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# Introduction

The WID on NR RF Enhancements for FR2 RP-202107 has been approved in RAN#89e meeting. The purpose of this work item is to specify the following FR2 UE features and associated requirements including RF and RRM requirements. This email discussion is to define the RRM core requirements for inter-band CA in FR2 corresponding to section 8.3.7 in the agenda.

In last RAN4#98-e meeting, RAN4 had discussions concerning the deployment and UE assumptions for CBM and IBM capable UEs in both RRM and RF sessions.

For CBM following was agreed:

* Deployment scenarios:
  + Assumption of deployment and band pair for IBM UE and CBM UE should follow the RF session conclusions (Up to 2nd round discussion).
* UE assumptions:
  + UE is assumed to make reception with one beam at a time, i.e. similar to Rel-15 baseline UE assumption.
  + At least one active panel at a time can be assumed as baseline for RRM requirements definition.
  + A UE that supports inter-band CA with CBM selects its DL Rx beam(s) for all CCs in all configured bands based on DL measurements made in the only CC configured with the reference signal for beam management.
    - In FR2 CA cases, requirements apply when the BM RS is provided in a CC with a configured UL BWP.
* MTTD:
  + RAN4 needs to study how to handle impact on performance due to Tx beam switching.
* RRM requirements:
  + Scope of the RRM requirements for FR2 inter-band DL CA includes but not limited to MRTD, Scaling factor CSSFoutside\_gap, interruption requirements, SCell activation requirements, Beam management requirements and scheduling/measurement restriction requirements

And for IBM following was agreed:

* Deployment scenarios:
  + Assumption of deployment and band pair for IBM UE and CBM UE should follow the RF session conclusions (Up to 2nd round discussion).
  + Follow the agreements in Rel16 i.e. there is no restriction on deployment scenario i.e. network assumes IBM UE supports both co-located and non-co-located deployments.
* UE assumptions:
  + IBM capable UE is assumed to be capable of receiving signals for FR2 inter-band CA with different beam directions at the same time.
  + A UE that supports inter-band CA with IBM selects its DL Rx beam(s) for all CCs in each configured band based on DL reference signals measurements made in that band.
* MRTD:
  + For IBM capable UE, the Rel16 MRTD requirements for FR2 inter-band CA can be applied in Rel-17 and no additional discussion is required in Rel17.
* MTTD:
  + For IBM capable UE, the Rel16 MTTD requirements for FR2 inter-band CA can be applied in Rel-17 and no additional discussion is required in Rel17.

Based on the agreements, the target of this meeting is to align the deployment and UE assumptions for CBM capable UEs and identify the potential impact to RRM requirements. The tentative target of email discussion for 1st round ad 2nd round is indicated below:

* 1st round: Companies are expected to provide views and/or comments on the listed open issues.
* 2nd round: Identify the potential RRM aspects to be defined in FR2 inter-band CA and converge on the assumptions if possible for defining the RRM requirements.

# Topic #1: Inter-band DL CA enhancements

Moderator comments: All the contributions discussing or partially discussing the RRM requirements for FR2 inter-band DL CA enhancements are listed here. According to the tdoc criteria in R4-2016602, all CRs will be postponed so the CR relevant to this topic is marked with ”~~strikethrough~~”.

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [R4-2104632](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2104632.zip) | vivo | Proposal 1: For the issue whether the symbol level alignment is within the CP length or not, suggest to focus on how to define MRTD requirements for CBM UE (option 3). It is also ok to use option 1.  Proposal 2: For the interruption requirement, suggest to option 2.  Proposal 3: Scheduling restriction, suggest to use option 1 as the conclusion.  Proposal 4: For the MRTD value for FR2 inter-band CA CBM scenario, reuse FR2 intra-band CA MRTD value, i.e., 260ns. |
| [R4-2104837](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2104837.zip) | Apple | Observation 1: For FR2 intra-band CA, symbol level alignment within CP length is essential to guarantee the same downlink spatial domain transmission filter on one OFDM symbol.  Observation 2: FR2 SCell activation requirements for intra-band CA suggests that when common beam management is assumed, fine timing and spatial information from one CC can be directly re-used by the other CC. This again makes it important that symbol level alignment should be with CP length.  Observation 3: For CBM based FR2 intra-band CA, L1 and L3 measurements on one CC can be reused for all the other CC. That implies the same Tx and Rx beams used across all CCs per OFDM symbol.  Proposal 1: In case of common beam management, it is assumed that gNB for all CC are collocated.  Proposal 2: It is proposed to reuse FR2 intra-band CA MRTD, i.e. 260ns for the MRTD of FR2 inter-band CA in case of common beam management. |
| [R4-2104978](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2104978.zip) | NEC | Proposal 1: RRM requirement for CBM are derived based on co-located deployment scenarios only.  Proposal 2: RAN4 to agree that MRTD is 3us for an UE which is capable of CBM.  Proposal 3: RAN4 to agree that symbol level alignment should be within MRTD value (3us) and not within the CP length.  Proposal 4: RAN4 to agree that RX beam switch (measurements) should be based on CC configured with beam management RS.  Proposal 5: RAN4 to agree on the RX beam switch value to be 150ns.  Proposal 6: RAN4 to agree that UE can switch RX beams (for example if it can switch during start of UL to DL transition) without major performance degradation.  Proposal 7: RAN4 to agree that there is no need to introduce scheduling restrictions on other bands due to measurements performed on one band.  Proposal 8: RAN4 not to define any measurement restrictions for CBM operation in FR2 inter-band CA.  Proposal 9: SCell activation delay for CBM operation of FR2 inter-band DL CA is 3ms. |
| [R4-2105141](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2105141.zip) | Ericsson | *Observation-1: There are many options before scheduling restrictions are needed, like available time in UL and DL (if carriers not full) and UL to DL switch, where UE could safely switch beams.*  *Observation-2: A beam switch change during TDL-UL guard period would not impact reception of another 3 µs late DL carrier.*  Given these observations, we propose the following:  *Proposal-1: Any change in MRTD should not impact already defined BS TAE of 3 µs for FR2 inter-band CA; i.e. keep Rel-15 values for BS TAE unchanged.*  *Proposal-2:*   * *The beam management is implementation dependent, thus not applicable to all UEs and to all band combinations.* * *The relevant UEs should be identified and distinguished (e.g. via capability indication, etc.) and the restrictions shall not be applied (e.g. deployment restrictions, etc.) for all UEs and all band combinations for the future of NR.* * An agreed and approved UE capability indication, as in the bullet above, is a precondition for proposals in this document.   *Proposal-3: Define MRTD for inter-band FR2 NR CA with common beam management as 3 µs.*  *Proposal-4: Corresponding MTTD for inter-band FR2 NR CA with common beam management as 3.5 µs.* |
| [R4-2106302](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2106302.zip) | LG Electronics Polska | Proposal 1: UE RRM requirements for CBM should be derived based on co-located deployment scenario same as RF requirements.  For MRTD  Proposal 2: Define MRTD requirements based on co-located deployment for CBM UE.  Proposal 3: If MRTD larger than CP length is defined for inter-band DL CA based on CBM, demodulation performance degradation should be noted due to Rx beam switch.  Proposal 4: If MRTD less than CP length is defined for inter-band DL CA based on CBM, reuse Rel-16 FR2 intra-band non-contiguous MRTD of 260ns. |
| [R4-2106393](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2106393.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 1. It is feasible to re-use Rel-15 baseline UE RRM requirements as baseline UE requirements for Rel-17 CBM capable UE.   UE assumptions:   1. Capture that for an IBM capable UE, with more than 1 panel, the UE is able to actively operate with multiple panels simultaneously. 2. Rel-15 RRM requirements can be re-used as baseline for Rel-17 FR2 inter-band CBM UE RRM requirements. 3. Rel-15 requirements should be readily applicable as UE requirements for the Rel-17 inter-band CA scenario for a CBM capable UE. 4. Rel-15 CA requirements are applicable for Rel-17 FR2 inter-band CA for CBM even if the SCS different between the bands. 5. If the DL timing between the bands is different, changing UE TCI state (Rx spatial settings) based on DL timing in band 1 may impact DL reception on band 2, which may lead to an loss of the DL signal in band 2. 6. Any timing impacts should be identified and should need to be accounted in the UE requirements.   CBM and UE interruption requirements:   1. Define UE interruption requirements for FR2 inter-band CA for a CBM capable UE. 2. Existing non-IBM UE interruption requirements would be applicable.   CBM and UE scheduling restrictions:   1. introduce UE scheduling restriction requirements for a CBM capable UE for the inter-band CA scenario. 2. Existing non-IBM UE scheduling restriction requirements would be applicable   CBM and UE measurement restrictions:   1. Measurement restriction requirements need to be defined for CBM capable UE for inter-band CA scenario. 2. Existing Measurement restriction requirements would be applicable.   CBM and SCell activation requirements:   1. If the FR2 SCell being activated is known the existing SCell activation requirements can be readily be re-used for CBM capable UE in inter-band CA scenario. 2. If the activated SCell is unknown but PCell/PSCell is in FR2, the SCell activation delay requirements defined for the scenario where there is at least one active serving cell in the band, apply.   CBM and CSSFoutside\_gap:   1. Existing R15 requirements for CSSFoutside\_gap can be used as the baseline for CBM UE   CBM and beam management:   1. The existing BFD/CBD requirements in Rel-16 can be applied for CBM type UE.   MRTD and MTTD for inter-band CA:   1. The MRTD requirements for inter-band CA in FR2 under CBM shall be 3us. |
| [~~R4-2106394~~](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2106394.zip) | ~~Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell~~ | 1. ~~Including the abbreviations for CBM and IBM.~~ 2. ~~Defining the conditions for when CBM and IBM UE requirements can apply.~~ |
| [R4-2106506](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2106506.zip) | Intel Corporation | Proposal 1: RRM requirements for CBM UEs will be derived based on co-located deployment scenario only  Observation 1: Inter-band TAE was increased from 260ns to 3us in order to support Non-Collocated deployments.  Proposal 2: MRTD requirements for CBM UEs should not rely on FR2 inter-band TAE requirement as it was defined for Non-co-located deployments.  Proposal 3: MRTD=260ns for CBM UEs |
| [R4-2106531](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2106531.zip) | OPPO | Proposal 1: Symbol level alignment should be with CP length.  Proposal 2: Demodulation performance degradation due to Rx beam switch should be noted in MRTD requirements for CBM UE if MRTD is larger than CP.  Proposal 3: For MRTD of FR2 inter-band CA with CBM, reuse FR2 intra-band CA MRTD, i.e. 260ns.  Proposal 4: For a FR2 inter-band CA with CBM, the existing interruption requirements of intra-band CA can be applied.  Proposal 5: As compromise, RRM discussion on DL interruption at NR SRS carrier-based switching can be hold until we have conclusion of FR2 inter-band UL CA in RF session.  Observation 1: The SCell activation requirements of CBM capable UE for case 2 depend on both RF architecture and MRTD requirements for CBM type UE.  Proposal 6: SCell activation delay would be reduced for the case provided that PCell/PSCell and the target SCell are in a FR2 band pair with CBM and the target SCell is unknown, compared to the existing SCell activation delay requirements for FR1+FR2 CA.  Proposal 7: If FR2 inter-band CA with two bands are only considered in Rel-17, then the existing requirements on scaling factor CSSFoutside\_gap in Rel-16 can be applied to Rel-17.  Proposal 8: The existing BFD/CBD requirements in Rel-16 can be applied for CBM type UE |
| [R4-2106944](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2106944.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | *Proposal 1: The existing scaling factor* *CSSFoutside\_gap requirements for FR2 inter-band CA in R16 can be applied in Rel-17 when the number of bands for FR2 inter-band CA is 2 bands.*  *Proposal 2: For IBM UE, the existing R16 RRM requirements for FR2 inter-band CA can be applied in Rel-17.*  *Proposal 3: For CBM type UE, the MRTD requirements for FR2 inter-band CA in Rel-17 can be defined as 3us with the assumption of co-located deployment.*  *Proposal 4: If there is no further RF inputs on the RF architecture of CBM type UE, the assumption of RF implementation for inter-band CA in R15/R16 can be reused in R17, and the existing interruption requirements for inter-band CA in R15/R16 can be reused for CBM type UE in R17.*  *Proposal 5: For known target SCell, the existing SCell activation requirements in Case 2 can be reused for CBM type UE.*  *Proposal 6: For unknown target SCell, the existing SCell activation requirements in Case 2 with removing L1-RSRP measurement delay can be used for CBM type UE.*  *Proposal 7: In Rel-17, the existing scheduling restriction requirements applied for FR2 intra-band CA need to be extended to FR2 inter-band CA with CBM type UE, and the scheduling restriction requirements for CBM UE can be defined as below:*   * *When inter-band carrier aggregation in FR2 is configured, the scheduling restrictions on one serving cell apply to all serving cells in a different band on the symbols that fully or partially overlap with restricted symbols, provided that UE is capable of common beam management on this FR2 band pair.*   *Proposal 8: For FR2 inter-band CA with CBM, RAN4 needs to study whether the UE would be configured with RS resources on different FR2 bands for layer 1 measurement.*  *Proposal 9: No additional scheduling restriction requirements are needed for Rx beam switching of intra-frequency measurement and layer 1 measurements, if the existing scheduling restriction requirements applied for FR2 intra-band CA are extended to FR2 inter-band CA with CBM type UE.* |
| [R4-2107289](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2107289.zip) | Qualcomm Incorporated | General aspects of CBM and IBM  Proposal 1: In accordance with the agreement made in RF session, UR RRM requirements for CBM shall be derived based on co-located deployment scenario only.  Timing aspects of IBM and CBM  Observation 1: No further discussion is needed for inter-band IBM UE.  Proposal 2: For CBM UEs in FR2 inter-band CA, if MRTD is larger than CP length with respect to serving cell numerology, serving cell(s) shouldn’t expect the UE to be able to receive/detect PDCCH(s) on search spaces including at least the first or last OFDM symbol of slot in a band where beam management reference resource(s) it not configured. FFS on multiple numerologies. FFS on further scheduling restrictions on PDCCH and/or PDSCH.  SCell activation for CBM UE  Proposal 3: For CBM UEs, SSB samples for Rx beam sweeping shouldn’t be accounted for in SCell activation latency requirement.  Measurement and Scheduling restrictions for CBM UE  Proposal 4: For CBM UEs in FR2 inter-band CA, measurement and/or scheduling restriction for RRM/RLM/Link Recovery/L1-RSRP/SINR measurements shall be applied across FR2 bands. The following sections shall be updated accordingly:   * For RRM (Neighbor cell measurement) * 9.2.5.3.3 Scheduling availability of UE performing measurements on FR2 * 9.10.2.6.2 Scheduling availability of UE performing CSI-RS based measurements in FR2 * For Radio Link Monitoring * 8.1.2.3 Measurement restrictions for SSB based RLM * 8.1.3.3 Measurement restrictions for CSI-RS based RLM * 8.1.7.3 Scheduling availability of UE performing radio link monitoring on FR2 * For Link Recovery * 8.5.2.3 Measurement restriction for SSB based beam failure detection * 8.5.3.3 Measurement restrictions for CSI-RS beam failure detection * 8.5.5.3 Measurement restriction for SSB based candidate beam detection * 8.5.6.3 Measurement restriction for CSI-RS based candidate beam detection * 8.5.7.3 Scheduling availability of UE performing beam failure detection on FR2 * 8.5.8.3 Scheduling availability of UE performing L1-RSRP measurement on FR2 * 8.5.8.3 Scheduling availability of UE performing L1-RSRP measurement on FR2 * For L1-RSRP/SINR measurements (Serving cell measurement) * 9.5.5.1 Measurement restriction for SSB based L1-RSRP * 9.5.5.2 Measurement restriction for CSI-RS based L1-RSRP * 9.5.6.3 Scheduling availability of UE performing L1-RSRP measurement on FR2 * 9.8.5.1 Measurement restriction if SSB configured for L1-SINR Measurement * 9.8.5.2 Measurement restriction if CSI-RS configured for L1-SINR measurement * 9.8.5.3 Measurement restriction if CSI-IM configured for L1-SINR measurement * 9.8.6.3 Scheduling availability of UE performing L1-SINR measurement on FR2 * If MRTD between the two bands is larger than CP length with respect to serving cell numerology, * Measurement and/or Scheduling restriction to serving cell(s) on the other band should account for the MRTD, e.g. [x] slots before and after SSB symbols and/or CSI-RS symbol(s) |
| [R4-2104691](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2104691.zip) | Xiaomi | Proposal 1: The RRM requirements for CBM capable UE shall be derived based on co-located deployment scenario only.  Observation 1: When the MRTD is larger than CP, the demodulation performance can be significantly degraded at any DL symbol(s) due to the unpredictable UE Rx beam switching.  Observation 2: For the CBM capable UE, the MRTD should be smaller than CP length in order to guarantee the UE Rx beam switching can be performed within CP and avoid the interruption on DL reception.  Proposal 2: For FR2 inter-band DL CA with CBM, the MRTD shall be defined as 260ns.  Observation 3: For the CBM capable UE, the MTTD should be smaller than CP length to avoid the interruption on uplink transmission.  Proposal 3: For FR2 inter-band DL CA with CBM, the MTTD shall be defined as 375ns.  Observation 4: if the single beam forming is shared by both bands, the existing interruption requirement of intra-band CA should be applied.  Observation 5: if the multiple beam forming is used and each dedicated to one band, for the cell(s) in the band including aggressor CC, the existing interruption requirement of intra-band CA shall be applied. And for the victim cell in the band without aggressor CC, the existing interruption requirement of inter-band CA shall be applied.  Proposal 4: For inter-band CA with CBM, the existing Rel-16 interruption requirements of intra-band CA shall be applied. |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 1-1: General

*Sub-topic description:* This sub-topic discusses the general issues relevant to defining the RRM requirements for FR2 inter-band DL CA e.g. the deployment and UE assumptions for IBM and CBM UEs.

