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# Introduction

This email discussion thread is related to NR PC2 CA basket WI, and will focus on the topic of following aspects:

* Topic #1: draft TR and revised WID
* Topic#2: UE RF requirements
  + Issue 2-1-1: MSD analysis
  + Issue 2-1-2: TPs for approval

Note that the tables for collecting comments for sub-topic issues are arranged just below each issue.... and the tables for collecting comments for CR/TP are still kept at the original position.

# Topic #1: draft TR and revised WID

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations/Abstracts** |
| R4-2101125 | China Telecom | **Abstract**:This draft TR provides the draft TR v0.2.0, which was reserved for email approval and aims to reflect the TP approved in this meeting. |
| R4-2101126 | China Telecom | **Abstract**:revised WI to update the WI code according to MCC suggestion and the target completion time. |

## 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 1-1: draft TR and revised WID

This sub-topic will discuss rapporteur input for draft TR and revised WID.

**Issue 1-1-1: draft TR**

* Recommended WF
  + It is recommended for email approval for the draft TR of R4-2101125

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments on Issue 1-1-1: draft TR** |
|  |  |

**Issue 1-1-2: Revised WID**

* Summarization for the WID revision
  + Update the WI code according to MCC suggestion and the target completion time.
* Recommended WF
  + It is recommended to approve the revised WID of R4-2101126

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments on Issue 1-1-2: Revised WID** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 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:* Further discussion on the revised WID. |

*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** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 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: UE RF requirements

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations/Abstracts** |
| R4-2100273 | Verizon Denmark | TP for TR38.xxx for PC2 CA\_n2A-n77A |
| R4-2100274 | Verizon Denmark | TP for TR38.xxx for PC2 CA\_n5A-n77A |
| R4-2100276 | Verizon Denmark | TP for TR38.xxx for PC2 CA\_n66A-n77A |
| R4-2100285 | LG Electronics France | Proposal 1: For cross-band isolation issue of PC2 NR inter band CA UE, the proposed MSD values in Table 5 shall be considered in TS38.101-1.  Proposal 2: For IMD problem by dual uplink transmission of PC2 NR inter band CA UE, the proposed MSD values in Table 9 shall be considered in TS38.101-1. |
| R4-2102220 | ZTE Corporation, CMCC | TP for TR38.xxx\_Clarification on PC2 CA\_n28A-n41A, CA\_n28-n79A and CA\_n40A-41A |
| R4-2102221 | ZTE Corporation, CMCC, Xiaomi | TP for TR38.xxx\_ PC2 CA\_n41A-n79A |
| R4-2102713 | vivo | Observation 1: As PC2 UE has higher maximum output power and larger dynamic power range, the linearity requirements of RF components is more stringent to meet the similar MSD requirement of PC3 UE.  Observation 2: To support multi-RAN, multi-bands, wide bandwidth, maintaining isolation in the limit area is a challenge.  Observation 3: CQI can already implicitly signal the quality of UE receiver sensitivity. Network would not have to rely on new capability to differentiate UE.  Proposal 1: MSD improvement analysis per band combination for PC3 UE is proposed.  Proposal 2: The MSD improvement is proposed to base the minimum requirement, new UE capability for MSD is not needed. |

## 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: UE RF requirements

This sub-topic will discuss UE RF requirements for proposed combinations.

**Issue 2-1-1: MSD analysis for PC2 NR inter-band CA**

* Proposals (R4-2100285)
  + Proposal 1: For cross-band isolation issue of PC2 NR inter band CA UE, the proposed MSD values in Table 5 shall be considered in TS38.101-1.

**Table 5 MSD due to cross band isolation for PC2 for CA band combinations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NR Band / Channel bandwidth of the affected DL band / MSD | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UL band | DL band | 5 MHz  (dB) | 10 MHz  (dB) | 15 MHz  (dB) | 20 MHz  (dB) | 25 MHz  (dB) | 30 MHz  (dB) | 40 MHz  (dB) | 50 MHz  (dB) | 60 MHz  (dB) | 70 MHz  (dB) | 80 MHz  (dB) | 90 MHz  (dB) | 100 MHz  (dB) |
| n41 | n25 | **2.3** | **2.3** | **2.3** | **2.3** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| n41 | n66 | **5.3** | **5.3** | **5.3** | **5.3** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| n78 | n40 | **6.5** | **6.5** | **6.5** | **6.5** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| n77 | n41 | **6.5** | **6.5** | **6.5** | **6.5** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| n41 | n77 |  | **10.5** | **10.5** | **10.5** | **9.5** | **8.6** | **8.3** | **7.2** | **6.3** | **6.0** | **5.7** | **5.6** | **[5.6]** |

* + Proposal 2: For IMD problem by dual uplink transmission of PC2 NR inter band CA UE, the proposed MSD values in Table 9 shall be considered in TS38.101-1.
* **Table 9: Proposed MSD test configuration and results by IMD problems for PC2 NR inter-band CA UE**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CA bands | UL band | IMD | UL Fc  (MHz) | UL BW (MHz) | UL  RB # | DL Fc  (MHz) | DL BW (MHz) | MSD  (dB) |
| CA\_n41A-n71A | n41 | IMD4  |3\*fn71 -fn41| | 2614 | 5 | 25 | 2614 | 5 | **18.2** |
| n71 |  | 665 | 5 | 25 | 619 | 5 | N/A |
| CA\_n2A-n77A | n2 | IMD2  |fn2 -fn77| | 1855 | 5 | 25 | 1935 | 5 | **32.6** |
| n77 | 3790 | 10 | 50 | 3790 | 10 | N/A |
| n2 | IMD4  |3\*fn2 -fn77| | 1885 | 5 | 25 | 1965 | 5 | **17.5** |
| n77 | 3690 | 10 | 50 | 3690 | 10 | N/A |
| CA\_n5A-n77A | n5 | IMD4  |3\*fn5 -fn77| | 844 | 5 | 25 | 889 | 5 | **17.7** |
| n77 | 3421 | 10 | 50 | 3421 | 10 | N/A |
| CA\_n66A-n77A | n66 | IMD2  |fn66 -fn77| | 1730 | 5 | 25 | 2130 | 5 | **34.6** |
| n77 | 3860 | 10 | 50 | 3860 | 10 | N/A |
| n66 | IMD5  |3\*fn66 -2\*fn77| | 1730 | 5 | 25 | 2130 | 5 | **10.8** |
| n77 | 3660 | 10 | 50 | 3660 | 10 | N/A |
| CA\_n71A-n77A | n71 | IMD5  |4\*fn71 -fn77| | 681.5 | 5 | 25 | 635.5 | 5 | **12.2** |
| n77 | 3361.5 | 10 | 50 | 3582.5 | 10 | N/A |

