1-2203012](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_109-e/Docs/R1-2203012.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.

**FL5 Question 1-1a: Please consider entering contact info below for the points of contact for this email discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point of contact** | **Email address** |
| FUTUREWEI | Vip Desai | vipul.desai@futurewei.com |
| Spreadtrum | Sicong Zhao | sicong.zhao@unisoc.com |
| Panasonic | Shotaro Maki | maki.shotaro@jp.panasonic.com |
| CATT | Yongqiang FEI | feiyongqiang@catt.cn |
| vivo | Lihui Wang | wanglihui@vivo.com |
| Qualcomm | Yongjun Kwak | yongkwak@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Transsion | Sha Wang | sha.wang@transsion.com |
| Nordic | Karol Schober | karol.schober@nordicsemi.no |
| NEC | Takahiro Sasaki | takahiro.sasaki@nec.com |
| ZTE | Youjun Hu | hu.youjun1@zte.com.cn |
| Ericsson | Sandeep Narayanan Kadan Veedu | sandeep.narayanan.kadan.veedu@ericsson.com |
| NTT DOCOMO | Mayuko Okano | mayuko.okano.ca@nttdocomo.com |
| Samsung | Feifei Sun | feifei.sun@samsung.com |
| LGE | Jay KIM | jaehyung.kim@lge.com |
| Intel | Yingyang Li | yingyang.li@intel.com |
| OPPO | Zhisong Zuo | zuozhisong@oppo.com |
| Xiaomi | Xuemei Qiao | qiaoxuemei@xiaomi.com |
| Nokia | Rapeepat Ratasuk | rapeepat.ratasuk@nokia-bell-labs.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Frank Long | frank.longyi@huawei.com |
| Lenovo | Yuantao Zhang | zhangyt18@lenovo.com |
| Sierra Wireless | Dejan Donin | ddonin@sierrawireless.com |
| Sharp | Xiaojun Ma | xiaojun.ma@cn.sharp-world.com |
| SONY | Martin Beale | martin.beale@sony.com |
| CMCC | Lijie Hu | hulijie@chinamobile.com |
| MediaTek | Chiou-Wei Tsai | cw.tsai@mediatek.com |
| Sequans | Efstathios Katranaras | ekatranaras@sequans.com |
| InterDigital | Erdem Bala | erdem.bala@interdigital.com |

# 6 Evaluation methodology

6.1 Evaluation methodology for UE complexity reduction

According to the Rel-18 study item description (SID) on further NR RedCap UE complexity reduction [1], further UE complexity reduction techniques should be studied based on Rel-17 evaluation methodology in TR 38.875 [4].

Several contributions [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 25, 27, 32, 38, 42] provide their views on the cost estimate methodology and present some initial results for Rel-18 enhanced RedCap (“eRedCap”). Regarding the cost estimation methodology, these contributions state that the detailed cost breakdown for the reference NR devices (as provided in Table 6.1-1 in TR 38.875 [4]) should be reused, where the RF-to-baseband cost ratio was assumed to be 40:60 for an FR1 UE. Also, [37] mentions that the selection of reference UE needs to be discussed for Rel-18 RedCap UE cost evaluation.

For cost saving evaluations compared to a Rel-17 baseline, contributions present their results with respect to different versions of Rel-17 RedCap UEs. For example, [10, 12, 14, 21, 39, 42] consider the simplest Rel-17 RedCap (with 20 MHz, 1 Rx, 1 layer, DL 64QAM, HD-FDD or TDD) as the baseline. In particular, the potential further UE complexity reduction features in Rel-18 are considered in combination with the mentioned simplest Rel-17 features [10, 36, 39]. One contribution [9] proposes to define a baseline Rel-17 RedCap UE that supports 20 MHz, 1 Rx, 1 layer, DL 64QAM without HD FDD.

* [9]: Define a baseline Rel-17 RedCap UE that supports a maximum 20 MHz bandwidth, one Rx branch, one MIMO layer, and a maximum DL modulation order of 64QAM.
* [10]: The potential gain of further complexity reduction in Rel-18 should be evaluated with respect to the simplest Rel-17 RedCap UEs.
* [21]: The results of the Rel-18 complexity reduction features are compared against a baseline Rel-17 RedCap UE (20 MHz) with 1Tx-1Rx, 64-QAM DL/ UL, HD-FDD or TDD.
* [36]: The cost evaluation for Rel-18 feature(s) should be carried out by comparing to the simplest Rel-17 RedCap.
  + Comparison of ‘all R17 RedCap features’ and ‘all Rel-17 RedCap features + Rel-18 feature(s)’.

Based on the views provided by contributions, the following questions can be considered regarding the evaluation methodology for Rel-18 UE complexity reduction.

**FL1 High Priority Question 6.1-1a: For cost reduction estimation, can the detailed cost breakdown for the Rel-15 reference NR devices (as provided in Table 6.1-1 in TR 38.875 [4]) be reused?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | We think both of the following alternatives are OK.   * Alternative 1: reuse the same reference NR device as R17 RedCap UE. * Alternative 2: take R17 RedCap device as reference. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Transsion | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y, but | It should be possible to challenge companies numbers before included into average. In other words, the cost reductions estimates should be justified technically. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y, in general | As discussed in Question 6.1-3a, L2 buffer size reduction aspects can be studied additionally. |
| Samsung | Y | We suggest to use R-15 cost breakdown.  No need to spend time on analysis R17 Redcap UE breakdown, considering we only have two meeting in this SI, and there are many options for R17 Redcap UEs |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 6.1-1b: For cost reduction estimation, the detailed cost breakdown for the Rel-15 reference NR devices (as provided in Table 6.1-1 in TR 38.875 [4]) is reused.** | |
| FL3 | The following agreement was made in the online (GTW) session on Thursday 12th May:  Agreement:  For cost reduction estimation, the detailed cost breakdown for the Rel-15 reference NR devices (as provided in Table 6.1-1 in TR 38.875) is reused. | |

**FL1 High Priority Question 6.1-2a: For comparison with a Rel-17 baseline when evaluating the potential Rel-18 UE complexity reduction features, can the simplest Rel-17 RedCap (with 20 MHz, 1 Rx, 1 layer, DL 64QAM, HD-FDD or TDD) be considered as the baseline? If no, please provide your comments with your proposed baseline.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We support having a Rel-17 baseline when evaluating potential Rel-18 complexity features. In our baseline, we used (20 MHz, 1 Rx, 1 layer, DL 64QAM) while excluding HD-FDD.  In our view, HD-FDD is a limited use case with access restrictions. We should not make a decision about whether to support complexity technique based on HD-FDD, but we could support HD-FDD if a majority of companies want to include it as part of the baseline. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | We agree with the proposed baseline. We do prefer to include HD-FDD as part of the baseline. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | Further question is: do we need to establish the detailed cost breakdown for the baseline (simplest Rel-17 RedCap)? After combine all the features (20 MHz, 1 Rx, 1 layer, DL 64QAM, HD-FDD or TDD), the rest cost of each component may need to be calibrated, e.g., take the average of all the values provided by companies. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | Take R17 RedCap with low end configuration as baseline is reasonable. |
| CATT |  | We think Rel-15 NR UE can still be a baseline. Nevertheless, we are open to reconsider defining a Rel-17 reference RedCap UE as the baseline.  Besides, to align TDD and FDD as much as possible, HD-FDD is not needed. Anyway, Type A HD-FDD is a common option feature to both Rel-17 RedCap and Rel-18 eRedCap in paired spectrum. For cost reduction, we should focus on the difference, rather than something common. |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Sharp |  | HD-FDD as a standalone feature is not available in many cases of R17-redcap UE. We don’t think HD-FDD shall be made as the sole baseline for FDD/eRedCap evaluation. |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Transsion | Y | Take simplest Rel-17 RedCap (with 20 MHz, 1 Rx, 1 layer, DL 64QAM, FDD or TDD) as baseline is reasonable while excluding HD-FDD. Half duplex can be estimated separately as TR 38.875. |
| Nordic | N | Not sure why FD-FDD product cost could not be reduced as well in R18. We should indeed look at HD-FDD and FD-FDD and TDD separately. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | We are also fine with having two sets of evaluation results, one for HD-FDD UEs and one for FD-FDD UEs, although we see a risk that the evaluation results will be less thorough if some companies only provide results for one of the cases.  Regarding Spreadtrum’s suggestion to establish a detailed cost breakdown for the simplest Rel-17 RedCap UE, we think that it can (and should) simply be included as one of the combinations to evaluate. (Ideally, it would have been good to agree on a common detailed cost breakdown for the simplest Rel-17 RedCap UE before carrying on with evaluation of the further complexity reduction techniques, but there does not seem to be enough time for such an additional step in the evaluation process due to the limited time for this study item.) |
| DOCOMO |  | We share the same view with CATT that Rel-15 NR UE can be the baseline, and hence it is necessary to discuss which UE of Rel-15 or Rel-17 RedCap can be the reference UE before we discuss the baseline for Rel-17 RedCap UE. |
| Samsung |  | We think HD-FDD shall not be the baseline.  FD-FDD and TDD shall be the baseline. |
| IDCC |  | We prefer FD-FDD and TDD. |
| LGE | Y | Taking the least complex (or most cost efficient) Rel-17 RedCap device for comparison with the Rel-18 RedCap study seems reasonable to us. Taking the HD-FDD as baseline in FDD bands is fine for us. Also looking into both the HD-FDD and FDD in FDD bands is fine for us. |
| SONY | Y | Include HD-FDD in the Rel-17 baseline. Including HD-FDD in the Rel-17 baseline does not preclude complexity reduction of FD-FDD UEs. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| OPPO |  | We think HD-FDD should be removed as this is not baseline case. Too much impact by HD-FDD in performance. BTW, FR1 also have TDD. |
| Xiaomi |  | Both FD-FDD and TDD shall be the baseline |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | OK with (20 MHz, DL 64QAM) while excluding HD-FDD.  We could assume all networks support 20Mhz, 1Rx, 1 layer and DL 64QAM because the network can configure and schedule a legacy UE with such setting. However, we cannot assume HD-FDD is supported by all networks since it is not a mandatory UE feature for Rel-17 RedCap and it also requires non-trivial gNB implementation. With limited access to network, it is not true that UEs can always get cost reduction from HD-FDD. Therefore, HD-FDD cannot be a baseline. FD-FDD and TDD should be the baseline.  Regarding 1Rx or 2 Rx, we prefer to also evaluate Rel-17 2Rx v.s. Rel-18 2Rx because 2Rx has better performance than 1Rx for all use cases while 1Rx is mainly used for wearable use case only. We believe Rel-18 RedCap is not limited to wearable UE only. Therefore, suggest both 1Rx and 2Rx as baseline. |
| FL2 | A slight majority of the received responses answered yes, whereas almost half of the responses express that the complexity reduction evaluation should include comparison with a reference Rel-17 RedCap UE that supports FD-FDD. Some responses indicated that they would be ok with two sets of evaluation results, one set comparing Rel-17 FD-FDD UEs with Rel-18 FD-FDD UEs and another set comparing Rel-17 HD-FDD UEs with Rel-18 HD-FDD UEs. One response proposed to evaluate both UEs with 1 Rx and UEs with 2 Rx.  **High Priority Proposal 6.1-2b: For comparison with a Rel-17 baseline when evaluating the potential Rel-18 UE complexity reduction features,**   * **The Rel-17 RedCap UE supports 20 MHz, 1 Rx, 1 layer, DL 64QAM, FD-FDD or TDD.** * **In addition, optional results for the following comparisons can also be reported:**   + **Results for HD-FDD UEs**   + **Results for UEs with 2 Rx** * **In all comparisons, the UEs being compared have the same number of antenna branches, the same number of layers, the same maximum supported modulation order, and the same duplex mode (among HD-FDD, FD-FDD, and TDD).** | |
| FL3 | The following agreement was made in the online (GTW) session on Thursday 12th May:  Agreement:  For comparison with a Rel-17 baseline when evaluating the potential Rel-18 UE complexity reduction features,   * The Rel-17 RedCap UE supports 20 MHz, 1 Rx, 1 layer, DL 64QAM, UL 64QAM, FDD or TDD. * In addition, optional results for the following comparisons can also be reported:   + Results for HD-FDD UEs   + Results for UEs with 2 Rx * In all comparisons, the UEs being compared have the same number of antenna branches, the same number of layers, the same maximum supported modulation order, and the same duplex mode (among HD-FDD, FD-FDD, and TDD). | |

Furthermore, L2 buffer size reduction aspect is mentioned in [9, 12, 14]. In [9], it is argued that it may not be worthwhile to spend time re-discussing L2 buffer size in Rel-18 as it is difficult to estimate its complexity reduction at the physical layer. Contribution [14] states that clarification about L2 buffer size reduction for peak rate reduction is important. Contribution [36] proposes to consider the cost of memory (external to the RF and BB parts) in the study.

**FL1 High Priority Question 6.1-3a: Should the impact on memory size/cost/complexity (external to the RF and BB parts) be studied/evaluated/captured somehow? Please elaborate in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | N | No changes are needed as the SID says the evaluation methodology is based on TR 38.875.  Even considering memory for the L2 buffer size will complicate the analysis:   * The ratio of RF complexity and baseband complexity may change (possibly in the reference model) – making comparisons to very difficult * The L2 buffer is also dependent on implementation, as the memory needed may be slower that the memory for HARQ * Because L2 memory is smaller since units are bits, not LLRs, the overall complexity for memory is smaller than for HARQ. |
| Sierra Wireless | N | Cost savings would be small. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | Rel-17 evaluation methodology is only focus on RF and BB, but the situation is there is no much room for cost reduction in RF and BB on top of R17 simplest RedCap.  However, BW reduction to 5MHz and reduced peak data rate are both lead to a lower peak data rate, which means lower L2 buffer size requirements. According to 38.306, if the peak data rate can be reduced from 80Mbps to 10Mbps, the L2 buffer size can be reduced by 87%. Further, lower peak data rate/L2 buffer size corresponding to lower memory requirements (e.g., model selection, from LPDDR to PSRAM), then the less cost of memory. At least from our perspective, the cost reduction for memory is significant, and it is another important motivation for R18 RedCap.  We understand that it is difficult and lack of time to establish an evaluation methodology for memory (external to the RF and BB parts), but we can **at least capture the information (e.g., the memory cost can be reduced by R18 features) in the TR** to convey correct and positive information to the vertical industries. |
| CMCC |  | We are open for such analysis if they do have non-negligible cost reduction gain, and if the performance impact and spec impact are small. |
| CATT |  | Open to consider. |
| vivo |  | We are open to study. |
| Sharp |  | Open |
| Qualcomm | N | It is clearly stated in SID that “Study further UE complexity reduction techniques based on Rel-17 evaluation methodology in TR 38.875”. In Rel-17, we have not evaluated additional memory cost which is external to RF/BB parts. Following the SID, we need to keep the same methodology for Rel-18 study. |
| Transsion |  | Open to discuss |
| Nordic | Y | Memory size and its cost and size should be clearly considered. And L2buffer size is not the only aspect, softbit memory should be considered as well.  It is not clear whether above is already reflected in HARQ buffer. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We are open to consider. |
| Ericsson |  | We are open to capture impact on memory size/cost/complexity qualitatively, but it should not be included in the quantitative evaluation (since that would mean that the cost breakdown for the reference UE cannot be reused). |
| DOCOMO |  | Open to consider the complexity reduction on memory size. |
| Samsung |  | We are open to capture some analysis on memory as commented by Spreadtrum. |
| IDCC |  | We are open to consider. |
| LGE | N | Unless the impact is significant, and we think it is not, we prefer to rely on the existing setup in TR 38.875. |
| SONY |  | Our preference is to focus on RAN1 aspects, hence we would not consider L2 buffer size. We agree with Spreadtrum’s comment that “**at least capture the information (e.g., the memory cost can be reduced by R18 features) in the TR**” |
| Intel | N | We prefer to not consider it. Otherwise, as commented by Futurewei, we need to adjust the reference model, and the cost breakdown for Rel-17 UE too. |
| OPPO |  | We can consider it as additional justification and does not affect the template. |
| Xiaomi |  | We are open to discuss. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | This should not be evaluated since there is no agreed evaluation methodology at the physical layer and we lack a baseline for Rel-17 RedCap UE. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Open to consider |
| FL2 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 6.1-3b: The impact on memory size/cost/complexity (external to the RF and BB parts) can be studied and captured in the TR, but it is not included in the quantitative UE complexity reduction estimates.** | |
| FL3 | The proposal above was discussed in the online (GTW) session on Thursday 12th May. The latest version of the proposal discussed during the session looked like this:   |  | | --- | | The impact on cost/complexity (external to the RF and BB parts) can be studied and captured in the TR, but it is not included in the quantitative UE complexity reduction estimates.  FFS： memory size, whether/how to be captured in the TR |   Based on the discussion, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 6.1-3c:**   * **Study of the impact on memory size/cost/complexity (external to the RF and BB parts) from the studied UE complexity reduction features is optional.**   + **This potential impact will not be included in the quantitative UE complexity reduction estimates.**   + **L2 buffer size assumptions can be based on TS 38.306 clause 4.1.4 (“Total layer 2 buffer size for DL/UL”).** | |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | N | The techniques in the scope of the SID are to reuse the methodology from the Rel-17 study (which we confirmed yesterday). This technique will show no benefit under the agreed methodology. The current wording seems to allow an SI exception for this technique, which in our view is not warranted. As commented, there should be “FFS whether/how to capture in the TR” |
| CATT | Y | Also OK to add ‘FFS whether/how to capture in the TR’ as a sub-bullet. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | @ FUTUREWEI, from our perspective, memory size/cost/complexity reduction is not a technique, it is simply a positive consequence of the introduction of R18 technique (e.g., Memory cost will be reduced by BW reduction and/or reduced peak data rate). What we need to do is show this positive information to the vertical. As mentioned by Johan, **we don’t even need the quantitative estimates, maybe just a qualitative description is enough.** |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| SONY | Y | Hopefully, it is clear that “size/cost/complexity” in the phrase “memory size/cost/complexity” all refer to memory-size/memory-cost/memory-complexity. This seemed to be unclear during the GTW on 12 May.  While we are not a proponent of reducing L2 buffer size, presumably RAN2 could consider applying a new formula for Rel-18 Redcap UEs in section 4.1.4 of 38.306. This is a RAN2 issue anyway, that doesn’t need to be considered in RAN1. |
| Samsung | Y | We are open to have some qualitative analysis on the memory size.  Qualitative analysis of the impact on   * **~~Study of the~~ Qualitative analysis of the impact on memory size/cost/complexity (external to the RF and BB parts) from the studied UE complexity reduction features can be considered in the study ~~optional~~.**   + **This potential impact will not be included in the quantitative UE complexity reduction estimates.**   + **L2 buffer size assumptions can be based on TS 38.306 clause 4.1.4 (“Total layer 2 buffer size for DL/UL”).** |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| LGE |  | With the understanding that the intention is just to estimate the memory-size/memory-cost/memory-complexity with the introduction of Rel-18 RedCap, then we would not object to study it.  Still how to capture it in the TR can be discussed later. |
| Ericsson | Y | We are also fine with suggestions from FUTUREWEI, CATT, and Samsung. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y | We are open for study. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are OK to consider this on the qualitative level. |
| Xiaomi |  | Based on this proposal, the evaluation methodology for memory cost reduction may should be further discussed later which is not included in the TR38.875. While, we think it is unnecessary due to the limited TU.  Besides, the memory size/cost/complexity is also reduced for R17 RedCap UE with BW reduction/RX reduction/Modulation order relaxation, but there is no study on memory size/cost/complexity reduction yet. |
| Sequans | Y | It will be useful to capture for Rel.18 RedCap studied features a qualitative indication of their impact on memory. |
| FL4 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 6.1-3d:**   * **~~Study~~ Qualitative analysis of the impact on memory size/cost/complexity (external to the RF and BB parts) from the studied UE complexity reduction features ~~is optional~~ can be considered in the study.**   + **This potential impact will not be included in the quantitative UE complexity reduction estimates.**   + **L2 buffer size assumptions can be based on TS 38.306 clause 4.1.4 (“Total layer 2 buffer size for DL/UL”).**   + **FFS whether/how to capture in the TR** | |
| Intel | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We can accept |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y, but | it is a bit unclear what “qualitative analysis” would be  Google says for “qualitative”: relating to, measuring, or measured by the quality of something rather than its quantity.  Therefore, we suggest the following wording (FFS is fine)  **The impact on memory size/cost/complexity (external to the RF and BB parts) from the studied UE complexity reduction features ~~is optional~~ can be considered in the study.**  **….** |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| LGE | Y | We are okay with this proposal. |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 6.1-3e:**   * **~~Qualitative analysis of~~ The impact on memory size/cost/complexity (external to the RF and BB parts) from the studied UE complexity reduction features can be considered in the study.**   + **This potential impact will not be included in the quantitative UE complexity reduction estimates.**   + **L2 buffer size assumptions can be based on TS 38.306 clause 4.1.4 (“Total layer 2 buffer size for DL/UL”).**   + **FFS whether/how to capture in the TR** | |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |

Beyond the cost/complexity reduction evaluations, many contributions provide their initial evaluations on the impacts of different potential complexity reduction features [9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 19, 23, 24, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35]. It seems to be a common understanding that for each potential further UE complexity reduction feature, the performance impacts, coexistence impacts, specification impacts need to be analyzed. Therefore, the following question can be considered.

**FL1 High Priority Question 6.1-4a: For each potential Rel-18 further UE complexity reduction feature, should the performance impacts, coexistence impacts, and specification impacts be evaluated as listed in the draft TR skeleton [3]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Partial Y | The question should be formulated to be independent of the ongoing skeleton discussion. We are OK to include subsections for Performance impacts, Network and coexistence impacts, and Specification impacts, but not (for now) any particular structure within Performance impacts. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | This is what has been done during R17 SI. For the coexistence impacts, and specification impacts, evaluation if mainly based on analysis. While for performance impacts, evaluation can be based on either SLS/LLS evaluation or analysis. |
| CATT | Y in general | Some features have already been analyzed in Rel-17, e.g. relax processing time. For these features we can just quote Rel-17 TR for simplicity. |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Transsion | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | Since the baseline is R17 RedCap UE, some updates for relax processing time also are needed, e.g., the additional complexity reduction based on R17 RedCap UE, more description regarding CSI relaxing. |
| Ericsson | Y | We are fine with Futurewei’s name proposal “Network and coexistence impacts”. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| LGE | Y in general | Okay in general. But, how it is captured in the TR can be discussed separately. |
| SONY | Y | The TR should say something about performance impacts, coexistence impacts and specification impacts. We would like to avoid a deep-dive / large simulation campaign, given the limited number of TU in this study. Some results from TR38.875 can be included in the current TR or cross-referenced from the current TR. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | But better not to overlap with the discussion for TR skeleton. |
| FL2  FL3 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered. The detailed meaning of “Performance impacts” remains to be decided.  **High Priority Proposal 6.1-4b: For each potential Rel-18 further UE complexity reduction feature, at least the following aspects will be studied:**   * **UE complexity reduction** * **Performance impacts** * **Network and coexistence impacts** * **Specification impacts** | |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| vivo | Need clarification | We are generally fine with the proposal.  But we see some overlapping between Performance impacts and NW impacts. So, we would like to clarify what metrics are included in performance impacts e.g. coverage, latency etc. and what are covered by NW impacts e.g. Network capacity and spectral efficiency? |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | For Vivo's question, most of the network aspects raised in the Rel-18 workshop discussions were deployment related not capacity related. We do not think network capacity needs to be evaluated for Rel-18, but if RAN1 agrees to do so, it would be under Performance. |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | In fact these are mostly required by SID. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | Yes, as these follow guidelines in SID. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | We are fine with the proposal. We share the similar view with vivo’s comment that performance impact aspects include at least coverage, reliability and latency, and NW impact aspects include at least NW capacity/spectral efficiency (if RAN1 evaluate) and impacts on Rel-17 RedCap/legacy UEs. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Need clarification | The network impacts, e.g., deployment related, need to be further clarified. Does the deployment related impacts mean the impacts on Rel-18 RedCap UE deployment or legacy NW deployment or any others? |
| LGE | Y | Okay in general. But, we think whether/how to evaluate the NW capacity/spectral efficiency should be discussed separately. If it is not quite sure at this moment, we could just add a square bracket to the Network or put FFS whether/how to evaluate NW capacity/spectral efficiency, and then continue the discussion next week. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | In TR38.875, the performance impact includes Coverage, Network capacity and spectral efficiency, Data rate, Latency and reliability, Power consumption, PDCCH blocking rate.  Among these, Network capacity and spectral efficiency is network impact, and for R17 bandwidth reduction, it states that “Bandwidth reduction in FR1 will not have a significant impact on capacity and spectral efficiency, although there may be some minor degradation due to the loss in frequency selective scheduling gain.” Whether and how to provide Network capacity and spectral efficiency can be further discussed.  Another network impact we need to consider is overhead, such as additional SSB, which draw much attention for R17, it is still impact we need to consider in R18. |
| MediaTek | Y | We are generally fine with the proposal but some more details on Performance impacts would be better, at least coverage and reliability should be captured. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Xiaomi |  | Share the same view as vivo that further clarification on performance impact and network impacts is needed.  Anyway, we think simulation on network capacity/spectral efficient is not needed. |
| Sequans | Y | Remove network impacts from wording if this is supposed to only include network capacity and spectral efficiency (already part of performance impacts). Otherwise use “network deployment impacts” – but need to clarify meaning as ZTE mentioned. |
| FL4 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered. The detailed meaning of “Performance impacts” remains to be decided.  **High Priority Proposal 6.1-4c: For each potential Rel-18 further UE complexity reduction feature, at least the following aspects will be studied:**   * **UE complexity reduction** * **Performance impacts [details FFS]** * **Network deployment and coexistence impacts** * **Specification impacts** | |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| CMCC |  | We want to know whether the “network deployment” impact includes the network overhead analysis.  The performance impact examples can refer to TR38.875 section 7.2.3. For the network impact, to our understanding, it may include restriction on network configuration for coexistence scenarios, increased overhead such as additional SSB/SIB1. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| vivo | Y | Based on companies’ inputs, our understanding for the Network deployment impacts may include following:   * Operation for supporting Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap and non-RedCap UEs in a cell (co-existence impacts) * NW overhead   Performance impact can include Network capacity and spectral efficiency with qualitative analysis, whether quantized analysis is needed depends on the discussion in AI 9.6.2. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Regarding the network deployment, it is still unclear. With CMCC and vivo’s explanation, it seems the the network deployment issue also come from the co-existence impacts. To have the clear description in TR, it is suggested to clarify the boundary between Network deployment and coexistence impacts. |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | Agree with CMCC and Vivo.  In TR 38.875, the performance impact includes (in most cases qualitative assessments of) coverage, network capacity and spectral efficiency, data rate, Latency and reliability, power consumption, and PDCCH blocking rate. These impacts could also be considered in Rel-18.  For network deployment impact: the impacts in terms of deployment flexibility (e.g., supported SCS) on Rel-18, Rel-17 and legacy can be studied. Other aspects are more related to coexistence impact. |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y | For performance impacts, it would be good to add some candidates. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered. Details regarding aspects to cover in the sections on “Performance impacts” and “Network deployment and coexistence impacts” can be discussed once agenda item 9.6.2 has progressed further.  **High Priority Proposal 6.1-4d: For each potential Rel-18 further UE complexity reduction feature, at least the following aspects will be studied:**   * **UE complexity reduction** * **Performance impacts [details FFS]** * **Network deployment and coexistence impacts [details FFS]** * **Specification impacts** | |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | OK with the current proposal |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Xiaomi5 | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |

# 7 UE complexity reduction features

7.1 Introduction to UE complexity reduction features

According to the SID [1], some further complexity reduction enhancements may be considered to further expand the market for RedCap use cases with relatively low cost, low energy consumption, and low data rate requirements, e.g., industrial wireless sensor network use cases. Rel-18 eRedCap should provide NR support for low-tier devices between existing LPWA UEs and the capabilities of Rel-17 RedCap UEs. The supported peak data rate for Rel-18 eRedCap targets to 10 Mbps and Rel-18 eRedCap should not overlap with existing LPWA solutions.

Specifically, the objectives of this SID are as follows ‎[1]:

|  |
| --- |
| * Study further UE complexity reduction techniques based on Rel-17 evaluation methodology in TR 38.875 [RAN1]   + Consider network impact, coexistence of Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap and non-RedCap UEs in a cell, UE impact, specification impact   + Potential solutions, which may complement each other, for reducing device complexity are focusing on:     - UE bandwidth reduction to 5 MHz in FR1,       * Possibly in combination with relaxed UE processing timeline for PDSCH and/or PUSCH and/or CSI     - reduced UE peak data rate in FR1,       * Possibly including restricted bandwidth for PDSCH and/or PUSCH       * Possibly in combination with relaxed UE processing timeline for PDSCH and/or PUSCH and/or CSI * Notes:   + Rel-15 SSB should be reused and L1 changes minimized.   + Operation in BWP with/without SSB and without/with RF retuning should be considered.   + It is not precluded that some solutions for FR1 can be applied to FR2 in WI stage.   + Aim to define a single Rel-18 RedCap UE type for further UE complexity reduction. |

As we can see, the three main potential complexity reduction features are further UE bandwidth reduction, further UE peak rate reduction, and relaxed UE processing timeline. In the following, different aspects of each potential complexity reduction feature and their potential combinations are discussed.

7.2 Further UE bandwidth reduction

This section focuses on different UE bandwidth reduction options which need to be evaluated. In general, the UE bandwidth reduction can be applied to both radio frequency (RF) and baseband (BB) parts or only to BB parts, both data and control channel or only data channels, and DL and/or UL. Contributions discuss different options for further UE bandwidth reduction in FR1 which are summarized below.

* **Option BW1:** Both RF and BB bandwidths are 5 MHz for UL and DL [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 24, 25, 32, 33, 35]
* **Option BW2:** 5 MHz BB bandwidth for data and control channels with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL [14, 18, 32, 33]
* **Option BW3:** 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for data channels with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL. The control channels and other reference signals are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF bandwidth [10, 18, 25, 24, 28, 32, 33, 35]
* **Option BW4:** Baseband bandwidths for data channels can be smaller than 5 MHz for further cost saving. For example, 3 MHz baseband bandwidth only for data channels with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL [10]
* **Option BW5:** 20 MHz UE bandwidth in idle/inactive state but 5 MHz bandwidth in connected state [9, 20, 31]
* **Option BW6:** 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for data channels only for DL with 20 MHz RF bandwidth [25]
* **Option BW7:** Both RF and BB bandwidths are 5 MHz only for DL while the UL bandwidth is 20 MHz [9]
* **Option BW8:** No RF reduction but BB reduction for all channels except SSB [18]

Clearly, there can be various options for further UE bandwidth reduction which some of them can be similar (or highly correlated). For evaluations, it is beneficial to down-select the most attractive options. In this regard, the following question can be considered.

**FL1 High Priority Question 7.2-1a: Among the different options presented above for further UE bandwidth reduction in FR1, which option(s) should be studied?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option(s)** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | At least BW1, BW3, BW5 | Given the number of options, it is necessary to downselect. But we are open to consider other options.  Note: BW5 is just a dedicated RRC configuration using a 5 MHz BWP (maximum) operating in 20 MHz. |
| Sierra Wireless | BW3, BW8 | In general we need support for 20MHz RF for SSB/CORESET. |
| Spreadtrum | Option BW3 and maybe BW6 | We also discussed option BW1 in our contribution [12], so we add [12] into the contribution list of option BW1.  While for option BW1, we observed the following: 1) Either great spec impacts or great limitations, 2) Performance is severely degraded, 3) Cost reduction is not significant compared to other solution (e.g., restricted BW for data). Therefore, we don’t think option BW1 is attractive.  From our perspective, we support 20MHz RF, and prefer to take option BW3 as the key option for the following study. In addition, we also think option BW6 is considerable. |
| Panasonic | BW1, BW2, BW3 |  |
| CMCC | 1st: BW3  2nd:BW2, BW1, BW5  3rd: others | Maybe companies are free to provide analysis for all the options, with performance impacts, coexistence impacts, and specification impacts. With limited inputs for some of the options, how to make conclusion needs to be discussed.  We have add [24] in BW1 since there is discussion on this option in our contribution. |
| CATT | BW1, BW3 | (1) We may need to further clarify that 5 MHz bandwidth is a centralized one.  (2) BW5 seems similar to BW3 in cost reduction, maybe the difference is power consumption in connected mode?  (3) BW8 seems similar to BW2. |
| vivo | Option BW1, Option BW2, Option BW3 | For Option BW4 of 3 MHz baseband bandwidth only for data channels, we do not think it is in the SI scope.  For Option BW5, if 20 MHz UE bandwidth needs to be supported in idle/inactive state, we do not think the cost can be reduced compared to Rel-17 RedCap UE.  Option BW6 is similar to Option BW3, we select Option BW3 with more interested companies.  For Option BW7, the motivation and cost saving are not clear compared to Option BW1.  Option BW8 is similar to Option BW2, we select Option BW2 with more interested companies. |
| Sharp | BW1, BW3, BW8 | BW1 may be included as the baseline for other bandwidth reduction schemes |
| Qualcomm | BW1, BW3 | We prefer to minimize the set of the options. |
| Transsion | BW1, BW3 | BW2 cannot resolve the CORESET#0 with SCS of 30KHz problem. If RF bandwidth is 20MHz, CORESET#0 occupied 20MHz is preferred. |
| Nordic | Do not agree with FL proposal | Above is not a complete list and further it is messy. We should consider structuring the discussion for RF and BB separately, something like this:   * RF reduced for both DL and UL, DL only, UL only * BB reduced   + All signals and channels are limited to 5MHz     - In RRC connected only     - Except SSB     - ….   + Data channels only are limited |
| NEC | BW1, BW3, |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | BW1, BW3 | These options can be divided into 2 categories  **Cat1:** reducing complexity/cost of data and control channel, i.e., 1, 2, 7 ,8  **Cat2:** mainly reducing complexity/cost of data channel for peak date reduction, i.e., 3,4,5,6  For Cat 2 options, they should be further discussed in 7.3 as shown in yellow highlighted part. And among these options, option **BW3** should be prioritized, which is more aligned with the SID and RAN discussion.  For Cat 1 options, according to the SID as shown in blue highlighted part, at least UE bandwidth reduction to 5M, i.e.,option **BW1** should be selected.   * + Potential solutions, which may complement each other, for reducing device complexity are focusing on:     - UE bandwidth reduction to 5MHz in FR1,       * Possibly in combination with relaxed UE processing timeline for PDSCH and/or PUSCH and/or CSI     - reduced UE peak data rate in FR1,       * Possibly including restricted bandwidth for PDSCH and/or PUSCH       * Possibly in combination with relaxed UE processing timeline for PDSCH and/or PUSCH and/or CSI |
| Ericsson | BW1, BW3, BW4 | We think the main options are RF+BB and BB-only bandwidth reduction for data channels for both UL and DL.  Option BW4 is attractive as further cost saving can be achieved with BB-only BW reduction by allowing the BB bandwidth to be smaller than 5 MHz while satisfying the peak data rate target. For example, with 3 MHz BB bandwidth the 10 Mbps peak data rate can be achieved.  Other options are either similar to (BW1/BW3) or are not expected to provide significant benefits. |
| DOCOMO | BW1, BW2, BW3 | BW2 can solve the potential frequency diversity gain degradation issue which is expected for RF BW reduction (e.g., BW1), and hence we prefer to include this option to evaluate.  We also prefer to include BW3 to evaluate since it can solve some impacts which is expected for BW1 and/or BW2, e.g., SSB reception, MIB-configured CORESET#0 and/or PDCCH AL with 5MHz BB BW etc.  We don’t see the need to differentiate the BW restriction between idle/inactive mode and connected mode (i.e., BW5). We are not sure whether BW reduction only for connected mode can provide meaningful complexity reduction gain given that idle/inactive mode may be the dominant state considering the traffic pattern of eRedCap UEs.  In our understanding, the target max. peak data rate (10Mbps) should be applied to both DL and UL while it is not clearly stated in SID. Therefore, regarding BW6 and BW7, we don’t see the need to differentiate DL BW and UL BW so far, but we are open to consider such option. |
| Samsung | BW1 | Our originally thinking BW 3 is part of peak data rate reduction solution. |
| IDCC | BW1, BW2, BW3 |  |
| LGE | BW1, BW3 | BW1 and BW3 should be essential for this study. The benefits of BW2 compared to BW1/BW3 would not be significant, but can be studied if there is enough support. |
| SONY | BW1, BW3, BW5 | We have tried to choose a subset of reasonably different options. While some of the other options have merit, studying them might not lead to a great deal of additional insight. |
| Intel | BW1, BW2, BW3 | One clarification question on BW3, is the 5MHz BB for data channel limited to localized 25 PRB? From our view, there will no difference between localized 25 PRBs or distributed 25 PRBs.  If there is a preference to categorize distributed 25 PRBs for data channel as PR3 for peak rate reduction, it needs to clarify that the number of PRBs in PR3 is the hard limit for data transmission, but not a value only for peak rate calculation. |
| OPPO | BW1 | That only option will make the evaluation simplified.  Other options may means the same as peak data rate reduction. |
| Xiaomi | BW1, BW3 | 1. On one hand, to obtain more cost saving gain, both RF and BB BW reduction to 5MHZ for all channels is the best way. 2. On the other hand, in order to avoid affecting the transmission of control and reference signals, only data channel BW reduction is the best choice.   Option BW2 with less cost gain compared with BW1 and can’t avoid affecting the transmission of control and reference signals, which can’t accept by us. |
| Nokia, NSB | BW1, BW3 | We think BW1 and BW3 are the two main options to be evaluated as BW1 provides the largest complexity reduction while BW3 has the smallest system/specification impact. Other options are hybrids of these two options and we don’t think they offer good trade-offs between complexity reduction and system/specification impact. We also need to minimize the number of options to evaluate due to the tight schedule and limited TU. Some specific comments –  BW2 – only PBCH would have no impact compared to BW1 and this is too minor to consider as a separate option.  BW4 – we prefer not to reduce data channel bandwidth beyond 5 MHz but instead use TBS restriction for further complexity reduction to reach 10 Mbps peak data rate.  BW5 – this option still requires all channels to support 20 MHz (e.g to receive SIB, to transmit Msg3), therefore we do not see how this will bring about meaningful complexity reduction.  BW6 – this is similar to BW3 but we are not sure it would be beneficial since 5MHz UL is sufficient to meet the peak data rate requirement.  BW7 – not sure if it is feasible to have different RF+BB for UL and DL.  BW8 – this would not save as much as BW1 but would still have all the same issues except for PBCH reception at 30 kHz SCS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | BW1, BW3 |  |
| FL2  FL3 | Study of options BW1 and BW3 are supported by a large majority of the received responses. About a quarter of the responses want to study option BW2. The other options receive very limited interest. Based on the responses the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 7.2-1b:**   * **The following options for further UE bandwidth reduction will be studied:**   + **Option BW1: Both RF and BB bandwidths are 5 MHz for UL and DL.**   + **Option BW3: 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for data channels with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL. The control channels and other reference signals are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF bandwidth.** * **In addition, optional results for the following option can also be reported:**   + **Option BW2: 5 MHz BB bandwidth for data and control channels with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL.** | |
| Nordic | N | We do no see BW3 to be different to PR3, option should be studied only once, not twice. **In addition, we hope that 3GPP remains technical group, not a political group where we vote to select technical solutions.**  Here are the arguments why IDLE/CONNECTED dependent BW reduction and UL/DL dependent reduction should be studied.  **IDLE/Connected**   * reception of common IDLE DL signals is not so challenging compared to RRC connected, **IDLE is using clearly less BB processing power than RRC connected.**   + Even though FFT must support 20MHz for CORESET#0/commonCORESET + broadcast, the buffering need is reduced, this because UE need to monitor significantly less PDCCH candidates in IDLE compared to RRC connected   + The timelines and/or max TBS sizes for processing SIBs, Paging, MSG2 are much lower than for unicast or could be further reduced.   + **As a consequence, chipset may be designed with less processing power**   **Asymmetric UL/DL (for HD-FDD)**   * If device has duplexer, it will take care of inter-modulation products and harmonics leaking from UL to the closest DL bands. In HD-FDD, there is no duplexer, so with keeping RF open to 20MHz UE/device must invest into more linear amplifier and/or invest into additional filters, which in fact are FDD band specific. With reducing UL RF to 5MHz, no filters after power amplifier are needed and power amplifier itself may be cheaper. * **In R17 Redcap, cost for duplexer was removed, but additional costs to support FDD bands with HD and 20MHz UL were omitted in R17 study.** |
| Vivo |  | We would like to understand what “optional results can also be reported” actually means. According to our understanding, companies are always free to choose all or a subset of BW1/2/3 for study and report the cost estimation analysis. Or is it the intention to say we will draw conclusion for BW1/3 but may not for BW2? |
| FUTUREWEI | Y with comment | We think BW5 is attractive in reusing the BWP framework but can accept not studying it. If more options beyond BW1/2/3 are included, we would like to see BW5 back. Given the similarity to BW2, we can add some qualitative text for BW5 in the sections for BW2. |
| Lenovo | Y | Reduction of UE BW naturally reduces UE peak data rate. This is reason there are some overlapping of candidates in 7.2 and 7.3, say BW3 and PR3. Per email discussion, the difference is regarding the localized/distributed resource allocation. So maybe good to clarify PR3 is for distributed resource allocation only. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | We think that BW3 should be studied as it has the smallest specification impact. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y with comment | Need to clarify BW3 whether 5MHz restriction is applied only to UE-specific data channels or applied to all data channels including common data channels like SIB1 PDSCH. |
| OPPO |  | We can list BW1 only.  Regarding the BW1 and BW3, we also think the latter is very close the PR3. Actually, we think this BW3 can be considered as a PRx solution. You mentioned the major different between BW3 and PR3 is the BW3 may only allow PRB been allocated within only 5 MHz. This is not necessary restriction and for IFFT part, since the 20MHz size is already there. It seems BW3 just spare the processing power able to span 20MHz. Then, the cost of BW3 and PR3 is very similar but the performance been unnecessarily restricted by narrower band. |
| Sharp | Need clarification | For BW3, it needs to be clarified what situation will be done for all channels. it proposes that control channel and other reference channels(signals?) will still use the full bandwidth of 20MHz. we can see that the reference signal listed in 38.211 can be the reference signal for data channels (i.e. DL/UL DMRS,PTRS) or common channels(e.g. CSI-RS,SRS) , they may be handled with different principles. Another question is whether PRACH channel will be classified as a control channel? |
| SONY | Y | We do sympathise with the comment from vivo. Presumably companies aren’t mandated to study BW1 and BW3. |
| Samsung | N | We suggest to only keep BW1 mandated.  We suggest the following changes:   * **The following options for further UE bandwidth reduction will be studied:**   + **Option BW1: Both RF and BB bandwidths are 5 MHz for UL and DL.**   + **~~Option BW3: 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for data channels with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL. The control channels and other reference signals are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF bandwidth.~~** * **In addition, optional results for the following option can also be reported:**   + **Option BW3: 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for data channels with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL. The control channels and other reference signals are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF bandwidth.**   + **Option BW2: 5 MHz BB bandwidth for data and control channels with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL.** |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Regarding BW3, some further clarifications are needed. From our understanding, the following assumption should be aligned   * PDSCH and/or PUSCH bandwidth in not larger than 5MHz, including UE specific data channels and common data channels * Frequency location of PDSCH/PUSCH is flexible in 20MHz BWP and BWP size is up to 20MHz * PUSCH hopping can be performed within 20MHz bandwidth * PDSCH resource can be assigned in non-continuous RBGs * SSB, PDCCH, CSI-RS, PTRS, PRS can be received within 20MHz bandwidth * PRACH, PUCCH, SRS, PTRS can be transmitted within 20MHz bandwidth   Additionally, compared with BP3, BW2 additionally includes the control channels. And whether the control channels is for UE specific channels and/or common channels need further clarification. |
| LGE | Y | As commented in the e-mail reflector, we are okay with the **High Priority Proposal 7.2-1b** as it is. Or if companies have concerns on Option BW3, then we would also be fine to make the Option BW3 as optional as suggested by Samsung above. |
| Ericsson | Y | It should be noted that, in TR 36.888 (Sections 6.2 and 6.4), PR3 and BW3 are treated separately. Specifically:   * “Restricting the number of PRBs in an assignment/grant” is considered as a peak rate reduction option (“Technique 2”). * “Reduced bandwidth for data channel in baseband only, while the control channels are still allowed to use the carrier bandwidth” is considered as a BW reduction option (“DL-3”).   Based on the analysis in TR 36.888, “Technique 2” seems to have much lower cost reduction than “DL-3”. Therefore, we think both BW3 and PR3 should be studied. However, |
| Intel | Y | We believe both BW3 and PR3 need study. The difference can be defined form several aspects. We are fine with either way   1. BW3 is localized 5Mhz, while PR3 can be distributed [25] RPBs 2. BW3 is localized or distributed 25 PRBs, while PR3 only use [25] PRBs to define peak data and it is up to gNB to schedule more PRBs with less OFDM symbols for PDSCH/PUSCH |
| CMCC | Y | We agree with above comments that some details clarification is needs, such as ZTE listed.  And for the selected BW options, our understanding is studies will be focus on them, and analysis for “UE complexity reduction, Performance impacts, Network and coexistence impacts, Specification impacts” will be provided for them, then at the end of SI, down selection can be done. |
| MediaTek |  | support |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Xiaomi |  | Can’t see the necessity to study option BW2. We recommend spending no time to discuss on how/what conclusion and simulation results will be captured in the TR for option BW2.  For the overlapping between Option BW3 and PR3, we share the same view as Lenovo that further clarification is needed for PR3 that it is only studied for distributed resource allocation only. |
| Sequans | Y | Agree with comment from Ericsson. BW1 and BW3 can be studied with higher priority. Optional results for any other option from the complete set can be reported if they can bring comparative reduction or significant reduction for given scenarios. |
| FL4 | Some received responses wonder about the intention of listing Options BW1 and BW3 in one group and BW2 separately as optional. The background is that in the initial round of discussion (corresponding to Question 7.2-1a), a very large majority of the responses expressed a wish to study Options BW1 and BW3, whereas only about a quarter of the responses expressed a wish to study BW2, and remaining options received comparatively small interest. The intention with the proposal is to reflect and focus on the options that received the most interest.  A few responses requested clarifications of Option BW3, and some responses offered clarifications. The proposal below has been updated to clarify that it is only PDSCH and PUSCH that have reduced (5 MHz) bandwidth, whereas other physical channels and signals are transmitted/received with full (20 MHz) bandwidth.  One response proposed to also study asymmetric BB/RF reduction between UL/DL and/or idle/connected mode. A new Question 7.2.2a has been added further down to address these cases.  **High Priority Proposal 7.2-1c:**   * **The following options for further UE bandwidth reduction will be studied:**   + **Option BW1: Both RF and BB bandwidths are 5 MHz for UL and DL.**   + **Option BW3: 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for ~~data channels~~ PDSCH and PUSCH with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL. The other physical ~~control~~ channels and ~~other reference~~ signals are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF bandwidth.** * **In addition, optional results for the following option can also be reported:**   + **Option BW2: 5 MHz BB bandwidth for data and control channels with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL.** | |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | We think both BW3 and PR3 should be studied as there are differences between them. If only one is to be studied, we prefer BW3. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Samsung | N | We have strong concern for BW 3. And want to move this to optional results collection. |
| vivo | Y | For progress, we are fine with it. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | From our understanding, according to the current the proposal description, it is assumed that the UL/DL channels for evaluation is for connected mode and idle mode. Based on the discussion of Question 7.2-2a, we can further consider to update this proposal.  Additionally, the following clarification also should be discussed and captured in the agreement for BW3   * PUSCH hopping can be performed within 20MHz bandwidth * PDSCH resource can be assigned in non-continuous RBGs in 20MHz bandwidth |
| Nordic | N | We also think that BW3 should be optional due to very small difference (if any) from PR3  Also, the asymmetric BW or excluding of DL Idle signals can be included under the BW1 and BW2.   * **The following options for further UE bandwidth reduction will be studied:**   + **Option BW1: Both RF and BB bandwidths are 5 MHz for UL and DL.**     - **Reduction for only UL can be considered** * **In addition, optional results for the following option can also be reported:**   + **Option BW2: 5 MHz BB bandwidth for data and control channels with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL.**     - **BB reduction excluding DL IDLE signals and channels can be considered**   + **Option BW3: 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for ~~data channels~~ PDSCH and PUSCH with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL. The other physical ~~control~~ channels and ~~other reference~~ signals are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF bandwidth.** |
| Ericsson | Y | We have similar understanding as ZTE. |
| LGE | Y | We are okay with the FL’s proposal. As commented earlier, if companies have concerns on Option BW3, we are also fine to make the Option BW3 as optional. |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y for the first bullet only | BW2 seems to overlap with BW1 or BWP, so it needs more clarification:   * Whether its AD/DA sampling rate corresponds to 20Mhz bandwidth or 5MHz? If it is 5MHz, then its effective RF bandwidth is 5MHz, what is the difference from BW1? * If it is 20MHz, then better to clarify it in the bullet. Compared to BW3, its control channel is further limited but only trivial cost reduction can be expected. Could proponent clarify any benefit to study BW2? |
| OPPO | N | We are not considered BW3 as bandwidth reduction. There is no much distinguishable reduction, compared with PR3. Since the SI have very limited scope prioritize the BW1 would be very helpful. |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| FL5 | Based on received responses to Proposal 7.2-1c and Question 7.2-2a, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 7.2-1d:**   * **The following options for further UE bandwidth reduction will be studied:**   + **Option BW1: Both RF and BB bandwidths are 5 MHz for UL and DL.**   + **Option BW3: 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for PDSCH and PUSCH with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL. The other physical channels and signals are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF bandwidth.** * **In addition, optional results for the following option can also be reported:**   + **Option BW2: 5 MHz BB bandwidth for data and control channels with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL.** * **At least the following cases are studied:**   + **The resource allocation spans a bandwidth of maximum 5 MHz.**   + **The same option is used for UL and DL.**   + **The same option is used for idle/inactive and connected mode.**   + **It is FFS whether to study other cases.** | |
| Nordic | N | We do not support FL limitations in RED. Further, BW2/3 should be optional and also better clarified, To move forward we suggest the following.  **High Priority Proposal 7.2-1d(Nordic):**   * **The following option for further UE bandwidth reduction will be studied:**   + **Option BW1: Both RF and BB bandwidths are 5 MHz for UL and DL.** * **In addition, results for the following options can also be optionally reported:**   + **Option BW2: The resource allocation of PUSCH, PDSCH, PDCCH is limited to span bandwidth of maximum 5 MHz within BWP of 20MHz**   + **Option BW3: The resource allocation of PUSCH and PDSCH is limited to span a bandwidth of maximum 5 MHz within BWP of 20MHz** |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | According to the current description, the read part are applied for the three BW options. |
| vivo | Y | To respond to HW’s comments on BW2, its AD/DA sampling rate corresponds to 20MHz bandwidth. The main benefit for BW2 is it may achieve good balance between BW1 perusing the most cost reduction with large specification impacts and BW3 that achieving the least cost reduction with small specification impacts. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y but | We prefer to have BW1 and BW3 only, but optional study is OK for BW2 if it is further clarified. Current BW2 option is not clear which channels will have 5MHz BB BW restriction. It has to be updated, for example (if my understanding is correct):   * **In addition, optional results for the following option can also be reported:**   + **Option BW2: 5 MHz BB bandwidth for PDSCH/PUSCH/PDCCH/PUCCH with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL.** |
| Samsung | N | Fully agree with Nordic |
| MediaTek | Y | We also prefer to have BW1 and BW3 only but is OK with companies optionally studying on BW2. In BW2, how about reference signals? For example, with SCS=30kHz, is SSB truncated to 5MHz or is full transmission of 20 PRBs allowed? |
| LGE | Y | We are okay with the FL’s proposal as it is. We are also fine to make Option BW3 as optional to address the concerns raised. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | The second sub-bullet of the red part (i.e., The same option is used for UL and DL) seems a redundancy, since there is a description in each option, highlight in blue.   * **The following options for further UE bandwidth reduction will be studied:**   + **Option BW1: Both RF and BB bandwidths are 5 MHz for UL and DL.**   + **Option BW3: 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for PDSCH and PUSCH with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL. The other physical channels and signals are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF bandwidth.** * **In addition, optional results for the following option can also be reported:**   + **Option BW2: 5 MHz BB bandwidth for data and control channels with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL.** |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | We are OK for the proposal. We share the view from Spreadtrum that the second sub-bullet under the 3rd main bullet can be removed. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We are fine with the proposal. Regarding BW2, we assumed BB bandwidth for all the channels/signals are restricted 5MHz, but open to discuss. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| Xiaomi5 | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |

One received response to Proposal 7.2-1b proposed to study asymmetric BB/RF reduction between UL/DL and/or idle/connected mode. The following question addresses this these cases.

**FL4 High Priority Question 7.2-2a: In addition, can asymmetric BB/RF reduction between UL/DL and/or idle/connected mode be studied? If so, what cases should be studied, and should they be studied as part of Options BW1/2/3 above or as separate options?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Sierra Wireless | N | There may not enough time to study these options. |
| Intel | N | It is still not clear for us how ‘asymmetric BB/RF reduction between UL/DL’ can be beneficial.  Regarding ‘asymmetric BB/RF reduction between idle/connected mode’, it seems the proponent is assuming a quite flexible architecture to share the capability of different component in idle/inactive or connected mode. We doubt if such design is realistic for a device for extreme complexity reduction. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Can accept only if no separate section and included as part of BW1 |
| Samsung | N | Consider limited TU |
| vivo |  | For asymmetric BB/RF reduction between idle/connected mode, based on proponent’s calcification in the email that the RF should be designed to support 20MHz in DL, and all DL signals are within 5MHz in RRC connected, we think this option is similar as Option BW2.  For asymmetric between UL/DL, our understanding is that cost reduction between 20MHz and 5MHz PA is insignificant. The statement “With reducing UL RF to 5MHz, no filters after power amplifier are needed and power amplifier itself may be cheaper.” is unclear to us. From our understanding, bandpass filter after PA is needed and the cost difference between PA+20MHz bandpass filter and PA+5MHz bandpass filter is not large. May be Nordic could clarify some details? |
| CATT | N |  |
| Panasonic |  | We are interested in BW3 for DL and BW1 for UL, which would bring less impact to SSB/CORESET#0 reception and reduced complexity. But it can be dropped for the study phase. In possible work item. we would like to discuss it again based on the outcome of the study. For this reason, we would like to have some text like "potential options for work items are not limited to options considered in this SI". |
| Sharp |  | We felt that there was not enough time for the study, as the SI only had 3 meetings. |
| DOCOMO | N | We tend to agree with Intel. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | From our understanding, the complexity reduction is mainly depending on the bandwidth reduction of DL channels. So the bandwidth reduction for DL is needed for complexity reduction. As for the UL, the the bandwidth reduction would have less impacts on the co-existence and performance. Therefore, the bandwidth reduction for UL is also needed for complexity reduction. Asymmetric UL/DL bandwidth is not our preference especially considering the limited TUs.  Additionally, for the asymmetric BB/RF reduction between connected mode/idle mode, we are open to consider as the optional evaluation if there are majority interests. |
| Nordic | Y | @VIVO -> as we explained  Karol: Let me clarify. If device has duplexer it will take care of inter-modulation products and harmonics leaking from UL to the closest DL bands.  In HD-FDD, there is no duplexer, so with keeping RF open to 20MHz UE must invest into more linear amplifier and/or invest into additional filters, which in fact are FDD band specific.  With reducing UL RF to 5MHz, no filters after power amplifier are needed and power amplifier itself may be cheaper.  Hopefully this clarifies.  @Intel: Do I understand that Intel is trying to preclude certain implementations?  It is fine to capture these under BW1 and BW2 as “can be considered” |
| Ericsson | N | We think it is sufficient to study BW1 and BW3 (and optionally BW2) as these options sufficiently capture the tradeoff between complexity reduction and system impacts.  Regarding asymmetric idle/connected mode, we tend to agree with Intel. Also, another potential issue is that the cost saving is not deterministic, and it depends on the scenario/traffic/implementation. Also, it depends on the percentage of time that UE is in idle and connected states. Therefore, the cost evaluations is not straightforward as other options. Moreover, we do not expect that this option provides significant benefits over BW1/2/3. |
| LGE | N | We don’t expect much cost/complexity reduction gain from asymmetric BB/RF reduction between UL/DL. Our preference is either not to study it or to study it as a separate option. |
| Lenovo |  | We are open to make it as optional. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We don’t think these cases will have meaningful reduction compared to BW1/BW2/BW3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | At least not for TDD which requires alignment of center frequency of DL and UL carrier.  For FDD/SUL, its benefit is not clear and some clarification is suggested. |
| Nordic |  | @Ericsson  Regarding asymmetric idle/connected mode, we tend to agree with Intel. Also, another potential issue is that the cost saving is not deterministic, and it depends on the scenario/traffic/implementation. Also, it depends on the percentage of time that UE is in idle and connected states. Therefore, the cost evaluations is not straightforward as other options. Moreover, we do not expect that this option provides significant benefits over BW1/2/3.  Nordic:  IDLE/Inactive: Cost saving is clearly deterministic, because it can be shown that 5MHz BB (like in BW1) can also handle IDLE/Inactive mode DL signals. Moreover, it does not depend on scenario/deployment, because scheduling is happening in BW of CORESET#0 with max 96PRBs.  Power saving would depend on percentage of time in IDLE, but this Study Item is about cost, not power saving.  Therefore, IDLE/Inactive differentiation can be close to BW2, when it comes to cost saving, while have good compatibility with legacy close to BW3….. but it seems some companies are afraid of this option 😊  Asymmetric UL and DL, is relevant in HD-FDD bands when duplexer is missing. So study could be limited to that case, which is optional already. |
| Intel2 | N | @Nordic. For asymmetric idle/connected mode, since a broadcast message needs to be received in both idle mode (e.g. for initial access) and connected mode (e.g. SI update triggered by paging), do you imply gNB to transmit separate broadcast PDSCHs for a UE in idle mode and another UE in connected mode with different BW capability? |
| Xiaomi5 | N | From the perspective of UE complexity reduction, there is limited cost gain if only reduce the BB bandwidth of UL or DL data channels, and it is better to reduce the BB BW of UL and DL data channels simultaneously.  Besides, there is an option for RF BW reduction that only reduce the UL data &control channel BW and remaining 20MHZ for DL channels, which has no impact on SSB/CORESET#0 reception. While, for HD-FDD RedCap UEs and TDD UEs, conserving that UL and DL channels share the same duplexer, which accounts for a large proportion of the RF cost. So, there is no more cost gain than Option BW3. Thus, no spare effort should be made for this study with the limited TU.  For the asymmetric BB/RF reduction between idle and connected mode, we share the same view as Intel. |

It should be noted that bandwidth reduction naturally results in the peak data rate reduction. The peak data rate can be larger than 10 Mbps with 5 MHz UE bandwidth and high modulation orders (e.g., 64QAM) in FDD. However, in TDD 5 MHz UE bandwidth, the peak data rate for UL or DL can be less than 10 Mbps depending on the TDD pattern [10].

Moreover, there can be similarity between bandwidth reduction options and peak data rate reductions. For example, under certain conditions, the option of BB bandwidth reduction for data channels can resemble the option of peak data rate reduction by restriction of number of PRBs for PUSCH/PDSCH discussed in the next section. Here, following TR 36.888, these two options are treated separately, one in the bandwidth reduction section and the other one in the peak reduction section. Meanwhile, the differences between these two options (i.e., in terms of PRB allocation) can be further discussed.

7.3 Further UE peak rate reduction

This section focuses on different UE peak rate reduction options which need to be evaluated. Contributions discuss different options for further UE peak data rate reduction (considering the 10 Mbps peak rate target) which are summarized below.

* **Option PR1:** Relaxation of the constraint for peak data rate reduction [10, 12, 13, 23, 31, 32, 35]
* **Option PR2:** Restriction of maximum TBS for PDSCH and PUSCH [10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 21, 32, 33, 34]
* **Option PR3:** Restriction of maximum number of PRBs (or bandwidth) for PDSCH and PUSCH [10, 11, 12, 13, 19, 24, 32, 33, 34, 35]
* **Option PR4:** Reduction of scaling factor for peak data rate reduction [12, 14]
* **Option PR5:** Relaxation of the maximum modulation order from 64QAM to 16QAM [14, 20, 30, 33]

Clearly, there can be various options for further peak data rate reduction which some of them can be similar (or highly correlated). For evaluations, it is beneficial to down-select the most attractive options. In this regard, the following question can be considered.

**FL1 High Priority Question 7.3-1a: Among the different options presented above for further UE peak data rate reduction, which option(s) should be studied?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option(s)** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | PR5, PR6 | PR6 is not listed above but in this option, data and control are not in same slot   * PR1/PR4: Should not be studied. Already discussed in Rel-17 * PR2: Should not be studied. It will come naturally from other techniques. * PR3: Neutral. It will be similar to some BW reduction option) |
| Sierra Wireless | PR2 | Reducing TBS size gives the most flexibility. |
| Spreadtrum | Option PR1, PR2, PR3 | For Option PR4, we think it can be discussed together with option PR1, since a smaller scaling factor may corresponding to a relaxed constraint.  Notes: we also discussed option PR1 in our contribution [12]. |
| Panasonic | PR1, PR2, PR4 |  |
| CMCC | PR1, PR2, PR3, PR4 | We are open for the options, while PR5 is not preferred due to low spectrum efficiency. |
| CATT | PR2, PR4, [PR3], [PR1] | I addback our position which is missing in the summary.  For PR3, it is more or less related to bandwidth reduction. Whether PR3 is needed or not depends on whether ‘BB bandwidth reduction’ is already assumed or not.  PR1 may be naturally applied with PR4. Otherwise it is questionable whether PR4 can work. |
| Vivo | Either Option PR1 or Option PR4,  Option PR2  Option PR5 | Option PR3 can be covered by BW reduction for data channel only.  We are fine with either Option PR1 or Option PR4 if down-selection is needed. |
| Sharp | PR3, PR5 | PR5: the limitation of 16QAM is sufficient to meet the peak rate of 10Mbps and can effectively reduce the complexity/cost of BB and RF. |
| Qualcomm | PR1, PR3 | We prefer to minimize the set of the options. |
| Nordic |  | The final solution can be combination of multiple.  PR1, PR4 and PR5 are interconnected as they tackle reduction of spectral efficiency per RE  In our opinion if PRBs are reduced, then those should be reduced for all signals and channels as part of BWP BW reduction. Otherwise, UE cannot reduce FFT and such post-FFT buffer. -> PR3 could be dropped since it is part of BW reduction discussion already  Again proposal should have been structured like   1. Reduce spectral efficiency per RE 2. Reduce PRB allocation (this is already part of BW reduction study) 3. Reduce max TBS size |
| NEC | PR1, PR2, |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | PR3/BW3, [PR1/PR4] | Fro our understanding, option PR3 is similar with option BW3. Only one of them need to be evaluated.  For PR1 and PR4, they are also similar, and only one of them is needed for evaluation.  For PR5, it may have the impacts on system capacity and spectrum efficiency, and it also brings marginal complexity reduction and impacts on RACH procedure. Therefore, it is not our preference.  Therefore, PR3 or BW3 is the baseline for evaluation and we are also open to consider PR1 or PR4(only one of them). |
| Ericsson | PR1, PR2, PR3 | With Option PR1, we do not see any need for Option PR4.  To our understanding, the main difference between PR3 and BW3 is that PR3 allows for non-contiguous/distributed allocation of the PRBs within the full RF BW (20 MHz), whereas BW3 only allows for allocation within 5 MHz BW. Therefore, for PR3, the UE may need to buffer the full RF BW for the slot that the UE is scheduled. For BW3, the UE needs to buffer the full RF BW only until the PDCCH is processed. So, there would be some differences in cost estimates for one or more of the BB blocks for PR3 and BW3. |
| DOCOMO | At least PR2, PR3, PR5 | We are also supportive to consider the relaxation of the constraint (PR1) and introduce new scaling factor (PR4) for peak data rate calculation which can possibly provide further BB processing complexity reduction. |
| Samsung | PR3 | We think this is same as BW 3.  In our understanding, as described in SI   * reduced UE peak data rate in FR1,   + Possibly including restricted bandwidth for PDSCH and/or PUSCH   Only restricted BW for PDSCH and/or PUSCH belong to this reduced UE peak data rate. We would like to focus on the BW restriction for PDSCH and/or PUSCH first. If time is allowed, we can be flexible to discuss others. |
| IDCC | PR1, PR2, PR3 |  |
| LGE | PR1, PR2, PR3 | Open to study PR1/2/3, but we expect the expected cost/complexity reduction gain is not comparable to the further UE bandwidth reduction. |
| SONY | PR2 | This seems like the most straightforward way of reducing the peak data rate. It is the approach that was adopted at the outcome of TR36.888. |
| Intel | PR1, PR2, PR3 (limit the max number of PRBs or REs) | For PR1/4, it is clear to put limitation on the formula for peak data rate in 38.306. Then, we have the following clarification questions. For PR3, is it the intention to put a hard limitation on PRBs for actual scheduled PDSCH/PUSCH, or just to use a limited max number of PRB in the formula for peak data rate in 38.306 (i.e., the scheduled PRB can be larger as long as data rate does not exceed the peak data rate)? Similar clarification is needed for PR5 (i.e., 16QAM is used in the formula but gNB can schedule a higher modulation order as long as data rate does not exceed the peak data rate).  As a variance to PR3, it can be considered to limit the maximum number of REs for PDSCH/PUSCH transmission. Note: if the maximum number of REs can be limited, it can also get the benefit of reduced post-FFT buffer which is similar to limit the number of PRBs. |
| OPPO | PR1, PR2, PR3 |  |
| Xiaomi | PR1, PR2, [PR3,] PR4 | PR3 is just the same as the Option BW3 for further BW reduction discussed in Section 7.2, and duplicate work should be avoid. |
| Nokia, NSB | PR2 | PR3 – we feel it is better to restrict TBS rather than number of PRBs as restricting the number of PRBs can reduce DL throughput for cell-edge UEs.  PR5 – we do not prefer to limit peak rate via 16-QAM as we expect this to reduce spectral efficiency significantly. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | PR2, PR3 |  |
| FL2  FL3 | Study of options PR1, PR2 and PR3 are supported by most of the received responses. The other options receive very limited interest. Based on the responses the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 7.3-1b:**   * **The following options for further UE peak rate reduction will be studied:**   + **Option PR1: Relaxation of the constraint for peak data rate reduction.**   + **Option PR2: Restriction of maximum TBS for PDSCH and PUSCH.**   + **Option PR3: Restriction of maximum number of PRBs (or bandwidth) for PDSCH and PUSCH.** | |
| Nordic | N | PR3 overlaps with BW3, solution should be studied only once. |
| vivo |  | We also wonder how much difference is between PR3 and BW3. We can understand that the PDSCH allocation should be within 5MHz for BW3 while the PDSCH allocation can be distributed in frequency with total size not exceeding 25RB (assuming 15KHz SCS). But from UE buffering perspective, the two options seem the same, i.e UE can reduce the buffering by only buffering the interested RBs after PDCCH is decoded. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | PR1 seems like another way to consider L2 buffer size. The complexity of L2 buffer size cannot be determined with the evaluation methodology.  PR2 seems like an academic exercise. Calculations can be made back and forth between the TBS and RBs used is what other techniques do, which would be similar enough. It is similar to 36.888, but we feel it is a low priority.  PR3 is indeed similar to BW3. We are open to discuss more whether to focus on one and just mention the other qualitatively in those sections.  For all of these, it is important that we have a similar comparison to BW1, i.e., at least results for TBS or RBs should be included in the TR that match that the TBS and RBs used for BW1. |
| Lenovo | Y | To differentiate PR3 with BW3, the “(or bandwidth)” shall be removed and clarify PR3 should be for distributed resource allocation only. |
| CATT | Y | Also open to remove PR3 if we agree BW3. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | Agree with Lenovo, we should remove “(or bandwidth)” in PR3. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | **Option PR1,** @ FUTUREWEI, for your comments about 7.3-1b, “PR1 seems like another way to consider L2 buffer size. The complexity of L2 buffer size cannot be determined with the evaluation methodology”. Do you mean we don’t need to consider any techniques that affect L2 buffer size? There is a very interest thing that almost all the R18 techniques(BW reduction, reduced peak data rate) will reduce the L2 buffer size. If that's the logic, there's nothing we can do for R18 RedCap.  **Option PR3:** Maybe clarifications for PR3 and BW3 are needed, if PR3 is the same as BW3, solution should be studied only once. |
| Qualcomm |  | As Lenovo mentioned, need to remove “(or bandwidth)” to differentiate PR3 from BW3.  We think that PR1 and PR2 is almost the same especially for cost breakdown. And actually PR1 can effectively include the PR2 because the peak rate reduction by relaxing the constraint will consequently limit the max TBS by itself. It is redundant to study both. We suggest to remove PR2 or at least put it as an optional study. |
| OPPO | Y | OK to remove modulation order reduction. |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| SONY | Y | While the complexity of PR3 might be similar to that of BW3, couldn’t the performance of PR3 be better than that of BW3 (frequency diversity). If there were two complexity reduction techniques (e.g. BW3, PR3) with the same complexity, but one had better performance (e.g. PR3), wouldn’t RAN1 choose the one with better performance? |
| Samsung | N | We suggest to focus the study on PR3 only.   * **The following options for further UE peak rate reduction will be studied:**   + **Option PR3: Restriction of maximum number of PRBs (or bandwidth) for PDSCH and PUSCH.** * **In addition, optional results for the following option can also be reported:**   + **Option PR1: Relaxation of the constraint for peak data rate reduction.**   + **Option PR2: Restriction of maximum TBS for PDSCH and PUSCH.** |
| DOCOMO |  | Indeed PR3 can be covered by BW reduction options for data channel BW reduction, so we are open to discuss whether option RP3 should be studied as a part of peak data rate reduction.  While we can accept this proposal, we prefer not to preclude possibility for studying modulation order reduction at this point, thus it is more comfortable for us to add bullet to current proposal same as complexity reduction for BW reduction so that companies can report the complexity reduction gain for it optionally. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | No significant difference between BW3 and PR3 is observed. Only one of them should be remained. Moreover, according the SID, BW3 actually is for UE peak data rate reduction and the corresponding TR text should be captured for the tech of peak data rate reduction. Therefore, BW3 should be listed here.  If the difference is clarified, PR3 also can be separately with BW3 and optionally considered, to avoid massive estimation efforts.  For PR2, whether it is applied for UE specific channels or common channels need further clarification. |
| LGE | Y | We can accept this proposal even though we share most of the concerns that there are redundancy if we evaluate all the three. |
| Ericsson | Y | It should be noted that, in TR 36.888 (Sections 6.2 and 6.4), PR3 and BW3 are treated separately. Specifically:   * “Restricting the number of PRBs in an assignment/grant” is considered as a peak rate reduction option (“Technique 2”). * “Reduced bandwidth for data channel in baseband only, while the control channels are still allowed to use the carrier bandwidth” is considered as a BW reduction option (“DL-3”).   Based on the analysis in TR 36.888, “Technique 2” seems to have much lower cost reduction than “DL-3”. Therefore, we think both BW3 and PR3 should be studied. However, if only one of BW3 and PR3 is studied, it should be BW3 since it appears to be more promising from cost reduction point of view. |
| Intel | Y | Agree with Lenovo, we should remove “(or bandwidth)” in PR3.  Clarification questions on PR3 from our side? Is the ‘**maximum number of PRBs**’ in PR3 used to define peak data or is a hard limit of PRBs can be scheduled for PDSCH/PUSCH? I mean, with the latter interpretation, PR3 just uses max [25] PRBs to define peak data and up to gNB to schedule more >[25] PRBs with less OFDM symbols for PDSCH/PUSCH |
| CMCC | Y | If the difference between PR3 and BW3 exists such as frequency diversity, we are Ok to study both. |
| MediaTek | Y but … | We share a similar view Docomo that complexity analysis with modulation order reduction can be optionally reported by companies. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are OK to study both BW3 and PR3. Our understanding is that BW3 would be limited to BW (i.e. localized) while PR3 would be PRB. Therefore we also support removing bandwidth from PR3 if BW3 is studied. |
| Xiaomi |  | Share the same view as Lenovo that PR3 is only worth to study for distributed resource allocation. |
| Sequans | Y | PR1 and PR3 (with clarifications as suggested above) can be studied with higher priority. |
| FL4 | One received response proposed to clarify whether the peak rate reduction is for both UE-specific and common channels or only for UE-specific channels. A new Question 7.3.2a has been added further down to address this aspect.  One response suggested that Options PR1 and PR2 may have a similar cost impact. A new Question 7.3.3a has been added further down to address this aspect.  Some responses suggested that it may not be necessary to study both Options PR3 and BW3, whereas some other responses want to study both. A new Question 7.3.4a has been added further down to address this aspect.  One response proposed to clarify whether the restricted number of PRBs in Option PR3 is a hard limit or can vary depending on other scheduling parameters. A new Question 7.3.5a has been added further down to address this aspect.  Two responses propose to include study of relaxed modulation order. A new Question 7.3.6a has been added further down to address this aspect.  Based on the received responses, the following updated proposal can be considered, together with the new questions further down in this section.  **High Priority Proposal 7.3-1c:**   * **The following options for further UE peak rate reduction will be studied:**   + **Option PR1: Relaxation of the constraint for peak data rate reduction.**   + **Option PR2: Restriction of maximum TBS for PDSCH and PUSCH.**   + **Option PR3: Restriction of maximum number of PRBs ~~(or bandwidth)~~ for PDSCH and PUSCH.** | |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | Preference is PR3 + one of either PR1 or PR2 |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Samsung | N | We suggest to focus the study on PR3 only.   * **The following options for further UE peak rate reduction will be studied:**   + **Option PR3: Restriction of maximum number of PRBs ~~(or bandwidth)~~ for PDSCH and PUSCH.** * **In addition, optional results for the following option can also be reported:**   + **Option PR1: Relaxation of the constraint for peak data rate reduction.**   + **Option PR2: Restriction of maximum TBS for PDSCH and PUSCH.** |
| vivo |  | We can come back to this proposal after some common understanding reached for the new questions related to above options. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Panasonic |  | Wait for 7.3-3a and 7.3-4a |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | If BW3 is supported for peak data rate reduction, we think PR1, PR2 and PR3 (if needed) should be optional. |
| Nordic | N | Wait for 7.2-1c + 7.2-2a or treat this Issue with 7.2-1c + 7.2-2a |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| LGE | N | We can come back to this after 7.3-3a. |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| OPPO |  | Since there are implication, we can come back to this after 7.3-3a. |
| Qualcomm | N | We still think that PR1 and PR2 is almost the same for cost so it is better to have one option. We need to discuss 7.3-3a first and come back to this. |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses to Proposal 7.3-1c, Question 7.3-2a, Question 7.3-3a, and Question 7.3-4a, the following updated proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 7.3-1d:**   * **The following options for further UE peak rate reduction will be studied:**   + **Option PR1: Relaxation of the constraint for peak data rate reduction.**   + **Option PR2: Restriction of maximum TBS for PDSCH and PUSCH.**   + **Option PR3: Restriction of maximum number of PRBs for PDSCH and PUSCH.** * **At least the following cases are studied:**   + **The studied peak rate reduction applies to both UE-specific (unicast) and common (broadcast) channels.**   + **The resource allocation spans a bandwidth of maximum 20 MHz.**   + **The same option is used for UL and DL.**   + **The same option is used for idle/inactive and connected mode.**   + **It is FFS whether to study other cases.** | |
| Nordic | N | We do not support the FL modification (in red) we OK with black text |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | While we would like to consider P3 and either P1 or P2, ok for the sake of progress |
| CATT | Y | Although we still think PR3 is a little redundant compared to BW3. For the sake of progress. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | OK for the current proposal for progress. BTW, the red part make the proposal clearer and it is needed from our perspective. |
| vivo |  | Since BW3 will be studied, Option PR3 can be optionally studied. Suggest following modification.  **High Priority Proposal 7.3-1d:**   * **The following options for further UE peak rate reduction will be studied:**   + **Option PR1: Relaxation of the constraint for peak data rate reduction.**   + **Option PR2: Restriction of maximum TBS for PDSCH and PUSCH.** * **In addition, optional results for the following option can also be reported:**   + **Option PR3: Restriction of maximum number of PRBs for PDSCH and PUSCH.** * **At least the following cases are studied:**   + **The studied peak rate reduction applies to both UE-specific (unicast) and common (broadcast) channels.**   + **The resource allocation spans a bandwidth of maximum 20 MHz.**   + **The same option is used for UL and DL.**   + **The same option is used for idle/inactive and connected mode.**   + **It is FFS whether to study other cases.** |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | We still see that PR1 and PR2 are almost equivalent (at least cost perspective) but we are OK to study how the spec impacts are different between two. |
| Samsung | N | We suggest to focus the study on PR3 only.   * **The following options for further UE peak rate reduction will be studied:**   + **Option PR3: Restriction of maximum number of PRBs ~~(or bandwidth)~~ for PDSCH and PUSCH.** * **In addition, optional results for the following option can also be reported:**   + **Option PR1: Relaxation of the constraint for peak data rate reduction.**   + **Option PR2: Restriction of maximum TBS for PDSCH and PUSCH.** |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| LGE | Y | We can live with this proposal for the sake of progress. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| Xiaomi5 |  | We are confused about the following bullet   * + **The studied peak rate reduction applies to both UE-specific (unicast) and common (broadcast) channels.**   Is the common channel dedicated for R18 eRedCap or the common for all UEs? |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |

**FL4 High Priority Question 7.3-2a: Does the studied peak rate reduction apply to both UE-specific (unicast) and common (broadcast) channels? If the answer is no, please elaborate in the Comments field. (Different answers can be provided for the different options.)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | It is not expected that a common broadcast channel has a quite extreme peak data rate. Further, there may be a slot configured/scheduled with both broadcast PDSCH and unicast PDSCH, if applicable. In this case, UE capability is surely limited by the sum of payload size for the two broadcast/unicast PDSCH. Therefore, both UE-specific (unicast) and common (broadcast) channels should be applicable |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y | Need further clarification that no A/N feedback for broadcast channel. And does not expect LLR combination during performance evaluation. |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | We prefer that it is applied to both unicast and broadcast channels as this can provide a higher cost saving and it represents an upper bound on the achievable cost saving. |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | From cost reduction perspective, both should comply with the reduced peak rate. |
| OPPO |  | We did not see the justification of the question. The broadcast channels may not have any specific target rate to be consider. In the SID, we believe the 10Mbps is for unicast |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Xiaomi5 |  | Is the common channel dedicated for R18 eRedCap or the common for all Ues? |

**FL4 High Priority Question 7.3-3a: Is it enough to study one of Options PR1 and PR2? Please elaborate in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Sierra Wireless | Y | PR2 is preferred as it is a clearer limit. |
| Intel | N | Since it is not precluded yet that multiple PDSCHs can be scheduled in a slot, PR2 is equivalent to PR1. In other words, PR1 is similar to limitation the sum of the TBS of multiple PDSCH/PUSCH in a slot. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Fine with studying either one of the options |
| Spreadtrum | N | Option PR1 and PR2 may have a similar cost impact, but the spec impacts were expected to be quite different. We can identify those different and then make down-selection.  But, if majority companies think study one option is enough, we can accept it. In that case, we prefer PR1. |
| CMCC |  | We are open to study both if differences are justified. |
| Samsung |  | We are only open to study them as optional options, since they are not listed in the SID. |
| vivo | Y | Fine with studying either one of the options |
| CATT |  | While we think the cost reduction between them may be similar, this question is a bit unclear.  We do not want to see the answer of this proposal precludes either PR1 or PR2 become ‘specified solution for reducing peak data rate’ at this early stage. |
| Panasonic |  | We are open whether to study one or both. |
| DOCOMO |  | We are fine to study either one of them in terms of complexity reduction. We think while the breakdowns for complexity reduction may be almost same between PR1 and PR2, other impacts (e.g., performance aspects, coexistence aspects, spec impact aspects etc.) for each PR1/PR2 should be studied separately. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We are open to study them as the optional evaluation. |
| Nordic | N | Because, PR2 is independent of max PRB allocation, while PR1 is still dependent on max PRB allocation |
| Ericsson | N | We prefer to study both options.  From cost reduction point-of-view, options PR1 and PR2 are perhaps equivalent. However, they may need to be considered separately for specification impact analysis. |
| LGE | Y | Fine to study one of the options. No strong preference b/w the two. |
| Lenovo |  | We are open to study both options. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We prefer PR2 as we think both cases have similar cost reduction but PR2 is more straightforward from specification and implementation impact perspectives. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | The difference between them seems about how to capture it in specification. |
| OPPO | N | May be it is a bit earlier to do the down-selection. |
| Qualcomm | Y | We prefer to study PR1 only |
| Xiaomi5 | N | PR1 and PR2 have the similar cost gain but they have different spec impact. So, it is better to study both options. |

**FL4 High Priority Question 7.3-4a: Is it enough to study one of Options PR3 and BW3? Please elaborate in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Sierra Wireless | N | We think both BW3 and PR3 should be studied as there are differences between them. If only one is to be studied, we prefer BW3. |
| Intel | N | Both BW3 and PR3 should be studied. BW3 is localized 5MHz for data channel, while PR3 allows a flexibility of distributed frequency resource allocation. Other difference for PR3 is up to clarification in 7.3-5a |
| FUTUREWEI | N | Okay to study both |
| Spreadtrum | N | As illustrated by some companies, there may some different between BW3 and PR3, we are OK to study both. |
| CMCC | N | According the previous comments, there may be different frequency allocation limitations for PR3 and BW3. Both can be analyzed or evaluated for further possible down selection. |
| Samsung | Y | We think PR 3 is align the description in the SID.  Although we are open to study BW3 optionally. |
| vivo | Y | We can understand that the PDSCH allocation should be within 5MHz for BW3 while the PDSCH allocation can be distributed in frequency with total size not exceeding 25RB (assuming 15KHz SCS). But from UE buffering perspective, the two options seem the same, i.e UE can reduce the buffering by only buffering the interested RBs after PDCCH is decoded. Therefore, study Option BW3 is sufficient. |
| CATT | Y | The difference should be small in either performance or cost. Between them we slightly prefer BW3. |
| Panasonic |  | We are open whether to study one or both. The difference (e.g., distributed allocation is allowed or not) should be clarified. |
| Sharp |  | We are open to study both |
| DOCOMO | N | We are fine to study both BW3 and PR3. We also agree with Lenovo’s comment at the previous round that PR3 should assume the distributed resource allocation only. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | Similar complexity reduction between BW3 and PR3 is observed. Study one of them would be enough. |
| Nordic | Y | As shown, while distributed/localized is difference between PR3 and BW3, there is no difference in hardware requirements to support those. |
| Ericsson | N | * Agree with Intel regarding differences between BW3 and PR3.We prefer to consider both options in the study phase so that we have clear descriptions and evaluations/comparisons. * If we need to down select, we should down select BW3 which can provide higher cost saving. |
| LGE | Y | The difference is small in our view. If both are to be studies, to avoid duplicate efforts, PR3 can be focused on the differences only, e.g., the aspect of different frequency allocation. |
| Lenovo |  | We are open to study both options. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We think it is enough to consider BW3 only as we don’t see meaningful difference in complexity between these two options. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | At least for UL, it is enough to study BW3 only, because UL PUSCH has contiguous PRB allocation. We don’t feel that almost-contiguous PUSCH is a typical scheme for Rel-18 RedCap, which requires optional UE capability.  For DL, some clarification is needed to clearly define its difference from BWP3, e.g. the UE supports to be scheduled with PRBs that is not localized within 5MHz only. |
| OPPO | Y | We would like to focus on PR3. |
| Qualcomm | N | Okay to study both |
| Xiaomi5 | Y | Share the same view as LGE. |

**FL4 Medium Priority Question 7.3-5a: Is the restricted number of PRBs in Option PR3 a hardcoded limit? If the answer is no, please elaborate in the Comments field on how the maximum number of PRBs depends on other (scheduling) parameters.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Intel | N | We prefer to study both the following two interpretations of PR3  Interpretation 1: Hard limit on maximum number of PRBs in PR3. This hard limit is also used in the formula in 38.306 for peak data rate calculation.  Interpretation 2: the maximum number of PRBs in PR3 just a value to define peak data, while the actually allocated PRBs of data channel can be larger. This is similar to the handling of modulation order in the formula for peak data rate calculation in 38.306. Further, it may be considered to limit the number of allocated OFDM symbols when the number of allocated PRBs is larger than 25. For example, gNB may schedule >25 PRBs with less OFDM symbols for PDSCH/PUSCH. Note: since total number of REs is limited in interpretation 2, it has similar complexity as interpretation 1 for post-FFT data buffering. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | We need to keep things simple and related to UE capability |
| CMCC | Y | To make clear difference between PR3 and PR2, it may be better to always limit the PRB number. |
| vivo | Y | For Interpretation 2 proposed by Intel, it is similar to Option PR2 that any factors determine the TBS can be relaxed. |
| CATT | Y | Otherwise it is more like just a variant of limiting the TBS. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We think the number of PRB should be hard limit for the complexity reduction gain evaluation since PR3 can be the one of the options of BW reduction as well. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y | Note: Intel’s interpretation 2 is even closer to BW3 😊 |
| Ericsson | Y | Our interpretation is that restricted number of PRBs is a hardcoded limit. The “maximum” number of PRBs can be hardcoded given the 10 Mbps peak data rate target.  @Intel Wouldn’t ‘Interpretation 2’ be equivalent to Option PR1 (from the perspective of “a value to define peak data”)? |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y | But seems to be better to list out options. |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **Medium Priority Proposal 7.3-5b: The restricted number of PRBs in Option PR3 is a hardcoded limit.** | |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Samsung | y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | We are fine for the proposal if only the understanding is aligned. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Xiaomi5 | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |

**FL4 Medium Priority Question 7.3-6a: In addition, can relaxed modulation order be studied? If so, what cases should be studied, and should they be studied as part of options PR1/2/3 above or as separate options?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Y | We support to study relaxed modulation order. It can be additional component of PR1/2/3. On other hand, the incorporation of 16QAM to PR3 depends on the targeted peak data rate for TDD |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | It is best as a separate PR option. We can reuse the text from the last TR and just add in the new options |
| CMCC | N | In R17, reduced UL modulation order has been studied and it is not introduced during WI.  Reduced modulation order has significant impact on network spectrum efficiency. Even for UEs in cell enter with high SINR, they still can not use high order, and will consume more resources, this is not desirable. |
| vivo | Y | Support to study relaxed modulation to 16QAM. It can be discussed as an separate option. |
| CATT | N | Recall the Rel-17 study, further reducing the modulation order to 16 QAM does not have significant cost reduction, but brings non-negligible throughput/SE reduction. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We support to study relaxed modulation order, i.e., the maximum modulation order from 64QAM to 16QAM. It can be studied as a part of options PR1/2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | For the modulation order reduction, it would have the impacts on NW capacity and Rel-17 evaluation results also show insignificant complexity reduction, there is no need to study the 16-QAM in Rel-18. |
| Nordic | Y | Reduced MO allows also for at least cheaper ADC. Reduction to 16QAM should be clearly studied. |
| Ericsson | N | We don’t see any need for re-studying relaxed modulation order. |
| LGE | N | Mainly due to the small cost/complexity reduction gain. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | In Rel-17, reducing modulation to 16-QAM in the UL has significant impact to the spectral efficiency while the cost saving is small. Therefore, we do not support relaxed modulation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | Relaxed modulation order causes spectral efficiency degradation but it has no additional benefit over PR1/2/3. |
| OPPO | N | We see no further options as already some there. |
| Qualcomm | Y | We support to study relaxed modulation order for UL |
| FL5 | Based on received responses, the following proposal can be considered (beside Proposal 7.3-1d).  **Medium Priority Proposal 7.3-6b:**   * **In addition, optional results for the following option for further UE peak rate reduction can also be reported:**   + **Option PR4: Relaxed maximum modulation from 64QAM to 16QAM.** | |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| CATT |  | Reduced modulation order is even rejected in the first round discussion in RAN#93-e for Rel-18 study (see RP-211657):  2.5.2 New use cases and UE bandwidth  A group of other proposals were only mentioned seldomly, e.g. CSI and beam mgmt, reduced modulation order, 40MHz UE bandwidth, coexistence, upper layer enh. **Unless there is more support, the moderator would propose not to discuss those further in the Intermediate Round.**  Don’t know why we are still pursuing this. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | According to the comments in last round, more companies show the objection. Considering the limited TU, we think this proposal is not needed. |
| vivo | Y | It should be clarified that the relaxed modulation order applies to both DL and UL, suggest following **modification**  **Medium Priority Proposal 7.3-6b:**   * **In addition, optional results for the following option for further UE peak rate reduction can also be reported:**   + **Option PR4: Relaxed maximum modulation from 64QAM to 16QAM for both PDSCH and PUSCH.** |
| Sierra Wireless |  | We do not see the need for re-studying the reduction in modulation order considering that expected cost savings are small. |
| CMCC | N | Same view as CATT and ZTE. |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Samsung | N | Same view as CATT, ZTE, and CMCC. |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| LGE | N | Mainly due to the small cost/complexity reduction gain. |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | We are also fine with the vivo’s update. |
| Xiaomi5 | N | Same view with CATT, ZTE, CMCC |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | N | No need to study. In Rel-17, reducing modulation to 16-QAM in the UL has significant impact to the spectral efficiency while the cost saving is small. Therefore, we do not support relaxed modulation. |

7.4 Relaxed UE processing timeline

This section focuses on different relaxed UE processing timeline options which could be evaluated. Contributions discuss two options for relaxed UE processing timeline which are summarized below.

* **Option PT1:** Relaxation of UE processing time for PDSCH/PUSCH in terms of N1 and N2 [9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35]
* **Option PT2:** Relaxation of UE processing time for CSI in terms of Z and Z’ [9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 20, 23, 25, 30, 35]

As discussed in Rel-17 [4], there is potential cost reduction for relaxed UE processing timeline with option P1 and/or option P2. Meanwhile, the evaluations in [4] assume the relaxation factor of 2, i.e., doubling N1/N2 and Z/Z’. In this regard, the following questions can be considered.

**FL1 High Priority Question 7.4-1a: Which option(s) should be studied? If some other relaxation factor(s) than 2 should be considered, please indicate so in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option(s)** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | PT1, PT2 | Given the interest during R18 discussions, we should continue examining process relaxation.  Both options have been examined in R17. However, more companies should provide results for CSI relaxation in order to evaluate the technique as the number of results was limited. |
| Spreadtrum | Option PT1 | Open to Option PT2 |
| CMCC | PT1, PT2 |  |
| CATT |  | We still feel no need to reopen Rel-17 discussion. Another thing is that in the SID relaxing processing timeline is not standalone approach. |
| Vivo | Option PT1, Option PT2 | In order to reduce the UE cost, both data and CSI processing time should be relaxed |
| Sharp | PT1, PT2 |  |
| Transsion | PT1, PT2 |  |
| Nordic | PT1, PT2 | We support both |
| NEC | PT1 |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | PT1, PT2 | Some new evaluation for R18 RedCap is needed, e.g., additional complexity reduction based on R17 RedCap need to be evaluated. |
| Ericsson | PT1, PT2 | As relaxed processing timeline is not listed as a standalone technique in the SID, it may not be necessary to provide complexity evaluation results for these options, i.e., it may be enough to report complexity evaluation results for combinations with these options in TR clause 7.5, but it is still good to have a TR clause 7.4 describing other aspects of relaxed processing timeline. |
| DOCOMO | PT1, PT2 |  |
| Samsung | PT1 | Open to PT2 |
| IDCC | PT1, PT2 |  |
| LGE |  | We share the view with CATT in that we should avoid reiterating the same evaluations and discussions on this topic and should only consider studying them if there is any further cost/complexity benefits identified in conjunction with the UE bandwidth reduction and/or peak rate reduction. |
| SONY | PT1, PT2 |  |
| Intel | PT1, PT2 |  |
| OPPO | PT1, PT2 |  |
| Xiaomi | PT1, PT2 |  |
| Nokia, NSB | PT1 | We are OK to consider relaxation factor of 2 for N1/N2.  Relaxation of UE processing time for CSI in terms of Z and Z’ was already considered in Rel-17 and not adopted for evaluations. We don’t see compelling reasons to consider this again in Rel-18. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | PT1, PT2 |  |
| FL2  FL3 | A large majority of the received responses express an interest in studying options PT1 and PT2. Based on the responses the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 7.4-1b:**   * **The following options for relaxed UE processing timeline will be studied:**   + **Option PT1: Relaxation of UE processing time for PDSCH/PUSCH in terms of N1 and N2**   + **Option PT2: Relaxation of UE processing time for CSI in terms of Z and Z** * **UE complexity reduction estimates for relaxed UE processing timeline are only reported for combinations with UE bandwidth reduction or UE peak rate reduction.** | |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | While we understand the use of the combination, we still would like to see the individual results for PT1 and PT2 reported for comparisons. |
| CATT |  | With the understanding that this will only be reported for combination case, we wouldn’t object if the majority would like to do so. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y | We consider both of Option PT1/2 can be supported if all have considerable complexity reduction. |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| SONY | Y | Shouldn’t the second “Z” in Option PT2 contain a “prime mark”: Z’ |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | Separate estimation for timeline relaxing is not in the SID scope. Therefore, relaxed UE processing timeline estimation should be reported for combinations with UE bandwidth reduction or UE peak rate reduction.  Correspondingly, the separate section for timeline relaxing in the TR skeleton also should be removed. |
| LGE |  | Again, we share the view with CATT in that we should avoid reiterating the same evaluations and discussions on this topic and should only consider studying them if there is any further cost/complexity benefits identified in conjunction with the UE bandwidth reduction and/or peak rate reduction.  We won’t object though, with the understanding that the second bullet addresses our concerns. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Xiaomi |  | Whether relaxed UE processing timeline is an independent solution, which doesn’t depend on UE BW reduction and UE peak data rate reduction, should be discussed at first.  If so, individual results for PT1 and PT2 should also be reported, since the evaluation results captured in TR38.875 for double relaxation factor are provided by only few companies and are not sufficient. Besides, other relaxation factor can also be evaluated.  Otherwise, only combination evaluation can be performed. |
| Sequans | Y | Complexity reduction from PT1 and PT2 should be studied in combination with the prioritized UE bandwidth reduction and/or peak rate reduction options |
| FL4 | Based on the received responses, it seems that the proposal can be agreed, with the addition of the missing prime mark on Z’ in Option PT2.  **High Priority Proposal 7.4-1c:**   * **The following options for relaxed UE processing timeline will be studied:**   + **Option PT1: Relaxation of UE processing time for PDSCH/PUSCH in terms of N1 and N2**   + **Option PT2: Relaxation of UE processing time for CSI in terms of Z and Z’** * **UE complexity reduction estimates for relaxed UE processing timeline are only reported for combinations with UE bandwidth reduction or UE peak rate reduction.** | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y with clarification | Just for clarification, Option PT1 and PT2 are not mutually exclusive but can be studied as a combination. Is it correct understanding? If so, better to capture it as a note. |
| FL5 | The following agreement was made on the RAN1 reflector:  Agreement:   * The following options for relaxed UE processing timeline will be studied:   + Option PT1: Relaxation of UE processing time for PDSCH/PUSCH in terms of N1 and N2   + Option PT2: Relaxation of UE processing time for CSI in terms of Z and Z’ * UE complexity reduction estimates for relaxed UE processing timeline are only reported for combinations with UE bandwidth reduction or UE peak rate reduction.   A new Proposal 7.4-2a has been added below. | |

Based on the received responses to Question 7.4-1a and Proposal 7.4-1c, the following proposal can be considered.

**FL5 High Priority Proposal 7.4-1d:**

* **In Option PT1, the relaxation factor for N1 and N2 is 2.**
* **In Option PT2, the relaxation factor for Z and Z’ is 2.**
* **The combination of Options PT1 and PT2 is also studied.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | Just some concern of tripling the combination cases, e.g. from BW1 to {BW1+PT1, BW1+PT2, BW1+(PT1+PT2)}. It would be good to limit the number of combinations. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| vivo | Y | Share the same views with CATT that better to limit the number of combinations. We think it may be sufficient to check only the BW1+(PT1+PT2) case for the combined cost reduction gain. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y | Share similar view with CATT, and vivo to further limited the combination. And the list shall based on the agreement for two cost reduction options. |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| LGE | Y | We are open for further discussion to reduce the number of combinations. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | We share the similar view with vivo that the combination of BW1+(PT1+PT2) seems sufficient but open to discuss further. |
| NEC | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | It may be enough to evaluate PT1 and PT1+PT2, i.e., no combination with PT2 but not PT1. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |

7.5 Combinations of UE complexity reduction features

This section focuses on identifying potential combinations of further UE complexity reduction features which need to be evaluated. Contributions present various combinations of the potential complexity reduction features/options discussed in the previous sections. Combinations of relaxed processing time with bandwidth reduction and peak data rate reduction options are generally considered in the contributions [9, 10, 12, 14, 25, 27]. However, since the bandwidth reduction techniques naturally result in the peak data rate reduction, combinations of BW reduction and peak data rate reduction techniques are not considered in most of the contributions. Specifically, contribution [12] points out that it is not necessary to combine the UE bandwidth reduction and reduced UE peak data rate in FR1, since a similar effect can be achieved by both solutions.

Meanwhile, one contribution [21] presents the combination of TBS restriction with bandwidth reduction for further peak rate reduction. Also, [39] indicates that whether both UE bandwidth reduction and reduced UE peak data rate can be selected or only one is down selected depends on not only the cost reduction, but also the performance impacts and specification effort.

In this regard, it can be discussed whether combinations of UE bandwidth reduction and UE peak data rate reduction are feasible options. Therefore, the following question can be considered:

**FL1 High Priority Question 7.5-1a: Should any combination(s) of the further UE bandwidth reduction options listed in Section 7.2 and the UE peak data rate reduction options listed in Section 7.3 be studied? Please elaborate in the Comments field.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI |  | From initial analysis, the complexity reduction for most individual techniques is generally small. In order to have a meaningful reduction for Rel-18, combinations of techniques will be needed. How to limit the number of combinations to examine is the challenge. |
| Sierra Wireless |  | Number of combinations should be limited. |
| Spreadtrum |  | We prefer to identify the most popular solutions first, i.e., after resolve the question of 7.2-1a and 7.3-1a, and then consider whether and how to combine. |
| CMCC |  | According to our understanding, when the bandwidth is reduced to 5MHz, peak data rate is also reduced, further reduce peak data rate may not bring significant cost reduction. And there will be only one type of R18 RedCap UE, except for the cost reduction, the design is better to satisfy the date rate requirement for different bandwidth, 1Rx/2Rx, modulation order combinations, combination of UE bandwidth of UE peak data rate reduction should be carefully examined. |
| CATT |  | Assuming that the following cases are already evaluated in standalone study, i.e. in either BW reduction or PR reduction:   * (RF: 5MHz, BB: 5MHz) + No further PR limit * (RF: 20MHz, BB: 5MHz) + No further PR limit * No BW reduction (all 20MHz) + (PR: 10Mbps)   Depending on the interest of the majority group, the following combination can be considered:   * (RF : 5MHz, BB : 5MHz) + (PR : 10Mbps) * (RF : 20MHz, BB : 5MHz) + ( PR : 10Mbps) |
| vivo | Y | Similar as in Rel-17, we think all the BW reduction options can be combined with Option PR5 of relaxation of the maximum modulation order from 64QAM to 16QAM. |
| Qualcomm | N | For BW reduction options (regardless of RF BW reduction or BB BW only reduction), the peak rate is naturally reduced and achieving the required bitrate (close to 10Mbps) without considering any peak data rate reduction schemes. Therefore, no further peak data rate reduction options are required for BW reduction options. If we consider combination of those two, it will bring too many combination options in the combination sets. |
| Transsion |  | The combination of the further UE bandwidth reduction options and the UE peak data rate reduction options may result in more cost reduction than single reduction option. |
| Nordic |  | We would like to avoid putting restrictions on combinations and this point |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Not all the combination should be studied. We need to determine the detailed combinations for evaluation, which depends on the discussion in 7.2 and 7.3.  Additionally, when calculating the complexity reduction based on combination, the calculating method should be discussed and aligned. |
| Ericsson | N | For bandwidth reduction options where the bandwidth reduction results in a peak rate reduction close to 10 Mbps, there is no need to evaluate the combination of that bandwidth reduction option with some explicit peak rate reduction option(s). |
| DOCOMO |  | We share the similar view with companies that the combination of complexity reduction techniques needs to be considered to achieve further complexity reduction compared to Rel-17 RedCap. The detailed combinations can be discussed after some progress for the discussion of section 7.2/7.3. |
| Samsung |  | We treat them as either A or B, but not combined. The only combination allows is timeline relaxation. |
| IDCC | N | We do not see a need for this. |
| LGE |  | Combinations of 7.2 and 7.3 need to be studied as some of the standalone benefits may disappear when they are jointly evaluated. This will help removing duplicate efforts to reduce the cost/complexity. |
| SONY | Y | Bandwidth reduction and peak data rate reduction are different issues. It might be desirable to support a low peak data rate in a wide bandwidth in order to operate at a more robust frequency diverse low coding rate. |
| Intel | Y | We are supportive to allow the combination of BW reduction and peak data rate reduction. For 5MHz BW and 64QAM, the data rate is around 20Mbps, therefore, it is possible to further limit the peak data rate or the maximum TBS, for further complexity reduction. |
| OPPO |  | We wonder if we made decision base on that in Rel17? |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We support the combination as BW reduction to 5MHz still has peak data rates higher than 10 Mbps. We don’t prefer further BW reduction to reach 10 Mbps as restricting the number of PRBs can reduce DL throughput for cell-edge UEs |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Prefer to achieve a limited number of combinations and avoid unnecessary overlaps between BW reduction to 5MHz and peak date rate reduction. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Xiaomi |  | Number of combinations should be limited due to the limited TU. |

While the exact sets of combination of techniques depend on the outcome of previous sections regarding the adopted options for evaluations, the two main sets of combinations are as follows:

* **Combination set 1:** Different combinations of UE bandwidth reduction options and relaxed processing time options.
* **Combination set 2:** Different combinations of UE peak data rate reduction options and relaxed processing time options.

**FL1 High Priority Question 7.5-2a: Can the following combination sets of complexity reduction features be considered as a starting point for the Rel-18 evaluations?**

* **Combination set 1: Different combinations of UE bandwidth reduction options and relaxed processing time options.**
* **Combination set 2: Different combinations of UE peak data rate reduction options and relaxed processing time options.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI |  | While it may be easier to discuss sets, the problem is the combination sets are not necessarily exclusive. A peak data rate reduction is possible with a 5 MHz BW. We can also have a combination of BW reduction and peak data rate (like modulation) and processing. Thus, it is somewhat difficult to create meaningful sets. |
| Spreadtrum | Y but | We think the study priority of these two combinations is high but other combinations are not preclude.  We indicated that it is not necessary to combine the UE bandwidth reduction and reduced UE peak data rate in our contribution, but for now, we are open to this combination, as some companies point out even the BW is reduced to 5MHz, the supported peak data rate is still higher than 10Mbps (the target data rate of R18). |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | At least for looking at the maximum possible cost saving, we prefer to study the different combinations of complexity reduction features. |
| Transsion | Y |  |
| Nordic | N | This proposal is pre-mature at this point. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| DOCOMO |  | We are fine with both Combination set 1 and 2 as a starting point in general. In addition to them, following two combinations can be considered depending on the discussion outcome of previous section.   * **Combination set 3: Different combinations of UE bandwidth reduction options and UE peak data rate reduction options.** * **Combination set 4: Different combinations of UE bandwidth reduction options, UE peak data rate reduction options and relaxed processing time options.** |
| Samsung | Y | But need to further clarify the scope of this SI. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| LGE |  | We prefer to comeback to this question once the discussion under 7.4 on the relaxed UE processing time settles down). |
| SONY | Y | Other combinations are not precluded. |
| Intel |  | We prefer to wait for a conclusion on 7.5-1a. In general, we prefer to evaluate all possible combinations to find the most favorite case for eRedCap. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We prefer to wait until the discussion on features is more stable. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | OK for a starting point. |
| FL2  FL3 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Question 7.5-2b: At least the following combination sets of complexity reduction features are used as a starting point for the Rel-18 evaluations:**   * **Combination set 1: Different combinations of UE bandwidth reduction options and relaxed processing time options.** * **Combination set 2: Different combinations of UE peak data rate reduction options and relaxed processing time options.** | |
| Nordic | N | We agree with Intel and Nokia that combinations depends on techniques which are not yet stable |
| vivo | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | N | It is difficult to discuss the combinations because the techniques are not settled. |
| Lenovo | N | Same view with Nordic and FUTUREWEI |
| CATT | Y in general | But the combination number may still be large, since we see 2 options for BW reduction (BW1, BW3), at least 2 options for peak data rate reduction (PR1, PR2, [PR3]), and 3 options for relaxed processing time (N, Z, N+Z). The combination number may be 2\*3 + 2\*3 = 12, which is huge.  hope we can reduce the combination number, e.g. only consider relax N but not Z. |
| Panasonic |  | As commented by companies, the combination is difficult to judge for now. |
| Sierra Wireless | N | We prefer to wait until techniques are more settled. |
| OPPO | N | We don’t expect much combination. The PTx may have cost saving not depending on others. |
| SONY | Y |  |
| Samsung | N | We suggest to only focus on the potential combination from SI. |
| DOCOMO | Y | Detailed combinations would be discussed further. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y with update | According to the SID, at least BW1+timeline relaxing and BW3+timeline relaxing should be evaluated. And the other combinations can be further determined according to the discussion in 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4. Therefore, the following update is suggested  **High Priority Question 7.5-2b: At least the following combination ~~set~~s of complexity reduction features are used as a starting point for the Rel-18 evaluations:**   * **Combination ~~set~~ 1: ~~Different~~ combinations of UE bandwidth reduction option~~s~~ (BW1) and relaxed processing time options.** * **Combination ~~set~~ 2: ~~Different~~ combinations of UE peak data rate reduction option~~s~~ (BW3) and relaxed processing time options.** |
| LGE | N | We share the views from other companies that it is difficult to agree on this proposal at this time. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Intel |  | It would be fine to wait until the options for each feature (BW reduction, peak rate reduction, relaxed process time, etc.) are finalized, then discuss possible combinations.  We prefer to allow the combination of BW reduction and peak data rate reduction and others. |
| CMCC |  | Combination is explicitly stated in the SID, so it will be analyzed. Agree with OPPO that processing time relax may provide additional cost reduction beside BW reduction or PR reduction, but the reduction gain may be independent from them. Then there can be parallel discussions, and when the options for BW and RP is stable, the combinations can be provided. |
| MediaTek |  | Better to postpone this discussion until techniques are more stable |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Same view as before that it is better to wait until the techniques are finalized |
| Xiaomi | N | Share the same view as some companies that should study single feature at first and then consider combination. |

In addition to the main complexity reduction features identified in the SID [1], a few contributions [9, 18, 20, 25, 31, 32, 35] point out other potential complexity reduction features for Rel-18. Specifically, the following aspects are discussed in these contributions:

* Reduced number of HARQ processes [9, 18, 20, 25, 32]
* HD-FDD complexity reduction [31, 32, 35]
* PDCCH monitoring reduction [35]

**FL1 High Priority Question 7.5-3a: In addition to the complexity reduction features/options described in previous sections, should RAN1 prioritize a study of any other aspects related to Rel-18 further UE complexity reduction?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | Studying reduction of the complexity for control processing, including PDCCH monitoring reduction. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Open to other features/options, if the TU permits |
| CMCC |  | These are low priority. |
| CATT |  | Considering that the group is now facing a lot of options in BW reduction and PR reduction, we prefer prioritizing those who are already in the SID scope. |
| Vivo |  | Reduced number of HARQ buffer processes can be studied as it is related to UE data rate reduction.  Others are not in SID scope. |
| Qualcomm | Y | We prefer to see the cost reduction for PDCCH monitoring reduction. There are some reasons for that:  1. The reduced PDCCH monitoring was studied in Rel-17 but it was not from the cost saving context but from the power saving context. That was because the DL control processing & decoder block shows very small portion of the total cost in Rel-15 reference and corresponding cost reduction would be also very small if any relaxation is applied. However, the portion of DL control processing & decoder block has been increased to about 20% of the total baseband cost of Rel-17 baseline UE (based on cost breakdown of Rel-17 RedCap UE in TR 38.875), so the corresponding cost saving would be much more significant if reduced PDCCH monitoring is applied to Rel-17 baseline.  2. We already have sufficient study on reduced PDCCH monitoring in Rel-17 RedCap TR, which can be simply reused for Rel-18 (no duplication of the study is needed). Only required thing is the cost breakdown, which was not done during Rel-17. |
| Transsion |  | If the TU permits, we are open to talk about these feature. |
| Nordic | Y | Modifications to R17 HD-FDD duplexing can clearly reduce processing peaks/ peak rates and thus should be studied as priority according to WID. This because UE does not need to process UL and DL data channels at the same. Ultimately reduce cost of   * DL control processing & decoder * UL processing block |
| NEC |  | As TU is limited, they should be of lower priority. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | They can be deprioritized to be considered at this point. |
| Ericsson |  | Considering the limited time available to conclude the Rel-18 eRedCap SI, the study should focus on UE bandwidth reduction, UE peak rate reduction, and UE processing timeline relaxation. |
| DOCOMO |  | At least the reduced number of HARQ processes should be considered, which was studied but not adopted for Rel-17. We are also open to study for other complexity reduction techniques, i.e., HD FDD complexity reduction and PDCCH monitoring reduction. |
| Samsung |  | We suggest to focus on the Sis. |
| IDCC |  | We do no think so due to limited TU. |
| LGE | N | They should be deprioritized given the time for evaluation and discussion.  But, among the techniques mentioned above, we are open to study HD-FDD type B for further cost/complexity reduction. |
| SONY | Y | We would be most interested in HD-FDD complexity reduction (for, e.g., the reasons stated by Nordic) and PDCCH monitoring reductions. |
| Intel | Y | Considering the benefit from BW reduction, peak rate reduction and relaxed processing time is not that large, it is preferrable to study more factors for a better design. Besides the three listed points, we think relaxed modulation order to 16QAM can be considered if the limitation on modulation order in PR5 is only for peak data rate calculation. |
| Xiaomi |  | They should be considered with lower priority due to the limited TU. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | These features should not be prioritized.  We don’t think PDCCH monitoring reduction will bring any meaningful reduction in complexity and will increase blocking, especially if the control channel is limited to 5MHz. |
| FL2  FL3 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Question 7.5-3b: Study of the following complexity reduction techniques is not prioritized in this study item.**   * **Reduced number of HARQ processes** * **HD-FDD complexity reduction** * **PDCCH monitoring reduction** | |
| Nordic | N | We still do not understand why enhanced HD-FDD should be excluded as it reduces peak rates for PDSCH and PUSCH, **well in scope of SID.** |
| Vivo | Y | We think reduced number of HARQ processes can be studied as it is related to UE data rate reduction. But we can accept the proposal. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | N | The main concern for those items is the limited TU for the study item. However, as mentioned, we have done sufficient study for PDCCH monitoring reduction in Rel-17 including performance impact (blocking prob), coexistence, and specification impacts which are captured in TR 38.875 (section 8.2). The only thing we need to do is the cost breakdown study. We support to study PDCCH monitoring reduction, as it brings meaningful cost saving gain as well as additional UE power saving gain. |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| SONY |  | We’d be OK with studying (2) further HD-FDD complexity reduction and (3) PDCCH monitoring reduction |
| Samsung |  | On the HD-FDD. In our understanding, it doesn’t need to be studied at all. By default, we assume HD-FDD can be optionally supported for R18 Redcap UE, just as the support 1 or 2 Rx, 64QAM, etc. |
| DOCOMO |  | We are fine not to prioritize other complexity reduction techniques than BW reduction, peak data reduction and relaxed processing time, but should not be precluded. As commented by Intel, to provide meaningful complexity reduction gain against Rel-17 RedCap, we believe it would be worth to consider any other complexity reduction techniques which may provide further complexity reduction gain and should not be regarded as out-of-scope at this point.  Regarding reduced number of HARQ processes, it was not supported for Rel-17 RedCap since the gain is relatively small compared to other complexity reduction techniques, while the impacts are not expected to be so large. Thus, we prefer to study the complexity reduction gain of it as a candidate solution. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| LGE | Y | But, we are open for further HD-FDD complexity reduction which we think is relevant for further UE cost/complexity reduction while meeting the reduced peak data rate. |
| Ericsson | Y | Considering the limited time available to conclude the Rel-18 eRedCap SI, the study should focus on UE bandwidth reduction, UE peak rate reduction, and UE processing timeline relaxation. |
| Intel | N | As commented in the first round, the 3 features listed in SID only provide a medium complexity reduction. Consequently, it would be beneficial to work on more techniques for reduction. On the other hand, it is just the first meeting of eRedCap, we prefer to study on the listed features. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| MediaTek | N | We don’t see why to prevent companies from studying techniques that may potentially lead to UE complexity reduction. The objectives of the SID are to reduce UE complexity. In the study item phase, companies should be encouraged to study and provide results, rather than being discouraged. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | N | Our concern is how to interpret the wording of “is not prioritized in this study item”. Does that mean these complexity reduction solutions will not be discussed in the SI? If so, we suggest the following update to make it clear.  The following complexity reduction techniques will not be studied in this study item.  • Reduced number of HARQ processes  • HD-FDD complexity reduction  • PDCCH monitoring reduction |
| Sequans | Y | We believe there is no time to focus study on additional new techniques for further complexity reduction. But we can of course capture any new observations regarding the use of techniques already studied in R17 RedCap in combination with the prioritized R18 RedCap features. |
| FL4 | Based on the received responses, the following question can be considered.  **High Priority Question 7.5-3c: Can any of the following techniques be studied with lower priority? Please elaborate in the Comments field.**   1. **Reduced number of HARQ processes** 2. **HD-FDD complexity reduction** 3. **PDCCH monitoring reduction** | |
| Intel |  | We support to study all 3 additional techniques. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | None of these should be studied |
| CMCC |  | Since they are not listed explicitly as BW reduction and peak date rate in the SID, they may have lower priority. However, we are open to study them if the cost reduction gain is justified. |
| Samsung |  | Again, in our understanding, HD-FDD can be optionally supported for R18 Redcap UE, just as the support 1 or 2 Rx, 64QAM, etc. |
| vivo |  | We support to study Reduced number of HARQ processes. |
| CATT |  | None. The first two are not accepted either in Rel-17 WID or Rel-18 RANP discussion thus we do not see the need to reopen the discussion. PDCCH monitoring reduction might be a little interesting, but the TU is too limited. |
| DOCOMO |  | We prefer to study reduced number of HARQ processes and we are fine that it can be studied as optional. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | They are discussed in Rel-17 but no significant complexity reduction is observed. For Rel-18 RedCap, we may do not want to reopen the discussion especially considering the limited TU. |
| Nordic |  | HD-FDD complexity reduction should be allowed to be studied, as avoiding concurrent processing of PUSCH and PDSCH will reduce peak rates, **well in SID scope.**  Please do NOT confuse HD-FDD TYPE-B with HD-FDD complexity reduction proposed by Nordic which tries to reduce processing peaks caused by concurrent processing of PDSCH and PUSCH. |
| Ericsson | N | Considering the limited time available to conclude the Rel-18 eRedCap SI, the study should focus on UE bandwidth reduction, UE peak rate reduction, and UE processing timeline relaxation. |
| LGE |  | None if there is enough support for none of them. From our perspective, we are okay to study further HD-FDD complexity reduction with low priority. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We don’t think any of these features need to be studied given the limited time. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | As commented by companies, out of scope. |
| Qualcomm | Y | We prefer to study PDCCH monitoring reduction |
| FL5 | Based on the received responses, the following proposal can be considered.  **High Priority Proposal 7.5-3d: Conclusion: There is no consensus in RAN1 to study the following techniques (even with lower priority).**   * **Reduced number of HARQ processes** * **HD-FDD complexity reduction** * **PDCCH monitoring reduction** | |
| Nordic | N | Disagree with the conclusion. UE peak rate reduction can be limited by HD-FDD complexity reduction. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| vivo | N | We suggest studying the Reduced number of HARQ processes **with low priority** since it is related to the peak data rate reduction. |
| Sierra Wireless | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | N | Strongly disagree with the conclusion. We need to have the proposed schemes at least for optional study/evaluation. |
| Samsung | N | No need to spend time on other schemes |
| MediaTek | N | We don’t see why companies are not even allowed optionally to study/evaluate these schemes in the study phase. |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Intel | N | We support to study all 3 additional techniques. If a technique will be removed, better to check it one by one. |
| DOCOMO | N | Agree with vivo.  Actually, while these listed complexity reduction techniques are not captured as objective in SID, it was clarified by moderator in FLS at RAN#94-e meeting discussion that they are not precluded as follows;  “The moderator's understanding is that there is nothing explicitly precluding study of these other techniques as long as they can be considered to be within the scope of the objective, but that study of the techniques that are explicitly listed as being in the "focus" of the study need to be prioritized over study of other potential techniques in case there is a need to prioritize due to lack of time, which seems quite likely given the small (1+1 TU) time allocation for this SI.”  Accordingly, we think they should be allowed to study at least with low priority. |
| SONY | N | Companies should be able to study these issues. If other companies aren’t interested in these cost reduction techniques, they don’t have to contribute. |
| Xiaomi5 | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
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