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# 1 Introduction

This document is to kick-off the following email discussion:

 **[AT109e][006][NR15] Potential easies II (Nokia, LG, Ericsson, ZTE)**

      Scope: Treat the documents R2-2000858, R2-2000859, R2-2000353, R2-2000879, R2-2000880, R2-2001612

      Intended outcome: Agreed CRs

      Deadline: Feb 27 1200 CET

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 R2-2000858, SSB-ToMeasure related clarification

|  |
| --- |
| R2-2000858 |
| COMPANY | COMMENT |
|  ZTE | We agree with the observations in this contribution. And we think this should already be aligned with UE’s current implementation.  |
|  CATT |  We also agree with the observations.  |
|  NTT DOCOMO | Agree on observations/proposals.  |
| Ericsson | Agree on observations/proposals |
|  |  |
|  Intel | Agree. |
| QCOM | Agree on observations and proposals |
| Huawei | Agree with the observations. |
| MediaTek | On observation 3, this is also our understanding. We are not so sure what the intention of proposal 1 is. But maybe that’s fine. We could just discuss on the proposed CR, which is more related to proposal 2. |
| Samsung | We think observation 1 is not always true and don’t agree to P1 (seems vague) |

 Rapporteur input: We suggest to note the document and to focus on the CR.

## 2.2 R2-2000859, SSB-ToMeasure related clarification (38.331)

|  |
| --- |
| R2-2000859 |
| COMPANY | COMMENT |
|  ZTE | We understand this was discussed/clarified last meeting, in our opinion, as long as all companies have the same understanding, it would be ok with current specification. But we are also ok if companies want to make is more clear in spec, and we suggest the following rewording:The IE SSB-ToMeasure is used to configure a pattern of SSBs. SSB-ToMeasure is based on the absolute SSB-Indexes, not the position ~~with~~within SMTC window. |
|  CATT |  We are ok to make this clear in the spec, and we slightly prefer ZTE’s suggested wording. |
|  NTT DOCOMO |  O.K with the change proposed by ZTE. |
| Ericsson | In the last meeting we had the following agreement:* RAN2 confirms that the SSB-ToMeasure is based on the absolute SSBIndexes.

According to this, we brough a CR that was not agreed. Therefore, we believe current specification seems ok (i.e., no changed needed). |
| Intel | We are OK to clarify as proposed. |
| MediaTek | We see no strong need to have this change and the current specification seems clear. However, we are also OK if majorities want to have this additional clarification. In that case, the proposed change from ZTE seems better. |
| QCOM | Ok to clarify the description .. prefer ZTE wording |
|  Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |  We prefer to make this clear in specifications to ensure no issues occur. We are also fine with the ZTE modification. |
| Huawei | We think the current spec is clear enough. No need to emphasize “absolute” SSB indexes because there is no other SSB index. |
| Samsung | Last time we agreed it was sufficient to capture something in the minutes and we don’t see need to add re-open/ change that conclusion |
|  |  |

 Rapporteur input: Majority of companies thinks that a clarification is needed. Therefore, would be good to submit a revision of R2-2000859 taking into account ZTE’s comment.

## 2.3 R2-2000353, Clarification on the PLMN-IdentityInfoList

|  |
| --- |
| R2-2000353 |
| COMPANY | COMMENT |
|  Samsung |  Agree with the intention of the CR that there should not be duplicated PLMN entry. The ASN.1 for PLMN is as follows:plmn-IdentityList                   PLMN-IdentityInfoList,PLMN-IdentityInfoList ::=               SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxPLMN)) OF PLMN-IdentityInfoPLMN-IdentityInfo ::=                   SEQUENCE {    plmn-IdentityList                       SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxPLMN)) OF PLMN-Identity,The ASN.1 provides the flexibility to include PLMN identities in the lower plmn-IdentityList:1. Only one entry in the  PLMN-IdentityInfo. ZTE CR clarifies that such entry should not be duplicated.
2. More than one PLMN identities in the  PLMN-IdentityInfo, when the TAC, CI and cellreservedforoperatoruse fields are coordinated to be the same for the PLMNs.

In our understanding regardless of how the PLMN is signalled, it should be only one entry.  On the wording in the CR we prefer “A given PLMN identity is listed only once in PLMN-IdentityInfo” |
|  Ericsson | We agree with the intention of the CR, and comments provided by Samsung above. We would like to propose a following wording: “A PLMN-identity can be included only once, and in only one entry of the *PLMN-IdentityInfoList*”  to more indicated more clearly that a PLMN identity can only be included once (in this list of lists). |
|  CATT |  We agree with the intention of the CR. And for the wording, we think Ericsson’s suggestion is clearer. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree on the intention and text proposed by Ericsson. |
| Intel | While we agree with the intention of the CR, we didn’t think there was a risk of wrong configuration in real networks (suspect this topics came about in the context of NPN). We are OK to clarify as suggested by Ericsson if other companies feel it is essential. |
| QCOM | Support Ericsson wording |
| MedaiTek | We agree the intention of the CR and we are fine with the wording provided by Ericsson. |
| Huawei | We have similar understanding with Intel. The intention is ok but network implementation will avoid the duplication. |
|  Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |  We agree with the intention that PLMN entry can only be included once. We support the Ericsson proposal on this. |

 Rapporteur input: Majority of companies thinks that a clarification is needed. Therefore, would be good to submit a revision of R2-2000353 taking into account Ericsson’s comment.

## 2.4 R2-2000879, Correction on p-maxNR-FR1 for NE-DC

|  |
| --- |
| R2-2000879 |
| COMPANY | COMMENT |
|  ZTE |  We are in general OK with this CR. Similar to the field description of p-maxEUTRA, we perfer to add the same sentence, so it is clear the field can be reused in NE-DC.

|  |
| --- |
| ***p-maxEUTRA***Indicates the maximum total transmit power to be used by the UE in the E-UTRA cell group (see TS 36.104 [33]). This field is used in (NG)EN-DC and NE-DC. |
| ***p-maxNR-FR1***Indicates the maximum total transmit power to be used by the UE in the NR cell group across all serving cells in frequency range 1 (FR1) (see TS 38.104 [12]). The field is used in (NG)EN-DC and NE-DC. |

 |
|  CATT |  We agree with the intention of the CR. And we think ZTE’s suggested wording is clearer. |
|  NTT DOCOMO |  Agree on the intention and text proposed by ZTE. |
|  Intel | We agree with the correction. |
| Huawei | For EN-DC, there are three fields in *CG-ConfigInfo* related to power coordination: *p-maxNR-FR1*, *p-maxEUTRA*, and *p-maxUE-FR1*.In our understanding, the power coordination procedure of NE-DC and NR-DC has not been discussed, so it’s better to first agree on the procedure and what parameters need to be used. In NE-DC or NR-DC, do we still have the requirement of transferring the maximum power of MCG? |
|  Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |  We agree with the intention of the CR and are fine with the ZTE proposal.  |
| Samsung | We agree and also fine with wording proposed by ZTE. |

Rapporteur input: Majority of companies agree on the CR. Therefore, would be good to submit a revision of R2-2000879 taking into account ZTE’s comment.

## 2.5 R2-2000880, Correction on SFTD frequency list in INM

|  |
| --- |
| R2-2000880 |
| COMPANY | COMMENT |
|  ZTE |  We are OK with this CR. |
|  CATT |  We are OK with this CR. |
|  NTT DOCOMO |  Agree on the CR to be in-line with measResultCellSFTD(-EUTRA). |
|  Intel |  Agree with the intention. But it may not be backward compatibility and should be checked. |
| Huawei | OK with the change, and we think it can go to the rapporteur’s CR. |
|  Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  |  We agree with the CR.  |
| Samsung | We are fine with the CR |

Rapporteur input: Majority of companies agree with the CR.

## 2.6 R2-2001612, Correction on handover preparation message

|  |
| --- |
| R2-2001612 |
| COMPANY | COMMENT |
|  ZTE | We agree with the intention of the CR. But in our opinion, LTE RETRIEVE UE CONTEXT is supported in RAN3 since Rel-13. So it is not a release 15 issue.We perfer to capture it in the Rapporteur’s CR. |
|  CATT |  For re-establishment case, context retrieval is already supported from Rel-13. So we don’t think this CR is essential for Rel-15.  |
|  NTT DOCOMO |  Same view as mentioned above. |
| Ericsson | Agree with ZTE proposal. |
| Intel | Agree with the intent and ZTE suggestion to include in rapporteur CR. |
| LG | We think this CR is essential for function addition in the Rel-15 spec.Regarding ZTE’s and CATT’s commentsWe think this CR is related to Rel-15 (NOT Rel-13). According to R3-183567 (2018 May, approved Rel-15.2) CR, the retrieve UE context procedure is decided to support during re-establishment procedure (e.g. due to RLF). So, I wonder why those companies are thinking this CR is related to Rel-13 Moreover, this correction is to address a missing function in the spec and has to be aligned with RAN3 spec. For this kind of change, we do not suggest to merge it Rapporteur’s CR.  |
|  Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  | We think the CR is text alignment to RAN3 message "RETRIEVE UE CONTEXT RESPONSE", we agree with ZTE’s proposal to capture it in the Rapporteur's CR. |
| Huawei | The changes are ok for us. |
| Samsung | We are fine and agree this is minor and appropriate to include in Rapporteur's CR |

Rapporteur input: Majority of companies agree with the intention of the CR but its content go in the Rapporteur´s CR.

3 ConclusionThe following CRs are clarified as EASY TO AGREED:

1. R2-2000859, SSB-ToMeasure related clarification (38.331)
2. R2-2000353, Clarification on the PLMN-IdentityInfoList
3. R2-2000879, Correction on p-maxNR-FR1 for NE-DC
4. R2-2000880, Correction on SFTD frequency list in INM
5. R2-2001612, Correction on handover preparation message