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# Introduction

During RAN2#906 it was agreed to have an offline email discussion, after the online discussion on Monday, about:

* [AT113bis-e][010][NR15] UE caps DL scheduling slot offset (Ericsson)

START ONLY AFTER ON-line Monday

 Scope: Taking into account on-line agreements, Treat R2-2103768, R2-2103770, R2-2103771, R2-2103769, R2-2103799

 Phase 1, determine agreeable parts, Phase 2, for agreeable parts Work on CRs.

 Intended outcome: Report and Agreed-in-principle CRs.

 Deadline: Schedule A

The deadline for the first round comments is **Wednesday April 14 1000 UTC**.

This report gives a summary and proposals for phase 1.

This report provides enables companies to comment issue 8 in phase 2.

# Contact information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Email** |
| Ericsson | martin.van.der.zee@ericsson.com |
| Apple | naveen.palle@apple.com |
| ZTE | li.wenting@zte.com.cn |
| MediaTek | Chun-fan.tsai@mediatek.com |
| Intel | Seau.s.lim@Intel.com |
| Nokia | amaanat-ali@nokia.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | kuangyiru@huawei.com |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | mkitazoe@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Samsung | seugnri.jin@samsung.com |
| LG | sunghoon.jung@lge.com |
| CATT | erlin.zeng@catt.cn |
| OPPO | duzhongda@oppo.com |
| vivo | Chenli5g@vivo.com |

# Introduction

There was no time for online discussion on monday, and no online agreements were reached, but in this first round we will look for agreeable parts in:

1. [R2-2103768](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103768.zip), *Summary of [Post113-e][051][NR15] DL scheduling slot offset*, Ericsson report, RAN2#113bis-e
2. [R2-2103770](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103770.zip), *Introduction of DL scheduling slot offset capabilities in UERadioPagingInformation*, Ericsson, CR 38.331, Rel-15, RAN2#113bis-e
3. [R2-2103771](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103771.zip), *Introduction of DL scheduling slot offset capabilities in UERadioPagingInformation*, Ericsson, CR 38.331, Rel-16, RAN2#113bis-e
4. [R2-2103769](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103769.zip), *Open issues K0 configuration and use*, Ericsson, DISC, RAN2#113bis-e
5. [R2-2103799](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103799.zip), *Configuration of common fields in dedicated signalling*, Ericsson, DISC, RAN2#113bis-e

# Discussion

## Add DL scheduling slot offset capabilities to *UERadioPagingInformation* message

The gNB currently does not know if the UE has IOT-tested K0 > 0 when receiving a Paging message from CN. Thus the gNB does not know if it can use K0 > 0 in the PDCCH scheduling of the Paging message on PDSCH, provided that only UE(s) supporting K0 > 0 are paged in the Paging Occasion (PO). When the gNB does not know if the UE supports K0 > 0, or if also legacy UEs are paged in the PO, then the gNB cannot use K0 > 0 in the PO.

**Issue 1**: Do companies agree to add *SchedulingOffset-PDSCH-TypeA* and *dl-SchedulingOffset-PDSCH-TypeB* capability to the *UERadioPagingInformation* message?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson (proponent) | Yes | None  |
| Apple | Yes | We are ok with this proposal |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |

**Summary**: 13 companies replied. All companies agreed that DL scheduling offset capabilities should be added to the *UERadioPagingInformation* message.

**Proposal 1**: *SchedulingOffset-PDSCH-TypeA* and *dl-SchedulingOffset-PDSCH-TypeB* capability are added to the UERadioPagingInformation message

**Issue 2**: Do companies agree with the draft CRs for Rel-15 and Rel-16 in [2,3]?

1. [R2-2103770](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103770.zip), *Introduction of DL scheduling slot offset capabilities in UERadioPagingInformation*, Ericsson, CR 38.331, Rel-15, RAN2#113bis-e
2. [R2-2103771](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103771.zip), *Introduction of DL scheduling slot offset capabilities in UERadioPagingInformation*, Ericsson, CR 38.331, Rel-16, RAN2#113bis-e

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson (proponent) | Yes | None  |
| Apple | Yes | We do not have strong preference on Rel-15, but are ok with majority agree.  |
| ZTE | Yes |   |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Vivo | Yes |  |

**Summary**: 12 companies replied. All companies found the draft CRs in [R2-2103770](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103770.zip) (Rel-15) and [R2-2103771](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103771.zip) (Rel-16) agreeable.

**Proposal 2**: Agree the CRs in [R2-2103770](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103770.zip) (Rel-15) and [R2-2103771](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103771.zip) (Rel-16).

## Open issues with K0 configuration and use

In the email discussion #051 [1] companies agreed that the NW can **configure** K0>0 in *pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationLis*t in *SIB1* which is a common configuration for all UEs in the cell i.e. for UEs supporting K0>0 and UEs not supporting K0>0:

A UE that does not support *dl-SchedulingOffset-PDSCH-TypeA* or *dl-SchedulingOffset-PDSCH-TypeB* capability does support *pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList* **configuration** in *PDSCH-ConfigCommon* in *SIB1* including K0 values larger than 0.

**Issue 3**: Do companies agree to clarify this in the chairman notes?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson (proponent) | Yes | None  |
| Apple | Ok |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | acceptable | We have some concern during the email discussion but would be fine to compromise as it is broadcast configuration in SIB1.  |
| Intel | No | We think that It is clear that the common configuration is per cell and thus network can provide configuration that may not be supported by all UEs. However, we are ok to clarify this in the chairman notes if majority thinks it is needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |

**Summary**: 13 companies replied. 12 companies replied to agree/ok/acceptable with the proposed chairman note. One company was not ok with the proposed note, because it considered that this was already clear, but it could go with majority if needed.

**Proposal 3**: Clarify in the chairman notes:

A UE that does not support *dl-SchedulingOffset-PDSCH-TypeA* or *dl-SchedulingOffset-PDSCH-TypeB* capability does support *pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList* **configuration** in *PDSCH-ConfigCommon* in *SIB1* including K0 values larger than 0.

In the email discussion #051 [1] it was also discussed whether it should be clarified that the NW cannot **use** K0>0 when the NW does not know if the UE has IOT-tested it:

The network cannot **use** K0>0 for PDCCH/PDSCH scheduling without possible IOT issues when the network does not know if the UE has IOT-tested K0>0.

**Issue 4**: Do companies agree to clarify this in the chairman notes?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson (proponent) | Yes | None  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Intel | No | This should already be clear. Again, we are ok to clarify this in the chairman notes if majority thinks it is needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Vivo | Yes |  |

**Summary**: 13 companies replied. 12 companies replied to agree with the proposed chairman note. One company was not ok with the proposed note, because it considered that this was already clear, but it could go with majority if needed.

**Proposal 4**: Clarify in the chairman notes:

The network cannot **use** K0>0 for PDCCH/PDSCH scheduling without possible IOT issues when the network does not know if the UE has IOT-tested K0>0.

In the email discussion #051 [1] it was also discussed whether the NW should use the UE capabilities when configuring K0 via *PDSCH-Config* (not *PDSCH-Config****Common***) in dedicated signalling, i.e. not configure K0>0 when the UE has not IOT-tested it. It is the understanding of the rapporteur that the normal approach is to use the UE capabilities in dedicated configuration in dedicated signalling:

The network configures K0 in *PDSCH-Config* in dedicated signalling according to the UE capabilities.

**Issue 5**: Do companies agree to clarify this in the chairman notes?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson (proponent) | Yes | None  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Intel | No | Not sure why we need such clarification. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | No strong view, it is a general principle that the NW configures UE according to the UE capabilities. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | seems to be common sense? |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |

**Summary**: 13 companies replied. 11 companies replied to agree with the proposed chairman note. One company was not ok with the proposed note, because it considered that this was already clear. One company did not have a strong view, but indicated that it is a general principle that the NW configures the UE according to the UE capabilities (in dedicated configuration in dedicated signalling).

**Rapporteur:** There is a large majority agreeing to clarify this in the chairman notes. But on the other hand this clarification reconfirms well understood principles of dedicated configuration in dedicated signalling. It is not clear if there is a strong reason to capture this in the chairman notes.

**Proposal 5**: Leave it to RAN2 chairman decision to capture the note below in the chairman notes:

The network configures K0 in *PDSCH-Config* in dedicated signalling according to the UE capabilities .

## Common configuration in dedicated signalling

The contribution [5] presents three types of RRC signaling in the dimension of common (cell specific) and dedicated (UE specific):

1. Common configuration included in SI
2. Dedicated configuration included in dedicated signaling
3. Common configuration included in dedicated signaling

The issue at hand is the third type, and the paper argues that it should be clarified whether Type 3 configurations should comply with what the UE supports or not.

**Issue 6**: Do you think clarifications are needed (why/why not)?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | In our view, the common config in the dedicated signalling should be the same (or similar) to the one in common config of SI. Infact, it is one of the agreements in RAN2 that UE gets the common config in a dedicated message that reflects the content of the common config of the cell in handover. However we understand the scenario in this case (Esp for BWP config which has common part in UE dedicated info). We think that if we follow the philosophy of including only cell-specific config in UE dedicated common config, then we do not have to run into the issue and the relation to UE capability (as cell-specific config using in broadcast does not depend on UE capability). We are open to other companies view in this regard. |
| Ericsson (proponent) | We think some clarification is needed. It seems there is a baseline principle of adapting all dedicated signalling to the capabilities of the UE. At the same time, there seems to be circumstances when this principle is broken. It can be for good reasons, but we think RAN2 should discuss why this happens and if it happens too often, does the baseline principle really hold? |
| ZTE | We think at least for the parameters that also included in the system information, it shall be aligned with the system Information. For other parameters, we need more time to check, maybe we need to list the related parameters and related UE capabilities then discuss them case by case. |
| MediaTek | There are two general principles<1> Configuration in dedicated signalling should match UE capability<2> common configuration is dedicated signalling and in broadcast information should be the sameWhile we agree both <1> and <2>, there seems conflict on principle <1> and <2> for some parameters in type 3 configuration. The parameters that are broadcasting in SI are mostly basic functionality and are mandatory support by the UE. So, we are hoping that this kind of “conflict parameter” is not much and we can discuss it case by base if needed.Note that UE in connected mode basically follow the dedicated signalling and it would NOT check whether the common configuration is the same in dedicate signalling and in SI. So, it may be okay to have some exception for <2> as it would not result in RRC Re-establishment. |
| Intel | It is unclear which common configuration this is referring to. If it is servingCellConfigCommon, similar to other companies, our understanding is that it should aligned with the servingCellConfigCommonSIB. Whether there are parameters in servingCellConfigCommon that is restricted by UE capability and may not be set the same as servingCellConfigCommonSIB, we may have to discuss this on a case by case basis. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share the same view that the common configuration should be cell-specific configuration and this principle is already clear in specifications.We also agree with ZTE that we should discuss case by case if there is a problem.  |
| Nokia | We think the dedicated configuration is always up to UE capabilities, unless this would create an issue with SIB configuration. But we hope that's not possible (otherwise we have a bigger problem), so we would go with always aligning with SIB configuration. Then generally we agree with MTK that one could discuss potential conflicts (based on overlap of 1 and 2) on a case by case basis but the 1 and 2 principles should hold independently.Given this, we also need time to digest the conflicting cases each of them and would need time until May meeting. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | It is clear from the section 5.3.5.8.2 “Inability to comply with RRCReconfiguration” that the UE does not distinguish between dedicated configuration and common configuration.We suggest we look at the configuration parameters in common configuration carefully. It should be noted that common configuration includes configurations of SUL or IAB. It is strange that the network “configures” those parameters even if the UE does not support the feature. Also the common configuration in SIB can include UL configuration, while the UE capability / configuration for the serving cell can be DL only.  |
| Samsung | We share the view with many others that the common configuration should be cell-specific configuration (i.e. network does not have to modify cell-specific configuration based on UE's capability).Regarding Qualcomm's comment, we are not sure whether UE should perform comply check for the common configuration, like UE does not perform comply check when it receives SIB.  |
| LG | We share the view with MTK that the two principles should hold true in general. So at least we should be able to say that for common parameters configured to UE via dedicated signalling, the values should be identical to those in SIB, but not exactly in the reverse way because some common but not essential parameters may not be comprehended by UEs (and thus ignored).  |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Just to respond to Samsung’s comment. Our comment is about the section 5.3.5.8.2, which is clearly for compliance check on RRC Reconfiguration message, but not SIBs. |
| CATT | Agree with the general principles mentioned by MTK. On top of that we do not see any issue specific to DL scheduling slot offset…Maybe this can be discussed based on real issue on a case by case basis.  |
| OPPO | We also think common parameters in SIB and dedicated signalling hold on same meaning for UE. In case there is any interpretation issue we can discuss case by case.  |
| vivo | Firstly, we think we should follow the principle that common configuration in dedicated signalling and broadcast should be guaranteed. This principle should be applicable at least for some parameters related to UE initial access, e.g. search space or CORESET configuration. (Actually, we had some discussion on this point during Rel-15). With this principle, we assume there is not much common configurations which cannot match UE capability in dedicated signaling, as common configuration (especially essential for UEs) should be supported by all UEs in the cell, except some features which are not supported by UEs (these parts should not be included in the common configuration of dedicated signaling). If some essential common configuration which cannot match UE capability were identified, we think we could discuss it.  |

**Summary**: The summary for both issue 6 and 7 is found below issue 7.

**Issue 7**: If clarifications are needed, what should be the intended behaviour (e.g. network adapts all type 3 signalling to UE capabilities, or network does not have to adapt all type 3 signalling and the UE has to comprehend it regardless of UE capabilities, or something else)?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Pls see our comments above. |
| Ericsson (proponent) | We are open to both having the network adapt Type 3 signalling to UE capabilities and forcing UEs to comprehend all common IEs, regardless if included in dedicated messages or not. As we do not want to create lots of problems for existing implementations, we are eager to hear from other companies. |
| ZTE | Pls see our comments above. |
| MediaTek | See comment above. A general rule to resolve this seems risky. Case by case discussion is preferred. |
| Intel | Please see our comments above. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Pls see our comments above. |
| Nokia | Agree with MTK. Given this, we also need time to digest the conflicting cases each of them and would need time until May meeting. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | It is clear from the section 5.3.5.8.2 “Inability to comply with RRCReconfiguration” that the UE does not distinguish between dedicated configuration and common configuration. |
| Samsung | We tend to agree with MediaTek. |
| LG | Please see our comments for issue5.  |
| CATT | See our previous comments.  |
| OPPO | Please refer to our previous comment |
| vivo | Please see our previous comment. |

**Summary**: 13 companies replied. The Rapporteur notices two trends among the replies. The first one is on the support for Mediatek's two general principles:

1. Configuration in dedicated signalling should match UE capability
2. Common configuration in dedicated signalling and in broadcast information should be the same

The second trend is trend is to treat this issue on a case-by-case basis. Some companies also wanted more time to check. One company used clause 5.3.5.8.2 of 38.331 to argue that the UE does not distinguish between dedicated and common configuration in RRC Reconfiguration message.

The Rapporteur prefers principles over case-by-case basis. The problem with case-by-case basis is that we will need to discuss this many times, and if we forget, there is nothing to fall back on. Hence the preference for principles.

The Rapporteur understands there are two problems for the UE. The first problem is what happens if the same field is included in broadcast and dedicated signalling but having different values. The second principle implies the network ensures this is not the case. The second problem is what happens if a field is included in the common configuration of a dedicated message and the UE does not support the capability associated to that field. In this case the first principle leaves no room for the network but to omit that field.

The Rapporteur suggests to companies to agree to the principles:

**Proposal 6**: Configuration in dedicated signalling should match UE capability (i.e. for common configuration in dedicated messages, network omits fields not supported by the UE capabilities).

**Proposal 7**: Common configuration in dedicated signalling and in broadcast information should be the same (i.e. the network ensures a field in included in both dedicated signalling and in broadcast configuration has the same value).

# Summary and proposals phase 1

**Issue 1**: Do companies agree to add *SchedulingOffset-PDSCH-TypeA* and *dl-SchedulingOffset-PDSCH-TypeB* capability to the *UERadioPagingInformation* message?

**Summary**: 13 companies replied. All companies agreed that DL scheduling offset capabilities should be added to the *UERadioPagingInformation* message.

**Proposal 1**: *SchedulingOffset-PDSCH-TypeA* and *dl-SchedulingOffset-PDSCH-TypeB* capability are added to the UERadioPagingInformation message

**Issue 2**: Do companies agree with the draft CRs for Rel-15 and Rel-16 in [2,3]?

**Summary**: 12 companies replied. All companies found the draft CRs in [R2-2103770](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103770.zip) (Rel-15) and [R2-2103771](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103771.zip) (Rel-16) agreeable.

**Proposal 2**: Agree the CRs in [R2-2103770](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103770.zip) (Rel-15) and [R2-2103771](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103771.zip) (Rel-16).

**Issue 3**: Do companies agree to clarify this in the chairman notes?

**Summary**: 13 companies replied. 12 companies replied to agree/ok/acceptable with the proposed chairman note. One company was not ok with the proposed note, because it considered that this was already clear, but it could go with majority if needed.

**Proposal 3**: Clarify in the chairman notes:

A UE that does not support *dl-SchedulingOffset-PDSCH-TypeA* or *dl-SchedulingOffset-PDSCH-TypeB* capability does support *pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList* **configuration** in *PDSCH-ConfigCommon* in *SIB1* including K0 values larger than 0.

**Issue 4**: Do companies agree to clarify this in the chairman notes?

**Summary**: 13 companies replied. 12 companies replied to agree with the proposed chairman note. One company was not ok with the proposed note, because it considered that this was already clear, but it could go with majority if needed.

**Proposal 4**: Clarify in the chairman notes:

The network cannot **use** K0>0 for PDCCH/PDSCH scheduling without possible IOT issues when the network does not know if the UE has IOT-tested K0>0.

**Issue 5**: Do companies agree to clarify this in the chairman notes?

**Summary**: 13 companies replied. 11 companies replied to agree with the proposed chairman note. One company was not ok with the proposed note, because it considered that this was already clear. One company did not have a strong view, but indicated that it is a general principle that the NW configures the UE according to the UE capabilities (in dedicated configuration in dedicated signalling).

**Rapporteur:** There is a large majority agreeing to clarify this in the chairman notes. But on the other hand this clarification reconfirms well understood principles of dedicated configuration in dedicated signalling. It is not clear if there is a strong reason to capture this in the chairman notes.

**Proposal 5**: Leave it to RAN2 chairman decision to capture the note below in the chairman notes:

The network configures K0 in *PDSCH-Config* in dedicated signalling according to the UE capabilities .

**Issue 6**: Do you think clarifications are needed (why/why not)?

**Summary**: The summary for both issue 6 and 7 is found below issue 7.

**Issue 7**: If clarifications are needed, what should be the intended behaviour (e.g. network adapts all type 3 signalling to UE capabilities, or network does not have to adapt all type 3 signalling and the UE has to comprehend it regardless of UE capabilities, or something else)?

