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# 1 Introduction

This document contains a list of TDocs to be discussed in the offline discussion below. Companies are invited to give their views on each TDoc submitted.

* [AT109e][007][NR15] Potential easies III (Huawei, Lenovo, NTT Docomo)

Scope: Treat the documents R2-2000763, R2-2000764, R2-2001324, R2-2000682, R2-2000692.

Intended outcome: Agreed CRs

Deadline: Feb 27 1200 CET

# 2 List of TDocs

Companies are invited to give their views on each TDoc submitted below.

## R2-2000763

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Intention agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Wording agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Views** |
| MediaTek | Y | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Y |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Y | Y | Fine to introduce these already now (they are not absolutely necessary yet and could be introduced also later, but doing it now prevents errors) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## R2-2000764

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Intention agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Wording agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Views** |
| MediaTek | Y | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Y |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Y | Y | Same reasoning as with 0763. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## R2-2001324

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Intention agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Wording agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Views** |
| MediaTek | Y | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Y |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Partly yes | N | It seems correct that UE only submits the report if allowed, but the wording now completely removed the "duplicate the report" aspect (i.e. that it is the **same report** that is re-transmitted after HO). We think the exact changes. We are fine to say “in accordance with 5.7.4.3 and with the same contents as in the previous report“. This also covers the case when not all the contents are allowed, as UE must comply with the gNB requirements but is not allowed to change the other contents as well.  The cover page could also be improved:   * consequence if not approved is also not correct: It should indicate “UE may not submit the UEAssistanceInformation to lower layers and, if submitted after handover, the message may contain information that is not allowed by the gNB configuration“ * The inter-operability qanalysis is also strage: If NW implements but UE doesn’t, the UE may submit information that is against NW configuration. And if UE implements but NW doesn’t, there is no issue as UE will not send anything network wouldn’t allow by configuration. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## R2-2000682

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Intention agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Wording agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Views** |
| MediaTek | Y | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Y |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Y | Y | The other alternative would have been SSB ARFCN, but using center frequency is more consistent with what has been used with IDC otherwise. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## R2-2000692

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Intention agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Wording agreeable?**  **(Y or N)** | **Views** |
| MediaTek | Y | See commnet | Usually we don’t say NW is allowed to XXX. The suggeted further changes as below.  „E-UTRAN ~~is allowed to~~ sets *fr1-Gap* to TURE only when the UE is configured with (NG)EN-DC“ |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | Y |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Y | N | The field description wording has a typo (“TURE“) and seems a bit incorrect: Setting the field FALSE is equivalent to not using it. For wording, we prefer to use "E-UTRAN only sets this field to TRUE when UE is configured with (NG)EN-DC".  Hence, the consequences if not approved and the cover page should also be updated due to these. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# 3 Conclusion

In the previous sections we made the following observations:

**No table of figures entries found.**

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

**No table of figures entries found.**