SONMDT for LTE Comments file

Template:

# Xnnn

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RIL Id | WI | Class | Title | Tdoc | Delegate | Misc | File version | Status |
| Xnnn |  |  |  |  |  |  | vnnn | ToDo |

 **[Description]**:

**[Proposed Change]**:

**[Comments]**:

Instructions:

1. Copy the template RIL comments fields above (including the Heading Xnnn)
2. Paste the RIL comments fields at its position while **respecting the order of the RILs in the Review file (i.e. keep the order of the spec).**
3. Fill in the fields, see R19 ASN.1 Guideline.
4. Companies may comment whether they agree or disagree.
5. Can copy spec text and use Word “Track changes”, etc.
6. Do not delete text added by other companies.

# C064

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RIL Id | WI | Class | Title | Tdoc | Delegate | Misc | File version | Status |
| C064 | SONMDT | 1 | reconfiguration with sync failure |  | Tangxun |  | V002 | ToDo |

 **[Description]**: “reconfiguration with sync failure” should be used instead of “handover failure” to cover LTM case, and this is also to align with the corresponding description in NR RRC spec.

**[Proposed Change]**: update the procedural text as below:

4> if the selected PCell is a suitable cell as defined in TS 36.304 [4]:

5> if the UE supports RLF-Report for MCG LTM and if *ltm-RecoveryCellId* in *VarRLF-Report* of TS 38.331 [82] is set:

6> set *timeUntilReconnection* in *VarRLF-Report* of TS 38.331 [82] to the time that elapsed since the radio link failure or reconfiguration with sync failure experienced in the *failedPCellID* stored in *VarRLF-Report* of TS 38.331 [82];

5> else:

6> set *timeUntilReconnection* in *VarRLF-Report* of TS 38.331 [82] to the time that elapsed since the last radio link failure or reconfiguration with sync failure;

**[Comments]**:

# N001

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RIL Id | WI | Class | Title | Tdoc | Delegate | Misc | File version | Status |
| N001 | SONMDT | 1 | What is capability SCG failure information for EN-DC MRO? |  | Jarkko Koskela |  | V003 | ToDo |

 **[Description]**: in 5.6.13a.2 on uses “if the UE supports SCG failure information for EN-DC MRO”. As I’m not expert on this feature I was not able to map this to any capability. Which one this refers to?

**[Proposed Change]**: Remove ambiquity regarding to which capability this refers to.;

**[Comments]**:

# H345

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RIL Id | WI | Class | Title | Tdoc | Delegate | Misc | File version | Status |
| H345 | SONMDT | 0 | Missing TS reference number for TS 38.331 |  | Jun Chen |  | V004 | ToDo |

 **[Description]**: in 5.6.13a.3, TS reference number for TS 38.331 is missing.

3> set *perRA-InfoListNR* to indicate the performed random access procedure related information as specified in 5.7.10.5 of TS 38.331

**[Proposed Change]**: Suggest to add TS reference number for TS 38.331:

3> set *perRA-InfoListNR* to indicate the performed random access procedure related information as specified in 5.7.10.5 of TS 38.331 [82]

**[Comments]**:

# H346

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RIL Id | WI | Class | Title | Tdoc | Delegate | Misc | File version | Status |
| N001 | SONMDT | 1 | perRA-InfoListNR |  | Jun Chen |  | V004 | ToDo |

 **[Description]**: in section 6.2.2, the following wording "RA information for NR RACH" is not accurate, and instead the it should be about NR RACH report information (which has been used in TS 38.331).

***perRA-InfoListNR***

This field is used to indicate per RA information for NR RACH.

**[Proposed Change]**: Suggest to change the wording into the following:

***perRA-InfoListNR***

This field is used to indicate ~~per RA information for NR RACH~~ per NR RACH report information.

**[Comments]**: