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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, P11  If 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 |
| Nokia | P3, P6, P9, P11, P13  If P4 is not agreed, RAN2 has to figure out how to identify RACH resource in the RACH report.  On P13, our understanding has been there is no specific UL or DL F1-U measurement: it is based on symmetric RTT. |