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# 1 Introduction

This document is to collect companies comments in the following email discussion:

**[Post112-e][050][NR15 NR16] RRC Rapporteur Correction CRs (Ericsson)**

Scope: CR approval, Revisions and merged versions of R2-2009840 (R15) and R2-2009841 (R16), converge on finally agreeable wording for CR2135/36.

Intended outcome: Agreed CRs.

Deadline: Short (for RP)

Please provide your comments no later than **Friday Nov 20 1100 UTC** .

# 2 Discussion

Companies are requested to add their comments for each topic of this email discussion in the boxes below.

### 2.1 Converge on finally agreeable wording for CR2135/36 (Rel-15/16 CR)

As outcome of [AT112-e][009][NR15] RRC Misc (Ericsson), chairman proposed to merge CR2136/36 on “Correction to release of list elements using toReleaseList” in **R2-2011149 and R2-2011150** to 38331 Rapporteur CRs.

There was also a late wording proposal by Huawei.  
Aim of this activity is to find agreeable wording.

**Original text**:

Note that the release of parent field also releases all of the child fields, regardless of whether they have been added via AddModList or as normal fields.

**Alt 1 (from R2-2011149 and R2-2011150):**

Note that the release of a field (a list element as well as any other field) releases all its sub-fields (sub-fields configured by *elementsToAddModList* and any other sub-field).

**Alt 2 (proposal by Huawei):**

Release of the parent field of a ToAddModList releases all entries of the ToAddModList

**Alt 3 (other proposal)**

Please provide your comments below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alternative** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Alt 1 or do nothing | As a background, this was discussed in RAN2#110 offline #006 with the summary paper in [link](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Inbox/Drafts/%5BOffline-006%5D%5BNR15%5D%20Release%20of%20Configuration%20(Nokia)/R2-200xxxx%20NR%20R15%20release%20of%20configurations_v12_Rapp.docx) (See **DISC S1\_2**). Based on clear majorities view, it was agreed in Chairman note that  “**[006] RAN2 confirms that release of parent field also releases all of the child fields, regardless of whether they have been added via AddModList or as normal fields.**”  So, we think that original text fully capture the agreement and is fine to keep it.  My understanding for the reason for change is that 1) unclear on “or as normal fields” and 2) it’s strange to have this in section A.3.9 which is used for guidelines on ToAddModList and ToReleaseList.  For 1), we could simply delete the “or as normal fields”. For 2), it is indeed related to ToAddModList and ToReleaseList and we actually do not find better place to capture this. Both 1) and 2) seems not critical and thus it would be fine for us to keep the original sentences.  Nevertheless, if companies want to do further clarification. Alt-1 matches the original agreement. So, we are fine with the change of Alt-1. The Alt-2 is only subset of Alt-1 and we prefer not to go in this way. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt 2 or nothing | The clarification is better to be focused on the exact point in the context which may be ambiguous to implementation.  Other than what Alt.2 says, other information in Alt.1 seems too straightforward and irrelevant, and a specific clarification would only create unnecessary confusion.  Alt.2 can be improved to “Release of the parent field of a ToAddModList releases all entries configured by the ToAddModList”.  But we also agree with MTK that the original text is also reflecting the intention. |
| Lenovo | Alt 1 | We think that Alt1 solves the unclarity of the original text. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 |  |
| CATT | Alt 1 or do nothing | For the original text, 1) “the normal fields” seems unclarity. But we also agree with MTK that 1) seems not critical and the original text is also reflecting the intention.  For Alt-1, we have some understandings: 1) since the note is under the clause of “A.3.9 Guidelines on use of ToAddModList and ToReleaseList”, thus we think put Alt1 which also cover other cases here seems not suitable, but we actually do not find better place to capture this. 2) The description in Alt-1 of “any other field” and “any other sub-field” still seems unclarity, it is better to clarify it.  As for Alt-2, our understandings are: 1) Alt-2 is only subset of Alt-1 2)we should not talk about the description of parent field here. As comment by Ericsson in the phase 1 discussion of [009], this is confusing.  Thus, if most companies want to do further clarification, we agree with do further clarification and prefer Alt-1 which better matches the original agreement. |

### 2.2 Miscellaneous non-controversial corrections Set VIII (Rel-15)

### Please provide other comments on the Rel-15 Misc Rapporteur CR.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alternative** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek |  | In field description of IE *ServingCellConfig*  ***supplementaryUplink***  Network may configure this field only when *supplementaryUplinkConfig* is configured in *ServingCellConfigCommon supplementaryUplink* is configured in or *ServingCellConfigCommonSIB*.  The correct should be  ***supplementaryUplink***  Network may configure this field only when *supplementaryUplinkConfig* is configured in *ServingCellConfigCommon* or *supplementaryUplink* is configured in *ServingCellConfigCommonSIB*.  Rapp: Fixed |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | In 5.3.10.3, not sure we need to remove the “and”:  2> if the indication is from SCG RLC, CA duplication is configured and activated, and for the corresponding logical channel *allowedServingCells* only includes SCell(s):  It reads better to me with it (not sure if it is correct English ☺).  Rapp: Fixed in Rel-15 and Rel-16 CRs |
| Lenovo |  | Agree with the comments from Mediatek and Huawei, HiSilicon.  Furthermore, on the change in 5.3.3.7 T300 expiry:  In 38.306 the feature is called “RRC connection establishment failure with temporary offset”. Therefore, we suggest to reflect this as shown below:  2> if the UE supports RRC connection establishment failure with temporary offset and the T300 has expired a consecutive connEstFailCount times on the same cell for which connEstFailureControl is included in SIB1:  Rapp: Agree, fixed in Rel-15 and Rel-16 CRs |
| CATT |  | 1. **In clause 5.2.2.4.2, changed names to use italics font, Corrected word withn-> within as the following (all changes are highlighted as green)**   5.2.2.4.2 Actions upon reception of the *SIB1*  omit  4> if *supplementaryUplink* is present in *servingCellConfigCommon*; and  4> if the UE supports one or more of the frequency bands indicated in the *frequencyBandList* for the *supplementaryUplink*; and  4> if the UE supports at least one *additionalSpectrumEmission* in the *NR-NS-PmaxList* for a supported supplementary uplink band; and  4> if the UE supports an uplink channel bandwidth with a maximum transmission bandwith configuration (see TS 38.101-1 [15] and TS 38.101-2 [39]) which  - is smaller than or equal to the *carrierBandwidth* (indicated in *supplementaryUplink* for the SCS of the initial uplink BWP), and which  - is wider than or equal to the bandwidth of the initial uplink BWP of the SUL:  5> consider supplementary uplink as configured in the serving cell;  5> select the first frequency band in the *frequencyBandList* for the *supplementaryUplink* which the UE supports and for which the UE supports at least one of the *additionalSpectrumEmission* values in *nr-NS-PmaxList*, if present;  5> apply a supported supplementary uplink channel bandwidth with a maximum transmission bandwidth which  - is contained within the *carrierBandwidth* (indicated in *supplementaryUplink* for the SCS of the initial uplink BWP), and which  - is wider than or equal to the bandwidth of the initial BWP of the SUL;  omit |

### 2.3 Miscellaneous non-controversial corrections Set VIII (Rel-16)

### Please provide other comments on the Rel-16 Misc Rapporteur CR.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alternative** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek |  | Just found 2 more typo  In 5.3.5.3  2> if the *RRCReconfiguration* message was received via SRB1, but not within *mrdc-SecondaryCellGroup* or E-UTRA *RRCConnectionReconfiguration*:  3> if the UE is configured to provide the measurement gap requirement information of NR target bands:  4> if the *RRCReconfiguration* message includes the *needForGapsConfigNR*; or  4> if the *NeedForGapsInfoNR* information is changed compared to last time the UE reported this information:  5> include the *NeedForGapsInfoNR* and set the contents as follows:  6> include *intraFreq-needForGap* and set the gap requirement informa~~n~~tion of intra-frequency measurement for each NR serving cell;  6> if *requestedTargetBandFilterNR* is configured, for each supported NR band that is also included in *requestedTargetBandFilterNR*, include an entry in *interFreq-needForGap* and set the gap requirement information for that band; otherwise, include an entry in *interFreq-needForGap* and set the corresponding gap requirement information for each supported NR band;  Rapp: Fixed  In 5.3.13.4  2> if the UE is configured to provide the measurement gap requirement information of NR target bands:  3> include the *NeedForGapsInfoNR* and set the contents as follows:  4> include *intraFreq-needForGap* and set the gap requirement informa~~n~~tion of intra-frequency measurement for each NR serving cell;  4> if *requestedTargetBandFilterNR* is configured, for each supported NR band that is also included in *requestedTargetBandFilterNR*, include an entry in *interFreq-needForGap* and set the gap requirement information for that band; otherwise, include an entry in *interFreq-needForGap* and set the corresponding gap requirement information for each supported NR band;  Rapp: Fixed |
| Lenovo |  | Cover page issues:   * Tdoc# R2-2009698 needs to be corrected to R2-2009699. Rapp: Fixed * Changes #9 and #13 are duplicated. Therefore, we suggest to rephrase change #9 to:   9.3 IE SL-PreconfigurationNR  Clarified misleading sentence on Need codes as it can be misunderstood that any field with Need code should be omitted.  Rapp: Fixed   * Furthermore, in order to reflect other editorial changes (removing suffices “-r16” in field descriptions, alignment of values between ASN.1 and field description), we suggest to rephrase change #13 to:   Corrected other editorial issues (typos, unnecessary suffices “-r16” in field descriptions etc.).  Rapp: FixedOn the change in 5.3.3.7 T300 expiry: same comment as for the R15 CR.  Rapp: Fixed  On the change in 9.3 IE SL-PreconfigurationNR: suggest to replace “according to” to “in” as it looks better.  Need codes or conditions specified for subfields in~~according to~~ SL-PreconfigurationNR do not apply  Rapp: Fixed |
| CATT |  | **(1) In clause 5.2.2.4.2, changed names to use italics font, Corrected word withn-> within as the following (all changes are highlighted as green)**  5.2.2.4.2 Actions upon reception of the *SIB1*  omit  4> if *supplementaryUplink* is present in *servingCellConfigCommon*; and  4> if the UE supports one or more of the frequency bands indicated in the *frequencyBandList* for the *supplementaryUplink*; and  4> if the UE supports at least one *additionalSpectrumEmission* in the *NR-NS-PmaxList* for a supported supplementary uplink band; and  4> if the UE supports an uplink channel bandwidth with a maximum transmission bandwith configuration (see TS 38.101-1 [15] and TS 38.101-2 [39]) which  - is smaller than or equal to the *carrierBandwidth* (indicated in *supplementaryUplink* for the SCS of the initial uplink BWP), and which  - is wider than or equal to the bandwidth of the initial uplink BWP of the SUL:  5> consider supplementary uplink as configured in the serving cell;  5> select the first frequency band in the *frequencyBandList* for the *supplementaryUplink* which the UE supports and for which the UE supports at least one of the *additionalSpectrumEmission* values in *nr-NS-PmaxList*, if present;  5> apply a supported supplementary uplink channel bandwidth with a maximum transmission bandwidth which  - is contained within the *carrierBandwidth* (indicated in *supplementaryUplink* for the SCS of the initial uplink BWP), and which  - is wider than or equal to the bandwidth of the initial BWP of the SUL;  5> apply the first listed *additionalSpectrumEmission* which it supports among the values included in *NR-NS-PmaxList* within *frequencyBandList* for the *supplementaryUplink*;  5> if the *additionalPmax* is present in the same entry of the selected *additionalSpectrumEmission* within *NR-NS-PmaxList* for the *supplementaryUplink*:  6> apply the *additionalPmax* in *supplementaryUplink* for SUL;  omit  **(2) In clause 5.5.5.1, changed names to use italics font as the following (all changes are highlighted as green)**  5.5.5.1 General  omit   1. if the *includeSensor-Meas* is configured in the corresponding *reportConfig* for this *measId*, set the *sensor-LocationInfo* of the *locationInfo* in the *measResults* as follows:   omit |

# 4. Conclusion

**TBA**
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