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# 1 Introduction

This is to report the result of the following email discussion in RAN2#111-e Meeting [1].

* [AT111-e][036][NR-R4] CSIRS L3 and RF FR1 (CATT)

Scope: Treat R2-2007001, R2-2007002, R2-2007065

Determine agreeable parts in a first phase, Agree CRs in a second phase

Deadline: Aug 26 0900 UTC, Intermediate deadlines by Rapporteur if needed.

The remainder of this document is organized as the following. The discussions are in Section 2 and the conclusions are summaried in Section 3.

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 CSI-RS based intra-frequency and inter-frequency measurement definition

Companies are invited to provide their views/comments on the following CRs in the following table.

R2-2007001‎ Correction on CSI-RS based intra-frequency and inter-frequency measurement definition CATT, ‎ZTE Corporation, Sanechips, Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-15‎ ‎38.300‎ ‎15.10.0‎ ‎0264‎ ‎-‎ F NR\_CSIRS\_L3meas

R2-2007002‎ Correction on CSI-RS based intra-frequency and inter-frequency measurement definition CATT, ‎ZTE Corporation, Sanechips, Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16‎ ‎38.300‎ ‎16.2.0‎ ‎0265‎ ‎-‎ F NR\_CSIRS\_L3meas

**Table 1**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Views:  Agree as is; Agree with changes; Disagree | Comments |
| Huawei | Agree | We support the CRs. |
| Intel | Agree | We also support the CRs |
| ZTE(LiuJing) | Agree(proponent) |  |
| Vivo(Chenli) | Agree |  |
| Ericsson (Pradeepa) | Agree |  |
| CATT(Da) | Agree(proponent) |  |
| MediaTek (Felix) | Agree R16 CR | We are not sure whether R15 CR is needed. Is it correct to agree a R15 CR with R16 WI code? |

**Phase 2**

**Proposed conclusion:**

Summary of the views

7 companies shared their views. Except 1 company, 6 companies explicitly agree with the CRs. 1 company agrees the R16 CR, but has some doubt on whether it’s nessary to have the R15 CR.

Rapporteur think in R15, the concept of CSI-RS based intra-frequency and inter-frequency‎ measurement has already been defined in 38.300. It’s no harm to correct the baseline concept and align the two versions of 38.300 in R15 and R16. Regarding to the WI code, since the changes are from RAN4 NR\_CSIRS\_L3meas WI, this WI code is also used for R15 CR.

According to the majority views, the following proposal is made.

**Proposal A To agree on the CRs in R2-2007001‎ and R2-2007002‎‎.**

Please provide your comments on Proposal A if you do NOT agree with it.

**Table 1a**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments if not agreeable |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.2 NR CA additional spectrum emission requirements

Companies are invited to provide their views/comments on the following CRs in the following table.

R2-2007065‎ NR CA additional spectrum emission requirements Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell CR Rel-16‎ ‎38.331‎ ‎16.1.0‎ ‎1775‎ ‎-‎ B NR\_RF\_FR1-Core

**Table 2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Views:  Agree as is; Agree with changes; Disagree | Comments |
| Huawei |  | Generally we agree the intention of introducing limitation for CA case. However, in LTE, there is a separate IE *additionalSpectrumEmissionSCell*, we are not sure if we need to do the same in NR or can use legacy field to cover non-CA and CA case. Also the description is not fully the same as it in LTE. In LTE it is “applicable for all serving cells (including PCell)”, in this CR “applicable for all serving cells (including PSCell)”, is the intention to also cover the DC case?  Besides, a wording change is suggested to be more precise in NR:  Network configures the same value in *additionalSpectrumEmission* for all uplink carrier(s)~~SCell(s)~~ of the same band with UL configured. |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| ZTE(LiuJing) | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Ericsson (Mattias) | Agree |  |
| CATT(Da) |  | We are fine with the CR. But we also have the same concern with Huawei. What is the intention to metion PSCell in this CR? |
| MediaTek (Felix) | Agree |  |

**Phase 2**

**Proposed conclusion:**

Summary of the views

7 companies shared their views. Except 2 companies, 6 companies explicitly agree with the CR. 2 company agrees the intention of the CR, but would like to further discuss the detail wordings, e.g., with the changes as following and clarification on the intention of including PSCell.

“Network configures the same value in *additionalSpectrumEmission* for all uplink carrier(s)~~SCell(s)~~ of the same band with UL configured.”

According to the majority views, the following proposal is made.

**Proposal B To agree on the CR in R2-2007065‎, with the change from ‎‎SCell(s) to uplink carrier(s) and the clarification on the intention of including PSCell‎.**

Please provide your comments on Proposal B if you do NOT agree with it.

**Table 2a**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments if not agreeable |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Conclusion

TBD
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