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# Introduction

One company objected to the submitted n38 CRs during the RAN4#96-e meeting which would make DSS support for band n38 mandatory from Rel-15. Therefore, an extended email discussion for contributions submitted under agenda item 10.28 for dynamic spectrum sharing in band n38 was requested by the RAN4 chairman.

Two approaches were discussed for the post-meeting email discussion:

* Approve the original CRs submitted to RAN4 making DSS support mandatory from Rel-15
* Approve the alternative CRs to made DSS support for band n38 mandatory from Rel-16, add release independence from Rel-15 and a note in the Rel-15 spec indicating the lack of 7.5 kHz shift support (whilst not mandatory) could cause issues when an n38 device is attempting to access a network

Discussion was invited on whether the alternative CRs would instead be an acceptable way forward, and the corresponding text for the Rel-15 note as part of that alternative approach.

# Discussion

Based on the feedback received, the majority view (3 companies including one UE chipset vendor) was still to approve the original CRs, on the basis that this is the cleanest approach for the specification and does not leave any ambiguity, and is technically leading to the same device behaviour as the alternative approach.

One company (UE vendor) still indicated that approval of the original CRs would not be acceptable on the basis that this is a non-backwards compatible change to the Rel-15 spec, and that the resulting change may lead to different UE flavours (despite this being the case anyway with either approach).

The same company indicated that they would accept the alternative CRs, with some minor modifications to the text of the Note in the Release 15 CR (which came quite late in the discussion) and question why this approach is not acceptable. There is also a question of what the overall anticipated system behaviour would be if there are a mixture of UEs supporting / not-supporting the UL shift.

Another company also raised general questions about whether a more generic discussion on how to do this, and it was commented that we agreed at RAN#88 on the approach to take, based on email discussion in the previous RAN4 meeting.

# Moderator Summary and Recommendation

Given the majority preference, and only one company expressing support for the alternative approach, the recommendation is for RAN4 to approve the original set of CRs.