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# Introduction

* In this email thread, the remaining issues related to UL gap is discussed and include
* 9.4.2 UL gaps for self-calibration and monitoring
* 9.4.5 UL gaps RRM
* 9.4.6.2 UL gap RRM perf

It is appreciated that the delegates for this topic put their contact information in the table below.

Contact information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email address** |
| Qualcomm | CH Park | chparkqc@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Qualcomm | Ville Vintola | [vvintola@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:vvintola@qti.qualcomm.com) |
| Ericsson | Christian  Venkat | [christian.bergljung@ericsson.com](mailto:christian.bergljung@ericsson.com);  venkatarao.gonuguntla@ericsson.com |

Note:

1. Please add your contact information in above table once you make comments on this email thread.
2. If multiple delegates from the same company make comments on single email thread, please add you name as suffix after company name when make comments i.e. Company A (XX, XX)

# Topic #1: RF requirements and related testing

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Title** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2211884**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211884.zip) | Maintenance of UL gaps for self-calibration and monitoring | Apple | **Proposal 2: If step 3 is to be defined, implementation margin needs to be added.**  **Proposal 3**: Modified step 3 test procedure as:  Measure the EIRP where the UL duty cycle is configured lower than the maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2 (or UL duty cycle = [10] % if UE does not report the maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2) and without the UL gap configured. 🡪 P-bit = 0 for UE report the maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2 or enhanced EIRP2 (should be at least reference EIRP **+ [1.25]** dB) for UE does not report the maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2.  - no P-MPR should be applied when the configured UL duty cycle is lower than the UE reported capability maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2 per Rel-15 agreement.  - For UE does not report maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2, it is still correct UE behaviour to lower the PMPR with reduced uplink duty cycle. |
| [**R4-2213641**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213641.zip) | UE Tx power management test case for MPE compliance | Sony, Ericsson | **Observation 1: no additional test effort is required for UE does not report the maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2 for step 3 to verify the PMPR behavior with uplink duty cycle since the measurement results in the MOP test can be re-used. Only one additional peak EIRP measurement at a higher duty cycle is needed.**  **Observation 2; the current wording in Tx power management can be misinterpreted as UE shall always apply PMPR as long as there is no uplink gap, and a clarification is needed.**  **Proposal 1: step 3 of the proposed test procedure (of the WF in R4-2206604) shall be specified; the Ppeak\_EIRP shall be attained a duty cycle lower than [10]% or for a duty cycle lower than the capability maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2. No P-MPR shall be applied for this case.**  **Proposal 2: It is proposed to revise the text in 38.101-2 as below:**  For UE support UL gap, when UL gap for Tx power management is not configured and activated or the configured uplink duty cycle is lower than the maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2 (or UL duty cycle = [10] % if UE does not report the maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2), UE shall set the P bit in PHR to 1 in the test when PHR is configured. |

## 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: on step 3 test procedure

*Related agreement in RAN#103e*

* *Agreement: Step 3 discussion is decoupled with UL gap.*
* *Agreement: When UL gap is not configured/activated and PHR is configured during the test, P bit in PHR shall be 1 during the UL gap test.*

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

* R4-2213641(Sony, Ericsson)

**Proposal 1: step 3 of the proposed test procedure (of the WF in R4-2206604) shall be specified; the Ppeak\_EIRP shall be attained a duty cycle lower than [10]% or for a duty cycle lower than the capability maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2. No P-MPR shall be applied for this case.**

**Proposal 2: It is proposed to revise the text in 38.101-2 as below:**

For UE support UL gap, when UL gap for Tx power management is not configured and activated or the configured uplink duty cycle is lower than the maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2 (or UL duty cycle = [10] % if UE does not report the maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2), UE shall set the P bit in PHR to 1 in the test when PHR is configured.

Proposal:

* Option 1: revisit step 3 agreement in RAN4#103 to specify step 3 in UL gap related tests
  + If Yes to option 1, please provide your comments on R4-2213641
* Option 2: keep the agreement in RAN4#103 unchanged
  + Option 2.1: discuss step 3 in this email thread independently from UL gap
    - If Yes to option 2.1, please provide your comments on R4-2211884
  + Option 2.2: stop step 3 related discussion in this email thread and seek for the guidance from chairman on how to proceed

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | We are supportive of this proposal, it is almost zero effort and addition to the test procedures and would clarify the UE behavior. However, it might make sense to us wording “lower or equal to” since the capability description says this value can be used for full power, see below.  ***maxUplinkDutyCycle-FR2***  Indicates the maximum percentage of symbols during 1s that can be scheduled for uplink transmission at the UE maximum transmission power, |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*For close-to-finalize WIs and maintenance work, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For ongoing WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **title** | **company** | **Comments collection** |
| [**R4-2212531**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212531.zip) | Draft CR to correct ‘Annex G Difference of relative phase and power errors’ for FR2 UL coherent MIMO | **Anritsu Limited** | Qualcomm: Change is appreciated |
| [**R4-2212775**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212775.zip) | Amendment of the requirement on TX power management | **Ericsson, Sony** |  |
| [**R4-2214047**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2214047.zip) | Correction CR on UL Gap | Qualcomm Incorporated |  |

## 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** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

# Topic #2: RRM requirements and the related tests

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Title** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2211884**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211884.zip) | Maintenance of UL gaps for self-calibration and monitoring | Apple | **Proposal 1: Confirm X=10ms.** |
| [**R4-2213864**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213864.zip) | Discussion on maintenance of UL gaps for self-calibration and monitoring | ZTE Corporation | **Proposal 1: Similar situation as RACH procedure, in order to finish some RRM procedures in which CSI report is involved in, CSI report can be prioritized over UL gap.** |
| [**R4-2211885**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211885.zip) | RRM performance requirements: UL gaps for self-calibration and monitoring | Apple | **Observation 1: It is up to the UE to determine when to transmit RACH, CG-PUSCH, PUCCH for SR and LRR.**  **Proposal 1: No need to define test cases for UL signal prioritization of RACH, CG-PUSCH, PUCCH for SR and LRR over UL gap.**  **Proposal 2: If prioritization rule for valid CQI report during Scell activation procedure is to be tested, use FR2 intra-cell Scell activation test case as baseline, with additional specification of UL gap configuration offset fully overlapping with the periodic CQI report.** |

## 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: time period between UL gap and CSI report colliding and MAC CE for SCell activation

*Related agreements in RAN4#103e*

* The valid CSI report and/or valid L1-RSRP report during SCell activation procedure, where the valid CSI report is valid CQI with non-zero CQI index defined in clause 5.2.2.1, TS 38.214 and the valid L1-RSRP report is non lowest L1-RSRP defined in clause 10.1.6.
  + The UE need not apply UL gap prioritization rules specified above for SCell activation procedure if the time period between UL gap colliding with CSI report of non-zero CQI or L1-RSRP and the slot where the SCell activation MAC CE or CSI report activation command is received is less than [X ms].
* Proposals
  + Remove the bracket and define X=10ms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Support the moderator’s proposal |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal |

### Sub-topic 2-2: Test on prioritized procedure over UL gap

*Sub-topic description*

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

* **Proposal 1: No need to define test cases for UL signal prioritization of RACH, CG-PUSCH, PUCCH for SR and LRR over UL gap.**
* **Proposal 2: If prioritization rule for valid CQI report during Scell activation procedure is to be tested, use FR2 intra-cell Scell activation test case as baseline, with additional specification of UL gap configuration offset fully overlapping with the periodic CQI report.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 1 and Proposal 2.  Regarding Proposal 2, the test configuration shall be adjusted in such a way that the timing gap from the slot where SCell activation MAC command is received to the first slot to be used for the valid CQI report of to-be-activated SCell shall meet the condition of the prioritization rule, i.e. [X]ms. |
| Ericsson | We agree with both the proposals.  RAN4 can define a test case for testing the prioritization rule of the CQI report during SCell activation. Configuration can be discussed and finalized in the second round. |

### Sub-topic 2-3: On other prioritized procedure over UL gap

*Sub-topic description*

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

**Proposal 1: Similar situation as RACH procedure, in order to finish some RRM procedures in which CSI report is involved in, CSI report can be prioritized over UL gap.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Please proponent of Proposal 1 provide more specific examples. |
| Ericsson | Do not understand the proposal well. May be proponents please clarify the specific RRM procedures. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Title** | **Company** | **Comments collection** |
| [**R4-2211886**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211886.zip) | DraftCR on UL gaps for BPS | Apple | Ericsson: I think the cover sheet needs to be updated. If Apple did not have a CR number, we can revise our CR. |
| Company B |
|  |
| [**R4-2213938**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213938.zip) | Draft CR on UL gaps for BPS | Ericsson | Ericsson: I think there is a typo, X should be equal to 10 and not X>=10 |
| Company B |
|  |

## 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** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **New Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
|  | WF on … | YYY |  |
|  | LS on … | ZZZ | To: RAN\_X; Cc: RAN\_Y |
|  |  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Revised to** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-22xxxxx |  | 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** | **Revised to** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-22xxxxx |  | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-22xxxxx |  | WF on … | YYY | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
| R4-22xxxxx |  | 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