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# Introduction

This document collects comments on the RIL resolutions and updates for the following email discussion

* [Post117-e][903][NR17] NR UE capabilties (Intel)

      Scope: Reflect R1 and R4 latest update of feature lists in UE caps. If a need to ask questions to other WG arises, LS out can be considered.

      Intended outcome, agreeable CRs, report if needed, LS out if needed.

      Deadlines : LS out can be agreed at the ASN.1 ad-hoc : submission deadline April 14. Otherwise : Long

# Comments on RIL resolutions

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | CR (TS38.306 or TS38.331) | RIL number | Comments | Rapporteur’s view |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | TS38.306 | HW0026 | There is no capability signalling to “indicate” support on the nonCodebook usage of SRS resource sets. We suggest to change to “The UE indicating this feature shall also ~~indicate~~ support ~~of~~ two SRS resource sets with usage set to 'nonCodebook’ , which is aligned with the description for *mTRP-PUSCH-RepetitionTypeB-r17*. | Change as proposed |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | TS38.306 | FW001 | The RAN4 LS was newly sent to RAN2 after last meeting, which has not been discussed in Redcap WI. Besides, there is other information about new power class in the LS for further discussion, which should be discussed together in RAN2.  Thus, we propose to postpone the LS until the conclusion was made in Redcap WI in the next meeting. | OK to postpone the update till the WI specific session discussion,  Change the status to PropPostponed |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | TS38.306 | H0029  H0035 | We notice that 32-4a is requested to be “per band” capability and 32-4 to be “per FS” capability.  We are fine with the resolution for H0029 on 32-4a. But for H0035 on 32-4, “Per FS” means some baseband processing aspect is involved, i.e. essentially the UE capability may be affected by processing of other features in the same band.  For FG32-4, we could communicate RAN2’s “intention” to use the signalling structure as proposed and ask if it is in line with RAN1’s intention to use “per FS” granularity.  [April 15]  Would like to thank the rapportetur for the feedback. After further checking internally, we are fine with the current implementation of FG32-4.  We should encourage our RAN1 colleagues to clarify those features in the feature list. But we are fine not to check with RAN1 from RAN2 side. | For 32-4, our understanding is that this is specifically discussed in RAN1 basically to allow the UE to report that it supports partial sensing in any of the bands but not in more than one band at any one time. One argument provided in RAN1 to go with per FS is as follow:  “  Let’s take the following scenario as an example. A commercial device, e.g. a wearable, could support sidelink in Bands A, B, and C. The most likely deployment for this device is that it would only have sidelink operating on one band only. When provisioning the baseband hardware to support partial sensing, the device could increase implementation complexity and support partial sensing in all three bands simultaneously for the rare case when all three are enabled simultaneously. Alternatively, the device could be implemented with the ability to perform partial sensing in any single band of the three, addressing its most likely deployment scenario. Per band reporting forces the device to go the first route (increasing complexity), to not implement partial sensing (reducing performance), or to only support a single sidelink band instead of three (underreporting and reducing deployment flexibility). Per FS reporting, on the other hand, allows the device to report that it supports partial sensing in any of the bands but not in more than one, providing performance gains and lower implementation complexity for the device’s typical deployment scenario, while maintaining deployment flexibly (band choice). Generating inter-UE coordination is similar too.  ”  But we are fine if companies still want to check with RAN1, |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | TS38.306 | H0014  OP008 | We agree with OPPO that it is preferable to use the language as agreed by RAN plenary in RP-220951.  PSD limitations are indeed subject to regional regulations. | Change as proposed |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Rapporteur’s summary:

# Conclusion

To be added latter