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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the following email discussion:

**[AT113-e][113][RACS] Corrections (Nokia)**

Scope: Discuss a revision of CRs in [R2-2101029](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2101029%20TS%2036.300%20Clarification%20on%20manufacturer%20based%20UE%20capability%20ID.docx), [R2-2101030](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2101030%20TS%2038.300%20Clarification%20on%20manufacturer%20based%20UE%20capability%20ID.docx) and [R2-2101031](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2101031%20CR%20TS%2038.331%20Clarification%20on%20manufacturer%20based%20UE%20capability%20ID.docx)

Intended outcome: rapporteur's summary in R2-2102032 and corresponding CRs (if agreeable)

Deadline (for companies' feedback): Tuesday 2021-02-02 17:00 UTC

Deadline (for summary and CRs): Tuesday 2021-02-02 23:00 UTC

CRs (if any) listed as "can be agreed as is" in R2-2102032 and not challenged until Wednesday 2021-02-03 11:00 UTC will be declared as agreed by the session chair. For the other ones, the discussion will continue online.

Status: Ongoing

# 2 **Discussion**

**Topic 1: Manufacturer based UE capability ID**

[R2-2100586](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_113-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2100586.zip) Clarification on inter node signalling upon SN initiated SCG release Samsung Telecommunications CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2340 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2101030](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2101030%20TS%2038.300%20Clarification%20on%20manufacturer%20based%20UE%20capability%20ID.docx) Clarification on manufacturer based UE capability ID Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell CR Rel-16 38.300 16.4.0 0336 - F RACS-RAN-Core

**Question 1**: How do companies understand the term “pre-provisioned” capability in the context of the Manufacturer assigned ID discussed in the Stage 2 CRs for TS 38.300 and TS 36.300? Also do the companies see the need for any clarification.

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 1 |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments (e.g. changes required to be acceptable, why the CR is or is not needed) |
| Nokia | Yes | [Proponent] It would be good to get common understanding of the system level behavior if the network is required to fetch the capabilities associated with the manufacturer assigned ID from the UE via. RRC or is this “pre-provisioned” i.e. already stored in the network.Depending on the outcome of the understanding, we can think if a CR is required or not. No strong views on that but this is a potential IODT issue. |
| Vodafone |  | If the UE has provided a Manufacturer provided UE Capability ID, then - if they are not already cached in that RAN node - the RAN should fetch the capabilities from the Core Network. However, if the RAN requests the UE capabilities from the UE, then the UE should supply them. Clarifying TS 36.300 and 38.300 is OK. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated |  | No strong view on the need of stage-2 CRs. Given Vodafone’s explanation though, we need to modify the proposed change so that it does not give the impression that Uu UE capability transfer is never used when Manufacturer provided UE Capability ID is in use. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 1**: TBD.

**Proposal 1**: TBD.

**Topic 2: UE Capability ID in MR-DC**

[R2-2101031](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2101031%20CR%20TS%2038.331%20Clarification%20on%20manufacturer%20based%20UE%20capability%20ID.docx) Clarification on UE capability ID in MR-DC scenarios Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell CR Rel-16 38.331 16.3.1 2380 - F RACS-RAN-Core

The UE Capability ID may be exchanged from MN to SN allowing a reduction in X2/Xn message size. However, the UE Capability ID may point to a UE Radio Access Capability that contains information on multiple RATs. Some of the additional information may not be interpreted by the SN. Additionally, for NR-DC, the additional capablities are irrelevant and if included should not cause any additional confusion.

For MR-DC scenarios apart from NR-DC, it may be misunderstood that the SN is allowed additional freedom due to the UE Capability ID to interpret MN capabilities which might break a Rel-15 principle. For NR-DC, the additional capablities are irrelevant and if included should not cause any additional confusion.

**Question 2**: Do companies agree that the SN is not required to receive the MN part of the UE’s standalone capability container as part of the UE Capability ID as discussed in [R2-2101031](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2101031%20CR%20TS%2038.331%20Clarification%20on%20manufacturer%20based%20UE%20capability%20ID.docx)?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 2 |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments (e.g. changes required to be acceptable, why the CR is or is not needed) |
| Nokia | Yes | [Proponent] The intention of the proposal is to ensure that we do not allow some additional interpretation that by passing the UE Capability ID to the SN which contains the MN part of the UE’s capabilities that the SN can use them.As Intel mentioned during the discussion we are fully open on the aspect on how we clarify this, no strong opinion on the chosen wording but we would like to have a common understanding as this is a potential IODT issue. |
| Vodafone  |  | Each UE Capability ID has to map to the same UE capabilities across the whole PLMN. The SN may act as a MN for other UEs. Hence the SN shall NOT discard the multi-RAT information related to the UE Capability ID, but should cache it for use by other UEs.Whether or not a SN is allowed to use information on the UE’s capabilities for other RATs ought to already be clearly documented in RAN specs -> what do they say?The existing text in 38.331 is misleading about RACS – but the CR in 1031 does not seem to clarify things. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated |  | We agree with the expected behaviour outlined in the CR.The proposed change is confusing because it was applied to the table describing inclusion of RAT containers in *ue-CapabilityInfo*, but not about how the UE capabilities indicated by UE Capability ID is treated in the receiving node.All in all we think the behaviour of the receiving node can be left to implementation. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 2**: TBD.

**Proposal 2**: TBD.

# 4 Conclusion

Always echo the list of observations and proposals.

# Annex A – Contact Points

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Nokia | Amaanat | amaanat.ali@nokia.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |