RAIL_900_1900MHz_BSRF_NWM - Version 0.0.6
RAN4

3GPP TSG-RAN WG4 Meeting # 101-e **R4-2120602**
Electronic Meeting, 01 – 12 November, 2021

Agenda item: 7.3.3, 7.4.3

Source: Moderator (Huawei)

Title: Email discussion summary for [101-e][314] RAIL_900_1900MHz_BSRF_NWM

Document for: Information

1 Introduction

This summary covers 7.3.3 and 7.4.3 agenda items for BS RF aspects of the RMR work items.

The following topics were identified:

1. General aspects
2. RF requirements for RMR900
3. RF requirements for RMR1900
4. TPs to Technical Reports

List of candidate target of email discussion for 1st round and 2nd round:

- 1st round: Aim to agree on the general aspects in Topic #1 (to allow progress on the RF requirements during the secong round), with the focus on EIRP-to-conductred conversion approach.
- 2nd round: TBA

2 Topic #1: General aspects

2.1 Companies' contributions summary

Table 1: Companies' contributions summary for general aspects

T-doc number	Company	Proposals / Observations

R4-2118164	Ericsson	RMR900: Proposal1: When relevant, convert EIRP limits from EC Decision(20)02 in conducted limits assuming a 17 dBi antenna gain.
R4-2118167	Ericsson	RMR1900: Proposal1: When relevant, convert EIRP limits from EC Decision(20)02 in conducted limits assuming a 18 dBi antenna gain.
R4-2119231	Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell	Summary of pros and cons for manufacturer declaration vs. fixed antenna gain.
R4-2119233	Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell	Summary of pros and cons for manufacturer declaration vs. fixed antenna gain.
R4-2119135	Huawei	RMR900: Proposal 1: RMR-specific RF requirement shall be considered as Regional requirements in TS 38.104.
R4-2119138	Huawei	RMR1900: Proposal 1: RMR-specific RF requirement shall be considered as Regional requirements in TS 38.104.
R4-2119136	Huawei	Proposal 1: in order to avoid risk of the ETSI Harmonized Standard progress blocking, it is proposed to proceed with the Option 2, i.e. fixed antenna gain approach for the EIRP-to-conducted requirements conversion. Proposal 2: It is assumed that the internal losses (feeder, etc.) are assumed to be 0 dB, for the purpose of requirements derivation. Proposal 3: based on Proposal 1, further discuss on the feasible antenna gain value for RMR 900, with the [17] dBi being the starting point.

R4-2119139	Huawei	Proposal 1: in order to avoid risk of the ETSI Harmonized Standard progress blocking, it is proposed to proceed with the Option 2, i.e. fixed antenna gain approach for the EIRP-to-conducted requirements conversion. Proposal 2: It is assumed that the internal losses (feeder, etc.) are assumed to be 0 dB, for the purpose of requirements derivation. Proposal 3: based on Proposal 1, further discuss on the feasible antenna gain value for RMR 1900, with the [18] dBi being the starting point.

2.2 Open issues summary

2.2.1 Sub-topic 1-1: EIRP-to-conducted requirements conversion

- Proposals
  - Option 1: Convert EIRP limits from EC Decision(20)02 into conducted limits assuming a fixed antenna gain (R4-2118164/67 Ericsson, R4-2119136/39 Huawei)
  - Option 2: Manufacturer declaration based approach
  - Option 3: Other
- Recommended WF
  - Double-check during the first round, whether Option 1 could be considered as a WF.

2.2.2 Sub-topic 1-2: Antenna gain value

- Proposals
  - Option 1:
    - RMR900: 17 dBi (R4-2118164, R4-2119231, R4-2119136 with [])
    - RMR1900: 18 dBi (R4-2118167, R4-2119233, R4-2119139 with [])
  - Option 2: Other
- Recommended WF
  - If the fixed value approach is selected in sub-topic 1-1, then follow Option 1.

2.2.3 Sub-topic 1-3: Internal losses

- Proposals
  - Option 1: It is assumed that the internal losses (feeder, etc.) are assumed to be 0 dB, for the purpose of requirements derivation (R4-2119136/39)
  - Option 2: Other.
- Recommended WF: Option 1

2.2.4 Sub-topic 1-4: Regional requirements

- Proposals
  - Option 1: RMR-specific RF requirement shall be considered as Regional requirements in TS 38.104 (R4-2119135, R4-2119138)
  - Option 2: Other
- Recommended WF
  - Continue discussion during the first round.

2.2.5 Sub-topic 1-5: Work-plan and work-split

- Proposals
  - Option 1: check with the RAN4 on the preferred handling of the WI during the remaining meetings before March 2022 (3 more RAN4 meetings beyond this one) (R4-2119136/39)
  - Option 2: Other
- Recommended WF
  - Collect feedback during the first round, and possibly arrange work-split during the second round.

2.3 Companies views' collection for 1st round

2.3.1 Open issues

Feedback Form 1: Feedback form for Topic#1: General aspects

1 – Nokia Germany

Sub-topic 1-1: option 1 has number of disadvantages as shown in R4-2119231. However, if majority prefers option 1, this option can be considered in the WF.

Sub-topic 1-2: option 1 is fine

Sub-topic 1-5: It is RAN discussion, there are 2 RAN4 meetings beyond this one until March.

2 – Ericsson Limited

Sub-topic 1-1: We prefer option 1. We could clearly mention if deployment is considering any other antenna gain, the limit could be adapted accordingly.

Sub-topic 1-2: option 1 to align with CEPT assumptions/reports.

Sub-topic 1-3: option 1 is ok.

Sub-topic 1-4: not sure why we would need this, but we could further discuss when drafting the specs on each specific cases.

Sub-topic 1-5: We could share the drafting work (TPs to TR + CRs) in between interesting companies (I guess it would be Nokia, Huawei, Ericsson and possibly UIC? then).

3 – Huawei Technologies Sweden AB

Sub-topic 1-1: We prefer option 1, being aware of its pros and cons.

Sub-topic 1-2: option 1

Sub-topic 1-3: option 1

Sub-topic 1-4: option 1 is preferred. We are fine to look into this case by case during the requirement's drafting.

Sub-topic 1-5: there was typo in the Option 1 text - there are clearly 2 more meetings left beyond RAN4#101-e. Lets try to arrange worksplit among interested companies during the 2nd round (two TRs, one TS; Rx/Tx requirements, with the general parts assumed to be handeled in the Main session).

2.4 Summary for 1st round

2.4.1 Open issues

Table 2:

	Status summary
Sub-topic 1-1: EIRP-to-conduced conversion	Candidate options: Option 1: Convert EIRP limits from EC Decision(20)02 into conducted limits assuming a fixed antenna gain (R4-2118164/67 Ericsson, R4-2119136/39 Huawei) **Recommendations for 2nd round: Option 1** Sub-topic to be closed.

Sub-topic 1-2: Antenna gain value	Candidate options: Option 1: – RMR900: 17 dBi (R4-2118164, R4-2119231, R4-2119136 with []) – RMR1900: 18 dBi (R4-2118167, R4-2119233, R4-2119139 with []) **Recommendations for 2nd round: Option 1** Sub-topic to be closed.
Sub-topic 1-3: Internal losses	Candidate options: Option 1: It is assumed that the internal losses (feeder, etc.) are assumed to be 0 dB, for the purpose of requirements derivation (R4-2119136/39) **Recommendations for 2nd round: Option 1** Sub-topic to be closed.
Sub-topic 1-4: Regional requirements	Candidate options: Option 1: RMR-specific RF requirement shall be considered as Regional requirements in TS 38.104 (R4-2119135, R4-2119138) **Recommendations for 2nd round: it was agreed to consider the need to define RMR-specific reuqirements as regional during the specification drafting.** Sub-topic to be closed.
Sub-topic 1-5: Work-plan, work-split	**Recommendations for 2nd round:** No need for further discussion on the work-plan and RAN4 calendar. **Arrange the worksplit for the TS/TR drafting during the second round. Moderator to share the template for the interested companies to fill.**

2.5 Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

3 Topic #2: RF requirements for RMR 900

3.1 Companies' contributions summary

Table 3: Companies' contributions summary for for Topic #2: RF requirements for RMR900

T-doc number	Company	Proposals / Observations

R4-2118164	Ericsson	Proposal2: Capture in TS 38.104 that for BS operating in [900MHz RMR band], for uncoordinated deployment, the BS rated output power Prated,c,AC shall not exceed: 47.5dBm/5MHz + (fDL-922.1) x 40/3 dB (considering a 17 dBi antenna gain, and with fDL being the centre frequency in MHz). Proposal3: Capture the following OBUE category B option 2 requirement for band [900MHz RMR] in TS 38.104: Proposal4: Capture the following additional requirement (most likely as an additional spurious limit) for band [900 MHz RMR] in TS 38.104: Proposal5: Capture the following additional BS blocking requirement for band [900 MHz RMR] in TS 38.104 and further study the interferer's characteristics.

R4-2119136	Huawei	**Proposal 4**: agree the following way to specify the maximum rated power limit for RMR BS: RMR900: (64.5 – $G_{antRMR900}$) dBm / 5 MHz + (f_{DL}-922.1) x 40/3 dB where $G_{antRMR900}$ is the antenna gain of the RMR BS. Referring to the discussion on section 2.1, the $G_{antRMR900}$ could be either of the options: manufacturer declared value, or fixed value. **Proposal 5**: agree the following way to specify the OBUE requirement for RMR900. **Observation**: -49dBm limit seems to be reused by ECC from the already existing requirements for other bands, e.g. band n8. **Observation**: as ECC limit was specified as "EIRP limit" and we need to define conducted requirement in RAN4, it requires further clarification whether there is need for the limit conversion at all, or ECC intention was to follow the already existing protection levels. **Observation**: the measurement bandwidth in case of -49dBm limits in RAN4 spec is specified as 1MHz. It requires further clarification if ECC intention was to specify RMR limit with 5MHz measurement bandwidth, or the "-49dBm/5MHz" only refers to the channel bandwidth.
R4-2119135	Huawei	Additional requirements (regional): For RMR900 operation in Europe, the sum of Prated,c,AC over all antenna connectors for BS type 1-C shall be equal to or less than the following limit per 5 MHz: (64.5 – GantRMR900) dBm / 5 MHz + (Ffilter -922.1) x 40/3 dB , where Ffilter is the centre frequency in MHz.

3.2 Open issues summary

3.2.1 Sub-topic 2-1: BS maximum output power

- Proposals
  - Option 1: Capture in TS 38.104 that for BS operating in [900MHz RMR band], for uncoordinated deployment, the BS rated output power Prated,c,AC shall not exceed: 47.5dBm/5MHz + (fDL-922.1) x 40/3 dB (considering a 17 dBi antenna gain, and with fDL being the centre frequency in MHz). (R4-2118164)
  - Option 2: Base station output power (R4-2119135) defined as:

For RMR900 operation in Europe, the sum of Prated,c,AC over all antenna connectors for BS type 1-C shall be equal to or less than the following limit per 5 MHz:

(64.5 – $G_{antRMR900}$) dBm / 5 MHz + (Ffilter -922.1) x 40/3 dB, where Ffilter is the centre frequency in MHz.

Recommended WF:

- Aim for alignments among the two options listed, as the final limit itself is the same in both.
- Decide whether to use parametrized approach (using GantRMR1900), or just the final limit value Possibly the former in TR, and the latter in TS. Align the approach with 2-2.

3.2.2 Sub-topic 2-2: OBUE

- Proposals
  - Option 1: Capture the following OBUE category B option 2 requirement for band [900MHz RMR] in TS 38.104 (R4-2118164)
  - Option 2: agree the following way to specify the OBUE requirement for RMR900: (R4-2119136)

Table 4:

Frequency offset of measurement filter □3dB point, Df	Frequency offset of measurement filter centre frequency, f_offset	*Basic limits* (dBm)	*Measurement bandwidth*
0 MHz £ Df < 0.2 MHz	0.1 MHz £ f_offset < 0.3 MHz	32.5 - $G_{antRMR900}$	200 kHz

0.2 MHz £ Df < 1 MHz	0.6MHz £ f_offset < 1.4 MHz	14 - $G_{antRMR900}$	800 kHz
1 MHz £ Df £ 10 MHz	1.5 MHz £ f_offset < 10.5	5 - $G_{antRMR900}$	1 MHz

where $G_{antRMR900}$ is the antenna gain of the RMR BS. $G_{antRMR900}$ could be either of the options:

- manufacturer declared value, or
- fixed value.

- Recommended WF
  - Aim for alignments among the two options listed, as the final limit itself is the same in both.
  - Decide whether to use parametrized approach (using GantRMR1900), or just the final limit value. Possibly the former in TR, and the latter in TS.Align the approach with 2-1.

3.2.3 Sub-topic 2-3: TX: spurious emissions

- Proposals
  - Option 1: Capture the following additional requirement (most likely as an additional spurious limit) for band [900 MHz RMR] in TS 38.104 (R4-2118164)
  - Option 2: First, conclude on the observations from in R4-2119136:
    - Observation: -49dBm limit seems to be reused by ECC from the already existing requirements for other bands, e.g. band n8.
    - Observation: as ECC limit was specified as “EIRP limit” and we need to define conducted requirement in RAN4, it requires further clarification whether there is need for the limit conversion at all, or ECC intention was to follow the already existing protection levels.
    - Observation: the measurement bandwidth in case of -49dBm limits in RAN4 spec is specified as 1MHz. It requires further clarification if ECC intention was to specify RMR limit with 5MHz measurement bandwidth, or the “-49dBm/5MHz” only refers to the channel bandwidth.
- Recommended WF
    - Further discuss if Option 1 can be used as baseline, subject to further clarifications on observations in R4-2119136 (listed in Option 2).

3.2.4 Sub-topic 2-4: RX: blocking

- Proposals
  - Option 1: Capture the following additional BS blocking requirement for band [900 MHz RMR] in TS 38.104 and further study the interferer's characteristics (R4-2118164)
  - Option 2: Other
- Recommended WF
  - Collect feedback during the first round.

3.3 Companies views' collection for 1st round

3.3.1 Open issues

Feedback Form 2: Feedback form for Topic#2: RF requirements for RMR900

1 – Nokia Germany Sub-topic 2-1: option 1 Sub-topic 2-2: option 1 but it should be confirmed if all limits are necessary since they may be automatically met with Cat B OBUE Sub-topic 2-3: option 1 Sub-topic 2-4: not clear why type and the center frequency of interfering signal (it is clear from ECC Decision (20)02) is not listed in the table ?
2 – Ericsson Limited Sub-topic 2-1: option 1 to align with above sub-topic 1-1 Sub-topic 2-2: option 1 Sub-topic 2-3: option 1, not sure what's the intention with option 2? To contact CEPT? Sub-topic 2-4: option 1. Well, it's not crystal clear what interferer should be considered in ECC Decision(20)02, see table 7 - note 1, where it's left up to ETSI to define this interferer. That would need further discussion in RAN4 then.
3 – Huawei Technologies Sweden AB Sub-topic 2-1: option 2 (even if both options end up with the same limit). We still have some concerns on the coordinated/uncoordinated issue - we hope to bring more analyses next meeting. Sub-topic 2-2: option 2 (even if both options end up with the same limit) Sub-topic 2-3: we have concerns with jumping into Option 1 already. It is felt, that EIRP limit from ECC was actually based on the -49dBm ocnducted limit, i.e. we may not need to complicate this particular requirement with the antenna gain assumptions. it is proposed to have more time to check ECC reports for possible background information.

Sub-topic 2-4: same concerns as Nokia. We prefer to have more discussion on this requirement, this or next meeting. Maybe we can already have tentative agreement as aspects which are non-controversial based on ECC20(02).

3.4 Summary for 1st round

3.4.1 Open issues

Table 5:

	Summary status
Sub-topic 2-1: BS maximum output power	Candidate options: There were two options resulting in the same limits (assuming sub-topic 1-1 agreed as Option1), but varying in the limit derivation approach (direct, or parametrized). **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Based on the feedback it is proposed to take Option 1 as beseline, with small adjustments ([] for uncoordinated deployment, band number fixed): Capture in TS 38.104 that for BS operating in band n100, [for uncoordinated deployment], the BS rated output power Prated,c,AC shall not exceed: 47.5dBm/5MHz + (fDL-922.1) x 40/3 dB Sub-topic to be closed.
Sub-topic 2-2: OBUE	Candidate options: There were two options resulting in the same limits (assuming sub-topic 1-1 agreed as Option1), but varying in the limit derivation approach (direct, or parametrized). **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Option 1 as baseline. For the next meeting verify whether the RMR-specific limits are necessary, since they may be automatically met with Cat B OBUE. Sub-topic to be closed.
Sub-topic 2-3: Tx spurious emissions	Candidate options: Option 1 proposing the final limit. **Recommendations for 2nd round:** The final limit for the additional Tx spur limit based on ECC decision is agreeable as the baseline (i.e. -66dBm/5MHz). However for possible requirement simplification: for the next meeting verify limit's derivation approach in ECC, i.e. whether the fixed antenna approach is needed, or the -49dBm limit can be directly reused for the conducted requiement. Sub-topic to be closed.

Sub-topic 2-4: RX blocking	Candidate options: Option 1 proposed incomplete requirement based in ECC decision. **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Option 1 agreed as baseline. For the next meeting provide more analysis on the interfering signal. Sub-topic to be closed.

3.5 Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

4 Topic #3: RF requirements for RMR 1900

4.1 Companies' contributions summary

Table 6: Companies' contributions summary for for Topic #3: RF requirements for RMR1900

T-doc number	Company	Proposals / Observations
R4-2118167	Ericsson	Proposal3: Capture in TS 38.104 that for BS operating in [1900MHz RMR band], for uncoordinated deployment, the BS rated output power Prated,c,AC shall not exceed 47 dBm/10MHz (considering a 18 dBi antenna gain). Proposal4: Capture the following additional requirement (most likely as an additional spurious limit) for band [1900 MHz RMR] in TS 38.104 Proposal5: Capture the following additional BS blocking requirement for band [1900 MHz RMR] in TS 38.104.
R4-2119233	Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell	Summary of pros and cons for manufacturer declaration vs. fixed antenna gain.

R4-2119138	Huawei	Additional requirements (regional): For RMR1900 operation in Europe, the sum of Prated,c,AC over all antenna connectors for BS type 1-C shall be equal to or less than (65 - GantRMR1900) dBm per 10 MHz.
R4-2119139	Huawei	**Proposal 4**: agree the following way to specify the maximum rated power limit for RMR BS: RMR1900: (65 - $G_{antRMR1900}$) dBm / 10MHz where $G_{antRMR1900}$ is the antenna gain of the RMR BS. **Observation**: -49dBm limit seems to be reused by ECC from the already existing requirements for other bands, e.g. band n1. **Observation**: as ECC limit was specified as "EIRP limit" and we need to define conducted requirement in RAN4, it requires further clarification whether there is need for the limit conversion at all, or ECC intention was to follow the already existing protection levels. **Observation**: the measurement bandwidth in case of -49dBm limits in RAN4 spec is specified as 1MHz. It requires further clarification if ECC intention was to specify RMR limit with 5MHz measurement bandwidth, or the "-49dBm/5MHz" only refers to the channel bandwidth.

