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# 1 Introduction

This document contains a list of proposals from R2-2001227 to be discussed in the offline discussion below. Companies are invited to give their views on each proposal.

* [AT109e][103][RACS] Optional signalling of UE capabilities at handover (Ericsson)

Intended outcome: Decision on proposals in [R2-2001227](file:///C:\\Data\\3GPP\\Extracts\\R2-2001227.docx" \o "C:Data3GPPExtractsR2-2001227.docx) and possible drafting of LS to SA2.

Deadline: Friday 2020-02-28 12:00 CET

# 2 List of proposals from R2-2001227

Companies are invited to give their views on each of the proposals below.

1. It is agreed that, for RACS, it should be optional to include the UE capabilities in the HO preparation transparent container.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | In TS 38.331:  UE-CapabilityRAT-ContainerList ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (0..maxRAT-CapabilityContainers)) OF UE-CapabilityRAT-Container  When there is no UE capability to be transfered, 0 UE-CapabilityRAT-Container would be included in HO preparation. Therefore, in current specification, the UE capabilities in the HO preparation transparent container is optional already. |
| Huawei | In some cases (e.g. source gNB and traget gNB can recognize the UE capability ID), the UE capabilities are not necessrary and introduce signalling overhead. Agree to make it “optional“. |
| NTT DOCOMO | By introducing the solution of UE capability ID, it is not so often that NW discovers unknow UE model. Nevertheless, the scenario explained in the paper is a valid scenario when brand new or old UE, etc. appear in the NW. In that case, I agree on the proposal of falling back to the legacy mechanism. |
| ZTE | Agree with the intention of the proposal.  When UE capability ID is available, it can be sent instead of the capabilities. As mentioned by CATT, having UE-CapabilityRAT-ContainerList with size = 0 can be one way to make the capabilities “absent” in the container. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

1. An LS is sent to SA2, informing them that RAN 2 agreed that it should be optional to send the UE capabilities for an UE with capability ID.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We have no strong view. It is acceptable to send an LS to SA2 to make the clarification. It is also ok to inform SA2 delegates about the RAN2 agreements internally. |
| Huawei | Support. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree to send an LS |
| ZTE | Agree to send an LS to SA2 to clarify that it is still allowed for NW to send the UE capabilities along with the UE capability ID if source NG RAN and target NG RAN support RACS in some cases (e.g. when brand new or old UE, etc. appear in the NW). |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 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:
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