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# 1 Introduction

This document is to collect companies comment in the following email discussion:

* **[AT112-e][009][NR15] RRC Misc (Ericsson)**

Treat R2-2009840, R2-2009842, R2-2009843, R2-2009074 - R2-2009077, R2-2009477

 Intended outcome: Intermediate: Determine agreeable parts. Final: For agreeable parts, agreed CRs.

 Deadline: Intermediate deadline(s) by Rapporteur, Final: Discussion stop at Wed Nov 11, 1200 UTC

Please provide your comments by this **Thursday 5 Nov 1200 UTC** to give us time to converge in a 2nd phase later on.

Also, following the Guidelines of the chairman: “*For specific corrections when needed it may be valid to discuss whether to make such correction instead only for Rel-16. When/if applicable, email discussions shall determine Release applicablity for such corrections.*”

Please provide your email address in section Contact information.

# 2 Discussion

Companies are requested to add their comments for each of the treated CRs of this email discussion in the boxes below (one for each CR to be treated).

### 2.1 Miscellaneous non-controversial corrections Set VIII (Rel-15)

[R2-2009840](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009840.zip) Miscellaneous non-controversial corrections Set VIII Ericsson CR Rel-15 38.331 15.11.0 2133 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
| QC | Yes |  Need to remove a duplicate "previous" in the change. |
| MediaTek | In general ok | In 5.3.10.3, remove duplicate “previous” in “previous previous UEAssistanceInformation”In field description of *supplementaryUplink*, it seems overlap with R2-2009698. We should discuss this in R2-2009698. |
| vivo | Yes | Agree with QC’s comment.  |
| Samsung | Yes | 1/ Same view to fix duplicated word in 5.3.10.3. 2/ No strong view but the change on the field description of *supplementaryUplink* seems just an editorial issue so we are fine to fix it here. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Generally OK. We agree the clarification on SUL field description, and it seems overlapping with offline 006. Anyway our view is to have this clarification and the change in R2-2009698 can be merged into the rapportuer’s CR. |
|  |  |  |

### 2.2 Correction to release of list elements using toReleaseList

[R2-2009842](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009842.zip) Correction to release of list elements using toReleaseList Ericsson CR Rel-15 38.331 15.11.0 2135 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2009843](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009843.zip) Correction to release of list elements using toReleaseList Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 2136 - A NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
| QC | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | No | Parent field is not necessarily a list (element), i.e. release of the parent field does not necessarily occur by elementsToReleaseList. It can just be a normal field with Need R, SetupRelease type of field, etc.The intention of the spec is to say that whenever parent field is released (no matter the type of the parent field), child fields are released (no matter the type of the child fields). So we think original wording if fine. If the intention of the CR is to clarify the “as normal fields” part, the following is our suggested wording“Note that the release of parent field also releases all of the child fields, ~~regardless of whether they have been added via AddModList or as normal fields.~~  including the child fields that are configured by ToAddModList.” |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes with comments | The intention is OK to us but why do we have yellow part (and why does it not say *elementsToAddModList)*? We think the yellow part could be removed. "Note that the release of list element(s) using the *elementsToReleaseList* releases the values of all the fields of the list element(s), including lists configured by ToAddModList." |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We think the original sentence has the meaning that when a parent field is released, the corresponding child fields should also be released. With the change the original meaning seems not obvious anymore. So we prefer the original wording and did not see the change is essential. If companies have problems with the yellow part highlighted by Samsung, we are OK to remove it and this change can be merged into the rapportuer’s CR as there is no functional change. |
|  |  |  |

### 2.3 Correction on UAI during handover (38.331)

[R2-2009075](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009075.zip) Correction on UAI during handover vivo, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Intel Corporation CR Rel-15 38.331 15.11.0 2030 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

Moved from 6.1.1

[R2-2009074](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009074.zip) Correction on UAI during handover vivo, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Intel Corporation CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 2029 - F NR\_newRAT-Core, 5G\_V2X\_NRSL-Core

Moved from 6.1.1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
| QC | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | No | We don’t think this is useful clarification and it is not essential at all. There is no need to interpret current wording as that this UAI is transmitted by the low layer. It could just saying from RRC perspective that it is transmitted to low layer.We prefer not to have this CR. |
| vivo | Yes | It is essential at least for Rel-16 with DAPS handover. For DAPS handover, the UE suspends the source SRB during the DAPS handover. Then, the UAI could get stuck in the L2-buffer (e.g. PDCP) when the SRB is suspended due to the reception of the DAPS handover CMD.According to the current RRC specification, the UAI which is stuck in the source SRB cannot be retransmitted to the target cell, as there is no transmission for this UAI during the last 1 second before the reception of *reconfigurationWithSync*.For Rel-15, there is also similar issue for non-DAPS handover: network may also configure “*discardOnPDCP*” when handover. Then, the UAI-1 in source SRB could be discard due to the reception of the handover CMD. Thus, we would like to keep the same text as Rel-16. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

### 2.4 Correction on UAI during handover (36.331)

[R2-2009077](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009077.zip) Correction on UAI during handover vivo, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Intel Corporation CR Rel-15 36.331 15.11.0 4455 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

Moved from 6.1.1

[R2-2009076](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009076.zip) Correction on UAI during handover vivo, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Intel Corporation CR Rel-16 36.331 16.2.1 4454 - F LTE\_eV2X-Core, NR\_newRAT-Core

Moved from 6.1.1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
| QC  | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | No | Similar comment as previous one.Also please note that this kind of wording has been used in earlier release for feature like MBMS, IDC, etc. There is no problem in previous SPEC, we are not sure why this is needed. |
| vivo | Yes | As we mentioned above, it is essential at least for Rel-16 with DAPS handover. For Rel-15 with non-DAPS handover, there is similar issue. Actually, there is also problem for earlies release of LTE specification. But we think products have already implemented these features. Thus, we could accept not to change them. But we are open to it if companies think it should be discussed. At least, we should have the correct behavior for 5G products.  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

### 2.5 Clarification on optional feature without UE AS capability

[R2-2009477](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009477.zip) Clarification on optional feature without UE AS capability Apple CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 2081 - F NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16

Moved from 6.16

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
| QC | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | No strong view. We are fine to clarify that the two function is optional without capability signaling. If agreed, we think the clarification should started from Rel-15. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Fine with some comments | It seems reasonable but on the other hand it’s somewhat strange that NW configures deprioritisationReq without knowing UE support. We are not sure whether need for capability was discussed or overlooked. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We are OK with the change, and as this seems editorial, we think it could be merged into the rapportuer’s CR. |
|  |  |  |

# 4. Conclusion

In the previous sections we made the following observations:

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