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# Introduction

IAB Requirements have been discussed for a few meetings but very few agreements have been reached. The requirements for IAB-DU are somewhat simpler to manage as they will mostly re-use the BS requirements in 38.104. The IAB-MT requirements are more complex/controversial as the IAB-MT is mostly behaving like a UE but it is a network node.

The most important topic for which progress is of most importance is the definition of IAB-MT classes as this influences the definition of many other requirements that are class dependent.

This e-mail discussion will target all IAB Tx requirements with an emphasis on IAB-MT Tx requirements since these are more complicated.

List of topics for the 1st round of discussion are:

* 1st round:
  + Definition of IAB-MT classes
  + IAB-MT Tx Power
  + IAB Tx Signal Quality
  + IAB-MT Beam Correspondence
  + IAB-MT Rx-Tx Switching time
  + IAB-MT Unwanted Emissions
  + Other IAB-DU Tx Requirements
* 2nd round:
  + IAB MT class definition
  + IAB-MT Tx power requirements
  + IAB Tx signal quality
  + IAB-MT beam correspondence
  + Other IAB-DU Tx requirements

# Topic #1: Definition of IAB-MT classes

Definition of IAB-MT classes has been discused for a few meetings. It is not yet decided whether multiple classes would be defined and what would be the differentiator.

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2001868 | Ericsson | **Proposal-1: Only study the IAB MT and IAB DU belong to the same class scenario.**  **Proposal-2: Assume that wide area and medium range IABs are planned and local area IABs are unplanned.** |
| R4-2001283 | Qualcomm | **Proposal 1: differentiate IAB-MT classes only based on dynamic range. Maximum or minimum power limits will not be introduced for IAB-MT**  **Proposal 2: define IAB-MT class 1 targeting planned deployment scenarios and characterized by a transmitter dynamic range of 20dB**  **Proposal 3: define IAB-MT class 2 targeting unplanned deployment scenarios and characterized by a transmitter dynamic range of 30dB** |
| R4-2001709 | Huawei | **Observation 1:** The BS “class” terminology (wide area, medium range, local area) is more suitable than the UE numbering system as it relevant to the IAB node deployment.  **Observation 2:** EIRP may be a better figure to specify for IAB-MT as an upper power limit with as it does not require an antenna gain limit  **Observation 3:** a simple link budget using Uma LOS PL2 indicates a macro power of 57dBm EIRP and a micro power of 47dBm EIRP is needed.  **Implied proposals:**  For IAB\_MT type 2-O, IAB-MT classes are defined as indicated below:  - Wide Area IAB-MT nodes are characterised by requirements derived from Macro Cell scenarios with a IAB-DU to IAB-MT minimum distance along the ground equal to [113] m.  - Medium Range IAB-MT nodes are characterised by requirements derived from Micro Cell scenarios with a IAB-DU to IAB-MT minimum distance along the ground equal to [20] m.  - [Local Area IAB-MT nodes are characterised by requirements derived from Micro Cell scenarios with a IAB-DU to IAB-MT minimum distance along the ground equal to 2 m.]  It’s clear that these numbers are suitable for the scenarios studied so far in the IAB WI but should not be finalised before there is the opportunity to add additional scenarios.  Using these definitions reasonable max power levels would be:  Wide area maximum EIRP - no limit (although we have been assuming 57dBm)  Medium range maximum EIRP ≤ 47dBm  Local area maximum EIRP ≤ FFS (not yet studied is it needed?) |
| R4-2001436 | Nokia | **Proposal 3: No output power based classes or categories shall be defined for IAB-MT.**  **Proposal 4: IAB-MT and IAB-DU radiated power capabilities shall be declared independent of each other. Same applies for output power.** |
| R4-2000276 | Samsung | **Proposal: Define 2 IAB-MT classes as below:**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **IAB-MT power class** | **TRP upper limit** | | I(higher power capability) | No upper limit | | II(lower power capability) | <30dBm | |

## Open issues summary

Introduction of one or multiple classes and what would the differentiator be. Most companies are proposing to define multiple classes(2 or 3) with differentiation based on Tx power, dynamic range or distance from the parent.

### Sub-topic 1-1

Introduction of multiple classes:

**Issue 1: Introduction of MT classes**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Do not introduce any class
  + Option 2: Introduce 2 classes
  + Option 3: Introduce 3 classes
* Recommended WF
  + Introduce 2 classes

### Sub-topic 1-2

How to differentiate between classes:

**Issue 1: What is the MT class differentiator**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Distance from donor node (minimum/maximum)
  + Option 2: Power dynamic range
  + Option 3: Max Tx power(TRP or EIRP)
  + Opion 4: Min distance to other operator
  + Option 5: planned or unplanned
* Recommended WF
  + Differentiate classes based on minimum distance from donor node

### Sub-topic 1-3

Which requirements would be class dependent should also be discussed:

**Issue 1: Which requirements would be class dependent if 2 classes are defined**

* Proposals – multiple options can be introduced at the same time
  + Option 1: Max Tx power(it is possible not to have max Tx power for at least one class
  + Option 2: Dynamic range
  + Option 3: ACLR and/or ACS?
  + Option 4: other requirements?
* Recommended WF

Option 1 and 2 – different distances will imply different deployment scenarios and different power needs.

### Sub-topic 1-4

Under the assumption that multiple classes are defined, should there be a 1-1 matching between the MT class and the DU class or not? It is assume that the DU will follow the BS classes currently defined.

**Issue 1: Should MT classes and DU classes have a 1-1 matching or is any combination allowed?**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Yes, any combination is allowed.
  + Option 2: No, IAB-MT and IAB-DU classes should have a 1-1 matching.
* Recommended WF

Option 1 – will allow for more flexibility to address different deployment scenarios.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Sub topic 1-1: the recommended WF is reasonable to have different MT class. In previous discussion, different deployment scenarios and use cases are considered. With 2 MT class as starting point for IAB it would ensure the implementation flexibility but avoid immoderate effort on standardization.  Sub topic 1-2/1-3: The more important aspect is how to define the criteria of MT class. For BS side the BS class is based on MCL or minimum distance between BS and UE which reflects the deployment scenario to some extent. However, for UE it is based on power class .It seems distance between donor gNB(parent IAB) and child IAB would be more generic principle to differentiate MT class. However, for case IAB we should be cautious to make the decision. Whether this definition would have restriction on the deployment and implementation flexibility? What’s the impact on other requirements? If maximum distance is considered, at least output power and ACLR may be impacted. But if minimum distance is considered, at least TX dynamic range and ACLR would be impacted. The MT class discussion would also have impact on REFSENS, which may implicitly impact RX requirements of which parameters mounted on REFSENS.  Sub topic 1-4: support option 1. |
| Ericsson | Sub topic 1-1: Option 3 is preferred, Option 2 is also ok if time is constrained in R16, the question is which are these two classes? Wide area IAB and local area IAB?  Sub topic 1-2: The main class differentiator is the deployment scenario, from different deployment scenario, then other RF parameter will differ.  From this aspect, we think option 1, 4 and 5 are important differentiator. Options 2 and 3 are not definitions of the deployment scenario and so should not define the class; they rather relate to the implications that the class has on requirements.  Sub topic 1-3: as there are multiple options which could be applied, so we think it is better to leave it to further discussion once the IAB different classes are agreed.  Sub topic 1-4: As we only see the same power of IAB MT and IAB DU in the coexisting simulation assumption, so in R16, only same class MT and DU will be specified. From RF requirement perspective, it is also this scenario that drive the RF req constrains and requirement. So for R16, only option 2 should be considered in the spec. For other combination, they are not in R16 IAB scope. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Sub-topic 1-1: One possible option is to limit rel-16 work to cover only the macro deployments to streamline the completion of rel-16. In case different classes are needed, the number should be limited to maximum two. One should correspond to a macro deployment with longer link distance for which no RRM requirements are defined according to the WF in RAN#86. A second class should apply to other deployments.  Sub-topic 1-2: As the two classes would be based on deployment scenario the most straightforward way is to differentiate them according to distance to donor node. However, this does not mean only difference between requirements is the distance.  Sub-topic 1-3: In case two classes are defined, most likely power control requirements need to be such that they enable more flexibility for the non-macro deployments, i.e. non-macro class. Similar to BS type 2-O, a more stringent absolute ACLR requirement could be set for other than macro deployments to ensure that while transmission happens at lower power levels the emissions are correspondingly lower.  Sub-topic 1-4: Any combination shall be allowed. |
| ZTE | Sub topic 1-1: support to introduce 3 power class, WA, MR, LA as from maximum transimission power perspective, IAB DU and MT should have the same capability. FFS is how to define the maximum EIRP for each power class, as there are no IAB DU power limits definition specified for FR2 NR, therefore the the specific power limit could be FFS.  Sub topic 1-2: combination of option 1 and option 3,   1. First of all, power class with specific power level are definitely necessary as IAB MT should report it to its parent IAB DU via capability report for scheduling, otherwise parent IAB has no idea on actual tranmission power of its child node and remaing power it could transmit. 2. Mini distance between IAB DU and MT. In the past, MCL or mini distance between BS and UE is based on the practical deployement scenario instead of requirements or performance, indeed this is coming from UTRA spec and reuse it for E-UTRA and NR spec, Based on the MCL or mini distance between BS and UE, then we define the relative requirements ,e.g. UE maximum input power for FR1 [45dBm{BS transmission power}-70{MCL}=-25dBm], high boundary of RSRP report table as far as I can remember, however the logic for IAB MT has been reversed, as we agree not to define maximum input power for IAB MT in the last Reno meeting, meanwhile IAB MT maximum input power are expected to not exceed its IBB power levels otherwise it will exceed its RX dynamic range requirement [Note IBB is mainly used to specify the RX dynamic range requirement if no maximum input power is defined], therefore we should use the IAB DU maximum allowed transmission power for each deployment scenario and its child IAB MT IBB requirement to derive the mini distance or MCL.   In short, powe class for IAB MT should be specified for network uplink scheduling and it’s better for IAB MT to follow the IAB DU power limits, but the problem is that no power limits for FR2 are defined; Indeed this requirement should be based on the excessive SLS on co-channel interference analysis to avoid lower BS class creating high interference to higher BS class from system level, that’s also why for MR, LA, Home eNB power limits are defined in the 3G and 4G.  New mini distance for parent IAB DU and child IAB MT should be specified for its RX capability as we defined its requirement firstly instead of based on the practical deployment, I think it’s also reasonable to have such assumption as mini distance between IAB DU and MT can be carefully planned insteaof randomly dropped like legacy mobile UE.  Examples are shown as following:  IAB MT class 1: {power class 1and mini distance 1 between IAB DU and MT}  IAB MT class 2: {power class 2 and mini distance 2 between IAB DU and MT}  IAB MT class 3: {power class 3 and mini distance 3 between IAB DU and MT}  Note: IAB MT mini distance should be moved to IAB DU class definition where mini distance between parent IAB DU and child IAB MT are added together with mini distance between IAB DU and legacy UE.  Sub topic 1-3: support only option 1 as ACLR/ACS or TX dynamic range requirement are defined independently with BS class, therefore we think option 1 is reasonable option.  Sub topic 1-4: support option 1 and IAB MT power class should follow IAB DU power class considering its practical capability. In addition, IAB MT will not cause more interference as IAB DU as power control might be enabled to remove its actual transmission power. |
| Huawei | Sub-topic 1-1: the number of classes is perhaps not important as more can always be added as necessary – based on scenarios we have looked at wide area and medium range (macro and micro) so it would make sense to introduce these. But of course local can be added later if needed.  Sub-topic 1-2: Distance seems to be the obvious differentiator. The max power may also be limited based on declared class as well as other requirements (min power/power control range for example).  Sub-topic 1-3: The original goal of the classes was to limit the max power and also the min power/dynamic range based on deployment – so recommended WF seems reasonable – but of course other parameters should not be excluded until we have studied them. Some receiver parameters (blocking) are dependent on class these need discussing at least.  Sub-topic 1-4: Scenario 1 we simulated was a mixture of macro IAB-DU and micro IAB-MT ? so it seems an important scenario. Recommended WF seems reasonable. |
| Qualcomm | Sub topic 1-1: we support having 2 classes to try to address a macro like scenario in which the IAB node is further away from the parent, most likely with LOS, has higher power and higher antenna gain. The 2nd class would be more of a micro-femto like scenario in which the IAB node is closer to the parent and could also be NLOS. These 2 classes are also close to what has been simulated in the co-existence study  Sub topic 1-2: Distance is the simplest differentiator to use in the specifications. Even using other differentiators(power or dynamic range) would end up in a distance differentiator because the deployment scenarios would be different and some of the requirements would end up being different as well.  Sub topic 1-3: If the definition of classes is based on distance and different deployment scenarios are targeted, the Tx power and dynamic range will be different. In a heterogeneous like scenario, a larger dynamic range is needed. This discussion could also be take later after the class definition is settled, however, there could be some dependencies between the definitions  Sub topic 1-4: support option 1 of allowing any combination, there is no need to introduce limitations considering the nodes are deployed by operators so it is very unlikely that there would be a big mismatch causing degradation in system performance. |

### 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** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| 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#1-1** | Companies agree to define different MT classes with the majority agreeing to having 2 classes while two companies prefer to have 3 classes. Considering that classes can be added later, it seems we could agree to defining 2 classes to start with and then keep the option of adding a 3rd class if the need is identified. The need could come from the definition of other requirements(ACLR, Tx power, dynamic range, also).  *Tentative agreements:* Define 2 MT classes, more classes can be added later depending on identified needs  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Agree the proposed WF above to have 2 MT classes as a starting point for Rel.16 and keep the option to add more classes in the future |
| **Sub-topic#1-2** | Companies agree to differentiate MT classes based on distance from the donor node as a starting point. There were several comments regarding the use of maximum power, maximum power can be defined separately for each class based on the identified deployment. UEs are differentiate based on power class because they are mobile so it would be impossible to differentiate them based on distance to a fixed point. Two classes could be defined to address a macro like scenario and a micro like scenario.  *Tentative agreements:* Define 2 MT classes based on at least distance from donor node. One class would be addressing the marco like scenario(larger distance from donor, higher power, likely LOS to donor) and another class to address the micro like scenario(smaller distance to donor, lower power, could also be NLOS to donor).  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Agree to define 2 MT classes based on distance from donor node.   Discuss how to decide on the distance to donor node. There were a few proposals made already, macro MT with a minimum distance of [100] meters, and micro with a distance of less than [100] meters, greater than [X] meters |
| **Sub-topic#1-3** | Companies expressed different opinions from not agreeing to anything(more discussion is needed) to agreeing to define Max Tx power and dynamic range based on classes. If 2 classes are agreed as per sub-topic 1-1 and the differentiator is distance to donor as per sub-topic 1-2 then it seems that at least max Tx power should be different depending on the class. Based on the co-existence simulations, different dynamic range was needed for homogeneous and heterogeneous scenarios.  *Tentative agreements:* Agree to having different max Tx power requirements and continue discussion on whether other requirements should also be differentiated  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree to having different max Tx power requirements for the 2 classes(no max Tx power is also an option). The maximum power is allowed maximum power, the actual Tx power can be smaller.  Discuss further the following options:   * Define different dynamic range for the 2 classes * Define different ACLR – this will also depend on the outcome of the ACLR discussion from another thread |
| **Sub-topic#1-4** | Except a single company, everyone else agrees to not having a 1-1 mapping between MT and DU class. Considering that this does not preclude having a IAB node with matching MT and DU classes, it should be agreeable to not have restrictions.  *Tentative agreements:* Agree to Option 1 to having any combination of DU and MT in the same IAB node  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Agree to the WF above of having any combination of DU and MT. * Discuss possible DU &MT class combination limitations in R16 |

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 | WF on IAB MT class definition | Samsung |

### 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)

Discussion in the 2nd round was focused on the WF on IAB-MT class definition that can be found in R4-2002494. The WF is agreeable. The WF proposed to have 2 IAB-MT classes defined and this was agreed. It was also discussed whether there should be any limitation on the pairing between the IAB-MT and IAB-DU class in the same IAB node. A single company had concerns on allowing any combination of IAB-MT and IAB-DU class so this was left for further discussion in the upcoming meetings.

## 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** |
| R4-2002494 | *Agreeable”* |

# Topic #2: IAB-MT Tx Power

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2000277 | Samsung | **Proposal 1**: The dynamic range can be defined to link with ACLR.  **Proposal 2**: It may not necessary to define ACLR and dynamic range as power class dependent requirement for IAB-MT. |
| R4-2001432 | Nokia | **Proposal 6: Adopt 20 dBm as minimum output power for IAB-MT with the side condition of channel being fully allocated.** |
| R4-2000965 | Qualcomm | **Tx Power**  Based on the agreements in [1], the Tx power requirements for IAB-MT will follow the BS framework of using manufacturer’s declaration. These requirements will depend on the outcome of the IAB-MT class discussions. The structure of the requirements should be similar to what will be used for the IAB-DU.  **Output power dynamics**  The UE requirements for output power dynamics are comprised of minimum output power, Tx off power, On/Off time mask and power control. We discuss them separately below:  Minimum Output Power  The minimum output power requirement for the IAB-MT is still under discussion (also if it will be defined or not). If this is defined, it should apply to all the Tx beams of the IAB-MT.  Tx off power  The Tx off power requirement is defined such that UL interference is minimized, as such, the current UE requirement in 38.101 should be re-used.  On/Off time mask  The on/off time mask requirement ensures that UL performance is not compromised, hence, the current UE requirements should be re-used.  Power control  The IAB-MT introduction into the network should minimize the impact over existing gNBs, as such, the best approach would be to re-use the UE requirements. For the OTA requirements in [3], the requirement should apply to the set of beam peak directions as discussed in Section 2.2. |
| R4-2000619 | CATT | **Observation 1: If IAB-MT follows the UE power control requirements, there’s no problem for the system performance.**  **Observation 2: IAB-MT can easily meet UE power control requirements.**  **Observation 3: IAB-MT power control requirements can be considered to be simplified compared with UE requirements.**  How to simplify the requirements needs discussion in RAN4. We slightly prefer no power control requirements for IAB-MT. |
| R4-2001436 | Nokia | **Proposal 2: IAB-MT shall declare its output power similar to BS type 2-O. BS EIRP and TRP accuracy requirements can be re-used. No requirement is set for extreme conditions.**  **Proposal 3: No output power based classes or categories shall be defined for IAB-MT.**  **Proposal 4: IAB-MT and IAB-DU radiated power capabilities shall be declared independent of each other. Same applies for output power.**  **Proposal 5: In addition to minimum output power, power control requirements as a function of RB allocation shall be specified. Allowed tolerances shall be greater than currently allowed for BS type 2-O.**  **Proposal 6: If OTA transmit OFF power requirement is needed, the BS requirement is adopted, i.e. maximum TRP during Tx OFF period is -36 dBm.** |
| R4-2001707 | Huawei | **Proposal 2:** Use the BS TX OFF levels for the IAB-MT  **Proposal 3:** Use the BS timing values for both IAB-DU and IAB-MT. |
| R4-2001866 | Ericsson | **Observation-1: The radio channel change by the slow fading could be compensated by power control. The magnitude to consider is between 4 dB to 8 dB.**  **Observation-2: IAB MT dynamic range is limited to provide fast switching between IAB MT and IAB DU for shared transceiver architecture.**  **Observation-3: IAB MT dynamic range is further limited to to support the FDM/SDM operation.**  **Proposal-1: IAB MT dynamic range suggest to be around [5] dB.**  **Proposal-2: Min TX power can be derived with declared maximum carrier TRP power and IAB MT dynamic range and thus there is no need to define the min TX power.** |
| R4-2001867 | Ericsson | **Observation-1: BS can transmit at uplink time slot with maximum TRP assuming a minimum distance with neighbour NR BS of at least 50m to 80m and assuming an ACIR of 28 dB, from regulator perspective.**  **Observation-2: The IAB-MT Tx maximum power could be set similar as the IAB-DU Tx maximum power with the similar conditions in [4] is met.**  **Proposal-1: IAB MT upper limit of output power can be set the same with IAB DU upper limit of output power on the condition of minimum physical separation distance and good ACIR.**  **Proposal-2: IAB maximum output power could be adjusted/limited to protect the neighbour BS service.**  **Proposal-3: Send a LS to RAN2 to request the additional signalling on the power limitation of the IAB MT in R16 to protect neighbour BS receiver.**  **Proposal-4: No upper limit on output power on the IAB MT for FR2.** |
| R4-2001872 | Ericsson | **Observation#1: The IAB is installed in a fixed location, the initial transmit power level setting could be fixed irrespective the RSRP estimation accuracy.**  **Observation#2: The initial power control tolerance relates to the IAB MT transmit power accuracy, which in turn could depend on the IAB MT declared transmit accuracy for different power level.**  **Proposal-1: Not specify the absolute PC tolerance requirement.**  **Proposal-2: due to the limited dynamic range of IAB MT, there is no need on the requirement of relative PC tolerance.**  **Proposal-3: Aggregate PC tolerance scenario not apply to IAB node.** |
| R4-2001283 | Qualcomm | **Proposal 2: define IAB-MT class 1 targeting planned deployment scenarios and characterized by a transmitter dynamic range of 20dB**  **Proposal 3: define IAB-MT class 2 targeting unplanned deployment scenarios and characterized by a transmitter dynamic range of 30dB** |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 2-1

**IAB-MT Tx power definition**

All companies seem to agree that the IAB-MT Tx power definition will follow the BS framework in which the power is declared by the manufacturer. For FR2, the beam pairs will be declared similar in the same way as the BS framework.

**Issue 2-1: IAB-MT Tx power definition**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Through manufacturer declaration using same framework as BS Tx power declaration
* Recommended WF
  + Agree option 1

### Sub-topic 2-2

**Tx Power Dynamic range definition**

For the dynamic range definition there are multiple proposals, ranging from no requirement to having requirements of up to 20dB or 30dB depending on the MT class.

**Issue 2-2: Tx power Dynamic range definition**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Introduce dynamic range requirement linked to ACLR
  + Option 2: Introduce different dynamic range requirement depending on the MT class
  + Option 3: introduce fixed value of dynamic range (e.g. 5dB as proposed by Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
  + Agree option 2, the values are FFS. Values can be discussed based on target deployment. Different deployment scenarios (e.g. macro vs. “small cell”) would have different channels to parent(LOS vs. NLOS, different shadowing and fading profiles)

### Sub-topic 2-3

**IAB-MT Power Control requirements**

The proposals for power control requirement range from no requirement to re-using the UE requirements with some options of relaxing the UE requirements.

**Issue 2-3: IAB-MT Power Control requirements**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Do not define any requirement
  + Option 2: Re-use UE requirements
  + Option 3: Take UE requirements as baseline with further simplification (e.g. no aggregate requirement)
* Recommended WF
  + Agree option 2: this would have the least impact to existing infrastructure

### Sub-topic 2-4

**IAB-MT Tx off power**

The proposals on this topic suggest re-using the BS requirements or the UE requirements. BS requirements assume that BS will not cause any self desense while the UE requirements also consider interference to other UEs that could be close by. A requirement is needed to define an on/off time mask.

**Issue 2-4: IAB-MT Tx off power**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Re-use the BS Tx off power
  + Option 2: Re-use the UE Tx off power
* Recommended WF
  + Agree option 1 – it is unlikely there will be many IAB nodes in close proximity so a relaxed requirement compared to UEs should not cause a rise in overall interference in the system

### Sub-topic 2-5

**IAB MT On-off transient period(time mask)**

The proposals are to either re-use the UE time mask or the BS time mask.

**Issue 2-1: IAB-MT on-off transient period(time mask)**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Re-use the BS time mask
  + Option 2: Re-use the UE time mask
* Recommended WF
  + Agree option 2

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 2-1:  Sub topic 2-2:  ….  Others: |
| Samsung | Sub topic 2-1: fine with the recommended WF. We also believe that it should be FFS on whether MT power class should be reported to donor gNB or parent IAB.  Sub topic 2-2: our preference is option 1 which is outcome of co-existence study. For option 2 is highly relied on what the criteria of MT class would be how it linked to dynamic range. For option 3, it is not preferable since it would be problem to ensure victim system performance according to co-existence simulation result.  Sub topic 2-3: option 2 can be starting point to be further discussed. In current TS38.101-2, the power control requirement is UE power class related requirement. If we agree on this, it should be clarified what and how to reuse.  Sub topic 2-4: fine with option 1. But more clarification needed regarding how to capture this requirement in specification and how to test it in conformance testing, e.g. the requirement would be applied for MT and DU separately or applied for one IAB-node with both IAB-DU and IAB-MT transmitter off especially for FR2.  Sub topic 2-4: no strong view on transient period. But regarding the on/off mask there are numerous mask cases defined for UE. Whether kind of simplification based on UE mask for IAB-MT on/off mask case need to be studied. |
| Ericsson | Sub topic 2-1: Option 1.  Sub topic 2-2: Option 3 is preferred for wide area IAB. Whether the different dynamic range can be achieved for local area IAB need more understanding, i.e for FDM/SDM operation.  Sub topic 2-3: Option 1 at least for wide area IAB. Our point is that IAB can transmit better accuracy without RSRP estimation so no impact on existing infrastructure at all. The absolute power accuracy can be covered by other RF req.  Sub topic 2-4: Option 1  Sub topic 2-5: we should have option 3, which reusing the UE spec time mask with FFS on transient time parameter. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Sub-topic 2-1: We agree with the proposed WF.  Sub-topic 2-2 and 2-3: The needed requirements have a relationship for what is the actual dynamic range. If the dynamic range is very small, the test may be covered by EIRP accuracy. Also in case the dynamic range is roughly as large as the allowed tolerance, the requirements do not bring added value. In case two classes are defined, it is reasonable that for non-macro class the power control requirements enable greater flexibility on the deployments and this is likely to result in wider dynamic range for non-macro class.  Sub-topic 2-4: We agree with the proposed WF.  Sub-topic 2-5: There has been a parallel discussion in UE session to improve UE transient time requirements as current UE transient time requirements cause issues for BS demodulation performance. Therefore option 1 is preferred here. |
| ZTE | Sub topic 2-1: partially agree with option 1 and it’s better to have clear defintion of IAB MT power class, otherwise how to signalling to parent IAB DU and how to the scheduling from CU . Even though for declaration, then it is still necessary for parent IAB DU to know that actual power of child IAB MT.  Sub topic 2-2: agree with option 2 and values could be FFS.  Sub topic 2-3: agree with option 2 to reuse UE requirement as power control accuracy is new to BS and need BS to do muliple power calibration at different power levels I think.  Sub topic 2-4: agree with option 1 to reuse BS OFF power requirement, however frankly speaking it my need some more discussion as FR2 NR BS OFF power is based on 100m dist separation, however for IAB MTs or IAB DUs, 100m is not good deployment as IAB DU/MT is almost at the center of cell center and cell edge, at least in HetNet IAB network, it is not good typical scenarios. Maybe we need to align with BS class mini distance discussion.  Sub topic 2-5: both are fine us, as the transient time is mainly depent on transmitter OFF/ON time, PA ramping up time and PLL settling time, from hardware perspective, it’s the same capability for IAB DU and IAB MT. |
| Huawei | Sub-topic 2-1: ok  Sub-topic 2-2: It’s difficult to agree to proposal (option2) without values, as it’s the values that ultimately are the important thing. Option 1 would also need to align with any absolute ACLR/OBUE requirements and it’s not easy to see how that could be done so we would rather avoid option 1. Option 3 is our preferred but obviously only if the dynamic range level were agreeable (our proposal is 10dB)  Sub-topic 2-3: Just to confirm, this refers to the equivalent of sub-clause 6.3.4 in 101-2. To some extent it depends on the result of sub-topic 2-2. As the absolute power accuracy requirement is +/- 12/14dB, many of the proposals for minimum power/dynamic range are less than this range – so effectively there would be no requirement. If we used BS style output power requirements (e.g. +/-3dB) and then +/- 12dB for any other steps with a limited dynamic range, this does not make sense.  Sub-topic 2-4: proposal is ok, option 1.  Sub-topic 2-5: BS and UE are practically the same, only difference is FR2 transient time is 3us for BS and 5us for UE. If OFF level is same as BS and range (antenna gain etc) is similar the timing should be same as BS. |
| CATT | Sub topic 2-1: We support the recommend WF.  Sub topic 2-2: We think the recommended WF can be a starting point to discuss further.  Sub topic 2-3: We don’t agree option 2, we can agree option 1 or 3.  Sub topic 2-4: We agree reusing BS’s off power. We think there’s some misunderstanding in the recommended WF. Regarding the BS and UE off power requirements including conducted and radiated requirements, some of BS requirements is more stringent than UE, not all of them are more relaxed.  ….  Others: |
| Qualcomm | Sub topic 2-1: recommended WF is fine  Sub topic 2-2: we support option 2, based on the co-existence study it is quite obvious that for the heterogeneous scenario(IAB close to parent) there is a need for a larger dynamic range to cope with possible shadowing or NLOS.  Sub topic 2-3: re-using UE requirements as they are is the simplest option and will ensure system performance. It is expected that if different requirements are used, there would be an impact to existing schedulers.  Sub topic 2-4: BS off power is the same  Sub topic 2-5: UE time mask is our first preference but if there is no material difference relative to the BS time mask then either of them would be fine. |

### 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** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| 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#2-1** | All companies agree with having the Tx power declared.  *Tentative agreements:* IAB-MT Tx power is declared by manufacturer sing same framework as BS Tx power declaration  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Agree above proposal |
| **Sub-topic#2-2** | Based on the comments there doesn’t seem to be convergence on this topic. Many companies agree with having the dynamic range based on the MT class. If the WF on defining 2 classes is agreed then, based on the co-existence simulation it seems necessary to have different dynamic ranges for the two classes. The proposals to have 5dB or 10dB dynamic range seem very small given that even base station dynamic range is larger than this. With such dynamic range, the received SNR will decrease with larger allocation or when shadowing is larger  *Tentative agreements:* Agree to have different dynamic range for the two MT classes (if it is agreed to have at least two classes). Continue the discussion on how to define the dynamic range requirements.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Agree above proposal. Continue the discussion on how to define the actual numbers. Some comments on the proposal in R4-2001283 would also help to see why people would not to agree to that analysis. |
| **Sub-topic#2-3** | Most companies agree to re-using the UE requirements while there are a few objections and dependencies. It would be useful to agree the dynamic range first because if the dynamic range is too small then there is no point in defining any requirements.  *Tentative agreements:* Defer discussion unitl the dynamic range discussion is concluded or at least until it is clear that dynamic range will be large enough for such a requirement to make sense.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* defer this discussion until after the dynamic range is concluded. |
| **Sub-topic#2-4** | All companies agree to re-use the BS off power requirements  *Tentative agreements:*Re-use the BS off power requirements for the IAB-MT  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Agree proposal to re-use the BS off power requirement for the IAB-MT |
| **Sub-topic#2-5** | *There is no clear convergence for now but the differences between the proposals are small. One company mentioned that improving the transient time is under discussion in the UE RF session however, this is only discussed for FR1 now. For the off power requirement, it seems agreeable to re-use the BS off power requirement. For FR2, the BS transient time is 3us while the UE transient time is 5us. For FR1 both are 10us. Considering that off power is based on BS requirements, re-using the BS requirements might be feasible.*  *Tentative agreements:* Agree to re-use the BS requirements for the on/off time mask(for both FR1 and FR2)  *Candidate options:*  *Option 1: Re-use the BS time mask*  *Option 2: Re-use the UE time mask*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss if option 1 is agreeable, if not then companies should clarify their preference and decide based on majority view considering the very small difference between the options. |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 | WF on IAB-MT Tx power requirements | Huawei |

### CRs/TPs

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| R4-201880 | *Based on the 1st round discussion, it seems agreeable to re-use the BS Tx off power for the IAB MT. This TP is written based on this assumption so it could be agreeable with some changes. Companies are invited to comment* |
| R4-201895 | *Based on the 1st round discussion, it seems agreeable to re-use the BS Tx off power for the IAB MT. This TP is written based on this assumption so it could be agreeable with some changes. Companies are invited to comment* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

The 2nd round discussion was focused on the WF on IAB-MT Tx power requirements in R4-2002495. The WF lists multiple agreements and some requirements which are left FFS for future meetings.

## 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** |
| R4-2002495 | *Agreeable* |
| R4-201880 | *No further discussion so should be noted* |
| R4-2001895 | *No further discussion so should be noted* |

# Topic #3: IAB Tx Signal Quality

IAB Tx signal quality requirements comprise of frequency error, transmit signal quality(EVM), In-band emissions(IBE) and carrier leakage. In previous meetings there were some agreements on frequency error(re-use absolute requirements for IAB-DU) but some companies wanted to re-open the discussion and further study the requirements

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2000618 | CATT | **Observation 1: IAB-MT should compensate the Doppler frequency shift if the IAB is mobile IAB.**  **Observation 2: Two implementations choices can be considered for the clock system of mobile IAB-DU.**  **Observation 3: DU and MT use independent clock systems is the correct implementation.**  **Proposal 1: IAB-MT frequency error requirement is the relative frequency error with the parent IAB.**  **Proposal 2: IAB-DU frequency error requirement should follow BS requirements of different classes.**  **Proposal 3: IAB-MT frequency error requirement should follow UE requirement to be ± 0.1 PPM.** |
| R4-2000965 | Qualcomm | **Transmitted signal quality**  The transmit signal quality requirements are comprised of frequency error and EVM.  Frequency error  Whether the UE requirements will be adopted or an absolute frequency error requirement will be allowed is still under discussion. The OTA requirements applicability should follow the BS framework as discussed in Section 2.2.  EVM  The UE requirements should be re-used and applicability should follow the BS framework as discussed in Section 2.2. |
| R4-2000975 | ZTE | **Observation 1: absolute frequency error for IAB DU and relative frequency error for IAB MT will reuslt in different RF testing setup enviroment.**  **Observation 2: if IAB MT reuse the IAB DU’s reference clock and are targeted to meet the UE relative frequency error 0.1ppm, then absolute frequency error for IAB DU will be maintained within 0.05ppm regardless of different BS class.** |
| R4-2000278 | Samsung | It is still proposed to define as +/- 0.1ppm as relative frequency error for IAB-MT. It may not be necessary to constrain the implementation flexibility. However, as comprise, we can consider both relative and absolute frequency error for IAB-MT. IAB-MT can declare regarding which requirement to be supported. And testability aspect can be discussed separately after core spec completion.  **EVM**  It is suggested to consider QPSK, 16QAM and 64QAM EVM requirement for IAB-MT in FR2. And for EVM itself the requirement the values are the same between IAB-MT and IAB-DU. Hence the same EVM level in percentage for each modulation scheme should be applied for IAB-MT. Regarding the test power condition on EVM for 16QAM and 64QAM IAB-MT could be based on declaration as well. |
| R4-2001434 | Nokia | **Observation 1: If an absolute frequency error would be specified, it would need to be such that the frequency received at the gNB would not deviate more than 4300 Hz from the gNB DL frequency, as otherwise there is a great risk impacting base station demodulation performance.**  **Observation 2: To avoid impact for gNB demodulation performance, IAB-MT absolute frequency error would need to be +/- 0.0075 ppm, which is roughly 6.7 times less than most stringent base station requirement. This is not a reasonable target.**  **Proposal 1: Confirm the original agreement of IAB-MT frequency error being +/- 0.1ppm relative to the DL frequency it receives.**  **Proposal 2: +/- 0.1 ppm frequency error limit will apply for both IAB-MT and IAB-DU, while for IAB-DU it shall be an absolute frequency error requirement.** |
| R4-2001436 | Nokia | **Proposal 7: UE requirements shall be adopted for frequency error and modulation quality. No requirement shall be specified for time alignment error.** |
| R4-2001869 | Ericsson | **Proposal-1: Reuse the item 1 and 2 for relative level of generic mask.**  **Proposal-2: the absolute level could to be removed.**  **Observation #1: There will be x dB PSD difference between IAB MT and DU carrier for shared transceiver if IAB MT and DU were configured with different # of carrier.**  **Observation #2: IAB MT LO leakage power only relative to the maximum transmitted PSD of IAB DU/MT.**  **Proposal-3: LO leakage power should be specified relative to IAB MT output power when IAB MT is configured with the maximum declared power.**  **Proposal-4: the additional suppression due to the uncorrelated LO signal can be implementation specific and so the correlation characteristic of LO signal discussion can be skipped.** |
| R4-2001871 | Ericsson | **Proposal-1: IAB DU frequency error requirement should follow the BS requirement for different BS classes.**  **Proposal-2: Align with RAN1 agreement that IAB parent shall be used as a synchronization source.**  **Proposal-3: IAB MT frequency error should be set as the same with IAB DU frequency error which is related to the IAB DU class.**  **Observation-1: IAB MT frequency error requirement can be set as** ±0.05 **PPM for FR1.**  **Observation-2: IAB MT frequency error requirement can be set as** ±0.05 **PPM for FR2 assuming the similar baseband performance (SSS/PSS) can be achieved for FR2 compared with FR1.** |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 3-1

**IAB-MT Frequency error**

Submitted papers present 2 options, re-use the UE requirements(error relative to signal from parent) or absolute accuracy or introduce an absolute requirement since the IAB-DU will probably re-use an absolute requirement from BS. Analysis in R4-2001434 shows that an absolute requirement for the IAB-MT would lead to very stringent requirement.

**Issue 3-1: IAB-MT Frequency Error definition**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Adopt UE requirements – 0.1ppm relative to DL(signal from parent)
  + Option 2: Adopt absolute requirement
  + Option 3: Define 2 requirements, one requirement relative to DL(re-use UE requirement) and one absolute requirement, MT has to meet one of them
* Recommended WF
  + Adapt option 1 as baseline, addition of an absolute requirement can be further discussed based on more analysis on impact to existing BS

### Sub-topic 3-2

**IAB-DU Frequency error**

Submitted papers disuss whether an absolute requirement is needed or a relative requirement to parent node could also be used. The argument for the relative requirement is that IAB nodes need to have relatively tight synchronization to the parent node, however, there is no qualitative analysis shown. In previous meetings it was agreed to use an absolute requirement because a relative requirement would cause a large frequency error in case of multiple hops.

**Issue 3-2: IAB-DU Frequency Error definition**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Adopt relative requirements to DL (signal from parent)
  + Option 2: Adopt absolute requirement, same as BS
* Recommended WF
  + Adapt option 2 as baseline, further discuss whether a relative requirement can be introduced under certain conditions

### Sub-topic 3-3

**IAB-MT EVM**

EVM requirements are the same for UE and BS, hence re-using these numbers is straighforwards.

**Issue 3-3: IAB-MT EVM**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Adopt UE requirements for all modulations currently defined
* Recommended WF
  + Agree Option 1

### Sub-topic 3-4

**IAB-MT IBE**

Papers treating these topics suggest either re-using the UE requirements or re-using the requirements with some modifications because the IAB-MT is not expected to transmit at low power.

**Issue 3-4: IAB-MT IBE definition**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Adopt UE requirements as they are in 101-1 and 101-2
  + Option 2: Adopt UE requirements with simplifications as proposed in R4-2001869
* Recommended WF
  + Adopt Option 2 – simplified requirement should cover the expected working point of IAB-MTs

### Sub-topic 3-5

**IAB-MT Carrier Leakage**

There is only 1 contribution(R4-2001869)explicitly discussing the carrier leakage proposing to define the requirements as below:

**Issue 3-5: IAB-MT Carrier leakage definition**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: LO leakage power should be specified relative to IAB MT output power when IAB MT is configured with the maximum declared power.
* Recommended WF
  + Adopt Option 1, actual level to be specified to be discussed

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 2-1:  Sub topic 2-2:  ….  Others: |
| Samsung | Sub topic 3-1: if option 2 adopted, what the motivation to discuss additional absolute frequency error.  Sub topic 3-2: fine with option 2. But try to understand the necessity to further discuss the relative frequency error for IAB-DU.  Sub topic 3-3: as mentioned in our contribution, at least BPSK is not needed for IAB-MT. And the power condition for EVM of IAB-MT to be tested should be discussed further as well.  Sub topic 3-4/3-5: fine with the recommended discussion direction |
| Ericsson | Sub topic 3-1: Option 2 with same Freq error definition with associated DU, we donot see the impact on DU frequency error.  Sub topic 3-2: option 2, same with BS.  Sub topic 3-3: there should be introduced option 2 which is modified version of the current UE EVM requirement. i.e Pi/2-BPSK is not applicable for IAB MT and the power level for EVM need FFS.  Sub topic 3-4: Option 2.  Sub topic 3-5: option 1. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Sub-topic 3-1: According to our analysis having only an absolute requirement may impact system performance negatively. Therefore, relative requirement (option 1) is preferred.  Sub-topic 3-2: option 2 is preferred  Sub-topic 3-3: Compared to UE requirements, we do not see the necessity for pi/2 BPSK. Otherwise, UE requirements can be adopted assuming in performance part of the work output power declarations for different modulations are further discussed.  Sub-topic 3-4 and 3-5: Especially in FR2 the need for in-band emission requirements including carrier leakage is unclear. The need to have a requirement should be agreed before copying (a subset of) values from UE requirements. |
| ZTE | Sub topic 3-1: support option 1 as this is aligned with RAN1 assumption parent node work as sync source.  Sub topic 3-2: support option 2 to reuse the BS requirement.  Sub topic 3-3: agree with option 1 and should further consider MPR is allowed or not for IAB MT as this is not allowed for QPSK/16QAM for FR2 BS. Meanwhile detailed EVM measurement in Annex is also different for IAB DU and IAB MT, as there are sync signal [ssb,csi-rs]provided for IAB DU testing and for IAB MT, we think some sync signal should be provided.  Sub topic 3-4: no strong view on that requirement  Sub topic 3-5: as same as IBE requirement. |
| Hauwei | Sub-topic 3-1: possibly the recommendation is not what you meant, from the text it seems you meant to recommend option 1? From the arguments given it seems option 1 may have to be adopted.  Sub-topic 3-2: ok  Sub-topic 3-3: the values are the same, so it seems a simple decision but it’s not as simple as just agreeing to use the UE spec. The full UE spec has different parameters for different power classes and as such differs from the BS, UE also contains BPSK req. whereas BS does not. We have not decided about classes yet but if we use BS classes this will need further study. The BS req. is not ideal either as it applies to PDSCH. It is likely the final IAB-MT req. will be modified version of the BS and UE.  Sub-topic 3-4, 3-5: simplified proposal is linked to the output power class and range of the IAB-MT, if those decisions are in line with this then it is probably ok. |
| CATT | Sub topic 3-1: We don’t agree the recommended WF. The MT frequency error should be the defined as relative frequency error as defined for UE. The reason is that from system performance point of view, MT should support high modulation scheme and mobile scenarios in R17, MT should calibrate it’s carrier frequency according to the parent node in order to make the frequency difference between MT and parent node is in the reasonable range. Even in R16, IAB is fixed node, MT still can’t make the frequency relative to parent accuracy enough to support high modulation if absolute clock system is used. If both of MT’s and DU’s absolute frequency error are 0.1ppm, then MT and parent DU’s frequency difference is in the range of 0.2 ppm.  Sub topic 3-2:We agree the absolute frequency error should be defined for DU for all of the scenarios, and we don’t think there’s exception to use relative requirement.  Sub topic 3-3: We support the recommended WF.  Sub topic 3-4: We support the simplification approach, but we’re not clear how to simplify it at present.  Sub topic 3-5: We’re not ready to agree the recommended WF. The justification in 1869 assumes MT and UD use the same LO. That assumption is related to sub topic 3-1 and 3-2. We don’t think we can have that conclusion at present.  ….  Others: |
| Qualcomm | Sub topic 3-1: we agree with Option 1 (Adopt UE requirements – 0.1ppm relative to DL(signal from parent)). R4-2001434 shows that an absolute requirement for the IAB-MT would lead to very stringent requirement  Sub topic 3-2: we agree with moderator’s recommendation.  Sub topic 3-4: in our view IBE should be tested at different power levels covering the whole Tx dynamic range. At all power levels, IAB-MT should not impact NR UE UL more than another NR UE. Further details on IBE testing are expected to be discussed during the conformance part of the IAB WI. |

### 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** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| 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#3-1** | There was a typo in the initial proposal and some companies were misled. Most companies support Option 1-adopting the UE frequency error requirements. It seems only a single company is objecting they should clarify if there are any issues with the analysis in R4-2001434. In RAN4#93 the following agreement was captured in R4-1916161- Companies to bring analysis next meeting on system impact of an absolute frequency error requirement on MT  *Tentative agreements:* Agree re-use the UE requirement for the frequency error of the IAB-MT – 0.1ppm relative to DL signal  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Agree to above proposals unless it is clearly proven that an absolute requirement can work. This agreement does not exclude adding another requirement but raises the bar considering the analysis shown in this meeting. |
| **Sub-topic#3-2** | Most companies agree to have just the BS requirement of an absolute frequency error. While there could be some benefits for the DU to be able to track the DL frequency from the parent, it is not clear if this is feasible or not based on the analysis so far  *Tentative agreements:*   * Agree to have BS requirement as baseline. * Keep the option of having also a relative requirement open until the next meeting if some analysis showing how this could be feasible is shown.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Agree to above proposal. Companies interested in having a relative requirement should bring convincing analysis how this can be achieved in practice |
| **Sub-topic#3-3** | Companies agree to re-use the UE requirements(same as BS), however, many companies commented that PI/2 BPSK modulation is not needed. Considering the typical operating point of the MT-Parent link, PI/2 BPSK should not be needed  *Tentative agreements:*Re-use UE EVM requirements, excluding the low output power range, do not define PI/2 BPSK support for IAB-MT. Introduce QPSK, 16QAM, 64QAM modulation for both FR1 and FR2 and 256QAM only for FR1.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* agree above proposal |
| **Sub-topic#3-4** | Most companies agree to re-use the UE requirements at least partially and further discuss how to simplify it. One company is questioning the need for the requirement. It is possible that IAB-MT is FDM-ed with other UEs or other IAB-MTs, hence, a requirement is needed. It doesn’t seem that it can guaranteed that IAB-MTs will always be scheduled separately(in time or space).  *Tentative agreements:* Agree to use UE requirements as baseline and further discuss how to simplify them. There is already a proposal on how to simplify, if companies want to have different simplfications then analysis should be brought up.  *Candidate options:*  *Option 1: re-use UE requirements with simplification proposed in R4-2001869(no absolute requirement)*  *Option 2: re-use UE requirements with other simplification, companies to propose how to simplify*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Try to agree Option 1 unless some ideas are provided on different ways to simplify the requirement |
| **Sub-topic#3-5** | Most companies agree that a requirement is needed but are not ready to agree to the proposal in R4-2001869. Considering that this the first meeting that this is discussed it seems rather difficult to agree on a requirement.  *Candidate options:*  *Option 1: agree to proposal in R4-2001869*  *Option 2: agree to re-use the UE requirements and define the requirement for any power level*  *Option 3: different requirement*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* discuss among the options above if an agreement can be reached |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 | WF on IAB Tx Signal Quality | Nokia |

### CRs/TPs

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| R4-2001431 | The TP on the frequency error could be revised and agreed if the recommended WF is agreed. |
| R4-2001892 | The TP on Tx EVM could be agreed based on the tentative agreement from the first round. Companies should comment if revisions are needed. |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

The discussion in the 2nd round focused on the WF on IAB Tx Signal Quality in R4-2002496. The WF lists the agreements on EVM and IBE and the clarifications needed on the frequency error requirement

## 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** |
| R4-2002496 | Agreeable |
| R4-2001431 | *No further discussion so should be noted* |
| R4-2001892 | *No further discussion so should be noted* |

# Topic #4 IAB-MT Beam Correspondence

Beam correspondence has been discussed mainly in the previous meeting, it was agreed not to define any requirement for the IAB-DU(similar to BS) and there were 2 options left for the IAB-MT:

**1.** MT declares UL EIRP range in different directions, MT picks UL beam based on received DL signals(reference signal) and has to meet EIRP in the direction it received from with TBD accuracy relative to declared EIRP capability in that direction

Functionality to be tested:

1. MT detects best DL beam with some accuracy

2. MT applies detected direction to the UL Tx beam

3. MT needs to transmit UL beam in the direction applied form step 2.

Accuracy would have to be derived based on combined accuracy/error from all 3 steps

**2.** MT declares UL EIRP and EIS range in different directions, functionality that MT can pick the right UL direction based on DL signals is assumed to be implicit if MT meets UL EIRP and EIS in the declared directions

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2000980 | ZTE | **Observation: there are no BC requriement defined for FR1 NR UE.**  **Proposal: to adopt the option 2 for IAB MT BC requirement.** |
| R4-2000901 | CMCC | Proposal: introduce beam correspondence requirements for IAB MT, whether it is mandatory in all cases can be further studied. |
| R4-2001281 | Qualcomm | **Proposal 1: define beam correspondence requirement for IAB-MT**  **Proposal 2: beam correspondence requirement is tested along the declared beam peak directions of the IAB-MT. Manufacturer claimed EIRP level in those same directions shall be met with an accuracy of [±TBD]** **dB** |
| R4-2001187 | Ericsson | **Observation 3: The beam correspondence requirement is only applicable for handheld UEs which need to use UL beam sweeping to meet spherical coverage.**  **Observation 4: The beam correspondence requirement is not applicable for fixed UEs.**  **Observation 5: The basestation coverage depends on the intended cell shape and is declared by the manufacturer.**  **Observation 6: The basestation must provide the declared power in a tested direction (within the declared coverage range) without any kind of DL beam sweeping.**  **Observation 7: Existing RF requirements verify that the BS is able to direct a beam in an intended direction and receive a beam in an intended direction.**  **Proposal 1: Do not introduce a beam correspondence requirement for IAB.** |
| R4-2001434 | Nokia | **Proposal 1: Beam correspondence requirement is adopted to IAB-Node RF core specification by adapting the IAB-MT OTA radiated output power requirement with different accuracy compared to current BS RF requirements.**  **Proposal 2: IAB-MT shall be capable of obtaining beam correspondence both based on SSB-only and CSI-RS only.**  **Observation 1: While conformance test details shall be left for performance part, it seems reasonable to consider how to ensure that IAB-MT used the configured DL reference signal for beam correspondence.** |
| R4-2001706 | Huawei | **Observation 1:** The IAB-MT node has directional antenna as such will have no spherical coverage requirement, so both the spherical coverage aspect and the beam correspondence metric are not suitable (in current form) for IAB\_MT  **Observation 2**: BS EIRP accuracy requirement therefore offers a better level of beam power accuracy in a specified direction than the UE beam correspondence specification.  **Observation 3:** the directional EIS minimum sensitivity requirement demonstrate the BS is capable of finding the direction of the incoming signal.  **Observation 4:** The ability to set the transmitter direction based on the RX direction is not an RF requirement.  **Proposal 1:** No beam correspondence requirement is needed for IAB\_MT the BS RF requirements are sufficient. |

## Open issues summary

The open issues are whether to define an explicity BC requirement for the IAB-MT, and if yes, what should the requirement be.

