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# 1 Introduction

This is report for the following AT119-e mail discussion.

* [AT119-e][033][MGE] (MediaTek)

 Scope: Treat R2-2206940, R2-2208471, R2-2207146, R2-2208464, R2-2208562, R2-2208106, R2-2207895. Determine agreeable parts, for agreeable parts, capture in CR(s)

 Intended outcome: Report, Agreed CR (s), LS out if applicable

 Deadline: EOM (offline only, if possible)

# 2 Contact Points

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| MediaTek (Rapp) | Felix Tsai | chun-fan.tsai@mediatek.com |
| Apple | Yuqin Chen | yuqin\_chen@apple.com |
| ZTE | LiuJing | liu.jing30@zte.com.cn |
| Samsung | Aby K Abraham | Aby.abraham@samsung.com |
| Nokia | Ping Yuan | Ping.1.Yuan@nokia-sbell.com |
| vivo | Xiaodong Yang | Yangxiaodong5g@vivo.com |
| CATT | Jie Shi | shijie@catt.cn |
| LGE | SangWon Kim | sangwon7.kim@lge.com |
| Ericsson | Felipe Arraño Scharager | felipe.arrano.scharager@ericsson.com |
| Intel (Rapp) | Candy Yiu | Candy.yiu@intel.com |
| Xiaomi | Yi Xiong | xiongyi3@xiaomi.com |
| DENSO | Tomoyuki Yamamoto | tomoyuki.yamamoto.j5c@jp.denso.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Lili Zheng | zhenglili4@huawei.com |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 Corrections on MGE configurations

The following P2 from R2-2208464 [1] is briefly discussed online but no agreement reached.

* Proposal 2: RAN2 confirms that the new gap configuration fields (*gapToAddModList-r17* and *gapToReleaseList-r17*) field could only be used for UE supporting any of Rel-17 MGE features. The network may configure legacy gap using new field for MGE-capable UE.

Rapporteur suggests not to discuss the second part of P2. Instead, companies could check whether the TP based on the first part of the proposal is agreeable. The intention is to clarify that the NW should only use this field for Rel-17 UE that supports any of MGE feature. The NW should not use this field for all Rel-17 UEs. The corresponding TP is shown below.

|  |
| --- |
| ***gapToAddModList***A list of of measurement gap configuration to be added or modified. If more than one measurement gap is configured (i.e. concurrent measurement gap as specified in TS 38.133[14], clause 9.1.8), the maximum number of configured measurement gap is limited by the gap combinations defined in Table 9.1.8-1 in TS 38.133 [14]. The network configures at most one NCSG or pre-configured measurement gap for a given gap type. In this version of the specification, the network configures this field only in NR standalone. This field is used only for a UE that supports pre-configured measurement gap, concurrent measurement gap, or NCSG.  |

**Question 1: Do companies agree the intention of above TP from R2-2208464 [1], any wording suggestion if the intention is agreed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agreed or not** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Agree  |  |
| ZTE | Agree | We are fine with the change, it also implies that only MGE capable UEs can support the new RRC signalling.  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree  |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| LGE  | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| DENSO | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree (Proponent) |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 1**

All companies agree the proposal. It is proposed to agree the TP and further discuss in MGE 38.331 CR.

**Proposal 1: [12/12] Agree to add the following clarification in 38.331 field *gapToAddModList***

* **This field is used only for a UE that supports pre-configured measurement gap, concurrent measurement gap, or NCSG.**

In P3 of R2-2208464 [1], it is proposed that

* **Proposal 3: RAN2 to define default priority value for the gap configured via legacy fields (*gapFR2*, *gapFR1*, *gapUE*) while the gap is used for concurrent gap operation.**

In current SPEC, the concurrent gap could be configured by one legacy field (*without* gap ID and gap priority) and one new field (*with* gap ID and gap priority). RAN2 has defined default association rule for gap configured by legacy field. However, there is no priority define for the gap configured by legacy field in this case.

