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# Introduction

This is the email discussion report for following email discussion:

**[Post115-e][214][R17 DCCA] UE capabilities (Intel)**

Scope: Discuss which (RAN2-determined) UE capabilities (for all features in this WI) are needed

Intended outcome: Report

Deadline: Long

Rapporteur would like to split the discussion in two phases:

**Phase 1**: To collect companies’ view on what UE features should be considered for R17 DCCA ; The **deadline for this 1st phase** of email discussion is **Thursday September 30.**

**Phase 2**: To collect companies’ view on identified UE features, and whether they are per UE, BC, FS, etc The **deadline for this 2nd phase** of email discussion is **Wednesday October 20.**

# RAN2 UE Feature list for Rel-17 DCCA-Phase 1

Note: In phase 1, we only collect potential features for R17 DCCA. The prerequisite feature groups, etc will be discussed in phase 2.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Features | Index | Feature group | Components | Prerequisite feature groups | Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | Need of FDD/TDD differentiation | Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation | Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2 | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| x. Rel-17 DCCA | X-0 | Activation/Deactivation of SCG | 1. Support of activation/deactivation of SCG; 2. RACH-less SCG activation; 3. UE initiated activation; 4. RLF/BFD monitoring on deactived SCG; |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| x-1 | CPAC | 1. CPAC for NR-DC 2. CPAC for (NG)EN-DC 3. A3/A5 based execution condition (if agreed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Question 1: Companies are invited to provide your views on Deactivation of SCG (from RAN2 perspective):**

* **For the feature group listed above, which are essential/basic components to the feature group and which should be added as separate features?**
* **whether there are other basic components related to the listed feature group or whether there are further separate features related that need to be added?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Essential/basic features, 1, 2, 3, 4, others? | remark |
| Ericsson | 1,2 | 3 is still FFS, so too early to discuss capabilities for this.  4 is a prerequisite for 2, i.e. RACH-less SCG activation does not work without RLF/BFD. |
| vivo | 1,2,4 | For 3), agree with Ericsson. Besides, whether “UE requested SCG deactivation to the MN” should be added and maybe as separate features. |
| CATT | 1,2,4 | Whether UE can intiated SCG activation is still under discussion  Minor eidtorial correction: we think it should be “RLM/BFD monitoring on deactivation SCG”  We also wonder whether the scenarios such as applicability of activation/deactivation of SCG for (NG)EN-DC, NR-DC, handover and RRC resume should be considered as separate features. |
| MediaTek | 1 | We think that SCG activation/dedicatation conttolled by NW and always triggering RACH is baseline of this feature. UE initiated activation or RACH-less opearation is not a must. Those two should be separated features. RLF/BFD is requested for RACH-less operation. |
| Apple | 1,2,3,4 | We do agree that topics related to 3 are FFS. We also have a couple of comments:   * We do not want to link 2 and 4. Obviously, for RACH-less activaiton, UE needs to do additional actions which warrants a capability. And same argument for 4. But we do not see that 4 is needed for 2. In small cell environments, the RACH might not be needed at all, irrespective of the usage/no-usage of 4. ‘4’ deals with beams, while ‘2’ is not limited to beams (TA is the main component). * We also think the support of SCG deactivation feature should be per-band-per-BC. * Also, a differentiation is needed on whether the UE supports SCG deactivation in NR-DC vs NG(EN)-DC. |

**Question 2: Companies are invited to provide your views on CPAC (from RAN2 perspective):**

* **For the feature group listed above, which are essential/basic components to the feature group and which should be added as separate features?**

**whether there are other basic components related to the listed feature group or whether there are further separate features related that need to be added**?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Essential/basic features, 1, 2, 3, others? | remark |
| Ericsson | 1, 2 | 3 is not needed as a separate capability since this needs to be supported in order to support MN initiated CPC. Since there is another ongoing email discussion on this it is anyway too early to discuss capabilities for this now. |
| vivo | 1, 2, 3 | Agree with the rapporteur. |
| CATT |  | We wonder whether it is necessary to separate 1) and 2). The UE supporting CPAC could be considered to support both CPAC for NR-DC and (NG) EN-DC as one feature.  Agree with Ericsson that it is too early for 3) as there is another discusion ongoign to discuss the use of A3/A5 based execution condition. |
| MediaTek | See comment | It is unclear to us why we want to combine CPA and CPC (to CPAC) into one capability bit. Those two procedures are different and deserved to have different IOT bit at least.  It is also unclear what would be the different UE behavior for intra-SN CPC and inter-SN CPC (For SN initialized).  In our understanding, we should have 4 different sub features  (1) CPA for NR-DC  (2) CPA for (NG)EN-DC  (3) MN initiated CPC in NR-DC  (4) MN initiated CPC in (NG)EN-DC  A3/A5 based execution condition could be discussed later if it is agreed. |
| Apple | Similar views are Mediatek. |  |

# Conclusion

The followings are proposed:

1. **a potential easy agreement**
2. **a candidate for immediate postpone, is contentious such that it is unlikely to converge at e-Meeting.**