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# Introduction

This contribution is to progress some of the general open issues that were left over from the previous email discussion from the last meeting as listed in the RILs in [1] and [2] as part of the email discussion below:

* [Post110-e][082][NR16] UE Capabilities (Intel, NTT Docomo)

      Scope: Progress further R1R4 UE capabilities and general items (if needed). Take into account latest R1 feature list. Discuss handling of FFS’es at next meeting. Can consider Reply LSes (to R4 and R1), e.g. on general matters or on specific points/questions from earlier discussion.

      Intended outcome: Report, Agreeable LSs out to be sent first day of next meeting (if applicable), Draft CRs 38306 38331 (agreeable as baseline for next meeting).

      Deadline: Next meeting.

The outcome is to provide proposals on the general open issues discussed and to provide Reply LS to RAN1 or RAN4 (if needed) for some of the open issues based on the proposals from the discussion points.

Also as part of the email discussion, a draft CRs for 38.306 and 38.331 will also be produced for review based on the latest RAN1 feature list [3] once the June version specifications are available and ASN.1 RIL will be used for collecting review comments on the newly added capabilities as well as any miscellaneous corrections on Rel-16 capabilities added in the previous email discussion.

UL capabilities related to LPP (i.e. updates to TS37.355) will not be handled in this email discussion and are assumed to be handled in positioning session.

V2X UE capability issues will all be discussed in email discussion [707], including all the remaining issues from the last email discussion.

The deadline of this email discussion is into the next meeting, however we suggest having 2 phases:

* Phase 1 until 2020-07-31 23:59 PST for companies to provide their views on the discussion points listed and the drafted CRs to 38.306 and 38.331.
* Phase 2 until 2020-08-06 23:59 PST for companies to provide their views on the updated CRs and the draft LSes.

# Discussion

## Handling of FFS’es at next meeting

It is assumed that further update of RAN1/RAN4 feature list will be made available at the end of week 1 of RAN2 meeting. Hence it can be handled in the same way as in the last meeting to include the further updates to the mega CRs. If there are still FFS’es in the further updates from RAN1/4, the same as in last meeting can be follow that they will not be included in the mega CRs.

**Potential Proposal 1:** Upon receiving further update of RAN1/RAN4 feature list at end of week 1 of RAN 2 meeting, Intel/DCM to trigger RAN2 review of the CRs before or by Thursday of August 27th with the deadline for review and RAN2 agreement set to Wednesday of September 2nd

**Potential Proposal 2:** Include the following in a LS to RAN1/4:

* Explain to them that any content that is FFS will NOT be part of the UE capability signalling for the September specification version but could be considered in the next quarter.
* Inform them that further agreements, if any, from email discussions after their meetings cannot be part of September specification version but could be considered in the next quarter.

1. Companies are requested to provide their view on the potential proposals on how to handle FFS’es at next meeting:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Company’s comments, if any** |
| Apple | Agree | We have one more item to be added to the LS to RAN4. Pls see response to Q4 (discussion point 2.4). |
| OPPO | Agree with comment | For FFS issue if RAN2 can make sure about ASN.1, then such UE capability should be at least captured in 38.331 and leave FFS in the 38.306 just to make progress. |
|  |  |  |

## Handling of the Per UE capability with XDD and FRX differentiation

In the previous email discussion, there is the following RIL which was postponed :

**[RIL]**: E010 **[Delegate]**: Ericsson (Lian) **[WI]**: MobEnh **[Class]**:3 **[Status]**: NotAgree **[TDoc]**: None **[Proposed Conclusion]**: Rapporeur thinks this needs to be discussed separately. Pls see comments

**[Description]**: If we keep “Yes” on both xDD and FRX column, we should add such parameters per band instead, i.e. condHandover-r16, condHandoverFailure-r16 and condHandoverTwoTriggerEvents-r16.

**[Proposed Change]**: See above.

**[Comments]**:[Rapporteur] There are quite many cases in this table, that “yes” for both XDD and FRX, but not put under per Band, e.g. ***handoverLTE-5GC, etc.***

Prefer to keep as is, as per endorsed CR, the FRX-XDD differentiation needs to be discussed for other capabilities as well.

