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# Introduction

This document is a summary of the following email discussion,

*Goal: Generate an agreeable SID*

*Input contributions covered: 2284, 2285*

*Moderator: Basaier Jialade*

**Final deadline for technical comments**: 12:29h UTC 10th December

# Discussion

**RP-202284**

Title: **New SID: Study on high power UE (power class 2) for one NR FDD band**

Agenda Item: 9.1.4

For: Approval

Source: China Unicom

SI Objectives

The objectives of the SID are as follows:

1. Study the applicable scheme(s) for new power class 2 UE for one NR FDD band to comply with the SAR limits with 26dBm UE Tx power, the example band for this study is NR band n1.
2. Study interference issues (e.g. self-desense, cross device coexistence…).
3. Study the possible UE implementations, e.g. RF front-end capability, UE architectures, etc., in achieving 26dBm in FDD bands.

Companies are encouraged to provide their views on the objectives.

2.1 Initial Email Discussion

1. Comments about the objectives of the SID:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective 1** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| Apple | There is no duty cycle concept in FDD bands. P-MPR would limit the UE maximum output power to no more than 23 dBm to fulfill the SAR requirement. |
| LGE | It is quite different operating scenarios between PC2 for FDD+TDD DC UE and PC2 UE in a single carrier NR FDD band.  In PC2 DC UE, the max power is 23dBm for FDD LTE band, but the max output power in FDD NR band is 26dBm in this WID. So need to study the SAR regulatory requirements where 26dBm power class in FDD bands is allowed. |
| Qualcomm | This objective could be ok, however, based on the discussions so far, it seems difficult to conclude on any schemes given there could be multiple. |
| Intel | Objective is generally ok.  Overall, we observe a very big amount of HPUE work items which may have an overlapping scope in terms of applicable schemes. So, there is a big risk that different solutions are used for different scenarios which would overcomplicate UE implementations. Also, some unification of the schemes is recommended to avoid duplicated work. |
| OPPO | Solving the SAR issue with introduction of duty cycle capability is not something new for all the HPUE in Rel-15/16, however, this is quite new for the FDD band.  The concept of duty cycle capability is simple, but how it will be handled by FDD NW actually hasn’t been discussed up to now.  With many UEs in FDD NWs reporting different UL duty cycle capabilities, the scheduling complexity will increase dramatically and how to handle them is unknown. This is different from TDD SA HPUEs which in real NWs the NR TDD deployments mostly use fixed UL/DL configuration whose UL duty cycle is below UE capability. If one fixed UL/DL configuration be used for FDD band to reduce the complexity then it will finally change FDD to TDD operation. How NWs will be deployed to support FDD HPUE and how UE be scheduled when PC2/PC3 UEs exists with different UL duty cycle capabilities should be understood better.  Besides, in our understanding the most fundamental advantage of FDD band comparing to TDD band is the small time delay and high throughput. If FDD bands are restricted by UL/DL configurations to solve the SAR issue caused by HPUE, then we need to understand better how much gain can be derived with the sacrifice of FDD nature. This is none trivial change to the FDD operation. |
| ZTE | We support the WID.  In order to fulfill the SAR limit, a concept similar to duty cycle may need to be introduced to FDD. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective 2** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| Apple | In addition to SAR issue, the duplexer power handling capability also needs to be considered. Redesign of duplexer may be needed to handle higher transmission power and provide better isolation to Rx band to prevent further REFSENS degradation. |
| LGE | Firstly, RAN4 need to study the coexistence evaluation to protect legacy system with max. output power. Based on the coexistence evaluation results, RAN4 need to discuss the detail RF requirements for PC2 UE in FDD band not only the self-desense but also detail Tx requirements such as MPR/A-MPR and so on. |
| Qualcomm | This objective is too generic, it has to clarified and fine tuned. What kind of co-existence study is sought? Is this also about having a adjacent channel co-existence study? |
| Intel | The objective is quite generic and more details should be provided |
| OPPO | More detailed objectives are needed, currently it only says study the interference issue which gives too much room for interpretation. |
| Skyworks | We agree with Apple that duplexer power handling is an issue that requires attention. Note that this is sensitive to both peak power and average power (thermal which in turns creates wider frequency shift in the filters). REFSENS will need reevaluation for self desense but also some band protection and AMPR/NS |
| ZTE | This objective can be further elaborated. In addition to assessment of self-desense, in-device interference caused by a higher peak power would also be investigated. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective 3** | |
| Company Name | Comments |
| T-Mobile USA | We have a fundamental question about the motivation for this WI. With TDD the duty cycle is limited to less than 100%, so it is obvious that there is benefit for transmitting higher power, and SAR requirements can be met due to the duty cycle. With FDD it is not clear why there would be a benefit for PC2. For instance, if UE 1 is assigned 1 PRB with 100% duty cycle and is limited to PC3, and UE 2 is assigned 2 PRBs with 50% duty cycle and can transmit at PC2, the PSD would be the same in both cases, so the throughput should be the same. We know there were simulation results in the motivation paper, but we’d like to understand the theoretical benefit, especially given the workload in RAN4. It would be helpful if we could have an explanation of why there should be improvement with PC2 with 50% duty cycle vs. PC3 with 100% duty cycle. Intuitively it seems like an even trade. |
| Apple | The SAR issue needs to be resolved first before we can discuss the possible UE implementation.  We also have the same question as raised by T-Mobile USA on why the PC2 throughput would be better between the two operation scenarios as exemplified. |
| LGE | For, Objective1, LGE would like to capture study on the detail SAR regulation requirements based on the regional regulatory in countries where 26dBm power class in FDD bands is allowed.  Also we need to clarify how to resolve the SAR issues with max. 26dBm Tx power in FDD bands. Only possible way might be to restrict duty-cycle in FDD bands. It is not clear what is beneficial point for system operating perspective. |
| Qualcomm | This objective should also discuss the feasibility of building components that can handle higher power and their impact on device implementation. |
| OPPO | Agree with Tmobile USA, the benefit of his feature needs to be justified. Regarding UE implementations, to achieve PC2 requires UE double PA implementations which will cause trouble to complexity, costs, power consumption, etc. especially considering UE needs to support so many bands/combinations in small form factor. All these factors actually needs to be analyzed. Without big improvement of system performance, the necessity of introducing FDD HPUE needs to be discussed further. |

2. Are there any other objectives to be added to the SID?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments |
| Qualcomm | We believe that first the system level gains from this feature should be understood. The proponent has shown some gains, however, it is not clear which aspects were taken into account. For example, was the impact of added Tx noise taken into account? How is the rise over thermal due to increase UL power modeled/quantified? This could lead to some REFSENS degradation. If there is a study on this feature, the first step should be system study to evaluate the gains. |
| Intel | Agree with Qualcomm and T-Mobile USA that system level gains should be clarified. For instance, the results show big gains for cell center UEs which may not necessarily use full TX power. The baseline assumptions on UL Duty cycle for PC3 and PC2 in the system level simulations are unclear. Is 50% or 100% UL duty cycle assumed for PC3? |
| OPPO | For the motivations, we would like to understand better. In the motivation paper, it mentioned that the coverage will be reduced due to larger CBW introduced in NR, our understanding is that this issue depends on several factors which might not be so straight forward since UEs in the cell edge most likely will be scheduled with partial RBs in the CBW. If same RBs are scheduled and other factors like MCS are same then LTE and NR will have same coverage, if more RBs are scheduled in NR and other factors like MCS are same, then the coverage might have some impact. Therefore, the benefit and impacts to NW and UE of introducing FDD HPUE in the NW needs to be analyzed. |
| ZTE | This objective can be treated as a further enhancement expecting more gain from a high power FDD. The focus at current stage should be the first two objectives. |

3. The target completion date is RAN#93 (3 quarters), any comments on the timeline?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments |
| Qualcomm | It seems very difficult to complete such a study in just 3 meetings given that some system level study is also needed. Even if the study was just on how to implement such a UE, we believe it is very unlikely that conclusions can be reached in just 3 quarters. |

# Summary and final proposal