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# Introduction

A RAN4 LS [1] asks RAN1 three questions on UL power control of SCells in NR-CA, as copied below.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Reference:******[1] R4-2103410, “LS on Scell dropping”, RAN4 #98-e******1. Overall Description:****RAN #92-e tasked RAN4 to further discuss on Scell dropping issue. Discussion on Scell dropping of CA is triggered by a measurement problem found in MoP(maximum output power) of FR2 intra-band UL CA and later commented the same unexpected SCell dropping issue is found problematic also in field operation (R4-2112826). Meanwhile, it is also confirmed by RAN4 that the problem also exists for FR1 CA. The background and suggestion on CA measurements are captured in [1] and sent to RAN5.* *In TS 38.213, the transmission priority rule for CA is specified based on physical channel, and also with: “In case of same priority order and for operation with carrier aggregation, the UE prioritizes power allocation for transmissions on the primary cell of the MCG or the SCG over transmissions on a secondary cell”. Thus, the UE is always required to drop the power on cell with lower priority when the configured power on cell with high priority occupies all power ability of the UE.* *In order to advance the above discussions, RAN4 would like to ask RAN1 following questions:****Question 1:*** *Whether UE drop Scell power according to the priority rule defined in 38.213 is considered as an issue from RAN1 perspective.****Question 2:*** *Whether UE drop Scell power according to the priority rule defined in 38.213 has been addressed from 16 or 17? If not, what expected solution(s) are?****Question 3:*** *If the problem above is solved in RAN4 specifications with solution by higher layer configuration, e.g. introduce additional UE-specific configuration of power limits on Pcmax,f,c for each CC to prevent SCell dropping (see e.g. R4-2112826 or R4-2114551 for details), is there any expected RAN1 spec impact or possible conflict with UE behaviour defined in RAN1 specifications?* |

As per chairman’s guidance, a reply LS is discussed and is expected to complete by October 18.

[106bis-e-NR-SCell-Dropping] Discuss incoming LS on SCell dropping issue of CA for a possible reply LS by October 18 – Frank (Huawei)

# Discussions

## Q1: Whether UE drop Scell power according to the priority rule defined in 38.213 is considered as an issue from RAN1 perspective.

Based on the contribution papers [2-7], companies have different views with respect to the question. To be specific, some companies concern about RAN1 specification impact and expect that the priority rule defined in 38.213 since Rel-15 should be unchanged. Therefore, to address such concern, whether the priority rule should be kept or not could be discussed.

### Question 1-1: Whether UE drop Scell power according to the priority rule defined in 38.213 is considered as an issue from RAN1 perspective. Whether the priority rule defined in TS 38.213 should be kept unchanged or not.

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Nokia, NSB | RAN1 specifications define power scaling (not dropping) rules because there is not enough Tx power to satisfy all the signals and channels to be transmitted. Changing the priority rule doesn’t help the underlying problem of running out of Tx power. UE dropping a transmission instead of scaling Tx power according to the 38.213-defined priority rule is against the intent of the RAN1 specification and in that respect it is an issue from RAN1 perspective.**Proposed Answer to Q1**: RAN1 specifies power scaling priority rules when the UE doesn’t have sufficient power budget to meet the requested Tx power on all the uplink transmissions. UE dropping instead of scaling is in contradiction to this specified behaviour and is in RAN1 perspective problematic. RAN1 doesn’t see changes to the RAN1 specification a way to address such kind of issues. |
| ZTE | From our perspective, the priority rule defined in TS38.213 should be kept unchanged. RAN1 specification (TS38.213) defines prioritization rules among cells and among transmissions. However, RAN1 doesn’t specify any detailed mechanism (e.g., how to scale the power) for UE to prioritize or deprioritize transmission. It is up to UE’s implementation from RAN1 perspective as long as it satisfies RAN4 requirements. Thus, from RAN1 perspective, UE drop Scell power according to the priority rule defined in 38.213 is NOT considered as an issue. |
| NTT DOCOMO | The issue of SCell dropping actually exists in commercial test with power limited case. We think it would be good if the issue can be solved by RAN4 or RAN1. From RAN1 perspective, the current power scaling and priority rules should be basically ok. We may just need to have some way to avoid SCell dropping in power limited CA case without causing performance degradation in other normal cases. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Q2: Whether UE drop Scell power according to the priority rule defined in 38.213 has been addressed from 16 or 17? If not, what expected solution(s) are?

