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The following proposals are proposed to be agreed through email. Please indicate your opinion in the table.

Proposals trying to be greed:

Proposal 1 Introduce a capability in 38.306 for cross-RAT RLF report delivery.

Proposal 2 The UE shall include the TAC of the source cell (previousPCellId-r16) in the RLF report.

Proposal 3 Re-connection attempt cell is not included in the RLF report.

Proposal 4 UE shall include absoluteFrequencyPointA-r16, locationAndBandwidth, subcarrierSpacing, msg1-FrequencyStart, msg1-FDMInfo and msg1-SubcarrierSpacing in the RLF report when the rlf-Cause is set to beamFailureRecoveryFailure or randomAccessProblem.

Proposal 5 Include the following frequency location related information of the RA resources used by the UE in the RAReport:

 a. msg1-FDM (e.g., in RACH-ConfigGeneric)

 b. msg1-FrequencyStart (e.g., in RACH-ConfigGeneric)

 c. msg1-SubcarrierSpacing (e.g., in RACH-ConfigCommon)

Proposal 6 Agree on one of the following option is to be adopted for RAReport retaining at the UE:

 The oldest RA entry will be replaced by new RA entry if the corresponding RA report is full (i.e., all entries are filled) and has not been fetched. A RA entry within a RA report will be deleted if it is already been stored for 48 hours.

Proposal 7 No need to add a new UE capability indication or not regarding the ability to include the locationInformation in SCGFailureInformationNR and SCGFailureInformation messages.

Proposal 8 For per DRB per UE measurement (e.g. UL delay meas), add the following description inside the table, *drbid*: The identity of the measured DRB.

Proposal 9 For number of active UE, add the following description inside the table, *drbid* : the DRBs mapped with the same 5QI for NR SA or mapped with the same QCI for EN-DC.

Proposal 10 For the UL PDCP packet average queuing delay measurement for split bearer in EN-DC, UE reports a single D1 value to the node where it receives the measurement configuration.

Proposal 11 For split bearer with PDCP duplication, reuse the same mechanism as non-duplication case for UL D1 delay measurement.

Proposal 12 0.1ms is applied for UL delay measurement.

Proposal 13 UL F1-U delay is measured using the same matrix as DL F1-U delay defined in TS 28.552.

### Table for opinion:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company name | Which proposals are not acceptable |
| CMCC | Non |
| QUALCOMM | P4,P5,P6,P7 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | P10, P11If there is no consensus on P10 and P11, we think that the consequence is that:- UL delay measurement is not supported for split bearer(s) for EN-DC case |
| Ericsson | * P10 is not agreeable
* If we cannot agree on P10 or other alternaties of P10, then how to interpret P11 is not clear to us.
* For P12- we can clarify that the granularity mentioned in the proposal is for UL PDCP queueing delay measurement i.e., the granularity of UL PDCP queueing delay measurement is 0.1ms.
 |
| Apple | P4, P5, P6 and P7 |
| Samsung | P4, P6 |
| ZTE | P10 might need further clarification. |
| CATT | P12 ,also fine to discuss P10 and P11 |
| Intel | P10 needs clarification. Other proposals look ok to us. |
| MediaTek | P4, P5 and P6 |
| Docomo | P10, P11 |