

Network-Controlled Repeater - An Introduction

Fco. Italo G. Carvalho, Raul Victor de O. Paiva, Tarcisio F. Maciel, *Senior Member, IEEE*,
Victor F. Monteiro, *Member, IEEE*, Fco. Rafael M. Lima, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Darlan C. Moreira,
Diego A. Sousa, Behrooz Makki, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Magnus Åström and Lei Bao

Abstract—In fifth generation (5G) wireless cellular networks, millimeter wave spectrum opens room for several potential improvements in throughput, reliability, latency, among other aspects. However, it also brings challenges, such as a higher influence of blockage which may significantly limit the coverage. In this context, network-controlled repeaters (NCRs) are network nodes with low complexity that represent a technique to overcome coverage problems. In this paper, we introduce the NCR concept and study its performance gains and deployment options. Particularly, presenting the main specifications of NCR as agreed in 3rd generation partnership project (3GPP) Rel-18, we analyze different NCR deployments in an urban scenario and compare its performance with alternative deployments. As demonstrated, with a proper network planning and beamforming design, NCR is an attractive solution to cover blind spots the base stations (BSs) may have.

Index Terms—Network-controlled repeater, 3GPP, network densification, 5G, beamforming, millimeter wave communications

I. INTRODUCTION

Fifth generation (5G) and beyond aim to provide *everyone everywhere* with high quality of service (QoS). To cope with such requirements, different techniques are used, among which network densification, beamforming and millimeter wave (mmWave) communications. Particularly, it is expected that, in near future, to assist the gNodeBs (gNBs), a wireless network will be densified with different types of beamforming-capable nodes such as integrated access and backhaul (IAB) nodes, network-controlled repeaters (NCRs) (sometimes called NetCRs), etc.

During the 3rd generation partnership project (3GPP) Rel-16-18, IAB has been specified as the main 5G relaying technique, which is based on decode-and-forwarding [1]–[3]. In a few words, the goal of IAB is to provide flexible wireless backhaul using 3GPP new radio (NR) technology, providing not only backhaul but also the existing cellular services in the same node. Although the coverage of IAB is typically larger than the coverage of, e.g., Rel-17 and Rel-18 repeaters, it is a relatively complex and expensive node compared to other relaying nodes. Thus, depending on the deployment, there may be need for simpler and more affordable nodes with low complexity for, e.g., *coverage hole* removal. Indeed, Rel-17 repeater [4] is one option, which simply amplifies-and-forwards every signal it receives.

Historically, repeaters are considered as a source of interference (since they forward everything including noise). So, it is beneficial to limit their interference via, e.g., proper beamforming. Additionally, as explained in the sequel, enabling the gNBs to control the repeaters makes it possible to deploy them in mmWave spectrum where beamforming

is a necessity, improve their data transmission and/or energy efficiency. These have been the main motivations for 3GPP to define and specify the requirements/capabilities for NCR in Rel-18, as repeaters with beamforming capabilities which are under network control.

In this paper, we introduce the NCR, as defined by 3GPP Rel-18, and study their potential gains/deployment options. Highlighting the main Rel-18 NCR-specific agreements on different protocol layers, we analyze different NCR deployments in an urban scenario. Furthermore, we compare the system-level performance of NCR-assisted networks with those in alternative network deployments. As we show, NCRs are attractive nodes to assist existing networks, especially for covering blind spots that are naturally inherent in present mmWave networks. Additionally, network planning and beamforming are shown to have large impact on the performance of NCR-assisted networks.

It is worth noting that the most relevant works to our paper are [5]–[7], in which the concept of a heterogeneous smart electromagnetic environment with different types of network nodes is studied [5], network planning is optimized for the cases with NCRs and reconfigurable intelligent surfaces (RISs) [6] and conceptual comparisons between NCRs and RISs are presented [7].

II. 3GPP NETWORK-CONTROLLED REPEATER

In general, NCRs are repeaters with beamforming capability that can receive and process side control information (SCI) from the network. NCRs are of interest in both outdoor and indoor networks as well as for outdoor-to-indoor or indoor-to-outdoor communications. Different from IAB which is based on decode-and-forward relaying, NCRs are beamforming-capable amplify-and-forward relay nodes and, thereby, amplify the noise/interferences. The SCI allows the NCRs to perform their amplify-and-forward operation efficiently. In other words, NCRs can be considered as network-controlled “beam benders” relative to the gNB. That is, although deployed at a distance from their controlling gNB, they are logically part of it for all management purposes, i.e., they are deployed under the control of the operator. Particularly, 3GPP has specified NCRs based on the following assumptions [8]:

- NCRs are in-band radio frequency (RF) repeaters used for extension of network coverage on frequency range (FR) 1¹ and FR 2 bands based on the NCR model given in [9];
- NCRs are deployed in single hop stationary deployments;

¹FR1 is defined as bands in the sub-6 GHz spectrum (although 7125 MHz is the maximum) while FR2 defines bands in the mmWave range.




Fig. 1. gNB to UE connection via an NCR.

- NCRs are transparent to the user equipment (UE), in the sense that the UE is not made aware of the NCRs by the network, following its normal behavior as in the cases without NCRs;
- NCRs can maintain the gNB-repeater link and the repeater-UE link simultaneously.

Figure 1 demonstrates the schematic of an NCR as defined in [8]. The NCR consists of two functions, namely, mobile termination (MT) and forwarding (Fwd). The NCR-MT is the entity responsible for communicating with its controlling gNB to exchange information, e.g., SCI. The link between the gNB and the NCR-MT is referred to as control link (C-link) which is based on NR Uu interface. The NCR-Fwd is the entity that performs amplify-and-forward in the uplink (UL)/downlink (DL) signals between the gNB and the UE. The links between the gNB and NCR-Fwd and between the NCR-Fwd and UE are referred to as backhaul and access links, respectively. The behavior of the NCR-Fwd is solely controlled based on the SCI received by the NCR-MT from the controlling gNB. The 3GPP Rel-18 NCR work-item has mainly focused on specifying the signaling of the SCI for controlling the NCR-Fwd behavior related to beamforming, UL-DL time division duplex (TDD) operation and ON-OFF configuration.

As one of its key properties, an NCR can be turned ON/OFF to save energy/manage interference. Here, by default an NCR is OFF, in which case the NCR-Fwd is not expected to forward signals. An NCR goes into ON state only in the time resources with an access link beam indication. Both slot- and symbol-level granularities are feasible for the time-domain resource indication and determination of the access link beam.

The NCR receives a signal from the gNB in DL (or, from the UE in UL). Within the NCR, the signal is amplified and possibly also filtered before it is transmitted to the UE in DL (or, to the gNB in UL). Beamforming is used for both reception and transmission, resulting in improved signal to interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR). Which beamforming to apply and when to apply it is provided to the NCR over the SCI. Consequently, the NCR is not required to have any signal and channel awareness for signals forwarded by the NCR-Fwd. The forwarding operation is performed entirely in the analog domain, implying a latency in the order of tens of nanoseconds, and it is fully manageable (if at all needed) with existing timing alignment procedures. To receive SCI, the NCR-MT uses the normal Uu interface and must therefore support a subset of UE capabilities.

Like fixed IAB-nodes, NCRs are stationary nodes deployed according to the network planning done by the operator. The planning can be expected to result in a stable control/backhaul link between the controlling gNB and NCR. Thus, the required

features/capabilities of NCR-MT are like those in IAB-MT (see [1] and [10] for detailed specifications for IAB).

As baseline, the same large-scale properties of the channel are expected to be experienced by the C-link and backhaul link, at least when the NCR-MT and NCR-Fwd operate in the same carrier as in Rel-18. The DL communication of C-link and backhaul link can be simultaneously performed or time division multiplexed (TDMed). The UL communication of C-link and backhaul link, on the other hand, can be performed at least TDMed. The simultaneous UL transmission of the C-link and backhaul link is subject to NCR capability.

Fixed and adaptive beams can be considered at NCR for C-link and backhaul-link, since support for a fixed beam is part of the basic NCR features, and, as a capability, the NCR-MT may perform adaptive beamforming on the C-link/backhaul link. On the one hand, in simultaneous operation, NCR-Fwd follows NCR-MT's beam indication (TCI or SRI). On the other hand, in non-simultaneous operation, NCR-Fwd follows dedicated backhaul beam indication or pre-defined rules. Conditioned on capability, the backhaul link may additionally be configured with separate TCI states.

The beam control of the NCR in the access link should be carefully addressed to minimize the impact on cell-common and UE-specific signals/channels which are forwarded towards the UEs. According to the specification, the forward resource can be configured periodically, semi-persistent, or dynamically. Periodic and semi-persistent beam configuration can be used, e.g., for repeating cell-specific signals, with rarely/never changed configuration and are configured per periodicity, where each periodicity includes a set of time offsets and durations. Additionally, dynamic access link beam configuration may be used for forwarding dynamically scheduled UE-specific channels, which are indicated as pairs of beam and time resource indices, where the full set of time resources is preconfigured by radio resource control (RRC).

The DL/UL transmission direction of the NCR-Fwd function can be principally derived from the NCR-MT configurations. Finally, NCRs do not support dynamic TDD since that would require signal awareness and a significantly more complicated NCR design.

Different ranges of NCRs' links have been defined. At the UE-side of NCR, wide-, medium- and local-area range have been defined. At the gNB-side, on the other hand, wide- and local-area range have been defined. These types of links' properties can be independently declared. The main differences between wide- and local-area links are the level of network planning and transmit power. Wide-area links benefit from high transmit power/amplification gain and are well-planned where, for instance, the gNB-side of the NCR is located on the rooftop or similar, to achieve line of sight (LOS) over a long distance to a controlling gNB. For the local-area type, on the other hand, the node may be mounted at low heights, e.g., lamppost, etc., and may have a power in the order of a typical UE.

In the initial discussions to define the Rel-18 NCR study-item, there have been discussions whether RISs should also be included into the NCR discussions. However, it was decided not to include and leave them for possible future

releases. There are similarities and differences between NCRs and RISs. In simple words, RISs are NCRs with negative amplification gain, and both emit the incoming signals without decoding. Compared to NCRs, RISs are expected to be simpler nodes with less focused beamforming capability/accuracy and without active amplification (or small amplification in the cases with active RIS). As opposed to NCRs, RISs do not amplify the signal but also not the noise/interference. Additionally, RISs have only one reflection matrix, while NCRs can do separate beamforming at the transmitter and receiver sides. This should be an advantage for the NCRs when controlling the interference in, e.g., multi-user scenarios.

III. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF NCR-ASSISTED NETWORKS

To study the performance of NCRs, we consider both UL and DL of a TDD 5G NR network, where NCRs are used to extend coverage and overcome possible coverage holes due to blockage. We assume the same type of data traffic in both link directions.

Consider a network composed of N NCRs and B gNBs serving U UEs, either directly or through one of the NCRs, over K resource blocks (RBs), which correspond to the minimum allocable time-frequency system resources. At each allocation period, namely transmission time interval (TTI), each gNB assigns RBs to its served UEs orthogonally, either directly or via an NCR. Thus, the links of the same gNB do not interfere with each other but may interfere with links from other gNBs reusing the same RBs. It is assumed that NCRs do not perform signal processing, i.e., do not filter out incoming signals that are transmitted to UEs who are not served by them. In other words, NCRs amplify and forward both desired and interfering signals. The gNBs and NCRs are equipped with antenna arrays while UEs have a single antenna.

Considering DL communication, the signal directly received by a UE from its serving gNB or indirectly via the gNB-controlled NCR might be formed by the superposition of several signal components, i.e.,

- i) signal of interest coming from the serving gNB, in case of direct communication, and/or an amplified and forwarded signal of interest coming from the NCR serving the UE;
- ii) amplified additive white gaussian noise (AWGN) of the receiver of the serving NCR, which is forwarded to the UE in case of indirect communication;
- iii) AWGN of the UE receiver;
- iv) interfering signal components coming directly from neighbor gNBs;
- v) interfering signals amplified and forwarded by neighbor NCRs; and
- vi) amplified AWGN components from neighbor NCRs receivers, which are forwarded towards the UE.

These components are subject to effects impaired by wireless channels, e.g., path loss, shadowing, fast fading, etc. They are also subjected to the gains of transmit/receive filters adopted by the gNBs and NCRs. A similar set of signals can be considered in UL communication.

In the considered scenario, the UE association to either gNBs or NCRs is performed as follows. Beam sweepings




Fig. 2. Scenarios of interest.

between gNB and NCR and between NCR and UE are periodically performed with different periodicities, selected considering the profile of each type of link [11]. Then, the best beam pairs for each link (backhaul and/or access) are selected and used until the next beam sweeping period. In this context, gNBs and NCRs are static nodes with LOS established during the network planning phase. Then, the gNB-NCR link usually has a long coherence time and, therefore, requires less beam update (or even never requires). Oppositely, the beamforming at the access link may require frequent updates since the channel varies faster due to the UEs' mobility [11]. The UE follows its typical behavior to measure the reference signal received power (RSRP) of the received reference signals and reports the measurements to its serving gNB. Based on the received RSRP measurement reports, the gNB evaluates whether to directly transmit to the UE or to serve the UE through its NCRs.

A key objective of NCRs is to extend/improve the coverage of 5G networks which tends to be less consistent at mmWave bands. Herein, we aim to contribute to the research on NCRs by assessing the gains of introducing different numbers of NCRs into networks covered originally only by conventional gNBs. For this purpose, we analyze the system performance of different setups. Two base scenarios, as shown in Fig. 2, are considered. In Scenario A, we consider two macro-gNBs at the central block and two NCRs. Scenario A is split into two cases: one case in which the shown gNBs and NCRs are present and another case where only the gNBs are used, which we refer to as macro-only scenario. Similarly, Scenario B contains four macro-gNBs at the central block, and four NCRs at the central blocks of each side road. Scenario B is also split into a case with only gNBs (macro-only scenario) and another case with gNBs and NCRs. The system-level performance of these four cases is evaluated through simulations and characterized in terms of SINR, modulation and coding scheme (MCS) usage and throughput.

A simplified version of the Madrid grid [12] is considered. The scenarios in Fig. 2 have nine $120\text{ m} \times 120\text{ m}$ blocks. They are surrounded by 3 m wide sidewalks and separated from each other by 14 m wide streets. The UEs are uniformly positioned on the sidewalks. When one of them reaches a block corner, it has 60 % of chance of continuing straight ahead and 20 % of chance to turn left or right. These probabilities are proportionally re-scaled whenever some of the directions are not available at a block corner.

TABLE I
SIMULATION PARAMETERS.

Parameter	Value		
System			
Layout	Simplified Madrid grid [12]		
Carrier frequency	28 GHz		
System bandwidth	50 MHz		
Subcarrier spacing	60 kHz		
Number of subcarriers per RB	12		
Number of RBs	66		
Slot duration	0.25 ms		
OFDM symbols per slot	14		
Channel generation procedure	Cf. [14, Fig. 7.6.4-1]		
Path loss	Cf. [14, Table 7.4.1-1]		
Fast fading	Cf. [14, Sec.7.5] and [14, Table 7.5-6]		
AWGN power per subcarrier	-174 dBm		
Noise figure	9 dB		
Mobility model	Pedestrian [15]		
Number of UEs	72		
CBR traffic packet size	3072 bits		
CBR traffic packet inter-arrival time	4 slots		
Nodes			
	gNB	NCR	UE
Height	25 m	10 m	1.5 m
Transmit power	35 dBm	33 dBm	24 dBm
Fixed DL/UL amplification gain	-	90 dB	-
Antenna tilt	12°	12°	0°
Antenna array	URA 8 × 8	URA 8 × 8	Single antenna
Antenna element pattern	3GPP 3D [14]	3GPP 3D [14]	Omni
Max. antenna element gain	8 dBi	8 dBi	0 dBi
Speed	0 km/h	0 km/h	3 km/h

The channel model of [13], which is compliant with [14], is used to model the links between all entities. It is consistent in space, time, and frequency dimensions and considers small-scale fading, log-normal shadowing and distance-dependent path loss propagation components. Links from the gNBs to the NCRs and to the UEs follow the 3GPP urban macro (UMa) profile [14]. Links from the NCRs to the UEs follow the 3GPP urban micro (UMi) [14]. From the gNBs to the NCRs, we consider LOS links, while those from the gNBs and the NCRs to the UEs can be LOS or non-line of sight (NLOS), depending on the UEs' positions. The NCRs have a fixed amplification gain of 90 dB subject to a maximum output power constraint. Other system and node parameters are summarized in Table I.

