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# Introduction

The scope of this email discussion includes the following agenda items:

|  |
| --- |
| 5.1.7 RRM core requirements maintenance (38.133/36.133) [NR\_newRAT-Core] |

In providing comments, companies are encouraged to:

* Ensure that the comments are inserted in the latest version of the document by checking the folder before uploading
* Use “Track changes” to help identify added comments/changes
* Pay attention to the rule for shortening file name

# Topic #1: Rel-15 NR RRM core requirements

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2111967**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2111967.zip) | CATT | CR  Add Ceil function to resolve the unclear behavior. |
| [**R4-2112084**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2112084.zip) | Apple | **Proposal 1: existing RRM requirements for PSCell change can cover the case wherein the target cell is just a neighbour cell before PSCell change.**  **Proposal 2: clarify that interruption on PCell and other serving cells are allowed. Requirements for interruption due to PSCell addition/release defined in TS38.133 clause 8.2 can be reused.** |
| [**R4-2112085**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2112085.zip) | Apple | CR for R4-2112084 |
| [**R4-2112111**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2112111.zip) | Apple | CR  Add the minimum requirement at transitions for BFD. |
| [**R4-2112953**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2112953.zip) | LG Electronics UK | CR  Remove sentence since the same sentence is repeated. |
| **R4-2112955** | LG Electronics UK | N/A |
| [**R4-2113537**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113537.zip) | vivo | CR  Use NSCC\_SSB for defining CSSF outside gap, NSCC\_SSB is the the number of configured SCell(s) measured outside gaps with only SSB based L3 measurement configured. |
| **R4-2113538** | vivo | N/A |
| **R4-2113539** | vivo | N/A |
| [**R4-2113632**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113632.zip) | Ericsson | CR  Delete the related capability wordings and add the wording for effective MGRP related to inter-frequency measurement without gap. |
| [**R4-2113633**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2113633.zip) | Ericsson | CR  Add the wording for effective MGRP related to inter-frequency measurement without gap. |
| [**R4-2114092**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114092.zip) | Huawei, Hisilicon | CR for 36133  Clarify that If such measObjectNRs configured by MN and SN have different SMTC, Trs is the periodicity of one of the SMTC which is up to UE implementation. |
| [**R4-2114095**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114095.zip) | Huawei, Hisilicon | CR for 38133  Clarify that If such measObjectNRs configured by MN and SN have different SMTC, Trs is the periodicity of one of the SMTC which is up to UE implementation. |
| [**R4-2114155**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114155.zip) | MediaTek inc. | CR  To clarify in Clauses 9.2.5.1, 9.2.5.2, 9.2.6.2 and 9.2.6.3 the applicable DRX cycle in NR SA, EN-DC, NE-DC, and NR-DC |
| [**R4-2114252**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114252.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR for 38133  1. Clarify that Kp calculation is based on smtc1 no matter if dual SMTC is configured or not.  2. Add to the FR1 known condition that the report has to be with SSB index.  3. Update the definition of “reference point” in clause 7.1.2 based on arrival time. |
| [**R4-2114255**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114255.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR for 36133  When UE is configured with inter-RAT NR measurement, the requirements defined for LTE inter-frequency RSTD measurement for EN-DC would apply. |
| [**R4-2114447**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_100-e/Docs/R4-2114447.zip) | Ericsson, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Intel | CR  The definition of the reference point for the UE initial transmit timing control requirement is clarified. |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 1-1: Measurement requirements

