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# 1 Introduction

This document is kick off the post meeting discussion [052]:

Per-FR Gap

[R2-2212388](file:///C:\Users\johan\OneDrive\Dokument\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\RAN2\Docs\R2-2212388.zip) Capability for per-FR gaps Ericsson discussion

[R2-2211620](file:///C:\Users\johan\OneDrive\Dokument\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\RAN2\Docs\R2-2211620.zip) Discussion on per-FR gap Intel Corporation discussion Rel-17 TEI17

[R2-2211363](file:///C:\Users\johan\OneDrive\Dokument\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\RAN2\Docs\R2-2211363.zip) More granular per-FR gaps Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell discussion Rel-17 TEI17

[R2-2212526](file:///C:\Users\johan\OneDrive\Dokument\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\RAN2\Docs\R2-2212526.zip) Higher granularity for per-FR gap capability discussion Qualcomm Incorporated discussion Rel-17 TEI17

* [Post120][052][NR17] higher granularity per-FR gap capability (Qualcomm)

Scope: Based on R2-2212527, R2-2212528, Review and update if needed, for agreement. Include also determination whether inter-node signalling is needed, and if so update CRs to include inter-node signaling.

Intended outcome: Tech Endorsed 38.331 38.306 CRs (for TSG RAN)

Deadline: Short

# 2 Contact Points

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Qualcomm (Rapporteur) | Mouaffac | [mambriss@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:mambriss@qti.qualcomm.com) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Discussion

The intention behind this discussion is to:

1. Check the draft CRs and provide feedback:
   * Modify the cover page of the CR to include (NG)EN-DC architecture.
   * Modify the capability CR to ensure *independentGapConfig* (legacy capability) and *independentGapConfig-maxCC-r17* (new capability) are mutually exclusive.
2. Check if there is a need to enhance the inter-node messaging to ensure proper coordination between MN and SN when this feature is supported.

One item still not agreed on, is the starting/ending range value for the N1/N2/N3. Some companies prefer it to start from [0..31], other from [1..32].

**Question 1**: please provide your preference for the N1/N2/N3 range:

Option-1: range is [0..31]

Option-2: range is [1..32]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 1 | | |
| Company | Selected Option | Please provide the technical Arguments behind your preference |
| Qualcomm Inc | 1 | This will allow the UE to provide value “0” to indicate that independentGapConfig is not supported when configured cells are:   * all FR1 cells (N1 = 0) * or FR2 cells (N2 = 0) * or mix of FR1 and FR2 cells (N3 = 0)   Subsequently when UE provides a N1/N2/N3 values > 0, then *independentGapConfig* will be supported when configured cells are:   * all FR1 cells and number of serving cells >= N1 🡪 in this case, per 38.133 UE is expected to support gapless measurement on FR2 * all FR2 cells and number of serving cells >= N2 🡪 in this case, per 38.133 UE is expected to support gapless measurement on FR1 * FR1+FR2 serving cells >= N3 🡪 2 independent gap configurations is supported on FR1 and FR2 cells. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 1**: TBD.

**Proposal 1**: TBD.

**Question 2**: is there a need to enhance the current inter-node messaging to ensure proper coordination exists between the MN and SN when this feature is supported?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 2 | | |
| Company | Yes/No | Please provide the technical Arguments that supports your claim |
| Qualcomm |  | It seems a minor introduce of 2 indications in both directions (MN🡨🡪SN) may be needed. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 2**: TBD.

**Proposal 2**: TBD.

**Question 3**:do companies agree with the suggested inter-node messaging by ZTE (please check draft CR)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answers to Question 2 | | |
| Company | Yes/No | Please provide the technical Arguments that supports your claim |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 3**: TBD.

**Proposal 3**: TBD.

# 4 Conclusion

TBD.