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# Introduction

*Briefly introduce background, the scope of this email discussion (e.g. list of treated agenda items) and provide some guidelines for email discussion if necessary.*

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

* 1st round: TBA
* 2nd round: TBA

# Topic #1: 8.3.2.1.1 Applicability of CBM/IBM for different CA configurations

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Title** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2104559**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104559.zip) | Add beam management type after particular band combination requirement | MediaTek Beijing Inc. | Approval:  **Proposal: Add “\_IBM” or “\_CBM” after particular band combination requirement directly to show the requirement is for IBM or CBM.** |
| [**R4-2105095**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2105095.zip) | Applicability of CBM/IBM for different CA configurations | Xiaomi | Approval:  **Proposal 1: The UE capability signalling to indicate both of IBM and CBM are supported by UE per band combination should be introduced.** |
| [**R4-2106364**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106364.zip) | Discussion on CBM&IBM for FR2 Inter-band DL CA | ZTE Corporation | Approval:  **Proposal 1. CBM and IBM should be explicitly indicated in the TP study and in the TS38.101-2 for FR2+FR2 band combination.** |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 1-1

**Issue 1-1: Add beam management type after particular band combination requirement**

Proposals

* + Option 1: Yes
  + Option 2: No
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Option 1.  As a proponent, our intention is very simple, just to make the particular requirement based on IBM/CBM be clearer, instead of use extra statement in TS to explain; because RAN4 would have different IBM/CBM requirements. Note that, The UEs still need to do signaling for IBM/CBM capability as agreed. |
| OPPO | Option 1. Ok to clarify the requirements are defined for CBM or IBM, maybe with a note in the band combination table is enough? |
| Qualcomm | Proposal is a possibility but is better revisited once we know UE RF requirements for CBM UE also. Until such time, it is not known which requirements need IBM qualification and which can be common for both |
| LG Electronics | Option 2. As agreed in last meeting, either IBM or CBM is applicable as UE capability. So, our preference is to note as UE capability. |
| Samsung | Option 1 makes requirements clearer. But it is also necessary to clarify the relationship with issue 1-2, i.e. in case a UE supports both IBM and CBM for the same band combo. |
| Xiaomi | Option1. We do need indicate whether the requirements are for CBM, IBM or both. It will be better to come back to discuss how to mark the requirements for CBM, IBM or both when the requirements are defined for CBM, IBM or both. |
| ZTE | It seems it depends on how CBM requirements are defined. If the RF requirements for CBM are defined in separate table, then no need to add the suffix, or maybe a new column is enough. And if CBM and IBM share the same requirements for some combination, then long suffix is foreseen. |
| Nokia | Agree with Qualcomm that it is better to wait and see how CBM requirements are defined, |
| Sony | Option 1 |
| Ericsson | Option 1 but the relation between IBM and CBM capability should be clarified so that the network can use the UE capability for configuring the UE with appropriate BM for a configured band combination. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It seems we need to configure out several questions before conclude on this topic:  We provide the questions and our understanding as below, and hope companies could provide views.   1. For one specific configuration, whether IBM and CBM type is also initiate by Basket request?   In our understanding, IBM/CBM is one of the UE capability for each band combination, it does not initiate by basket request. So, one a band configuration is requested, we need to define both IBM and CBM requirement for this band combination.   1. Whether CBM/IBM requirement only relate to specific requirement to each band configuration?   In our understanding, CBM/IBM may have the same or different requirement framework, that could be general requirement defined in the spec, e.g.: both of them have peak EIS requirement. Also, CBM/IBM may have the same or different specific requirement, e.g. relaxation requirement.  So, if each band configuration has both CBM and IBM RF requirement, and UE can indicate by capability to comply with the corresponding requirement, we don’t need to add beam management type after particular band combination. |
| DOCOMO | We agree to add it, but we may need update based on discussion such as CBM requirements for L+H. |
| vivo | Option 1 is OK. Some explanation about the UE that support both IBM and CBM may also be needed. |
| Apple | In a previous meeting, we proposed (R4-2009963) to introduce beam management type per band pair, assigned to the band groups. We think that this information should be assigned considering the band group. |

**Issue 1-2: The UE capability signalling to indicate both of IBM and CBM are supported by UE per band combination should be introduced**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Yes
  + Option 2: No
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Option 1.  If UE can meet both IBM and CBM requirements of the particular band combination, respectively, it makes sense to allow UE indicates both IBM and CBM are supported. How to simplify the signaling architecture/format can be FFS, we don’t have strong view on this currently. |
| OPPO | It has been supported by current signaling, i.e. beamManagementType-r16 -> ENUMERATED {ibm, cbm}. Not sure what is new here. |
| LG Electonics | It needs to be clarified. Does it mean either IBM or CBM, or both IBM and CBM ? As either IBM or CBM as UE capability, we support Option 1. For both IBM and CBM, we support Option 2. |
| Samsung | We also propose to discuss the case in our contribution R4-2105042, i.e. if a UE is allowed to support both IBM and CBM for a band combo. In our understanding, a UE can supports both, but current signaling can only indicating to support one of the two. To address this issue, we can accept option 1. To avoid signaling change, another manner can be also considered, i.e. define CBM as a fall back mode of IBM. (A UE indicating IBM capability implicitly indicates its support of CBM). |
| Xiaomi | Option1. Based on current signaling i.e. beamManagementType-r16 -> ENUMERATED {ibm, cbm}, the UE could just report it supports IBM or CBM, it can’t report it supports both simultaneously. It UE could report the capability of supporting CBM and IBM simultaneously, it will leave the network scheduling flexibility. |
| ZTE | Similar view with OPPO. There are already capabilities defined in RAN2, no need to introduce a new one. Some corrections are needed for the current IE description, especially if both CBM and IBM are supported. |
| Nokia | Option 1 |
| Sony | To our understanding, A UE that supports both CBM and IBM will naturally be signalling the network with CBM capability and IBM capability simultaneously. However, we don’t think it is needed to add a newly dedicated signalling to say, “both IBM and CBM are supported” if this is the intention of the question.  Additionally, we would like to emphasise that this signalling is for UE RF requirement, and it does not limit the how network configure the reference signal in the field. |
| Ericsson | Why are both needed? In our understanding, the definition of the CBM and IBM capability in RAN4 specifications is for the purpose of setting requirements. For a UE supporting CBM, the network can still configure the UE with RS for BM in both bands, but the performance expected would be that assumed for CBM in accordance with the definition in the RAN4 specification. In case IBM requirements apply, can the network assume that the UE meets the requirements for CBM with RS for BM only configured in one band? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer Option 2. If UE support IBM, then CBM is supported from UE capability perspective. For UE indicates IBM, Whether UE measure beam on both band or only on one band, depends on how gNB config/trigger RS for BM. |
| vivo | Prefer option 2, the current signaling may be enough to solve the problem. |

**Issue 1-3: CBM and IBM should be explicitly indicated in the TP study and in the TS38.101-2 for FR2+FR2 band combination.**

Proposals

* + Option 1: Yes
  + Option 2: No
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Option 1.  Clear indication can make the CA band combination type demand be clearer. Note that, The UEs still need to do signaling for IBM/CBM capability as agreed. |
| OPPO | Option 1 |
| Qualcomm | Proposal may be a good method, but it is better to revisit if and when RAN4 decides that some band pair needs BM restrictions by specification (example: RAN4 may decide n2xx+n2yy may not be served by UEs with CBM). Until such time, it would appear both any band pair can be served with either IBM or CBM. |
| LG Electronics | Support option 1 as UE capability. |
| Samsung | Option 1 makes requirements clearer. But it is also necessary to clarify the relationship with issue 1-2, i.e. in case a UE supports both IBM and CBM for the same band combo. |
| Xiaomi | Agree Qualcomm’s proposal, it is a good method to mark the BM restriction for the detail band combination, we need first define the general requirements, then decide whether just some band combination need BM restriction, or case by case requestes it. |
| ZTE | Option 1 makes requirements clearer, the requirement for CBM and IBM may be defined separate, so it is more clearer to mark the BM restrictions for each band combination to indicate which sets of RF requirements are applied. |
| Nokia | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Sony | Option 1 |
| Ericsson | The applicability of the requirement must be stated. If the UE supports a requirement, it will indicate the corresponding UE capability |
| DOCOMO | We agree to add it, but we may need update based on discussion such as CBM requirements for L+H. |
| vivo | Option 1. In our understating, the CBM is quite different from IBM, and the requirements of different BM types will be discussed separately. This option may helpful to make requirements clearer. |
| Apple | Same comment as in Issue 1-1. CBM/IBM support can be indicated by band group. |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Comment directly under each issue above.

### CRs/TPs comments collection

No CRs/TPs.

## 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** | **Issue 1-1: Add beam management type after particular band combination requirement**   * + Option 1: Yes (7 companies + some almost yes)   + Option 2: No (1 company)   ***Tentative agreements:***  Option 1 but its implementation is put on hold as it is not 100% clear if it is needed. We know that after CBM requirement framework is agreed. For example, if both CBM and IBM requirements apply to all band combinations then this differentiation is not needed in specification. Or if the CBM and IBM requirements are separated by other means clearly. UE behavior itself is based on UE capability singling.  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Discuss if tentative agreement is acceptable. |
| **Issue 1-2: The UE capability signalling to indicate both of IBM and CBM are supported by UE per band combination should be introduced**   * + Option 1: Yes (4 companies)   + Option 2: No (5 companies)   + Three opinions that current signalling supports this already   ***Tentative agreements:*** None  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Comeback next meeting and allow people to do homework on current signaling and the need. |
| **Issue 1-3: CBM and IBM should be explicitly indicated in the TP study and in the TS38.101-2 for FR2+FR2 band combination.**   * + Option 1: Yes (8 companies)   + Option 2: No   ***Tentative agreements:***  Option 1 but its implementation is put on hold as it is not 100% clear if it is needed. We know that after CBM requirement framework is agreed. For example, if both CBM and IBM requirements apply to all band combinations then this differentiation is not needed in specification. Or if the CBM and IBM requirements are separated by other means clearly. UE behavior itself is based on UE capability singling.  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Discuss if tentative agreement is acceptable. |

### 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)

Please comment moderator recommendations in table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Status summary** | **Company view on Recommendations for 2nd round:** |
| **Issue 1-1: Add beam management type after particular band combination requirement**   * Option 1: Yes (7 companies + some almost yes) * Option 2: No (1 company)   ***Tentative agreements:***  Option 1 but its implementation is put on hold as it is not 100% clear if it is needed. We know that after CBM requirement framework is agreed. For example, if both CBM and IBM requirements apply to all band combinations then this differentiation is not needed in specification. Or if the CBM and and IBM requirements are separated by other means clearly. UE behavior itself is based on UE capability singling.  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Discuss if tentative agreement is acceptable. | MediaTek: We are okay for Moderator’s suggestion (i.e. agree Option1 but on hold firstly).  OPPO: Ok with moderator suggestion |
| **Issue 1-2: The UE capability signalling to indicate both of IBM and CBM are supported by UE per band combination should be introduced**   * Option 1: Yes (4 companies) * Option 2: No (5 companies) * Three opinions that current signalling supports this already   ***Tentative agreements:*** None  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Comeback next meeting and allow people to do homework on current signaling and the need. | MediaTek: We are okay for Moderator’s suggestion (i.e. comeback next meeting)  OPPO: Ok with comeback next meeting. |
| **Issue 1-3: CBM and IBM should be explicitly indicated in the TP study and in the TS38.101-2 for FR2+FR2 band combination.**   * Option 1: Yes (8 companies) * Option 2: No   ***Tentative agreements:***  Option 1 but its implementation is put on hold as it is not 100% clear if it is needed. We know that after CBM requirement framework is agreed. For example, if both CBM and IBM requirements apply to all band combinations then this differentiation is not needed in specification. Or if the CBM and and IBM requirements are separated by other means clearly. UE behavior itself is based on UE capability singling.  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Discuss if tentative agreement is acceptable. | MediaTek: It is very helpful if we can know the exact IBM/CBM demand, no matter RAN4 finally define same or different requirements for IBM and CBM.  OPPO: Agree with the tentative agreement. |

# Topic #2: 8.3.2.1.2 UE requirements for CA configurations CA\_n258A-n260A and CA\_n257A-n259A based on IBM

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc** | **Title** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2106287**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106287.zip) | Discussion on RF requirements for inter-band DL CA based on CBM and IBM | LG Electronics Polska | Discussion  **Proposal 4: Define relaxation values considering frequency separation per band pair for FR2 inter-band CA with IBM in different frequency group.** |
| [**R4-2105095**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2105095.zip) | Applicability of CBM/IBM for different CA configurations | Xiaomi | **Approval:**  **Proposal 3: Inter-band DL CA based on IBM need consider the relaxations of EIS and EIS spherical coverage:**   * **No matter within the same frequency group or between different frequency groups, reuse the same framework established for n260+n261 and the same relaxation values 3.5dB.** |
| [**R4-2106364**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106364.zip) | Discussion on CBM&IBM for FR2 Inter-band DL CA | ZTE Corporation | Approval:  **Proposal 2. No need to limit the maximum number of CCs** |
| [**R4-2104561**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104561.zip) | RIB proposal of CA\_n258A-n260A and CA\_n257A-n259A based on IBM | MediaTek Beijing Inc. | ***Proposal 1:*** *The relaxation values shall be further discussed based on per band pair case by case.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *PC3 ΔRIB of CA\_n258A-n260A and CA\_n257A-n259A based on IBM shall be defined as:*  For CA\_n258A-n260A:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **NR CA bands** | **NR band** | **ΔRIB,P,n (dB)** | | CA\_n258-n260 | n258 | 4.1 | | n260 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **NR CA bands** | **NR band** | **ΔRIB,S,n (dB)** | | CA\_n258-n260 | n258 | 4.2 | | n260 | 3.2 |   For CA\_n257A-n259A:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **NR CA bands** | **NR band** | **ΔRIB,P,n (dB)** | | CA\_n257-n259 | n257 | 4.2 | | n259 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **NR CA bands** | **NR band** | **ΔRIB,S,n (dB)** | | CA\_n257-n259 | n257 | 4.2 | | n259 | 3.2 | |
| [**R4-2104698**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104698.zip) | UE requirements for CA based on IBM | Sony, Ericsson | Approval:  **Proposal 1: Reuse the IBM inter-CA requirement framework established for n260+n261 for any requested CA band pair from the same frequency group**  **Proposal 2: The same relaxation value as the ones for CA\_n260-n261, i.e., 3.5 dB, can be used for all these band pairs from different frequency groups for IBM.**  **Proposal 3: Band combinations specified in Rel-17 can be implemented in a release-independent manner as long as no new signaling must be used by a UE of an earlier release.** |
| [**R4-2104715**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104715.zip) | FR2 inter-band CA for different frequency band groups with IBM | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Approval:  **Proposal 1: The relaxation values for CA\_n260-n261 are reused as the ones for CA\_n258-n260 and CA\_n257-n259. For other band pairs, it should be further discussed based on per band pair case by case.**  **Proposal 2:** **The release independence of inter-band FR2 CA based on IBM for the different frequency groups is applied from Rel-16 as far as the number of bands is two and CA bandwidths class already defined in Rel-16.**  **Proposal 3: TP to TR 38.851 is approved as attached in Annex for CA\_n257A\_n259A.** |
| [**R4-2105096**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2105096.zip) | Rx requirements for CA\_n258A-n260A and CA\_n257A-n259A based on IBM | Xiaomi | Approval:  **Proposal 1: The maximum number of CCs for inter-band CA including intra-band contiguous CA:**   * **Option1: there is no need to limit the maximum number of CCs.** * **Option2: it should keep align with the maximum number of CCs of intra-band contiguous CA.**   **Proposal 2: ΔRIB,P,n and ΔRIB,S,n should be defined as 3.5dB for all CA combination between the low band group (n257, n258 or n261) and high band group (n259 and n260) for IBM** |
| [**R4-2106346**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106346.zip) | Band specific requirements for DL CA\_n257-n259 including TP for TR 38.851 | NTT DOCOMO INC. | Approval:  **Proposal 1: For ΔRIB,P,n and ΔRIB,S,n, the same relaxation values with n260+n261 should be applied to n257+n259.**  **Observation 1: We need to discuss based on per band pair case by case, but we can reuse the relaxation values for CA\_n260-n261 as the ones for CA\_n258-n260 and CA\_n257-n259.**  **Proposal 2: We should not limit the maximum number of CCs for FR2 DL inter band CA for future expansion.** |
| [**R4-2106365**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106365.zip) | Discussion on UE requirements for CA configurations of CA\_n258-n260 and CA\_n257-n259 based on IBM | ZTE Corporation | Approval:  **Proposal. The relaxation values for CA\_n260-n261 are reused as the ones for CA\_n258-n260 and CA\_n257-n259. For other band pairs, it should be further discussed based on per band pair case by case.** |
| [**R4-2106565**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106565.zip) | R17 FR2 Inter-band DL CA with IBM | OPPO | Approval:  ***Proposal 1: It is proposed to clarify whether the 3.5dB relaxation defined in Rel-16 is for UE that only support n260 and n261 or it also consider UEs that support other FR2 bands.***  ***Proposal 2: If the conclusion for Proposal 1 is YES (3.5dB relaxation in Rel-16 only considered UEs support n260 and n261), then it is proposed to add 0.5dB multi-band relaxation difference to the total relaxations, i.e. in total 4dB relaxation.***  ***Otherwise, it is proposed to keep the 3.5dB total relaxation for n258+n260, and n257+n259.*** |
| [**R4-2107108**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107108.zip) | Discussion on FR2 inter-band DL CA with CBM and IBM | Google Inc. | Approval:  **Proposal 4: The REFSENS and EIS spherical coverage requirement for FR2 inter-band DL CA within the different frequency group based on IBM should be further discussed case by case for every band pair.** |
| [**R4-2107265**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107265.zip) | inter-band CA DL CA with IBM | Huawei, HiSilicon | Approval:  ***Proposal 4: Define 4dB relaxation for CA\_n257+n259.***  ***Proposal 5: for inter-band CA, single polarization for each band is assumed to define the Rx requirement.***  ***Proposal 6: 3dB EIS requirement difference is required between single polarization and dual polarization architecture for each Band.*** |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 2-1

**Issue 2-1: Inter-band DL CA based on IBM relaxations of EIS and EIS spherical coverage**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: No matter within the same frequency group or between different frequency groups, reuse the same framework established for n260+n261 and the same relaxation values 3.5dB.
  + Option 2: The same relaxation value as the ones for CA\_n260-n261, i.e., 3.5 dB, can be used for all band pairs from different frequency groups for IBM.
  + Option 3: The relaxation values for CA\_n260-n261 are reused as the ones for CA\_n258-n260 and CA\_n257-n259. For other band pairs, it should be further discussed based on per band pair case by case.
  + Option 4: Relaxations as in [R4-2104561](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104561.zip)
  + Option 5: Define relaxation values considering frequency separation per band pair for FR2 inter-band CA with IBM in different frequency group
  + Option 6: define relaxation as 4dB for CA\_ n257+n259
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | We are open for Option 4/5/6. Basically, we think the relaxation value shall be defined per band pair, and the exact value can be further discussed.  About Option1/2/3, we think reuse CA\_n260-n261 relaxation value directly is not made sense from technical perspective, because the relaxation value including MBR etc, which is heavily related to band components.  Hence, as Option4 proponent, we calculate the value after considering both relaxation value of CA\_n260-n261and also MBR difference of exact band components.  About Option 5, consider frequency separation as one of factors is fine, but we still need to consider exact bandwidth etc.  About Option 6, a clarification question to Huawei (proponent), does the proposal is as below?   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **NR CA bands** | **NR band** | **ΔRIB,P,n (dB)** | | CA\_n257-n259 | n257 | 4.0 | | n259 | 4.0 | | **NR CA bands** | **NR band** | **ΔRIB,S,n (dB)** | | CA\_n257-n259 | n257 | 4.0 | | n259 | 4.0 | |
| OPPO | Others, the framework can be reused, however, the values need to be clarified.  It is unclear whether the 3.5dB relaxation defined in Rel-16 is for UE that only support n260 and n261 or it also consider UEs that support other FR2 bands. If Rel-16 only consider UE supports n260 and n261, then the Multi-Band relaxation difference for n258+n260, and n257+n259 comparing to n260+n261 would achieve at least 0.5dB for these bands.  Therefore:   * If the conclusion for is 3.5dB relaxation in Rel-16 only considered UEs support n260 and n261 then add 0.5dB multi-band relaxation difference to the total relaxations, i.e. in total 4dB relaxation. * Otherwise, keep the 3.5dB total relaxation for n258+n260, and n257+n259. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 or option 3 modified by option 6 |
| LG Electronics | Support Option 5. Because, the frequency separation for CA\_n258-n260 and CA\_n257-n259 is larger than CA\_n260-n261. |
| Samsung | To be compatible with more bands (47GHz, etc), for relaxation value, it seems that option 1 and option 2 can be precluded. Agree with companies comments that the relaxation values absorb MBR which is band combination dependent. The simultaneous operation of two bands further deteriorate the performance. |
| Xiaomi | Option3, in the discussion of CA\_n260-n261, it already considered 0.7dB multi-band relaxation. |
| ZTE | Option3. |
| Nokia | Option 3 |
| Sony | We support option 2. We also support reusing the same framework established for n260+n261 no matter within the same frequency group or between different frequency groups (values could be FFS if it would be majority view).  Option 1 is also acceptable for us. Though the relaxation values may differ between the same frequency group and the different frequency groups, it is okay for us to unify them as 3.5 dB.  Option 3 may also acceptable if we only focus on CA\_n258-n260 and CA\_n257-n259 for sake of progress.  It is worth pointing out that by reviewing the email discussion back in August meeting, we believe roughly 1 dB MBR relaxation has been included into the total 3.5 dB relaxation. Therefore, we already have sufficient margin to accommodate all the MRB values for any band combinations with 3.5 dB relaxation. |
| Ericsson | Option 2 preferred. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This issue is about requirement for IBM type for different frequency group:  We prefer option 6.  For option 5, we would like to keep it open for further analysis.  To MTK, yes, your understanding is correct. |
| SoftBank | Support option 3. |
| DOCOMO | We support Option3.  The relaxation value for n260-n261 was specified with sufficient margin to allow the difference between n257-n259 and n260-n261. The same is true for n258-n260.  Option2 is also acceptable for us.  There are concerns about handling it as relaxation value for all band pairs. Therefore, we provided compromise as option3. However, we guess the relaxation value for n260-n261 has sufficient margin for all band pairs from different frequency groups for IBM. |
| vivo | Option 3 or others, we are fine with reusing the framework from n260-n261, but relaxation values might be better to discuss case by case. |
| Apple | For CA\_n258A-n260A and CA\_n257A-n259A, it can be reused the 3.5 dB relaxations for CA\_n260-n261. For other bands pairs it should be further discussed. Therefore, we support Option 3 |

**Issue 2-2: What is the maximum number of CCs in 2-band DL CA combination that is release independent from REL-16.**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: No need to limit the maximum number of CCs
  + Option 2: Band combinations specified in Rel-17 can be implemented in a release-independent manner as long as no new signalling must be used by a UE of an earlier release.
  + Option 3: The release independence of inter-band FR2 CA based on IBM for the different frequency groups is applied from Rel-16 as far as the number of bands is two and CA bandwidths class already defined in Rel-16.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | In our understanding, the 3 options are not exclusive. Hence, we share our view on each option:  For Option 1: different maximum CC number demand would lead to quite different UE hardware capability, we prefer to define exact maximum number of CCs.  For Option 2 & 3, Rel-16 only defines “inter-band DL CA based on IBM of different frequency group type (i.e. DL CA\_n261+n260, IBM)”. We think at least OTHER inter-band DL/UL CA types shall NOT be considered to be release independent from Rel-16.  For the “inter-band DL CA based on IBM of different frequency group” type, release independent manner for other band pairs is FFS, at least clear other band pairs demand shall be clarified firstly. Note that, “DL CA configurations CA\_n258A-n260A and CA\_n257A-n259A are release independent from REL-16” was agreed. |
| OPPO | Option 3 is ok.  For the option 2, signaling can supports both CBM and IBM in Rel-16, however, there is no CBM requirements for inter-band FR2 CA which means this inter-band CBM feature is not supported in RAN4 Rel-16. The CBM requirement itself needs to be introduced before discussing whether the CBM band combinations can be release independent to Rel-16. |
| Qualcomm | All the options seem to point in a similar direction. Perhaps a WF can be constructed around option 3 |
| LG Electronics | Support Option 3. |
| Samsung | Option 3 is okay |
| Xiaomi | Option3 |
| ZTE | Option 3. The question is for combination that is release independent from REL-16. Indeed, all of the configurations requested should compliance to the defined bandwidth classes.  However, we found some new bandwidth classes are proposed in Rel-17, and proponent may request new combination based on the bandwidth classes in Rel-17. For these combination with new bandwidth classes in Rel-17, can it also be release independent from REL-16? |
| Nokia | Option 3 |
| Sony | Option 2 |
| Ericsson | Option 2, general for release independent implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We define CBM and IBM capability in Rel-16, as long as we define RF requirements for CBM or IBM in Rel-17, the requirement can be release independent from Rel-16. I mean Option 3 seems exclude CBM case for release independent issue. Furthermore, we prefer to have explicit limitation on CC number for inter-band DL CA in Rel-17, not only for combination that is release independent from REL-16. |
| DOCOMO | All options are acceptable for us.  We think Option3 is most appropriate. |
| vivo | Option 3. |
| Apple | Option 3, release independence of inter-band FR2 CA supporting IBM considering 2 bands with CA BW classes defined in Rel-16. |

**Issue 2-3: Polarization number for each Band of inter-band CA IBM.**

* Proposals
  + Single polarization for each band is assumed to define the Rx requirement.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | We prefer to leverage single-band (non-CA) Rx assumption, in our understanding, it is average of two polarizations for REFSENS, for example. |
| OPPO | If single polarization is assumed for each band in Rx, does this also apply to Tx?  Our understanding on the UE topology is both polarization is supported by UE, however, there is issues caused by the polarization mismatch in FR2 test enhancement WI and the problem is that UE cannot transmit dual polarization due to only 1 polarization at once in TE but diversity gain was calculated in requirement definition. So calculate requirements with single polarization for inter-band CA probably can avoid this issue. |
| Qualcomm | The impact on UE demodulation performance when it has only a single receiver is not clear if the gNB uses frequency diversity schemes in addition to dual pol transmit. We are not keen on revisiting demod assumptions just for this feature. This problem exists in the UL direction also – for this reason it is agreed elsewhere that TE should have dual pol Rx for OTA demod of UL. Moreover, it will result in further dilution of requirements. |
| LG Electronics | Need further discussion on impact by single polarization per band for inter-band CA considering RF architecture. In addition, we think the single polarization for each band is applicable to Tx side in aspect of implementation. So we needs to consider impact on Tx requirement of inter-band UL CA with the single polarization for each band. |
| Samsung | For Tx, it is not mandatory to support dual transmission. For Rx, it is mandatory to support dual RX. For single-CC Rx, it is assumed dual polarization receiving. But for inter-band CA, it is not clear in the group if dual polarization receiving should also be assumed since “polarization per band” is also one feasible implementation for IBM. |
| Xiaomi | Inter-band CA should keep align with single band operation, since the Rx requirements of inter-band CA for IBM just have a delta based on single band operation. |
| Nokia | We do not support this proposal |
| Sony | We do not support this proposal |
| Ericsson | We do not support this proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In UL, there is no polarization assumption issue, because Tx with 1polarization is always permitted, this is why we get the polarization mismatch test problem.  In DL, 2 polarization for each Band is one assumption when we define the refsens requirement. However, for 2 Band CA IBM type, there is no mandatory requirement on 2Rx assumption for FR2 currently, from both requirement and signaling perspective.  For the current refsens measurement method, single polarization assumption do no have impact on test procedure and accuracy. |
| Apple | It is not clear on the purpose of this proposal. Does it mean if the proposal was agreed, more EIS relaxation would be specified? |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Comment directly under each issue above.

### 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** | **TDoc** | **company** | **Comments collection** |
| [**R4-2104715**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104715.zip) | TP: FR2 inter-band CA for different frequency band groups with IBM | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Company A  Company B |
| [**R4-2106346**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106346.zip) | TP: Band specific requirements for DL CA\_n257-n259 including TP for TR 38.851 | NTT DOCOMO INC. | 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#2** | **Issue 2-1: Inter-band DL CA based on IBM relaxations of EIS and EIS spherical coverage**   * + Option 1: No matter within the same frequency group or between different frequency groups, reuse the same framework established for n260+n261 and the same relaxation values 3.5dB.   + Option 2: The same relaxation value as the ones for CA\_n260-n261, i.e., 3.5 dB, can be used for all band pairs from different frequency groups for IBM.   + Option 3: The relaxation values for CA\_n260-n261 are reused as the ones for CA\_n258-n260 and CA\_n257-n259. For other band pairs, it should be further discussed based on per band pair case by case.   + Option 4: Relaxations as in [R4-2104561](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104561.zip)   + Option 5: Define relaxation values considering frequency separation per band pair for FR2 inter-band CA with IBM in different frequency group   + Option 6: define relaxation as 4dB for CA\_ n257+n259   Many companies supported multiple options hence calculation of positions was tricky. However option 3 gained clearly most support and 1 and 4 least.  ***Tentative agreements:***  Option 3: The relaxation values for CA\_n260-n261 are reused as the ones for CA\_n258-n260 and CA\_n257-n259. For other band pairs, it should be further discussed based on per band pair case by case.  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Discuss if option 3 is acceptable in GTW session. |
| **Issue 2-2: What is the maximum number of CCs in 2-band DL CA combination that is release independent from REL-16.**   * + Option 1: No need to limit the maximum number of CCs   + Option 2: Band combinations specified in Rel-17 can be implemented in a release-independent manner as long as no new signalling must be used by a UE of an earlier release.   + Option 3: The release independence of inter-band FR2 CA based on IBM for the different frequency groups is applied from Rel-16 as far as the number of bands is two and CA bandwidths class already defined in Rel-16.   For this one 9 companies supported option 3 and two supported option 2. One company raised concern that CBM would not be release independent from REL16, however this can be discussed once we know if there are CBM requirements in REL17 specs.  ***Tentative agreements:***  Option 3: The release independence of inter-band FR2 CA based on IBM for the different frequency groups is applied from Rel-16 as far as the number of bands is two and CA bandwidths class already defined in Rel-16.  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Discuss if option 3 is acceptable in GTW session. |
| **Issue 2-3: Polarization number for each Band of inter-band CA IBM.**   * Proposals   + Single polarization for each band is assumed to define the Rx requirement.   There was a lack of understanding of what the proposal means or clear objection.  ***Tentative agreements:***  None  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Proponent can come back in next meeting and try to explain the intention more widely. |

### CRs/TPs

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Title** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| [**R4-2104715**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104715.zip) | TP: FR2 inter-band CA for different frequency band groups with IBM | No comments received, as a part of WF discussion try to see if R4-2104715 or R4-2106346 can be approved or merged and Approved |
| [**R4-2106346**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106346.zip) | TP: Band specific requirements for DL CA\_n257-n259 including TP for TR 38.851 | No comments received, as a part of WF discussion try to see if R4-2104715 or R4-2106346 can be approved or merged and Approved |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

Please comment moderator recommendations in table below. WF is assigned to Nokia and is also based on outcome of the GTW session. Also two TPs provided for requirements will be discussed as a part of WF discussion.

GTW reached agreements on open issues, these will be added to WF to be formally approved.

We have two TPs which are overlapping and needs to be merged. Separate email discussion is started for merged TP.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Title** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| [**R4-2104715**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104715.zip) | TP: FR2 inter-band CA for different frequency band groups with IBM | No comments received, as a part of WF discussion try to see if R4-2104715 or R4-2106346 can be approved or merged and Approved |
| [**R4-2106346**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106346.zip) | TP: Band specific requirements for DL CA\_n257-n259 including TP for TR 38.851 | No comments received, as a part of WF discussion try to see if R4-2104715 or R4-2106346 can be approved or merged and Approved |

# Topic #3: 8.3.2.1.3 UE requirements for CA configurations within the same frequency group based on CBM

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Title** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2104491**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104491.zip) | Requirement framework for Inter-band CA with CBM | Qualcomm Incorporated | Approval:   1. **Adopt ‘unified requirement framework’, see table below** 2. **Requirements apply in both conditions to verify that beam squint related degradation is not excessive:**    1. **Beam management reference signal in tested band**    2. **Beam management reference signal in non-tested ‘other’ band**   **See draft CR [4] for spec. language proposal** |
| [**R4-2105095**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2105095.zip) | Applicability of CBM/IBM for different CA configurations | Xiaomi | **Approval:**  **Proposal 2: Inter-band DL CA based on CBM need only consider the EIS relaxation:**  **• Between overlapping or touching bands, reused the same framework established for intra-band non-contiguous CA.**  **• Between different frequency groups, reuse the same framework established for n260+n261 based on IBM.** |
| [**R4-2106364**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106364.zip) | Discussion on CBM&IBM for FR2 Inter-band DL CA | ZTE Corporation | Approval:  **Proposal 3. Prefer not to introduce Fs\_inter\_CBM as capability. Instead, The related RF requirements should be defined for all different frequency configurations.** |
| [**R4-2107108**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107108.zip) | Discussion on FR2 inter-band DL CA with CBM and IBM | Google Inc. | Approval:  **Proposal 1: The REFSENS relaxations framework for FR2 inter-band DL CA within the same frequency group based on CBM shall follow intra-band DL CA scenario for every band pair.**  **Proposal 2: The EIS spherical coverage requirements for FR2 inter-band DL CA within the same frequency group based on CBM shall not be specified.**  **Proposal 3: The Fs\_inter\_CBM should be introduced as UE capability.** |
| [**R4-2106287**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106287.zip) | Discussion on RF requirements for inter-band DL CA based on CBM and IBM | LG Electronics Polska | Discussion:  **Proposal 1: Introduce ‘Fs\_inter\_CBM’ as UE capability to indicate the maximum frequency span between lower edge of lowest CC and upper edge of highest CC in FR2 inter-band DL CA based on CBM which UE can support.**  **Proposal 2: Define REFSENS relaxation similar to Rel-16 intra-band non-contiguous CA considering an extended frequency separation in FR2 inter-band DL CA based on CBM.**  **Proposal 3: Not define EIS relaxation in FR2 inter-band DL CA based on CBM.** |
| [**R4-2104401**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104401.zip) | UE RF CBM requirements for CA configurations within same frequency group | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Discussion:  **Observation 1: RAN4 needs to clarify in specification that current inter-band CA maximum input level, ACS and in-band blocking apply only for IBM UE**  **Observation 2: RAN4 needs to clarify whether it is contiguous or non-contiguous intraband CA requirements or both that apply for inter-band CA within same frequency group when UE is using CBM .**  **Observation 3: REFSENS relaxation value which depends on CC separations in frequency would seem to be good choise.**  **Observation 4: EIS spherical coverage requirement may not bring additional value for CBM UE testing.**  **Observation 5: Fs\_inter\_CBM capability fragments UE ecosystem and makes NW operation more difficult thus it should not be introduced.** |
| [**R4-2104524**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104524.zip) | Discussion on EIS spherical coverage and Fs,inter for CBM | vivo | Approval:  **Proposal 1: CBM also needs to specify the EIS spherical coverage, which can ensure a more reasonable implementation.**  **Proposal 2: The relaxation of EIS spherical coverage for CBM only need apply to the SCC and related to the span between CCs, which can be as follows:**  **Proposal 3: Introduce Fs, inter\_cbm, which is similar to Fs from intra-band CA, to inter-band CA with the same frequency group, and more frequency separation class is needed.** |
| [**R4-2104562**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104562.zip) | Introduce Fs\_inter\_CBM as UE capability for inter-band DL CA based on CBM | MediaTek Beijing Inc. | Approval:  **Proposal: Introduce ‘Fs\_inter\_CBM’ as UE capability to indicate the maximum frequency span between lower edge of lowest CC and upper edge of highest CC in FR2 inter-band CA based on CBM which UE can support** |
| [**R4-2104699**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104699.zip) | UE requirements for CA based on CBM | Sony, Ericsson | Approval:  **Observation 1: Different RF architectures are possible for CBM UEs, and it is important to align the assumption to create the framework of RF requirements.**  **Observation 2: For the purpose of setting minimum requirements for CBM-capable UEs, the definition of CBM with measurement “the only CC configured with RS” for RX beam management is fine, while RS measurements on different bands (serving cells) are likely to be configured since the beams can be different.**  **Observation 3: The following EIS spherical coverage degradation on secondary CC is obtained:**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Frequency separation (Fs) | Fs < 1400 MHz | 1400 MHz < Fs < 2400 MHz | 2400 MHz < Fs < 5200 MHz | | Primary CC at 24 GHz | 0 dB - 0.2 dB | 0.2 dB - 1 dB | 1 dB -1.5 dB | | Frequency separation (Fs) | Fs < 1400 MHz | 1400 MHz < Fs < 2400 MHz | 2400 MHz < Fs < 6400 MHz | | Primary CC at 37 GHz | 0 dB - 0.2 dB | 0.2 dB – 0.8 dB | 0.8 dB -2.1 dB |   **Observation 4: the relaxation of single RF chain architecture CBM UE can be composed as wideband performance degradation + beam squint effect.**  **Observation 5: In case there is a limitation of the frequency separation of CCs in different bands supported by the UE for an advertised (supported) inter-band DL CA configuration, the capability of ’Fs\_inter\_CBM’ would be needed.**  **Proposal 1: Create the requirement framework based on the single RF chain architecture.**  **Proposal 2: The RF requirement should be agnostic to any implementation.**  **Proposal 3: The requirement relaxation of CBM UE needs to be limited to a reasonable level to ensure inter-band DL CA's network coverage.** |
| [**R4-2105097**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2105097.zip) | Rx requirements for inter-band DL CA within the same frequency groups based on CBM | Xiaomi | Approval:  **Proposal 1: RAN4 should define the requirements based on the single beam formed by singe Rx chain architecture as shown in Figure 2-1 for inter-band DL CA within the same frequency groups based on CBM.**  **Proposal 2: the EIS relaxations for inter-band CA based on CBM between overlapping or touching bands should be defined as Table 2-1:**  Table 2-1: EIS Relaxation for inter-band CA based on CBM between overlapping or touching bands   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Configured DL spectrum (MHz) | (dB) | | ≤ 800 | 0.0 | | > 800 and ≤ 1400 | 0.5 | | > 1400 and ≤ 2400 | 1.5 | | > 2400 and ≤ 6400 | 2.5 |   **Proposal 3: EIS spherical coverage requirements shall not be specified.** |
| [**R4-2106564**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106564.zip) | R17 FR2 Inter-band DL CA within same frequency group based on CBM | OPPO | Approval:  **UE architecture and behaviour**  ***Observation 1: For the shared RF chain and antenna panel architecture, the supported inter-band CA within same frequency group might be restricted by the maximum receive BW limitation.***  ***Observation 2: For the separate RF chain and antenna panel architecture, no restriction on the frequency separation of the band combination, but most likely this UE can also support IBM.***  ***Proposal 1: Use shared RF chain and antenna panel architecture as the baseline for inter-band combination within same freq group CBM to define requirements.***  ***Proposal 2: Introduce frequency separation class for inter-band combination within same freq group CBM UE similar as the Fs in intra-band non-contiguous CA.***  **REFSENS requirements**  ***Proposal 3: REFSENS relaxation structure of intra-band non-contiguous CA is applied to inter-band CA within same freq group.***  ***Observation 3: There are two approaches to apply the REFSENS relaxation, one is apply same for both bands, and the other is apply different values for each band.***  ***Observation 4: Current inter-band DL CA within same freq group is targeting 28GHz band groups with the FR2 bands defined up to now.***  ***Observation 5: There is no REFSENS difference between bands in 28GHz group, and same relaxation can be applied.***  ***Proposal 4: Same REFSENS relaxation is applied to both bands of a band combination within same freq group.***  ***Proposal 5: Further study whether same REFSENS relaxation can be applied to all bands within same freq group no matter which combination belongs to.***  ***Observation 6: The EIS spherical coverage for inter-band DL CA within same freq group based on CBM is same as the case of intra-band DL CA due to same UE architecture is used.***  ***Proposal 6: No EIS spherical coverage requirement needs to be defined for inter-band DL CA within same freq group based on CBM.*** |
| [**R4-2107262**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107262.zip) | inter-band CA DL CA with CBM | Huawei, HiSilicon | Approval:  ***Proposal 1: Separation class extends to be indicated per band combination for inter-band CA within the same frequency group in CBM.***  ***Observation 1: RAN4 already agrees to define Maximum Peak EIS requirement for inter-band CA within same Frequency group in CBM.***  ***Proposal 2: Define Maximum spherical coverage EIS for inter-band CA within same frequency group in CBM.***  ***Proposal 3: Define PSD difference between 2 Bands as 6dB within inter-band separation class capability, and XdB across inter-band separation classes, in which X dB is the difference between peak EIS on one band and spherical EIS on the other Band.***  ***Observation 2: Without performance degradation allowance, “BCs within the same freq. group based on CBM” is not applicable.***  ***Proposal 4: RAN4 introduce “BCs within the same freq. group based on CBM”, performance relaxation should be allowed:***  ***Accept demodulation performance degradation for L+L/H+H band combinations with CBM type, and make clarification into RAN4 spec.*** |

## Open issues summary

Most important topic to be agreed is the Issue 3-1 requirement framework. Then 3-3 and 3-4 would loqically follow.

### Sub-topic 3-1

**Issue 3-1:CBM requirement framework**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Create the requirement framework based on the shared RF chain and antenna panel architecture
  + Option 2: Create the requirement framework based unified requirement framework as presented in R4-2104491.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Option 1.  “Shared RF chain and antenna panel architecture” is the basic understanding for CBM while RAN4 started to use the wording IBM/CBM in our understanding. |
| OPPO | Option 1.  For the separate RF chain and antenna panel architecture, no restriction on the frequency separation of the band combination, but most likely this UE can also support IBM since the hardware already support that and there is no reason this multi-panel UE does not support IBM. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2, because option 1 is not fair to all implementations. Examples:   1. single or shared RF chain requirements for REFSENS are unreasonable to impose on multi-beam or multi-chain implementations, because with single chain assumption REFSENS for both bands will be tested in a single direction. A multi-chain UE may not be able to guarantee same REFSENS directions in both bands and the network is no worse for it (IBM REFSENS is precedent, and allows for REFSENS in each band to have an independent direction) 2. skipping EIS spherical coverage is reasonable for single chain implementations, but not reasonable for multi-chain implementations. Multi-chain UEs need to demonstrate they have good inter-band’ beam mapping (due to BM ref. signal in only one band, the UE must set up 1:1 spatial association between beams in band with BMRS to beams in second band)   While this is true:*“Shared RF chain and antenna panel architecture” is the basic understanding for CBM while RAN4 started to use the wording IBM/CBM in our understanding.* , also implicit was L+L of H+H type of band combinations. Since there is no longer such restriction on the band pairing for CBM, we can no longer limit to *“Shared RF chain and antenna panel architecture”. We do not think a UE with single chain can support an L+M or L+H combination with acceptable network performance.* |
| LG Electronics | Support option 1. |
| Samsung | The requirement framework should address the single chain implementation which can be considred as typical implementation, but also should be inclusive to other implementations. If the consensus in group is CBM is also feasible for different frequency group, then option 2 seems a middle way. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1. |
| Verizon | Option 2, as this CBM framework can be suited to L+M or L+H |
| ZTE | Option 2. |
| Nokia | Option 2 |
| Sony | We think option 1 is the most straightforward and typical way to go. However, we agree with the considerations in R4-2104491 that link budgets should be aligned between CBM and IBM UEs, and rrequirements must be implementation-agnostic. One way to align the link budget between CBM and IBM is to introduce a cap on the highest allowed relaxation for CBM UEs. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 for setting minimum requirements for CBM and would allow this type of implementation. It is recognized that IBM with BM on both bands/CCs would have improved performance in the field. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | “Shared RF chain and antenna panel architecture” is only one implementation of CBM type.  In our understanding, CBM is more pointed to the beam measurement behaviour on BB side, there is no one-to-one RF architecture mapping for CBM. |
| vivo | Option 2 or others.  For option1, even for same freq. group, we cannot eliminate the implementation as individual RF chain, which is more flexible but may cause some unexpected problems. For option2, we agree with the requirements should consider different implementation, but CBM performance is restricted by more factors than IBM, and it may hard to have a unified framework. |
| Apple | Option 1 |

**Issue 3-2: Introduction of ‘Fs\_inter\_CBM’ as UE capability to indicate the maximum frequency span between lower edge of lowest CC and upper edge of highest CC in FR2 inter-band for band combinations within same frequency group**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Do not to introduce Fs\_inter\_CBM as a capability
  + Option 2: Fs\_inter\_CBM as a capability is introduced
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Option 2.  From UE hardware perspective, CBM is similar to NCCA; hence, Fs\_inter\_CBM shall be introduced to indicate clear UE capability. |
| OPPO | Option 2  The Fs\_inter\_CBM is similar as the Fs in intra-band non-contiguous to indicate the freq span of CBM. Without the capability introduced UE might only choose to not support large freq separation bands. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1: It is important not to dilute the meaning of ‘inter-band’. The UE still retains the ability to signal frequency separation class in each band. Instead of creating a new capability, performance degradation due to wide frequency coverage can be captured. |
| LG Electronics | Support option 2. With this capability, there can be more opportunities to support FR2 inter-band CA based on CBM with same frequency group. |
| Samsung | A question is, if ‘Fs\_inter\_CBM’ is introduced for CBM within same frequency group, how to handle Fs\_inter\_CBM for CBM across different frequency group? |
| Xiaomi | Option2 |
| ZTE | Option 1. Share QC’s view. Performance degradation should be included for all the frequency range of inter-band. |
| Nokia | Option 1 as otherwise UE population would be fragmented and that would also create additional complexity to gNodeB as scheduler would need to keep track on which UEs can do CA and which not if CC separation is large. |
| Sony | We are open to further discussion. However, it seems that this capability would be needed if there is a limitation of the frequency separation of CCs in different bands supported by the UE for a supported inter-band DL CA configuration. |
| Ericsson | This requires further discussion. If the restriction on the frequency separation implies that the network cannot configure the UE with a CA configuration with a carrier separation larger than Fs\_inter\_CBM then a capability is needed (RRC reject otherwise). Requirements for CBM could contain a constraint on the frequency separation for which the requirement applies. Would a UE indicate support for a BC with an associated BM capability if it does not support the requirements (and be functional for) the maximum carrier separation for the said BC? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2.  To Qualcomm, your explanation seems only applied for UEs implement 2 or more receiving chains for one frequency group, e.g. UE have 2 receiving chain to support 28GHz frequency group, it means UE can support any inter-band CA combinations in the same frequency group with the current intra-band Fs signalling.  However, for UEs with only 1 receiving chain to support one frequency group, Fs\_inter is very important for such UEs to support inter-band CA in the same frequency group.  We don’t want to have limitation on UE implementation, so prefer option 2. |
| vivo | Option 2. For CBM with shared RF chain (more likely to be used for same freq. group), the capability is similar to Fs of intra-band CA, which is limited by hardware. For CBM with individual RF chain (more likely to be used for different freq. group), the capability can ensure the minimum acceptable performance of CBM, because the relaxation cannot be unlimited. |
| Apple | If the requirements at maximum frequency separation for each band combination would be defined, it does not seem to be necessary to introduce such capability. However, we are open for defining such capability if most companies consider necessary. |

**Issue 3-3: EIS spherical coverage for band combinations within same frequency group**

Proposals

* + Option 1: EIS spherical coverage requirements is not specified for CBM UE
  + Option 2: EIS spherical coverage requirements is specified for CBM UE
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | We prefer to achieve consensus on REFSENS firstly. |
| OPPO | Option 1.  The CBM UE cannot adjust the 2nd band beam direction with 1st band beamforming matrix, there is no meaning to define spherical requirements for this kind of UE. For example, if the spherical cannot be met what should this UE do? |
| Qualcomm | Option 2: The requirements must be inclusive of all reasonable implementations, which also means that the requirements must be set in a way to check for degradation mechanisms of all implementations.  Skipping EIS spherical coverage is reasonable for single chain implementations, but not reasonable for multi-chain implementations. Multi-chain UEs need to demonstrate they have good inter-band ‘beam mapping’ (due to BM ref. signal in only one band, the UE must set up 1:1 spatial association between beams in band with BMRS to beams in second band)  Without EIS spherical coverage requirement, a multi-beam UE can have extremely poor common coverage and be compliant which can severely impact co-located deployments. |
| LG Electronics | Support option 1. It is similar to Rel-16 intra-band non-contiguous CA based on CBM. |
| Samsung | Based on consensus up to now, we can firstly focus on REFSENS |
| Xiaomi | Agreed MediaTek and Samsung, we can firstly focus on REFSENs. |
| Nokia | Option 2 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2. Even for UEs with 1 Rx chain supporting inter-band CA, spherical coverage requirement is necessary. It ensures UE can meet X% coverage with the max EIS limitation when one band use the measurement result on the other band. For UEs with 2Rx chains, it seems more important since there would be beam squint issue considering a large frequency span may happen. |
| vivo | Option2 or others. For individual RF chain, some implementations cannot ensure the EIS spherical coverage always meet the requirements, because the beam can be different. However, we can also solve the REFSENs first. |
| Apple | Option 1 |

**Issue 3-4: REFSENS relaxation framework**

Proposals

* + Option 1: REFSENS relaxation structure of intra-band non-contiguous CA is applied to inter-band CA within same freq group and same REFSENS relaxation is applied to both bands of a band combination within same freq group.
  + Option 2: REFSENS relaxation structure is based on IBM interband CA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Option 1.  Apply NCCA concept as starting point is made sense basically, and the exact relaxation value shall be FFS. |
| OPPO | Option 1.  This inter-band within same freq group is more like intra-band non-contiguous CA, and the framework can be shared for them. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2: The requirements must be inclusive of all reasonable implementations, which also means that the requirements must be set in a way to check for degradation mechanisms of all implementations.  Single or shared RF chain requirements for REFSENS are unreasonable to impose on multi-beam or multi-chain implementations, because with single chain assumption REFSENS for both bands will be tested in a single direction. A multi-chain UE may not be able to guarantee same REFSENS directions in both bands and the network is no worse for it (IBM REFSENS is precedent, and allows for REFSENS in each band to have an independent direction) |
| LG Electronics | Support option 1. Same REFSENS relaxation can be applied to both bands of a band combination within same freq group, however the REFSENS relaxation value needs to be specified per band pair considering the frequency separation per band pair. |
| Samsung | Firstly of all we need to align on understanding of CBM implementation. To address CBM across different frequency group, option 2 is more compatible. |
| Xaiomi | Option 1, inter-band within same freq. group could be treat as like intra-band CA, somehow, it make sense to reuse the same framework. |
| Nokia | Option 2 |
| Sony | We think this issue will depend on the outcome of issue 3-1. |
| Ericsson | Depends on the assumptions on the CBM reference architecture for requirements as discussed in 3-1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 and something may not covered by option 2. Generally, RRM requirement is different between inter-band CA and intra-band CA, even for inter-band collocated deployment. We already agree that “There are no deployment restrictions (Non-co-located/co-located) for network to configure inter-band DL CA for CBM UEs.”, our understanding is that we need consider more for inter-band CA PSD difference.  But there is also issue on Fs\_inter. Within the Fs\_inter, the PSD difference may need further limitation compared with IBM. |
| vivo | Considering the CBM within same freq. group is more likely implemented by shared RF chain, option1 can be a starting point. However, we still have same concern as QC, and different implementation (e.g., individual RF chain) should not simply be excluded. |
| Apple | Option 1 |

**Issue 3-5: RAN4 introduce “BCs within the same freq. group based on CBM”, performance relaxation should be allowed**

Proposals

* + Option 1: Accept demodulation performance degradation for L+L/H+H band combinations with CBM type, and make clarification into RAN4 spec.
  + Option 2: No demodulation performance degradation
  + Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Option 1.  While basic Rx requirement is relaxed (ex: REFSENS), it makes sense to have relaxation for demodulation. |
| OPPO | Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3:  We prefer to confine ourselves to RF performance requirements. Demod performance and RRM impact can be separately studied and quantified by baseband sessions. We however agree that single chain implementations are likely to see unpredictable degradation in the real world. |
| LG Electronics | Support option 1. The performance degradation cannot be avoided if rx beam switch occurs in not CP duration but symbol duration. |
| Samsung | Option 3  Degradation is expected but shall be discussed in other thread |
| Xaiomi | Option 1, the degradation could be discussed in demod part |
| ZTE | Option 1 |
| Nokia | Should be discussed in RRM/demod sessions as this proposal is linked to MRTD/MTTD. |
| Ericsson | Degradation compared to what? Is this intended as a “disclaimer”? The prerequisites for the demodulation requirements applicable to a band combination would be specified (e.g. MRTD > 3 us) – if beyond these there is no guarantee – the same for all demodulation requirements. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1. If we can confirm the relaxation can be seen from RF perspective, at least we should inform RRM and demod session, they do need to input from RF side. However, to have a degradation note in 38.101-2 is also fine for us.  To Qualcomm, for CBM why there is no degradation for 2 chain implementation? In our understanding, degradation do not have relation on Rx chain implementation. |
| vivo | Option 3, we should focus on RF requirements first. |
| Apple | We think we should revisit this issue after MRTD and beam management mechanism for CBM are decided. |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Comment directly under each issue above.

### 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** | **TDoc** | **Company** | **Comments collection** |
| [**R4-2104490**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104490.zip) | Draft CR to 38.101-2 on requirements for UEs that support inter-band CA with CBM | Qualcomm Incorporated | Huawei, HiSlicon:  We do not need to add the column on “allowed beam management type” in the table 5.2A.2-1, it is indicated by UE capability, but no limitation from Band combination perspective.  For receiver requirements, testing issue should not reflect in TS 38.101-2. RMC could reflect the RS configuration. PSD requirement is not clear in the CR.  Relaxation requirement is not shown in the CR.  Fs\_inter is not shown in the CR.  It seems we need to first consensus on the general issues before conclude on the CR.Apple: According to this meeting’s rules, no CR/Draft CR submissions are allowed in Rel-17 AI except where it is explicitly said. Therefore, following the rules this draft CR should be noted and discussed next meeting. |

## 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** | **Issue 3-1:CBM requirement framework**   * + Option 1: Create the requirement framework based on the shared RF chain and antenna panel architecture   + Option 2: Create the requirement framework based unified requirement framework as presented in R4-2104491.   Both options received roughly equal support.  ***Tentative agreements:***  None:  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Continue discussion on second round. WF is assigned |
| **Issue 3-2: Introduction of ‘Fs\_inter\_CBM’ as UE capability to indicate the maximum frequency span between lower edge of lowest CC and upper edge of highest CC in FR2 inter-band for band combinations within same frequency group**   * + Option 1: Do not to introduce Fs\_inter\_CBM as a capability   + Option 2: Fs\_inter\_CBM as a capability is introduced   More companies supported option 2 than option 1 but some companies were in between and no clear opinion. More discussion is needed.  ***Tentative agreements:***  None  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Continue discussion on second round part of the WF discussion. |
| **Issue 3-3: EIS spherical coverage for band combinations within same frequency group**   * + Option 1: EIS spherical coverage requirements is not specified for CBM UE   + Option 2: EIS spherical coverage requirements is specified for CBM UE   Support for both options exists and three companies want to prioritize REFSENS first, but RAN4 needs to firstly decide what to do with the Issue 3-1 then it is possible to discuss EIS spherical coverage  ***Tentative agreements:***  None  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue discussion on second round if Issue 3-1 is resolved |
| **Issue 3-4: REFSENS relaxation framework**   * + Option 1: REFSENS relaxation structure of intra-band non-contiguous CA is applied to inter-band CA within same freq group and same REFSENS relaxation is applied to both bands of a band combination within same freq group.   + Option 2: REFSENS relaxation structure is based on IBM interband CA   Support for both options exists but RAN4 needs to firstly decide what to do with the Issue 3-1 then it is possible to discuss REFSENS.  ***Tentative agreements:***  None  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Continue discussion on second round if Issue 3-1 is resolved |
| **Issue 3-5: RAN4 introduce “BCs within the same freq. group based on CBM”, performance relaxation should be allowed**   * + Option 1: Accept demodulation performance degradation for L+L/H+H band combinations with CBM type, and make clarification into RAN4 spec.   + Option 2: No demodulation performance degradation   + Option 3: Other   Opinions were split between Option and 1 and 3. It is clear that this is linked to RRM session MRTD decision and based on that decision demod-session may need to define something. Hard to see what are the RF implications mentioned by proponent.  ***Tentative agreements:***  None.  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Comeback in next meeting. |

### CRs/TPs

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Title** | **Source** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| [R4-2104490](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104490.zip) | Draft CR to 38.101-2 on requirements for UEs that support inter-band CA with CBM | Qualcomm Incorporated | *Return to* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

Will be carried out in email discussion on WF initiated by Qualcomm.

# WF is assigned to Qualcomm.Topic #4: 8.3.2.2 Inter-band UL CA

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Title** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2104525**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104525.zip) | Discussion on per UE concept of FR2 UL CA | vivo | Discussion:  **Observation 1:** The max EIRP limitation of 43 dBm is mainly due to the consideration of exposure, which is related to the power density in the free space.  **Proposal1:** The max EIRP for FR2 UL CA should be defined as “per UE”.  **Observation 2:** The EIRP is conceptually linked to a certain direction which is unclear for the multi-CC/multi-Beam simultaneous radiation scenario.  **Proposal 2:** The “per UE” EIRP in multi-CC/Beam scenario can be clarified as the sum of the EIRP of all respective CCs/Beams in a certain direction, which can be express as:  **Proposal 3:** The max EIRP can be described as the largest “per UE” EIRP among all the directions, as follows:  *max EIRP = max (c-EIRP (θ1, φ1), c-EIRP (θ1, φ2), …, c-EIRP (θn, φn)) ≤ 43dBm*  **Proposal 4:** The max TRP for FR2 UL CA should be per band, and there is no conflict with max EIRP. |
| [**R4-2106289**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106289.zip) | Discussion on RF requirements for inter-band UL CA based on IBM | LG Electronics Polska | Discussion:  **Proposal 1: Specify max EIRP as per UE for inter-band CA based on IBM for n257A-n259A.**  **Proposal 2: Specify Min Peak EIRP as per band for inter-band CA based on IBM for n257A-n259A taking multiband relaxation (RMB) into account.**  **Proposal 3:** **Specify Spherical Coverage for inter-band CA based on IBM taking UE architecture into account.** |
| [**R4-2104560**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104560.zip) | Proposal on inter-band UL CA requirement framework | MediaTek Beijing Inc. | Approval:  **Proposal 1: For inter-band UL CA, specify max EIRP as per band**  **Proposal 2: For inter-band UL CA, specify min Peak EIRP as per band with 3dB relaxed requirement compared to single-CC** |
| [**R4-2104706**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104706.zip) | UE UL CA requirements based on IBM | Sony, Ericsson | Approval  **Observation 1: The PCMAX is defined in a different reference plane than EIRP, which may create issues especially when the beams point towards different directions for UL inter band CA operation.**  **Proposal 1: Specify max EIRP as per band with PC1: max EIRP of each band set to 55 dBm, and PC3/4: max EIRP of each band set to 43 dBm**  **Proposal 2: Specify min peak EIRP as per band with relaxed requirement compared to single-CC, i.e., n257=22.4-X dBm, n259=18.7-Y dBm. The value of relaxation (e.g., X, Y) can equal the MBR.**  **Proposal 3: Absorb the MBR into the total relaxation for inter-band UL CA in FR2 to align with the inter-band DL CA in FR2.** |
| [**R4-2104716**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104716.zip) | On FR2 inter-band UL CA for different frequency group based on IBM | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Approval:  **Observation 1: The regulatory coexistence requirement is specified per band in general.**  **Observation 2: Per UE power limitation of maximum EIRP does not help MPE requirement in FR2 unlike FR1 SAR requirement.**  **Proposal 1 Maximum EIRP and maximum TRP requirement are applied per band.**  **Proposal 2 Minimum peak EIRP and EIRP spherical coverage requirement is specified per band, while allowing the relaxation per CA band combination.** |
| [**R4-2104918**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104918.zip) | Definition of Max EIRP limit for FR2 ULCA | Qualcomm Incorporated | Approval:  **Proposal 1: For non-overlapping bands specify the max EIRP limit as per band, with max EIRP limit of each band set to 43 dBm (PC3/PC4) and 55 dBm (PC1).**  **Proposal 2: For overlapping bands where the UL of both bands are not in the overlapping region specify the max EIRP limit as per band, with max EIRP limit of each band set to 43 dBm (PC3/PC4) and 55 dBm (PC1).**  **Proposal 3: For overlapping bands where the UL of one band is not in the overlapping region and the UL of the other band is in the overlapping region specify the max EIRP limit as per band, with max EIRP limit of each band set to 43 dBm (PC3/PC4) and 55 dBm (PC1).**  **Proposal 4: The max EIRP limit for overlapping bands where the UL of both bands are in the over lapping region needs to be discussed further.** |
| [**R4-2105098**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2105098.zip) | Tx requirements for inter-band UL CA for two bands between different frequency groups based on IBM | Xiaomi | Approval:  **Proposal 1: The package requirements of MOP should be defined per band and reuse the requirements of single CC operation for inter-band UL CA between different frequency groups for IBM.**  **Proposal 2: The relaxation requirements for min peak EIRP and min EIRP spherical coverage (i.e., ΔTIB,P,n and ΔTIB,S,n) should be introduced for inter-band UL CA between different frequency groups for IBM.**  **Proposal 3: ΔTIB,P,n and ΔTIB,S,n for CA\_n257-n259 could be defined as below framework:**  Table 2-1 ΔTIB,P,n min peak EIRP relaxation   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **NR CA bands** | **NR band** | **ΔTIB,P,n (dB)** | | CA\_n257-n259 | n257 | 3 | | n259 | 3 |   Table 2-2 ΔTIB,S,n min EIRP spherical coverage requirement relaxation   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **NR CA bands** | **NR band** | **ΔTIB,S,n (dB)** | | CA\_n257-n259 | n257 | 3 | | n259 | 3 |   **Proposal 4: In additional, MPR, AMPR, Output RF spectrum emissions and beam correspondence could reuse the requirements of single CC operation for inter-band UL CA between different frequency groups for IBM.** |
| [**R4-2106402**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106402.zip) | UE requirements for FR2 UL Inter-band CA from the perspective of Japanese regulations | NTT DOCOMO, INC., SoftBank Corp., KDDI Corporation, Rakuten Mobile, Inc | Information:  **Observation 1: There are no Japanese regulation for max EIRP of inter-band UL CA for 28GHz+40GHz at this time.**  **Observation 2: There are no Japanese regulation for MPE of inter-band UL CA for 28GHz+40GHz at this time.**  **Observation 3: When the PD requirement for 40GHz is introduced in the future, if the PD requirement is specified as sum of 28GHz and 40 GHz, it is necessary to control the P-MPR value appropriately in consideration of each transmission power.** |
| [**R4-2106563**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106563.zip) | R17 FR2 Inter-band UL CA | OPPO | Approval:  ***Observation 1: Max EIRP/TRP are regulation requirements that is not defined by 3GPP, what 3GPP can do is to follow the inter-band UL CA regulatory requirements if there is any.***  ***Observation 2: If there is no such inter-band UL CA regulatory requirements, what can be relied on is the existing single band regulatory requirements.***  ***Proposal 1: If there is no inter-band UL CA regulatory requirements, it is proposed to follow single band regulatory requirements, i.e. Max EIRP/TRP are per-band defined.***  ***Observation 3: The factors like relaxation to meet common spherical coverage requirements, and multi-band relaxations also exist in inter-band UL CA.***  ***Observation 4: 2dB relaxation is needed to meet the common spherical coverage requirements in DL, and similar in UL.***  ***Observation 5: More than 0.5dB relaxation is needed according to the multi-band relaxation differences between n257+n259 and n260+n261.***  ***Proposal 2: It is proposed to define 2.5dB relaxation for each band in n257+n259 compared with single band requirements.*** |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 4-1

**Issue 4-1: The max EIRP for FR2 UL CA**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: per UE
  + Option 2: per band with max EIRP limit of each band set to 43 dBm (PC3/PC4) and 55 dBm (PC1).
  + Option 3: per band but the max EIRP limit for overlapping bands where the UL of both bands are in the over lapping region needs to be discussed further.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Option 1.  Do alignment on min/max EIRP requirement. |
| OPPO | Option 2 or Option 3  Our understanding is the max EIRP is regulation defined requirements not RAN4, and if there is no inter-band UL CA regulatory requirements, it is proposed to follow single band regulatory requirements, i.e. Max EIRP/TRP are per-band defined. And in this meeting, we notice that there is some feedback from FCC but no mention about the case of overlapping bands. It might be better to further get clarification from FCC, it is not an issue can be interpreted by companies here. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3: per band but the max EIRP limit for overlapping bands where the UL of both bands are in the over lapping region needs to be discussed further.  One possibility for when the UL of both bands falls in the overlapping region is a hard -3 dB split in max EIRP limit. |
| LG Electronics | Support option 1. The max EIRP needs to be limited per UE in order to meet regulatory requirement. For example, if the max EIRP is specified per band, total max EIRP is larger than the regulatory requirement regardless of overlapping band or non-overlapping band. |
| Samsung | Further study on option 1 or 3  Similar understanding as OPPO that it is dependent on regulation. Option 2 seems not reasonable for frequency overlapping case. |
| Xaiomi | Option2, the proposal in Option3 has been beyond the scope of the revised WID RP-210412, currently, we just need specify requirements for inter-band UL CA for two bands between different frequency groups based on IBM. |
| Verizon | Option 3: Although max EIRP is per band, the max EIRP limit should be overlapping bands where the UL of both bands |
| Nokia | Option 2 or 3 |
| Sony | We think Option 2 can be taken as a baseline, and FFS the overlapping bands. |
| Ericsson | Option 2, it does not make sense to add EIRP from different bands (unless a regulatory requirement on total power applies per UE for multiple bands). An additional requirement could be introduced for any overlap if that falls within a spectrum block subject to a particular regulatory requirement on the EIRP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For IBM type with different frequency group:  Option 2. Seems scenario in option 3 is not existed, the gNB is not possible to configure 2 CC from 2 Bands which are overlapped simultaneously. |
| DOCOMO | We support Option2 for CA between different frequency groups based on IBM. Per band is suited to L+H, but L+L and H+H need further discussion. |
| vivo | Option 1. Our view is the concept of “Per UE EIRP” is absent from the current spec, which may bring more problems in the discussion about MPE, Multi-beam transmission, etc. We think that those simultaneous mutli-beam transmission would be more precisely depicted using this concept and could be useful in multiple cases.    BTW, we’re sorry for the wrong reference in our paper and the correct one is follows:  *Report and Order and* ***Further*** *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, accessed on Dec. 2, 2016.* |
| Apple | Option 2. However, 43 dBm maximum EIRP limit is defined for PC2/PC3 |

**Issue 4-2: Min Peak EIRP**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: per band with relaxed requirement compared to single-CC, i.e., n257=22.4-X dBm, n259=18.7-Y dBm. The value of relaxation (e.g., X, Y) can equal the MBR.
  + Option 2: per band with 3dB relaxed requirement compared to single-CC
  + Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Option 2.  That keep total power concept, and still have good alignment between min and max EIRP requirements. |
| OPPO | Option 3, in our view 2.5dB should be defined.  The factors like relaxation to meet common spherical coverage requirements, and multi-band relaxations also exist in inter-band UL CA as inter-band DL CA.  2dB relaxation is needed to meet the common spherical coverage requirements in DL, and similar in UL.  More than 0.5dB relaxation is needed according to the multi-band relaxation differences between n257+n259 and n260+n261.  Therefore, in total the relaxation could be 2.5dB. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3: Other.  per band with relaxed requirement compared to single-CC, I.e., n257=22.4-X dBm, n259=18.7-Y dBm. X,Y not necessarily limited to MBR of table 6.2.1.3-4. FFS on impairments to be considered for X and Y |
| LG Electronics | Support option 3. We think that single polarization per band should not be excluded in UE implementation aspects. Therefore the single polarization per band should be considered for Tx requirements for FR2 inter-band UL CA. In addition, the single polarization can support multi band. Therefore, both 3dB relaxed requirement compared to single-CC and MBR needs to be considered.  Option 3: Both per band with 3dB relaxed requirement compared to single-CC and MBR |
| Samsung | Option 3  Note that min peak EIRP is the minimum requirement, considering power splitting and CA relaxation, the relaxation value may be higher than 3dB. |
| Xiaomi | Option2 or Option3, per band with the relaxation and the values could be further discussion |
| Nokia | We would need to agree the requirement condition when we discuss the relaxations.   * We understand 2UL are simultaneously activated. * Are min peak EIRP for two bands achieved simultaneously at the same direction? |
| Sony | Option 1. For the DL, we have MBR margin included in the total relaxation, and thus we think the relaxation value for UL should include at least the MBR margin.  We can also accept other values of X and Y if additional relaxation would be identified. |
| Ericsson | Option 1. Relaxations other than MBR, if any, may depend on test method and the band configuration. |
| Huawei,HiSilicon | For IBM type with differnet frequency group:  Option 3. per band with relaxed requirement compared to single-CC, i.e., n257=22.4-X dBm, n259=18.7-Y dBm. With X and Y value FFS. |
| DOCOMO | We prefer option1, but we can accept other additional relaxations if it is needed. If TRP is specified as 23dBm in per band, no need for 3dB relaxation in Option2. |
| vivo | Option 3. Per band is OK but the value needs further discussion. The different BM type may also influence the relaxation. |
| Apple | Option 1. We agree that min. peak EIRP should be defined per band with some relaxation compared to single CC. However, X should be FFS. |

**Issue 4-3: Spherical coverage**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: EIRP spherical coverage requirement is specified per band, while allowing the relaxation per CA band combination.
  + Option 2: EIRP spherical coverage requirement is specified per band, while allowing 3 dB relaxation per band.
  + Option 3: Other
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Option 1.  The basic requirement framework leveraged from “inter-band DL CA based on IBM” is made sense. The exact relaxation value shall be FFS, it may need to consider not only conductive power difference, but also common coverage definition impact, if it follows inter-band DL CA spherical coverage definition. |
| OPPO | Option 3, same relaxation as min peak EIRP, i.e. 2.5dB in total. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3: We would like to try and align with DL inter-CA spherical coverage requirements that emphasizes common spherical coverage. It is not obvious if option 1 or 2 imply that requirement. |
| LG Electronics | As issue 4-2, we support option 3 as,  Option 3 : EIRP spherical coverage requirement is specified per band, while allowing both 3 dB relaxation per band and MBR. |
| Samsung | Option 3: similar view as Qualcomm that the group should firstly align common spherical coverage |
| Xiaomi | Option2 or Option3, per band with the relaxation and the values could be further discussion |
| Nokia | Common coverage among bands should be the baseline when we discuss the relaxations as in downlink CA. |
| Sony | Option 3 |
| Ericsson | Option 3 |
| DOCOMO | Option 3. Common spherical coverage should be considered. |
| vivo | Option 3. Similar to issue 4-2, needs more discussion. |
| Apple | Option 1 |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Comment directly under each issue above.

### CRs/TPs comments collection

No CRs or TPs.

## 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#4** | **Issue 4-1: The max EIRP for FR2 UL CA**   * + Option 1: per UE   + Option 2: per band with max EIRP limit of each band set to 43 dBm (PC3/PC4) and 55 dBm (PC1).   + Option 3: per band but the max EIRP limit for overlapping bands where the UL of both bands are in the over lapping region needs to be discussed further.   Options 2 and 3 got most of support, more discussion is needed. WF assigned to Samsung.  ***Tentative agreements:***  None  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Continue discussion and try to get WF stable. |
|  | **Issue 4-2: Min Peak EIRP**   * + Option 1: per band with relaxed requirement compared to single-CC, i.e., n257=22.4-X dBm, n259=18.7-Y dBm. The value of relaxation (e.g., X, Y) can equal the MBR.   + Option 2: per band with 3dB relaxed requirement compared to single-CC   + Option 3: Other   All options got support and option 3 most hence no agreement possible.  ***Tentative agreements:***  None  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Continue discussion and try to get WF stable. |
|  | **Issue 4-3: Spherical coverage**   * + Option 1: EIRP spherical coverage requirement is specified per band, while allowing the relaxation per CA band combination.   + Option 2: EIRP spherical coverage requirement is specified per band, while allowing 3 dB relaxation per band.   + Option 3: Other   All options got support and option 3 most hence no agreement possible.  ***Tentative agreements:***  None  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Continue discussion and try to get WF stable. |

### 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)

Will be carried out in WF email discussion initiated by Samsung.

# Topic #5: 8.3.3 Feasibility study

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Title** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2106287**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106287.zip) | Discussion on RF requirements for inter-band DL CA based on CBM and IBM | LG Electronics Polska | Discussion  **Proposal 5: Consider frequency separation per band pair to define RF requirements for FR2 inter-band CA with IBM in same frequency group.** |
| [**R4-2107262**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107262.zip) | inter-band CA DL CA with CBM | Huawei, HiSilicon | Approval:  ***Proposal 5: For inter-band CA from different frequency group in CBM, the RF requirement framework can follow IBM requirement. Maximum Peak EIS requirement, spherical coverage EIS, relaxation requirements, and PSD difference should be defined. For relaxation requirements, it can be defined based on specific Band combination.***  ***Proposal 6: Define 4dB relaxation for CA\_n257+n259 in CBM.***  ***Observation 3: if beam squinting effect is small, it seems BM RS is not mandatory to be configured in a CC with configured UL BWP.*** |
| [**R4-2104524**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104524.zip) | Discussion on EIS spherical coverage and Fs,inter for CBM | vivo | Approval:  **Proposal 4: Fs,inter\_cbm, which is the max frequency span that UE can support under the influence by “beam squint” with different frequency group, should be specified in spec.** |
| [**R4-2106290**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106290.zip) | Discussion on feasibility for inter-band DL CA | LG Electronics Polska | Discussion:  **Feasibility study for CA configurations within same frequency group based on IBM**  **Proposal 1: For inter-band DL CA within same frequency group, either IBM or CBM is applicable as per UE capability.**  **Proposal 2: For inter-band DL CA within same frequency group based on IBM, whether or not to reuse Rel-16 reference sensitivity relaxation and EIS spherical coverage relaxation should be investigated for corresponding band combination.**  **Feasibility study for CA configurations within different frequency group based on CBM**  **Proposal 3: For CBM on inter-band DL CA, performance degradation due to Rx beam switch should be allowed if MRTD is defined that is larger than CP.**  **CBM/IBM vs *simultaneousRxTxInterBandCA***  **Proposal 4: For inter-band CA within same frequency group, simultaneous Rx/Tx capability is not applicable.** |
| [**R4-2104400**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104400.zip) | UE RF IBM requirements for CA configurations within same frequency group | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Approval:  **Proposal 1: Rel-16 reference sensitivity requirement including power imbalance aspect can be reused for the CA configurations within same frequency group in Rel-17. ΔRIB can be discussed case by case when new CA configurations are introduced which is a RAN4 custom.**  **Proposal 2: Rel-16 EIS spherical coverage requirement can be reused for the CA configurations within same frequency group in Rel-17. ΔRIB,S,n can be discussed case by case when new CA configurations are introduced which is a RAN4 custom.** |
| [**R4-2105099**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2105099.zip) | The feasibility of inter-band CA within the same frequency group for IBM | Xiaomi | Approval:  **Observation 1: Whether the inter-band CA within the same freq. group support IBM depends on UE implementation.**  **Proposal 1: The UE capability signalling to indicate both of IBM and CBM are supported by UE per band combination should be introduced for inter-band CA within the same frequency group.**  **Proposal 2: The separate relaxation requirements for the same band combination within the same freq. group should be defined according to IBM or CBM capability.**  **Proposal 3: ΔRIB,P,n and ΔRIB,S,n for all inter-band CA within the same freq. group for IBM could reuse the same framework established for n260+n261 and the same relaxation values 3.5dB.** |
| [**R4-2107265**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107265.zip) | inter-band CA DL CA with IBM | HiSilicon Technologies Co. Ltd | Approval:  ***Proposal 1: Reuse the RF requirement framework for any requested CA band pair from the same frequency group***  ***Proposal 2: for Relaxation requirement, reuse 3.5dB for CA\_n257+n258. FFS for CA\_n259+n260.***  ***Proposal 3: For FR2 inter-band DL CA, we prefer to have limitation on CC number in Rel-17.***  ***Proposal 5: for inter-band CA, single polarization for each band is assumed to define the Rx requirement.***  ***Proposal 6: 3dB EIS requirement difference is required between single polarization and dual polarization architecture for each Band.*** |
| [**R4-2105042**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2105042.zip) | Discussion on CBM inter-band CA | Samsung | Discussion:  **Observation 1: CBM UE does not have to receive two CCs with the same beam.**  **Observation 2: CBM UE does not have to be restricted to band combo within the same frequency group.**  **Proposal 1: RAN4 discuss if a UE is allowed to support both IBM and CBM for a band combo. If yes, RAN4 further discuss if CBM is considered as the fall back mode of IBM.**  **Proposal 2: different requirement framework shall be adopted for CBM than that of IBM. It is preferred to minimize the impact of PSD difference for CBM requirements. RAN4 further discuss the following alternatives for EIS requirements of CBM:**  **Alt1: CC1 and CC2 achieve sensitivity status simultaneously**  **Alt2: when testing EIS of CC1, make sure CC2 throughput is below a certain level, e.g. <100%TP** |
| [**R4-2105100**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2105100.zip) | The feasibility of inter-band CA between different frequency groups for CBM | Xiaomi | Approval:  **Proposal 1: All inter-band CA between different frequency groups can support both of IBM and CBM simultaneously.**  **Proposal 2: Just REFSENs relaxation requirements need define for inter-band CA between different frequency groups for CBM, the relaxation value:**   * **Option1: ΔRIB,P,n need further study.** * **Option2: ΔRIB,P,n could keep the same value (3.5dB) with IBM.** |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 5-1 IBM UE for band combinations within same frequency group

**Issue 5-1-1: whether IBM inter-CA requirement framework established for n260+n261 shall be applied to any requested CA band pair from the same frequency group (parameter values discussed separately)**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Yes
  + Option 2: No
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Option 1.  We think “IBM type” can have similar discussing framework no matter same frequency group or different frequency group, and the exact value shall be discussed per band pair; moreover, potential additional loss factor shall not be excluded. Besides, we’d like to clarify the exact demand of this type, we think discuss requirement based on exact band pair is more efficient. |
| OPPO | Option 1. But to clarify the answer is “IBM inter-CA requirement framework established for n260+n261 shall be applied to any requested CA band pair from the same frequency group (parameter values discussed separately) with IBM” |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 (for DLCA, FFS for ULCA) |
| LG Electronics | Support Option 1. In Rel-16, CA\_n260-n261 was specified to only Rx requirements. And, frequency separation per CA band pair from same frequency group is different from that of n260-n261. |
| Samsung | If there is no PSD difference issue for IBM inter-band CA within same frequency group, option 1 is fine. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 for DL CA |
| ZTE | Option 1 (DL).. Same view as OPPO, need to clarify it is for IBM.. |
| Nokia | Option 1 |
| Sony | Option 1 |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1. This framework can be general part for IBM type inter-band CA, regardless of Band combinations. This is why we say IBM or CBM requirement can have some general part. |
| vivo | Option 1 for DL CA. In our understanding, whether same or different freq. group has little effect on IBM framework. We can reuse the framework and decide the value case by case. |
| Apple | Question for clarification, is the intention to introduce two sets of requirements, one based on CBM, one based on IBM? It is also unclear if the statement refers to apply the new requested CA band pair to the same frequency group as n260+n261 (CC1 and CC2 are in the same frequency group of n260 and n261, respectively) or does it refer to the same (single) frequency group of the CA bands pairs? |

**Issue 5-2-1: how to define the relaxation values of FR2 inter-band CA within same frequency group for IBM**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: reuse 3.5dB for all band combinations
  + Option 2: reuse 3.5dB for CA\_n257+n258. FFS for CA\_n259+n260.
  + Option 3: other
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Option 3.  We shall clarify exact demand on this type, and then discuss the relaxation value by band pair. |
| OPPO | Option 2, and to clarify this is for DL. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 (not sure if there is market demand for n259+n260) |
| LG Electronics | Support option 3. For relaxation, it needs to be taken the smaller frequency separation within same frequency group than n260-n216 into account. |
| Samsung | Option 3  Similar view as MediaTek. |
| Xiaomi | Option 2 for DL CA |
| ZTE | Option 2 |
| Nokia | Option 2 |
| Sony | Support option 1, but can accept option 2. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2. |
| vivo | Option 2 for DL CA. |
| Apple | Question for clarification, is the intention to introduce two sets of requirements, one based on CBM, one based on IBM? |

### Sub-topic 5-2 CBM UE for band combinations between frequency groups

**Issue 5-2-1: CBM inter-CA requirement framework for band combinations between the frequency groups**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RF requirement framework can follow IBM requirement. Maximum Peak EIS requirement, spherical coverage EIS, relaxation requirements, and PSD difference should be defined. For relaxation requirements, it can be defined based on specific Band combination.
  + Option 2: different requirement framework shall be adopted for CBM than that of IBM. It is preferred to minimize the impact of PSD difference for CBM requirements. RAN4 further discuss the following alternatives for EIS requirements of CBM:
    - Alt1: CC1 and CC2 achieve sensitivity status simultaneously
    - Alt2: when testing EIS of CC1, make sure CC2 throughput is below a certain level, e.g. <100%TP
  + Option 3: Just REFSENs relaxation requirements need define for inter-band CA between different frequency groups for CBM, the relaxation value:
    - Option1: ΔRIB,P,n need further study.
    - Option2: ΔRIB,P,n could keep the same value (3.5dB) with IBM.
  + Option 4: Other
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | We are open for Option2/3/4. However, we’d like to clarify the exact demand on this type “CBM UE for band combinations between frequency groups” firstly.  About Option1. We think IBM and CBM are quite different. |
| OPPO | Option 2 with alt-1.  For UE with CBM to support inter-band between freq groups, this UE is not a capable UE as IBM and people should not expect this UE can support as high PSD difference as IBM. Meanwhile, for the inter-band between freq groups, the PSD is less likely to be equal. Note that current REFSENS for different freq group already have several dB difference which can reflect the PSD different at certain level. Then with these two factors considered, alt-1 might be a better choice. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1  Any other option can compromise network performance. See R4-2104491 for detail. |
| LG Electronics | At first, we need to decide whether CBM UE is feasible for inter-band CA within different frequency group or not. After that, we can discuss for related RF requirements. |
| Samsung | Option 2 with alt-1  It is important to minimize PSD difference for CBM. Moreover, Option 2 is not contradict with the unified framework in R4-2104491 on PSD difference. |
| Xiaomi | We are open for all Options |
| ZTE | Share same view with LGE. |
| Sony | Different frameworks may be adopted for CBM and IBM, and we are open for further discussion. However, we think it is important to align the link budget between CBM and IBM UEs. Therefore, Option 2 of Option 3 “ΔRIB,P,n could keep the same value (3.5dB) with IBM” maybe a reasonable way to go in our opinion. |
| Ericsson | Option 2 of Option 3 preferrable from a network deployment perspective. |
| Huawei | Option 1.  Furthermore, For CA\_n257+n259 in CBM, define 4dB relaxation for both peak and spherical coverage. Considering CA\_n257+n259 is a requested Band combination, we suggest define both CBM and IBM requirement for this requested BC. |
| vivo | Similar to LGE’s view, the feasibility of CBM between different freq. group is not clear. |
| Apple | CBM applies for the same frequency group, therefore different requirement framework than IBM should be considered. We agree that the requirement framework should minimize the impact of PSD difference for CBM requirements. |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Comment directly under each issue above.

### CRs/TPs comments collection

No CRs or TPs.

## 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#5-1** | **Issue 5-1-1: whether IBM inter-CA requirement framework established for n260+n261 shall be applied to any requested CA band pair from the same frequency group (parameter values discussed separately)**   * + Option 1: Yes   + Option 2: No   Companies felt that option 1 is reasonable approach and do not see a need to develop new framework for IBM requirements for band combinations within same (single) frequency group.  ***Tentative agreements:***  Option 1: IBM inter-CA requirement framework established for n260+n261 shall be applied to any requested CA band pair from the same frequency group (parameter values discussed separately) with IBM”  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Discuss if tentative agreement is acceptable first in GTW session. |
| **Issue 5-1-2: how to define the relaxation values of FR2 inter-band CA within same frequency group for IBM**   * + Option 1: reuse 3.5dB for all band combinations   + Option 2: reuse 3.5dB for CA\_n257+n258. FFS for CA\_n259+n260.   + Option 3: other   Option 2 got most of the support if we count two proposal for option 1 not to be against option 2.  ***Tentative agreements:***  Option 2: reuse 3.5dB for CA\_n257+n258. FFS for CA\_n259+n260.  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Discuss if tentative agreement is acceptable first in GTW session. |
| **Sub-topic#5-2** | **Issue 5-2-1: CBM inter-CA requirement framework for band combinations between the frequency groups**   * + Option 1: RF requirement framework can follow IBM requirement. Maximum Peak EIS requirement, spherical coverage EIS, relaxation requirements, and PSD difference should be defined. For relaxation requirements, it can be defined based on specific Band combination.   + Option 2: different requirement framework shall be adopted for CBM than that of IBM. It is preferred to minimize the impact of PSD difference for CBM requirements. RAN4 further discuss the following alternatives for EIS requirements of CBM:     - Alt1: CC1 and CC2 achieve sensitivity status simultaneously     - Alt2: when testing EIS of CC1, make sure CC2 throughput is below a certain level, e.g. <100%TP   + Option 3: Just REFSENs relaxation requirements need define for inter-band CA between different frequency groups for CBM, the relaxation value:     - Option1: ΔRIB,P,n need further study.     - Option2: ΔRIB,P,n could keep the same value (3.5dB) with IBM.   + Option 4: Other   Basically, all option got support.  ***Tentative agreements:***  None  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  Comeback next meeting. |

### 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)

Please comment moderator recommendations in table below.

Issue 5-1-1 was solved in GTW

Issue 5-1-2 is part on IBM WF email discussion initiated by Nokia.

Issue 5-2-1 is part of CBM email discussion initiated by Qualcomm.

# Topic #6: LS on introduction of new frequency separation classes (R4-2104402)

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Title** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2104402 | LS on introduction of new frequency separation classes | Nokia | **1. Overall Description:**  RAN4 has introduced two new frequency separation classes into Table 5.3A.4-2 in TS 38.101-2. Values in that table correspond to IE *FreqSeparationClass.* New values are 400 and 600 MHz.  **2. Actions:**  **To RAN2:**  **ACTION:** RAN4 respectfully asks RAN2 to update the signalling. |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 6-1: Approval of LS on introduction of new frequency separation classes

**Issue 6-1: Is the LS agreeable on** **R4-2104402**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Yes
  + Option 2: Yes, but with modifications
  + Option 3: Not needed
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Option 1.  It’s good to sync-up with RAN2. |
| OPPO | Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 |
| Samsung | Option 1 |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 |
| Nokia | Option 1 |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The new separation classes are introduced from Rel-16, but this is a Rel-17 WI. Better to handle this in Rel-16 topic? |
| vivo | Option 1. |
| Apple | Option 1 |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Comment directly under each issue above.

### CRs/TPs comments collection

No CRs or TPs.

## 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#6** | **Issue 6-1: Is the LS agreeable on** **R4-2104402**   * + Option 1: Yes   + Option 2: Yes, but with modifications   + Option 3: Not needed   All companies support to Approve the LS.  ***Tentative agreements:***  LS on R4-2104402 is Approved  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:***  None |

### 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)

Not needed LS is agreeable.

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| WF on IBM Requirements | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |  |
| WF on UE requirements for CA configurations based on CBM | Qualcomm |  |
| WF on Inter-band UL CA | Samsung |  |
| LS on … | ZZZ | To: RAN\_X; Cc: RAN\_Y |
|  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-2104402 | LS on introduction of new frequency separation classes | Nokia | Agreeable | To RAN2 |
| [R4-2104559](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2104559.zip) | Add beam management type after particular band combination requirement | MediaTek Beijing Inc. | Noted |  |
| [R4-2106287](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2106287.zip) | Discussion on RF requirements for inter-band DL CA based on CBM and IBM | LG Electronics Polska | Noted |  |
| [R4-2104490](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2104490.zip) | Draft CR to 38.101-2 on requirements for UEs that support inter-band CA with CBM | Qualcomm Incorporated | Return to |  |
| [R4-2104491](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2104491.zip) | Requirement framework for Inter-band CA with CBM | Qualcomm Incorporated | Noted |  |
| [R4-2105095](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2105095.zip) | Applicability of CBM/IBM for different CA configurations | Xiaomi | Noted |  |
| [R4-2106364](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2106364.zip) | Discussion on CBM&IBM for FR2 Inter-band DL CA | ZTE Corporation | Noted |  |
| [R4-2107108](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2107108.zip) | Discussion on FR2 inter-band DL CA with CBM and IBM | Google Inc. | Noted |  |
| [R4-2104561](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2104561.zip) | RIB proposal of CA\_n258A-n260A and CA\_n257A-n259A based on IBM | MediaTek Beijing Inc. | Noted |  |
| [R4-2104698](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2104698.zip) | UE requirements for CA based on IBM | Sony, Ericsson | Noted |  |
| [R4-2104715](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2104715.zip) | FR2 inter-band CA for different frequency band groups with IBM | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Return to |  |
| [R4-2105096](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2105096.zip) | Rx requirements for CA\_n258A-n260A and CA\_n257A-n259A based on IBM | Xiaomi | Noted |  |
| [R4-2106346](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2106346.zip) | Band specific requirements for DL CA\_n257-n259 including TP for TR 38.851 | NTT DOCOMO INC. | Return to |  |
| [R4-2106365](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2106365.zip) | Discussion on UE requirements for CA configurations of CA\_n258-n260 and CA\_n257-n259 based on IBM | ZTE Corporation | Noted |  |
| [R4-2106565](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2106565.zip) | R17 FR2 Inter-band DL CA with IBM | OPPO | Noted |  |
| [R4-2104401](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2104401.zip) | UE RF CBM requirements for CA configurations within same frequency group | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Noted |  |
| [R4-2104524](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2104524.zip) | Discussion on EIS spherical coverage and Fs,inter for CBM | vivo | Noted |  |
| [R4-2104562](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2104562.zip) | Introduce Fs\_inter\_CBM as UE capability for inter-band DL CA based on CBM | MediaTek Beijing Inc. | Noted |  |
| [R4-2104699](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2104699.zip) | UE requirements for CA based on CBM | Sony, Ericsson | Noted |  |
| [R4-2105097](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2105097.zip) | Rx requirements for inter-band DL CA within the same frequency groups based on CBM | Xiaomi | Noted |  |
| [R4-2106564](file:///C:\Users\vasenkap\Documents\Työt\RAN4\%2398e-bis\Docs\R4-2106564.zip) | R17 FR2 Inter-band DL CA within same frequency group based on CBM | OPPO | Noted |  |
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