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# 1 Introduction

This document reports on the following email discussion during RAN#90-e:

**[90E][17][Band\_combo\_simplification]**

Goal: Find an agreeable way forward

Input contributions covered: 2619, 2671, 2670.

The target in this email thread is to make the contents, specifically objectives of SID proposal in RP-202670 stable:

* refine objectives in SID proposal in RP-202670
* identify additional ones and add them to the SID, if any

***Moderator’s view on observations in*** ***2619 and relations with 2670 and 2256***

* Observation 1: something quite generic so that this will not be handled in this thread.
* Observation 2: will be discussed in the Email thread of [90E][13][BCS4]
* Observation 3: can be covered by objective 2 in 2670
* Observation 4: the aspect would be overlapping with that of [90E][13][BCS4]. Clarification or coordination is needed which SID(2619) or WID(2256) should handle this objective.
* Observation 5: will be covered the TR in 2619
* Observation 6: is not covered by any objectives in 2619

Initial round of discussion: Please respond by Tuesday 8 December at 12:29h UTC.

## 2 Initial round discussion

### 2.1 Question 1: Necessity of additional objectives to RP-202670

**Q1: Companies are invited to provide their views on the necessity of adding the following two observations provided by RP-202619 to RP-202670 and if there are some other objectives which should be included, if any.**

Observation 4: RAN4 can consider a general approach to further improve the MSD exception requirements for solving the raised issues.

Observation 6: Some mechanisms/process are needed to treat the general issues which are identified in the basket WI agenda.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | For observation 4, it depends on what is going to be addressed in BCS4 WI. We can make MSD objective as generic as possible at this moment. The potential SID can handle what BCS4 WID does not handle.For observation 6, we would not need to add this to potential SID as an objective. This will be handled by each rapporteur of the basket WIs. If they identify general issues, they should inform RAN4 chairman for further solution.  |
| ZTE | For observation 4, we are ok with a general MSD approach as part of the improvement/optimization on specifying band combinations.For observation 6, it is a bit too vague for the time being, and we can see later whether or not the SID once there is a concrete issue identified. |
| Ericsson | These are good observations. But we agree with Nokia that some of the aspects will be covered in BCS4 WI. What is the intention of the proponent regarding process? Is the intention to document in a new TR? If so then we are ok.  |
| Qualcomm | The observations are a bit vague. Is there any new idea to further improve the MSD exception requirements? And what’s the potential identified general issues for basket WI agenda? |
| Samsung | For observation 4, we agree that a general approach to further improve the MSD exception requirements is helpful for RAN4 solving the raised issues.For observation 6, we have some question with Qualcomm, what’s the potential identified general issues for basket WI agenda? The detail issues should be firstly explicitly defined before further discussion. |
| Huawei | Thanks for comments on observation 4, we are considering some general approach to further simplify MSD. We can start BCS4 WID and further discuss how to deal with MSD. If a general solution could be found, it would be helpful especially considering there would be many band combinations which need be checked.Regarding comments on observation 6, one example of general issue is to support 4Rx for DL intra-band non-contiguous CA n77(3A). It was identified during the discussion for intra-band non-contiguous CA. The discussion on UE architecture would be needed. |
| CHTTL | We also think the observations are a bit vague, not sure what excaltly the general approach is, as some of the requirements are already implemented in the spec for a while, it is not prefered to have some big changes. Probably can be further discussed and refined. |

### 2.2 Question 2: SID objectives proposed in RP-202670

**Q2: Companies are invited to provide their specific amendments on the objectives of RP-202670. The objectives of the SID proposal in RP-202670 are the following:**

*The objectives of this study item is to improve and optimize specification of the band combination in the current RAN4 specifications. The study proceeds within the following scopes.*

1. *Analyse and identify the redundant contents in RAN4 specifications.*
2. *Study potential future-proof solutions for band combination configuration tables in RAN4 specifications for concise representation, better readability and better trackability and editability.*
3. *Study the potential influence on request sheet template due to RAN4 band combination specification optimization.*
4. *Study the possible optimizations on band combination indication.*

*The target is that after the completion of the study item, a guidance on optimized specification of band combinations for RAN4 specifications will be approved and then applied to the latest RAN4 specifications.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | With the increasing demands, and under the current way of specifying band combinations, something should be done in order to guarantee specs quality and efficient standardization efforts. |
| Ericsson | The band combination improvement is a regular process and is handled under specific AI in RAN4 (e.g. 17.1 Simplification of band combinations in RAN4 specifications). So we do not see the need to have a SI for improving the readability, simplification, optimization etc., of the specs for band combos.  |
| Intel | We support to have simplifications of band combinations. But we prefer to handle it as TEI or contribution driven manner. SI is not preferred since this is optimization of RAN4 specification rather than technical improvement |
| Qualcomm | We support the simplification of band combinations. We did a good job in RAN4 specific AI on simplification of band combinations before. Not sure why we need a new SI, we can have the related simplification/optimization discussion with current approach i.e., contribution driven in specific AI/TEI.  |
| Apple | We do support the simplification of band combinations. At least for further simplification/optimisation discussions RAN WG4 can continue the same process through contributions submitted to the corresponding AI. |
| AT&T | We fully support the simplification of band combinations and guaranteeing specification quality. We support the comments from Ericsson, Intel, Qualcomm, and Apple that we can handle these improvements as part of the normal RAN4 process without the need of a new SI. |
| Huawei | In current RAN4 work, the discussion is organized under a dedicated agenda and the outcome is good. |
|  |  |

### 2.3 Question 3: Views on matters in RP-202670 other than objective

**Q3: Companies are invited to provide their Views on matters in RP-202670 other than objective.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3 Round 2 of discussion

## 4 Intermediate Summary

## 5 Contacts

Please provide a company contact that the email discussion moderator can contact if required.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact name and email** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |