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# Introduction

In the last RAN4#96e meeting, the SAR schemes for UE power class 2 NR inter-band CA and SUL configurations were discussed and a WF of R4-20011789 was approved with the following candidate options for SAR schemes:

* *Duty cycle based solutions*
	+ *Option 1: Report one total UL duty cycle capability*
	+ *Option 2: Report the duty cycle capabilities per band*
* *UE implementation based solution, i.e. P-MPR*
* *Other options are not precluded and will be continually discussed in next meeting*

Based on this alignment, companies further study the SAR solutions for CA and SUL. In this meeting, according to the contributions submitted, this email discussion thread will focus on the following aspects:

* Topic #1: PC2 band-combination requirements for example combos
* Topic#2: PC2 SAR solutions
	+ Sub-topic 2-1: For PC2 inter-band CA
	+ Sub-topic 2-2: For PC2 SUL configurations
	+ Sub-topic 2-3: Release independency issue

Note that the table for filling comments is assigned just at the bottom of each section of issues.... But the table for collecting comments for CR/TP is still kept in the original position.

# Topic #1: PC2 band-combination requirements for example combos

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations/Abstracts** |
| [R4-2015039](file:///E%3A%5C01%20%E6%A0%87%E5%87%86%5C14%20HPUE%5C02%20UL_interCA%5CRAN4_97_e%5CDocs%5CR4-2015039.zip) | ZTE Corporation | we give some discussion on the cross band isolation MSD for PC2 NR inter-band CA n41-n79. For the three cases, i.e. 23dBm+26dBm, 26dBm+23dBm and 26dBm +26dBm, the MSD values are proposed:Table 2: Reference sensitivity exceptions (MSD) due to cross band isolation for PC2 NR CA n41-n79

|  |
| --- |
| NR Band / Channel bandwidth of the affected DL band |
| UL band | DL band | 5MHz (dB) | 10MHz (dB) | 15MHz (dB) | 20MHz (dB) | 25MHz (dB) | 30 MHz (dB) | 40 MHz (dB) | 50 MHz (dB) | 60 MHz (dB) | 70MHz(dB) | 80 MHz (dB) | 90 MHz (dB) | 100 MHz (dB) |
| n41 | n79 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 |  | 3.4 |  | 3.4 |
| n79 | n41 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.2 |  | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.7 |  | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.5 |

 |
| [R4-2015266](file:///E%3A%5C01%20%E6%A0%87%E5%87%86%5C14%20HPUE%5C02%20UL_interCA%5CRAN4_97_e%5CDocs%5CR4-2015266.zip) | Xiaomi | Observation 1: No need to consider harmonic and IMD issues for PC2 band combination CA\_n41-n79.Observation 2: Cross band isolation issue shall be re-evaluated for those PC2 cases that one band can support 26dBm if simultaneous Rx/Tx is supported for CA\_n41-n79.Proposal 1: The MSD value due to cross band isolation as illustrated in table 3 is proposed for PC2 in band n41 for CA\_n41-n79 case c and d.Proposal 2: The MSD value due to cross band isolation as illustrated in table 5 is proposed for PC2 in band n79 for CA\_n41-n79 case b and d. |
| [R4-2015190](file:///E%3A%5C01%20%E6%A0%87%E5%87%86%5C14%20HPUE%5C02%20UL_interCA%5CRAN4_97_e%5CDocs%5CR4-2015190.zip) | China Telecom | Proposal 4: It is proposed to define the MSD requirement as 17.8dB for PC2 CA\_n1A-n78A due to IMD4. The detailed analysis can be found in annex. |
| [R4-2015889](file:///E%3A%5C01%20%E6%A0%87%E5%87%86%5C14%20HPUE%5C02%20UL_interCA%5CRAN4_97_e%5CDocs%5CR4-2015889.zip) | China Telecom, ZTE, Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT | Abstract: CR to 38.101-1 Introduce band combination requirements for PC2 CA\_n1A-n78A |

## 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: PC2 band-combination requirements

This sub-topic will discuss band-combination requirements for PC2 inter-band CA, i.e. CA\_n41A-n79A and CA\_n1A-n78A.

**Issue 1-1-1: Requirements for PC2 CA\_n41A-n79A**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: For the three cases, i.e. 23dBm+26dBm, 26dBm+23dBm and 26dBm +26dBm, the MSD values are proposed ([R4-2015039](file:///E%3A%5C01%20%E6%A0%87%E5%87%86%5C14%20HPUE%5C02%20UL_interCA%5CRAN4_97_e%5CDocs%5CR4-2015039.zip))

**Table 1: Reference sensitivity exceptions (MSD) due to cross band isolation for PC2 NR CA n41-n79**

|  |
| --- |
| NR Band / Channel bandwidth of the affected DL band |
| UL band | DL band | 5MHz (dB) | 10MHz (dB) | 15MHz (dB) | 20MHz (dB) | 25MHz (dB) | 30 MHz (dB) | 40 MHz (dB) | 50 MHz (dB) | 60 MHz (dB) | 70MHz(dB) | 80 MHz (dB) | 90 MHz (dB) | 100 MHz (dB) |
| n41 | n79 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 |  | 3.4 |  | 3.4 |
| n79 | n41 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.2 |  | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.7 |  | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.5 |

* + Option 2: The MSD value due to cross band isolation is proposed in table 2 and 3 ([R4-2015266](file:///E%3A%5C01%20%E6%A0%87%E5%87%86%5C14%20HPUE%5C02%20UL_interCA%5CRAN4_97_e%5CDocs%5CR4-2015266.zip))

**Table 2 MSD due to cross band isolation for PC2 in band n41 for CA\_n41-n79 case c and d**

|  |
| --- |
| E-UTRA or NR Band / Channel bandwidth of the affected DL band / MSD |
| UL band | DL band | 5 MHz(dB) | 10 MHz(dB) | 15 MHz(dB) | 20 MHz(dB) | 25 MHz(dB) | 30 MHz(dB) | 40 MHz(dB) | 50 MHz(dB) | 60 MHz(dB) | 80 MHz(dB) | 90 MHz(dB) |
| n41 | n79 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 |

**Table 3 MSD due to cross band isolation for PC2 in band n79 for CA\_n41-n79 case b and d**

|  |
| --- |
| E-UTRA or NR Band / Channel bandwidth of the affected DL band / MSD |
| UL band | DL band | 5 MHz(dB) | 10 MHz(dB) | 15 MHz(dB) | 20 MHz(dB) | 25 MHz(dB) | 30 MHz(dB) | 40 MHz(dB) | 50 MHz(dB) | 60 MHz(dB) | 80 MHz(dB) | 90 MHz(dB) | 100 MHz(dB) |
| n79 | n41 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.0 |  |  | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 |

* Recommended WF
	+ Collect views on the proposed MSD values according to option 1 and option 2

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

**Issue 1-1-2: Requirements for PC2 CA\_n1A-n78A**

* Proposals
	+ Define the MSD requirement as 17.8dB as shown in table 4 for PC2 CA\_n1A-n78A due to IMD4 ([R4-2015190](file:///E%3A%5C01%20%E6%A0%87%E5%87%86%5C14%20HPUE%5C02%20UL_interCA%5CRAN4_97_e%5CDocs%5CR4-2015190.zip))

**Table 4: 2DL/2UL interband Reference sensitivity QPSK PREFSENS and uplink/downlink configurations for PC2 CA (**R4-2015889)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Band / Channel bandwidth / NRB / Duplex mode | Source of IMD |
| NR CAConfiguration | NR band | UL Fc (MHz) | UL/DL BW (MHz) | UL CLRB | DL Fc (MHz) | MSD (dB) | Duplex mode |
| CA\_n1A-n78A | n1 | 1950 | 5 | 25 | 2140 | [17.8] | FDD | IMD4 |
| n78 | 3710 | 10 | 50 | 3710 | N/A | TDD | N/A |

* Recommended WF
	+ Collect views on the proposed MSD value and corresponding formal CR of R4-2015889.