Figure 3 presents the cumulative distribution functions (CDFs) of the SINRs of the direct and forwarded links for both Scenarios A and B. Solid curves refer to direct links between gNBs and UEs, while dashed curves refer to links forwarded by NCRs. The blue and green curves are obtained for Scenario A without and with NCRs, respectively, while the yellow and red ones relate to Scenario B analogously.

Considering the DL, at the 10th percentile of SINR CDFs shown in Fig. 3 and summarized in Table II, Scenario A achieved SINR of 2.97 dB for the direct links in the macro-only case. In Scenario A with NCRs, at the 10th percentile, we observe an SINR of 8.93 dB for the direct links and 25.05 dB for the forwarded links, respectively. Therefore, compared to the cases with macro-only, the worst connections are improved by around 6 dB when connected to the gNBs and by 22 dB when served through the NCRs. This is intuitive because the introduction of the NCRs reduces the effective distance between UE and their serving nodes. Regarding the




Fig. 3. CDF of SINR for the direct and forwarded link for Scenarios A and B on Downlink and Uplink, respectively.

50th percentile of the SINR in the same scenarios, the value of 18.13 dB for the macro-only case improves to 25.72 dB for the direct links and to 34.94 dB for the NCR-forwarded links, achieving gains of ≈ 7.60 dB and 16.81 dB, respectively. With respect to the 90th percentile of the SINR in the same scenarios, the value of 46.64 dB for the macro-only case improves to 47.74 dB for the direct links and to 47.85 dB for the NCR-forwarded links, i.e., we have gains of ≈ 1 dB and 1.20 dB, respectively.

As for the UL, Scenario A at the 10th percentile of SINR CDFs, also shown in Fig. 3 and summarized in Table II, had an SINR of -1.72 dB for the direct links considering the deployment composed only of gNBs, while having 1.51 dB and 19.50 dB for the direct and forwarded links when using NCRs. Therefore, by using NCRs, the worst connections are improved by around 3.23 dB when connected to the gNBs and by 21.22 dB when served through the NCRs. For the 50th percentile of the SINR, the value of 9.65 dB for the macro-only case improves to 13.32 dB for the direct links and 26.70 dB for the forwarded links, achieving gains of ≈ 3.70 dB and 17.05 dB, respectively. Furthermore, for the 90th percentile of the SINR, the value of 35.66 dB for the macro-only case improves to 36.04 dB for the direct links and 39.52 dB for the forwarded links, i.e., we have gains of ≈ 0.38 dB and 3.86 dB, respectively.

For Scenario B DL, we have similar trends in terms of SINR at the 10th percentile with a value of 6.92 dB for the direct links in the macro-only deployment, while for the case with NCRs we observe 6.05 dB for direct links and 22.95 dB for the forwarded links. For the 50th percentile of the SINR, the value of 18.79 dB for the macro-only case improves to 22.05 dB for the direct links and 36.81 dB for the forwarded links, achieving gains of ≈ 3.26 dB and 18.02 dB, respectively. In Scenario B, it is perceived a more expressive relative growth at the 90th percentile of the SINR values between the cases without and with NCR. We observe 35.50 dB for direct links in the macro-only case and 43.76 dB and 48.70 dB for the direct and forwarded links DL, respectively, in the case with NCRs. The same trend is observed for the cases with UL

TABLE II
SINR AND THROUGHPUT VALUES FOR SCENARIOS A & B AT THE 10TH, 50TH AND 90TH PERCENTILES.

		Scenario A					Scenario B				
		SINR (dB)			Throughput (Mbits/s)		SINR (dB)			Throughput (Mbits/s)	
		Percentile	Direct links		Forwarded links	w/o NCRs	w/ NCRs	w/o NCRs	w/ NCRs	w/o NCRs	w/ NCRs
Downlink	w/o NCRs		w/ NCRs	w/o NCRs							
	10 th	2.97	8.93	25.05	1.28	2.54	6.92	6.05	22.95	3.08	3.20
	50 th	18.13	25.72	34.94	2.75	3.16	18.79	22.05	36.81	3.58	4.08
	90 th	46.64	47.74	47.85	3.40	3.63	35.50	43.76	48.70	4.50	4.53
Uplink	Percentile	Direct links		Forwarded links	w/o NCRs	w/ NCRs	Direct links		Forwarded links	w/o NCRs	w/ NCRs
		w/o NCRs	w/ NCRs				w/o NCRs	w/ NCRs			
	10 th	-1.72	1.51	19.50	0.10	1.81	-0.83	1.70	21.40	1.87	2.67
	50 th	9.65	13.32	26.70	2.21	3.01	8.18	14.06	32.49	3.31	3.69
	90 th	35.66	36.04	39.52	3.15	3.78	25.46	33.06	44.15	4.68	5.08

communication.

While the absolute values of SINR in Scenario B are generally lower than those seen in Scenario A, the relative improvements are higher. This is because Scenario B has four macros which introduce more interference in the system and lead to lower overall SINR values. In this more challenging interference scenario, the relative gains that can be brought by NCR are naturally larger. Notice that for the forwarded links, which remain relatively separated from each other in both Scenarios A and B, the NCRs' performance remains similar to each other. In this way, the presence of NCRs improves the QoS experienced by the weak UEs significantly, in harmony with the main objectives considered by 3GPP Rel-18. However, to limit the interference, one needs to determine the proper number of NCRs and deploy them with proper planning. Moreover, due to the lower transmit power of the UEs, compared to gNBs, the UL direction is the one that benefits the most from the deployment of NCRs.

It is interesting to note that we have observed the same qualitative conclusions when considering different MCSs (although not demonstrated in the figures). For the highest MCS, i.e., MCS 15, we have observed a 40% usage for Scenario A without NCRs and 70% for the Scenario A with NCRs while for Scenario B, we have observed a 30% usage with macro-only and 50% with NCRs. In absolute terms, Scenario A has in general larger usage of the highest MCS than Scenario B, while the relative increase (fourfold) for the highest MCS usage in Scenario B is larger.

Figure 4 shows the CDFs of the throughput values for Scenarios A and B. Solid and dashed lines refer to DL and UL, respectively. The blue and green curves refer to Scenario A, without and with NCRs, respectively, while, analogously, the yellow and red curves refer to Scenario B. As demonstrated in Fig. 4 and Table II, for Scenario A in UL, the 10th percentile throughput is 0.10 Mbits/s and 1.81 Mbits/s without and with NCRs, respectively. The 50th percentile throughput is 2.21 Mbits/s and 3.01 Mbits/s without and with NCRs, respectively, while the 90th percentile throughput is 3.15 Mbits/s and 3.78 Mbits/s, respectively. That means an eighteen-fold improvement for the worst links in UL when NCRs are used in Scenario A. That is, the UEs with poor direct link to the gNB (for instance, cell-edge UEs) benefit most from the presence of NCRs, although even the cell-center UEs still benefit slightly from the presence of the NCRs.

For Scenario B in UL, the 10th percentile throughput




Fig. 4. CDF of throughput.

is 1.87 Mbits/s and 2.67 Mbits/s without and with NCRs, respectively. The 50th percentile throughput is 3.31 Mbits/s and 3.69 Mbits/s without and with NCRs, respectively, while the 90th percentile throughput is 4.68 Mbits/s and 5.08 Mbits/s, respectively. The different values of throughput gain between Scenarios A and B are explained by the higher interference level in the latter which strongly impacts the worst links. On the other hand, since in Scenario B without and with NCRs we have larger number of nodes reusing the spectrum, the overall throughput obtained in Scenario B in both DL and UL is larger in absolute values, compared to those obtained in Scenario A (see Fig. 4). Note that very high but different SINR values may lead to the same throughput, since this latter is ultimately limited by the capacity of the highest MCS.

IV. ON THE CHALLENGES OF NCR-ASSISTED NETWORKS

Although the system-level evaluations show great potential for coverage improvement via the implementation of NCRs, there are still challenges to be considered before the NCR can be implemented on a large-scale. Some of them are listed in the following:

- Lack of testbed evaluations: To the best of our knowledge, there is yet no practical implementation of NCRs. Once NCRs are manufactured, testbed evaluations and field measurements can provide better understanding of the potentials and challenges of NCRs.
- (Self-)Interference management: Rel-17 repeaters support up to 90 dB amplification gains and NCRs are expected to support at least the same number. In such cases,

self-interference as well as interference to/from the other nodes can be an issue which requires accurate interference management mechanisms. Here, network planning and beamforming are expected to reduce the effect of (self-)interference remarkably. However, in scenarios where the spatial deployment is not able to filter (self-)interference links, (self-)interference effects need to be considered.

- **Cost-efficiency tradeoff:** Although NCR can improve the network coverage, its performance, in terms of both cost and efficiency, needs to be further evaluated compared to its alternative competitors such as IAB and RIS. Particularly, while IAB is a more complex node than NCR, it covers a larger area. Thus, compared to NCRs, a fewer number of IAB nodes may be required to cover an area, and the total cost of ownership, on the network level, for these technologies need to be carefully investigated. On the other hand, NCR is expected to outperform the RIS in terms of performance, with limited or no cost increment (see [7] for a conceptual comparison between the RIS and NCR).

V. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

In this paper, we introduced the NCR concept, the main standardization effort on it, as well as its potential and challenges in different deployments. As shown, employing NCRs improves the performance of both direct and forwarded links considering different performance metrics. Particularly, cell-edge UEs and UL communications are the ones with the highest benefit from the presence of NCRs in mmWave networks. Furthermore, the results show the importance of network planning where the relative performance gains achievable using NCR depend on the number and positions of these nodes selected for deployment. Depending on the number of nodes, resource reuse and interference levels, the introduction of NCRs may result in UL throughput gain of up to ten times for the cell-edge UEs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by Ericsson Research, Sweden, and Ericsson Innovation Center, Brazil, under UFC.51 Technical Cooperation Contract Ericsson/UFC. The work of Victor F. Monteiro was supported by CNPq under Grant 308267/2022-2. The work of Tarcisio F. Maciel was supported by CNPq under Grant 312471/2021-1. The work of Francisco R. M. Lima was supported by FUNCAP (edital BPI) under Grant BP4-0172-00245.01.00/20.

REFERENCES

- [1] 3GPP, “NR; integrated access and backhaul radio transmission and reception,” 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), TS 38.174, Sep. 2023, v.18.2.0. [Online]. Available: <http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Specs/html-info/38174.htm> (visited on 06/16/2023).
- [2] V. F. Monteiro, F. R. M. Lima, D. C. Moreira, *et al.*, “Paving the way towards mobile IAB: Problems, solutions and challenges,” *IEEE Open J. Commu. Soc.*, vol. 3, pp. 2347–2379, Nov. 2022. DOI: 10.1109/OJCOMS.2022.3224576.
- [3] C. Madapatha, B. Makki, C. Fang, *et al.*, “On integrated access and backhaul networks: Current status and potentials,” *IEEE Open J. Commu. Soc.*, vol. 1, pp. 1374–1389, Sep. 2020. DOI: 10.1109/OJCOMS.2020.3022529.

- [4] 3GPP, “NR; NR repeater radio transmission and reception,” 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), TS 38.106, Mar. 2023, v.17.4.0. [Online]. Available: <http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Specs/html-info/38106.htm> (visited on 06/16/2023).
- [5] R. Flamini, D. De Donno, J. Gambini, *et al.*, “Towards a heterogeneous smart electromagnetic environment for millimeter-wave communications: An industrial viewpoint,” *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag.*, vol. 70, no. 10, pp. 8898–8910, Feb. 2022. DOI: 10.1109/TAP.2022.3151978.
- [6] G. Leone, E. Moro, I. Filippini, A. Capone, and D. D. Donno, “Towards reliable mmWave 6G RAN: Reconfigurable surfaces, smart repeaters, or both?” In *Proc. of the Internat. Symp. on Modeling and Opt. in Mobile, Ad Hoc, and Wireless Netw. (WiOPT)*, Turin, Italy, Sep. 2022, pp. 1–9. DOI: 10.1109/AERO.2015.7118906.
- [7] H. Guo, C. Madapatha, B. Makki, *et al.* “A comparison between network-controlled repeaters and reconfigurable intelligent surfaces.” arXiv: 2211.06974 [cs.NI]. (Nov. 2022).
- [8] 3GPP, “New WID on NR network-controlled repeaters,” 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), RP 222673, Sep. 2022, TSG RAN meeting no. 97-e. [Online]. Available: https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/TSG_RAN/TSGR_97e/Docs/RP-222673.zip (visited on 06/16/2023).
- [9] 3GPP, “Study on NR network-controlled repeaters,” 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), TR 38.867, Sep. 2022, v.18.0.0. [Online]. Available: <http://www.3gpp.org/DynaReport/38867.htm>.
- [10] 3GPP, “5G;NR;User Equipment (UE) radio access capabilities,” 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), TS 38.306, Oct. 2023, v.17.6.0. [Online]. Available: https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Specs/archive/38_series/38.306/ (visited on 09/28/2023).
- [11] 3GPP, “NR; radio resource control (RRC) protocol specification,” 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), TS 38.331, version 17.6.0, Sep. 2023. [Online]. Available: <http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Specs/html-info/38331.htm> (visited on 10/01/2018).
- [12] P. Agyapong *et al.*, “Simulation guidelines,” METIS, Deliverable 6.1, Oct. 2013. [Online]. Available: https://metis2020.com/wp-content/uploads/deliverables/METIS_D6.1_v1.pdf (visited on 09/20/2021).
- [13] A. M. Pessoa, I. M. Guerreiro, C. F. M. e Silva, *et al.*, “A stochastic channel model with dual mobility for 5G massive networks,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 149 971–149 987, Oct. 2019, ISSN: 2169-3536. DOI: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2947407.
- [14] 3GPP, “Study on channel model for frequencies from 0.5 to 100 GHz,” 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), TR 38.901, Mar. 2022, v.17.0.0. [Online]. Available: <http://www.3gpp.org/DynaReport/38901.htm> (visited on 09/26/2017).
- [15] 3GPP, “Study on evaluation methodology of new vehicle-to-everything (V2X) use cases for LTE and NR,” 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), TS 37.885, Jun. 2019, v.15.3.0. [Online]. Available: <http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Specs/html-info/37885.htm> (visited on 04/17/2019).

BIOGRAPHIES

- **Fco. Italo G. Carvalho** (italoguedes@gtel.ufc.br) is an undergraduate student at the Federal University of Ceará (UFC), Fortaleza, Brazil and is with the Wireless Telecommunications Research Group (GTEL), UFC.
- **Raul Victor de O. Paiva** (raul.paiva@gtel.ufc.br) is a PhD student at UFC and is with GTEL.
- **Tarcisio F. Maciel** (maciel@gtel.ufc.br) is a Professor at UFC and is with the GTEL. He is interested on multiuser/multiantenna communications.
- **Victor F. Monteiro** (victor@gtel.ufc.br) is a Professor at UFC and is with the GTEL. He is focused on network architecture and protocols.
- **Fco. Rafael M. Lima** (rafaelm@gtel.ufc.br) is a Professor at UFC and is with the GTEL. He has focused on radio resource management.
- **Darlan C. Moreira** (darlan@gtel.ufc.br) is a senior researcher at GTEL focusing on simulation programming.
- **Diego A. Sousa** (diego@gtel.ufc.br) is a Professor at the Federal Institute of Education, Science, and Technology of Ceará (IFCE), Paracuru, Brazil and is with the GTEL. He has focused on radio resource management.
- **Behrooz Makki** (behrooz.makki@ericsson.com) is a Senior Researcher in Ericsson, focusing on different aspects of network densification.
- **Magnus Åström** (magnus.astrom@ericsson.com) is a Research Leader in Ericsson, developing different aspects of 5G and beyond.
- **Lei Bao** (lei.bao@ericsson.com) is a Senior Researcher in Ericsson, focusing on wireless backhaul.