Following was agreed in RF session at last RAN4 meeting:

* *network deployment restriction for CBM*
  + *There are no deployment restrictions (Non-co-located/co-located) for network to configure inter-band DL CA for CBM UEs.*
  + *UE RF requirements for CBM shall be derived based on co-located deployment scenario only.*

**Issue 1-1-1: Deployment scenarios assumption for CBM**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: In case of CBM, it is assumed that gNB for all CC are collocated (Apple)
  + Option 2: The cell deployment assumption in the inter-band CA scenario may be fully co-located or almost co-located (Nokia)
  + Option 3: Define MRTD and RRM requirements for CBM capable UEs based on co-located deployment scenarios only. (NEC, LG, Intel, Qualcomm, LG, Huawei, Xiaomi)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 as per the agreement below.  **Agreement on Network deployment scenarios assumption made in RF session in RAN4#98e meeting (R4-2103399)**   * There are no deployment restrictions (Non-co-located/co-located) for network to configure inter-band DL CA for CBM UEs.   UE RF requirements for CBM shall be derived based on co-located deployment scenario only. |
| Intel | Option 3. |
| LG Electronics | Support option 3. It needs to align with RF session’s agreement. |
| MTK | Option 3 as per the agreement in RF session. |
| OPPO | Option 3 as per the agreement in RF session. |
| Ericsson | Option 3. : Define MRTD and RRM requirements for CBM capable UEs based on co-located deployment scenarios only. |
| NEC | Option 3 |
| Nokia | We can agree to use the same assumptions as agreed for the RF requirements development in order to ensure that RF and RRM requirements are based on the same assumptions. Hence, there will be no deployment restrictions (co-located or non-co-located) for the network to configure inter-band CA for CBM capable UEs.  The RRM requirements for CBM will be developed based on co-location deployment scenario only. This does not mean any implicit MRTD assumptions (which is handled in other sub-topics). |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | We are fine with option 3 but have same understanding as Nokia. Co-location deployment assumption does not implicitly limit the MRTD assumption. |
| Huawei | Agree with option 3.  The propagation delay difference can be assumed as 0. MRTD and RRM requirements for CBM UEs can be developed under the assumption that the propagation delay difference is 0. |
| SoftBank | We have the same understanding of the comment from Nokia. |
| Apple | Option 3 is OK |
| Xiaomi | Support option 3, as point out by QC, in RF session, the UE RF requirement for CBM shall be derived based on co-located deployment scenario only. |
| vivo | We support option 3 based on RF session agreement of previous meeting. |

**Issue 1-1-2: UE assumption for IBM**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For an IBM capable UE, with more than 1 panel, the UE is able to actively operate with multiple panels simultaneously. (Nokia)
  + Option 2: No further discussion is needed for inter-band IBM UE. (Qualcomm)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Option 2. The following agreements were made in RF session in RAN4#98e. At to “multiple panels” in Option 1, the exact definition and whether it has any restriction on the applicability of the set of agreements can be further discussed in RF session as needed.  **Definition of IBM (Independent Beam Management):**   * A UE that supports inter-band CA with IBM selects its DL Rx beam(s) for all CCs in each configured band based on DL reference signals measurements made in that band.   **Network deployment scenarios assumption**   * Follow the agreements in Rel16 i.e. there is no restriction on deployment scenario i.e. network assumes IBM UE supports both co-located and non-co-located deployments.   **UE beam/panel assumptions**  IBM capable UE is assumed to be capable of receiving signals for FR2 inter-band CA with different beam directions at the same time |
| Intel | Issues on the number of panels should be discussed in RF session but not in RRM. |
| LG Electronics | Support option 2 for inter-band DL CA based on IBM UE. |
| Ericsson | Option 1: For an IBM capable UE, with more than 1 panel, the UE is able to actively operate with multiple panels simultaneously. |
| Nokia | We are fine not discussing number of panels further. Only aspect we would like to discuss as being common understanding is that an IBM capable UE is able to operate the independent beams independently and without panel restrictions. Meaning, assumption would be that an IBM capable UE would not be restricted in independent beam operations due to the potential active beams not being handled by same panel. |
| Huawei | Support option 2.  The number of antenna panels for IBM UEs is up to UE implementation. There is no need to discuss on how UE to implement multiple beams simultaneously. |
| Apple | Propose to introduce option 3. Also, IBM related requirements have been specified in R16 based on the assumption of single panel operation.  Option 3: RRM requirements specified for IBM is based on the assumption that UE is able to actively operate with single panel per time instance. The related requirements should be restrict UE from operating with multiple panels simultaneously. |
| Xiaomi | Support option 2 |
| vivo | We share the same view that panel related issues should not be discussed here. Prefer option 2. |

### Sub-topic 1-2: MRTD for common beam management

*Sub-topic description:* This sub-topic discusses the MRTD requirements for common beam management and potential performance impact in FR2 inter-band DL CA.

**Issue 1-2-1: MRTD value for FR2 inter-band CA**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Reuse FR2 intra-band MRTD i.e. 260ns (Vivo, Apple, Intel, OPPO, Xiaomi)
  + Option 2: 3us (NEC, Ericsson, Nokia, Huawei)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Option 1. As per the agreement below, a set of requirements for CBM based inter-band FR2 CA shall be based on co-located deployment scenario for which “BS type 1-O” is applicable. TAE requirement for “BS type 1-0” is 260ns which coincides with intra-band FR2 MRTD.  **Agreement on Network deployment scenarios assumption made in RF session in RAN4#98e meeting (R4-2103399)**   * There are no deployment restrictions (Non-co-located/co-located) for network to configure inter-band DL CA for CBM Ues.   UE RF requirements for CBM shall be derived based on co-located deployment scenario only. |
| Intel | Based on the reviewed proposals we don’t see that agreement on MRTD value could be made.  The proposal of introducing the performance degradation is not acceptable – the RX beam switching is unpredictable and in the extreme case it can happen after each slot, which leads to severe upper bound of performance degradation.  The solutions proposed by Ericsson, NEC and Huawei to switch Rx beams only during UL-DL switch and during SSB/RSSI symbols may work. But Rx beam switching is implementation specific and, in general, we should assume that UE can switch its Rx beams at any time. Limiting implementations by spec is unlikely to be agreed.  At the same time the issue can also be resolved from the BS side. As we mentioned in our paper, current inter-band TAE was defined to support non-co-located deployments. We don’t see any technical reasons why TAE should be larger than 260ns for co-located deployment and within the same frequency band group. So, we believe that BS implementations with TAE<260ns are possible.  **We see the compromised solution in introducing UE capability which informs network whether UE can support 3us MRTD or 260ns MRTD. This will allow different implementations for both UE and BS not limiting to them.**  If the corresponding flag is 1, that means that UE implementation allows 3us MRTD by using, for instance, only UL-DL guard period or SSB/RSSI symbols for Rx beam switch during CA (or any other implementation specific solution). No problem for CBM inter-band CA in this case.  If the corresponding flag is 0 then it is up to network to decide. If it can support TAE<260ns then no problem for CBM inter-band CA. But if its implementation doesn’t allow that then it just doesn’t schedule that UE in inter-band CA.  The main drawback of this solution is that we can come to the situation when UE vendors will always set this field as false and network will always choose not to schedule such Ues in CA. In this case we will fall back to no worse than current situation. But we believe that good implementations are possible from both sides. |
| LG Electronics | Support Option 1. |
| MTK | Option 1. The Rx beam switching is up to UE implementation and we should assume that UE can switch its Rx beams at any time. It is not agreeable on limiting the switching time during RS symbols. |
| OPPO | Support Option 1. |
| Ericsson | Option 2: 3 µs. Applicable for UE which is only capable of common beam management for a band combination where common beam management is possible. The UE may, assume collocated site, in this case. |
| NEC | We support option 2. Our view is there exists a method using which UE can complete RX beam switch without any performance degradation.  However since the company’s position is same since Rel-16, to make progress we can consider supporting Intel’s suggestion of introducing new UE capability. |
| Nokia | We support option 2. As discussed, we see that the MRTD consist of the TAE and the propagation time. For the current scenarios defined for inter-band CA we can assume that the DL propagation delay will be the same on both bands and hence the difference will be ~0.  The impact on the UE reception from different DL reception in each band for the CBM capable UE will occur if the misalignment is larger than the CP.  But even for the case when the scenario when co-location is assumed for developing the RRM requirements the CBM Ues will be to receive on both bands even if the MRTD is larger than 260ns. In some situation, e.g. if the MRTD is significantly larger than 260ns (but lower than CP), the CBM UE will see some impact on the performance. However, such performance impact will be visible on the network side and network can take appropriate actions. Hence, in the end it will be the network configuration choice and network responsibility.  Inter-band CA is different from intra-band CA from network configuration. For inter-band CA, the default implementation is two remote radio heads. For intra-band CA, since we assume co-located scenarios, one RRH is applied. Too tight MRTD for example 260ns for inter-band FR2 CA will restrict the network deployment especially for not fully collocated deployment or multiple RRHs implementation, and it will be also difficult for operators to synchronize multiple RRHs. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | We support option 2. Since the scenario is inter-band CA, TAE requirement is less than 3us. In addition, there are no concrete definition of co-location in the specification so real deployment environment is completely up to operator handling. Hence, MRTD value for FR2 inter-band CA should be 3us. |
| Huawei | Support option 2.  MRTD is derived from BS TAE and propagation delay difference. The BS TAE requirement for FR2 inter-band CA is 3us. The propagation delay difference for FR2 inter-band CA with CBM is assumed as 0 for co-located deployment. Then, the MRTD value for FR2 inter-band CA with CBM is defined as 3us. |
| SoftBank | Support Option 2. |
| Apple | Support option 1 |
| Xiaomi | Support option 1, as the Rx beam switching can be done at any time, if the MRTD is larger than CP, then impact can be happened at any symbol. |
| vivo | Support option 1. Following UE RF agreements the requirements for CBM shall be derived based based on co-located deployment assumption. |

**Issue 1-2-2: Symbol level alignment assumption**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Symbol level alignment should be with CP length (OPPO, Apple, Vivo)
  + Option 2: Symbol level alignment should be within MRTD value (3us) (NEC)
  + Option 3: RAN4 should focus on how to define MRTD requirements for CBM UE (Vivo)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Option 1. We see no need for a separate discussion for this from MRTD. |
| Intel | Option 3. |
| LG Electronics | Support option 3. |
| MTK | Option 3. |
| OPPO | Option 1. |
| Ericsson | Option 2: Symbol level alignment should be within MRTD value |
| NEC | Option 2. |
| Nokia | we support option 2. Symbol level alignment should be within MRTD. We suppose the option 1 is derived from the applicability of intra-band CA, however it is different case for inter-band FR2 CA. For intra-band CA, single transmitter/receiver chain architecture is assumed, hence, same Tx beam is assumed for all CCs. For inter-band CA, there will have multiple transmitter/receiver chain architecture, there will have multiple Tx beams for all CCs. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Support option 2. |
| Huawei | Support option 3.  MRTD is defined as the relative receive timing difference between slot boundary timing of different carriers to be aggregated. RAN4 should focus on how to define the relative receive timing difference between slot boundary timing of carriers in different FR2 bands. |
| Apple | Either option 1 or 3. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 |
| vivo | Ok with option 1 and 3 |

**Issue 1-2-3: How to derive MRTD for FR2 inter-band CA?**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: MRTD = TAE + Δ\_propagation\_time (Ericsson, NEC, Nokia, Huawei)
    - Option 1a: Any change in MRTD should not impact already defined BS TAE of 3 µs for FR2 inter-band CA; i.e. keep Rel-15 values for BS TAE unchanged.
  + Option 2: MRTD requirements for CBM UEs should not rely on FR2 inter-band TAE requirement as it was defined for Non-co-located deployments. (Intel)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Option 2. In accordance with the agreement below, the requirement shall be based on “BS type 1-0” for which TAE requirement is 260ns.  **Agreement on Network deployment scenarios assumption made in RF session in RAN4#98e meeting (R4-2103399)**   * There are no deployment restrictions (Non-co-located/co-located) for network to configure inter-band DL CA for CBM UEs.   UE RF requirements for CBM shall be derived based on co-located deployment scenario only. |
| Intel | Option 2 as it is discussed in our paper. |
| LG Electronics | Support Option 2. |
| MTK | Option 2. |
| OPPO | Option 2. |
| Ericsson | Option 1: MRTD = TAE + Δ\_propagation\_time.  TAE for inter band CA has been 3 µs since release 15 and we prefer to keep TAE = 3 µs for inter band, since there exist existing transmission solutions assuming this. |
| NEC | Option 1. Whether UE supports it or not can be UE capability |
| Nokia | We support option 1. MRTD are derived from TAE, MRTD for intra-band CA also defined as this way. What this issue is raised is some companies think it is the similar case between inter-band FR2 CA for CBM UE and intra-band FR2 CA, however, from network point of view, they are different. From network configurations, the default implementation is two remote radio heads for inter-band CA, however one RRH is applied for intra-band FR2 CA with co-located deployment. FR2 inter-band TAE requirement is defined because of network configuration with multiple RRHs, it is not limited by non-collocated deployment. Too tight MRTD like less than TAE for inter-band FR2 CA will restrict the network deployment and configurations with multiple RRHs implementation, and it will be also difficult for operators to synchronize multiple RRHs. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Support option 1. |
| Huawei | Support option 1 and 1a.  Option 1 is the common methodology for deriving MRTD requirements in both LTE and NR spec. MRTD requirements for CBM UEs shall be derived based on the existing BS TAE requirements. 3us TAE for FR2 inter-band CA allows BS to have different implementations. To revisit the existing BS TAE requirements would cause backward-compatible issues. |
| Apple | Option 2 |
| Xiaomi | Option 2 |
| vivo | Option 2 since it is more aligned with RF session’s agreement. |

**Issue 1-2-4: Performance degradation due to Rx beam switch**

* Proposals (The options/sub-options are not mutually exclusive)
  + Option 1: UE can switch RX beams without major performance degradation even if MRTD is larger than CP length
    - Option 1a: UE can switch RX beams (for example if it can switch during start of UL to DL transition) without major performance degradation (NEC)
    - Option 1b: A beam switch could be performed safe within the DL2UL guard if properly performed (Ericsson)
  + Option 2: Any timing impacts should be identified and should need to be accounted in the UE requirements (Nokia).
    - Option 2a: If MRTD larger than CP length is defined for inter-band DL CA based on CBM, demodulation performance degradation should be noted due to Rx beam switch. If MRTD less than CP length is defined for inter-band DL CA based on CBM, reuse Rel-16 FR2 intra-band non-contiguous MRTD of 260ns (LG, OPPO)
    - Option 2b: For CBM UEs in FR2 inter-band CA, if MRTD is larger than CP length with respect to serving cell numerology, serving cell(s) shouldn’t expect the UE to be able to receive/detect PDCCH(s) on search spaces including at least the first or last OFDM symbol of slot in a band where beam management reference resource(s) it not configured. FFS on multiple numerologies. FFS on further scheduling restrictions on PDCCH and/or PDSCH. (Qualcomm)
    - Option 2c: When the MRTD is larger than CP, the demodulation performance can be significantly degraded at any DL symbol(s) due to the unpredictable UE Rx beam switching. (Xiaomi)
  + Option 3: No additional scheduling restriction requirements are needed for Rx beam switching of intra-frequency measurement and layer 1 measurements, if the existing scheduling restriction requirements applied for FR2 intra-band CA are extended to FR2 inter-band CA with CBM type UE. (Huawei)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Option 2. And to us, Option 3 is not different from Option 2 in terms of performance degradation due to MRTD larger than CP if nothing is explicitly specified for CBM based inter-band FR2 CA.  As the first OFDM symbol of slot is typically used for PDCCH and/or front-loaded PDSCH-DMRS transmission, the impact of one OFDM symbol interruption will likely result in a significant performance loss.  For option 1, we don’t really follow what exactly it means. Does the UE beam switching during “UL-to-DL gap” and/or “DL-to-UL gap” mean that network will extend the each gap by, e.g. 3usec, to account for TAE between the two bands for CBM based inter-band CA UEs? If then, isn’t it at the expense of available UE resources? If this additional gap is provided implicitly by TDD pattern configuration, UEs not configured with CA in the two FR2 bands or UEs capable of IBM UEs can be unfairly penalized. Besides, RAN4 should keep in mind that UEs should be always allowed to switch Rx beams for BM/RRM/RLM purposes in any DL slots where relevant reference resources are configured. |
| Intel | Option 2c. In the worst case the performance loss can be too bad. Prefer not to allow it at all. |
| LG Electronics | Support option 2. |
| MTK | Option 2. |
| OPPO | Option 2 and 2c. |
| Ericsson | Option 1, 1b. We argue the following:   1. A Band combination where the inter band CA combination bands are not so well separated that the channel models and propagation are significantly different. 2. A Band combination that allows CBM (and where it would make sense to restrict to CBM). 3. A UE indicating only capable of CBM for the specific inter band CA band combination. 4. The network is deployed as co-located (a pre-requisite for supporting CA for CBM restricted UEs, refer to Section 3 for further details). 5. A beam switch or change is still needed, despite network deployed as co-located. 6. There will be no available time occasion in DL (or UL as well for that matter) where the UE could safely perform a beam switch within CP. If both carriers are not full then there might still exist opportunities to switch. What is the likelihood of both carriers full, at all times? Even if both carriers are active, there are possibilities to use the DL to UL guard. One such opportunity is developed in section 2.2 below. 7. If it is not possible to mitigate effects of the beam switch during actual transmission/reception, then consequences would be dependent on how frequent beam switch would occur. 8. If it is not possible to mitigate effects of beam switch during transmission/reception and if happens to frequent then consequences would be dependent beam switch time compared to symbol time   ***There are many options before scheduling restrictions are needed, like available time in UL and DL (if carriers not full) and DL to UL switch, where UE could safely switch beams.*** |
| NEC | Option 1a. Our understanding is as follows.  MTTD is more than MRTD value. If MRTD is agreed as 3us, MTTD can be in the order of 3.5us that means one CC (e.g. CC1) will start DL switch 3.5us ahead of other CC (e.g. CC2). If UE starts Rx beam switch immediately after UL to DL switch completion of CC1, since CC2 UL to DL switch complete only after 3.5us, and since RX beam switch value do not exceed CP, UE can perform DL RX switch on CC1 before the start of DL CP start on CC2. That means there may not be any performance degradation.  To Qualcomm, in this method there is no need to extend the UL to DL switching gap as the switch happens on one CC (e.g. CC1 in the above example) DL CP immediately after the UL to DL switch gap, and the other CC (e.g. CC2) would not have completed UL to DL switch by the time CC1 completed RX beam switch. |
| Nokia | We would support option 1 although it is not clear what ‘major’ really means. If option 1b is seen feasible from UE implementation point of view this is our preferred solution. We would be interested in understanding any technical reasonings on the feasibility of option 1b and in case unfeasible, what would be the reason?  As can be understood and seen from input from many companies, the potential performance impact from larger MRTD happens if the MRTD increases beyond the CP. If the misalignment at the UE side increases beyond the CP the UE may not be able to receive the impacted symbols. Hence, UE may have performance loss of typically 1 symbol (but could be more if SCS is large).  However, instead of forcing a common and very strict MRTD requirement, RAN4 should instead analyze the further the potential impact under the different scenario (as done in Qualcomm paper) to evaluate conditions under which performance may be impacted and how much we expect the impact to be.  Based on such evaluation RAN4 would be able to define UE requirements with larger MRTD like 3us than 260ns accounting both UE and network concerns. |
| Huawei | UE is not required to perform Rx beam switching in every slot. RAN4 should investigate the cases that UE need to perform Rx beam switching, then study the performance impacts due to Rx beam switching.  Case 1: intra-frequency measurement without gaps  Case 2: SSB or CSI-RS based Layer 1 measurements  Case 3: TCI-state change configured by network  Case 4: UE autonomous Rx beam switching  For cases 1/2, support option 3. The impacts of Rx beam sweeping due to L3/L1 measurements can be solved by defining scheduling restriction requirements on inter-band CCs.  For case 3, support option 1. UE may need to switch Rx beam due to TCI-state change. Performance degradation can be allowed within TCI-state switching delay if the Rx beam switching could not be performed within CP. The Rx beam switching period is assumed to be very short, around 150ns (≈1.7% symbol or 0.12% slot for SCS=120kHz). So, there will be no major performance degradation.  For case 4, support option 1b. Since when to perform Rx beam switching is up to UE implementation, UE can perform Rx beam switching together with D2L/U2D switching. Then, there is no performance impact. |
| Apple | No sure if we have to make decision among these options. When MRTD is within CP, there is no performance degradation due to Rx beam switch. We agree performance impact should be identified if MRTD is more than CP. Meanwhile, we should also understand what’s the potential impact to NW if MRTD is limited with CP. |
| Xiaomi | Support option 2 and 2c, as the Rx beam switching is transparent to NW and it can happen at any time, thus when the MRTD is larger than CP, the demodulation performance can be significantly degraded at any DL symbol(s) due to the unpredictable UE Rx beam switching. |
| vivo | Support option 2 |

**Issue 1-2-5: reference signals for Rx beam switch**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RX beam switch (measurements) should be based on CC configured with beam management RS (NEC)
  + Option 2: For FR2 inter-band CA with CBM, RAN4 needs to study whether the UE would be configured with RS resources on different FR2 bands for layer 1 measurement. (Huawei)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Option 1.  For Option 2, we do not see the need for the study and believe Huawei has the same understanding based on my reading of the contribution R4-2106944. |
| Intel | Option 1. |
| MTK | Option 1. |
| Ericsson | Option 1. |
| NEC | Option 1 |
| Nokia | We do not think either option 1 or 2 are clear enough and prefer additional discussion.  In last meeting following was agreed:   * A UE that supports inter-band CA with CBM selects its DL Rx beam(s) for all CCs in all configured bands based on DL measurements made in the only CC configured with the reference signal for beam management.   + In FR2 CA cases, requirements apply when the BM RS is provided in a CC with a configured UL BWP   First of all one should likely be clear that above agreement is for FR2 inter-band CA for CBM capable UE.  Secondly, RAN4 would need to agree what assumptions should be made related to DL RS for BM for the CBM UE in FR2 inter-band CA. E.g. if DL RS for BM is available in both bands? What would be the related UE requirements? Etc.  We would assume that the agreement made in last meeting means that the CBM UE in FR2 inter-band CA configuration, would only need to be configured with DL RS for BM in one CC. And this CC would be the CC with an UL BWP. We would assume that the UE at least perform BM related measurements at least on that CC in that band. Whether the UE additionally is required to perform other BM related measurements needs to be discussed. |
| Huawei | We have same views as option 1.  RF session agreed on CBM UEs that only one CC with UL BWP will be configured with BM-RS. This CC almost would be PCC (or PSCC). UE would only need to perform RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements based on the RSs transmitted in PCC (or PSCC). |
| Apple | Option 1 and 2 are unnecessarily contradict to each other. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 |

**Issue 1-2-6: Rx beam switch delay**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RX beam switch value is 150ns (NEC)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | The value should be discussed and decided in RF session. |
| Intel | The value should be discussed in RF session. Based on the contribution from NEC it looks like we have different understanding of the Rx beam switch problem. Our understanding is that the problem is not only in missed samples during the beam switch but in using non-optimal beam in CC2 for the rest of the symbol. So, short Rx beam switch value will not help. |
| LG Electronics | Same view with QC. |
| MTK | The value should be discussed in RF session. And agree that short value will not help much on the degradation. |
| Ericsson | The value should be discussed in RF session. |
| NEC | We agree that value can be discussed in RF session. However unless the value is known, we may not be able to quantify the performance degradation. Can we make some working assumption for further discussion of performance degradation? |
| Huawei | Option 1 can be used as an assumption for investigating the performance impact of Rx beam switching. |
| Apple | Agree with companies’ view to decide this in RF session. |
| Xiaomi | The value should be discussed and decided in RF session. |

### Sub-topic 1-3: MTTD for common beam management

*Sub-topic description:* This sub-topic discusses the MTTD requirements for common beam management.

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

**Issue 1-3-1: The MTTD value for FR2 inter-band CA with CBM**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: 3.5 µs (E///)
  + Option 2: 375 ns (Xiaomi)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Close to Option 2. We believe MTTD shouldn’t be in the order of micro-seconds. The exact value can be discussed later on. |
| Intel | MTTD is related to UL transmission but based on a revised WID (RP-210914) approved in RAN#91e, CBM-based FR2 inter-band UL is no longer in the scope of Rel-17. |
| LG Electronics | At first, MRTD needs to be decided. Postpone MTTD until MRTD is decided. |
| Ericsson | Ericsson shares Intel’s analysis of revised WID RP-210914 CBM-based FR2 inter-band UL is no longer in the scope of Rel-17. |
| Nokia | Once RAN4 has decided on the MRTD the MTTD should be defined based on the agreed MRTD. |
| Huawei | Support option 1, if FR2 inter-band UL CA with CBM would be introduced. |
| apple | Can be defined based on agreed MRTD. |
| Xiaomi | Option 2, but we are fine to discuss MTTD value until MRTD is determined. |

### Sub-topic 1-4: RRM requirements for common beam management

*Sub-topic description:* This sub-topic discusses the RRM requirements other than MRTD and MTTD in case of CBM for FR2 inter-band DL CA. Please note that not all the options/sub-options are mutually exclusive.

**Issue 1-4-1: RRM requirements baseline**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Rel-15 RRM requirements can be re-used as baseline for Rel-17 FR2 inter-band CBM UE RRM requirements (Nokia)
    - Option 1a: Rel-15 CA requirements are applicable for Rel-17 FR2 inter-band CA for CBM even if the SCS different between the bands (Nokia)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | It is unclear about which specific RRM requirements Option 1 refers to. For example, as CBM UE doesn’t need to perform Rx beam sweeping on CCs in a band where BM resources are not configured, there can be RRM requirements that may not be developed based on Rel-15 even if MRTD is not larger than CP, e.g. SCell activation latency requirement. And it is also unclear what “baseline” exactly means here. It needs to be more specific. |
| Intel | Clarification on “baseline” is needed. |
| Ericsson. | Clarification on “baseline” is needed |
| NEC | We share same view as Intel and Ericsson. |
| Nokia | To clarify our proposal. We suggest that existing Rel-15 CA requirements can be applied as baseline for the FR2 RF CBM RRM requirements (excluding MRTD part). It can be further discussed whether there is a need for updates. |
| apple | With MRTD/MTTD issues resolved, we need to discuss if BM for CBM of inter-band CA can be identical to the BM for intra-band CA in R15. There is not urgent to make such decision now. |

**Issue 1-4-2: Interruption requirements**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: The interruption requirements applied for CBM based FR2 inter-band CA need to be introduced in Rel-17:
    - Option 1a: The existing interruption requirements of intra-band CA can be applied (OPPO, Xiaomi)
    - Option 1b: Existing non-IBM UE interruption requirements would be applicable (Nokia)
    - Option 1c: The existing interruption requirements for inter-band CA in R15/R16 can be reused for CBM type UE in R17 (Huawei)
    - Option 1c: Need RF inputs on the RF architecture of CBM type UE (Vivo)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Option 1. By default, the existing interruption requirements of intra-band and inter-band CA are expected to be applied here, and there can be more depending on RF input and a conclusion on MRTD/MTTD. |
| Intel | Option 1c. Depending on implementation (shared RF chain or independent RF chains) either existing inter-band CA or existing intra-band CA interruption requirements can be applied. We are ok to wait for RF inputs if such discussion is expected there. Otherwise, if there will be no agreement on exact implementation, the most conservative requirement should be chosen which is the existing interruption requirements of intra-band CA – Option 1a. |
| MTK | Option 1a can be the starting point, and it can be revised up to RF input. |
| OPPO | Option 1a. More RF input may be needed. |
| Ericsson | Option 1c: The interruption requirements applied for CBM based FR2 inter-band CA need to be introduced in Rel-17, which need RF inputs on the RF architecture of CBM type UE |
| NEC | We can wait for further RF input. |
| Nokia | Accounting or proposal in Issue 1-4-1 and option 1b here, we see 1b and 1c as the same and we have same view as Huawei and option 1c. The requirements would need to capture the CBM capable UE requirements. |
| Huawei | Option 1c.  In R15/R16, the UE is assumed to use separate RF chains for different bands. If RF session would not revise this assumption in R17 for CBM type UE, then the same assumption in R15/R16 can be used in R17. |
| Apple | OK to take option 1a as the starting point. MRTD decision may have impact |
| Xiaomi | Option 1a, single beamforming was supported for inter-band CA with CBM, the antenna-to- ADC resources are shared across bands (same antenna, LNA, AGC, etc). This UE topology of inter-band CA with CBM is similar as intra-band CA case, thus, the existing interruption requirement of intra-band CA should be applied |
| vivo | Ok with option 1c |

**Issue 1-4-3: Scheduling restriction**

* Proposals
  + Option1: The scheduling availability requirements for FR2 inter-band CA scenario shall be introduced to clarify there is scheduling restriction on one FR2 band due to RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements being performed on another FR2 band if UE uses common beam (Vivo, Qualcomm, Nokia):
    - Option 1a: The existing scheduling restriction requirements on FR2 shall be extended to serving cells in different bands. (Vivo, Qualcomm, Huawei)
    - Option 1b: Existing non-IBM UE scheduling restriction requirements would be applicable (Nokia)
    - Option 1c: In Rel-17, the existing scheduling restriction requirements applied for FR2 intra-band CA need to be extended to FR2 inter-band CA with CBM type UE, and the scheduling restriction requirements for CBM UE can be defined as below (Huawei):
      * When inter-band carrier aggregation in FR2 is configured, the scheduling restrictions on one serving cell apply to all serving cells in a different band on the symbols that fully or partially overlap with restricted symbols, provided that UE is capable of common beam management on this FR2 band pair.
  + Option 2: There is no need to introduce scheduling restrictions on other bands due to measurements performed on one band (NEC)
  + Option 3: If MRTD between the two bands is larger than CP length with respect to serving cell numerology, Measurement and/or Scheduling restriction to serving cell(s) on the other band should account for the MRTD, e.g. [x] slots before and after SSB symbols and/or CSI-RS symbol(s) (Qualcomm)
    - Option 3a: For CBM UEs in FR2 inter-band CA, if MRTD is larger than CP length with respect to serving cell numerology, serving cell(s) shouldn’t expect the UE to be able to receive/detect PDCCH(s) on search spaces including at least the first or last OFDM symbol of slot in a band where beam management reference resource(s) it not configured. FFS on multiple numerologies. FFS on further scheduling restrictions on PDCCH and/or PDSCH.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 and Option 3. In our understanding, for the restriction, there are two factors that need to be taken into consideration. (1) Spatially separate beams for the two bands can’t be generated by the UE concurrently. (2) UE may not be able to always receive all OFDM symbols without any loss unless Time-difference-of-arrival between CCs in the two bands is less than or equal to CP length. For Option 3, if RAN4 concludes that MRTD is not larger than CP length, it can be delisted. |
| Intel | Option 1 |
| MTK | Fine with Option 1. |
| OPPO | Option 1 is fine. |
| Ericsson | Option 1a: The existing scheduling restriction requirements on FR2 shall be extended to serving cells in different bands |
| NEC | We feel that further RF input is needed. Information of common RF chain or separated RF chain for different bands may be needed.  May be a clarification question to other companies. Aren’t we discussing scheduling restriction on one band due to measurements performed on other band? Since there is only one RS for BM on one band, won’t it have effect on requirements discussed here? |
| Nokia | In general, there seems to be agreement to introduce scheduling availability requirements for FR2 inter-band CA scenario. then on the details how to capture the scheduling restriction on one FR2 band due to RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements being performed on another FR2 band if UE uses common beam, there are different proposals.  From our view we see options 1a and 1b as being the same. How then to capture the inter-band CBM requirements the detailed proposals in option 1c and 3a needs further discussion. In one aspect we have a slight preference for the principle in option 3a as it defines more clearly the UE requirements and restrictions. |
| Huawei | Support option 1a or 1c.  If there are scheduling restrictions on symbols in one CC, then the scheduling restrictions are also applied on the symbols of the other CCs that are partially or fully overlapped with the restricted symbols. |
| apple | Option 1 is fine |
| Xiaomi | Option 1. For option 3, we do not think it works, since the Rx beam switching is transparent to NW and it can happen at any time. |
| vivo | Ok with option 1 |

**Issue 1-4-4: Measurement restriction**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Measurement restriction requirements need to be defined for CBM capable UE for inter-band CA scenario.
    - Option 1a: Existing Measurement restriction requirements would be applicable (Nokia)
  + Option 2: RAN4 not to define any measurement restrictions for CBM operation in FR2 inter-band CA (NEC).
  + Option 3: If MRTD between the two bands is larger than CP length with respect to serving cell numerology, Measurement and/or Scheduling restriction to serving cell(s) on the other band should account for the MRTD, e.g. [x] slots before and after SSB symbols and/or CSI-RS symbol(s) (Qualcomm)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 and Option 3. For Option 3, if RAN4 concludes that MRTD is not larger than CP length, it can be delisted. Please refer to the comment provided in Issue 1-4-3. |
| Intel | Option 1. |
| MTK | Fine with Option 1. |
| Ericsson | Option 1a: The existing scheduling/measurement restriction requirements applied for FR2 intra-band CA need to be extended to FR2 inter-band CA with CBM type UE. |
| NEC | Same comments as above |
| Nokia | Suggest taking same approach as for Issue 1-4-3. If companies can agree to use similar approach and re-use existing non-IBM requirements as baseline and make the necessary updates to capture the measurement restrictions for the CBM capable UE when configured with inter-band CA in FR2. |
| Huawei | Support option 2.  Since only one CC with UL BWP will be configured with BM-RS and this CC would be PCC or PSCC, UE would perform RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements based on the RS transmitted in PCC or PSCC. It will not occur that CBM UEs need to perform RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements on different CCs in FR2. Also there is no need to define measurement restrictions between FR2 bands. |
| apple | Option 1 |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 is fine |

**Issue 1-4-5: SCell activation delay**

* Proposals
  + Case 1: if PCell/PSCell and the target SCell are in a FR2 band pair with CBM and the target SCell is known,
    - Option 1: the existing SCell activation requirements can be readily be re-used for CBM capable UE in inter-band CA scenario (Nokia, Huawei).
    - Option 2: SCell activation delay for CBM operation in FR2 inter-band DL CA is 3ms (NEC).
  + Case 2: if PCell/PSCell and the target SCell are in a FR2 band pair with CBM and the target SCell is unknown,
    - Option 1: SCell activation delay would be reduced compared to the existing SCell activation delay requirements for FR1+FR2 CA (OPPO)
    - Option 2: the existing SCell activation requirements in Case 2 with removing L1-RSRP measurement delay can be used for CBM type UE (Huawei).
    - Option 3: the SCell activation delay requirements defined for the scenario where there is at least one active serving cell in the band, apply (Nokia)
    - Option 4: For CBM UEs, SSB samples for Rx beam sweeping shouldn’t be accounted for in SCell activation latency requirement. (Qualcomm)
    - Option 5: SCell activation delay for CBM operation in FR2 inter-band DL CA is 3ms (NEC).
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | For Case 1, Option 1.  For Case 2, Option 1. More specifically, Option 2 and Option 4. If MRTD is no larger than CP length, a further latency reduction can be considered, e.g. Option 3. |
| Intel | Case 1: Option 1  Case 2: Option 1 |
| MTK | Case 1: Option 1  Case 2: Option 1/2/4. |
| OPPO | Case 1: Option 1  Case 2: Option 1 |
| Ericsson | Case 1: Option 1. Case 2: For this scenario there is no need for UE Rx beam sweeping since the spatial downlink transmission filter already is set by spCell or by other already activate serving cell in the FR2 band combination. But some SSB detection for the purpose of timing acquisition may be needed when MRTD is larger than CP/2 ~ CP. So this would be some combination of Option 2 and Option 4, or Option 3, depending on MRTD. |
| NEC | May be we didn’t understand the agreement that beam management RS is present on only one band. Isn’t this assumption and co-location assumption means, SSB less SCell activation? Can companies clarify why this can’t be treated as SSB less SCell activation? |
| Nokia | For Case 1 it seems agreeable to re-use existing requirements while the conditions and final requirements needs more discussion.  For Case 2 our view is that based on the assumption of colocation the SCell activation delay can be reduced. As minimum we do not see any need for UE sweeping as the CBM capable UE would not benefit from identifying any/better DL in any other direction than the QCL source of the already active serving cell(s) in the other band.  The exact Tactivation\_time delay and UE need for measurement can be discussed further. |
| Huawei | For case 1, support option 1.  For case 2, the Rx beam sweeping time is not considered for SCell activation delay. Then, the total time for AGC settling and cell search can be reduced from (TFirstSSB\_MAX + 15\*TSMTC\_MAX + 8\*Trs ) to (TFirstSSB\_MAX + TSMTC\_MAX + Trs). The L1-RSRP measurement time for BM also can be excluded from SCell activation delay requirements. So, the SCell activation delay requirements can be defined as:  If the Pcell/PSCell and the target Scell are in a FR2 band pair with common beam management, and the target Scell is unknown to UE and semi-persistent CSI-RS is used for CSI reporting, provided that the side condition Ês/Iot ≥ -2dB is fulfilled, then Tactivation\_time is:  - 6ms + TFirstSSB\_MAX + TSMTC\_MAX + Trs + THARQ + max(Tuncertainty\_MAC + TFineTiming + 2ms, Tuncertainty\_SP).  If the Pcell/PSCell and the target Scell are in a FR2 band pair with common beam management, and the target Scell is unknown to UE and periodic CSI-RS is used for CSI reporting, provided that the side condition Ês/Iot ≥ -2dB is fulfilled, then Tactivation\_time is:  - 3ms + TFirstSSB\_MAX + TSMTC\_MAX + Trs + max {(THARQ + Tuncertainty\_MAC + 5ms + TFineTiming), (Tuncertainty\_RRC + TRRC\_delay)}. |
| Apple | MRTD matters. We can revisit this after resolving MRTD. |

Issue 1-4-6: CSSFoutside\_gap

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Existing R15 requirements for CSSFoutside\_gap can be used as the baseline for CBM UE (Nokia)
  + Option 2: If FR2 inter-band CA with two bands are only considered in Rel-17, then the existing requirements on scaling factor CSSFoutside\_gap in Rel-16 can be applied to Rel-17 (OPPO, Huawei)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Close to Option 2, but want to a further check. |
| Intel | Option 2. The requirements on scaling factor CSSFoutside\_gap need to be revised if FR2 inter-band CA with more than two bands will be introduced in Rel-17 |
| MTK | Option 2 because it is more specific in our view. |
| Ericsson: | Option 2: If FR2 inter-band CA with two bands are only considered in Rel-17, then the existing requirements on scaling factor CSSFoutside\_gap in Rel-16 can be applied to Rel-17 |
| Nokia | To clarify our proposal: As the WI only so far include inter-band CA in FR2 among 2 bands the existing CSSFoutside\_gap can be applied. Hence, options 1 and 2 are the same. |
| Huawei | Support option 2.  The CSSFoutside\_gap requirements for FR2 inter-band CA has been introduced since R16. So, the R16 CSSFoutside\_gap requirements can be reused. |
| apple | Ok with option 2 |
| Xiaomi | OK with option 2 |

Issue 1-4-7: Beam management

* Proposals
  + Option 1: The existing BFD/CBD requirements in Rel-16 can be applied for CBM type UE (Nokia, OPPO)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Is Option 1 similar to Issue 1-2-5? If it means BFD/CBD is performed on a CC where CBM resources are configured, we support Option 1. |
| Intel | Option 1. |
| MTK | Does it mean no spec change is needed? |
| OPPO | Option 1. |
| Ericsson | Option 1. |
| Nokia | We support option 1. |
| Apple | With much wider frequency span and the corresponding beam squint expected, we should investigate if existing BM can be extended. For example, can the measurement in one CC on one band represent the channel condition of the other CC on the other band? |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 |

### Sub-topic 1-5: RRM requirements for independent beam management

*Sub-topic description:* This sub-topic discusses the RRM requirements in case of IBM for FR2 inter-band DL CA.

**Issue 1-5-1: RRM requirements baseline**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For IBM UE, the existing R16 RRM requirements for FR2 inter-band CA can be applied in Rel-17. (Huawei)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Option 1. |
| Intel | Option 1. |
| MTK | A bit unclear the motivation of Option 1 because even without this agreement, the existing IBM requirement shall apply.  Option 1 is fine in general. |
| OPPO | Option 1. |
| Ericsson | Option 1. |
| Apple | Option 1 |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator’s comments: Companies please provide your comments in the tables below each separate sub-topic summary in section 1.2.*

### CRs/TPs comments collection

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

Moderator comments: According to Andrey’s email, the CR R4-2106394 will be postponed and not be discussed in the email discussion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1-1** | **Issue 1-1-1: Deployment scenarios assumption for CBM**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 3: Define MRTD and RRM requirements for CBM capable UEs based on co-located deployment scenarios only. (NEC, LG, Intel, Qualcomm, Huawei, Xiaomi, OPPO, Ericsson, MTK, Apple, Xiaomi, Vivo)   + Option 4: Define RRM requirements for CBM capable UEs based on co-located deployment scenarios only. This does not mean any implicit MRTD assumptions. (Nokia, Docomo)   Moderator’s comments:  There is consensus on at least defining RRM requirements for CBM capable UEs based on co-located deployment scenarios only, which is recommended to be agreed.  Here is the network deployment assumption agreed in RF session in RAN4#98 meeting. It is suggested to apply the RF conclusion also to RRM requirements.   * *network deployment restriction for CBM*   + *There are no deployment restrictions (Non-co-located/co-located) for network to configure inter-band DL CA for CBM UEs.*   + *UE RF requirements for CBM shall be derived based on co-located deployment scenario only.*   *Tentative agreements:*   * + Define MRTD and RRM requirements for CBM capable UEs based on co-located deployment scenarios only.     - this does not mean any implicit MRTD assumptions   + There are no deployment restrictions (Non-co-located/co-located) for network to configure inter-band DL CA for CBM UEs.     *Recommendations for 2nd round:* To confirm if the tentative agreements are agreeable. |
| **Issue 1-1-2: UE assumption for IBM**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: For an IBM capable UE, with more than 1 panel, the UE is able to actively operate with multiple panels simultaneously. (Nokia, Ericsson)   + Option 2: No further discussion is needed for inter-band IBM UE. (Qualcomm, Intel, LG, Nokia, Huawei, Xiaomi, Vivo)   + Option 3: RRM requirements specified for IBM is based on the assumption that UE is able to actively operate with single panel per time instance. The related requirements should be restrict UE from operating with multiple panels simultaneously. (Apple)   Moderator’s comments:  Majority of the companies think this can be further discussed in RF session as needed. Option 3 is also added as proposed by one company.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* To continue the discussion in 2nd round. |
| **Sub-topic #1-2** | **Issue 1-2-1: MRTD value for FR2 inter-band CA**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: Reuse FR2 intra-band MRTD i.e. 260ns (Vivo, Apple, Intel, OPPO, Xiaomi, Qualcomm, LG, MTK)   + Option 2: 3us (NEC, Ericsson, Nokia, Huawei, Docomo, Softbank)   + Option 3: Introduce UE capability which informs network whether UE can support 3us MRTD or 260ns MRTD. (Intel, NEC)   Moderator’s comments:  There is no consensus on this issue. Option 3 is proposed as another candidate option. Please continue the discussion in 2nd round.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* To continue the discussion in 2nd round. |
| **Issue 1-2-2: Symbol level alignment assumption**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: Symbol level alignment should be with CP length (OPPO, Apple, Vivo, Qualcomm, Xiaomi)   + Option 2: Symbol level alignment should be within MRTD value (3us) (NEC, Ericsson, Nokia, Docomo)   + Option 3: RAN4 should focus on how to define MRTD requirements for CBM UE (Vivo, Intel, LG, MTK, Huawei, Apple, vivo)   Moderator’s comments:  There is no consensus on this issue. It’s understood this issue discusses the assumption for defining the MRTD requirements in Issue 1-2-1. Could we come back to this issue once MRTD value is agreed if needed?  *Tentative agreements:*   * We come back to this issue once MRTD value in Issue 1-2-1 is agreed if needed.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:* To confirm if the tentative agreement is agreeable. |
| **Issue 1-2-3: How to derive MRTD for FR2 inter-band CA?**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: MRTD = TAE + Δ\_propagation\_time (Ericsson, NEC, Nokia, Huawei, Docomo)   + Option 1a: Any change in MRTD should not impact already defined BS TAE of 3 µs for FR2 inter-band CA; i.e. keep Rel-15 values for BS TAE unchanged.   + Option 2: MRTD requirements for CBM UEs should not rely on FR2 inter-band TAE requirement as it was defined for Non-co-located deployments. (Intel, Qualcomm, LG, MTK, OPPO, Apple, Xiaomi, vivo)   + Option 2a: The requirement shall be based on “BS type 1-0” for which TAE requirement is 260ns (Qualcomm)   Moderator’s comments:  There is no consensus on this issue. It is understood some companies going for Option 2 also refer to TAE when deriving MRTD value just with a different value of TAE. Please have it clarified and continue the discussion in 2nd round.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* To continue the discussion in 2nd round. |
|  | **Issue 1-2-4: Performance degradation due to Rx beam switch**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: UE can switch RX beams without major performance degradation even if MRTD is larger than CP length (Ericsson, NEC, Nokia, Huawei)   + Option 1a: UE can switch RX beams (for example if it can switch during start of UL to DL transition) without major performance degradation (NEC)   + Option 1b: A beam switch could be performed safe within the DL2UL guard if properly performed (Ericsson, Nokia, Huawei)   + Option 2: Any timing impacts should be identified and should need to be accounted in the UE requirements (Nokia, Qualcomm, LG, MTK, OPPO, Xiaomi, vivo).   + Option 2a: If MRTD larger than CP length is defined for inter-band DL CA based on CBM, demodulation performance degradation should be noted due to Rx beam switch. If MRTD less than CP length is defined for inter-band DL CA based on CBM, reuse Rel-16 FR2 intra-band non-contiguous MRTD of 260ns (LG, OPPO)   + Option 2b: For CBM UEs in FR2 inter-band CA, if MRTD is larger than CP length with respect to serving cell numerology, serving cell(s) shouldn’t expect the UE to be able to receive/detect PDCCH(s) on search spaces including at least the first or last OFDM symbol of slot in a band where beam management reference resource(s) it not configured. FFS on multiple numerologies. FFS on further scheduling restrictions on PDCCH and/or PDSCH. (Qualcomm)   + Option 2c: When the MRTD is larger than CP, the demodulation performance can be significantly degraded at any DL symbol(s) due to the unpredictable UE Rx beam switching. (Xiaomi, Intel, OPPO, Xiaomi)   + Option 3: No additional scheduling restriction requirements are needed for Rx beam switching of intra-frequency measurement and layer 1 measurements, if the existing scheduling restriction requirements applied for FR2 intra-band CA are extended to FR2 inter-band CA with CBM type UE. (Huawei)   Moderator’s comments:  There is no consensus on this issue. Please continue the discussion in 2nd round.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* To continue the discussion in 2nd round. |
| **Issue 1-2-5: reference signals for Rx beam switch**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: RX beam switch (measurements) should be based on CC configured with beam management RS (NEC, Qualcomm, Intel, MTK, Erisson, NEC, Huawei, Xiaomi)   + Option 2: For FR2 inter-band CA with CBM, RAN4 needs to study whether the UE would be configured with RS resources on different FR2 bands for layer 1 measurement. (Huawei)   + Option 3: The CBM UE in FR2 inter-band CA would only need to be configured with DL RS for BM in one CC. And this CC would be the CC with an UL BWP. (Nokia, Huawei)   Moderator’s comments:  Majority of the companies go for Option 1. And some companies brought further clarification in Option 3. It is suggested to continue the discussion in 2nd round.   * *A UE that supports inter-band CA with CBM selects its DL Rx beam(s) for all CCs in all configured bands based on DL measurements made in the only CC configured with the reference signal for beam management.*   + *In FR2 CA cases, requirements apply when the BM RS is provided in a CC with a configured UL BWP*   *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* To continue the discussion in 2nd round. |
| **Issue 1-2-6: Rx beam switch delay**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: RX beam switch value is 150ns (NEC, Huawei)   + Option 2: This should be discussed in RF session (Qualcomm, Intel, LG, MTK, Ericsson, NEC, Apple, Xiaomi)   Moderator’s comments:  Majority of the companies think this should be discussed in RF session. Could we go for Option 2?  *Tentative agreements:*   * This should be discussed in RF session   *Recommendations for 2nd round:* No discussion is needed in 2nd round. |
| **Sub-topic 1-3** | **Issue 1-3-1: The MTTD value for FR2 inter-band CA with CBM**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + ~~Option 1: 3.5 µs (E///, Huawei)~~   + ~~Option 2: 375 ns (Xiaomi, Qualcomm)~~   + Option 3: This is postponed until MRTD is decided (LG, Nokia, Qualcomm, Apple, Xiaomi)   + Option 4: It is not in the scope of Rel17 as it is related to CBM-based inter-band UL CA (Intel, Ericsson).   Moderator’s comments:  As Majority of the companies go for Option 3 and Option 4, it is proposed not discussing the MTTD value hence removing Option 1 and Option2. Companies are encouraged to provide comments on Option 3 and Option 4 in the 2nd round.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* To continue the discussion in 2nd round. Companies are encouraged to provide comments on Option 3 and Option 4. |
| **Sub-topic 1-4** | **Issue 1-4-1: RRM requirements baseline**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: Rel-15 RRM requirements can be re-used as baseline for Rel-17 FR2 inter-band CBM UE RRM requirements (Nokia)     - Option 1a: Rel-15 CA requirements are applicable for Rel-17 FR2 inter-band CA for CBM even if the SCS different between the bands (Nokia) * Option 2: Clarification on “baseline” is needed. (Qualcomm, Intel, Ericsson, NEC) * Option 3: It is not urgent to make such decision (Apple)   Moderator’s comments:  Majority of the companies were asking for clarification on the proposal especially what “baseline” means. The proponent of Option 1 please clarifies the proposal and discussion can be continued in 2nd round.  Tentative agreements: None.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* To continue the discussion in 2nd round. |
|  | **Issue 1-4-2: Interruption requirements**   * Views after 1st round comments   + Option 1: The interruption requirements applied for CBM based FR2 inter-band CA need to be introduced in Rel-17 (Qualcomm, Ericsson):     - Option 1a: The existing interruption requirements of intra-band CA can be applied (OPPO, Xiaomi, Intel, MTK, Apple, Xiaomi)     - ~~Option 1b: Existing non-IBM UE interruption requirements would be applicable (Nokia)~~     - Option 1c: The existing interruption requirements for inter-band CA in R15/R16 can be reused for CBM type UE in R17 (Huawei, Ericsson, Intel, Nokia,Vivo)     - Option 1d: Need RF inputs on the RF architecture of CBM type UE (Vivo, Qualcomm, Intel, MTK, OPPO, Ericsson, NEC)   Moderator’s comments:  All the companies agree to introduce the interruption requirements for CBM based FR2 inter-band CA. Meanwhile majority of the companies agreed the RF inputs are needed. The options are reorganized to reflect latest views:   * + The interruption requirements applied for CBM based FR2 inter-band CA need to be introduced in Rel-17, which need RF inputs on the RF architecture of CBM type UE:     - Option 1a: The existing interruption requirements of intra-band CA can be applied     - Option 1c: The existing interruption requirements for inter-band CA in R15/R16 can be reused for CBM type UE in R17   Tentative agreements:   * The interruption requirements applied for CBM based FR2 inter-band CA need to be introduced in Rel-17, which need RF inputs on the RF architecture of CBM type UE.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:* No discussion is needed in 2nd round. The details can be discussed in next meeting. |
|  | **Issue 1-4-3: Scheduling restriction**   * Views after 1st round comments   + Option1: The scheduling availability requirements for FR2 inter-band CA scenario shall be introduced to clarify there is scheduling restriction on one FR2 band due to RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements being performed on another FR2 band if UE uses common beam (Vivo, Qualcomm, Nokia, Intel, MTK, OPPO, Apple, Xiaomi):     - Option 1a: The existing scheduling restriction requirements on FR2 shall be extended to serving cells in different bands. (Vivo, Qualcomm, Huawei, Ericsson, Nokia, Huawei)     - ~~Option~~ 1b~~: Existing non-IBM UE scheduling restriction requirements would be applicable (Nokia)~~     - Option 1c: In Rel-17, the existing scheduling restriction requirements applied for FR2 intra-band CA need to be extended to FR2 inter-band CA with CBM type UE, and the scheduling restriction requirements for CBM UE can be defined as below (Huawei):       * When inter-band carrier aggregation in FR2 is configured, the scheduling restrictions on one serving cell apply to all serving cells in a different band on the symbols that fully or partially overlap with restricted symbols, provided that UE is capable of common beam management on this FR2 band pair.   + Option 2: There is no need to introduce scheduling restrictions on other bands due to measurements performed on one band (NEC)   + Option 3: If MRTD between the two bands is larger than CP length with respect to serving cell numerology, Measurement and/or Scheduling restriction to serving cell(s) on the other band should account for the MRTD, e.g. [x] slots before and after SSB symbols and/or CSI-RS symbol(s) (Qualcomm)     - Option 3a: For CBM UEs in FR2 inter-band CA, if MRTD is larger than CP length with respect to serving cell numerology, serving cell(s) shouldn’t expect the UE to be able to receive/detect PDCCH(s) on search spaces including at least the first or last OFDM symbol of slot in a band where beam management reference resource(s) it not configured. FFS on multiple numerologies. FFS on further scheduling restrictions on PDCCH and/or PDSCH. (Nokia)   Moderator’s comments:  Majority of the companies support Option 1, which is suggested to be agreed. As this depends on MRTD, the details can be discussed in next meeting.  *Tentative agreements:*  The scheduling availability requirements for FR2 inter-band CA scenario shall be introduced to clarify there is scheduling restriction on one FR2 band due to RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements being performed on another FR2 band if UE uses common beam.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* To confirm if the tentative agreement is agreeable. |
|  | **Issue 1-4-4: Measurement restriction**   * Views after 1st round comments   + Option 1: Measurement restriction requirements need to be defined for CBM capable UE for inter-band CA scenario (Qualcomm, Intel, MTK, Apple, Xiaomi).     - Option 1a: Existing Measurement restriction requirements would be applicable (Nokia, Ericsson)   + Option 2: RAN4 not to define any measurement restrictions for CBM operation in FR2 inter-band CA (NEC, Huawei).   + Option 3: If MRTD between the two bands is larger than CP length with respect to serving cell numerology, Measurement and/or Scheduling restriction to serving cell(s) on the other band should account for the MRTD, e.g. [x] slots before and after SSB symbols and/or CSI-RS symbol(s) (Qualcomm)   Moderator’s comments:  There is no consensus on this issue. Please continue the discussion in 2nd round.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* To continue the discussion in 2nd round. |
|  | **Issue 1-4-5: SCell activation delay**   * Views after 1st round comments   + Case 1: if PCell/PSCell and the target SCell are in a FR2 band pair with CBM and the target SCell is known,     - Option 1: the existing SCell activation requirements can be readily be re-used for CBM capable UE in inter-band CA scenario (Nokia, Huawei, Qualcomm, Intel, MTK, OPPO, Ericsson, Huawei).     - Option 2: SCell activation delay for CBM operation in FR2 inter-band DL CA is 3ms (NEC).   + Case 2: if PCell/PSCell and the target SCell are in a FR2 band pair with CBM and the target SCell is unknown,     - Option 1: SCell activation delay would be reduced compared to the existing SCell activation delay requirements for FR1+FR2 CA (OPPO, Qualcomm, Intel, MTK, OPPO, Nokia)     - Option 2: the existing SCell activation requirements in Case 2 with removing L1-RSRP measurement delay can be used for CBM type UE (Huawei, Qualcomm, MTK, Ericsson).     - Option 3: the SCell activation delay requirements defined for the scenario where there is at least one active serving cell in the band, apply (Nokia, Ericsson)     - Option 4: For CBM UEs, SSB samples for Rx beam sweeping shouldn’t be accounted for in SCell activation latency requirement. (Qualcomm, MTK, Ericsson)     - Option 5: SCell activation delay for CBM operation in FR2 inter-band DL CA is 3ms (NEC).   Moderator’s comments:  For Case 1, majority of the companies agreed with Option 1 while one company has some questions. It is suggested to take majority views as agreement.  For Case 2, majority of the companies can go for Option 1, and some company commented this depends on MRTD and can be discussed later. This can be further discussed in next meeting.  *Tentative agreements:.*   * Case 1: if PCell/PSCell and the target SCell are in a FR2 band pair with CBM and the target SCell is known,   + Option 1: the existing SCell activation requirements can be readily be re-used for CBM capable UE in inter-band CA scenario   *Recommendations for 2nd round:* To confirm if the tentative agreement is agreeable. |
|  | **Issue 1-4-6: CSSFoutside\_gap**   * Views after 1st round comments   + Option 1: Existing R15 requirements for CSSFoutside\_gap can be used as the baseline for CBM UE (Nokia)   + Option 2: If FR2 inter-band CA with two bands are only considered in Rel-17, then the existing requirements on scaling factor CSSFoutside\_gap in Rel-16 can be applied to Rel-17 (OPPO, Huawei, Qualcomm, Intel, MTK, Ericsson, Nokia, Apple, Xiaomi)   Moderator’s comments:  All the companies can go for Option 2, therefore it is suggested to be agreed.  *Tentative agreements:.*   * + If FR2 inter-band CA with two bands are only considered in Rel-17, then the existing requirements on scaling factor CSSFoutside\_gap in Rel-16 can be applied to Rel-17.   *Recommendations for 2nd round: This issue is closed and will not be discussed in 2nd round.* |
|  | **Issue 1-4-7: Beam management**   * Views after 1st round comments   + Option 1: The existing BFD/CBD requirements in Rel-16 can be applied for CBM type UE (Nokia, OPPO, Qualcomm, Intel, Xiaomi, Ericsson)   Moderator’s comments:  Majority of the companies agree with Option 1, and two companies have some questions. It is suggested that proponent company clarifies the proposal and we can continue the discussion in 2nd round.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round: To continue the discussion in 2nd round.* |
| **Sub-topic 1-5** | **Issue 1-5-1: RRM requirements baseline**   * Views after 1st round comments   + Option 1: For IBM UE, the existing R16 RRM requirements for FR2 inter-band CA can be applied in Rel-17. (Huawei, Qualcomm, Intel, MTK, OPPO, Ericsson, Apple, Xiaomi)   Moderator’s comments:  All the companies agree with Option 1.  *Tentative agreements:*  For IBM UE, the existing R16 RRM requirements for FR2 inter-band CA can be applied in Rel-17.  *Recommendations for 2nd round: No discussion is needed.* |

### 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)

**Issue 1-1-1: Deployment scenarios assumption for CBM**

*Tentative agreements:*

* + Define MRTD and RRM requirements for CBM capable UEs based on co-located deployment scenarios only.
  + This does not mean any implicit MRTD assumptions
  + There are no deployment restrictions (Non-co-located/co-located) for network to configure inter-band DL CA for CBM UEs.

*Recommendations for 2nd round:* To confirm the tentative agreements are agreeable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | The tentative agreement is fine. |
| Verizon | Ok for the tentative agreements. |
| AT&T | OK with the tentative agreement proposed by the moderator. |
| Huawei | Agree with the tentative agreements |
| NEC | OK with tentative agreements |
| LG Electronics | Fine with the tentative agreement. |
| T-Mobile USA | OK with the tentative agreement. |
| Qualcomm | Agreed in GTW session as below:   * Agreements (in GTW):   + Define MRTD and RRM requirements for CBM capable UEs based on co-located deployment scenarios only.     - There are no deployment restrictions (Non-co-located/co-located) for network to configure inter-band DL CA for CBM UEs.     - Note: this does not imply that MRTD requirements will be defined based on intra-band CA assumptions |
| vivo | Follow GTW decision |
| Nokia | Tentative agreement is agreeable |

**Issue 1-1-2: UE assumption for IBM**

*Tentative agreements: None.*

*Candidate options (after 1st round comments):*

* + Option 1: For an IBM capable UE, with more than 1 panel, the UE is able to actively operate with multiple panels simultaneously.
  + Option 2: No further discussion is needed for inter-band IBM UE.
  + Option 3: RRM requirements specified for IBM is based on the assumption that UE is able to actively operate with single panel per time instance. The related requirements should be restrict UE from operating with multiple panels simultaneously.

*Recommendations for 2nd round:* To continue the discussion in 2nd round.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 1: For an IBM capable UE, with more than 1 panel, the UE is able to actively operate with multiple panels simultaneously. However we also agree to moderator’s comments end of first round, that this can be further discussed in RF session as needed. |
| Verizon | Option 1: An IBM capable UE should not be restricted in independent beam operations due to the potential active beams not being handled by same panel |
| AT&T | Option 1: An IBM-capable UE should be able to actively operate with multiple panels simultaneously. |
| NEC | Our understanding is Option 1 |
| LG Electronics | Option 2. For inter-band IBM UE, there is no difference between Rel-16 and Rel-17. For option 1, it may say another UE capability for only 1 panel and more than 1 panel. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2.  What panel(s) looks like doesn’t really matter to RRM requirement development in our view. RF session already agreed “IBM UE is capable of receiving signals for FR2 inter-band CA with different beam directions at the same time using independent beams trained by DL reference signals in respective bands.”  If there is no technical reason to discuss whether the “different beam directions at the same time using independent beams” should be formed by multiple panels or not in the context of RRM requirements, we don’t think Option 1 needs to be discussed/agreed. |
| MTK | Prefer to Option 2, unless RRM requirement impacts has been technically identified. |
| vivo | Prefer option 2. |
| Nokia | We support Option 1 as that for the IBM UE which has more than 1 panel, such UE is also able to have more than 1 panel active simultaneously. However, we do not necessarily see a need to capture such assumption in the specification. This would also need to be aligned with the RF discussion. |

**Issue 1-2-1: MRTD value for FR2 inter-band CA**

*Tentative agreements: None.*

*Candidate options (after 1st round comments):*

* + Option 1: Reuse FR2 intra-band MRTD i.e. 260ns
  + Option 2: 3us
  + Option 3: Introduce UE capability which informs network whether UE can support 3us MRTD or 260ns MRTD.

*Recommendations for 2nd round:* Companies are encouraged to provide your views on the listed options.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 2: 3 µs. Applicable for UE which is only capable of common beam management for a band combination where common beam management is possible. The UE may, assume collocated site, in this case.  Intel comments in first round: “The solutions proposed by Ericsson, NEC and Huawei to switch Rx beams only during UL-DL switch and during SSB/RSSI symbols may work. But Rx beam switching is implementation specific and, in general, we should assume that UE can switch its Rx beams at any time. Limiting implementations by spec is unlikely to be agreed. ”   Ericsson: It is good that it is acknowledged that it may work to switch. In out tdoc we propose DL to UL switch.  Intel comments in first round: “The proposal of introducing the performance degradation is not acceptable – the RX beam switching is unpredictable and in the extreme case it can happen after each slot, which leads to severe upper bound of performance degradation.”  Ericsson: It is unlikely that all resources are utilized at all times and that RX beam switching has to happen after each slot.  Intel comments in first round: “We see the compromised solution in introducing UE capability which informs network whether UE can support 3us MRTD or 260ns MRTD. This will allow different implementations for both UE and BS not limiting to them.”  Ericsson: It is likely that all CBM UE will only be capable of TAE=260 ns for intra band combinations with CC close together. This means that operators can never enable CA for CBM UE, for such bands. |
| Verizon | Option 2: 3 µs. We prefer the MRTD value for FR2 inter-band CA with CBM to be defined as 3us. The compatibility in requirement to the NR Rel-15 is another our concern. |
| AT&T | Option 2: 3 µs. Based on co-located deployment scenario assumption, we should keep MRTD = 3 µs to maintain compatibility with TAE requirement for inter-band CA from NR Rel-15. |
| Huawei | Option 2: 3us.  It is common understanding that the MRTD value for CA is derived from BS TAE and propagation delay difference, i.e., the MRTD requirements for FR2 inter-band CA implicitly limit the BS TAE requirements and network deployment. CBM UE with 260ns MRTD will be allowed for both option 1 and option 3. However, CBM UE with 260ns MRTD will require the existing network to revise BS TAE from 3us to 260ns, otherwise CBM UE with 260ns MRTD cannot be configured with FR2 inter-band CA. To revisit the existing BS TAE requirements would cause backward-compatible issues. |
| NEC | Based on our discussion paper, if UE switches Rx beam during UL to DL switch, performance degradation may be avoided. If the concern is only performance degradation, we should work towards discussing solutions to mitigate performance degradation by agreeing MRTD as 3us.  If the concern is implementation, we should first agree on the number of RF chains and FFT used for inter-band FR2 CA using CBM. |
| LG Electronics | Continue to discuss in next meeting as GTW’s conclusion. |
| T-Mobile USA | Option 2: 3 µs. |
| Qualcomm | Continue discussion in May meeting. We will consider the alternative value, e.g.5xx nesec, as mentioned in the GTW session to break through the deadlock. |
| MTK | Continue to discuss in next meeting as GTW’s conclusion. |
| vivo | Follow GTW’s conclusion |
| Nokia | We support option 2. As discussed, we see that the MRTD consist of the TAE and the propagation time. As we commented in 1st round, Inter-band CA is different from intra-band CA from network configuration, Too tight MRTD for example 260ns for inter-band FR2 CA will restrict the network deployment and configurations with multiple RRHs implementation, it will be also difficult for operators to synchronize between multiple RRHs. We understand that the CBM UE will see some impact on the performance if the MRTD is larger than CP, we can further discuss the performance impact. |

**Issue 1-2-2: Symbol level alignment assumption**

*Tentative agreements:*

* We come back to this issue once MRTD value in Issue 1-2-1 is agreed if needed.

*Recommendations for 2nd round:* To confirm if the tentative agreement is agreeable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Tentative agreement is ok. We prefer that symbol level alignment should be within MRTD value. |
| Huawei | Agree with the tentative agreement. |
| NEC | It depends on MRTD value. |
| T-Mobile USA | Tentative agreement is OK. |
| Qualcomm | Okay for the tentative agreements. |
| MTK | Fine with the tentative agreements. |
| vivo | Tentative agreement is ok |
| Nokia | We are fine with the tentative agreements. |

**Issue 1-2-3: How to derive MRTD for FR2 inter-band CA?**

*Tentative agreements: None.*

*Candidate options (after 1st round comments):*

* + Option 1: MRTD = TAE + Δ\_propagation\_time
  + Option 1a: Any change in MRTD should not impact already defined BS TAE of 3 µs for FR2 inter-band CA; i.e. keep Rel-15 values for BS TAE unchanged.
  + Option 2: MRTD requirements for CBM UEs should not rely on FR2 inter-band TAE requirement as it was defined for Non-co-located deployments.
  + Option 2a: The requirement shall be based on “BS type 1-0” for which TAE requirement is 260ns

*Recommendations for 2nd round:* Could companies agreed on the general principle of deriving MRTD i.e. “MRTD = TAE + Δ\_propagation\_time”? If yes, companies are encouraged to comment on the value of TAE.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 1: MRTD = TAE + Δ\_propagation\_time.  TAE for inter band CA has been 3 µs since release 15 and we prefer to keep TAE = 3 µs for inter band, since there exist existing transmission solutions assuming this. |
| AT&T | Option 1. TAE should be 3 µs (see comments for Issue 1-2-2). |
| Huawei | Support option 1.  All the existing MRTD requirements in both LTE and NR are defined based on the principle of “MRTD = TAE + Δ\_propagation\_time”. |
| NEC | Support option 1 |
| T-Mobile USA | Option 1 |
| Qualcomm | Option 2.  During the GTW session, it was almost a common understand that there won’t be a different propagation delay between the two bands. |
| MTK | Option 2. The Δ\_propagation\_time is zero in this case. |
| vivo | Option 2 |
| Nokia | We support option 1. We have similar view as Huawei |

**Issue 1-2-4: Performance degradation due to Rx beam switch**

*Tentative agreements: None.*

*Candidate options (after 1st round comments):*

* + Option 1: UE can switch RX beams without major performance degradation even if MRTD is larger than CP length
  + Option 1a: UE can switch RX beams (for example if it can switch during start of UL to DL transition) without major performance degradation
  + Option 1b: A beam switch could be performed safe within the DL2UL guard if properly performed
  + Option 2: Any timing impacts should be identified and should need to be accounted in the UE requirements.
  + Option 2a: If MRTD larger than CP length is defined for inter-band DL CA based on CBM, demodulation performance degradation should be noted due to Rx beam switch. If MRTD less than CP length is defined for inter-band DL CA based on CBM, reuse Rel-16 FR2 intra-band non-contiguous MRTD of 260ns
  + Option 2b: For CBM UEs in FR2 inter-band CA, if MRTD is larger than CP length with respect to serving cell numerology, serving cell(s) shouldn’t expect the UE to be able to receive/detect PDCCH(s) on search spaces including at least the first or last OFDM symbol of slot in a band where beam management reference resource(s) it not configured. FFS on multiple numerologies. FFS on further scheduling restrictions on PDCCH and/or PDSCH.
  + Option 2c: When the MRTD is larger than CP, the demodulation performance can be significantly degraded at any DL symbol(s) due to the unpredictable UE Rx beam switching.
  + Option 3: No additional scheduling restriction requirements are needed for Rx beam switching of intra-frequency measurement and layer 1 measurements, if the existing scheduling restriction requirements applied for FR2 intra-band CA are extended to FR2 inter-band CA with CBM type UE.

*Recommendations for 2nd round:* Companies are encouraged to provide your views on the listed Options.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 1, 1b. We argue the following:   1. A Band combination where the inter band CA combination bands are not so well separated that the channel models and propagation are significantly different. 2. A Band combination that allows CBM (and where it would make sense to restrict to CBM). 3. A UE indicating only capable of CBM for the specific inter band CA band combination. 4. The network is deployed as co-located (a pre-requisite for supporting CA for CBM restricted UEs, refer to Section 3 for further details). 5. A beam switch or change is still needed, despite network deployed as co-located. 6. There will be no available time occasion in DL (or UL as well for that matter) where the UE could safely perform a beam switch within CP. If both carriers are not full then there might still exist opportunities to switch. What is the likelihood of both carriers full, at all times? Even if both carriers are active, there are possibilities to use the DL to UL guard. One such opportunity is developed in section 2.2 below. 7. If it is not possible to mitigate effects of the beam switch during actual transmission/reception, then consequences would be dependent on how frequent beam switch would occur. 8. If it is not possible to mitigate effects of beam switch during transmission/reception and if happens to frequent then consequences would be dependent beam switch time compared to symbol time   ***There are many options before scheduling restrictions are needed, like available time in UL and DL (if carriers not full) and DL to UL switch, where UE could safely switch beams.*** |
| Huawei | Support option 1.  Share same views as Ericsson. UE can perform Rx beam switching on the scheduling restricted symbols, transient period for U2D/ D2U switching or other unused resources. |
| NEC | Support option 1. It can be UE implementation between 1a/1b |
| LG Electronics | Performing Rx beam switching is entirely up to UE implementation. RAN4 needs to specify minimum requirements considering UE implementation. Regarding, Option 2 is preferred. |
| T-Mobile USA | Option 1b |
| Qualcomm | Option 2. The sub-options can be further discussed later.  This can be discussed after MRTD value gets agreed first. |
| MTK | Option 2 and it depends on the open issue of MRTD value. |
| vivo | Prefer option 2 |
| Nokia | We prefer option 1 in general. RAN4 should exploit the potential of the UE implementation optimizations when feasible, and not only define RRM requirements based on worst case. We are open for further discussing what is feasible for the UE implementations. In case it is technically infeasible for UE implementation to operate as option 1, we can consider other options. |

**Issue 1-2-5: reference signals for Rx beam switch**

*Tentative agreements: None.*

*Candidate options (after 1st round comments):*

* + Option 1: RX beam switch (measurements) should be based on CC configured with beam management RS
  + Option 2: For FR2 inter-band CA with CBM, RAN4 needs to study whether the UE would be configured with RS resources on different FR2 bands for layer 1 measurement.
  + Option 3: The CBM UE in FR2 inter-band CA would only need to be configured with DL RS for BM in one CC. And this CC would be the CC with an UL BWP.

*Recommendations for 2nd round:* It is understood Option 1 is aligned with agreements from RF session, and Option 3 further clarifies how many CCs can be configured with DL RS for BM. Could companies agree to the combination of Option 1 and 3 as below?

* RX beam switch (measurements) should be based on CC configured with beam management RS.
* The CBM UE in FR2 inter-band CA would only need to be configured with DL RS for BM in one CC. And this CC would be the CC with an UL BWP.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We can agree to the combination of options 1 and 3, as proposed by moderator. |
| Huawei | We can agree with the combination of Option 1 and 3. It seems align with RF agreements. |
| NEC | Agree with moderator recommendation. |
| T-Mobile USA | We can agree to the combination of options 1 and 3, as proposed by moderator. |
| Qualcomm | Okay with moderator’s recommendation. |
| MTK | Would like to clarify the “DL-RS for BM” includes RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP but not includes RS for RRM/cell search/AGC/fine time tracking. |
| vivo | Ok with the recommendation |
| Nokia | We are in principle in agreement with the proposed WF. However, we would like to update the wording just slightly to:   * UE beam management measurements should be based on CC configured with beam management RS. * The CBM UE in FR2 inter-band CA would only need to be configured with DL RS for BM in one CC. And this CC would be the CC with an UL BWP. |

**Issue 1-3-1: The MTTD value for FR2 inter-band CA with CBM**

*Tentative agreements: None.*

*Candidate options (after 1st round comments):*

* + Option 1: This is postponed until MRTD is decided
  + Option 2: It is not in the scope of Rel17 as it is related to CBM-based inter-band UL CA

*Recommendations for 2nd round:* Companies are encouraged to provide your views on above two options.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 2 |
| Huawei | Agree with Option 2 |
| LG Electronics | Support Option 2. |
| T-Mobile USA | Option 2 |
| Qualcomm | Option 2. |
| MTK | Option 2. |
| Nokia | We support option 2. |

**Issue 1-4-1: RRM requirements baseline**

*Tentative agreements: None.*

*Candidate options (after 1st round comments):*

* + Option 1: Rel-15 RRM requirements can be re-used as baseline for Rel-17 FR2 inter-band CBM UE RRM requirements
    - Option 1a: Rel-15 CA requirements are applicable for Rel-17 FR2 inter-band CA for CBM even if the SCS different between the bands
* Option 2: Clarification on “baseline” is needed.
* Option 3: It is not urgent to make such decision

*Recommendations for 2nd round:* Proponent company of Option 1 please clarify what “Option 1” means.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 2: Clarification on “baseline” is needed |
| T-Mobile USA | Option 2 |
| Qualcomm | Option 2. |
| MTK | Option 2. |
| Nokia | Baseline here simply means that when discussing the RRM requirements for CBM capable UE the discussion will start from the current UE RRM requirements for a UE not supporting IBM. When needed, according to the technical discussions and agreements in RAN4, the requirements would be updated to accommodate any needed changes. |

**Issue 1-4-3: Scheduling restriction**

*Tentative agreements:*

The scheduling availability requirements for FR2 inter-band CA scenario shall be introduced to clarify there is scheduling restriction on one FR2 band due to RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements being performed on another FR2 band if UE uses common beam.

*Recommendations for 2nd round:* To confirm if the tentative agreement is agreeable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 1a: The existing scheduling restriction requirements on FR2 shall be extended to serving cells in different bands |
| Huawei | Agree with the tentative agreement. We also can agree on the option 1a proposed from Ericsson. |
| NEC | We have different understanding on tentative agreement. As RS for BM is configured for only one CC, UE may not need to perform measurements on other band. Hence there will not be any scheduling restrictions due to measurements performed on other band.  Can companies clarify if our understanding is not correct? We cannot agree to tentative agreement at the moment. |
| T-Mobile USA | Option 1a |
| Qualcomm | Option 1a. And okay with the tentative agreement.  To NEC, the restriction above is about scheduling restriction on the other band. Here, scheduling is, e.g. PDCCH/PDSCH/CSI-RS/etc. |
| MTK | Fine with the tentative agreement. |
| NEC2 | Thank you QC for clarification, we are OK with tentative agreement.. |
| Nokia | We agree with the tentative agreement. Ericsson 1a proposal is also fine (essentially more detailed than the tentative agreement). Maybe worth clarifying option 1 and/or 1a to include that this is for FR2 inter-band CA for CBM capable UE:  The scheduling availability requirements for CBM capable UE in FR2 inter-band CA scenario shall be introduced to clarify there is scheduling restriction on one FR2 band due to RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements being performed on another FR2 band if UE uses common beam |

**Issue 1-4-4: Measurement restriction**

*Tentative agreements: None.*

*Candidate options (after 1st round comments):*

* + Option 1: Measurement restriction requirements need to be defined for CBM capable UE for inter-band CA scenario
    - Option 1a: Existing Measurement restriction requirements would be applicable (Nokia, Ericsson)
  + Option 2: RAN4 not to define any measurement restrictions for CBM operation in FR2 inter-band CA.
  + Option 3: If MRTD between the two bands is larger than CP length with respect to serving cell numerology, Measurement and/or Scheduling restriction to serving cell(s) on the other band should account for the MRTD, e.g. [x] slots before and after SSB symbols and/or CSI-RS symbol(s)

*Recommendations for 2nd round:* Could companies agree to Option 1 (excluding Option 1a)?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 1a: The existing scheduling/measurement restriction requirements applied for FR2 intra-band CA need to be extended to FR2 inter-band CA with CBM type UE. |
| Huawei | Option 2: The measurement restriction requirements for FR2 inter-band CA are applied for the scenario where the UE need to perform L1 measurements on CCs in different bands. However, this scenario will not occur for CBM UE. “The CBM UE in FR2 inter-band CA would only need to be configured with DL RS for BM in one CC. And this CC would be the CC with an UL BWP” limits that this only one CC configured with BM-RS would be PCC (or PSCC for EN-DC). So, CBM UE is only required to perform RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements on PCC (or PSCC for EN-DC). |
| NEC | Option 2. Similar comments as Huawei. |
| T-Mobile USA | Optin 1a |
| Qualcomm | Let’s come back to this in May meeting. If this is only about L1 measurement, what Huawei commented looks valid. We want to go back and check it further. |
| MTK | Need more discussion. It would need to consider SSB for other purpose, e.g. cell search, AGC, fine time tracking. |
| Nokia | Option 1. Even for option 2 it would be good to capture that there would be no additional measurement restrictions for CBM UE in FR2 inter-CA scenario. |

**Issue 1-4-5: SCell activation delay**

*Tentative agreements:*

* Case 1: if PCell/PSCell and the target SCell are in a FR2 band pair with CBM and the target SCell is known,
  + Option 1: the existing SCell activation requirements can be readily be re-used for CBM capable UE in inter-band CA scenario

*Recommendations for 2nd round:* To confirm if the tentative agreement is agreeable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Tentative agreement is ok |
| Huawei | Agree with the tentative agreement. |
| NEC | Can companies clarify our first round comment?  “May be we didn’t understand the agreement that beam management RS is present on only one band (May be that is PCC). Isn’t this assumption and co-location assumption means, SSB less SCell activation? Can companies clarify why this can’t be treated as SSB less SCell activation?”  We cannot agree to tentative agreement at the moment. |
| T-Mobile USA | Tentative agreement is OK. |
| Qualcomm | Okay for the tentative agreements.  To NEC, SSB usage is not limited to BM. UE still need SSB for AGC and timing/freq tracking loop/etc. For example, even in intra-band FR2 CA, in the current SCell activation requirement, we consider both SSB-based and SSB-less. |
| MTK | Fine with the tentative agreements. |
| NEC2 | Thank you QC for clarifications. We are OK with tentative agreement. |
| Nokia | Tentative agreement is agreeable. |

**Issue 1-4-7: Beam management**

*Tentative agreements: None.*

*Candidate options (after 1st round comments):*

* + Option 1: The existing BFD/CBD requirements in Rel-16 can be applied for CBM type UE

*Recommendations for 2nd round:* It is suggested that proponent company clarifies the proposal in response to the questions in 1st round. With the clarification, is it possible to go for Option1?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | option 1. |
| Huawei | Agree with option 1. |
| T-Mobile USA | Option 1 |
| Qualcomm | Option 1. |
| MTK | Needs more discussion. For examples, on SCell BFD, UE is required to monitor 1 serving cell per band, and it seems this requirement should be extended as “band group in CBM”?  Besides, is the requirement also includes scheduling restriction and measurerment restriction? If so, it depends on other open issues.  It needs more investigation. |
| Nokia | Agree with Option 1 |

## Summary for 2nd round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round, list all the identified open issues and agreements or candidate options and suggestion for next meeting.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1-1** | **Issue 1-1-1: Deployment scenarios assumption for CBM**  *Agreements (in GTW):*   * Define MRTD and RRM requirements for CBM capable UEs based on co-located deployment scenarios only.   + There are no deployment restrictions (Non-co-located/co-located) for network to configure inter-band DL CA for CBM UEs.   + Note: this does not imply that MRTD requirements will be defined based on intra-band CA assumptions     *Recommendations:* No discussion is needed for next meeting. |
| **Issue 1-1-2: UE assumption for IBM**  *Candidate options (after 2nd round comments):*   * + Option 1: For an IBM capable UE, with more than 1 panel, the UE is able to actively operate with multiple panels simultaneously. (Nokia, Ericsson, Verizon, AT&T, NEC)   + Option 2: No further discussion is needed in RRM session for inter-band IBM UE. (Qualcomm, Intel, LG, Nokia, Huawei, Xiaomi, Vivo, Ericsson, MTK)   + Option 3: RRM requirements specified for IBM is based on the assumption that UE is able to actively operate with single panel per time instance. The related requirements should be restrict UE from operating with multiple panels simultaneously.   Moderator’s comments:  Majority of the companies think this can be further discussed in RF session as needed. And no objection was received to go for Option 2 in the WF. Following has been agreed in RF session:  *“IBM UE is capable of receiving signals for FR2 inter-band CA with different beam directions at the same time using independent beams trained by DL reference signals in respective bands.”*  *Agreements:*   * No further discussion is needed for inter-band IBM UE in RRM session.   *Recommendations:* No discussion is needed for next meeting. |
| **Sub-topic #1-2** | **Issue 1-2-1: MRTD value for FR2 inter-band CA**  *Candidate options (after GTW and 2nd round comments):*   * Option 1: Do not define any requirements for CBM UEs for FR2 inter-band CA * Option 2: Introduce UE capability to support MRTD = 260ns and MRTD = 3us (Intel, NEC) * Option 3: MRTD = 260ns (Vivo, Apple, Intel, OPPO, Xiaomi, Qualcomm, LG, MTK) * Option 4: MRTD = 3us (NEC, Ericsson, Nokia, Huawei, Docomo, Softbank, AT&T, Verizon, ZTE, T-mobile) * Other options are not precluded   Moderator’s comments:  There is no consensus on this issue. We will follow GTW agreements and please continue the discussion in next meeting.  *Agreements (in GTW):*   * *Candidate options*   + *Option 1: Do not define any requirements for CBM UEs for FR2 inter-band CA*   + *Option 2: Introduce UE capability to support MRTD = 260ns and MRTD = 3us (Intel, NEC)*   + *Option 3: MRTD = 260ns (Vivo, Apple, Intel, OPPO, Xiaomi, Qualcomm, LG, MTK)*   + *Option 4: MRTD = 3us (NEC, Ericsson, Nokia, Huawei, Docomo, Softbank, AT&T, Verizon, ZTE)*   + *Other options are not precluded* * *Note 1: Decision shall be made in RAN4 #99-e* * *Note 2: Companies are encouraged to bring further analysis on achievable MRTD from the network and UE perspectives and the possible impact on the implementation and performance*   *Recommendations:* To continue the discussion in next meeting. |
| **Issue 1-2-2: Symbol level alignment assumption**  Moderator’s comments:  The tentative agreement is agreeable to all the companies.  *Agreements:*   * We come back to this issue once MRTD value in Issue 1-2-1 is agreed if needed.   *Recommendations:* This can be discussed together with MRTD in next meeting. |
| **Issue 1-2-3: How to derive MRTD for FR2 inter-band CA?**  *Candidate options (after 2nd round comments):*   * + Option 1: MRTD = TAE + Δ\_propagation\_time (Ericsson, NEC, Nokia, Huawei, Docomo, AT&T, T-mobile)   + Option 1a: TAE = 3us (Ericsson, AT&T).   + Option 2: MRTD requirements for CBM UEs should not rely on FR2 inter-band TAE requirement as it was defined for Non-co-located deployments. (Intel, Qualcomm, LG, MTK, OPPO, Apple, Xiaomi, vivo)   + Option 2a: The requirement shall be based on “BS type 1-0” for which TAE requirement is 260ns (Qualcomm)   Moderator’s comments:  There is no consensus on going for general principle in Option 1. Please continue the discussion in next meeting.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations:* To continue the discussion in next meeting. |
|  | **Issue 1-2-4: Performance degradation due to Rx beam switch**  *Candidate options (after 2nd round comments):*   * + Option 1: UE can switch RX beams without major performance degradation even if MRTD is larger than CP length (Ericsson, NEC, Nokia, Huawei)   + Option 1a: UE can switch RX beams (for example if it can switch during start of UL to DL transition) without major performance degradation (NEC)   + Option 1b: A beam switch could be performed safe within the DL2UL guard if properly performed (Ericsson, Nokia, Huawei, T-mobile)   + Option 2: Any timing impacts should be identified and should need to be accounted in the UE requirements (Nokia, Qualcomm, LG, MTK, OPPO, Xiaomi, vivo).   + Option 2a: If MRTD larger than CP length is defined for inter-band DL CA based on CBM, demodulation performance degradation should be noted due to Rx beam switch. If MRTD less than CP length is defined for inter-band DL CA based on CBM, reuse Rel-16 FR2 intra-band non-contiguous MRTD of 260ns (LG, OPPO)   + Option 2b: For CBM UEs in FR2 inter-band CA, if MRTD is larger than CP length with respect to serving cell numerology, serving cell(s) shouldn’t expect the UE to be able to receive/detect PDCCH(s) on search spaces including at least the first or last OFDM symbol of slot in a band where beam management reference resource(s) it not configured. FFS on multiple numerologies. FFS on further scheduling restrictions on PDCCH and/or PDSCH. (Qualcomm)   + Option 2c: When the MRTD is larger than CP, the demodulation performance can be significantly degraded at any DL symbol(s) due to the unpredictable UE Rx beam switching. (Xiaomi, Intel, OPPO, Xiaomi)   + Option 3: No additional scheduling restriction requirements are needed for Rx beam switching of intra-frequency measurement and layer 1 measurements, if the existing scheduling restriction requirements applied for FR2 intra-band CA are extended to FR2 inter-band CA with CBM type UE. (Huawei)   Moderator’s comments:  There is no consensus on this issue. Please continue the discussion in next meeting.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations:* To continue the discussion in next meeting. |
| **Issue 1-2-5: reference signals for Rx beam switch**  Moderator’s comments:  Majority of the companies could agree to the moderator’s recommendation.  *Agreements:*   * UE beam management measurements should be based on CC configured with beam management RS. * The CBM UE in FR2 inter-band CA would only need to be configured with DL RS for BM in one CC. And this CC would be the CC with an UL BWP.   *Recommendations:* No discussion is needed in next meeting. |
| **Sub-topic 1-3** | **Issue 1-3-1: The MTTD value for FR2 inter-band CA with CBM**  Moderator’s comments:  All companies agree to go for Option 2.  *Agreements:*   * It is not in the scope of Rel17 as it is related to CBM-based inter-band UL CA   *Recommendations:* No discussion is needed in next meeting. |
| **Sub-topic 1-4** | **Issue 1-4-1: RRM requirements baseline**  *Candidate options (after 2nd round comments):*   * + Option 1: Rel-15 RRM requirements can be re-used as baseline for Rel-17 FR2 inter-band CBM UE RRM requirements (Nokia)     - Option 1a: Rel-15 CA requirements are applicable for Rel-17 FR2 inter-band CA for CBM even if the SCS different between the bands (Nokia) * Option 2: Clarification on “baseline” is needed. (Qualcomm, Intel, Ericsson, NEC, T-mobile, MTK) * Option 3: It is not urgent to make such decision (Apple)   Moderator’s comments:  Majority of the companies were asking for clarification on Option 2. Please continue the discussion in next meeting.  Tentative agreements: None.  *Recommendations:* To continue the discussion in next meeting. |
|  | **Issue 1-4-3: Scheduling restriction**  Moderator’s comments:  All the companies could agree to the tentative agreements.  *Agreements:*   * The scheduling availability requirements for CBM capable UE in FR2 inter-band CA scenario shall be introduced to clarify there is scheduling restriction on one FR2 band due to RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements being performed on another FR2 band if UE uses common beam.   *Recommendations:* To continue the discussion on the details in next meeting. |
|  | **Issue 1-4-4: Measurement restriction**  *Candidate options (after 2nd round comments):*   * + Option 1: Measurement restriction requirements need to be defined for CBM capable UE for inter-band CA scenario (Qualcomm, Intel, MTK, Apple, Xiaomi).     - Option 1a: Existing Measurement restriction requirements would be applicable (Nokia, Ericsson, T-mobile)   + Option 2: RAN4 not to define any measurement restrictions for CBM operation in FR2 inter-band CA (NEC, Huawei).   + Option 3: If MRTD between the two bands is larger than CP length with respect to serving cell numerology, Measurement and/or Scheduling restriction to serving cell(s) on the other band should account for the MRTD, e.g. [x] slots before and after SSB symbols and/or CSI-RS symbol(s) (Qualcomm)   Moderator’s comments:  There is no consensus on this issue. Please continue the discussion in next meeting.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations:* To continue the discussion in next meeting. |
|  | **Issue 1-4-5: SCell activation delay**  Moderator’s comments:  For Case 1, all the companies could go for the tentative agreement.  *Agreements:*   * Case 1: if PCell/PSCell and the target SCell are in a FR2 band pair with CBM and the target SCell is known, the existing SCell activation requirements can be readily be re-used for CBM capable UE in inter-band CA scenario   *Recommendations:* To continue the discussion on other cases in next meeting. |
|  | **Issue 1-4-7: Beam management**  Moderator’s comments:  Majority of the companies agree with moderator’s recommendation with some additions of FFS.  *Agreements:*  The existing BFD/CBD requirements in Rel-16 can be the starting point for CBM type UE  FFS scheduling restriction, measurement restriction  FFS how many serving cell the CBM UE is required to monitor per band group.  *Recommendations:* To continue the discussion on the details in next meeting. |

# Topic #2: Inter-band UL CA

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [R4-2106945](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2106945.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: It is suggested to start the discussion on RRM requirements for FR2 inter-band CA based on CBM after the feasibility is confirmed in RF session.  Proposal 2: For IBM type UE, the existing interruption and delay requirements for UL carrier RRC reconfiguration in Rel-16 can be applied in Rel-17.  Proposal 3: The Rel-16 interruption requirement for UE switching between two uplink carriers can be applied in Rel-17 since it is only applicable in FR1. There is no impact due to introducing FR2 inter-band UL CA.  Proposal 4: RAN4 investigates the interruption requirements for NR SRS carrier based switching applicable for inter-band SRS carrier switching in FR2. |
| [R4-2106531](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2106531.zip) | OPPO | Proposal 1: Symbol level alignment should be with CP length.  Proposal 2: Demodulation performance degradation due to Rx beam switch should be noted in MRTD requirements for CBM UE if MRTD is larger than CP.  Proposal 3: For MRTD of FR2 inter-band CA with CBM, reuse FR2 intra-band CA MRTD, i.e. 260ns.  Proposal 4: For a FR2 inter-band CA with CBM, the existing interruption requirements of intra-band CA can be applied.  Proposal 5: As compromise, RRM discussion on DL interruption at NR SRS carrier-based switching can be hold until we have conclusion of FR2 inter-band UL CA in RF session.  Observation 1: The SCell activation requirements of CBM capable UE for case 2 depend on both RF architecture and MRTD requirements for CBM type UE.  Proposal 6: SCell activation delay would be reduced for the case provided that PCell/PSCell and the target SCell are in a FR2 band pair with CBM and the target SCell is unknown, compared to the existing SCell activation delay requirements for FR1+FR2 CA.  Proposal 7: If FR2 inter-band CA with two bands are only considered in Rel-17, then the existing requirements on scaling factor CSSFoutside\_gap in Rel-16 can be applied to Rel-17.  Proposal 8: The existing BFD/CBD requirements in Rel-16 can be applied for CBM type UE |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 2-1 RRM requirements for common beam management

**Issue 2-1-1: General**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: It is suggested to start the discussion on RRM requirements for FR2 inter-band CA based on CBM after the feasibility is confirmed in RF session (Huawei, OPPO)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | As per a revised WID (RP-210914) approved in RAN#91e, CBM-based FR2 inter-band UL is no longer in the scope of Rel-17. And the last sub-bullet below should be only for IBM based inter-band FR2 CA in our understanding, hence, no further discussion shall be pursued in Rel-17. |
| Intel | Agree with Qualcomm’s comment. Based on a revised WID (RP-210914) approved in RAN#91e, CBM-based FR2 inter-band UL is no longer in the scope of Rel-17. |
| LG Electronics | For FR2 inter-band UL CA, objectives related to CBM were removed. Therefore, further discussion is not needed in Rel-17. |
| Ericsson | Based on a revised WID (RP-210914) approved in RAN#91e, CBM-based FR2 inter-band UL is no longer in the scope of Rel-17. |
| Nokia | Agree. No need to discuss UL CA for CBM unless agreements are reached in RF. The latest WI is no longer including this objective. |
| Huawei | We can agree that there is no need to discuss this issue. |

**Issue 2-1-2: DL interruption at NR SRS carrier based switching**

* Proposals
  + Option 3: RRM discussion should be hold until we have conclusion of FR2 inter-band UL CA in RF session. (OPPO)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | The same comment as Issue 2-1-1. |
| Intel | Based on a revised WID (RP-210914) approved in RAN#91e, CBM-based FR2 inter-band UL is no longer in the scope of Rel-17. |
| Ericsson | Based on a revised WID (RP-210914) approved in RAN#91e, CBM-based FR2 inter-band UL is no longer in the scope of Rel-17. |
| Nokia | Same comments as Issue 2-1-1. |

### Sub-topic 2-2 RRM requirements for independent beam management

**Issue 2-2-1: Interruption due to UL carrier RRC reconfiguration**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For IBM type UE, the existing interruption and delay requirements for UL carrier RRC reconfiguration in Rel-16 can be applied in Rel-17 (Huawei)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | In principle, Option 1 is okay. However, we want to consult with RF session on the exact value. |
| Ericsson | Option 1. |
| Nokia | Referring to below texts in TS38.133, UL carrier RRC configuration is not necessarily dependent on UL CA. It is also applicable for single carrier. Why do we discuss it here?  *The requirements in this clause shall apply when a supplementary UL carrier or an UL carrier is configured or de-configured in NR standalone carrier aggregation as defined in TS 38.331 [2].* |
| Huawei | Support option 1. |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-2-2: DL interruption at UE Tx switching between two uplink carriers**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: The Rel-16 interruption requirement for UE switching between two uplink carriers can be applied in Rel-17 since it is only applicable in FR1. There is no impact due to introducing FR2 inter-band UL CA. (Huawei)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Want to revisit the issue in the next meeting. We’re internally double checking the issue/spec. |
| Ericsson | Option 1. There is no switching between two uplink carriers in FR2. Therefore, this issue does not apply to FR2 inter-band UL CA. |
| Nokia | We also understood the interruption at Tx switching in current spec is only applicable to FR1. So it is natural the Rel16 interruption requirements for FR1 is still applicable in Re17. Just to confirm this is not intending to extend the applicability to FR2 inter-band UL CA. |
| Huawei | Support option 1.  We agree that there is no need to extend UE Tx switching requirements to FR2 inter-band UL CA. |

**Issue 2-2-3: DL interruption at NR SRS carrier based switching**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 investigates the interruption requirements for NR SRS carrier based switching applicable for inter-band SRS carrier switching in FR2 (Huawei)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Needs to consult with RF session on, e.g. RF switching time defined for FR2 inter-band CA. |
| Ericsson | Needs further discussion. |
| Nokia | It seems to propose discuss inter-band SRS carrier switching but this seems not to be part of this WI. In current spec, SRS carrier based switching only concerns intra-band and inter-band FR1. It is not clear if it is feasible to switch between carriers in different bands in FR2. In addition, the SRS carrier based switching is not necessarily dependent on UL CA, which seems better to be discussed in other WI. |
| Huawei | The existing interruption requirements for NR SRS carrier based switching are not applicable for FR2 inter-band SRS carriers. RAN4 could investigate whether UE will perform SRS carrier switching between FR2 inter-band CCs and whether the corresponding interruption requirements are needed. |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator’s comments: Companies please provide your comments in the tables below each separate sub-topic summary in section 2.2.*

### 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** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | 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 2-1** | **Issue 2-1-1: General**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: It is suggested to start the discussion on RRM requirements for FR2 inter-band CA based on CBM after the feasibility is confirmed in RF session (Huawei, OPPO)   + Option 2: The RRM requirements for FR2 inter-band CA based on CBM shall not be pursued in Rel-17 (Qualcomm, Intel, LG, Ericsson, Nokia, Huawei)   Moderator’s comments:  As per a revised WID (RP-210914) approved in RAN#91e, CBM-based FR2 inter-band UL is no longer in the scope of Rel-17. hence, no further discussion shall be pursued in Rel-17.    *Tentative agreements:*  The RRM requirements for FR2 inter-band CA based on CBM shall not be pursued in Rel-17  *Recommendations for 2nd round: No discussion is needed in 2nd round.* |
|  | **Issue 2-1-2: DL interruption at NR SRS carrier based switching**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: RRM discussion should be hold until we have conclusion of FR2 inter-band UL CA in RF session. (OPPO)   Moderator’s comments:  With the agreement in Issue 2-1-1, the DL interruption shall not be discussed in Rel17 either.  *Tentative agreements:*  The RRM requirements for FR2 inter-band CA based on CBM shall not be pursued in Rel-17  *Recommendations for 2nd round: No discussion is needed in 2nd round.* |
| **Sub-topic 2-2** | **Issue 2-2-1: Interruption due to UL carrier RRC reconfiguration**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: For IBM type UE, the existing interruption and delay requirements for UL carrier RRC reconfiguration in Rel-16 can be applied in Rel-17 (Huawei, Qualcomm, Ericsson)   Moderator’s comments:  Some company raised question if UL carrier RRC reconfiguration is in the scope of UL CA. It is suggested to have questions clarified and could continue the discussion in next meeting.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* This can be further discussed in next meeting. Companies are welcome to provide further views if any. |
| **Issue 2-2-2: DL interruption at UE Tx switching between two uplink carriers**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: The Rel-16 interruption requirement for UE switching between two uplink carriers can be applied in Rel-17 since it is only applicable in FR1. There is no impact due to introducing FR2 inter-band UL CA. (Huawei, Ericsson)   Moderator’s comments:  Some company wants to check internally and come back to it next meeting. This can be further discussed in next meeting.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* This can be further discussed in next meeting. Companies are welcome to provide further views if any. |
| **Issue 2-2-3: DL interruption at NR SRS carrier based switching**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: RAN4 investigates the interruption requirements for NR SRS carrier based switching applicable for inter-band SRS carrier switching in FR2 (Huawei)   + Option 2: Needs to consult with RF session (Qualcomm, Nokia)   + Option 3: Need further discussion (Ericsson)   Moderator’s comments:  This can be further discussed in next meeting.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* This can be further discussed in next meeting. Companies are welcome to provide further views if any. |

### CRs/TPs

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

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

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

No discussion is planned in 2nd round. The remaining issues of Topic #2 will be discussed in next meeting.

# Topic #3: UL gaps for self-calibration and monitoring

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [R4-2106395](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2106395.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | UL gaps for PA calibration:   1. If UL gaps for PA calibration are very infrequent, there is no need to define configurable UL gaps for this purpose. 2. If UL gaps for PA calibration gaps are very frequent there may be a need to define configurable UL gaps for this purpose. 3. Wait for input from RF session whether UL gaps for PA calibration is needed or not.   UL gaps for proximity detection:   1. UL gaps for proximity detection may be used for improving P-MPR. 2. UL gaps with a periodicity of 5% correspond to 1 slot every 2.5 ms which may have be a significant impact on system level performance. 3. Frequent UL gaps for proximity detection would lead to a need for defined UL gaps and likely UL gap pattern to be defined. 4. RAN4 need to agree on UL gap length and periodicity in order to define UL GP. 5. Agreement on the need for introducing UL gaps for proximity detection is still pending. 6. RAN4 would first agree on introduction of configurable UL gaps before detailed design is started. |
| [R4-2106946](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2106946.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | ***Proposal 1: RAN4 needs to investigate the pattern design of network configured UL gaps used for self-calibration and monitoring.***  ***Proposal 2: RAN4 study whether the network configured UL gaps is per-UE UL gap or per-FR UL gap.***  ***Proposal 3: RAN4 study whether to define the applicability for UL gap pattern configurations.***  ***Proposal 4: For network configured UL gap, RAN4 needs to define the scheduling restriction requirements during gap duration.***  ***Proposal 5: For UE specific UL gap, RAN4 study the conditions allowing UE self-calibration with autonomous UL gaps.***  ***Proposal 6: For UE specific UL gap, interruption requirements, including interruption length and interruption rate, to allow UE self-calibration with autonomous UL gaps.*** |
| [R4-2107078](file:///C:\DuLei2019\RAN4\RAN4%2398ebis\Docs\R4-2107078.zip) | vivo | **Observation 1 Uplink gaps that are already defined in TS 38.133 are mainly due to the unavoidable RF processing or the necessary requirements that UE has to follow.**  **Observation 2 Uplink duty cycle is defined in R16 to ensure RF performance. It is captured in RF specs and RAN2 specs.**  **Proposal 1 RAN4 further discuss whether uplink gaps are captured in RRM specs or in RF specs.** |

## Open issues summary

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

### Sub-topic 3-1 General

**Issue 3-1-1: General**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 further discuss whether uplink gaps are captured in RRM specs or in RF specs (Vivo)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Can be discussed/decided later, if introduced. |
| Intel | Prefer to wait for RF session to decide on whether the performance gain identified. |
| MTK | whether to introduce uplink gaps should be discussed in the RF session. |
|  | It is premature to discuss the uplink gaps in RRM group at this stage.  RRM group should wait for discussing any uplink gaps until the RF group has concluded their work on UL gaps and corresponding use cases/scenarios. |
| Nokia | We see that would depend on which type of gaps RAN4 decide to introduce. If the gaps are rare (e.g. for PA calibration) and only happening infrequent there is likely no need to define any related RRM requirements and/or configurable UL gaps.  If on the other hand it is agreed to introduce gaps which are more frequent and thereby have significant impact on the overall scheduling and performance, there may be a need to define configurable gaps. Such gaps could resemble those known from DL gaps.  However, RAN4 has no decision yet to introduce any additional UL gaps compared to those in Rel-15. |
| Huawei | Agree to wait RF inputs. |
| Apple | Agree to hold the discussion until decision in main session. |
| vivo | Agree with option 1 |

### Sub-topic 3-2 UL Gaps for PA calibration

**Issue 3-2-1: UL gaps for PA calibration**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Wait for input from RF session how frequent UL gaps for PA calibration is needed (Nokia)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Option 1, and even for UL gaps for Proximity detection, it needs to be first studied in RF. |
| Intel | In the WID it is said that RRM requirements should be defined in Phase 2 based on the outcome of RF discussion in Phase 1. Prefer to wait for RF Phase 1 agreements first. |
| MTK | Option 1, wait for input from RF session |
| Ericsson | RRM group should wait for outcome/conclusion of RF group before discussing any issue related to the UL gaps in RRM session. |
| Huawei | Agree with option 1. Postpone RRM discussion on this issue. |
| apple | Option 1 |
| vivo | Option 1 |

### Sub-topic 3-3 UL Gaps for proximity detection

**Issue 3-3-1: Network configured UL gaps**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 would first agree on introduction of configurable UL gaps before detailed design is started (Nokia)
    - Option 1a: RAN4 need to agree on UL gap length and periodicity in order to define UL GP (Nokia)
  + Option 2: RAN4 needs to investigate the pattern design of network configured UL gaps used for self-calibration and monitoring. (Huawei)
  + Option 3: RAN4 study whether the network configured UL gaps is per-UE UL gap or per-FR UL gap. (Huawei)
  + Option 4: RAN4 study whether to define the applicability for UL gap pattern configurations. (Huawei)
  + Option 5: For network configured UL gap, RAN4 needs to define the scheduling restriction requirements during gap duration.(Huawei)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Should start the discussion when NW-configured UL gap feature is justified based on a demonstration of the benefits and the scenarios where the benefit can be observed are identified in RF session. |
| Intel | In the WID it is said that RRM requirements should be defined in Phase 2 based on the outcome of RF discussion in Phase 1. Prefer to wait for RF Phase 1 agreements first.  However, we are ok to define such topics for discussion for next meetings. |
| MTK | wait for RF Phase 1 agreements |
| Ericsson | RRM group should wait for outcome/conclusion of RF group before discussing any issue related to the UL gaps in RRM session. |
| Nokia | Initially we see that there need to an agreement in RAN4 to introduce configurable UL gaps. If such agreement is reached, we agree that the aspect raised by Huawei would need to be addressed.  However, until there is an agreement to introduce configurable UL gaps RAN4 can focus the work on other open aspects in this WI. |
| Huawei | We can agree to postpone RRM discussion on this issue and wait RF inputs. |
| apple | Ok to wait for the decision in main session. |
| vivo | Wait for RF session conclusions. |

**Issue 3-3-2: UE specific UL gaps**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For UE specific UL gap, RAN4 study the conditions allowing UE self-calibration with autonomous UL gaps.(Huawei)
  + Option 2: For UE specific UL gap, interruption requirements, including interruption length and interruption rate, to allow UE self-calibration with autonomous UL gaps. (Huawei)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | In our understanding, “UE autonomous UL gap-based approach” is an implementation specific solution which doesn’t cause an interruption. If Option 1 and Option 2 propose to consider allowing UE to cause interruptions due to PA calibration and/or Proximity detection and such, its benefit and required interruption ratio need to be assessed and decided in RF session. |
| Intel | In the WID it is said that RRM requirements should be defined in Phase 2 based on the outcome of RF discussion in Phase 1. Prefer to wait for RF Phase 1 agreements first. |
| MTK | wait for RF Phase 1 agreements |
| Ericsson | RRM group should wait for the outcome/conclusion of the RF group before discussing any interruption requirements for any autonomous gaps. |
| Nokia | Both options are under discussion in the RF session and should not be discussed in parallel here. |
| Huawei | We can agree to postpone RRM discussion on this issue and wait RF inputs. |
| vivo | Wait for RF session conclusions. |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator’s comments: Companies please provide your comments in the tables below each separate sub-topic summary in section 3.2.*

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic 3-1** | **Issue 3-1-1: General**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: RAN4 further discuss whether uplink gaps are captured in RRM specs or in RF specs (Vivo)   + Option 2: This can be discussed later if introduced. (Qualcomm)   + Option 3: This should be firstly discussed in RF session (Intel, MTK, Ericsson, Huawei, Apple, Vivo)   + Option 4: This depends on which type of gaps RAN4 decide to introduce (Nokia)   Moderator’s comments:  This can be further discussed in next meeting.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* This can be further discussed in next meeting. |
| **Sub-topic 3-2** | **Issue 3-2-1: UL gaps for PA calibration**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: Wait for input from RF session how frequent UL gaps for PA calibration is needed (Nokia, Qualcomm, Intel, MTK, Ericsson, Huawei, Apple, Vivo)   Moderator’s comments:  All companies agreed with Option 1.  *Tentative agreements:*  Wait for input from RF session how frequent UL gaps for PA calibration is needed  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* No discussion is needed. |
| **Sub-topic 3-3** | **Issue 3-3-1: Network configured UL gaps**   * Views after 1st round comments:   + Option 1: RAN4 would first agree on introduction of configurable UL gaps before detailed design is started (Nokia)     - Option 1a: RAN4 need to agree on UL gap length and periodicity in order to define UL GP (Nokia)   + Option 2: RAN4 needs to investigate the pattern design of network configured UL gaps used for self-calibration and monitoring. (Huawei)   + Option 3: RAN4 study whether the network configured UL gaps is per-UE UL gap or per-FR UL gap. (Huawei)   + Option 4: RAN4 study whether to define the applicability for UL gap pattern configurations. (Huawei)   + Option 5: For network configured UL gap, RAN4 needs to define the scheduling restriction requirements during gap duration.(Huawei)   + Option 6: Wait for RF session agreements (Qualcomm, Intel, MTK, Ericsson, Huawei)   Moderator’s comments:  Most of the companies suggest waiting for RF phase-1 outcome. This can be discussed in next meeting.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* This can be discussed in next meeting. |
| **Issue 3-3-2: UE specific UL gaps**   * Proposals   + Option 1: For UE specific UL gap, RAN4 study the conditions allowing UE self-calibration with autonomous UL gaps.(Huawei)   + Option 2: For UE specific UL gap, interruption requirements, including interruption length and interruption rate, to allow UE self-calibration with autonomous UL gaps. (Huawei)   Moderator’s comments:  Some companies suggest waiting for RF phase-1 outcome. This can be discussed in next meeting.  *Tentative agreements: None.*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* This can be discussed 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** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

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

No discussion is planned in 2nd round. The remaining issues of Topic #3 will be discussed in next meeting.

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| WF on the RRM requirements or FR2 Inter-band DL CA and UL CA | Nokia |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**New tdocs**

**Existing tdocs**

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

Notes:

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

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-2105785 | WF on RRM requirements for FR2 Inter-band DL CA and UL CA | Nokia | Agreeable |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

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