### Sub-topic 4-1

**IAB-MT Beam correspondence requirement definition**

Multiple papers discuss the definition of the requirements with proposals ranging from defining a requirement to not defining any requirement. Papers proposing to define a requirement do not have any concrete proposals on how to define the requirement.

**Issue 1-1: IAB-MT Beam correspondence requirement definition**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Do not define any requirement
  + Option 2: Define explicit requirement for beam correspondence on the IAB-MT
  + Option 3: Do not define any concrete requirement, it will be implicitly tested by IAB-MT meeting the declared EIRP by picking the transmit direction/beam based on the received signal direction
* Recommended WF
  + Adopt Option 3, this will ensure that desired functionality is tested. FFS how to include this in the specifications

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 2-1:  Sub topic 2-2:  ….  Others: |
| Samsung | Sub topic 4-1: our preference is option 1. |
| Ericsson | Sub topic 4-1: We do not see a large difference between option 1 and option 3. The existing BS EIRP and EIS requirements test all RF performance needed to achieve beam correspondence. We do not see a need to test that the logic of relatin an RX and TX direction is correct. So we think that the beam correspondence is implicitly met using the existing requirements and there is no need to write anything in the specifications. Formally speaking we support option 1 on the basis that the needed RF performance is already captured. |
| ZTE | Sub topic 4-1: support option 1 to not define any BC requirement for IAB MT as there are almost no rational to have beam sweeping from it’s parent IAB DU as this is almost fixed network. |
| Huawei | Sub-topic 4-1: Option 3 does not align with current OTA testing, BS RF testing does not pick Tx direction by copying receive direction, the 2 tests are separate. The BS points the beam in the direction it is told to. If the direction is not clear then the accuracy requirement is not clear. We see no need for this test it’s just a BB function not an RF requirement. |
| CATT | Sub topic 4-1: We would like to discuss further if beam correspondence requirement will be defined.  Sub topic 2-2:  ….  Others: |
| Qualcomm | Sub topic 4-1: We support Option 3 because it will implicitly check the functionality of beam correspondence. Beam correspondence is the ability to point the Tx beam in the direction from which the node is receiving. It has also to do with baseband capability but it is also related to RF because the Rx beams and Tx beams have to be somewhat aligned. IF the node can point in certain directions just based on a test function, it is not clear that it is actually capable of doing this based on measurements on incoming signals. |

### 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** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| 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** | All companies agree that there is no need for an explicit requirement. Some companies prefer not to have any requirement at all and contest the benefit of having beam correspondence functionality implicitly tested when max EIRP is tested. Some companies would like to further discuss  *Candidate options:*  *Option 1: Do not define any requirement*  *Option 3: Do not define any concrete requirement, it will be implicitly tested by IAB-MT meeting the declared EIRP by picking the transmit direction/beam based on the received signal direction*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Further discuss the 2 options. Companies proposing to use option 1 should further clarify how the beam correspondence functionality through which the MT is supposed to transmit in the direction it is receiving from can be ensured. |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| R4-2002503 | WF on IAB-MT Beam Correspondence | Qualcomm Incorporated |

### CRs/TPs

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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)

The discussion in the 2nd round focused on the WF on IAB-MT Beam Correspondence in R4-2002503. It was agreed not to define any explicit requirements for IAB-MT beam correspondence while the need for testing and further testing details are left FFS.

## 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** |
| R4-2002503 | *Agreeable* |

# Topic #5: IAB-MT Rx-Tx Switching time

asfd

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2001433 | Nokia | **Observation 1: RAN1 has developed a framework on how the switching time between MT and DU can vary and how it is reported to the parent node.**  **Proposal 1: Minimum requirements shall not be specified for switching time between IAB-MT and IAB-DU.** |
| R4-2000976 | ZTE | **Proposal 5: not to define switching delay in IAB RF part and define the switching delay in RRM part.** |
| R4-2001870 | Ericsson | **Proposal-1: There is no need to define additional latency requirements between the DU to MT switching** |

## Open issues summary

The open issue is whether the IAB-DU to IAB-MT switching delay should be defined or not

### Sub-topic 5-1

**IAB-DU to IAB-MT swicthing delay requirement**

Contributions submitted on this topic propose not to define any RF requirement for the switching delay.

**Issue 5-1: IAB-DU to IAB-MT switching delay requirement definition**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Do not define any RF requirement
* Recommended WF

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 2-1:  Sub topic 2-2:  ….  Others: |
| Samsung | Sub topic5-1: according to our analysis, the switching case with potential problem would be scenario dependent which related to propagation delay. It would be difficult to define the scenario related requirement especially target with fixed IAB. And if no RF requirement defined, the necessity to define related RRM requirement would be questioned. |
| Ericsson | Sub topic 5-1: Option 1 |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Sub-topic 5-1: We agree with the proposal, there is no need to define an RF requirement |
| ZTE | Sub topic 5-1: support option 1 to not define any RF requirement. the maximum switching timing between IAB DU MT is less than the guard period beteen DL and UL, therefore we think 3 symbols in FR2 might be sufficient which has already included in RAN1 agreement.  FR1 needs some further analysis at least from RAN4 internally. |
| CATT | Sub topic 5-1: We support not defining RF requirements  Sub topic 2-2:  ….  Others: |

### 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** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| 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** | Companies agree not to define any requirement for the IAB-MT Rx-Tx switching time  *Tentative agreements:*Agree not to define any requirement for the IAB-MT Rx-Tx switching time  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Agree above proposal |

*Suggestion 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 provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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)

T

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

here was no need for any further discussion in the 2nd round, the agreement not to define any requirement for the IAB-MT Rx-Tx switching time is captured in the chairman notes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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”* |

# Topic #6: IAB-MT Unwanted Emissions

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2000965 | Qualcomm | **Unwanted emissions**  The UE unwanted emissions are comprised of the occupied BW, out of band emissions and spurious emissions.  Occupied BW  The occupied BW requirement is the same for UE and BS and is defined as a directional requirement. The IAB-MT requirement should be the same and follow the applicability as discussed in Section 2.2.  Out of band emissions  UE out of band emissions are comprised of SEM and ACLR. The SEM should follow the UE requirements. The ACLR will be defined based on the outcome of the co-existence study. These requirements are defined as TRP.  Spurious emissions  Spurious emissions should re-use the UE requirements. These requirements are also defined as TRP. |
| R4-2001436 | Nokia | **Proposal 8: Adopt an OBUE requirement with levels matching PC1 UE requirement, i.e. -5 dBm/MHz closest to the transmission and at offsets greater than 10% of contiguous transmission BW -13 dBm/MHz.**  **Proposal 9: Adopt absolute ACLR requirement of -20 dBm/MHz.**  **Proposal 10: Adopt 1.5 GHz OBUE boundary similar to BS type 2-O.** |
| R4-2000279 | Samsung | **Proposal 1**: OBW requirement can be the same for IAB-MT and IAB-DU.  **Proposal 3**: UE emission level can be applied for IAB-MT for operating band emission and spurious emission. |
| R4-2001882 | Ericsson | As OBUE is power relevant and IAB MT declare its transmission power as the same as IAB DU, hence the same OBUE requirement of the IAB DU could be reused on IAB MT. As IAB is fixed node as the same as BS, the OBUE requirement for IAB MT also is regional related. |

## Open issues summary

The definition of the unwanted emissions requirements(OWB, out of band emissions, spurious emissions) is still open. The discussion revolves around whether the UE emission levels should be re-used or the BS type of emission limits should be used.

### Sub-topic 6-1

**IAB-MT Unwanted emissions**

The unwanted emissions requiremetns are comprised of: Occupied Bandwith, Out of band emisisons and Spurious emissions. The IAB-MT will behave more like a UE in the network and will transmit and recieve at the same time as a UE.

