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# Introduction

The following topics were identified:

* Remaining aspects for BS RF requirements
* TPs to TR 38.852 and TR 38.853
* CRs

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

* 1st round:
* 2nd round:
	+ Conclude on open issues 1-2-1 and 1-2-2 for the RMR900 blocking requirement treatment, and related blocker signal,
	+ Conclude on TP revisions for the “maximum gain” terminology and related losses consideration,
	+ Conclude on the LS text to ETSI TC RT,
	+ Conclude on the remaining CRs.

# Topic #1: Remaining aspects for BS RF requirements

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2205138 | UIC, Ericsson, Nokia | Proposal 1: To allow the necessary flexibility for deployment along railway lines it is proposed to use the term of “maximum gain” (defined as antenna gain and losses) instead of “antenna gain”.Proposal 3: Capture the revisions in CRs applicable for band n100 in 3GPP TS 38.104. |
| R4-2205139 | UIC, Ericsson, Nokia | TP 1900MHz RMR band – BS RFProposal 1: To allow the necessary flexibility for deployment along railway lines it is proposed to use the term of “maximum gain” (defined as antenna gain and losses) instead of “antenna gain”.Proposal 3: Capture the revisions in CRs applicable for band n101 in 3GPP TS 38.104. |
| [R4-2205994](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205994.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Interferer signal for the BS RF RX blocking requirement for RMR900Proposal 1: send liason statement to ETSI RT, providing RAN4 work status on the BS RF requirements development for RMR 900, and asking for inputs and clarifications on the RMR900 BS Rx blocker characteristics (on top of the ECC decision (20)02 content). Proposal 2: specify the Core requirement for RMR900 Rx blocking as per information contained in ECC, ERC Recommendation 70-03, and EU decision 2018/1538, i.e. consider SRD as blocker (i.e. 200 kHz, 500mW e.r.p, duty cycle ≤10%, etc.) for the Rx blocking requirement. Proposal 3: Continue the analysis of the conformance testing aspects (including aspects of the Rx blocker signal configuration, TE capabilities, etc.) during the Performance part of Rel-17 timeframe, i.e. end of Q3 2022. |
| [R4-2205995](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205995.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | draft LS to ETSI TC RT on the interferer signal definition for the RMR900 BS Rx blocking requirement |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 1-1: “maximum gain” terminology

The antenna gain of 17/18 dBi (RMR900/1900) corresponds to ECC Report 318 table 5 but internal losses in ECC Report 318 are considered and agreed as 4dB. As internal losses of Report 318 were not accounted in previous discussions, there is proposal to enable deployment flexibility by modifying the terminology used:

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: To allow the necessary flexibility for deployment along railway lines it is proposed to use the term of “maximum gain” (defined as antenna gain and losses) instead of “antenna gain” (R4-2205138, R4-2205139)
	+ Option 2: Other
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

Moderator: the outcome of the sub-topic needs to be accordingly reflected in the related CR to TS 38.104.

### Sub-topic 1-2: Interferer signal for the BS RF RX blocking requirement for RMR900

During previous RAN4#101bis-e meeting, the interferer signal characteristic for the RMR900 Rx blocking requirement was discussed in R4-2203095. WF was agreed in R4-2203062, capturing the following agreement on the interferer signal for the RX blocking requirement:

|  |
| --- |
| According to ECC Decision(20)02, the interferer should be a 200kHz signal but FFS what exact signal it is:* Option 1: GSM
* Option 2: 1 RB from 5MHz NR signal
* Other
 |

Interferer for RMR900 needs to be decided.

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: follow proposals in R4-2205994:
		- Proposal 2: specify the Core requirement for RMR900 Rx blocking as per information contained in ECC, ERC Recommendation 70-03, and EU decision 2018/1538, i.e. consider SRD as blocker (i.e. 200 kHz, 500mW e.r.p, duty cycle ≤10%, etc.) for the Rx blocking requirement.
		- Proposal 3: Continue the analysis of the conformance testing aspects (including aspects of the Rx blocker signal configuration, TE capabilities, etc.) during the Performance part of Rel-17 timeframe, i.e. end of Q3 2022.
	+ Option 2: Other (including options from previous WF in R4-2203062)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

### Sub-topic 1-3: LS to ETSI TC RT

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: send liason statement to ETSI RT, providing RAN4 work status on the BS RF requirements development for RMR 900, and asking for inputs and clarifications on the RMR900 BS Rx blocker characteristics (on top of the ECC decision (20)02 content) (R4-2205995)
	+ Option 2: no LS needed (if so, provide the proposed conclusion on the RMR900 blocked in sub-topic 1-2)
* Recommended WF
	+ TBA

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Sub topic 1-1:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| UIC | In general, UIC agrees with the approach regarding harmonized standards.In the consideration of RMR900 and RMR1900 antenna gains and losses have been assumed. According to our understanding, the ECC Report 318 contains the values regarding antenna gain and losses (see table 1 and table 5) which is the corresponding document to ECC Decision (20)02. The value given for the loss is shown as 4dB (ECC Report 318). Accordingly, exactly the 4dB loss must be taken into account when considering the rated output power and the reporting of emissions. If this is not taken into account accordingly, this can lead to more investment in the infrastructure across Europe, due to the low rated output power assumption, of up to 100M euros that would have to be raised by the taxpayer. Accordingly, the templates in 3GPP TR 38.852/3GPP TR 38.853 and the corresponding normative CR shall take the value of 4dB into account. |
| Nokia | Agree to use “maximum gain” term, we are also fine to proceed with 4dB loss proposal from UIC above. |
| Ericsson | Fine to use “maximum gain” instead and consider the 4dB loss, that’s still aligned with the initial intention of this proposal to transpose CEPT EIRP limits. |
| Huawei | Modification seems to be well justified.  |

Sub topic 1-2:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| UIC | Alignment between ETSI TC RT and 3GPP is necessary in this context. UIC follows “proposal 1”in accordance with R4-2205994. The affected CR in R4-2205996 keeps the interferer values applicable for band n100 in square brackets. The next ETSI TC RT meeting ( RT#85) is planned for March 28th – April 1st 2022 targeting to finalize this subject in RAN4#103-e meeting. |
| Nokia | Agree to clarify further with ETSI TC RT on the blocking signal type. |
| Ericsson | It’s also ok to send LS to TC RT and keep the CEPT wording for the blocking interferer for the time being. |
| Huawei | Option 1 |

Sub topic 1-3:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| UIC | Option 1 |
| Nokia | OK to send LS. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |
| Huawei | Option 1 |
| UIC | Thanks for the draft LS proposal. The progress of the work in RAN4 is constantly monitored by ETSI TC RT. With respect to the work that has been done, the LS should mainly (only) address the aspect of necessary RMR 900 interferer definition. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

Summary of the open issues is provided below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Sub-topic 1-1: “maximum gain” terminology** | Candidate options:Option 1: To allow the necessary flexibility for deployment along railway lines it is proposed to use the term of “maximum gain” (defined as antenna gain and losses) instead of “antenna gain” (R4-2205138, R4-2205139)Based on the 1st round discussion, consensus is achieved. Recommendations for 2nd round: Option 1 is considered as agreeable. During the 2nd round, consider related modifications to TPs/CRs. No further discussion during the second round. Focus on related TPs/ CRs. |
| **Sub-topic 1-2: Interferer signal for the BS RF RX blocking requirement for RMR900** | Candidate options:Option 1: follow proposals in R4-2205994: * Proposal 2: specify the Core requirement for RMR900 Rx blocking as per information contained in ECC, ERC Recommendation 70-03, and EU decision 2018/1538, i.e. consider SRD as blocker (i.e. 200 kHz, 500mW e.r.p, duty cycle ≤10%, etc.) for the Rx blocking requirement.
* Proposal 3: Continue the analysis of the conformance testing aspects (including aspects of the Rx blocker signal configuration, TE capabilities, etc.) during the Performance part of Rel-17 timeframe, i.e. end of Q3 2022.

Based on the 1st round discussion, initially it was proposed to follow Option 1. After first round deadline, further comments were provided by companies. Therefore, it was suggested to continue the discussion during the second round. Recommendations for 2nd round: ~~Option 1 is considered as agreeable.~~ ~~No~~ further discussion during the second round. ~~For sake of formally capturing the above agreements (Proposal 2 and 3), it is proposed to reflect it in the LS text.~~  |
| **Sub-topic 1-3: LS to ETSI TC RT** | Candidate options:Option 1: send liason statement to ETSI RT, providing RAN4 work status on the BS RF requirements development for RMR 900, and asking for inputs and clarifications on the RMR900 BS Rx blocker characteristics (on top of the ECC decision (20)02 content) (R4-2205995)Based on the 1st round discussion, consensus is achieved. Recommendations for 2nd round: Option 1 is considered as agreeable. No further discussion during the second round. Focus on LS text (new tdoc); no need to report the WI work progress in the LS – focus on technical aspects for the RMR900 blocker.  |

### CRs/TPs

## Discussion on 2nd round

Sub topic 1-2: provide further feedback in relation to RMR900 blocking requirement, with the assumption that the LS to ETSI TC RT will be sent:

* 1-2-1: possibility to conclude Core requirement this meeting (based on existing ECC/ERM/EC information), to be further updated later this year based on ETSI TC RT feedback,
* 1-2-2: on the need for WI exception sheet in March RAN meeting.

Please note that WI exception sheets were discouraged, if possible.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  | 1-2-1:1-2-2:  |

# Topic #2: TPs to TR 38.852 and TR 38.853

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2205138 | UIC, Ericsson, Nokia | TP 900MHz RMR band – BS RFProposal 2: Accordingly the approach in TR 38.853 need to be revised. |
| R4-2205139 | UIC, Ericsson, Nokia | TP 1900MHz RMR band – BS RFProposal 2: Accordingly the approach in TR 38.853 need to be revised. |

## Open issues summary

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### CRs/TPs comments collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2205138 | Ericsson: this tdoc was initially ok but it should be revised to update with above agreement (if confirmed) on “maximum gain” . |
| Huawei: @Ericsson: our understanding of that TP was that proponents have already captured the intended information. Still, it may be worth to also capture information that the losses in the ECC Report 318 were assumed as 4dB. |
|  |
| R4-2205139 | Ericsson: this tdoc was initially ok but it should be revised to update with above agreement (if confirmed) on “maximum gain” . |
| Huawei: @Ericsson: our understanding of that TP was that proponents have already captured the intended information. Still, it may be worth to also capture information that the losses in the ECC Report 318 were assumed as 4dB. |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### CRs/TPs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation**  |
| R4-2205138 | To be revised – consider further TP refinements to reflect “maximum gain” terminology, and capture information that the losses in the ECC Report 318 were assumed as 4dB. |
| R4-2205139 | To be revised – consider further TP refinements to reflect “maximum gain” terminology, and capture information that the losses in the ECC Report 318 were assumed as 4dB. |

## Discussion on 2nd round

### CRs/TPs comments collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2205138 revision |  |
|  |
| R4-2205139 revision |  |

# Topic #3: CRs

Moderator: Endorsed draft CRs to AAS BS specifications were not resubmitted this meeting as formal CRs:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [**R4-2203057**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_101-bis-e/Docs/R4-2201810.zip) | Draft CR to TS 37.105: RMR implementation |
| [**R4-2202026**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_101-bis-e/Docs/R4-2202026.zip) | Draft CR to TS 37.145-1: RMR implementation |
| [**R4-2202027**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_101-bis-e/Docs/R4-2202027.zip) | Draft CR to TS 37.145-2: RMR implementation |

One draft CR was submitted to this meeting.

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2205064 | Ericsson | CR to TS 38.104 - Tx requirements: RMR 900MHz and 1900MHz bands introduction |
| [R4-2205065](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205065.zip) | Ericsson | CR to TS 38.141-2: RMR 900MHz and 1900MHz bands introduction |
| [R4-2205066](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205066.zip) | Ericsson | CR to TS 36.104: RMR 900MHz and 1900MHz bands introduction |
| [R4-2205067](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205067.zip) | Ericsson | CR to TS 36.141: RMR 900MHz and 1900MHz bands introduction |
| [R4-2205943](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205943.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR to 37.104 on introduction of n100 and n101 co-existence requirements |
| [R4-2205945](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205945.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR to 37.141 on introduction of n100 and n101 co-existence requirements |
| [R4-2205948](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205948.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR to 38.104 on introduction of n100 and n101 (system parameters) |
| [R4-2205949](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205949.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | CR to 38.141-1 on introduction of n100 and n101 requirements |
| R4-2205996 | Huawei  | Draft CR to TS 38.104: RX requirements (revision) |

## Open issues summary

### CRs/TPs comments collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2205064 | Moderator: - update the CR cover page to add missing information on CR number of the “Other specs affected”.- This CR is subject to topic 1-1. |
| Nokia: further updates needed in the co-ex table as in CR to 38.141-1 |
| Huawei: I think we have agreed not to use “uncoordinated” terminology in the TS. |
| [R4-2205065](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205065.zip) | Moderator: update the CR cover page to add missing information on CR number of the “Other specs affected”. |
|  |
|  |
| [R4-2205066](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205066.zip) | Moderator: update the CR cover page to add missing information on CR number of the “Other specs affected”. |
| [R4-2205067](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205067.zip) | Moderator: update the CR cover page to add missing information on CR number of the “Other specs affected”. |
| [R4-2205943](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205943.zip) | Moderator: update the CR cover page to add missing information on CR number of the “Other specs affected”. |
| [R4-2205945](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205945.zip) | Moderator: update the CR cover page to add missing information on CR number of the “Other specs affected”. |
| [R4-2205948](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205948.zip) | Moderator: update the CR cover page to add missing information on CR number of the “Other specs affected”. |
| [R4-2205949](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205949.zip) | Moderator: - “Clauses affected” information on the cover page to be updated. - update the CR cover page to add missing information on CR number of the “Other specs affected”.Ericsson: As stated in the CR, it should be revised to align with 38.104 and consider possible agreement made in this meeting.Huawei: reuse and align the blocking tables template from R4-2205996, due to issues identified in R4-2205996.  |
| R4-2205996 | Moderator: this is draft CR. Formal CR shall have been submitted. Nokia: different text is proposed in CR to 38.141-1 – to be discussed and aligned with this CR. For n101, shall it be additional OOBB (not IBB) requirement?Huawei: blocking tables to be aligned among core and test specs. For the IBB vs OOBB: for the OOBB requirement we use CW signal as the interferer, while the n101 uses 5MHz LTE blocker. On the other hand, the interferers frequency range (1807-1877MHz) seems to be in the OOB region of the 1900-1910MHz operating band. So it seems to be OOBB indeed. Is that a common understanding? |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

### CRs/TPs

All the CRs are revised. Some require only CR cover page correction. For detailed guidance, refer to section 4.1.

## Discussion on 2nd round

### CRs/TPs comments collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2205064 revision | CR to TS 38.104 - Tx requirements: RMR 900MHz and 1900MHz bands introductionCompany A: Company B:  |
| R4-2205949 revision | CR to 38.141-1 on introduction of n100 and n101 requirementsCompany A: Company B: |
| New tdoc | LS to ETSI TC RT on the interferer signal definition for the RMR900 BS Rx blocking requirementCompany A: Company B: |
| New tdoc | CR to TS 37.105: RMR implementationCompany A: Company B: |
| New tdoc | CR to TS 37.145-1: RMR implementationCompany A: Company B: |
| New tdoc | CR to TS 37.145-2: RMR implementationCompany A: Company B: |
| New tdoc | CR to TS 38.104: RX requirementsCompany A: Company B: |

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

Based on the agreement, formal LS to ETSI TC RT was agreed to be drafted based on the draft LS in R4-2205995, and further comments.

3 new CRs are needed for AAS BS specifications to formally Agree on the technical content endorsed last meeting (R4-2203057, R4-2202026, R4-2202027).

Additionally, one draft CR was submitted this meeting in R4-2205996 – related formal CR is requested, while R4-2205996 is to be marked as not pursued.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| LS to ETSI TC RT on the interferer signal definition for the RMR900 BS Rx blocking requirement | Huawei, HiSilicon | To: ETSI TC RT; Cc: RAN |
| CR to TS 37.105: RMR implementation | Huawei, HiSilicon | Formal CR mirroring the draft CR which was Endorsed last meeting in R4-2203057. |
| CR to TS 37.145-1: RMR implementation | Huawei, HiSilicon | Formal CR mirroring the draft CR which was Endorsed last meeting in R4-2202026. |
| CR to TS 37.145-2: RMR implementation | Huawei, HiSilicon | Formal CR mirroring the draft CR which was Endorsed last meeting in R4-2202027. |
| CR to TS 38.104: RX requirements | Huawei, HiSilicon | Formal CR based on R4-2205996 (Draft CR to TS 38.104: RX requirements (revision)) content. Related draft CR marked as Not pursued.Technical comment to R4-2205996 to be addressed in this CR. |

**Existing tdocs**

The following guidance is proposed for CRs, depending on the required corrections:

1. CRs with technical comments received during the 1st round, we follow the regular way, i.e. revisions to be discussed during the second round.

2. CRs with CR cover page issues only, the following is proposed to reduce the workload during the 2nd round:

* Revise CR (please remember to indicate the revision field “rev” by 1),
* Proponents to correct the CR cover page, as per comments received during the first round,
* Other specs affected: for completeness and easier spec updates tracking in future, it is suggested by the Moderator to capture related CR numbers irrespective of core, or test specification.
* Formal revised CR to be uploaded to the Inbox WITHOUT further discussion during the 2nd round.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation**  | **Comments** |
| [R4-2205064](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205064.zip) | CR to TS 38.104 - Tx requirements: RMR 900MHz and 1900MHz bands introduction | Ericsson | Revised | Technical comments, CR cover corrections |
| [R4-2205065](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205065.zip) | CR to TS 38.141-2: RMR 900MHz and 1900MHz bands introduction | Ericsson | Revised | CR cover corrections only |
| [R4-2205066](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205066.zip) | CR to TS 36.104: RMR 900MHz and 1900MHz bands introduction | Ericsson | Revised | CR cover corrections only |
| [R4-2205067](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205067.zip) | CR to TS 36.141: RMR 900MHz and 1900MHz bands introduction | Ericsson | Revised | CR cover corrections only |
| [R4-2205138](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205138.zip) | TP BS RF conducted requirements for n100  | Union Inter. Chemins de Fer | Revised |  |
| [R4-2205943](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205943.zip) | CR to 37.104 on introduction of n100 and n101 co-existence requirements | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Revised | CR cover corrections only |
| [R4-2205945](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205945.zip) | CR to 37.141 on introduction of n100 and n101 co-existence requirements | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Revised | CR cover corrections only |
| [R4-2205948](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205948.zip) | CR to 38.104 on introduction of n100 and n101 (system parameters) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Revised | CR cover corrections only |
| [R4-2205949](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205949.zip) | CR to 38.141-1 on introduction of n100 and n101 requirements | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Revised | Technical comments, CR cover corrections |
| [R4-2205139](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205139.zip) | TP BS RF conducted requirements for n101 | Union Inter. Chemins de Fer | Revised |  |
| [R4-2205994](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205994.zip) | Interferer signal for the BS RF RX blocking requirement for RMR900 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Noted |  |
| [R4-2205995](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205995.zip) | draft LS to ETSI TC RT on the interferer signal definition for the RMR900 BS Rx blocking requirement | Huawei, HiSilicon | Noted | Related formal LS requested. |
| [R4-2205996](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205996.zip) | Draft CR to TS 38.104: RX requirements (revision) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Not pursued | Related formal CR requested; content of the draft CR to be reused.  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics incl. existing and new tdocs.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
	1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
	2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. For new LS documents, please include information on To/Cc WGs in the comments column
4. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation**  | **Comments** |
| R4-22xxxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-22xxxxx | WF on … | YYY | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
| R4-22xxxxx | LS on … | ZZZ | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
	1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
	2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

# Annex

Contact information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email address** |
| Huawei  | Michal Szydelko | Michal.szydelko@huawei.com |

Note:

1. Please add your contact information in above table once you make comments on this email thread.
2. If multiple delegates from the same company make comments on single email thread, please add you name as suffix after company name when make comments i.e. Company A (XX, XX)