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# 1 Introduction

This document is to kick off the following email discussion:

* [AT121][202][MUSIM] LS to RAN4 on Rel-18 MUSIM impacts (vivo)

      Scope: Discuss the topic and aim for consensus.

      Intended outcome: Summary in R2-2302008 and agreeable LS (if possible) to RAN4 in [R2-2302007](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cterhentt%5CDocuments%5CTdocs%5CRAN2%5CRAN2_121%5CR2-2302007.zip).

      Deadline: Friday morning (before morning coffee break)

# 2 Contact Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Ozcan Ozturk (oozturk@qti.qualcomm.com) |
| Charter Communications Inc | Phillip Oni c-phillip.oni@charter.com  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Discussions

During the RAN2 post email discussion R2-2300773, the potential RAN4 impact identified by the companies includes the interruption caused by UE capability switching, and the maximum UE power change.

**The interruption caused by UE capability switching:**

When the UE receives RRC reconfiguration or carrier deactivation in NW A which is a response to the UE’s capability restriction request, there is an interruption on the active carriers in NW A. This interruption is called interruption 1 in this offline. The interruption 1 follows the current RAN4 requirement.

There could be an additional interruption (called interruption 2) in NW A due to RF retuning for starting NW B activity, e.g., RRC connection setup procedure in NW B. The interruption 2 is different from that of RRC reconfiguration or carrier deactivation, and is not specified in RAN4. The interruption 2 could be close to the interruption 1, and for this case we can discuss whether new interruption requirement in NW A can be defined.

 

**Figure1**

**Observation 1: The interruption 2 in NW A may happen, and it is different from that of RRC reconfiguration or carrier deactivation, and it is possible/realistic to define the interruption 2.**

**Q1: Do you agree with the above OB1?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| See comment | The interruption in NW A may be longer. However, the figure is not always accurate since the UE can do the NW B retuning in parallel with NW A reconfiguration and thus it is not always the sum of two interruptions. As always, the specification will define everything from NW A perspective. |
| Charter – No | UE performing RRC reconfiguration in NW A should not interrupt RF retuning in NW B, and these two activities can happen in parallel. |

**Q2: if the answer to Q1 is YES, do you think we should send an LS to RAN4 to ask if the interruption 2 in NW A due to MUSIM capability switching should be defined in RAN4?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| See comment | It is not clear how RAN4 can make an accurate assesment of this extended interruption since this depends on the configuration of NW B.  |
| Charter – No | Agreed with QC, RAN2 should perform this assessment first since everything is being defined from NW A perspective. |

Whenever there is RRC reconfiguration in NW B, interruption may occur in NW A due to RF retuning at the UE. And this interruption time (called interruption 3 in this offline) is also not specified in RAN4. As the RRC reconfiguration in NW B may happen at any time and the interruption time depends on the configuration parameters involved, it is impossible to specify such interruption.



**Figure2**

**Observation 2: The interruption 3 in NW A may happen, and it is different from that of RRC reconfiguration or carrier deactivation, and it is impossible to define the interruption 3 because the uncertain time of the RRC reconfiguration in NW B and the involved configuration parameters.**

**Q3: Do you agree with the above OB2?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Yes | Agree that it will not be possible to assess and define interruption 3. |
| Charter – Yes | This is a valid concern. |

**Q4: If the answer to Q3 is YES, do you think we should send an LS to RAN4 to confirm the above understanding?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| No | Not for this particular use case. If we end up sending an LS for other reasons, we should capture the RAN2 understanding that interruption 3 will not be specified. |
| Charter – No | Agreed with QC. We could try to understand in RAN2 if interruption 3 could be defined, if not we pass our understanding to RAN4. |

**UL maximum power:**

Due to dual active transmission of R18 MUSIM, the maximum power may be constrained in NW A due to power sharing between NW A and NW B. And basically, this is RAN4 scope, so we think it would be better to get RAN4 input on this.

**Q5: Do you think we should send an LS to RAN4 to evaluate potential RAN4 impact for maximum power constraint for R18 MUSIM?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Maybe | It would be easier to rely on PHR reporting. Changes to UL maximum power may depend on the band combinations across the two NWs and may require frequent signaling. Since PHR is alays the most recent and accurate, it can solve the problem without any specification impact. |
| Charter – Yes | PHR reporting might be the way to go but LS should be sent to RAN4 for potential impact evaluation. |