**Summary**: 13 companies replied. The Rapporteur notices two trends among the replies. The first one is on the support for Mediatek's two general principles:

1. Configuration in dedicated signalling should match UE capability
2. Common configuration in dedicated signalling and in broadcast information should be the same

The second trend is trend is to treat this issue on a case-by-case basis. Some companies also wanted more time to check. One company used clause 5.3.5.8.2 of 38.331 to argue that the UE does not distinguish between dedicated and common configuration in RRC Reconfiguration message.

The Rapporteur prefers principles over case-by-case basis. The problem with case-by-case basis is that we will need to discuss this many times, and if we forget, there is nothing to fall back on. Hence the preference for principles.

The Rapporteur understands there are two problems for the UE. The first problem is what happens if the same field is included in broadcast and dedicated signalling but having different values. The second principle implies the network ensures this is not the case. The second problem is what happens if a field is included in the common configuration of a dedicated message and the UE does not support the capability associated to that field. In this case the first principle leaves no room for the network but to omit that field.

The Rapporteur suggests to companies to agree to the principles:

**Proposal 6**: Configuration in dedicated signalling should match UE capability (i.e. for common configuration in dedicated messages, network omits fields not supported by the UE capabilities).

**Proposal 7**: Common configuration in dedicated signalling and in broadcast information should be consistent (i.e. the network ensures a field in included in both dedicated signalling and in broadcast configuration has the same value).

# Discussion phase 2

**Proposal 6**: Configuration in dedicated signalling should match UE capability (i.e. for common configuration in dedicated messages, network omits fields not supported by the UE capabilities).

**Proposal 7**: Common configuration in dedicated signalling and in broadcast information should be consistent (i.e. the network ensures a field in included in both dedicated signalling and in broadcast configuration has the same value).

**Issue 8**: Companies are invited to express and motivate their views (e.g. agree to proposals 6 and 7 or postpone them for one meeting) in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree to Proposal 7, which is already clear in specifications and people are aligned on this according to Phase I discussion.We disagree to Proposal 6. We still think we should focus on the specific issue if any, and this also seems to be majority view in phase I. It is not the time to agree on this kind of general guidance like P6 for network configuration for Rel-15. We should focus on real issues in the field. |
| CATT | We tend to agree with Huawei’s comment. P6 does not seem to result from the original issue. As said in Ph1 we’d prefer to discuss based on real issue on a case by case basis.  |
| Samsung | We agree to P7 but do not agree to P6, as Huawei and CATT commented, and we understand that that was the majority's understanding from the Phase 1 discussion. P6, especially the sentence after 'i.e.', creates more confusion and also contradicts with P7 (we understand that the intention in P7 from rapporteur seems 'If included based on P6', though). |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | We support both P6 and P7.I would like to request companies objecting to P7, how they interpret the section of 5.3.5.8.2 of 38.331. Where does it say that the UE does not check the compliance to the common configuration?Also allowing RRC configuration not supported by the UE complicates the delta signalling in connected mode. Let’s say the network configures SUL configuration in common configuration even though the UE does not support SUL operation in the current configuration, e.g. the band combination. Now PCell change occurs and SUL is indeed used in the target configuration. Is the understanding that the UE still uses the previous SUL common configuration in the source as the baseline for the delta configuration, even though the UE was supposed to “disregard” the SUL configuration at the source?To us, this behaviour of network configuring something and the UE disregarding the configuration creates a lot of uncertainties in the RRC protocol behavior. |
| Ericsson | We want clarification and therefore we are fine with the proposals. If some tweaking is needed that's fine too. It is important, but not urgent, for us to get this right. If companies are concerned and want examples, we are fine postponing this one meeting. |
| Apple | We think its better to postpone to digest better.  |
| MediaTek | We support both P6 and P7. It matches our understanding as commented in phase 1. |
| vivo | We support P7, which is aligned with our understanding and also the majority view in phase 1. Regarding P6, we would like to check companies’ view on the realistic cases. Besides, the second part of P6 will somehow contradict with P7. We are fine to address the problem if some essential common configuration which cannot match UE capability were identified. Before that, we could postpone the discussion on P6.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Summary and proposals phase 2

TBD

# Conclusions

TBD