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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][008][NR15] Cap Discussion (Ericsson, Mediatek, Huawei, NTT docomo, Qualcomm, Nokia)

Scope: Treat the documents [R2-2001322](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_109_e\Docs\R2-2001322.zip), [R2-2001224](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_109_e\Docs\R2-2001224.zip), [R2-2000425](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_109_e\Docs\R2-2000425.zip), R2-2000684, [R2-2001221](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_109_e\Docs\R2-2001221.zip), [R2-2000165](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_109_e\Docs\R2-2000165.zip), [R2-2002081](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_109_e\Docs\R2-2002081.zip), [R2-2000034](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_109_e\Docs\R2-2000034.zip), [R2-2001220](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_109_e\Docs\R2-2001220.zip), [R2-2000011](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_109_e\Docs\R2-2000011.zip).

Intended outcome: First Round comments, goal to determine which of the CRs that we should attempt to agree, find candidates to leave out (postpone).

Deadline: Feb 26 1200 CET

# 2 List of TDocs

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

## R2-2001322

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Nokia | Disagree. This seems tob pretty obvious that the procedure description was to be read with a given rat-type.  Isn't this enough tht it is stated already in the description "This procedure is invoked once per requested rat-Type". |
| Intel | Agree with Nokia, not needed. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## R2-2001224

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Nokia | Partially agree to the issue but not to the proposed solution, but we don't need a new list indicator but just probably indicate that the index refers to a different BC list since a UE cannot be in NE-DC and other variant of DC at the same time? So, partially OK with the proposal but we don't need separate signalling. |
| Intel | Same comments as Nokia |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## R2-2000425

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Nokia | Disagree. This is not correct as we think the BCs should not even be filled in. |
| Intel | We think there is scope for mis-alignment and are ok to see other company views, esp considering that this changes the procedural text of how UE prepares capability. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## R2-2000684

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Nokia | Disagree, it is clear to us that the common fields must be used. |
| Intel | We think the CR is ok. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## R2-2001221

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Intel | We think the CR is not needed, if the IE is absent, the UE does not support this feature. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## R2-2000165

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Nokia | Please note we are waiting for RAN1 feedback on the LS we sent tot hem. The contribution is tentatively submitted to current meeting with the values based on our understanding of what defaults might be reasonable. |
| Intel | We think we can wait until the RAN1 feedback to conclude this then. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## **R2-2002081**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Intel | Our view is to get more clarification from RAN4.  For us this LS has created quite a bit of ambiguity …!   It would have been easier if RAN4 just introduced contiguous intra-band operation on inter-band EN-DC combinations where there is frequency overlap between NR and LTE **(interpretation #1**). Then the introduction of the new feature would simply be covered using the below signaling and all the legacy UEs and gNBs would use the contiguous operation based on the new signaling. And without this signaling the non-contiguous means of operation is assumed.    ***InterBandENDC-ContiguousSupport* ENUMERATED { supported}   OPTIONAL**    But, it is not clear from the LS that RAN4 assumes the intra-band non-contiguous operation is already the working case for existing UEs and gNBs that support such inter-band EN-DC BCs.    “RAN4 has agreed that intra-band EN-DC requirements shall apply for inter-band EN-DC configurations where the frequency range of the E-UTRA band is a subset of the frequency range of the NR band”  Does this mean that based on this agreement, a new set of requirements are applied to these inter-band EN-DC config? And among these new set of requirements, the ones related to non-contiguous operation are mandatory and contigous are optional…? **(interpretaion #2)**  If yes, then the signaling from DCM would be useful, and for UEs which do not signal this IE, the new set of requirements do not apply.    Another ambiguity if we assume that the second interpretaion is correct is the deployment of carriers for the legacy UE (the UE does not report this IE). Can the gNB configure contiguous and non-contiguous way for the carriers as it wishes, but the new requirements introduced in the LS are not applicable?    We hope it’s the first interpretation! But think more clarity is needed, as the current TP from DCM brings the question of what is the difference in UE behaviour if the UE reported that it only supports non-contiguous operation using new signaling vs the UE which does not report this IE. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## R2-2000034

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## R2-2001220

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Intel | Ok with this. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## R2-2000011

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Intel | RAN1 LS |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 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.**