**Comments on ECC Deliverable**

**“Draft ECC Report 358”**

**1 Sources**

**Administration/Company/Entity:** Nokia Corporation

**Name of contributor:** Theodoros Spathopoulos ([theorodos.spathopoulos@nokia.com](mailto:theorodos.spathopoulos@nokia.com))

**2 General Comments**

**3 Proposals related to the ECC Deliverables**

| **Comment number** | **Section number**  **Clause** | **Paragraph**  **Figure**  **Table** | **Type of comment**  (General,  Technical or  Editorial) | **Comment** | **Proposed change** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Nokia/1 | 0 Executive summary | Section: Adjacent channel coexistence for WBB LMP networks with synchronisation to other WBB LMP and MFCN | Editorial | Propose rewording the title | Previous title  *Adjacent channel coexistence for WBB LMP networks with synchronisation to other WBB LMP and MFCN*  New title:  *Adjacent channel coexistence for synchronised WBB LMP networks with other WBB LMP and MFCN* |
| Nokia/2 | 0 Executive summary | Section: Adjacent channel coexistence for WBB LMP networks with synchronisation to other WBB LMP and MFCN | Editorial | Propose rewording the second sentence of the paragraph | Previous sentence:  *This assumption also accounts for adjacent channel operation of these WBB LMP networks*  New sentence substituting “channel” with “band”, making the sentence:  *This assumption also accounts for adjacent band operation of these WBB LMP networks…* |
| Nokia/3 | 0 Executive summary | Section: Other aspects regarding the shared use of the frequency band 3.8-4.2 GHz for WBB LMP | General/Editorial | Propose to reword the last sentence of the first paragraph | In the first paragraph of this section, the last sentence says “*some of the technical conditions that were studied in this report would reduce to a certain extent the amount of coordination needed”*  When reading this sentence, the word “some” implies that there were technical conditions studied, which do not aim to reduce coordination. Then the question is which technical conditions these are and what is the reason of having those conditions, if they don’t have an impact on coordination  Suggestion either to specify which are these technical conditions, or to delete the word “some” and the words “to a certain extent” |
| Nokia/4 | 0 Executive summary | Section: Other aspects regarding the shared use of the frequency band 3.8-4.2 GHz for WBB LMP | General/Editorial | In the 2nd paragraph, regarding the text within the parenthesis.  The studies have identified (as concluded in Section 7.1.8) *“the need for frequency separation for unsynchronised WBB LMPs to protect MFCN below 3.8 GHz”*. The way this frequency separation aspect is used in this parenthesis, is complementing the text in the sense that it may be used as a complementary mitigation to manage coordination. The studies however show that frequency separation is needed for unsynchronised WBB LMP operation to protect MFCN. | We propose to delete the text “and/or frequency separation requirements”  Previous sentence  *“in order to manage remaining coordination cases not addressed by the harmonised technical conditions (for example on synchronisation and/or frequency separation requirements)”*  New sentence  *“in order to manage remaining coordination cases not addressed by the harmonised technical conditions (for example synchronisation requirements)”* |
| Nokia/5 | 2.1.4 Semi-synchronised operation with DL to UL modifications for WBB LMP | First paragraph | Editorial | Propose editorial in the last two sentences of the first paragraph | Edit 1:  Previous text  *“However, WBB LMP network will receive additional BS-to-BS cross-interference”*  New text  *“However, WBB LMP network could receive additional BS-to-BS cross-interference”*  Edit 2  Previous text  *“Semi-synchronised operation is also possible”*  New text  *“Although semi-synchronised operation is also possible”* |
| Nokia/6 | 3.1.1 Fixed satellite service | 3rd paragraph | General/Editorial | The end of the penultimate sentence of the 3rd paragraph says:  *“mobile backhauling and video contribution and distribution”*  What is meant by video contribution? | Propose deleting the word *“contribution”* in the penultimate sentence of the 3rd paragraph.  Previous sentence  *“mobile backhauling and video contribution and distribution”*  New sentence  *“mobile backhauling and video distribution”* |
| Nokia/7 | 3.1.1 Fixed satellite service | 4th paragraph | Editorial | Reference link of the reference [8] is missing. | If no such reference is available, we propose deleting the whole sentence as otherwise it is not justifiable information |
| Nokia/8 | Section 4.2.1 3GPP 5G NR | Table 4 and Table 5 | Technical/Editorial | The out-of-block and out-of-band emissions in those tables represent values of the out-of-block and out-of-band emissions of non-AAS antennas as per ECC Decision (11)06. The out-of-block and out-of-band emission levels for AAS antennas in ECC Decision (11)06 are specified as TRP. As demonstrated in previous inputs to PT1 meetings (e.g. in [ECC PT1(23)217](ECC%20PT1(23)217)) the use of TRP is a more representative way of specifying the unwanted emissions levels of AAS antennas. In addition, the unwanted EIRP levels of non-AAS antennas, as specified in Tables 4 and 5, may not be achievable in practice by AAS antennas which use different antenna configurations and patterns. | Suggest to include a note in Table 4 and Table 5, highlighting the acknowledgment that the use of EIRP is not a fully representative way of defining the unwanted emissions for AAS antennas and that the use of such EIRP values in those Tables aimed to compare the coexistence situation between non-AAS and AAS antennas using the same unwanted emission levels, even though they may not be achievable by AAS in practice |
| Nokia/9 | 0 Executive summary | Section: Studies on WBB LMP networks with no synchronisation to other WBB LMP nor to MFCN | General/Technical | Related to the comment above, it is worth mentioning that while the in-band transmit power of WBB LMP BS is specified as EIRP for both non-AAS and AAS systems, the unwanted emissions studied are also specified as EIRP for both non-AAS and AAS systems, while the conditions investigated to address coexistence issues were based on conducted power and TRP for non-AAS and AAS systems respectively.  The logic in the ECC Report 358 regarding the EIRP, OOB emissions and BEM limits for AAS and non-AAS antennas, seems to follow an abstractly unified approach when selecting the suitable parameter to model or describe the performance of WBB LMP BS. ECC Decision (11)06 considers that for non-AAS antennas the most suitable parameter to describe their performance is EIRP, while for AAS antennas the most suitable parameter to describe their performance is TRP | As such, for technical consistency, we propose to translate the conducted power levels described in this section to EIRP levels for non-AAS and translate the EIRP levels to TRP for AAS. |