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# Introduction

This discussion includes RP-211300 [1], RP-211425 [2], RP-211310 [3], RP-211478 [4].

# Contacts

Please provide a company contact that the email discussion moderator can contact if required.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact name and email** |
| Moderator | Johan.Johansson@mediatek.com |
| NTT DOCOMO | hiroki.harada@docomo-lab.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | zhaoyang@huawei.com |
| Futurewei | hao.bi@futurewei.com |
| Apple | sigen\_ye@apple.com |
| LG | Sunghoon.jung@lge.com |
|  |  |

# NR URLLC UE categories/profiles

RP-211300 [1] Discusses the necessity of NR URLLC UE categories/profiles. The goal of the discussion in RAN#92-e is to make an initial decision on whether or not 3GPP RAN takes care of the definition of UE categories/profiles for URLLC, e.g. defining latency and/or reliability target, given the situation where Rel-17 is going to provide a complete set of URLLC functionalities.

Proposal from [1]: RAN to discuss again the necessity of UE category/profile for URLLC.

Q: Moderator asks companies to Please feedback on whether 3GPP RAN should take care of the definition of UE categories/profiles for URLLC, see explanations in [1]. Can also comment in general on [1].

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment / Justification** |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | Although it may be useful for NW to have URLLC UE categories/profiles, it is still unclear how/where to define them. In addition, we have already discussed on the possibility of defining URLLC basic FGs in Rel-16, but there was no consensus to define them even after extensive discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We in general support to define UE type (whether it is a sort of category or profiles can be further discussed) for URLLC. As 3GPP has defined multiple features since Rel-15, with more and more features introduced for Rel16/Rel-17 continuously, it is difficult to leave to the market to choose which features are required to support URLLC services. Therefore we think such definition is very useful and should be defined in Rel-17. |
| OPPO | No | The definition of “essential features” could be different due to different marketing purpose and real deployment of the features. In some sense it could be even a bit subjective. So it is not easy to have consensus in 3GPP to do so, hence becomes extra burden for RAN WGs to work on this. On other hand the updated 38.822 capture the feature list quite well as such that all the relevant UE capability parameters can be easily found in the table for one specific feature like URLLC/IIOT. So we think industry can dig them out from 38.822 to decide which ones should be properly tested and deployed. |
| Futurewei |  | We have sympathy with the need of UE categories/profiles for URLLC. We are, however, also aware of the challenges in reaching consensus on the definition of URLLC categories/profiles. The situation may be even more complicated in Rel-17 given that many URLLC functionalities are optional in Rel-15/16.  We think the discussion may start with operators and vertical industry participants to assess if there is sufficient market interest. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | No | Very resource consuming exercise without a good prospect of success. |
| Apple | No | URLLC consists of a very diverse set of applications with wide range of requirements on latency, reliability and data rate. It is not quite possible to define a small number of UE categories/profiles for URLLC that match well with different URLLC applications. On the other hand, if we define a large number of UE categories/profiles, it is not meaningful any more. It would be better to leave it to the market to determine which features are most useful for the important URLLC applications, or the topic can be revisited later on when the market need is clearer.  The same issue had been extensively discussed in Rel-16, but there was no consensus. |
| LG | No | There is no common understanding on how to categorize URLLC features, because URLLC applications are very diverse in terms of KPIs and use cases. Given the inherent diversity of URLLC features, we do not clearly understand how to define URLLC categories/profiles and whether such diverse URLLC categories/profiles can better promote URLLC deployments than existing capability signaling framework. |
|  |  |  |

# Handling of TR 38.822 for Rel-16 and related handling of R1 and R4 feature lists.

As reported in the R2 report to RP-92-e, RP-210931, the current RAN2 agreements is to treat TR38.822 the same way for Rel-16 Contents as for Rel-15 Contents, i.e. the **Approach 2** below.

RP-211425 [2] proposes the following:

RAN discuss which approach should be taken to handle TS38.822 and notify RAN WGs to have common understanding on the future update on Rel-16 feature lists.

**Approach 1**: update the TR 38.822

An update is allowed to include new feature groups but not for any small “corrections” etc. Instead, the small “corrections” should be made directly to TS 38.306 if applicable.

**Approach 2**: not update the TR 38.822

RAN1/4 can continue with updated feature lists but they reside only in RAN1/4 Tdocs.

Any correction/new features will be introduced only in TS 38.306 directly.

**Approach 2a**: not update the TR 38.822 and RAN1/4 does not update feature lists

Any correction/new features will be introduced only in TS 38.306 directly

Q: Moderator asks companies to feedback on the proposals above, which approach would be preferred and justification, and whether any of the approaches above would not be acceptable. In particular if to deviate from current RAN2 decisions (approach 2), explicit opinions with justifications should be provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preference** | **Comment / Justification** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Approach 1 | Allowing “essential” update (if any) for the TR38.822 is beneficial as this TR has been a good reference for 3GPP discussion (e.g., next release UE feature discussion, CR discussion, etc.) and also for development. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Either Approach 1  Or approve TR 38.822 only when RAN1/RAN4 becomes stable | In Rel-15 we have had a one short approval for 38.822 without subsequent updates. If RAN1/RAN4 continues updating the feature list, and 38.822 is approved at this plenary without any update, it may bring the risks that misalignment was found later and causes confusion. So either we go for Approach 1, or we only approve 38.822 once RAN1/RAN4 feature list becomes stable enough as a snapshot. |
| OPPO | Approach 1 | Basically we agree with NTT DOCOMO. Plus it could be helpful to resolve the 1st issue |
| Futurewei | Approach 1 | We see the value of keeping TR 38.822 as a good reference to overall UE features. Approach 1 seems a good balance between relevance of TR 38.822 in newer releases and the required maintenance work. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Approach 1 | 38.322 has become a good reference providing the linking among WI, sub-features, and UE capability parameters. |
| Apple | Approach 1  (Approach 2 as 2nd preference) | We think updating the TR 38.822 is quite useful.  Approach 2a should be avoided because we should not interfere with the current good practice in RAN1/RAN4. |
| LG | Approach1 | 38.822 is a valuable reference to industry. We think the minimization of discrepancy between 38.822 and 38.806 is always beneficial at least for Rel-16. |
|  |  |  |

# Capability for per FR gap

RP-211310 [3] discussed Capability of per-FR gap and proposes the below:

Q: Moderator asks companies to feedback on the following proposal: Introduce a new A new “per-BC based per-FR gap capability” in Rel.16. If the feature cannot be introduced from Rel.16 because it is “too late”, it should be introduced from Rel.17

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No/Rel** | **Comment / Justification** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Rel-17 | This issue should be discussed as part of Rel-17 RRM enh. (as discussed in [92-e-23-RRM-Enh]). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes  prefer Rel-16 | We support the idea of having finer granularity of per FR gap for Rel-16 as also proposed in RP-211392. If companies think it is too late, to have signaling change for Rel-17 with early implementation since Rel-16 is also acceptable for us. |
| OPPO |  | Wait a bit for the progress of [92-e-23-RRM-Enh] |
| Futurewei | Yes/Rel-17 | We can see“per-BC based per-FR gap capability” may ease UE implementation. But we also share concern that it is a bit “too late” for Rel-16. It can be specified in Rel-17 with early implementation in Rel-16. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Yes, prefer Rel-l6 | This was discussed in RAN4 but consensus could not be reached even though opposing companies didn’t present any technical reasons. No significant impact to RAN4 specs so this can be handled just as a capability.  To NTT Docomo and Oppo, this is just about introducing a capability, there are no changes to RAN4 requirements. this topic does not need to be handled in RRM enhancements as there is nothing left to study in RAN4. |
| Apple |  | RAN4 had already concluded not to introduce it in Rel-16.  The issue should be further discussed as part of [92-e-23-RRM-Enh]. |
| LG | Yes, Rel-17 | But, we also think this issue should be discussed under [92-e-23-RRM-Enh]. |
|  |  |  |

# RAN2 CR Pack in RP-211478

Any other comments on [4] RAN2 CR Pack in RP-2114768 (assume this was flagged)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | We are fine with the RAN2 CR Pack. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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