#### Issue 1-1-1: CSSF for SCell measurements outside gaps

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (vivo)
    - Reason for change
      * Based on agreements in RAN4 #98e-bis, the interpretation of current R15/R16 spec is that NSCC\_SSB includes the number of configured SCell(s) measured both outside gaps and within gaps. In other word, the SCells measured within gap are counted twice, i.e. counted in CSSFoutside\_gap,i and CSSFwithin\_gap,i
    - Summary of Changes
      * Update the CSSF outside gap, replacing “Number of configured SCell(s)” to NSCC\_SSB, which is the number of configured SCell(s) measured outside gaps with only SSB based L3 measurement configured.
    - Related changes are as shown in R4-2113537 (vivo)
* Recommended WF
  + Further discuss if option 1 agreeable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We understood the motivation. However, we prefer not to change R15 spec unless critical issue. This can be considered as some relaxation, as mentioned by some company during previous RAN4 meeting discussion. On the other hand, RAN4 requirements are just minimum requirements, which don’t preclude UE from measuring faster (with shorter measurement period) |
| Ericsson | We share the same view as Apple. We would like to avoid non-critical changes to Rel-15. |
| QC | Issue discussed in thread 217, suggest not to repeat the discussion. |
| vivo | We prefer to revise the R15 spec if there is no strong concern. If there is no revision in R15 spec, companies may still need to discuss whether to enhance/revise this in future release, which may need potential new UE feature, or may even be under certain scenarios. This is not preferred in our view. According to R15 spec, we see quite many companies interpret this scaling factor as the number of cells to be measured without gaps (which seems the correct understanding technically), and there could be actually no backward compatibility issue.  To Apple, if it is relaxation then there could be no technical justification for such relaxation. It is more like some mistakes that we need to correct during maintenance phase.  We are also fine to follow conclusion from email thread 217. For now, it seems companies are fine that NSCC\_SSB clarification/correction should cover non-HST as well as HST, i.e., unified NSCC\_SSB design for both HST and non-HST. |
| Huawei | We do not support option 1.  The issue has been discussed for HST in previous meeting, and RAN4 has reached common understanding about the current non-HST requirements as captured WF R4-2105793. We prefer to stick to this common understanding and avoid changes to Rel-15. |
| OPPO | Agree with the observation from vivo. We are ok with such an update. |
| Nokia | Share same view that this is not an essential correction. One could assume that a good UE implementation would account this and perform better. |

#### Issue 1-1-2: Calculation of Kp factor in case of dual SMTC

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (HW)
    - Reason for change
      * Current requirements assume smtc2 is used when dual SMTC is configured. This means when smtc1=40ms, smtc2=20ms and MGRP=80ms, Kp=1.33 based on smtc2, but for smtc1 the MG punctures half of the SMTC windows, so Kp should be calculated based on smtc 1 and thus equals to 2
    - Summary of Changes
      * Clarify that Kp calculation is based on smtc1 no matter if dual SMTC is configured or not
    - Related changes are as shown in Change#1 in R4-2114252 (HW)
* Recommended WF
  + Further discuss if option 1 is agreeable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Fine with Option 1. |
| Apple | We think the Kp calculation for target cell identification/measurement is based on the smtc which is used by target cell. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with Option 1. However, we have some comments on the wording in the CR.  We would like the following added sentence "For calculation of Kp, the SMTC period corresponds to the value of higher layer parameter smtc1 no matter if high layer in TS 38.331 [2] signalling of smtc2 is configured or not." to be modified into: "For calculation of Kp, the SMTC period corresponds to the value of higher layer parameter smtc1 no matter whether smtc2 is configured or not.” |
| vivo | In the time period requirements table for PSS/SSS detection, the SMTC period is the one used by the cell being identified.  If different SMTC periodicities are configured for different cells, the SMTC period in the requirement is the one used by the cell being identified  We think Kp should follow the same rule. Otherwise, the time period requirements for PSS/SSS detection may need further discussion. |
| Huawei | We are fine with Apple and vivo’s comment, and a new TP is provided as follows which is based on the existing wording in Note 1 of Table 9.2.5.1-1. We look forward to further comments from companies on the new TP.  For calculation of Kp, if different SMTC periodicities are configured for different cells, the SMTC period corresponds to the one used by the cell being identified/measured. |
| OPPO | Fine with the revised text proposal above from HW. SMTC should be selected based on the cell being identified/ measured |
| Nokia | Option 1 is agreeable.  For the actual TP in the CR we would suggest a rewording:  *For calculation of Kp, the SMTC period corresponds to the value of higher layer parameter smtc1 no matter if high layer in TS 38.331 [2] signalling of smtc2 is configured or not*  to:  where, the SMTC period correspond to the higher layer parameter *smtc1.* |

#### Issue 1-1-3: Condition for MG-less inter-frequency measurement

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Ericsson)
    - Reason for change
      * The spec. specifies the capability for inter-frequency without gaps, but no such capability was introduced in Rel-15 for inter-frequency measurements.
      * The effective MGRP scenario isn’t covered for UE measurement capability:
    - Summary of Changes
      * For Rel-15: delete the capability wordings related to inter-frequency without gaps, and add the wording for effective MGRP scenario.
      * Rel-16: add the wording for effective MGRP scenario
    - Related changes are as shown in R4-2113632 (Rel-15) and R4-2113633 (Rel-16) (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF
  + Further discuss if option 1 is agreeable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Fine with Option 1. |
| Apple | We have comment on R15 revision of effective MGRP: in R15 NR-DC, only FR1+FR2 NR-DC is assumed, and therefore the effective MGRP cannot be used in this NR-DC since the serving cells are always in both FR1 and FR2. |
| Ericsson | Could Apple further clarify why effective MGRP cannot be applied in R15 NR-DC? We think the effective MGRP can be applied when MN configures FR2 MOs during the transition period for FR2 PSCell addition in SN. In current specification, it is clearly indicated that effective MGRP will be applied in NR-DC.   |  | | --- | | For per-FR measurement gap capable UE in NR standalone operation (with single carrier, NR CA and NR-DC configuration), for per-FR gap based measurement, when there is no serving cell in a particular FR, where measurement objects are configured, regardless if explicit per-FR measurement gap is configured in this FR, the effective MGRP in this FR is used to determine requirements;  - 20 ms for FR2 NR measurements  - 40 ms for FR1 NR measurements  - 40 ms for LTE measurements  - 40 ms for FR1+LTE measurements | |
| QC | Whether effective MGRP is applicable to NR-DC depends on whether serving cells are always in “both” FR1 and FR2. Our understanding is it’s not necessary true since in PSCell change, the source and target cells can be in different FRs, which implies that NR-DC can have CGs in the same FR. |
| Apple2 | To Ericsson, the effective MGRP only applies when UE support per-FR MG and UE doesn’t have serving cell in the specific FR where MO is configured. However, in R15 NR-DC, the PCell and PSCell is in FR1 and FR2 respectively, so it’s not a valid case to apply effective MGRP. The excerpt Ericsson used may also need to be revised for R15.  To QC, regarding this PSCell change for R15 NR-DC, if PCell is in FR1, how can PSCell change from FR2 to FR1 for R15? Since R15 UE only supports FR1 PCell+FR2 PSCell NR-DC. |
| Huawei | We are fine with option 1.  On NR-DC, we have same understanding as Apple that in Rel-15 we only have BC for FR1+FR2 NR-DC, so we do not need the change to the NR-DC section 9.1.3.1c in the CR otherwise it is a bit confusing. The general requirements in 9.1.2 do not need to be changed because it is clearly mentioned that effective MGRP is used “when there is no serving cell in a particular FR”. |
| OPPO | Agree with only NR-DC for FR1+FR2 in R15. The revision should base on the assumption that effective MGRP is used “when there is no serving cell in a particular FR”. |
| Nokia | This would need more offline discussion as it is not clear what the intention with the CR is.  in 9.1.2 we have what is also copied above:  ‘For per-FR measurement gap capable UE in NR standalone operation … when there is no serving cell in a particular FR, where measurement objects are configured, regardless if explicit per-FR measurement gap is configured in this FR, the effective MGRP in this FR is used to determine requirements’  And this together with the original ext (now removed) in our understanding cover what this change aims at. |

#### Issue 1-1-4: Applicable DRX cycle in EN-DC, NR SA, NE-DC, and NR-DC

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (MTK)
    - Reason for change
      * It was agreed in R4-1816115 that SCG DRX cycle shall apply for the infra-frequency measurement requirement when SCG DRX is in use. In that time only EN-DC mode was considered and NR was always SCG. However, in NR SA, NE-DC, and NR-DC, NR could also be MCG, and thus when MCG DRX is in use, it is unclear which DRX cycle shall apply for infra-frequency measurement requirement.
    - Summary of Changes
      * If MCG DRX is in use, requirements for intra-frequency in MCG shall depend on the MCG DRX cycle.
      * If SCG DRX is in use, requirements for intra-frequency in SCG shall depend on the SCG DRX cycle.
      * Otherwise, the requirements for when DRX is not in use shall apply
    - Related changes are as shown in R4-2114155 (MTK)
* Recommended WF
  + Further discuss if option 1 is agreeable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Fine with Option 1. |
| Apple | Fine with option 1. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with Option 1. |
| vivo | Fine with option 1. |
| Huawei | Fine with option 1. |
| OPPO | Fine with option 1. |
| Nokia | The principles of Option 1 are correct and agreeable. However, it applies not only to intra-frequency measurements, but any measurements configured by the MCG/SCG (e.g. inter-frequency as well).  We are as such fine with clarifying this but instead of having to update all places in the specification we are wondering if this can be done in high level? E.g.:  ‘The DRX to be applied for the DRX related requirements in this specification, is the DRX cycle in use in the MCG (PCell) or SCG (PSCell) of the cell’ |

#### Issue 1-1-5: Collision between inter-frequency RSTD and inter-RAT NR measurement in LTE SA

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (HW)
    - Reason for change
      * When PRS for LTE RSTD measurement and SMTC window for NR measurement collide, the two measurements compete MG as defined in the CSSF within gap. On the requirement side, when UE is configured with EN-DC, both the LTE-NR inter-RAT measurement (section 8.17.4) and the LTE inter-frequency RSTD measurement (section 8.17.15) are defined based on CSSF, which is correct. However, when UE is in LTE SA, the LTE inter-frequency RSTD measurement (section 8.1.2.6) are not scaled with CSSF, so the time sharing with inter-RAT NR measurement is not accounted.
    - Summary of Changes
      * Clarify in section 8.1.2.6 of 36133 for LTE SA that when UE is configured with inter-RAT NR measurement, the requirements defined for LTE inter-frequency RSTD measurement for EN-DC (section 8.17.15 of 36133, scaled with CSSF) would apply.
    - Related changes are as shown in R4-2114255 (HW)
* Recommended WF
  + Further discuss if option 1 is agreeable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Fine with Option 1. |
| Apple | Fine with option 1. |
| Ericsson | We disagree with Option 1.  RSTD inter-freq measurement is always done in gaps as PRS has long periodicity. UE can be configured with inter-RAT NR when RSTD inter-freq measurement is configured. Section 8.17.15 is RSTD inter-freq measurement when EN-DC is configured. It is NOT inter-RAT NR. |
| Huawei | To Ericsson,  We agree that RSTD inter-freq measurement is always done in gaps, and we also agree that UE can be configured with inter-RAT NR when RSTD inter-freq measurement is configured. The only problem is that when both inter-RAT NR and inter-freq RSTD measurements are configured, UE needs to share the gap between the two measurements, and this is same when UE is LTE SA and in EN-DC.  Currently the gap sharing between the two measurements is already accounted in CSSF definition, and the inter-freq RSTD requirements for EN-DC in clause 8.17.15 is also scaled with CSSF, so we suggest that the inter-freq RSTD for LTE SA would apply the same requirements as inter-freq RSTD requirements for EN-DC. We are not proposing to change the requirement for inter-RAT NR measurement in LTE SA. |
| Nokia | The change is not clear regarding:  ‘All inter-frequency RSTD measurement requirements specified in Sections 8.7.15.1-8.7.15.4 shall apply’  Latest version of 36.133 Rel-15 does not have such sections? |

### Sub-topic 1-2: Signaling characteristic related requirements

#### Issue 1-2-1: Clarification to the PSCell change requirements

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Apple)
    - Reason for change
      * existing RRM requirements for PSCell change can cover the case wherein the target cell is just a neighbour cell before PSCell change.
      * clarify that interruption on PCell and other serving cells are allowed. Requirements for interruption due to PSCell addition/release defined in TS38.133 clause 8.2 can be reused.
    - Summary of Changes
      * Update the applicability such that existing RRM requirements for PSCell change can cover the case wherein the target cell is just a neighbour cell before PSCell change.
      * Clarify interruption requirements.
    - Related changes is as shown in R4-2112085 (Apple)
* Recommended WF
  + Further discuss if option 1 is agreeable

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Fine with Option 1. |
| Apple | We support these two changes. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with Option 1. |
| Huawei | We are fine with Option 1. |
| OPPO | Fine with Option 1 |
| Nokia | Option 1 is agreeable |

#### Issue 1-2-2: Minimum requirement at transitions for BFD

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Apple)
    - Reason for change
      * minimum requirement at transitions for BFD is missing
    - Summary of Changes
      * Add the minimum requirement at transitions for BFD, similar as minimum requirement at transitions for RLM
    - Related changes is as shown in R4-2112111 (Apple)
* Recommended WF
  + Further discuss is option 1 is agreeable

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Fine with Option 1. |
| Apple | Support option 1. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with Option 1. |
| Huawei | We are fine with Option 1. |
| OPPO | Fine with Option 1 |
| ZTE | OK with the CR. |
| Nokia | Option 1 is agreeable. |

#### Issue 1-2-3: SMTC configuration determination in DC

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (HW)
    - Reason for change
      * Capture the following agreement from RAN4#99-e

|  |
| --- |
| * When SMTC configuration is not provided within the corresponding command (e.g. Handover, RRC release with redirection, SCell activation and PSCell addition/change), and MN and SN configure measObjectNR having same SSB frequency and subcarrier spacing but with different SMTC configurations,   + It is up to UE implementation which SMTC configuration to use   + UE requirements will be based on the SMTC configuration used by the UE |

* + - Summary of Changes
      * Clarify that If such measObjectNRs configured by MN and SN have different SMTC, Trs is the periodicity of one of the SMTC which is up to UE implementation.
    - Related changes is as shown in R4-2114092 (36133) and R4-2114095 (38188) (HW)
* Recommended WF
  + Further discuss is option 1 is agreeable

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Fine with Option 1. |
| Apple | In general, we support option 1. However, we would like clarify that we don’t have such problem in PSCell addition. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with Option 1. |
| Huawei | We agree with Apple's comments that the issue may not exist in PSCell addition. But currently PSCell change requirements are directly referred to PSCell addition. One solution is to remove the change in PSCell addition and add the clarification in PSCell change only. |
| OPPO | Fine with Option 1 for PSCell change only |
| Nokia | This change is not essential.  This is a nice clarification, but we do not see this as being really essential. In general, if we do not have any requirements related to this it is not specified and it is up to UE implementation.  Hence, if we do not have this CR the outcome is the same. There is no UE requirements and UE behavior is left for UE implementation. In fact, this CR is not introducing any new requirements but only clarifies. |

#### Issue 1-2-4: Known condition for FR1 SCell activation

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (HW)
    - Reason for change
      * FR1 SCell activation, for known case it was considered that NW would know the Tx beam to use because there is L3 report. However, unlike FR2 known condition, in the FR1 known condition, the report of SSB index is not required. In this case, even the FR1 SCell is known, NW may still have no idea which Tx beam to use for scheduling the UE in the SCell.
    - Summary of Changes
      * Add to the FR1 known condition that the report has to be with SSB index
    - Related changes is as shown in Change#2 in R4-2114252 (HW)
* Recommended WF
  + Further discuss is option 1 is agreeable

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Fine with Option 1. |
| Apple | We have some comments:   * For FR1 SCell activation, if network is not using Tx beamforming or single TCI is configured, the SSB reporting without SSB index can still be used as known condition * When network have multiple TCI configuration to UE, then it could be understood as associated SSB is used to determine the TCI, and therefore SSB reporting with SSB index can be used as known condition. |
| Ericsson | We disagree with Option 1 in its current form. The reason is that beam index reporting is only needed when multiple beam indexes are used in the cell. This proposal is de facto making beam index reporting mandatory.  Hence the condition needs to be updated to indicate that SSB index is needed only in cases where multiple SSBs are transmitted in the cell. |
| Huawei | We are fine with the comments from Apple and Ericsson, and based on the comments, we suggest a new TP as follows  For SCell in FR1, if ‘ssb-PositionInBurst’ indicates only one SSB is being actually transmitted or a single TCI state is configured in tci-StateToAddModList, it is known if it has been meeting the following conditions:  [existing condition on valid report, can be with or without SSB index]  For SCell in FR1, if ‘ssb-PositionInBurst’ indicates multiple SSBs are being actually transmitted and multiple TCI states are configured in tci-StateToAddModList, it is known if it has been meeting the following conditions:  [updated condition on valid report, with SSB index]  We look forward to further comments from companies on the new TP. |
| ZTE | Similar concern as Ericsson that this change might mean mandating a feature that was not discussed before. |
| Nokia | We do not agree to option 1.  Agree with Ericsson and then in addition this is for FR1 and we have not assumed Index reporting in FR1. The principle followed in FR1 is same as for LTE (and assuming omnidirectional reception on UE side) |

### Sub-topic 1-3: Others

#### Issue 1-3-1: Update definition of ’reference point’ in UL timing requirements

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (HW, Ericsson, Nokia, Intel)
    - Update the definition of ’reference point’ as follows
    - Related changes is as shown in R4-2114447 (Ericsson, Nokia, Intel) and Change#3 in R4-2114252 (HW)

|  |
| --- |
| The UE shall meet the Te requirement for an initial transmission provided that at least one SSB is available at the UE during the last 160 ms. The reference point for the UE initial transmit timing control requirement shall be the downlink timing of the reference cell minus . The downlink timing is defined as the time when the first path (in time) of the corresponding downlink frame from the reference cell arrives at the UE antenna. *N*TA for PRACH is defined as 0. |

* Recommended WF
  + Same as in RAN4#99-e, moderator suggests to treat the issue in Rel-17 URLLC WI, under email #239, so no technical discussion is expected in this email thread.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Moderator | No technical discussion is expected here. |
|  |  |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

### CRs/TPs comments collection

***No need to repeat the comments if you have already provided comments to the related open issue in section 1.2. Comments on the exact wording can be provided here, if any.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2112953 (LGE) | Moderator: this CR is not for open issues listed in section 1.2, so please provide your comments to the CR directly here, if any. |
| Apple: fine with CR |
| Ericsson: OK |
| Huawei: OK |
| Nokia: OK |
| R4-2111967 (CATT) | Moderator: this CR is not for open issues listed in section 1.2, so please provide your comments to the CR directly here, if any. |
| Apple: fine with CR |
| Ericsson: OK |
| Huawei: OK |
| Nokia: OK |
| R4-2112085 (Apple) | Moderator: Related to 1-2-1 |
| Ericsson: OK |
| Nokia: OK |
| R4-2112111 (Apple) | Moderator: Related to 1-2-2 |
| Ericsson: OK |
| Nokia: OK |
| R4-2113537 (vivo) | Moderator: Related to 1-1-1 |
| Apple: depends on outcome of 1-1-1 |
| Ericsson: Would like to avoid non-critical changes to Rel-15, hence do not support this CR. See our comment to 1-1-1. |
| vivo: In email thread 217, Ericsson commented that ‘But we have not strong view on which release should take clarification/correction’. We think E/// would be fine if the change is from Rel-15. In general, we can follow conclusion of email thread 217. |
| Nokia: We do not see this change essential for R15 |
| R4-2113632 (Ericsson) | Moderator: Related to 1-1-3, Rel-15 |
| Nokia: More discussion needed. In our view the intention of this change is not clear and would already be covered by the text removed. |
|  |
| R4-2113633 (Ericsson) | Moderator: Related to 1-1-3, Rel-16 |
| Nokia: More discussion needed. In our view the intention of this change is not clear and would already be covered by the text removed. |
|  |
| R4-2114092 (HW, 36) | Moderator: Related to 1-2-3 |
| Apple: in general, we support the CR. One comment regarding change 2: is this clarification needed in PSCell addition? |
| Ericsson: OK |
| Huawei: To Apple, we have provided some reply for Issue 1-2-3, and we are open to further discussions. |
| Nokia: This change is not essential.  If we do not have this CR the outcome is the same. There is no UE requirements and UE behavior is left for UE implementation. |
| R4-2114095 (HW, 38) | Moderator: Related to 1-2-3 |
| Apple: in general, we support the CR. One comment regarding change 4: is this clarification needed in PSCell addition? In our view the issue may exist in PSCell change but not PSCell addition. |
| Ericsson: OK |
| Huawei: To Apple, we have provided some reply for Issue 1-2-3, and we are open to further discussions. |
| Nokia: This change is not essential.  If we do not have this CR the outcome is the same. There is no UE requirements and UE behavior is left for UE implementation. |
| R4-2114155 (MTK) | Moderator: Related to 1-1-4 |
| Ericsson: OK |
| vivo: In general okay. Minor change as follows.  If MCG DRX is in use, cell identification requirements for intra-frequency measurement in MCG  , cell identification requirements for intra-frequency measurement in SCG |
| Nokia: The principles of Option 1 are correct and agreeable. However, it applies not only to intra-frequency measurements, but any measurements configured by the MCG/SCG (e.g. inter-frequency as well).  We should cover all needed changes in one CR. We suggest that maybe RAN4 can capture the proposal as a generic principle (which it is) e.g. in section 3. |
| R4-2114255 (HW, 36) | Moderator: Related to 1-1-5 |
| typo on  All inter-frequency RSTD measurement requirements specified in Sections 8.7.15.1-8.7.15.4 shall apply, provided that  - the UE is capable of inter-frequency RSTD measurements for OTDOA [24], and  It should to be 8.17.15.1- 8.17.15.4 |
| Ericsson: The CR is not agreeable to us.  RSTD inter-freq measurement is always done in gaps as PRS has long periodicity. UE can be configured with inter-RAT NR when RSTD inter-freq measurement is configured. Section 8.17.15 is RSTD inter-freq measurement when EN-DC is configured. It is NOT inter-RAT NR. |
| Huawei:  To MTK, thanks for pointing out, we will correct the typo in the updated version  To Ericsson, we provided some feedback to Issue 1-1-5, and we are open to further discussions. |
| Nokia: Same Typo comment as MTK above |
| R4-2114252 (HW, 38) | Moderator: Related to 1-1-2, 1-2-4  Moderator: No discussion on change #3 expected, this change is handled in email #239 |
|  |
|  |
| R4-2111313 (Ericsson, Nokia, Intel) | Moderator: No discussion expected, this CR is handled in email #239 |
|  |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 |  |  |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| WF on … | YYY |  |
| LS on … | ZZZ | To: RAN\_X; Cc: RAN\_Y |
|  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics incl. existing and new tdocs.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. For new LS documents, please include information on To/Cc WGs in the comments column
4. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-210xxxx | WF on … | YYY | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
| R4-210xxxx | LS on … | ZZZ | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

Annex

Contact information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email address** |
| MediaTek Inc. | Hsuanli Lin | Hsuanli.Lin@mediatek.com |
| Apple (Jie Cui, Qiming Li) | Jie Cui, Qiming Li | [Jie\_cui@apple.com](mailto:Jie_cui@apple.com); li\_qiming@apple.com |
| Ericsson | Joakim Axmon | joakim.axmon[at]ericsson.com |
| OPPO | Roy Hu | hurongyi@oppo.com |
| Nokia | Lars Dalsgaard | lars.dalsgaard@nokia.com |

Note:

1. Please add your contact information in above table once you make comments on this email thread.
2. If multiple delegates from the same company make comments on single email thread, please add you name as suffix after company name when make comments i.e. Company A (XX, XX)