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# 1 Introduction

This is the report from the offline discussion below:

**\* [AT118-e][102][RedCap] RRC CR (Ericsson)**

Initial scope: continue the discussion on the RedCap WI-specific RILs, also considering the submitted contributions

Initial intended outcome: Summary of the offline discussion with e.g.:

·         List of resolved RILs

·         List of RILs for online discussion

·         List of RILs for further offline discussion

Deadline (for companies' feedback): Wednesday 2022-05-11 2000 UTC

Deadline (for rapporteur's summary in R2-2206192): Wednesday 2022-05-11 2200 UTC

Companies should consider the following Tdocs and the discussions therein in mind when providing feedback to the offline discussion:

[R2-2206021](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206021.zip) Miscellaneous corrections for RedCap WI Ericsson CR Rel-17 38.331

[R2-2206022](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206022.zip) RedCap WI ASN1 RIL list Ericsson discussion Rel-17

[R2-2204725](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2204725.zip) [O374] correction on RedCap UE’s cell barring OPPO draftCR 38.331

[R2-2204736](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2204736.zip) [O372] Discussion on prohibit timer for UAI for RRM relaxation fulfilment indication OPPO

[R2-2204737](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2204737.zip) [O377] Correction to 38.331 on UAI for RRM relaxation fulfilment indication OPPO draftCR 38.331

[R2-2204813](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2204813.zip) [V166] Including RedCap Capability in the UERadioPagingInformation Inter-Node Message vivo, Guangdong Genius discussion

[R2-2204814](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2204814.zip) [V170] Discussion on Inter-RAT Mobility from LTE to NR for RedCap vivo, Guangdong Genius discussion

[R2-2204929](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2204929.zip) RRC open issues on Rel17 RedCap WI Intel Corporation

[R2-2206059](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206059.zip) [X115]38.331 Corrections on UE's behaviour of getting SIB1 for Redcap Xiaomi Communications draftCR 38.331

[R2-2206060](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206060.zip) [X119][X114] Discussion on PDCCH-ConfigCommon for Redcap Xiaomi Communications

[R2-2206061](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206061.zip) [X119][X114] 38.331 Corrections on PDCCH-ConfigCommon for Redcap Xiaomi Communications draftCR 38.331

[R2-2206062](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206062.zip) [X120] 38.331 Corrections on Need code of RedCap-specific initial DL BWP for handover Xiaomi Communications draftCR 38.331

[R2-2204541](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2204541.zip) [S953] SI Request for RedCap UEs Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd

[R2-2204936](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2204936.zip) I051 support of RedCap based on intraFreqReselectionRedCap Intel Corporation

[R2-2204979](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2204979.zip) Cell reselection priority for RedCap (RIL#: S952) Samsung

[R2-2205523](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205523.zip) SIB validity with eDRX MediaTek Inc.

[R2-2205783](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205783.zip) Miscellaneous RedCap corrections Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell CR 38.331

[R2-2205785](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205785.zip) HD-FDD RedCap support in system information Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell

[R2-2206080](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206080.zip) [H507] Corrections on cell re-selection measurements during RRC setup/resume Huawei, HiSilicon CR 38.331

[R2-2206081](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206081.zip) [H511] Corrections on redcapAccessRejected Huawei, HiSilicon CR 38.331

[R2-2206082](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206082.zip) [H513 H516 H520 H524 H525 H526 H527] Corrections on RedCap initial BWP Huawei, HiSilicon CR 38.331

[R2-2204819](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2204819.zip) UE Capability and System Information for eDRX vivo, Guangdong Genius

In this document, we continue the discussion based on the agreements above and the list of Tdocs provided above with the intention to formulate a list of proposals that are agreeable and a list of proposals that require further discussion during the related online session.

# Contact Information

Please fill in the following table for contact information:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact person - [email@address.com](mailto:email@address.com) |
| Ericsson | Emre A. Yavuz – emre.yavuz@ericsson.com |
| Intel | Yi.guo@intel.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 2 Discussion on RILs and open issues

## 2.1 RILs marked with “PropAgree”

**Q 2.1** The following is a list of RILs which are marked as “PropAgree” in the latest version of the Excel document that contains RILs, i.e., R2-2206022:

H506, V163, H509, V168, V169, H514, H704, Z033, H515, M608, H517, V161, Z034, H522

The rapporteur has implemented those RILs in the 38.331 CR provided in R2-2206021, which is to be updated once RILs marked with “PropModifyAgree”, “PropDiscMeeting” or “PropReject” are concluded. The rapporteur proposes the following:

**Proposal The following RILs are agreed: H506, V163, H509, V168, V169, H514, H704, Z033, H515, M608, H517, V161, Z034, H522 (as captured in R2.2206021).**

Do you agree with the proposal above? Please elaborate your reply, especially if you do not, and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Yes | V168/V169 are related to the discussion on whether FD-FDD is mandatory or not. But it is ok for us for the changes.  We did not find H704, is it typo?  H509: We don’t agree to H509. We don’t see a benefit to move from field description to condition. In general, conditions should be used if the conditions is related to something in the same message and not something that was configured previously (though this may not be strictly followed). |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.1**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

## 2.2 RILs marked with “PropModifyAgree”

**Q 2.2** The following is a list of RILs which are marked as “PropModifyAgree” in the latest version of the Excel document that contains RILs, i.e., R2-2206022:

H520, H705

The rapporteur has implemented those RILs in the 38.331 CR provided in R2-2206021 with a modification on the text proposed by the source company. The rapporteur proposes the following:

**Proposal The following RILs are agreed: H520, H705 (as captured in R2.2206021).**

Do you agree with the proposal above? Please elaborate your reply, especially if you do not, and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Comments | H520, is related to the discussion in Atmeeting 105,  **Proposal 9: Clarify in the RRC field description that the paging search space is configured in an initial BWP only if that BWP includes the CD-SSB.**  Would be good to wait a bit. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.2**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

## 2.3 RILs marked with “PropReject”

**Q 2.3** The following is a list of RILs which are marked as “PropReject” in the latest version of the Excel document that contains RILs, i.e., R2-2206022:

X115, X110, X111, X112, V165, H525, H526

The rapporteur has indicated that there is no need to implement those RILs as argued in R2-2206022. The rapporteur proposes the following:

**Proposal The following RILs are not pursued: X115, X110, X111, X112, V165, H525, H526.**

Do you agree with the proposal above? Please elaborate your reply, especially if you do not, and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.3**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

## 2.4 RILs marked with “PropDiscMeeting”

The discussion in this section is on a selection of RILs from the following list which are marked as “PropDiscMeeting”:

I051, O374, V162, X116, H507, V170, H508, N016, H510, FW001, S952, H511, C271, H512, Z035, Z036, N107, X119, V164, H513, H516, H518, X114, H523, S953, H524

**Q 2.4.1** This question is regarding RILs I051 and N016, which are related.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Yes | As proponent. It would be good to follow legacy way, i.e. the UE only needs to check cell barring information, it can also save 1 bit in system information. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.1**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.2** This question is regarding RIL O374.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Yes | Ok to us. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.2**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.3** This question is regarding RIL V162.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.3**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.4** This question is regarding RIL X116.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | No | Do not see the problem to keep the sentence. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.4**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.5** This question is regarding RIL H507.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Maybe | No strong opinion on whether the Note should be added. It would be good to capture something in RAN4 spec. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.5**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.6** This question is regarding RIL H510.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Maybe | No strong opinion on whether “dB2” should be added as minimum value for stationary evluation. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.6**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.7** This question is regarding RIL FW001.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided, e.g., R2-2204353.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | No | Do not see the problem since TS38.304 is clear. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.7**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.8** This question is regarding RILs S952, H511, and C271.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | No | S952 cell reselection priority Cell level resele3ction priority for RedCap (1 rx, HDD)  It has been excluded in last meeting. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.8**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.9** This question is regarding RIL H512.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Comments | It is related to At meeting discussion 105, should wait. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.9**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.10** This question is regarding RIL H512.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel |  | Duplicated with Q 2.4.9 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.10**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.11** This question is regarding RIL Z035.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Yes | Looks good to us. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.11**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.12** This question is regarding RILs Z036, N107, and H523.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Comments | H523, Need R should be correct since the field is put under extension and we need the way to delete it.  Z036, we agreed in last meeting delta signalling is not used. So do not understand why the need code should be changed to Need M?   1. For RedCap-specific BWP, both common and dedicated configurations are provided using full configuration, i.e., delta configuration is not supported.   N107, seems correct. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.12**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.13** This question is regarding RIL X119-1.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Comments | May discuss based on Vivo R2-2204817 on the UE behavior if the RedCap-specific initial BWP is not configured. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.13**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.14** This question is regarding RIL V164.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | No | Do not see the need to add every RAN1 details in RRC specification. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.14**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.15** This question is regarding RILs H513 and H516.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | No | Editorial change, do not see the problem. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.15**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.16** This question is regarding RIL H518.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | No | Do not see the problem, since we already mentioned “the UE uses this BWP also for receiving DL messages during initial access (Msg2, Msg4, ...) and after initial access .” |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.16**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.17** This question is regarding RIL X119-2.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | No | We think from signalling pov, all signalling in PDCCH-CommonConfig should be in RedCap specific initial BWP. Then whether further UE needs to get it from the RedCap specific initial BWP or from the legacy initial BWP is for signalling optimisation. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.17**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.4.18** This question is regarding RIL X114.

Do you agree with the issue(s) indicated? Please elaborate your reply, regardless of whether you do or not and provide a resolution/text proposal that addresses your concerns, if you agree with the intention considering the feedback from companies, if provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | No | Do not see the strong need on the suggested sentence. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.4.18**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

## 2.5 RRC related issues discussed separately

In this section, we discuss the open RRC related issues brought up in the contributions below:

[R2-2204929](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2204929.zip) RRC open issues on Rel17 RedCap WI Intel Corporation

[R2-2204819](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2204819.zip) UE Capability and System Information for eDRX vivo, Guangdong Genius

[R2-2205523](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205523.zip) SIB validity with eDRX MediaTek Inc.

**Q 2.5.1** In R2-2204929, it is proposed that supported number of Rx for RedCap UEs is provided in *UERadioPagingInformation*.

Do you agree with the proposal? Please elaborate your reply, especially if you do not.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.5.1**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.5.2** In R2-2204819 it is proposed that there should be two indications in SIB1, one that indicates whether IDLE eDRX is enabled in the serving cell, and one that indicates whether INACTIVE eDRX is enabled in the serving cell.

Do you agree with the proposal? Please elaborate your reply, especially if you do not.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Comments | It depends on the discussion in 110 on whether we have separate capability for IDLE and INACTIVE UE or not. It would be good to wait a bit. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.5.2**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

**Q 2.5.3** In R2-2205523 it is proposed that, by default, UEs configured with eDRX should consider stored system information to be invalid after 24 hours from the moment it was successfully confirmed as valid, which is currently specified as 3 hours, and suggested to introduce an optional parameter, i.e., *si-ValidityTime*, in case an operator prefers to configure it with 3 hours.

Do you agree with the proposal? Please elaborate your reply, especially if you do not.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Maybe | The intention seems reasonable however it seems more logical if this kind of config is defined as UE-specific (i.e. provided in *RRCRelease*) as the storage requirement may be very different for a UE config with eDRX of 2.56sec vs very long values, In addition, the procedural text needs to check whether *eDRX-Allowed* is set by the network. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary – Q 2.5.3**

???

Based on the observations above, the rapporteur proposes the following:

1. ???

# 3 Conclusion

Based on the discussion above rapporteur suggests a discussion on the following proposals:

[Proposal 1 ???](#_Toc103003480)

[Proposal 2 ???](#_Toc103003481)

[Proposal 3 ???](#_Toc103003482)

[Proposal 4 ???](#_Toc103003483)

[Proposal 5 ???](#_Toc103003484)

[Proposal 6 ???](#_Toc103003485)

[Proposal 7 ???](#_Toc103003486)

[Proposal 8 ???](#_Toc103003487)

[Proposal 9 ???](#_Toc103003488)

[Proposal 10 ???](#_Toc103003489)

[Proposal 11 ???](#_Toc103003490)

[Proposal 12 ???](#_Toc103003491)

[Proposal 13 ???](#_Toc103003492)

[Proposal 14 ???](#_Toc103003493)

[Proposal 15 ???](#_Toc103003494)

[Proposal 16 ???](#_Toc103003495)

[Proposal 17 ???](#_Toc103003496)

[Proposal 18 ???](#_Toc103003497)

[Proposal 19 ???](#_Toc103003498)

[Proposal 20 ???](#_Toc103003499)

[Proposal 21 ???](#_Toc103003500)

[Proposal 22 ???](#_Toc103003501)

[Proposal 23 ???](#_Toc103003502)

[Proposal 24 ???](#_Toc103003503)
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