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# Introduction

*This discussion covers the documents submitted under AIs - 9.16.7.1, 9.16.7.2, 9.16.7.3*

*RRM issues on the WI NR\_ext\_to\_71\_GHz were first discussed during RAN4#99e (WF: R4-2108354, Summary:* *R4-2108405) where the impact on RRM requirements was discussed on a higher level. In this meeting, we further discuss the impact of higher SCS (480/960kHz) on RRM requirements, for most cases without considering the LBT impact.*

*No CR/TPs are treated during this meeting*

A topic/issue proposed for discussion in: GTW session 1

Agreements from the first round of email discussion

Agreements from GTW session

Agreements from second round of email discussion

*List of candidate target of email discussion for 1st round and 2nd round*

* 1st round: The following list of open issues was identified, based on the contributions, for the 1st round
  + General
    - Working assumptions and deployment scenarios
      * Issue 1-1-1: Deployment scenarios
      * Issue 1-1-2: Working assumptions for creating new FR2-2 RRM requirements
    - RX beam sweeping scaling factor
      * Issue 1-2-1: Rx beam sweeping scaling factor
    - Scheduling restrictions
      * Issue 1-3-1: Scheduling restrictions
    - Random access
      * Issue 1-4-1: Random access requirements for new SCS/preamble sequence length
      * Issue 1-4-2: Power accuracy of PRACH preambles
    - Measurement procedures
      * Issue 1-5-1: Measurement capability
      * Issue 1-5-2: Cell detection
      * Issue 1-5-3: PBCH detection for SSB index acquisition
      * Issue 1-5-4: SSB measurements
  + Timing requirements
    - UE transmit timing error
      * Issue 2-1-1: General principles in defining the Te requirements
    - UE timer accuracy
      * Issue 2-2-1: UE timer accuracy requirements
    - Timing advance
      * Issue 2-3-1: UE timing advance adjustment accuracy
    - MTTD/MRTD
      * Issue 2-4-1: MRTD/MTTD requirements
  + Interruptions
    - Requirement prioritization
      * Issue 3-1-1: Prioritization of interruption requirements
    - General principles
      * Issue 3-2-1: Applicability of FR2-1 interruption durations
      * Issue 3-2-2: Impact of MRTD
    - Interruption requirements
      * TBD
* 2nd round: The following list of open issues was identified, based on the contributions, for the 2nd round
  + General
    - Scheduling restrictions
      * Issue 1-3-1: Scheduling restrictions
    - Measurement procedures
      * Issue 1-5-5: Simulations for Cell detection, PBCH detection and SSB measurements
  + Timing requirements
    - UE transmit timing error
      * Issue 2-1-1: General principles in defining the Te requirements
    - MTTD/MRTD
      * Issue 2-4-1: MRTD/MTTD requirements
  + Interruptions
    - Interruption requirements
      * Issue 3-3-1: Interruptions at SCell addition/release (inter-band CA)
      * Issue 3-3-2: Interruptions at SCell addition/release (intra-band CA)
      * Issue 3-3-3: Interruptions at SCell activation/deactivation (inter-band CA)
      * Issue 3-3-4: Interruptions at SCell activation/deactivation (intra-band CA)
      * Issue 3-3-5: Interruptions during measurements on deactivated SCC
      * Issue 3-3-6: Interruptions due to Active BWP switching Requirement
      * Issue 3-3-7: Interruptions due to UE-specific CBW change
      * Issue 3-3-8: Interruptions at NR SRS carrier based switching

# Topic #1: General

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [R4-2112488](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2112488.zip) | Mediatek | **Proposal 3: RAN4 to discuss whether to conduct system-level-simulation for defining RRM requirements regarding the scaling factor for RX beam sweeping.**  **Proposal 4: As a starting point, reuse FR2-1 measurement capability of number of cells and beams for FR2-2.**  **Proposal 5: The existing FR2-1 measurement gap patterns can be reused for FR2-2.**  **Proposal 6: RAN4 further to discuss whether to introduce independent gap for FR2-2.** |
| [R4-2112548](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2112548.zip) | Vivo | **Proposal 1: RAN4 works on RRM requirements for standalone single-carrier and multi-carrier operation (CA) firstly.**  **Proposal 2: RRM requirements for CA/DC with FR1 and legacy FR2 bands is discussed and specified after corresponding band combinations are introduced.**  **Proposal 3a: Cell detection requirements for both intra-frequency measurement and inter-frequency measurement for FR2-1 can be reused for FR2-2 under the condition that channel model TDL-A 30ns is assumed.**  **Proposal 3b: Cell detection requirements for both intra-frequency measurement and inter-frequency measurement for FR2-1 is extended by 3 samples for FR2-2.**  **Proposal 4: SSB index acquisition delay for FR2-2 should be extended compare to that for FR2-1 and 5 samples are needed for SSB index acquisition for inter-frequency measurement.**  **Proposal 5: SSB measurement period requirements for FR2-1 can be reused for FR2-2 for both intra-frequency inter-frequency measurements.**  **Proposal 6: Changing scaling factor for Rx beam sweeping should be well justified.**  **Proposal 7: Factors that may impact scheduling restriction requirements, if any, would be identified firstly.**  **Proposal 8: For operation in the new licensed band in FR2-2, necessary RRM requirements are given in Table 5.**  **Proposal 9: For operation in the new unlicensed band in FR2-2, necessary RRM requirements are given in Table 6.** |
| [R4-2112683](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2112683.zip) | LGE | **Proposal 1: RAN4 works on RRM requirements for standalone single carrier operation first, and CA/DC can be considered depending on RF session progress.**  **Proposal 2: Define separate scaling factor for Rx beam sweeping in FR2-2**  **Proposal 3: Consider at least two sets of scaling factors for Rx beam sweeping in FR2-2**  **Proposal 4: Define scaling factor for Rx beam sweeping in FR2-2 for all UE types defined in FR2-1.**  **Proposal 5: Scheduling restriction in FR2-2 should be further discussed after the UE beam switching time is finalized.** |
| [R4-2113220](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113220.zip) | Nokia | **Proposal 1: FR2 RRM requirements apply for the operation in FR2-2, unless there is technical justification for a revision of the FR2 requirements.**  Observation 1: The calculation of the transmitted power of preamble transmissions in Random Access core requirements are specified independently of the frequency range in the RRM core requirements.  Observation 2:The calculation of the transmitted power of preamble transmissions in Random Access core requirements are specified different accuracies for FR1 and FR2 in the RRM core requirements.  **Proposal 2: Update if needed power accuracy of PRACH preambles for operation above 52.6GHz once RF has clear agreements on Output power dynamics/power control requirements.**  Observation 3: PRACH sequence length of LRA=571 and LRA=1151 are being specified in RAN1 for operation above 52.6 GHz.  Observation 4**:** RRM core requirements for random access are agnostic to SCS and preamble length.  **Proposal 3: RAN4 to define reuse existing random access requirements for the new SCS and preamble sequence length.**  Observation 5:By increasing the beam sweeping scaling factor, the time for the UE completing procedures may be too large and increase measurement overhead in RRM.  **Proposal 4: RAN4 to reuse the RX beam sweeping scaling factor from FR2 for the operation on FR2-2.** |
| [R4-2113334](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113334.zip) | Ericsson | Observation 1: To our understanding, Carrier Aggregation and Dual connectivity are important features for operator deployment of new spectrum resources. Standalone single-carrier is more complicated scenario since then RAN4 has to also define requirements for idle mode, HO etc.  Observation 2: Some existing RRM requirements are defined as function of SCS and/or slot lengths; some are defined for FR1/FR2.  Observation 3: For RRM specifications, differentiation of requirement level approach should be made on a basis of supported SCS (which would anyhow be needed even with introduction of new Frequency Range) and can be adopted since generic and agnostic requirements are difficult to define due to large difference between new specified SCS’s.  **Proposal 1: Considering most possible application scenario of frequency range: 52.6-71GHz, we, therefore, suggest to prioritize non-standalone scenario where new band is used for SCell while PCell belongs to FR1 and FR2-1 band. we propose two scenarios: Scenario A and Scenario B shown in below figure, in which Scenarios A has higher priority.**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Scenario | Frequency Range | | | Cell in MCG | Cell in SCG | | A | FR1 | FR2-2 | | B | FR2-1 | FR2-2 |   **Proposal 2: In essence, the RRM requirements of FR2-2 as SCG is examined without influence by the type of cell in MCG. If differentiation in requirements is necessary, DC/CA with FR1 and DC/CA with FR2-1 are needed to be checked separately.**  **Proposal 3: For RRM requirements defined with SCS already, higher SCS (e.g., 480 kHz and 960 kHz) applicable for 52.6 – 71 GHz can be defined (if needed) as function of SCS within FR2; For RRM requirements defined with FR2, it needs check if involvements of new SCS’s, division of FR2-1/FR2-2 or FR2 already can cover it.**  **Proposal 4: For higher SCS (e.g., 480 kHz and 960 kHz) applicable for 52.6 – 71 GHz, the number of SSBs are the same as in FR2 according to RAN1’s decision, therefore UE RX beams is native to be assumed as same as FR2. We do not see any major impact on measurement requirements.**  **Proposal 5: While UE may utilize the same solution as FR2 or retain the FR2 architecture, we assume the scaling factor for RX beam sweeping should be the same as FR2, at the very least as a starting point.**  **Proposal 6: Follow conclusion of FR2, no extra scheduling restriction/availability is needed at the very least as a starting point.** |
| [R4-2114142](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114142.zip) | Huawei | Observation 1: Impacts on current spec should be minimized and inheriting the requirements of legacy FR2 (FR2-1) as much as possible.  **Proposal 1: The current requirements for FR2 shall include both FR2-1 and FR2-2 without explicit statement, and the new or updated requirements for FR2-2 should be implemented in the existing sections.**  **Proposal 2: The specific scenario shall be decided with more RF inputs.**  Observation 2: Narrower beam width can be expected with more antenna elements accommodated within the array.  **Proposal 3: Consider increasing the beam sweeping scaler for operation in FR 2-2.**  **Proposal 4: Updating the scheduling restriction for L1/L3 measurement considering the following aspects:**   * + - * **Beam switching time**       * **Synchronization assumptions with large SCS**   Observation 3: For operation in unlicensed band without LBT, the RRM requirements are same as that of operation in licensed band.  **Proposal 5: Define RRM requirements for operation with LBT with more RAN1 inputs.** |
| [R4-2114189](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114189.zip) | Intel | **Proposal 1: RAN4 to deprioritize scenarios with an anchor on FR2-1**  **Proposal 2: RAN4 to deprioritize NE-DC scenario with NR operating in FR2-2**  **Proposal 3: For operation with high SCS RAN4 to introduce the scheduled gaps for UE to switch its beam**  **Proposal 4: Network will apply scheduling restrictions during that scheduled beam switching gap.**  **Proposal 5: The beam switching gaps can be scheduled based on UE feedback on the preferable beam switch periodicity** |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 1-1: Working assumptions and Deployment scenarios

*Sub-topic description: Discussion on various deployment scenarios applicable to the WI and priorities, if any.*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-1-1: Deployment scenarios**

* Proposal 1 (Vivo, LGE): RAN4 works on RRM requirements for standalone single-carrier and multi-carrier operation in FR2-2 first.
  + CA/DC with FR1 and FR2-1 can be further discussed and specified after corresponding band-combinations are introduced in RF session. (Vivo, LGE, Huawei)
* Proposal 2a (Ericsson): Prioritize non-standalone scenario where new band is used for SCell while PCell belongs to FR1(high priority) and FR2-1 band
* Proposal 2b (Ericsson): RRM requirements of FR2-2 as SCG are examined without influence by the type of cell in MCG. If differentiation in requirements is necessary, DC/CA with FR1 and DC/CA with FR2-1 are needed to be checked separately.
* Proposal 3 (Intel): De-prioritize the following deployment scenarios
  + FR2-2 CA/DC with anchor on FR2-1
  + NE-DC scenario with NR operating in FR2-2
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG | RRM can use the same scenario agreed RF session. According to last meeting agreement in RF session, single band requirement is the first, and CA/DC scenario can be discussed in parallel. So, option 1 could be available. |
| vivo | Support option 1. CA/DC with FR1 and FR2-1 can be discussed after there are relevant conclusions in RF session. |
| Nokia | We think it is important to start already working in the DC/CA scenarios in order to avoid too much delay in defining the requirements. What we would leave out for the time being is DC with FR2-2 anchor. So, we would prefer to prioritize first the following scenario:  Proposal 4: Prioritize the following deployment scenarios:  • Standalone CA/DC in FR2-2  • FR2-2 CA and DC with anchor on FR1  • EN-DC |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Proposal 4 by Nokia. |
| Huawei | Support option 1. |
| CMCC | Option 1 is preferred. |
| Intel | Support Option 4 from the Nokia comment |
| Ericsson | In WF [R4-2107997](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_99-e/Docs/R4-2107997.zip), WF on [145] NR\_ext\_to\_71GHz Part1, Intel, from RAM4#99, it is stated “Agreement: RAN4 aims to finish a single band requirement first. CA/DC can be discussed in parallel.”, hence we bring our input to this meeting.  Considering possible practical deployments when FR2-2 appears in the market, we believe DC/CA between FR1/FR2-1 and FR2-2. Therefore, we propose below application scenarios for FR2-2, in which Scenario A is prioritized firstly and Scenario B also should be considered to our acknowledgement.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Scenario | Frequency Range | | | Cell in MCG | Cell in SCG | | A | FR1 | FR2-2 | | B | FR2-1 | FR2-2 |   Also, developing non-standalone cases as in proposals 2a and 2b are efficient, since many RRM procedures are then already in place and it is therefore efficient in terms of Time Units needed in RAN4. |

**Issue 1-1-2: Working assumptions for creating new FR2-2 RRM requirements**

* Proposal 1 (Nokia): FR2 RRM requirements apply for the operation in FR2-2, unless there is technical justification for a revision of the FR2 requirements.
* Proposal 2 (Ericsson): For RRM requirements defined with SCS already, higher SCS (e.g., 480 kHz and 960 kHz) applicable for 52.6 – 71 GHz can be defined (if needed) as function of SCS within FR2; For RRM requirements defined with FR2, it needs check if involvements of new SCS’s, division of FR2-1/FR2-2 or FR2 already can cover it.
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | For FR2-2, we reuse the current FR2 requirements as much as possible. When the legacy RRM requirements cannot cover FR2-2 (e.g., new higher SCS), the new requirements for FR2-2 need to be considered. |
| Nokia | We agree with Proposal 1.  We think it is important to agree on this as a working assumption, so that we are clear that FR2 requirements are reused whenever possible, and that we need good justification for changing RRM requirements that need to be updated for FR2-2.  We are fine with Proposal 2. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with proposal 1 and 2. |
| Huawei | Fine with proposal 1 and 2 as general guidance. |
| CMCC | Both proposal 1 and proposal 2. |
| Intel | Fine with both Proposal 1 and 2 |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1 and Proposal 2 are similar. |

### Sub-topic 1-2: Rx beam sweeping scaling factor

*Sub-topic description: Discussion on Rx beam sweeping scaling factor.*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-2-1: Rx beam sweeping scaling factor**

* Proposal 1 (LGE, Huawei): RAN4 to consider defining new scaling factor for Rx beam sweeping in FR2-1
* Proposal 2 (Nokia, Ericsson): RAN4 to reuse the scaling factor from FR2-1 for operation in FR2-2 as a starting point
* Proposal 3 (Mediatek, Vivo): RAN4 to further study (based on SLS etc.) whether new scaling factor is needed for FR2-2 considering the trade-off between link coverage and measurement delay
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Agree proposal 3, more study is needed. |
| LG | Support proposal 1 to support 52.6~71GHz with more narrow beams. New scaling factor for Rx beam sweeping for FR2-2 should be considered.  It might be related RF decision about how many antenna elements are assumed to define Tx/Rx requirements. We are fine to wait conclusion of RF discussion for assumption of antenna elements to define EIRP/EIS requirements. |
| vivo | Support Proposal 3. We understand this needs more research on trade-off between link coverage and measurement delay. |
| Nokia | We agree with Proposal 2 as a baseline.  As for Proposal 3, we believe that SLS simulations might not be necessarily needed. The exact method for studying it can be defined latter once we have more evidence indicating that the number of RX beams needs revision. |
| Apple | Proposal 3 is reasonable as indeed more study is needed. Also, this may depend on the RF discussion on the UE min. peak EIRP power and its assumption of antenna array size. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with proposal 2. We can re-visit if needed, based on RF discussions. |
| Huawei | Support option 1 but also agree that more RF inputs are needed. |
| CMCC | Proposal 2 can be considered as a starting point, while proposal 3 to further study is also needed. |
| Intel | Agree with Proposal 2 and 3. For Proposal 3 the following aspects should be considered:   * Expected typical use cases for FR2-2 in the sense of required coverage * Outcome of RF session discussion on number of antenna elements and UE min. peak EIRP * Reasonable measurement delay extension |
| Ericsson | Given that RRM requirements for FR2 should be applicable to FR2-2, we believe same scaling factor reusing current FR2’s definition is reasonable. |

### Sub-topic 1-3: Scheduling restrictions

*Sub-topic description:*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-3-1: Scheduling restrictions**

* Proposal 1 (Ericsson, Vivo): Follow conclusion of FR2, no extra scheduling restriction/availability is needed at the very least as a starting point
  + Factors that may impact scheduling restriction requirements, if any, would be identified first. (Vivo)
* Proposal 2 (LGE): Scheduling restriction in FR2-2 should be further discussed after the UE beam switching time is finalized
* Proposal 3 (Huawei): Updating the scheduling restriction for L1/L3 measurement considering the following aspects:
  + Beam switching time
  + Synchronization assumptions with large SCS
* Proposal 4 (Intel): For operation with high SCS RAN4 to introduce the scheduled gaps for UE to switch its beam
  + Network will apply scheduling restrictions during that scheduled beam switching gap
  + The beam switching gaps can be scheduled based on UE feedback on the preferable beam switch periodicity
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | It would to too early to decide whether to introduce scheduling restriction or not. The beam switching time and sync. assumption need RF input. |
| LG | We are fine Huawei’s proposal. Both beam switching time and sync assumption for high SCS should be considered for updating scheduling restriction |
| vivo | Support Proposal 1 as starting point.  There is no conclusion for UE beam switching time with higher SCS so far. Scheduling restriction requirements can be further discussed after there is conclusion on UE beam switching time. |
| Nokia | We agree with Proposal 1. |
| Apple | We also think it is a bit early to decide on it, given the valid points raised by Huawei. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Proposal 1. Can re-visit once we have more agreements on beam switching times. |
| Huawei | We are fine to further investigate the issue with more concrete conclusion. We would like to rephrase proposal 3 as follows:  Further investigate whether to update the scheduling restriction for L1/L3 measurement considering at least the following aspects with further inputs from RAN1 and RF:   * + Beam switching time   + Synchronization assumptions with large SCS |
| CMCC | More discussion is needed. |
| Intel | We are ok with Proposal 1 as starting point. Ok to wait for more agreements on synchronization assumptions and beam switching time. |
| Ericsson | More studies is needed to check SCS impact to scheduling restriction. |

### Sub-topic 1-4: Random access

*Sub-topic description:*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-4-1: Random access requirements for new SCS/preamble sequence length**

* Proposal 1 (Nokia): RAN4 to reuse existing random-access requirements for the new SCS and preamble sequence length
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | We think there is no technical justification to introduce new random-access requirements for new SCS. |
| Nokia | Agree with Proposal 1. |
| CMCC | OK with proposal 1 |
| Ericsson | Needs further discussion. |

**Issue 1-4-2: Power accuracy of PRACH preambles**

* Proposal 1 (Nokia): Update, if needed, power accuracy of PRACH preambles for operation above 52.6GHz once RF has clear agreements on Output power dynamics/power control requirements
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | it can be discussed in RF session. |
| Vivo | We understand power accuracy of PRACH preambles is up to RF session. Not RRM work is seen. |
| Nokia | This proposal was intended to reflect changes on power accuracy from RF if needed only.  Following companies comments, I think we don’t need this as an agreement necessarily. |
| Huawei | Agree with the comments by other companies that it is related to RF session. The accuracy is just referred to RF spec in RRM spec. |
| CMCC | If the intention is to reflect the changes on power accuracy from RF session, the discussion can be delayed under RF session make conclusion. |
| Ericsson | Needs further discussion. |

### Sub-topic 1-5: Measurement procedures

*Sub-topic description:*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-5-1: Measurement capability**

* Proposal 1 (Mediatek): As a starting point, reuse FR2-1 measurement capability of number of cells and beams for FR2-2.
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Support Proposal 1. |
| Vivo | Fine with Proposal 1. |
| Nokia | Agree with Proposal 1 |
| Qualcomm | Agree with proposal 1. |
| Huawei | Fine with proposal 1. |
| CMCC | OK with proposal 1 |
| Intel | Ok with Proposal 1 |
| Ericsson | We agree with WF proposal to discuss. If further analysis does not find any critical cases for FR2:2 it should be possible to recuse FR1:1. |

**Issue 1-5-2: Cell detection**

* Proposal 1a (Vivo): Cell detection requirements for both intra-frequency measurement and inter-frequency measurement for FR2-1 can be reused for FR2-2 under the condition that channel model TDL-A 30ns is assumed.
* Proposal 1b (Vivo): Cell detection requirements for both intra-frequency measurement and inter-frequency measurement for FR2-1 is extended by 3 samples for FR2-2.
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | need to further study before we agree on the specific numbers. |
| Vivo | According to our simulation results, if channel models in TS38.808 are used to defined requirements, the cell detection requirements for legacy FR2 can be reused for new SCS.  However, the cell detection delay needs to be extended if the requirements are defined under same channel models used for legacy FR2.  So this depends to the channel model used. In our opinion, the channel delay spread is expected to be smaller for FR2-2 than that for legacy FR2. Therefore, cell detection requirements for FR2-1 can be reused for FR2-2. |
| Nokia | That needs further consideration |
| Apple | Further study is needed before reaching an agreement. |
| Huawei | Further study is needed. |
| CMCC | Existing FR2-1 requirements can be considered as a starting point. More discussion is needed. |
| Intel | Further study is needed |
| Ericsson | We need further analysis. |

