**3GPP TSG RAN Meeting #90e RP-20xxxx**

**Electronic Meeting, December 7 – 11, 2020**

**Agenda item:** 10.4

**Source:** Moderator (AT&T)

**Title:** Moderator's summary for email discussion [90E][37][MBMS\_flexible\_BW]

**Document for:** Discussion

# Introduction

In this document, we will provide a summary for the email discussion on MBMS flexible bandwidth for Rel-16 LTE at RAN#90-e.

# Topic #1: MBMS flexible bandwidth

## Proposed objectives

Topic #1 will capture the outcome of the discussions on the following documents:

1) RP-202793 [1] containing a discussion paper on support of flexible bandwidth for MBMS

2) RP-202412 [2] containing a TS 36.213 Cat-F Rel-16 CR on Flexible bandwidth for MBMS

3) RP-202413 [3] containing a TS 36.331 Cat-F Rel-16 CR on Flexible bandwidth for MBMS.

## Initial round

### Open issues

The following summarizes the key proposal listed in [1].

**Proposal 1: Allow configuring PMCH bandwidth larger than the system bandwidth indicated by MIB. The following PMCH bandwidth values are supported for :**

* **8MHz:**
* **7MHz:**
* **6MHz:**

### Companies views’ collection

Issue 1: Is Proposal 1 from RP-202793 agreeable?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | We support the CR and proposals as is.  We also note the large number of supporting companies from all parts of the broadcasting ecosystem and others. This is an important corrections to ensure 3GPP technologies can proliferate in this vertical |
| EBU | We support the proposal and the associated CRs as they are. The proposal adds an important element to finish off the specification of LTE based 5G terrestrial broadcast (EnTV) which is a prerequisite for successful deployment of this technology for the broadcast vertical. |
| Rohde & Schwarz GmbH | We definitely support the proposal and the associated CRs as they are. The proposal helps finish off the specification of LTE based 5G terrestrial broadcast (EnTV) and enable a prerequisite for successful deployment of this technology for the broadcast vertical. It is highly needed to start commercial deployments. |
| Saankhya Labs | We support the CR and the proposal |
| MediaTek | No. we think the proposal itself is not a small change or simple correction for LTE Rel-16, which has already been technically frozen. In general, there should be a need to take some RAN work group level study (e.g. at RAN1, RAN2 and RAN4) to evaluate the technical requirement and the details of the candidate solutions. On top of that, we may know the feasibility for the flexible bandwidth in context of LTE MBMS operation. |
| IRT | We strongly support the CR and proposals as is. |
| Deutsche Telekom | We do not think that this proposal for Rel-16 should be approved, as Rel-16 is already frozen since a long time. We also do not see any clear motivation for any ongoing release. |
| Digital Catapult | We support the proposal and the associated CRs. This is an important addition to provide more spectrum options for dynamic broadcast services. |
| Panasonic | Although Release 16 is frozen, in order to address strong need from the broadcast vertical, our view is the proposal provides the minimized modification to fully utilize 6, 7, 8 MHz band usage for broadcast content (EnTV) as PMCH in order to enable good co-existence with DVB-T2/T, ISDB-T, ATSC 1.0/3.0, ... and 5G Broadcast in UHF. Therefore, we support the proposal. |
| Reliance Jio | We support the Proposal and the associated CRs as it is. |
| TDF | We support the CR and proposal as is. The proposal is an important element towards deploying LTE based 5G terrestrial broadcast (EnTV) technology in the future. |
| SyncTechno Inc. | We strongly support the CR as well as the proposal. |
| Fraunhofer | We support the proposal and the CRs  Potential RAN4 impact should be checked, e.g. for UE/eNB requirements and for coexistence scenarios with DVB-T(2). |
| OneMedia | We support the proposal and the associated CRs. |
| IIT Bombay | We support the proposal and the CR |
| ESA | We support the proposal and the CR |
| ATEME | We support proposal as is. |
| VTT | We support the proposal and associated CRs. We see the motivation here to support flexibly the terrestrial UHF broadcast and DVB-T/T2 scenarios with MBMS. However, some coexistence scenarios and requirements should be further evaluated also for future use cases. |
| ORANGE | We oppose to the approval of the CRs as Rel16 is already frozen. The nature of the proposal is not a correction of the Rel16 spec but a more fundamental change that should be discussed as part of a proper WI in Rel17. Besides, as the proposal defines new bandwidths, RAN4 work is also needed. |
| Facebook | We support the proposal and the CR |
| Samsung | We are not supportive of the proposal and the CR  The proposal is not an essential correction but an addition of new functionality. Rel-16 was already frozen and this kind of proposal should be avoided because there is impact on implementation not only at the UE side but also at the base station side. |
| ABS | We support the CR and proposals as is. We are thinking to make use of 3GPP Release 16 enTV for mobile TV which will be deployed nationwide as a standalone HPHT network running in UHF band. We think the proposal to utilize 6, 7, 8 MHz band for standalone HPHT broadcast have minimal modification to Release 16. |

Issue 2: Is TS 36.213 Cat-F Rel-16 CR RP-202412 agreeable?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Same as above. The CRs are agreeable |
| EBU | Yes, see issue 1 |
| Rohde & Schwarz GmbH | CRs are agreeable. See issue 1 |
| Saankhya Labs | Support the CR. |
| MediaTek | No |
| IRT | The CRs are agreeable, see issue 1. |
| Deutsche Telekom | We do not see an urgent need that this CR should be approved, as Rel-16 is already frozen since a long time. |
| Digital Catapult | CRs are agreeable. See issue 1 |
| Panasonic | Yes, agreeable – as the logical consequence of issue 1 above. |
| Reliance Jio | Agreeable, we support the CRs as it is. |
| TDF | The CRs are agreeable, see issue 1. |
| SyncTechno Inc. | Yes, CRs are agreeable. |
| Fraunhofer | We support the CR |
| OneMedia | We support the CR |
| IIT Bombay | We support the CR |
| ESA | We support the CR |
| ATEME | The CRs are agreeable, see issue 1. |
| VTT | We support the CR as is, see issue 1 |
| ORANGE | The CRs are not agreeable as explained in Issue 1. |
| Facebook | We support the CR |
| Samsung | No support  This seems not Cat-F but Cat-B which should be avoided at this very late stage.  Works on RAN1 and RAN2 are marginal as compared to RAN4 work, but the proposal does not say anything about RAN4 work. |
| ABS | We support the CR. |

Issue 3: Is TS 36.331 Cat-F Rel-16 CR RP-202413 agreeable?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Same as above. The CRs are agreeable |
| EBU | Yes, see issue 1 |
| Rohde & Schwarz GmbH | CRs are agreeable. See issue 1 |
| Saankhya Labs | Support the CR |
| MediaTek | No |
| IRT | The CRs are agreeable, see issue 1. |
| Deutsche Telekom | We do not see an urgent need that this CR should be approved, as Rel-16 is already frozen since a long time. |
| Digital Catapult | CRs are agreeable. See issue 1 |
| Panasonic | Yes, agreeable – as the logical consequence of issue 1 above. |
| Reliance Jio | Agreeable, we support the CRs as it is. |
| TDF | The CRs are agreeable, see issue 1. |
| SyncTechno Inc. | Yes, CRs are agreeable. |
| Fraunhofer | We support the CR |
| OneMedia | We support the CR |
| IIT Bombay | We support the CR |
| ESA | We support the CR |
| ATEME | The CRs are agreeable, see issue 1. |
| VTT | We support the CR as is, see issue 1 |
| ORANGE | The CRs are not agreeable as explained in Issue 1. |
| Facebook | We support the CR |
| Samsung | No support  This is not Cat-F but Cat-B which should be avoided at this very late stage.  Works on RAN1 and RAN2 are marginal as compared to RAN4 work, but the proposal does not say anything about RAN4 work. |
| ABS | We support the CR. |

### Summary and recommendation for further discussion

In this section, the summary of comments on Topic#1 and the corresponding recommendations are provided.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Summary and recommendation** |
|  |  |

## Intermediate round

### Open issues

### Companies views’ collection

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

### Summary and recommendation for further discussion

In this section, the summary of comments on Topic#1 and the corresponding recommendations are provided.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Summary and recommendation** |
|  |  |

## Fine-tuning round

### Open issues

### Companies views’ collection

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

### Summary and recommendation for further discussion

In this section, the summary of comments on Topic#1 and the corresponding recommendations are provided.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Summary and recommendation** |
|  |  |

## Final comments
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