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# Introduction

The scope of this email discussion is to specify REFSENS and A-MPR requirements when introducing 50 MHz channel BWs in band n65.

The focus of the discussion should be on getting possible agreement on REFSENS values and A-MPR assumptions (1st round) and capturing agreements in w Way Forward (2nd round).

# Topic #1: 50 MHz CBW

*Main technical topic overview:* Addition of 50 MHz channel BWin band n65.

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2000089 | Qualcomm | **Proposal 1**: Use at least 5MHz protection region for B34 so upper channel BW is restricted to 2005MHz.**Proposal 2**: No AMPR requirement for B3 protection is FFS pending agreement on n65 filter rejection at B3 frequency to be at least 37dB.**Proposal 3**: Define n1 AMPR for B34 protection as shown in section 2.3 with B3 filter rejection assumption

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Channel Bandwidth, MHz | Carrier Center Frequency, Fc, MHz | Regions | A-MPR | Meas. A-MPR DFT/CP |
| RBend\*12\*SCSMHz | LCRB\*12\*SCSMHz |
| 50 MHz | Fc = 1945 |  |  |  |  |
| ≤ 9 | > 0 | A3 | 16.5 |
| > 9, < 37.8 | ≥ 9.0 | A4 | 8/9.5 |
| > 9, < 37.8 | < 9.0 | A5 | 4/5.5 |
| ≥ 37.8 | > 0 | A3 | 16.5 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 50 MHz | 1945 < FC ≤ 1980 |  |  |  |  |
| ≤ 18 | > 0 | A1 | 24/22 |
| > 18, < 27.0 | ≥ 0 | A2 | 12.5 |
| ≥ 27.0 | > 0 | A1 | 24/22 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Modulation/Waveform | A1 | A2 | A3 | A4 | A5 |
| Outer/Inner | Outer/Inner | Outer/Inner | Outer/Inner | Outer/Inner |
| DFT-s-OFDM PI/2 BPSK | 22 | 12.5 | 17 | 8 | 4 |
| DFT-s-OFDM QPSK | 22 | 12.5 | 17 | 8 | 4 |
| DFT-s-OFDM 16 QAM | 22 | 12.5 | 17 | 8 | 4 |
| DFT-s-OFDM 64 QAM | 22 | 12.5 | 17 | 8 | 4 |
| DFT-s-OFDM 256 QAM | 22 | 12.5 | 17 | 8 | 4 |
| CP-OFDM QPSK | 24 | 12.5 | 17 | 9.5 | 5.5 |
| CP-OFDM 16 QAM | 24 | 12.5 | 17 | 9.5 | 5.5 |
| CP-OFDM 64 QAM | 24 | 12.5 | 17 | 9.5 | 5.5 |
| CP-OFDM 256 QAM | 24 | 12.5 | 17 | 9.5 | 5.5 |

 |
| R4-2001210 | Ericsson | **Proposal: Approve the REFSENS values and RB allocation for 50MHz CBW as proposed in this contribution (Table 2 and Table 3).**

| Operating Band | SCS kHz | 50MHz(dBm) | Duplex Mode |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| n65 | 15 | **-79.3** | FDD |
| 30 | **-89.3** |
| 60 | **-89.4** |

 |
| R4-2001211 | Ericsson | **Proposal1: Add NS to protect band 33 and band 34, avoiding then any scheduling restriction, as it was already done for bands n1 and n38. A-MPR simulations should then be done based on below assumptions.****Proposal2: If confirmed by Japanese operators, NS\_05 (PHS service protection) will not be considered for 50MHz channel BW and corresponding A-MPR table would not be updated.** |

## Open issues summary

A-MPR assumptions and bands protection should be further discussed add agreed.

REFSENS values might be agreeable.

### Sub-topic 1-1

*Sub-topic description:* A-MPR -PHS protection.

**Issue 1-1: A-MPR - PHS protection**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: 50MHz CBW will not be regulated where PHS service exists, no need to udpate NS\_05 for 50MHz CBW.
* Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 1-2

*Sub-topic description:* A-MPR –5 MHz offset in the upper band.

**Issue 1-2: A-MPR – 5 MHz offset**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Use at least 5MHz protection region for B34 so upper channel BW is restricted to 2005MHz
* Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 1-3

*Sub-topic description:* A-MPR – Band 3 protection

**Issue 1-3: A-MPR – Band 3 protection**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: No AMPR requirement for B3 protection is FFS pending agreement on n65 filter rejection at B3 frequency to be at least 37dB.
* Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 1-4

*Sub-topic description:* A-MPR – Band 34 protection

**Issue 1-4: A-MPR – Band 34 protection**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: A-MPR values according to proposal 3 in R4-2000089
	+ Option 2: Protect Band 34 and Band 33 to avoid RB restriction.
* Recommended WF

### Sub-topic 1-5

*Sub-topic description:* REFSENS

**Issue 1-5: REFSENS**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: REFSENS values and RB allocation according to R4-2001210.
* Recommended WF

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm Inc. | Sub topic 1-5: 1. Regarding R4-2001210: The 15K SCS REFSENS is too high. There is no distortion to cause this REFSENS value. This is possibly a typo. Value should be -89.1dBm when scaled with BW at 15K SCS.
2. The UL configuration is ok.

Sub topic 1-2, 1-3, 1-4:1. Regarding R4-2001211: Finalizing requirements is mandatory before finalizing AMPR, which includes maximum carrier frequency location for 50MHz BW.

….Others: |
| Skyworks | Sub topic 1-5: About R4-2001210:1. Could there be a copy and paste typo in the UL RB configuration table 3? For n1 we discussed using 128RB, 64RB and 30RBs for SCS15,30 and 60kHz for 50MHz CBW.
2. Same comment for REFSENS. RB scaling would take REFSENS to -89.6 dBm at SCS 15kHz for 50MHz CBW.
 |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close-to-finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2000089 | [Skyworks]: 1. Observation 2: We agree this observation. We would like to suggest collecting more measurement data at next meeting on this item.
2. Proposal 3: is there a typo in “Define n1 AMPR for B34…” ?
 |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Sub-topic#1** | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
| #1 |  |  |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation**  |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation**  |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |