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# Introduction

This document summarizes the following email discussion.

* [AT110e][023][NR15] UE cap Miscellaneous III (ZTE)

Scope: Treat R2-2004560, R2-2004561, R2-2004972, R2-2004969, R2-2004970, R2-2004844, R2-2004845 (proponents are responsible to explain and drive)

Part 1: Decision whether to make corrections or not, identify agreeable corrections. Deadline: June 4, 0700 UTC.

Part 2: For agreeable parts, continuation to agree CRs. Deadline: June 10, 0700 UTC

# Discussion: Part 1 (by June 4 0700 UTC)

It is proposed to try to come to a set of agreeable proposals out of the documents listed above.

## Invalidating bandwidth class F for FR1(R2-2004560[1], R2-2004561[2])

These CRs try to add a clarification as below to the ***ca-BandwidthClassDL-NR/ca-BandwidthClassUL-NR.***

For FR1, the value ‘F’ shall not be used as it is invalidated in TS 38.101-1 [2].

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Support / Not support** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Further consideration on the Notes to the FeatureSetCombination ([R2-2004972](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2002696.zip)[3])

In the current spec, there is a note to the *FeatureSetCombination* as below, which was introduced by [4] [5] to reduce the signalling overhead.

|  |
| --- |
| NOTE 2: The UE may advertise a *FeatureSetCombination* containing only fallback band combinations. That means, in a *FeatureSetCombination,* each group of *FeatureSets* across the bands may contain at least one pair of *FeatureSetUplinkId* and *FeatureSetDownlinkId* which is set to 0/0. |

As described in [4], with this note, if a UE supports only combinations of up to two bands (e.g. BC A+B, BC A+C, BC B+C), the UE can report a super BC with Band A+B+C and set the corresponding elements in the *FeatureSetCombination* to zero respectively for the BC A+B, BC A+C and BC B+C.

However, in the last meeting, the following RAN2 understanding [6] was added.

|  |
| --- |
| The UE should not report a super set band combination not supported or not defined in RAN4 only for the purpose to reduce the fallback band combination report, where the consequence is that the network will ignore the super set band combination and its fallback band combinations. |

Combined this understanding with the above example, there would be 2 different understandings:

*A: The UE shall not report a super set band combination with bands A+B+C if the UE only supports BC A+B, BC A+C and BC B+C.*

*B: The UE can report a BC with A+B+C even the UE only supports BC A+B, BC A+C and BC B+C, for that the UE/Network shall determine the indeed supported BCs (e.g. BC A+B, BC A+C and BC B+C) from both the Bandcombinaitonlist and the FeatureSetCombination.*

### **2.2.1 Which understanding do companies prefer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Preference A or B** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### **2.2.2 Related issues for the understanding A (Please go the 2.2.3 directly if understanding B is preferred)**

If we go to the understanding A that the UE shall not report a super set band combination (e.g. BC A+B+C) when the UE only supports the fallback BCs (e.g. BC A+B, BC A+C and BC B+C), it seems that we need to find some other use cases for the Note 2 to the *FeatureSetCombination.*

#### **Q1: If the understanding A is preferred, do companies agree that RAN2 shall re-evaluate whether the Note2 to the FeatureSetCombination is still needed.**

Note: If disagree, please also provide the existing use cases for the Note 2 (except the use case in the Q2, which is still under discussing and would be discussed in Q2/3 separately), and the Q4 can be ignored directly.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments/Use cases for the note 2** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Meanwhile, another email discussion is undergoing as below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Miscellaneous I*** [AT110e][021][NR15] UE cap Miscellaneous I (Qualcomm)

 Scope: Treat R2-2005630, R2-2005631, R2-2005632, R2-2005633, R2-2004326, R2-2005577, R2-2005578, R2-2004436, R2-2004437 (proponents are responsible to explain and drive) Part 1: Decision whether to make corrections or not, identify agreeable corrections. Deadline: June 4, 0700 UTC.  Part 2: For agreeable parts, continuation to agree CRs. Deadline: June 10, 0700 UTC[R2-2004436](file:///D%3A/Documents/3GPP/tsg_ran/WG2/RAN2/2005_R2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004436.zip) Signalling of NR-DC only band combination Qualcomm Incorporated discussion Rel-15 NR\_newRAT-Core[R2-2004437](file:///D%3A/Documents/3GPP/tsg_ran/WG2/RAN2/2005_R2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004437.zip) Clarification on supported NR-DC cell grouping Qualcomm Incorporated CR Rel-15 38.306 15.9.0 0264 1 F NR\_newRAT-Core R2-2002579 |

In [R2-2004436](file:///D%3A/Documents/3GPP/tsg_ran/WG2/RAN2/2005_R2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004436.zip)[7] and [R2-2004437](file:///D%3A/Documents/3GPP/tsg_ran/WG2/RAN2/2005_R2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004437.zip)[8], it wants to clarify that whether the UE is allowed to declare band combinations where NR-DC is supported but the NR-CA is not supported.

#### **Q2: Do companies agree that if the UE is allowed to declare band combinations where NR-DC is supported but the NR-CA is not supported, the Note 2 to the FeatureSetCombination can be reused for this case.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments/Use cases for the note 2** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### **Q3: If Q2 was agreed, do companies agree to add a clarification to the Note2 as below to make it clearer.**

|  |
| --- |
| NOTE 2: The UE may advertise a *FeatureSetCombination* containing only fallback band combinations. That means, in a *FeatureSetCombination,* each group of *FeatureSets* across the bands may contain at least one pair of *FeatureSetUplinkId* and *FeatureSetDownlinkId* which is set to 0/0. The UE may use this method to declare band combinations where NR-DC is supported, but the NR-CA is not supported. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### **Q4: If RAN2 confirms that the UE shall not declare band combinations where NR-DC is supported, but NR CA is not supported, and there is no any other use cases for the Note 2 in the Q1, do companies agree that the Note 2 to the FeatureSetCombination shall be deleted.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### **2.2.3 Related issues if the understanding B is preferred**

If the understanding B is preferred, a supper BC (e.g. BC A+B+C) would be adopted, according to the current BandCombination structure, the following parameters are defined per BC or per band per BC.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CA related Parameters | ca-ParametersEUTRA/ca-ParametersEUTRA-v1560/ca-ParametersEUTRA-v1570 |
| ca-ParametersNR/ca-ParametersNR-v1540 /ca-ParametersNR-v1550 |
| ca-ParametersNRDC  |
| MR-DC parameters | mrdc-Parameters/mrdc-Parameters-v1580/ mrdc-Parameters-v1590  |
| BCS | SupportedBandwidthCombinationSet/ supportedBandwidthCombinationSetIntraENDC  |
| Other | powerClass-v1530/ne-DC-BC  |
| SRS(per Band per BC) | srs-CarrierSwitch/srs-TxSwitch/supportedSRS-TxPortSwitch-r16  |

#### **Q5: If the understanding B is preferred, do companies agree that only when the per BC parameters are consistent among the fallback BCs , the UE can put these fallback BCs (e.g. BC A+B, BC A+C and BC B+C) into a supper BC (e.g. BC A+B+C).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Obviously, the UE shall keep very careful when adopting such super BC scheme, which may increase the unexpected complexity on the UE side. For example, the UE has to check the detail BCS related Info of each fall back BC. Once the UE reports the wrong UE capability, it will also cause some trouble to the network side, e.g. the reconfiguration always failed. To avoid such kind of issues, a note can be added to the 5.6.1.4 of 38.331 to reminder the UE vendor adopt the Super BC scheme carefully.

#### **Q6: If the understanding B is preferred, do companies agree that a note as below can be added to the 5.6.1.4 of 38.331 to reminder the UE vendor adopt the Super BC scheme carefully.**

Note: The UE shall be careful to use a super BC to indicate the fallback BCs on purpose of saving signalling, only when the per BC capabilities are consistent among the fallback BCs, the UE can put the fallback BCs (e.g. BC A+B, BC A+C and BC B+C) into a supper BC (e.g. BC A+B+C).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Clarifications on the BandList of the BandCombination (R2-2004969[9], R2-2004970[10])

These CRs try to add a clarification as below to BandList-v1540/BandList-v16xy as the LTE has done.

|  |
| --- |
| ***BandList-v1540/BandList-v16xy***The UE shall include the same number of entries, and listed in the same order, as in *BandList* (without suffix). |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Missing UE capability requirements (R2-2004844[11], R2-2004845[12])

The ROHC profiles that an IMS voice capable UE shall support are missing, these CRs try to fix this issue.

### **2.4.1 Do companies agree with the motivation of these CRs?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### **2.4.2 Do companies agree with the proposed changes to the field description of the “supportedROHC-Profiles”?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### **2.4.3 Do companies agree with the proposed changes to the conditionally mandatory features in clause 6 of 38.306?**

#### **2.4.3.1 IMS emergency calls**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### **2.4.3.2 OTDOA Inter-frequency RSTD measurement indication**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### **2.4.3.3 Different UL/ DL configuration for TDD inter-band carrier aggregation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### **2.4.3.4 Simultaneous transmission of PUCCH and PUSCH across PUCCH groups**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Proposal 1: xxxx**

# Discussion: Part 2

xxxxxxxxxx

# Conclusion

xxxxxxxxxx
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