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# Introduction

This part includes contributions in agenda 8.13.1 except 8.13.1.6.

Classify the contents into four topics:

1. Topic #1: intra-band contiguous UL CA for FR1 power class 3 which is for agenda 8.13.1.1 and 8.13.1.4
2. Topic #2: CRs for intra-band DL CA for FR1 which is for agenda 8.13.1.2 and 8.13.1.3.
3. Topic #3: intra-band non-contiguous UL CA for FR1 power class 3 which is for agenda 8.13.1.5
4. Topic #4: transient period capability which is for agenda 8.13.1.7

For intra-band CA RF requirement, topic 1 and topic 2 are with high priority for this meeting, candidate target of email discussion are as below:

* 1st round:
  + Approve on the CRs on new configurations and editorial corrections
  + Approve on the CRs not related to the MPR and ACLR requirement
  + Reach consensus on ACLR MBW, MPR inner/outer RB allocations definition
  + Have agreement on whether MPR requirement is independent of PA architecture for contiguous CA
  + Have agreement on the MPR definition format for the spec, e.g. whether classify with Bandwidth class
  + If time is allowed, try to have some consensus on the assumption for intra-band NC UL CA, e.g. architecture
* 2nd round:
  + Approve on the CR for emission requirement which is related to MBW
  + Approve on the CR on MPR definition format which can leave the MPR value as TBD
  + Try to reach consensus on MPR value for intra-band UL contiguous CA in QPSK
  + Anything not completed in 1st round

For transient period capability, candidate target of email discussion are as below:

* 1st round:
  + Identify testability issues raised in the contributions
* 2nd round:
* Decision on the conclusion in RAN4 and feedback to RAN#87 meeting

# Topic #1: intra-band contiguous UL CA for FR1 power class 3

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2000093 | Qualcomm | **Proposal 1:** Use CA MPR for contiguous allocations as shown in Table 2.3-1.  **Table 2.3-1 Contiguous allocation CA MPR**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Modulation | | MPR (dB) | | | | | | Edge | Inner CA;  All BW class | Outer CA;  BW class B LCRB >0 | Outer CA;  BW class C  LCRB ≤ β\*BWCA | Outer CA  BW class C; LCRB > β\*BWCA | | DFT-S-OFDM | Pi/2 BPSK | TBD | ≤ 0.0 | ≤ 1.5 | ≤ 1.5 | ≤ 6 | | QPSK | TBD | ≤ 0 | ≤ 2 | ≤ 2 | ≤ 6 | | 16 QAM | TBD | ≤ 1 | ≤ 3 | ≤ 3 | ≤ 6 | | 64 QAM | TBD | ≤ 2.5 | ≤ 3.5 | ≤ 3.5 | ≤ 6 | | 256 QAM | TBD | ≤ 4.5 | ≤ 5.5 | ≤ 5.5 | ≤ 6 | | CP-OFDM | QPSK | TBD | ≤ 1.5 | ≤ 3 | ≤ 3 | ≤ 6 | | 16 QAM | TBD | ≤ 2 | ≤ 3 | ≤ 3 | ≤ 6 | | 64 QAM | TBD | ≤ 3.5 | ≤ 3.5 | ≤ 3.5 | ≤ 6 | | 256 QAM | TBD | ≤ 6.5 | ≤ 6.5 | ≤ 6.5 | ≤ 6.5 | | Note 1: β = [0.75] and Inner CA and outer CA defined per [1] [2].  β = (NRB\_alloc,1\*SCS1 + NRB\_alloc,2\*SCS2)/ (NRB,1\*SCS1 +NRB,2\*SCS2). | | | | | | |   **Proposal 2**: Use CA MPR for non-contiguous allocations as shown in Table 2.4-1.  **Table 2.4-1:** MPR for non-contiguous allocations   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Modulation | | MPR (dB) | | | | MInner | MOuter1 | MOuter2 | | DFT-S-OFDM | Pi/2 BPSK | ≤ 0.0 | ≤ 4.5 | ≤ MA | | QPSK | ≤ 0 | ≤ 4.5 | | 16 QAM | ≤ 1 | ≤ 4.5 | | 64 QAM | ≤ 2.5 | ≤ 4.5 | | 256 QAM | ≤ 4.5 | ≤ 4.5 | | CP-OFDM | QPSK | ≤ 1.5 | ≤ 5.5 | ≤ MA + 1 | | 16 QAM | ≤ 2 | ≤5.5 | | 64 QAM | ≤ 3.5 | ≤5.5 | | 256 QAM | ≤ 6.5 | ≤6.5 |   MPR = CEIL { min(MInner, MOuter1, MOuter2), 0.5}]  MA [Pi/2 BPSK,QPSK, 16QAM, 64QAM] =  8.2 ; 0 ≤ A < 0.025  9.2 - 40A ; 0.025 ≤ A < 0.05  8 – 16A ; 0.05 ≤ A < 0.25  4.83 – 3.33A ; 0.25 ≤ A ≤ 0.4,  3.83 – 0.83A ; 0.4 ≤ A ≤ 1,  MA [256QAM] =  8.2 ; 0 ≤ A < 0.025  9.2 - 40A ; 0.025 ≤ A < 0.05  8 – 16A ; 0.05 ≤ A < 0.16  5.5 ; 0.16 ≤ A ≤ 1,  A = (NRB\_alloc,1\*SCS1 + NRB\_alloc,2\*SCS2)/ (NRB,1\*SCS1 +NRB,2\*SCS2)  Fagg\_alloc\_low Aggregated Transmission Bandwidth Configuration. The lowest frequency of the simultaneously transmitted resource blocks.  Fagg\_alloc\_high Aggregated Transmission Bandwidth Configuration. The highest frequency of the simultaneously transmitted resource blocks.  FC\_agg Aggregated Transmission Bandwidth Configuration. Centre frequency of the aggregated carriers.  NRB\_alloc Total number of simultaneously transmitted resource blocks in Channel bandwidth or Aggregated Channel Bandwidth.  **∆**IM3 = max( | FC\_agg  – (2\*Fagg\_alloc\_low – 1\*Fagg\_alloc\_high) |, | FC\_agg  – (2\*Fagg\_alloc\_high – 1\*Fagg\_alloc\_low) | )  **∆**IM5 = max( | FC\_agg  – (3\*Fagg\_alloc\_low – 2\*Fagg\_alloc\_high) |, | FC\_agg  – (3\*Fagg\_alloc\_high – 2\*Fagg\_alloc\_low) | )  FC\_agg = (Fedge\_high + Fedge\_low)/2 |
| R4-2000711 | Skyworks | **Proposal 1**: on contiguous inner/outer allocation equations: **Contiguous allocation is defined as: RBe1= SU1-1 AND RBs2 = 0**  **Contiguous inner equations is defined as:**  **RBs1\*2^mu1 ≥ max(1,floor((LCRB1\*2^mu1+LCRB2\*2^mu2)/2))**  **AND**  **RBs1\*2^mu1 ≤ (SU1-LCRB1)\*2^mu1+(SU2-LCRB2)\*2^mu2-max(1,floor((LCRB1\*2^mu1+LCRB2\*2^mu2)/2))**  **Any other allocation is an outer allocation.** **Proposal 2:** on non-contiguous inner/outer allocation equations: **Contiguous allocation is defined as: RBe1 < SU1-1 AND RBs2 > 0**  **Non-contiguous inner equations is defined as:**  **(2\*RBs1-SU1/2)\*2^mu1+(SU2/2-(RBe2+1))\*2^m2 ≥ BWCA/0.36**  **AND**  **(RBs1-SU1/2)\*2^mu1+3/2\*(3/2\*SU2-2\*(RBe2+1))\*2^mu2 ≥ BWCA/0.36**  **Any other allocation is an outer allocation.**  **Proposal 3:** on ENDC applicability:   * Contiguous/noncontiguous inner/allocation types should be studied to optimize intra-band contiguous ENDC MPR/AMPR * Same definition than for UL CA applies when using the ENDC bandwidth definition and LTE parameters for one of the CC |
| R4-2000712 | Skyworks | **Proposal 1: on CA bandwidth:**   * **There is no need for fundamental spec change which is aligned with the above definitions** * **Some text clarification may be done to remove any ambiguities**   **Proposal 2 : for ACLR definition:**   * **The wanted and adjacents measurement bandwidth is :**   **Nominal Channel Spacing + (SU, low\*12 +1)\*0.015/2\*2^(mu, low)+ (SU, low\*12 -1)\*0.015/2\*2^(mu, high)**   * **The offset frequency between the center of the wanted and adjacent channel is:**   **BWchannel, low + BWchannel, high**  **Proposal 3: for SEM definition:**   * **The OOB domain should start at:**   **+/-(BWchannel, low+BWchannel, high)/2**   * **The -15 dBm/MHz region should end at:**   **+/-3\*(BWchannel, low+BWchannel, high)/2**   * **The requirement in the first OOB MHz should be:**   **-13 dBm/Min(0.01\*(BWchannel, low+BWchannel, high);0.4) [MHz]**   * + **above 40 MHz aggregated bandwidth, the measurement bandwidth is clamped at 400 kHz** |
| R4-2000713 | Skyworks | **Proposal 1: ON SEM definition:**   * **The definition of the SEM mask in the first OOB MHz shall use the single CC definition of -13dBm/1% BW up to 40MHz aggregated bandwidth then -13dBm/ 400kHz for higher aggregated bandwidths** * **The OOB starting point is based on cumulated channel BW instead of CABW to be on par with single CC case**   **Proposal 2: for NS04 and NS27 AMPR:**   * **The measured values in this contribution (CShapter 2.4) should be used for A-MPR studies as 1RB+1RB cases are often worse in measurements than in simulation (as a consequence of memory effect)** * **NS04 A-MPR regions and frequency offsets must consider IMD3 and IMD5 with at least:**   + - **13 dB for IMD3**     - **7 dB for IMD5** * **NS27 A-MPR regions and frequency offsets must consider IMD3, IMD5 and IMD7 with at least:**   + - **20 dB for IMD3**     - **13 dB for IMD5**     - **9 dB for IMD7**   **Proposal 3: for MPR table:**  Table 7: Proposed PC3 MPR table structure and values for QPSK   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Modulation** | | **MPR for contiguous allocations (dB)** | | **MPR for non-contiguous allocations (dB)** | | | **Outer RB allocations** | **Inner RB allocations** | **Outer RB allocations** | **Inner RB allocations** | | DFT-s-OFDM | Pi/2 BPSK | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | | QPSK | ≤ 5 | ≤ 1.5 | ≤ 91 | ≤ 1.51 | | 16 QAM | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | | 64 QAM | TBD\* | | TBD\* | | | 256 QAM | TBD | | TBD | | | CP-OFDM | QPSK | ≤ 8 | ≤ 3 | ≤ 101 | ≤ 31 | | 16 QAM | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | | 64 QAM | TBD | | TBD | | | 256 QAM | TBD | | TBD | | | Note: for aggregated BW>100MHz 0.5dB is added for inner allocations and 1dB for outer allocations Note 1: for large non-contiguous allocations, the value is relaxed by TDB dB | | | | | |   \*May still need to be split in inner/outer allocations |
| R4-2001129 | Skyworks | **Observations:**   * **Baseline approach when relative and/or absolute bandwidths are exceeded should use extra MPR or spectrum flatness relaxation and is applicable to linear and APT PAS** * **Optional approach may be developed to enable ET implementations but overall capability set and power class in different modes should be understood first** |
| R4-2001756 | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 1: for intra-band UL contiguous CA with contiguous RB allocation, inner/outer RB allocation is defined as in 2.2.1**   * For Aggregated channel bandwidth>100MHz, the inner allocation can be defined as below:   *For RBstart,low=max(1,NRB\_alloc), RBStart,High = NRB,agg – RBStart,Low –NRB\_alloc*  *Inner RB allocation is defined as RBStart,Low ≤ RBStart ≤ RBStart,High, and NRB\_alloc≤Floor[(1/3NRB,agg) ]*  *Where NRB\_alloc=LCRB1 + LCRB2\*(SCS2/SCS1), in which SCS2 ≥ SCS1*  *NRB,agg=NRB1+NRB2\*(SCS2/SCS1), in which SCS2 ≥ SCS1*  *SCS1 and SCS2 are the SCS for CC1 and CC2 respectively*   * For Aggregated channel bandwidth ≤ 100MHz, the inner allocation can be defined as below:   For RBStart,Low = max(1, floor(*NRB\_alloc* /2)), RBStart,High = NRB – RBStart,Low – LCRB,  *Inner RB allocation is defined as* RBStart,Low ≤ RBStart ≤ RBStart,High, LCRB ≤ ceil(*NRB,agg* /2)  *Where NRB\_alloc=LCRB1 + LCRB2\*(SCS2/SCS1), in which SCS2 ≥ SCS1*  *NRB,agg=NRB1+NRB2\*(SCS2/SCS1), in which SCS2 ≥ SCS1*  *SCS1 and SCS2 are the SCS for CC1 and CC2 respectively*  **Proposal 2: for intra-band UL contiguous CA with non-contiguous RB allocation, inner/outer RB allocation is defined as in 2.2.2**  *For RBstart,low=max(1,NRB\_alloc), RBStart,High = NRB,agg – RBStart,Low –NRB\_alloc*  *Inner RB allocation is defined as RBStart,Low ≤ RBStart ≤ RBStart,High, and NRB\_alloc≤Floor[(1/3NRB,agg) ]*  *Where NRB\_alloc=LCRB1 + LCRB2\*(SCS2/SCS1)+∆fc,gap/SCS1, in which SCS2 ≥ SCS1*  *NRB,agg=NRB1+NRB2\*(SCS2/SCS1), in which SCS2 ≥ SCS1*  *SCS1 and SCS2 are the SCS for CC1 and CC2 respectively*  *∆fc,gap is the frequency gap between the RB allocations on each CC*  **Initial MPR value recommendations:**  **Table 1 Contiguous allocation MPR >100MHz**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Modulation | | MPR | | | inner | outer | | DFT-s-OFDM | Pi/2 BPSK | TBD | TBD | | QPSK | 1 | 2 | | 16QAM | 2 | 3 | | 64QAM | 3.5 | 4.5 | | 256QAM | 6 | 6.5 | | CP-OFDM | QPSK | 3.5 | 4 | | 16QAM | 3.5 | 4 | | 64QAM | 5.5 | 5.5 | | 256QAM | 7 | 8 |   **Table 2 Non-Contiguous allocation MPR >100MHz**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Modulation | | MPR | | | inner | Outer | | DFT-s-OFDM | Pi/2 BPSK | TBD | TBD | | QPSK | 8 | 14 | | 16QAM | | 64QAM | | 256QAM | 9 | 15 | | CP-OFDM | QPSK | 9 | 14 | | 16QAM | | 64QAM | | 256QAM | 10 | 15 | |
| R4-2001385 | Nokia | **Move from agenda 8.13.1.2, there is discussion paper on the related aspects**  **Proposed solution 1:** Replace “for the said 𝜇 value” with “for 𝜇=𝜇0”.  **Proposed solution 2:** For the UEDefine ), indicating that the maximum is taken across the CCs, and the included minimum guard band widths correspond to, the largest *μ* value among the subcarrier spacing configurations supported in the operating band for both of the channel bandwidths (see the definition of CA channel spacing).  **Problem 3:** The definitions of channel spacing, Foffset,low, and Foffset,high  **Proposed solution 3:** To be solved.  This problem does not exist in the base station because 38.104 has a different definition of Foffset,low and Foffset,high. [1][2] |
| CR R4-2001759 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Provide initial intra-band contiguous CA MPR definition format with MPR value TBD which depends on the discussion |
| CR R4-2001772 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Provide CR on emission RF requirement for intra-band UL CA including:   * OBW * SEM * ACLR * SE |
| CR R4-2001773 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Provide CR on output power RF requirement for intra-band UL CA including:   * Power class * Configured output power * Minimum output power * Off power * On/off time mask * Power control |
| CR R4-2001774 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Provide CR on signal quality RF requirement for intra-band UL CA including:   * Frequency error * EVM * In-band emission |
| CR R4-2002051 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Move from agenda 9.1.2  This draft CR is to introduce related UL CA band combinations:  CA\_n41C  CA\_n41(2A) |
| CR R4-2001762 | Huawei, HiSilicon | As agreed in RAN4 #92bis meeting, almost contiguous RB allocation is not supported for intra-band CA. |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 1-1 CRs for UL CA requirement not related to ACLR and MPR

