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# Introduction

This document is to gather input for below email discussion.

* [AT119bis-e][419][POS] PRS capability information (Ericsson)

Scope: Check and update the CR in R2-2210310.

Intended outcome: Agreeable CR

Deadline: Friday 2022-10-14 1000 UTC

[1] R2-2210310 Correcting PRS capability information reported to gNB Ericsson

# Contact Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| Intel | Yi.guo@intel.com |
| CATT | lijianxiang@catt.cn |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Discussion

Based upon online discussion, the revised CR has been provided [here](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_119bis-e/Inbox/Drafts/%5BOffline-419%5D%5BPOS%5D%20PRS%20capability%20information%20(Ericsson)/draft_CR/draft_R2-2210310_capabilityCR.docx)

Question 1: Do companies agree with the changes

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Lenovo | Yes but | To be aligned with the description in TS 38.133 V17.7.0 (2022-09), clause 9.9.1.2 (see below) it may be better to say „containing PRS“ instead of „for PRS measurements“.  „Indicates whether the UE supports using the maximum Rx timing difference threshold to compare against with the Rx timing difference between the serving cell and a neighbor cell/TRP for PRS measurements to determine whether the PRS from the non-serving cell satisfy the condition of PRS measurement outside MG.“  TS 38.133 V17.7.0 (2022-09), clause 9.9.1.2:  max∣ΔT∣≤ THR, where  ∆T is the time difference between the start of a slot containing PRS from the neighbor cell/TRP and the start of the closest slot from the serving cell;  the range of ∆T is determined by the expected RSTD and expected RSTD uncertainty in the assistance data;  THR is the threshold as reported in UE capability [TBD]. |
| Intel | No strong opinion | Should not RAN4 specification is clear enough? |
| CATT | Yes | It seems that the wording proposed by Lenovo is clearer. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion

Based on the discussion in section 2 we propose the following:
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