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# 1 Introduction

An offline discussion has been set up to progress the ASN.1 review for WI specific issues:

* [AT109bis-e][314][NBIOT] ASN.1 review of NB-IoT (Huawei)

 Status: Starts Monday April 20th at 7:00 UTC

 Scope: ASN.1 WI specific issues discussion

 Intended outcome: progress the ASN.1 review and conclude as much as possible, report in R2-2004049

 Deadline: 27-04-2020, 10:00 UTC

All RIL class 3 and 4 issues with rapporteur status equal to PropAgree, PropReject, and PropNoAct are listed in section 2 and will be agreed in block unless they are flagged via email, in which case they will move to the discussion section.

The document discusses RIL class 3 and 4 issues that have not been concluded by the rapporteur, i.e. status different from PropAgree, PropReject, and PropNoAct.

The document is organised by topic as follows

* PUR related issues
* GWUS related issues
* NB-IoT specific issues

It is assumed that the following topics are handled in the corresponding email discussion for eMTC [AT109bis-e][416][eMTC] ASN.1 review for eMTC (Qualcomm):

* MT-EDT
* Coexistence with NR
* Connection to 5GC
* eMTC specific

Note that it is recommended to refer to the ASN review file [2] for the details of the proposed changes, as RIL extraction does not reflect the text formatting (e.g. strike out, underline…).

# 2 RIL issues not for discussion unless flagged

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| H084 | 3 | None | PropAgree | v11: As suggested | 5GS optimisations are missing. | v05: Change to for the Control Plane CIoT EPS/5GS optimisation. |  | 5.3.7.2 Initiation |
| H089 | 3 | None | PropAgree | v11: As suggested, and also the addition from ZTE | RLF report also applies to NB-IoT but he variable has a different name | v05: Change 1:2> store the following radio link failure information in the VarRLF-Report (VarRLF-Report-NB in NB-IoT) by setting its fields as follows:3> clear the information included in VarRLF-Report (VarRLF-Report-NB in NB-IoT), if any;Change 2: (last sentence in this section) The UE may discard the radio link failure information, i.e. release the UE variable VarRLF-Report (VarRLF-Report-NB in NB-IoT) 48 hours after the radio link failure is detected, upon power off or upon detach. | ZTE (LuTing): We agree with this change. Moreover, we think the similar issue exists in the section “5.6.5.3 Reception of the UEInformationRequest message” and needs to be changed accordingly. E.g., “if rlf-ReportReq is set to true and the UE has radio link failure information or handover failure information available in VarRLF-Report (VarRLF-Report-NB in NB-IoT) and if the RPLMN is included in plmn-IdentityList stored in VarRLF-Report: | 5.3.11.3 Detection of radio link failure |
| H091 | 3 | None | PropAgree | v11: As suggested | UE information Request procedure does not apply to UE only supporting the Control Plane optimisation. | v05: Add "(NOTE)" here and put the following NOTE after the table:NOTE: Not applicable for a UE that only supports the Control Plane CIoT EPS optimisation (see TS 24.301 [35]). |   | 5.6.0 General |
| N014 | 4 | None | PropNoAct | v22: Class changed | Since this procedure is only used in CONNECTED mode, how can this ever happen? If the UE is in CONNECTED, it must have gone through at least one successful (normal) RACH procedure, so this flag is never sent. Presumably, the intent is to indicate that prior to becoming CONNECTED, UE did EDT, but if that’s the case, it should be captured properly. | Clarify how this field is supposed to be used. | Qualcomm v17: “initiated with EDT PRACH resource and succeded after receving EDT fallback indication” should already be clear. The whole procedure consists of one successfully completed random access: starting from EDT but fallback to legacy.Rap: Understood that after clarification from QC, there seems no need for further action | – UEInformationResponse |
| H116 | 3 | None | PropAgree | v22: As suggested | There were no comment on the 'Editor’s Note' for several meetings. It is porposed to remove | v07: remove the editor's note | Qualcomm v19: ok with proposed change. | – Multiplicity and type constraint definitions |
| H127 | 3 | None | PropAgree | v22: As suggested | It has been agreed that the procedure can only be triggered after security is activated, thus SRB1bis cannot be used | v07: remove SRB1bis | Qualcomm v17: Agree to proposed change. | – UEInformationRequest-NB |
| H130 | 3 | None | PropAgree | v22: As suggested | It has been agreed that the procedure can only be triggered after security is activated, thus SRB1bis cannot be used | v07: Remove SRB1bis | Qualcomm v17: Agree to proposed change. | – UEInformationResponse-NB |
| H134 | 3 | None | PropAgree | v11: as suggested | PUR same as EDT only applies to FDD | v07: Add 'For FDD:' at the beginning of the field description | Qualcomm v17: While we agree with the comment (to add FDD), we further think “respectively” here is confusing as EPS/5GS is used. So, it is better to align the field description to that of cp-EDT-5GC (and that in eMTC), to “For FDD: This field indicates whether the UE is allowed to initiate CP-EDT when connected to EPC/5GC, see 5.3.3.1c.” | – SystemInformationBlockType2-NB |
| H133 | 3 | None | PropAgree | v11: as suggested | Needs alignment with eMTC, see proposed change | v07'Rename rai-SupportEnh-r16 to rai-ActivationEnh-r16 to align with eMTC Refer to the MAC CE name in the field description, i.e. add "to report the AS release assistance indication (AS AS RAI) via the MAC DCQR and AS RAI CE" | Qualcomm v17: Agree with intent but wording should be “to report the AS release assistance indication via the DCQR and AS RAI MAC CE”. Similar to H103 | – SystemInformationBlockType2-NB |
| H136b | 3 | None | PropAgree | v11: As suggested | wus-ConfigPerCarrier and gwus-Config are separate & independent parameters, so we should have separate field descriptions Also as the condition indicates' this field is optionally present, Need OR' there is no need to add a statement in case of absence in the field description. | v08remove the last two sentences in the description of wus-ConfigPerCarrier and add a row for gwus-Config as belowgwus-ConfigFor FDD: Carrier specific GWUS Configuration. E-UTRAN only configures value explicit if wus-Config is not present for the carrier. | Rap: There may be ways to simplify the actual signalling, but that seems an independent issue | – SystemInformationBlockType22-NB |
| H141 | 3 | None | PropAgree | v11: as suggested | According to RAN1 parameters list, the CHOICE is netween single tone/ multitone | v081) change the enumerated valuesnpusch-MCS-r16 CHOICE { singleTone INTEGER (0..10), multiTone INTEGER (0..13) },2) update the descriptionnpsch-MCSThis field contains an index to tables specified in TS 36.213 [23], Table 16.5.1.2-1 and Table 16.5.1.2-2 for subcarrier spacing 3.75 kHz and 15 kHz single tone and multi tone respectively, that defines modulation and TBS index for NPUSCH for PUR. |   | – PUR-Config-NB-r16 |
| H144 | 3 | None | PropAgree | v11: As suggested with minor to change i.e. to ENUMERATED { n0, n6 } | the parameter definition is not aligned with RAN1, value should be 0 or 6 | v081) Change parameter to : npusch-CyclicShift-r16 ENUMERATED { ncs0, ncs6 },2) Add at the end of the field description: Value ncs0 corresponds to value 0 and value ncs6 corresponds to value 6. | ZTE (LuTing): We agree with the intention but why not just a simple change like the following?npusch-CyclicShift -r16 INTEGER (0..6)ENUMERATED {0, 6},Moreover, similar change should be applied to pusch-CyclicShift -r16 in eMTC | – PUR-Config-NB-r16 |
| H143 | 3 | None | PropAgree |   | the field description is not aligned with RAN1 | v08alphaParameter: αc( 13) . See TS 36.213 [23], clause 16.2.1.1.1. |   | – PUR-Config-NB-r16 |
| H150 | 3 | None | PropAgree | v22 | There were no comment on the 'Editor’s Note' for several meetings. It is proposed to remove | Remove the editor's note | Qualcomm v19: ok with proposed change (i.e., remove Ed note) | – Multiplicity and type constraint definitions |

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 PUR related issues

### RIL Z603

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| Z603 | 4 | [R2-2003278](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003278.zip) | TDoc | v21: Class changed | In RAN2#107 meeting, RAN2 has agreed “The UE may use the D-PUR resource to send RRCConnectionRequest or RRCConnectionResumeRequest to establish or resume RRC connection.” However, the transmission of RRCConnectionRequest message using PUR to establish RRC connection hasn’t been captured in 36.331. | 1> the establishment or resumption request is for mobile originating calls and the establishment cause is mo-Data or mo-ExceptionData or delayTolerantAccess or mt-Access or mo-Signalling; |  | 5.3.3.1c Conditions for initiating transmission using PUR |

**Rapporteur’s comment:**

This looks more like an open issue and should be handled in [AT109bis-e][311][NBIOT] PUR open issues (Huawei)

Conclusion will be captured in this document.

Conclusion:

### RIL N001/ H098

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| N001 | 4 | None | DiscMail | v22: Class changed | This name is very difficult to comprehend, especially if H098 is agreed. Since this is about whether UE preference for the PUR scheduling, name could be e.g. “noL1-ACK-Needed-r16” to better indicate UE indicates it doesn’t require DL L1 ACK for the UL using PUR. | Use “noL1-ACK-Needed-r16” for the field name. | Qualcomm v17: Do not agree to have “no” in the name. Because what the field is saying is L1 ack is sufficient, not the other way around. Can be discussed along with H098.Rap: Agree this is best concluded with H098. Name seems somewhat matter of taste i.e. could reflect if RRC acknowledgment is needed, or be general with 2 values indicating the ACK options (rrc, l1) | PURConfigurationRequest |
| H098 | 4 | None | DiscMail | v21: Class changed | Application layer has no understanding of L1 Ack, propose to remove the last sentence in the description. | v07: remove "i.e. …" | Rap: Seems to require some discussion. May be appropriate to instead refer to MAC. May be better to defer | PURConfigurationRequest |

**Companies’ view:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |

Conclusion:

### RIL H122/ H125

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| H122 | 4 | None | DiscMail | v18 | There is no need for a condition, this is dedicated signalling and the field is not conditional to any other one. We normally rely on correct network behaviour. | v07: Remove the Editors'note | Rap: Seems that eMTC decided otherwise i.e. introduced a condition. Conclude together with H125Rap2: Class 4 used for issues for common session on eMTC and NB-IoT (same for H125) | – RRCConnectionResume-NB |
| H125 | 4 | None | DiscMail | v15 | There is no need for a condition for newUE-Identity-r16 , this is dedicated signalling and the field is not conditional to any other one. We normally rely on correct network behaviour. | v07: Remove the Editors'note. A condition on dedicatedInfoNAS-r16 could be useful to avoid that this becomes implicitly applicable to MO-EDT, which was not agreed in Rel-15 | Rap: Conclude together with H122 | – RRCConnectionSetup-NB |

**Rapporteur’s comment:**

Only handle the need for a condition for ‘newUE-Identity-r16 here.

The need for a condition for dedicatedInfoNAS-r16 can be handled with N009 in [AT109bis-e][416][eMTC] ASN.1 review for eMTC (Qualcomm)

**Companies’ view:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |

Conclusion:

## 3.2 GWUS related issues

### RIL H108/ H109

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| H108 | 4 | [R2-2003250](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003250.zip) | TDoc | v11 | Same issue applies to gwus-Config-NB in 6.7.3.2'timeOffset-eDRX-Short is always present in wus-Config-r15 / GWUS-TimeParameters-r16 then a WUS resource shall always be configured for the gap. Thus OPTIONAL Need OR is not correctThere are two options.1) parameter is defined as MP and the fallback configuration is described in ta CHOICE structure2) parameter is defined as need OP, there is NO CHOICE structure, and the fallback configuration is described in the fleld decription | v07: See Tdoc |   | – GWUS-Config |
| H109 | 4 | [R2-2003250](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003250.zip) | TDoc | v22: Class changed | This issue also applies to gwus-Config-NB in 6.7.3.21. timeOffset-eDRX-Long is present , then a WUS resource for the gap should be configured. 2. parameter is defined as OPTIONAL Need OR but default configuration in absence is defined in the field descriotion3. two different ways of implementing default configuration iare used for the same parameter, the CHOICE structure and | v071) change Need OR to Cond TimeOffset2. for default configuration there are the same two options as for gwus-ResourceConfig-eDRX-Short.1) parameter is defined as MP if timeoffset is present and the fallback configuration is described in the CHOICE structure2) parameter is defined as need OP if timeoffset is present ,there is NO CHOICE structure, and the fallback configuration is described in the fleld decriptionTdoc will be submitted to the meeting |   | – GWUS-Config |

**Companies’ view:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |

Conclusion:

### RIL H105/ H106

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| H105 | 3 | None | DiscMail | v11 | We don't use 'group WUS' in RAAN2 spec for the resource. This is the RAN1 language to distinguish the rel-15 and rel-16 feature | v07: remove all occurrences of the word 'group' in the description | Rap: Should be concluded together with H106 | – GWUS-Config |
| H106 | 4 | None | DiscMail | v21: Class changed | GWUS-Config-NB:gwus-CommonSequenceParameter is defined as ENUMERATED {legacyWUS, groupWUS} but is unclear what legacyWUs and groupWUS mean.In my understanding: legacyWUS is Rel-15 WUS and groupWUS is rel-16 GWUS so we think it may be better to align with RAN2 terminology {wus, gwus} | v07:1) Change enumerated value to "wus" and "gwus". 2) gwus-CommonSequencePresence of the field indicates common WUS sequence is configured.Value legacyWUSwus indicates the common WUS sequence for the shared WUS resource is the legacy WUS sequence, value groupWUSgwus indicates the common WUS sequence for the shared WUS resource is the group WUS sequence, see TS 36.211[21].3) Same changes in 6.7.3.2 gwus-Config-NB | Rap: seems desirable to agree and consistently use some clear terminology (should be consistent with H105) | – GWUS-Config |

**Companies’ view:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |

Conclusion:

### RIL H107

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| H107 | 4 | None | DiscMail | v21: Class changed | gwus-GroupAlternation is Enumerated {True}, This is the presence that enables hopping. Also Hopping is not defined, better use 'alternation' | v07Presence of the field eEnables hoppingWUS group alternation between thetwo or more WUS resources for the gap type, see TS 36.304 [4].Same chang in 6.7.3.2 gwus-Config-NB. |   | – GWUS-Config |

**Companies’ view:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |

Conclusion:

### RIL H110

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| H110 | 4 | None | DiscMail | v22: Class changed | gwus-ProbaThreshList-r16 and gwus-GroupsForServiceList-r16 are defined as OPTIONAL need OR. There is no need to specify the absence case. It is not clear what happens in only one of the two parameters is configured or if they don't have the same of entries.Same issue in 6.7.3.2 gwus-Config-NB. | v07 It is proposed1) to define the parameters as OPTIONAL-- Cond probabilityBased and remove the sentence 'If this field is absent, paging probability based WUS group selection is not configured'2) clarify in the field description of gwus-GroupsForServiceList that E-UTRAN includes the same number of entries and in the same order in gWUS-GroupsForServiceList and gwus-ProbThreshList.gWUS-GroupsForServiceListNumber of WUS groups for each paging probability group, see TS 36.304 [4]. The first entry corresponds to the first probability group, second entry corresponds to the second paging probability group, and so on. E-UTRAN includes the same number of entries and in the same order in gWUS-GroupsForServiceList and gwus-ProbThreshList. Any WUS group from the list of WUS groups defined in the numWUS-GroupsPerResourceList that are not assigned to a probability group is considered to be part of the list used for UE ID based group only list. Total number of WUS groups in this list cannot be more than total number of WUS groups in gwus-NumGroupsList. If this field is absent, paging probability based WUS group selection is not configured.gwus-ProbThreshListPaging probability thresholds corresponding to the paging probability groups, see TS 36.304 [4]. If this field is absent, then paging probability based WUS group selection is not configured.Cond probabilityBased: The field is mandatory present if paging probability based WUS group selection is configured; otherwise the field is not present, and the UE shall delete any existing value for this field. | Rap: Somewhat related to R2-2003184, although that addresses parameter gwus-NumGroupsList while this comment concerns parameter gwus-GroupsForServiceListQualcomm v19: The issue stems from the fact that number of paging probability thresholds (1, 2 or 3) are common for all WUS configurations while gwus-GroupsForServiceList can be configured on per GAP type. Basically the concern is how to handle the case where the number of enteries in gwus-GroupsForServiceList are different from the number of entries in gwus-ProbThreshList. Seems this would be clear from 36.304 TP where the mapping of group WUS to paging probability set is defined and we don’t see the need to make this any clearer in 36.331. Basically, it boils down to this:- If gwus-ProbThreshList has more enteries than in gwus-GroupsForServiceList then all extra entries in gwus-ProbThreshList are not assigned any group WUS.- If gwus-GroupsForServiceList has more enteries than in gwus-ProbThreshList then all extra entries in gwus-GroupsForServiceList are ignored.  | – GWUS-Config |

**Companies’ view:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |

Conclusion:

## 3.3 NB-IoT specific issues

### RIL H081, H086

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| H081 | 3 | None | DiscMail | v11 | earlyContentionResolution is only included in RRCConnectionResume for EPC | v05: Change to "2> if the UE is connected to EPC. set earlyContentionResolution to TRUE;" | Rap: seems that issue requires discussionQualcomm v17: agree that this indication is only for EPC, but need to also clafiry that for 5GC, the suppor tis mandatory without indication. | 5.3.3.3a Actions related to transmission of RRCConnectionResumeRequest message |
| H086 | 3 | None | DiscMail | v11 | earlyContentionResolution is only included in RRCConnectionReestablishment for EPC | v052> if the UE is connected to EPC, set earlyContentionResolution to TRUE; | Rap: Resolve together with H081 | 5.3.7.4 Actions related to transmission of RRCConnectionReestablishmentRequest message |

**Companies’ view:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |

Conclusion:

### RIL H094

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| H094 | 3 | None | DiscMail | v11 | ANR is not applicable to UE using the CP optimisation but when UE is in RRC\_IDLE, it is difficult to decide using or not the CP CIOT optimisation. | v05: We propose to remove the sentence as it clear in TS 36.300. | Rap: understand this may require some further checking, also of what’s is/ would be captured in stage 2 | 5.6.24.0 General |

**Companies’ view:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |

Conclusion:

### RIL H095 / Z607 / H146

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| H095 | 3 | None | DiscMail | v11 | If the carriers for ANR measurements are not signalled explicitly, the UE selects two carriers from SIB5 to perform the measurements. | v053> for each of the two carrier frequenciesy signalled in selected from SystemInformationBlockType5-NB: | Qualcomm v19: proposal intent is ok but what if SIB5 only has 1 carrier. So it should be for each of up to two … | 5.6.24.1 Initiation |
| Z607 | 3 | None | DiscMail | v22 | According to field description of carrierFreqIndex, such value of INTEGER (1..2) means only the first two carriers in interFreqCarrierFreqList can be assigned. But we understand any two carriers of interFreqCarrierFreqList can be assigned. So we assume the value range of such index should be 1~8, e.g., (1.. maxFreq). | carrierFreqIndex-r16 INTEGER (1.. maxFreqANR-NB-r16maxFreq), | Relates to H095; conclude togethe | – ANR-MeasConfig-NB |
| H146 | 3 | None | DiscMail | v22 | RAN2 has agreed max two carriers to be measured | v08: Change the field descriptionanrCarrierListList of NB-IoT carriers to be measured for ANR. If the field is absent, the UE selects two of the carriers in interFreqCarrierFreqList in SystemInformationBlockType5-NB are to be measured. | ZTE (LuTing): We may have no specific discussion on the scenario that anr-CarrierList is absent. Is it really needed to measure two carriers in SIB5? Per our previous understanding, in this case, UE only needs to measure the serving frequency and no need to measure other frequencies. Similar comments to H095.Relates to H095; conclude togethe | – ANR-MeasConfig-NB |

**Companies’ view:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |

Conclusion:

### RIL H096

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| H095 | 3 | None | DiscMail | v11 | If the carriers for ANR measurements are not signalled explicitly, the UE selects two carriers from SIB5 to perform the measurements. | v053> for each of the two carrier frequenciesy signalled in selected from SystemInformationBlockType5-NB: | Qualcomm v19: proposal intent is ok but what if SIB5 only has 1 carrier. So it should be for each of up to two … | 5.6.24.1 Initiation |

**Companies’ view:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |

Conclusion:

### RIL H228/ H229

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| H229 | 3 | [R2-2003251](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003251.zip) | TDoc | v14 | multiTBConfig configuration implies configuration of two harq Processes. This is not specified . | v08: See Tdoc |   | – PhysicalConfigDedicated-NB |
| H228 | 3 | [R2-2003251](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003251.zip) | TDoc | v14 | multiTBConfig contains configuration for both UL and DL, which are independent of each other. It would have been better to separate . | v08: see Tdoc |   | – PhysicalConfigDedicated-NB |

**Companies’ view:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |

Conclusion:

### RIL H118

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| H118 | 3 | None | ToDo |   | The same message is used for 5GS | Change "CIoT EPS" to "CIoT EPS/5GS" |   | – RRCConnectionReestablishment-NB |

**Companies’ view:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |

Conclusion:

### RIL H148 (flagged)

Extract of the RIL:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Class** | **Tdoc** | **Status** | **Proposed Conclusion** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments** | **Section** |
| H148 | None |  |  DiscMail | v11 | nrsrqResult should be removed as there is no measurements required defined for inter-frequency cell in TS 36.133 | remove nrsrqResult | Rap: It seems 36.133 section 9.1.22.7 covers Inter-frequency Absolute NRSRQ Accuracy for UE Category NB1 | – RRCConnectionReestablishment-NB |

**Companies’ view:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |

Conclusion:

# 4 Conclusion

TO BE COMPLETED
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