**Issue 1-1-1: comments on the CR for R4-2001773 for output power RF requirement for intra-band UL CA**

**Issue 1-1-2: comments on the CR for R4-2001774 for signal quality RF requirement for intra-band UL CA**

**Issue 1-1-3: comments on the CR for R4-2001762 for almost contiguous allocation for intra-band UL CA**

**Issue 1-1-4: comments on the CR for R4-2002051 for configurations for intra-band UL CA**

### Sub-topic 1-2 CR for UL CA emission requirement

*In WF R4-1915417 approved in RAN4 #93, we have agreement: ACLR MBW as BWChannel\_CA – 2\***max(GB(low),GB(high)) for both wanted and adjacent.*

*Where BWChannel\_CA is defined in 5.3A.3 of TS 38.101-1/2:*

*BWChannel\_CA = Fedge,high - Fedge,low= nominal channel space+ Foffset,high + Foffset,low*

*Hence ACLR MBW issue is related to the calculation on BWChannel\_CA and max(GB(low),GB(high))*

**Issue 1-2-1: how to define ACLR MBW**

* Proposals
  + **Option 1:** ), indicating that the maximum is taken across the CCs, and the included minimum guard band widths correspond to, the largest μ value among the subcarrier spacing configurations supported in the operating band for both of the channel bandwidths

May Adopt Foffset,low and Foffset,high definition in TS 38.104

Need revision on the ambiguity part in TS 38.101, and align definition with TS 38.104

* + **Option 2:**

• ACLR MBW for both wanted and adjacent is :

Nominal Channel Spacing + (SU, low\*12 +1)\*0.015/2\*2^(mu, low)+ (SU, low\*12 -1)\*0.015/2\*2^(mu, high)

• The offset frequency between the center of the wanted and adjacent channel is: BWchannel, low + BWchannel, high

No need for fundamental spec change which is aligned with the above definitions

May Need revision on the ambiguity part in TS 38.101

* + **Option 3:** other options are not precluded
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-2-2: How to define SEM offset and Measurement bandwidth**

* + **Option 1:**
* The OOB domain should start at:

+/-(BWchannel, low+BWchannel, high)/2

* The -15 dBm/MHz region should end at:

+/-3\*(BWchannel, low+BWchannel, high)/2

* The requirement in the first OOB MHz should be:

-13 dBm/Min(0.01\*(BWchannel, low+BWchannel, high);0.4) [MHz]

above 40 MHz aggregated bandwidth, the measurement bandwidth is clamped at 400 kHz

* + **Option 2:** As per agreed in WF R4-1910273:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ΔfOOB  (MHz) | Spectrum emission limit(dBm) | MBW |
| ± 0 - 1 | Max(Round(10\*log(0.15/BWchannel\_CA)),-24) | 30kHz |
| ± 1 - 5 | -10 | 1MHz |
| ± 5 – BWchannel\_CA | -13 | 1MHz |
| ±BWchannel\_CA- BWchannel\_CA+5 | -25 | 1MHz |
| Note 1: BWchannel\_CA=nominal channel spacing+Foffset,high + Foffset,low, where the nominal channel spacing, Foffset,high and Foffset,low refers to subclause 5.4A.1 and subclause 5.3A.3. | | |

**Issue 1-2-3: CR for R4-2001772 on emission RF requirement for intra-band UL CA**

* + Recommended WF
  + Capture the agreements in the above two issues

### Sub-topic 1-3 Inner and outer RB allocation definition

*In WF R4-1915417, we have agreement on inner and outer RB allocation:*

* *[Aggregated channel bandwidth≤100MHz]: Inner RB allocation is defined according to 1CC inner and be up to Floor(1/2NRB,agg)*
* *[Aggregated channel bandwidth>100MHz]: for RBstart,low=max(1,NRB\_alloc), RBStart,High = NRB,agg – RBStart,Low –NRB\_alloc*

*Inner RB allocation is defined as RBStart,Low ≤ RBStart ≤ RBStart,High, and NRB\_alloc≤Floor[(1/3NRB,agg) ], this equation only based on the same SCS between CCs*

**Issue 1-3-1: contiguous allocations**

* Proposals
  + **Option 1:**

Contiguous inner equations is defined as:

RBs1\*2^mu1 ≥ max(1,floor((LCRB1\*2^mu1+LCRB2\*2^mu2)/2))

AND

RBs1\*2^mu1 ≤ (SU1-LCRB1)\*2^mu1+(SU2-LCRB2)\*2^mu2-max(1,floor((LCRB1\*2^mu1+LCRB2\*2^mu2)/2))

Any other allocation is an outer allocation.

* + **Option 2:**
* For Aggregated channel bandwidth>100MHz, the inner allocation can be defined as below:

For RBstart,low=max(1,NRB\_alloc), RBStart,High = NRB,agg – RBStart,Low –NRB\_alloc

Inner RB allocation is defined as RBStart,Low ≤ RBStart ≤ RBStart,High, and NRB\_alloc≤Floor[(1/3NRB,agg) ]

Where NRB\_alloc=LCRB1 + LCRB2\*(SCS2/SCS1), in which SCS2 ≥ SCS1

NRB,agg=NRB1+NRB2\*(SCS2/SCS1), in which SCS2 ≥ SCS1

SCS1 and SCS2 are the SCS for CC1 and CC2 respectively

* For Aggregated channel bandwidth ≤ 100MHz, the inner allocation can be defined as below:

For RBStart,Low = max(1, floor(NRB\_alloc /2)), RBStart,High = NRB – RBStart,Low – LCRB,

Inner RB allocation is defined as RBStart,Low ≤ RBStart ≤ RBStart,High, LCRB ≤ ceil(NRB,agg /2)

Where NRB\_alloc=LCRB1 + LCRB2\*(SCS2/SCS1), in which SCS2 ≥ SCS1

NRB,agg=NRB1+NRB2\*(SCS2/SCS1), in which SCS2 ≥ SCS1

SCS1 and SCS2 are the SCS for CC1 and CC2 respectively

* + **Option 3:** 
    - * Bandwidth class B: *[Aggregated channel bandwidth≤100MHz]: Inner RB allocation is defined according to 1CC inner and be up to Floor(1/2NRB,agg)*
      * Bandwidth class C: [Aggregated channel bandwidth>100MHz]: for RBstart,low=max(1,NRB\_alloc), RBStart,High = NRB,agg – RBStart,Low –NRB\_alloc
        + Outer 1: LCRB ≤ β\*BWCA
        + Outer 2: LCRB > β\*BWCA

β = (NRB\_alloc,1\*SCS1 + NRB\_alloc,2\*SCS2)/ (NRB,1\*SCS1 +NRB,2\*SCS2).

* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-3-2: non-contiguous allocations**

* Proposals
  + **Option 1:**

on-contiguous inner equations is defined as:

(2\*RBs1-SU1/2)\*2^mu1+(SU2/2-(RBe2+1))\*2^m2 ≥ BWCA/0.36

AND

(RBs1-SU1/2)\*2^mu1+3/2\*(3/2\*SU2-2\*(RBe2+1))\*2^mu2 ≥ BWCA/0.36

Any other allocation is an outer allocation.

* + **Option 2:**

For RBstart,low=max(1,NRB\_alloc), RBStart,High = NRB,agg – RBStart,Low –NRB\_alloc

Inner RB allocation is defined as RBStart,Low ≤ RBStart ≤ RBStart,High, and NRB\_alloc≤Floor[(1/3NRB,agg) ]

Where NRB\_alloc=LCRB1 + LCRB2\*(SCS2/SCS1)+∆fc,gap/SCS1, in which SCS2 ≥ SCS1

NRB,agg=NRB1+NRB2\*(SCS2/SCS1), in which SCS2 ≥ SCS1

SCS1 and SCS2 are the SCS for CC1 and CC2 respectively

∆fc,gap is the frequency gap between the RB allocations on each CC

* + **Option 3:**
  + The inner 1 region is defined for cases where the IM3 falls within the aggregated channel BW.
  + The outer 1 region is where the IM3 and IM5 falls within the -13dBm/MHz SEM mask and outside of the aggregated channel BW
  + The outer 2 region is defined when IM5 falls outside of the -13dBm/MHz SEM mask or in the -25dbm/MHz and -30dBm/MHz spurious region. For the outer 2 regions, we allow MPR to be reduced by the allocation ratio as was done for LTE CA.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 1-4 MPR definition format

**Issue 1-4-1: contiguous allocations**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: classify into bandwidth class B and C with inner and outer allocation respectively
  + Option 2: define MPR based on bandwidth class B with inner and outer allocation respectively, MPR for bandwidth class C are added with extra part
* Recommended WF
  + Option 1

**Issue 1-4-2: non-contiguous allocations**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: classify into bandwidth class B and C with inner and outer allocation respectively
  + Option 2: define MPR based on bandwidth class B with inner and outer allocation respectively, MPR for bandwidth class C are added with extra part
* Recommended WF
  + Option 1

**Issue 1-4-3: CR for R4-2001759 on MPR requirement for intra-band contiguous UL CA**

* + Recommended WF
  + Capture the agreement we have in above issues

### Sub-topic 1-5 MPR value for intra-band UL contiguous CA in QPSK

**Issue 1-5-1: contiguous allocations for inner RB**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: 1.5dB/2dB for DFT-OFDM, 3dB/3.5dB for CP-OFDM
  + Option 2: 1dB for DFT-OFDM, 3.5dB for CP-OFDM
  + Option 3: 0dB for DFT-OFDM, 1.5dB for CP-OFDM
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-5-2: contiguous allocations for outer RB: the data is not good aligned, provide the RB allocation position for further evaluation**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: 5.5dB/6.5dB for DFT-OFDM, 8dB/9dB for CP-OFDM, limited by full RB allocation
  + Option 2: 2dB for DFT-OFDM, 4dB for CP-OFDM
  + Option 3: 2~6dB for DFT-OFDM, 3~6dB for CP-OFDM, limited by LCRB > β\*BWCA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-5-3: non-contiguous allocations for inner RB**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: 1.5dB/2dB for DFT-OFDM, 1.5dB/2dB for CP-OFDM , relaxation for large non-contiguous allocation is TBD
  + Option 2: 8dB for DFT-OFDM, 9dB for CP-OFDM
  + Option 3: 0dB for DFT-OFDM, 1.5dB for CP-OFDM
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-5-4: non-contiguous allocations for outer RB**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: 9dB/10dB for DFT-OFDM, 10dB/11dB for CP-OFDM, limited by 1+1 RB case which IMD fall into SEM part
  + Option 2: 14dB for DFT-OFDM, 14dB for CP-OFDM, limited by 1+1 RB case
  + Option 3: <=8.2dB for DFT-OFDM, <=9.2dB for CP-OFDM, limited by case which IMD5 fall into -25dBm/MHz and -30dBm/MHz region and small A, where A= (NRB\_alloc,1\*SCS1 + NRB\_alloc,2\*SCS2)/ (NRB,1\*SCS1 +NRB,2\*SCS2)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 1-6 AMPR value for intra-band UL contiguous CA

**Issue 1-6-1: whether NS04 and NS27 need to be complete in Rel-16 FR1 WI**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: yes
  + Option 2: no
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-6-2: AMPR for NS04 and NS27**

* Proposals
  + Option 1:

•NS04 A-MPR regions and frequency offsets must consider IMD3 and IMD5 with at least:

* 13 dB for IMD3
* 7 dB for IMD5

•NS27 A-MPR regions and frequency offsets must consider IMD3, IMD5 and IMD7 with at least:

* 20 dB for IMD3
* 13 dB for IMD5
* 9 dB for IMD7
  + Option 2:
* Recommended WF
  + We capture the key RB position for companies provide their simulation/measurement results in the next meeting

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-topic** | **Comments: (Company: …)** |
| 1-1:CRs | Issue 1-1-1: CR R4-2001773 on output power  Sprint: The CR says  \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*start of quote\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*For uplink intra-band contiguous and non-contiguous carrier aggregation, MPR*c* = MPR and A-MPR*c* = A-MPR with MPR and A-MPR specified in subclause 6.2A.2 and subclause 6.2A.3 respectively. There is one power management term for the UE, denoted P-MPR, and P-MPR*c* = P-MPR. PCMAX,*c* is calculated under the assumption that the transmit power is increased by the same amount in dB on all component carriers. The PSD difference between UL CCs shall not exceed 3dB.”  \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*end of quote\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*  I don’t think that equal MPR on each cell is in line with RAN 1 requirements for UE behaviour when UL power is limited. From 38.213:  \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*start of quote\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*   * 7.5 Prioritizations for transmission power reductions   For single cell operation with two uplink carriers or for operation with carrier aggregation, if a total UE transmit power for PUSCH or PUCCH or PRACH or SRS transmissions on serving cells in a frequency range in a respective transmission occasion  would exceed , where  is the linear value of  in transmission occasion  as defined in [8-1, TS 38.101-1] for FR1 and [8-2, TS38.101-2] for FR2, the UE allocates power to PUSCH/PUCCH/PRACH/SRS transmissions according to the following priority order (in descending order) so that the total UE transmit power for transmissions on serving cells in the frequency range is smaller than or equal to  for that frequency range in every symbol of transmission occasion . When determining a total transmit power for serving cells in a frequency range in a symbol of transmission occasion , the UE does not include power for transmissions starting after the symbol of transmission occasion . The total UE transmit power in a symbol of a slot is defined as the sum of the linear values of UE transmit powers for PUSCH, PUCCH, PRACH, and SRS in the symbol of the slot.  - PRACH transmission on the PCell  - PUCCH transmission with HARQ-ACK information and/or SR or PUSCH transmission with HARQ-ACK information  - PUCCH transmission with CSI or PUSCH transmission with CSI  - PUSCH transmission without HARQ-ACK information or CSI  - SRS transmission, with aperiodic SRS having higher priority than semi-persistent and/or periodic SRS, or PRACH transmission on a serving cell other than the PCell  In case of same priority order and for operation with carrier aggregation, the UE prioritizes power allocation for transmissions on the primary cell of the MCG or the SCG over transmissions on a secondary cell. In case of same priority order and for operation with two UL carriers, the UE prioritizes power allocation for transmissions on the carrier where the UE is configured to transmit PUCCH. If PUCCH is not configured for any of the two UL carriers, the UE prioritizes power allocation for transmissions on the non-supplementary UL carrier.  \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*end of quote\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*  It seems like just like LTE is prioritized for EN-DC, the Pcell needs to be prioritized over the secondary cell for NR UL CA.  Skyworks: CA\_n41(2A) and CA\_n41C 160MHz (>6% BW) or 190MHz (>7%BW) exceeds 4%BW. It needs to be clear how >4% BW is addressed in the requirements before power class is fully defined and CR agreed  Huawei: The relative CBW criteria shall not be used everywhere. The current spec just says the MPR for CBW exceeds the limitation could be defined different compared to the values in the spec. Now the MPR for UL CA is still under study, which should consider the new scenario requested by operators with large aggregated CBW.  To Sprint, NR UL CA is unlike ENDC, the power scaling is based on the priority for physical channel defined in TS 38.213, not based on CG priority. The sentence in our CR is follow the definition in TS 36.101, however since the physical channel on CCs may different then power scaling may be different on each CC, so I add one sentence “The PSD difference between UL CCs shall not exceed [3]dB.” to ensure that the PSD on each CC are almost identical.  Nokia: CR should contain whole feature. Intra band CA requirements are put to interband CA clause.  Huawei: To Nokia, in the CR, I made the CA feature as a whole, and adding intra-band UL CA part into CA feature. I think it follows TS 36.101 type.  Proposed WF from moderator: Can revise the CR capturing all the comments. |
| Issue 1-1-2: CR R4-2001774 for signal quality  Not agreeable: NR image and carrier leakage are 28dBc in NR not 25dB  Huawei: will revise CR on this part.  Qualcomm:   1. Why do we have to worry about LO location parameter when IBE exceptions for intra-band contiguous ULCA and if we propose 2 PA architecture for intra-band non-contiguous ULCA?   Nokia: CR should contain whole feature. Intra band CA requirements are put to interband CA clause.  Huawei: To Nokia, in the CR, I made the CA feature as a whole, and adding intra-band UL CA part into CA feature. I think it follows TS 36.101 type. To QC, it is agreed in RAN1 that 3301 is allowed for intra-band CA and RAN4 send reply LS confirm RAN1’s agreement in RAN4#93 meeting. Furthermore, LO location is related to LO number but not PA architecture.  Proposed WF from moderator: Can revise the CR capturing all the comments. |
| Issue 1-1-3: CR R4-2001762 for almost contiguous allocation  Proposed WF from moderator: Seems no objective comments. Can be approved. |
| Issue 1-1-4: CR R4-2002051 for configuration on intra-band UL CA  Skyworks: for UL CA\_n41(2A) we need to understand the maximum instantaneous BW: 160MHz for NS01 and 190MHz for NS04? Is this intended with 1 or 2 PAs and with which support for UL MIMO or transparent TX diversity.  Huawei: NS\_04 can be considered later in order to complete the WI on time. The requirements shall be architecture agnostic, and UL MIMO or transparent Tx div are not excluded.  Nokia: Could be merged to feature CR.  Apple: Introduces CA\_n41C and CA\_n41(2A), however, the feature intra-band UL CA is not yet completed. And even when the general feature intra-band UL CA is specified, for band 41 specific emissions requirements are needed requiring MPR and A-MPR, this is not done yet.  Huawei: to Nokia, the UL CA feature includes too much contents, in case we stuck in one tiny issue that nothing can be approved, we propose to separate the feature CR into several parts, it make sure the WI can complete in time. We are open to discuss on this. |
| 1-2:emission requirement | Issue 1-2-1: ACLR MBW  NTT DOCOMO, INC.: We have a question that is it OK if the definition of the channel arrangement of UE and BS does not align each other, and how about using the same definition of BS. We would like to note that MBW of ACLR for intra-band contiguous CA in FR2 is specified as:  *BWChannel\_CA – GBChannel(1) - GBChannel(2)*  *NOTE 1: The GBChannel(i) is the minimum guard band of the component carriers at the lower edge Fedge, low and the upper edge Fedge,high of the sub-block respectively.*  , which seems to be the same definition as that of channel arrangement of BS specification.Skyworks: ACLR is easily defined from the channel spacing and Foffset, low, Foffset high srther than from removing GB to CA\_BW that is anyhow related to channel spacing and Foffst, low, Foffset high. The key is that channel spacing is properly defined and that the measurement BW ensures all the possible allocated RBS of the wanted signals fit in the measurement BW.  We believe it is fair that frequency offset is based on the sum of each individual CC channel BW as it would be for a single CC that would have the same BW.  Huawei: Firstly, we think the Foffset,low and Foffset,high need to be aligned between 38.101 and 38.104. The BWGB shall be identical on two sides of intra-band contiguous CA. For ACLR MBW, we now have two options:   * Two CCs are positioned with a certain channel space which is less than or equal to the nominal channel space, then the SCS adoption can defined as current 5.3A.3 of 38.101. It ensures the MBW always capture the signal within the wanted channel. * Two CCs are positioned definitely with nominal channel space, then the SCS adoption shall be revised as common largest µ defined in nominal channel space part. It ensures the verification condition is not flexible with CCs configuration, and ensures the aggregated channel bandwidth is not larger than CBW1+CBW2.   We are open to both options and welcome to better solution.  For FR2 ACLR MBW, I check f80 TS 38.101-2 , ACLR MBW is defined as BWChannel\_CA – 2\*BWGB, NOTE 1: BWGB is defined in clause 5.3A.2.  Qualcomm:   1. MBW=BWCA-2max(GB1, GB2). Do not use largest common mu. Largest common mu is only used for channel spacing. 2. Offset = +/-BWCA 3. Note that BWCA for different numerology can exceed sum(CCBW1, CCBW2).   Proposed WF from moderator:   * Foffset,low and Foffset,high shall be aligned between 38.101 and 38.104. CR is needed for TS 38.104. * ACLR MBW:   + Offset for ACLR: +/-BWchannel\_CA   + MBW= BWchannel\_CA -2\*max(BWGB1, BWGB2). SCS adoption of each CC is defined as current 5.3A.3 of 38.101   + Channel space can be less or equal to nominal channel space to ensure BWchannel\_CA not exceed CBW1+CBW2   Skyworks: On ACLR BW, we indeed need to find a consistent solution such that BWchannel\_CA is less than CBW1+CBW2 and all allocations fit inside the measurement B. but what should be the baseline for simulations and measurements? For Foffset, we agree UL and DL and UE and BS should be aligned but that needs further discussions how. |
| Issue 1-2-2: SEM offset and MBW  NTT DOCOMO, INC.: We would like to take Option 2 which is the previous agreement.  Thank you for Skyworks R4-2000713. Is it correct understanding that if we take option2, MPR for non-contiguous allocation of both inner and outer allocation is increasing according to Table 3? To be more specific, MPR for DFT-s-OFDM for non-contiguous allocation of inner allocation increase from 1.5 to 6.6, and MPR for CP-OFDM for non-contiguous allocation of inner allocation increase from 3 to 6.9, and MPR for CP-OFDM for non-contiguous allocation of outer allocation increase from 10 to 12.3?  Skyworks: our document points at two separate issue:  What is the OOB starting position: based on CA\_BW or sum of channel BW. we belive the last one is fair compared to single CC case but we are open to discuss.  The measurement BW and requirement in the first OOB MHz. we believe this is a serious issue as it shows in our 1RB+1RB measurements that -24dBm/30kHz would be the cause of larger MPR even for inner allocations. Our measurements do account for memory effects in PA which simulations do not account for. Only other solution would be to reduce further the inner region. We do not understand the justification for a stricter requirement at larger bandwidth.  Huawei: we shall follow the agreement already reached in RAN4. We shall avoid to be back and forth on each requirement. We prefer option 2. Actually, we don’t see much difference on option 1 and option 2 except for the first OOB range, there may 1RB+1RB IMD falls into. We should not relax on SEM requirement, with this issue we prefer to have some relaxation on MPR.  Qualcomm:   1. Prefer to use the 1% BW for 0-1MHz SEM up until 40MHz BW then 400KHz thereafter. The 30KHz MBW is more pessimistic and may create larger inner MPR.   Proposed WF from moderator:   1. OOB domain start at ±BWchannel\_CA/2 2. The SEM follows agreement in WF R4-1910273   Skyworks: we could agree to 1 with same comment that BWchannel\_CA must be less than CBW1+CBW2. We think further discussion is needed for 2 and the impact of the requirement in the first MHz, we note that there is different way for this first MHz in single CC, LTE, ENDC so we believe it should still be open for discussion as some issues have been demonstrated. Let’s have further discussion in round 2. Especially as it is suggested to look into the cases where IMD3 falls in that region.  **Qualcomm**: We should be open to change the MBW in SEM mask in 1st 1MHz from channel edge to potential lower inner MPR values. |
| Issue 1-2-3:CR R4-2001772 on emission RF requirement  Skyworks: we believe we need to have consensus on the issue described above and whther it has been properly been verified by other companies.  Qualcomm:   1. Prefer to use the 1% BW for 0-1MHz SEM up until 40MHz BW then 400KHz thereafter. The 30KHz MBW is more pessimistic. 2. Title in 6.5A.1.3 should change to “Occupied Bandwidth for CA”. (remove inter-band word). 3. Definition for no OBW is unclear. Is this Wgap > max(∆FOOBL, ∆FOOBH). Can we refer to the TR in FR2 as a guideline?   For different numerology, the aggregated channel BW > sum(CBW1, CBW2), and how does this align with FCC. This needs to be investigated before finalizing OBW requirement in 3GPP.  Nokia: CR should contain whole feature. Intra band CA requirements are put to interband CA clause.  Huawei: To Nokia, in the CR, I made the CA feature as a whole, and adding intra-band UL CA part into CA feature. I think it follows TS 36.101 type.  To QC, for OBW issue, we don't want to follow FR2. No OBW is because the test procedure requires to search for the 1% power as the first step, with overlapping, the point is not expected correctly found.  Proposed WF from moderator:  Revise the CR based on the 1-2-1 and 1-2-2 agreements. |
| 1-3:inner/outer allocation | Issue 1-3-1: contiguous allocation  Skyworks:  We suggest the condition for contiguous allocation is added as per our proposal independently to inner/outer definition.  In our measurements and the requirements we do not see the justification that wider bandwidth should have a smaller inner region (other than 1MHz OOB which should not reguce the region from ½ to 1/3rd. We believe using a single inner definition is better and allocated additional MPR for >100MHz but also potentially for >4% fractional BW.  At this point we believe that the defining two types of outer has proposed by Qualcomm is an unnecessary complexity compared to increasing the inner region for BW class C.  Whether equation uses mu or SCS is not important to us although it is confusing to see different notations for different things: SCS for allocation, mu for bandwidths…  Huawei:  For option 1, the meaning is similar as inner/outer allocation for single CC. we think it is better to align the terminology with single CC. The other issue is for aggregated channel bandwidth>100MHz, we already agree in WF R4-1915417 that inner/outer allocation is different with aggregated channel bandwidth≤100MHz.  We prefer option1. Actually option1 and option2 is the same for aggregated channel bandwidth ≤100MHz.  Qualcomm:   1. **In both R4-2000711 and R4-2000756**, the RBstart condition is missing for when contiguous allocation is only in the 2nd CC. So, RBstart1\*2^mu1 covers cases for only when CC1 is allocated or there is allocation across the gap. For cases, where CC! is not allocated, then the RBstart\_composite should be SU1\*2^mu1 + RBstart2\*2^mu2. 2. **In R4-2000711**, Proposal 3 needs further study. 3. **In R4-2000756**, the RBstart condition must be a composite RBstart value as indicated in R4-2000711 to account for different numerology.   **In R4-2000756**, inner/outer condition should cover all BW class and not 2 different inner/outre conditions. MPR should be adjusted in BW class C to account for the difference to reduce implementation complexity.  Nokia: Problems in interpreting Table 2.3-1: NOTE 1 is ambiguous, β is defined twice. What is the difference between LCRB and NRB\_alloc,*i*? LCRB is used as a bandwidth even though it is an RB count.  Proposed WF from moderator:   1. Terminology on the definition shall be aligned with single CC. 2. For aggregate channel bandwidth≤100MHz, Inner RB allocation is defined according to 1CC inner and be up to Floor(1/2NRB,agg) , the equation can be as below:   For RBStart,Low = max(1, floor(*NRB\_alloc* /2)), where *NRB\_alloc=LCRB1\*2^µ1+LCRB2\*2^µ2*  *Inner RB allocation is defined as* RBStart,Low ≤ RBStart ≤ RBStart,High, *NRB\_alloc≤ceil[(1/2NRB,agg) ]*  RBStart,High = NRB,agg – RBStart,Low – NRB,alloc, where NRB,agg=NRB1*\*2^µ1+* NRB1*\***2^µ2*  For the case only RBs configured in CC2,  RBStart,Low = max(1, floor((NRB1*\*2^µ1+LCRB2\*2^µ2)/2)*   1. For aggregate channel bandwidth>100MHz, 2 options:  * Different inner/outer allocation definition:   For RBStart,Low = max(1, floor(*NRB\_alloc*)), where *NRB\_alloc=LCRB1\*2^µ1+LCRB2\*2^µ2*  *Inner RB allocation is defined as* RBStart,Low ≤ RBStart ≤ RBStart,High, *NRB\_alloc≤Floor[(1/3NRB,agg) ]*  RBStart,High = NRB,agg – RBStart,Low – NRB,alloc, where NRB,agg=NRB1*\*2^µ1+* NRB1*\*2^µ2*  For the case only RBs configured in CC2,  RBStart,Low = max(1, floor((NRB1*\*2^µ1+LCRB2\*2^µ2)/2)*   * Same inner/outer allocation definition with bullet 2, but with a relaxed MPR.   Skyworks: There are a few errors in the equations (missing parathesis) and both all allocations in CC1 and CC2 should be covered but we think 1 and 2 are acceptable. For 3, we have a preference for second bullet option with separate MPR values and would like that moderator clarifies if this is for further discussion in round 2 or further evaluation in the future since there is only one company input for the first bullet.  **Qualcomm**: For #2, the RB\_low and RB high thresholds do not have to change. You just need to make sure the RBstart value accounts for NRB in CC1 when you have allocation only in CC2. I mentioned thjs in my previous comment.  **Qualcomm**: Prefer the 2nd bullet in #3 as we already mentioned. |
| Issue 1-3-2: non-contiguous allocation  Skyworks: we believe there may not be significant difference between the two the two definition but we are cross checking if one might have better behavior (especially with regard to the issue in the first OOB MHz that Skyworks has found)  Huawei: option 3 is what we mentioned in our contribution in the last RAN4 meeting. We agree with option3, and we can see that MPR is with big difference between outer1 and outer2,  Qualcomm:   1. **In R4-2000756**, **R4-2000711, and R4-2000093** all agree on the IM3 all falling within BWCA as an inner waveform. The question is which is easier or better for implementation.   Proposed WF from moderator:   1. Inner allocation: IM3 all falling within aggregated channel bandwidth, the equation can be as below:   For RBStart,Low = max(1, floor(*NRB\_alloc*)), where *NRB\_alloc=LCRB1\*2^µ1+LCRB2\*2^µ2+∆fc,gap/0.18*  *Inner RB allocation is defined as* RBStart,Low ≤ RBStart ≤ RBStart,High, *NRB\_alloc≤Floor[(1/3NRB,agg) ]*  RBStart,High = NRB,agg – RBStart,Low – NRB,alloc, where NRB,agg=NRB1*\*2^µ1+* NRB1*\*2^µ2*  *∆fc,gap is the frequency gap between the RB allocations on each CC*   1. Outer allocation:  * Divided into outer 1 and outer2 * Do not use RB allocation reduction as LTE did * Skyworks: We believe that all companies have the same understanding for the IMD3 criteria for inner but we believe the addition of *∆fc,gap/0.18* is unnecessary and if removed provides some guard-band for the IMD3 versus SEM. For 2, outer 1 and outer 2, we are welcoming further discussions but believe it is too early to agree on second bullet * **Qualcomm**: We agree with Skyworks on the equation. Also, even with the removal of *∆fc,gap/0.18*, the IM3 is not fully contained within channel BW according to these equations. Needs further checking in round2. Qualcomm’s equations are based on what we have used in LTE. * **Qualcomm**: There is too much difference between 1RB+1RB and fullRB+fullRB to removing MPR Vs RB allocation. You can reduce complexity by providing a single MPR value as a function of allocation ratio for all waveforms as in LTE and ENDC. |
| 1-4:MPR definition format | Issue 1-4-1: contiguous allocation  Skyworks: as already stated our preference is for a larger inner region for class C with a small delta MPR for inner, slightly larger for outer)  Huawei: prefer option1. The extra MPR may not fair to each waveform or modulation order, it is better more specific.  Qualcomm:   1. We are fine with different MPR as a function of BW class as long as the MPR definition is structured so that it can default back to LTE back-off with equivalent RB allocation. Companies must agree on Inner/Outer condition, preferably one condition for all BW class.   Proposed WF from moderator:  Option 1, Bandwidth class B and C are defined separately |
| Issue 1-4-2: non-contiguous allocation  Skyworks: for non-contiguous case there is anyhow only one inner definition for class B and C. If outer 1 and outer 2 is defined (we find it too complex) we believe it sould use a single value and not depend on allocation ratio. In the end we believe that the scheduler only needs to distinguish between good and less good allocations like in the single CC case. We also believe that a simple MPR reduction could be given to large non-contiguous allocations.  Huawei: prefer option1. The extra MPR may not fair to each waveform or modulation order, it is better more specific.  Qualcomm:   1. We are fine with different MPR as a function of BW class as long as the MPR definition is structured so that it can default back to LTE back-off with equivalent RB allocation. Companies agree on IM3 falling in BWCA as inner.   Proposed WF from moderator:   * Option 1, Bandwidth class B and C are defined separately |
| Issue 1-4-3:CR for R4-2001759  Skyworks: it is too early to agree inner/outer and table structure based on current results unless we have a way forward on allocation definition and difference between class B and C  Huawei: we target on completing the format discussion in this meeting, the CR will capture the agreement.  Qualcomm:   1. Need consensus before finalizing values and agreement. 2. Qualcomm prefers same inner/outer for all BW class.   Nokia: Cannot have a CR with all entry’s TBD. CR should contain whole feature. Intra band CA requirements are put to interband CA clause.  Huawei: to Nokia, the UL CA feature includes too much contents, in case we stuck in one tiny issue that nothing can be approved, we propose to separate the feature CR into several parts, it make sure the WI can complete in time.  Proposed WF from moderator:  Revise the CR. |
| 1-5:MPR value | Issue 1-5-1: contiguous allocation for inner RB  Skyworks: the key is to settle on QPSK first and pay attention to measurements which account properly for worst case asymmetry in spectral regrowth which may be the reason for slightly higher MPR for Skyworks notably for inner contiguous. Some of the difference between CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM is due to the feasible number of RB in DFT-s-OFDM which means that the CP-OFDM region is larger than for DFT-s-OFDM. Delta is around 1-1.5dB and there is no significant difference between class C and B justifying to use the same inner/outer definition. Delta of 2.5dB seems very high for Huawei. It would be of interest that companies provide background on what was the worst case limitation and for which allocation.  Huawei: we can see that the results provided in this meeting quite aligned for contiguous inner RB allocation. For option 3, we see 0dB MPR with 2PA architecture. For contiguous allocation, 1PA architecture was agreed in the last meeting. Propose to define MPR for contiguous inner RB allocation as 1.5dB for DFT-OFDM, 3.5dB for CP-OFDM for aggregated channel bandwidth ≤200MHz.  For the difference between DFT-s-OFDM and CP-OFDM, we think DFT-s-OFDM is under estimate with 1dB(from some initial measurement). For inner case, the 1+1RB case which IMD5 falls into SEM part seems worst case.  Qualcomm:   1. [R4-2000713]: What is the cause of inner MPR for DFT QPSK from contiguous measurements since ACLR should be very good for inner waveforms?   Proposed WF from moderator:   * Align the data on contiguous inner RB * Propose to define MPR for contiguous inner RB allocation as 1.5dB for DFT-OFDM, 3.5dB for CP-OFDM for aggregated channel bandwidth ≤200MHz. * **Attention!!** Target for align the data in this meeting * **Skyworks:** at this time it is too early to agree on Bullet 2 values, also as the moderator has suggested the value may be different for class B and C. * **Qualcomm:** Further insight and clarification from Skyworks measurements show IM5 and IM7 issues in spurious regions so it may not be all about IM3 containment. This needs to be double checked if this is a real issue. |
| Issue 1-5-2: contiguous allocation for outer RB  Skyworks: our measurements show that fully allocated is the worst case and due to IMD assynmetry is worse than for QCOM and Huawei.  Huawei: According to the contributions, the limitation is full RB(large RB) allocation. We would like further evaluation on the MPR for full RB(large RB) allocation. At least, we can align on 2dB for DFT-OFDM, 4dB for CP-OFDM for RB allocation with NRBalloc≤β\*BWCA, where β is TBD.  Qualcomm:   1. [R4-2001129]: For BW class B, only CA\_n7B and CA\_n40B have the MPR threshold failure. For BW class C, CA\_n41C always fails this threshold. Rather than define a % failure threshold as in single CC, it is better to adjust MPR values to account for the worst-case relative BW. 2. [R4-2000713]:, Why is there 4.5dB MPR for outer 20+20 DFT-s-OFDM measurement which should be same as LTE (2dB). Is the PA calibration point different? 3. [R4-2001756]. Why no MPR values for < 100MHz? the MPR values for > 100MHz are too low.   Proposed WF from moderator:   * Further evaluate the MPR for full/large RB allocation in the 2nd round * **Attention!!** Target for align the data in this meeting |
| Issue 1-5-3: non-contiguous allocations for inner RB  Skyworks: we do not understand the large MPR from Huawei, some explantion on which limitatiuon and allocation is needed. For QCOM and Skyworks the differences are similar than for contiguous case and Skyworks values account for IMD5/7 asymmetry in 1RB+1RB that are the worst cases. As we suggested some improvement could be done for large allocation (but in a simple way)  Huawei: from simulation, we see that some non-contiguous allocations for inner RB may limited by ACLR, for 1RB+1RB case. We need further evaluation with measurement.  Qualcomm:   1. [R4-2001756]. For the defined inner region, the MPR values look to be too high. Qualcomm needs to submit MPR numbers once requirements and definition is finalized. 2. [R4-2000713]. Your measurements show that IM5 in SEM -13dBm/M region is the cause for 1.5dB MPR for inner waveforms. Or is it the IM3 leaking into 0-1MHz of SEM region? Need Clarification.   Proposed WF from moderator:   * Further evaluate the MPR for 1RB+1RB that IMD5 fall into the SEM -13dBm/MHz in the 2nd round. * **Attention!!** Target for align the data in this meeting |
| Issue 1-5-4: non-contiguous allocations for outer RB  Skyworks: this is where using -24dBm/30kHz could hurt significantly. This may be the reason for Huawei large MPR. When considering worst case 1RB+1RB Skyworks and QCOM results are close. As we suggested some improvement could be done for large allocation (but in a simple way)  Huawei: the worst case come from 1RB+1RB edge case. For outer2 RB allocation(IM3 in -13dBm/MHz, at least one IM5 in -25dBm/MHz or -30dBm/MHz), We think take MPR be reduced by the allocation ratio would be fair to each allocations.  Qualcomm:  Regarding, [R4-2001756], Qualcomm needs to submit MPR numbers once requirements and definition is finalized. We expect similar back-off as intra-band ENDC.  Proposed WF from moderator:   * Further evaluate the MPR for worst 1RB+1RB case, and IMD fall into -24dBm/30kHz case * **Attention!!** Target for align the data in this meeting * **Skyworks:** This must be carefully be evaluated before CR on SEM mask can be agreed. |
| 1-6: AMPR NS04 and NS27 | Issue 1-6-1: whether NS04 and NS27 need to be complete in Rel-16 FR1 WI  Skyworks: we believe band 41 and 48 (and C-band) could be key deployements in the US like band 41/77/78/790 in the rest of the world. We also belive there is potentially other emission issues for n77/78/79 that could arise with bandwidth class C.  Huawei: considering the MPR discussion status, we recommend NS04 and NS27 AMPR be completed in Rel-17 to ensure the WI can be completed in time.  Proposed WF from moderator:  Currently de-prioritize the NS04 and NS27 in Rel-16, it may delay to TEI16 or Rel-17  Skyworks: we will continue to provide inputs on this as we believe UL CA feature can be deployed in any region. |
| Issue 1-6-2: AMPR for NS04 and NS27  Skyworks: our values are indicative a possible worst case and need to pay attention up to IMD5/7 for the strict OOB emissions rules of FCC for band 41 and 48  Proposed WF from moderator:  Discuss in the next RAN4 meeting |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close-to-finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## 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.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sub-topic#1 | *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| 1-1 CRs for UL CA requirement not related to ACLR and MPR | Issue 1-1-1 **CR R4-2001773 for output power RF requirement for intra-band UL CA**  Can revise the CR capturing all the comments. |
| Issue 1-1-2 **CR R4-2001774 for signal quality RF requirement for intra-band UL CA**  Can revise the CR capturing all the comments. |
| Issue 1-1-3 **CR R4-2001762 for almost contiguous allocation for intra-band UL CA**  Can be approved. |
| Issue 1-1-4 **CR for R4-2002051 for configurations for intra-band UL CA**  Can revise the CR |
| 1-2 CR for UL CA emission requirement | Issue 1-2-1 **ACLR MBW**  Proposed WF from moderator:   * Foffset,low and Foffset,high shall be aligned between 38.101 and 38.104. CR may be needed for TS 38.104. Further discuss in the 2nd round on how to align the Foffset * ACLR MBW:   + Offset for ACLR: +/-BWchannel\_CA   + MBW= BWchannel\_CA -2\*max(BWGB1, BWGB2). SCS adoption of each CC is defined as current 5.3A.3 of 38.101   + Channel space can be less or equal to nominal channel space to ensure BWchannel\_CA not exceed CBW1+CBW2   + Further discuss the MBW baseline for simulations and measurements   companies have concern should provide concrete input in 2nd round. |
| Issue 1-2-2 **SEM offset and Measurement bandwidth**  Proposed WF from moderator:   * OOB domain start at ±BWchannel\_CA/2, with condition that BWchannel\_CA less than or equal to CBW1+CBW2 * The SEM follows agreement in WF R4-1910273 except 0-1MHz, operators are encouraged to provide views on whether we can relax on SEM 0-1MHz for a lower MPR |
| Issue 1-2-3 **CR R4-2001772 on emission RF requirement for intra-band UL CA**  Revise the CR based on the 1-2-1 and 1-2-2 agreements. |
| 1-3 Inner and outer RB allocation definition | Issue 1-3-1 **contiguous allocations**  Proposed WF from moderator:   1. Terminology on the definition shall be aligned with single CC. 2. For aggregate channel bandwidth≤100MHz, Inner RB allocation is defined according to 1CC inner and be up to Floor(1/2NRB,agg) , the equation can be as below:   For RBStart,Low = max(1, floor(*NRB\_alloc* /2)), where *NRB\_alloc=LCRB1\*2^µ1+LCRB2\*2^µ2*  *Inner RB allocation is defined as* RBStart,Low ≤ RBStart ≤ RBStart,High, *NRB\_alloc≤ceil[(1/2NRB,agg) ]*  RBStart,High = NRB,agg – RBStart,Low – NRB,alloc, where NRB,agg=NRB1*\*2^µ1+* NRB1*\*2^µ2*  For the case only RBs configured in CC2,  RBStart,Low = max(1, floor((NRB1*\*2^µ1+LCRB2\*2^µ2)/2)*   1. *Basically agreeable, Optimize the equation in the 2nd round*For aggregate channel bandwidth>100MHz, 2 options:  * Different inner/outer allocation definition:   For RBStart,Low = max(1, floor(*NRB\_alloc*)), where *NRB\_alloc=LCRB1\*2^µ1+LCRB2\*2^µ2*  *Inner RB allocation is defined as* RBStart,Low ≤ RBStart ≤ RBStart,High, *NRB\_alloc≤Floor[(1/3NRB,agg) ]*  RBStart,High = NRB,agg – RBStart,Low – NRB,alloc, where NRB,agg=NRB1*\*2^µ1+* NRB1*\*2^µ2*  For the case only RBs configured in CC2,  RBStart,Low = max(1, floor((NRB1*\*2^µ1+LCRB2\*2^µ2)/2)*   * Same inner/outer allocation definition with bullet 2, but with a relaxed MPR. |
| Issue 1-3-2 **non-contiguous allocations**  Proposed WF from moderator:   1. Inner allocation: IM3 all falling within aggregated channel bandwidth, the equation can be as below:   For RBStart,Low = max(1, floor(*NRB\_alloc*)), where *NRB\_alloc=LCRB1\*2^µ1+LCRB2\*2^µ2+∆fc,gap/0.18*  *Inner RB allocation is defined as* RBStart,Low ≤ RBStart ≤ RBStart,High, *NRB\_alloc≤Floor[(1/3NRB,agg) ]*  RBStart,High = NRB,agg – RBStart,Low – NRB,alloc, where NRB,agg=NRB1*\*2^µ1+* NRB1*\*2^µ2*  *∆fc,gap is the frequency gap between the RB allocations on each CC*  *Basically agreeable, Optimize the equation in the 2nd round*   1. Outer allocation: further discuss on below topics in 2nd round  * Divided into outer 1 and outer2? * use RB allocation reduction as LTE did? |
| 1-4 MPR definition format | Issue 1-4-1: **contiguous allocations**  Proposed WF from moderator:  Option 1, MPR for Bandwidth class B and C are separately listed in the table |
| Issue 1-4-2: **non-contiguous allocations**  Proposed WF from moderator:  Option 1, MPR for Bandwidth class B and C are separately listed in the table |
| Issue 1-4-3 **CR R4-2001759 on MPR requirement for intra-band contiguous UL CA**  Revise the CR. |
| 1-5 MPR value for intra-band UL contiguous CA in QPSK | Issue 1-5-1 **contiguous allocations for inner RB**  Proposed WF from moderator:   * Align the data on contiguous inner RB * Propose to define MPR for contiguous inner RB allocation as [1.5dB] for DFT-OFDM, [3.5]dB for CP-OFDM for aggregated channel bandwidth [≤200MHz]. * Further evaluate on the IM5 and IM7 issues in spurious regions   Attention!! Target for align the data in this meeting |
| Issue 1-5-2 **contiguous allocations for outer RB**  Proposed WF from moderator:   * Further evaluate the MPR for full/large RB allocation in the 2nd round   Attention!! Target for align the data in this meeting |
| Issue 1-5-3 **non-contiguous allocations for inner RB**  Proposed WF from moderator:   * Further evaluate the MPR for 1RB+1RB that IMD5 fall into the SEM -13dBm/MHz in the 2nd round.   Attention!! Target for align the data in this meeting |
| Issue 1-5-4 **non-contiguous allocations for outer RB**  Proposed WF from moderator:   * Further evaluate the MPR for worst 1RB+1RB case, and IMD fall into -24dBm/30kHz case   Attention!! Target for align the data in this meeting |
| 1-6 AMPR value for intra-band UL contiguous CA | Issue 1-6-1 **whether NS04 and NS27 need to be complete in Rel-16 FR1 WI**  Proposed WF from moderator:  Discuss whether we Currently de-prioritize the NS04 and NS27 in Rel-16, it may delay to TEI16 or Rel-17 |
| Issue 1-6-2 **AMPR for NS04 and NS27**  Proposed WF from moderator:  Discuss in the next RAN4 meeting |

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 | WF on emission RF requirement for intra-band contiguous UL CA | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| #2 | WF on MPR requirement for intra-band contiguous UL CA | Huawei, HiSilicon |

### 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** |
| CR R4-2001773 | to be revised |
| CR R4-2001774 | to be revised |
| CR R4-2001772 | to be revised |
| CR R4-2001759 | To be revised |
| CR R4-2001762 | Agreeable |
| CR R4-2002051 | return to |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| T-doc number | Title | Comments |
| Draft R4-2002804 | WF on emission RF requirement for intra-band contiguous UL CA | Skyworks:   * For the measurement bandwidth in the first MHz of the SEM. Regarding Option 1 and 3, I’ve done the calculation and the difference is not significant so resulting MPR from IMD3 of 1RB+1RB will be high, in my opinion they are redundant. So our preference is for option 2 and we are ready to discuss and evaluate further in next meetings. * For starting point for SEM mask:   + May be first, we should be a bit more precise and rather than calling this the start of OOB domain we should say position of ∆fOOB = 0MHz   + Although I was a proponent for Option 2 I am OK with option 1 too.   QC:   1. For SEM (slide 5), I am ok with either option 1 or 2 since regulatory compliance is met with both options, with option 2 aligning more with FCC and option 1 aligning more with ENDC. 2. For ACLR (slide 4), I prefer MBW and Offset per option 2, with BWCA defined per the specification. 3. We prefer starting point of OOB domain (slide 5) to be Fedge,low and Fedge,high which is option 1 at +/-BWCA/2. Keep numerologies same for BWCA < (CBW1+CBW2). 4. Agree with slide 3.   Huawei:  Revise the WF accordingly. Capture the issue on Foffset,low and Foffest,high issue in the WF, which we agrees to align TS 38.101 and TS 38.104, further discuss how to align in the next meeting. |
| Draft R4-2002805 | WF on MPR requirement for intra-band contiguous UL CA | Qualcomm：  Slide 2   * 1st bullet: Same comment as Nokia below, and this was mentioned in the email discussion.   + Insert in your WF:     - RBStart = RBStart1 ∙ 2^1, if LCRB1 > 0     - RBStart = NRB1 ∙ 2^1 + RBStart2∙2^2, if LCRB1 = 0 * 2nd bullet: Prefer option 2. Skyworks had same comment in email discussion.   Slide 3   * 1st bullet:   + RBStart = RBStart1 ∙ 2^1.   + Equations chosen from your contribution needs to be further vetted, so I cannot agree to your equations just yet.   + IM3 could be leaking out of aggregated CA BW for the inner condition. * 2nd bullet: Option 3 is ok for simplification.   Slide 4, 5:   * How did we arrive at the numbers in the table? * Noncontiguous allocations should be specified as a function of allocation ratio for outer2. Also consider outer2 as one number as for all waveforms as a function of allocation ratio for simplicity.   Nokia：  The draft WF R4-2002805 looks mostly good. A couple of parameters were left ambiguous, as discussed below.  The definition of RBStart (subblock-wide allocation start) is missing, though discussed very briefly. Clearly, it is:  RBStart = RBStart1 ∙ 2^1, if LCRB1 > 0  RBStart = NRB1 ∙ 2^1 + RBStart2∙2^2, if LCRB1 = 0  This applies to both contiguous and noncontiguous allocations.  For noncontiguous allocations, ∆fc,gap remains ambiguous. The figure on page 3 suggests that it contains the inter-CC gap, but this is incompatible with the definitions of NRB,agg and NRB\_alloc. To make the quantities compatible, avoid dealing with frequency units, and account for single-CC allocations, we can again omit the inter-CC gap and define directly:  NRB\_alloc = LCRB2 ∙ 2^µ2, if LCRB1=0  NRB\_alloc = LCRB1 ∙ 2^µ1, if LCRB2=0  NRB\_alloc = (NRB1- RBStart1) ∙ 2^µ1 + (RBStart1+ LCRB2) ∙ 2^µ2, otherwise  This is the equivalent number of 15 kHz RBs within the CC allocations and between them.  There is a typo in the formula(s) for NRB,agg. The second NRB1 should be NRB2.  Huawei： Revise the WF according to the above comments |
| Draft R4-2002806 | CR for intra-band UL CA output power | Nokia: As an example below you have changed the agreed sub-clause structure by changing the interband CA clause to generic CA clause.  Instead you should have used the 6.2A.1.1 and 6.2A.1.2 which are reserved for intraband contiguous and non-contiguous CA respectively.  Huawei: revise the CR accordingly. Since some UL CA requirement are still under discussion, this T-doc could be for technical endorsed. |
| Draft R4-2002807 | CR for intra-band UL CA signal quality | Nokia: As an example below you have changed the agreed sub-clause structure by changing the interband CA clause to generic CA clause.  Huawei: revise CR on image and Leakage requiement, and capture Nokia’s comment. Since some UL CA requirement are still under discussion, this T-doc could be for technical endorsed. |
| Draft R4-2002808 | CR for intra-band UL CA emission requirement | Huawei: capture the agreement in the WF. For ACLR MBW part, still wait for the consensus, we may revise the CR if getting more confirmation from companies. |
| Draft R4-2002809 | CR on FR1 UL CA MPR requirement Rel-16 | Huawei: people do not have consensus on MPR values but just the initial format. Since companies have comments that MPR with all values TBD can not be in CR, may not have further progress in this meeting. |
| CR R4-2002051 | draftCR for TS 38.101-1 intra-band UL contiguous CA combinations | Huawei: most concerns are from that the feature CR for UL CA has not been agreed in RAN4. This CR may be technical endorsed? |

## 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** | **Title** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| Draft R4-2002804 | WF on emission RF requirement for intra-band contiguous UL CA | Can be approved |
| Draft R4-2002805 | WF on MPR requirement for intra-band contiguous UL CA | Can be approved |
| Draft R4-2002806 | CR for intra-band UL CA output power | be technical endorsed |
| Draft R4-2002807 | CR for intra-band UL CA signal quality | be technical endorsed |
| Draft R4-2002808 | CR for intra-band UL CA emission requirement | Waiting for the confirmation from interested companies |
| Draft R4-2002809 | CR on FR1 UL CA MPR requirement Rel-16 | Submit in the next RAN4 meeting |
| CR R4-2002051 | draftCR for TS 38.101-1 intra-band UL contiguous CA combinations | be technical endorsed |

# Topic #2: intra-band DL CA for FR1

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

**Topic2 includes contributions for agenda 8.13.1.2 and 8.13.1.3**

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| CR R4-2000754 | Media Tek | Clarify on n48 receiver requirements |
| CR R4-2000234 | Huawei, HiSilicon | BCS0 configurations for CA\_n77C and CA\_n78C lack 10+100\20+100\30+100\40+100, etc. Because of the stronge market demand and uncertainty of spectrum auction in EU, we need to add BCS1 configurations for CA\_n77C and CA\_n78C. It’s inconveniet and unsuitable to place CA\_n77C, CA\_n78C and CA\_79C into one grid. |
| CR R4-2001077 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Editorial correction |
| CR R4-2001771 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Adding Bandwidth class D CA configuration and corresponding receiver requirement. |
| CR R4-2001074 | Huawei, HiSilicon | simply intra-band CA operating band table in clause 5.2A.1 |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 2-1: comments on other CRs for new configuration and editorial correction

*Provide comments for each CR, we are targeting to complete this part in the 1st round fast*

**Issue 2-1-1: R4-2000754**

**Issue 2-1-2: R4-2000234**

**Issue 2-1-3: R4-2001077**

**Issue 2-1-4: R4-2001771**

**Issue 2-1-5: R4-2001074**

* Recommended WF
  + Approved

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-topic** | **Comments (Company: …)** |
| 2-1 | Issue 2-1-1: CR R4-2000754 n48 receiver requirement clarify  Skyworks: question for clarification: has it been verified that using <2700MHz blocking requirements for n48 is compatible with co-banding with n78/n77 and associated RF front-end filters?  Apple: If the n48 is moved to the table with < 2700 MHz a NOTE should be included for band n48 in the Out of Band Blocking requirement, in which the power of the interferer for Range 3 is modified to -20 dBm. Similar to the NOTE 3 in Table 7.6.3-4. |
| Issue 2-1-2: CR R4-2000234 new BCS introduction  Skyworks: since the the combination is no longer in the order of the CCs it seems a lot of rows are redundant.  Huawei: We can revise this paper based on your comments. |
| Issue 2-1-3: CR R4-2001077 editorial correction  Nokia: Also Class F needs maintenance, we have a CR to fix both B and F R4-2000525.  Skyworks: overlaps with CRs in basket thread  Huawei: This paper has been merged into R4-2002575. This contribution can be noted. |
| Issue 2-1-4: CR R4-2001771 Adding Bandwidth class D CA configuration  Nokia: What is the reasoning saying that class D was wrongly removed  Skyworks: Can huawei clarify in which band there is 300MHz of contiguous spectrum available to a single operator? In our view this is not urgent for release 16.  MediaTek Inc:   1. MediaTek would like to clarify that CA\_n77D, CA\_n78D, CA\_n79D were not wrongly removed since there was no TP in TR37.865-01-01 neither in TR38.716-01-01.We offline checked with some companies in last Sep. and online checked during last Oct. meeting, there was no sound that bandwidth class D/E for n77/n78/n79 are required. This was the reason why n77/n78/n78 class D/E were removed in Rel-15 and Rel-16. We recommend people shall avoid introduce new feature in TS before there is TP/TR.   MediaTek would like to know who the operators request for bandwidth class D  China Unicom:  We support this CR to add back bandwidth class D CA configuration and corresponding requirements. China Unicom does have demand to support maximum of 300MHz CA bandwidth in n77/n78 band in the specification.  China Telecom: We have the potential request for n78D. Regarding timeline/procedure for CA work, we don’t have strong opinion.  Huawei: requirements see comments from operators. We will revise the CR cover on change reason accordingly. |
| Issue 2-1-5: CR R4-2001074 simply intra-band CA operating band table  Nokia: We would like to keep CA band as it may be used later to address all caonfigurations that have different CA BW Class. Table 5.2A.1-2 has some erronous entries which could be fixed  Skyworks: to be revised as in any case CA\_nXX\_nXX should be CA\_nXX(2A)  Huawei: The specific configuration can be found in 5.5A. This subclause is only about operating bands. In this sub-clause, we can just indicate which bands support intra-band contiguous or non-contiguous CA  Apple: We agree on the simplification of the table. However, our recommendation is to keep the first column and delete the second column.  Huawei: can be noted. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2001771 | MediaTek Inc:   1. MediaTek would like to clarify that CA\_n77D, CA\_n78D, CA\_n79D were not wrongly removed since there was no TP in TR37.865-01-01 neither in TR38.716-01-01.We offline checked with some companies in last Sep. and online checked during last Oct. meeting, there was no sound that bandwidth class D/E for n77/n78/n79 are required. This was the reason why n77/n78/n78 class D/E were removed in Rel-15 and Rel-16. We recommend people shall avoid introduce new feature in TS before there is TP/TR. 2. MediaTek would like to know who the operators request for bandwidth class D |
| China Unicom:  We support this CR to add back bandwidth class D CA configuration and corresponding requirements. China Unicom does have demand to support maximum of 300MHz CA bandwidth in n77/n78 band in the specification. |
| China Telecom: We have the potential request for n78D. Regarding timeline/procedure for CA work, we don’t have strong opinion. |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## 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.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-topic** | **Status summary** |
| 2-1 | Issue 2-1-1 CR R4-2000754 n48 receiver requirement clarify  no clear objection, agreeable |
| Issue 2-1-2 CR R4-2000234 new BCS introduction  Revise the CR |
| Issue 2-1-3 CR R4-2001077 editorial correction  CR can be noted |
| Issue 2-1-4 CR R4-2001771 Adding Bandwidth class D CA configuration  Revise the CR |
| Issue 2-1-5 CR R4-2001074 simply intra-band CA operating band table  CR can be noted |

*Suggestion 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 provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| CR R4-2000754 | Agreeable |
| CR R4-2000234 | to be revised |
| CR R4-2001077 | Can be noted |
| CR R4-2001771 | to be revised |
| CR R4-2001074 | Can be noted |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| T-doc number | Title | Comments |
| CR R4-2000754 | CR for TS 38.101-1: Corrections for n48 receiver requirements | Huawei: revised in R4-2002908, according to the offline discussion, there is already consensus. |
| Draft R4-2002810 | CR for 38.101-1 to introduce BCS1 for CA\_n77C and CA\_n78C | [Skyworks] we agree with the reduced list of cases for the new BCS accounting for the fact that CCs are not in order.  CHTTL: (Sorry for missed comment in the first round.) as we commented on the reflector, usually adding new BCS needs to go through the "band combination request" process, (ex: indicate contact person, 3 supporting companies), as we have a solid basket approach, and we already have a corresponding basket WI for these combos.  Also we are not sure the band specific part for the intra-band contiguous DL CA is covered by this UE RF WID, the WID seems only covers general requirement for intra-band contiguous DL CA.  Though we are wondering whether it is so urgent that these combos need to go directly by CR rather than propose them to some WID first, we are fine to capture these in Rel.16 as there are clear demands from operators. But we hope normal basket approach can be considered in the future if time is allowed. Thank you,  Huawei: According to the offline discussion with CHTTL, there is already consensus to agree on this CR. |
| Draft R4-2002811 | CR for intra-band CA configuration and DL requirement | CHTTL: (Sorry for missed comment in the first round.) as we commented on the reflector, usually adding new combos needs to go through the "band combination request" process, (ex: indicate contact person, 3 supporting companies), as we have a solid basket approach, and we already have a corresponding basket WI for these combos.  Also we are not sure the band specific part for the intra-band contiguous DL CA is covered by this UE RF WID, the WID seems only covers general requirement for intra-band contiguous DL CA.  Though we are wondering whether it is so urgent that these combos need to go directly by CR rather than propose them to some WID first, we are fine to capture these in Rel.16 as there are clear demands from operators.But we hope normal basket approach can be considered in the future if time is allowed. Thank you,  Huawei: According to the offline discussion with CHTTL, there is already consensus to agree on this CR. |

## 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*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| T-doc number | Title | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| CR R4-2002908 | CR for TS 38.101-1: Corrections for n48 receiver requirements | can be approved |
| CR R4-2002810 | CR for 38.101-1 to introduce BCS1 for CA\_n77C and CA\_n78C | Can be approved |
| Draft R4-2002811 | CR for intra-band CA configuration and DL requirement | Can be approved |

# Topic #3: intra-band non-contiguous UL CA for FR1 power class 3

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2000104 | Qualcomm | **Observation 1:** In gap ACLR relaxation or no ACLR requirement due to image offers reduced protection of another user in the gap.  **Observation 2:** Large back-off is required for LO leakage to meet SEM requirement even with in-gap ACLR relaxation.  **Proposal 1**: RF Requirements for non-contiguous ULCA shall assume dual PA architecture due to LO and image in-gap emissions.  **Proposal 2**: Use SEM, ACLR, EVM, and Spurious requirements as specified in 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 respectively.  **Proposal 3**: Use MPR regions as specified in 2.6. |
| CR R4-2001772 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Provide CR on emission RF requirement for intra-band UL CA including:   * OBW * SEM * ACLR   SE |
| CR R4-2001773 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Provide CR on output power RF requirement for intra-band UL CA including:   * Power class * Configured output power * Minimum output power * Off power * On/off time mask * Power control |
| CR R4-2001774 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Provide CR on signal quality RF requirement for intra-band UL CA including:   * Frequency error * EVM * In-band emission |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 3-1 PA architecture

*Sub-topic description:*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-1-1: PA architecture for intra-band UL NC CA**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Assume dual PA architecture due to LO and image in-gap emissions
  + Option 2: as captured in R4-1915417, depends on the largest gap between 2CC and aggregated CC BW
  + Option 3: report UE capability on PA architecture as for EN-DC
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 3-2 RF requirements other than MPR

*Sub-topic description*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-2-1: SEM**

* Proposals
* Option 1: composite SEM mask of the individual sub-blocks, ± ΔfOOB starting from the edges of the sub-blocks, it is already captured in R4-2001772
  + Option 2:
* Recommended WF
  + Capture it in the CR.

**Issue 3-2-2: ACLR treatment of in-gap and out of gap**

* Proposals
  + Option 1:
  + Adjacent Channel Leakage Power Ratio is the ratio of the sum of the filtered mean powers centered on each of the assigned sub-block frequency to the filtered mean power centered on an adjacent sub-block frequency at nominal channel spacing equal to the aggregated bandwidth of the sub-block.
  + Measurement BW is the aggregated sub-block bandwidth minus twice the maximum of the guard bands of the carriers within the aggregated sub-block configuration containing one or more CCs.
  + No ACLR requirement if Wgap < BWsub\_block to prevent excessive in-band emission with other sub-block.
  + Option 2:
* Recommended WF
  + Capture it in the CR.

**Issue 3-2-3: other RF requirements for NC CA** **as proposed in R4-2001773**/**R4-2001774**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Approve the CR R4-2001773/R4-2001774, complete all RF requirement other than MPR for intra-band NC CA in this meeting
  + Option 2:
* Recommended WF
  + Option 1

### Sub-topic 3-3 inner/outer RB allocation for intra-band NC CA

**Issue 3-3-1: MPR**

* Proposals
  + Option 1:
* MInner\_NC region: **∆**IM3\_L ≤ 0.5 \* BW Channel, block1 and **∆**IM3\_H ≤ 0.5 \* BW Channel, block2
  + IM3 within edges of Channel block 1 and Channel block 2
* MOuter1\_NC region: 0.5 \* BW Channel, block1 < **∆**IM3\_L ≤ 1.5 \* BW Channel, block1 and 0.5 \* BW Channel, block2 < **∆**IM3\_H ≤ 1.5 \* BW Channel, block2
  + IM3 within composite -13dBm/MHz spec
* MOuter2\_NC region: **∆**IM3\_L > 1.5 \* BW Channel, block1 and **∆** IM3\_H > 1.5 \* BW Channel, block2
  + IM3 outside of composite -13dBm/MHz emission limit.
  + Option 2:
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 3-4 AMPR value for intra-band UL non-contiguous CA

**Issue 3-4-1: whether NS04 AMPR need to be complete in Rel-16 FR1 WI**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: yes
  + Option 2: no
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-topic** | **Comments (Company: …)** |
| 3-1 | Issue 3-1-1: PA architecture for intra-band UL NC CA  KDDI: Since the big technical challenge of this wide band and limited Rel-16 time frame, it’s better to make use cases of this topic clearer. We have collected requirements from some Japanese operators as follows.   * TX BW (BWCC1+gap+BWCC2): 280MHz for n78 and 600MHz for n77. The following figure (sourced by Softbank) shows Japanese spectrum allocation of n77 and n78.      * Instantaneous UL and DL BW: 180MHz for n78 and 200MHz for n77. * MIMO (2x2 or 4x4): prefer to support 4x4MIMO   Others aspects  Skyworks: we can agree that two PA is an option especilally for very wide BW but it is too restrictive for all cases (smaller BW, small gaps...), If two PA option, we should assume two UL antennas, should this be an option only if UL MIMO is supported? if this is the case how to cover UL CA + UL MIMO, separate/different capabilities in single CC vs CA? it is not clear that it is sufficient to report capability as we have found in EN\_DC cases, it also must be clear what is the UE capability in the different CA and MIMO modes. Carrier leakage could be treated as an exception.  Huawei: Thanks for KDDI providing the spectrum information. Encourage operators provide more NC CA information, the PA architecture is highly related with the gap between 2 CCs. For Uplink, we think 2\*2 MIMO would be the upper limitation?  Currently, both 1PA and 2PA architecture should not be precluded. Even with small gap, we have some consideration on IMD product falling region may have impact on other RF requirement with 2PA. RAN4 may need discuss on the scenario that UE can use 1 PA architecture.(the gap value)  With 2PA architecture, if 2\*2 MIMO is supported, UE need 4Tx for intra-band NC CA.  For EN-DC, we introduce UE capability on PA architecture per band combination. We may reuse the capability for UL CA?  LGE: it may not be relevant to this issue but I would like to clarify about baseline PA architecture for intra-band UL contiguous CA. I assume that a single PA architecture should be baseline for intra-band UL contiguous CA.  Proposed WF from moderator:   * Evaluate PA architecture with the gap frequency span and the potential impairment on ACLR or other emission requirement * Encourage operators provide spectrum information like KDDI provides, that really helpful * **Qualcomm:** If 1 PA architecture is not being precluded for NC-ULCA, then there needs to be some limitation on BW class. For instance, we can limit 1PA to BW class B with the relaxed requirement, but as I discussed, even though we can report LO location, the emission will always be there and another operator will see this emission. If that is acceptable, and agreeable with LO exception then ok, but again that emission will far exceed SEM mask. * **Qualcomm:** Support for 2 x2 TX can be discussed in later round. |
| 3-2 | Issue 3-2-1: SEM requirement  Skyworks: Composite SEM can be used as in ENDC but we need to clarify if we start from individual CC SEM and the related different requirements in the first OOB MHz. this is probably lees critical for non-contiguous UL CA but worth discussing.  Proposed WF from moderator:  Huawei: agree with composite SEM. We recommend to agree on this issue.  Skyworks: can moderator clarify if the composite SEM is based on the single CC SEM definition when one cluster is using a single CC?  **Qualcomm**: Composite SEM from our contribution is based on the composite mask of a 2 single non-contiguous CCs if each sub block is one CC each. If one sub-blcok contains a 2CC’s and the other subblock contains 1CC then the composite is based on the SEM of 2CC sublock and the SEM of the single CC subblock. |
| Issue 3-2-2: ACLR treatment  Skyworks: For non-contiguous UL CA it is not clear why aggregated bandwidth is used for ACLR unless one of the sub-block uses contiguous CA: the single CC ACLR requirement applies to each CC and if one sub-block uses contiguous CA then contiguous CA ACLR applies. The only question is how to treat the in gap requirement when the gap is smaller than the aggregated bandwidth or one of the CC/sub-block bandwidth. As for EN\_DC the in-gap ACLR of one CC does not apply when the gap is smaller than its channel bandwidth. Still the caes described in our previous papers exists and we believe that relaxation to 27dB ACLR in-gap for these cases is a suitable compromise as it is representative of the interference of two collocated UEs using the one of the channel each. We have commented on this in the NR basket thread. Also ACLR applies referred to the power sum of all active carriers.  Huawei: Prefer Option1.  Proposed WF from moderator:  Option1  Skyworks: what is suggested to solve the issue with image leakage that Skyworks has demonstrated (is higher image rejection expected from UEs supporting this CA, should we capture the value in the specification)?  **Qualcomm:** There should be no ACLR requirement in the gap when the gap is smaller than the maximum of the subblock bandwidths regardless of PA architecture. Composite SEM mask should cover in-gap emissions. |
| Issue 3-2-3: NC CA CRs as in R4-2001773/R4-2001774  Nokia: CR should contain whole feature. Intra band CA requirements are put to interband CA clause.  Skyworks:  R4-2001773: CA\_n41(2A) and CA\_n41C 160MHz (>6% BW) or 190MHz (>7%BW) exceeds 4%BW. It needs to be clear how >4% BW is addressed in the requirements before power class is fully defined and CR agreed  R4-2001774: Not agreable: NR image and carrier leakage are 28dBc in NR not 25dB  Huawei: The relative CBW criteria shall not be used everywhere. The current spec just says the MPR for CBW exceeds the limitation could be defined different compared to the values in the spec. Now the MPR for UL CA is still under study, which should consider the new scenario requested by operators with large aggregated CBW.  For R4-2001774, we will revise the CR.  Proposed WF from moderator:  Revise the CR |
| 3-3 | Issue 3-3-1:inner and outer RB allocation  Skyworks: proposal in R4-2000104 is similar to an approach presented by Skyworks in previous meeting. If we support the concept we are not sure it should define 3 types of allocations. The inner do not exist anytime the gap is larger than one of the CC so we think the outer 1 and outer 2 are the only cases that are worth. Then inner+outer1 becomes inner and outer2 becomes outer.  Huawei: we propose to discuss clearly on PA architecture first. |
| 3-4 | Issue 3-4-1:whether NS04 AMPR need to be complete in Rel-16 FR1 WI  Skyworks: we believe that it is too early to exclude NS04 being covered but we believe OOB emission and total instantaneous BW needs to be discussed for both band 41 and Band 77/78/79. For band 77/78/79 even with a two PA approach that would help for BW there are still issues to discuss in terms of support of UL MIMO or not and potential RIMD emission issues within radio altimeters or other C bands. We have commented on this in the NR basket thread.  Huawei: is there deployment requirement from north America on n41 NC CA. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## 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.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-topic#3** | **Status summary** |
| 3-1 | Issue 3-1-1 PA architecture for intra-band UL NC CA  Proposed WF from moderator:   * Evaluate PA architecture with the gap frequency span and the potential impairment on ACLR or other emission requirement * Evaluate PA architecture with 2\*2 MIMO in the 2nd round   Encourage operators provide spectrum information like KDDI provides, that really helpful |
| 3-2 | Issue 3-2-1 SEM requirement  Proposed WF from moderator:  Huawei: agree with composite SEM. We recommend to agree on this issue.  We have agreed that upper limitation for intra-band UL CA are 2CCs in Rel-16, so composit SEM must be based in single CC. cluster issue is out of range of Rel-16. |
| Issue 3-2-2 ACLR treatment  Proposed WF from moderator:  Further discuss ACLR treatment in 2nd round:   * No ACLR requirement in gap when gap is less than maximum of the subblock bandwidths regardless of PA architecture? * Image leakage falling in the gap issue |
| Issue 3-2-3 NC CA CRs as in R4-2001773/R4-2001774  Proposed WF from moderator:  Revise the CR |
| 3-3 | Issue 3-3-1 inner and outer RB allocation  Proposed WF from moderator:  Discuss later after PA architecture have agreement or common understanding. |
| 3-4 | Issue 3-4-1 whether NS04 AMPR need to be complete in Rel-16 FR1 WI  Proposed WF from moderator:  Currently de-prioritize the NS04 and NS27 in Rel-16, it may delay to TEI16 or Rel-17 |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 | WF on RF architecture for intra-band UL non-contiguous CA | Qualcomm? |

### CRs/TPs

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| R4-2001773 | to be revised |
| R4-2001774 | to be revised |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| T-doc number | Title | Comments |
| Draft R4-2002806 | CR for intra-band UL CA output power | Huawei: capture the agreement in WF if architecture of UL NC CA. also target for technical endorsed. |
| Draft R4-2002807 | CR for intra-band UL CA signal quality | Huawei: revise the CR for image and leakage requirement. Also target for technical endorsed. |
| draft R4-2002812 | WF on RF architecture for intra-band UL non-contiguous CA | 1. Huawei: Could you add the assumption that the maximum UL CC number in Rel-16 is up to 2. 2. Could you add one bullet that to deprioritize  the NS04 and NS27 study before MPR requirement is completed. 3. Could you make it clear whether the RF requirement is for WF or for information? I guess it is for the WF. 4. For OBW requirement, could you provide some options we have in 1st round discussion and task to have conclusion in next RAN4 meeting.   Sprint: Since we already have MPR and A-MPR for intra-band contiguous and not contiguous EN-DC for the 2 PA architecture, is there any reason to not re-use that as much as possible for UL CA? Wouldn’t it be better to take what was done for intra-band EN-DC and reuse it for intra-band UL CA  Skyworks: I don't agree that this applies though. CA is easier vs DC because we can account for equal PSD and equal Back off, its based on PC3 not PC2, and we have on going work defining allocations.  LGE: We don’t agree to reuse MPR/A-MPR of intra-band EN-DC to UL CA. |

## 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*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| T-doc number | Title | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| Draft R4-2002806 | CR for intra-band UL CA output power | *to be technical endorsed* |
| Draft R4-2002807 | CR for intra-band UL CA signal quality | *To be technical endorsed* |
| draft R4-2002812 | WF on RF architecture for intra-band UL non-contiguous CA | *Can be approved* |

# Topic #4: transient period capability

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

**Topic2 includes contributions for agenda 8.13.1.1, 8.13.1.2 and 8.13.1.3**

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2000442 | Anritsu | ***Observation 1: EVM measurement with a 20 dB power step (1 RB to 100 RB, or vice versa) is feasible under a condition of CBW 20 MHz and SCS 15 kHz.***  ***Observation 2: Test equipment has enough sampling resolution to differentiate EVM measurement results between transient periods (1, 2, 4, 7, 10 s).***  ***Proposal 1: Clarify the UL/ DL configuration pattern for TDD on-to-on transient period requirements.***  ***Proposal 2: With regards to transient edges to include, clarify a way to calculate EVM including only symbols in which the transient occurs.***  ***Option 1: Calculate EVM which includes symbols in which only rising or falling edges of transient occur.***  ***Option 2: Calculate EVM which includes symbols in which both rising and falling edges of transient occur.***  ***Proposal 3: Create Annex F.8 (new) “Averaged EVM including symbols with transient period” to clarify assumptions for on-to-on transient period once the common assumptions have been established.*** |
| R4-2001757 | Huawei, HiSilicon | ***Observation 1: the RMS EVM over 1 slot with exclusion window cannot reflects the real transient period. This issue is also identified by most of companies which are interested in the topic.***  ***Observation 2: in the current spec, both RS symbol and data symbol are used for equalizing, and the equalizing result is used to calculate the EVM.***  ***Observation 3: three columns DMRS in one slot is defined in the current RMC, which can increase EVM measurement accuracy much with DMRS interpolation. Data symbols are also used for equalizing which further increase EVM measurement accuracy.***  ***Observation 4: Even for RMS EVM measurement, different channel estimates implementations for UE test are allowed, which will lead to EVM measurement inaccuracy.***  ***Observation 5: there are several problems on 1 OS EVM measurement unsolved or unexperienced in RAN4 and RAN5, no technical study is processed in the history.***  ***Observation 6: Based on the EVM measurement procedure defined in the current RAN4 and RAN5 spec, RMS EVM on one OFDM is not supported.***  ***Proposal 1: RAN4 agrees to lead a new WI in Rel-17 on defining EVM measurement processing procedure especially for one symbol RMS EVM.***  ***Observation 7: the test method proposed by [1] cannot differentiate UEs with different UE capability.***  ***Observation 8: there is no method to guarantee transient period is symmetrically positioned.***  ***Proposal 2: If RAN4 agrees the new WI on detailing the EVM measurement procedure, defining transient period capability can be one objective of the new WI.*** |
| R4-2002096 | Qualcomm | Proposal  **🡪 The new feature of transient capability reporting is agreed and its testability is established by modified/new EVM requirements.**  **🡪 LS is sent to RAN plenary to inform that RAN4 has agreed that testability of the new feature on transient capability reporting is captured in the CR.**  **🡪 CR in RP-192948 to be resubmitted at RAN #87.** |
| R4-2002143 | Skyworks | **Proposal 1 for operation in FR1:**   * **20 MHz Channel Bandwidth,** * **Highest supported modulation scheme,** * **Power change triggered by a 1:100 RB allocation change,** * **Initial PUSCH RB allocation is 1 RB,** * **Initial PUSCH power class 3 transmit power of [-3dBm] ± [3.2] dB for carrier frequency f ≤ [3.0] GHz or [-3dBm] ± [3.5] dB for carrier frequency [3.0] GHz < f ≤ 7.125 GHz,** * **Slot type: 14 OFDM symbols / slot,** * **PUSCH mapping type A** * **rmsEVM to be averaged over 10 subframes for the symbols that are not impacted by the RF transient,** * **rmsEVM to be averaged over [70] subframes for the symbols where the transient occurs,** * **Test pattern: Alternating 1 subframe modulating 1RB at offset position 0, 1 subframe modulating 100 RB at offset position 0.**   **Proposal 2: We invite interested companies to provide their views on the maximum EVM budget of [5%] and [15%] for 256QAM and 64QAM respectively, for the symbols where the transient occurs.** |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 4-1 feasibility of transient period measurement

**Issue 4-1-1: whether RMS EVM over 1 slot can represent the transient period capability**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: no
  + Option 2: yes
* Recommended WF
  + Option 1

**Issue 4-1-2: for RMS EVM over 1 slot, whether EVM measurement procedure on equalizing is clear for UE**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: no, for equalizing procedure there is difference between TS 38.101 and 38.104. RAN4 need evaluation on this topic for transient period testability study.
  + Option 2: yes
* Recommended WF
  + Option 1

**Issue 4-1-3: For RMS EVM over 1 symbol, how to define EVM measurement procedure in the spec**

* Proposals
  + Option 1:RAN4 agrees to lead a new WI in Rel-17 on defining EVM measurement processing procedure especially for one symbol RMS EVM.
  + Option 2: Create Annex F.8 (new) “Averaged EVM including symbols with transient period” to clarify assumptions for on-to-on transient period once the common assumptions have been established.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 4-1-4: whether 20dB power change can represent the maximum power change in the network, if not, whether TE can provide the test condition for the maximum power change**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: no, the worst case for the on-on power change in FR1 is up to 55dB. Comments from TE company are welcome
  + Option 2: 20dB is enough
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 4-1-5: how to ensure the transient period is symmetrically positioned**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: currently we cannot ensure the UE always position transient period symmetrically in the boundary.
  + Option 2: Setting the RF transient Timing Advance to -75% CP length gives UE vendors sufficient margin to pass EVM with transient conformance test
  + Option 3: detecting ‘tp’ with Timing Advance Violating the EVM Exclusion Period using EVM=min(EVM\_l,EVM\_h) for CP-OFDM.
* Recommended WF
  + Option 1

**Issue 4-1-6: whether EVM=min(EVML, EVMH) can differentiate UE with different transient period ability**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: it cannot differentiate UEs with different UE capability.
  + Option 2: EVM=min(EVM\_l,EVM\_h) in symbols where the transient occurs effectively creates an EVM measurement exclusion period of 150% CP length, i.e., approximately 7, 3.5 and 1.75μs for SCS 15,30,60 kHz respectively.
* Recommended WF
  + Option 1

**Issue 4-1-7: whether RMS EVM with DFT-OFDM measurement similar with LTE can be tested for transient period**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: yes
  + Option 2: no, the RMS EVM test method which used for LTE is not serving for transient period
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 4-2 other clarification on the transient period measurement

**Issue 4-2-1: UL DL configuration**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For TDD, DDSUUDDSUU and/or DDDDDDSUUU
  + Option 2:
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 4-2-2: how to calculate EVM for symbols in which the transient occurs**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Calculate EVM which includes symbols in which only rising or falling edges of transient occur.
  + Option 2: Calculate EVM which includes symbols in which both rising and falling edges of transient occur.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 4-3

Sub-topic 4-3 is only discussed after the above testability issues are solved

**Issue 4-3: EVM budget for symbol where the transient occurs**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: [5%] and [15%] for 256QAM and 64QAM
  + Option 2:
  + Option 3:
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 4-4 feedback to RAN #87

Based on the discussion on the 3 subtopics, draft LS is prepared

**Issue 4-4: LS to RAN**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: TBA
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-topic** | **Comments (Company: …)** |
| 4-1 | Issue 4-1-1: whether RMS EVM over 1 slot can represent the transient period capability  Qualcomm: The direction from RAN plenary was to focus on testability rather than discussion of the CR. This is not related to testability.  Anritsu: Share the same view with QC. And also the transient period can be included in every slot, which we think is different understanding from Huawei’s paper.  Skyworks: We do not see the relation to testability and this is not what is proposed.  Huawei: for introducing transient period capability, RAN4 agrees to discuss on testability issue. It means we need to ensure the capability UE indicating can be captured by TE accurately. For RMS EVM over 1slot, 14 symbols are participating into the average EVM calculating, the symbols without transient occurs will drastically smooth the test result on the symbol with transient occurs. It definitely within the scope of testability. And we think RAN4 already have discussion on this issue, and it is the intention on introducing 1 symbol EVM measurement.  Ericsson: This is not the proposal to test the transient, this question is out of scope.  Nokia: RAN#86 made the following conclusion on the topic and CR: “*conclusion: task for RAN4 to clarify testability by RAN #87, i.e. how it will be tested; CR will not be further discussed in RAN4 but will be provided to RAN #87*” Open items should be focusing on clarifying the testability aspect i.e. how to make the requirement testable rather than questioning again if improved transient period requirements with UE capability are feasible. This open item is not related to testability. |
| Issue 4-1-2: for RMS EVM over 1 slot, whether EVM measurement procedure on equalizing is clear for UE  Qualcomm: Equalization procedure is for the basestation, not the UE since this is a UE Tx requirement. Since the basestation is not limited to channel estimation on a single symbol, the existing procedure for equalization does not need any modification.  Skyworks: There may be differences in equalizing procedure between TS 38.101 and 38.104 but they are not specific to the case with transient period so this does not justify delaying introduction of the capability  Huawei: Equalization procedure is not clear for UE since both data symbols and DMRS are allowed to do the equalization. While which one is used and whether interpolation is used are all depending on TE implementation. In our view, EVM result would be different with different equalization implementation. We think the clear definition in TS 38.104 is better than UE spec. There may be different view from TE vendors, thus we think a new WI can be led by RAN4.  Ericsson: EVM is UE Tx requirement, so what’s the point to compare equalization procedures in between BS and UE? This is out of scope.  Nokia: The intention of this question is unclear. The UE does not need to know TE measurement procedure for equalizing. Why is BS requirements linked to the UE testing discussion? RAN5 tests and TE implementations need to ensure that good UE does not fail the test and bad UE does with sufficiently high probability. If there TE uncertainties that cannot be removed, RAN5 can use test tolerances to make sure that good UE does not fail. RAN5 of course tries to minimize test uncertainties for improving test confidence. |
| Issue 4-1-3: For RMS EVM over 1 symbol, how to define EVM measurement procedure in the spec  Qualcomm: RAN4 does not decide or propose a new work item. Work items are proposed by individual companies and can only be decided at RAN plenary. Therefore, discussion of new work items in RAN4 is meaningless.  Anritsu: Support Option 2. As explained in Anritsu’s paper (R4-2000442) proposal 1 and 2, this relates to the test case implementation not only for EVM over 1 symbol, but also for over 1 slot. We need a clarification of the TDD configuration pattern and assumption of transient edges to include in the EVM calculation. Especially if there is a case that the EVM varies depending on the case that we calculate EVM only with the rising ede or falling edge.  Skyworks: The CR proposes a method and we agree that this can be reflected in Annex in the release 16 timeframe like proposed in R4-2000442. Release 17 WI is not in line with RAN plenary guidance and not needed.  Huawei: equalization procedure is even more vague for 1symbol case. For front-loaded DMRS, whether it can be used for equalizing? For data symbol, whether all symbols in 1 slot is used for equalizing on the symbol with transient occurs?  Ericsson: There is no point to further delay this feature, it has already been postponed from Rel-15 to Rel-16 to give companies more time to study it. Option is definitively the way to go.  Nokia: RAN4 was tasked to clarify testing aspects so that the Rel-16 CR can be resubmitted to the next RAN plenary meeting. RAN4 was not tasked to discuss new Rel-17 work item listed in the option 1. If and when further clarifications are made to the requirements and related assumptions, they can be added to the specifications as business as usual. |
| Issue 4-1-4: whether 20dB power change can represent the maximum power change in the network, if not, whether TE can provide the test condition for the maximum power change  Qualcomm: This has already been discussed by RAN4 and is not related to testability.  Anritsu: From the testability point of view, there is a limit of power level difference up to approx 20 dB due to the limit of dynamic range in the test equipment.  Skyworks: The 55dB value has not been proposed or discussed in any paper and is not related to testability.  Huawei: we provide analysis in R4-1915367, in real network, the maximum power change range for NR will be up to 55dB since the P0 configuration could be different for each physical channel. If TE can not provide the environment with maximum power change range, how we can verify UE’s transient period capability? The UE may pass the test with 2us TP verifiacation but need 10us transient period in the network. Attention!! PA with APT and ET switch will consume much time on transient period, such issue is not raised only by Huawei but other chipset vendor in previous RAN4 meetings. As we see in UL CA part, SKW mentioned that all PAs are evaluated with only APT.  Ericsson: This was already discussed in past RAN4 meetings. There might be limitation due to the test equipment, but this is not related to the proposed method, and is applicable already for existing requirements. This is separate discussion.  Nokia: How is this question related to testability? It seems that the aim is again to question the need for the improved transient period requirement. |
| Issue 4-1-5: how to ensure the transient period is symmetrically positioned  Qualcomm: This has already been discussed by RAN4 and is not related to testability  Anritsu: This is rather the UE implementation and not related to the testability.  Skyworks: Only the EVM measurement exclusion period is symmetrically placed.  Huawei: in SKW’s contribution, TA commanding for PA is mentioned. It means UE vendor can control UE on-on power switching point, the power adjustment can be configured in advance, it means all transient period can be placed on the before-symbol. Then exclusion window cannot capture any transient occurs on the first symbol.  Ericsson: This is not the point and has already been addressed in previous RAN4 meetings. The UE shall report the exclusion period corresponding to its supported transient time. So, if the transient period is not symmetrically positioned (e.g. 2us in one symbol and 3us in the other symbol), UE shall report a transient time equivalent to the corresponding exclusion period (e.g. any value >6us in the given example). The reported UE transient time shall always correspond to the worst case situation that could be tested.  Nokia: How is this question related to testability? It seems that the aim is again to question the need for the improved transient period requirement. |
| Issue 4-1-6: whether EVM=min(EVML, EVMH) can differentiate UE with different transient period ability  Qualcomm: The proposed CR allows testing of reported transient with 15 kHz SCS. If finer resolution is needed by RAN5, one possibility is to use a higher SCS.  Skyworks: option 2 allows to create exclusion period for the different transient period capabilities for CP-OFDM. We have shown that even with the rounding to the upper 1us the test is valid.  Huawei: firstly, each capability proposed need to be rounded, we don’t see enough accuracy.  For NSA UE, it may not support every SCS, e,g, 15kHz, 30kHz, 60kHz, it can be indicated in the featuresetlist defined in TS 38.331. How could a UE only support 15kHz have measurement on 2us and 1us?  Ericsson: Contributions are demonstrating that several transient period values could be tested, no contribution is showing the opposite.  Nokia: Companies have shown in RAN4 that this is possible. But again the question seems to rather question the need for the requirement rather than trying to find out how to improve the testing. If RAN5 finds out that it is difficult to differentiate good and bad UEs e.g. due to too large test uncertainties, as business as usual RAN5 will ask further updates e.g. to the parameter settings from RAN4. When RAN4 defines its core requirements, it does not always (typically?) know how well good and bad UEs can be differentiated in the final RAN5 tests e.g. due to test uncertainties but with RAN5- RAN4 collaboration RAN5’s test cases can be improved. |
| Issue 4-1-7: whether RMS EVM with DFT-OFDM measurement similar with LTE can be tested for transient period  Qualcomm: It has already been established in LTE that a method to exclude samples within the transient period post-FFT for DFT-S-OFDM is a reliable means to measure EVM that extends beyond 150% CP.  Anritsu: We assume Option 1: yes.  Skyworks: current exclusion period created for SC-FDMA in LTE is applicable to NR DFT-s-OFDM at the iFFT stage. Exclusion can be made to match declared transient period capability (or default one) and thus EVM test be valid.  Huawei: as the issues mentioned above are not solved, we can not take RMS EVM with DFT-OFDM measurement similar with LTE on transient period.  Ericsson: This was demonstrated with LTE and is so applicable to NR for DFT-s-OFDM.  Nokia: Why wouldn’t RMS EVM test method which used for LTE is not serving for transient period? RAN4 has already discussed that especially requirements and tests for the DFT-s-OFDM waveform is straightforward as LTE methods can be utilized and in Rel-16 RAN4 has also been developing and verifying methods for the CP-OFDM waveform. |
| 4-2 other test configuration discussion | Issue 4-2-1: UL DL configuration  Qualcomm: This is not related to testability  Skyworks: our preference is TDD pattern Figure 2.3-2 from R4-2000442  Huawei: we propose to discuss on this topic after testability issue is solved.  Ericsson: This is not impacting testability and could be decided later.  Nokia: This needs to be decided but how is this related to clarification on the testability aspects. Surely UL/DL configuration needs to be decided before finalizing the test cases as business as usual. |
| Issue 4-2-2: how to calculate EVM for symbols in which the transient occurs  Qualcomm: This is not related to testability  Skyworks: the proposal from RAN plenary CR is clear that the EVM of the two symbols affected by the exclusion should be evaluated and check against a separate EVM requirement for 64QAM and 256QAM.  Ericsson: EVM shall be calculated for the two symbols impacted by the transient. This is what the proposed method is doing.  Nokia: This is defined when the requirements (CR) is agreed. How is this related to the open item to clarifying testability? |
| 4-3 EVM budget for symbol | Issue 4-3: EVM budget for symbol where the transient occurs  Qualcomm: This is not related to testability  Skyworks: we can keep the current numbers in brackets and evaluate further in next meeting as proposed in our contribution (especially for 64QAM).  Huawei: relaxation on EVM may have impact on high order modulation, it is not our intention on introducing transient period capability. If 5% for 256QAM is enough on throughput, why not just change the EVM requirement?  Ericsson: This could be finalized later as it doesn’t impact testability.  Nokia: How is this related to the open item to clarifying testability? The discussion on this type of further details can continue once the basic requirement definition is agreed. |
| 4-4 LS | Issue 4-4: LS to RAN  Qualcomm: Send LS to RAN plenary to inform that RAN4 has agreed that testability of the new feature on transient capability reporting is captured in the CR, as co-signed by a vast majority of companies  Skyworks: at this moment we do not see the reason to send an LS to RAN as the guidance from December RAN plenary is clear.  Huawei: Send LS to RAN plenary to inform that RAN4 cannot make consensus on testability of the new feature on transient period reporting.  Ericsson: We could send a LS to RAN and let them know RAN4 has an agreement on the testability of this feature.  Nokia: RAN4 should confirm that the proposed requirements are testable. That information can be communicated to RAN plenary. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## 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#4-1 to 4-4** | *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Capture the issues during discussion in the WF. Ask for T-doc number on WF.  Ask for T-doc number on LS, focus on LS in the 2nd round. The title of the LS is :  R4-20XXXXX LS on testability of transient period capability  To: RAN  Skyworks: Can moderator clarify the intention of the LS as we believe there is a large consensus on testability in RAN4. Given that consensus we suggest that the necessity of an LS and its assignment should be further discussed in round 2. |

Suggestion on WF/LS assignment

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| **#1** | WF on testability of transient period capability | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| #2 | LS on testability of transient period capability | Huawei, HiSilicon  LS to RAN plenary |

### CRs/TPs

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| T-doc number | Title | Comments |
| Draft R4-2002813 | WF on testability of transient period capability | [Skyworks] comment to draft R4-2002813 WF on testability of transient period capability\_rev3:  • This way forward does not represent the majority view  • Does not address any of the comment provided on what belongs to testability or not  • All slides are titled WF, are they agreements or just background? (Please clarify this if any further revision). If most are background, the background has to be related to all of the inputs given in the meeting. And if agreements we don’t agree with most of these being related to testability  • If in interpret that the slide titled WF7 is the only agreement slide then we are not ready to agree to this and the last bullet goes directly against RAN plenary guidance  Starpoint: As a TE vendor and a co-source company, we do believe that the issues identified in the WF are testabliity related, and we need to have a clear understanding of all these aspects for development due to introduction of the new feature. In particular, the two solutions in WF2 and WF3 still cannot determine the exact TP duration, and we cannot determine the significance of performing these two measurements.  Moderator Note: many discussions are in the email loop from other companies. Will provide summary of 2nd round in 4.6. |
| Draft R4-2002814 | LS on testability of transient period capability |  |

## 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*

*The WF R4-2002813 which captured 2nd discussion status and remaining issues was submitted by Huawei during the 2nd round email discussion. The T-doc is co-sourced by 6 companies who agree with Huawei’s standpoint. Meanwhile, there are some companies commented not all of the identified issues are related to testability but a TE vendor confirmed that all of them are testability related in the development of the newly introduced feature.*

*The discussions are focus on following 3 points:*

* *Testability issues proposed in WF R4-2002813: there are still testability problems not solved in RAN4(No consensus on the detailed technical issues during the discussion)*
* *Transient period UE capability introducing in Rel-16 (support by all companies)*
* *Provide the CR of TS 38.101-1 on transient period capability to RAN #87 and shall be checked during RAN#87 meeting(follow RAN guidance which is supported by all companies)*

*According to the 2nd round email discussion status, the recommended conclusion from moderator are as below:*

* *Testability related issues will be further discussed in RAN4 and test case for transient period capability is introduced in Rel-17 after the testability issues are solved.*
* *RF requirement on transient period capability (section 6.3.3 for on-on time mask) can be introduced in TS 38.101-1 in Rel-16 with no Rel-independent manner before all testability issues are addressed.*
* *The CR will be provided in RAN#87 meeting and should be further checked in RAN#87 meeting based on the above agreements.*

# Topic #5: Time mask for ULSUP-TDM due to FDD with flexible duplex

NOTE: this topic is missed in the first round. The discussion will be moved to the 2nd round.

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2000069 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Observation 1: There would be uplink performance loss if there is up to 3us uplink transmission timing difference between LTE and NR for ULSUP-TDM.  Proposal #1: Specify the new timing mask requirements for ULSUP-TDM with uplink timing difference in a new sub-clause different from the existing timing mask.  Proposal #2: Define a new UE capability to indicate whether UE can support ULSUP-TDM with uplink timing difference. |
| R4-2000070 | Huawei, HiSilicon | 38.101-3 CR:  The existing timing mask requirement for ULSUP-TDM specified in Rel-15 applies for the case where there is no significant uplink timing difference between LTE and NR. According to the updated WID on RF requirements for NR frequency range 1 (FR1), the new timing mask requirement for ULSUP-TDM will be specified.  Specify the timing mask requirements for ULSUP-TDM with uplink timing difference up to 3us. |
| R4-2001323 | Ericsson | No proposals are given in a clear way. But try to summarize the observation and proposals.   1. TAE between CGs plus double time of SA UE UL timing alignment error causes the overlapping slots or gaps between slots for ULSUP-TDM 2. Applicability of time mask should be specified in RAN4 specifications and the UE behaviour should possibly be specified in RAN1 specification. 3. Test current method in RAN5 for ON/OFF time mask requirement cannot be used for verify the time mask. Additional requirements should be considered, e.g. symbol-level EVM in the symbol near the EUTRA/LTE transition. |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 5-1

**Issue 5-1: Should the uplink timing difference between LTE and NR up to BS TAE+Tae be considered for ULSUP-TDM**

* Proposals
  + View 1 (Ericsson): Yes. If BS (and TAs) for two CGs are independent and UE follows DL timing each CGs, the non-trivial uplink timing difference, e..g, up to 5.21us for collocated deployment, could be observed.
  + View 2 (Huawei): No. There would be uplink performance loss if there is up to 3us uplink transmission timing difference between LTE and NR for ULSUP-TDM.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 5-2

**Issue 5-2: How to capture the impact of uplink timing difference on the core specifications for ULSUP-TDM**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Ericsson): Applicability of time mask should be specified in RAN4 specifications and the UE behaviour should possibly be specified in RAN1 specification.
  + Option 2 (Huawei): Specify the new timing mask requirements for ULSUP-TDM with uplink timing difference in a new sub-clause different from the existing timing mask. And define a new UE capability to indicate whether UE can support ULSUP-TDM with uplink timing difference.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 5-3

**Issue 5-3: Whether and how to test the time mask**

* Proposals
  + Proposal 1(Ericsson): Test current method in RAN5 for ON/OFF time mask requirement cannot be used for verify the time mask. Additional requirements should be considered, e.g. symbol-level EVM in the symbol near the EUTRA/LTE transition.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round [for this issue the 2nd round]

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Issue 5-1:  Issue 5-2: for Option 2, how would a capability be specified? We note that a network with joint TA management is a particular implementation.  Issue 5-3: the transient behavior in the LTE/NR switch cannot be verified using the conformance test method for the general time mask in 38.521-1. |
| Huawei | Issue 5-1:  In our view, it is quite fundamental question. As explained in our paper, there will be performance loss if we allow such timing difference between LTE and NR, e.g., 5.21us, as proposed by Ericsson. Assume there are two UEs collocated and thus two UE observe almost the same LTE and NR downlink signaling timing. Both supports NSA with ULSUP. If in one slot UE#1 transmit NR while UE#2 transmit LTE, then the timing difference between signals of two UEs in that slot is about 5.21us, which cause the inter-subcarrier interference. Thus the performance of them will degrade due to that mutual interference.  Issue 5-2:  To Ericsson question on how to specify a capability: We propose to define two separate requirements. If UE complies with the first one, UE can indicate capability#1, while if UE complies with the second one UE should indicate capability #2.  Based on the analysis for Issue 5-1, network has to implement joint TA if it supports ULSUP. But we do not insist on precluding other implementation although we think non-joint TA will lead to performance loss. But we could not mandate UE to support both. From UE perspective, to support non joint-TA implementation needs the extra effort such as padding zero or partially drop the transmissions. So we would like to define the different UE capabilities.  Issue 5-3:  No comment so far. But we should reach agreement for Issue 5-1 and 5-2 before discussing how to verify UE behavior. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

CRs included in the above sub-topics are not listed here.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-200070 | Ericsson: why repeating the same time mask (6.1.1b) when the only added condition is an allowed extension of the transient mask when there is an UL (and DL) timing misalignment? Otherwise this CR is a good start. We propose to come back to this topic at the next meeting. |
| Huawei: We think it would be OK to just simply add sentence to extend the transient period. We are OK to come back next meeting, given that we miss this topic in the first round. |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round [not applicable]

### 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#5-1** | Tentative agreements:  Candidate options:  Recommendations for 2nd round: |

Suggestion on WF/LS assignment

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LS number** | **LS Status update recommendation** |
|  |  |

### CRs/TPs

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
|  |  |

## 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** |
|  |  |