Some examples of such Rel-16 capabilities that have these issues are listed below:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***condHandover-r16***  Indicates whether the UE supports conditional handover including execution condition, candidate cell configuration and maximum 8 candidate cells. | UE | No | Yes | Yes |
| ***condHandoverFailure-r16***  Indicates whether the UE supports conditional handover during re-establishment procedure when the selected cell is configured as candidate cell for condition handover. | UE | No | Yes | Yes |
| ***condHandoverTwoTriggerEvents-r16***  Indicates whether the UE supports 2 trigger events for same execution condition. This feature is mandatory supported if the UE supports *condHandover-r16*. | UE | CY | Yes | Yes |

One proposal is to make these Rel-16 capabilities per band (instead of per UE) to resolve the issue when either XDD or FRX or both is set to ‘Yes’, as per RAN2 intention as in the LS to RAN1 [R2-2006367]:

*For release-16 UE capabilities for which both xDD and FRx differentiations are allowed, RAN2 intends to use “per band” capability signalling.*

Based on the above, the solution could be: Make those Rel-16 UE capabilities which have either XDD or FRX or both = ‘Yes’ to per band, if they are not already so.

1. Companies are requested to provide their view on the above solution or provide other suggestions:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Company’s comments, if any** |
| Apple | Agree | Per-band approach seems reasonable. |
| OPPO | Agree with comment | If an UE capability could be different for either XDD or FRX, then there is no any controversial issue. Therefore for those UE capability, they should still be per UE capability instead of per band. |
|  |  |  |

## Intra-frequencies DAPS related issues

RAN4 feature list has left FFS on per FS or per BC on the following capabilities. HoweverRAN2 had agreed that they are to be made per band per band combination from the RAN2 WI session in the last meeting.

| ***intraFreqAsyncDAPS-r16***  Indicates whether the UE supports asynchronous DAPS handover. | Band | No | No | No |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***intraFreqDAPS-r16***  Indicates whether UE supports DAPS handover in source PCell and intra-frequency target PCell, e.g support of simultaneous DL reception of PDCCH and PDSCH from source and target cell. | Band | No | No | No |
| ***intraFreqDiffSCS-DAPS-r16***  Indicates whether UE supports different SCS in source PCell and intra-frequency target PCell in DPAS handover. The UE can include this field only if *intraFreqDAPS-r16* is present. Otherwise, the UE does not include this field. | Band | No | No | No |
| ***intraFreqDynamicPowersharingDAPS-r16***  Indicates the value of T offset (short or long) for the UE supports dynamic UL power sharing during DAPS handover between source and target cells of same FR. It is only applicable to DAPS HO in synchronous scenarios. The UE can include this field only if *intraFreqSemiStaticPowerSharingDAPS-Mode 1-r16* is present. Otherwise, the UE does not include this field. | Band | No | No | No |
| ***intraFreqMultiUL-TransmissionDAPS-r16***  Indicates that the UE supports simultaneous UL transmission in source PCell and target PCell. The UE can include this field only if *intraFreqDAPS-r16* is present, and if any of *intraFreqSemiStaticPowerSharingDAPS-Mode1-r16, intraFreqSemiStaticPowerSharingDAPS-Mode2-r16* or *intraFreqDynamicPowersharingDAPS-r16* are present. Otherwise, the UE does not include this field. | Band | No | No | No |

During the email discussion, it was proposed to check with RAN4 by sending a LS to confirm that they are ok with RAN2 decision, while RAN2 keeps RAN2 agreement.

From the rapporteur point of view, it is reasonable to send a LS to RAN1/RAN4 to inform them of RAN2 decision and check their view.

1. Companies are requested to provide their view on including the above in the LS to RAN 1/4 to check their view on the RAN2 decision

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Company’s comments, if any** |
| Apple | Agree | Ok to send an LS to RAN4 to inform them. |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Co-location indication for band combination

In the last email discussion, the following RAN4 feature is removed from the draft CRs as checking is needed on whether it is non-backward compatible:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2-20 | support co-located scenario only for inter-band EN-DC | Indicates the inter-band EN-DC combination supported by the UE can only work at co-located scenario, and in this scenario the PSD difference between DL carriers and MRTD can be guaranteed.  candidate values set: {type1, type2}  type 1 UE: performance guaranteed with PSD difference between DL carriers < 6dB, and MRTD=3us (current only DC\_20\_n28 has this limitation)  type 2 UE: performance guaranteed without limitation on PSD difference between DL carriers and MRTD=33us |  | Yes | N/A | If UE does not reports this capability, the performance cannot be guaranteed under inter-band non-collocated scenario. | Per band combination | N/A | FR1 only | NA | Optional |

The related RIL is also provided:

**[RIL]**: E009 **[Delegate]**: Ericsson (Lian) **[WI]**: Gen **[Class]**:3 **[Status]**: Proposal to remove this field in this version **[TDoc]**: None **[Proposed Conclusion]**: Rapporteur [Intel] proposes to handle this capability after discussion in RAN2, as the NBC as proposed by Ericsson is valid and we also cannot have BCs that are only from Rel-16 as RAN4 treats BCs as release independant.

**[Description]**: We assume that this field would be applicable to band combinations added in Rel-16, otherwise it would be non-backwards compatible. We would like to confirm this aspect.

**[Proposed Change]**:

**[Comments]**:

Such a Rel-16 extension of an inter-band EN-DC combination will not be release independent as Rel-15 gNBs and UEs will not be able use it to indicate whether the EN-DC inter-band combination is for only co-located or not.

As suggested in the RIL, one possibility is to make clear that such band combination with co-located indication can only be possible from Rel-16 (i.e. Rel-15 gNB and UE does not support/operate in such band combination with UE type indication). However, this would mean that band combination type indication can be not release independent. Use of magic sentence allowing UE and network to implement this signaling early without being fully Rel-16 compliant could also be considered.

Alternative is to introduce late critical extension for Rel-15. This will make the signaling release independent. However, it will still not be fully backward compatible since legacy gNBs will not be able to comprehend the UE type indication signaling.

If backward compatibility towards legacy gNBs is required, an alternative is to use a gNB “request”. If the UE only supports the co-located scenario for a certain inter-band EN-DC Band Combination, the UE will include these Band Combinations with co-located scenario in the reported capability only if gNB indicates it can comprehend type signalling i.e. UE will not include these Band Combinations in the list of supported band combinations when gNB cannot understand the UE type indication.

1. Companies are requested to provide their view on how to handle UE Type indication of the support of co-located only scenario for inter-band EN-DC combination

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Company’s comments, if any** |
| Apple | We think we can have the UE signal only type-2 and absence of this capability for inter-band EN-DC combinations would mean the UE supports type-1.  Our approach is that any new restriction to be introduced, should be considered as baseline operation without signaling capability, and is associated with that feature. And UEs and NWs implementing that feature should support the baseline operation. Capability signaling is for extra options of the feature (or relaxation of restrictions).  In this case, we request that RAN4 capture the type-1 restriction (of MRTD and PSD) is expected by the UEs and NWs for any inter-band EN-DC combination that gets added, and this is without any signaling support. Only for the UEs which can handle relaxed MRTD/PSD, can report this “additional” capability by signaling {type-2}. This can ensure backward compatibility as any UE or NW implementing the new combination already knows the minimum expected operation requirements.  Our view is to add to the LS that is being prepared the below points:   1. Explain to them that RAN2 will only add signaling for type-2 and expect type-1 as the default behaviour. 2. Request RAN4 to capture the type-1 requirement in RAN4 spec as default behaviour, and also follow this general principle for an future additions like these. |
| OPPO | To add a new filter is a valid approach and can resolve the backwards compatibility issue. Another alternative is to introduce a separate EN-DC band combination list. UE will report this new band combination list if it can only support co-located case, or report them in legacy band combination list otherwise. Legacy gNB will ignore them and hence no backward compatibility issue will be caused. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Others

Any other open issues that was left opened from the last email discussion and would need to be discussed (i.e. Class 3) can be included here

Note that any new miscellaneous or WI specific correction should be provided as RIL on the new updated mega CRs when they are sent out.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company’s name** | **Company’s comments, if any** |
| Apple | The support of async NR-DC is not part of the UE feature list from RAN1 and so it is not captured in the spec. However, RAN1 has asked for this separately in the same LS. We request that this capability be added. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Report summary

*<If needed, to be updated when doing the summary>*

1. *<If needed, to be updated when doing the summary>*.

# Conclusion

The proposals captured are the following:
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