* Recommended WF
  + Collect views on these two proposals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments on Issue 2-1-1: MSD analysis for PC2 NR inter-band CA** |
| **ZTE** | Generally, the MSD should be discussed per case per band combination. For FDD-TDD NR CA combination, case a(23+23) and case b(23+26) are applied, and for TDD-TDD NR CA combination, case a(23+23), case b(23+26), case c(26+23) and case d(26+26) are applied. We think the MSD should be defined for each power configuration.  For example: CA\_n41A-n71A, we think MSD should be defined for case b/c/d for IMD MSD. But from the table, it seems no different cases are distinguished. |
| Huawei | Our MSD estimation for the ULCA combo are listed below.   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Combo** | **IMD Order** | **IMD** | **LGE (R4-2100285)** | **Verizon, Ericsson** | **Huawei** | | CA\_n2A\_n77A | IMD2 | n2-n77 | 32.6 | 32 | 31.7 | |  | IMD4 | 3\*n2-n77 | 17.5 | 20 | 19.8 | | CA\_n5A\_n77A | IMD4 | 3\*n5-n77 | 17.7 | 20.3 | 17.8 | |  | IMD5 | 4\*n5-n77 | n/a | 20.5 | [16.4] | | CA\_n41A\_n71A | IMD4 | 3\*n71-n41 | 18.2 | n/a | 17.9 | | CA\_n66A\_n77A | IMD2 | n66-n77 | 34.6 | 37 | 31.4 | |  | IMD5 | 3\*n66-2\*n77 | 10.8 | 20 | <3 | | CA\_n71A-n77A | IMD5 | 4\*n71-n77 | 12.2 | n/a | 14.4 |   Similar to our comments in the EN-DC PC2 thread, the MSD for IMD5 of CA\_n66A\_n77A should be double checked due to large variations among proposals. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-1-2: TPs for approval**

* Proposed TPs
  + R4-2100273, R4-2100274, R4-2100276, R4-2102220, R4-2102221
* Recommended WF
  + Collect the comments for proposed TPs in the section 2.3.1. If no comments for certain of TP’s, the TP’s will be recommended as approved.

### Sub-topic 2-2: MSD improvement

**Issue 2-2-1: MSD improvement**

* Proposals (R4-2102713)
  + Proposal 1: MSD improvement analysis per band combination for PC3 UE is proposed.
  + Proposal 2: The MSD improvement is proposed to base the minimum requirement, new UE capability for MSD is not needed.
* Recommended WF
  + Collect views on these two proposals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments on Issue 2-2-1: MSD improvement** |
| **Nokia** | We don’t think that the Observation 3 justifies denying necessity of new UE capability. The point is that by seeing huge MSD, network even may not try to configure CA. Even if we assume dual UL becomes active, then, suddenly DL quality degrades and network would de-configure the CA. This may be repeated. And this is an unnecessary overhead.  For proposal 1, we need to study if there is meaningful information by having two types requirements for both PC3 and PC2 UL before we agree with this proposal.  For proposal 2, as commented to the Observation 3, we need a new UE capability to make network aware which UEs can deal with the noise impact on its DL due to IMD/Harmonics. |
| ZTE | **Issue 2-1-2:** |
|  | For these three TPs: R4-2100273, R4-2100274, R4-2100276, it seems the MSD for case a and case b are the same. But we think they are not the same, especially for IMD MSD, since the power allocation for case a and case b are different.  **Issue 2-2-1:**  In principle we also agree with the possibility for the MSD improvements. The question is how to improve the MSD if there are no agreements on the aggressive parameters?  Also we have a question for clarification. if define two sets of MSD value, does it mean that the completed combination with high MSD needs to be re-defined? Even for PC3.  We agree with Proposal 2. |
| Huawei | This is a PC2 WI. Proposal 1 is about PC3 hence should not be discussed here. For the various reasons as described in Vivo’s paper, MSD improvement is very challenging. The evidence in the paper to support Proposal 2 is lacking. Moreover, as we commented in the EN-DC PC2 thread, the MSD values defined in the spec do not preclude certain UE implementations to have smaller degradations. And this potential advantage could be seen by the network from CQI report, ACK/NACK feedback, etc. Hence we do not see the need for two sets of requirements or new UE capability. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### CRs/TPs comments collection

The following table aims to collect the comments for proposed TPs. If no comments for certain of TP, the TP will be recommended as approved in the summary for 1st round.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2100273 | company A: |
|  |
|  |
| R4-2100274 |  |
|  |
|  |
| R4-2100276 |  |
|  |
|  |
| R4-2102220 |  |
|  |
|  |
| R4-2102221 |  |
|  |
|  |

## 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** |
|  |  |  |

### 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** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |