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# Introduction

This document summarizes the following offline discussion for Rel-15 UE capability corrections.

* [AT112-e][013][NR15] UE caps III (Huawei)

Treat R2-2009480, R2-2008734, R2-2008770, R2-2008771, R2-2010241, R2-2010242, R2-2009392, R2-2009393, R2-2010239, R2-2010240, R2-2010545, R2-2010546, R2-2010561, R2-2010562

Intended outcome: Intermediate: Determine agreeable parts. Final: For agreeable parts, agreed CRs.

Deadline: Intermediate deadline(s) by Rapporteur, Final: Discussion stop at Wed Nov 11, 1200 UTC

# Contact from companies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Email |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Masato Kitazoe <mkitazoe [at] qti.qualcomm.com> |
| Intel Corporation | Seau Sian Lim <seau.s.lim@intel.com |
| MediaTek Inc. | Nathan Tenny <nathan.tenny@mediatek.com> |
| OPPO | Qianxi Lu <qianxi.lu@oppo.com> |
| CATT | Erlin Zeng (erlin.zeng@catt.cn) |
| Ericsson | Lian Araujo <lian.araujo@ericsson.com> |

# Discussion

## Part 1 discussion: to achieve agreeable principle

Part 1 discussion is focusing on reaching conclusion whether the proposals/CRs can be agreed in principle, and Part 2 discussion would then focus on detailed changes for those agreeable contributions.

*Note: Regarding R2-2010561, R2-2010562, as it was already discussed on Monday GTW, the current discussion did not cover these two contributions.*

### 2.1.1 Clarification on the capability of supportedNumberTAG

Discussion is in [1]. The intention is to indicate the support of 2TAGs in a subset of the band combination,and the following 2 options are proposed:

* **Option 1:** UE is required to support the different TAGs in the different bands if the TAG number < band entry number;
* **Option 2:** Introduce the association between the TAG and the band entries, e.g. via the cell grouping;

**Proposal 1: Adopt Option 1 or Option 2 for the *supportedNumberTAG*** **capability** **indication in the mix intra/inter-band BC.**

**Q1-1 Do companies agree with P1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Originally the capability is associated with the band entry, and in our understanding the network interprets the applicability of TAG for each added SCell of different band entry (regardless whether it is from the different or same bands), and the SCells added later will use same TAG as PCell. So with such a change, it is NBC for interpreting the capability especially for Rel-15. |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| CATT | See comments | We first would like to understand whether this CR intends to change the current behaviour? If as Huawei commented this is NBC then we need further checking.  Then we think the concerned scenario is mainly when you have intra-band non continuous entries and or inter band entries in a BC, but UE only report a supported TAG number that is less than the number of band \* entries per band. This might only be a corner case, so no over specification is needed. |
| Ericsson | No | A UE setting supportedNumberTAG to something larger than 1 must support any set of contiguous carriers in any group. The reasoning in Rel-15 was that UEs would anyway serve each group of contiguous carriers by one RF chain and, if it supports several sets of contiguous UL carriers, it should also be able to handle those with different TAGs. There should be no difference between intra-band non-contiguous and inter-band non-contiguous, hence the change would be NBC. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q1-2 If companies agree with P1, which option is preferred and which release is expected to start the changes?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2** | **Release** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Option 1 and maybe Option 2 | Release-15 for Option 1. | Some clarification like option 1 is needed anyway even if we are to introduce an enhancement like option 2.  We understand the option 1 to mean that band entries from the same band (intra-band non-contiguous) shall be assigned into the same TAG. This looks to support typical deployment scenarios. Option 2 can be considered when companies (especially infra-vendors and operators) expect intra-band non-collocated topology to be important scenario. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  |  | As we stated above, this change seems NBC. If we want to use cell grouping to associate with different TAGs, it still needs to be first confirmed what is the default behaviour when such association is absent. |
| MediaTek | Option 1 | Rel-15 | We understand that if there is a mix of intra- and inter-bands in a BC, multiple TAGs should apply to inter-band only. So option 1 is a useful clarification. For option 2, it is a further enhancement and could be discussed if really needed. |
| OPPO | 1 | R15 | Option-2 is not feasible to interpret R15 UE behaviour, yet Option-1 requires further clarification if the number of TAG is larger than the number of inter-band entries in a BC (considering intra-band non-contiguous BC), i.e., whether that is not to happen or if that can happen, how to interpret the applicability for the TAG to the blocks in a same band. |
| Ericsson |  |  | The change would be NBC, see comments above. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### 2.1.2 Clarification on RAN4 features of NE-DC

The corresponding LS and CRs are in [2]-[6]. The main intention is to clarify the applicability of some features for NE-DC. The two sets of the CRs are quite similar and the major differences are whether to also have changes for some MR-DC parameters. So it could be discussed first and then decide which set of CRs is used as the baseline.

**Q2-1 Do companies agree *syncIntraBandENDC*, *intraBandENDC-Support* and *UL-TimingAlignmentEUTRA-NR* are applied to NE-DC as proposed in [3][4]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Yes | Proponent |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We understand the reply from RAN4 is corresponding to the context of SupportedBandwidthCombinationSet, and thus we are not sure whether the reply from RAN4 is actually expanded to all features defined in RAN4. In addition there seems ongoing discussion in RAN4 on further clarifying intraBandENDC-Support, and we think it is safer to wait to see RAN4 agreement first. |
| MediaTek | No | We have the same understanding as Huawei that the RAN4 reply is about the supportedBandwidthCombinationSet; we didn’t ask them about the other parameters. The change may be right but it seems premature to make it without further clarification. |
| OPPO | Yes | Proponent |
| CATT | No | We agree with Huawei and MTK. |
| Ericsson |  | We agree with the intention of the CR, but we would be fine to wait for RAN4. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q2-2 Do companies agree with other changes for BandCombinationList and CA-ParametersEUTRA listed in [3][4][5][6]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Yes | Proponent |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Proponent |
| MediaTek | Yes | This seems in line with the RAN4 reply. |
| OPPO | Yes | Proponent |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q2-3 Please indicate which release to start adopting the changes if companies support in general to have the above changes?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Release** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Release-15 | Proponent |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Release-15 |  |
| MediaTek | Rel-15 |  |
| OPPO | R15 | Proponent |
| CATT | R15 |  |
| Ericsson | Rel-15 |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### 2.1.3 Correction on PDCP duplication capability for NR-DC

The CRs are in [7][8], and the intention is to add duplication related capabilities specifically for NR-DC.

**Q3 Do companies agree with the major principle of the CRs? If yes, please indicate the starting release for the changes.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Release** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Yes | Release-15 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Release-15 | Proponent |
| Intel | Yes | Rel-15 |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | Rel-15 |  |
| OPPO | Yes | R15 |  |
| CATT | Yes | R15 |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | Rel-15 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### 2.1.4 Clarification on handover capability

The CRs are in [9][10], and the main intention is to clarify how to interpret the FDD/TDD and FR1/FR2 differentiation.

**Q4 Do companies agree with the major principle of the CRs? If yes, please indicate the starting release for the changes.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Release** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Yes | Release-15 | Our understanding has been that the handoverInterF indicates the UE capability “within” duplex mode or “within” frequency range. But we can accept the changes as proposed in the CRs, since we see some UE implementations may benefit from it. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Release-15 | Proponent  We understand FDD-TDD or FR1-FR2 handover capabilities are special cases for inter-frequency handover, and thus handoverInterF has to be supported. Actually in the agreed CR R2-1819056 it was already clarified that when the UE includes inter-frequency handover capability in UE-NR-CapabilityAddXDD-Mode or in UE-NR-CapabilityAddFRX-Mode, the duplex mode or the frequency range corresponds to that of the source cell. So we understood consequently there is no limitation on the target cell and thus it is in line with our proposal. |
| Intel | Yes for the Rel-15 CR | Rel-15 | The rel-16 CR is not purely a shadow as it contains changes to rel-16 capability on CHO. We would prefer this part to be discussed in Rel-16 eMOB. |
| MediaTek | Yes | Rel-15 | We understand the capabilities refer to the duplexing mode/frequency range of the source cell, so the CR doesn’t seem to make a functional change; but OK to have it as a clarification. |
| OPPO | Yes | Rel-15 | Same view as MTK. |
| CATT | Yes | Rel-15 | We also understand that these changes do not intend to change the current behaviour, so OK. Regarding Intel comment on R16 CR, it seems cat F, not A. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Rel-15 | Same view as Huawei. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### 2.1.5 Clarification on xDD differentiation

The CRs are in [11][12]. The main intention is to clarify how FDD/TDD differentiation applies to rsrqMeasWidebandEUTRA.

**Q5 Do companies agree with the major principle of the CRs? If yes, please indicate the starting release for the changes.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Release** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Yes | Release-15 | Release-16 CR (Cat.F) deals with other UE capabilities. We are fine with those other changes as well. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Release-15 |  |
| Intel | Yes | Rel-15 |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | Rel-15 |  |
| OPPO | Yes | R15 |  |
| CATT | Yes | R15 |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | Rel-15 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Part 1 discussion summary

## Part 2 discussion: TBD

To be updated after Phase I discussion

…

# Reference

1. [R2-2009480](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2009480.zip) Clarification on the capability of supportedNumberTAG Apple
2. [R2-2008734](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2008734.zip) Reply LS on Clarification on RAN4 features of NE-DC (R4-2011688; contact: Samsung)
3. [R2-2008770](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2008770.zip) Correction for RAN4 features of NE-DC OPPO, Qualcomm Incorporated CR
4. [R2-2008771](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2008771.zip) Correction for RAN4 features of NE-DC OPPO, Qualcomm Incorporated CR
5. [R2-2010241](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2010241.zip) Clarification on NE-DC for bandwidth combination set Huawei, HiSilicon, Samsung
6. [R2-2010242](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2010242.zip) Clarification on NE-DC for bandwidth combination set Huawei, HiSilicon, Samsung
7. [R2-2009392](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2009392.zip) Corrections on PDCP duplication capability for NR-DC Huawei, HiSilicon
8. [R2-2009393](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2009393.zip) Corrections on PDCP duplication capability for NR-DC Huawei, HiSilicon
9. [R2-2010239](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2010239.zip) Clarification on the inter-frequency handover capability Huawei, HiSilicon, Ericsson
10. [R2-2010240](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2010240.zip) Clarification on the inter-frequency handover capability Huawei, HiSilicon, Ericsson
11. [R2-2010545](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2010545.zip) Clarification on UE capabilities with FDD/TDD differentiation Ericsson, ZTE Corporation, Sanechips
12. [R2-2010546](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2010546.zip) Clarification on UE capabilities with FDD/TDD differentiation Ericsson, ZTE Corporation, Sanechips