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# Introduction

This is the email discussion report for following email discussion:

* [Post115-e][108][RedCap] 38.306 Running CR (Intel)

Scope: draft 38.306 running CR based on meeting agreements, also trying to resolve structural open issues from R2-2108891 (e.g. reusing existing sections/fields vs introducing new ones, etc.)

Intended outcome: Endorsable 38.306 running CR

Deadline: Long

Rapporteur would like to split the discussion in two phases:

**Phase 1**: To check the proposals from Rapporteur and the draft TP; The **deadline for this 1st phase** of email discussion is **Wednesday Oct 13 , 0900 UTC.**

**Phase 2**: To finalize the draft running CR; The **deadline for this 2nd phase** of email discussion is **Wednesday Oct 20 , 0900 UTC.**

# Annex: companies’ point of contact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point of contact** | **Email address** |
| Intel Corporation | Yi Guo | Yi.guo@intel.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yulong Shi | shiyulong5@huawei.com |
| Apple | Naveen Palle | naveen.palle@apple.com |
| OPPO | Haitao Li | lihaitao@oppo.com |
| Futurewei | Yunsong Yang | yyang1@futurewei.com |
| CATT | Xiangdong zhang | zhangxiangdong@catt.cn |
| Samsung | Seungbeom Jeong | s90.jeong@samsung.com |
| Vivo | Chenli | Chenli5g@vivo.com |
| LGE | HyunJung Choe | stella.choe@lge.com |
| Sequans | Noam Cayron | noam.cayron@sequans.com |
| ZTE | LiuJing | liu.jing30@zte.com.cn |
| Ericsson | Emre A. Yavuz | emre.yavuz@ericsson.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Phase 1the draft on how to capture meeting agreements

At RAN2#115-e, based on [1], [2] and [3], RAN2 discussed RedCap UE capabilities and agreed:

Agreements:

1. The number of DRBs supported by RedCap UEs is less than legacy value (which is 16). There will be a single mandatory value (FFS if 4 or 8). FFS if it will be possible to have an optional capability
2. “RRC processing delay” is not relaxed for RedCap UE
3. PDCP/RLC AM 12 bits SN is mandatory for RedCap UE, and PDCP/RLC AM 18bits SN is optional supported by RedCap UE; FFS on how to capture this in specification
4. NE-DC, and (NG)EN-DC are not supported by RedCap UE; FFS on how to capture it in the specification
5. DAPS and CAPC related capabilities are not applicable for RedCap UE; [8/20] FFS on CHO. FFS on how to capture this in the specification;

Agreements via email - from offline 109:

1. Maximum 8 DRBs is mandatory supported by RedCap UEs.
2. From RAN2 perspective, inter RAT mobility related capabilities are applicable for RedCap UE;
3. From RAN2 perspective, measurement related capabilities are applicable for RedCap UE;
4. From RAN2 perspective, URLLC related capabilities are applicable for RedCap UE except those affected by CA/DC;
5. From RAN2 perspective, IAB related capabilities are not applicable for RedCap UE, i.e. the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node;
6. Do not introduce capability signalling on the supported Rx number for RedCap UE since the number of Rx branches for RedCap is implicitly indicated by the corresponding capability parameter maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH in the existing UE capability framework;

Based on agreements, Rapporteur believes following should be captured in TS38.306:

* 1 PDCP/RLC AM 12 bits SN is mandatory for RedCap UE, and PDCP/RLC AM 18bits SN is optional supported by RedCap UE;
* 2 Maximum 8 DRBs is mandatory supported by RedCap UEs.
* 3 DAPS and CAPC related capabilities are not applicable for RedCap UE;
* 4 From RAN2 perspective, IAB related capabilities are not applicable for RedCap UE, i.e. the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node;

In addition, as discussed in [1], [2], following also should be captured:

* 5 Maximum BW (proposal 9 in [2]);
* 6 MIMO limitation (proposal 11 in [2]);
* 7 Modulation (proposal 20 in [1])
* 8 NE-DC, and (NG)EN-DC are not supported by RedCap UE; Note: It should be captured together with CA/MR-DC case; CA/DC (proposal 19 in [1]);

**Discussion point 1: Any additional agreements need be captured?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Yes/No** | **Comments, if any** |
| Apple |  | RedCap UE is allowed to supported more than the mandatory DRB of 8. |
|  |  |  |

## How to capture the agreements on PDCP/RLC AM SN;

* 1 PDCP/RLC AM 12 bits SN is mandatory for RedCap UE, and PDCP/RLC AM 18bits SN is optional supported by RedCap UE;

According to 4.2.4 of TS38.306, so far 12 bits SN is mandatory for non-RedCap UE. Therefore we do not need to clarify that this is also applicable for RedCap UE since based on RAN2 Working Assumption: by default, all non-RedCap UE capabilities are applicable for RedCap UE, and therefore only for non-RedCap capabilities that are not appliable for RedCap UE, we clarify in the definitions for parameters in TS38.306, the value or feature is not applicable for RedCap UE.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Definitions for parameters | Per | M | FDD-TDD DIFF |
| ***shortSN***  Indicates whether the UE supports 12 bit length of PDCP sequence number. | UE | Yes | No |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Definitions for parameters | Per | M | FDD-TDD DIFF |
| ***am-WithShortSN***  Indicates whether the UE supports AM DRB with 12 bit length of RLC sequence number. | UE | Yes | No |

**Observation 1: PDCP parameter *shortSN* and RLC parameter *am-WithShortSN* are also applicable for redcap UE, and therefore no change is needed for 12 bits SN;**

However for non-RedCap UE, 18 bits SN is mandatory without capability bit. Therefore we need to introduce a capability bit for RedCap UE, i.e. both TS38.331 and TS38.306 need to be changed.

#### TS38.331 TP on PDCP/RLC 18 bits SN

– *PDCP-Parameters*

The IE *PDCP-Parameters* is used to convey capabilities related to PDCP.

***PDCP-Parameters* information element**

-- ASN1START

-- TAG-PDCP-PARAMETERS-START

PDCP-Parameters ::= SEQUENCE {

supportedROHC-Profiles SEQUENCE {

profile0x0000 BOOLEAN,

profile0x0001 BOOLEAN,

profile0x0002 BOOLEAN,

profile0x0003 BOOLEAN,

profile0x0004 BOOLEAN,

profile0x0006 BOOLEAN,

profile0x0101 BOOLEAN,

profile0x0102 BOOLEAN,

profile0x0103 BOOLEAN,

profile0x0104 BOOLEAN

},

maxNumberROHC-ContextSessions ENUMERATED {cs2, cs4, cs8, cs12, cs16, cs24, cs32, cs48, cs64,

cs128, cs256, cs512, cs1024, cs16384, spare2, spare1},

uplinkOnlyROHC-Profiles ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

continueROHC-Context ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

outOfOrderDelivery ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

shortSN ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

pdcp-DuplicationSRB ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

pdcp-DuplicationMCG-OrSCG-DRB ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

...,

[[

drb-IAB-r16 ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

non-DRB-IAB-r16 ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

extendedDiscardTimer-r16 ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

continueEHC-Context-r16 ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

ehc-r16 ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

maxNumberEHC-Contexts-r16 ENUMERATED {cs2, cs4, cs8, cs16, cs32, cs64, cs128, cs256, cs512,

cs1024, cs2048, cs4096, cs8192, cs16384, cs32768, cs65536} OPTIONAL,

jointEHC-ROHC-Config-r16 ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

pdcp-DuplicationMoreThanTwoRLC-r16 ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL

]],

[[

longSN-RedCap-r17 ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL

]]

}

-- TAG-PDCP-PARAMETERS-STOP

-- ASN1STOP

– *RLC-Parameters*

The IE *RLC-Parameters* is used to convey capabilities related to RLC.

***RLC-Parameters* information element**

-- ASN1START

-- TAG-RLC-PARAMETERS-START

RLC-Parameters ::= SEQUENCE {

am-WithShortSN ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

um-WithShortSN ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

um-WithLongSN ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

...,

[[

extendedT-PollRetransmit-r16 ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,

extendedT-StatusProhibit-r16 ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL

]],

[[

am-WithLongSN-RedCap-r17 ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL

]]

}

-- TAG-RLC-PARAMETERS-STOP

-- ASN1STOP

#### TS38.306 TP on PDCP/RLC 18 bits SN- Option 1 capture under normal capability sections

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Definitions for parameters** | **Per** | **M** | **FDD-TDD DIFF** |
| ***jointEHC-ROHC-Config-r16***  Indicates whether the UE supports simultaneous configuration of EHC and ROHC protocols for the same DRB. | UE | No | No |
| ***longSN-RedCap-r17***  Indicates whether the RedCap UE supports 18 bit length of PDCP sequence number. This capability is only applicable for RedCap UEs. | UE | No | No |
| ***maxNumberROHC-ContextSessions***  Defines the maximum number of ROHC header compression context sessions supported by the UE, excluding context sessions that leave all headers uncompressed. | UE | No | No |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Definitions for parameters | Per | M | FDD-TDD DIFF |
| ***am-WithLongSN-RedCap-r17***  Indicates whether the RedCap UE supports AM DRB with 18 bit length of RLC sequence number. This capability is only applicable for RedCap UEs. | UE | No | No |
| ***am-WithShortSN***  Indicates whether the UE supports AM DRB with 12 bit length of RLC sequence number. | UE | Yes | No |
| ***extendedT-PollRetransmit-r16***  Indicates whether the UE supports the additional values of *T-PollRetransmit timer*. The supported additional values are 1ms, 2ms, 3ms and 4ms, as specified in TS 38.331 [9]. | UE | No | No |
| ***extendedT-StatusProhibit-r16***  Indicates whether the UE supports the additional values of *T-StatusProhibit timer*. The supported additional values are 1ms, 2ms, 3ms and 4ms, as specified in TS 38.331 [9]. | UE | No | No |
| ***um-WithLongSN***  Indicates whether the UE supports UM DRB with 12 bit length of RLC sequence number. | UE | Yes | No |
| ***um-WithShortSN***  Indicates whether the UE supports UM DRB with 6 bit length of RLC sequence number. | UE | Yes | No |

#### TS38.306 TP on PDCP/RLC 18 bits SN- Option 2 capture under Redcap specific sections [6]

4.2.xx RedCap parameters

4.2.xx.x PDCP Parameters

| **Definitions for parameters** | **Per** | **M** | **FDD-TDD**  **DIFF** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***longSN-RedCap-r17***  Indicates whether the RedCap UE supports 18 bit length of PDCP sequence number. This capability is only applicable for RedCap UEs. | UE | No | No |

4.2.xx.y RLC Parameters

| **Definitions for parameters** | **Per** | **M** | **FDD-TDD**  **DIFF** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***am-WithLongSN-RedCap-r17***  Indicates whether the RedCap UE supports AM DRB with 18 bit length of RLC sequence number. This capability is only applicable for RedCap UEs. | UE | No | No |

**Companies are invited to provide your view on the TP for PDCP/RLC SN shown as above, and which options (TS38.306) are preferred. Also please indicate if anything is missing.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree or not** | **Option1/2?** | **Comments, if any** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree;  No for 12 bits case | Option 2 | Option 2 is more readable. Also, there may be more RAN1/4 RedCap specific parameters to be captured, it is always good to gather RedCap related capabilities together. Please see the R16 cases of V2X and IAB to capture in their specific section 4.2.15/16.  On the “PDCP/RLC AM 12 bits SN is mandatory for RedCap UE”, we have different understanding on  **Observation 1: PDCP parameter *shortSN* and RLC parameter *am-WithShortSN* are also applicable for redcap UE, and therefore no change is needed for 12 bits SN;**  It was “Mandatory with capability signalling” for non-RedCap UE, but it should be always set to 1 for RedCap UE (more like mandatory without singalilng).  Therefore, we should also clarify that PDCP/RLC AM 12 bits SN is mandatory for RedCap UE. We prefer to capture this as one sub-clause in the RedCap specific section as “Mandatory features for RedCap”. |
| Apple | Agree. | No strong view, ok with majority. | We slightly prefer 18bit to be present in the field name than ‘long’, as it is clearer. But again no strong stance here.  We also agree with Huawei’s comments on 12-bit PDCP/RLC comment on mandatory support. |
| OPPO | Agree | Option 1/2 | No strong view, both options are ok for us.  We also agree with Huawei’s comments on 12-bit PDCP/RLC comment on mandatory support. |
| Futurewei | Agree | No strong view on either | But agree to add a statement that the support of 12 bit length of PDCP or RLC SN is mandatory for RedCap UEs. |
| CATT | Agree with comments | Option 2 | We suggest to include some clarification on the following working assumption, not just for 12-bit. Otherwise, a produce developer , who has not followed the standard discussion, may have confusion that, e.g., whether the 12-bit is applicable for Redcap UE or not:  1. RAN2 Working Assumption: by default, all non-RedCap UE capabilities are applicable for RedCap UE, and therefore only for non-RedCap capabilities that are not eighbore for RedCap UE, we clarify in the definitions for parameters in TS38.306, the value or feature is not applicable for RedCap UE |
| Samsung | Agree | Option 2 | We prefer capturing in RedCap specific section, and agree with Huawei (i.e., clarify that PDCP/RLC AM 12 bits SN is mandatory for RedCap UE.) |
| Vivo | Agree | Option 2 | We prefer option 2, which is more readable and clean for RedCap features.  Besides, we also agree Huawei the corresponding clarification on mandatorily support on 12-bit SN should be captured in spec TS 38.306. |
| LGE | Agree | No strong view | Slightly prefer option 1 but ok with majority |
| Sequans | Agree | Option 2 | Agree with HW |
| ZTE | Agree | No strong view |  |
| Ericsson | Agree | Option 2 | No strong view but slightly prefer Option 2. Agree with Huawei regarding the comments on mandatory support for PDCP/RLC AM 12 bits SN. |

**Phase 1-Summary: 11 companies provided inputs;**

* Option 2: capture descriptions in RedCap specific section; 6 companies (Huawei, CATT, Samsung, Vivo, Sequans, Ericsson)
* Option 1: LGE (slightly prefer)
* Rest companies have no strong opinion;

**Proposed TS38.331 TP and TS38.306 TP** **that defined a RedCap specific section (option 2) for PDCP/RLC SN seems agreeable;**

In addition, for 12 bit SN, Huawei commented to “clarify that PDCP/RLC AM 12 bits SN is mandatory for RedCap UE.”, and got support from Apple, OPPO, Futurewei, Samsung, Vivo, Sequans, Ericsson.

**Rapporteur would suggest, in RedCap specific section of TS38.306, to add the clarification that “****PDCP/RLC AM 12 bits SN is mandatory for RedCap UE”;**

## How to capture the agreements on maximum DRB;

* 3 Maximum 8 DRBs is mandatory supported by RedCap Ues.

#### TS38.306 TP on maximum DRB

| Parameter | Description | Value |
| --- | --- | --- |
| #DRBs | The number of DRBs that a UE shall support. | 16 per UE.  8 per UE, only for RedCap Ues.  NOTE 1  NOTE 3 |
| #minCellperMeasObjectNR | The minimum number of eighbor cells (excluding black list cells) that a UE shall be able to store associated with a MeasObjectNR. | 32  NOTE 2 |
| #minBlackCellRangesperMeasObjectNR | The minimum number of blacklist cell PCI ranges that a UE shall be able to store associated with a MeasObjectNR. | 8 |
| #minBlackCellperMeasObjectEUTRA | The minimum number of blacklist cells that a UE shall be able to store associated with a MeasObjectEUTRA. | 32 |
| #minCellperMeasObjectEUTRA | The minimum number of eighbor cells that a UE shall be able to store associated with a MeasObjectEUTRA. | 32  NOTE 2 |
| #minCellTotal | The minimum number of eighbor cells (excluding black list cells) that UE shall be able to store in total from all measurement objects configured. | 256 with counting CSI-RS and SSB as 2. |
| #maxDeprioritisationFreq | The UE shall be able to store a depriotisation request for up to 8 frequencies (applicable when receiving another frequency specific deprioritisation request via *RRCRelease* before T325 expiry). | 8 |
| #minCellperMeasObjectUTRA-FDD | The minimum number of eighbor cells that a UE shall be able to store associated with a MeasObjectUTRA-FDD. | 32 |
| NOTE 1: For one MAC entity, the maximum number of DRBs configured with PDCP duplication and with RLC entity(ies) associated with this MAC entity is 8.’This is not applicable for RedCap Ues.  NOTE 2: In case of CGI reporting, the limit regarding the cells configured includes the cell for which the UE is requested to report CGI i.e. the amount of eighbor cells that can be included is at most (# minCellperMeasObjectRAT – 1), where RAT represents NR and EUTRA.  NOTE 3: This requirement is applicable in NR SA, NR-DC and NE-DC. | | |

**Companies are invited to provide your view on the TP for maximum DRB shown as above. Also please indicate if anything is missing.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree or not** | **Comments, if any** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree, but | It is better to also clarify this in the RedCap specific section. Maybe together with the PDCP/RLC AM 12 bits SN. |
| Apple | Needs clarification | The table should convery the maximum **mandatory** supported value for DRB. This should also mean a RedCap UE can support more than 8 DRBs. The proposed text needs this clarification.  Maybe we can say “ atleast 8 per UE, only for RedCap Ues”. But we assume this needs discussion in RAN2. |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Futurewei | Partially agree. | Suggested change #1:  16 per UE, for non-RedCap Ues.  8 per UE, for RedCap Ues.  Suggested change #2:  NOTE 1: For one MAC entity, the maximum number of DRBs configured with PDCP duplication and with RLC entity(ies) associated with this MAC entity is 8.’This exception is not applicable for RedCap Ues. |
| CATT |  | Agree with Futurewei |
| Samsung | Agree, but | Agree with Huawei. |
| vivo | Agree with comments | 16 per UE, for non-RedCap UEs  8 per UE, ~~only~~ for RedCap Ues. |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree, but | Agree with HW and FW |
| ZTE | see comments | The suggested change#1 from Futurewei looks good to us.  For the 2nd change, seems no need to update NOTE1, anyway, RedCap UE will not be configured with PDCP duplication. |
| Ericsson | Agree, but | It would be good to capture this capability in the RedCap specific section. Regarding Futurewei’s suggestion above, i.e., 16 per UE, **for non-RedCap UEs**; this may not be future proof, e.g., let’s assume RAN2 introduces a new type of UE that does not support 16 DRBs, would we then need to update that line with 16 per UE, **for non-RedCap and non-NewType UEs** and so on? |

**Phase 1-Summary: 11 companies provided inputs;**

* TS38.306 TP on max DRB for RedCap UEs: supported by 4 companies (Huawei, OPPO, Samsung, LGE);
* Futurewei suggested to change the #1 as below and got support from CATT, vivo, Sequans, ZTE; However Ericsson commented that “16 per UE, for non-RedCap UE” is not future proof since we may introduce a new type of UE that does not support 16 DRBs;
  + 16 per UE, for non-RedCap Ues.
  + 8 per UE, for RedCap Ues.”,

Apple commented that we should say “at least 8 per UE” in order to support more than 8 DRBs. Rapporteur think it is still open in RAN2, and could be updated once RAN2 has conclusion on this;

Huawei commented that “Maximum 8 DRBs is mandatory supported by RedCap Ues” should be also captured in RedCap specific section, and got support from Samsung, Sequans, Ericsson;

ZTE commented that the change on Note 1 is not needed since PDCP duplication is not supported by RedCap UEs;

Rapporteur suggests to remove the change on Note 1, and remove “only” from #1 change, i.e.

**Proposed TP:**

| Parameter | Description | Value |
| --- | --- | --- |
| #DRBs | The number of DRBs that a UE shall support. | 16 per UE.  8 per UE, for RedCap UEs.  NOTE 1  NOTE 3 |
| #minCellperMeasObjectNR | The minimum number of neighbour cells (excluding black list cells) that a UE shall be able to store associated with a MeasObjectNR. | 32  NOTE 2 |
| #minBlackCellRangesperMeasObjectNR | The minimum number of blacklist cell PCI ranges that a UE shall be able to store associated with a MeasObjectNR. | 8 |
| #minBlackCellperMeasObjectEUTRA | The minimum number of blacklist cells that a UE shall be able to store associated with a MeasObjectEUTRA. | 32 |
| #minCellperMeasObjectEUTRA | The minimum number of neighbour cells that a UE shall be able to store associated with a MeasObjectEUTRA. | 32  NOTE 2 |
| #minCellTotal | The minimum number of neighbour cells (excluding black list cells) that UE shall be able to store in total from all measurement objects configured. | 256 with counting CSI-RS and SSB as 2. |
| #maxDeprioritisationFreq | The UE shall be able to store a depriotisation request for up to 8 frequencies (applicable when receiving another frequency specific deprioritisation request via *RRCRelease* before T325 expiry). | 8 |
| #minCellperMeasObjectUTRA-FDD | The minimum number of neighbour cells that a UE shall be able to store associated with a MeasObjectUTRA-FDD. | 32 |
| NOTE 1: For one MAC entity, the maximum number of DRBs configured with PDCP duplication and with RLC entity(ies) associated with this MAC entity is 8.  NOTE 2: In case of CGI reporting, the limit regarding the cells configured includes the cell for which the UE is requested to report CGI i.e. the amount of neighbour cells that can be included is at most (# minCellperMeasObjectRAT - 1), where RAT represents NR and EUTRA.  NOTE 3: This requirement is applicable in NR SA, NR-DC and NE-DC. | | |

**Note: In RedCap specific section of TS38.306, to add the clarification that “Maximum 8 DRBs is mandatory supported by RedCap UEs”;**

## How to capture the agreements on DAPS and CAPC related capabilities;

* 2 DAPS and CAPC related capabilities are not applicable for RedCap UE;

Similar as what we discussed for CA/DC in [1], it is difficult to clarify this one by one since there are many DAPS/CAPC related capabilities. Rapporteur would suggest to add the clarification in general part, e.g. RedCap specific section that “All UE capabilities related to DAPS and CAPC are not applicable for RedCap UE.”;

**Companies are invited to provide your view on whether it is ok to add the clarification in RedCap specific section that “All UE capabilities related to DAPS and CAPC are not applicable for RedCap UE.”.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree or not** | **Comments, if any** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Futurewei | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree | Just wonder this sentence will also be captured in stage 2 TS 38.300. Is it repeated to capture it in both place? |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |

**Note: the changes on RedCap specific section are shown in section 3.9.**

**Phase 1-Summary: 10 companies provided inputs and all companies agreed to capture it in RedCap specific sections;**

ZTE commented that whether it should be captured in both TS38.300 and TS38.306. Rapporteur think TS38.306 is the right place to capture such capability limitation. But leave the discussion on whether it should be also captured in TS38.300 to email discussion [107].

The related changes should be discussed based on TP in section 3.9.

## How to capture the agreements on IAB related capabilities;

* 4 From RAN2 perspective, IAB related capabilities are not applicable for RedCap UE, i.e. the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node;

Similar as what we discussed for CA/DC in [1], it is difficult to clarify this one by one since there are many IAB related capabilities. Rapporteur would suggest to add the clarification in general part, e.g. RedCap specific section that “All UE capabilities related to IAB are not applicable for RedCap UE.” Or exactly same as agreements “the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node”;

**Companies are invited to provide your view on whether it is ok to add the clarification in RedCap specific section?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree or not** | **Comments, if any** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Futurewei | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree | Just wonder this sentence will also be captured in stage 2 TS 38.300. Is it repeated to capture it in both place? |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |

**Phase 1-Summary: 11 companies provided inputs and all companies agreed to capture it in RedCap specific sections;**

ZTE commented that whether it should be captured in both TS38.300 and TS38.306. Rapporteur think TS38.306 is the right place to capture such capability limitation. But leave the discussion on whether it should be also captured in TS38.300 to email discussion [107].

The related changes should be discussed based on TP in section 3.9.

**If answer is yes, which option is preferred?**

**Option 1:** All UE capabilities related to IAB are not applicable for RedCap UE.

**Option 2:** the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node

**Other options?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Option 1, 2, ?** | **Comments, if any** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 | No strong view, since option 1 is clear enough. Or, we could say “All UE capabilities related to IAB are not applicable for RedCap UE (i.e. the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node).”  Minor wording clarification: “IAB node” should be “IAB-MT” since IAB-DU is more like the NW functionality rather than UE functionality. |
| Apple | No strong view. |  |
| OPPO | Option 1/2 | No strong view. |
| Futurewei | Option 1 | (No need to change Option 1, but) just want to clarify that “All UE capabilities related to IAB” refers to those UE capabilities that are unique for IAB-MT, such as those UE capabilities defined in 4.2.15.2 – 4.2.15.9 of TS 38.306, not including those basic UE capabilities (as an IAB-MT) that are even applicable to RedCap UEs. For example, 4.2.15.1 of TS 38.306 includes some basic UE capabilities that are also applicable to RedCap UEs.  The proposed language for Q3.9 is softer than this (i.e., without “All”) and therefore should be OK. |
| CATT | Option 1/2 | Also agree with the merged version from Huawei, but “IAB-node” is ok. |
| Samsung | Either |  |
| vivo | Option 1 | Slightly prefer option 1. Option 2 is also acceptable. |
| LGE | Either is fine |  |
| Sequans | Either/Both | Agree with CATT |
| ZTE | Either |  |
| Ericsson | Option 1 | No strong view but slightly prefer Option 1. OK with the following proposal from Huawei “All UE capabilities related to IAB are not applicable for RedCap UE, i.e., the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node.” |

**Note: the changes on RedCap specific section are shown in section 3.9.**

**Phase 1-Summary: 11 companies provided inputs; 4 companies prefer option 1 and rest companies have no strong opinion;**

Regarding the wording, Huawei, Ericsson would like to change it to “All UE capabilities related to IAB are not applicable for RedCap UE, i.e., the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node.”; Huawei commented that IAB node should be IAB-MT; But CATT, Sequans, Ericsson are ok with IAB node. Futurewei commented that “all” may not be accurate, but would be fine with the language in Q3.9 without “all”.

Rapporteur would suggest to discuss the related changes based on TP in section 3.9 and to add “, i.e., the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node.” in TP in section 3.9.

## How to capture Maximum BW;

As discussed in [2],

|  |
| --- |
| 21 companies provided inputs to this discussion point.   * **Option 2)** to add “For FR1 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 20MHz shall be set to 1, and the bits which indicate 25, 30, 40, 50, 60 and 80MHz are ignored. For FR2 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 100MHz shall be set to 1, and the third / rightmost bit is ignored.” and “channelBWs-DL-v1590 is not applicable to RedCap UE.” for field description of existing fields “channelBWs-DL” and “channelBWs-UL” and add “This capability is not applicable to RedCap UE.” for field description of existing fields “channelBW-90mhz”;   The option 2 is supported by 10 companies (Intel, Spreadtrum, ZTE, CMCC, vivo, Ericsson, NEC, LGE, Nokia, OPPO)   * **Option 3)** to create a new section in 38.306 to capture the maximum UE bandwidth for RedCap UE   The option 3 is supported by 9 companies (Huawei, Qualcomm, Futurewei, Sequans, CATT, Turkcell, MediaTek, Nokia, Telecom Italia)   * **Compromised solution** to combine option 2 and 3, for new section capture “For RedCap UE, the maximum bandwidth on FR1 is 20 MHz, and the maximum bandwidth on FR2 is 100 MHz.””   The compromised solution is supported by 3 companies (Huawei, Sequans, Ericsson )  Ericsson commented that “Regarding the suggested text, it is actually not correct as RedCap UE should not indicate “1” for channels which do not support 20 MHz bandwidth. Thus, perhaps the wording in the description should be changed to something like “RedCap UEs shall support the maximum channel bandwidth defined for the respective band but no more than 20 MHz.”; Rapporteur tends to agree with this, and would suggest to change option 2 to   * **Option 2)** to add “RedCap UEs shall support the maximum channel bandwidth defined for the respective band but no more than 20 MHz for FR1 and no more than 100 Mhz for FR2.~~For FR1 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 20MHz shall be set to 1, and the bits which indicate 25, 30, 40, 50, 60 and 80MHz are ignored. For FR2 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 100MHz shall be set to 1, and the third / rightmost bit is ignored.~~” and “channelBWs-DL-v1590 is not applicable to RedCap UE.” for field description of existing fields “channelBWs-DL” and “channelBWs-UL” and add “This capability is not applicable to RedCap UE.” for field description of existing fields “channelBW-90mhz”;   **Rapporteur**: Rapporteur consider Huawei’s WF is the good compromise that can resolve most companies’ concern. In addition, Ericsson’s wording looks good. Therefore Rapporteur would suggest to agree:  **Proposal 9.** **[To discuss]** Whether to capture Maximum BW limitation for RedCap UE in existing field description, and add the clarification in the new section for the definition of RedCap UE:  **Proposal 9.1.** To create a new section in 38.306 to capture the maximum UE bandwidth for RedCap UE as“For RedCap UE, the maximum bandwidth on FR1 is 20 MHz, and the maximum bandwidth on FR2 is 100 MHz.”  **Proposal 9.2.** to add “RedCap UEs shall support the maximum channel bandwidth defined for the respective band but no more than 20 MHz for FR1 and no more than 100 Mhz for FR2.” and “channelBWs-DL-v1590 is not applicable to RedCap UE.” for field description of existing fields “channelBWs-DL” and “channelBWs-UL” and add “This capability is not applicable to RedCap UE.” for field description of existing fields “channelBW-90mhz”; |

Rapporteur suggest to change proposal 9.2 a bit as

**Proposal 9.2.** to add “RedCap UEs shall support the maximum channel bandwidth defined for the respective band up to ~~but no more than~~ 20 MHz for FR1 and up to ~~no more than~~ 100 Mhz for FR2.” and “channelBWs-DL-v1590 is not applicable to RedCap UEs.” for field description of existing fields “channelBWs-DL” and “channelBWs-UL” and add “This capability is not applicable to RedCap UEs.” for field description of existing fields “channelBW-90mhz”;

**Companies are invited to provide your view on whether the compromised solution in proposal 9, 9.1 and updated 9.2 is acceptable?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree or not** | **Comments, if any** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with the intention to capture both.  But not fine with 9.2 wording. | “RedCap UEs shall support the maximum channel bandwidth defined for the respective band up to 20 MHz for FR1 and up to 100 Mhz for FR2”  In the above wording, it has to be clarified on the meaning “shall support”. As agreed in R1, 20Mhz for FR1 and 100Mhz for FR2 shall be set to 1. This is different with the 5/10/15 MHz cases. Therefore, we have to specifically clarified the 20MHz and 100MHz is mandatory supported (cannot be set to 0). It is not possible for RedCap UE not supporting “20Mhz for FR1 and 100Mhz for FR2”. The R1 agreement “*For RedCap UEs in FR1, The baseline UE bandwidth capability is 20 MHz, which can be assumed during the initial access procedure.*” is clear that RedCap not supporting “20Mhz for FR1 and 100Mhz for FR2” cannot work during initial access.  The wording in P9.2 is not acceptable without the clarification that “For FR1 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 20MHz shall be set to 1. For FR2 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 100MHz shall be set to 1”. |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Futurewei | Agree but | But also agree with Huawei that the description should be consist with the current RAN1 agreement without ambiguity. We can also consider an earlier version of option 2 as follows:  **Option 2)** to add “RedCap UEs shall support the maximum channel bandwidth defined for the respective band but no more than 20 MHz for FR1 and no more than 100 Mhz for FR2. For FR1 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 20MHz shall be set to 1, and the bits which indicate 25, 30, 40, 50, 60 and 80MHz are ignored. For FR2 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 100MHz shall be set to 1, and the third / rightmost bit is ignored.” and “channelBWs-DL-v1590 is not applicable to RedCap UE.” for field description of existing fields “channelBWs-DL” and “channelBWs-UL” and add “This capability is not applicable to RedCap UE.” for field description of existing fields “channelBW-90mhz”; |
| CATT | Agree | It is clear enough, when considering the context description. |
| Samsung | Agree | We support rapporteur's compromise and update. |
| vivo | Agree with comments | Our understanding is that original Option 2 is more accuracy.  Besides, we need also need to capture the mandatory supported BW: “For RedCap UE, the maximum bandwidth on FR1 is 20 MHz, and the maximum bandwidth on FR2 is 100 MHz.” |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree with comments | We prefer the wording of original Option 2:  “RedCap UEs shall support the maximum channel bandwidth defined for the respective band but no more than 20 MHz for FR1 and no more than 100 Mhz for FR2. For FR1 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 20MHz shall be set to 1, and the bits which indicate 25, 30, 40, 50, 60 and 80MHz are ignored. For FR2 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 100MHz shall be set to 1, and the third / rightmost bit is ignored.” and “channelBWs-DL-v1590 is not applicable to RedCap UE.” for field description of existing fields “channelBWs-DL” and “channelBWs-UL” and add “This capability is not applicable to RedCap UE.” for field description of existing fields “channelBW-90mhz”;  No strong view on “no more than” or “up to”. |
| Ericsson | Agree | Agree with Huawei that a RedCap UE shall support 20 MHz / 100 MHz BWs. However this capability is per band, and considering that 20 MHz is supported in all bands, the question is what RedCap UEs should indicate for such bands. Shouldn’t the UE report those combinations which can possibly be used in practice?  It would also be good to capture the RedCap supported BW limitation in *supportedBandwidthDL* and *supportedBandwidthUL*? |

**Note: the changes on RedCap specific section (proposal 9.1) are shown in section 3.9.**

**Phase 1-Summary: 10 companies provided inputs;**

No comment on “capture Maximum BW limitation for RedCap UE in existing field description, and add the clarification in the new section for the definition of RedCap UE:”

**Rapporteur would suggest to capture Maximum BW limitation for RedCap UE in existing field description, and add the clarification in the new section for the definition of RedCap UE;**

Regarding proposal 9.2, 4 companies had concern, and would like to add “FR1 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 20MHz shall be set to 1. For FR2 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 100MHz shall be set to 1”;

In addition, Ericsson commented that “It would also be good to capture the RedCap supported BW limitation in supportedBandwidthDL and supportedBandwidthUL?”. Rapporteur thought the RedCap UEs cannot support CA/DC and therefore it is not needed. But as clarified in below question, it is still possible for UE to indicate MIMO capability based on this. And therefore the limitation should be added for “supportedBandwidthDL and supportedBandwidthUL”.

#### TS38.306 TP on Maximum Bandwidth (proposal 9.2):

#### 4.2.7.2 *BandNR parameters*

/\*\*\* omitted unrelated parts\*\*\*/

| **Definitions for parameters** | **Per** | **M** | **FDD-TDD**  **DIFF** | **FR1-FR2**  **DIFF** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***channelBWs-DL***  Indicates for each subcarrier spacing the UE supported channel bandwidths. Absence of the *channelBWs-DL* (without suffix) for a band or absence of specific scs-XXkHz entry for a supported subcarrier spacing means that the UE supports the channel bandwidths among [5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 40, 50, 60, 80, 100] and [50, 100, 200] that were defined in clause 5.3.5 of TS 38.101-1 version 15.7.0 [2] and TS 38.101-2 version 15.7.0 [3] for the given band or the specific SCS entry. For IAB-MT, to determine whether the IAB-MT supports a channel bandwidth of 100 MHz, the network checks c*hannelBW-DL-IAB-r16*.  For FR1, the bits in *channelBWs-DL* (without suffix) starting from the leading / leftmost bit indicate 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 40, 50, 60 and 80MHz. For FR2, the bits in *channelBWs-DL* (without suffix) starting from the leading / leftmost bit indicate 50, 100 and 200MHz. The third / rightmost bit (for 200MHz) shall be set to 1. For IAB-MT the third / rightmost bit (for 200MHz) is ignored. To determine whether the IAB-MT supports a channel bandwidth of 200 MHz, the network checks *channelBW-DL-IAB-r16*.  For FR1, the leading/leftmost bit in *channelBWs-DL-v1590* indicates 70MHz, the second leftmost bit indicates 45MHz, the third leftmost bit indicates 35MHz and all the remaining bits in *channelBWs-DL-v1590* shall be set to 0.  RedCap UEs shall support the maximum channel bandwidth defined for the respective band up to 20 MHz for FR1 and up to 100 Mhz for FR2. *channelBWs-DL-v1590* is not applicable to RedCap UEs.  NOTE: To determine whether the UE supports a specific SCS for a given band, the network validates the *supportedSubCarrierSpacingDL* and the *scs-60kHz*. To determine whether the UE supports a channel bandwidth of 90 MHz, the network may ignore this capability and validate instead the *channelBW-90mhz* and the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSet*. For serving cell(s) with other channel bandwidths the network validates the *channelBWs-DL*, the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSet*, the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSetIntraENDC*, the *asymmetricBandwidthCombinationSet* (for a band supporting asymmetric channel bandwidth as defined in clause 5.3.6 of TS 38.101-1 [2]) and *supportedBandwidthDL*. | Band | Yes | N/A | N/A |
| ***channelBWs-UL***  Indicates for each subcarrier spacing the UE supported channel bandwidths.  Absence of the *channelBWs-UL* (without suffix) for a band or absence of specific scs-XXkHz entry for a supported subcarrier spacing means that the UE supports the channel bandwidths among [5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 40, 50, 60, 80, 100] and [50, 100, 200] that were defined in clause 5.3.5 of TS 38.101-1 version 15.7.0 [2] and TS 38.101-2 version 15.7.0 [3] for the given band or the specific SCS entry. For IAB-MT, to determine whether the IAB-MT supports a channel bandwidth of 100 MHz, the network checks *channelBW-UL-IAB-r16*.  For FR1, the bits in *channelBWs-UL* (without suffix) starting from the leading / leftmost bit indicate 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 40, 50, 60 and 80MHz. For FR2, the bits in *channelBWs-UL* (without suffix) starting from the leading / leftmost bit indicate 50, 100 and 200MHz. The third / rightmost bit (for 200MHz) shall be set to 1. For IAB-MT the third / rightmost bit (for 200MHz) is ignored. To determine whether the IAB-MT supports a channel bandwidth of 200 MHz, the network checks *channelBW-UL-IAB-r16*.  For FR1, the leading/leftmost bit in *channelBWs-UL-v1590* indicates 70 MHz, the second leftmost bit indicates 45MHz, the third leftmost bit indicates 35MHz and all the remaining bits in *channelBWs-UL-v1590* shall be set to 0.  RedCap UEs shall support the maximum channel bandwidth defined for the respective band up to 20 MHz for FR1 and up to 100 Mhz for FR2. *channelBWs-UL-v1590* is not applicable to RedCap UEs.  NOTE: To determine whether the UE supports a specific SCS for a given band, the network validates the *supportedSubCarrierSpacingUL* and the *scs-60kHz*. To determine whether the UE supports a channel bandwidth of 90 MHz the network may ignore this capability and validate instead the *channelBW-90mhz* and the *supportedBandwidthCombiantionSet*. For serving cell(s) with other channel bandwidths the network validates the *channelBWs-UL*, the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSet*, the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSetIntraENDC*, the *asymmetricBandwidthCombinationSet* (for a band supporting asymmetric channel bandwidth as defined in clause 5.3.6 of TS 38.101-1 [2]) and *supportedBandwidthUL*. | Band | Yes | N/A | N/A |
| ***channelBW-DL-IAB-r16***  Indicates whether the IAB-MT supports channel bandwidth of 100 MHz for a given SCS in FR1 for DL or whether the IAB-MT supports channel bandwidth of 200 MHz for a given SCS in FR2 for DL. | Band | No | N/A | N/A |
| ***channelBW-UL-IAB-r16***  Indicates whether the IAB-MT supports channel bandwidth of 100 MHz for a given SCS in FR1 for UL or whether the IAB-MT supports channel bandwidth of 200 MHz for a given SCS in FR2 for UL. | Band | No | N/A | N/A |

#### 4.2.7.6 *FeatureSetDownlinkPerCC* parameters

| **Definitions for parameters** | **Per** | **M** | **FDD-TDD**  **DIFF** | **FR1-FR2**  **DIFF** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***channelBW-90mhz***  Indicates whether the UE supports the channel bandwidth of 90 MHz.  For FR1, the UE shall indicate support according to TS 38.101-1 [2], Table 5.3.5-1. This capability is not applicable to RedCap UEs. | FSPC | CY | N/A | FR1 only |
| ***maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH***  Defines the maximum number of spatial multiplexing layer(s) supported by the UE for DL reception. For single CC standalone NR, it is mandatory with capability signaling to support at least 4 MIMO layers in the bands where 4Rx is specified as mandatory for the given UE and at least 2 MIMO layers in FR2. If absent, the UE does not support MIMO on this carrier. | FSPC | CY | N/A | N/A |

Note: Rapporteur considers the changes in 4.2.7.6 on *channleBW-90mhz* is not needed since the RedCap UE cannot support CA/DC and therefore *FeatureSetDownlinkPerCC* parameter shall not be included.

**Companies are invited to provide your view on the TP for maximum bandwidth shown as above (proposal 9.2). Also please indicate if anything is missing. Companies that do not agree the TP should provide the alternative TP or suggested change.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree or not** | **Comments, if any** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | The intention is fine. But:  1: The TP is only agreeable with the condition that we also capture “For RedCap UE, the maximum bandwidth on FR1 is 20 MHz, and the maximum bandwidth on FR2 is 100 MHz.” (Proposal 9.1) in the RedCap specific section.  2: *channleBW-90mhz* should also be clarified. Actually, UE not supporting CA/DC also reports the FeatureSetDownlinkPerCC, which is the only way to report DL MIMO layer capability.  3: “supportedBandwidthDL” in *FeatureSetDownlinkPerCC* and” supportedBandwidthUL” in *FeatureSetUplinkPerCC* should also be clarified using the same sentence, because its description “*When this field is included in a band combination with a single band entry and a single CC entry (i.e. non-CA band combination), the UE shall indicate the maximum channel bandwidth for the band according to TS 38.101-1 [2] and TS 38.101-2 [3].*” is not aligned with what we are trying to clarify for RedCap in channelBWs-DL.  4. Also see our concern on the wording in previous question. |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Futurewei | Partially agree | We think it is beneficial to further clarify how various bits in *channelBWs-DL* and  *channelBWs-DL* are treated differently for RedCap UEs than for non-RedCap UEs, as in our response to the previous question. |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree | Comments see above Q. |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree, but | Agree with HW, FW |
| ZTE | Agree, but | See our response to previous question. |
| Ericsson | Agree | Agree with the comments 1 to3 from Huawei. |

**Phase 1-Summary: 10 companies provided inputs;**

Similar discussion as above, i.e. to add “FR1 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 20MHz shall be set to 1. For FR2 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 100MHz shall be set to 1”;

In addition, the limitation should be added for “channleBW-90mhz, supportedBandwidthDL and supportedBandwidthUL”.

Therefore the **proposed TP** is:

#### TS38.306 TP on Maximum Bandwidth (proposal 9.2):

#### 4.2.7.2 *BandNR parameters*

/\*\*\* omitted unrelated parts\*\*\*/

| **Definitions for parameters** | **Per** | **M** | **FDD-TDD**  **DIFF** | **FR1-FR2**  **DIFF** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***channelBWs-DL***  Indicates for each subcarrier spacing the UE supported channel bandwidths. Absence of the *channelBWs-DL* (without suffix) for a band or absence of specific scs-XXkHz entry for a supported subcarrier spacing means that the UE supports the channel bandwidths among [5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 40, 50, 60, 80, 100] and [50, 100, 200] that were defined in clause 5.3.5 of TS 38.101-1 version 15.7.0 [2] and TS 38.101-2 version 15.7.0 [3] for the given band or the specific SCS entry. For IAB-MT, to determine whether the IAB-MT supports a channel bandwidth of 100 MHz, the network checks c*hannelBW-DL-IAB-r16*.  For FR1, the bits in *channelBWs-DL* (without suffix) starting from the leading / leftmost bit indicate 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 40, 50, 60 and 80MHz. For FR2, the bits in *channelBWs-DL* (without suffix) starting from the leading / leftmost bit indicate 50, 100 and 200MHz. The third / rightmost bit (for 200MHz) shall be set to 1. For IAB-MT the third / rightmost bit (for 200MHz) is ignored. To determine whether the IAB-MT supports a channel bandwidth of 200 MHz, the network checks *channelBW-DL-IAB-r16*.  For FR1, the leading/leftmost bit in *channelBWs-DL-v1590* indicates 70MHz, the second leftmost bit indicates 45MHz, the third leftmost bit indicates 35MHz and all the remaining bits in *channelBWs-DL-v1590* shall be set to 0.  RedCap UEs shall support the maximum channel bandwidth defined for the respective band up to 20 MHz for FR1 and up to 100 Mhz for FR2. *channelBWs-DL-v1590* is not applicable to RedCap UEs. For FR1 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 20MHz shall be set to 1. For FR2 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 100MHz shall be set to 1.  NOTE: To determine whether the UE supports a specific SCS for a given band, the network validates the *supportedSubCarrierSpacingDL* and the *scs-60kHz*. To determine whether the UE supports a channel bandwidth of 90 MHz, the network may ignore this capability and validate instead the *channelBW-90mhz* and the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSet*. For serving cell(s) with other channel bandwidths the network validates the *channelBWs-DL*, the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSet*, the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSetIntraENDC*, the *asymmetricBandwidthCombinationSet* (for a band supporting asymmetric channel bandwidth as defined in clause 5.3.6 of TS 38.101-1 [2]) and *supportedBandwidthDL*. | Band | Yes | N/A | N/A |
| ***channelBWs-UL***  Indicates for each subcarrier spacing the UE supported channel bandwidths.  Absence of the *channelBWs-UL* (without suffix) for a band or absence of specific scs-XXkHz entry for a supported subcarrier spacing means that the UE supports the channel bandwidths among [5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 40, 50, 60, 80, 100] and [50, 100, 200] that were defined in clause 5.3.5 of TS 38.101-1 version 15.7.0 [2] and TS 38.101-2 version 15.7.0 [3] for the given band or the specific SCS entry. For IAB-MT, to determine whether the IAB-MT supports a channel bandwidth of 100 MHz, the network checks *channelBW-UL-IAB-r16*.  For FR1, the bits in *channelBWs-UL* (without suffix) starting from the leading / leftmost bit indicate 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 40, 50, 60 and 80MHz. For FR2, the bits in *channelBWs-UL* (without suffix) starting from the leading / leftmost bit indicate 50, 100 and 200MHz. The third / rightmost bit (for 200MHz) shall be set to 1. For IAB-MT the third / rightmost bit (for 200MHz) is ignored. To determine whether the IAB-MT supports a channel bandwidth of 200 MHz, the network checks *channelBW-UL-IAB-r16*.  For FR1, the leading/leftmost bit in *channelBWs-UL-v1590* indicates 70 MHz, the second leftmost bit indicates 45MHz, the third leftmost bit indicates 35MHz and all the remaining bits in *channelBWs-UL-v1590* shall be set to 0.  RedCap UEs shall support the maximum channel bandwidth defined for the respective band up to 20 MHz for FR1 and up to 100 Mhz for FR2. *channelBWs-UL-v1590* is not applicable to RedCap UEs. For FR1 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 20MHz shall be set to 1. For FR2 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 100MHz shall be set to 1.  NOTE: To determine whether the UE supports a specific SCS for a given band, the network validates the *supportedSubCarrierSpacingUL* and the *scs-60kHz*. To determine whether the UE supports a channel bandwidth of 90 MHz the network may ignore this capability and validate instead the *channelBW-90mhz* and the *supportedBandwidthCombiantionSet*. For serving cell(s) with other channel bandwidths the network validates the *channelBWs-UL*, the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSet*, the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSetIntraENDC*, the *asymmetricBandwidthCombinationSet* (for a band supporting asymmetric channel bandwidth as defined in clause 5.3.6 of TS 38.101-1 [2]) and *supportedBandwidthUL*. | Band | Yes | N/A | N/A |
| ***channelBW-DL-IAB-r16***  Indicates whether the IAB-MT supports channel bandwidth of 100 MHz for a given SCS in FR1 for DL or whether the IAB-MT supports channel bandwidth of 200 MHz for a given SCS in FR2 for DL. | Band | No | N/A | N/A |
| ***channelBW-UL-IAB-r16***  Indicates whether the IAB-MT supports channel bandwidth of 100 MHz for a given SCS in FR1 for UL or whether the IAB-MT supports channel bandwidth of 200 MHz for a given SCS in FR2 for UL. | Band | No | N/A | N/A |

#### 4.2.7.6 *FeatureSetDownlinkPerCC* parameters

| **Definitions for parameters** | **Per** | **M** | **FDD-TDD**  **DIFF** | **FR1-FR2**  **DIFF** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***channelBW-90mhz***  Indicates whether the UE supports the channel bandwidth of 90 MHz.  For FR1, the UE shall indicate support according to TS 38.101-1 [2], Table 5.3.5-1.  This capability is not applicable to RedCap UEs. | FSPC | CY | N/A | FR1 only |
| ***maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH***  Defines the maximum number of spatial multiplexing layer(s) supported by the UE for DL reception. For single CC standalone NR, it is mandatory with capability signaling to support at least 4 MIMO layers in the bands where 4Rx is specified as mandatory for the given UE and at least 2 MIMO layers in FR2. If absent, the UE does not support MIMO on this carrier. | FSPC | CY | N/A | N/A |
| ***multiDCI-MultiTRP-r16***  Indicates whether the UE supports multi-DCI based multi-TRP and support of fully/partially overlapping PDSCHs in time and non-overlapping in frequency. This capability applies only to BWPs where two values of *coresetPoolIndex* are configured. The capability signalling contains the following:  - *maxNumberCORESET-r16* indicates maximum number of CORESETs configured per BWP per cell in addition to CORESET 0.  - *maxNumberCORESETPerPoolIndex-r16* indicates maximum number of CORESETs configured per *coresetPoolIndex* per BWP per cell in addition to CORESET 0.  - *maxNumberUnicastPDSCH-PerPool-r16* indicates maximum number of unicast PDSCHs per *coresetPoolIndex* per slot.  NOTE 1: A UE may assume that its maximum receive timing difference between the DL transmissions from two TRPs is within a Cyclic Prefix.  NOTE 2: Processing capability 2 is not supported in any CC if at least one CC is configured with two values of *coresetPoolIndex*.  NOTE 3: If UE reports value N1 for *maxNumberCORESET-r16*, that means UE supports up to min (N1+1, 5) CORESETs in total (including CORESET#0) if there is CORESET#0, and supports maximal N1 CORESETs if there is no CORESET#0.  NOTE 4: If UE reports value N2 for *maxNumberCORESETPerPoolIndex-r16*, that means UE supports up to min (N2+1, 3) CORESETs in total (including CORESET#0) for a TRP if there is CORESET#0, and supports maximal N2 CORESETs for another TRP if there is no CORESET#0. | FSPC | No | N/A | N/A |
| ***supportedBandwidthDL***  Indicates maximum DL channel bandwidth supported for a given SCS that UE supports within a single CC (and in case of intra-frequency DAPS handover for the source and target cells), which is defined in Table 5.3.5-1 in TS 38.101-1 [2] for FR1 and Table 5.3.5-1 in TS 38.101-2 [3] for FR2.  For FR1, all the bandwidths listed in TS38.101-1 Table 5.3.5-1 for each band shall be mandatory with a single CC unless indicated optional. For FR2, the set of mandatory CBW is 50, 100, 200 MHz. When this field is included in a band combination with a single band entry and a single CC entry (i.e. non-CA band combination), the UE shall indicate the maximum channel bandwidth for the band according to TS 38.101-1 [2] and TS 38.101-2 [3].  The UE may report a *supportedBandwidthDL* wider than the *channelBWs-DL*; this *supportedBandwidthDL* may not be included in the Table 5.3.5-1 of TS 38.101-1[2]/TS 38.101-2[3] for the case that the UE is unable to report the actual supported bandwidth according to the Table 5.3.5-1 of TS 38.101-1[2]/TS 38.101-2[3].  RedCap UEs shall support the maximum channel bandwidth defined for the respective band up to 20 MHz for FR1 and up to 100 Mhz for FR2. For FR1 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 20MHz shall be set to 1. For FR2 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 100MHz shall be set to 1.  NOTE: To determine whether the UE supports a channel bandwidth of 90 MHz, the network may ignore this capability and validate instead the *channelBW-90mhz*, the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSet* and the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSetIntraENDC*. For serving cell(s) with other channel bandwidths the network validates the *channelBWs-DL*, the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSet*, the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSetIntraENDC*, the *asymmetricBandwidthCombinationSet* (for a band supporting asymmetric channel bandwidth as defined in clause 5.3.6 of TS 38.101-1 [2]) and *supportedBandwidthDL*. | FSPC | CY | N/A | N/A |

4.2.7.8 *FeatureSetUplinkPerCC* parameters

| **Definitions for parameters** | **Per** | **M** | **FDD-TDD**  **DIFF** | **FR1-FR2**  **DIFF** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***channelBW-90mhz***  Indicates whether the UE supports the channel bandwidth of 90 MHz.  For FR1, the UE shall indicate support according to TS 38.101-1 [2], Table 5.3.5-1. | FSPC | CY | N/A | FR1 only |
| ***maxNumberMIMO-LayersCB-PUSCH***  Defines supported maximum number of MIMO layers at the UE for PUSCH transmission with codebook precoding. UE indicating support of this feature shall also indicate support of PUSCH codebook coherency subset. This feature is not supported for SUL. | FSPC | No | N/A | N/A |
| ***maxNumberMIMO-LayersNonCB-PUSCH***  Defines supported maximum number of MIMO layers at the UE for PUSCH transmission using non-codebook precoding. This feature is not supported for SUL.  UE supporting non-codebook based PUSCH transmission shall indicate support of *maxNumberMIMO-LayersNonCB-PUSCH, maxNumberSRS-ResourcePerSet* and *maxNumberSimultaneousSRS-ResourceTx* together. | FSPC | No | N/A | N/A |
| ***maxNumberSimultaneousSRS-ResourceTx***  Defines the maximum number of simultaneous transmitted SRS resources at one symbol for non-codebook based transmission to the UE. This feature is not supported for SUL. | FSPC | No | N/A | N/A |
| ***maxNumberSRS-ResourcePerSet***  Defines the maximum number of SRS resources per SRS resource set configured for codebook or non-codebook based transmission to the UE. This feature is not supported for SUL. | FSPC | No | N/A | N/A |
| ***supportedBandwidthUL***  Indicates maximum UL channel bandwidth supported for a given SCS that UE supports within a single CC (and in case of intra-frequency DAPS handover for the source and target cells), which is defined in Table 5.3.5-1 in TS38.101-1 [2] for FR1 and Table 5.3.5-1 in TS 38.101-2 [3] for FR2.  For FR1, all the bandwidths listed in TS38.101-1 Table 5.3.5-1 for each band shall be mandatory with a single CC unless indicated optional. For FR2, the set of mandatory CBW is 50, 100, 200 MHz. When this field is included in a band combination with a single band entry and a single CC entry (i.e. non-CA band combination), the UE shall indicate the maximum channel bandwidth for the band according to TS 38.101-1 [2] and TS 38.101-2 [3].  The UE may report a *supportedBandwidthUL* wider than the *channelBWs-UL*; this *supportedBandwidthUL* may not be included in the Table 5.3.5-1 of TS 38.101-1[2]/TS 38.101-2[3] for the case that the UE is unable to report the actual supported bandwidth according to the Table 5.3.5-1 of TS 38.101-1[2]/TS 38.101-2[3].  RedCap UEs shall support the maximum channel bandwidth defined for the respective band up to 20 MHz for FR1 and up to 100 Mhz for FR2. For FR1 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 20MHz shall be set to 1. For FR2 RedCap UE, the bit which indicates 100MHz shall be set to 1.  NOTE: To determine whether the UE supports a channel bandwidth of 90 MHz the network may ignore this capability and validate instead the *channelBW-90mhz*, the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSet* and the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSetIntraENDC*. For serving cell(s) with other channel bandwidths the network validates the *channelBWs-UL*, the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSet*, the *supportedBandwidthCombinationSetIntraENDC*, the *asymmetricBandwidthCombinationSet* (for a band supporting asymmetric channel bandwidth as defined in clause 5.3.6 of TS 38.101-1 [2]) and *supportedBandwidthUL*. | FSPC | CY | N/A | N/A |

**Note: RedCap specific section is discussed in section 3.9.**

## How to capture MIMO layer;

As discussed in [2],

|  |
| --- |
| 20 companies provided inputs to this discussion point.   * **Option 1: to add “**RedCap UE supports 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported.” for field description of existing fields “***maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH***”   Option 1 is supported by 3 companies (Intel, Huawei, CMCC ), Sequans, NEC, Telecom Italia, Deutsche Telekom can also accept this.   * **Option 2**: to add “For RedCap UE, if signalled, only 2 MIMO layers can be reported.” for field description of existing fields “***maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH***”;   Option 2 is supported by 4 companies (Spreadtrum, ZTE, Apple, vivo, OPPO )   * **Option 3:** to create a new section in 38.306 to capture the relationship between Rx and MIMO layers;   Option 3 is supported by 12 companies (Qualcomm, vivo, Sequans, Ericsson, CATT, Turkcell, NEC, MediaTek, LGE, Telecom Italia, Nokia, Deutsche Telekom,)  Huawei, ZTE discussed whether “support 1 DL MIMO layer” is same as “not supporting DL MIMO”. This is the main different between option 1 and 2. From Rapporteur perspective, the confusion came from the wording “If absent, the UE does not support MIMO on this carrier.”. The UE should at least support 1 MIMO layer to receive PDSCH. Then we may clarify this in TS38.306, i.e. “If absent, the UE ~~does not~~ support 1 MIMO layer on this carrier.”.. But this is out of RedCap discussion.  Futurewei, Sequans would like to support the scenario that 2Rx with 1 layer, however vivo commented that it has been excluded as clearly described in the WID.  **Rapporteur**: The main question for option 1 and 2 is whether not supporting DL MIMO is same as support 1 DL MIMO layer. This should be confirmed in the meeting. But to be safe, we can follow the WID, i.e. RedCap UE supports 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported. In addition, the situation is similar as 2.2.1 on how to capture maximum BW. We may agree to capture the relationship between Rx and MIMO layer in the new section. And FFS on whether to capture anything in field description of maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH, as commented by Ericsson “if new values are created and existing signaling is not used as-is, then the field description needs to be updated (Option 1).”  **Proposal 11.** **[To discuss]** Whether to create a new section in 38.306 to capture the relationship between Rx and MIMO layers “RedCap UE supports 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported”;  **Proposal 12.** **[FFS]** To discuss in main session whether “support 1 DL MIMO layer” is same as “not supporting DL MIMO”, and whether current field description “If absent, the UE does not support MIMO on this carrier.” in TS38.306 needs to be updated; |

Rapporteur comments:

Proposal 12 is not RedCap specific issue, and therefore should be discussed separately.

There is large support on option 3, i.e. to create a new section in 38.306 to capture the relationship between Rx and MIMO layers “RedCap UE supports 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported”;

Rapporteur would suggest to go with option 3 for now. And may update the field description if new values are created and existing signaling is not used as-is.

**Companies are invited to provide your view on whether the proposal 11 is acceptable**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree or not** | **Comments, if any** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | Agree with rapporteur to capture option 3 at least as baseline, which means any other additional change can be discussed in next meeting. |
| Apple | Option 3 is ok for us. |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Futurewei | Disagree but willing to compromise with the majority. | We continue to believe that setting the number of Rx branches to be equal to maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH has a drawback, which is either a RedCap UE equipped with multiple Rx branches will be penalized as being mandated to support DL MIMO with number of layers greater than 1, when the RedCap UE just needs the extra Rx branches for receiver diversity gain to achieve better DL coverage, or the network may be penalized for scheduling a RedCap UE equipped with multiple Rx branches in an overly conservative manner (i.e., applying a margin in the scheduling algorithm to overcome the seemingly lack of receiver diversity) when the RedCap UE doesn’t support DL MIMO and therefore its number of Rx branches is understated by maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH. |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree, but | We don’t understand the WID to exclude 2 Rx branches + 1 MIMO layer.  The WID only sidcusses the **maximum** number of DL MIMO layers:   * + Maximum number of DL MIMO layers:     - For a RedCap UE with 1 Rx branch, 1 DL MIMO layer is supported.     - For a RedCap UE with 2 Rx branches, 2 DL MIMO layers are supported.   Agree with FW’s comments |
| ZTE | Agree with comments | Ok to capture a general sentence in RedCap specific section. But we understand RAN2 still need to discuss how to signal those capabilities and make it clear in the field description of capabilities.  Regarding the comment from Futurewei, RAN1 agreement already indicates the number of Rx branches is implicitly indicated by MIMO capabilities, in RAN2, we cannot revert it without their permission. |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |

**Note: the changes on RedCap specific section (proposal 11) are shown in section 3.9.**

**Phase 1-Summary: 11 companies provided inputs;**

All companies are ok with option 3, i.e. “- Option 3: to create a new section in 38.306 to capture the relationship between Rx and MIMO layers;”. Futurewei and Sequans still have concern on “why 2 Rx branches + 1 MIMO layer is not supported.”. As clarified by ZTE “RAN1 agreement already indicates the number of Rx branches is implicitly indicated by MIMO capabilities, in RAN2, we cannot revert it without their permission.”.

Regarding ZTE’s comments “But we understand RAN2 still need to discuss how to signal those capabilities and make it clear in the field description of capabilities.”, Rapporteur assumes it can be discussed if companies find problem.

The changes are discussed in section 3.9 and no proposal is made here.

## How to capture maximum modulation order;

As discussed in [1]:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 21 companies provided inputs to this discussion point.   * 17 Companies (ZTE, Apple, OPPO, Spreadtrum, Qualcomm, Sierra Wireless, Futurewei, Samsung, Lenovo, KDDI, vivo, Sharp, Xiaomi, CATT, Ericsson, ChinaTelecom, MediaTek) support the suggestion from ZTE as  | **Definitions for parameters** | **Per** | **M** | **FDD-TDD**  **DIFF** | **FR1-FR2**  **DIFF** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***pdsch-256QAM-FR1***  Indicates whether the UE supports 256QAM modulation scheme for PDSCH for FR1 as defined in 7.3.1.2 of TS 38.211 [6].  It is mandatory with capability signaling for non-RedCap UE and optional for RedCap UE. | UE | CY | No | FR1 only |   **Proposal 19.** **[To agree] [TP to TS38.306] to capture maximum modulation order for RedCap UE as, for the field “pdsch-256QAM-FR1”, the value for column “M” should be changed from “Yes” into “CY”, add in the field description “It is mandatory with capability signaling for non-RedCap UE and optional for RedCap UE.”.** |

Rapporteur comments: there is clear majority on this, and therefore Rapporteur would like to check whether the following TP is ok or not.

#### TS38.306 TP on Maximum number of 256QAM

4.2.7.10 *Phy-Parameters*

| **Definitions for parameters** | **Per** | **M** | **FDD-TDD**  **DIFF** | **FR1-FR2**  **DIFF** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***pdsch-256QAM-FR1***  Indicates whether the UE supports 256QAM modulation scheme for PDSCH for FR1 as defined in 7.3.1.2 of TS 38.211 [6].  It is mandatory with capability signalling for non-RedCap UEs and optional for RedCap UEs. | UE | CY | No | FR1 only |

**Companies are invited to provide your view on the TP for maximum DL modulation order shown as above. Also please indicate if anything is missing.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree or not** | **Comments, if any** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No, but | Even though we still believe it is better to capture it in the RedCap specific section as below, we are fine to compromise to the majority view. Maybe it is also good to capture this in both exiting field description and Redcap specific section. |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Futurewei | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree | Similar view as Huawei, whether to have a separate section for RedCap in TS 38.306 could be discussed in general for all siganling. |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree, but | Would prefer to capture in both existing field and dedicated RedCap section |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Agree | Depending on how the changes would look on overall, it might be better to have it in a specific section as Huawei suggested. |

**Phase 1-Summary: 10 companies provided inputs;**

9 companies are ok with the proposal. 4 companies (Huawei, vivo, Sequans, Ericsson) suggested to also capture it in RedCap specific section. Rapporteur would suggest to discuss this together with section 3.9.

**Rapporteur consider the proposed TS38.306 TP on 256QAM seems agreeable.**

## How to capture CA, DC;

In last meeting, RAN2 agreed that “NE-DC, and (NG)EN-DC are not supported by RedCap UE; ”, therefore it can be covered by MR-DC case.

As discussed in [1]:

|  |
| --- |
| 20 companies provided inputs to this discussion point.   * 14 companies (Intel, ZTE, Apple, Spreadtrum, Sierra Wireless, Futurewei, Samsung, Lenovo, Sharp, Xiaomi, Ericsson, ChinaTelecom, LGE, MediaTek,) agree the idea from Rapporteur. ZTE commented that the sentence could be changed to “All UE capabilities related to CA and MR-DC are not applicable for RedCap UE.”. * 8 companies (Qualcomm, Futurewei, Samsung, vivo, MediaTek, Xiaomi, CATT, Ericsson) would like to introduce the definition of RedCap UE instead of including everything in the field description. * 4 companies (Sierra Wireless, Futurewei, vivo, Xiaomi ) would like to clarify BW, QAM, etc together. Rapporteur consider this is also related to discussion in previous sections.   **Proposal 20.** **[To agree] [14/20] [TP to TS38.306] Add the clarification “All UE capabilities related to CA and MR-DC are not applicable for RedCap UE.”in RedCap specific section; FFS on the definition of RedCap UE, and whether to capture other restrictions together, e.g. BW, RX, MIMO, QAM, etc.** |

**Companies are invited to provide your view on whether it is ok to add the clarification in RedCap specific section that All UE capabilities related to CA and MR-DC are not applicable for RedCap UE.”.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree or not** | **Comments, if any** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Futurewei | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree | Just wonder this will also be captured in stage 2 TS 38.300. Is it repeated to capture it in both place? |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |

**Note: the changes on RedCap specific section are shown in section 3.9.**

**Phase 1-Summary: 10 companies provided inputs and all companies agreed to capture it in RedCap specific sections;**

ZTE commented that whether it should be captured in both TS38.300 and TS38.306. Rapporteur think TS38.306 is the right place to capture such capability limitation. But leave the discussion on whether it should be also captured in TS38.300 to email discussion [107].

The related changes should be discussed based on TP in section 3.9.

## TP on RedCap specific section

A TP on RedCap specific section is shown as below to capture DAPS/CAPC, IAB, Maximum BW, Rx/MIMO and CA/DC:

#### TS38.306 TP on RedCap specific section

4.2.xx RedCap parameters

RedCap UE is the UE with reduced capability:

* The maximum bandwidth up to 20 MHz for FR1, and up to 100 MHz for FR2;
* 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported;
* CA, MR-DC, DAPS, CPC and IAB related UE features and corresponding capabilities are not supported by RedCap UEs. All other feature groups or components of the feature groups as captured in TR 38.822 [24] as well as capabilities specified in this specification remain applicable for RedCap UEs, unless indicated otherwise.

**Companies are invited to provide your view on the TP for RedCap specific section shown as above. Also please indicate if anything is missing.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree or not** | **Comments, if any** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, but | One typo maybe: It seems there is no “CPC” in our agreement. Is it CAPC? But, it seems the terminology should be “Conditional PSCell Addition and Change->CPAC”, rather than CAPC.   * *DAPS and CAPC related capabilities are not applicable for RedCap UE; [8/20] FFS on CHO. FFS on how to capture this in the specification;*   The wording itself is general OK. The current formulation is somehow aligned with RAN1 agreement. However, there seems missing the “RedCap UE” terminology definition in the section 3.1 of TS 38.306. Therefore, we should also add one sentence in section 3.1, such as below  “  3.1 Definitions  **RedCap UE:** the UE mandatorily supporting maximum bandwidth 20MHz in FR1 and 100MHz in FR2, and other reduced capabilities specified in sub-clause 4.2.x.x.  ”  One minor wording comment on “remain applicable for RedCap UEs”. Maybe it is better to use “remain applicable for RedCap UEs same as non-RedCap UEs”. This is not just to clarify its applicability but also to clarify the “mandatory or optional” remain same as legacy UE. |
| OPPO | Agree with comments | Agree with Huawei’s comment to change “CPC” into “CPAC”. |
| Futurewei | Agree | Also agree with Huawei on changing “CPC” to “CPAC”. |
| Samsung | Agree | Agree to use "CPAC" |
| vivo | Agree | Whether we need to have a definition of RedCap UE? |
| LGE | Agree | Agree to use “CPAC” |
| Sequans | Agree, but | Agree with HW |
| ZTE | Agree | Agree to use “CPAC” |
| Ericsson | Agree, but | Agree with Huawei’s comment on CPAC. |

**Phase 1-Summary: 9 companies provided inputs;**

Huawei commented CPC should be changed to CPAC, and got support from OPPO, Futurewei, Samsung, LGE, Sequans, ZTE and Ericsson.

Huawei also commented that RedCap terminology definition should be added in the section 3.1 as

3.1 Definitions

**RedCap UE:** the UE mandatorily supporting maximum bandwidth 20MHz in FR1 and 100MHz in FR2, and other reduced capabilities specified in sub-clause 4.2.x.x..

However it is unclear whether we still need the definition since current wording should be sufficient?

The **proposed TP** is shown as

#### TS38.306 TP on RedCap specific section

4.2.xx RedCap parameters

RedCap UE is the UE with reduced capability:

* The maximum bandwidth up to 20 MHz for FR1, and up to 100 MHz for FR2;
* The maximum mandatory supported DRB number is 8;
* The maximum mandatory supported PDCP SN number is 12;
* The maximum mandatory supported RLC AM SN number is 12;
* 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported;
* CA, MR-DC, DAPS, CPAC and IAB ( i.e., the RedCap UE is not expected to act as IAB node) related UE features and corresponding capabilities are not supported by RedCap UEs. All other feature groups or components of the feature groups as captured in TR 38.822 [24] as well as capabilities specified in this specification remain applicable for RedCap UEs, unless indicated otherwise.

## Phase 2

**Companies are invited to provide your view on summary, proposed (updated) TPs from phase 1. Also please indicate if anything is missing.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Concerned TP, summary** | **Comments, if any** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No concern, but just minor comments | We have below suggestions on the running CR:  1) In the running CR, “RedCap UE” is used. This definition is also used by other spec, which are referring to 306. We should anyway have the conclusion on the wording to section 3.1. If our suggested wording is not endorsable, at least we should add “**RedCap UE**: TBD”  3.1 Definitions  **RedCap UE:** the UE mandatorily supporting maximum bandwidth 20MHz in FR1 and 100MHz in FR2, and other reduced capabilities specified in sub-clause 4.2.x.x.  2) In section 4.2.xx, may be “up to” should be “is”, since it is redundant with maximum. Also better to stick to the wording in WID.  RedCap UE is the UE with reduced capability:   * The maximum bandwidth up to 20 MHz for FR1, and up to 100 MHz for FR2;   3) In section 4.2.xx, we could add two ENs to say ”FFS to add sub-clause for mandatory features and not applicable features”. This is because R1/R4 may inform us many RedCap specific features. It is not that readable to combine too many in one paragraph.  4) One minor wording comment on “remain applicable for RedCap UEs”. Maybe it is better to use “remain applicable for RedCap UEs same as non-RedCap UEs” in section 4.2.xx. This is not just to clarify its applicability but also to clarify the “mandatory or optional” remain same as legacy UE. |
| Sequans | Concern on Rx branch/MIMO issue  A few other comments | * Agree with HW’s comments, and especially on need for RedCap UE definition * Regarding Rx branch / MIMO: * As ZTE mentioned RAN 1 agreement is: “For UE capability signalling, the number of Rx branches for RedCap is implicitly indicated by the*corresponding capability*parameter *maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH* in the existing UE capability framework” * RAN2 wants to write: " RedCap UE is the UE with reduced capability: ….; 1 DL MIMO layer if 1 Rx branch is supported, and 2 DL MIMO layers if 2 Rx branches are supported" but this is not quite correct as the RAN1 agreement is about **max** DL MIMO layers indicated. * In addition, the action is not quite clear, i.e., which of the two is indicated and which is inferred, so we would suggest: “max 1 DL MIMO layer is indicated if 1 Rx branch is supported, and max 2 DL MIMO layers are indicated if 2 Rx branches are supported” or  “If max 1 DL MIMO layer is indicated the UE supports 1 Rx branch, and if max 2 DL MIMO layers are indicated the UE supports 2 Rx branches ” * Either way, the description of *maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH* also needs to be updated; if going by the other changes, the fact that only some values are applicable needs to be clear there as well.  Another way to go about it is to introduce a new parameter altogether, which may be what RAN1 intended (their agreement was originally “The number of Rx branches for RedCap is implicitly indicated by the existing capability parameter maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH” and was changed at least after a comment “Understand the intention while needs to clarify that maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH only applies to non-RedCap UEs since it does not include the candidatevalues allowed by RedCap. Suggest The number of Rx branches for RedCap is implicitly indicated by the existing/corresponding capability parameter maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH in existing framework”) * It does seem to us that NOTE 1 and 3 in section 8 UE capability constarint of the TP (3.2 here in the discussion) does not apply, at least partially, to a RedCap UE. We have no strong view, though it does seem misleading. Maybe adding “if supported” before PDCP duplication (Note 1) and NR-DC and NE-DC (Note 3) would be best? |
| Futurewei | Concern on text for parameter #DRBs in 3.2 and text for section 4.2.xx in 3.9 | As commented in 3.2 and 3.9.  Also encourage companies to discuss internally with your RAN1 colleagues whether we really want the number of Rx branches to be derived as being equal to maxNumberMIMO-LayersPDSCH. The drawback has been expressed by us and Sequans before. |
| Ericsson | Concern related to BW capabilities  Definition | As mentioned earlier, we are wondering whether it is the intention that RedCap UEs shall indicate ‘1’ for e.g. 20 MHz channel BW also in such cases where for the particular band there is no support for 20 MHz BW as specified in TS 38.101. We would like to discuss this and confirm what is the exact intention.  Regarding the UE definition, we are not sure if the “L2 capabilities“ need to be listed in the definition. |

Summary:

Companies provided comments on different aspects:

**1 the RedCap UE definition raised by Huawei, Ericsson and Sequans,**

[Rapporteur] Added in the CR as

**RedCap UE:** the UE with reduced capabilities specified in sub-clause 4.2.x.x.

**2 Why 2 Rx branches + 1 MIMO layer is not supported.” Raised by futureWei and Sequans**

As clarified by ZTE “RAN1 agreement already indicates the number of Rx branches is implicitly indicated by MIMO capabilities, in RAN2, we cannot revert it without their permission.”.

[Rapporteur] We can update the description once RAN1 has conclusion on this. An EN is added in the CR as

Editor's Note: May be updated based on latest RAN1 and RAN4 agreements.

**3 In section 4.2.xx, we could add two ENs to say ”FFS to add sub-clause for mandatory features and not applicable features”. This is because R1/R4 may inform us many RedCap specific features. It is not that readable to combine too many in one paragraph. Raised by Huawei**

[Rapporteur] Assume it can be covered by above EN;

**4 4) One minor wording comment on “remain applicable for RedCap UEs”. Maybe it is better to use “remain applicable for RedCap UEs same as non-RedCap UEs” in section 4.2.xx. This is not just to clarify its applicability but also to clarify the “mandatory or optional” remain same as legacy UE. Raised by Huawei**

[Rapporteur] Updated in the CR;

**5 It does seem to us that NOTE 1 and 3 in section 8 UE capability constarint of the TP (3.2 here in the discussion) does not apply, at least partially, to a RedCap UE. We have no strong view, though it does seem misleading. Maybe adding “if supported” before PDCP duplication (Note 1) and NR-DC and NE-DC (Note 3) would be best? Raised by Sequans**

[Rapporteur] Did not change for now.Would like to hear more view on this.

**62) In section 4.2.xx, may be “up to” should be “is”, since it is redundant with maximum. Also better to stick to the wording in WID. Raised by Huawei**

[Rapporteur] Updated in the CR;

**7 As mentioned earlier, we are wondering whether it is the intention that RedCap UEs shall indicate ‘1’ for e.g. 20 MHz channel BW also in such cases where for the particular band there is no support for 20 MHz BW as specified in TS 38.101. We would like to discuss this and confirm what is the exact intention. Raised by Ericsson**

[Rapporteur] The issue was discussed in offline discuss 109, that ‘s why Rapporteur suggested to use the wording

““RedCap UEs shall support the maximum channel bandwidth defined for the respective band but no more than 20 MHz.” However Huawei commented that “The R1 agreement “*For RedCap UEs in FR1, The baseline UE bandwidth capability is 20 MHz, which can be assumed during the initial access procedure.*” is clear that RedCap not supporting “20Mhz for FR1 and 100Mhz for FR2” cannot work during initial access.

”

Rapporteur would suggest to leave an EN on this

Editor's Note: FFS on how to handle the case that the UE cannot support 20MHz BW as specified in TS38.101.

# Summary report and proposals

There is not proposal in this summary since it is just to capture the discussion progress. We can discuss the draft CR directly in the meeting.
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