Please note that there are **some proposed solutions in [6], R4-2112826 and R4-2114551.**

E.g. in [6]

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 2:*** Introduce a higher-layer parameter for relative power offset to reflect the priority difference for concurrent UL transmissions in case of power-limited.
* For UL-CA power-limited handling, the UE allocates transmission powers to the concurrent transmissions taking into account the total available power and the relative power offset.

**Proposal 3:*** Adopt either of the following UL-CA power-limited handling:
	+ Option 1:
		- Find K that satisfies $K×\left\{P\_{req\\_U1}+P\_{tmp\\_U2}\right\}\leq P\_{CMAX}$
			* where $P\_{tmp\\_U2}=min\left\{P\_{req\\_U2}, δ×P\_{req\\_U1}\right\}$, and
			* $P\_{req\\_U1}$ and $P\_{req\\_U2}$ are the requested transmission powers for U1 and U2 before power-limited handling, respectively
		- Transmit power for U1 is given by $P\_{U1}=min\left\{P\_{req\\_U1}, K×P\_{req\\_U1}\right\}$
		- Transmit power for U2 is given by $P\_{U2}=min\left\{P\_{req\\_U2}, P\_{CMAX}-P\_{U1}\right\}$
	+ Option 2:
		- Find K that satisfies $K×\left\{P\_{req\\_U1}+P\_{tmp\\_U2}\right\}\leq P\_{CMAX}$
			* where $P\_{tmp\\_U2}=min\left\{P\_{req\\_U2}, δ×P\_{max⁡\\_U2}\right\}$, and
			* $P\_{req\\_U1}$ and $P\_{req\\_U2}$ are the requested transmission powers for U1 and U2 before power-limited handling, respectively, and $P\_{max⁡\\_U2}$ is the maximum available power for U2 when there is no concurrent transmission(s) (e.g., PCMAX,f,c)
		- Transmit power for U1 is given by $P\_{U1}=min\left\{P\_{req\\_U1}, K×P\_{req\\_U1}\right\}$
		- Transmit power for U2 is given by $P\_{U2}=min\left\{P\_{req\\_U2}, P\_{CMAX}-P\_{U1}\right\}$
 |

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Nokia, NSB | **Proposed Answer to Q2**: RAN1 has not changed the power scaling priority rules in Rel-16 and is not working to modify them in Rel-17. |
| ZTE | It seems these proposals are discussing under RAN4, not sure whether RAN1 needs to anything here. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We share the same understanding with Nokia. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Q3: If the problem above is solved in RAN4 specifications with solution by higher layer configuration, e.g. introduce additional UE-specific configuration of power limits on Pcmax,f,c for each CC to prevent SCell dropping (see e.g. R4-2112826 or R4-2114551 for details), is there any expected RAN1 spec impact or possible conflict with UE behaviour defined in RAN1 specifications?

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Nokia, NSB | The uplink Tx power allocation specification split between RAN1 and RAN4 specifications are complicated so it is difficult to give a blanket answer without knowing exactly what the solution RAN4 would adopt is, but it should be possible to introduce such limits directly to the RAN4 specs without impacting the RAN1 specification.**Proposed Answer to Q3**: RAN1 believes that it is possible to mitigate the referred issue directly in RAN4 (and potentially RAN2) specifications without impacting RAN1 specifications, but a definite answer can only be provided when the detailed solution is agreed in RAN4 |
| ZTE | From our perspective, RAN1 specification defines how to calculate the desired power and priority rule. RAN4 specification defines the power limitation. It is possible that there is no RAN1 impact for these potential solutions, effectively it only changes the power limitation and the RAN1 spec can kept as it is. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Whether there is any RAN1 impact or not would depend on the solution. The solution in R4-2112826 would not require RAN1 spec impact (as described in R4-2112826 that “no change of RAN1 specifications (including priority mechanism)”), while the solution in R4-2114551 would have RAN1 spec impact as it proposes to introduce new parameter indicating priority between UL cells (i.e., the priority rule may be impacted). |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Draft text for reply LS

TBD

## Other Issues

Issues or comments that do not fit in any of the previous sections of this document can be provided in this section.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusions

TBD
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