**3GPP TSG-RAN WG4 Meeting #102-e R4-220xxxx**

**e-Meeting, Feb.- Mar. 2022**

**Title: WF on FR2 inter-band UL CA**

**Source: Qualcomm Incorporated**

# 1. WF – Band Combinations

1. GTW Agreement: RAN4 recommends that UL CA\_n260-n261 is included in this WI in addition to CA\_n257-n259.

*Moderator-note: Discussion will be transferred to email discussion document at the end of 2nd round, any agreements from discussion will be retained here*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| MediaTek | Okay, it’s operator’s demand |
| ZTE | Ok. Revised this WI to include UL CA n260-n261 in March RAN plenary meeting is needed. Then UL CA n260-n261 can be discussed in this WI. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# WF – Power Classes applicable for inter-band ULCA

1. **GTW Agreements:** 
   1. Focus on the common requirements (i.e., MPR and power control) of PC1/2/3/4/5 and Delta\_TIB values of PC1/2/4/5
   2. Discuss PC3-specific requirements after step 1a (i.e., Delta\_TIB values and total power issue).
   3. A power class cannot be supported without finalizing requirements including Delta\_TIB.
2. **GTW Agreements:** 
   1. The total power concept is not applied for power classes such as PC1/2/5
   2. FFS include new power class
   3. Further check the MPE regulation for FWA/CPE.
3. **PC4 is removed from WF2.1 to make consistent with GTW agreement in WF2.2 (y/n)**

*Moderator-note: Discussion will be transferred to email discussion document at the end of 2nd round, any agreements from discussion will be retained here:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree, include justification |
| MediaTek | Agree. Not only for consistence, PC4 device size could be not large, may suffer similar issues as PC3 handheld device. |
| OPPO | After checking the regulations, currently both CE/FCC/ICNIRP have the restriction of total Tx power for FWA/CPE also. It seems MPE impacts would be similar as handheld UE. |
| Xiaomi | Support bullet 3 |
| Qualcomm | OK to remove PC4.  To Oppo : Would you clarify how MPE impact would change the requirement structure? P-MPR would already capture MPE impact in the configured power requirement, so not sure if any further consideration is required. MPE already impacts single band requirements and it is captured in configured power for that configuration. |
| vivo | OK with bullet 3 |
| Nokia | Support. |
| Ericsson | It is difficult to progress without an agreement on the power control. OK to specify PC3 at a later stage. |
| Sony | From the practical aspect, it might be even better to only focus on PC1/5 for Rel-17, which has more clear demand on UL CA feature. However, we are fine with the current agreement.  For MPE issue, again, it can be addressed by PMPR and uplink duty cycle, we don’t think the CA operation is anything special comparing to the single CC case. Therefore, there is no need to compromise the minimum requirement due to the MPE limitation. |
| Huawei | Support to remove PC4. |

1. **RAN4 to complete inter-DLCA requirements for power classes that are enabled for inter-band ULCA**
   1. **Companies are encouraged to bring proposals for delta(RIB) for:**
      1. **PC1/2/5**
      2. **IBM inter-band DLCA for agreed band combinations (WF1)**

*Moderator-note: Discussion will be transferred to email discussion document at the end of 2nd round, any agreements from discussion will be retained here:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree, include justification |
| MediaTek | We are open for this; however, it would be better to have operator’s clarification on the demand firstly, compared to do all the possible combination directly. For example, there is even no PC2 n260 or n259 single band requirement so far, it would be not made sense to define PC2 DL/UL CA with n259 or n260.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | CA | CA\_n257-n259 | CA\_n260-n261 | | PC1 | DL |  |  | | UL |  |  | | PC2 | DL |  |  | | UL |  |  | | PC5 | DL |  |  | | UL |  |  |   **(Added in v8)**  **Response to Qualcomm:** Thanks for the discussion. Because FR2 power class are related to UE type (assumption), our intention is to clarify market’s interest firstly, instead of discussing all possibilities. |
| OPPO | Need more time to study the PC1/2/5 since previous analysis is only based on handheld UE types. |
| Xiaomi | We are open for this issue, as Media Tek comments, whether single CC operation need support the related power class firstly, i.e., n260 just supports PC1/3/4 and n259 supports PC3/5 currently. If needed, just need define   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | CA | CA\_n257-n259 | CA\_n260-n261 | | PC1 | DL |  | N/A | | UL |  | N/A | | PC2 | DL | N/A | N/A | | UL | N/A | N/A | | PC5 | DL | N/A |  | | UL | N/A |  | |
| Qualcomm | We support  To MTK: We are not sure an operator would care which power class is enabled for the feature, it is up to UE vendors to provide solutions. The network can choose to configure each PC individually for inter-ULCA.  We do see that PC1 can only be defined currently for n260+n261 and PC5 for n257+n259, due to insufficient single band coverage |
| LG Electronics | For PC2, We prefer not to leave PC2 out based on GTW agreement. To cover PC2, we’re going to submit contribution which includes single band(39GHz, i.e, n259) and CA bands in next meeting. We believe that PC2 can be covered in next meeting not lately given that WI is extended with 1Q. |
| vivo | Generally OK. We also support only define n260-n261 for PC1 and n257-n259 for PC5 due to lack of single band requirements. |
| ZTE | We also think the PC should be supported for the constituent band first for FR2 inter-band CA. |
| Samsung, | Agree with PC1 for n260+n261 and PC5 for n257+n259 for now. For PC2, if one quarter is extended and 39GHz band is added, also okay for PC2. |
| Nokia | PC1 is originally requested for US market and PC5 for Japanese market. Furthermore, UL CA\_n260-n261 and CA\_n257-n259 are requested by operators from these regions.  PC1 for CA\_n260-n261 and PC5 for CA\_n257-n259 should be in a higher priority than others. |
| Sony | As we commented in the previous issue, it might be more practical to focus on only PC1/5 for Rel-17. However, we are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei | In general ok with the proposal. |

1. **A new power class is defined to enable inter-band ULCA for non-handheld devices like laptop PCs and table-top UEs (y/n)**
   1. New power class is assumed to be an industrial-packaged UE that would normally declare itself to be PC3 to the network
   2. New power class would carry over all existing requirements from PC3 without changes
   3. Total power concept is not applied for the new power class

*Moderator-note: Discussion will be transferred to email discussion document at the end of 2nd round, any agreements from discussion will be retained here:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree, include justification |
| MediaTek | We are open for this; however, it would be better to have operator’s clarification on the demand firstly.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | CA | CA\_n257-n259 | CA\_n260-n261 | | New power class (# handheld is precluded.) (UE type assumption is laptop.) | DL |  |  | | UL |  |  |   (Added in v8)  **Response to Qualcomm:** As commented above. |
| OPPO | For clarification, is the a/b/c all need to be met by UE? Why this UE will declare itself to be PC3 rather than PC1/2/5? |
| Qualcomm | To Oppo: a/b/c is proposed to be the characteristics of the new power class. A laptop or desktop UE would be able to declare itself to be PC\_<new powerclass> if it wants to support inter-ULCA and its original design was to meet PC3 like requirements.  To MTK: see comment to #4 above |
| Samsung | We are open to define new power class for Ues like laptop and table-top, but we are not sure to carry over all existing PC3 requirements. For example the use scenario for the new power class is placed on table and lower half hemisphere may have no radiation, so the spherical coverage percentile may be different from PC3’s.  Moreover, as we have commented in 1st round, we need to exclude the dongle type and embedded type UE etc. which are also industrial-packaged UE that would normally declare itself to be PC3 to the network  Besides, it seems necessary to revise WID to include this objective. |
| Nokia | We are open for further discussion.  We assume this new power class (if introduced) would be based on the similar chipset and RF/antenna modules as existing PC3 but with sufficient power supply and heat sink like a modem card/module form factor so that that it can avoid power and thermal issues. Thus all existing RF requirement are the same as PC3. So it makes sense to us. |
| Huawei | Disagree. If all requirements are inherited from existing requirements from PC3 without changes but not total power concept, we think it just changes a name for PC3, then why not continue the discussion of PC3 and trying to address the remaining issues. As mentioned by Samsung, the usage scenario could be different from the one we discussed for PC3, which means requirements affiliated to the scenario still need further discussion.  What’s the new power class number? PC7? Shouldn’t we need to have a new WI for the new power class? |

# 3. WF – Power Control for IBM and bands from different band groups

1. **GTW Agreement:** Focus on inter-band IBM UL CA for agreed band combinations (WF1)
2. **Options (***moderator-note: options below are compliant with 38.213***):**
   1. The UE configures a PCMAX in an implementation-specific manner like for the intra-band case and relative power limits are used for controlling the power on the serving cells. PCMAX ≥ PCMAX,f,c for each configured serving cell *c* with PCMAX,f,c as specified in clause 6.2.4 with parameters MPR and A-MPR as specified per serving cell or modified as needed for the band combination (CA MPR)
   2. **From [R4-22006057]:**

A UE can configure its maximum output power for each uplink band when it is configured for inter-band UL carrier aggregation with two NR bands each with a single UL CC. For each uplink band *n*, the configured UE maximum output power PCMAX,f,c,n for carrier *f* of a serving cell *c* is defined as that available to the reference point of a given transmitter branch that corresponds to the reference point of the higher-layer filtered RSRP measurement as specified in TS 38.215 [11].

The configured UE maximum output power PCMAX,f,c,n for carrier *f* of a serving cell *c* in band *n* shall be set such that the corresponding measured peak EIRP PUMAX,f,c,n is within the following bounds

PPowerclass + PIBE – MAX(MAX(MPRf,c,n, A- MPRf,c,n) + ΔTIBP,n, P-MPRf,c,n) – MAX{T(MAX(MPRf,c,n, A- MPRf,c,n,)), T(P-MPRf,c,n)} ≤ PUMAX,f,c,n ≤ EIRPmax

while the corresponding measured total radiated power PTMAX,f,c,n is bounded by

PTMAX,f,c,n ≤ TRPmax

with PPowerclass the UE power class as specified in sub-clause 6.2.1, EIRPmax the applicable maximum EIRP as specified in sub-clause 6.2A.1, MPRf,c,n as specified in sub-clause 6.2A.2 , A-MPRf,c,n as specified in sub-clause 6.2A.3, ΔTIBP,n the peak EIRP relaxation as specified in clause 6.2A.1 and TRPmax the maximum TRP for the UE power class as specified in sub-clause 6.2.1. The requirement is verified in beam peak direction.

PIBE, *mpr-PowerBoost-FR2-r16* and *maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2* are described in clause 6.2.4.

P-MPRf,c,n is the power management maximum output power reduction P-MPRf,c in band *n.* P-MPRf,c is defined in clause 6.2.4.

The tolerance T(∆P) for applicable values of ∆P (values in dB) in each band is specified in Table 6.2.4-1.

*Moderator-note: Discussion will be transferred to email discussion document at the end of 2nd round, any agreements from discussion will be retained here:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Qualcomm | ‘independently’ needs to be removed from alt2 |
| vivo | We do not support option a for now. option b with ‘independently’ is ok to us. |
| Samsung | For alt2, it is better not to refer to the reference point of RSRP. refer to details in https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg\_ran/WG4\_Radio/TSGR4\_102-e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B102-e%5D%5B125%5D%20NR\_RF\_FR2\_enh2\_Part\_1/UL%20CA%20draft%20CR/revisedR4-2206057\_dCRB\_FR2ULCA\_v02\_QC\_Samsung.docx |
| Ericsson | We support alt a. as proponents. The power control is specified in 38.213 and this includes a total PCMAX. There would be a limit to the total power, if not due to the TER. This does not necessarily mean that the EIRP for the two uplink beams need be significantly degraded.  We assume that the regulators apply the total exposure ratio TER that can include MPE in different FR2 bands (ignoring SAR for the moment by assuming EN-DC is not considered). Hence there will be a dependence between the power levels on the uplink bands. However, this does not necessarily mean that the peak EIRP on the two uplinks must be reduced significantly, would depend on the implementation since the MPE is measured on all surfaces of the device to our understanding and P-MPR is already allowed. |
| Huawei | We don't think we can have a conclusion without answering the following questions:  1. Whether we need to consider Pcmax,ca  if needed, we need to consider whether and how to define Ptmax,total and Pumax,total that is similar to intra-band CA  2. If we introduce MPRpa-pa for inter-band CA, even Pcmax,ca is not defined for inter-band CA, whether the power control for each cell can be independent. If not, whether we need to introduce MPRpa-pa |

# 4. Extension of WI for completion of CA MPR

1. **Rel-17 WI to be extended one quarter to allow companies time to finalize MPR proposals**

*Moderator-note: Discussion will be transferred to email discussion document at the end of 2nd round, any agreements from discussion will be retained here:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| MediaTek | Just for clarification, is the extension is only for CA MPR? |
| Qualcomm | The extension is by WI objective, and we think it would apply to all of FR2 ULCA |
| LG Electronics | If 1Q is extended, all PC1/2/5 and new Power Class UL CA would be applied. |
|  |  |