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# Introduction

*Briefly introduce background, the scope of this email discussion and provide some guidelines for email discussion if necessary.*

This email thread is assigned to discuss issues related to Rel-15 system parameters maintenance.

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

* 1st round:
  + Collect understanding and views of each company on the listed open issues
    - If there is an unanimous understanding on one issue after collection, the issue will be removed from the open issues.
  + Discussion aiming to aligned understanding
* 2nd round: TBA

# Topic #1: Add 30 kHz SCS for n40 SSB

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2000193 | Huawei | Proposal: to address the misalignment between SSB SCS configuration and data SCS configuration when 30KHz data SCS is configured for Band n40, the following alternative solutions are proposed:  • Alt#1: Add 30KHz SSB SCS in the synchronization raster configuration for n40 from Rel-15  • Alt#2: Add 30KHz SSB SCS in the synchronization raster configuration for n40 from Rel-16, and check the feasibility of Rel-16 network supporting both 15KHz SSB SCS and 30KHz SSB SCS.  • Alt#3: Define a new band with the same frequency range as n40 and reusing the same RAN4 requirements and add 30KHz SSB SCS for it.  --------------------------------------------------------------  Observation 1: Enabling 30KHz SCS for n40 SSB can improve the spectrum efficiency by saving the guard bands between SSB with 15KHz SCS and data with 30KHz SCS when 30KHz SCS is used.  Observation 2: The UE capability of simultaneous reception of SSB and data with different numerologies is optional, and without supporting that capability the longer measurement time, the more frequent interruptions on the service and more scheduling restrictions will be expected.  Observation 3: To support the simultaneous reception of SSB and data with different numerologies will result in the increasing complexity for UE, BS and test equipment, which would delay the deployment for n40.  Observation 4: Adding 30KHz SCS for n40 SSB could lead to the tolerable additional delay for initial access, which is comparable to the initial access delay for the bands which support both 15KHz and 30KHz SCS SSB.  Observation 5: if there was or was going to be no n40 device in the market, it could be feasible to add 30KHz SCS for n40 SSB from Rel-15. |

## Open issues summary

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

The main motivation of the issue comes from the intention of avoiding a configuration of different SCSs between SSB and data, i.e., to align the SCS between SSB and data. This sub-topic is to align understanding within the group on the necessity of adding 30kHz SCS for n40 SSB, which is fundamental to decide whether or not to introduce the new SCS for n40 SSB into specs.

Notes:

* The below issue 1-1 and 1-2 are for non-CA case, and 1-3 s for CA case, and please keep in minds that these issues are generic, not only to n40.
* Issue 1-4 is n40 specific.
* If adding 30k SCS for n40 SSB, it is obvious that the searching time will be increased during initial access, thus this is not listed.

### Sub-topic 1-1

*Sub-topic description:*

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

**Issue 1-1: Is additional specs change required to address the case where SSB and data have different SCSs?**

* Views
  + View 1: Yes, it can be at least 4 PRBs on each side of SSB
  + View 2: No, up to implementation according to current specs “inter-numerology guard band within the carrier is implementation dependent”

### Sub-topic 1-2

*Sub-topic description*

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

**Issue 1-2: In addition to potential guard-band, what would be other consequences if SSB and data is configured with different SCSs? And is any standardization efforts/correction required?**

* Views
  + View 1: Long interruption and downlink throughput loss, and increased implementation complexity for BS, UE and test equipment, so the specs shall ensure that the same SCS of both SSB and data be supported for all supported SCSs in each band.
  + View 2: Implementation dependent only, and already addressed in the current specs via different capability signalling. No more specs change required.

**Issue 1-3:** **Does *supportedSubCarrierSpacingDL* indicate both SSB and data in NR CA? For example, in an inter-band CA configuration, if CC#1 is configured with a 15k SCS SSB and 30k SCS data, and CC#2 is configured with a 30k SCS SSB and 30k SCS data, is the configuration supported by the current specs without the capability of simultaneous reception with different numerologies in CA?**

* Views
  + View 1: both SSB and data, and the example is not supported if the capability of simultaneous reception with different numerologies in CA.
  + View 2: only refer to data, and the example is supported because the data SCS of both CCs are the same.

### Sub-topic 1-3

*Sub-topic description*

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

**Issue 1-3:** **Does *supportedSubCarrierSpacingDL* indicate both SSB and data in NR CA? For example, in an inter-band CA configuration, if CC#1 is configured with a 15k SCS SSB and 30k SCS data, and CC#2 is configured with a 30k SCS SSB and 30k SCS data, is the configuration supported by the current specs without the capability of simultaneous reception with different numerologies in CA?**

* Views
* View 1: both SSB and data, and the example is not supported if the capability of simultaneous reception with different numerologies in CA.
* View 2: only refer to data, and the example is supported because the data SCS of both CCs are the same (30k).

### Sub-topic 1-4

*Sub-topic description*

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

**Issue 1-4:** **Is there any NBC issue for Rel-15 if adding 30k SCS for n40 SSB? And what could be the solution to solve if yes?**

* Views
* View 1: No
* View 2: Yes, add 30k SCS for n40 SSB from Rel-16
* View 3: Yes, define a mirror band supporting 30k SCS SSB from Rel-16

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 1-1:  Sub topic 1-2:  ….  Others: |
| CMCC | Sub topic 1-1 (Issue 1-1): We think “View 2” is better. In the case that SSB and data have different SCSs, the guard band can leave to implementation.  Sub topic 1-2 (Issue 1-2): It is not clear whether there is any standardization efforts required if SSB and data is configured with different SCSs. Our understanding is that the current spec can support mix numerology. But from practical deployment perspective, it is better to use the same SCS for SSB and data in order to get better performance.  Sub topic 1-3 (Issue 1-3): Our understanding is that ***supportedSubCarrierSpacingDL*** only indicate data for CA. But there is another UE capability ***simultaneousRxDataSSB-DiffNumerology***, which indicates whether UE supports concurrent intra-frequency measurement on serving cell or neighbouring cell and PDCCH or PDSCH reception from the serving cell with a different numerology. This capability will have impact on the performance if 15K SCS SSB and 30KHz SCS data are deployed.  Sub topic 1-4 (Issue 1-4): Based on our knowledge, there is no UE supporting n40 so far. We prefer to add 30KHz SSB SCS in Rel-15 (Veiw 1). |

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

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

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

### CRs/TPs

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| R4-2000194 TS38.101-1 CR: adding 30KHz SSB SCS for n40, Huawei | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |
|  |  |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

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

# Topic #2: Redundant sentence for the intraband EN-DC channel spacing

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2000489 CR to TS 38.101-3: Correct the intra-band ENDC channel spacing | ZTE Corporation | Proposal : remove the redundant sentence:  For NR operating bands with 15 kHz channel raster,  ~~Nominal Channel spacing = (BWE-UTRA\_Channel + BWNR\_Channel)/2+{-5kHz, 0kHz, 5kHz}~~  - Nominal Channel spacing = (BWE-UTRA\_Channel + BWNR\_Channel)/2+{-5kHz, 0kHz, 5kHz} for ∆FRaster equals to 15 kHz  - Nominal Channel spacing = (BWE-UTRA\_Channel + BWNR\_Channel)/2+{-10 kHz, 0 kHz, 10 kHz} for ∆FRaster equals to 30 kHz |
|  |  |  |

## 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 2-1

*Sub-topic description:*

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

**Issue 2-1: Redundancy confirmed**

* Views
  + View 1: Yes
  + View 2: No

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 2-1:  Sub topic 2-2:  ….  Others: |

### 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#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** |
| #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** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

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

# Topic #2: Wording and reference correction for CA channel spacing

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2001783 CR for 38.101-1 channel space for CA\_Rel15,  R4-2001785 CR for 38.101-2 channel space for CA\_Rel15 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: Add “common” to µ  Proposal 2: Referring to Table 5.3.2-1 instead of 5.3.5-1 |
|  |  |  |

## 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 2-1

*Sub-topic description:*

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

**Issue 2-1: Necessity to add “common” to µ**

* Views
  + View 1: Yes, more clear
  + View 2: No, it is clear enough for the current wording “μ0 is the common largest μ value among the subcarrier spacing configurations supported in the operating band for both of the channel bandwidths”

### Sub-topic 2-2

*Sub-topic description*

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

**Issue 2-2: which is preferred, Table 5.3.5-1 or Table 5.3.2-1?**

* Views
  + View 1: Table 5.3.5-1 as it is now, since this allows for band specific definition.
  + View 2: Table 5.3.2-1 as proposed, since it applies to all bands.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 2-1:  Sub topic 2-2:  ….  Others: |

### 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#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** |
| #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** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

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