Rapporteur understands that there are also some proposals in R4. In summary, there could be several way to resolve the issue

* Option 1 – No change in 38.331. Assuming no requirement if gap collision in this kind of scenario. In other word, the NW has to ensure no gap collision if it wants to configure one gap via legacy field and one gap via new field.
* Option 2a – Define default priority (as highest) for the gap configured by legacy field in 38.331 (as proposed in [1])
* Option 2b – Define default priority (as lowest) for the gap configured by legacy field in 38.331
* Option 3 – Add new gap priority configuration for legacy gap in 38.331
* Option 4 – Ask RAN4 to define default priority in 38.133 for this case

LS to RAN4 may be needed.

**Question 2: Companies are invited to provide comment on how to handle the gap configured by legacy field (no gap priority) in concurrent gap operation.**

* **Option 1 – No change in 38.331. Assuming no requirement if gap collision in this kind of scenario. In other word, the NW has to ensure no gap collision if it wants to configure one gap via legacy field and one gap via new field.**
* **Option 2a – Define default priority (as highest) for the gap configured by legacy field in 38.331 (as proposed in [1])**
* **Option 2b – Define default priority (as lowest) for the gap configured by legacy field in 38.331**
* **Option 2c – Define default priority (as a value between lowest and highest) for the gap configured by legacy field in 38.331.**
* **Option 3 – Add new gap priority configuration for legacy gap in 38.331**
* **Option 4 – Ask RAN4 to define default priority in 38.133 for this case**
* **Option 5 – To disallow the network to use legacy field to configure concurrent gap (to revert the last RAN2 agreement).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Prefer option** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 3 | All Options among 1/2/3 are workable but we think Option 3 is future proof. |
| ZTE | Option 2a/2bor Option 5 | We added Option 5 because we think using legacy IE to configure concurrent gap more or less causes some mess in specification, as there is no gap association and gap priority, and it is unclear how to provide suitable gap sharing configuration.If we stick to the previous RAN2 agreement, then either Option 2a or Option 2b is fine for us. Option 3 is unacceptable to us, because it violates the intention of introducing GapConfig-r17. Option 4 is not preferred because as we know RAN4 has discussed this “default priority” but no conclusion was made, and RAN4 also did not expect that legacy IE can also be used to configure concurrent gaps.  |
| Samsung | option 2c  | We have added another option Option 2c: Define the default priority as a value which is not lowest and highest (for e.g. default priority =2 or default priority=8). This will allow the network to configure a higher priority or a lower priority for the gaps configured with new structure which could cover all the scenarios, without introducing any new ASN changes.We don’t see any special reason why default value should be only highest or lowest. However, If the majority prefers, option 2a/2b also are fine.There is no need to discuss about reverting the agreement as in newly added option 5. It was evidently clear from the discussions in last meeting that legacy+new structure approach has several benefits. We don’t see any other issue once default gap priority is provided. Gapsharing for gaps configured through legacy signalling can work as in legacy without any changes. |
| Nokia | Option 3 or Option 4 | Similar view as Apple. Also, fine to ask RAN4 on how to define the priority for legacy gap since it is in discussion in RAN4. |
| vivo | Option 1 or option3  | We consider that default priority is bad solution, it is not flexible for different case. We prefer option1 in R17. However we are also ok with option 3 for future proof.  |
| CATT | Option 1  | To keep it simple, we prefer option 1. And RAN4 is also discussing the relation between legacy (classic) MG and concurrent MG. Maybe we can also wait for RAN4’s further conclusion. |
| LGE | Option 5 | If the gap priority needs to be assigned to the legacy gap (i.e. a gap which is not pre-configured and is not associated with a frequency layer), the GapConfig-r17should be used to configure the gap. The configuration limitation in option 5 doesn’t need to be captured in spec. If the gap priority is not needed, NW still can use both the legacy configuration and the new configuration at the same time. |
| Ericsson | Option 5(See comment)  | Judging by companies’ preferences, we notice that this discussion and the difficulties encountered to reach a consensus come from the fact that RAN2 allowed this in the first place, i.e., for legacy fields to be considered as part of the concurrent gap configuration framework. So, even when we understand that there are benefits linked to allowing this type of configuration (as pointed out by Samsung above) … We however believe that by doing so we encounter further/more drawbacks, e.g., in terms of configuration complexity, impact to existent procedures and not favouring towards the readability of the spec.In this regard, we believe that there are enough/solid arguments to revert the concerning (prior) RAN2 agreement, i.e., to go for Option 5.By doing so, NWs should be restricted from configuring legacy measurement gap fields (e.g., gapFR2, gapFR1, gapUE) together with Rel-17’s ToAddModList approach.In case Option 5 and the arguments provided above, are by no means acceptable to other companies, then we would be inclined towards considering a default priority Option(s) 2. |
| Intel | Option 1 | We can for now leave it to NW implementation until RAN4 has further guidelines. Default priority is not preferred. If collision happens, it can be up to UE implementation which measurement to perform during collided gap. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | Agree with Intel |
| DENSO | Option 1 | Agree with Intel. We think it could be left to NW implementation. |
| MediaTek | Option 1 | Define default priority (option 2a/2b/2c, option 4) is also okay but after thinking we think option 1 would be the easiest one.Option 3 (as ZTE mentioned) violates the motivation of having new R17 IE and is not preferred by us.Option 5 would be controversial and is not preferred for us to rediscuss this.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 3 or Option 1 | Agree with Apple that Option 3 is future proof. Option 1 is also feasible for this release and brings minimum spec change. |

**Summary 2**

The view is somehow diverse, however, there is slight majority (6/12) supports option 1. One companies mentioned that option 3 is unacceptable and one company clear don’t want to revert previous agreement (option 5). For the default priorities options (option 2a/2b/2c), there is no much support to define this rule and some companies think it is a bad solution. In summary, option 1 has more support and seems no objection. So, rapporteur suggest to go with option 1.

**Proposal 2: [6/12] For concurrent gap configuration, RAN2 understands that:**

* **The NW can configure one gap via legacy field (*without* gap ID and gap priority) and the other gap via new field (with gap ID and gap priority). In this configuration, there is no requirement in case of gap collision.**
* **If NW want to ensure there is UE requirement, it can configure all concurrent gaps via new field or ensure no gap collision.**

In R2-2208562 [2], it is proposed to clarify the field *associatedMeasGapSSB* as below.

|  |
| --- |
| ***associatedMeasGapSSB***Indicates the associated measurement gap for SSB measuring identified by *ssb-ConfigMobility* or for SSB measuring to provide timing reference for CSI-RS based measurement identified by *csi-rs-ResourceConfigMobility* in this measurement object. When multiple *MeasObjectNR* with the same SSB frequency are configured, the network configures the same measurement gap ID in this field for each *MeasObjectNR*. If this field is absent, the associated measurement gap is the gap configured via *gapFR1*, *gapFR2*, or *gapUE*. |

The main reason is that

In the field description of *associatedMeasGapSSB*, it only captures the IE can indicate the associated measurement gap for SSB measuring identified by *ssb-ConfigMobility* but does not cover the case of SSB measurement to provide timing reference for CSI-RS based measurement

**Question 3: Do companies agree the intention of R2-2208562 [2]? Any wording suggestion if the intention is agreed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agreed or not** | **Comments** |
| Apple | No strong view | Not essential. |
| ZTE | Prefer to disagree | The last sentence can already cover the case when the SSB is configured to provide timing reference. If there is only one MO for this SSB, and the SSB is only provided for timing not for SSB based measurements, there seems no harm to not configure this field. |
| Samsung | Disagree | It is sufficiently clear in the current version. |
| Nokia | Agree | Proponent- When there is only one MO for this SSB, it is NW implemenation to configure the *associatedMeasGapSSB* to provide timing reference for CSI-RS based measurement. The case should be captured in the field description.- When multiple MOs (with the same SSB frequency) are configured, we prefer to explicitly clarify that *associatedMeasGapSSB* can be used for SSB measuring to provide timing reference for CSI-RS based measurement |
| vivo | Disagree  | we agree with ZTE.  |
| CATT | No strong view |  |
| Ericsson | No strong view |  |
| Intel | No strong view | Change is not needed. |
| Xiaomi | Disagree | Agree with ZTE |
| DENSO | No strong view |  |
| MediaTek | Tend to disagree | While we think the intention is fine, it seems current text is always clear enough. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with the intention | The issue is similar for the current smtc and ssbFrequency in the MO. And we suggest the following modification (similar to the descriptions in smtc and ssbFrequency).***associatedMeasGapSSB***Indicates the associated measurement gap for measuring the SS associated to this *MeasObjectNR*. When multiple *MeasObjectNR* with the same SSB frequency are configured, the network configures the same measurement gap ID in this field for each *MeasObjectNR*. If this field is absent, the associated measurement gap is the gap configured via *gapFR1*, *gapFR2*, or *gapUE*.We can also accept no change to the spec. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 3**

There is no enough support to the CR R2-2208562. Companies don’t have strong view but seems understand current text is fine.

**Proposal 3: [11/12] CR R2-2208562 is not pursued.**

In R2-2208106 [3], it is proposed to have the following clarification on field *mgta*

GapConfig-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {

 <Skip>

 mgta-r17 ENUMERATED {ms0, ms0dot25, ms0dot5, ms0dot75},

 <Skip>

 ...

}

|  |
| --- |
| ***mgta***Value *mgta* is the measurement gap timing advance in ms. The applicability of the measurement gap timing advance is according to clause 9.1.2 of TS 38.133 [14], or according to clause 9.1.9 of TS 38.133 [14] if *ncsgInd* is present. Value *ms0* corresponds to 0 ms, *ms0dot25* corresponds to 0.25 ms, *ms0dot5* corresponds to 0.5 ms and *ms0dot75* corresponds to 0.75 ms. For FR2, the network only configures 0 ms and 0.25 ms if *ncsgInd* is not present. If *ncsgInd* is present, value *ms0dot5* can not be configured for FR1 NCSG (i.e. *gapType* is set to *perFR1*) and *ms0dot25* can not be configured. Value *ms0dot75* can only be configured if *ncsgInd* is present. |

Rapporteur understands most change are straightforward corrections except for the highlight part may request some discussion. The intention of the highlight part is to capture below R4 agreement and clarify that “*mgta*=0.5ms cannot be configured for FR1 NCSG, but *mgta*=0.5 ms can be configured for per-UE NCSG”

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN4#103e Agreements:**Remove the interruption requirements for 0.5ms mgta for FR1 NCSG and 0.25ms mgta for FR2 NCSG in 38.133. |

**Question 4: Do companies agree the intention of R2-2208106 [3]? Any wording suggestion if the intention is agreed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agreed or not** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree with some modification | Proponent. The same issue is under discussion in RAN4, e.g. whether mgta=0.5ms can be configured for per-UE NCSG. After checking with our RAN4, we now turn to agree that mgta=0.5ms should not be configured for both FR1 NCSG and per-UE NCSG. (the RAN4 agreement is unclear about this)So for the yellow highlighted part, we suggest to update it into:“If *ncsgInd* is present, value *ms0dot5* ~~can not be configured for FR1 NCSG (i.e.~~ *~~gapType~~* ~~is set to~~ *~~perFR1~~*~~)~~ and *ms0dot25* can not be configured.” |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree | We should stick to what RAN4 agreed now for the modification. |
| vivo | Agree  |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| LGE | Agree | Same view as Nokia. |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| DENSO | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree | However, we may need further check on mgta limitation part. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 4**

All companies agree the intention of CR R2-2208106. It is not clear to rapporteur that whether companies agree the further change from ZTE. It is suggested to take the CR as baseline for further discussion. Companies are invited to check with their RAN4 colleagues especially on mgta configuration limitation.

**Proposal 4: [12/12] CR R2-2208106 is agreed to be added in MGE RRC correction CR for further discussion.**

In R2-2207895 [4], it is proposed to add the following inter-node signaling

MeasConfigMN ::= SEQUENCE {

 measuredFrequenciesMN SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxMeasFreqsMN)) OF NR-FreqInfo OPTIONAL,

 measGapConfig SetupRelease { GapConfig } OPTIONAL,

 gapPurpose ENUMERATED {perUE, perFR1} OPTIONAL,

 ...,

 [[

 measGapConfigFR2 SetupRelease { GapConfig } OPTIONAL

 ]],

 [[

 measGapConfig-r17 MeasGapConfig OPTIONAL

 ]],

}

The reason from [4] is that

MN should be able provide MN configurations of NCSG, pre-configured, concurrent and positioning gaps to SN in SN Addition or Modification procedure for gap coordination. However, this is now allowed in the inter-node message.

Rapporteur understands that Rel-17 MGE features are not supported in MR-DC. So the change seems not necessary. It is not clear that whether this is needed for ePOS gap but probably it should be discussed in positioning work item.

**Question 5: Do companies agree the intention of** **R2-2207895 [4]? Any wording suggestion if the intention is agreed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agreed or not** | **Comments** |
| Apple | No | We agree with rapporteur that Rel-17 MGE does not support MR-DC. |
| ZTE | No | Agree with rapporteur. |
| Samsung | No | Agree with rapporteur. |
| Nokia | No | No MR-DC support in Rel-17 MGE. |
| vivo | No  |  |
| CATT | No |  |
| LGE | No | Agree with rapporteur. |
| Ericsson | No | Agree with Rapporteur. Not having this has been previously agreed in RAN2 |
| Intel | No | MR-DC is not supported |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| DENSO | No |  |
| MediaTek | No |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 5**

There is no support to have CR R2-2207895.

**Proposal 5: [12/12] CR R2-2207895 is not pursued.**

## 3.2 Corrections on MGE Capabilities

For MGE capabilities discussion, rapporteur understand that we aim to endorse a 38.306 CR and will be merged to general capability CR in offline #014. Note that the new R4 FG 19-2-1 is already handled in offline #014, so no discussion here.

RAN4 sent and LS R2-2206940 [5] to RAN2 on NCSG capabilities as below

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **NCSG patterns**
* In RAN4#102e meeting, RAN4 agreed that NCSG pattern #0, #1, #13 and #14 are mandatory for UE supporting NCSG. In RAN4#103e meeting, RAN4 further discussed mandatory NCSG pattern and reached the following agreement.
* NCSG pattern #13 and #14 are mandatory for UE supports per-FR MG or UE capable of FR2 standalone mode.
 |

In R2-2207146 [6], it is proposed to clarify the field *ncsg-MeasGapPatterns-r17* as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***ncsg-MeasGapPatterns-r17***Indicates whether the UE supports NCSG patterns. The left most bit in the bitmap corresponds to NCSG pattern #0 and the right most bit in the bitmap corresponds to NCSG pattern #23. A bit in the bitmap is set to 1 if the corresponding pattern is supported by the UE. NCSG patterns #0 to #23 are as specified in TS38.133 [5].NCSG patterns #0 and #1 are mandatory (i.e. the corresponding bits in the bitmap is set to 1) if the UE includes this field. NCSG patterns #13 and #14 are mandatory (i.e. the corresponding bits in the bitmap is set to 1) if UE supports *ncsg-MeasGapPerFR-r17* or the UE is an NR standalone capable UE that supports a band in FR2. UEs supporting this shall indicate support of *nr-NeedForGapNCSG-reporting-r17* and *eutra-NeedForGapNCSG-reporting-r17*. | UE | No | No | No |

In R2-2208471 [7], it is proposed to clarify the field *ncsg-MeasGapPatterns-r17* as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***ncsg-MeasGapPatterns-r17***Indicates whether the UE supports NCSG patterns. The left most bit in the bitmap corresponds to NCSG pattern #0 and the right most bit in the bitmap corresponds to NCSG pattern #23. A bit in the bitmap is set to 1 if the corresponding pattern is supported by the UE. NCSG patterns #0 to #23 are as specified in TS38.133 [5].NCSG patterns #0 and #1 are mandatory (i.e. the corresponding bits in the bitmap is set to 1) if the UE includes this field. NCSG patterns #13 and #14 are mandatory (i.e. the corresponding bits in the bitmap is set to 1) if UE supports *ncsg-MeasGapPerFR-r17* or if the UE is NCSG capable and supports *pCell-FR2*. UEs supporting this shall indicate support of *nr-NeedForGapNCSG-reporting-r17* and *eutra-NeedForGapNCSG-reporting-r17*. | UE | No | No | No |

**Question 6: Do companies agree clarify the field description of ncsg-MeasGapPatterns-r17 based in incoming LS R2-2206940? If agreed, any preference on using the wording in [6] or [7], or other suggestion?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agreed or not** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| ZTE | See comments | There are two different understandings regarding the RAN4 agreements, * + - Understanding 1: For UE supports FR2 SA (in [6]);
		- Understanding 2: For UE supports FR2 SA+ NCSG (in [7]);

The RAN4’s agreement seems to align with understanding 1, but we assume that understanding 2 makes more sense. So [7] is preferred. In our view, the “NCSG capable” in [7] means the UE either support per-UE NCSG or per-FR NCSG, or both.Besides this question, we would like to point out that “per-UE NCSG” capability seems missing in current specification?We now only have “ncsg-MeasGapPerFR-r17”, but there is no capability used to indicate the support of per-UE NCSG?[MediaTek] Our understanding is that if the UE reports any of NCSG gap pattern, it implies that it supports per-UE NCSG. |
| Samsung | Agree | Prefers change in [6]. |
| Nokia | Agree | We prefer change in [7] but with some modification, e.g. “if the UE is NCSG capable and supports FR2 band in standalone mode” |
| vivo | agree |  |
| CATT | Agree | Prefer change in [7]. |
| LGE | Agree | Prefer Nokia’s modification. |
| Ericsson | Agree | Inclined towards Nokia’s rewording. |
| Intel | Agree | Prefer change in [7] |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| DENSO | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree | Proponent of [7] and we agree with the wording suggestion from Nokia. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | Proponent of [6]. Nokia’s modification is combining [6] and [7], and looks good to us. |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 6**

All companies agree the intention and most companies seems okay with the TP from [7] with additional suggestion from Nokia.

**Proposal 6: [12/12] 38.306 TP for capability field *ncsg-MeasGapPatterns-r17* in R2-2208471 is agreed to be added in MGE Capability CR for further discussion.**

In R2-2208471 [7], it is proposed to remove the following editor note for pre-configured MG in 38.306.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***preconfiguredUE-AutonomousMeasGap-r17***Indicates whether the UE supports the preconfigured measurement gap with UE-autonomous mechanism for activation and deactivation as specified in TS 38.133 [5]. | UE | No | No | No |
| ***preconfiguredNW-ControlledMeasGap-r17***Indicates whether the UE supports the preconfigured measurement gap with network-controlled mechanism for activation and deactivation as specified in TS 38.133 [5].. | UE | No | No | No |

The reason is that RAN4 has specified how the UE determine the Pre-configured MG activation/deactivation status. There is no need to keep the EN.

**Question 7: Do companies agree to remove below editor note in 38.306?**

* ***Editor's Note: current version assume procedure is specify in RAN4 spec. Change is needed according if it will specify in 331.***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agreed or not** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree  |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| LGE | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| DENSO | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 7**

All companies agree to remove the editor note in 38.306.

**Proposal 7: [12/12] RAN2 agree to remove the following editor note in 38.306**

* ***Editor's Note: current version assume procedure is specify in RAN4 spec. Change is needed according if it will specify in 331.***

# 4 Conclusions

Based on the discussion in section 2, we propose the following:

Easy Agreements

**Proposal 1: [12/12] Agree to add the following clarification in 38.331 field *gapToAddModList***

* **This field is used only for a UE that supports pre-configured measurement gap, concurrent measurement gap, or NCSG.**

**Proposal 3: [11/12] CR R2-2208562 is not pursued.**

**Proposal 4: [12/12] CR R2-2208106 is agreed to be added in MGE RRC correction CR for further discussion.**

**Proposal 5: [12/12] CR R2-2207895 is not pursued.**

**Proposal 6: [12/12] 38.306 TP for capability field *ncsg-MeasGapPatterns-r17* in R2-2208471 is agreed to be added in MGE Capability CR for further discussion.**

**Proposal 7: [12/12] RAN2 agree to remove the following editor note in 38.306**

* ***Editor's Note: current version assume procedure is specify in RAN4 spec. Change is needed according if it will specify in 331.***

Need Further discussion

**Proposal 2: [6/12] For concurrent gap configuration, RAN2 understands that:**

* **The NW can configure one gap via legacy field (*without* gap ID and gap priority) and the other gap via new field (with gap ID and gap priority). In this configuration, there is no requirement in case of gap collision.**
* **If NW want to ensure there is UE requirement, it can configure all concurrent gaps via new field or ensure no gap collision.**
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