**3GPP TSG-RAN** **WG2 Meeting #111-e R2-200xxxx**

**Electronic, 17th – 28th August 2020**

**Agenda Item: 6.1.2**

**Source: China Telecom**

**Title: Summary of offline 019 UE cap UL TX switching**

**Document for: Discussion and decision**

# Introduction

This document summarizes the following offline discussion.

* [AT111-e][019][NR16] UE cap UL TX switching (China Telecom)

Scope: Treat R2-2006985, 7604, 7949, 7085, 8106, 7086, 7950, 7087, 6895, 6896

Deadlines: Short UE Caps

This offline discussion includes contributions [1]-[10] which were moved from 6.15.

Rapporteur suggests to divide to discussion into two phases:

Phase I: solution selection, Deadline 2020-08-19 19:00 UTC

Phase II: CR/LS details, Deadline 2020-08-21 07:00 UTC

# Discussion

## Remaining issues for UE capability report

In RAN2#110e meeting, the following agreement on UE capability reporting was achieved,

* In the new BC list, the UE reports a mixed UE capability which exceeds its total Tx number, e.g., 1Tx on carrier 1 and 2 Tx on carrier 2 and relies on NW side to figure out 1Tx+2Tx can only be used in a TDM manner.

The remaining issue whether report 1T+1T capability in new BC list for option2 was discussed in [1][2][3][4].

**Issue 1: whether report 1T+1T capability in new BC list for option2.**

[2] thought there is no particular use of advertising 1Tx+1Tx or 0Tx+2Tx in *BandCombination-UplinkTxSwitch-r16* and proposed that

* The band combinations where UL Tx switching is supported can only contain two UL carriers, where 1Tx is advertised on one of the carriers and 2Tx is advertised in the other carrier.

[3] had an observation that whether to report 1T+1T in addition to agreed 1T+2T UE capability is the specific issue for inter-band CA/EN-DC option2 and proposed that

* RAN2 to confirm apart from the agreed 1T+2T UE capability there is no need to report 1T+1T UE capability in new BC list specific for inter-band CA/EN-DC option2.

[4] thought it is unclear whether some capabilities would make a difference when carrier 2 switches to 1Tx, and proposed that

* Send a LS to RAN1/RAN4 for ask in Option 2 for carrier 2, whether 1Tx UE capability can be derived from 2Tx UE capability.

Therefore, there are two potential solutions for this issue:

* **Solution 1-a: no need to report 1T+1T UE capability in new BC list specific for option2 [2][3].**
* **Solution 1-b: send a LS to RAN1/RAN4 for ask in Option 2 for carrier 2, whether 1Tx UE capability can be derived from 2Tx UE capability [4].**

Please note the deadline for the solution selection, i.e., Question 1, is 2020-08-19 19:00 UTC. IF Solution 1-b is preferred, we would discuss the LS details then and the LS discussion deadline will be 2020-08-21 07:00 UTC. [6] provided a draft LS.

**Question 1: do companies prefer Solution 1-a or Solution 1-b? Any comments?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Solution 1-a/ Solution 1-b/  other | Comments if there is any |
| Ericsson | Other | We do not think the new BC list is necessary and it is obvious that it creates new problems (e.g. fallback issues).  A UE supporting option 2 shall indicate the corresponding band combinations in the legacy list, since this is what a legacy gNB can use (UL CA with 1 layer on each carrier). We see no need to convey the same information in a new band combination list. |
| OPPO | 1-b | So the problem is whether RAN2 can ensure in option-2 for carrier-2, the reported 2-Tx capability can be used to derive the 1-Tx capability (here the 1-Tx is for the capability of carrier-2 when UL-switching is configured, and even NW would check the old BC-list to find the 1-Tx capability, it is not sure whether the 1-TX capability in old BC list for TX-switching not being configured is the same as the 1-TX capability for TX-switching being configured).  We believe it is out of the scope of RAN2, so that a LS to RAN1/4 is a safer way to solve this. |
| Huawei | Prefer 1-a, but can accept 1-b | Based on previous agreement that UE will anyway report 1T@carrier1+2T@carrier2 UE capabilities in new BC list, we think it is possible to derive 1T @carrier2 UE capability for Option-2. **Note that there is not much ambiguity of 1T capability, so we think it is possible to derive 1T cap from 2T cap, but NOT the case to derive 2T cap form 1T cap.**  But we also understand the concerns raised by companies, so we are also ok to send LS to RAN4/RAN1 for further issue checking. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated (Masato) | 1-a | Reporting UE capabilities for 1T+2T is sufficient. |
| CMCC | 1-a | In our view, 1Tx can be derived from the 2Tx capability. If UE report support of option2, and UE report 1Tx in carrier 1 and 2Tx in carrier 2, it means UE supports switching between 1Tx+1Tx and 0Tx+2Tx. So we don’t see the necessity to send the LS. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 1-a | The network should already have all knowledge necessary for the 1T+1T case:   1. Since the BC in question is in the UL TX switching BC list, it’s known that the BC is only relevant for UL Tx switching. Therefore, network knows how to interpret the capabilities for the BC. 2. The UE capability for option1 and option 2 (i.e. the field uplinkTxSwitching-OptionSupport-r16) indicates what UE supports for Case2 operation.   Based on these, we think it’s already clear the existing signalling can support 1T+1T and no LS is needed. |
| CATT  (Da) | 1-a, but can consider 1-b | We should rely on the previous agreements. If other companies also want to check with RAN1/4, we are also OK for LS. |
| MediaTek (Felix) | 1-b | We also assume 1-a works but it is seems safer to ask RAN1/4. |
| Intel  (Youn) | 1-b | Since it is complicated feature, it would be safe to ask RAN1/4. |
| ZTE(LiuJing) | 1-a | We also think the reporting 1T+2T capability is sufficient, the network can derive the 1T+1T and 0T+2T capability from it, and LS is not needed. |
| Futurewei (Hao) | 1-a | The current agreement of 1T+2T in UL switching BC list should already carry sufficient information for network to derive configuration for 1T on 2nd carrier of option 2.  We can send LS to inform RAN1/4 our decision, and check if they’d have issue. |

There is a sequent issue raised in [2] for the UE capability signalling structure. [2] thought there is no particular advantage between indicating support of UL Tx switching in *BandCombination-UplinkTxSwitch-r16* rather than using *BandCombinationList*, and proposed that

* RAN2 to discuss whether it is still beneficial to keep a separate band combination list for the support of UL Tx switching.

We discussed the problem that introducing a new BC list for UL Tx switching or using legacy BC list in RAN2#109bis-e [12] and RAN2#110e [13]. The majority choose to introduce a new BC list, which was agreed to introduce a new BC list [14], because of the following concerns for using legacy BC list:

-backward compatibility,

-fallback BC supporting UL Tx switching when its superset BC without such capability,

-difficulty to identify the specific parameters impacted by UL Tx switching.

According to the proposal of [2], the question would be re-opened as whether keep a separate band combination list for the support of UL Tx switching or use the legacy BC list, which is aligned with the motivation of the proposal of [2] in Rapporteur’s understanding. If there is any analysis of pros and cons for either option, companies can offer it in the below table.

**Issue 2: whether keep a separate band combination list for the support of UL Tx switching or use the legacy BC list.**

Please note the deadline for Question 2 is 2020-08-19 19:00 UTC. If we need corresponding CRs, we would discuss the CRs details then and the CRs discussion deadline will be 2020-08-21 07:00 UTC. [2] provided a text proposal for using legacy BC list.

**Question 2: do companies prefer to keeping a separate band combination list for the support of UL Tx switching or using the legacy BC list? Any comments, including analysis of pros and cons?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Keep New BC list/  use legacy BC list | Comments if there is any |
| Ericsson | Use legacy BC list | We think that 1+1 case is signalled in the legacy list and the 2+0 case is also signalled in the legacy list as two separate FeatureSetEntries. The **legacy** gNB can “switch” between those configurations by means of RRC configuration (i.e. not using DCI signalling for UL TX switching which we are doing now).  The open question then becomes how signal to the **new** gNB that the UE supports UL TX switching on these FeatureSetEntries. We think new fields can be added to the FeatureSetEntry corresponding to 1+1. These new fields would indicate that the UE supports switching to 2+0 and/or 0+2 (in the corresponding FeatureSetUplinkPerCC).  This structure would also   * resolve the issue of the implicit fallbacks as the legacy gNB sees the band combinations as usual * have less signalling overhead * be easier to maintain as there is no need to add the same future fields to both lists. |
| OPPO | New BC list | We do not see motivation to revert the previous agreement on this. |
| Huawei | New BC list | We do not see motivation to revert the agreement of new BC list either.  We doubt it is even feasible to use the method proposed in [2], as only *FeatureSetUplinkPerCC* is extended to include MIMO layer capability. We think there are other UE capabilities outside of *FeatureSetUplinkPerCC* can also be different in UL Tx switching case (2T@carrier2), compared with normal CA operation (1T@carrier2). In this case, we need to check all the capabilities reported per BC case by case.  Whether to use a new BC list or legacy BC list was raised long time ago, and has been fully discussed and evaluated. After that, we made the agreement to introduce new BC list. The current signalling structure designed based on the new BC list works well, we do not agree to revert it and pursue an unclear solution at this stage. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated (Masato) | New BC list | Do not see a strong reason to overturn the previous agreement.  As indicated in the previous section, we do not see the need of indicating UE capabilities separately for 0T+1T, 1T+1T and so on. |
| CMCC | New BC list | RAN2 already agreed to introduce new BC list for UL Tx switching. We prefer to not revert the previous agreement |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | New BC list | We think the already-agreed list can work as well. The case when UE “switches” between the new and legacy BC list always happens via RRCReconfiguration. The FSC for both cases can also be indicated in the new BC list.  However, we have some sympathy for the Ericsson proposal as in general RAN2 should avoid using separate BC lists. But it seems to us that in this case, reusing the legacy list might create additional difficulties. |
| CATT  (Da) | New BC list | We think the current CR can work well. No big motivation to revert it. |
| MediaTek (Felix) | New BC list, but | So far we do not see strong motivation to revert the agreement but would be open to discuss if there is issue in current structure. |
| Intel  (Youn) | New BC list | It would be good to have a common signaling in general but the last moment structure change would cause additional issues. For example, we may also ask RAN1/RAN4 that the separate capability of 1T+1T and 0+2T in the normal operation can be the same capabilities in dynamic switching between 1T+1T and 0+2T. Also, the UE may choose not to support 0+2T in normal mode than Tx switching. Using normal BC cannot support this case. |
| ZTE(LiuJing) | New BC list | We don’t see strong motivation to revert the previous agreement. |
| Futurewei (Hao) | New BC list | We are afraid that there’d be another list of issues to check with RAN1/4 about the capability compatibility between TX switching and non-switching cases.  Given this issue has been discussed and decided for quite time, we shouldn’t change it at this stage of Rel-16. |

## Fallback band combinations

In last RAN2 meeting, RAN2 made the following agreements:

* Do not consider the lower order band combination from the parent band combination with UL Tx switching as fallback band combination.
* Confirm that for a parent band combination without UL Tx switching, UE is allowed to report a lower order band combination with UL switching.

The issue how to interpret fallback BC in new BC list in [1][2][3][4][5].

**Issue 3: how to interpret fallback BC in new BC list.**

For issue 3, we can directly go to the details of the corresponding CRs or TPs in [7] (R2-2007950, which has been revised to R2-2008100[11] with updating source companies), [8] and [5]. The changes are copied under the solutions respectively.

**Solution3-a: Changes for 38.306 in [11].**

| ***supportedBandCombinationList-UplinkTxSwitch***  Defines the NR inter-band UL CA, SUL and/or EN-DC band combinations where UE supports dynamic UL Tx switching. UE only includes this field if requested by the network. A lower order band combination not including a band pair supporting UL Tx switching reported in the parent band combination is not considered to be a fallback band combination of the parent band combination. For an inter-band UL CA band combination that supports UL Tx switching, the UE shall also support the inter-band UL CA without UL Tx switching in a band combination with the same band entries. | UE | No | No | No |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

**Solution3-b: Changes for 38.306 in [8].**

| ***supportedBandCombinationList-UplinkTxSwitch***  Defines the NR inter-band UL CA, SUL and/or EN-DC band combinations where UE supports dynamic UL Tx switching. UE only includes this field if requested by the network.  Lower order band combinations with only carrier 1 or only carrier 2 from parent band combination with UL Tx switching are not considered as fallback band combinations. | UE | No | No | No |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

**Solution3-c: Changes for 38.306 and 38.331 in [5].**

Changes for 38.306 in [5]:

| ***supportedBandCombinationList-UplinkTxSwitch***  Defines the NR inter-band UL CA, SUL and/or EN-DC band combinations where UE supports dynamic UL Tx switching. UE only includes this field if requested by the network. A fallback band combination resulting from the reported band combination, which includes at least carrier 1 and carrier 2 for a band pair supporting UL TX switching, shall be supported by the UE. | UE | No | No | No |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

[5] also proposed that

* Clarify in 38.331 that no need to consider UL-switching during removal of fallback-BC, so that lower order band combination (e.g., band A/B-only) can be removed as fallback-BC of the parent band combination reported in *supportedBandCombinationList* even if the the same patent band combination supports UL-switching (i.e., is also reported in *supportedBandCombinationList-UplinkTxSwitch*), and agree either Alt-1 or Alt-2 of the TP in Annex-I,

and provided the text proposal for 38.331 by adding either one of the following two notes to 38.331 5.6.1.4:

* **Alt-1:** NOTE 5: UL TX switching capability is not taken in account when evaluating “the same capabilities of another band combination”.
* **Alt-2:** NOTE 4: When compiling the list of “candidate band combinations”, for a same band combination supporting UL TX switching, two separate entries for the band combination shall be included, for with and without UL TX switching capability.

**Question 3a: For 306, which solution do companies prefer? Any comments or other text proposals?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Solution 3-a/ Solution 3-b/  Solution 3-c/  other | Comments /other text proposals |
| Ericsson | Other | If we go for a single band combination list (see previous question), there is no fallback issue.  According to clause 5.6.1.4 of 38.331 a band combination is only removed (i.e. not signalled) if it supports only **the same** capabilities as its parent band combination. That means that if a child band combination supports UL TX switching, but its parent band combination does not, the UE shall signal both of them. There is no need for any further clarification.  The actual fallback problem arises if we keep the new list and if the UE includes a band combination in the new list but omits the corresponding band combination, but without supporting UL TX Switching, from the legacy list. If the corresponding band combination is implicitly supported (i.e. not signalled), the legacy gNB would not understand it. We do not think this issue is addressed by any of the solutions above.  Furthermore, the current procedure in clause 5.6.1.4 is probably not correct as the UE would add band combinations for UL TX Switching to the legacy band combination list only or add them to both lists. |
| OPPO | 3-c | Firstly, our understanding is that for a BC supporting UL-switching, it has to be reported in both old and new BC list, in order for backwards compatibility of legacy gNB. When it is reported in the old BC list, it only includes the capability for UL-switching not configured.  The problem is if a patent-BC supports UL-switching, how for NW to assume the capability of child-BC (contains only carrier-1/2) not supporting UL-switching. We understand the main intention of 3-a/b/c are the same, i.e., from network perspective, when it receives the reported UE capability in the new BC list, it is not to be used for the fallback BC (only carrier-1 or only carrier-2) when UL-switching is not configured.  However, 3a/b describes the intention in a way to re-define the definition of fallback BC: *lower order band combination.. is not considered as fallback band combination*. But the fallback-BC is not defined per-BC-list, but is defined in a BC-list-agnostic way – “**Fallback band combination:** A band combination that would result from another band combination by releasing at least one SCell or uplink configuration of Scell, or SCG. An intra-band non-contiguous band combination is not considered to be a fallback band combination of an intra-band contiguous band combination.”. And in 331, the definition is used to remove the fallback-BC entries from the “candidate BC list”, before setting the old/new BC list, i.e., the usage of the “fallback BC” definition has nothing to do with the old/new BC list at all. |
| Huawei | 3-a | [Proponent]  We understand the intention of three solutions is the same, so we are open to discuss the wording.  In response to Ericsson’s comments, we also share the same view with OPPO that UE can report normal capabilities (without UL Tx switching) in legacy BC list and UL Tx switching capabilities in new BC list for the same BC. And legacy/new network looks into legacy BC list for normal UE capabilities while new network looks into new BC list for UL Tx switching capabilities. The fallback BC will not cross legacy BC list and new BC list. Therefore, UE will not omit any BC from legacy BC list. This is also our initial intention to decouple legacy BC list and new BC list to avoid any misalignment/interoperability issues between UE and network. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated (Masato) | 3-c | Positive sentence which is easy to understand. |
| CMCC | Slightly prefer 3-a | We agree that the intention of 3 options are the same. The wording can be further discussed.  We slightly prefer option 3-a, which further clarifies that“  For an inter-band UL CA band combination that supports UL Tx switching, the UE shall also support the inter-band UL CA without UL Tx switching in a band combination with the same band entries.” |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 3-c | Same view as Qualcomm.  The text could make it clearer that UL Tx switching shall be supported also for the fallback combinations containing carrier1 and carrier2. |
| CATT  (Da) | Slightly prefer 3-a or 3-c | We tend to agree the intention of the 3 options to support fallback BC for UL Tx switching. The detail wording can be further discussed during the CR discussion.  For 3-a, it’s better to change into a positive sentence‎.  For 3-c, it’s better to add some clarification on inter-band UL CA band combination case similar as 3-a. |
| MediaTek (Felix) | 3-a and 3-c | The intention of all proposals seems the same. Maybe better to combine 3-a and 3-c as following.  “A fallback band combination resulting from the reported band combination, which includes at least carrier 1 and carrier 2 for a band pair supporting UL TX switching, shall be supported by the UE. For an inter-band UL CA band combination that supports UL Tx switching, the UE shall also support the inter-band UL CA without UL Tx switching in a band combination with the same band entries.” |
| Intel  (Youn) | 3-a and 3-c | Agree with MediaTek. It would be good to provide more descriptions especially for the feature is complicated like this. |
| ZTE(LiuJing) | 3-a and 3-c | We also think the intention of 3 options are the same. We prefer 3-a, because it covers two aspects,  If most companies prefer a positive sentence (3-c), we are also fine with it. And the merged version from MediaTek looks good to us. |
| Futurewei (Hao) | 3-a and 3-c | The 3 versions share similar intention. And MediaTek’s merging of 3a and 3c seems to be a good baseline. |

**Question 3b: For 331, which solution do companies prefer? Any comments or other text proposals?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes change is needed (and in this case, would 3-c is preferred or some other option) / No change is not needed | Comments /other text proposals |
| OPPO | Yes, 3-c | As clarified in 8106, now following the procedural text 331, when the UE composes the “candidate BC list”, for a BC A+B supporting UL switching, the fallback BC entry of A-only and B-only cannot be removed although it should be.  The change in 3-c is to clarify that:   1. To confirm the A/B-only should be removed from the candidate BC list, when the procedural text in 331 is used; 2. And to remove A/B-only, since the current 331 procedural text cannot achieve that, how to clarify/revise the text in order to achieve it. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated (Masato) |  | It is not a good idea to make all this hidden in RRC procedural text. Prefer to capture the intended behaviour in 38.306. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |  | Agree with Qualcomm: 38.306 seems the most natural place for this requirement. |
| Futurewei (Hao) |  | We understand the intention, but also see explicit clarification in 38.306 better than somewhat convoluted procedural text in 38.331. |

## Introducing power boosting in UL Tx switching CA case

In the RP#88e meeting, the support of power boosting for CA case was discussed. The following exception sheet [2] and the WF [3] were approved/endorsed during the meeting.

The exception sheet for NR\_RF\_FR1 included the following bullet as

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2:   * The capability to indicate support of power boosting for CA case, and the RRC signalling to indicate whether such power boosting for CA case is allowed will be specified. |

The corresponding part of the WF is copied as below,

|  |
| --- |
| For RAN2, the capability to indicate support of power boosting for CA case, and the RRC signaling to indicate whether such power boosting for CA case is allowed will be specified in Q3, while keep the RAN2 CR pack to this RAN plenary as approved. The capability for 3dB power boosting is defined per band combination. No spec change for RAN2 RRC procedures and MAC procedures. Send the LS to RAN2 in this RAN plenary. |

As indicated above, RAN2 should specify the UE capability and RRC configuration when the UE supports power boosting for CA case in UL Tx switching.

**Issue 4: Introducing power boosting in UL Tx switching CA case.**

For issue 3, we can directly go to the details of the corresponding CRs [9][10] or TPs for RRC configuration in [2]. [2] proposed that

* a single field is included per band combination to indicate support of power boosting for CA case. This field can only be present if UL Tx switching is supported in the band combination.

The changes for the capability to indicate support of power boosting for CA case are provided in [9] for 38.306 and [10] for 38.331.

**Solution4-a: the changes of 38.306 and 38.331 for the capability to indicate support of power boosting for CA case in [9][10].**

**Question 4: do companies agree with the changes for the capability to indicate support of power boosting for CA case are provided in [9] for 38.306 and [10] for 38.331? Any comments or text proposals?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | yes/yes but…/no | Comments/ text proposals |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm Incorporated (Masato) | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes but... | We have some comments for both CRs:  38.331  - There’s no need to repeat the same text in both 38.331 and 38.306. The 38.331 field description could be simpler so we propose the following: "*Indicates whether the UE is allowed to use 3dB boosting for the maximum output power for transmission for the 2-port transmission in carrier2 with UL Tx switching. This only applies in inter-band UL CA case.*"  38.306:  The text is a bit complicated also here and is missing the linkage to the primary capability. Hence, we would propose the following:  “*Indicates UE supports 3dB maximum output power boosting for UL Tx switching for carrier2 with 2-port transmission. This capability is only applicable for UL Tx switching in uplink inter-band CA case with power Class 3 as defined in TS 38.101-1 [2]. UE indicating this capability shall also indicate support for UL TX switching for at least one band combination.*” |
| CATT  (Da) | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | We are basically fine with CR R2-2006895 and R2-2006896. Please fix the typo in the field descriptions.  ***uplinkTxSwitchingPowerBoosting***  Indicates whether the UE is allowed to enable 3dB boosting on the maximum output power for transmission under the operation state in which 2-port transmision can be supported on carrier2 in case of inter-band UL CA case in dynamic UL Tx switching. Network can only configure this field in inter-band UL CA case where UE supports dynamic UL Tx switching and power boosting, and nework can only configure this field in case UE power class for uplink inter-band CA is Class 3 as defined in TS 38.101-1 [15].  [ZTE] Thanks for reminding, will be fixed. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | Proponent.  Regarding the comments from Nokia, we actually think it is not correct to simplify the wording into “2-port transmission”. The conclusion made in RANP(RP-201365) is “power boosting for carrier 2 with 2Tx for transmission in Case 2”. And based on the agreed RAN1 table, for carrier2 with 2Tx in Case2, both 1P and 2P transmission are supported. We understand the current wording is a bit complex, but it is aligned with the wording “Case2” in RAN1 spec.  Hope above explanation can solve the concern.  While for the comment on adding “*UE indicating this capability shall also indicate support for UL TX switching for at least one band combination.*” to TS38.306. Since the capability is defined as per-BC level and included in the new BC list, seems such condition is naturally fulfulled. Please correct me if I misunderstand your point. |
| Futurewei  (Hao) | Yes |  |

The changes forthe RRC signaling to indicate whether such power boosting for CA case is allowed are provided in [10] and [2] in different ways. [10] introduced a single field *uplinkTxSwitchingPowerBoosting* while [2] proposed that the field *uplinkTxSwitchingCarrier* is used to indicate the configuration of power boosting for CA.

**Solution4-b: introduce a signle field *uplinkTxSwitchingPowerBoosting* to indicate the configuration of power boosting for** **UL Tx switching CA case as the changes of 38.331 in [10].**

**Solution4-c: use the field *uplinkTxSwitchingCarrier* to indicate the configuration of power boosting for UL Tx switching CA case as the changes of 38.331 in section 5.2 of [2].**

**Question 5: do companies prefer Solution4-b or Solution4-c for the RRC signaling to indicate whether such power boosting for UL Tx switching CA case is allowed? Any comments or text proposals?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Solution4-b/Solution4-c/other | Comments/ text proposals |
| Ericsson | Solution 4-c | We can also accept solution 4-b. |
| OPPO | 4-b | proponent |
| Huawei | 4-b |  |
| Qualcomm Incorporated (Masato) | 4-b |  |
| CMCC | 4-b | 4-b is more clear |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 4-b | It seems that with 4-c, UE supporting the boost always be allowed to use it, which removes all network control from it. In contrast, 4.b allows network to decide when to use the boosting, which is why we think it’s better to retain network control over the feature (as not all networks may want to use it). |
| CATT  (Da) | 4-b |  |
| MediaTek (Felix) | 4-b |  |
| Intel | 4-b |  |
| ZTE | 4-b |  |
| Futurewei | 4-b | Agree with Nokia. |

# 3 Conclusions

Based on the discussion above, we have the following proposals.
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