**Issue 1-5-3: PBCH detection for SSB index acquisition**

* Proposal 1 (Vivo): SSB index acquisition delay for FR2-2 should be extended compare to that for FR2-1 and 5 samples are needed for SSB index acquisition for inter-frequency measurement.
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | need to further study before we agree on the specific numbers. |
| vivo | Support Proposal 1. According to our simulation results, for new SCS (e.g., 960kHz), more samples are required for PBCH detection compared with the current requirements. Therefore, it is necessary to extend SSB index acquisition delay for FR2-2. |
| Nokia | Needs more evaluation. |
| Apple | Further study is needed before reaching an agreement. |
| Huawei | Further study is needed. |
| CMCC | Existing FR2-1 requirements can be considered as starting point. More discussion is needed. |
| Intel | Further study is needed |
| Ericsson | We need further analysis. |

**Issue 1-5-4: SSB measurements**

* Proposal 1 (Vivo, Ericsson): SSB measurement period requirements for FR2-1 can be reused for FR2-2 for both intra-frequency inter-frequency measurements.
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | need to further study before we agree on the specific numbers. |
| vivo | Support Proposal 1. According to our simulation results, SSB measurement period requirements for FR2-1 can be reused for FR2-2. |
| Apple | Further study is needed before reaching an agreement. |
| Huawei | Further study is needed. |
| CMCC | Existing FR2-1 requirements can be considered as starting point. More discussion is needed. |
| Intel | Further study is needed |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1. |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1-1** | **Issue 1-1-1: Deployment scenarios**  *Companies’ views:*  There seems to be some consensus on defining SA FR2-2 with CA/DC and FR1 (PCell) with FR2-2(SCell). There are some disagreements over FR2-1 (PCell) with FR2-2(SCell)  *Tentative agreements:*  RAN4 to (equally) prioritize the following deployment scenarios:   * Standalone CA/DC in FR2-2 * FR2-2 CA and DC with anchor on FR1   *GTW agreements:*   * Agreements:   + Define the requirements for the following deployment scenarios with equal priority:     - Standalone single carrier and CA in FR2-2     - FR2-2 CA and DC with anchor on FR1       * Note: the scenario may be further adjusted pending further discussion in the RF session   *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* No further discussion needed.  **Issue 1-1-2: Working assumptions for creating new FR2-2 RRM requirements**  *Companies’ views:*  All companies seem to agree on both the working assumptions.  *Tentative agreements:*  Working assumptions:   * FR2 RRM requirements apply for the operation in FR2-2, unless there is technical justification for a revision of the FR2 requirements. * For RRM requirements defined with SCS already, higher SCS (e.g., 480 kHz and 960 kHz) applicable for 52.6 – 71 GHz can be defined (if needed) as function of SCS within FR2; For RRM requirements defined with FR2, it needs check if involvements of new SCS’s, division of FR2-1/FR2-2 or FR2 already can cover it.   *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round*  No discussion needed in 2nd round. |
| **Sub-topic #1-2** | **Issue 1-2-1: Rx beam sweeping scaling factor**  *Companies’ views:*  Some companies believe that same scaling factor as in FR2-1 can be re-used, while others think that more study is needed and needs some inputs on UE min. peak EIRP power, antenna array size etc. from RF session  *Tentative agreements:*  No clear agreement, further discussion is needed  *GTW agreements:*   * + Rx beam sweeping scaling factor     - Further study whether new scaling factor is needed for FR2-2 considering RF session conclusions on UE antenna array assumptions and UE power classes and the difference with FR2-1 assumptions     - Rx beam sweeping factor from FR2-1 can be used as a starting point for analysis   *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  No discussion needed in second round |
| **Sub-topic #1-3** | **Issue 1-3-1: Scheduling restrictions**  *Companies’ views:*  Some companies are okay with starting with FR2-1 requirements first and further study the impact of beam switching time and synchronization assumptions with higher SCS etc while other’s believe that further study is needed on this topic.  *Tentative agreements:*  No agreements. More discussion is needed  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue discussion in the second round and consider agreeing to the following:  Further investigate whether to update the scheduling restriction for L1/L3 measurement considering at least the following aspects with further inputs from RAN1 and RF:   * Beam switching time * Synchronization assumptions with large SCS |
| **Sub-topic #1-4** | **Issue 1-4-1: Random access requirements for new SCS/preamble sequence length**  *Companies’ views:*  This issues to decide if RAN4 can reuse existing random-access requirements for the new SCS and preamble sequence length. Very few companies commented on this and at this point there seems no technical discussion on what new requirements may be needed. But it may be too early to make an agreement on this.  *Tentative agreements:*  RAN4 to re-use existing random access requirements for new SCS and preamble sequence length in the beginning. New requirements, if needed, could be further discussed.    *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  No discussion needed for second round  **Issue 1-4-2: Power accuracy of PRACH preambles**  *Companies’ views:*  This issue discusses a proposal on updating, if needed, power accuracy of PRACH preambles for operation above 52.6GHz once RF has clear agreements on Output power dynamics/power control requirements. Most companies believe this is an RF issue and RRM should wait for agreements from the RF session  *Tentative agreements:*  This must be discussed in RF session. No need to capture any agreement on this issue in the WF.  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  No further discussion needed in the second round. |
| **Sub-topic #1-5** | **Issue 1-5-1: Measurement capability**  *Companies’ views:*  This issue discusses reusing FR2-1 measurement capability of number of cells and beams for FR2-2. Most companies agree to it.  *Tentative agreements:*  Re-use FR2-1 measurement capability of number of cells and beams for FR2-2.  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  No further discussion needed in the second round.  **Issue 1-5-2: Cell detection**  **Issue 1-5-3: PBCH detection for SSB index acquisition**  **Issue 1-5-4: SSB measurements**  *Companies’ views:*  There was only one submission on the above three topics and most companies need more time to study the impact of higher SCS on cell detection, PBCH detection for SSB index acquisition and SSB measurements requirements. So we can postpone discussion on these issues until the next meeting  *Tentative agreements:*  FFS: The impact of higher SCS on cell detection, PBCH detection for SSB index acquisition and SSB measurements requirements  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Discuss whether simulations are needed to study the impact. If yes, try to agree on initial parameters. |

## Discussion on 2nd round

### Sub-topic 1-3: Scheduling restrictions

*Sub-topic description:*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-3-1: Scheduling restrictions**

* Recommended WF
  + Consider agreeing to the following:
    - Further investigate whether to update the scheduling restriction for L1/L3 measurement considering at least the following aspects with further inputs from RAN1 and RF:
      * Beam switching time
      * Synchronization assumptions with large SCS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Support the Recommended WF. |
| LG | Support the recommended WF |
| Nokia | We think that proposal 1 that was being discussed on the first round is good starting point   * Proposal 1: Follow conclusion of FR2, no extra scheduling restriction/availability is needed at the very least as a starting point   Factors that may impact scheduling restriction requirements, if any, would be identified first |
| Ericsson | Agree with Recommended WF |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Sub-topic 1-5: Measurement procedures

*Sub-topic description:*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-5-5: Simulations for Cell detection, PBCH detection and SSB measurements**

* Recommended WF
  + Discuss whether simulations are needed to study the impact of higher SCS on the following
    - Cell detection
    - PBCH detection for SSB index detection
    - SSB measurements
  + If yes, also provide inputs on the simulation assumptions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | We understand in order to further study the issue, simulation assumptions could be necessary. In the paper R4-2112548, we already provided simulation assumptions.  We think it would be better that simulation assumptions for these aspects could be agreed in this meeting. Then in the next meeting, interested companies can provide results based on agreed simulation assumptions. |
| Nokia | We agree with the WF.  We think the need for simulations have to be clarified.  As for simulation assumptions, we would like to discuss it further once it is clarified the need for simulations. |
| Ericsson | Agree with recommended WF. Simulation assumptions need check. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Topic #2: Timing requirements

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2112488 | Mediatek | **Observation 1: UL performance will be degraded for higher SCS if the Te is kept as 3\*64\*Tc.**  **Observation 2: Tightening Te too much will introduce huge impact on UE implementation.**  **Proposal 1: RAN4 further to discuss the timing error limit in FR2-2 for SCS of 480 kHz and 960 kHz based on RF’s input**  **Proposal 2: For FR2-2 MRTD requirements, FR2-1 MRTD requirements are reused as the baseline. FFS separate MRTD requirements for SCS of 480kHz and 960kHz.** |
| R4-2112135 | Apple | **Proposal 1: RAN4 to discuss the following points before proposing any concrete Te values:**   * **How much percent of UL CP length Te can occupy without impacting UL system performance? Note two UEs may have the same amount of Te in plus and minus direction.** * **How much channel delay spread for this band needs to be accounted for? The general understanding is in this frequency band, the cell coverage is expected to be even smaller than current FR2 bands and even finer beams are going to be used to increase beamforming gain. As such, the channel delay spread is expected to be smaller than that for other FR2 bands.** * **Is it possible to rule out the case of 120kHz SSB SCS and 480/960kHz UL signal SCS if UE implementation turns out to be too challenging?** |
| R4-2112559 | Vivo | **Proposal 1: The uplink signal SCS should be no greater than SSB SCS for 52.6-71GHz.**  **Proposal 2: Since FR2-1 and FR2-2 is different in content, the initial transmission timing requirements for 24.25-52.6GHz and 52.6-71GHz need to be discussed separately.**  **Proposal 3: The UE initial transmission timing error shall be less than or equal to Te where the timing error limit value Te is specified in Table 4.**  Table 4: Te Timing Error Limit   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Frequency Range | SCS of SSB signals (kHz) | SCS of uplink signals (kHz) | Te | | 1 | 15 | 15 | 12\*64\*Tc | |  |  | 30 | 10\*64\*Tc | |  |  | 60 | 10\*64\*Tc | |  | 30 | 15 | 8\*64\*Tc | |  |  | 30 | 8\*64\*Tc | |  |  | 60 | 7\*64\*Tc | | 2-1 | 120 | 60 | 3.5\*64\*Tc | |  |  | 120 | 3.5\*64\*Tc | |  | 240 | 60 | 3\*64\*Tc | |  |  | 120 | 3\*64\*Tc | | 2-2 | 120 | 120 | 3.5\*64\*Tc | | 480 | 120 | 2.75\*64\*Tc | | 480 | 2.75\*64\*Tc | | 960 | 120 | 2.5\*64\*Tc | | 480 | 2.5\*64\*Tc | | 960 | 2.5\*64\*Tc | | Note 1: Tc is the basic timing unit defined in TS 38.211 [6] | | | |   **Proposal 4: The UE shall adjust the timing of its transmissions with a relative accuracy better than or equal to the UE Timing Advance adjustment accuracy requirement in Table 7.**  **Table 7: UE Timing Advance adjustment accuracy**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | UL Sub Carrier Spacing(kHz) | 15 | 30 | 60 | 120 | 480 | 960 | | UE Timing Advance adjustment accuracy | ±256 Tc | ±256 Tc | ±128 Tc | ±32 Tc | ±4 Tc | ±4 Tc | |
| R4-2113221 | Nokia | **Observation 1:** The UL timing error limit and TA command accuracy need to be scaled in order to keep errors within a small fraction of the CP length.  **Proposal 1: Define RRM requirements for UE transmit timing such that overall UE transmit timing error divided by CP length is similar to the one for existing SCS.**  **Proposal 2: Define timing error limit requirements as in the table below:**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Frequency Range | SCS of SSB signals (kHz) | SCS of uplink signals (kHz) | Te | | 2-2 | 120 | 480 | 0.9\*64\*Tc | |  |  | 960 | 0.5\*64\*Tc | |  | 480 | 480 | 0.9\*64\*Tc | |  |  | 960 | 0.5\*64\*Tc | |  | 960 | 960 | 0.5\*64\*Tc |   **Proposal 3: Define UE Timing Advance adjustment accuracy for 480 and 960 kHz SCS as in the table below:**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | UL Sub Carrier Spacing(kHz) | 480 | 960 | | UE Timing Advance adjustment accuracy | ±8 Tc | ±4 Tc |   **Observation 2:** UE timer accuracy requirements relate to accuracy of RRC related timers which vary on orders of tens of milliseconds to seconds.  **Observation 3:** UE timer accuracy requirement are defined as band agnostic.  **Proposal 4: RAN4 not to define new UE Timer accuracy requirements for the operation above 52.6 GHz.** |
| R4-2113518 | Ericsson | **Proposal 2: In response to adding additional SCS (240kHz, 480kHz, 960kHz) for SSB, and additional SCS(480kHz, 960kHz) for initial access related signals/channels in initial BWP, in this sense, combination of CSC of SSB and uplink signals needs to be checked and Te will be decided based on check results.**  **Proposal 3: Add SCS (480kHz, 960kHz) in UE Timing Advance adjustment accuracy**  Table 7.3.2.2-1: UE Timing Advance adjustment accuracy   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | UL Sub Carrier Spacing(kHz) | 15 | 30 | 60 | 120 | 480 | 960 | | UE Timing Advance adjustment accuracy | ±256 Tc | ±256 Tc | ±128 Tc | ±32 Tc | ±8 Tc | ±4 Tc |   **Proposal 4: The conclusion in previous 3GPP meeting: scaling MRTD/MTTD with increasing SCS will severely restrict the CA deployment options isn’t valid due to higher SCS in 52.6 – 71 GHz.**  **Proposal 5: For MTTD, existing FR2 cannot cover higher SCS according to the rationale of existing definitions including FR2. More options for SCS of the pair of TAGs are required.**   * **Minimum Requirements for inter-band EN-DC**   Table 7.5.4-1: Maximum uplink transmission timing difference requirement for inter-band NR carrier aggregation   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Frequency Range of the pair of TAGs | Maximum uplink transmission timing difference (µs) | | FR1 | 34.6 | | FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | 8.5 Note1 | | FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | | Between FR1 and FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | 26.1 | | Between FR1 and FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | | Between FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) and FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | | Note1: This requirement applies to the UE capable of independent beam management for FR2 inter-band CA. | |  * **Minimum Requirements for NR Carrier Aggregation**   Table 7.5.4-1: Maximum uplink transmission timing difference requirement for inter-band NR carrier aggregation   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Frequency Range of the pair of TAGs | Maximum uplink transmission timing difference (µs) | | FR1 | 34.6 | | FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | 8.5 Note1 | | FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | | Between FR1 and FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | 26.1 | | Between FR1 and FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | | Between FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) and FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | | Note1: This requirement applies to the UE capable of independent beam management for FR2 inter-band CA. | | |  * **Minimum Requirements for inter-band NR DC**   The UE shall be capable of handling at least a relative receive timing difference between slot timing of signal from a cell belonging to the MCG and slot timing of signal from a cell belonging to the SCG at the UE receiver as shown in Table 7.6.6-1 provided that the UE indicates that it is capable of synchronous NR DC only [16].  Table 7.5.6-1: Maximum uplink transmission timing difference requirement for inter-band synchronous NR DC   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Frequency Range | | Maximum uplink transmission timing difference (µs) | | Cell in MCG | Cell in SCG |  | | FR1 | FR1 | 34.6 | | FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | 8.5 | | FR1 | FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | 34.1 | | FR1 | FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | | FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD |   **Proposal 6: For MRTD, existing FR2 cannot cover higher SCS according to the rationale of existing definitions including FR2. More options for Frequency Range of the pair of TAGs are required.**   * **Minimum Requirements for inter-band EN-DC**   Table 7.6.4-2: Maximum receive timing difference requirement for inter-band NR carrier aggregation   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Frequency Range of the pair of carriers | Maximum receive timing difference (µs) | | FR1 | 33 | | FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | 8 note1 | | FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | | Between FR1 and FR2FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | 25 | | Between FR1 and FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | | Between FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) and FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | | Note1: This requirement applies to the UE capable of independent beam management for FR2 inter-band CA. | |  * **Minimum Requirements for NR Carrier Aggregation**   Table 7.6.4-2: Maximum receive timing difference requirement for inter-band NR carrier aggregation   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Frequency Range of the pair of carriers | Maximum receive timing difference (µs) | | FR1 | 33 | | FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | 8 note1 | | FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | | Between FR1 and FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | 25 | | Between FR1 and FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | | Between FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) and FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | | Note1: This requirement applies to the UE capable of independent beam management for FR2 inter-band CA. | | |  * **Minimum Requirements for inter-band NR DC**   The UE shall be capable of handling at least a relative receive timing difference between slot timing of signal from a cell belonging to the MCG and slot timing of signal from a cell belonging to the SCG at the UE receiver as shown in Table 7.6.6-1 provided that the UE indicates that it is capable of synchronous NR DC only [16].  Table 7.6.6-1: Maximum receive timing difference requirement for inter-band synchronous NR DC   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Frequency Range | | Maximum receive timing difference (µs) | | Cell in MCG | Cell in SCG |  | | FR1 | FR1 | 33 | | FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | 8 | | FR1 | FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | 33 | | FR1 | FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | | FR2(SCS ≤120KHz) | FR2(120KHz<SCS≤ 960KHz) | TBD | |
| R4-2114143 | Huawei | **Observation 1: The minimum channel bandwidth for each SCS shall be considered when defining the requirements for transmit timing and timing advance adjustment accuracy.**  **Observation 2: UE may have better timing accuracy with larger SCS and larger minimum channel bandwidth.**  **Observation 3: Many components will contribute to the overall timing error, and the accuracy of some components will not change significantly when operating in FR2-2 compared to FR2-1.**  **Proposal 1: Take the requirements for 120 kHz SCS in FR2-1 as the baseline for Te and TA accuracy requirements.**  **Proposal 2: Wait for conclusions on TAE before defining the MRTD/MTTD requirements.** |
| R4-2114573 | Qualcomm | **Observation 1: RAN4 specifies the UE transmit timing based on the SSB bandwidth.**  **Observation 2: An additional margin in the timing error is specified to account for UE artifacts related to DL to UL switching.**  **Observation 3: The upper limit on the timing error is half CP length on the uplink transmission.**  **Observation 4: Reduction in CP length of the UL transmission for higher SCS of 480/960kHz leaves the UE with very little timing estimation error margin which does not scales down linearly with wider DL SSB bandwidth.**  **Proposal 1: For UL SCS of 480/960 kHz, the UE shall use a Te corresponding to half CP length of the UL transmission.**   * **For UL SCS of 480 kHz, Te = 4.5\*32\*Tc** * **For UL SCS of 960 kHz, Te = 4.5\*16\*Tc** |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 2-1: UE transmit timing error

*Sub-topic description:*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 2-1-1: General principles in defining the Te requirements**

* Recommended WF
  + Considering multiple very different proposals on this topic, it is important to first agree on some basic principles in defining the Te requirements. As noted by most of the companies, it is quite challenging for the UE to meet the Te requirements with high SCS of SSB and UL signals. The following questions needs to be addressed before specifying the exact Te values
    - How much percent of UL CP length Te can occupy without impacting UL system performance?
      * Note two UEs may have the same amount of Te in plus and minus direction.
    - How much channel delay spread for this band needs to be accounted for?
      * The general understanding is in this frequency band, the cell coverage is expected to be even smaller than current FR2 bands and even finer beams are going to be used to increase beamforming gain. As such, the channel delay spread is expected to be smaller than that for other FR2 bands.
    - Check the possible combinations of SSB SCS and UL signal SCS for FR2-2 and discuss if it is possible to rule out some of the combinations if UE implementation turns out to be too challenging? E.g.
      * 120kHz SSB SCS and 480/960kHz UL signal SCS
      * Uplink signal SCS is greater than SSB SCS for 52.6-71GHz
    - Is any input from RF is needed to assist the discussion?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | 1. We need to investigate the overall UL timing error budget, the Te can be 0.5\*CP - TAC step size error - TA adjustment accuracy. 2. Smaller than FR2. FFS the exact value. 3. We can prioritize 120kHZ, FFS 480/960kHz UL signal SCS. 4. It would be needed. Because it includes DL/UL RF path mismatch. |
| vivo | In current requirements, the minimum UE implementation margin is about 2.75Ts for FR2. The value is already greater than the CP length of 960kHz.  There are two directions to define Te requirements.  Alt 1. Te occupies certain reasonable percentage of UL CP length so BS demodulation performance is guaranteed.  Alt 2. Te is derived based on legacy principle by taking practical achievable implementation margin into account.  Alt 1 cannot always work. It may lead to requirements that cannot be met by UE in practice. Inputs from companies on practical implementation margin, e.g., RF calibration error are necessary.  If Alt 2 is used, scheduling restriction would be needed to ensure system performance.  For the questions raised by moderator,  For Q1, it is also depending on gNB implementation. Not sure if it is possible to have a typical value.  For Q2, we may follow channel mode in TS38.808. However, this is not related to Te directly.  For Q3, based on our analysis, some combinations of SSB SCS and UL signal SCS for FR2-2 are too challenging and would be ruled out. |
| Nokia | 1. How much percent of UL CP length Te can occupy without impacting UL system performance?   There are some aspects that need to be considered Even if the delay spread is small in comparison to the CP length, there is demodulation degradation when the RX side doesn’t know the timing of the TX side. That is not only caused by inter symbol interference.  That situation can cause imperfection on the channel estimation smoothing and can account for significant degradation even for error on the order of 30% of the CP length.  Therefore, it is important to keep the Te within the same percentage of the CP length as it was done for the existing SCS.   1. How much channel delay spread for this band needs to be accounted for?   As in our reply in question 1, inter-symbol interference is not the only problem.   1. Check the possible combinations of SSB SCS and UL signal SCS for FR2-2 and discuss if it is possible to rule out some of the combinations if UE implementation turns out to be too challenging? E.g.   We don’t think it is possible to rule out SSB SCS smaller than the data SCS. The reason is that SSBs with 480/960 SCS were ruled out by RAN1 for initial access.   1. Is any input from RF is needed to assist the discussion?   We think this issue is more related to the ability of the UE to keep TA and the impact on UL demodulation performance. |
| Apple | Thanks for all the comments above. It would be very challenging to keep Te within the same percentage of the CP length as it was done for the existing SCS, simply because 1) the large SCS, i.e., 480/960kHz leads to very small CP 2) implementation margin has components that don’t scale with SCS.  Given the agreed SSB SCS 120/480kHz for initial access could be used for different scenarios, there seems to be some room to narrow down the combinations of SSB SCS and UL signal SCS for FR2-2. |
| Qualcomm | 1) We want to echo what Apple mentioned. It becomes really challenging for the UE to meet Te requirements while keeping the same cyclic prefix occupancy. Allowing even maximum possible Te of about 50% CP leaves extremely small implementation margin and is hard to meet.  2) Delay spread would be much smaller for FR2-2, so Te can be allowed to occupy more than current occupancy of 30%  3) We are open to discuss not defining Te requirements for certain SSS SCS – UL SCS combinations which are challenging to meet. |
| Huawei | 1. How much percent of UL CP length Te can occupy without impacting UL system performance?  Similar views as Apple and Qualcomm. There are multiple components contributing to the Te, and some can not be scaled accordingly with SCS. 50% CP is already challenging especially for some SSB and UL SCS combination.  3. Check the possible combinations of SSB SCS and UL signal SCS for FR2-2 and discuss if it is possible to rule out some of the combinations if UE implementation turns out to be too challenging? E.g.  We are fine to not define requirements for some challenging cases. Eg. 120 KHz SCS with large UL SCS. |
| CMCC | 1. How much percent of UL CP length Te can occupy without impacting UL system performance?   Keep the Te within the same percentage of the CP length as existing SCS is preferred   1. Check the possible combinations of SSB SCS and UL signal SCS for FR2-2 and discuss if it is possible to rule out some of the combinations if UE implementation turns out to be too challenging? E.g.    * + - 120kHz SSB SCS and 480/960kHz UL signal SCS        - Uplink signal SCS is greater than SSB SCS for 52.6-71GHz   Rule out some of the combinations is a bit risky and will impact the deployment in the future. If certain combination is indeed challenging for UE to implement after investigation, then RAN4 should inform other WGs. |
| Ericsson | 1: How much percent of UL CP length Te can occupy without impacting UL system performance  From existing specification we get:  Table 7.1.2-1: Te Timing Error Limit   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Frequency Range | SCS of SSB signals (kHz) | SCS of uplink signals (kHz) | Te | %CP | | 1 | 15 | 15 | 12\*64\*Tc | 8.3 % | |  |  | 30 | 10\*64\*Tc | 14 % | |  |  | 60 | 10\*64\*Tc | 28 % | |  | 30 | 15 | 8\*64\*Tc | 5.6 % | |  |  | 30 | 8\*64\*Tc | 11 % | |  |  | 60 | 7\*64\*Tc | 19 % | | 2 | 120 | 60 | 3.5\*64\*Tc | 9.7 % | |  |  | 120 | 3.5\*64\*Tc | 19 % | |  | 240 | 60 | 3\*64\*Tc | 8.3% | |  |  | 120 | 3\*64\*Tc | 17 % | | Note 1: Tc is the basic timing unit defined in TS 38.211 [6] | | | |  |   If we take the above table. Repeat it and then extend to new cases we get, for the new cases, for instance (it seems rel15 goal was to keep below 20% (except 15,60)):   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **SSB SCS** | **UL SCS** | **Te** | **1/SSB SCS** | **UL CP** | | 15 | 15 | 12 | 0,6% | 8% | | 15 | 30 | 10 | 0,5% | 14% | | 15 | 60 | 10 | 0,5% | 28% | | 30 | 15 | 8 | 0,8% | 6% | | 30 | 30 | 8 | 0,8% | 11% | | 30 | 60 | 7 | 0,7% | 19% | | 120 | 60 | 3,5 | 1,4% | 10% | | 120 | 120 | 3,5 | 1,4% | 19% | | 240 | 60 | 3 | 2,3% | 8% | | 240 | 120 | 3 | 2,3% | 17% | |  |  |  |  |  | | 120 | 480 | 0,9 | 0,4% | 20% | | 120 | 960 | 0,45 | 0,2% | 20% | | 480 | 120 | 3,6 | 5,6% | 20% | | 480 | 480 | 0,9 | 1,4% | 20% | | 480 | 960 | 0,45 | 0,7% | 20% | | 960 | 120 | 3,6 | 11,3% | 20% | | 960 | 480 | 0,9 | 2,8% | 20% | | 960 | 960 | 0,45 | 1,4% | 20% |   2: How much channel delay spread for this band needs to be accounted for?  Regarding question 2 channel delay spread, please see section 6.3 of TR 38.808:6.3 Summary of delay spread evaluations  The following are observations on the delay spread distribution:  - One source [60] observed that for the delay spread distributions for the typical indoor scenarios evaluated, the delay spread of almost 80% of the users are less than 30 nsec.  - One source [18] observed that Factory Scenario A (InF-DH) results in post-beamforming delay spreads that are a significant fraction of the CP duration for 960 kHz SCS.  - One source [63] observed that 85% of the UE experience r.m.s delay spread small than CP length of 1.92 MHz subcarrier spacing (i.e. 36.6ns) in indoor, outdoor, and factory scenarios.  - One source [30] observed that for small range indoor hotspot deployment, the channel delay spread is not an issue with normal CP. For outdoor scenarios with larger ISD and at moderate to high SNR (this may be produced by higher EIRP or smaller BW), normal CP demonstrates SINR degradation compared to extended CP. However, for such large coverage, high EIRP, and small BW use cases, we can choose to use a small SCS, e.g., 120kHz, with NCP.  - One source [38] observed that while each scenario experiences different amounts of r.m.s. delay spread, regardless of scenarios, most of UEs experience smaller r.m.s. delay spreads than normal CP of 960 kHz.  Ref [18] is Ericsson R1-2007982, in which we showed the system should be designed to handle 40 ns after TX/RX beamforming.  3: Check the possible combinations of SSB SCS and UL signal SCS for FR2-2 and discuss if it is possible to rule out some of the combinations if UE implementation turns out to be too challenging?  RAN4 should focus on same SCS for SSB and UL. That was the motivation to introduce the new SCS for SSB in RAN1.  **Prio 1**  (120,120) (We assume the requirements will be the same as for FR2-1)  (480,480)  (960,960)  For the mixed numerology case, the SSB SCS supported for initial access i.e. 120 and 480 + the next UL SCS could be possible i.e. (120,480) and (480,960). However (120,480) can be challenging with respect to estimating the timing good enough based on the SSB.  For the combinations with higher SSB SCS than UL SCS (480,120) and (960,480) (960,120), there could be issues with estimating the frequency errors if the difference is too large?   1. 4: Is any input from RF is needed to assist the discussion? |

### Sub-topic 2-2: UE timer accuracy

*Sub-topic description*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 2-2-1: UE timer accuracy requirements**

* Proposal 1 (Nokia): RAN4 not to define new UE Timer accuracy requirements for the operation above 52.6 GHz.
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Support Proposal 1. |
| Nokia | We agree with Proposal 1.  We don’t see the need for new UE timer accuracy requirements for FR2-2, since they are band agnostic. |
| Apple | Proposal 1 seems reasonable. |
| Qualcomm | Fine with proposal 1 |
| Huawei | Fine with proposal 1. |
| CMCC | Proposal 1 |
| Ericsson | Option 1. |

### Sub-topic 2-3: Timing advance

*Sub-topic description*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 2-3-1: UE timing advance adjustment accuracy**

* Proposal 1: The UE shall adjust the timing of its transmissions with a relative accuracy better than or equal to the UE Timing Advance adjustment accuracy requirement in the below table
  + Option 1 (Vivo):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UL Sub Carrier Spacing(kHz) | 15 | 30 | 60 | 120 | 480 | 960 |
| UE Timing Advance adjustment accuracy | ±256 Tc | ±256 Tc | ±128 Tc | ±32 Tc | ±4 Tc | ±4 Tc |

* + Option 2 (Nokia, Ericsson):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UL Sub Carrier Spacing(kHz) | 15 | 30 | 60 | 120 | 480 | 960 |
| UE Timing Advance adjustment accuracy | ±256 Tc | ±256 Tc | ±128 Tc | ±32 Tc | ±8 Tc | ±4 Tc |

* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Support Option 1. The UE timing advance adjustment can be derived from minimum sampling rate which is equal to the product of FFT size and SCS. The minimum channel bandwidths for both 480kHz and 960kHz is 400M. So the FFT size is 1024 and 512 for 480kHz and 960kHz respectively. The timing advance adjustment is 4Tc for both 480kHz and 960kHz.  We are fine with Option 2. |
| Nokia | We agree with Option 2.  We understand Option 2 as being a simple extrapolation of the existing TA accuracy requirements, which would mean we just scale the requirements to the new SCS.  We don’t see a problem in compromising to Option 1, if other companies prefer it. |
| Apple | While we agree with vivo on the methodology of deriving UE Timing Advance adjustment accuracy, we believe we also need to consider the implementation aspects. As such, we would like to have more discussions before making a decision. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with both the options. |
| Huawei | Fine with 1 and 2. |
| CMCC | Option 1 |
| Ericsson | Both option 1 and option 2 are fine for Ericsson. |

### Sub-topic 2-4: MTTD/MRTD

*Sub-topic description*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 2-4-1: MRTD/MTTD requirements**

* Proposal 1 (Mediatek): For FR2-2 MRTD requirements, FR2-1 MRTD requirements are reused as the baseline. FFS separate MRTD requirements for SCS of 480kHz and 960kHz.
* Proposal 2 (Huawei): Wait for conclusions on TAE before defining the MRTD/MTTD requirements
* Proposal 3 (Ericsson): For MTTD/MRTD, existing FR2 cannot cover higher SCS according to the rationale of existing definitions including FR2. More options for SCS of the pair of TAGs are required.
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Proposal 1.  Existing FR2 can cover 120kHz in FR2-2. So the existing MRTD can apply.  We need to investigate requirement for higher SCS. |
| LG | Fine with proposal 1. We focus on MRTD for higher SCS. Additionally, deployment scenario for Issue 1-1-1 should be considered for this discussion. |
| Vivo | The MRTD/MTTD requirements are dependent on deployment scenarios. We may define MRTD/MTTD requirements for intra-band CA firstly. For other CA/DC cases, it can be further discussed after there is conclusion on deployment scenarios.  For intra-band CA MRTD/MTTD, it depends on TAE requirements. |
| Nokia | We do not see any difference between FR2-1 and FR2-2 that should impact MRTD requirements. So we would like to keep FR2 requirements and rules as a baseline, and we suggest another proposal:  Proposal 4: MRTD requirements for FR2-2, reuse current FR2-1 MRTD requirements and rules. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with proposal 1. Can re-use FR2-1 requirements to begin with. |
| Huawei | MRTD/MTTD are relate to the assumption of deployment/coverage. We are fine with proposal 1 that take FR2-1 as the starting point for 120 KHz. 480 and 960 need FFS. |
| CMCC | Proposal 1 |
| Intel | Proposals 1 and 2 are ok for us. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 3 and proposal 1.   Our starting point is to check if higher SCS of FR2:2 can support existing MRTD. |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#2-1** | **Issue 2-1-1: General principles in defining the Te requirements**  *Companies’ views:*  Since there were a lot of mixed proposals on this topic, it was requested that companies comment on the following:   1. How much percent of UL CP length Te can occupy without impacting UL system performance? 2. How much channel delay spread for this band needs to be accounted for? 3. Check the possible combinations of SSB SCS and UL signal SCS for FR2-2 and discuss if it is possible to rule out some of the combinations if UE implementation turns out to be too challenging?E.g.    * + 120kHz SSB SCS and 480/960kHz UL signal SCS      + Uplink signal SCS is greater than SSB SCS for 52.6-71GHz 4. Is any input from RF is needed to assist the discussion?   There was no clear agreement on these general principles.  On cyclic prefix occupancy, let’s follow this approach:   1. Agree on the percent of CP length that Te can occupy. Can we use the following principle? **0.5\*CP - TAC step size error - TA adjustment accuracy** 2. Identify the combinations which cannot meet Te based on 1, because of low implementation margin. 3. How to address such combinations? Define scheduling restrictions, no requirement specifications etc.   Further discussion is needed. This topic is recommended to be discussed during the GTW session.  *Tentative agreements (GTW):*   * Further study percentage of UL CP length Te can occupy without impacting UL system performance?   + Option 1: Keep the Te within the same percentage of the CP length as existing SCS   + Option 2: 30%   + Option 3: 50%   + Option 4: 60% * Further study achievable Te from UE perspective * Study different combinations of SSB SCS and UL signal SCS for FR2-2   *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue discussion in 2nd round. |
| **Sub-topic#2-2** | **Issue 2-2-1: UE timer accuracy requirements**  *Companies’ views:*  All the companies agree to not define new UE Timer accuracy requirements for the operation above 52.6 GHz.  *Tentative agreements:*  RAN4 not to define new UE Timer accuracy requirements for the operation above 52.6 GHz.  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  No discussion needed in the second round |
| **Sub-topic#2-3** | **Issue 2-3-1: Timing advance**  *Companies’ views:*  All the companies agree to both the proposed option  *Tentative agreements:*  The UE shall adjust the timing of its transmissions with a relative accuracy better than or equal to the UE Timing Advance adjustment accuracy requirement in the below table   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | UL Sub Carrier Spacing(kHz) | 15 | 30 | 60 | 120 | 480 | 960 | | UE Timing Advance adjustment accuracy | ±256 Tc | ±256 Tc | ±128 Tc | ±32 Tc | ±8 Tc | ±4 Tc |   *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  No discussion needed in the second round |
| **Sub-topic#2-4** | **Issue 2-4-1: MTTD/MRTD**  *Companies’ views:*  This issue discusses whether to define new MTTD/MRTD requirements for FR2-2 or re-use requirements from FR2-1. It seems like all companies agree on using FR2-1 requirements for 120kHz SCS, but some discussion is needed for 480/960 kHz SCS. Except for one company which thinks FR2-1 requirements can apply for FR2-2, all companies believes that it should be further discussed whether new requirements are needed or not. Some companies note that it also depends on deployment scenarios.  *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Further discuss in 2nd round based on agreements (if any) on the deployment scenarios from GTW. |

## Discussion on 2nd round

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

### Sub-topic 2-1: UE transmit timing error

*Sub-topic description:*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 2-1-1: General principles in defining the Te requirements**

* Recommended WF : Further discuss the percentage of UL CP length Te can occupy based on the following GTW agreement:
  + Further study percentage of UL CP length Te can occupy without impacting UL system performance?
    - Option 1: Keep the Te within the same percentage of the CP length as existing SCS
    - Option 2: 30%
    - Option 3: 50%
    - Option 4: 60%
  + Further study achievable Te from UE perspective
  + Study different combinations of SSB SCS and UL signal SCS for FR2-2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | In our understanding, TE needs more study to trade-off between the UL system performance and the practical UE implementation margin. We are fine to further study for Te requirements.  Support the Recommended WF. |
| Nokia | We agree to evaluate it further.  Some considerations to take into account are the conditions to avoid inter-symbol interference and the UL, and the impact in PUSCH demodulation performance when the gNB doesn’t know the timing of the OFDM symbol accurately.  In the first case, the gNB has to place the FFT in accordance to worst case Te, UE Tac error, and quantization error of the Tac, which can move in both forward or backward manner. Additionally, also the channel delay spread has to be considered. Considering the FFT window placement, it is already clear that in order to prevent inter-symbol interference ISI, the Te cannot be larger than 50%. If all these factors are not considered, than there is no guarantee of orthogonality of consecutive OFDM symbols and performance will be degraded due to ISI. |
| Ericsson | Option 1. We need some margin for time dispersive channel. for instance (it seems rel15 goal was to keep below 20% (except 15,60)):   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **SSB SCS** | **UL SCS** | **Te** | **1/SSB SCS** | **UL CP** | | 15 | 15 | 12 | 0,6% | 8% | | 15 | 30 | 10 | 0,5% | 14% | | 15 | 60 | 10 | 0,5% | 28% | | 30 | 15 | 8 | 0,8% | 6% | | 30 | 30 | 8 | 0,8% | 11% | | 30 | 60 | 7 | 0,7% | 19% | | 120 | 60 | 3,5 | 1,4% | 10% | | 120 | 120 | 3,5 | 1,4% | 19% | | 240 | 60 | 3 | 2,3% | 8% | | 240 | 120 | 3 | 2,3% | 17% | |  |  |  |  |  | | 120 | 480 | 0,9 | 0,4% | 20% | | 120 | 960 | 0,45 | 0,2% | 20% | | 480 | 120 | 3,6 | 5,6% | 20% | | 480 | 480 | 0,9 | 1,4% | 20% | | 480 | 960 | 0,45 | 0,7% | 20% | | 960 | 120 | 3,6 | 11,3% | 20% | | 960 | 480 | 0,9 | 2,8% | 20% | | 960 | 960 | 0,45 | 1,4% | 20% | |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Sub-topic 2-4: MTTD/MRTD

*Sub-topic description*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 2-4-1: MRTD/MTTD requirements**

* Proposal 1 (Mediatek): For FR2-2 MRTD requirements, FR2-1 MRTD requirements are reused as the baseline. FFS separate MRTD requirements for SCS of 480kHz and 960kHz.
* Proposal 2 (Huawei): Wait for conclusions on TAE before defining the MRTD/MTTD requirements
* Proposal 3 (Ericsson): For MTTD/MRTD, existing FR2 cannot cover higher SCS according to the rationale of existing definitions including FR2. More options for SCS of the pair of TAGs are required.
* Recommended WF
  + Consider agreeing to the following
    - RAN4 to further discuss whether new MRTD/MTTD requirements are needed for SCS of 480/960 kHz based on the agreed deployment scenarios
    - Identify other parameters that needs to be considered for the discussion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Support the Recommended WF. |
| LG | Support the recommended WF |
| Nokia | In our opinion the rules for defining the MRTD requirements can be reused for FR2-2. That doesn’t mean reusing exactly the same values as in FR2-1, but using the same derivation formulas that are currently being used. That means   * Assync cases – ½ slot * Other cases   + TAE + propagation delay   That is why we proposed in the first round Proposal 4:  Proposal 4: MRTD requirements for FR2-2, reuse current FR2-1 MRTD requirements and rules. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 3 and proposal 1. WF is fine. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Topic #3: Interruptions

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations (Tables are skipped to avoid formatting issues)** |
| R4-2112560 | Vivo | **Observation 1: The value of MRTD would change the interruption requirements. RAN4 can further improve the interruption requirements when the MRTD requirements are completed.**  **Proposal 1: For Standalone NR Carrier Aggregation, when one SCell is added or released**，**the interruption requirements can be shown in Table 1 and Table 2:**  **Proposal 2: For Standalone NR Carrier Aggregation, when one SCell is activated or deactivated**, **the interruption requirements can be shown in Table 3 and Table 4:**  **Proposal 3: For Standalone NR Carrier Aggregation, when BWP is switched on PCell and or Scell**, **the interruption requirements can be shown in Table 5:**  **Proposal 4: For Standalone NR Carrier Aggregation, when SRS carrier based switching is performed between carriers**, **the interruption requirements on any active serving cell can be shown in Table 6 and Table 7:** |
| R4-2113222 | Nokia | 1. Existing intra-band interruptions for NR-DC and SA consists of 1 ms + SMTC duration for tSCell addition/release and 0.5 ms + SMTC duration for Scell activation deactivation and measurements on SCC. . 2. Define interruption duration requirements for 480 kHz and 960 kHz in Intra-band CA and NR-DC as 1 ms + SMTC duration for tSCell addition/release and 0.5 ms + SMTC duration for SCell activation deactivation and measurements on SCC. 3. Define interruption duration requirements for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS in Intra-band CA and NR-DC as in the table below: 4. Interruption duration requirements for intra-frequency for NR SA (CA and NR-DC) with aggressor and victim cells on the same frequency are of 1 ms for Scell addition/release and 0.5 ms for other inter-band requirements. 5. When aggressor and victim cells are in different frequency ranges, the inter-band requirements for 60 kHz and 120 kHz SCS in SA scenarios are increased by 1 slot. 6. Define interruption duration requirements for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS in Inter-band CA and NR-DC as in the table below: |
| R4-2113336 | Ericsson | **Observation 1: The SCS (e.g., 480 kHz and 960 kHz) applicable for 52.6 – 71 GHz and their corresponding interruption lengths can be included in the tables on the interruption requirements.**  **Proposal 1: Below three interruptions are prioritised as follows, taking possible application scenarios into account we proposed:**  **• EN-DC Interruption**  **Add SCS (e.g., 480 kHz and 960 kHz)**  **• SA: Interruptions with Standalone NR Carrier Aggregation**  **Add SCS (e.g., 480 kHz and 960 kHz)**  **• NR-DC: Interruptions**  **Add SCS (e.g., 480 kHz and 960 kHz)** |
| R4-2114144 | Huawei | **Observation 1: The interruption requirements are derived based on absolute time durations for certain UE actions.**  **Proposal 1: Define the interruption requirements for FR2-2 based on the same assumptions as in legacy FR2.**  **Observation 2: The interruption requirements for FR2-2 shall consider the MRTD between CCs where additional slot may be allowed when the MRTD is non-negligible considering the slot length of 480 kHz and 960 kHz.** |
| R4-2114190 | Intel | **Proposal 1: For new SCSs RAN4 to define interruption length at transition between active and non-active during DRX (Table 8.2.1.2.1-1 in TS38.133) as shown in Table 1**  **Proposal 2: For new SCSs RAN4 to define interruption length at Scell addition/release for EN-DC (Tables 8.2.1.2.3-1, 8.2.1.2.3-1 in TS38.133) as shown in Tables 2-3 and for SA (Tables 8.2.2.2.1-1, 8.2.2.2.1-1 in TS38.133) as shown in Tables 4-5**  **Proposal 3: For new SCSs RAN4 to define interruption length at Scell activation/deactivation for EN-DC (Tables 8.2.1.2.4-1, 8.2.1.2.4-2) as shown in Tables 6-7 and for SA (Tables 8.2.2.2.2-1, 8.2.2.2.2-2) as shown in Tables 8-9**  **Proposal 4: For new SCSs RAN4 to define interruption length at measurements on deactivated E-UTRA SCC (Table 8.2.1.2.5.2-1) as shown in Table 10.**  **Proposal 5: For new SCSs RAN4 to define interruption length at Active BWP switching for EN-DC (Table 8.2.1.2.7-1) and SA (Table 8.2.2.2.5-1) as shown in Table 11.**  **Proposal 6: For new SCSs RAN4 to define interruption length due to UE-specific CBW change (Table 8.2.1.2.11-1) as shown in Table 12.**  **Proposal 7: For new SCSs RAN4 to define interruption length at NR SRS carrier based switching (Tables 8.2.1.2.12-1, 8.2.1.2.12-2 for EN-DC and Tables 8.2.2.2.9-1, 8.2.2.2.9-2 for SA) as shown in Table 12-13.** |
| R4-2114572 | Qualcomm | **Proposal 1: Given the limited number of RAN4 meetings for this WI, propose that RAN4 prioritize specifying interruption requirements for FR2-2 in the following order:**   1. **NR-SA** 2. **NR-DC** 3. **EN-DC and NE-DC (if time permits or during maintenance phase)**   **Observation 1: RAN4 specifies the UE transmit timing based on the SSB bandwidth.**  **Observation 2: An additional margin in the timing error is specified to account for UE artifacts related to DL to UL switching.**  **Observation 3: The upper limit on the timing error is half CP length on the uplink transmission.**  **Observation 4: Reduction in CP length of the UL transmission for higher SCS of 480/960kHz leaves the UE with very little timing estimation error margin which does not scales down linearly with wider DL SSB bandwidth.**  **Proposal 2: For UL SCS of 480/960 kHz, the UE shall use a Te corresponding to half CP length of the UL transmission.**   * **For UL SCS of 480 kHz, Te = 4.5\*32\*Tc** * **For UL SCS of 960 kHz, Te = 4.5\*16\*Tc**   **Proposal 3: Propose to update Table 8.2.2.2.1-1 and 8.2.2.2.1-2 with 480/960 kHz subcarrier spacing as below:**  **Proposal 4: Propose to update Table 8.2.2.2.2-1 and 8.2.2.2.2-2 with 480/960 kHz subcarrier spacing as below:**  **Proposal 5: Propose to update Table 8.2.2.2.3-1 with 480/960 kHz subcarrier spacing as below:** |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 3-1: Requirement prioritization

*Sub-topic description:*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-1-1: Prioritization of interruption requirements**

* Proposal 1 (Ericsson): Below three interruptions are prioritised as follows, taking possible application scenarios into account we proposed:
  + EN-DC Interruption
    - Add SCS (e.g., 480 kHz and 960 kHz)
  + SA: Interruptions with Standalone NR Carrier Aggregation
    - Add SCS (e.g., 480 kHz and 960 kHz)
  + NR-DC: Interruptions
    - Add SCS (e.g., 480 kHz and 960 kHz)
* Proposal 2 (Qualcomm): RAN4 prioritize specifying interruption requirements for FR2-2 in the following order:
  + SA: Interruptions with Standalone NR Carrier Aggregation (Vivo)
  + NR-DC: Interruptions
  + EN-DC and NE-DC Interruptions (if time permits or during maintenance phase)
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the proposals along with the deployment scenarios being discussed under Sub-topic 1-1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **MTK** | **It seems similar discussion as in Issue 1-1-1** |
| **LG** | **The scope of interruption requirements depends on conclusion of deployment scenario.** |
| Vivo | We understand this is related to Sub-topic 1-1.  Interruption requirements can be further discussed after there is conclusion on deployment scenarios. So RAN4 may define SA NR carrier aggregation interruption requirements firstly for FR2-2. |
| Nokia | We prefer to discuss this issue as part of the general topic on deployment scenarios. |
| Qualcomm | Agree, that this could be discussed along with Issue 1-1-1 on deployment scenarios. |
| Huawei | Suggest to conclude on Issue 1-1-1 first. |
| CMCC | Agree with other companies that this should follow the conclusion of deployment scenarios |
| Intel | The decision should be based on the outcome of Issue 1-1-1 |
| Ericsson | It depends on conclusion in Sub-topic 1-1. |

### Sub-topic 3-2: General principles

*Sub-topic description:*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-2-1: Applicability of FR2-1 interruption durations**

* Proposal 1 (Huawei, Vivo, Nokia, Intel, Qualcomm): Define the interruption requirements for FR2-2 based on the same assumptions (RF retunings, AGC etc) as in legacy FR2 (FR2-1).
  + The baseline interruption time (Ti) in FR2-2 to be same as FR2-1
    - Nslot,interrupted = ⌈ Ti/Tslot ⌉ for synchronous scenario
    - Nslot,interrupted = ⌈ Ti/Tslot ⌉ + 1, for asynchronous scenario
* Recommended WF
  + Agree on proposal 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Support the recommended WF. |
| Nokia | We agree with proposal 1. |
| Qualcomm | Support proposal 1 |
| Huawei | Support option 1. |
| CMCC | Proposal 1 |
| Intel | Agree with recommended WF |
| Ericsson | Agree with Recommended WF |

**Issue 3-2-2: Impact of MRTD**

* Proposal 1a (Huawei, Vivo): The interruption requirements for FR2-2 shall consider the MRTD between CCs where additional slot may be allowed (asynchronous scenarios) when the MRTD is non-negligible considering the slot length of 480 kHz and 960 kHz.
* Proposal 1b (Intel): The symbol length for 480/960kHz SCS is very short and CP length is shorter than MRTD (considering that legacy FR2 MRTD requirements can be applied both for FR2-1 and FR2-2) implying that FR2-2 will always have asynchronous scenario. Always allow an additional slot, wherever applicable.
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss proposal 1a and 1b.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Perfer to Proposal 1a. The MRTD for higher SCS should be investigated first. |
| Vivo | We are fine with Proposal 1a. We understand the value of MRTD would impact the interruption requirements. Maybe more than one additional slot is needed for some cases, which is depending on deployment scenarios and corresponding MRTD requirements.  RAN4 can decide the requirements’ framework firstly, i.e., the structure of the requirements. |
| Nokia | We agree with Proposal 1a.  As for Proposal 1b, we prefer to keep on investigating that issue as in Proposal 1a, and wait for more conclusions on the MRTD topic. |
| Apple | We support proposal 1a |
| Qualcomm | Agree with proposal 1a. |
| Huawei | Support option 1a. |
| CMCC | Proposal 1a |
| Intel | We are ok to wait for an agreement on MRTD. Ok with proposal 1a |
| Ericsson | In general, we agree that MRTD has an influence on existing interruption definitions. We recommend that the study be continued while keeping an eye on Sub-topic 2-4 MTTD/MRTD issues. |

### Sub-topic 3-3: Interruption requirements

*Sub-topic description: The exact interruption tables will be updated here in the second round once we have some agreements on the deployment scenarios and/or general principles.*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-3-1: TBD**

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

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#3-1** | **Issue 3-1-1: Prioritization of interruption requirements**  *Companies’ views:*  Most companies believe that this issue is being discussed with Issue 1-1-1 and agreement from there could be directly used  *Tentative agreements:*  Follow agreement from Issue 1-1-1. No need to capture any agreement from this issue in the WF  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  No further discussion needed |
| **Sub-topic#3-2** | **Issue 3-2-1: Applicability of FR2-1 interruption durations**  *Companies’ views:*  Most companies agree with the proposal.  *Tentative agreements:*  Define the interruption requirements for FR2-2 based on the same assumptions (RF retunings, AGC etc) as in legacy FR2 (FR2-1).   * The baseline interruption time (Ti) in FR2-2 to be same as FR2-1   + Nslot,interrupted = ⌈ Ti/Tslot ⌉ for synchronous scenario   + Nslot,interrupted = ⌈ Ti/Tslot ⌉ + 1, for asynchronous scenario   *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  No further discussion needed in the second round.  **Issue 3-2-2: Impact of MRTD**  *Companies’ views:*  Most companies agree with proposal 1a.  *Tentative agreements:*  The interruption requirements for FR2-2 shall consider the MRTD between CCs where additional slot may be allowed (asynchronous scenarios) when the MRTD is non-negligible considering the slot length of 480 kHz and 960 kHz.  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  No further discussion needed in the second round. |

## Discussion on 2nd round

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

### Sub-topic 3-3: Interruption requirements

*Sub-topic description: Given the agreements on the deployment scenarios, let’s focus on defining interruption requirements for agreed scenarios only.*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-3-1: Interruptions at SCell addition/release (inter-band CA)**

* Proposal 1(Moderator): Propose to update Table 8.2.2.2.1-1 in TS 38.133 with 480/960 kHz subcarrier spacing as below:

Interruption length X1 for SCell addition/release for inter-band CA

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NR Slot length (ms) of victim cell | Interruption length X1 (slots) | |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | |
| 1 | 0.5 | 2 | |
| 2 | 0.25 | Both aggressor cell and victim cell are on FR2 | 4 |
|  |  | Either aggressor cell or victim cell is on FR1 | 5 |
| 3 | 0.125 | Aggressor cell is on FR2 | 8 |
|  |  | Aggressor cell is on FR1 | 9 |
| 4 | NA | NA | NA |
| 5 | 0.03125 | Aggressor cell is on FR2-2 | 32 |
| Aggressor cell is on FR2-1 | FFS |
| Aggressor cell is on FR1 | FFS |
| 6 | 0.015625 | Aggressor cell is on FR2-2 | 64 |
| Aggressor cell is on FR2-1 | FFS |
| Aggressor cell is on FR1 | FFS |

* Recommended WF
  + Agree on proposal 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Vivo | In the GTW, the following deployment scenarios was agreed:   * standalone single carrier and CA in FR2-2 * FR2-2 CA and DC with anchor on FR1   There is no combination of FR2-2 CA/DC with anchor carrier on FR2-1.  Therefore, for Proposal 1, “Aggressor cell is on FR2-1” may need to be ruled out. And there is only a band for FR2-2, so “Aggressor cell is on FR2-2” may also need to be ruled out for Inter-band CA. For FR1 and FR2-2 CA, we may need to wait for exact value of MRTD to determine the interruption requirements.  Base on the above analysis, the interruption requirements could be shown as follows:  Interruption length X1 for SCell addition/release for inter-band CA   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NR Slot length (ms) of victim cell | Interruption length X1 (slots) | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0.5 | 2 | | | 2 | 0.25 | Both aggressor cell and victim cell are on FR2 | 4 | |  |  | Either aggressor cell or victim cell is on FR1 | 5 | | 3 | 0.125 | Aggressor cell is on FR2 | 8 | |  |  | Aggressor cell is on FR1 | 9 | | 4 | NA | NA | NA | | 5 | 0.03125 | Aggressor cell is on FR1 | FFS | | 6 | 0.015625 | Aggressor cell is on FR1 | FFS | |
| LG | Need double check whether “aggressor cell is on FR2-1” is in scope or not to define interruption requirements. We think that this case is out of scope in Rel-17. |
| Nokia | We agree with WF in general. we see no need to include the row with numerology 4.  Fine with removing FR2-1 aggressor. |
| Ericsson | Fine with Recommended WF |

**Issue 3-3-2: Interruptions at SCell addition/release (intra-band CA)**

* Proposal 1 (Qualcomm, Intel, Nokia, Vivo): Propose to update Table 8.2.2.2.1-2 in TS 38.133 with 480/960 kHz subcarrier spacing as below:

Interruption duration for SCell addition/release for intra-band CA

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | NR Slot length (ms) | Interruption length (slots) |
| 0 | 1 | 1 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 1 | 0.5 | 2 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 2 | 0.25 | 4 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 3 | 0.125 | 8 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 4 | NA | NA |
| 5 | 0.03125 | 32 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 6 | 0.015625 | 64 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| NOTE 1: TSMTC\_duration measured in subframes is  - the longest SMTC duration among all above active serving cells and the SCell being added when one SCell is added;  - the longest SMTC duration among all active serving cells in the same band when one SCell is released.  NOTE 2: is as defined in TS 38.211 [6]. | | |

* Recommended WF
  + Agree on proposal 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Support Proposal 1. |
| Nokia | We agree with WF in general. we see no need to include the row with numerology 4. |
| Ericsson | Fine with Recommended WF |

**Issue 3-3-3: Interruptions at SCell activation/deactivation (inter-band CA)**

* Proposal 1(Moderator): Propose to update Table 8.2.2.2.2-1 in TS 38.133 with 480/960 kHz subcarrier spacing as below:

Interruption length X2 for SCell activation/deactivation for inter-band CA

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NR Slot length (ms) of victim cell | Interruption length X2 (slots) | |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | |
| 1 | 0.5 | 1 | |
| 2 | 0.25 | Both aggressor cell and victim cell are on FR2 | 2 |
|  |  | Either aggressor cell or victim cell is on FR1 | 3 |
| 3 | 0.125 | Aggressor cell is on FR2 | 4 |
|  |  | Aggressor cell is on FR1 | 5 |
| 4 | NA | NA | NA |
| 5 | 0.03125 | Aggressor cell is on FR2-2 | 16 |
| Aggressor cell is on FR2-1 | FFS |
| Aggressor cell is on FR1 | FFS |
| 6 | 0.015625 | Aggressor cell is on FR2-2 | 32 |
| Aggressor cell is on FR2-1 | FFS |
| Aggressor cell is on FR1 | FFS |

* Recommended WF
  + Agree on proposal 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Vivo | In the GTW, the following deployment scenarios was agreed:   * standalone single carrier and CA in FR2-2 * FR2-2 CA and DC with anchor on FR1   There is no combination of FR2-2 CA/DC with anchor carrier on FR2-1.  Therefore, for Proposal 1, “Aggressor cell is on FR2-1” may need to be ruled out. And there is only a band for FR2-2, so “Aggressor cell is on FR2-2” may also need to be ruled out for Inter-band CA. For FR1 and FR2-2 CA, we may need to wait for exact value of MRTD to determine the interruption requirements.  Interruption length X2 for SCell addition/release for inter-band CA   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NR Slot length (ms) of victim cell | Interruption length X1 (slots) | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | | | 2 | 0.25 | Both aggressor cell and victim cell are on FR2 | 2 | |  |  | Either aggressor cell or victim cell is on FR1 | 3 | | 3 | 0.125 | Aggressor cell is on FR2 | 4 | |  |  | Aggressor cell is on FR1 | 5 | | 4 | NA | NA | NA | | 5 | 0.03125 | Aggressor cell is on FR1 | FFS | | 6 | 0.015625 | Aggressor cell is on FR1 | FFS | |
| LG | Same comments in Issue 3-3-1 |
| Nokia | We agree with WF in general. we see no need to include the row with numerology 4.  Fine with removing FR2-1 aggressor. |
| Ericsson | Fine with Recommended WF |

**Issue 3-3-4: Interruptions at SCell activation/deactivation (intra-band CA)**

* Proposal 1 (Qualcomm, Intel, Nokia, Vivo): Propose to update Table 8.2.2.2.2-2 in TS 38.133 with 480/960 kHz subcarrier spacing as below:

Interruption duration for SCell activation/deactivation for intra-band CA

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | NR Slot length (ms) | Interruption length (slots) |
| 0 | 1 | 1 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 1 | 0.5 | 1 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 2 | 0.25 | 2 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 3 | 0.125 | 4 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 4 | NA | NA |
| 5 | 0.03125 | 16 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 6 | 0.015625 | 32 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| NOTE 1: TSMTC\_duration measured in subframes is  - the longest SMTC duration among all above active serving cells and the SCell being added when one SCell is added;  - the longest SMTC duration among all active serving cells in the same band when one SCell is released.  NOTE 2: is as defined in TS 38.211 [6]. | | |

* Recommended WF
  + Agree on proposal 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Support Proposal 1. |
| Nokia | We agree with WF in general. wesee no need to include the row with numerology 4. |
| Ericsson | Fine with Recommended WF |

**Issue 3-3-5: Interruptions during measurements on deactivated SCC**

* Proposal 1 (Qualcomm): Propose to update Table 8.2.2.2.3-1 in TS 38.133 with 480/960 kHz subcarrier spacing as below:
* Interruption duration for measurement on deactivated SCell for intra-band CA

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NR Slot length (ms) | X (slots) | Interruption length (slots) |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 1 | 0.5 | 1 | 2 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 2 | 0.25 | 2 | 4 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 3 | 0.125 | 4 | 8 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 4 | NA |  |  |
| 5 | 0.03125 | 16 | 32 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| 6 | 0.015625 | 32 | 64 + TSMTC\_duration \* |
| NOTE 1: TSMTC\_duration measured in subframes is the longest SMTC duration among all above active serving cells and the deactivated SCell to be measured;  NOTE 2: is as defined in TS 38.211 [6]. | | | |

* Recommended WF
  + Agree on proposal 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Support Proposal 1. |
| Nokia | We agree with WF in general. we see no need to include the row with numerology 4. |
| Ericsson | Fine with Recommended WF |

**Issue 3-3-6: Interruptions due to Active BWP switching Requirement**

* Proposal 1 (Vivo, Intel): Propose to update Table 8.2.2.2.1-1 in TS 38.133 with 480/960 kHz subcarrier spacing as below:

**Interruption length X**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | NR Slot | Interruption length X (slots) |
|  | length (ms) |  |
| 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 0.5 | 1 |
| 2 | 0.25 | 3 |
| 3 | 0.125 | 5 |
| 5 | 0.03125 | 17 |
| 6 | 0.015625 | 33 |
| Note1: void | | |

* Recommended WF
  + Agree on proposal 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Support Proposal 1. |
| Nokia | Fine with WF |
| Ericsson | Fine with Recommended WF |

**Issue 3-3-7: Interruptions due to UE-specific CBW change**

* Proposal 1 (Intel): Propose to update Table 8.2.2.2.1-1 in TS 38.133 with 480/960 kHz subcarrier spacing as below:

**Interruption length X**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | NR Slot | Interruption length X (slots) |
|  | length (ms) |  |
| 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 0.5 | 1 |
| 2 | 0.25 | 3 |
| 3 | 0.125 | 5 |
| 5 | 0.03125 | 17 |
| 6 | 0.015625 | 33 |

* Recommended WF
  + Agree on proposal 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Support Proposal 1. |
| Nokia | Fine with WF |
| Ericsson | Fine with Recommended WF |

**Issue 3-3-8: Interruptions at NR SRS carrier based switching**

Proposal 1 (Vivo, Intel): For Standalone NR Carrier Aggregation, when SRS carrier based switching is performed between carriers, the interruption requirements on any active serving cell can be shown in Table 1 and Table 2:

Table 1: Interruption length X1 (slot)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NR Slot length | SRS carrier | Interruption length X1 (slots) | |
|  | (ms) of victim cell | switching time (us)Note 1 | Sub carrier spacing for agressor cell (kHz) | |
|  |  |  | 15 | 30 |
| 0 | 1 | ≤ 200 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | 300, 500 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | 900 | 2 | 2 |
| 1 | 0.5 | ≤ 200 | 3 | 2 |
|  |  | 300, 500 | 3 | 3 |
|  |  | 900 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | 0.25 | ≤ 200 | 4 | 3 |
|  |  | 300, 500 | 5 | 4 |
|  |  | 900 | 7 | 6 |
| 3 | 0.125 | ≤ 200 | 7 | 5 |
|  |  | 300, 500 | 9 | 7 |
|  |  | 900 | 12 | 10 |
| 5 | 0.03125 | ≤ 200 | 22 | 15 |
| 300, 500 | 31 | 24 |
| 900 | 44 | 37 |
| 6 | 0.015625 | ≤ 200 | 42 | 28 |
| 300, 500 | 61 | 47 |
| 900 | 87 | 73 |
| Note1: NR SRS carrier switching time is UE capability indicated by higher layer parameter *SRS-SwitchingTimeNR*. | | | | |

Table 2: Interruption length X2 (slot)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NR Slot | SRS carrier | Interruption length X2 (slots) | | | |
|  | length (ms) of victim cell | switching time (us) Note 1 | Sub carrier spacing for agressor cell (kHz) | | | |
|  |  |  | 60 | 120 | 480 | 960 |
| 0 | 1 | ≤ 200 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 1 | 0.5 | ≤ 200 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | 0.25 | ≤ 200 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 0.125 | ≤ 200 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 5 | 0.03125 | ≤ 200 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 8 |
| 6 | 0.015625 | ≤ 200 | 21 | 18 | 15 | 15 |
| Note1: NR SRS carrier switching time is UE capability indicated by higher layer parameter *SRS-SwitchingTimeNR*. | | | | | | |

* Recommended WF
  + Agree on proposal 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Support Proposal 1. |
| Ericsson | Fine with Recommended WF |

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| WF on NR extension to 71 GHz – RRM - 1 | Qualcomm | All agreements to be captured in this document |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics incl. existing and new tdocs.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. For new LS documents, please include information on To/Cc WGs in the comments column
4. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-210xxxx | WF on … | YYY | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
| R4-210xxxx | LS on … | ZZZ | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. Do not include hyper-links in the documents