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# Introduction

This document summarizes the following offline discussion.

* [Post115-e][060][NR15] Support of 100M bandwidth for band n40 (Huawei)

Scope: CR covering P1 in R2-2108578, as discussed in [AT115-e][016]

Intended outcome: Agreed CR(s)

Deadline: Short (for RP)

# Contact from companies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Email |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yiru Kuang, kuangyiru@huawei.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Discussion

Qualcomm summarized the understanding for the current situation:

- Mandatory or optional is defined by RAN4

- Support for the bandwidth is release-independent.

- Mandatory or optional may be different among releases.

Companies are invited to provide the views for the above understanding.

**Q1 Do companies agree with the following understanding?**

**- Mandatory or optional is defined by RAN4**

**- Support for the bandwidth is release-independent.**

**- Mandatory or optional may be different among releases.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

For now, RAN4 has introduced the 100MHz for the existing band n40 in Rel-17, the 100MHz for band n40 is mandatory, if the above “Support for the bandwidth is release-independent” is the common understanding, the Rel-15/Rel-16 UE can also implement 100MHz for band n40 but should be optional. Thus, capability signalling for 100MHz is needed and adding it in per-band bitmap, e.g. using the fourth bit in the bitmap *channelBWs-DL/UL*, is preferred based on previous discussion.

Ericsson pointed out that it is not easy to use an accurate description for a general case, and the case for n40 might be a particular case. So it should be discussed whether the introduced bit for 100MHz is restricted for n40, or a general wording can be used.

**Q2 Do companies prefer to restrict to band n40 or to use a general wording?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **“Only band n40” or “General wording”** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | General wording | Based on RAN4 conclusion, it is agreed to also introduce 100MHz for band n97, and this will be added in the WID in RAN#93. So regarding adding 100MHz for the existing band(s), n40 may not be a particular case, using general wording is more forward compatible. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

If a general wording is used for introduced bit for 100MHz, to understand how the UE set this new bit for 100MHz, there are several cases can be considered which was provided by OPPO:

* Case 1: existing band mandatorily supporting 100MHz from Rel-15
* Case 2: band mandatorily supporting 100MHz from Rel-17 e.g. band n40 and optionally in previous releases i.e. Rel-15/Rel-16
* Case 3: band mandatorily supporting 100MHz from late release X we don’t know yet and optionally supporting in Rel-15~Rel-X-1

There are two ways of wording was given, and the moderator understands the one of the issue is how to handle the mandatory 100MHz for existing band before the TS 38.101-1 v17.2.0.

* *the fourth leftmost bit indicates 100MHz defined in clause 5.3.5 of TS 38.101-1 v17.2.0 and on*
* *the fourth leftmost bit indicates 100MHz defined in clause 5.3.5 of TS 38.101-1. UE shall set it to be 1 for this band from the release 100MHz bandwidth is mandatorily supported*

The following is UE and NW behaviour from moderator’s understanding:

1. For case 1, the legacy and new NW should always comprehend the existing band mandatorily supporting 100MHz based on TS 38.101-1 v17.2.0 (this logic has been implemented), since the NW cannot distinguish the UE not indicating support of 100MHz by new bit is the legacy UE (does not support new bit) or new UW (supports new bit but does not support 100MHz). Thus, no matter if the UE sets the new bit for 100MHz or not in case 1, there is no mismatch between NW and UE.
2. For case 2/3, the legacy NW cannot comprehend the new bit for 100MHz, the new NW checks the new bit for 100MHz to determine whether the UE supports 100MHz for “new introduced 100MHz” in TS 38.101-1 v17.2.0 and on.

Thus, it is moderator observation: it makes no difference for NW implementation and there is no mismatch between NW and UE no matter if the UE sets the new bit for 100MHz or not in case 1. This only influences the UE behaviour for capability reporting, i.e. whether the new UE needs to set the new bit for 100MHz for case 1.

So “*the fourth leftmost bit indicates 100MHz defined in clause 5.3.5 of TS 38.101-1 v17.2.0 and on*” may be easier. For 100MHz defined in before TS 38.101-1 v17.2.0 (mandatory), there is no signaling, both UE and NW would understand these are supported; For the 100MHz introduced from TS 38.101-1 v17.2.0, new bit for 100MHz should be used to determine whether the 100MHz is supported or not, no matter if the “new introduced 100MHz” is mandatory or optional.

For the case if the fifth bit becomes valid for another new bandwidth xxMHz, the fifth bit and the fourth bit are independent, and the NW only validates the fourth bit for the “new introduced 100MHz” from TS 38.101-1 v17.2.0, that is, there may be the case that the fifth bit is valid but the fourth bit is invalid, e.g. xxMHz is defined but 100MHz is not defined in TS 38.101-1, but this won’t lead to mis-alignment issue.

For how to reflect the 100MHz is mandatory, based on the above wording, it is clear that the fourth bit indicates 100MHz introduced from TS 38.101-1 v17.2.0, if the 100MHz is mandatory supported by later release UE, the UE should always report this new bit since the UE actually supports it. If companies prefer to explicitly capture it in the spec, “The fourth bit shall be set to 1” can be added in later release, e.g. in Rel-17 spec.

**Q3 Do companies agree to use “*the fourth leftmost bit indicates 100MHz defined in clause 5.3.5 of TS 38.101-1 v17.2.0 and on*”, or any comments to the wording?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Based on moderator observation, we understand easier way is consider the new bit for 100MHz only for “new introduced 100MHz” in TS 38.101-1 v17.2.0 and on, and no impacts on 100MHz defined before TS 38.101-1 v17.2.0.  For the issue of fifth bit, maybe a NOTE can be added, e.g. the network validates the fourth bit only for the 100MHz defined in clause 5.3.5 of TS 38.101-1 v17.2.0 and on. But not sure if this is necessary as it states that the fourth leftmost bit indicates **100MHz defined in clause 5.3.5 of TS 38.101-1 v17.2.0 and on**.  “*UE shall set it to be 1 for this band from the release*” is not preferred, as the release is not clear, is the RAN4 spec release or RAN2 spec release? If it is RAN4 spec release, it seems useless as the Rel-15/Rel-16 UE can implement bandwidth in Rel-17 RAN4 spec. If it is RAN2 spec, we understand this sentence can be added from the release that the signalling is considered to be mandatory to report from RAN2 spec perspective. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |