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# Introduction

This document summarizes the email discussion on topics related to NR-U UE RF requirements in Agenda 7.1.2, 7.1.2.1, and 7.1.2.2.

# Topic #1: Tx requirements

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2014903**](http://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014903.zip) | Apple Inc. | PC5 NR-U MPR for NS\_53 and NS\_54Proposal: Remove brackets for all A-MPR found in NS\_53 and NS\_54 |
| [**R4-2015697**](http://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015697.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | A-MPR evaluation for NR-UProposal 1: A-MPR for NS\_54 is defined in Table 2-2. |

## Open issues summary

### A-MPR for NS\_53 and NS\_54

Simulation results from R4-2014903 have confirmed A-MPR for NS\_53. Moderator recommends that square brackets can be removed from A-MPR table for NS\_53.

For NS\_54 A-MPR, there is a proposal in R4-2015697 to reduce a few values by 0.5 dB due to the increased guard band.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

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

## 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**  |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |
| [**R4-2016436**](http://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016436.zip) | Removal of square brackets for 38.101-1 NR-U (Qualcomm Incorporated) |
| [**R4-2014916**](http://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014916.zip) | CR for TS 38.101-1: NR-U UE RF open requirements (Apple Inc.) |

## 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: Rx requirements

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2014185**](http://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014185.zip) | MediaTek Inc. | Discussion and TP for NR-U UE ACSProposal 1: ACS for NR-U UE is 25dB for 20MHz channel bandwidthModerator’s comment: There is no TP in this document. |
| [**R4-2015018**](http://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015018.zip) | MediaTek Inc. | Architecture and REFSENS discussion for NR-U 6GHzProposal 1: RAN4 shall agree on FE architecture and total loss for n96 REFSENS evaluation assumption firstProposal 2: We propose n96 REFSENS as below table

|  |
| --- |
| Operating band / SCS / Channel bandwidth |
| Operating Band | SCS kHz | 20 MHz (dBm) | 40 MHz (dBm) | 60 MHz (dBm) | 80 MHz (dBm) |
| n96 | 15 | -88 | -84.9 |  |  |
| 30 | -88.2 | -85 | -83.1 | -81.9 |
| 60 | -88.4 | -85 | -83.3 | -81.9 |

Proposal 3: 6GHz front-end loss assumption shall be at least 6dBProposal 4: We propose n79 REFSENS as below table (1.6dB relaxation than current values) according to FE architecture change |
| [**R4-2014497**](http://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014497.zip) | Skyworks Solutions Inc. | [NRU] UE REFSENS for NRU Band n96Proposal:• Band n96 REFSENS is specified as the same than n46• The only aspect that is different from n46 is a 20% frequency increase and a 4% increase in fractional bandwidth. Only a 0.5dB relaxation could be acceptable to account for this. |
| [**R4-2015799**](http://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015799.zip) | Charter Communications, Inc, Qorvo, Inc. | UE Reference Sensitivity considerations for band n96Proposal: The reference sensitivity for n96 should be derived by the standalone case. For more complex architectures were multiple bands are integrated with n96, analysis should dictate what the ΔRIB,c. values shall be for such aggregation. The reference sensitivity values for n96 should be the same as n46, worse-case scenario 0.3 dB higher. |
| [**R4-2016294**](http://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016294.zip) | Apple Inc. | REFSENS for n96Proposal 1: For band n96 a margin of 0.5 dB should be considered compared to band n46 for the REFSENS requirement, as shown in Table 1. |
| [**R4-2016437**](http://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016437.zip) | Qualcomm Incorporated | Reference sensitivity for NR-U band n96It is proposed to adopt the same value as already agreed for Band n46, which is already significantly relaxed compared to other 3GPP bands and compared to studies conducted by RAN4 in the context of IMT parameters in the same frequency range.  |

## Open issues summary

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

### ACS value

The compromise value is [24] dB. Proposal in R4-2014185 is 24.5 dB which is then rounded to 25 dB. Since the previous compromise value was already 24 dB and the calculated value in R4-2014185 is 24.5 dB, the calculated value is no closer to proposal of 25 dB than it is to compromise from many companies of 24 dB. Moderator suggests to accept the 24 dB ACS value and remove the square brackets in the specification. Can companies agree?

### Refsens

It is proposed in R4-2015018 to first agree on a reference architecture and FE loss for Band n96 (at least 6 dB) before deciding reference sensitivity. Do companies feel it is mandatory for RAN4 to agree on a reference architecture and FE loss for band n96 before RAN4 can agree to a reference sensitivity value? The view of the moderator is that reference architecture and FE loss are not requirements that will be specified in 38.101-1, so while it may be helpful it is not absolutely required to agree upon them. It is only required to agree on the reference sensitivity value itself. Do companies have the same or different view?

Reference sensitivity value: Contributions mentioned refsens values 0 dB, 0.3 dB, 0.5 dB, 1.7 dB degraded compared to Band n46. All contributions on this topic included technical justification for their proposals. Reasons cited include increased FE loss due to sharing with other bands, increased LNA noise figure due to wider bandwidth and higher frequency. Moderator requests companies to share views on what value to agree upon for refsens.

It is proposed in R4-2015018 to revisit reference sensitivity for Band n79 due to expected common RF FE with 5 and 6 GHz bands. Proposal to relax Band n79 reference sensitivity by 1.6 dB. The view of the moderator is that the reference sensitivity for Band n79 has already been defined some time ago and network operators may have already planned deployment with this understanding. It seems unfair and inappropriate to degrade the reference sensitivity on an existing band because a new band in a nearby frequency range has been defined. If this were to become a norm, new bands would never be allowed since they might negatively impact another operator’s existing band. At the minimum, before degrading Band n79 reference sensitivity, the opinion of the impacted operators should be sought.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

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

## 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”* |
| [**R4-2015974**](http://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015974.zip) | Correction to receiver requirements for shared spectrum channel access (Ericsson) |

## 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 #3: Dual connectivity requirements

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2015927**](http://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015927.zip) | Ericsson, Charter Communications, T-Mobile US | Rel-16 CR 38.101-3 NR-U EN-DC band combinations  |
| [**R4-2015803**](http://ftp.3gpp.org/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015803.zip) | Charter Communications, Inc. | Draft CR to add NR-DC\_n48-n46 combinations  |

## Open issues summary

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

Technical requirements for EN-DC combinations with NR-U Band n46 are provided in R4-2015927 as a CR to 38.101-3. However, the general requirements for EN-DC with NR-U (suffix F) are not available. Will there be a “big CR” made available for 38.101-3 or is R4-2015927 intended for that purpose? Are suffix F general requirements needed?

NR-DC combinations are introduced in R4-2015803 to 38.101-1 in a draft CR. However, general requirements for NR-DC with NR-U are not yet available. For example, ACS is defined for NR-U in clause 7.5F of 38.101-1, with NR-U CA in sub-clause 7.5F.2. DC with NR-U could possibly be added as sub-clause 7.5F.3 but a discussion is welcomed. Furthermore, while NR-DC is included in the NR-U WID [RP-192926] as scenario E, it is included in the Objective section of the WID that scenario E “will be treated with lower priority in the context of this WI.” There are no band combinations listed for Scenario E in Annex A of the WID so the band combinations in R4-2015803 are without support in the WID and there is no mention of NR-DC in the work item exception sheet [RP-202099]. The moderator recommends to have brief discussion and collect comments on R4-2015803, but that this topic should be treated with lower priority since the focus of this meeting should be to complete those items listed in the WID and in the exception sheet.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 3-1: ….Others: |

## 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”* |