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# 1 Scope of the offline email discussion

This document contains the summary of the offline email discussion “**[AT109e][204][LTE16] Agreeable CRs for LTE High-speed performance enhancement (NTT DOCOMO)**”, as indicated below:

* [AT109e][204][LTE16] Agreeable CRs for LTE High-speed performance enhancement (NTT DOCOMO)

Scope:

* + - Agree to CRs in [R2-2002048](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109_e/Docs/R2-2002048.zip), [R2-2002050](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109_e/Docs/R2-2002050.zip).

Intended outcome:

* + - Agreeable CRs
    - Summary of discussions (by email rapporteur).

Deadline for providing comments and for rapporteur inputs:

* + - Companies input: Thursday, Feb. 27th 17:00 CET
    - Rapporteur summary: Friday, Feb. 28th 17:00 CET (one day for rapporteur to make conclusions)
    - Updated CRs from each CR proponent: Monday Mar. 2nd 17:00 CET
    - Comments on CR wording, Tuesday, March 3rd by 17:00 CET

# 2 Offline email discussion

## 2.1 [R2-2002048](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109_e/Docs/R2-2002048.zip) Introduction of RRC parameters and UE capabilities for enhanced high speed scenario

Companies are requested to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree to the intent of the CR?** | **Detailed comments** |
| Qualcomm | **Agree with Intent, see comments** | I understand this was agreed in principle in R2-1913059.  However, I am wondering why we need OPTIONAL in highSpeedEnhMeasFlagSCell-r16  as this is a single element that is being configured by an OPTIONAL field highSpeedConfigSCell-v16xy. Both are Need OR. So, unless I am missing some previous discussion (please let me know in that case), I think the following should be sufficient.  <skip>  [[  highSpeedConfigSCell-v16xy HighSpeedConfigSCell-v16xy OPTIONAL -- Need OR  ]]  <skip>  HighSpeedConfigSCell-v16xy ::= SEQUENCE {  highSpeedEnhMeasFlagSCell-r16 ENUMERATED {true} ~~OPTIONAL -- Need OR~~  } |
| Ericsson | **Agree with intention** | While I understand and appreciate the proposal from Qualcomm as it saves one bit I think there is a possibility for error if we were to add an additional field to the IE *HighSpeedConfigSCell-v16xy* and forget to add back OPTIONAL. So normally I'd suggest we can do this type of improvements at ASN.1 review, but in this case (given that the CRs have been stable for very long) I'm fine with Qualcomm's proposal. |
| docomo | **Agree with intention** | While highSpeedConfigSCell-r14 is the same way as shown blow  highSpeedConfigSCell-r14 HighSpeedConfigSCell-r14 OPTIONAL, -- Need OR  HighSpeedConfigSCell-r14 ::= SEQUENCE {  highSpeedEnhancedDemodulationFlag-r14 ENUMERATED {true} OPTIONAL -- Need OR  }  We are fine with this optimization pointed out by Qualcomm by considering no other field is going to be included in highSpeedConfigSCell-v16xy in rel-16. |

Conclusion1: One company commented that the OPTIONAL, -- Need OR for field highSpeedEnhMeasFlagSCell-r16 is not needed. Other companies are fine with removing it.

Proposal1: Remove the OPTIONAL, -- Need OR for field highSpeedEnhMeasFlagSCell-r16.

## 2.2 [R2-2002050](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109_e/Docs/R2-2002050.zip) Introduction of UE capabilities for further performance enhancement for LTE in high speed scenario in Rel-16

Companies are requested to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree to the intent of the CR?** | **Detailed comments** |
| Qualcomm | **Agree with Intent, See comments** | I understand this was agreed in principle in R2-1913066.  The new clauses should be 4.3.33.x, 4.3.33.y etc.  Cover-page:   * Clauses affected should be 4.3.33.x (new), 4.3.33.y (new) etc. |
| Ericsson | **Agree** | Support Qualcomm's comments. |
| Docomo | **Agree** | Agree with Qualcomm’s comments. |

Conclusion2: One company commented on the Clause affected in the cover page. Other companies agree with it.

Proposal2: Revise the Clause affected in the cover page to 4.3.33.x (new), 4.3.33.y (new), 4.3.33.z (new).

# 3 Conclusions

**Conclusions:**

Proposal1: Remove the OPTIONAL, -- Need OR for field highSpeedEnhMeasFlagSCell-r16 in R2-2002048.

Proposal2: Revise the Clause affected in the cover page to 4.3.33.x (new), 4.3.33.y (new), 4.3.33.z (new) in R2-2002050.

**Agreed CRs:**

R2-2002173

R2-2002174
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