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# Introduction

*The email discussion on FS\_FR2\_enhTestMethods is organized into the following topics:*

* Topic #1: Test methodology for high DL power and low UL power test cases
* Topic #2: Solutions to minimize the impact of polarization basis mismatch between the TE and DUT on the RF testing
* Topic #3: Testability enhancements to support the verification of RF requirements for inter-band (FR2+FR2) CA
* Topic #4: Extreme temperature conditions for all applicable FR2 UE RF test cases
* Topic #5: Testability enhancements to support the verification of RF requirements for FR2 DL 256QAM
* Topic #6: Testability enhancements to reduce test time
* Topic #7: Testability aspects for the introduction of the new band n262

We note that Topic #5 did not receive any contributions during this meeting.

# Topic #1: Test methodology for high DL power and low UL power test cases

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [R4-2100525](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100525.zip) | Apple Inc. | **TP to TR38.884 on High DL and Low UL power test cases**Proposal 1: It is proposed to continue discussions related to the applicability of the DNF system to test cases where the beam peak search is performed in the NF.Proposal 2: It is proposed to capture the following intermediate conclusion: at least with the CFFNF system the enhancement of performing beam peak search in the FF/IFF system and then executing the test case in the NF is considered feasible.Proposal 3: It is proposed to capture the intermediate conclusion that both DNF and CFFNF systems are feasible enhancements to measure TRP. Further discussions are needed to resolve the source(s) of systematic errors.Proposal 4: For EIRP measurements using the DNF system and both EIRP and TRP measurements using the CFFDNF system, the declaration of antenna phase centre offset of antenna yielding beam peak leads to a maximum 14 dB measurement system link budget improvement and can be considered feasible.Proposal 5: For a given test case, non-permitted methods should be only considered if the improvement is better than the potential improvement of the permitted method. |
| [R4-2101485](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2101485.zip) | MVG Industries, Sony | **Overview of the Impact of phase variation for Direct NF Method**Observation 1: DNF does suffer from a Beam Selection Error. It means beam steered in NF is different than beam steered at classical FF distance.Observation 2: For the case of 4x1 antenna arrays, the error on Peak EIRP, TRP, and Spherical Coverage is less than 0.5dB when the antenna arrays are on a phone model ground plane (realistic case). The errors are approximately the same when the arrays are in FS (the same offset along X, Y, and Z axis is considered). Errors are DUT dependent.Observation 3: There is a limit in terms of range length for DNF. This limit seems to be 30cm for the simulated 4x1 antenna array.Observation []: At distances less than classical FF (ideal case) distance, the selected beams are different with respect to the FF case.Observation []: With the considered UE models (arrays on a phone size ground plane), figure of merits such as EIRP, TRP, and Spherical Coverage are not influenced dramatically from range length especially if the dynamic beam scenarios is considered.Observation []: When considering antenna arrays in Free Space, the FoMsâ€™ errors increase especially when the offset is along the beam peak direction.Observation 4: FoMsâ€™ errors is DUT dependentObservation 5: Based on the simulated antenna arrays in both FS and the UE model, the distance of 30cm seems to be the minimum range length for DNF test method for FR2.Observation []: Based on the simulated antenna arrays both FS and UE model, the distance of 30cm seems to be the minimum range length for DNF test method FR2.Observation 6: In comparison with a CATR with focal length of 1m, the improvement in terms of free space path loss for DNF test method with 45cm, and 30 cm range length is 10.5dB, and 7dB respectively. |
| [R4-2102616](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2102616.zip) | Keysight Technologies | **On Test methodology for high DL power and low UL power test cases**Observation 1: The NF interface distances of 4x1 and 8x2 antenna arrays are in the FF of the single element.Observation 2: A measurement grid with 5o spacing or better shows almost insignificant differences in the spherical coverage curves for the 8x2 antenna array and max offsets up to 12.5cm.Observation 3: The measurement uncertainties (mean error and std. deviation) for 50%-ile and 100%-ile CDF the 8x2 antenna array for offsets up to 12.5cm are in excess of 0.5dB for NF distances up to 45cm.Observation 4: The measurement uncertainties (mean error and std. deviation) for 50%-ile and 100%-ile CDF the 4x1 antenna array for offsets up to 12.5cm are in excess of 0.5dB for NF distances up to 45cm.Observation 5: The black-box CFFDNF approach with the UBF to activate to steer the beam towards the FF beam peak direction with a separate FF probe is not suitable for EIRP/EIS measurements towards the declared FF BP direction in the NF (even at 45cm range length) due to the very large measurement uncertaintiesObservation 6: The black-box DFF/CFFDNF approach while allowing the DUT to optimize the beams, is not suitable for EIRP/EIS measurements towards the declared FF BP direction in the NF (even at 45cm range length) due to the very large measurement uncertaintiesObservation 7: The NF testing approach with asymptotic expansion transform shows measurement accuracies of less than 0.2dB (mean error) and less than 0.3dB (std. dev.) and for NF EIRP measurements utilizing the black-box approachObservation 8: The NF testing approach with asymptotic expansion transform can accurately predict the offset of the antenna array from the centre of QZ.Observation 9: The black&white box approach (black: geometric centre of DUT is aligned with centre of QZ; white: phase centre offset of active panel is declared) does not require a FF probe to steer and lock the antenna beam towards the FF beam peak direction and has the same advantages in terms of relaxations as the black-box approach over the white-box approach.Observation 10: The novel NF testing approach with asymptotic expansion transform yields similar measurement accuracies for NF EIRP measurements utilizing the black&white-box approach when compared to the black-box approachObservation 11: The black&white-box approach exhibits larger MUs without the asymptotic expansion transform (single radius) when compared with the asymptotic expansion transform (two radii).Observation 12: The black&white-box approach exhibits unacceptable MUs without the asymptotic expansion transform (single radius) for PC1.Proposal 1: Do not consider the Direct NF methodology as enhanced methodology for spherical coverage test cases and beam peak searches.Proposal 2: Do not consider the black-box DNF/CFFDNF approach as enhanced methodology for EIRP/EIS-based measurements with known FF BP direction.Proposal 3: Focus on the CFFNF approach with asymptotic expansion transformProposal 4: Feedback from industry is requested whether the combination of black and black&white-box approaches is acceptable to avoid the need for a vendor declaration. |
| [R4-2102620](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2102620.zip) | Rohde & Schwarz | **NF based solutions and Enhancement of permitted methods**Observation 1: an offset correction is not required for TRP measurements on CFFDNF systems if minimum range length respects the Derat distance.Observation 2: an offset correction is required for EIRP measurements on all types of CFF(D)NF systems.Observation 3: a local search to maximize EIRP is required on all types of CFF(D)NF systems.Observation 4: offset correction requires a knowledge of the antenna offset from the center of the DUT.Observation 5: manufacturer declaration is the easiest and most consistent way to obtain the antenna offset required for offset correction.Proposal 1: adopt the algorithm described in [12] for offset correction on CFF(D)NF systems.Proposal 2: manufacturer shall declare antenna phase centre offset with respect to the center of the DUT for the antenna panel that corresponds to the FF beam peak.Proposal 3: group to prioritize the work for non-permitted methods on the following requirements: |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 1-1: beam management sensitivity study of NF based solutions

*This sub-topic is focused on finding consensus on the conclusions of the beam management sensitivity study of NF based solutions.*

**Issue 1-1-1: conclusions related to the CFFNF system**

* Proposals:
	+ Alt 1-1-1-1: Confirm feasibility of the CFFNF system for test cases where the beam peak search is performed in the NF and for TRP measurements
		- At least with the CFFNF system the enhancement of performing beam peak search in the FF/IFF system and then executing the test case in the NF is considered feasible
		- The CFFNF system is a feasible enhancements to measure TRP
	+ Alt 1-1-1-2: Confirm feasibility of the CFFNF system with asymptotic expansion transform for test cases where the beam peak search is performed in the NF and the feasibility of the CFFNF system for TRP measurements
		- Do not consider the black-box DNF/CFFDNF approach as enhanced methodology for EIRP/EIS-based measurements with known FF BP direction
		- Focus on the CFFNF approach with asymptotic expansion transform
		- Update comparison of black and black&white box approaches as shown in R4-2102616
	+ Alt 1-1-1-3: Confirm feasibility of the CFF(D)NF system for test cases where the beam peak search is performed in the NF and for TRP measurements
		- Beam peak search and UBF are performed with the FF method.
		- Maximum EIRP with (D)NF is measured after a local search to maximize it.
		- Offset correction is implemented as described in R4-2102620
		- An offset correction is not required for TRP measurements on CFFDNF systems if minimum range length respects the Derat distance
		- An offset correction is required for EIRP measurements on all types of CFF(D)NF systems

