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# Introduction

This discussion summary will cover two agendas:

5.30 High power UE (power class 2) for NR inter-band Carrier Aggregation with 2 bands downlink and 2 bands uplink

5.32 Power Class 2 UE for NR inter-band CA and SUL configurations with x (x>2) bands DL and y (y=1, 2) bands UL

According to the contributions submitted, this discussion summary will focus on the following topics:

* Topic#1: Discussion on general issues for HPUE CA
  + Sub-topic 1-1: Power Class notation for BCSs
  + Sub-topic 1-2: MSD update checking
* Topic#2: HPUE CA correction and introduction
  + Sub-topic 2-1: Corrections
  + Sub-topic 2-2: TPs/draft CRs to introduce UE requirements for combos

Note that the tables for collecting comments for sub-topic issues are arranged just below each issue...

# Topic #1: Discussion on general issues for HPUE CA

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations/Abstracts** |
| [R4-2202020](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2202020.zip) | Skyworks Solutions Inc. | Proposal: Potential MSD increase or new MSD should be checked for the added HPUE UL configurations listed above before the end of Release 17 to maintain those cases in the specification. |
| [R4-2202041](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2202041.zip) | T-Mobile USA | Proposal: Add superscripts to BCSs to indicate which BCSs have been analyzed for support of PC2 and PC1.5 |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 1-1: Power Class notation for BCSs

**Proposal (R4-2202041):**

* Add superscripts to BCSs to indicate which BCSs have been analyzed for support of PC2 and PC1.5

Table

Description automatically generated

**Recommended WF:**

* Collect views on this proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments on Sub-topic 1-1: Power Class notation for BCSs** |
| ZTE | It seems only BCS0 was analized for PC2 and PC1.5 since usually the BCS information were not included when requesting the HPUE NR CA combinations. However, when combining the PC2/PC1.5 table with the existing PC3 table in last meeting, companies think the BCS should be same for all the power classes band combinations although BCS information for the HPUE band combination in TR38.841 are not totally the same with PC3.  So far we don’t think the proposal in 2202041 is a good approach, it does not make sense to check all the HPUE combinations one by one since the approaches and templates for HPUE inter-band CA band combination requesting are quite different compared with PC3. on the contrary, it would make the table a bit difficult to understand when joint all the power classes band combinations in the same table but with different BCS information. In addition, HPUE rapporteur may need to maintain this table which might cause overlapping when PC3 rapporteur maintain the same table in the same meeting.  It might be better to remove the BCS information for HPUE combs in TR38.841, instead using a common wording like BCS for the HPUE inter-band CA band combination are the same with the corresponding PC3 inter-band CA band combination, in both TR38.841 and TS38.101-1. |
| Skyworks | One of the topis that should be clarified is that in our view a PC2 inter-band combination that use PC1.5 1UL cannot work without the increased power feature otherwise it is clamped at 26dBm (without changes to PCMAX). Since this is still discussed in 114 I am not sure how these should be treated in the spec. at least some additional note is needed to clarify this. Also in the TR, even is the 29dBm MSD is there it should add a note that this is applicable only if the UE is capable of “increased power”. Furthermore there are companies wanting to limit PC2 increased power to 28.6dBm and thus would not fully work for 1Ul PC1.5. I am supportive of enabling those but at this point these cases are not complete without a solution in the PC2 “increased power” PCMAX enabling up to 29dBm. These are already in the draft spec and I am not suggesting to remove them but at least the note for PC1.5 should aknowledge the dependency to “increased power” capability and the associated MSD requirement should also do the same. |
| Huawei | We tend to support that BCS should be independent of power classes. It’s not clear about the consequence if certain BCS is not analysed for PC2/PC1.5. On the other hand, if it’s analysed, maybe we’ll get a different MSD. But will that mean tightened UE requirements?  Regarding Skyworks’ comments above, for PC1.5 1UL, the UL is in non-CA mode, though the DL may be inter-band CA. But for 1UL, maybe the single-band power class should apply? I think the intention of the table in question is to indicate the combination of DL and UL configurations including power classes. |
| AT&T | We also tend to support that BCS should be independent of power classes, but we do recognize that there could be cases where additional BCSs are added in the future which may require further analysis for the higher power classes.  It is our understanding that any existing PC3 BCSs at the time of the PC2/PC1.5 analysis were considered. We do not agree that only BCS0 was considered for PC2/PC1.5 based on the ZTE comment since there was no specific BCS called out in the 2DL/xUL WIDs which would imply that the existing PC3 BCSs should have been considered. In reference to the Skyworks comment, we would rather keep this discussion to the existing power classes and not add any complexity related to the “increased power” WID. Any additional clarifications related to the “increased power” WID can be considered under that topic. We agree with the Huawei comment that for PC1.5 1UL that the UL is not in CA mode and the single-band power class applies. It is our understanding that this was the intent when the CA configuration table was updated to show the power class associated with the single-uplink carrier and was in-line with the requests made in the WIDs for the single-carrier case. |
| T-Mobile USA | We agree that ideally power class should be independent of BCS, but since MSD needs to be analyzed for each BCS, we proposed adding the footnote to the BCS as a way to indicate if that was done.  We think that it is clear that PC1.5 only applies to single carrier. The heading of the second column of Table 5.5A.3.1-1 is: Uplink CA configuration **or single uplink carrier10**  Note 10 says: NOTE 10: Only single uplink carriers with power class other than PC3 are listed.  Then combinations with PC1.5 for single uplink carrier are listed as:  n418, 9  CA\_n41C  CA\_n41A-n71A8  So, it should be clear that PC1.5 only applies to single carrier n41, and not for UL CA. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Sub-topic 1-2: MSD update checking

**Proposal (R4-2202020):**

* Potential MSD increase or new MSD should be checked for the added HPUE UL configurations listed below before the end of Release 17 to maintain those cases in the specification.
* CA\_n25A-n41C or CA\_ n25A-n41(2A) DL with PC2 or PC1.5 n41 UL or PC2 CA\_n25A-n41A UL
* CA\_n41(2A)-n66A DL with PC2 or PC1.5 n41 UL or PC2 CA\_ n41A-n66A UL
* CA\_n41C-n66A DL with PC2 or PC1.5 n41 UL or PC2 CA\_ n41A-n66A UL
* CA\_n41C-n71A DL with PC2 or PC1.5 n41 UL or PC2 CA\_ n41A-n71A UL
* CA\_n1A-n78A DL with PC2 n78 UL or PC2 CA\_ n1A-n78A UL
* CA\_n2A-n77/78A or CA\_n2A-n77(2A) DL with PC2 n77/n78 UL or PC2 CA\_n2A-n77A UL
* CA\_n3A-n41A DL with PC2 n41 UL or PC2 CA\_n3A-n41A UL
* CA\_n3A-n78A DL with PC2 n78 UL or PC2 CA\_n3A-n78A UL
* CA\_n5A-n77A or CA\_n5A-n77(2A) DL with PC2 n77 UL or PC2 CA\_n5A-n77A UL
* CA\_n12A-n77A or CA\_n12A-n77(2A) DL with PC2 n77 UL or PC2 CA\_n12A-n77A UL
* CA\_n14A-n77A or CA\_n14A-n77(2A) DL with PC2 n77 UL or PC2 CA\_n14A-n77A UL
* CA\_n25A-n77A DL with PC2 n77 UL
* CA\_n28A-n41A DL with PC2 n41 UL or PC2 CA\_n28A-n41A UL
* CA\_n28A-n79A DL with PC2 n79 UL or PC2 CA\_n28A-n79A UL
* CA\_n30A-n77A or CA\_n30A-n77(2A) DL with PC2 n77 UL or PC2 CA\_n30A-n77A UL
* CA\_n40A-n41A with PC2 n41 UL or PC2 CA\_n40A-n41A UL (MSD unless non-simultaneous Tx/Rx is granted, note is missing)
* CA\_n41A-n77A DL with PC2 or PC1.5 n41 UL or PC2 n77 UL or PC2 CA\_ n41A-n77A UL (unclear if both can be PC2 and simultaneously, MSD unless non-simultaneous Tx/Rx is granted, note is missing)
* CA\_n41A-n79A DL with PC2 n41 or n79 UL or PC2 CA\_ n41A-n79A UL (unclear if both can be PC2 and simultaneously, MSD unless non-simultaneous Tx/Rx is granted, note is missing)
* CA\_n66A-n77A or CA\_n66A-n77(2A) DL with PC2 n77 UL or PC2 CA\_ n66A-n77A UL
* CA\_n71A-n77A DL with PC2 n77 UL or PC2 CA\_ n71A-n77A UL

**Recommended WF:**

* Collect views for this proposal.
* Please contacts for the above CAs check if MSD values have been analyzed? Or if Skyworks could further clarify the proposal? As we have TR 38.841 that have captured the MSD analysis and also reflected the corresponding requirements into TS 38101-1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments on Sub-topic 1-2: MSD update checking** |
| ZTE | We think the MSD values for PC2 UL inter-band CA have already defined for all the PC2 UL inter-band CA band combination, i.e. IMD MSD needs to be checked and defined if there are IMD issues in the corresponding PC3 combs.  However, for PC2 UL intra-band CA, such as PC2 n77(2A) for some combs, the MSD should be discussed but it seems the MSD were not checked. |
| Xiaomi | Generally we agree with the intention that the MSD issue should be carefully checked since more and more PC2 band combinations are introduced. However, It seems the MSD values for most of listed band combination have been correctly reflected in the latest spec. For CA\_n40A-n41A, although it can found that this band combination only applicable for UE supporting inter-band carrier aggregation without simultaneous Rx/Tx from Table 6.2A.4.2.3-1, it is better the same wording note 9 should be added as subscript in Table 5.2A.2.1 in operation band section. |
| LGE | RAN4 need further discuss which impact will be issued in each CA/DC band combinations. So we are support SKW proposals. Continually RAN4 discussed in Rel-18 TEI or create new WI even though the Rel-17 WI was closed. |
| Verizon | The MSD values for PC2 UL inter-band CA should be already defined for all the PC2 UL inter-band CA band combination with the agreed case a, b, c and d.  However, RAN4 may need to introduce additional requirements as what Skyworks commented out, and we support the proposal. |
| T-Mobile USA | For our combinations, we feel MSD has been thoroughly studied, although we can recheck for the next meeting. Specifically:  CA\_n25A-n41C or CA\_ n25A-n41(2A) DL with PC2 or PC1.5 n41 UL or PC2 CA\_n25A-n41A UL                  DL CA\_n25A-n41A with PC2 UL CA\_n25A-n41A UL and PC2 and PC1.5 n41 was already analyzed. Does DL 41C or 41(2A) change anything?  CA\_n41(2A)-n66A DL with PC2 or PC1.5 n41 UL or PC2 CA\_ n41A-n66A UL                  DL CA\_n41A-n66A with PC2 UL CA\_n41A-n66A and DL CA\_n41A-n66A with UL PC2 and PC1.5 n41 was already analyzed. Does DL 41(2A) change anything?  CA\_n41C-n66A DL with PC2 or PC1.5 n41 UL or PC2 CA\_ n41A-n66A UL                  DL CA\_n41A-n66A with PC2 UL CA\_n41A-n66A and DL CA\_n41A-n66A with UL PC2 and PC1.5 n41 was already analyzed. Does DL 41C change anything?  CA\_n41C-n71A DL with PC2 or PC1.5 n41 UL or PC2 CA\_ n41A-n71A UL                  DL CA\_n41A-n71A with PC2 UL CA\_n41A-n71A and DL CA\_n41A-n71A with UL PC2 and PC1.5 n41 was already analyzed. Does DL 41C change anything?  CA\_n25A-n77A DL with PC2 n77 UL                  This was studied long ago and MSD documented, although in Table 7.3A.4-4 and  Table 7.3A.5-1a,  although Table 7.3A.5-1a is out of order.  CA\_n41A-n77A DL with PC2 or PC1.5 n41 UL or PC2 n77 UL or PC2 CA\_ n41A-n77A UL (unclear if both can be PC2 and simultaneously, MSD unless non-simultaneous Tx/Rx is granted, note is missing)                  Not sure what is not clear. The notes indicate PC2 or PC1.5 for n41, PC2 for n77, or PC2 for n41\_n77. ~~All have been analyzed~~ Update: We thought these had been analyzed in R4-2107834, but it looks like we missed PC2 intermodulation.  CA\_n66A-n77A or CA\_n66A-n77(2A) DL with PC2 n77 UL or PC2 CA\_ n66A-n77A UL                  Analysis was done for PC2 UL CA\_n66A-n77a. See cross band isolation in Table 7.3A.6-1a, intermodulation in Table 7.3A.5-1a  CA\_n71A-n77A DL with PC2 n77 UL or PC2 CA\_ n71A-n77A UL                  MSD for PC2 intermodulation can be found in Table 7.3A.5-1a |
| Skyworks | To ZTE: MSD related to UL configurations including intra-band UL CA (like n77(2A) have been discussed in the not for block approval thread and MSD specs exist for the single band cases. For the two band cases, it involves triple beat calcualtion which are still not fully mature and work is on going in R17 to come to a stable framework  For the cases to be checked: I apologize again that I did not have a chance to go through all the CRs to know what was there or not and it was too late when the draft spec was available but based on the TR, after further crosscheck and letting aside the PC1.5 cases already discussed above, here are my remaining questions:   * I could not find CA\_n2-n78 and CA\_n1-n78 although they have been added as PC2 inter-band CR last meeting. * For MB (DL)+HB (UL) cases I’d like to have clarification if cross-band isolation MSD has been considered for PC2 even though they do not exist all for PC3 (it is worth checking), this is for: CA\_n2A-n77, CA\_n3-n78, CA\_n25A-n77A, CA\_n30A-n77A, CA\_n41A-n77A (n41 UL to n77 DL if simultaneous Tx/Rx is supported), CA\_n66A-n77A. * For PC2 n41-n77 as both can be PC2, or even PC1.5+PC2 or PC1.5+PC1.5: if I agree that MSD for single and dual UL have been considered, It would be of interest to indicate what are the per band max power in the 2UL case to understand whther this needs “increased power” capability to work.   I did not have time to fully check but at least we want to be able to reconsider values, or add requirement if needed in next meeting. It also means that we may also need to have a completed “increased power” framework for some of those to be complete. |
| AT&T | The PC2 combinations with single UL and UL CA configurations are included in the specification and were analyzed and presented in on-time text proposals which were approved in previous RAN4 meetings in-line with the WID requests.  We are OK to allow companies to further check MSD values, but we strongly do not agree that the combinations should be removed from the Rel-17 specification. This approach would rescind previous RAN4 decisions which were also subsequently approved at RAN Plenary. This would also cause a significant delay in the visibility of the core requirements as Rel-18 specifications will not be published for some time.  If any interested company finds an issue, this can be handled by a Category F CR. |
| China Telecom | To Skyworks, regarding CA\_n1-n78, it has been finished in the completed SAR WI as an example combination, the CR number is R4-2015889. For CA\_n2-n78, from rapporteur point I also didn’t find it captured in combinations table in WI, guess this is maybe a typo when making the PC2 to be indicated in the CA configuration tables. Because we have so many combos, although many companies help to check in last meeting, there still may be some mistakes. Maybe T-Mobile Bill could give more clarifications as it was shown in your CR R4-2119885.  For UL CA n77(2A) as mentioned by ZTE and Skyworks, I think there is no issue/additional requirement for DL\_CA\_n77(2A)\_UL\_n77. We have never touched UL intra-band CA, is that right?  We share the same view with AT&T, and think companies have no mean to rescind the combos captured in the spec but would like to further check. If any issues found for the specific combo, it could be handled by Category F CR. |
| T-Mobile USA | To China Telecom: Indeed, PC2 for CA\_n2-n78 was a typo in R4-2015889. The superscript note should be removed. Sorry about that. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 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: Power Class notation for BCSs | Companies have different views on whether to indicate the power class supporting for BCS. Almost companies think BCS should be independent of power class, however how to solve the issue that some MSD requirements are not aligned with new BCS which is added after MSD analysis for power class other than power class3, this is still an open issue. Here, we list some options for further discussion in 2nd round  **Recommended WF:**  Power class is independent of BCS, options for whether/how to indicate power class for BCS are listed as:   * Option1: Add footnote to the BCS to indicate power class * Option2: No need to indicate power class for BCS (People shall check if power class is supported for specific BCS by themselves) * Option3: Other suggestions? |
| Sub-topic 1-2: MSD update checking | **Recommended WF:**   * No request for PC2 CA\_n2-n78, typo will be corrected in the corresponding big CR. * Other technical issues including MSD checking etc for the combinations have reflected in the spec. could be handled by proposed TP/contribution in this release or Category F CR if this release WI is closed. |

## Discussion on 2nd round

### Sub-topic 1-1(2nd round): Power Class notation for BCSs

**Continue discuss based on the recommended WF from 1st round summary:**

* Power class is independent of BCS, options for whether/how to indicate power class for BCS are listed as:
  + Option1: Add footnote to the BCS to indicate power class
  + Option2: No need to indicate power class for BCS (People shall check if power class is supported for specific BCS by themselves)
  + Option3: Other suggestions?

**Recommended WF:** Collect views on the above options.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments on Sub-topic 1-1(2nd round): Power Class notation for BCSs** |
| ZTE | Option 3.  As we commented in 1st round, if all companies think BCS are the same for all the power classes band combinations, then it might be better to remove the BCS information for HPUE combs in TR38.841, instead using a common wording like BCS for the HPUE inter-band CA band combination are the same with the corresponding PC3 inter-band CA band combination, in both TR38.841 and TS38.101-1. |
| MediaTek | Tend to agree on option 2. We share the view that power class should be independent of BCS. All CBW permutations shall be analyzed when new power class other than PC3 for the combination is introduced. It is not necessary to have additional superscript. |
| Huawei | Option 2 is acceptable. |
| T-Mobile USA | Option 2 is acceptable. |
| China Telecom | Option 2 is acceptable. We think the option1 may make spec looks a little redundant, as other power classes other than PC3 will share the same procedures. However it indeed exists the issue that BCS may not match with the MSD requirements. Towards this issue, we think common wording also cannot solve it well, so leave it to combos’ contributor checking and maintaining seems to be a better way. Or if we could come out a suitable note to not only describe the story clearly but also make the spec well readable.  Given the deadline for 2nd round summary is very near, if we could not make consensus on this, from moderator point, I will suggest to continue discuss in next meeting if people are interested on this. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Sub-topic 1-2 (2nd round): MSD update checking

According to email reflector discussion, following proposals are suggested to be further discussed:

**Proposals for PC1.5 CA from one company:**

* + Proposal1: If we are OK with the explanation that when single band UL is configured then that band power class applies but we would like to make sure that this is in accordance with PCmax behavior.
  + Proposal2: Also when a band declares PC1.5 and is part of a two band UL CA, what is the expected behavior when there is RB allocations in both band or only in the PC1.5 band and what PCmax/MPR applies.

**Recommended WF:** Collect views on the above proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments on Sub-topic 1-2 (2nd round): MSD update checking** |
| Skyworks | Regarding MSD after rd 1 checking we are OK with the values but we would like to discuss applicability depending on the UL configuration for PC1.5. The common understanding is that when single UL PC1.5 is configured, PC1.5 power class applies and then the PC1.5 MSD applies (together with single CC PCmax and MPR)  But when a 2UL PC2 is configured with PC1.5 in one band then: CA PCmax applies whether there is RB allocation in both CC or only the one CC) but in this case R17 does not allow 3Tx thus the PC1.5 band can only use one of its PC2 PA and is anyhow limited to PC2:   * PC2 PCmax and MPR applies to the PC1.5 band and PC2 MSD should apply.   If this is the correct understanding we would like to encourage companies to check that PCmax and MPR behavior is properly covered by the specification.  Independently it would be useful to capture clarification on which MSD applies under the different UL configuration as it is not linked to the power class declaration per band in this case but also depends on UL configuration and use of TxD or not.  I used PC1.5 as an illustration but the same issue applies for 2 band UL configuration with one band implementing PC2 with 2Tx : it will have to fall back to a single PC3 PA and thus PC3 PCmax, MPR and MSD should apply thus it depends on the TxD capability signaling.  Finally, this behavior also needs to account for the fact that for example a 2 band UL configuration with PC3 in one band and PC1.5 in the other band would be eligible to “increased power” since it only uses one PC2 PA and could reach 28.6dBm. |
| T-Mobile USA | We appreciate Skyworks raising this issue. It is our understanding that if a UE is configured for UL CA in a combination that it declares as PC2 capable, even it is capable of PC1.5 on one or both of the individual carriers the UE is limited to PC2 even if there are only RB allocations a single carrier. We plan to bring a CR to RAN4#102-e to clarify this in the Pcmax equations to avoid any confusion in the future. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Topic #2: HPUE CA correction and introduction

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations/Abstracts** |
| R4-2201225 | Xiaomi | Draft CR to 38.101-1 corrections on Tx power configuration on IMD requirement for high power UE inter-band CA |
| [R4-2201680](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2201680.zip) | AT&T | TP for TR 38.841 Addition of CA\_n29-n77 |
| [R4-2201717](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2201717.zip) | Verizon, AT&T | DraftCR to 38.101-1 for HPUE CA with 2 bands downlink and x bands uplink (x =1,2) |
| [R4-2202042](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2202042.zip) | T-Mobile USA | Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for DL CA\_n41(2A) UL n41 |
| [R4-2202043](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2202043.zip) | T-Mobile USA | Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for combinations with n25 and n41 |
| [R4-2202044](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2202044.zip) | T-Mobile USA | Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for combinations with n41 and n66 |
| [R4-2202045](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2202045.zip) | T-Mobile USA | Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for combinations with n41 and n71 |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 2-1: Corrections

**Proposed CR:**

* R4-2201225 Draft CR to 38.101-1 corrections on Tx power configuration on IMD requirement for high power UE inter-band CA

**Recommended WF:**

* Collect the comments for proposed draft CR.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection for Sub-topic 2-1: Corrections** |
| R4-2201225 | Xiaomi: It can be noted. We didn’t note that the change has been reflected in the latest version. Sorry for the confusion. |
|  |
|  |

### Sub-topic 2-2: TPs/draft CRs to introduce UE requirements for combos

**Proposed CRs/TP:**

* [R4-2201680](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2201680.zip) TP for TR 38.841 Addition of CA\_n29-n77
* R4-2201717 Draft CR to 38.101-1 for HPUE CA with 2 bands downlink and x bands uplink (x =1,2)
* R4-2202042 Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for DL CA\_n41(2A) UL n41
* R4-2202043 Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for combinations with n25 and n41
* R4-2202044 Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for combinations with n41 and n66
* R4-2202045 Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for combinations with n41 and n71

**Recommended WF:**

* Collect the comments for proposed TP and draft CRs. If no comments for certain of TP or draft CR, the TP or draft CR will be recommended as approved.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection for Sub-topic 2-2: TPs/draft CRs to introduce UE requirements for combos** |
| [R4-2201680](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2201680.zip) |  |
|  |
|  |
| [R4-2201717](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2201717.zip) | ZTE: It is a bit weird to use band number in the UL column. What does it mean? We think it cannot equal to single carrier. In addition, if PC2 UL intra-band CA is supported/requested, what should we do? |
| Verizon: For the 1UL part in the first part of ZTE comment, it should be same as the Skyworks one in [R4-2202020](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2202020.zip), then we remove the n778 from UL column from this contribution. Please refer the revision ([Rev R4-2201717 DraftCR to 38.101-1 for HPUE CA -5-30-1.docx](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.3gpp.org%2Fftp%2Ftsg_ran%2FWG4_Radio%2FTSGR4_101-bis-e%2FInbox%2FDrafts%2F%255B101-bis-e%255D%255B112%255D%2520NR_PC2_SUL_CA_lowMSD%2FRound%25201%2FRev%2520R4-2201717%2520DraftCR%2520to%252038.101-1%2520for%2520HPUE%2520CA%2520-5-30-1.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK)) here.  For the 2UL, the draftCR is created based on the approved PC2 requirements which have been specified in both 38.101-1 and TR 38.841 for the following CA combos. The contribution is only to add the “Note 8” from the early approved PC2 CA combos.   * CA\_n2A-n77A * CA\_n5A-n77A * CA\_n66A-n77A   This should be what we exactly should do. Otherwise, it is great ZTE to narrate the comment in detail. |
| T-Mobile USA: To ZTE: There are lots of combinations with n41, n77 or m78 with superscript notes already in the table. At the last meeting it was agreed that the second column would indicate uplink CA or single uplink carrier with a power class other than power class 3:  Uplink CA configuration or single uplink carrier10  NOTE 10: Only single uplink carriers with power class other than PC3 are listed. |
| Skyworks: Just for clarification these are just PC2 cases, I assume that MSDs have already been captured in the spec. In my view it would be better if the CRs had all of the spec aspects in them or at least point that the combinations have been completed. I will further crosscheck these for next meeting. Should we rather have a big CR approach? Also even if things are already in the spec I should say the CR did not have much visibility. One aspect is whether the single UL nXX is the best way to capture or whather we should have some text saying that for PC2 inter-band CA with one UL bands that support PC2 , 1UL PC2 in that band is a valid fallback. Similarly for PC2 inter-band with increased power capability with one UL bands that support PC1.5 , 1UL PC1.5 in that is a valid fallback. This may be more generic and provide proper conditions to apply. |
| [R4-2202042](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2202042.zip) | ZTE: Same as above |
| T-Mobile USA: Same response as above |
| Skyworks, the PC1.5 case needs “increased power” framework for completness |
| T-Mobile USA: To Skyworks: Why is the “Increased power” framework needed for completeness? PC1.5 is only being applied for UL single carrier, not for UL CA. UL CA is only PC2. |
|  |
|  |
| [R4-2202043](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2202043.zip) | ZTE: Same as above |
| T-Mobile USA: Same response as above |
| Skyworks, the PC1.5 case needs “increased power” framework for completness |
| T-Mobile USA: To Skyworks: Why is the “Increased power” framework needed for completeness? PC1.5 is only being applied for UL single carrier, not for UL CA. UL CA is only PC2. |
|  |
|  |
| [R4-2202044](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2202044.zip) | ZTE: Same as above |
| T-Mobile USA: Same response as above |
| Skyworks, the PC1.5 case needs “increased power” framework for completness |
| T-Mobile USA: To Skyworks: Why is the “Increased power” framework needed for completeness? PC1.5 is only being applied for UL single carrier, not for UL CA. UL CA is only PC2. |
|  |
|  |
| [R4-2202045](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2202045.zip) | ZTE: Same as above |
| T-Mobile USA: Same response as above |
| Skyworks, the PC1.5 case needs “increased power” framework for completness |
| T-Mobile USA: To Skyworks: Why is the “Increased power” framework needed for completeness? PC1.5 is only being applied for UL single carrier, not for UL CA. UL CA is only PC2. |
|  |
|  |

## 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: Corrections | **Recommended WF:**   * The R4-2201225 Draft CR to 38.101-1 corrections on Tx power configuration on IMD requirement for high power UE inter-band CA is noted based on the CA owner comments |
| Sub-topic 2-2: TPs/draft CRs to introduce UE requirements for combos | **Recommended WF:**   * The [R4-2201680](file:///E:\01%20标准\14%20HPUE\02%20UL_interCA\RAN4_101b_e\Docs\R4-2201680.zip) TP for TR 38.841 Addition of CA\_n29-n77 is recommended as approved, since no comments on this. * The R4-2201717 Draft CR to 38.101-1 for HPUE CA with 2 bands downlink and x bands uplink (x =1,2) is recommended as revised. * The other draft CR including R4-2202042, R4-2202043, R4-2202044, R4-2202045 are recommended as return to, since no clear consensus on whether to revise them. |

## Discussion on 2nd round

### Sub-topic 2-2(2nd round): TPs/draft CRs to introduce UE requirements for combos

**Continue discuss the revised/return to draft CRs, which are**

* Rev of R4-2201717 Draft CR to 38.101-1 for HPUE CA with 2 bands downlink and x bands uplink (x =1,2)
* (Return to) R4-2202042 Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for DL CA\_n41(2A) UL n41
* (Return to) R4-2202043 Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for combinations with n25 and n41
* (Return to) R4-2202044 Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for combinations with n41 and n66
* (Return to) R4-2202045 Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for combinations with n41 and n71

**Recommended WF:** Collect comments for these draft CRs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection for Sub-topic 2-2(2nd round): TPs/draft CRs to introduce UE requirements for combos** |
| [Rev](file:///E:\\01%20标准\\14%20HPUE\\02%20UL_interCA\\RAN4_101b_e\\Docs\\R4-2201680.zip) of R4-2201717 | AT&T: We do not agree to remove the n77 PC2 single uplink configuration in the revised CR for all CA combinations covered in the draft CR. We recommend withdrawing the revision and endorse the original draft CR.  The updated PC2 combinations with single UL are adding the corresponding PC2 configuration to higher-order combinations with additional intra-band CA configurations in the DL for already agreed lower-order PC2 combinations that support PC2 single UL configuration. This should not be controversial since there are no additional MSD analyses required in these cases.  We agree with the comments made by T-Mobile USA in the first round that there are lots of combinations with n41, n77 or n78 with superscript notes already in the table. These were introduced as a mechanism to clearly identify the combinations with single UL PC2 that were previously analyzed and completed in earlier RAN4 meetings based on the approved combinations in the WID with single UL configurations.  We also support the T-Mobile USA comments that the single UL configuration work should not be combined with the “increased power” WI. |
| T-Mobile USA: We agree with AT&T. We support the original draft CR in R4-2201717. PC2 for n77 has already been analyzed for CA\_n2A-n77A, CA\_n5A-n77A and CA\_n66A-n77A so n77 with PC2 can be used with the other DL CA combinations in R4-2201717 as well. We think the table headers and notes make it quite clear that n778 means PC2 for single CC n77. |
| Verizon: For draft CR in R4-2201717 we agree to use the original draft CR without any change following the existing analyzed results. We agree to withdraw the revision. |
| R4-2202042  (Return to) |  |
|  |
|  |
| R4-2202043  (Return to) |  |
|  |
|  |
| R4-2202044  (Return to) |  |
|  |
|  |
| R4-2202045  (Return to) |  |
|  |
|  |

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

### 5.30 High power UE (power class 2) for NR inter-band Carrier Aggregation with 2 bands downlink and 2 bands uplink

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-2201225 | Draft CR to 38.101-1 corrections on Tx power configuration on IMD requirement for high power UE inter-band CA | Xiaomi | noted |  |
| R4-2201680 | TP for TR 38.841 Addition of CA\_n29-n77 | AT&T | Approved |  |
| R4-2201717 | Draft CR to 38.101-1 for HPUE CA with 2 bands downlink and x bands uplink (x =1,2) | Verizon, AT&T | revised |  |
| R4-2202041 | Power Class notation for BCSs | T-Mobile USA | noted |  |
| R4-2202042 | Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for DL CA\_n41(2A) UL n41 | T-Mobile USA | Return to |  |
| R4-2202043 | Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for combinations with n25 and n41 | T-Mobile USA | Return to |  |
| R4-2202044 | Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for combinations with n41 and n66 | T-Mobile USA | Return to |  |
| R4-2202045 | Draft CR for 38.101-1: Addition of PC2 and PC1.5 for combinations with n41 and n71 | T-Mobile USA | Return to |  |

### 5.32 Power Class 2 UE for NR inter-band CA and SUL configurations with x (x>2) bands DL and y (y=1, 2) bands UL

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-2202020 | MSD update needed for PC2 and PC1.5 UL configurations | Skyworks Solutions Inc. | noted |  |

## 2nd round