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# Introduction

REL16 FR2 maintenance stream.

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

* 1st round: None
* 2nd round: TBA

# Topic #1:General and work plan (AI 12.3.1)

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2014513 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | TR skeleton for Rel-17 FR2 UE RF WI |
| R4-2014514 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Work plan for New WID on NR RF Enhancements for FR2 |

## Open issues summary and views’ collection for 1st round

### CRs/TPs comments collection

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Type/Source** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2014513 | Draft TR skeletonRapporteur | TR skeleton for Rel-17 FR2 UE RF WI |
| Company A: |
| Company B: |
| … |
| R4-2014514 | ApprovalRapporteur | Work plan for New WID on NR RF Enhancements for FR2 |
| Company A: |
| Company B: |
| … |
|  |
|  |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

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

### CRs/TPs

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

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

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

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

# Topic #2: Applicability of CBM/IBM for different CA

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2014724 | Samsung | Discussion on Rel-17 FR2 inter-band CADiscussion.Note this contribution has content to three AI and proposals are discussed accordingly.Observation 1: for a particular CA configuration, the same CBM/IBM attributes apply for both DL CA and UL CA as long as UL CA is supportedObservation 2: CBM is not applicable for CA configurations between different freq. groups, but only applicable within same freq. group.Observation 3: IBM is not only applicable for CA configurations between different freq. groups, but also applicable within same freq. group.**Proposal 1:  IBM is applicable for all CA configurations while CBM is only applicable for CA configurations with same freq. group. UE can report either IBM or CBM depending on UE capability for CA configurations with same freq. group.****Proposal 3:  For forward compatibility, the “frequency group” term shall not be defined in specification.** |
| R4-2014912 | Apple Inc. | More on FR2 Inter-band DL CAApproval**Proposal 1: RAN4 to develop the remaining inter-band DL CA requirements based on the band group categorization as shown in Table 2.1-2.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Group 1** | **Group 2** |
| n257, n258, n261 | n259, n260, n262 |

**Observation 1**: For a typical FR2 PC3 radio architecture design, inter-band CA combinations composed by bands within Group 1 or within Group 2 can only be supported by CBM.**Observation 2**: For a typical FR2 PC3 radio architecture design, inter-band CA combinations composed by one band from Group 1 and one band from Group 2 can be supported by IBM.**Observation 3**: It is feasible to support IBM for inter-band CA within the same band group which however is at the expenses of increasing mmW module size, cost, and power consumption during CA operation.**Observation 4**: Repurposing the existing transceiver path not designed for the intended band group to support IBM would cause substantial performance degradation for SCell despite no area and cost penalty. **Observation 5**: CBM for inter-band CA from different band groups can be subjected to more than 10 dB performance loss for SCell. |
| R4-2015327 | vivo | Discussion on FR2 inter-band DL CA enhancementsDiscussion**Observation 1:** Co-located deployment is more reasonable for CBM.**Observation 2:** Non-co-located deployment has more problem on implementation while the feasibility is still unclear.**Proposal 1:** **For IBM/CBM, the priority is to discuss the performance under co-located deployment, and more study is needed on whether non-co-located deployment is feasible.** **Observation 3:** The performance of CBM depends on both the frequency separation between CCs, and the specific band (combination).**Proposal 2: Study the feasibility that only part of the spectrum of the band pair can be used for inter-band CA with CBM. It is preferred to allow this as option 2.****Proposal 3: Based on previous observations and proposals, study and introduce per-band combination parameter F**s,inter **in the specification as a reference of applicability for IBM/CBM. A draft could be as following table:****Table 2 Distinction of IBM/CBM using F**s,inter

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Band A-Band B | Fs,inter≤[TBD] | CBM&IBM (chosen by UE) |
| Fs,inter＞[TBD] | IBM |

**Observation 4:** As a range for which CBM is applicable, intra-band CA can also use this Fs,inter as a reference for CBM applicability.**Proposal 4:** **How to determine the value of Fs,inter to distinguish between IBM and CBM needs more discussion** |
| R4-2014293 | Qualcomm Incorporated | Inter-band DL CA CBM band pairs for FR2 Rel-17 Approval**Observation 2:** CBM capability means UE is not able to follow beam management reference symbols independently for the bands defined as part of CBM band pair**Observation 3:** IBM capability for UE means that UE is able to follow beam management reference symbols independently for each band part of declared inter-band CA configuration and UE is able to follow beam management reference symbols from an other band |
| R4-2014515 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | FR2 interband CA CBM vs IBMDiscussion |
| R4-2014586 | Intel Corporation | CBM IBM Applicability for Inter-Band DL CAApproval**Proposal 1**: **CBM/IBM applicability should be based on UE capability.****Proposal 2: Consider IBM as baseline architecture for L+H inter-band DL CA.****Proposal 3: Consider CBM with capability of frequency separation as baseline architecture for L+L and H+H inter-band DL CA.** |
| R4-2015348 | OPPO | Discussion on Rel-17 FR2 inter-band DL CAApproval**Observation 1:** Issues like IBM/CBM capabilities, collocated/non-collocated scenarios, common coverage requirements, beam squint evaluation, etc. were difficult to reach consensus which makes slow progress in Rel-16.**Observation 2:** Clearly defined scope will benefit of the discussion in Rel-17.**Proposal 1: It is proposed to take IBM for inter freq group and CBM for same freq group as 1st priority in Rel-17.****Proposal 2: It is proposed to take CBM for inter freq group and IBM for same freq group as 2nd priority, and the discussion will based on the clear demands from industry.****Observation 3**: Whether IBM or CBM will be used for certain band combination depends on UE implementation.**Proposal 3: is proposed to clearly define whether IBM or CBM requirements are defined for certain band combination and it depends on UE to decide which beam management type will be implemented.** |
| R4-2016344 | Ericsson, Sony | Views on applicability of CBM/IBM for different CA configurationsApproval**Observation 1:** a CBM UE is assumed to support the co-located deployment scenarios. An IBM UE is assumed to support both co-located and non-co-located deployment scenarios.**Observation 2:** the MRTD for a collocated scenario cannot be less than 3 us. A UE indicating CBM requirements for a band combination can expect the MRTD for a collocated scenario.**Proposal 1: the network shall be able to configure a UE with a supported band combination according to its advertised capabilities, including the BM capability (that must be indicated for each supported band combination) in accordance with standard capability indication.** **Proposal 2: a band combination should not be conditioned on the support of a particular BM capability; if requirements for a particular BM are not specified for a band combination, then this is noted in the specification.** |
| R4-2016523 | Huawei, HiSilicon | On Rel-17 inter band DL CA\_FR2Approval**Observation1**: 3us MRTD is not applicable for inter-band CA CBM under common RF chain assumption if performance loss is not expected.**Proposal 1: Accept demodulation performance degradation for L+L/H+H band combinations with CBM type, and make clarification into RAN4 spec.****Proposal 2: Separation class extends to be indicated per band combination per receiving chain** **for L+L and H+H CA combinations.****Proposal 3: Clarify in RAN4 spec that CBM type can support non-collocated deployment with possible demodulation performance degradation.****Proposal 4: Introduce RF requirements for L+L/H+H band combinations with IBM type into TS 38.101-2.****Proposal 5: For L+L/H+H band combinations with IBM type, max PSD difference follows the definition for L+H IBM type in Rel-16.** |

## Open issues summary and views’ collection for 1st round

**Issue 2-1:** **CBM is only applicable for CA configurations with same freq. group (R4-2014724).**

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1: Yes CBM can only support CA configurations within same frequency group
	+ Option 2: No there is not restrictions which CA configurations CBM UE can support
	+ Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Issue 2-1: CBM is only applicable for CA configurations with same freq. group (R4-2014724).Option 1 with additional restriction on 1) collocated scenario. 2) limited MRTD  |
| YYY |  |
| XXX |  |

**Issue 2-2: IBM is applicable for all CA configurations (R4-2014724).**

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1: Yes by default IBM is applicable for all CA configurations
	+ Option 2: No IBM is not by default applicable for all CA configurations
	+ Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Option 1. But depending on the same frequency group or different frequency groups two CA bands are associated with, the requirements may be different.  |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-3: The “frequency group” term shall not be defined in specification (R4-2014724).**

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1: “frequency group” term shall not be defined
	+ Option 2: “frequency group” term is defined
	+ Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-4: Clearly state in specification whether IBM and/or CBM requirements are defined for certain band combination (R4-2015348).**

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1: Yes
	+ Option 2: No
	+ Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Option 2. It is up to UE’s capability signalling. UE may claim IBM and/or CBM for each band combination. |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-5: Study and introduce per-band combination parameter Fs,inter in the specification as a reference of applicability for IBM/CBM (R4-2015327)**

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1: YesFs,inter parameter is studied further
	+ Option 2: No Fs,inter parameter is not studied further
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Option 1. Considering the frequency span of inter-band CA in 28GHz and 39GHz can be as large as 5~6GHz, such parameter is needed. |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-6: Separation class extends to be indicated per band combination per receiving chain for L+L and H+H CA combinations (R4-2016523).**

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1:  New UE capability for separation class is only introduced per band combination
	+ Option 2：New UE capability for separation class is introduced per band combination per receiving chain
	+ Option 3:  separation class is not indicated per band combination per receiving chain, no new UE capability is introduced
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Option 1. Considering CBM limitation on large frequency span support, such parameter is needed. |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

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

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

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

### CRs/TPs

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

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

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

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

# Topic #3: UE requirements for CA configurations CA\_n258A-n260A and CA\_n257A-n259A based on IBM (AI 12.3.2.1.4)

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2014589 | Intel Corporation | UE requirements for CA\_258A-n260A and CA\_257A-n259A based on IBMApproval**Proposal: Apply the same requirements defined for CA\_n260A-n261A to CA\_n258A-n260A and CA\_n257A-n259A.** |
| R4-2014966 | NTT DOCOMO INC. | DL Inter-band CA\_n257-n259Approval**Observation 1:** For difference of MBR between CA\_n257-n259 and CA\_n260-n261, there is 0.2 dB difference on dMBP,n between n257 and n261 in 28GHz bands. Other factors have no difference.**Observation 2:** Required relaxation value due to common spherical coverage for n258+n260 and n260+n261 is expected to be the same value although the frequency ranges of n258 and n261 are different.**Observation 3:** Relaxation due to beam squint loss seems not needed for IBM UE.**Proposal 1: For ΔRIB,P,n and ΔRIB,S,n, apply the same relaxation values with n260+n261 to n257+n259.****Proposal 2: Release independent from Rel-16 shall apply to DL inter-band CA of n257-n259.** |
| R4-2015875 | Sony, Ericsson | Views on Rel-17 inter-band DL CA in FR2Approval**Observation 1:** 2.5 dB relaxation on each band is sufficient for the common spherical coverage of band combination CA\_n258A-n260A and CA\_n257A-n259A to reach the 50% spatial coverage.**Observation 2:** A significant EIS difference can occur because the PSD level of the untested band is fixed at EIS spherical overage requirement level.**Observation 3:** Additional performance relaxation is needed to fulfill the EIS spherical coverage requirement for inter-band CA operation.**Proposal 1: Introduce 2.5 dB + 1dB = 3.5 dB relaxation on the spherical coverage requirement for the band combination CA\_n258A-n260A and CA\_n257A-n259A based on IBM.**  |

**Issue 3-1: Apply the same requirements defined for CA\_n260A-n261A to CA\_n258A-n260A**

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1: Yes same requirements apply
	+ Option 2: No same requirements do not apply
	+ Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Option 1. Due to the similar frequency gap sizes in these CA configurations, the same IBM requirements can be applied. |
| YYY |  |
| XXX |  |

**Issue 3-2: Apply the same requirements defined for CA\_n260A-n261A to CA\_n257A-n259A**

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1: Yes same requirements apply
	+ Option 2: No same requirements do not apply
	+ Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Option 1. Due to the similar frequency gap sizes in these CA configurations, the same IBM requirements can be applied. |
| YYY |  |
| XXX |  |

**Issue 3-3: DL CA configurations CA\_n258A-n260A and CA\_n257A-n259A are release independent from REL-16**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: from Rel-16
	+ Option 2: from Rel-17
	+ Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| YYY |  |
| XXX |  |

## Open issues summary and views’ collection for 1st round

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

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

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

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

### CRs/TPs

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

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

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

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

# Topic #4: UE requirements for CA configurations within the same frequency group based on CBM (AI 12.3.2.1.5)

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2014588 | Intel Corporation | UE requirements for CA configurations within the same frequency group based on CBMDiscussion**Observation 1:** CBM is more applicable to collocated gNB deployment scenario.**Observation 2:** There is no beam squint degradation at beam peak under perfect phase calibration.**Proposal**: **RAN4 should study the impact of beam squint effect on beam peak (REFSENS and peak EIRP) based on practical phase calibrations for CBM together with spherical coverage.** |
| R4-2014724 | Samsung | Discussion on Rel-17 FR2 inter-band CADiscussion.**Proposal 2:  For CBM band pairs, no spherical coverage requirement will be defined.** |
| R4-2014912 | Apple Inc. | More on FR2 Inter-band DL CAApproval**Proposal 2**: **For FR2 inter-band CA within the same band group, the UE RF requirements are only defined based on cell collocation and intra-band CA MRTD requirement.** |
| R4-2014293 | Qualcomm Incorporated | Inter-band DL CA CBM band pairs for FR2 Rel-17 Approval**Observation 1:** RAN4 firstly needs to understand how to define requirements for the CBM band pair and then decide how to capture them in the TS.**Observation 4:** RAN4 may withhold defining spherical coverage requirements for CBM band pair**Proposal:** **Define at least peak EIS requirement for CBM band pair for inter-band DL CA** |

**Issue 4-1:** For FR2 inter-band CA CBM band pairs, no spherical coverage requirement will be defined.

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1: spherical coverage requirement is not defined for FR2 inter-band CA CBM band pairs
	+ Option 2: spherical coverage requirement is defined for FR2 inter-band CA CBM band pairs
	+ Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| YYY |  |
| XXX |  |

**Issue 4-2:** For FR2 inter-band CA define at least peak EIS requirement for CBM band pair for inter-band DL CA

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1: Yes
	+ Option 2: No
	+ Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Option 1 |
| YYY |  |
| XXX |  |

**Issue 4-3:** For FR2 inter-band CA within the same band group, the UE RF requirements are only defined based on cell collocation

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1: Yes UE requirements only assume cell collocation for FR2 inter-band CA within the same band group
	+ Option 2: No UE requirements assume both cell collocation and non-collocation for FR2 inter-band CA within the same band group
	+ Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Option 1.  |
| YYY |  |
| XXX |  |

## Open issues summary and views’ collection for 1st round

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

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

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

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

### CRs/TPs

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

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

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

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

# Topic #5: UE requirements for CA configuration CA\_n257A-n259A based on IBM (AI 12.3.2.2.3)

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2016086 | NTT DOCOMO INC. | UL inter-band CA for different band group based on IBEApproval**Proposal 1: For maximum TRP for FR2 UL inter-band CA, the sum of TRP from LB and HB shall not exceed maximum TRP associated with each power class, e.g., 23dBm for power class 2/3/4.****Proposal 2: For maximum peak EIRP for FR2 UL inter-band CA, it should be guaranteed that the sum of peak EIRP from LB and HB in any direction does not exceed the allowable level, e.g., 43dBm for PC 2/3/4.****Proposal 3: For FR2 UL inter-band CA, UE should meet minimum peak EIRP of LB and HB individually, and should meet common spherical coverage EIRP.****Proposal 4: UE should meet emission requirements of LB and HB under UL inter-band CA operation, respectively.** |

**Issue 5-1:** **For maximum TRP for FR2 UL inter-band CA,** **the sum of TRP from LB and HB shall not exceed maximum TRP associated with each power class, e.g., 23dBm for power class 2/3/4.**

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1: Yes the sum of TRP from LB and HB shall not exceed maximum TRP associated with each power class
	+ Option 2: No there will not be such limitation
	+ Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  Intel | Option 3. Need further study. |
| YYY |  |
| XXX |  |

**Issue 5-2: For maximum peak EIRP for FR2 UL inter-band CA, it should be guaranteed that the sum of peak EIRP from LB and HB in any direction does not exceed the allowable level, e.g., 43dBm for PC 2/3/4.**

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1: Yes it should be guaranteed that the sum of peak EIRP from LB and HB in any direction does not exceed the allowable level
	+ Option 2: No there will not be such limitation
	+ Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Option 3: Need further study |
| YYY |  |
| XXX |  |

**Issue 5-3: For FR2 UL inter-band CA, UE should meet minimum peak EIRP of LB and HB individually, and should meet common spherical coverage EIRP.**

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1: Yes UE should meet minimum peak EIRP of LB and HB individually, and should meet common spherical coverage EIRP
	+ Option 2: Needs more discussion
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Option 2: Need more discussion. Supporting peak EIRP and spherical coverage on both LB and HB simultaneously needs to double Tx power consumption comparing with single CC or intra-band UL. RAN4 needs to decide if this is practical for some UE power class, for example, PC3. |
| YYY |  |
| XXX |  |

**Issue 5-4: UE should meet emission requirements of LB and HB under UL inter-band CA operation, respectively.**

* Proposals:
	+ Option 1: UE meets emission requirements of LB and HB under UL inter-band CA operation, respectively i.e. both LB and HB meet own applicable requirements
	+ Option 2: Needs more discussion
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Option 2 |
| YYY |  |
| XXX |  |

## Open issues summary and views’ collection for 1st round

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

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

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

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

### CRs/TPs

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

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

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

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