**Issue 1-1-2: conclusions related to the DNF system**

* Proposal:
	+ Alt 1-1-2-1: Confirm feasibility of the DNF system for TRP measurements and FFS for EIRP measurements
		- The DNF system is a feasible enhancements to measure TRP
		- Continue discussions related to the applicability of the DNF system to test cases where the beam peak search is performed in the NF
	+ Alt 1-1-2-2: Confirm feasibility of the DNF system for TRP measurements and consider DNF system with path loss compensation for EIRP measurements
		- The DNF system is a feasible enhancements to measure TRP
		- The DNF system with path loss compensation, which depends on the manufacturer declaration of the phase center of the antenna under test (see R4-2101485), is a feasible enhancement to measure EIRP
		- Capture updated simulation results based on DNF (see R4-2101485) with path loss compensation in the TR
		- Capture updated path loss improvement results based on DNF (see R4-2101485) in the TR
	+ Alt 1-1-2-3: Do not consider the Direct NF methodology as enhanced methodology for spherical coverage test cases and beam peak searches

**Issue 1-1-3: remaining open issues with NF based solutions**

* Proposals:
	+ Alt 1-1-3-1: based on the simulated antenna arrays in both FS and the UE model, the distance of 30cm seems to be the minimum range length for DNF test method for FR2
	+ Alt 1-1-3-2: based on the analysis of the minimum FF and NF range lengths for black box conditions and PC3 devices with a 30cm QZ utilizing the fixed aperture approach, capture the min range length calculations as shown in R4-2102616

### Sub-topic 1-2: manufacturer declarations

**Issue 1-2-1: feasibility and efficacy of manufacturer declarations**

* Proposal:
	+ Alt 1-2-1-1: For EIRP measurements using the DNF system and both EIRP and TRP measurements using the CFFDNF system, the declaration of antenna phase centre offset of antenna yielding beam peak leads to a maximum 14 dB measurement system link budget improvement and can be considered feasible
	+ Alt 1-2-1-2: The manufacturer declaration of the phase center of the antenna under test enables path loss compensation for the DNF system to perform beam peak search
		- Manufacturer shall declare antenna phase centre offset with respect to the center of the DUT for the antenna panel that corresponds to the FF beam peak
	+ Alt 1-2-1-3: feedback from industry is requested whether the combination of black and black&white-box approaches is acceptable to avoid the need for a vendor declaration (see R4-2102616)

### Sub-topic 1-3: applicability of permitted and non-permitted methods

**Issue 1-3-1: applicability of non-permitted methods**

* Proposal:
	+ Alt 1-3-1-1: For a given test case, non-permitted methods should be only considered if the improvement is better than the potential improvement of the permitted method.
	+ Alt 1-3-1-2: Group to prioritize the work for non-permitted methods on the following requirements:
		- 6.3.2 Transmit OFF power
		- 6.5.3.2 Additional spurious emissions
		- 7.4 Maximum input power
		- 7.9 Receiver spurious emissions

**Issue 1-3-2: enhancement of permitted methods**

* Proposal: update the table of potential improvements of current permitted methods in the TR with updates provided in R4-2102620
	+ In-band blocking test case: 50MHz: 1.8dB relaxation for power in transmission BW and interferer for band n260; 100MHz: 4.8dB relaxation for power in transmission BW and interferer for band n260; 200MHz and 400MHz are deemed not testable.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Company Comments** |
| Issue 1-1-1: conclusions related to the CFFNF system |  Keysight: Most of the Issue #1 topics outlined below should differentiate between black-box approach and two different black&white box approaches. * Black box: no antenna location is declared and the geometric centre of DUT is aligned with the centre of QZ
* Black&white box (beam peak search, spherical coverage): all active antenna locations are declared together with the angular ranges (theta, phi) each active antenna performs best (when compared to the remaining antenna panels). The geometric centre of DUT is aligned with the centre of QZ
* Black&white box (EIRP/EIS/TRP in known FF beam peak direction): only the antenna location of the antenna that yields the beam peak needs to be declared. The geometric centre of DUT is aligned with the centre of QZ

Additionally, we would like to highlight some of the applicability criteria for CFFNF, CFFDNF, and DNF based on the views presented in the various contributions. The CFFNF with asymptotic expansion transform has the following applicability:* Beam peak searches and spherical coverage test cases are performed with black box approach using the FF probe
* The low UL power/high DL power EIRP/EIS test cases in known FF BP direction are applicable to the black box approach using local search on radius r1 and very localized searches at r2 and r3 (three radii approach)
	+ EIRP/EIS can be approximated very accurately with the NF probe at very close distances (~22cm for PC3, ~27cm for PC1) with optimized improvements in relaxations
	+ The unknown antenna location can be estimated accurately which allows very accurate TRP measurements at very close distances with large improvement in relaxations
* The low UL power/high DL power EIRP/EIS test cases in known FF BP direction are applicable to the ‘black&white box (EIRP/EIS/TRP in known FF beam peak direction) approach’ using local search on radius r1 and very localized searches at r2 (two radii approach)
	+ EIRP/EIS can be approximated very accurately with the NF probe at very close distances (~22cm for PC3, ~27cm for PC1) with optimized improvements in relaxations
* The beam peak search and spherical coverage tests are not applicable to ‘Black&white box (beam peak search, spherical coverage)’ approach since these tests are performed using the FF probe without an issue; performing these tests with the NF probe instead would be test time prohibitive and require a detailed vendor declarations
* The low UL power TRP test cases are not applicable to asymptotic expansion transform approach (CFFNF) since that approach would be test time prohibitive. However, the known offset (empirical evaluation with black box approach or declared with black&white box approach) can be compensated using CFFDNF approach to obtain very accurate TRP results at very close distances.

CFFDNF has the following applicability:* Beam peak searches and spherical coverage test cases are performed with black box approach using the FF probe
* The low UL power/high DL power EIRP/EIS test cases in known FF BP direction are not applicable to the black box approach
	+ Per KS (Tables 5 and 6) and R&S (Table 2-1) and MVG (Table 4), uncertainty is too large and therefore not applicable.
* The low UL power/high DL power EIRP/EIS test cases in known FF BP direction are applicable to the ‘black&white box (EIRP/EIS/TRP in known FF beam peak direction) approach’
	+ R&S believes a local search is required (Observation 3 from R4-2102620) while KS does not believe a local search is required and the test direction can be calculated. Measurements are performed with the NF probe at a single radius/range length only
	+ EIRP/EIS can be approximated accurately at very close distances (~22cm for PC3, ~27cm for PC1).
* TRP test cases at very close distances/range lengths require offset compensation and for PC3, range lengths beyond 43cm do not necessarily require offset compensations. However, at those range lengths, the relaxations are not minimized.
* The beam peak search and spherical coverage tests are not applicable to ‘Black&white box (beam peak search, spherical coverage)’ since these tests are performed using the FF probe without an issue; performing these tests with the NF probe would require a detailed vendor declaration

DNF has the following applicability:* The low UL power/high DL power EIRP/EIS test cases in the known FF BP direction as well as spherical coverage and beam peak search are not applicable to the black box approach
	+ Per KS (Tables 5 and 6 for CFFDNF) and R&S (Table 2-1 for CFFDNF) and MVG (Table 4) contributions, EIRP/EIS uncertainty is too large and therefore not applicable.
* The low UL power/high DL power EIRP/EIS test cases in the known BP direction and applicability to the ‘black&white box (EIRP/EIS/TRP in known FF beam peak direction) approach’
	+ MVG showed in Table 5 that DNF is feasible but showed relatively large measurement uncertainties for large offsets
	+ KS has not analyzed this case yet since we felt that a FF probe is necessary to make sure the correct beam is selected
* The beam peak search and spherical coverage tests and applicability to ‘Black&white box (beam peak search, spherical coverage)’ approach
	+ MVG showed in Figure 19 for one offset that a compensation approach is able to estimate the spherical coverage curves.
	+ KS believes that the beam peak could be estimated with path losses of the known antennas compensated but with uncertainties (at 30cm: ~0.4dB std. deviation and 0.2dB mean error); the spherical coverage results, however, would be estimated very poorly with each EIRP measurement compensated. More importantly, the detailed vendor declaration with the declaration of coverage ranges for each antenna seems very problematic.

KS believes that for black&white approach the asymptotic expansion approach (2 radii measurements) yields more accurate measurements than the direct NF approach (1 radius) as outlined in Figures 41&42 and Table 9. A very simple example is given in the following table by looking at the EIRP of the 8x2 antenna in the broadside direction without any offset and comparing it with the FF EIRP. The CFFDNF approach is limited to these types of mean errors while the CFFNF approach with the asymptotic transform can further reduce/eliminate these errors.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Range Length [m]** | **EIRP Error in broadside direction with 0cm offset w.r.t. FF for [dB]** |
| **Matlab** | **CST**  |
| **0.2** | 0.20 |   |
| **0.22** | 0.16 | 0.13 |
| **0.32** | 0.08 | 0.06 |
| **0.43** | 0.04 | 0.03 |

Alt 1-1-1-1: CFFNF should assume that beam peak search is performed in FF instead of NF (as stated in first sentence). The two bullets under 1-1-1-1 are correct (see applicability statement earlier)Alt 1-1-1-2: as outlined in the applicability statements above, the DNF/CFFDNF approach is not suitable for EIRP/EIS measurements with black box approach but CFFDNF could be suitable for EIRP/EIS/TRP test cases with the black&white box approach Alt 1-1-1-3: we are not convinced that a local search is required. Other offset correction algorithms are not precluded. While at larger NF range lengths, no offset compensation might be necessary for TRP, the relaxations can be further minimized when measuring at shorter range lengths.  |
| Issue 1-1-2: conclusions related to the DNF system | Alt 1-1-2-1: DNF is not feasible to measure TRP for black box as the correct beam cannot be activated. Beam peak searches cannot be performed accurately with DNF for black box. We should instead focus on CFFNF and CFFDNF instead.Alt 1-1-2-2: DNF is not feasible to measure TRP for black box as the correct beam cannot be activated. Beam peak searches cannot be performed accurately with DNF for black box. We should instead focus on CFFNF and CFFDNF instead.Alt 1-1-2-3: we believe DNF is not suitable for spherical coverage and beam peak searches (for more information, see applicability discussion above). We should instead focus on CFFNF and CFFDNF instead.  |
| Issue 1-1-3: remaining open issues with NF based solutions | Alt 1-1-3-1: as we do not believe DNF is not suitable for black box testing, we cannot support the statement that 30cm seems to be the minimum range length for DNF.  |
| Issue 1-2-1: feasibility and efficacy of manufacturer declarations | Various vendor declarations need to be discussed (as discussed briefly above)* Black box: no antenna location is declared and the geometric centre of DUT is aligned with the centre of QZ. The CFFNF approach does not require a vendor declaration.
* Black&white box (beam peak search, spherical coverage): all active antenna locations are declared together with the angular ranges (theta, phi) each active antenna performs best (when compared to the remaining antenna panels). The geometric centre of DUT is aligned with the centre of QZ. This is the most extensive vendor declaration and would look something like this:

Table 1: Sample Vendor Declaration for white box approach supporting all conformance test cases

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Number of Antenna Panels in DUT** | # |
| **Antenna Panel #** | **Phase-centre offset from geometric centre of DUT:** | **Range of Angles covered by Antenna Panel** |
| 1 | (*x*off1, *y*off1, *z*off1) | (start1 to end1,start1 to end1)  |
| 2 | (*x*off2, *y*off2, *z*off2) | (start2 to end2,start2 to end2)  |
| … | … | … |
| N | (*x*offN, *y*offN, *z*offN) | (startN to endN,startN to endN)  |

This declaration would be needed for beam peak search and spherical coverage measurements using the DNF system. In CFFNF/CFFDNF, this extensive declaration would not be needed since these tests can be performed with black box approach and FF probe. This declaration should be avoided especially since we eliminated the white box approach in the last meeting which required the same level of vendor declaration. * Black&white box (EIRP/EIS/TRP in known FF beam peak direction): only the antenna location of the antenna that yields the beam peak needs to be declared. The geometric centre of DUT is aligned with the centre of QZ. The CFFDNF requires this declaration for EIRP/EIS measurements and TRP measurements at very close NF distances. For TRP test cases and larger NF range lengths (~43cm for PC3), this declaration is not required. A rather simple declaration would be sufficient:

Table 1: Sample Vendor Declaration for black&white-box approach

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Phase-centre offset from geometric centre of DUT of antenna panel yielding TX beam peak:** | **Phase-centre offset from geometric centre of DUT of antenna panel yielding RX beam peak:** |
| (*x*off, *y*off, *z*off) | (*x*off, *y*off, *z*off) |

Alt 1-2-1-1: the 14dB link budget improvement is applicable to CFFNF and CFFDNF only; not DNF since MVG suggests a 30cm min range lengthAlt 1-2-1-2: manufacturers are not required to declare the antenna offset with CFFNF; if the phase centre offset is declared, the simple declaration, i.e., the single antenna that corresponds to FF beam peak, should be used. Alt 1-2-1-3: this approach would avoid any vendor declaration while leveraging the advantage of black&white box approach for many test cases.  |
| Issue 1-3-1: applicability of non-permitted methods | Alt 1-3-1-2: we cannot agree to limit the scope of test cases as agreed earlier; at this point, all test cases previously identified should be included given the improvements were considered potential. For instance, it is not clear why min output power (still non-zero relaxations) and OBW (MU still under discussion) have been excluded from the list.  |

### 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** |
| [R4-2100525](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100525.zip) | Keysight: As outlined earlier, more differentiation between black and black&white box is needed. We are willing to work with Apple on the TP. Concern with P3: DNF does not allow proper beam selection for black box and therefore should not be applicable to TRP.  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

## 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**  |
| Issue 1-1-1: conclusions related to the CFFNF system | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 1-1-2: conclusions related to the DNF system | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 1-1-3: remaining open issues with NF based solutions | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 1-2-1: feasibility and efficacy of manufacturer declarations | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 1-3-1: applicability of non-permitted methods | *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 |  |  |

*Scope of the WF:*

* *TBD*

### 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”* |
| [R4-2100525](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100525.zip) |  |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue or WF** | **Company comments**  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

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

# Topic #2: Solutions to minimize the impact of polarization basis mismatch between the TE and DUT on the RF testing

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [R4-2100526](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100526.zip) | Apple Inc. | **TP to TR38.884 on polarization mismatch** |
| [R4-2100571](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100571.zip) | Sony, Ericsson | **Views on solutions to minimize the impact of polarization basis mismatch**Observation 1: The TPC power command is also the only mechanism that the network can use to control the UE output power in real life.Observation 2: The power UP command has been adopted in the RF test to ensure the UE reaches its maximum output power.Proposal 1: Any potential command or setting (test mode) for the EIRP test enhancement shall be avoided. The Test Equipment shall use the same signaling/commands to the UE as used in a real network deployment.Proposal 2: There is no need to introduce additional test methods for Rel-15 nonCoherent UEs and Rel-16 nonCoherent UEs |
| [R4-2100664](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100664.zip) | LG Electronics | **Discussion on enhanced test method for polarization basis mismatch**Proposal 1: Introduce test mode to trigger Tx diversity as one of the hybrid methodsProposal 2: Do not introduce additional UE capability for hybrid methods and apply UE declaration for test mode to be used |
| [R4-2100699](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100699.zip) | MediaTek Inc. | **Practical TPMI and 2-port CSI-RS for FR2 SISO test enhancement**Observation 1: â€œpractical TPMIâ€ is aligned with networkâ€™s capability, and it can further enhance UE performance.Observation 2: â€œ2-port CSI-RSâ€ is a feasible test method and aligned with networkâ€™s capability, and it can further enhance UE performance.Proposal 1: For â€œTPMI methodâ€, â€œpractical TPMIâ€ shall be further applied.Proposal 2: For â€œTPMI methodâ€, â€œ2-port CSI-RSâ€ shall be further applied. |
| [R4-2100894](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100894.zip) | Samsung | **Discussion on FR2 EIRP measurement enhancement**Observation 1: TPMI method coverage is very limited. If TPMI method is not applicable for clause 6.2 of TS38.101-2, then TPMI method is only applicable for Rel-16 UEs which support uplink full power transmission to verify requirements in UL MIMO section.Observation 2: given limited coverage of TPMI method, it is necessary to further study other methods including EIRP measurement of UEs supporting TX diversity.Proposal 1: RAN4 further discuss if TPMI method is applicable for clause 6.2 of TS38.101-2 or not.Proposal 2: RAN4 further discuss EIRP measurement enhancement for core requirement in clause 6.2 of TS38.101-2 to reflect diversity gain as long as UE supports 2TX TPMI and/or TX diversity, and test mode is a reliable method by locking the 2TX transmission status. |
| [R4-2101759](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2101759.zip) | OPPO | **Solution to minimize the impact of polarization basis mismatch**Proposal []: For Rel-15 nonCoherent UEs and Rel-16 nonCoherent UEs which do not support full power transmission, the link antenna should keep transmitting with two polarizations simultaneously during EIRP measurement to avoid polarization basis mismatch. |
| [R4-2101830](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2101830.zip) | vivo | **TP to TR38.884 v0.1.0 on polarization basis mismatch** |
| [R4-2102090](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2102090.zip) | Rohde & Schwarz | **Discussion on FR2 UL demodulation measurements**Observation 1: Annex F of TS 38.101-2 and Annex E of TS 38.521-2 must be updated to accommodate the dual polarization measurements.Proposal 1: RAN4 agrees to define a zero-forcing MIMO receiver for FR2 UL EVM measurements.Proposal 2: The same receiver architecture shall be used for FR1 and FR2.Proposal []: |
| [R4-2102674](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2102674.zip) | Qualcomm Incorporated | **FR2 testability enhancement for polarization mismatch**Observation 1: Test modes must not be used as an avenue to trigger special UE behaviour that is not available during deployment conditions.Observation 2: The associated objective of the study item can be considered complete without identifying a test method enhancement for every UE type. |

## 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: EIRP measurements

**Issue 2-1-1: Remaining issues with the TPMI method**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 2-1-1-1: Apply practical TPMI method, as described in R4-2100699
		- Test facility sends suitable TPMI from TPMI table based on real channel condition
		- Practical TPMI is aligned with network’s capability, and it can further enhance UE performance
	+ Alt 2-1-1-2: RAN4 further discuss if TPMI method is applicable for clause 6.2 of TS38.101-2 or not
		- TPMI method coverage is very limited. If TPMI method is not applicable for clause 6.2 of TS38.101-2, then TPMI method is only applicable for Rel-16 UEs which support uplink full power transmission to verify requirements in UL MIMO section

**Issue 2-1-2: Proposals related to methods other than TPMI**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 2-1-2-1: Introduce test mode and UE declaration
		- Introduce test mode to trigger Tx diversity as one of the hybrid methods
		- Do not introduce additional UE capability for hybrid methods
		- Apply UE declaration for test mode to be used
	+ Alt 2-1-2-2: there is no need to introduce additional test methods for Rel-15 nonCoherent UEs and Rel-16 nonCoherent UEs
		- Any potential command or setting (test mode) for the EIRP test enhancement shall be avoided. The Test Equipment shall use the same signaling/commands to the UE as used in a real network deployment
		- The TPC power command is also the only mechanism that the network can use to control the UE output power in real life
	+ Alt 2-1-2-3: 2-port CSI-RS is a feasible test method enhancement
		- See R4-2100699 for the list of 6 clarifications related to the 2-port CSI-RS method
	+ Alt 2-1-2-4: RAN4 further discuss EIRP measurement enhancement for core requirement in clause 6.2 of TS38.101-2 to reflect diversity gain as long as UE supports 2TX TPMI and/or TX diversity, and test mode is a reliable method by locking the 2TX transmission status
	+ Alt 2-1-2-5: For Rel-15 nonCoherent UEs and Rel-16 nonCoherent UEs which do not support full power transmission, the link antenna should keep transmitting with two polarizations simultaneously during EIRP measurement to avoid polarization basis mismatch
	+ Alt 2-1-2-6: Test modes must not be used as an avenue to trigger special UE behaviour that is not available during deployment conditions
		- The associated objective of the study item can be considered complete without identifying a test method enhancement for every UE type

### Sub-topic 2-2: UL demodulation

**Issue 2-2-1: remaining issues with enhancements related to UL demodulation**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 2-2-1-1: enhance the test equipment receiver architecture, such that:
		- Annex F of TS 38.101-2 and Annex E of TS 38.521-2 must be updated to accommodate the dual polarization measurements
		- RAN4 agrees to define a zero-forcing MIMO receiver for FR2 UL EVM measurements
		- The same receiver architecture shall be used for FR1 and FR2

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Company Comments** |
| Issue 2-1-1: Remaining issues with the TPMI method | MediaTek: “Alt 2-1-1-1: Apply practical TPMI method, as described in R4-2100699.” is proposed, because it is based on agreed TPMI method and much aligned with real network behaviour, and can reflect real UE achievable performance. Besides, we think the TPMI method shall be applied to all Tx item test procedures, such as EVM, they all are actually relative. |
| Issue 2-1-2: Proposals related to methods other than TPMI | MediaTek: ”Alt 2-1-2-3: 2-port CSI-RS is a feasible test method enhancement” is further proposed. We clarify all raised issues in last meeting, and think it can be further applied on top of TPMI method to further enhance UE test result, that is much aligned to real network behavior. Again, we think the selected enhancement methods(s) shall be applied to all Tx item test procedures, such as EVM, they all are actually relative. |
| Issue 2-2-1: remaining issues with enhancements related to UL demodulation |  |

### 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** |
| [R4-2100526](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100526.zip) | **MediaTek:**We are fine to further revisit the CR together based on current content and overall discussion result this meeting. Besides, we think the selected measurement enhancement method shall be applied to all Tx item test procedures, such as EVM, they all are actually relative. |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| [R4-2101830](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2101830.zip) | **MediaTek:**We are not okay about the statement “only one precoding matrix (i.e. TPMI index 2 [1, 1]T) is selected for EIRP measurement”, as our clarification on “practical TPMI” and “dummy TPMI” in R4-2100699. |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

## 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**  |
| Issue 2-1-1: Remaining issues with the TPMI method | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 2-1-2: Proposals related to methods other than TPMI | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 2-2-1: remaining issues with enhancements related to UL demodulation | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
| #2 |  |  |

*WF scope: TBD*

### 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)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue or WF** | **Company comments**  |
|  |  |

## 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: Testability enhancements to support the verification of RF requirements for inter-band (FR2+FR2) CA

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [R4-2100096](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100096.zip) | Anritsu Corporation | **Impact of offset antenna to quiet zone in FR2 OTA chamber**Observation 1: An antenna pattern of the feed antenna mainly decides an electric field intensity and QoQZ.Observation 2: Impact of the offset antenna varies by a pattern of a feed antenna (amplitude taper).Observation 3: It is possible to limit the impact of the offset antenna to QoQZ by optimizing an antenna arrangement.Observation 4: It is possible to mitigate the impact of the offset antenna to QoQZ by improving a placement of antenna direction towards a reflector.Observation 5: As far as the UE is supporting the IBM, and both main antenna and offset antenna are arranged along with the q rotation of the positioner, it is possible to obtain the identical EIS results from either of the two antennas even with the inter-band CA tests.Observation 6: As far as the UE is supporting the IBM, and both main antenna and offset antenna are arranged along with the q rotation of the positioner, choice of relative UE beam direction should be same between the measurement from the main antenna and the offset antenna.Observation 7: There is a fair chance to apply the offset antenna test system also to the inter-band CA with CBM UE. |
| [R4-2100097](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100097.zip) | Anritsu Corporation | **TP to TR 38.884 on Inter-band DL CA in FR2**Proposal 1: It is proposed to approve the text proposal related to the feasibility of inter-band DL CA (FR2 + FR2). |
| [R4-2100527](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100527.zip) | Apple Inc. | **Impact of AoA offset on inter-band CA PSD difference**Observation 1: For CBM inter-band CA requirements, AoA offsets of up to 7 degrees between two FR2 CA component carriers increase the PSD difference between spatially filtered carriers by up to 1.7 dB. This effect compounts with the beam squint impairment.Proposal 1: The impact of AoA offset on the assumption of PSD difference for CBM CA made in the core requirement definition should be taken into account either together with the core requirement definition or as part of the measurement uncertainty and test tolerance for the applicable test case. |
| [R4-2102673](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2102673.zip) | Qualcomm Incorporated | **On impact of non-co-located test antennae for FR2 inter-band testing**Observation 1: For a given source antenna angular offset, it is possible to optimize the QZ illumination by adjusting distance between source and mirrorObservation 2: Band-selective beam tilt penalizes CBM inter-band UEs with dense beam packing.Observation 3: For a given source antenna angular offset from focus, it is possible to flatten the wavefront by optimizing the distance between source and mirror.Observation 4: It is advantageous for the antenna serving the highest frequency to be prioritized for ideal (on-focus) location.Observation []: captures a serious problem with utilizing an offset antenna approach for UEs that employ CBM. The mechanism impacts a UEâ€™s beam management differently based on probability of finding a beam boundary. Beam boundaries are intimately tied to UE design, so ultimately, the effects of offset antennae for CBM testing will manifest differently from UE design to UE design.Observation []: For a given source antenna angular offset it is possible to optimize the QZ illumination by adjusting distance between source and mirror.Observation []: implies that it is not feasible to expose the CBM UE to band-selective beam tilt and simultaneously put reasonable bounds on MU.Proposal []: An IFF test set up with multiple test antennae is feasible for inter-band CA testing of UEs with CBM limitation, but only for band combinations that share the same TE antenna. |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 3-1: Offset test antennae for FR2 inter-band testing

