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# Introduction

This is the report of following at meeting offline discussion:

* [AT126][015][NCR] Miscellaneous corrections (Apple)

 Intended outcome: Discuss corrections submitted to AI 7.1 and agree to final CRs (if needed)

 Deadline: 05-24-24

Please provide your comments till 7pm (local time) 05-23-24. The moderator will then propose the final conclusions which you will have the chance to comment on (by email) on Friday. The intention is to conclude this discussion by email without online time.

# Contact Points

Respondents to the offline discussion are asked to fill in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| CATT | Hao Xu | xuhao@catt.cn |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Xubin | xubin10@huawei.com |
| Samsung | Jonas Sedin | j.sedin@samsung.com |
| Intel | Ziyi Li | ziyi.li@intel.com |
| ZTE | LiuJing | liu.jing30@zte.com.cn |

# Discussion

R2-2405054 RILs conclusion for NCR ZTE Corporation (Rapporteur) report Rel-18 NR\_netcon\_repeater

**Comments on the RIL resolutions?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Comments | Notes |
| CATT |  No Comments for marking N141 and N142 to Agree. |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| Samsung | No |  |
| Intel | No |  |
| ZTE | No |  |

**Proposed rapporteur’s conclusion: TBD**

[R2-2405055](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Csasha.sirotkin%5Cmeetings%5CTSGR2_126%5CDocs%5CR2-2405055.zip) Miscellaneous RRC corrections for NCR ZTE Corporation (Rapporteur), Nokia CR Rel-18 38.331 18.1.0 4809 - F NR\_netcon\_repeater

**Can the CR be agreed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes, with comments | For “release the received ncr-FwdConfig”, “received” is odd and confusing wording and there was nothing wrong with the previous wording. The UE always releases a configuration that has been “received”, so at least “received” should be removed.  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | Regarding the comment from Samsung, we intend to use the same wording as current spec, like below:2> if the *sl-SFN-DFN-Offset* is set to *release*:3> release the received *sl-SFN-DFN-Offset*; |

**Proposed rapporteur’s conclusion: TBD**

[R2-2405263](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Csasha.sirotkin%5Cmeetings%5CTSGR2_126%5CDocs%5CR2-2405263.zip) Clarification to Network-Controlled Repeaters Stage-2 description Ericsson, Nokia CR Rel-18 38.300 18.1.0 0808 3 F NR\_netcon\_repeater [R2-2403970](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Csasha.sirotkin%5Cmeetings%5CTSGR2_126%5CDocs%5CR2-2403970.zip)

**Can the CR be agreed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |

**Proposed rapporteur’s conclusion: TBD**

[R2-2405679](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Csasha.sirotkin%5Cmeetings%5CTSGR2_126%5CDocs%5CR2-2405679.zip) 38.306 correction on reference for NCR Samsung CR Rel-18 38.306 18.1.0 1126 - F NR\_netcon\_repeater

**Can the CR be agreed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| CATT | Yes | It is fine to correct the reference.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Intention OK | We see there are other similar “xx”s as the undecided parts in the capability mega CR for different WIs. We assume the capability Rapporteur will take care of these in the final mega CR so that we don’t need multiple WI specific CRs for this editorial correction. |
| Samsung | Yes | Our intention for this was that companies should check and agree that the suggested reference is correct.As we coordinated with Intel before, we are fine to agree to capture to capture it in rapporteurs mega CR.  |
| Intel |  | As commented by companies above, this can be corrected in mega CR as editorial correction. No need to endorse in our understanding.  |
| ZTE |  | We support the suggestion from capability spec rapporteur (Intel).Regarding the change, we are fine with the modification considering the listed elements are RAN1 related, we are also fine if the reference is removed.  |

**Proposed rapporteur’s conclusion: TBD**

# 3 Conclusion