**Topic #3: Ambiguity issue in deciding TL,C**

Agreements from 1st round discussion:

* The relaxation should not be double counted

The solution to correct the double-counting issue (2nd round discussion):

**Both solutions are doable:**

* Scheme #1: Correct the equation (R4-2112777)

|  |
| --- |
| The UE is allowed to set its configured maximum output power PCMAX,f,c for carrier f of serving cell c in each slot. The configured maximum output power PCMAX,f,c is set within the following bounds:PCMAX\_L,f,c ≤ PCMAX,f,c ≤ PCMAX\_H,f,c with PCMAX\_L,f,c = MIN {PEMAX,c, (PPowerClass – ΔPPowerClass) – MAX(MAX(MPRc, A-MPRc)+ ΔTIB,c +∆TRxSRS, P-MPRc) }PCMAX\_H,f,c = MIN {PEMAX,c, PPowerClass – ΔPPowerClass }Note: After 1st round discussion, this solution is recognized that it will change minimum performance PCMAX\_L,f,c (improved minimum performance). |

* Scheme #2: add clarification texts (R4-2113398)

|  |
| --- |
| The measured configured maximum output power PUMAX,f,c shall be within the following bounds:PCMAX\_L,f,c – MAX{TL,c, T(PCMAX\_L,f,c)} ≤ PUMAX,f,c ≤ PCMAX\_H,f,c + T(PCMAX\_H,f,c).where the tolerance T(PCMAX,f,c) for applicable values of PCMAX,f,c is specified in Table 6.2.4-1. The tolerance TL,c is the absolute value of the lower tolerance for the applicable operating band as specified in Table 6.2.1-1 without further taking into account NOTE 3 in Table 6.2.1-1. |

During the second round discussion, for the new issue 3-2:

5 companies to accept change of minimum performance (where 2 of them accept majority view in order to close this issue in this meeting), 2 companies to the other choice. And one company thinks both options tighten the minimum performance.

Target in GTW discussion:

* Close the issue in this meeting with one of the two alternatives selected
	+ Alt. #1: Go for modified equation scheme #1, then
		- endorse R4-2112777/2778/2779, and
		- approve reply LS R4-2112776 to R5-206676,
		- note R4-2113399 and withdraw its mirror CRs R4-2113400/3401.
	+ Alt. #2: Go for clarification texts scheme #2, then
		- endorse R4-2113399/3400/3401, and
		- revise reply LS R4-2112776 to R5-206676 accordingly,
		- note R4-2112777, and withdraw its mirrors R4-2112778/2779

Annex: Tdoc list for the topics involved:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TDoc** | **Mirrors** | **Title** | **Source** | **Moderator’s remarks** |
| [**R4-2112776**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2112776.zip) |  | Reply LS on ambiguity in deciding TL,C | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Reply LS: according to the proposed corrections in R4-211277/78/79 |
| [**R4-2112777**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2112777.zip) | R4-2112778R4-2112779 | CR on ambiguity in deciding TL,C R15 CATF | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Qualcomm Incorporated | Option 2 to address ambiguity issue by correcting double counted **∆TC,c** in the lower bound calculation of P\_CMAX in RAN4 specs |
| [**R4-2113398**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113398.zip) |  | Discussion and draft Reply LS on ambiguity in deciding TL,C | Huawei, HiSilicon | Discussion paper and draft LS: Option 1 to address ambiguity issue in deciding T\_L,C, while Option 2 proposed in R4-2112776 |
| [**R4-2113399**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113399.zip) | R4-2113400R4-2113401 | Draft CR for 38.101-1 clarification on the lower limit of Pumax(Rel-15) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Draft CR: implementation of proposals in R4-2113398 |