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1. Introduction

Per chairman’s instruction, the goal and pertinent contributions for this email discussion is as follows:

* Goal: Generate an agreeable way forward.
* Input contributions covered:  2300 [1]

Table 1 Summary of the identified input contributions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Tdoc** | **Summary of issue and proposals** |
| RP-202300 | Issue: Sending LS to RAN2/4 in the early phase of Rel.17 NR FeMIMO WI:* RAN4 is occupied with Rel.16 NR\_eMIMO and RAN2 work load is close to critical
* RAN2/4 will not start until the last (2) RAN1 meeting(s) before RAN1 freeze with limited TU allocation
* Difficult to gauge the required amount of work in RAN2/4 to generate helpful LS response to RAN1
* Inter-WG ping-pong inevitably disrupts RAN1 progress

Proposal: RAN to discuss and (preferably) provide guideline (criteria) for the necessity of LS from RAN1 to RAN2/4 in early phase of Rel.17 NR FeMIMO |

1. Compilation of companies’ inputs: initial round

During the initial round, interested companies are encouraged to share their view on the following:

|  |
| --- |
| Given the issues with sending LS to RAN2/4 in the early phase of Rel.17 NR FeMIMO WI (e.g. those identified in RP-202300):* Q1: What general criteria should RAN1 employ to address this problem?
* Q2: If an LS is sent by RAN1 to RAN2/4 and the associated amount of required work seems infeasible, how should RAN2/4 respond?
 |

Table 2 Inputs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Samsung | On Q1: * In general, sending an LS to RAN2/4 in the early phase of FeMIMO is done only when it is extremely necessary.
* When a topic involves some RAN2/4 aspects, interested companies can discuss such aspects in RAN1 contributions and consolidate their inputs in RAN1. This also includes gauging the amount of RAN2/4 works involved in providing sufficiently helpful response if an LS is to be sent.

On Q2: * If the amount of works seems excessive, RAN2/4 may simply respond that at that stage, RAN2/4 cannot provide a response due to the current workload.
 |
| FUTUREWEI | Q1 and Q2 are simply of normal RAN WG work procedures and the answers to them may not address the issue when RAN2 and RAN4 effort are needed to provide answers to RAN1 questions. The proper solution is to ensure RAN2 and RAN4 enough time with or without TU assigned explicitly to work out the reply to RAN1 LS. |
| Apple | For Q1RAN1 can be cautious on sending LS to RAN2/4 during the early phase of the FeMIMO. For Q2RAN2/4 can reply the LS back to RAN1 indicating the situation that it is exceeding the RAN2/4 bandwidth. Then RAN1 can try to find a solution, or it can be escalated to RAN plenary  |
| vivo | In our view, for Q1, it is normal procedure to send LS to relevant WGs based on consensus in RAN1. There are even cases of LS being sent to RAN4 during “study item”. For Q2, it is up to RAN2/4 how and when to respond. It may have impact on progress of the issue in RAN1 depending on how closely the response(s) from RAN2/4 is related to the specific technique. If the specific issue is not possible to discuss/progress in RAN1 due to lack of input from RAN2/4 then it can be escalated to RAN or it can be discussed in future meetings depending on criticality and completion of WI. |
| ZTE | Q1:Due to the extremely stressful TU budget in RAN2 and RAN4, and the fact that the start time of RAN2/RAN4 FeMIMO WI is much later than RAN1, an LS out from RAN1 is expected to have large latency in terms of response. Hence we agree with the assessment that RAN1 should send out an LS only when it is extremely necessary, e.g., when it is not possible for RAN1 to find a solution.Q2:If so, RAN2/RAN4 should reply that it exceeds the RAN2/RAN4 capacity, and it is encouraged to find a solution in RAN1. |
| OPPO | For Q1:The information sharing by LS among different WGs are normal work procedures. Meanwhile, RAN1 should carefully consider the workload of RAN2 and RAN4, and try to only send out the “necessary” LS especially in the early phase. For example, without the feedback of the “necessary” LS, RAN1 work cannot move forward. For Q2:It is up to the discussion and final decision in RAN2/RAN4 for each LS. For different LS, RAN2/RAN4 may have different actions depending on their evaluation of the corresponding issues.  |
| LG | For Q1, we agree with most companies that sending LS from RAN1 to RAN2/4 should be very careful. On the other hand, we see some needs to start RAN2 work as early as possible especially for the support of MTRP BFR, which would require TU allocation for RAN2. For Q2, RAN2/4 can reply that they cannot provide a response due to the current workload, and may provide the answer later when they have enough TU to discuss that topic. |
| Qualcomm | For Q1: LS should be sent if the continuation of RAN1 work is dependent on information received from other WGs, where providing the information is not in RAN1’s expertise.For Q2: Other WGs can always respond with stating that immediate response is not possible and stating when response may be provided. |

1. Summary and moderator proposals

Based on the collected inputs in section 3, the following **observation** can be made:

...

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposed way forward (after the initial round)**: ... |
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