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# 1 Introduction

This document contains a list of TDocs to be discussed in the offline discussion below. Companies are invited to give their views on each TDoc submitted.

* [AT109e][007][NR15] Potential easies III (Huawei, Lenovo, NTT Docomo)

Scope: Treat the documents R2-2000763, R2-2000764, R2-2001324, R2-2000682, R2-2000692.

Intended outcome: Agreed CRs

Deadline: Feb 27 1200 CET

# 2 List of TDocs

Companies are invited to give their views on each TDoc submitted below.

## R2-2000763

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Intention agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Wording agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Views** |
| MediaTek | Y | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Y |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Y | Y | Fine to introduce these already now (they are not absolutely necessary yet and could be introduced also later, but doing it now prevents errors) |
| NTT DOCOMO | Y | Y | Agre with Nokia to prepare for the future extensions. |
| QCOM | Y | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y | Y | Agree these could in principle be introduced in R15 when taken into use but fine to do it now |
| Ericsson | Y | Y | Can also be merged into 38331 Rapporteur CR |
| ZTE | Y | Y |  |

Summary:

8 companies participate in this offline.

All companies think the intention and wording of the CR are both agreeable. One company suggests to merge it into 38331 Rapporteur CR.

Considering the majority’s view, we have the following proposal:

Proposal 1: RAN2 agree R2-2000763

## R2-2000764

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Intention agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Wording agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Views** |
| MediaTek | Y | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Y |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Y | Y | Same reasoning as with 0763. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Y | Y | Agre with Nokia to prepare for the future extensions. |
| QCOM | Y | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y | Y | Same remark as for R2-2000763 |
| Ericsson | Y | Y | Can also be merged into 36331 Rapporteur CR |
| ZTE | Y | Y |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Summary:

8 companies participate in this offline.

All companies think the intention and wording of the CR are both agreeable. One company suggests to merge it into 38331 Rapporteur CR.

Considering the majority’s view, we have the following proposal:

Proposal 2: RAN2 agree R2-2000764

## R2-2001324

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Intention agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Wording agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Views** |
| MediaTek | Y | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Y |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Partly yes | N | It seems correct that UE only submits the report if allowed, but the wording now completely removed the "duplicate the report" aspect (i.e. that it is the **same report** that is re-transmitted after HO). We think the exact changes. We are fine to say “in accordance with 5.7.4.3 and with the same contents as in the previous report“. This also covers the case when not all the contents are allowed, as UE must comply with the gNB requirements but is not allowed to change the other contents as well.  The cover page could also be improved:   * consequence if not approved is also not correct: It should indicate “UE may not submit the UEAssistanceInformation to lower layers and, if submitted after handover, the message may contain information that is not allowed by the gNB configuration“ * The inter-operability qanalysis is also strage: If NW implements but UE doesn’t, the UE may submit information that is against NW configuration. And if UE implements but NW doesn’t, there is no issue as UE will not send anything network wouldn’t allow by configuration. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Y | N | Agree with Nokia. |
| QCOM | Y | Y | Disagree with Nokia as suggested wording will cause confusion, since the sentence carries 2 contradicting statements “same contentes“ vs “not all the contents are allowed“  We support current wording for the text. |
| Samsung | Partly | N | We agree there is a need to add a condition that UE is still configured to report the assistance provided shortly prior to reconfiguration with sync. We think it it seems not just possible to refer to 5.7.4.3 as that section requires clarification for which assistance the reporting is triggered. Our suggestion is shown below.  2> if the UE transmitted a *UEAssistanceInformation* message during the last 1 second; and the UE is (still) configured to provide UE assistance included in that message:  3> initiate transmission of a *UEAssistanceInformation* message to transfer each included UE assistance that UE is still configured to provide~~with the same contents~~; |
| Ericsson | Partly | N | CR cover page does not correctly describe the problem, and seems not in alignment with the actual change in section 5.3.5.3. At least, hard to follow.  We understand the intention is that UE should not send assistance data to a Target Pcell that Target Pcell has not asked for.  First we thought this is a "problem" we need not fix, since Target Pcell could get the original UE transmission of the message.  But if we are going to fix this, Samsung proposal is fine, maybe slightly reworded:  2> if the UE transmitted a *UEAssistanceInformation* message during the last 1 second; and the UE is (still) configured to provide UE assistance informatrion included in that message:  3> initiate transmission of a *UEAssistanceInformation* message to re-send the UE assistance information that UE is still configured to provide~~with the same contents~~; |
| ZTE | Partly | N | The proposed change from Samsung looks good to us. |
|  |  |  |  |

Summary:

8 companies participate in this offline.

All companies think the intention of the CR is agreeable (some are partly agreeable). Five companies think the wording need to be updated, and the updated CR is R2-2002149 with incorporating the comments from Nokia, Samsung and Ericsson.

Considering the majority’s view, we have the following proposal:

Proposal 3: RAN2 agree R2-2002149.

## R2-2000682

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Intention agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Wording agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Views** |
| MediaTek | Y | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Y |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Y | Y | The other alternative would have been SSB ARFCN, but using center frequency is more consistent with what has been used with IDC otherwise. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Y | Y | Just to reply to Nokia’s feedback: SSB can be located anywhere in a carrier bandwidth. So, the SSB frequency may not always corresponds to the center frequency. |
| QCOM | Y | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y | N | We understand that intention is to clarify that ARFCN can indicate any frequency in the band and that UE should consider ARFCN to indicate the center frequency around which it is requested to report IDC issues. Perhaps the following wording is somewhat clearer:  Indicates for each candidate NR serving cells, the center frequency around which UE is requested to report IDC issues for MR-DC. |
| Ericsson | Y | Y |  |
| ZTE | Y | Y |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Summary:

8 companies participate in this offline.

All companies think the intention of the CR is agreeable. Seven companies think the wording is also agreeable, and one company still has different understanding.

Considering the majority’s view, we have the following proposal:

Proposal 4: RAN2 agree R2-2000682

## R2-2000692

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Intention agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Wording agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Views** |
| MediaTek | Y | See commnet | Usually we don’t say NW is allowed to XXX. The suggeted further changes as below.  „E-UTRAN ~~is allowed to~~ sets *fr1-Gap* to TURE only when the UE is configured with (NG)EN-DC“ |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Y |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Y | N | The field description wording has a typo (“TURE“) and seems a bit incorrect: Setting the field FALSE is equivalent to not using it. For wording, we prefer to use "E-UTRAN only sets this field to TRUE when UE is configured with (NG)EN-DC".  Hence, the consequences if not approved and the cover page should also be updated due to these. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Y | N | Agree on MediaTek and Nokia’s suggestion |
| QCOM | Y | N | Agree iwth MTK and Nokia... suggested text: “E-UTRAN sets fr1-Gap to TRUE only when the UE is configured with (NG)EN-DC and the UE has indicated support for independentGapConfig.“ |
| Samsung | Y | N | Agree with suggestions from MediaTek and Nokia. We think CR is really minor and can be included in Rapporteurs CR, also noting cover page is not really correct as there is no UE impact (box, impact analysis) |
| Ericsson | Y, but | N | We think already with existing text, nw can set the field to FALSE when releasing the NR SCG.  In our view, the UE is configured with EN-DC also at reception of the reconfiguration message that releases the NR SCG. If this is not the case, the CR ihas BW issue.  So from this reason, the CR is not really needed.  But if companies insist, MTK proposal is fine, and can be included in Rapporteur CR. (We should be careful with the exact wording (where we put the „only“ in the sentence), and not prevent E-UTRA to set the value FALSE. |
| ZTE | Y, but | N | We are ok with the proposed change from MTK, but we also think this can be included in Rapporteur CR.  Note that we had similar CR(R2-1906522) on *mgta* field in RAN2#106 meeting, and the meeting conclusion is to capture it in rapporteur CR.s |

Summary:

8 companies participate in this offline.

All companies think the intention of the CR is agreeable. Seven companies think the wording need to be updated, and the updated CR is R2-2002143 with new field description suggested by MTK and Nokia. The cover sheet has also been updated correspondingly. Three companies suggest to merge it into 38331 Rapporteur CR.

Considering the majority’s view, we have the following proposal:

Proposal 5: RAN2 agree R2-2002143.

# 3 Conclusion

In the previous sections we made the following observations:

**No table of figures entries found.**

Based on the discussion in the previous sections we propose the following:

**No table of figures entries found.**