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# 1 Introduction

This document is to handle the following email discussion:

* [AT113bis-e][034][1024QAM] (Ericsson)

 Scope: Take into account relevant tdocs. Progress RAN2 configuration CR (not UE cap). Can consider whether to send LS.

 Intended outcome: Agreed in principle CR. If applicable, approved LS out.

 Deadline: Deadline for Comments Mon April 19. Allow for checking until EOM.

Regarding the deadlines, I would like to set the following deadline for providing comment:

- Deadline on **Monday April 19 1200 UTC** to agree the CRs (where applicable) and final check.

# 2 Contact information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company (Name) | Email |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Discussion

According to the LS received in [R2-2102619](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102619.zip) it is quite clear that what RAN1 is asking us is to introduce basically three new RRC parameters:

- A new mcs-Table-r17 field in PDSCH-Config IE

- A new mcs-TableDCI-1-2-r17 field in PDSCH-Config IE

- A new cqi-Table-r17 in CSI-ReportConfig IE

However, from the current RRC specification, the field cqi-Table within CSI-ReportConfig IE has a spare value that can be used and there is not really needed to introduce a new field.

Further, even if RAN1 is asking RAN2 to call the codepoint for the cqi-Table-r17 as “1024qam”, it would be good to align the terminology with respect to that one that we have since Rel-15 and thus have “table4” as name of the codepoint instead.

This of course mean that RAN1 should be informed about this small changes since their specification(s) may need to be updated. On top of this, it would be also good to inform RAN4 that RAN2 work may be done (except for capabilities), if we are able to endorse the RRC CR in this meeting.

Given this, and taking the CR in [R2-2103665](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103665.zip) as baseline for discussions, we would like to ask the following two questions to companies:

**Question 1**: Do company agree with the changes proposed in CRs [R2-2103665](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103665.zip) for introducing DL 1024QAM in NR?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Agree (y/n) | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 2**: Do company agree to send an LS to RAN1 and RAN2 to inform RAN1 about the changes made by RAN2 to the RRC parameters requested by RAN1 and to inform RAN1/RAN4 about the RAN2 progresses (please check [R2-2103666](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103666.zip) as reference when providing comments)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company  | Agree (y/n) | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion

Based on the discussion in the previous sections we propose the following:
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