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The following proposals are proposed to be agreed through email. Please indicate your opinion in the table.

Proposals trying to be greed:

Proposal 1 UE shall include absoluteFrequencyPointA-r16, locationAndBandwidth, subcarrierSpacing, msg1-FrequencyStart, msg1-FDMInfo and msg1-SubcarrierSpacing in the RLF report when the rlf-Cause is set to beamFailureRecoveryFailure or randomAccessProblem.

Proposal 2 Include the following frequency location related information of the RA resources used by the UE in the RAReport:

a. msg1-FDM (e.g., in RACH-ConfigGeneric)

b. msg1-FrequencyStart (e.g., in RACH-ConfigGeneric)

c. msg1-SubcarrierSpacing (e.g., in RACH-ConfigCommon)

Proposal 3 Agree the following option is to be adopted for RAReport retaining at the UE:

UE will stop logging RA info if all 8 entries is filled in RA report, and starts to count the duration. If not fetched within 48 hours, then the whole RA report will be deleted.

Proposal4 The issue that whether to add a new UE capability indication or not regarding the ability to include the locationInformation in SCGFailureInformationNR and SCGFailureInformation messages should be addressed in running stage3 CR email discussion.

Proposal 5 0.1ms is applied for UL delay measurement D1.

Proposal 6: The following proposals are recommended to be postponed:

- 1: min/max value for delay measurement.

- 2: excess delay measurement.

Because all the above original proposals are collected from long-time technical discussion. It is common understanding that there is no technical issue for them. I also notice that the benefit is clear. The concern is about the complexity. After online and offline discussion, I modifired some of the content and hope everyone is OK for the proposals.

Table I: Opinion on P1 to P6

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal # | Who objects to agree this proposal!!!  Show your company name here!!! |
| 1 |  |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |
| 4 |  |
| 5 |  |
| 6 |  |

To agree P7 and P8 together, or we conclude that UL delay measurement is not supported for split bearer(s) for EN-DC case.

Proposal 7 For the UL PDCP packet average queuing delay measurement for split bearer in EN-DC, - MN and SN can independently configure the UE with D1 measurements in the split bearer configurations.

- The UE shall perform two independent D1 delay measurements in the split bearer configuration, one for MN associated D1 delay measurement and the other for SN associated D1 delay measurement.

- The UE shall report the MN configured D1 delay measurement to the MN and the SN configured D1 delay measurement to the SN.

Proposal 8 For split bearer with PDCP duplication, reuse the same mechanism as non-duplication case for UL D1 delay measurement.

I would like use the majority preference to make agreements on proposal 7 and 8.

Option 1: To agree proposal 7 and proposal 8.

Option2: UL delay measurement is not supported for split bearer(s) for EN-DC case in R16

Table I: Opinion on P7 and P8

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company name | Preference option 1 or 2 |
| CMCC | 1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 2 |
| QUALCOMM | 1 |
|  |  |
|  |  |