**Issue 2-1: Definition of IAB-MT Unwanted emissions**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Re-use the UE emissions
  + Option 2: Re-use the Bs emissions
* Recommended WF
  + Adopt Option 1: Re-use the UE emissions

Re-using the UE emissions should be the simplest solution from a regulatory and practical point of view since the IAB-MT will behave like a UE in the network.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 2-1:  Sub topic 2-2:  ….  Others: |
| Samsung | Sub topic 6-1: recommended WF aligns with our proposal. But it should be clarified that to reuse UE operating band emission and spurious emission the proposal is applied for general mask/limit and UE OOB range. For that additional spurious emission level the applicability should be discussed further. |
| Ericsson | Sub topic 6-1: When IAB is deployed at different region (cat A or B), different regulator requirement will apply. IAB MT can behavior more than UE in a network, i.e it can transmit downlink time slot. It can also FDM/SDM with access link.  In R4-1700305, the BS spectrum mask is connected to different power level, so SEM is tightened for lower output power BS. Question is that when IAB MT transmit on downlink time slot, should SEM be tightened also as the same as BS? If so, the tightened SEM will decide for IAB MT not relaxed one. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Sub-topic 6-1: There are rather big differences in UE and BS emission requirements in FR1. Also the proposed ACLR in FR1 ranges from 30 to 45 dB. Emissions should be reasonable compared to ACLR so a blanket decision without considering ACLR in FR1 is not a good way forward. All the further comments from us are for FR2.  Occupied bandwidth is the same for UE and BS so both options work for occupied BW.  In case UE requirements are chosen as the baseline, CA operation should be limited to contiguous CA as UE requirements in FR2 have not considered non-contiguous operation. From this perspective OBUE requirement type is more flexible.  Absolute ACLR requirement is preferred to be defined for IAB-MT as meeting relative ACLR requirement over possibly very wide dynamic range is excessive from co-existence perspective and should not be required.  For spurious emissions further discussion is needed whether IAB-MT can follow UE limits from regulatory perspective. |
| ZTE | Sub topic 6-1: option 1 to reuse the UE in-band emission requiement is more relaxed and it’s fine to adopt that.  Here one example for n258 with 400MHz, comparing with 30dBm [typical WA BS with 5-7dBm per RF chain within analog antenna array] BS and UE mask, then mask for BS and UE is the same, only difference is additional mask defined for BS is between 2\*BW from carrier edge and band edge+1.5GHz.    If we further look at the Cat B spurious emission requirement from FR2 NR BS [down to -25dBm] and NS\_201 for 23.6-24GHz, [-8dBm for 200MHz ], indeed it’s the same issue for protecting EESS band, for IAB MT with A-MPR, therefore lower spurious emission could be achieved. However for BS, only fitler atteunation is considered for -25dBm spurious emission.  If A-MPR is also allowed for IAB MT, then maybe follow the FR2 UE additional spurious emisson is fine, otherwise it’s better to follow the BS Cat B spurious emission requirement. |
| Huawei | Sub-topic 6-1: Maybe it’s better to treat the different emissions as different sub-topics?  Occupied BW: requirements are essentially the same we don’t need to agree UE or BS  Out of band emissions: Basic UE and BS requirements are the same for BS >30dBm, below that requirements get tougher. UE must have TRP>32dBm so has a simpler table. IAB-MT doe not have same min power requirement so conceivably have a lower TRP output power (especially if it has a high antenna gain) as such should reduce emission requirement like a BS?  Spurious emissions: Essentially the same requirements with some differences based on wider measurement BW (and associated power levels) for terminals based on recommendation 74-01. Terminal and BS are not really defined in 74-01 but we read as BS and UE. IAB-MT is not clearly either of these. Do we need the terminal BW relaxations (which are granted due to limitations with terminal architectures? And allow slightly larger narrow band emission levels) If not then the BS method is safer ones to adopt. |
| Qualcomm | Sub-topic 6-1: for OBW, it is clear that 99% should be used.  for Out of band emissions and spurious, there are some minor difference between BS and UE, we thought re-using the UE framework is simpler and also would work better with added NS values that MT has to follow and corresponding A-MPR definitions. MPR/A-MPR tables would have to be defined because they impact the schedulers. |

### 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** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| 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#6-1** | The topic should be broken further into OBW, Out of band emissions and Spurious emissions as some companies pointed out.  For OBW the 99% requirement should be re-used, all companies agree to this.  Out of band emissions is the topic with least convergence and needs further discussion. The discussion points are whether the SEM should depend on the power level(like BS) and what is the relationship with the ACLR.  For spurious emissions, multiple companies agree to re-use the UE requirements. It is expected that MPR/A-MPR will be allowed for the MT and the MT will have to comply with all the NS values signaled by the network for the additional emission limits. Following the UE requirements could be agreeable or companies could point out why there would be problems with this approach and what the options would be  *Tentative agreements:*  OBW: Agree to define OBW of 99% for the IAB-MT.  *Candidate options:*  *Spurious emissions:*  *Option 1: Agree to re-use the UE requirements*  *Option 2: Further discussion what other options are available.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Agree OBW  Out of band emissions: discuss the need for SEM that scales with power levels and consider the relationship with ACLR based on the ACLR discussion in the other thread  Spurious emissions: discuss the options above, if Option 1 is not agreeable then some other proposals on how to proceed should be made |

*Suggestion 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 provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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)

There was no further discussion on this topic as there was no clear WF. Agreement on OBW was captured in the chairman notes.

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*The agreement that OBW will be defined at 99% was captured in the meeting notes.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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”* |

# Topic #7: Other IAB-DU Tx Requirements

IAB-DU Tx requirements have not been discussed extensively because the IAB-DU serves the functionalaty of the BS and should behave just like a BS such that the fact that it is an IAB node is transparent to UEs. Hence, most of the BS requirements will be re-used for the IAB-DU

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2001436 | Nokia | **Proposal 1: Re-use BS type 2-O transmitter requirements for IAB-DU for all transmitter requirements in FR2.** |
| R4-2000964 | Qualcomm | |  |  | | --- | --- | | **RF Requirement** | **IAB-DU** | | Radiated transmit power – only OTA | Import from BS specs | | IAB output power | Import from BS specs | | Output power dynamics | Import from BS specs | | Transmit ON/OFF power | Import from BS specs | | Transmitted signal quality – Frequency Error | Under discussion, see below | | Transmitted signal quality – EVM | Import from BS specs | | Transmitted signal quality – TAE | Import from BS if CA is defined | | Unwanted emissions | Import from BS specs | | Transmitter intermodulation | Import from BS specs | | OTA sensitivity level | Import from BS specs | | Reference sensitivity level | Import from BS specs | | In-band selectivity and blocking | Import from BS specs | | OTA out-of-band blocking | Import from BS specs | | OTA receiver spurious emissions | Import from BS specs | | OTA receiver intermodulation | Import from BS specs | | OTA in-channel selectivity | Import from BS specs | | Beam correspondence | Not needed as agreed in [1] | |
| R4-2000900 | CMCC | Paper proposes to re-use all the BS conducted requirements for the IAB-DU for FR1 with the exception of on/off power transient that should be based on UE specs and power control that is FFS.  For the radiated spec(type 1-O or type 1-H) it is proposed to re-use the BS radiated requirements |

## Open issues summary

The IAB-DU Tx requirements are still open, the proposals are to re-use the BS specs with a few exceptions.

### Sub-topic 7-1

**Definition of IAB-DU Tx requirements other than frequency error**

Apart from the frequency error requirement that was discussed separately, all other requirements can be re-used from the BS specs. It is not clear why it was proposed in R4-2000900 to use the UE specs for the on/off power transient when the BS specs can also be re-used

**Issue 7-1: Definition of IAB-DU Tx requirements other than frequency error**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Re-use the BS requirements
* Recommended WF
  + Adopt Option 1

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 2-1:  Sub topic 2-2:  ….  Others: |
| Samsung | Sub topic 7-1: fine with the recommended WF. |
| Ericsson | Sub topic 7-1: Re-use BS requirement including the freq error req from BS spec. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Sub.topic 7-1: We agree with the WF. |
| ZTE | Sub topic 7-1: support option 1 for IAB DU reuse BS requirement. |
| Huawei | Proposal is ok |

### 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** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| 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** | Companies agree to re-use all the BS requirements other than frequency error for the IAB-DU. The frequency error is discussed separately in sub-topic 3-2  *Tentative agreements:* agree to re-use all the BS requirements other than frequency error for the IAB-DU.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* agree above proposal |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 | WF on IAB-DU Tx Requirements | ZTE |

### CRs/TPs

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| R4-2001881 | *Based on the 1st discussion it seems agreeable to re-use the IAB-DU Tx intermod rewquirement for the DU. The TP could be revised to capture just this aspect. – revised to R4-2002497* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

The discussion in the 2nd round focused on the WF on IAB-DU Tx Requirements in R4-2002498.

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*The agreements are summarized in R4-2002498. It was agreed to re-use all BS Tx requirements besides frequency error and EVM that were discussed separately.*

*The IAB-DU Tx intermod TP was captured in R4-2002497, a revision of R4-2001881.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| R4-2002498 | *Agreeable* |
| R4-2002497 | *Agreeable* |