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

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### CRs/TPs comments collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2015889 | Company A |
| 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:* |

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
| #1 |  |  |

### CRs/TPs

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation**  |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

# Topic #2: PC2 SAR solutions

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations/Abstracts** |
| R4-2014383 | CATT | Observation 1: If there’s no Tx diversity implementation demands for the single band mode in 2UL CA, current spec already can distinguish the different implementation scenarios for PC2.Proposal 1: Option 2 is selected as the duty cycle based SAR solutions for PC2 inter-band CA.Proposal 2: Option 2 is selected as the duty cycle based SAR solutions for SUL configuration.Observation 2: The solution for the UE behaviour when the scheduling is beyond UE duty cycle capability and/or the capability is absent needs more discussion. |
| R4-2015040 | ZTE Corporation | Proposal 1. For duty cycle based solutions, report both total duty cycle capability and duty cycle of PCell.Proposal 2. The release independence for PC2 inter-band NR CA is from Rel-16. |
| R4-2015190 | China Telecom | Proposal 1: Report one total UL duty cycle capability for PC2 NR inter-band UL CA.Proposal 2: Report the *maxUplinkDutyCycle-CA-PC2* asthesequence of *maxUplinkDutyCycle[1,2,3,4]* for power class 2 case [a,b,c,d] correspondingly.* Proposal 2a: Choose the *Case a* with n50 dutycycle as default for TDD+TDD CA, and choose the *Case b* with n50 dutycycle as default for FDD+TDD CA, when signalling is absent.

Proposal 3: It is proposed to be release independent from Rel-15 for PC2 NR inter-band UL CA |
| R4-2015192 | China Telecom | Abstract: draft CR to 38.101-1 Introduce SAR solution for UE power class 2 NR inter-band CA with 2UL |
| R4-2015260 | Xiaomi | Observation 1: the UE implementation based solution, i.e. P-MPR should be always allowed for UE meeting SAR issue regardless of CA, DC or non-CA case.Observation 2: Dutycycle based solution is widely adopted in HP UE caseObservation 3: if dutycycle based solution is used, the P-MPR impact on UE maximum permitted output power could be decrease.Proposal 1: Besides the default solution, i.e. UE implementation based solution (P-MPR), the dutycycle based solution can be introduced as a capability for PC2 NR inter-band CA UE meeting SAR issue.Observation 4：If the approach that reporting one capability based on the fixed dutycycle in other band is used, the power configuration does not need to be reported.Proposal 2: For dutycycle based solution, it is proposed that the approach that reporting one capability based on the fixed dutycycle in PCC band is adopted. The number of fixed dutycycle in PCC band shall be FFS. |
| R4-2015287 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: UE reports one scaled dutycycle capability for UL CA combination with 26dbm maximum total output power. |
| R4-2015329 | vivo | Observation 1: There are 3 totally different SAR solutions for SA, ENDC TDD-TDD, ENDC FDD-TDD.Observation 2: For ENDC TDD-TDD/FDD-TDD, the duty cycle of NR bands is reported based on the LTE band configuration/duty cycle.Proposal 1: Reuse the SA, ENDC TDD-TDD, ENDC FDD-TDD HPUE SAR solution as much as possible for inter band CA to reduce complexity.Proposal 2: Reuse ENDC FDD-TDD solution and set 2 reference points in FDD carrier, and to report maximum supported UL duty cycle on TDD carrier for FDD-TDD inter-band CA case. Proposal 3: For the duty cycle values which serve as reference points in FDD carrier, considering forward compatibility and alignment with NR TDD-TDD CA case, the values of reference points are proposed to be reported by UE and [40% 70%] can be default. Proposal 4: Considering NR TDD frame configuration flexibility, based on 2 UL duty cycle reference points on a TDD carrier, which is similar to FDD-TDD EN-DC case, UE reports maximum supported UL duty cycle on another TDD carrier for TDD-TDD inter-band CA case.Proposal 5: Specify a reference band among the two TDD bands. To align with RAN1 power allocation prioritizing order, Pcell or Pscell band is proposed to be reference band.Proposal 6: Considering forward compatibility and UE implementation flexibility, e.g. different capability 23/26dBm in reference TDD carrier, the specific UL duty cycles which serve as reference points are proposed to be reported, rather than fixed values, by UE for TDD-TDD inter-band CA case.Proposal 7: With UE Power class for the band combination and PHR for each carrier reported, no new signaling is needed for the detail power class 2 scenarios.Proposal 8: Confirm it is the maximum output power that is behind the duty cycle reporting, while not to reflect this in the spec to keep the flexibility.Proposal 9: Further discuss the release independency, based on the signaling scheme etc. |
| R4-2015346 | OPPO | Observation 1: Reporting of combined Band X +Band Y duty cycle capability is a possible way for inter-band UL CA HPUE SAR issues.Proposal 1: It is proposed to consider reporting a group of combined maxUplinkdutycycle capabilities for inter-band UL CA HPUE SAR issue. |
| R4-2015983 | Ericsson | Proposal 1: duty cycle reporting should not the basis for UL CA PC2; it is not viable.Proposal 2: to facilitate SAR compliance for UL CA PC2 and prevent dropping of SCells for all CA power classes, specify UE-specific absolute and/or relative power limits (P-Max) modifying the configured maximum output power per serving cell. Proposal 3: the absolute and or relative power limits are set up in an RRC meassage. Then limit to be used by the UE is determined by a MAC-CE or a PDCCH message based on a DCI format, which enables fast adaptation to changing radio conditions (e.g. temporarily disabling limits). This should be liased with RAN1 and RAN2. |
| R4-2016439 | Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal: Remove the PPowerClass term within the PCMAX\_H for inter-band UL CA. |
| R4-2015041 | ZTE Corporation | Proposal 1. For duty cycle based solutions, report both total duty cycle capability and duty cycle of PCell.Proposal 2. Introduce maximum output power table for both PC3 and PC2 SUL in TS38.101-1. |
| R4-2015191 | China Telecom | Proposal 1: Report one total UL duty cycle capability for PC2 NR SUL configurations.Proposal 2: Report the *maxUplinkDutyCycle-SULcombination-PC2* for power class 2 NR SUL configurations.* Proposal 2a: Choose the value of n50 dutycycle as default when signalling is absent.

Proposal 3: It is proposed to be release independent from Rel-15 for PC2 NR SUL configurations |
| R4-2015194 | China Telecom | Abstract: draft CR to 38.101-1 Introduce SAR solution for UE power class 2 NR SUL configurations |
| R4-2015286 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: UE reports maximum supported UL duty cycle on the SUL band according to the TDD configuration when configured with SUL + TDD combinations.Proposal 2: PC2 HPUE only falls back maximum output power on TDD band but not SUL band when operating under SUL-TDD band combinations.Proposal 3: The condition for UE power fallbacks is met when either 1) the network configures 23dbm or less Pmax or 2) the network schedules too much UL resources, under SUL-TDD band combinations operating with 26dbm MOP. |
| [R4-2015330](file:///E%3A%5C01%20%E6%A0%87%E5%87%86%5C14%20HPUE%5C02%20UL_interCA%5CRAN4_97_e%5CDocs%5CR4-2015330.zip) | vivo | Proposal 1: Reuse the SA, ENDC TDD-TDD, ENDC FDD-TDD HPUE SAR solution as much as possible for PC2 UE with SUL to reduce complexity.Proposal 2: Considering NR TDD frame configuration flexibility, UE reports maximum supported UL duty cycle on the SUL band based on 2 reference points of NR TDD uplink transmission.Proposal 3: Considering UE implementation flexibility and forward compatibility, the specific reference points are proposed to be reported by PC2 UE with SUL case.Proposal 4: To align with power allocation prioritizing order in 38.213, UE reduces the transmission power on the lower priority carrier.Proposal 5: Confirm it is the maximum output power that is behind the duty cycle reporting, while not to reflect this in the spec to keep the flexibility.Proposal 6: Further discuss the release independency, based on the signaling scheme etc.Observation 1: Whether and how to distinguish the power class 2 scenarios is not applicable to SUL case. |
| [R4-2015345](file:///E%3A%5C01%20%E6%A0%87%E5%87%86%5C14%20HPUE%5C02%20UL_interCA%5CRAN4_97_e%5CDocs%5CR4-2015345.zip) | OPPO | 2.1 The normal handling of SAR*Observation 1: Reporting of maxUplinkdutycycle was widely used to solve HPUE SAR issues.*2.2 Possibility of reusing EN-DC SAR solutions*Observation 2: In TDD+TDD EN-DC, the maxUplinkdutycycle was reported based on fixed LTE TDD UL/DL configuration.**Observation 3: SUL is DCI dynamic scheduling transmission, and there is no fixed UL duty cycle.**Observation 4: The TDD+TDD EN-DC SAR scheme cannot be reused directly.**Observation 5: The FDD+TDD EN-DC scheme is based on two reference FDD band duty cycle which makes the reported NR TDD capability is inaccurate in most of the time.**Proposal 1: SUL SAR solutions should be fully considered rather than directly reuse the legacy TDD+TDD or FDD+TDD EN-DC duty cycle SAR solutions due to possible degraded system performance.*2.3 Potential SUL SAR solutions*Observation 6: SUL has its own special characteristics, i.e. non-simultaneous transmission with NUL, separate power class defined, and already reported NR TDD band duty cycle capability.**Observation 7: One straightforward approach is to reuse the NR TDD band maxUplinkdutycycle, and further report the maxUplinkdutycycle for SUL band, and then combine these two capability together.**Observation 8: With new SUL band duty cycle capability further reported, the SUL+NR TDD SAR can be solved by simple time average of the SUL band and NR TDD band duty cycle capability.**Observation 9: NR TDD and SUL band can be scheduled flexibly and no longer be restricted to one or two fixed duty cycles.**Observation 10: Tight coordination between SUL and NUL BS is not a problem since SUL feature is already under the condition of tight coordination.**Observation 11: Calculation of the total duty cycle in SUL and NUL from UE side is no more work than the current maxUplinkdutycycle in SA or TDD/TDD FDD/TDD NSA HPUE.**Proposal 2: It is proposed to only report maxUplinkdutycycle for SUL band under 26dBm to solve the SAR issue.**Proposal 3: SUL maxUplinkdutycycle capability is only for NW to consider and no restriction on the NW scheduler design as other maxUplinkdutycycle capabilities have done.**Observation 12:* Current *maxUplinkDutyCycle-PC2-FR1* can be extended to SUL band with modification of the description in 38.306 and no new signaling needs to be defined to provide further information to NW.*Observation 13:* Flexibility can be given to UE implementation on calculation of the averaged duty cycle.*Proposal 4: It is proposed to consider reusing the current maxUplinkDutyCycle-PC2-FR1 capability for SUL band capability reporting.* |

## 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: For PC2 inter-band CA

This sub-topic will discuss SAR schemes/solutions for PC2 inter-band CA.

**Issue 2-1-1: SAR schemes for PC2 inter-band CA**

* Proposals
	+ Duty Cycle based solutions
		- Option 1: Report one total UL duty cycle capability
			* CTC: Report one total UL duty cycle capability for PC2 NR inter-band UL CA.
			* HW: UE reports one scaled dutycycle capability for UL CA combination with 26dbm maximum total output power.
			* ZTE: For duty cycle based solutions, report both total duty cycle capability and duty cycle of PCell.
		- Option 2: Report the duty cycle capabilities per band
			* CATT: Option 2 is selected as the duty cycle based SAR solutions for PC2 inter-band CA.
			* Xiaomi: reporting one capability based on the fixed dutycycle in PCC band is adopted. The number of fixed dutycycle in PCC band shall be FFS.
			* vivo: Reuse ENDC FDD-TDD solution and set 2 reference points in FDD carrier, and to report maximum supported UL duty cycle on TDD carrier for FDD-TDD inter-band CA case. Considering NR TDD frame configuration flexibility, based on 2 UL duty cycle reference points on a TDD carrier, which is similar to FDD-TDD EN-DC case, UE reports maximum supported UL duty cycle on another TDD carrier for TDD-TDD inter-band CA case.
			* OPPO: reporting a group of combined maxUplinkdutycycle capabilities for inter-band UL CA HPUE SAR issue.
			* ZTE: For duty cycle based solutions, report both total duty cycle capability and duty cycle of PCell.
	+ UE implementation based solution, i.e. P-MPR
		- Xiaomi: Considering NR TDD frame configuration flexibility, based on 2 UL duty cycle reference points on a TDD carrier, which is similar to FDD-TDD EN-DC case, UE reports maximum supported UL duty cycle on another TDD carrier for TDD-TDD inter-band CA case.
	+ Other options: Similar to “blind scheme”
		- Ericsson: to facilitate SAR compliance for UL CA PC2 and prevent dropping of SCells for all CA power classes, specify UE-specific absolute and/or relative power limits (P-Max) modifying the configured maximum output power per serving cell.
* Recommended WF
	+ Figure out the capabilities reporting for duty cycle solution
	+ Determine the baseline solution
	+ Discussion on other options

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | **Issue 2-1-1: SAR schemes for PC2 inter-band CA*** + Duty Cycle based solutions

We still have the slight preference of option 2. We understand the intention of the option 1 that the signalling seems cleaner than option 2. And the option 2 has some draw backs that signalling is more complicated and also reference configuration needs to be discussed. However, for the option 1, we’re not sure what’s the exact definition of the total duty cycle capability. Does UE need to measure the every possible configuration possibilities for the bands pair then report the worst case? Should NW configure the UL duty cycle considering the reported capability is the maximum capability? It seems UE needs to do more if option 1 is chosen although the signalling is cleaner. And for the future test case discussion, how to confirm the performance needs more discussion. For example, if 50% is reported, which configuration is used to check the performance?* + UE implementation based solution, i.e. P-MPR

We don’t have strong opinion but think P-MPR can be a candidate when the NW scheduling is beyond UE capability or the capability is absent. |
| Intel | **Issue 2-1-1: SAR schemes for PC2 inter-band CA****Both option 1 and option 2 can be used. We slightly prefer option 1 due to signalling simplicity. But neither option provides the detail fallback behaviour. The UE fallback behaviour needs to be specified as well.**  |
| Xiaomi | * + Duty Cycle based solutions

As mentioned in our paper, the option 1 that Reporting one total UL duty cycle capability has two disadvantages. One is that it is based on the assumption that equal weighting for the SAR effect between bands, which may not be always reasonable in term of actual implementation, the other one is that it is not straightforward for BS to determine whether current dutycycle configuration excess its capacity, as it needs to check through the equation. If we look at the approaches used in NSA FDD+TDD and TDD+TDD, it can be found they are actual the same, that is reporting one capability based on the fixed dutycycle in other band. We think the similar approach could be also used for inter-band CA. Therefore for dutycycle based solution, it is proposed that the approach that reporting one capability based on the fixed dutycycle in PCC band is adopted. The number of fixed dutycycle in PCC band can be for further study.* + UE implementation based solution, i.e. P-MPR

The UE implementation based solution, i.e. P-MPR should be always allowed for UE meeting SAR issue regardless of CA, DC or non-CA case.* + Other options: Similar to “blind scheme”

We think the traditional dutycycle approach and P-MPR shall be reused as much as possible to address SAR issue. |

**Issue 2-1-2: Power configuration issue for PC2 inter-band CA**

* Proposals for output power limit
	+ Qualcomm: Remove the PPowerClass term within the PCMAX\_H for inter-band UL CA.
* Recommended WF
	+ Collect views on this proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | In general, agree with the idea. But not sure 1) if UE co-existence needs re-evaluation due to removing PPowerClass in upper bound of Pcmax. 2) how to address SAR issue, etc  |
| Xiaomi | This should be carefully studied since it may be a challenge to meet the out of band emission such as SEM and spurious emission with the original MPR per band especially for those band combinations that having the poor cross band isolation.In addition, to address SAR issue, even it can be done with a lower dutycyle reporting for a UE with higher transmission power, but when the UL EN-DC scheduling exceeds the UE capability, what is UE behavior in this case, how to fallback? |

### Sub-topic 2-2: For PC2 SUL configurations

This sub-topic will discuss SAR schemes/solutions for PC2 SUL configurations.

**Issue 2-2-1: SAR schemes for PC2 SUL configurations**

* Proposals
	+ Duty Cycle based solutions
		- Option 1: Report one total UL duty cycle capability
			* CTC: Report one total UL duty cycle capability for PC2 NR SUL configurations
			* ZTE: For duty cycle based solutions, report both total duty cycle capability and duty cycle of PCell
		- Option 2: Report the duty cycle capabilities per band
			* Huawei: UE reports maximum supported UL duty cycle on the SUL band according to the TDD configuration when configured with SUL + TDD combinations
			* vivo: Considering NR TDD frame configuration flexibility, UE reports maximum supported UL duty cycle on the SUL band based on 2 reference points of NR TDD uplink transmission.
			* OPPO: It is proposed to only report maxUplinkdutycycle for SUL band
			* ZTE: For duty cycle based solutions, report both total duty cycle capability and duty cycle of PCell
			* CATT: Option 2 is selected as the duty cycle based SAR solutions for SUL configuration.
* Recommended WF
	+ Figure out the capabilities reporting for duty cycle solution
	+ Determine the baseline solution

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | The same comment as 2-1. We still have slight preference of option 2. One question from our side for other companies’ proposals in option2, why NUL is prioritized that only the duty cycle capability of SUL should be reported. Our understanding is that NUL and SUL should be treated equally when considering SAR schemes. |
| Intel | See comments to Issue 2-1-1. |
| Xiaomi | See comments to 2-1-1 |

### Sub-topic 2-3: Release independency issue

**Issue 2-3-1: Release independency issue for PC2 inter-band CA**

* Proposals
	+ CTC: It is proposed to be release independent from Rel-15 for PC2 NR inter-band UL CA
	+ ZTE: The release independence for PC2 inter-band NR CA is from Rel-16
	+ vivo: Further discuss the release independency, based on the signaling scheme etc
* Recommended WF
	+ Determine the release

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | It seems the PC2 release independent follows the release independent of the CA. We would like to know if there’s any issue if it’s from R15. |
| Intel | Which release being independent from can be determined by UE behavior when signaling is absent – behavior must be backward compatible. Since early release UEs don’t support such signaling, then their behavior must be same with the new release UEs with signaling absent. |
| Xiaomi | Share the same view with intel |

**Issue 2-3-2: Release independency issue for PC2 SUL configurations**

* Proposals
	+ CTC: It is proposed to be release independent from Rel-15 for PC2 SUL configurations
	+ vivo: Further discuss the release independency, based on the signaling scheme etc
* Recommended WF
	+ Determine the release

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT  | Same comment as above. |
| Intel | Same comments to Issue 2-3-1 |
| Xiaomi | Same comment as above. |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### CRs/TPs comments collection

The following two draft CRs will depend on the progress of SAR schemes discussion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2015192 | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| R4-2015194 | Company A |
| 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:* |

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title**  | **Assigned Company,****WF or LS lead** |
| #1 |  |  |

### CRs/TPs

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation**  |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |