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# 1 Introduction

This is report for the following e-mail discussion.

* [AT110e][025][TEI16 Other] In-principle Agreed CRs (Mediatek)

Scope: Treat all documents under 6.19.0, and 6.20.1.0 (proponents are responsible to explain and drive)

Expected Outcome: Agree In-principle agreed CRs, Deadline: June 5, 0700 UTC.

# 2 Discussion on In-principle Agreed CRs

## 2.1 single entry PHR with P bit (OPPO)

Discussion on the following IPA CRs:

[R2-2004583](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2004583.zip) UE capability for single entry PHR with P bit OPPO, Ericsson, MediaTek Inc., Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, vivo, ZTE, Xiaomi CR Rel-16 38.331 16.0.0 1589 1 F TEI16 R2-2004214

[R2-2004584](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2004584.zip) UE capability for single entry PHR with P bit OPPO, Ericsson, MediaTek Inc., Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, vivo, ZTE, Xiaomi CR Rel-16 38.306 16.0.0 0296 1 F TEI16 R2-2004215

[R2-2004883](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2004883.zip) P bit for Single Entry PHR Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Apple, Ericsson, Lenovo, MediaTek Inc., NTT DOCOMO, INC., OPPO CR Rel-16 38.321 16.0.0 0716 1 F TEI16 R2-2003010

Companies are invited to provide comments on the IPA CR(s). Could they be agreed or there is some additional suggestion? Proponent companies please clarify whether there is change compared to the IPA CR(s) in last meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | The CRs can be agreed. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.2 BCS to asymmetric channel bandwidths (Huawei)

Discussion on the following IPA CR:

[R2-2005399](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2005399.zip) CR on introduction of BCS to asymmetric channel bandwidths (38.306) Huawei, HiSilicon, Telus CR Rel-16 38.306 16.0.0 0289 2 B NR\_n66\_BW R2-2004210

Companies are invited to provide comments on the IPA CR(s). Could they be agreed or there is some additional suggestion? Proponent companies please clarify whether there is change compared to the IPA CR(s) in last meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | The CR can be agreed. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.3 eCall (Huawei)

Discussion on the following LS and IPA CRs:

[R2-2004318](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2004318.zip) Reply LS on support for eCall over NR (S2-2003308; contact: Qualcomm) SA2 LS in Rel-16 EIEI, 5GS\_Ph1 To:SA, RAN2, CT1, CT Cc:SA1, SA4, TSG RAN, SA5, RAN5

Expect to be Noted

[R2-2005388](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2005388.zip) Introduction of eCall over IMS for NR Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 38.300 16.1.0 0239 - C TEI16

[R2-2005389](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2005389.zip) Introduction of eCall over IMS for NR Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 38.304 16.0.0 0173 - C TEI16

[R2-2005390](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2005390.zip) Introduction of eCall over IMS for NR Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 38.331 16.0.0 1670 - C TEI16

[R2-2005391](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2005391.zip) Corrections on Emergency Services Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-15 38.300 15.9.0 0240 - F TEI15

Companies are invited to provide comments on the IPA CR(s) and incoming LS. Could the CRs to be agreed or there is some additional suggestion? For the incoming LS, could we just note it? Proponent companies please clarify whether there is change compared to the IPA CR(s) in last meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Just some comments on “For the incoming LS, could we just note it?”.  At RAN2-109b-e meeting, we also provided a draft reply LS (respond to the SA LS [R2-2002549](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2002549.zip)), and the LS was not needed based on RAN2 minutes.  [R2-2003568](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003568.zip) Draft reply LS on support for eCall over NR Huawei discussion Rel-16 TEI16  [055] noted, not needed  So we think that RAN2 could just note the LS [R2-2004318](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2004318.zip). |
| Ericsson | The CRs can be agreed. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.4 Need for Gap (MediaTek)

Discussion on the following IPA CRs:

[R2-2004806](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2004806.zip) Introduction of NeedForGap capability for NR measurement - 36.306 MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-16 36.306 16.0.0 1730 2 B NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16 R2-2002782

[R2-2004807](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2004807.zip) Introduction of NeedForGap capability for NR measurement - 36.331 MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-16 36.331 16.0.0 4197 4 B NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16 R2-2002781

[R2-2004808](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2004808.zip) Introduction of NeedForGap capability for NR measurement - 38.300 MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-16 38.300 16.1.0 0191 3 B NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16 R2-2004160

[R2-2004810](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2004810.zip) Introduction of NeedForGap capability for NR measurement - 38.306 MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-16 38.306 16.0.0 0238 2 B NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16 R2-2002785

[R2-2004811](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2004811.zip) Introduction of NeedForGap capability for NR measurement - 38.331 MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-16 38.331 16.0.0 1453 4 B NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16 R2-2004161 Revised

R2-2005693 Introduction of NeedForGap capability for NR measurement - 38.331 MediaTek Inc. CR Rel-16 38.331 16.0.0 1453 5 B NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16 [R2-2004811](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2004811.zip) Late

Companies are invited to provide comments on the IPA CR(s). Could they be agreed or there is some additional suggestion? Proponent companies please clarify whether there is change compared to the IPA CR(s) in last meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | The current submitted CRs are the same as the AIP CRs in last meeting. However, we have noticed that there is an ASN.1 RIL issue E209 that proposes some related change on 38.331. Therefore, I have reserved one more revision for the 38.331 CR. I intend to follow the proposal from E209. In addition, there is one discussion paper (R2-2004393) that is going to be treated in offline#036. The P1 in R2-2004393, if agreed, requires more change on inter-node message part of 38.331.  In summary, there may be 3 additional change in 38.331 CR  <1> As suggested by the E209, rewording the 3 if statement in 5.3.5.3  <2> As suggested by rapporteur in E209, move the *needForGapsConfigNR* from *OtherConfig* to *RRCReconfiguration-v16xy-IEs*. The reason is that the feature that is configured via *OtherConfig* usually does not reporting is in *RRCReconfigurationComplete.* For consistent, it is suggested to move it to the configuration to message level.  <3> Depending on the discussion in offline#026, add new inter-node signaling. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.5 Upper Layer Indication (Huawei)

Discussion on the following IPA CR:

[R2-2005308](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_110-e\Docs\R2-2005308.zip) upperLayerIndication enhancements Huawei, HiSilicon, BT, Samsung CR Rel-16 36.331 16.0.0 4266 2 C NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16 R2-2004264

Companies are invited to provide comments on the IPA CR(s). Could they be agreed or there is some additional suggestion? Proponent companies please clarify whether there is change compared to the IPA CR(s) in last meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Conclusions

Base on the discussion in section 2, we have the following proposals:

**Proposal 1:**