**Issue 3-1-1: offset antenna impact to QoQZ**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 3-1-1-1: Impact of the offset antenna varies by a pattern of a feed antenna (amplitude taper)
		- It is possible to mitigate the impact of the offset antenna to QoQZ by improving a placement of antenna direction towards a reflector
	+ Alt 3-1-1-2: recover desired QZ illumination by adjusting the source location distance from mirror in concert with angular offset

**Issue 3-1-2: potential to trigger different choice of optimum UE beam**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 3-1-2-1: choice of the relative UE beam direction from the viewpoint of UE should be same
		- As far as the UE is supporting the IBM, and both main antenna and offset antenna are arranged along with the θ rotation of the positioner, choice of relative UE beam direction should be same between the measurement from the main antenna and the offset antenna
		- Choice of the beam by UEs with common beam management (CBM) should be further studied
	+ Alt 3-1-2-2: on-focus offset source location optimization
		- For a given source antenna angular offset from focus, it is possible to flatten the wavefront by optimizing the distance between source and mirror
		- It is advantageous for the antenna serving the highest frequency to be prioritized for ideal (on-focus) location
		- An IFF test set up with multiple test antennae is feasible for inter-band CA testing of UEs with CBM limitation, but only for band combinations that share the same TE antenna

**Issue 3-1-3: impact on PSD difference**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 3-1-3-1: The impact of AoA offset on the assumption of PSD difference for CBM CA made in the core requirement definition should be taken into account either together with the core requirement definition or as part of the measurement uncertainty and test tolerance for the applicable test case
		- For CBM inter-band CA requirements, AoA offsets of up to 7 degrees between two FR2 CA component carriers increase the PSD difference between spatially filtered carriers by up to 1.7 dB. This effect compounts with the beam squint impairment.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Company Comments** |
| Issue 3-1-1: offset antenna impact to QoQZ | Anritsu: From both alt 3-1-1-1 and 3-1-1-2, we suppose that we can conclude that the impact of offset antenna to QoQZ can be mitigated within an acceptable range by a design of an antenna arrangement. A discussion regarding whether the different QoQZ MU needs to be applied compared to the single carrier case can be left to RAN5.  |
| Issue 3-1-2: potential to trigger different choice of optimum UE beam | Anritsu: We assume we can conclude at least for measurement with IBM UEs. i.e. There is a way to make IBM UEs to choose same relative beam direction and conduct spherical coverage tests properly like a single test antenna system. On a test for UEs supporting inter-band CA with CBM, there might be a limitation with the feasibility by the offset antenna test system. But this also relates to the current WI discussion on the necessity of spherical coverage requirements with CBM UEs supporting a same band group.  |
| Issue 3-1-3: impact on PSD difference |  |

### 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** |
| [R4-2100097](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100097.zip) | Anritsu: This TP needs a revision to capture contents from new contributions submitted to this meeting(R4-2100527 and R4-2102673).  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

## 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**  |
| Issue 3-1-1: offset antenna impact to QoQZ | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 3-1-2: potential to trigger different choice of optimum UE beam | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 3-1-3: impact on PSD difference | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
| #3 |  |  |

*Scope: TBD*

### 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)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue or WF** | **Company comments**  |
|  |  |

## 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 #4: Extreme temperature conditions for all applicable FR2 UE RF test cases

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [R4-2100098](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100098.zip) | Anritsu Corporation | **DUT repositioning during ETC measurement in FR2**Observation 1: Though the 3D scan of DUT under ETC is possible similar to NTC, there are cases that a test procedure may become complicated and test time takes longer than NTC when we need to reposition the DUT during beam peak search and spherical coverage test.Observation 2: The procedure to return to the normal temperature in a case the UE needs to be repositioned cannot be skipped to avoid malfunctions of the DUT and the positioner.Observation 3: A necessity of the DUT repositioning during beam search under ETC depends on the outcome of the current study with impacts of temperature on FR2 beamforming.Observation 4: Test time of beam peak search can be less than half under ETC if we can omit the DUT repositioning.Observation 5: From an idea that a UE shall be tested under the black box condition, and also a nature of the UE spherical coverage performance, DUT repositioning cannot be omitted during the spherical coverage test, which means that we need to accept a test time of spherical coverage under ETC becomes longer than NTC.Proposal 1: In a case an outcome of the study on impacts of temperature on FR2 beamforming has resulted that an EIRP/EIS beam peak position under ETC can be within a certain amount of ranges from the peak position under NTC, allow to limit the beam peak search range under ETC. The range to limit shall follow an outcome of the study above.Proposal 2: The group clarifies whether the spherical coverage test is really necessary under ETC. Companies are encouraged to bring views if an impact of temperature may really cause changes with the spherical coverage performance of the UE.Proposal []: The group should clarify whether the spherical coverage test is really necessary under ETC. Companies are encouraged to bring views if an impact of temperature may really cause changes with the spherical coverage performance of the UE. |
| [R4-2100528](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100528.zip) | Apple Inc. | **Impact of ET on measurement uncertainty and test tolerance of spherical coverage EIRP and EIS**Observation 1: The REFSENS requirement is derived under normal temperature condition (NTC) assumption and testing it in extreme temperature condition (ETC) will result in 0.5dB difference in noise floor.Observation 2: In addition to impact on thermal noise floor which impacts magnitude error, TX/RX VGA gain control and phase shifter loss variation also impact magnitude error. It is expected to observe 0.1 dB under NTC and 1.0 dB under ETC.Observation 3: Phase error from TX/RX VGA phase variation which impacts beam forming is 1.5Â° under NTC and 2.0Â° under ETC.Observation 4: RSRP measurement accuracy for RRM specification in FR2 is derived from TS 38.133 clauses 10.1.3 is 6 dB for NTC and 9 dB for ETC. The RRM requirement is defined as low SNR. The beam correspondence tolerance requirement is defined over the link angles â€œcorresponding to the top 50% of the EIRP measurement over the whole sphere.â€ This, the BC requirement is defined as high SNR, so RSRP error is expected to be less than 6 dB for NTC and less than 9 dB for ETC.Observation 5: Based on our initial simulations with all impairment models, maximum difference magnitude and angle in beam peak direction between ETC and NTC for worst case of 9 beam code books and 21 beam code books is 0.9 dB and 14Â°.Observation 6: With proposed procedure by locking beam peak in NTC, then apply ETC. RSRP error between ETC and NTC shall be negligible; however, the impact of magnitude error and phase error is expected. The maximum difference in beam peak direction between ETC and NTC with magnitude error and phase error for worst case of 9 beam code books and 21 beam code books is 0.7 dB and 12Â°.Proposal 1: Perform a beam peak search refinement over conical region spanning +/- 12Â° around beam peak direction which was found under NTC.Proposal 2: In case that the chamber isnâ€™t able to move positioner in conical region spanning +/- 12Â° inside a temperature control bubble, we propose to increase test tolerance for ETC by 0.9 dB for MOP and REFSENs test cases.Proposal 3: A simulation campaign is needed to quantify the impact of ETC on measurement uncertainty and test tolerance. RAN4 shall provide a recommendation to RAN5 based on the results. |
| [R4-2101828](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2101828.zip) | vivo | **Discussions on FR2 Extreme temperature conditions**Observation 1: The shape of reflector in IFF test system is very sensitive to the temperature variation, thermal deformation may appear if the isolation effect of the ETC enclosure is not Long-term stable for the time-consuming test case, e.g. EIS beam peak searching.Observation 2: The effect of the ETC enclosure surrounding the DUT may have impacts on the UE performance under ETC, which could be different under different frequency.Observation 3: For the EIRP or EIS values at low performance area of the CDF curve, the performance may be impacted greater under ETC, compare with the peak EIRP beam.Proposal 1: For IFF based ETC test system, the impacts on UE performance due to non-perfect isolation and electromagnetic wave absorption effect of ETC enclosure should be studied.Proposal 2: A MU element (systematic error) related to ETC testing of 3D scan is required. Analysis on the value of this MU element is encouraged.Proposal 3: The testing time under ETC 3D scan should also be considered.Proposal 4: In case the spherical coverage is tested under ETC, consider a 2dB relaxation in the spherical coverage requirement to address the impact of extreme temperature conditions. |
| [R4-2102617](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2102617.zip) | Keysight Technologies | **On extreme temperature condition testing**Proposal 1: For the IFF methodology with a 30cm Quiet Zone, set the MU element of Quality of Quiet Zone for FR2\_A and FR2\_B to [0.7]dB for Stage 2 (EIRP, EIS) and to [0.4]dB for Stage 1 (EIRP, EIS) for test cases with ETC.Proposal 2: For the IFF methodology with a 30cm Quiet Zone, introduce a new MU element (systematic error) â€˜Influence of ETC on EIRP/EISâ€™ based on the mean EIRP differences of the QoQZ measurements and set this MU element to [0.4]dB for FR2\_A and FR2\_B. Alternate approaches to further improve or completely compensate this systematic error, e.g., considering the difference of the P1 data compared to the mean of the QoQZ data, are FFS. The use case where the ETC environment is used for the NTC test cases, i.e., leveraging the ETC enclosure at all times for NTC and ETC test cases, is FFS.Proposal 3: Adjust the editor notes in 38.521-2 and remove statements that test procedure for EIRP/EIS beam peak extreme conditions are FFS.Proposal 4: RAN5 acknowledges that ETC shall be tested. The new target completion date for TE vendors to complete MU on ETC is RAN5#90-e.Proposal []: RAN4 should assume that ETC testing is feasible from a testability perspective for all applicable FR2 UE RF test casesProposal []: The restrictions in 38.101-2 that UE EIRP and EIS spherical coverage, Power control, EVM, and UE beam correspondence are not testable should be revised as the ETC testability has been confirmedProposal []: RAN4 to clarify whether other core requirements (different from the ones in Proposal 2) will require any relaxation in case of ETC |
| [R4-2102675](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2102675.zip) | Qualcomm Incorporated | **FR2 testability in ETC**Observation 1: A TE capable of testing at ETC must be capable of performing the 3D scan at any temperature and be able to hold the test temperature static.Observation 2: UE behaviour is already defined over ETC, so no further study on UE beam behaviour is necessary when using TE capable of testing at ETC.Proposal 1: RAN4 to establish tolerance around target temperature as limits for â€˜staticâ€™ thermal regulation by TE.Proposal 2: TE vendors are encouraged to share thermal regulation schemes and anticipated thermal regulation capabilities. |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 4-1

**Issue 4-1-1: impact on measurement system**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 4-1-1-1: For IFF based ETC test system, the impacts on UE performance due to non-perfect isolation and electromagnetic wave absorption effect of ETC enclosure should be studied
	+ Alt 4-1-1-2: In a case an outcome of the study on impacts of temperature on FR2 beamforming has resulted that an EIRP/EIS beam peak position under ETC can be within a certain amount of ranges from the peak position under NTC, allow to limit the beam peak search range under ETC. The range to limit shall follow an outcome of the study above.
	+ Alt 4-1-1-3: improvement to the test procedure is considered, as described in R4-2100528:
		- Perform a beam peak search refinement over conical region spanning +/- 12° around beam peak direction which was found under NTC
		- In case that the chamber isn’t able to move positioner in conical region spanning +/- 12° inside a temperature control bubble, we propose to increase test tolerance for ETC by 0.9 dB for MOP and REFSENs test cases
	+ Alt 4-1-1-4: test equipment capable of testing at ETC must be capable of performing the 3D scan at any temperature and be able to hold the test temperature static
		- RAN4 to establish tolerance around target temperature as limits for ‘static’ thermal regulation by test equipment
		- Test equipment vendors are encouraged to share thermal regulation schemes and anticipated thermal regulation capabilities

**Issue 4-1-2: impact on UE performance**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 4-1-2-1: In case the spherical coverage is tested under ETC, consider a 2dB relaxation in the spherical coverage requirement to address the impact of extreme temperature conditions
	+ Alt 4-1-2-2: The group clarifies whether the spherical coverage test is really necessary under ETC. Companies are encouraged to bring views if an impact of temperature may really cause changes with the spherical coverage performance of the UE
	+ Alt 4-1-2-3: The restrictions in 38.101-2 that UE EIRP and EIS spherical coverage, Power control, EVM, and UE beam correspondence are not testable should be revised as the ETC testability has been confirmed
		- RAN4 should assume that ETC testing is feasible from a testability perspective for all applicable FR2 UE RF test cases
	+ Alt 4-1-2-4: UE behaviour is already defined over ETC, so no further study on UE beam behaviour is necessary when using test equipment capable of testing at ETC

**Issue 4-1-3: impact on measurement uncertainty**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 4-1-3-1: A MU element (systematic error) related to ETC testing of 3D scan is required. Analysis on the value of this MU element is encouraged
	+ Alt 4-1-3-2: A simulation campaign is needed to quantify the impact of ETC on measurement uncertainty and test tolerance. RAN4 shall provide a recommendation to RAN5 based on the results
	+ Alt 4-1-3-3: RAN4 should assume that ETC testing is feasible from a testability perspective and that MUs will be finalized shortly in RAN5

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Company Comments** |
| Issue 4-1-1: impact on measurement system | Keysight:Alt 4-1-1-1: we believe these effects are included in the QoQZ MU with the “bubble” surrounding the reference antenna in all 7 reference positions. It was shown that the QoQZ MU difference with and without bubble is very small. Alt 4-1-1-2: we believe a full 3D scan should be performed to avoid vendor declarations or measurements within certain ranges. Alt 4-1-1-3: Based on the agreements in RAN5, it should be assumed that spherical coverage test in 3D can be performed and that no test tolerance adjustment is needed. Alt 4-1-1-4: we agree that a temperature tolerance is needed to consider the temperature “static.” We propose a +/-4C tolerance. Anritsu: Alt 4-1-1-1: Similar view with Keysight. The impacts of ETC enclosure can be seen by verifying the QoQZ MU. Actual MU discussion can be left to RAN5.Alt 4-1-1-2: Since anyway we need to run the beam peak search under NTC, we can reuse the result of the beam peak position when running the peak search under ETC, which does not require the vendor declaration for ETC. This is related to the topic of test time reduction and from a feasibility point of view, we are fine to choose either full 3D scan or limited scan. But the group needs to accept a trade-off in a case of full 3D scan since there is a need to reposition the DUT, and that requires more complicated test procedure especially under ETC.Alt 4-1-1-3: Spherical coverage test with 3D scan is feasible under ETC. So no need the proposed test tolerance.Alt 4-1-1-4: To decide temperature tolerance, we suppose following factors need to be considered, 1) an accuracy of temperature control by an air conditioner, 2) accuracy of a thermocouple to measure a temperature in the ETC enclosure, and 3) temperature deviation at the center of the QZ. The proposal of +/- 4 degrees C tolerance from Keysight looks reasonable to us but we would like to be a little careful and prefer to keep it in brackets for a moment to confirm from a product guarantee point of view.  |
| Issue 4-1-2: impact on UE performance | Alt 4-1-2-2: since spherical coverage is listed in the SID [RP-201862], we believe that has been confirmed already that spherical coverage test is necessary under ETCAlt 4-1-2-3: we support MediaTek:About spherical coverage (spherical EIRP/EIS), there is a note in Tx and Rx relative table in 38.101-2, the note concept is “the requirements in this table are verified only under normal temperature conditions as defined in Annex E.2.1.”. Hence, if we plan to verify spherical coverage under ETC, further discussion on requirement relaxation is needed due to ETC condition. Anritsu: Alt 4-1-2-2: Just to note, we are fine to run spherical coverage test under ETC. But it is just a matter of test time.Alt 4-1-2-3: Agree with the proposals. But the group should be careful before applying the ETC condition to all TCs.  |
| Issue 4-1-3: impact on measurement uncertainty | Alt 4-1-3-1: currently, a systematic MU element has already been defined in RAN5 [38.903]. Additional discussions will be held in the upcoming meeting on this systematic MU element. Alt 4-1-3-2: we believe these simulation results should be used to define impact of ETC on core requirements rather than impact of ETC on MU/TT. Alt 4-1-3-3: we support |

### 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**  |
| Issue 4-1-1: impact on measurement system | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 4-1-2: impact on UE performance | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 4-1-3: impact on measurement uncertainty | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
| #4 |  |  |

*Scope: TBD*

### 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)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue or WF** | **Company comments**  |
|  |  |

## 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 #5: Testability enhancements to support the verification of RF requirements for FR2 DL 256QAM

## Companies’ contributions summary

No contributions were submitted

# Topic #6: Testability enhancements to reduce test time

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [R4-2100161](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100161.zip) | Fraunhofer HHI, Fraunhofer IIS | **Test time reduction in FR2 using beam sweeping**Observation []:Issue to be addressed - reduction of measurement uncertainty.Observation []:Issue to be addressed - reduction of measurement time.Observation []:Beam sweeping can be used to reduce the time needed for FR2 testing.Observation []:Beam sweeping is used in the “Tx direction search and EIRP spherical coverage” conformance test.Observation []:Beam sweeping can be used to reduce the time needed for FR2 development testing.Observation []:Beam sweeping methods can be used to reduce the time needed for FR2 measurements which are at present undefined.Proposal []: As part of the enhanced test methods for FR2 study item, RAN4 should consider beam sweeping techniques as a method suitable for non-conformance tests (i.e., those beyond “Tx direction search and EIRP spherical coverage” [see TR 38.810 Sect. 5.2.1.3.7]) and for conformance tests which are as yet undefined. |
| [R4-2100245](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100245.zip) | Anritsu Corporation | **Test time reduction in OTA measurement**Observation 1: Declaration of an approximate beam peak location also has a benefit which simplifies a test procedure under the extreme temperature condition (ETC).Proposal 1: Add Option 7 to reduce test time of the Tx/Rx beam peak search. OEMs may declare search ranges where a beam peak is possibly located (e.g. hemisphere) along with applicable DUT alignment options. |
| [R4-2100665](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100665.zip) | LG Electronics | **Discussion on enhance test method to reduce FR2 OTA test time**Proposal 1: Introduce additional measurement grid based on 4X2 antenna array as Option 3Proposal 2: Update EIRP test for UL MIMO with single link polarization as Option 5Proposal 3: Need further study test procedure using single link polarization for ULFPTx mode UEObservation 1: RSRP measurement accuracy at each measurement grid point can be unstable due to UE beam direction.Proposal 4: Introduce concept of RSRPB based scan to Rx beam peak direction search instead of EIS based Rx beam peak search in RF test |
| [R4-2100895](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100895.zip) | Samsung | **Discussion on FR2 test time reduction**Observation 1: 4x2 antenna array assumption based measurement grid is a practical and promising candidate test time saving method for PC3 UE and test time could be saved for all TX and RX test cases.Observation 2: Our simulation based on 8x2 shows generally aligned results with that of TR38.810, and hence it is reliable for measurement grid derivation based on 4x2 array assumption.Observation 3: for RX beam peak search, the SNR is about 20dB better than -3dB and hence RSRP measurement accuracy is significantly improved.Observation 4: for RX beam peak search, RSRP accuracy at RX beam peak can be expected within 1dBObservation 5: UE determines RX beam based on RSRP measurement results ranking and EIS scan has not any contribution to RX beam selection.Observation 6: RX beam peak direction is defined based on RSRP in core specification and aligns with practical UE behaviour in filed.Proposal 1: reuse the simulation assumption and rules for measurement grid derivation in TR38.810 except changing the array configuration from 8x2 to 4x2.Proposal 2: based on simulation results of 4x2 antenna array assumption, constant step size grid with at least 422 grid points (corresponding to an angular step size of 12Âº) is adopted for beam peak search.Proposal 3: RAN4 adopts RSRP based approach into RX beam peak search test procedure.Proposal 4: Only one link polarization EIRP test should be allowed for 2TX scenarios in principle.Proposal 5: beam sweeping further enhancement is necessary to save FR2 antenna test time for development and industry, and can be considered as one of test time saving approaches for FR2 test method enhancement SI. |
| [R4-2101829](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2101829.zip) | vivo | **Discussions on Test Time Reduction for NR FR2 RF**Observation 1: The 8x2 reference antenna pattern does not represent the worst-case antenna patterns of FR2 PC3 smartphone UEs properly, which is grossly overestimated.Observation 2: It is reasonable to assume a narrower beam pattern (compared with typical FR2 smartphone with 4x1 or 2x2 antenna array) to derive FR2 measurement grids and MU assessment. But the adopted 8x2 antenna array is nearly 3 times thinner than the real case.Observation 3: The testing time of FR2 RF test case is dramatically increased, the main reason is the large number of measurement grid points, which is derived from the unreasonable FR2 UE antenna array assumption.Observation 4: If the measurement grids is derived based on new antenna assumption but without changing the MU of maximum standard deviation, then there is no impact on RAN5 FR2 MU and TT assessment work.Observation 5: Rx test cases are playing the dominate role of RF conformance testing time, which is several times longer than Tx test cases.Observation 6: For LTE SISO OTA, to reduce the testing time, the number of sampling points for Rx test case is much smaller.Proposal []: SEQ Proposal \\* ARABIC 1: Study whether the worst-case antenna pattern assumption (8x2) of PC3 smartphone UEs should be relaxed in order to reduce the min number of grid points and thus test time.Proposal 2: Revisit the worst-case antenna assumptions for smartphone UEs to a reasonable one could yield an improvement in test time by reducing the minimum number of test points without affecting the MU and TT in RAN5.Proposal []:Proposal 3: 4x2 antenna array should be selected as the reference assumption of FR2 PC3 for deriving measurement grid.Proposal 4: To reduce the testing time, the number of measurement sampling points for Rx should be defined smaller than Tx test cases.Proposal 5: Alternative search algorithms (e.g., coarse and fine measurement grid) could be adopted by UE declaration to improve beam peak search test time.Proposal 5: Alternative search algorithms (e.g., coarse and fine measurement grid) could be adopted by UE declaration to improve beam peak search test time. |
| [R4-2102088](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2102088.zip) | Rohde & Schwarz | **Discussion on test time reduction methods**Proposal 1: RAN4 agrees to allow the fast spherical coverage method as an optimized method for the spherical coverage tests. |
| [R4-2102401](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2102401.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Analysis on reduce test time for FR2**Observation 1: compared with 8x2, 4x2 UE antenna array assumption can significantly reduce the required grid number. For constant density grid, around 200 grids points seem to be able to meet the 0.5dB systematic error criteria.Observation 2: in case of 8x2 UE antenna array assumption, the simulation assumptions used in this document significantly reduce the required grid number, i.e. around 400 compared with 800 in TR38.810 Table G.2.3-3 for constant density grid.Proposal 1: in the WF [1], option2 and option3 with 4x2 array should be further studied considering the above results that 4x2 antenna array can significantly reduce the required number of measurement grids, compared with 8x2.Proposal 2: beside the â€œDetailed parameters of 4x2 antenna array assumption for PC3 should be aligned in next meetingâ€ [1], the simulation assumptions for 8x2 antenna array may also need to be discussed considering the above results that different assumptions can have very different required number of measurement grids, for the same 8x2 antenna array. |
| [R4-2102618](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2102618.zip) | Keysight Technologies | **On Test Time Enhancements based on different Antenna Array Assumptions**Observation 1: Revised antenna assumptions (4x2 vs 8x2) for PC3 devices yield a reduction of grid points of ~3 for beam peak searches.Proposal 1: Do not adopt the 4x2 array assumption to replace the worst-case 8x2 antenna assumption due to the impact in RAN5 and industryProposal 2: Keep the system-related assumptions unchanged in RAN5, i.e., based on the previously agreed worst case 8x2 assumptions.Proposal 3: Inform RAN5 via LS to allow only the beam peak search measurement grid requirements to be relaxed based on an optional vendor declaration. |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 6-1: Potential test time reduction techniques

*NOTE: each issue below corresponds to each option in the WF R4-2017597*

**Issue 6-1-1: beam sweeping techniques (Option 1)**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 6-1-1-1: beam sweeping further enhancement is necessary to save FR2 antenna test time for development and industry, and can be considered as one of test time saving approaches for FR2 test method enhancement SI
	+ Alt 6-1-1-2: Beam sweeping is used in the “Tx direction search and EIRP spherical coverage” conformance test.
		- it is envisioned that electronic beam sweeping techniques can be used to reduce the test time of measurements that are at present undefined, for example enhanced beam correspondence measurements and multi-beam measurements

**Issue 6-1-2: measurement grid based on 4x2 array antenna assumption for PC3 (Option 2)**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 6-1-2-1: reuse the simulation assumption and rules for measurement grid derivation in TR38.810 except changing the array configuration from 8x2 to 4x2
		- based on simulation results of 4x2 antenna array assumption, constant step size grid with at least 422 grid points (corresponding to an angular step size of 12º) is adopted for beam peak search
		- Beam peak search mean error results provided in R4-2100895; spherical coverage is FFS
	+ Alt 6-1-2-2: Study whether the worst-case antenna pattern assumption (8x2) of PC3 smartphone UEs should be relaxed in order to reduce the min number of grid points and thus test time
		- It is reasonable to assume a narrower beam pattern (compared with typical FR2 smartphone with 4x1 or 2x2 antenna array) to derive FR2 measurement grids and MU assessment. But the adopted 8x2 antenna array is nearly 3 times thinner than the real case
		- Revisit the worst-case antenna assumptions for smartphone UEs to a reasonable one could yield an improvement in test time by reducing the minimum number of test points without affecting the MU and TT in RAN5
	+ Alt 6-1-2-3: 4x2 antenna array can significantly reduce the required number of measurement grids, compared with 8x2
		- compared with 8x2, 4x2 UE antenna array assumption can significantly reduce the required grid number. For constant density grid, around 200 grids points seem to be able to meet the 0.5dB systematic error criteria
		- in case of 8x2 UE antenna array assumption, the simulation assumptions used in this document significantly reduce the required grid number, i.e. around 400 compared with 800 in TR38.810 Table G.2.3-3 for constant density grid
		- Simulation assumptions need to be discussed based on analysis in R4-2102401
	+ Alt 6-1-2-4: Do not adopt the 4x2 array assumption to replace the worst-case 8x2 antenna assumption due to the impact in RAN5 and industry
		- Keep the system-related assumptions unchanged in RAN5, i.e., based on the previously agreed worst case 8x2 assumptions
		- Inform RAN5 via LS to allow only the beam peak search measurement grid requirements to be relaxed based on an optional vendor declaration

**Issue 6-1-3: measurement grids based on 8x2 and 4x2 array antenna assumptions and UE declaration (Option 3)**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 6-1-3-1: Introduce additional measurement grid based on 4X2 antenna array as Option 3

**Issue 6-1-4: RSRP based RX beam peak search (Option 4)**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 6-1-4-1: Introduce concept of RSRPB based scan to Rx beam peak direction search instead of EIS based Rx beam peak search in RF test
		- RSRP measurement accuracy at each measurement grid point can be unstable due to UE beam direction
	+ Alt 6-1-4-2: RAN4 adopts RSRP based approach into RX beam peak search test procedure
		- for RX beam peak search, RSRP accuracy at RX beam peak can be expected within 1dB

**Issue 6-1-5: For EIRP test of UL MIMO including TX beam peak search, only one link polarization is enough (Option 5)**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 6-1-5-1: Only one link polarization EIRP test should be allowed for 2TX scenarios in principle
	+ Alt 6-1-5-2: Update EIRP test for UL MIMO with single link polarization as Option 5

**Issue 6-1-6: For EIRP test when TX diversity (dual polarization transmission) is activated, only one link polarization is enough (Option 6)**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 6-1-6-1: Only one link polarization EIRP test should be allowed for 2TX scenarios in principle
	+ Alt 6-1-6-2: Need further study test procedure using single link polarization for ULFPTx mode UE

**Issue 6-1-7: New options**

* Proposals
	+ Alt 6-1-7-1: Add Option 7 to reduce test time of the Tx/Rx beam peak search. OEMs may declare search ranges where a beam peak is possibly located (e.g. hemisphere) along with applicable DUT alignment options
		- Declaration of an approximate beam peak location also has a benefit which simplifies a test procedure under the extreme temperature condition (ETC)
	+ Alt 6-1-7-2: To reduce the testing time, the number of measurement sampling points for Rx should be defined smaller than Tx test cases
	+ Alt 6-1-7-3: Alternative search algorithms (e.g., coarse and fine measurement grid) could be adopted by UE declaration to improve beam peak search test time
	+ Alt 6-1-7-4: RAN4 agrees to allow the fast spherical coverage method as an optimized method for the spherical coverage tests
		- The procedure in R4-2102088 requires to measure at least 50% of the points (i.e. half-sphere) but also allows to measure only a reduced number of test points in the 2nd hemisphere in case the UE meets the limit before completing the whole scan

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Company Comments** |
| Issue 6-1-1: beam sweeping techniques (Option 1) |  |
| Issue 6-1-2: measurement grid based on 4x2 array antenna assumption for PC3 (Option 2) | Huawei2: * + Alt 6-1-2-3: 4x2 antenna array can significantly reduce the required number of measurement grids, compared with 8x2

Below left table is our further simulation results, compared with the results in R4-2102401(below right table), the difference of new results is “UE beam steering is not applied”. The new results are in line with TR 38810 section “G.2 Beam Peak Search Measurement Grids”.However, in the same TR 38810, section “5.2.1.3.7 TX Beam Peak direction search and EIRP Spherical Coverage”, UE applies “beam correspondence” during the test.So we propose to discuss whether UE beam steering/beam correspondence should be applied in the simulation of UE beam peak search?  w/o UE beam steering with UE beam steering (as in R4-2102401)MediaTek:We think “measurement grid based on 4x2 array antenna assumption for PC3” can be considered if we cannot achieve consensus on other potential methods. |
| Issue 6-1-3: measurement grids based on 8x2 and 4x2 array antenna assumptions and UE declaration (Option 3) |  |
| Issue 6-1-4: RSRP based RX beam peak search (Option 4) |  |
| Issue 6-1-5: For EIRP test of UL MIMO including TX beam peak search, only one link polarization is enough (Option 5) |  |
| Issue 6-1-6: For EIRP test when TX diversity (dual polarization transmission) is activated, only one link polarization is enough (Option 6) |  |
| Issue 6-1-7: New options | Anritsu:Alt 6-1-7-1: I withdraw a part of sentence above “Declaration of an approximate beam peak …” since we anyhow can reuse the beam peak search result under NTC when measuring under ETC. (Of course there needs to be a pre-condition that the peak position under ETC exists in close proximity from NTC.)Alt 6-1-7-4: Support the proposal since it is a reasonable choice as a procedure. |

### 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**  |
| Issue 6-1-1: beam sweeping techniques (Option 1) | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 6-1-2: measurement grid based on 4x2 array antenna assumption for PC3 (Option 2) | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 6-1-3: measurement grids based on 8x2 and 4x2 array antenna assumptions and UE declaration (Option 3) | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 6-1-4: RSRP based RX beam peak search (Option 4) | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 6-1-5: For EIRP test of UL MIMO including TX beam peak search, only one link polarization is enough (Option 5) | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 6-1-6: For EIRP test when TX diversity (dual polarization transmission) is activated, only one link polarization is enough (Option 6) | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| Issue 6-1-7: New options | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
| #6 |  |  |

### 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)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue or WF** | **Company comments**  |
|  |  |

## 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 #7: Testability aspects for the introduction of the new band n262

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| T-doc number | Company | Proposals / Observations |
| [R4-2100529](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100529.zip) | Apple Inc. | Extending the applicability of permitted methods to band n262**Document is withdrawn** |
| [R4-2102619](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2102619.zip) | Keysight Technologies | **On Testability for band n262**Observation 1: The abbreviated QoQZ scan with 14 measurement points shows good correlation with the full scan for the EIRP QoQZ MU.Observation 2: The preliminary QoQZ MU at 49Â GHz is within the example MU value defined in RAN5.Observation 3: Little to no increase in QoQZ MU is expected for 49Â GHz.Proposal 1: No additional MU elements are needed for n262 but several MU elements need to be further analysed. |
| [R4-2100530](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100530.zip) | Apple Inc. | **TP to TR38.884 on structure updates related to band n262**Proposal 1: It is proposed to approve the text proposal related to the structure updates related to band n262 testability. |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 7-1: uncertainty analysis

**Issue 7-1-1: further analysis of existing MU elements**

* Proposals:
	+ Alt 7-1-1-1: The preliminary QoQZ MU at 49 GHz is within the example MU value defined in RAN5
		- The abbreviated QoQZ scan with 14 measurement points shows good correlation with the full scan for the EIRP QoQZ MU
		- Little to no increase in QoQZ MU is expected for 49 GHz

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Company Comments** |
| Issue 7-1-1: further analysis of existing MU elements | Keysight: the revision of KS contribution R4-2102619 uploaded to the inbox replaced the preliminary MU results using an abbreviated QoQZ MU evaluation with results from a full QoQZ MU evaluation and confirmed that the sample QoQZ MU for n262 will not have to be raised. While the MU element will not increase, other test equipment and component based MU elements will need to be studied in more detail.  |

### 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** |
| [R4-2100530](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98_e/Docs/R4-2100530.zip) |  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

## 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**  |
| Issue 7-1-1: further analysis of existing MU elements | *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
| #7 |  |  |

### 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)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue or WF** | **Company comments**  |
|  |  |

## 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”* |
|  |  |