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# 1 Introduction

This feature lead (FL) summary (FLS) concerns the Rel-18 study item (SI) on further NR RedCap (reduced capability) UE complexity reduction [1, 2, 3].

This document summarizes contributions [4] – [23] submitted to agenda item 9.6.2 and relevant parts of contribution [24] submitted to other agenda items and captures this email discussion on simulation needs and assumptions:

|  |
| --- |
| [109-e-R18-RedCap-03] Email discussion on simulation needs and assumptions by May 20 – Shinya (NTT DOCOMO)   * Check points: May 18 |

The issues that are in the focus of this round of the discussion are tagged FL8.

Follow the naming convention in this example:

* *eRedCapSimFLS1-v000.docx*
* *eRedCapSimFLS1-v001-CompanyA.docx*
* *eRedCapSimFLS1-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*
* *eRedCapSimFLS1-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx*

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

* Assume CompanyC wants to update *eRedCapSimFLS1-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*.
* CompanyC uploads an empty file named *eRedCapSimFLS1-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 *eRedCapSimFLS1-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.

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point of contact** | **Email address** |
| Ericsson | Sandeep Narayanan Kadan Veedu | sandeep.narayanan.kadan.veedu@ericsson.com |
| CATT | Yongqiang FEI | feiyongqiang@catt.cn |
| vivo | Lihui Wang | wanglihui@vivo.com |
| ZTE | Youjun Hu | hu.youjun1@zte.com.cn |
| CMCC | Lijie Hu | hulijie@chinamobile.com |
| Samsung | Seunghoon Choi | seunghoon.choi@samsung.com |
| NTT DOCOMO | Mayuko Okano | mayuko.okano.ca@nttdocomo.com |
| Intel | Yingyang Li | yingyang.li@intel.com |
| OPPO | Zhisong Zuo | zuozhisong@oppo.com |
| Nokia | Rapeepat Ratasuk | rapeepat.ratasuk@nokia-bell-labs.com |
| LGE | Sunghoon Lee | [sunghoon29.lee@lge.com](mailto:sunghoon29.lee@lge.com) |
| FUTUREWEI | Vip Desai | [vipul.desai@futurewei.com](mailto:vipul.desai@futurewei.com) |
| Qualcomm | Yongjun Kwak | yongkwak@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Frank Long | frank.longyi@huawei.com |
| Lenovo | Yuantao Zhang | zhangyt18@lenovo.com |
| Xiaomi | Xuemei Qiao | qiaoxuemei@xiaomi.com |
| MediaTek | Chiou-Wei Tsai | cw.tsai@mediatek.com |
| Sequans | Efstathios Katranaras | ekatranaras@sequans.com |
| InterDigital | Erdem Bala | erdem.bala@interdigital.com |

This FLS should focus on aspects related to the following bullets in the work plan proposed in [2]:

* Discuss and agree what (LLS/SLS) simulations are needed.
* Discuss and agree on potential updates of the (link-budget/LLS/SLS) methodology/assumptions compared to TR 38.875.

# 2 General aspects

As general aspects, following views are provided in the company contributions:

* RAN1 to discuss whether/which simulation results to plan to include in the Rel-18 TR [4]
  + it may not be worth the effort to “redo” the Rel-17 study for every technique
* Any planned simulations should include UE bandwidth reduction to 5MHz. [4]
* neither link-level simulation nor system-level simulation is essential to make a conclusion on the scope of Rel-18 RedCap WI [19]
* Do not duplicate the same evaluation that was already done in Rel-17 [23]
  + If needed, we can directly capture some results from TR 38.875 without redoing the same evaluation

Since the motivation for the necessary evaluations would be different from each other, **FL suggestion is to discuss which evaluations will be carried out individually in the ollowing sections.**

# 8 Coverage recovery

For coverage evaluation, following views on whether/which evaluations are necessary are provided in the company contributions:

* Evaluation is **NOT** necessary [6]
  + *UE bandwidth reduction and reduced UE peak data rate may have little impact on coverage*
  + *very limited TU for Rel-18 RedCap*
  + Data CH [8]
    - *along with the reduced bandwidth of (at least) baseband (e.g. 20 MHz → 5 MHz), the target data rate is also reduced (e.g. 50 Mbps → 10 Mbps) in a similar proportion*
  + SSB w/ 30KHz SCS [8]
    - *the SSB is 7.2 MHz, which cannot even be completely received by a UE with 5 MHz RF bandwidth*
* Evaluation is necessary
  + PBCH [5, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 22]
    - when the SSB is configured with 30 kHz SCS
      * only 11 valid RBs can be received for eRedCap UE with 5MHz, while 20RBs are occupied by the PBCH
  + PDCCH [5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23]
    - If RF BW is reduced to 5MHz
      * CORESET with 24 PRBs in frequency domain and 3 symbols in time domain can support at most aggregation level (AL) 8 when the SCS of PDCCH is configured as 15 kHz
      * when SCS is configured as 30 kHz, the maximum AL of a candidate PDCCH is 4. No valid configuration for CORESET#0
  + PDCCH scheduling Msg2/4 [5]
  + PDSCH [5, 10, 12, 14, 21, 23]
    - limited frequency diversity gain for 5MHz bandwidth
    - w/ inter-BWP FH [21]
  + SIB1 [13, 14, 20]
    - If SCS is 30 kHz, SIB1 needs to be punctured
  + Msg2 [5, 12, 14]
  + Msg4 [5, 12, 14]
  + PUCCH [5, 12, 16, 21]
    - limited frequency diversity gain for 5MHz bandwidth
    - w/ RF retuning /inter-BWP FH [9, 21]
      * compare the performance for frequency hopping over 100MHz or 20MHz with 2-/4-symbol RF retuning gap vs. the performance for the frequency hopping over 5MHz without RF retuning gap
  + PUSCH [5, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 21, 23]
    - limited frequency diversity gain for 5MHz bandwidth
    - w/ RF retuning/inter-BWP FH [9, 21]
      * compare the performance for frequency hopping over 100MHz or 20MHz with 2-/4-symbol RF retuning gap vs. the performance for the frequency hopping over 5MHz without RF retuning gap
  + Msg3 [5, 12]
    - w/ RF retuning [9]
      * compare the performance for frequency hopping over 100MHz or 20MHz with 2-/4-symbol RF retuning gap vs. the performance for the frequency hopping over 5MHz without RF retuning gap
  + PRACH [5, 12]

As pointed out by some companies, which evaluations are necessary depends on the options for bandwidth reduction to be considered in this SI, i.e.,

* Option1: RF+BB bandwidth reduction to 5 MHz for all DL/UL channels [5, 9, 18, 21]
* Option2: BB bandwidth reduction to 5 MHz for all DL/UL data and control channels [9, 21]
* Option3: BB-only bandwidth reduction to 5 MHz for DL/UL data channels [5, 9, 18, 21]

Although moderator expects that the considered options would be discussed at first in AI 9.6.1, it is worth starting some discussion in parallel from 9.6.1. Given coverage evaluation have much interest from companies, moderator would propose at least Option1 of RF+BB BW reduction is considered in this study. The LLS results for Option1 can be reused for other options (e.g., PDSCH results for Options 2/3, PDCCH results for Option 2).

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 8-1:**

* **At least the option of RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels is considered for coverage evaluation**
  + **FFS whether/which other options are also considered**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Y | In addition to RF+BB BW reduction, we think that at least Option 3 (BB-only bandwidth reduction to 5 MHz for DL/UL data channels) should be considered for coverage evaluation.  For comparison, the impact of different BW reduction options on the coverage should be clear (even if there is no impact). A subset of Option 1 (RF+BB) evaluation results can be directly applicable to Options 2 and 3 and so additional work is expected to be quite small. |
| CATT |  | Even in (RF+BB) BW=5 MHz case, we think not all of the channels need evaluation. The channels who really need to be re-evaluated may be PDCCH and SSB (30 kHz) in this case. |
| Vivo | N | We do NOT think it is necessary to simulate all DL/UL channels for RF 5MHz for Coverage. It is sufficient to simulate some channels like PBCH, CORESET#0 for 5MHz RF BW. At least the DL/UL data chanenls and PUCCH does not need to be simulated from coverage perspective given the repetition and mehanisms developed in Rel-17 Cov\_enh. Can be used. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | From our understanding, the coverage evaluation for option2 and option3 can refer to the results for option1.  However, whether all the DL/UL channels requires the simulation need further discussion. From our point of view, PDCCH and PBCH for option1 are needed and the others DL/UL channel may need some discussion. |
| CMCC |  | Exhaustive coverage evaluation is not needed. The affected channels are PBCH, PDCCH, SIB1 PDSCH. Then maybe we can examine the R17 results and find the gap between them and the bottleneck channel, and then check whether the performance loss due to bandwidth reduction to 5MHz is within the gap.  If not, then we can discussion solutions, such as separate CORESET#0, reduced payload size, limited SCS, etc. |
| Samsung |  | Even if Option 1 is considered, we think specific channels (e.g., DL channels) instead of all DL/UL channels can be evaluated taking into account limited TU for SI and limited performance impacts on some channels from BW reduction (e.g., UL channels). |
| DOCOMO | Y | For the FFS, in addition to RF+BB BW reduction, it would be good to evaluate BB-only BW reduction since it would be worth to evaluate the compareion of frequency diversity gain between RF+BB BW reduction and BB-only BW reduction. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nordic | N | We do not think UL channels are of concern since R17 Cov\_enh can be used to compensate.  We should focus on DL signals SSB, PBCH, PDCCH in IDLE mode.  In RRC connected full-scale MIMO can be used to provide coverage, no bottleneck is seen there either. |
| Intel | Y | Assuming Option1 for RF+BB BW reduction is simulated, we basically get all evaluation results for all 3 options. For example, for data channel, the evaluation results can be from the evaluation for RF+BB BW reduction, while for control channel, it is same as Rel-17 RedCap UE.  Therefore, observations on all options can both be obtained. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Options to evaluate depends on the outcome of the discussion in 9.6.1.  However, we think coverage evaluation for RF+BB reduction to 5 MHz is an important case and therefore should be considered. |
| LGE | Y | Link level simulation results for option 1 can be used to identify and verify potential performance impact. Especially, evaluations for PDCCH with limited AL and SSB with 30kHz SCS are very helpful. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Note that R18 is much smaller than R17 in scope, and objectives like coverage recovery and power savings were not included in the SID. So while RAN1 can still decide by consensus to perform some evaluations for coverage. We also feel that even if we look at link budgets, studying coverage recovery techniques is beyond the scope or TU of the SI other than maybe listing some possibilities in the Performance subsections. So for now we recommend to the FL not to call the section of the paper “Coverage recovery” but just “Coverage”.  [FL] The title of each section comes from the skeleton of TR 38.865. It can be revised if the skeleton is updated |
| Qualcomm | Partly Y | We generally agree on the proposal. However, we need to discuss which channels to be evaluated. Our preference is to study the link budget at least for PBCH/PDSCH/PDCCH/PUSCH. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon |  | Coverage recovery is out of SI scope. Detailed coverage recovery evaluation is not necessary considering the very limited TU. Evaluation for coverage can be considered, but not for excessive coverage recovery. Therefore, we suggest not to call this section “Coverage recovery”.  [FL] The title of each section comes from the skeleton of TR 38.865. It can be revised if the skeleton is updated  Additionally, we don’t feel UL coverage evaluation is necessary because uplink is Tx power limited rather than bandwidth limited. For a Rel-18 RedCap UE targeting lower peak date rate, BW reduction to 5MHz does not causes UL coverage reduction,  For DL, only SS/PBCH and PDCCH evaluations is sufficient. Given the limited TU, we feel the other DL evaluations in Rel-17, like RAR evaluation is unnecessary. |
| Lenovo |  | We think only need to evaluation coverage for some DL channels like PBCH, PDCCH and SIB1 PDSCH.  Actually, our understanding is that before conducting any performance evaluation for coverage, we need to decide which BW reduction candiate to be agreed/excluded. The decision could mostly based on the evaluation of complexity reduction and the analysis on the standard impact, etc, even not based on coverage performance. |
| Xiaomi | Y | The option of RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels can bring the most cost gain, thus it is the most significant case to evaluate.  Besides,since this option covers all channels, only evaluating the coverage of this option is sufficient and the results can be reused for other options, such as only BB bandwidth for data channels reduction to 5MHZ. |
| FL2 |  | While a number of companies don’t think coverage evaluation is necessary for all DL/UL channel, they didn’t cleary object to consider this option itself. To make it clear, an FFS is added, which will be further discussed in **Question 8.0-2**  **High Priority Proposal 8-1:**   * **At least the option of RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels is considered for coverage evaluation**   + **FFS whether/which other options are also considered**   + **FFS which DL/UL CHs are evaluated** |
| FL3 |  | Following was agreed in the GTW on May 12.  **Agreement:**   * At least the option of RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz is considered for coverage evaluation   + FFS whether/which other options are also considered   + FFS which DL/UL Channels of all the DL/UL channels are evaluated   2nd FFS is discussed in **Proposal 8.0-2**  Regarding 1st FFS, companies are encouraged to provide view whether/which other options are also considered for coverage evaluation |
| vivo |  | We think RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz is sufficient. The coervage for the BB BW reduction for data channel can be dereived from the option of RF+BB BW reduction. |
| Samsung |  | Given the limited TU, one option is sufficient for the evaluation. If necessary, results for other options can be derived from the evaluation. |
| DOCOMO |  | BB-only reduction option, i.e., UE BW reduction option of BW2 and/or BW3 for the discussion in AI 9.6.1, can be considered additionally. We are also fine to leave it to companies’ choice. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | No need to define other options, since the coverage evaluation for other options(mainly for bandwidth reduction) can refer to the results for RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz. |
| Intel | Y | We share the view from vivo and Samsung. Once the option of RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz is evaluated, we should have available data for Option 2/3. |
| Ericsson |  | While it is sufficient to conduct LLS for RF+BB BW to 5 MHz as some of the results can be directly reused for other options as well, we still need to compare the coverage performance of different BW reduction options. In particular, the coverage performance of BB-only BW reduction and RF+BB BW reduction options needs to be compared in terms of link budget analysis.  To have a comprehensive link budget analysis, the results for all DL/UL channels should be provided. It is up to individual companies to reuse their results from Rel-17 for different BW reduction options as applicable. |
| CMCC |  | Coverage evaluation of the option of RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz can be reused for other option. |
| Nordic |  | Agree that what is to be studies is impact from restricting signals and channels to 5MHz.  Main bullet of agreement we made is misleading. |
| IDCC |  | We think coverage of RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz is sufficient. Results of other options can be derived from this. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz is sufficient for LLS and coverage analysis. Coverage analysis for other options still need to be evaluated but this would depend on the agreed techniques from AI 9.6.1. |
| Sequans |  | Agree with Ericsson and Nokia. No need to focus study on other options for now but if additional options needed will depend on outcome of 9.6.1 discussion |
| Qualcomm |  | It is sufficient with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz and results can be recused for other options. |
| Xiaomi |  | Share the same view as IDCC and Qualcomm. |
| FL4 |  | Summary of companies view   * LLS results of Option 1 can be reused for other options   + vivo, SS, DCM, ZTE, Intel, E///, CMCC, IDCC, Nokia, Sequans, QC, Xiaomi   + E///: need to compare the coverage performance of different BW reduction options   Given most companies think the LLS results of Option 1 can be reused for other options, following proposal is made.  **High Priority Proposal 8-1a:**   * **The LLS results of the option of “RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels” can be reused for the coverage evaluation of other BW reduction options** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| LGE | Y | We are fine with the Proposal. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y, with updates | We think it is more important to agree that impact from restricting signals and channels to 5MHz would be studied (as also suggested by Nordic in the previous round). Therefore, we propose the following update:  **High Priority Proposal 8-1a:**   * **Impact from restricting signals/channels to 5 MHz will be studied.** * **The LLS results of the option of “RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels” can be reused for the coverage evaluation of other BW reduction options** |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| FL5 |  | All companies are fine with the proposal while one company proposed to add “Impact from restricting signals/channels to 5 MHz will be studied.”.  From moderator perspective, it is clear from previous agreement that the option of RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz is considered for coverage evaluation to study the impact from restricting signals/channels to 5 MHz.  Let’s hear companies view in the GTW whether the proposed sentence is necessary or not.  **High Priority Proposal 8-1a:**   * **Impact from restricting signals/channels to 5 MHz will be studied.** * **The LLS results of the option of “RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels” can be reused for the coverage evaluation of other BW reduction options** |
| FL6 |  | Since this proposal could not be discussed in the GTW on May 17, companies are encouraged whether the 1st main bullet is necessary or not. |
| vivo |  | We are fine with the 2nd bullet. For the 1st bullet, the impacts including performance, NW impacts, co-existence etc will be studied for all BW reduction options in AI 9.6.1. What additional impcts we need to study in AI 9.6.2? |
| CATT |  | The 2nd bullet is fined.  For the 1st bullet, the intention might be good, but should it be discussed in 9.6.1? Not understand why it is parallel with the 2nd bullet in simulation assumption discussion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | We do not think the first bullet is needed, since these impacts are being discussed as following and would be captured in the TR.  **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** |
| LGE |  | We think it is already being discussed in AI 9.6.1. If there is no other aspects, then we prefer to the previous version which is without the first bullet. |
| IDCC |  | Bullet 1 can be discussed in the other agenda. |
| CMCC | N | For the first bullet, we also think it is captured in above ZTE quoted proposal, and there is no need to put it here. |
| Samsung |  | We share other companies’ view and then the second bullet only is fine. |
| FUTUREWEI | N | The first bullet is not needed – the impacts are discussed in AI 9.6.1 |
| Intel |  | We agree with other companies that the first bullet is not needed. It is not clear what impact will be discussed in 9.6.2 |
| Ericsson | Y | The first bullet clarifies that *coverage* impact of other BW reduction options than RF+BB BW reduction will be studied.  We could further clarify the intention of the 1st bullet as follows:   * **Coverage impact from restricting signals/channels to 5 MHz will be studied.** * **The LLS results of the option of “RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels” can be reused for the coverage evaluation of other BW reduction options** |
| Nordic | N | First added bullet is not under agenda of this section. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon |  | The 1st bullet is not necessary. It is obviously that AI 9.6.2 is to study the coverage impact. |
| DOCOMO |  | We are fine with the 2nd bullet. For the 1st bullet, share similar view with companies that it is not necessary. |
| OPPO |  | Fine with the 2nd bullet and share the similar view for the 1st bullet that it is not necessary. |
| FL7 |  | If I understand Ericsson’s intention correctly, if only the 2nd bullet is agreed, it may be unclear whether to consider other BW reduction options for coverage evaluation. As agreed in AI 9.6.1, Option BW3 and Option BW2 (optional) can be studied.   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**   * The following options for further UE bandwidth reduction can 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 (for both unicast and broadcast) and PUSCH with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL. The other physical channels and signals are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF+BB bandwidth. * In addition, optional results for the following option can also be reported:   + Option BW2: 5 MHz BB bandwidth for all signals and 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. * Note: As part of study of above options, it is not precluded to indicate that an observation is relevant for UL only or DL only. |   To address the concern, the proposal is updated as follows.  **High Priority Proposal 8-1a:**   * **For coverage evaluation, following options can be considered in addition to option BW1 of “RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**   + **Option BW3: 5 MHz BB bandwidth only for PDSCH (for both unicast and broadcast) and PUSCH with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL. The other physical channels and signals are still allowed to use a BWP up to the 20 MHz maximum UE RF+BB bandwidth.**   + **Option BW2 (optional): 5 MHz BB bandwidth for all signals and channels with 20 MHz RF bandwidth for UL and DL.**   + **The LLS results of the option BW1 ~~of “RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”~~ can be reused for the coverage evaluation of other BW reduction options** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

8.0 Evaluation methodology for coverage recovery

For the evaluation methodology for coverage recovery, following views are provided in the company contributions:

* The methodology in TR 38.875 is reused for the determining the target performance for coverage recovery in the Rel-18 eRedCap SI [5, 12, 14]

|  |
| --- |
| - Step 1: Obtain the link budget performance of the channel based on link budget evaluation  - Step 2: Obtain the target performance requirement for RedCap UEs within a deployment scenario  - Step 3: Find the coverage recovery value for the channel if the link budget performance is worse than the target performance requirement  The target performance requirement for each channel is identified by the link budget of the bottleneck channel(s) for the reference NR UE within the same deployment scenario. The "bottleneck channel(s)" are the physical channel(s) that have the lowest MIL |

* UE antenna efficiency loss of 3 dB
  + Discuss whether the UE antenna efficiency loss of 3 dB that was assumed for Rel-17 RedCap UEs in FR1 in TR 38.875 should be included in link budget evaluations in the Rel-18 eRedCap SI [5]
  + Reused [12, 14]
* Reuse Table 6.3-1 in 38.875 [5, 12, 14, 21, 23]
* Considered UE type
  + Reference UE
    - Reuse Table 6.3-2 in 38.875 [5, 12]
  + Rel-17 RedCap
    - simplest RedCap UE that was specified in Rel-17 for FR1 [5]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **FR1 values** |
| # UE Tx chains | 1 |
| # UE Rx chains | 1 |
| UE bandwidth | Rural: 20 MHz (106 PRBs, 15 kHz SCS)  Urban: 20 MHz (51 PRBs, 30 kHz SCS) |

* + 5MHz-BW RedCap
    - 1 Rx [5, 14]
    - 1 Rx or 2Rx [12, 13, 23]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **FR1 values** |
| UE bandwidth | Rural: 5 MHz (25 PRBs, 15 kHz SCS)  Urban: 5 MHz (11 PRBs, 30 kHz SCS) |

* CH specific simulation parameters
  + PBCH [5, 13, 14]
    - To be discussed whether any update from Table A.1-8 in TR 38.830 is necessary for 5MHz-BW RedCap
    - for a RedCap UE with a bandwidth of 5 MHz and with 30 kHz SCS, the UE is assumed to be able to receive only 144 subcarriers [14]
  + PRACH [5]
    - To be discussed whether any update from Table A.1-4 in TR 38.830 is necessary for 5MHz-BW RedCap
    - The size of the PRACH occasion in the frequency domain expressed in number of RBs for PUSCH (c.f. TS 38.211, Table 6.3.3.2-1) is determined based on the preamble sequence length, LRA, SCS for PRACH, and SCS for PUSCH. For PRACH format B4 with 30 kHz SCS and 30 kHz SCS PUSCH, the number of RBs occupied will be 12 RBs (with starting subcarrier of the preamble sequence = 2). However, for a UE with 5 MHz BW and 30 kHz SCS, the maximum transmission BW is only 11 RBs. The number of preamble subcarriers that fits within the 11 RBs is 127 (assuming is the same). Therefore, for the 5 MHz-UE, we consider LRA = 127. [5]
  + PDCCH [5, 13, 14, 21]
    - To be discussed whether any update from Table A.1-7 in TR 38.830 is necessary for 5MHz-BW RedCap
    - for a RedCap UE with a maximum channel bandwidth of 5 MHz, the aggregation level is 8 using a CORESET size of 24 PRBs and 2 OFDM symbols with 15 kHz SCS, and the aggregation level is 1 using a CORESET size of 6 PRBs and 1 OFDM symbol with 30 kHz SCS [14]
    - Note that with the 5 MHz UE maximum RF bandwidth, the largest CORESET that fits within the UE bandwidth has size of 24 PRBs (15 kHz SCS) and 3 symbols. In this case, the maximum possible PDCCH aggregation level (AL) confined within the UE bandwidth is 8. However, for some other CORESET configurations, the CORESET bandwidth can exceed the maximum UE bandwidth, such as: (48 PRBs, 15 kHz SCS), (96 PRBs, 15), (24 PRBs, 30 kHz SCS), and (48 PRBs, 30 kHz SCS). Therefore, for such configurations (which can be shared with legacy UEs), if the UE is constrained to have 5 MHz RF bandwidth, it must skip/puncture the PRBs that fall outside of its Rx bandwidth.
  + PDSCH [5]
    - To be discussed whether any update from the target data rate in TR 38.875 is necessary for 5MHz-BW RedCap
      * The target data rate for 5-MHz RedCap UE in DL and UL is the scaled value of the Rel-17 RedCap UE by a factor of 0.25 if UE antenna efficiency loss (3 dB) is assumed and by a factor of 0.5 if there is no assumption of the antenna efficiency loss.[5]
      * the target data rate for PDSCH is scaled down relative to Rel-17 RedCap UE in proportion to the bandwidth reduction [14]
        + 1Mbps to 250kbps, 10Mbps to 500kbps
      * A linear scaling factor 1/4 can be applied to derive the DL target data rate for F-RedCap UE, i.e. 0.5Mbps for Urban and 0.25Mbps for Rural [21]
    - To be discussed whether any update from Table A.1-6 in TR 38.830 is necessary for 5MHz-BW RedCap
  + SIB1 [13, 14, 21]
    - To be discussed whether any update from Table A.1-6 in TR 38.830 is necessary for 5MHz-BW RedCap
    - a TBS of 1256 bits [14]
  + Msg2 [5, 14]
    - To be discussed whether any update from Table A.1-6 in TR 38.830 is necessary for 5MHz-BW RedCap
    - To be discussed whether any update from Table 6.3-4 in TR 38.875 is necessary for 5MHz-BW RedCap
    - payload of 72 bits [5, 14]
  + Msg4 [5, 14]
    - To be discussed whether any update from Table A.1-6 in TR 38.830 is necessary for 5MHz-BW RedCap
  + PUCCH [5, 21]
    - To be discussed whether any update from Table A.1-3 in TR 38.830 is necessary for 5MHz-BW RedCap
  + PUSCH [5, 21]
    - To be discussed whether any update from the target data rate in TR 38.875 is necessary for 5MHz-BW RedCap
      * The target data rate for 5-MHz RedCap UE in DL and UL is the scaled value of the Rel-17 RedCap UE by a factor of 0.25 if UE antenna efficiency loss (3 dB) is assumed and by a factor of 0.5 if there is no assumption of the antenna efficiency loss.[5]
      * the target data rate should be reduced for a 5 MHz UE [14]
      * The scaling on the UL target data rate is not necessary. However, it would be reasonable that the UL target data rate is not more than the corresponding DL target data rate. Based on such criteria, UL target data rate for F-RedCap UE can be 0.5Mbps for Urban and 100Kbps for Rural. [21]
    - To be discussed whether any update from Table A.1-2 in TR 38.830 is necessary for 5MHz-BW RedCap
  + Msg3 [5]
    - To be discussed whether any update from Table A.1-5 in TR 38.830 is necessary for 5MHz-BW RedCap

As mentioned in **Proposal 8-1**, at least Option1 of RF+BB BW reduction should be considered in this study. To avoid lengthy discussion of evaluation assumption for each channel, moderator would ask following two questions:

**FL1 High Priority Question 8.0-1:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide view on whether/which LLS results can be reused for reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE from TR 38.875.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** | |
| Ericsson | It only needs to be agreed that LLS *assumptions* for the reference UE and the Rel-17 RedCap UE from TR 38.875 can be reused. Whether LLS *results* need to be reused or be updated can be up to individual companies. | |
| CATT | We think LLS results can be reused for reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE. The TR 38.875 already includes the simulation assumptions for legacy UE and the represented simplest Rel-17 RedCap (i.e. 1Tx and 1Rx, while HD-FDD and modulation order does not have impact on LLS). We can focus on the LLS for Rel-18 eRedCap UE with further reduced bandwidth. | |
| vivo | For reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE, we think the LLS results in TR38.875 all can be reused. | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Some simulation assumptions from TR38.875 can be reused in principle for Rel-18 coverage evaluation. The simulation results need to be updated based on specific features，e.g, PDDCH aggregation level reduction, uncompleted PBCH reception.  [FL] This question is about the coverage performance for reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE. 5MHz-BW UE (which may include PDDCH aggregation level reduction, uncompleted PBCH reception) is discussed in **Question 8.0-2** | |
| CMCC | Can be reused. | |
| Samsung | In general, we think all LLS results from TR38.875 can bacially be reused for reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE. But, there is no need to agree it because it is up to each company. | |
| DOCOMO | We think all the LLS results for reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE in TR38.875 can be reused. | |
| IDCC | Same view as ZTE. | |
| Nordic | It depends whether R17 simulations are reused or not. And at least we have a concern on number of Tx chains at gNB in R17 assumptions for LLS. | |
| Intel | we support to reuse evaluation assumptions from 38.875 | |
| OPPO | Reuse the evaluation assumption. | |
| Intel | we support to reuse evaluation assumptions from 38.875 | |
| Nokia, NSB | LLS results for reference NR UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE can be reused as appropriate. | |
| LGE | We prefer to reuse LLS results from TR 38.875 as much as possible to minimize simulation efforts. | |
| FUTUREWEI | It is a bit hard to answer this question or the next without discussing some of the changes to e.g. the target data rate for a link budget. For that, our view is that we should scale with BW in a similar way as we did in Rel-17. Agree with Ericsson that it could be up to the company whether to reuse or update results. | |
| Qualcomm | Reuse the evaluation assumption from 38.875. | |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | In our view, all the LLS results for reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE from TR 38.875 can be reused. | |
| Xiaomi | Reuse simulation results for reference NR UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE in TR38.875. | |
| FL2 | Given majority companies are fine to reuse the LLS results for reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE from TR 38.875 while come companies think it is up to each company whether to reuse the LLS results or not. Most companies have common understanding that the evaluation methodology and assumption in TR 38.875 can be reused. Therefore, following proposal is made.  **High Priority Proposal 8.0-1:**   * **Evaluation methodology and assumption in Clause 6.3 in TR 38.875 is reused for coverage evaluation of reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE.**   + **Note: It is up to each company whether to reuse the LLS results** | |
| FL3 | This proposal was discussed in the GTW on May 12 but no consensus was achieved.  Companies are encouraged to provide view whether it is acceptable or not. If not, please provide another proposal which is acceptable to all. | |
| FUTUREWEI | We can accept the proposal with the addition of “except for the cell-edge data rates and whether or not the small form factor should be used”  [FL] As mentioned in the main bullet, this proposal is for “reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE”, which I believe no update for the assumption is necessary. For Rel-18, assumption will be discussed once considered CHs are decided in **Proposal 8.0-2** | |
| CATT | As explained by FL, Clause 6.3 is reused only for ‘reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE’. Hence we would be fine with this proposal.  For Rel-18 eRedCap UE with lower BW or peak data rate, at least target data rate should be scaled down, which means Clause 6.3 cannot directly resued for Rel-18 eRedCap UE. | |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal. | |
| Samsung | OK | |
| DOCOMO | We support this proposal. | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK. It is nature to refer to TR 38.875 if reference NR UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE requires some evaluation results for discussion. | |
| OPPO | We think the Rel-18 already have DL data rate of 10MHz. and UL data rate is missing. We are OK to clarify that and possibly convert to cell edge/reference data rate.  May be we can add a bullet FFS, the cell-edge/reference data rate in the simulation methodology.  [FL] R18 assumption will be discussed once considered CHs are decided in **Proposal 8.0-2**. | |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. | |
| LGE | We are okay with the proposal. | |
| Ericsson | We are generally fine with the proposal. However, the assumption for # UE Rx branches for a Rel-17 RedCap UE in Clause 6.3 are “1 or 2”. However, to minimize the amount of work, we think that it is sufficient to consider only the simplest Rel-17 RedCap UE (i.e., # UE Rx branch is 1).  With regards to target data rates, we have the same understanding as CATT. | |
| CMCC | We are fine as it is for reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE. And noticed that SCS=30KHz is assumed for section 6.3 of TR38.875, while for channels in **Question 8.0-2** to be simulated for R18, SCS =15KHz and 30KHz should both be considered. Then the comparison between R18 15KHz and reference 30KHz will be happened. | |
| Nordic | This is incomplete proposal, because it does NOT address R18 RedCap. We shall agree first on R18 assumptions and then make sure that comparison with legacy is fair.  [FL] R18 assumption will be discussed once considered CHs are decided in **Proposal 8.0-2**. | |
| IDCC | We are fine with the proposal. | |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the FL proposal. | |
| Sequans | We are in principle fine with the proposal but assumptions should be eventually aligned with Rel-18 RedCap case for meaningful comparisons | |
| Huawei, Hisilicion | | Fine with the proposal. | |
| Qualcomm | | We support the FL proposal | |
| Xiaomi | | Fine with the FL proposal. | |
| FL4 | | As mentioned in the GTW, this proposal is for “reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE”. R18 assumption will be discussed once considered CHs are decided in **Proposal 8.0-2.**  Given most companies are fine with the proposal, the same proposal is set for further discussion.  **High Priority Proposal 8.0-1:**   * **Evaluation methodology and assumption in Clause 6.3 in TR 38.875 is reused for coverage evaluation of reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE.**   + **Note: It is up to each company whether to reuse the LLS results**   Note that one company (E///) proposed to consider only the simplest Rel-17 RedCap UE (i.e., # UE Rx branch is 1) to minimize the amount of work. Therefore, additional proposal for the assumption of the number of Rx branches for Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UE is added in **Proposal 8.0-3**. | |
| vivo | | Fine with the proposal | |
| Nokia, NSB | | We support the FL proposal | |
| DOCOMO | | Support the FL proposal. | |
| CATT | | We are fine with the proposal. | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | | OK with the FL’s proposal. | |
| LGE | | We are fine with the proposal. | |
| IDCC | | We are fine with the proposal. | |
| FUTUREWEI | | We are ok with that understanding about R18 assumptions. There should soon be questions on the data rate | |
| Nordic | | Still not fully convinced, these are also R18 assumptions applicable to reference UEs, aren’t they. | |
| Ericsson | | Fine with the proposal.  Thanks @FL for accommodating our concern. | |
| Samsung | | OK | |
| OPPO | | Fine with the proposal. | |
| Lenovo | | Fine with the proposal. | |
| Xiaomi | | Fine | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | | Support. | |
| Qualcomm | | We are fine with FL proposal | |
| CMCC | | Fine with the proposal. | |
| FL5 | | @Nordic: Could you elaborate which R18 assumptions are applicable to reference UEs?  Most companies are fine with the proposal while still one company are not convinced. Further discuss in the GTW  **High Priority Proposal 8.0-1:**   * **Evaluation methodology and assumption in Clause 6.3 in TR 38.875 is reused for coverage evaluation of reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE.**   + **Note: It is up to each company whether to reuse the LLS results** | |
| FL6 | | Following was agreed in the GTW on May 17.  **Agreement**   * Evaluation methodology and assumption in Clause 6.3 in TR 38.875 is reused for coverage evaluation of reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE.   + Note: It is up to each company whether to reuse the LLS results | |

**FL1 High Priority Question 8.0-2:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide view on what additional LLS results are necessary in the Rel-18 RedCap SI for reference UE, Rel-17 RedCap UE, and Rel-18 RedCap UE with 5MHz BW.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** | |
| Ericsson | At least for Rel-18 bandwidth reduction Option 1 (RF+BB), link budget analysis covering all physical channels should be carried out. Therefore, LLS results for all the channels for the 5-MHz UE are needed. Most of the LLS assumptions for the Rel-17 RedCap UE could be reused for the 5-MHz UE. However, some parameters may need to be updated for the 5-MHz UE (e.g., occupied BW, cell-edge target data rate, etc.).  Regarding additional LLS results, as also pointed out by several companies, we think SIB1 should be part of link budget analysis. Since SIB1 was not considered in Rel-17, LLS for SIB1 would be needed for the reference UE, the Rel-17 RedCap UE, and the 5-MHz UE. | |
| CATT | Regarding the question on ‘necessary additional LLS results’, we do not see there is strong need. For SIB1, maybe considerable, but one critical issue is its typical payload size, which highly depends on network deployment. It is unclear whether we really have to use up to 3000 bits? | |
| vivo | For 5MHz RF BW, to support 30KHz SCS, performance loss is expected. Due to limited SI time, we think it is more efficient to assess the performance for some channels taking RF retuning into account. For example,   * For SSB/CORESET#0, simulate the reception of the channel within 5MHz without RF retuning, and with RF retuning and combining the receptions. * For PUCCH/PUSCH,  1. Investigate the frequency diversity loss of 5MHz compared to 20MHz 2. Investigate whether RF retuning with reasonable retuning gap can make up for this loss | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For RF+BB bandwidth reduction, the available aggregation level for PDCCH is limited. The coverage performance evaluation is needed for PDCCH. For PBCH with 30KHz SCS, it also can not be received by the 5M bandwidth UE completely. Therefore, PBCH and PDCCH should be evaluated with high priority. | |
| CMCC | For R18 RedCap with 5MHz, the affected channels such PBCH, PDCCH, SIB1 PDSCH can be evaluated. For SIB1, the performance rely on payload size as CATT mentions.  And vivo’s suggestion for RF retuning and combining different part of period signals can also be considered. | |
| Samsung | We don’t think additional LLS results are necessary for reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE. Only things to be considered are about whether or how to evaluate Rel-18 RedCap UE with 5MHz. | |
| DOCOMO | For RF and BB BW reduction to 5MHz, we think the link budget analysis should be evaluated at least for UL channels to evaluate whether/how the frequency diversity gain would be lost even if frequency hopping is applied.  In addition, we share the similar view with vivo that RF retuning should be considered as a potential solution and evaluated in the SI phase. More specifically, the following evaluations can be considered;   * SSB reception w/ RF retuning which is configured with 30 kHz * PDCCH reception w/ RF retuning with MIB-configured CORESET#0 which is configured with 48/96 RBs for 15 kHz SCS and/or 24/48/96 RBs for 30 kHz SCS   In addition, to compensate the expected coverage loss due to the restricted AL for PDCCH with 5MHz BW, PDCCH repetition can be a candidate solution and we propose to consider this as a target LLS scenario. | |
| IDCC | PBCH, PDCCH and SIB1 need to be considered due to 5 MHz BW. | |
| Intel | We don’t see a necessity to evaluate the reception of particially punctured PDCCH in CORESET#0 and SIB1 PDSCH. In fact, it requires further discussion on the total BW without puncturing, details of puncturing scheme, etc.  For PDCCH, since 3 OFDM symbols with 5MHz BW can only provide 12 CCEs, CORESET bundling can be simulated for at least PDCCH AL=16.  For data channel, it is common understanding there is loss on frequency diversity. Then, inter-BWP hopping may be evaluated, however, BWP switching time is a limitation factor for the gain which should be considered too. | |
| OPPO | We can consider for 5MHz without puncturing, LLS results or Linkbudget analysis to be performaned to study the coverage issue of narrow band.  If some additional operation, e.g. 5MHz for 30kHz SCS, is justified for supporting. We can also consider the LLS evaluation of 5MHz RF for supporting the case. Also the mechanism for operation should be clarified first. | |
| Nokia, NSB | Additional LLS results are necessary for Rel-18 RedCap UE with 5 MHz RF+BB BW as follows.  PBCH (Urban/30 kHz SCS): Limit the receive BW to 144 subcarriers.  PRACH (Urban/30 kHz SCS): Limit the number of preamble subcarriers to 127 for PRACH format B4 (assuming ).  PDCCH (Rural/15 kHz SCS, Urban/30 kHz SCS): Limit CORESET size to 24 PRBs/3 symbols (max AL = 8) for Rural and 6 PRBs/2 symbols (max AL = 2) for Urban.  PDSCH (Rural/15 kHz SCS, Urban/30 kHz SCS: LLS with FDRA in 5 MHz based on scaled down data rate (TBD).  SIB1(Rural/15 kHz SCS, Urban/30 kHz SCS): Selected payload (TBD) and FDRA (TBD).  Msg2 (Urban/30 kHz SCS): Payload of 72 bits and FDRA limited to 11 PRBs.  Msg4: Payload of 1040 bits and same FDRA assumption as SIB1.  PUSCH (Urban/30 kHz SCS: LLS with FDRA in 5 MHz based on scaled down data rate (TBD). | |
| LGE | We think that the channels that would inevitably have coverage loss for BW reduced Rel-18 RedCap UE have to be evaluated. Companies may have different views on the channels for coverage evaluation as it somehow depends on the bandwidth reduction options. If it is the case, then we can further discuss which channels to evaluate or we can just leave it to companies to make a choice. | |
| FUTUREWEI | Additional LLS may be needed if *there is substantially* new UE behavior for Rel-18 RedCap UEs and/or modification of channels is being considered | |
| Qualcomm | For 5MHz BW option, at least PDCCH (15/30KHz SCS) and PBCH (30KHz SCS) need to be evaluated with potential coverage recovery options. | |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | For 5MHz BW, in the evaluation for periodic DL signals like SIB1 and SS/PBCH, UE reception combination with RF retuning can be considered if the DL signal setting has larger bandwidth than 5MHz. | |
| Xiaomi | PDCCH (15/30KHZ SCS) with puncturing and/or with lower AL, PBCH (30KHZ SCS) and SIB1 need to be evaluated for coverage.  Besides, frequency diversity gain and frequency selective gain for data channels, i.e., PDSCH and PUSCH should be evaluated due to the narrower bandwidth. | |
| FL2 | Summary of companies view   * RF+BB 5MHz UE   + All CHs: E///, OPPO(?)   + PDSCH: Intel, Xiaomi     - SIB1: E///, [CATT], IDCC, Nokia, HW, Xiaomi       * FFS payload size     - Msg2: Nokia     - Msg4: Nokia   + PBCH: vivo, ZTE, CMCC, DCM, IDCC, Nokia, QC, HW, Xiaomi   + PDCCH: ZTE, CMCC, DCM, IDCC, Intel, Nokia, QC, Xiaomi     - CORESET#0: vivo, DCM   + PUCCH: vivo, DCM   + PUSCH: vivo, DCM, Intel, Nokia, Xiaomi   + PRACH: Nokia   Based on the above, following proposal is made  **High Priority Proposal 8.0-2:**   * **Coverage for the following channels is evaluated for Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels**   + **SIB1**   + **PBCH**   + **PDCCH**   + **PUSCH**   + **FFS evaluation assumption for the above channels**   + **FFS whether to add other channels** | |
| FL3 | This proposal could not be discussed in the GTW on May 12.  Companies are encouraged to provide view whether it is acceptable or not. If not, please provide another proposal which is acceptable to all. | |
| FUTUREWEI | This proposal has the same problematic formulation from the GTW where “for all DL/UL channels” should be removed from the main bullet. As discussed on the GTW, there is no need for simulations for the PUSCH. Note however that we can still have a qualitative statement for PUSCH in the TR, such as coverage is not an issue for PUSCH because of lower data rates, availability of Rel-17 CE techniques, handling the small form factor as in the Rel-17 WID rather than the Rel-17 SID, etc. | |
| CATT | Agree with Futurewei. We can focus on DL channels.  For PUSCH we do not think there is a strong need since: (1) The target UL data rate should also be scaled down at least with a similar propotion to 0.25, hence the performance gap with Rel-17 should be small. (2) Rel-17 CE techniques can be applied to PUSCH to increase its coverage. | |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal in general.  We prefer to keep the PUSCH, for RF+BB 5MHz BW, RF retuning can be one potential solution for PBCH receptition and PUSCH transmission, the performance with and without RF retuning should be evaluated. | |
| Samsung | We’d like to focus on DL channels since limited performance impacts on PUSCH are expected from BW reduction and also given Rel-17 Cov\_Enh WI. | |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the Proposal. For PUSCH, we share the similar view with vivo that it would be worth to consider transmission with RF retuning as a candidate solution to compensate the coverage loss of BW reduction to 5MHz for Rel-18 RedCap, and hence prefer to keep it as an evaluation target. | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the channel PUSCH, a clarification regarding whether it refers to msg3 and/or PUSCH in connected mode is needed.  [FL] PUSCH here means PUSCH for data in conncected mode, as Rel-17  We also think the DL channels should be prioritized, including PBCH and PDCCH. For SIB1, SIB1 coverage may not be impacted via gNB configuration. | |
| OPPO | Fine in general.  For SIB1, would it be more specific break in to CORESET#0 or additionally with PDSCH. But The CORESET#0 Coverage would be the bottleneck. | |
| Intel | We are fine to limit to DL channels if majority companies prefer that. On the other hand, we want to know what kind of DL evaluation should be done. Is it to similar reception of a DL channel only using partial allocated frequency resource? It may be used to prove the bad performance with enhancement. However, we don’t think such partial reception is a good solution for eRedCap  [FL] For coverage evaluation, at least reception of 5MHz BW only needs to be considered to see how much coverage is affected. Any enhanced solution can be further considered, if agreed. | |
| LGE | As commented in the 1st round, channels that would inevitably have coverage loss for BW reduced Rel-18 RedCap UE, such as PBCH and PDCCH, should be evaluated. SIB1 can also be considered. So, we are fine with the proposal. The evaluation of PUSCH seems to be controlversial and we are open to discuss. | |
| Ericsson | For PDCCH, both CSS and USS should be considered in the link budget, as in the Rel-17 SI.  Furthermore, Msg4, PUCCH and PRACH should be considered in the link budget since they may become coverage bottlenecks.  So, all in all, at least the following should be considered in the link budget:   * SIB1 * PBCH * PDCCH CSS * PDCCH USS * Msg4 * PUSCH * PUCCH * PRACH   It is up to individual companies to reuse their results from the Rel-17 SI as applicable. This also allows a clear comparison between Rel-17 and Rel-18, i.e., coverage can be the same or different depending on the channel. | |
| CMCC | Fine with the proposal although we think PUSCH is not necessary, may be we can have a clearer picture from the evaluation results. | |
| Nordic | We agree DL is priority   * + **SIB1**   + **PBCH**   + **PDCCH with and without CSI knowledge at gNB** | |
| IDCC | We are fine with the proposal. | |
| MediaTek | We think LLS simulations can be helpful. R18 5MHz RedCap with *truncated reception* on DL channels should be evaluated. Furthermore, we can start with the assumption that network does not change broadcast channels to accomcomdate 5MHz UEs. The DL channels should include at least PBCH, SIB1 PDSCH (FFS payload size), and PDCCH CSS (CORESET#0). We are open for evaluating other DL channels. | |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the FL proposal. Among the other channels, we think at least PDSCH should be evaluated. | |
| Sequans | Fine with the proposal | |
| Huawei, Hisilicion | Agree with Futurewei and CATT. We can focous on some DL channels, such PBCH, SIB1, PDCCH.  Evaluation of UL channels, such as PUSCH, are not necessary.  One question for clarification, whether the phrase “for all DL/UL channels” in the main bullet means “evaluated for all DL/UL channels” or “BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”?  [FL] Latter one  If it is the latter, then the main bullet could be rephrased a bit to avoid ambiguity, e.g. “For Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels, coverage is evaluated for the following channels” | |
| Qualcomm | We are generally fine with the proposal. In order to remove the confusion, it is suggested to remove “for all DL/UL channels” from the main bullet. We prefer keep SIB1/PBCH/PDCCH only and put other channels as FFS or optional study.   * **Coverage for the following channels is evaluated for Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz**    + **SIB1**   + **PBCH**   + **PDCCH**   + **FFS evaluation assumption for the above channels**   + **FFS other channels, e.g., PUSCH** | |
| Xiaomi | Support to evaluate all the channels mentioned in the FL proposal.  Besides, PDSCH/PUSCH frequency diversity loss and frequency selective loss should be evaluated due to a narrower bandwidth. | |
| FL4 | For UL channels, companies have different preference, and hence, they are added as optional evaluation.  **High Priority Proposal 8.0-2:**   * **Coverage for the following channels is evaluated for “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**   + **SIB1**   + **PBCH**   + **PDCCH CSS**   + **PDCCH USS**   + **~~PUSCH~~**   + **~~FFS whether to add other channels~~ Following channels can be optionally evaluated**     - **PUSCH**     - **PUCCH**     - **PRACH**     - **PDSCH**     - **Msg4**   + **FFS evaluation assumption for the above channels** | |
| vivo | We prefer to keep SIB1 and PDCCH USS as optional given the size for SIB1 is not large and periodically transmited. For PDCCH USS, it can be handled by gNB’s proper configuration or its results can be derived from PDCCH CSS. | |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the FL proposal. We think it’s important to evaluate SIB1 coverage, at least to see whether the UE can decode SIB1 using one transmission. | |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal in general but don’t see the strong need to differentiate the evaluation for PDCCH USS and CSS since it may depend on the beam management deployment. | |
| CATT | We support this proposal which focuses on DL coverage performance. UL channels can be optionally reported if companies have interest.  If SIB1 is evaluated, we may have to align the payload of SIB1, which seems not done in Rel-17.  [FL] Yes, if SIB1 is agreed, we can discuss the payload size. | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | From our understanding, Msg4 is also a kind of PDSCH. To differentiate them, the PDSCH here may refer to connected mode. For the PUSCH, according to the FL’s response, it is for connected mode. For PUCCH, whether it is for idle mode or connected mode also should be clarified.  To make it clearer, we should clarify that PUSCH, PUCCH and PDSCH are for connected mode, or for both connected mode and idle mode. An modification to clarify them should be incorporated in the proposal.  [FL] In Rel-17 coverage recovery evaluation, we didn’t differentiate those channels in idle mode and connected mode, as captured in TR 38.875 (other than Msg2/3/4). | |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal. We are okay to separate PDCCH evaluation into CSS and USS as in Rel-17 study. | |
| IDCC | We are fine with the proposal. | |
| FUTUREWEI | Similar comment as vivo regarding PDCCH USS | |
| Nordic | We support. | |
| Ericsson | Mostly fine. However, **Msg4** should be evaluated (not optionally). Note that during Rel-17 RedCap SI, most companies considered >30 PRBs for Msg4.  We agree with Nokia that it’s important to evaluate SIB1 coverage.  Note that link budget is not only affected by the channels that are impacted by the BW reduction to 5-MHz. So, it could be clarified that **all channels are included in the link budgets** although companies may not need to rerun their simulations (and can simply reuse the results from Rel-17 SI).  Is it clear that same deployment scenarios as in Rel-17 SI will be considered (i.e., Rural at 0.7 GHz, Urban at 2.6 GHz, and Urban at 4 GHz)? | |
| Samsung | We are fine with having SIB1 and PDCCH USS as optional. | |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. | |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. Support to evaluate SIB1 coverage given restricited time/frequency resource for transmitting SIB1. | |
| Xiaomi | Similar view as vivo on separate simulation on PDCCH CSS and PDCCH USS | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with SIB1, PBCH and PDCCH. It is very unclear why coverage of uplink channel needs additional evaluation for 5MHz. Therefore, they should be FFS instead of optional.  For PDCCH, as commented by companies, the only difference between PDCCH in CSS and PDCCH in USS is beamforming gain, which depends on gNB implementation, thus there is no need to differentiate these two cases. | |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with FL proposal | |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal. | |
| FL5 | Summary of companies view   * SIB1   + Optional: vivo, SS   + Not optional: Nokia, E///, Lenovo * PDCCH USS   + Optional: vivo, FW, SS, Xiaomi   + Merged with CSS: DCM, HW   + Not merged with CSS: LGE * Msg4   + Not optional: E///   One company (E///) still prefer to evaluate all channels. Another company (HW) prefer to keep FFS for UL channels  Also, Ericsson pointed out that it is unclear whether same deployment scenarios as in Rel-17 SI will be considered. Another main bullet is added (similar to reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE) to clarify that the evaluation methodology and assumption in Rel-17 TR is reused by default for Rel-18 RedCap UE.  Based on the above, the proposal is updated as follows:  **High Priority Proposal 8.0-2:**   * **Coverage for the following channels is evaluated for “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**   + **SIB1**   + **PBCH**   + **PDCCH CSS**   + **Msg4**   + **Following channels can be optionally evaluated**     - **PUSCH**     - **PUCCH 2bits**     - **PUCCH 11bits**     - **PUCCH 22bits**     - **PRACH**     - **PDSCH**     - **PDCCH USS**     - **Msg2**     - **Msg3**     - **~~Msg4~~** * **Evaluation methodology and assumption in Clause 6.3 in TR 38.875 is reused for coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels” by default.**   + **FFS which evaluation assumption should be updated for the above channels** | |
| FL6 | Following was agreed in the GTW on May 17.  **Agreement**   * Coverage for the following channels is evaluated for “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”   + SIB1   + PBCH   + PDCCH CSS   + [Msg4]   + Following channels can be optionally evaluated     - PUSCH     - PUCCH 2bits     - PUCCH 11bits     - PUCCH 22bits     - PRACH     - PDSCH     - PDCCH USS     - Msg2     - Msg3 * Evaluation methodology and assumption in Clause 6.3 in TR 38.875 is reused for coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels” by default, except for, UE bandwidth, cell edge data rate, and small form factor degradation   + FFS which evaluation assumption should be updated for the above channels   For the potential update of UE bandwidth, cell edge data rate, small form factor degradation, and evaluation assumption for each channel, I add new proposals/questions.  Here remaining issue is whether Msg4 is optional or non-optional. Companies are encouraged to provide view on this aspect. | |
| Company name | Optional or  Non-optional | Comments |
| vivo | Optional | The TBS for Msg.4 is smaller than the unicast PDSCH, therefore, we do not think it is necessary to evaluate Msg.4 specifically. |
| CATT | Optional | Do not think this is essential assuming a typical DL PSD 33 dBm/MHz. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Optional | Incomplete reception of SIB1, PBCH, and PDCCH CSS may happen, which may bring serious performance issue. For msg4, similar as PDSCH, the performance may be impacted due to the limited frequency diversity gain but not serious. Therefore, msg4 together with PDSCH can be optionally evaluated. |
| CMCC | Non-optional | Considering the payload size 1040bits in Table A.1-6 of TR 38.830, it is possible that Msg4 can not be fully received with low MCS. So it can be evaluated. |
| Samsung | Optional | Msg4 can be optionally treated similar to PDSCH. |
| FUTUREWEI | Optional | Similar comment as vivo. Also, gNB can use retransmissions for msg4, if needed |
| Intel | Optional | We agree that Msg4 can be handled as PDSCH optionally |
| Ericsson | Non-optional | With 5 MHz, the numbers of PRBs are 25 (15 kHz SCS) and 11 (30 kHz SCS). Considering that in Rel-17 RedCap SI most of the companies considered more than 30 PRBs for Msg4, there would be some impacts on Msg4 due to further BW reduction to 5 MHz. Therefore, we think it is important to evaluate Msg4.  Furthermore, the Msg4 payload size of 1040 bits in Table A.1-6 of TR 38.830 is much more than the TBS determined from the PDSCH target date rate of 500 kbps (if Proposal 8.0-5 is agreed). Also, as can be seen in Section 3 of our 9.6.2 contribution ([R1-2203118](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_109-e/Docs/R1-2203118.zip)), Msg4 would require substantial coverage recovery in some deployment scenarios. |
| Nokia, NSB | Non-optional | Although the target data rate for unicast PDSCH is scaled down for 5 MHz UE bandwidth compared with the Rel-17 SI assumption, the TBS assumption for Msg4 is unchanged (1040 bits). On the other hand, the PRB allocation for Msg4 is reduced with 30 kHz SCS compared with the Rel-17 SI assumption (where we assumed 37 PRBs). Therefore, coverage degradation of Msg4 is expected for 5 MHz UE. |
| Nordic | Optional | We assume that at this point gNB for sure knows this is R18 RedCap and it can limit TBS to extend coverage. For exmaple, dedicate BWP parameters can optimized for R18 RedCap. |
| Qualcomm | Optional |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Optional | Similar comment as vivo and FutureWei. |
| DOCOMO | Optional |  |
| OPPO | Optional | Not necessary to evaluate Msg4 specifically. Msg4 can be treated similar to PDSCH. |
| FL7 |  | Given more companies prefer optional, following proposal is made  **High Priority Proposal 8.0-2a:**   * **Coverage of Msg4 can be optionally evaluated for “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”** |
|  |  | Following was agreed in the GTW on May 19  **Agreement**   * Coverage of Msg4 can be optionally evaluated for “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels” |

**FL4 High Priority Proposal 8.0-3:**

* **For coverage evaluation of Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UEs, only 1 Rx branch is assumed.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| ZTE, sanechips |  | 2RX is not precluded in the SID and it can provide better coverage performance. We are OK with 1Rx as the baseline and 2Rx as the optional evaluation.   * **For coverage evaluation of Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UEs, ~~only~~ 1 Rx branch is assumed as the baseline and 2 Rx as optional.** |
| LGE | Y | We think it’s sufficient to consider the simplest Rel-17 RedCap UE for evaluation. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We are ok with ZTE’s suggestion |
| Nordic | Y | We should focus on 1Rx |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Xiaomi |  | We share the similar view as ZTE that 2RX should also be focused. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | For coverage simulation, it is OK. |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| FL5 |  | Most companies are fine with the proposal while two companies (ZTE, Xiaomi) think 2Rx should not be precluded.  Given the situation, the same proposal is set for the discussion in the GTW  **High Priority Proposal 8.0-3:**   * **For coverage evaluation of Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UEs, only 1 Rx branch is assumed.** |
| FL6 |  | This proposal could not be discussed in the GTW.  **@ZTE, Xiaomi**: Given the situation, could you live with the proposal?  **@Others**: Can you consider 2Rx as optional evaluation? |
| vivo |  | Still prefer to focus on 1Rx to align with the Rel-17 baseline RedCap UE agreed for cost reduction evaluation. |
| CATT |  | Since we agreed in 9.6.1 that the simplest Rel-17 RedCap UE (1Rx) is compared to, we would suggest focusing on 1 Rx only. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | For evaluation purpose, we could live with it. However, the following Note should be added:  Note: it does not mean that 2Rx is precluded for Rel-18 RedCap UE  Or as we suggested in last round, 2Rx can be optionally evaluated   * **For coverage evaluation of Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UEs, ~~only~~ 1 Rx branch is assumed as the baseline and 2 Rx as optional.** |
| LGE |  | We support FL’s proposal, i.e. only 1 Rx is assumed. |
| IDCC |  | We are ok with the proposal. |
| CMCC |  | We think for evaluation purpose, 1Rx is enough. And we can accept 2Rx as optional. |
| Samsung |  | Only 1 RX is preferred. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Ok for coverage evaluation |
| Intel |  | We prefer to only evaluation for 1Rx. |
| Ericsson | Y | Agree with other companies above that we need to focus on 1 Rx. We should try as much as possible to align with the reference Rel-17 RedCap UE assumed in AI 9.6.1 |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We don’t think study of 2Rx is needed and should focus on 1Rx. |
| Qualcomm | Y | We are ok with FL proposal |
| Huawei, Hisilicon |  | For coverage simulation, it is OK. |
| DOCOMO |  | Agree with companies that it is prefarable to focus on 1 Rx as agreed as Rel-17 RedCap baseline in 9.6.1. |
| OPPO |  | Prefer to focus on 1Rx. |
| FL7 |  | Most companies still prefer to evaluate 1Rx only.  ZTE showed their flexibility to live with 1Rx only with adding a note to clarify that 2Rx is not precluded for Rel-18 RedCap UE  Therefore, proposal is updated as follows  **High Priority Proposal 8.0-3:**   * **For coverage evaluation of Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UEs, only 1 Rx branch is assumed.**   + **Note: it does not mean that 2Rx is precluded for Rel-18 RedCap UE** |
|  |  | Following was agreed in the GTW on May 19  **Agreement**   * For coverage evaluation of Rel-17 and Rel-18 RedCap UEs, only 1 Rx branch is assumed.   + Note: it does not mean that 2Rx is precluded for Rel-18 RedCap UE |
|  |  |  |

**FL6 High Priority Proposal 8.0-4:**

* **For coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”, following parameters are used.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **FR1 values** |
| UE bandwidth | Rural: 5 MHz (25 PRBs, 15 kHz SCS)  Urban: 5 MHz (11 PRBs, 30 kHz SCS) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT |  | For Urban with 30 kHz SCS, we suggest 12 PRB, since  (1) It is more like an in-band narrow BWP configuration rather than cell carrier deployment. The later one needs to reserve guard band for neighbor cell, but the former one doest not have to.  (2) 11 PRB makes the deployment of CORESET difficult, which typically has a granularity with 6 PRB (which has further impact on REG and CCE). |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | The frequency should be further clarified, e.g., selected among 2.6GHz/ 2GHz/700MHz can be further determined. |
| LGE | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | Ok for the number of RBs and SCS assumptions here. |
| Samsung | Y | Also, fine with CATT’s suggestion. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Nordic | N | Also we think 12PRB channel BW for 30kHz SCS should be considered. |
| Qualcomm |  | We are generally fine. Like CATT’s suggestion, 12 PRB may be another candidate for 30KHz SCS. This may need inputs from RAN4 but we do not have time to wait for RAN4 input. So we can have 11 PRB as the baseline and 12 PRB as an optional assumption. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | For the number of RB with 30 kHz SCS, we think it should be 11 RB as specified in 38.101. |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| FL7 |  | Some companies prefer to include 12PRB for 30kHz SCS, and hence, added as optional  Add a note to clarify the frequency based on the comment from ZTE.  **High Priority Proposal 8.0-4:**   * **For coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”, following parameters are used.**  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Parameters** | **FR1 values** | | UE bandwidth | Rural: 5 MHz (25 PRBs, 15 kHz SCS)  Urban: 5 MHz (11 PRBs or 12 PRBs (optional), 30 kHz SCS) |  * + **Note: Rural scenario at 0.7 GHz, Urban scenario at 2.6 GHz, and Urban scenario at 4 GHz (optional) are considered.** |
|  |  | Following was agreed in the GTW on May 19  **Agreement**   * For coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”, following parameters are used.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Parameters** | **FR1 values** | | UE bandwidth | Rural: 5 MHz (25 PRBs, 15 kHz SCS)  Urban: 5 MHz (11 PRBs or 12 PRBs (optional), 30 kHz SCS) |  * + Note: Rural scenario at 0.7 GHz, Urban scenario at 2.6 GHz, and Urban scenario at 4 GHz (optional) are considered. |
|  |  |  |

**FL6 High Priority Proposal 8.0-5:**

* **For coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”, target data rates are**
  + **FR1 Rural: 250 kbps on DL and 25 kbps in UL**
  + **FR1 Urban: 500 kbps on DL and 250 kbp in UL**
  + **Note: The target data rates are the scaled value in the Rel-17 RedCap SI by a factor of 0.25**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | A typo?   * + **FR1 Rural: 250 kbps on DL and 250 kbps in UL** |
| LGE | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | Typo: **250 kbp -> 250 kbps**  @ZTE/Sanechips We do not think 25 kbps is a typo. Note that in TR 38.875, we considered target data rate of 100 kbps in UL for Rural scenario. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are ok with the proposal but we think saling down target data rate for FR1 Urban in UL to 25 kbps is not necessary. |
| Nordic |  | Not a typo  FR1 Rural: 1 Mbps on DL and 100kbps in UL  - FR1 Urban: 2 Mbps on DL and 1Mbps in UL (Note: The 2Mbps target data rate in downlink is the scaled value of the 10Mbps in the Rel-17 Coverage Enhancement SI by a factor of 0.2) |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| FL7 |  | As kindly explained by some companies, 25 kbps is not typo, which is the scaled value 100 kbps by a factor of 0.25  Most companies are fine with the proposal.  **High Priority Proposal 8.0-5:**   * **For coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”, target data rates are**   + **FR1 Rural: 250 kbps on DL and 25 kbps in UL**   + **FR1 Urban: 500 kbps on DL and 250 kbps in UL**   + **Note: The target data rates are the scaled value in the Rel-17 RedCap SI by a factor of 0.25** |
|  |  | Following was agreed in the GTW on May 19  **Agreement**   * For coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”, target data rates are   + FR1 Rural: 250 kbps on DL and 25 kbps in UL   + FR1 Urban: 500 kbps on DL and 250 kbps in UL   + Note: The target data rates are the scaled value in the Rel-17 RedCap SI by a factor of 0.25 |
|  |  |  |

**FL6 High Priority Question 8.0-6:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide view on whether to assume 3dB antenna efficiency loss for coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | The 3dB antenna efficiency loss can be optionally evaluated for the eRedCap with form factor limitation |
| CATT |  | For simple comparison with the simplest Rel-17 RedCap UE, we think it is natural to assume 3dB small form factor for Rel-18 eRedCap UE.  Or do companies really think a lower cost Rel-18 eRedCap UE is able to equipt larger size/better quality antennas than Rel-17 RedCap UE? |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | If the 3dB efficiency loss comes from the antenna size, considering the small size of antenna is not the main requirement of Rel-18 RedCap UE, this 3dB efficiency loss may not be needed. |
| LGE |  | As we already considered potential 3dB antenna efficiency loss due to device size limitations in FR1 in Rel-17 SI, we are okay to assume it for coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”. |
| IDCC |  | We are ok to consider it. |
| CMCC | Y | Since 3dB antenna efficiency loss is assumed for R17 RedCap coverage recovery evaluation, and R18 RedCap does not change antenna assumption, it can also be assumed for R18 5MHz RedCap UE. |
| Samsung |  | Share a view with CATT. 3dB antenna efficiency loss should be considered for simple comparison with Rel-17 RedCap. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | While the small form factor was studied in TR38.875, it was decided not to consider the small form factor in the work item. We suggest to follow the latest status (not using in the WI) and not use the 3dB factor. If some companies want a comparison, perhaps using the factor can be optional. |
| Intel | Y | The form factor should be considered otherwise eRedCap UE for further complexity reduction is even powerful than Rel-17 RedCap UE |
| Ericsson |  | No strong view. But the baseline should be aligned between companies. Perhaps evaluations without 3 dB antenna efficiency loss could be the baseline and evaluations with 3 dB loss could be optional. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We agree to also assume 3dB antenna efficiency loss, at least for a straightforward comparison with Rel-17 RedCap UE. We also think a small form factor would also be a requirement in many of the use cases for the Rel-18 RedCap UE with further complexity reduction. |
| Nordic |  | It depends on use case, but clearly wearables are not the target in R18 based on SID. Industrial sensors may not be necessarily constrained by size. Thus, we think that 3dB loss should not be a baseline for R18 RedCap. |
| Qualcomm |  | We prefer to have evaluations without 3 dB antenna efficiency loss as a baseline and evaluations with 3 dB loss as an optional |
| Huawei, Hisilicon |  | It can be optionally considered. |
| DOCOMO |  | To align with the evaluation for Rel-17 RedCap, the 3dB antenna efficiency loss needs to be assumed for Rel-18 eRedCap for the fair comparison. |
| OPPO |  | 3dB antenna efficiency loss could be evaluated for simple comparison with Rel-17 RedCap. |
| FL7 |  | Companies view are split.   * Yes: CATT, LGE, IDCC, CMCC, SS, Intel, Nokia, DCM   + As optional: vivo, [FW], E///, QC, HW * No: ZTE, FW, Nordic   As some companies suggested, it can be considered as optional  **High Priority proposal 8.0-6:**   * **3dB antenna efficiency loss can be optionally assumed for coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”** |
|  |  | Following was agreed in the GTW on May 19  **Agreement**   * 3dB antenna efficiency loss can be optionally assumed for coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels” |
|  |  |  |

**FL6 High Priority Question 8.0-7:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide view on whether any update from Table A.1-6 in TR 38.830 is necessary for SIB1 coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y | Number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap should be 1. |
| CATT | Y | Agree with vivo.  Additionally, in **Table A.1-6,** we donot find payload assumption for SIB1, but only Msg4 (1040bits). We’d better settle a typical payload for SIB1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Besides the Number of UE receive chains, the PRBs/MCS/TBS can be further clarified for SIB1 coverage evaluation. |
| LGE | Y | The number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap UE should be 1. |
| IDCC | Y | Agree with CATT. |
| CMCC | Y | Payload size of SIB1 needs to be clarified, which is important for coverage evaluation. And also the number of Rx chains should be change to 1 as pointed by above companies. |
| Samsung |  | The number of UE receive chain should be 1.  For PRBs/MCS/TBS, further decision may be needed. Otherwise, similar handling in Table A.1-6 can be considered like “can be reported by companies”. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Agree with vivo. Agree that the TBS is needed for SIB1 |
| Intel | Y | Agree with other companies that the number of UE receive chain should be 1. |
| Ericsson |  | Agree with other companies regarding 1 Rx assumption. We also agree with CMCC that payload size of SIB1 needs clarification.  It is also not clear to us whether 5-MHz UE would receive a punctured SIB1. For example, the gNB may transmit SIB1 (common to all types of UEs in the cell) with 48 PRBs, but a 5-MHz UE would be able to receive only 11 PRBs.  Also, we assume we would use 3 DMRS symbols. 120 km/h is not needed for Rel-18 RedCap UE. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Agree with 1Rx comment and the need to agree on TBS. |
| Nordic | Y | We agree with 120 km/s removal, #antennas need to be fixed for all below questions. TBS size depends on whether legacy SIB1 is shared with R18 RedCap or not. |
| Qualcomm |  | Agree with CATT. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Y | Number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap is 1 for 1Rx. |
| DOCOMO | Y | Agree with companies that the Rx chain should be 1 for Rel-18 RdeCap and also the assumption for SIB1 payload size should be aligned. |
| OPPO | Y | Agree with other companies that the number of UE receive chain should be 1. |
| FL8 |  | The number of Rx chain is addressed by **Proposal 8.0-3**  120km/h is addressed by Table 6.3-1 in TR38.875, since we agreed to reuse the assumption by default.  Companies are encouraged to provide view on the followings:   * Whether to consider following options   + Opt1: Share legacy SIB1 whose BW is wider than 5MHz   + Opt2: Dedicated SIB1 with 5MHz BW * SIB1 payload size for the above options |
| vivo |  | Clarification, the dedicated SIB1 means we will study R18 eRedCap specific SIB1? or the intention for option 2 is legacy SIB1 for which the frequency domain resource is limited to 5MHz BW?  We think that legacy SIB1 for which the frequency resource allocation is within 5MHz BW should be evaluated.  The maximum payload sizefor SIB1 is 2976 bits, smaller value is expected to be more typical, we are open for smaller values. |
| Nordic |  | There should be possibility to assume dedicated SIB1 with optimized smaller content at least for study purpose. |
| DOCOMO |  | In our view, both of option 1 and 2 can be considered but at least option 2 should be evaluated. Regarding vivo’s comment, for option 2, we prefer to consider both cases that SIB1 may or may not be shared between Rel-18 eRedCap and legacy UEs at this point, i.e., if the content of SIB1 is optimized for eRedCap as commented by Nordic, it would not be shared, otherwise, it can be shared between Rel-18 eRedCap and legacy UEs.  For SIB1 payload size, we don’t have strong viewand can be flexible. |
| Intel |  | One clarification, by Opt 1, does it mean number of PRBs for SIB1 can be larger than 25 or 11 for SCS 15 or 30kHz? Consequently, UE can only receive partial SIB1 PDSCH? In this case, more clarification on the TBS, number of allocated PRBs for the SIB1 PDSCH is necessary. One general question, shall we align certain details on how to receive a part of SIB1 PDSCH? For example, which part of the SIB1 PDSCH can be received by the UE, and whether to consider the combination of the SIB1 PDSCHs in different slots?  Partial reception may be applied to other channels, e.g. PBCH or CORESET 0 too. We would like to clarify if it is considered in the simulation of PBCH/CORESET 0?  Above all, we have a general question: is puncturing or partial reception of DL or UL channel a promising solution for eRedCap? It is expected that the performance of the puncturing or partial reception will depend on code rate, TBS, etc. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We would like to clarify our understanding of Opt1. Our interpretation of this option is that the Rel-18 5 MHz RedCap UE receives SIB1 that is transmitted with a bandwidth that is larger than 5 MHz (e.g., by puncturing the bits transmitted outside its receive bandwidth)?  For Opt2, if are assuming that SIB1 content can be optimized for Rel-18 RedCap UE, it is premature at this stage to predict how much optimization can be achieved. Therefore, for simplicity, the same SIB1 payload size as for the legacy should also be assumed for a dedicated SIB1 for Rel-18 RedCap UE in 5 MHz.  Although the maximum SIB1 payload is 2976, in our experience the typical size is close to around 1200 bits. Therefore, we propose a TBS of 1256 bits for SIB1. |
| Ericsson |  | Opt1 should be the baseline and Opt2 can be optional.  The TBS for SIB1 can be ~1000 bits. We are also fine with TBS of 1256 bits, as suggested by Nokia.  Regarding Opt1, we have the similar understanding as Nokia. We may assume SIB1 uses MCS0 or MCS1. So, once TBS is agreed, we can calculate the number of PRBs accordingly.  Also fine with Nokia’s suggestion regarding TBS assumption for Opt2. |

**FL6 High Priority Question 8.0-8:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide view on whether any update from Table A.1-8 in TR 38.830 is necessary for PBCH coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y | Number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap should be 1. |
| CATT | Y | Agree with vivo. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Number of UE receive chains may need update and others are fine with us. |
| LGE | Y | The number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap UE should be 1. |
| IDCC | Y | Number of UE receive chains should be 1. |
| CMCC | Y | Same view as above companies if 1Rx is agreed for coverage evaluation. |
| Samsung | Y | Share a view with other companies about the number of UE receive chains. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Same comment about the number of UE receive chains |
| Intel | Y | Share a view with other companies about the number of UE receive chains. |
| Ericsson |  | Agree with other companies above regarding 1 Rx assumption. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Agree with 1Rx comment. |
| Qualcomm |  | Agree with vivo. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Y | Number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap is 1 for 1Rx. |
| DOCOMO | Y | Agree with vivo. |
| OPPO | Y | Number of UE receive chains should be 1. |
| FL7 |  | The number of Rx chain is addressed by **Proposal 8.0-3**  Other than the Rx chain, no update is found so far |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**FL6 High Priority Question 8.0-9:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide view on whether any update from Table A.1-7 in TR 38.830 is necessary for PDCCH CSS/USS coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y | Number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap should be 1.  For 15KHz SCS, aggregation level can be 8 for CORESET size of 3-symbol x 24 PRBs  For 30KHz SCS, aggregation level can be 4 for CORESET size of 3-symbol x 11 PRBs |
| CATT | Y | Agree that the number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap should be 1.  For CORESET size, we prefer 3 symbol x 24 PRBs for 15kHz, but 3 symbol x 12 PRBs for 30kHz. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Besides the Number of UE receive chains   1. For CORESET size, 3 symbols and 24PRBs/6PRBs for 15KHz/30KHz SCS shall be considered.   Explanation for 6PRBs with 30KHz SCS: for the Frequency domain resources indication for the CORESET. Each bit corresponds a group of 6 RBs. The incomplete RBG of 6RBs would not be assigned for the CORESET.   1. For Aggregation level, for USS and CSS, maximum aggregation level 8 for 15KHz SCS should be used instead of 16. 2. For Aggregation level, for USS, maximum aggregation level 2(based on 6PRBs\*3OS CORESET size) for 30KHz SCS should be used instead of 16. 3. For Aggregation level, for CSS, aggregation level 2(based on 6PRBs\*3OS CORESET size) for 30KHz SCS should be used. However. For CSS, aggregation level 2 is not supported and the minimum aggregation level is 4. In this case, actually, the PDCCH for CSS can not be completely received if aggregation level 4 or larger AL is used. 4. For the Payload, in the connected mode, the payload size may be larger than 40bits. |
| LGE | Y | The number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap UE should be 1.  Redcued AL should be assumed. |
| IDCC | Y | Number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap should be 1.  For 15KHz SCS, aggregation level can be 8.  For 30KHz SCS, aggregation level can be 4. |
| CMCC | Y | Rx chains as commended by above companies.  If retuning for reception of larger bandwith than 5MHz is not allowed, then   * for the AL, 24RB\*3 OS can be used for 15KHz, AL=8 is possible. * for 30KHz, the current CORESET#0 can not be reused, new CORESET#0 design is needed, then 6RB\*3OS, AL=2 is possible. If 12RB is allowed as CATT suggested, then 12RB\*3OS, AL=4 is possible.   If retuning can be considered for evaluation, then larger AL is possible. But for this operation, the retuning behavior needs more discussion. For example, there is only 11 RBs for 5MHz with 30KHz, then how can UE get 48RBs CORESET size with 4 retuning. |
| Samsung |  | Share a view with other companies about the number of UE receive chains.  CORESET size: 3 symbol x 24 PRBs for 15kHz, 3 symbol x 12 PRBs for 30kHz  AL: Reduced AL is fine but no strong view with exact number. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Agree with the comments about 1 Rx  The CORESET size should be 3 symbols. For 15 kHz SCS, 24 PRBs, and aggregation level of 8. For 30 kHz, use 11 RBs and the aggregation level of 4. |
| Intel |  | The number of Rx chains should be 1. The number of OFDM symbols should be 3  For PDCCH AL, it seems fine to keep 16 since anyway puncturing reception can be assumed similar to PBCH/SIB1 in SCS 30kHz. |
| Ericsson | Y | As also indicated by few other companies above, with the 5 MHz UE maximum RF bandwidth, the largest CORESET that fits within the UE bandwidth has size of 24 PRBs (15 kHz SCS) and 3 symbols. In this case, the maximum possible PDCCH aggregation level (AL) confined within the UE bandwidth is 8. Therefore, the following case can be **added** for Rel-18 PDCCH coverage evaluations:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Parameter** | **Values for 5-MHz RedCap UE (config2)** | | DCI payload size | 40 bits+CRC | | Aggregation level (AL) | 8 | | CORESET | 3 symbols x 24 PRBs | | Precoding | Precoder cycling at CCE level (REG bundle=6) | | BLER target | 1% | |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Agree with vivo and other companies regarding number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap UE.  For 15 kHz SCS, the CORESET size can be 24 PRBs × 2 symbols, and the aggregation level is 8.  For 30 kHz SCS, the CORESET size can be 6 PRBs × 2 symbols, and the aggregation level is 2. |
| Nordic |  | CSS legacy CORESET#0 and candidate mapping is used  It can be assumed that R18 RedCap UE can monitor.  8CCEs (15kHz) and 6CCEs (30KHz) out of 16CCEs of AL16 candidate.  Here DCI format size should be given by size of CORESET#0 (96/48 for 15/30 kHz SCS)  USS/new CORESET#0  Since CORESET size is dropped to 24/12 for 15KHz/30KHz SCS  This results in 12 and 6 CCEs -> Allowing for AL 8 and AL 4 respectivelly.  Optionally, we should consider one candidate that spans whole CORESET, resulting in 6 and 12 CCEs. These can be done by truncat ing AL 8 and 16 and mapping it to the whole CORESET.  Here DCI format size could be further reduced based on size of new CORESET#0 |
| Qualcomm |  | Number of UE receive chains should be 1. CORESET size assumption depends on outcome of **FL6 High Priority Proposal 8.0-4.** |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Y | 1. Number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap is 1 for 1Rx. 2. The CORESET size and AL can be updated.  * For 15KHz SCS, CORESET size can be 3 symbol & 24 PRB, AL can be 8. * For 30KHz SCS, CORESET size can be 3 symbol & 11 PRB, AL can be 4. |
| DOCOMO | Y | Agree with companies that the number of Rx chain should be 1.  For the AL and CORESET size, we agree with vivo. |
| OPPO | Y | Number of UE receive chains should be 1.  For 15 kHz SCS, the CORESET size can be 24 PRBs × 3 symbols, and the aggregation level can be 8.  For 30 kHz SCS, the CORESET size can be 12PRBs × 3symbols, and the aggregation level can be 4. |
| FL7  FL8 |  | The number of Rx chain is addressed by **Proposal 8.0-3**  Based on the comment, following proposal is made  **FL7 High Priority Proposal 8.0-9:**   * **For PDCCH CSS/USS coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”, following revision are assumed**   + **For 15KHz SCS, CORESET size is 3 symbols and 24 PRBs, AL is 8.**   + **For 30KHz SCS,**     - **Opt1: CORESET size is 3 symbols and 6 PRBs, AL is 2**     - **Opt2: CORESET size is 3 symbols and 12 PRBs, AL is 4.**   [FL8] Also, companies are encouraged to provide view on thether to consider following options for PDCCH CSS   * Opt1: Share CORESET#0 whose BW is wider than 5MHz * Opt2: Dedicated CORESET#0 with 5MHz BW * Note: current proposal assumes Opt2 |
|  |  | Following was agreed in the GTW on May 19  **Agreement**   * For at least PDCCH USS coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”, following revision are assumed   + For 15KHz SCS, CORESET size is 3 symbols and 24 PRBs, AL is 8.   + For 30KHz SCS,     - Opt1: CORESET size is 3 symbols and 6 PRBs, AL is 2 (baseline)     - Opt2: CORESET size is 3 symbols and 12 PRBs, AL is 4 (optional)   FFS: Use all CCEs of the CORESET  The FFS part is discussed directly over the reflector. |
| vivo |  | More clarification for Opt2: Dedicated CORESET#0 with 5MHz BW is needed.  Does it mean we will study R18 eRedCap specific CORESET#0?  Our understanding for 15KHz SCS, CORESET size is 3 symbols and 24 PRBs, R18 eRedCap UE can still share the CORESET#0 with non-RedCap UEs and the BW for CORESET#0 should be within 5MHz BW.  Opt.1 can be considered only for 30KHz SCS, Opt.2 or other options for CORESET#0@30KHz for CORESET#0 can be optionally evaluated and reported by companies. |
| Nordic |  | Our assumption has been that gNB should have choice to configure CORESET#0 up to 96RB for legacy UE in 15kHz, and 48RB in 30kHz SCS.  As said, with current hashing function it is feasible for band reduces UE to receive hald of each candidate with index #0.  As a consequence, in 30KHz UE can receive 6CCE from legacy AL16 candidate. 4CCE from AL8 candidate ….  As we commented in reflector new ways of how to map PDCCH candidate to CORESET should be considered as well.  **In addition, support of 12/6CCE PDCCH candidate would not cause significant specification impact, and such impact could be limited to RAN1 only**.  At the same time we would see the physical limits of NR CORESET for 5MHz UEs.   * **For PDCCH CSS/USS coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”, following revision are assumed**   + **For 15KHz SCS, CORESET size is 3 symbols and 24 PRBs, AL is 8.**   + **For 30KHz SCS,**     - **Opt1: CORESET size is 3 symbols and 6 PRBs, AL is 2**     - **Opt2: CORESET size is 3 symbols and 12 PRBs, AL is 4.**   + **(Optional) PDCCH candidate is mapped to all resources of a 24/12 PRB wide and 3 symbols long CORESET.** |
| DOCOMO |  | According to the current specification, the configurable AL for Type0-PDCCH CSS is 4, 8 or 16. Therefore, if we assume AL2 for CORESET#0, it cannot be shared among legacy UEs and eRedCap UEs, and hence option 2 (dedicated CORESET#0 for eRedCap) is applied especially for opt.1 for 30 kHz SCS in Proposal 8.0-9.  For other cases, i.e., 15 kHz SCS and 12 RB CORESET# for 30 kHz SCS, both option 1 and 2 can be considered and at least option 2 should be studied. |
| Intel |  | For proposal 8.0-9, we understand the logic to propose AL 8 or 4 or 2. On the other hand, if partial reception is applicable to SIB PDSCH or PBCH, why can’twe consider it for PDCCH detection in CORESET 0? It is expected to provide a better coverage. For example, based on ‘Opt1: Share CORESET#0 whose BW is wider than 5MHz’, gNB may transmit a PDCCH with AL=16 and UE receives 12 CCEs of the the PDCCH. |
| Ericsson |  | We are fine with the following proposal from Nordic:   * + **(Optional) PDCCH candidate is mapped to all resources of a 24/12 PRB wide and 3 symbols long CORESET.**   For PDCCH CSS, we think only Opt1 needs to be evaluated. For Opt1, same assumptions as in Rel-17 SI could be used. That is:   * CORESET size (for both Rural and Urban): 2 symbols, 48 PRBs (AL16)   In addition, we think the following evaluations can be optional:   * CORESET size (for both Rural and Urban): 2 (or 3) symbols, 24 PRBs (AL8)   We don’t see a strong need to evaluate Opt2 as this case is more or less already captured by the PDCCH USS case. |

**FL6 High Priority Question 8.0-10:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide view on whether any update from Table A.1-6 in TR 38.830 is necessary for Msg4 coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y | Number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap should be 1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | For DMRS configuration, 120km/h scenario is not needed for Rel-18 RedCap UE. |
| LGE | Y | The number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap UE should be 1. |
| IDCC |  | Number of UE receive chains should be 1. |
| CMCC | Y | Number of Rx chains. |
| Samsung |  | Share a view with other companies about the number of UE receive chains and DMRS configuration. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Same comment as vivo. Okay with ZTE to not consider 120 km/h. |
| Ericsson |  | Agree with other companies above. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | The number of UE receive chains should be 1. |
| Nordic |  | Assume RRC optimisations for band limited R18 RedCap  We think that size of RRC parameters for R18 RedCap could be optimized. For example, dedicated CORESET could be configured with bitmap of 4bits instead of 45bits. And we believe that more could be optimized in dedicated BWP RRC. |
| Qualcomm |  | Number of UE receive chains should be 1. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Y | Number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap is 1 for 1Rx. |
| DOCOMO | Y | Agree with vivo. |
| OPPO | Y | Number of UE receive chains should be 1. |
| FL8 |  | The number of Rx chain is addressed by **Proposal 8.0-3**  120km/h is addressed by Table 6.3-1 in TR38.875, since we agreed to reuse the assumption by default.  Companies are encouraged to provide view on whether the RRC optimization proposed by Nordic should be considered. |
| vivo |  | For evaluation, we think the TBS for Msg4 smaller than 1040 bits can be optionally reported by companies. |
| Nordic |  | Optional is OK for us. |
| DOCOMO |  | Eavaluation for optimized RRC size can be optionally reported by companies. |
| Intel |  | The RRC signaling may be thousands of bits, the benefit of saving 41 bits for CORESET configuration is not clear. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We have a similar view as Intel. Also, the topic of how to optimize RRC signaling is more appropriately discussed in RAN2. Therefore, we think the assumption of 1040 bits should be reused. However, we can agree to optional reporting of evaluations for Msg4 with TBS smaller than 1040 bits. |
| Ericsson |  | Similar view as Intel and Nokia. Also, for coverage impact study, these kinds of optimizations are not necessary. We may consider them during the normative phase, if needed. |

**FL6 High Priority Question 8.0-11:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide view on whether any update from Table A.1-2 in TR 38.830 is necessary for PUSCH coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | 1. For Number of UE transmit chains, 2 (optional) shall be removed. 2. For PRBs/TBS/MCS for eMBB, at least 30 PRBs is not appropriate to use for 5MHz bandwidth UE. 3. For DMRS configuration, 120km/h scenario is not needed for Rel-18 RedCap UE. |
| LGE |  | It seems the recommended number of PRBs should be updated after the discussion on Proposal 8.0-5. |
| Samsung |  | Share a view with other companies about the number of UE receive chains and DMRS configuration. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Similar comment as Samsung |
| Ericsson |  | Agree with suggestion from ZTE/Sanechips. It could be clarified that, for Urban scenario, 11 PRBs can be used. For Rural scenario, fine with using 4 PRBs (or even lower). |
| Nokia, NSB |  | For the number of UE transmit chains, “2 (optional)” should be removed. |
| Nordic |  | R17 CovEnh should be baseline for R18 RedCap |
| Qualcomm |  | Agree with ZTE on number of UE transmit chains and DMRS configuration. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon |  | PUSCH evaluation is not needed. |
| DOCOMO |  | We are fine with the current assumption but open to discuss. |
| OPPO |  | Share similar view on number of UE transmit chains and DMRS configuration. |
| FL7 |  | 120km/h is addressed by Table 6.3-1 in TR38.875, since we agreed to reuse the assumption by default.  Thank you for reminding me that we need one more proposal to decide the number of Tx.  **High Priority Proposal 8.0-11:**   * **For coverage evaluation of Rel-18 RedCap UE, 1 Tx branch is assumed.** |
|  |  | Following was agreed in the GTW on May 19  **Agreement**   * For coverage evaluation of Rel-18 RedCap UE, 1 Tx branch is assumed. |
|  |  |  |

**FL6 High Priority Question 8.0-12:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide view on whether any update from Table A.1-3 in TR 38.830 is necessary for PUCCH 2/11/22 bits coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Format 3, 4bits (3 bits A/N + 1 bit SR), can be removed |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Ok with ZTE’s suggestion |
| Ericsson |  | Fine with suggestion from ZTE/Sanechips. |
| Nordic |  | R17 CovEnh should be baseline for R18 RedCap |
| Huawei, Hisilicon |  | PUCCH evaluation is not needed. |
| DOCOMO |  | We are fine with the current assumption but open to discuss. |
| OPPO |  | Number of UE receive chains should be 1. |
| FL7 |  | Since we agreed to consider PUCCH 2/11/22 bits, it is not necessary to further discuss 4bits case.  No update is found for now. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**FL6 High Priority Question 8.0-13:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide view on whether any update from Table A.1-4 in TR 38.830 is necessary for PRACH coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | 1. For Number of UE transmit chains, 2 (optional) shall be removed. 2. For the preamble format, more specifically, Format 0 with length 829, Format B4 with length 139, or Format C2 with length 139 should be considered, since other configurations may exceed the 5MHz bandwidth |
| Ericsson |  | We think it could be clarified that Format 0 is used for Rural scenario and Format B4 is used for Urban scenario.  We think Format C2 (6 symbols) should not be considered so that there is some synergy between the results from companies. Note that Format B4 (12 symbols) was considered in Urban scenario during Rel-17 RedCap SI. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | For Format B4 and Format C2, the number of subcarriers for 30 kHz SCS should be clarified if limiting the bandwidth to 11 PRBs (based on outcome of discussion on FL6 High Priority Question 8.0-4), since the bandwidth of the preamble (139 subcarriers) with these formats exceeds 11 PRBs. |
| Nordic |  | Can be reused |
| Huawei, Hisilicon |  | PRACH evaluation is not needed. |
| DOCOMO |  | We are fine with the current assumption but open to discuss. |
| OPPO |  | Number of UE receive chains should be 1. |
| FL8 |  | 2Tx is addressed by **Proposal 8.0-11**  As pointed out by some companies, the assumed preamble format should be updated.  Companies are encouraged to provide the view which preamble format should be assumed for each scenario |
| Nordic |  | Short PRACH preambles fit into 12RBs, which should not be an issue for operator’s carrier of BW larger than 5MHz. In corner case of when operator carrier BW is 5MHz, format 0 can be still used, plus even here it could be studied whether RF requirements can be met for 139SC transmission. |
| DOCOMO |  | We are fine with the current assumption, i.e., Format0/B4/C2. |
| Intel |  | It is fine to exclude PRACH format C2 in the simulation for coverage analysis  For PRACH preamble B4, it is 12 PRBs. For SCS 30kHz with only 11 PRBs, does it mean we need to simulate a punctured transmission of PRACH preamble B4? The PAPR due to punctured PRACH sequence will be increased. Further, it will increase the correlation of the preambles. |
| Nokia, BSB |  | We are fine with assuming format B4 with 139 subcarriers. |
| Ericsson |  | As we commented in the previous round, it could be clarified that Format 0 is used for Rural scenario and Format B4 is used for Urban scenario (as in Rel-17 SI).  We think Format C2 (6 symbols) should not be considered so that there is some synergy between the results from companies. Note that Format B4 (12 symbols) was considered in Urban scenario during Rel-17 RedCap SI.  Also, we have similar understanding as Intel that punctured PRACH should be considered for Format B4. |

**FL6 High Priority Question 8.0-14:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide view on whether any update from Table A.1-6 in TR 38.830 is necessary for PDSCH coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y | Number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap should be 1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Besides Number of UE receive chains , For DMRS configuration, 120km/h scenario is not needed for Rel-18 RedCap UE. |
| LGE | Y | The number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap UE should be 1. |
| Samsung |  | Share a view with other companies about the number of UE receive chains and DMRS configuration. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Similar comment as Samsung |
| Ericsson |  | Same view as others above. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | The number of UE receive chains should be 1. |
| Qualcomm |  | Agree with ZTE on number of UE receive chains and DMRS configuration. |
| DOCOMO | Y | Agree with vivo. |
| FL7 |  | 2Tx is addressed by **Proposal 8.0-11**  120km/h is addressed by Table 6.3-1 in TR38.875, since we agreed to reuse the assumption by default.  Other than the above, no update is found for now. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**FL6 High Priority Question 8.0-15:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide view on whether any update from Table A.1-6 in TR 38.830 or Table 6.3-4 in TR 38.875 is necessary for Msg2 coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y | For Table A.1-6 in TR 38.830, Number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap should be 1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Besides Number of UE receive chains, For DMRS configuration, 120km/h scenario is not needed for Rel-18 RedCap UE. |
| LGE | Y | The number of UE receive chains for Rel-18 RedCap UE should be 1. |
| Samsung |  | Share a view with other companies about the number of UE receive chains and DMRS configuration. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Similar comment as Samsung |
| Ericsson |  | Same view as others above. Also, we think that the payload size of Msg2 could be aligned between companies. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | The number of UE receive chains should be 1. In addition, MCS0 was assumed for Msg2 in the Rel-17 SI. With a maximum bandwidth of 11 PRBs for 30 kHz SCS, it may not be possible to support the payload size assumed in the Rel-17 evaluations. |
| Nordic |  | Table A.1-6 in TR 38.830 and Table 6.3-4 are contradicting on what TBS should be. |
| Qualcomm |  | Agree with ZTE on number of UE receive chains and DMRS configuration. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | N | Parameters in Table 6.3-4 in TR 38.875 can be reused directly. |
| DOCOMO | Y | Agree with vivo. |
| FL8 |  | The number of Rx chain is addressed by **Proposal 8.0-3**  120km/h is addressed by Table 6.3-1 in TR38.875, since we agreed to reuse the assumption by default.  @Nordic: As you can see in TR38.875, Table A.1-6 in TR 38.830 is used by defalt with the revision in Table 6.3-4 in TR38.875  ---  The assumptions for channel specific parameters are also based on reusing the Rel-17 Coverage Enhancement SI agreements [5], with the revision or addition described below.  ---  Companies are encouraged to provide view on   * Whether to decide Msg2 payload size (commented by E//) * Whether to revise MCS (commented by Nokia) |
| vivo |  | It would be good if we can align at least for TBS. It is also fine that companies can report the assumed TBS/MCS etc. |
| Nordic |  | Agree that TBS size or sizes should be agreed. |
| DOCOMO |  | We share similar comment as vivo that it would be good to align the TBS among companies but fine to conclude that companies will report the assumption considering remaining time in this meeting. |
| Intel |  | We prefer the same handling as Rel-17. i.e., companies to report the used number of PRBs and corresponding TBS value of Msg2 |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We are fine with agreeing on a TBS (which should be common for Rel-17 UE and Rel-18 UE). |
| Ericsson |  | * We propose a Msg2 TBS of 9 bytes for the Rel-15 reference UE, the Rel-17 RedCap UE, and the 5- MHz UE. * MCS0 (w/o TBS scaling) may be assumed for Msg2. TBS scaling may be optional in which case a different MCS may be chosen. |

**FL6 High Priority Question 8.0-16:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide view on whether any update from Table A.1-5 in TR 38.830 is necessary for Msg3 coverage evaluation of “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | For Number of UE transmit chains, 2 (optional) shall be removed. |
| Ericsson |  | Agree with ZTE/Sanechips |
| Nokia, NSB |  | For the number of UE transmit chains, “2 (optional)” should be removed. |
| Nordic |  | MSG3 R17 enahcements should be taken into account |
| Huawei, Hisilicon |  | PUSCH evaluation is not needed. |
| DOCOMO |  | We are fine with the current assumption but open to discuss. |
| FL7 |  | 2Tx is addressed by **Proposal 8.0-11**  Other than the abovem, no update is found for now. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

8.1 Introduction to coverage recovery

[Placeholder]

8.2 Coverage recovery evaluation
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8.3 Coverage recovery for <CHANNEL>

For the coverage recovery techniques, following views are provided in the company contributions, **which will be discussed once necessary evaluations are decided**:

* PBCH
  + Longer acquisition time allows multiple trials of SSB/SI acquisition [5]
  + PBCH reception across multiple times [16]
  + RF retuning after detecting the PSS and SSS successfully with increased cell search delay [11]
  + design a new channel to replace the legacy PBCH [22]
  + use only 15 kHz SCS for SSB [22]
* SI acquisition
  + Longer acquisition time allows multiple trials of SSB/SI acquisition [5]
* PDCCH
  + Reduce DCI sizes [5]
  + Introducing a higher aggregation level [5]
  + frequency hopping CORESET [5]
  + PDCCH repetition [5, 16, 21]
  + PDCCH reception across multiple times [16]
* PDSCH
  + frequency hopping [5, 21]
  + PDSCH repetition [5]
* PRACH
  + Repeat random access attempts [5]
  + Use longer PRACH preambles [5]
* PUCCH
  + Use a longer PUCCH format [5]
  + PUCCH repetition [5]
  + frequency hopping [21]
* PUSCH
  + Use slot aggregation [5]
  + frequency hopping [5, 21]
  + BWP larger than maximum UE bandwidth [11]
  + Optimize the BWP framework [11]

9 Impact to network capacity and spectral efficiency

For network capacity and spectral efficiency, following views on whether the SLS evaluation are necessary are provided in the company contributions:

* SLS for network capacity and spectral efficiency is **NOT** necessary [5, 6, 8, 23]
  + Both UE bandwidth reduction and reduced UE peak data rate have little impact on network capacity and spectral efficiency
  + The network capacity and spectral efficiency are usually affected by the reduced peak data rate caused by the relaxation of maximum number of MIMO layers and maximum modulation order
  + improving the system capacity is not included in the SI scope
  + very limited TU for Rel-18 RedCap
* Spectral efficiency and UE throughput in co-existence of eMBB, Rel-17 RedCap UEs and Rel-18 RedCap UEs should be evaluated [10(?), 12, 14]
  + excessive SSB resource usage and less frequency diversity gain may result in some performance degradation on network capacity and spectral efficiency
  + reuse evaluation methodology for system level simulations in TR38.875 [12, 14]
  + Keep urban macro at 2.6 GHz in TDD as the main deployment configurations for SLS evaluation [14]
  + To be discussed whether any update from Section 6.4 in TR 38.875 is necessary

**FL1 High Priority Question 9-1: Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether the SLS evaluation are necessary for network capacity and spectral efficiency.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson |  | We do not see a strong need for SLS for studying network capacity and spectral efficiency impacts in Rel-18, considering that the main motivation for SLS in the Rel-17 RedCap SI was to study the impact of reduction of number of Rx branches and that we have limited TUs available to conclude the Rel-18 eRedCap SI.  Also, in TR. 38.875, the following statement was captured on the impact of UE BW reduction on network capacity and spectral efficiency for Rel-17 RedCap:  *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.*  However, if proponents could provide a good enough motivation, we would be open to consider SLS in the SI. We would also be fine with capturing qualitative assessments of network capacity and spectral efficiency impacts due to the complexity reduction techniques in TR 38.865 (as we did in TR 38.875). |
| CATT | N | The network capacity and spectral efficiency are mainly affected by the relaxation of maximum number of MIMO layers and maximum modulation order. They are unlikely to be largely affected due to the reduction of bandwidth alone. In addition, improving the system capacity is not included in the SI scope.  In fact, we do not need to worry too much about network capacity. Network can control the access/barring of RedCap UE to balance the capacity. |
| vivo | N | As observed in TR. 38.875, the bandwidth reduction will not have a significant impact on capacity and spectral efficiency, and the SI time is quite limited, no strong jusitification is found to do the SLS. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | In Rel-17, reduced number of Rx antennas and layers and relaxed modulation order would cause network capacity and spectral efficiency degradation，therefore SLS is needed.  However, in Rel-18, at least for UE BW reduction, no significant network capacity and spectral efficiency impacts are foreseen. Considering the limited TU and massive efforts for parameter alignment, SLS is not necessary. |
| CMCC | N | Separate section for this may not be necessary. Company can bring up evaluation along with performance impact of each solution in section 7.2.3 or 7.3.3. |
| Samsung | N | We don't see a strong need of SLS in Rel-18. Impact on network capacity or spectral efficiency from BW reduction, relaxed UE processing time and also the reduced peak data rate (caused by the relaxed maximum number of MIMO layers and maximum modulation order) was already analyzed in Rel-17 RedCap and then captured in TR38.875. |
| DOCOMO | N | As commented by companies, it is captured in TR38.875 that BW reduction will not have a significant impact on the network capacity and spectral efficiency, and hence we don’t see the need for SLS to evaluate at this point. |
| IDCC | N |  |
| Nordic | N |  |
| Intel | N | The main feature for complexity reduction is BW reduction or relaxed processing time, both features are not expected to have large impact to network capability and spectral efficiency. |
| OPPO | N | No SLS is needed at this moment. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We think it would be beneficial to perform SLS evaluations to evaluate the network capacity and spectral efficiency as we do see some impact. We do agree that the expected impact from BW reduction should be small. Therefore, if the majority view is not to have SLS evaluations then we are fine to accept majority view. |
| LGE | N | We don’t think SLS evaluation is necessary for network capacity and spectrail efficiency. Given the scope of Rel-18 RedCap SI, SLS is not essential to make a conclusion on the scope of Rel-18 RedCap WI. Also, we have very limited time for evaluations and discussions, so we believe that it is better to focus on essential issues. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | We think that no network capacity simulations are needed. The simulations are both out of scope of the SI and also not needed, as the network impact concern is mainly of a deployment nature and not on whether low data rate UEs are worth supporting in the network from a capacity perspective. |
| Qualcomm | N | No SLS evaluation is needed for Rel-18 study item |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | N | All the studied UE cost reduction techniques, such as UE bandwidth reduction, UE peak data rate reduction, relaxed UE processing time have little impact on network capacity and efficiency. SLS simulation is not necessary. |
| Xiaomi | N | SLS on netwok capacity and spectral efficiency is not needed, since all the cost reduction solution has limited impact on them. SLS on eRedCap UE average throughput may need to evaluate for relaxed processing timline and HARQ process number reduction if studied. |
| Sequans | N | No significant network capacity and spectral efficiency impact is expected from BW reduction. |
| FL2 |  | Most companies don’t think SLS evaluation is necessary for network capacity and spectral efficiency. Also, proponent showed their flexibility to accept majority view. Therefore, following proposed conclusion is made  **High Priority Proposed conclusion 9-1:**   * **SLS evaluation for network capacity and spectral efficiency is not conducted in Rel-18 RedCap SI.** |
| FL3 |  | This proposal could not be discussed in the GTW on May 12.  Based on the comments in the previous round, this proposed conclusion can be endorsed over the reflector. If you concern on agreeing this proposal, please indicate it directly over the reflector. |
| FL4 |  | Following was agreed as conclusion by email endorsement  **Conclusion:**   * SLS evaluation for network capacity and spectral efficiency is not conducted in Rel-18 RedCap SI. |

# 10 Other evaluations

For other evaluations, following views on whether/which evaluations are necessary are provided in the company contributions:

* O1: PDCCH blocking probability
  + depends on which bandwidth reduction option will be agreed [8, 11]
    - When RF bandwidth is reduced to 5MHz, a narrower CORESET with fewer PDCCH candidates may increase the blocking probability even if lower aggregation level is used
    - if the CORESET is allowed to be shared by Rel-18 RedCap UEs and legacy UEs including Rel-17 RedCap UE, PDCCH blocking will be more serious
  + Reuse the PDCCH AL distributions as in Rel-17 RedCap TR 38.875 [23]
    - Any modification of AL distributions to be reported by companies (e.g., restriction on some ALs by BW reduction)
  + To be discussed whether any update from Table 6.2-4 in TR 38.875 is necessary
* O2: Latency
  + Whether to evaluate the latency for relaxed N1/N2 should be determined with high priority [10]
  + For reduced number of HARQ processes [11]
    - singficant impact on the overall delay of the payload and indirectly impact on the system throughput
* O3: Throughput
  + For TBS restriction [11]
    - singficant impact on the overall delay of the payload and indirectly impact on the system throughput
* O4: Power saving gain
  + discuss if it needs to evaluate and compare power saving gain of the candidate solutions for complexity reduction, given that different solution may provide different power gain [17]
* [7, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 23] discuss cost evaluation aspects, which will be discussed in AI 9.6.1.

**FL1 High Priority Question 10-1: Companies are encouraged to provide views on which evaluations listed above are necessary.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Supported evaluations (O1/O2/O3/O4)** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | O1 and O2 | O3: We do not think evaluations to study the impacts of TBS restriction should be prioritized. However, we would be fine with capturing qualitative assessments of the impacts, e.g., in Clause 7.3.3 of TR 38.865 (if endorsed).  O4: Unlike Rel-17 RedCap SI, UE power saving is not part of the objectives of Rel-18 eRedCap SI. |
| CATT | O1 | We think O1 can be considered, if the bandwidth of PDCCH is redued to 5 MHz.  Other evaluations are not critical. |
| vivo |  | We do not think O1 ~ O4 is needed.  For O1, for the connected R18 eRedCap UE, gNB can configure the CORESET properly. For idle/inactive R18 eRedCap, it can also be controlled by gNB, depending on whether there is PDCCH blocking issue, gNB can decide whether the shared or separate CORESETs for R18 eRedCap and non-RedCap UE should be used.  For O2, double the processing timeline, as evalueated in our contribution R1-2203572, the latency requirement can still be satisfied.  For O3, we do not think it will bring significate loss to the overall system throughput.  For O4, it can be low priority for this study, quantitative analysis is not needed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | O1 and O2 |  |
| Samsung |  | We think which evaluations are further needed depends on proposals by proponents and so, there is no need to agree on further evaluations. |
| DOCOMO | O1 | For O1, it can be expected that the PDCCH blocking rate may be increased with 5MHz RF BW.  For O4, we are open but don’t see the strong need for evaluation campaign and it can be evaluated with low priority. |
| IDCC | O1, O2 |  |
| Nordic |  | No need to study any of these. |
| Intel | O1 | If duration of CORSET is not increased and CORSET bundling is not supported, it will be necessary to evaluate PDCCH blocking rate since there are only quite limited CCEs in the CORESTE. On the other hand, if CORESET bundling or larger duration of CORESET is supported, we don’t see a necessity for the evaluation of PDCCH blocking rate |
| OPPO | O1 | We can consider the blocking issue due to the much lower availiby CORESET resource. |
| Nokia, NSB | O1 | For BB+RF reduction to 5MHz, PDCCH blocking can be studied. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| LGE | O1 | For O1, if option1: RF+BB BW reduction is considered, PDCCH blocking rate is expected to be increased due to restriced CORESET with fewer PDCCH candidates. We think it is worth evaluating PDCCH blocking rate. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | O4 is out of scope, O3 may not be needed. Open to at least statements on blocking and latency, not sure yet if evaluations are necessary, though if companies provide results, we can discuss. |
| Qualcomm | O1 | For 5MHz BW CORESET option, we need to perform evaluation for PDCCH blocking probability. For 20MHz BW CORESET option, we already have sufficient results in TR38.875 so we can reuse them. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | O4 is out of scope.  O2 is not necessary at least for doubling N1/N2. |
| Xiaomi | O1 and O2 |  |
| FL2 |  | Summary of companies view   * O1   + Yes: E///, CATT, ZTE, DCM, IDCC, Intel (if no enhancement), OPPO, Nokia, LGE, QC, Xiaomi   + No: vivo, SS, Nordic * O2   + Yes: E///, ZTE, IDCC, Xiaomi   + No: CATT, vivo, SS, Nordic, HW * O3   + Yes:   + No: E///, CATT, vivo, SS, Nordic, FW * O4   + Yes:   + No: E///, CATT, vivo, SS, [DCM], Nordic, FW, HW   Based on the above, following proposal is made  **High Priority Proposal 10-1:**   * **PDCCH blocking probability is evaluated for Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels** * **(As conclusion) Following evaluations are not conducted in Rel-18 RedCap SI**   + **Latency**   + **Throughput**   + **Power saving gain** |
| FL3 |  | This proposal could not be discussed in the GTW on May 12.  Companies are encouraged to provide view whether it is acceptable or not. If not, please provide another proposal which is acceptable to all. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | This proposal has the same problematic formulation from the GTW where "for all DL/UL channels" should be removed from the main bullet. It may not be necessary to study O1. As suggested by some companies, in connected mode, the gNB can manage the PDCCH resources appropriately. In idle mode, a separate CORESET can be used for Rel-18 UEs. |
| CATT |  | Fine with the conclusion part.  While it is natural that 5MHz RF+BB will have impact to PDCCH blocking, we also agree that many implementation-based method can address the PDCCH blocking issue. Furthermore, if we agree to try to increase the PDCCH coverage by some methods, empirically, these methods can be easily reused to extend the PDCCH capacity.  Hence, even if we agree to study PDCCH blocking probability, it seems the priority is lower than PDCCH coverage evaluation. |
| vivo |  | We do not think we need to evaluate PDCCH blocking probability for RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz. Qualitative analysis for the PDCCH blocking can be made based on the coverage performance. In addition, for the connected R18 eRedCap UE, gNB can configure the CORESET properly. For idle/inactive R18 eRedCap, it can also be controlled by gNB, gNB can decide whether the shared or separate CORESET for R18 eRedCap and non-RedCap UE should be used. |
| Samsung |  | Conclusion in the second bullet is fine. PDCCH blocking issue can be managed by gNB as other companies comment. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We support this proposal. We are not sure how PDCCH blocking rate would increase with 5MHz BW CORESET and whether it can be addressed by some implementation-based methods. Hence, it may not require any specification impact but we think it is worth evaluating in study phase to identify whether it is problematic and solusions need to be considered. We are also fine that this evaluation is optional with low priority as compromise. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Generally Y | We support that PDCCH blocking probability can be evaluated for Rel-18 RedCap UE. Compared with Rel-17, the PDCCH blocking issue would be serious, since the PDDCH capability is limited in a CORESET due to BB+RF BW reduction to 5MHz. We need to check and confirm whether this blocking issue exists in the SI stage and then decide whether/how the solution is performed in the WI stage.  Additionally, we are OK to remove “for all DL/UL channels”, which is redundant under the condition of BB+RF BW reduction to 5MHz. |
| OPPO |  | Share similar view as above companies, PDCCH blocking probability is not necessary to evaluate, it can be managed by gNB. |
| Intel | Y | We are OK for the proposal. The number of CCEs is limited to 12 or 3 for SCS 15kHz and 30kHz respectively, it is clear it will result in bad PDCCH blocking if enhancement is not considered. Therefore, the degradation should be evaluated and quantized. |
| LGE |  | We are generally okay with the proposal.  But, if other companies have concerns on evaluating the PDCCH blocking probability in this study, we are okay to deprioritize it. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| CMCC |  | Share similar view as vivo that, if CORESET#0 can be shared, then it means the type0-PDCCH can be common to schedule the same SIB1, then no blocking issue. if CORESET#0 can not be shared, then the blocking has nothing to do with legacy UEs.  For connected CORESET, gNB can decide whether to share it with legacy UEs.  However, blocking may happen when the CORESET#0 is not shared but overlapped and the search space are also overlapped. And it is not easy to draw conclusion for such case . |
| Nordic |  | We share the same view with CMCC |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are OK to study the PDCCH blocking. For power saving gain, we feel qualitative analysis would be beneficial but agree that evaluations are not needed. |
| Sequans | Y | We are fine with the conclusion. Also OK to clarify PDCCH blocking probability for BB+RF reduction to 5MHz if companies think there is a problem. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon |  | In Rel-17 RedCap WI, it has been identified that UE bandwidth reduction and UE Rx branch reduction will lead to higher PDCCH blockage probability. This issue will more severe with introduction of Rel-18 RedCap. Thus, PDCCH blocking probability can be considered Rel-18 RedCap.  However, for the first bullet, we don’t feel that the evaluation is limited only for Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz. The other BW options, such as RF BW 20MHz + BB BW 5MHz only for data channels, should also be considered. Because in the same 20MHz system bandwidth, four FDM-ed 5MHz CORESETs are available for the 5MHz BW UEs, whose resoures are comparable to a 20MHz CORESET for a UE of RF BW 20MHz + BB BW 5MHz. For fair comparison, the other interested BW Option should be evaluated. |
| Qualcomm |  | We generally support to study blocking probability but we need to wait until we decide which complexity reduction schemes will be studied in AI 9.6.1. |
| Xiaomi |  | Since there are less CCEs available if both BB and RF are reduced to 5MHZ, it is necessary to evaluate PDCCH blocking rate for this option. |
| FL4 |  | Summary of companies view   * O1   + Yes: E///, CATT (low priority), ZTE, DCM (optional), IDCC, Intel (if no enhancement), Nokia, LGE (low priority), QC, Xiaomi, CMCC(?), HW   + No: vivo, SS, Nordic, FW, OPPO   Some companies showed their flexibility that this evaluation can be low priority or optional.  One company (HW) pointed out that another option of “RF BW 20MHz + BB BW 5MHz only for data channels” should also be considered.  Also, another company (QC) pointed out that we need to wait until we decide which complexity reduction schemes will be studied in AI 9.6.1  Therefore, the proposal is updated as follows.  **High Priority Proposal 10-1:**   * **PDCCH blocking probability ~~is~~ can be optionally evaluated for “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**   + **Whether to consider the option of “RF BW 20MHz + BB BW 5MHz only for data channels”** * **(As conclusion) Following evaluations are not conducted in Rel-18 RedCap SI**   + **Latency**   + **Throughput**   + **Power saving gain** |
| vivo |  | We still do not think it is necessary to evaluat PDCCH blocking probability. We would like better understand what scenario is the focus for PDCCH blocking from proponent company perspective:   1. Scenario with only eRedCap 5MHz UE 2. Scenario with mixed of eRedCap 5MHz and RedCap 20MHz UEs. 3. Scenario with mixed of eRedCap 5MHz and RedCap 20MHz and non-RedCap 100MHz UEs.   For scenario 2 and 3, what would be the performance metric, the blocking performance of eRedCap UEs, or other UEs (including RedCap and/or non-RedCap UEs) |
| DOCOMO | Y | Regarding vivo’s comment, while scenario 2 or 3 is more practical to consider the coexistence with legacy UEs, we believe it would be worth even if only scenario 1 is evaluated to observe how PDCCH blocking probability increase when UE BB BW for PDCCH is restricted to 5MHz. For example, CORESET resources can be shared (i.e., not FDMed) among Rel-18 RedCap UEs in connected mode and PDCCH blocking probability may increase considerably for such case. |
| CATT |  | Maybe OK to consider it as optional evaluation.  Regarding vivo’s comment, we also recall that there was no (?) common consensus on the performance metric in Rel-17. It would be good if companies also report the performance metric by themselves, if no consensus is achieved. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | We are open to consider “RF BW 20MHz + BB BW 5MHz only for data channels”. And, the detailed evaluation method and assumption should be further clarified.  As for the simulation scenarios for eRedCap 5MHz UE, from our understanding, the blocking probability comparison between 5MHz UE and 20MHz UE is needed. Some points are shown as follows:   1. 20MHz UE uses the 20MHz CORESET(case1) and 5MHz UE uses the 5MHz CORESET(case2) 2. They have the same aggregation level {1, 2, 4 ,8}. 5MHz UE can not use aggregation level 16, therefore 16 is not used for the fair comparison. 3. Distribution probability is different for the two cases, because they have the different frequency diversity gain. For example, for 5MHz bandwidth CORESET, the probability for large aggregation level would be relatively larger due to the frequency diversity gain compensation. 4. the results analysis can be based on blocking probability assuming the two cases have the same UE number and a threshold can be considered to determine whether the PDCCH blocking issue should be addressed. For example, if the difference blocking rate for case1 and case2 is larger than the threshold under the same UE number, then PDCCH blocking issue should be addressed and corresponding enhancement should be considered.   Or the results analysis can be based on UE number assuming the two cases have the same blocking probability and a threshold can be considered to determine whether the PDCCH blocking issue should be addressed. For example, if the difference UE number for case1 and case2 is larger than the threshold under the same blocking probability, then PDCCH blocking issue should be addressed and corresponding enhancement should be considered. |
| LGE |  | We are generally fine with the proposal.  If companies still have concerns on evaluating the PDCCH blocking probability in this study, we can add “Note: some companies think that PDCCH blocking issue can be managed by gNB”. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| FUTUREWEI |  | OK for an optional evaluation |
| Nordic | Y, but | As CMCC mentioned, blocking is an issue only for Common CORESETs, not for UE-specfic.  **PDCCH blocking probability in common CORESETs ~~is~~ can be optionally evaluated for “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels**  **Regarding HW proposal, as CMCC explained, gNB can use different dedicated CORESETs for different UEs. There is no blocking issue for dedicated CORESETs. Moreover, since CORESET is not reduced in below option, not sure what should be studied.**   * + **~~Whether to consider the option of “RF BW 20MHz + BB BW 5MHz only for data channels~~”** |
| Ericsson | Y | We think suggestions from DOCOMO and ZTE are reasonable. In particular, the blocking probability comparison between 5MHz UE and 20MHz UE is needed. This is also important for comparing “RF+BB” BW option and BB-only BW reduction option (with control channel up to 20 MHz). As pointed out by ZTE, at least the following scenario needs to be evaluated:   1. 20MHz UE uses the 20MHz CORESET (case1) and 5MHz UE uses the 5MHz CORESET (case2) 2. They have the same aggregation level {1, 2, 4 ,8}. 5MHz UE cannot use aggregation level 16, therefore 16 is not used for the fair comparison. 3. Same number of UEs should be considered for comparison.   Regarding AL distribution, it is not clear how CORESET size would impact. For example, for non-interleaved CORESET, the coverage for a PDCCH candidate only depends on the AL not the CORESET size. Although for an interleaved CORESET there is a potential benefit of frequency diversity, the frequency diversity gain is expected to be small. We think that the same (or very similar) AL distribution can be considered for both cases (20 MHz and 5 MHz), especially as it is not straightforward to fully capture the impact of CORESET size on the AL distribution. In this case, the existing AL distribution from Rel-17 RedCap study can be reused (with minor adjustment if needed).  Should the sub-bullet under 1st main bullet include “is FFS”? |
| Samsung |  | We are fine with the update from Nordic. |
| OPPO |  | OK for an optional evaluation. |
| Xiaomi |  | Don’t see the need to evaluate the option of “RF BW 20MHz + BB BW 5MHz only for data channels”. From our point of view, for this option, the maximum bandwidth of 20MHZ still can be used for control channels and reference signals. With BB BW reduction to 5MHZ, only the model related to data processing will be impacted:  o Post-FFT data buffering  o LDPC decoding  o HARQ buffer  That is, there is no impact on control channel/reference singals reception for this option.  Regarding the evaluation on PDCCH blocking rate for the option of “both RF and BB reduction to 5MHZ”, we think at least the scenario with “only eRedCap 5MHz UE” should be evaluated. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | RF BW 20MHz + BB BW 5MHz only for data channels should also be considered. For the two BW options of Re1-18 RedCap UEs, the same UE numbers per 5MHz bandwidth should be assumed. |
| CMCC | Y | Thank ZTE for the detail explanation. We can accept the proposal. And for fair comparison, may be the number of UEs for 5MHz CORESET can be 1/4 of 20MHz CORESET, otherwise, the blocking probability will be obviously increased due to smaller PDCCH resource for the number of UE. That’s because the 5MHz CORESETs can be FDMed among 20MHz bandwidth to carry PDCCHs for larger number of UEs. |
| FL5 |  | 2nd main bullet is quite stable and hence, separated as an independent **Proposed conclusion 10-1a**.  Regarding PDCCH blocking probability, companies have different view on the scenarios assumed for the evaluation. Therefore, before discussing further **Proposal 10-1**, **interested companies are invited to provide view on which scenarios should be assumed for the evaluation.**  **High Priority Proposal 10-1:**   * **PDCCH blocking probability can be optionally evaluated for “Rel-18 RedCap UE with RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz for all DL/UL channels”**   + **FFS: Whether to consider the option of “RF BW 20MHz + BB BW 5MHz only for data channels”**   **High Priority Proposed conclusion 10-1a:**   * **Following evaluations are not conducted in Rel-18 RedCap SI**   + **Latency**   + **Throughput**   + **Power saving gain** |
| FL6 |  | For **Proposal 10-1**, **interested companies are invited to provide view on which scenarios should be assumed for the evaluation.**  Since **Proposed conclusion 10-1a** is stable, it is set for email endorsement. If you have concern on the proposed conclusion, please indicate it directly over the reflector. |
| Intel |  | We think it should be sufficient to evaluate RF+BB BW reduction to 5MHz. For RF BW 20MHz + BB BW 5MHz only for data channels, it will have same PDCCH blocking property as Rel-17 RedCap UE |
| Ericsson |  | Fine with Proposal 10-1 and Proposed conclusion 10-1a.  Regarding scenarios for Proposal 10-1, we should not consider scaling down the number of UEs according to the CORESET BW (i.e., same number of UEs per 5 MHz). For example, in typical BWP configurations, small BWPs are located near the carrier edges to minimize resource fragmentation. In case all reduced BW UEs must be scheduled within the small BWPs located at the edges. Consider schdeudling 8 Rel-18 UEs in 20 MHz BWP vs. 5 MHz BWP located at one edge of a 60 MHz carrier. Then the same number of UEs (e.g., 8) should be considered for CORESET of size 20 MHz and 5 MHz. |
| DOCOMO |  | Regarding the target scenario of PDCCH blocking probability evaluation, the comparison between 20MHz CORESET and 5MHz CORESET with same ALs and the same number of UEs as suggested by ZTE/Ericsson should be considered. For the distribution probability, we tend to agree with Ericsson but don’t have strong view. |
|  |  | Following was agreed via email endorsement  **Agreement**   * Following evaluations are not conducted in Rel-18 RedCap SI   + Latency   + Throughput   + Power saving gain |
| FL7 |  | Moderator expected intetested companies would explain why such evaluation is necessary but none of them did.  Based on the companies position in the last round (only three interesting companies vs five companies who don’t see the necessity) and considering remaing time in this meeting, moderator suggests to stop the discussion with the following conclusion.   * O1   + Yes: E///, CATT (low priority), ZTE, DCM (optional), IDCC, Intel (if no enhancement), Nokia, LGE (low priority), QC, Xiaomi, CMCC(?), HW   + No: vivo, SS, Nordic, FW, OPPO   **High Priority Proposal conclusion 10-1:**   * **Evaluation of PDCCH blocking probability is not conducted in Rel-18 RedCap SI** |
|  |  | Following was agreed as conclusion in the GTW on May 19  **Conclusion**   * Evaluation of PDCCH blocking probability is not conducted in Rel-18 RedCap SI |
|  |  |  |
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