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# Introduction

This is the document for capturing comments, suggestions and text proposals for the TR update:

* [POST112-e][111][REDCAP] TP drafting for the TR (Ericsson)

 Scope: draft a TP based on meeting agreements

 Intended outcome: Endorsed TP in R2-2011165

 Deadline: Friday 2020-11-20

Companies are asked to provide their comments, suggestions and text proposals for the provided draft TR in this document.

It is expected the draft TR will be updated few times during the discussion until the deadline. Draft TR updates will be announced on the RAN2 reflector.

This document currently contains the “Phase 2” section of the RAN2#112-e offline discussion [111].

# Delegate contact information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Delegate contact |
| COMPANY\_NAME | NAME (email@address.com) |
| Rapporteur (Ericsson) | tuomas.tirronen@ericsson.com |
| Xiaomi | Liyanhua1@xiaomi.com |
| vivo | Cheli (Chenli5g@vivo.com) |
|  |  |

# Comments for draft TR

The following analysis was missed in the beginning of Phase 1 of [AT112][111] thus companies are asked to provide their views on this analysis:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | OK to include analysis from [R2-2009087](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_112-e/Docs//R2-2009087.zip) (vivo) (on RRM) in the TR? | Suggestions on which parts/details to capture or concerns with the analysis. Please elaborate if you think the analysis should not be captured. |
| vivo | OK | We are fine to capture the analysis in the TR. |
| MediaTek | No | We find this analysis incomplete to be captured in the TR. The suggestion made in this analysis is that serving cell monitoring can be applied to high SINR UEs, for which SSBs only need to be monitored once per 5.12s. However, if the SINR is only measured every 5.12s, how does one know that the UE remains in high SINR over this duration?For example, over a period of 5.12s the UE can move:1. 500kmph (High Speed): 711m2. 120kmph (Rural): 170m3. 30kmph (dense urban, urban macro): 42m4. 3kmph (Indoor hotspot, dense urban): 4.2mThe missing aspect in this analysis is the impact of blockage and fading due to this level of movement, and if the UE can be still considered as remaining in high SINR over such a long interval.[Chenli to clarify]: I would like to further clarify our simulation assumption: we only evaluate the stationary UEs. We are OK to further clarify this assumption in the TR with the simulation results. About “5.12s” in the paper: actually, in our simulation model, the DRX cycle is 1.28s (the evidence could be found in our RAN1 paper R1-2007672.). After 4 times of RRM relaxation, SSB reception period will be 5.12s (4\*1.28s), which is the meaning of 5.12s in our contribution. We perform some calculation to proof that SSB reception period of 5.12s after RRM relaxation will still maintaining good time synchronization in Table 2. Whether to capture this part is up to Rapporteur. Our intention is to provide the power saving gain with the corresponding impacts. |
| Rapporteur | v2  | Analysis not yet included – waiting for more comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Companies are asked to provide comments and Text Proposals for draft TR 38.875 per section based on the POST-112 version of the draft TR:

(Current version is -v1)

**Section 8.3 “Extended DRX for RRC Inactive and/or Idle”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Subsection** | **Comment / text proposal** |
| Xiaomi | 8.3 | We agree with the current TP. |
| vivo | 8.3.1 | I assume the following part should be updated based on the latest agreements:“For RedCap UEs in RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE, if the eDRX cycle is less than 10.24 s, paging monitoring does not use PTW and PH, if any. “[Rapp v2] This should be still correct, or do you refer to the intention on exactly 10.24 s cycle? This is captured in current version. |
| Rapporteur | v2 available, editorial changes made in section |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Section 8.4 “RRM relaxation for stationary devices”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Subsection** | **Comment / text proposal** |
| Xiaomi | 8.4 | The TP says” The study includes objective on RRM relaxation for stationary RedCap devices. Considering the mobility status of the target RedCap UE, the stationarity property is not limited to a strictly fixed UE, but such UE can also have low mobility even during periods of time it is “stationary”. ”I got a little bit confused as the meeting minutes captured:1. The target REDCAP UE, considering mobility, is not limited to a fixed UE, but can also experience some low mobility, and this, during some “stationary” periods of time.

Is this meaning the UE can also have low mobility even during periods of time it is “stationary” or outside periods of time it is “stationary”?Maybe the rapporteur can help me to clarify this.[Rapp] My interpretation of the agreement is that a “stationary” UE can be truly stationary or experience low mobility.  |
| Rapporteur | v2 available with editorial updates in section, please check |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Section 10.1 “Definition of reduced capabilities”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Subsection** | **Comment / text proposal** |
| Xiaomi | 10.1 | We agree with the current TP. |
| Rapporteur | v2 available with editorial updates in section |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Section 10.2 “Constraining of reduced capabilities”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Subsection** | **Comment / text proposal** |
| Xiaomi | 10.2 | We agree with the current TP. |
| Rapporteur | v2 available with editorial updates in section and some suggestion on to clarify some options – especially proponent companies please check.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Section 11.1 “UE identification”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Subsection** | **Comment / text proposal** |
| Xiaomi | 11.1 | We agree with the current TP. |
| vivo | 11.1 | According to the below agreement:1. Do not send a LS on RedCap UE identification to RAN1 and wait for more RAN1 process

I think one more clarification could be added, e.g. The feasibility of the different solutions on when such information should be available to the network depends on whether there is a need for network to have the information that the UE is a RedCap UE prior to scheduling a particular message, which is up to RAN1 discussion. [Rapp] I’m fine to clarify however I suggest to wait a bit until we have RAN1 TR and see if they have any suggestions. I’ll consider this for next update (comments welcome) |
| Rapporteur | v2 available. I suggest we take a look on RAN1 TR updates in this section and base further RAN2 work on that when available. There seems to be extensive analyses from RAN1 part on Options 1-3.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Comments for the analyses captured in draft TR

New in v2 of the draft TR

**Comments on results related to eDRX in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Subsection** | **Comment / text proposal** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Comments on results related to RRM relaxation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Subsection** | **Comment / text proposal** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Summary

TBD