4.2 Open issues summary

4.2.1 Sub-topic 3-1: BS maximum output power

- Proposals
  - Option 1: Capture in TS 38.104 that for BS operating in [1900MHz RMR band], for uncoordinated deployment, the BS rated output power Prated,c,AC shall not exceed 47 dBm/10MHz (considering a 18 dBi antenna gain). (R4-2118167)
  - Option 2: Base station output power (R4-2119138) defined as:
    For RMR1900 operation in Europe, the sum of Prated,c,AC over all antenna connectors for BS type 1-C shall be equal to or less than (65 - GantRMR1900) dBm per 10 MHz.

- Recommended WF
  - Aim for alignments among the two options listed, as the final limit itself is the same in both.
  - Decide whether to use parametrized approach (using GantRMR1900), or just the final limit value.

4.2.2 Sub-topic 3-2: TX: spurious emissions

- Proposals
  - Option 1: Capture the following additional requirement (most likely as an additional spurious limit) for band [1900 MHz RMR] in TS 38.104 (R4-2118167)
  - Option 2: First, conclude on the observations from in R4-2119139:
    - Observation: -49dBm limit seems to be reused by ECC from the already existing requirements for other bands, e.g. band n1.
    - Observation: as ECC limit was specified as "EIRP limit" and we need to define conducted requirement in RAN4, it requires further clarification whether there is need for the limit conversion at all, or ECC intention was to follow the already existing protection levels.
    - Observation: the measurement bandwidth in case of -49dBm limits in RAN4 spec is specified as 1MHz. It requires further clarification if ECC intention was to specify RMR limit with 5MHz measurement bandwidth, or the "-49dBm/5MHz" only refers to the channel bandwidth.
- Recommended WF
  - Further discuss if Option 1 can be used as baseline, subject to further clarifications on observations in R4-2119139 (listed in Option 2).

4.2.3 Sub-topic 3-3: RX: blocking

- Proposals
  - Option 1: Capture the following additional BS blocking requirement for band [1900 MHz RMR] in TS 38.104 (R4-2118167)
  - Option 2: Other
- Recommended WF
  - Collect feedback during the first round.

4.3 Companies views' collection for 1st round

4.3.1 Open issues

Feedback Form 3: Feedback form for Topic#2: RF requirements for RMR1900

1 – Nokia Germany Sub-topic 3-1: option 1 Sub-topic 3-2: option 1, ECC EIRP requirement is -43dBm/5MHz Sub-topic 3-4: option 1, type of the interfering signal requires further discussion
2 – Ericsson Limited Sub-topic 3-1: option 1. Sub-topic 3-3: option 1. Again, we are not sure what's the intention with option 2? To contact CEPT? Sub-topic 3-3: option 1
3 – Huawei Technologies Sweden AB Sub-topic 3-1: option 2 (even if both options end up with the same limit). We still have some concerns on the coordinated/uncoordinated issue - we hope to bring more analyses next meeting. Sub-topic 3-2: Option 2 was to verify if we can avoid using the antanna assumption here (we suspect that we can directly reuse the -49dBm limit, but more technical verification on the RMR discussions in ECC is needed based on their technical reports). Sub-topic 3-3: the Note can be tuned as only NR needs to be addressed, or?

4.4 Summary for 1st round

4.4.1 Open issues

Table 7:

	Summary status
Sub-topic 3-1: BS maximum output power	Candidate options: There were two options resulting in the same limits (assuming sub-topic 1-1 agreed as Option1), but varying in the limit derivation approach (direct, or parametrized). **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Based on the feedback it is proposed to take Option 1 as beseline, with small adjustments ([] for uncoordinated deployment, band number fixed): Capture in TS 38.104 that for BS operating in n101 band, [for uncoordinated deployment], the BS rated output power Prated,c,AC shall not exceed 47 dBm/10MHz Sub-topic to be closed.

Sub-topic 3-2: Tx spurious emissions	Candidate options: Option 1 proposing the final limit. **Recommendations for 2nd round:** The final limit for the additional Tx spur limit based on ECC decision is agreeable as the baseline (i.e. -61dBm/5MHz). Sub-topic to be closed.
Sub-topic 3-3: RX blocking	Candidate options: Option 1 proposed incomplete requirement based in ECC decision. **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Option 1 agreed as baseline. For the next meeting provide more analysis on the interfering signal. Sub-topic to be closed.

4.5 Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

5 Topic #4: TPs to Technical Reports

5.1 Companies' contributions summary

Table 8: Companies' contributions summary for Topic #4: TPs to Technical Reports

T-doc number	Company	Proposals / Observations
R4-2119137	Huawei	TPs to TR 38.853: BS RF related agreements for RMR900, based on WF agreements from previous meetings.
R4-2119140	Huawei	TPs to TR 38.852: BS RF related agreements for RMR1900, based on WF agreements from previous meetings.

5.2 Open issues summary

5.3 Companies views' collection for 1st round

5.3.1 CRs/TPs comments collection

Feedback Form 4: Feedback form for Topic#4: TPs to Technical Reports

1 – Nokia Germany Band numbers have been already agreed for these bands, also some TPs were also agreed in the last meeting (system parameters) so documents are not based on the latest version.
2 – Ericsson Limited Following comments are applicable to both TPs: The note on high speed train is not needed. The TP to TR adds reference to its own TR... e.g. TP to TR 38.853 is adding a reference to TR 38.853! We have TP to address section 4, the proposed sentence is not needed. There is reference to 1900MHz band in the TR for 900MHz... The list of impacted specs in 7.1.0 is not needed.
3 – Huawei Technologies Sweden AB Based on the above comments there are some issues to fix. We suggest to use those (revised?) TPs as placeholders to capture agreements from this meeting already (and avoid WF document(s)). For next meeting, work-split to also account for the two TRs.

5.4 Summary for 1st round

5.4.1 CRs/TPs

Table 9:

CR/TP number	CRs/TPs Status update recommendation
R4-2119137	To be Revised Address all the comments; add agreements from this meeting.
R4-2119140	To be Revised Address all the comments; add agreements from this meeting.

5.5 Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

6 Recommendations for Tdocs

6.1 1st round

Existing tdocs:

Table 10:

tdoc number	Title	Source	Recommendation
R4-2119138	Consideration of RMR1900-specific requirements as regional requirements	Huawei	Noted
R4-2119135	Consideration of RMR900-specific requirements as regional requirements	Huawei	Noted
R4-2119139	Further discussion on the BS RF requirements for RMR1900	Huawei	Noted
R4-2119133	On 1900MHz RMR RAN4 BS RF requirements impact due to ECC Decision (20)	Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell	Noted
R4-2119131	On 900MHz RMR RAN4 BS RF requirements impact due to ECC Decision (20)	Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell	Noted
R4-2118167	RMR 1900 MHz - BS RF	Ericsson	Noted
R4-2118164	RMR 900 MHz - BS RF	Ericsson	Noted
R4-2119136	Further discussion on the BS RF requirements for RMR900	Huawei	Noted
R4-2119140	TPs to TR 38.852: BS RF related agreements for RMR1900	Huawei	Revised
R4-2119137	TPs to TR 38.853: BS RF related agreements for RMR900	Huawei	Revised

2nd round

7 Annex

Note:

Please add your contact information in above table once you make comments on this email thread.If multiple delegates from the same company make comments on single email thread, please add you name as suffix after company name when make comments i.e. Company A (XX, XX)

Feedback Form 5: Contact information

1 – Nokia Germany iwajlo.angelow@nokia.com
2 – Ericsson Limited dominique.everaere@ericsson.com
3 – Huawei Technologies Sweden AB michal.szydelko@huawei.com