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1 Introduction

In this contribution, a list of RILs for the Mobility work item with relating conclusion and comment is provided.

# 2 Discussion

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Delegate** | **Work Item** | **Class** | **Propose Conclusion** | **Comment to Proposed Conclusion** | **RIL source leader (who should provide the tdoc)** | **Description** | **Proposed Change** | **Comments**  **(Example 🡪 [Ericsson-Tony] bla bla)** |
| X121 | Xiaomi (Yi) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | In current procedure, for the IMR available report, only when the UE has valid NR reselection measurements, the UE shall report reselectionMeasAvailable, which does not capture the case when measReselectionValidityDuration is not configured. Furthermore, whether the measurement result is valid or not is unrelated to the report of reselectionMeasAvailable. It is an available indication. Hence “valid” shall be removed in the procedure text to align with the EMR available report. | Suggest to remove “valid” |  |
| M020 | MediaTek (Li-Chuan Tseng) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] In the last meeting we decided to not have the UE variable anymore and the text in the note needs to be update to reflect this. |  | The problem with the text is that clauses 5.3.5.18.6 or 5.3.5.13.8 do not specify that the UE generates and stores RRCReconfiguration message. They only specify that in some case (when reference configuration is used), the UE implementation may generate and store a message. Instead, when these clauses refer to 5.3.5, they use term "UE applies" RRCReconfiguration message. Another problem is that all occurrences of "received" are not before message name. For example, clause 5.3.5.3 has text like this "if the RRCReconfiguration message was received..." | When a clause of 5.3.5 is executed due to an LTM cell switch execution (i.e., as specified in 5.3.5.18.6) or due to a conditional reconfiguration execution for subsequent CPAC (i.e., as specified in 5.3.5.13.8), every appearance of "the received" before RRCReconfiguration, before a field name, or before an IE name, refers to the RRCReconfiguration, to the field name, or to the IE, respectively, that the UE applies was generated and stored by the UE as specified in 5.3.5.18.6 or 5.3.5.13.8. |  |
| E232 | Ericsson (Tony) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | In RAN2#124 it was agreed that "Confirm that UE may receive mrdc-SecondaryCellGroupConfig set as release even when there is no SCG, for a subsequent LTM and it is not considered as an error." We propose to capture this in a note that it is sure that UE will not trigger any RRC re-establishment procedure. | Add a note as following: NOTE: If the UE receives an mrdc-SecondaryCellGroupConfig set to release even if no SCG is configured, the UE does not consider this as an invalid configuration. |  |
| G125 | Google (Eric) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] When there is a MCG RLF the transmissions over the MCG are suspended. Therefore, if there is a LTM on the SCG and there is no SRB3, the complete message over the SRB1 cannot be transmitted and this will result in a RRC re-establishment. I guess current procedure already handle this and nothing new is needed. This is not really related to LTM but is also a normal DC operation. |  | The LTM cell switch for SCG may be tiggerred during fast MCG recevoery procedure. Under this situation, the UE is unable to transmit ULInformationTransferMRDC via MCG and the UE behaviour is unclear. | Clarify the detail UE behaviours. We will provide a tdoc to address this issue. |  |
| S792 | Samsung (Aby) | Mob | 1 | ToDisc |  | Samsung (to coordinate with the other companies) | UE may not have a SRB3 configuration for Subsequent CPAC or LTM here if it is not present in candidate configuration or reference configuration, so RAN2 needs to discuss whether there is any need to map the ReconfigurationComplete on the same SRB as the one sending RRCReconfiguration for subsequent CPAC and LTM. [Proposed Change]: If companies still think that complete needs to be send on same SRB on which configuration is send, =>it needs to be discussed the RRCReconfiguration refers to the one that is adding Subsequent CPAC (or LTM) configuration, adding reference configuration, message that has last modified subsequent CPAC (or LTM) configuration, message that has last modified reference configuration. =>Either UE may be allowed to send RRCReconfigurationComplete over SRB1 or there needs to have a restriction at network from configuring the UE without SRB3 when the RRCReconfiguration is send over SRB1 | If companies still think that complete needs to be send on same SRB on which configuration is send, =>it needs to be discussed the RRCReconfiguration refers to the one that is adding Subsequent CPAC (or LTM) configuration, adding reference configuration, message that has last modified subsequent CPAC (or LTM) configuration, message that has last modified reference configuration. =>Either UE may be allowed to send RRCReconfigurationComplete over SRB1 or there needs to have a restriction at network from configuring the UE without SRB3 when the RRCReconfiguration is send over SRB1 |  |
| E202 | Ericsson (Cecilia) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] I guess the procedure should not be applied when both the SCG and MCG are updated but also when one of them is. |  | The "and" means that execution of an SCG (i.e. SN generated) subsequent CPAC configuration could trigger updates of both SCG and MCG subsequent CPAC configurations. Should it not be only the entries in the condReconfigList for the MCG or the SCG VarConditionalReconfig that are to be handled here, i.e. if the RRCReconfiguration message that is applied (in bullet level 2 above) is in the MCG VarConditionalReconfig, then only the entries in the MCG VarConditionalReconfig should be handled and vice versa. | Change the "and" to "or". | This may not be a problem now that there is only subsequent CPAC, but if other subsequent mechanisms are added for the MCG, there will be an issue |
| C128 | CATT (Rui) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] Ok, since at least CATT and MTK believe that this change is needed, I can do it in my RRC CR. I think that the "SCG configuration" refers typically to the CellGroupConfig of the SCG and thus this may mislead the UE to not release the LTM-Config. |  | In the current spec, the SCG LTM configuration is not released upon SCG release.It does not make sense to keep the SCG LTM configuration when SCG has already been released | the SCG LTM configuration is released upon SCG release.we will submit a tdoc to address it |  |
| E219 | Ericsson (Cecilia) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] If the SCG configuration is released, it does not make sense to keep the SCG-related UE variables. Ideally, this change would not be needed because the UE should release already such configuration by itself, but for consistency on what is already in the spec for CHO would be good to have such change. |  | The VarServingSecurityCellSetId needs to be deleted when the SCG is released, otherwise, there is problem if the SCG is released and if there later is a subsequent CPA in the same SCG. It is not possible to signal any release in the message when the SCG is released, so the variable cannot be released by signaling. | Add the text "remove the servingSecurityCellSetId within the VarServingSecurityCellSetID, if any ". . |  |
| M023 | MediaTek (Li-Chuan Tseng) | Mob | 1 | Duplicate | [Ericsson-Tony] See C128 |  | The UE should perform LTM configuration release procedure for SCG when the UE releases the secondary cell group, because according to clause 5.3.5.2 the UE can have LTM configuration for SCG only when at least one RLC bearer is configured for SCG. 5.3.5.2: ... the ltm-Config for LTM on the SCG is included only when at least one RLC bearer is setup in SCG | After highlight text, add the following: “ 3> perform the LTM configuration release procedure for the SCG as specified in clause 5.3.5.18.7;” |  |
| E233 | Ericsson (Tony) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] It may be possible that UE is already DL synchronized, so there is no need to re-sync again. |  | The UE when executing this section may be already DL synchronized with the target cell in case of an LTM cell switch. For this reason, the UE should start to DL synchronize only if the synchronization for the target cell is not acquired yet. This need to be clarified. | Do the following change: 2> start synchronising to the DL of the target SpCell, if no DL synchronization for the target SpCell has been already acquired; |  |
| E203 | Ericsson (Cecilia) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] Once the UE does the compliance check once, it is questionable whether the UE will do again the compliance check for the same CPAC configuration. My understanding is that this does not happen. Also, if there are information that UE would need to decode and apply right when the configuration is received e.g., the sk-counter list, then is better to clarify this explicitly. E.g., with a note in this section or somewhere else. |  | For subsequent CPAC, the UE may need to do compliance check multiple times due to that the same subsequent CPAC configuration (RRCReconfiguration message) can be executed multiple times and there is then a need for a new sk-counter at each inter-SN execution. [Proposed Change]: Add the text "For an RRCReconfiguration received as part of a subsequent CPAC configuration, the UE however needs to perform a compliance check before each execution that includes a security key change (taking the availability of an sk-counter into account)." | Add the text "For an RRCReconfiguration received as part of a subsequent CPAC configuration, the UE however needs to perform a compliance check before each execution that includes a security key change (taking the availability of an sk-counter into account)." |  |
| E204 | Ericsson (Cecilia) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | The "and" shouldn't be here as there is no more action on level 3. [Proposed Change]: Remove the "and". | Remove the "and". |  |
| C146 | CATT (Rui) | Mob | 1 | ToDisc | [Ericsson-Tony] It seems that there is no solution explianed for the problem. | CATT (to coordinate with the other interested companies) | the text is intended to capture the following agreement, but it is not correct. It “the PSCell” here it the current serving PSCell due to a legacy PScell change.the candidate PSCell for the condReconfigId should not be the applicable cell,as there is no subsequent execution condition for it. UE stops evaluating cand cell for which execution condition is not provided (but configurations are kept) |  |  |
| N91 | Nokia | Mob | 1 | Duplicate | [Ericsson-Tony] See C146, please coordinate with them |  | The condReconfigToAddMod need not be used in the text as all the steps are for given condReconfigID.. And any field reference can use this itself. Second bullet is not needed. Is it possible to have this variable with only one entry with subsequentConfig. The reference to subsequentCondReconfig is meant for the configuration not for the PSCell referred in 3>. To avoid this confusion these bullets can be rewritten with reference to the configID of current serving cell. We propose TP for consideration in our contributio |  |  |
| C144 | CATT (Rui) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] It should be up to the network to guarantee that the execution conditions at the UE are always valid. Thus I don't think this UE action is needed. In this way we force the network to provide new execution conditions at every PSCell change and thus there is no "subsequent" CPAC. |  | in some cases(e.g.,after legacy PSCell change/CPC execution), the stored condExecutionCondSCG can be invalid.so these is a problem that UE may use a invalid execution condition. | To ensure the stored condExecutionCondSCG is valid, UE removes the stored condExecutionCondSCG when UE performs reconfiguration with sync for SCG or SCG release.we will address it in our tdoc. |  |
| N92 | Nokia | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] The scenario assumed in this RIL is not valid as when the SCG is released, also VarConditionalReconfig for the SCG is released. Check clause 5.3.5.4 |  | Scenario : After SCG release the UE can maintain varConditionalReconfig.. But only with the entries taken from the subsequentConfig of released SCG. If the subsequentReconfig is also maintained in the variable , after CPA to one of the serving cell UE may still have the subsequent-config for the added cell. There may be attempt to evaluate the conditions. So it is better to clean-up the subsequentCondReconfig in all entries on SCG release and only maintain the variable for CPA executio |  |  |
| N93 | Nokia | Mob |  | ToDisc | [Ericsson-Tony] There is no solution to the proposed RIL. | Nokia (to coordinate with the interested companies) | subsequent CPAC still can be based on MCG measurement ID.. This is applicable only if both conditions are configured. This check is missing in 2 |  |  |
| C147 | CATT (Rui) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] If there is the application of the default MAC configuration then it safe to do a MAC reset. I see no problem is current procedure. |  | MCG MAC reset should not be performed upon S-CPAC execution if the MCG MAC is reset upon S-CPAC execution, the network does not know the MAC reset is performed by UE, so it will not perform MAC reset, this may cause the misalign for MAC states between UE side and network side, which may cause the RRCReconfigurationComplete message cannot be received successfully by network | Remove the “2> reset MCG MAC” | Huawei: is it possible to apply default MAC cell group configuration but not reset MCG MAC? The MN will only know upon receiving the complete message, but perhaps it can work this way? |
| H083 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] This procedure involves reconfiguration with sync and the application of the L1 parameter is done there already. Do we need to repeat this procedure twice? |  | Default L1 parameter values should also be applied. | Add "apply the default L1 parameter value for the MCG and for the SCG, as specified in corresponding physical layer specifications except for the parameters for which values are provided in SIB1." |  |
| E206 | Ericsson (Cecilia) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] The proposed change is not enterely correct as timer T311 applies only to the MCG but not the SCG, whereas T310 may apply to both. Maybe okay to leave the procedure as it it? Also, my understanding is that this is for the MCG? |  | It is not clear if the default values of the MCG and/or the SCG should be used. As both the MCG and the SCG are reconfigured, the default values of both cell groups need to be taken into account. [Proposed Change]: Add "for both the MCG and the SCG" at the end of the sentence. | Add "for both the MCG and the SCG" at the end of the sentence. |  |
| E207 | Ericsson (Cecilia) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] The proposed change is not enterely correct as timer T311 applies only to the MCG but not the SCG, whereas T310 may apply to both. I think is better to leave the text as it it. |  | It is a bit strange to say "for the cell group for which the execution was triggered" when the else case is only about the SCG. [Proposed Change]: Change "cell group for which the subsequent CPAC execution procedure is triggered" to "SCG". | Change "cell group for which the subsequent CPAC execution procedure is triggered" to "SCG". |  |
| H087 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] It may be possible for the network to change the security key also for an intra-SN CPAC. So maybe is okay to keep this text? |  | According to the field description in ConditionalReconfiguration, the network always includes servingSecurityCellSetId when it configures inter-SN SCPAC, so this condition can only be true if only intra-SN SCPAC is configured, in which case there is no reason to change the SN key. | Remove this bullet. |  |
| H114 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] As explained in the RIL, network can use the legacy flag to trigger such procedures. There is no need to hardcode them in the spec. |  | The network can include discardOnPDCP and reestablishRLC for SRB3 in the RRC message, so we see no reason to introduce this text. This is also how it is done for SRBs for LTM. | Remove the 2> and sub-bullets. |  |
| H084 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | ToDisc | [Ericsson-Tony] I guess the scenario of change of termination point should be discussed, if this has not be done already | Huawei (to coordinate with the other interested companies) | this is about the "RadioBearerConfig that is part of the UE configuration", so this is not what the author thinks it does. In addition, keyToUse is not part of the AS security config, it is part of the RB configuration, so it was released and it is unclear what "different keyToUse" means. | Discuss whether we need to support termination point change at SCPAC execution. If so, some more work is needed. |  |
| H085 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] My understanding if that current procedure it works, even is there is some repetition. Maybe there is no need to have fixses for something that is not broken. |  | Duplication of existing procedures (DRB handling here) is not good. | Consider alternative solutions, e.g. set/remove reestablishPDCP for DRBs in the reference and in the target configuration, since these are UE variables, they can be modified, and then when 5.3.5.3 is applied, the existing procedures are sufficient. |  |
| E208 | Ericsson (Cecilia) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] From the ASN.1 signalling, is possible to have only 1 SRB3. There should be no problems with such procedure. |  | The text sounds like there can be multiple SRB3 bearers. [Proposed Change]: Insert a line break after "and", so that the test "if the radio bearer is SRB3…" is in a separate clause. | Insert a line break after "and", so that the test "if the radio bearer is SRB3…" is in a separate clause. |  |
| E234 | Ericsson (Tony) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | Suggest to add “included” in order to align also with the existing text in other sections | Do the following change: 1> for each ltm-CandidateId value included in the ltm-CandidateToAddModList: |  |
| E236 | Ericsson (Tony) | Mob | 1 | ToDisc | [Ericsson-Tony] I think that "release all current radio configuration associated with the cell group.." may include also the RadioBearerConfig. Maybe a solution would be to include a note by explicitly saying that RadioBearerConfig is not included in the action (something similar to what we have in the fullConfig procedure). This will make up keep the current text. | Ericsson (to coordinate with the other interested companies) | The UE first execute the actions related to the SRB and DRBs, but later on in the procedure the UE release all the current dedicated configurations and thus whatever has been done for the SRBs and DRBs because meaningless, since those will be release (which is not the intention). We should include this text within the exception of releasing the dedicated configurations. | Include the actions related to the SRBs and DRBs within the exceptions on what the UE releases the dedicated configuration or clarify the actions related to SRBs and DRBs are not within “release/clear all current dedicated ration configurations”. | Huawei v14: Disagree, the following text does not release anything for SRBs or DRBs because they are neither "associated with the MCG" nor "associated with the SCG" |
| E235 | Ericsson (Tony) | Mob | 1 | ToDisc | [Ericsson-Tony] I don't think the SCG LTM is broken as later on in the procedure the UE will apply the default configuration for SRB1 and all other SRB for which the UE has an SRB identity. Therefore, I see no problem or? | Ericsson (to coordinate with the other interested companies) | A DRB using the primary or secondary key can also be mapped to the SCG or MCG, respectively, and thus this is not enterely correct. We propose to delete the reference to the key used. | Do the following change: 2> if the LTM cell switch is triggered on the MCG and for the SRB/DRB using the master key; or 2> if the LTM cell switch is triggered on the SCG and for the SRB/DRB using the secondary key: | Huawei v14: With the proposed change, at SCG LTM, the UE will release PDCP and SDAP of MN-terminated bearers, including SRB1/2, but the candidate configuration is prepared by the SN, so it cannot provide such configuration, so SCG LTM is entirely broken. The current procedure seems to work actually |
| F035 | Fujitsu (Takako) | Mob | 1 | Duplicate | [Ericsson-Tony] My understanding is that even if the L3 HO has failed, the UE when triggers the RRC-reestablishment procedure it will restore the source cell configuration and thus there is never security key change at such. Therefore, in this case there should be no issue2. |  | (Issue 1) The fast LTM recovery is supported also for non-LTM failure (L3 HO/CHO and mobility from NR failures). For these case, security key change might be applied for the failed handover. If security key change was applied, COUNT values for SRBs were set to zero at the target configuration. These COUNT values should not be continued at fast LTM recovery. (Issue2) Also, state variables continuation for non-LTM failure case may have implementation impact. If this is the case, this should be solved. | Two proposed options: Option 1: Fast LTM recovery is supported only after LTM cell switch execution failure. (covers both Issue 1 and Issue 2) Option 2: Fast LTM recovery is applied after reconfiguration with sync failure and mobility from NR failure but:  - State variable continuation is only applied the case security key update was not applied for the failed handover; (covers Issue 1) and  - for reconfiguration with sync failure, fast recovery is only applied the case masterKeyUpdate was included in the failed handover. (covers Issue 2) |  |
| C127 | CATT (Rui) | Mob | 1 | ToDisc | [Ericsson-Tony] There is no solution to the proposed RIL. I guess this can be discussed together with F035 | CATT (to coordinate with the other interested companies) | The purpose of continuing the PDCP state variable for SRB1 cannot be achieved with the change as UE has already reverted back the PDCP state variable when T304 expires.we will submit a tdoc to address it. |  | Huawei v14: The need for this bullet and the previous one is unclear, they could be removed |
| F034 | Fujitsu (Takako) | Mob | 1 | Duplicate | [Ericsson-Tony] See C127 |  | RAN2 agreed that COUNT for SRB would be continued at LTM recovery. However, the text in the RRC specification specifies COUNT for only SRB1 is continued. Since RRC message(s) via other MCG SRB(s) may be transmitted with RRCReconfigurationComplete via SRB1, other SRB(s) has the same problem with SRB1. Also, for DAPS case, state variables continuation is applied for all MCG SRBs. Therefore, state variable continuation should be applied for all MCG SRBs. | continue using PDCP entity for each SRB associated to MCG with state variables continuation as specified in TS 38.323 [5] |  |
| E237 | Ericsson (Tony) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | The SRB1 is always configured for the case when fast RLF recovery is triggered and thus “(if configured)” can be deleted. | Do the following change: 2> continue using PDCP entity for SRB1 (if configured) with state variables continuation as specified in TS 38.323 [5]; |  |
| M021 | MediaTek (Li-Chuan Tseng) | Mob | 1 | Duplicate | [Ericsson-Tony] See C127. My understanding is that something in PDCP spec needs some update. |  | Corresponding procedure 38.323 is written in such way that the PDCP entity of an SRB should be configured for state variable continuation. Also other parts of 38.331 (DAPS related) where the state variables continuation is used, the PDCP entity of SRB is always "configured" for state variables continuation. So, should this text be updated to "configure the PDCP entity of SRB1 for state variables continuation", i.e., is that the intention here? In addition, in 38.323, state variables continuation requires 'source SRB' and 'target SRB', i.e., the target SRB inherits the state variables of the source SRB. It is unclear what is considered source SRB and what is target SRB in the case of LTM cell switch execution. In addition, in 38.323, state variables continuation requires 'source SRB' and 'target SRB', i.e., the target SRB inherits the state variables of the source SRB. It is unclear what is considered source SRB and what is target SRB in the case of LTM cell switch execution. |  |  |
| H096 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | ToDisc | [Ericsson-Tony] There is no solution to the proposed RIL. | Huawei (to coordinate with the other interested companies) | For a number of fields, it is not clear whether that are "associated with the MCG" or not, e.g. fields in otherConfig directly received on SRB1 (not in mrdc-secondaryCellGroupConfig), which can result in mismatch between the UE and the network. | See discussion and proposal in Tdoc. |  |
| M022 | MediaTek (Li-Chuan Tseng) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | (typo) | associated withto the |  |
| H093 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] LTM re-use the reconfiguration with sync procedure and in that section there is a UE action to apply the L1 parameter. I think we don't need to repeat this actions twice. |  | In the full configuration procedure, after which this procedure is modelled, the UE applies default L1 parameters, but not here. | Add a statement to apply default L1 parameters for the CG for which the LTM cell switch procedure is triggered. |  |
| N133 | Nokia (Jedrzej) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] We agree during the WI to not have a specific section for how the UE should generate the applied complete LTM configuration. Also, the final applied complete LTM configuration does not take into account the source configuration, as the complete LTM configuration is always a full configuration with respect to the source confituration. I think that the current text is indeed in line with the Rel-18 agreements. |  | The way reference configuration in LTM is applied is not in line with the R18 agreements. The applied final configuration is a combination of source, reference and candidate delta configuration. | Avoid the release of source configuration when using reference configuration. Modify the procedure in 5.3.5.18.6 and add a new section. TP to be submitted to RAN2#125bis |  |
| S810 | Samsung (Aby) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] This is in line with what we did already for subsequent CPAC. |  | Handling reference configuration modification in LTM configuration. | Problem: It is specified that UE stores and applies the RRCReconfiguration for a LTM cell switch for subsequent LTM cell switch. When the Reference configuration or candidate cell is modified, UE also should regenerate any stored RRC reconfiguration message using the modified reference configuration message. There is a line in the note added for SCPAC case, a similar line may be added for LTM also. Solution: Update NOTE 2 as follows similar to the note in subsequent CPAC. NOTE 2: When ltm-ConfigComplete is not included for an LTM candidate configuration, before an LTM cell switch is triggered a UE implementation may generate and store an RRCReconfigurationmessage by applying the received LTM candidate configuration on top of the LTM reference configuration, and the stored RRCReconfiguration message is applied when the LTM cell switch is triggered. The UE need to ensure that RRC reconfiguration applied at the time of LTM cell switch is in accordance with the latest LTM reference configuration and LTM candidate configuration. |  |
| G126 | Google (Eric) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] The current text if correct and the absence of the "if…else" condition in on purpose. The UE will only perform fast RLF recovery once for CHO and if a cell has both a CHO and a LTM candidate, is up to the UE which one to chose. |  | After apply the condRRCReconfig. If the attemptLTM-Switch is not configured or the selected cell is not a LTM candidate cell, the UE will peforem 1>else bullet below to pefrom RRC coneection re-establishment procedure. | Change the bullet to: 1> else if attemptLTM-Switch is configured; and |  |
| C129 | CATT (Rui) | Mob | 1 | ToDisc | [Ericsson-Tony] It looks like this is one of the remaining issues and needs to be discussed. At the moment the 38.300 and 38.331 are not aligned | CATT (to coordinate with the other interested companies) | according to the spec, multiple attempts of the LTM recovery is supported, but it has the risk to let UE falls into a cycle to access the same cell unsuccessfully | LTM recovery should be only performed once after the failure happens.we will submit tdoc to address it. |  |
| N111 | Jarkko(Nokia)\_update | Mobility Enhancements (EMR) | 2 | PropAgree |  |  | One possible issue with validityStatus reporting that now R18 validity status supporting UE could report the status to the gNB not supporting the feature. In order to prevent this it would seem logical to have in SIB1 indication from NW whether it wants validityStatus reported | Add in SIB1 a indication whether validityStatus reporting is allowed (similar to idleModeMeasurementsEUTRA/NR) e.g. idleModeMeasurementsValidity |  |
| H143 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] This modify the legacy text, so is correct that the work "valid" should be removed. |  | This is NBC and should be removed. | Remove this. |  |
| E217 | Ericsson (Cecilia) | Mob | 0 | PropAgree |  |  | ":" missing. [Proposed Change]: Insert ":". | Insert ":". |  |
| H144 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | ToDisc |  | Huawei (to coordinate with the other interested companies) | It should be possible to configure a timer and not a list of carriers, i.e. in this care the UE reports any cell reselection measurements it has. | See TP in Tdoc. |  |
| X122 | Xiaomi (Yi) | Mob | 1 | Duplicate | [Ericsson-Tony] See X121 |  | Same as RIL X121 in 5.3.3.4 Reception of the RRCSetup by the UE. | Suggest to remove “valid” |  |
| N112 | Jarkko(Nokia)\_update | Mobility Enhancements (EMR) |  | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] I think the procedural text should be updated to clarify this. |  | The condition of T331 runing should not be applied to reselection measurements. | T331 condition should not be applied for reselection measurements i..e this bullet below “ if the UE supports reselection measurement reporting:” |  |
| H145 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | Duplicate | [Ericsson-Tony] can be addressed together with H144 |  | Action for the carrier list for cell resleection measurement should not be under a 1> which is about the carrier list for EMR, it should be under a separate 1> bullet about the carrier list for cell reselection measurements | See TP in Tdoc. |  |
| H146 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | Duplicate | [Ericsson-Tony] can be addressed together with H144 |  | Action for the validity timer for cell reselection measurement should not be under a 1> which is about the carrier list for EMR, it should be under a separate 1> bullet about the validity timer for cell reselection measurements. | See TP in Tdoc. |  |
| H147 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | Duplicate | [Ericsson-Tony] can be addressed together with H144 |  | Action for the validity timer for Rel-16 EMR should not be under a 1> which is about the carrier list for EMR, it should be under a separate 1> bullet about the validity timer for EMR. In addition, it should not be under a condition for support of cell reselection reporting, it should rather be under a condition for support of NR EMR measurement and support of the validity check of EMR. | See TP in Tdoc. |  |
| X123 | Xiaomi (Yi) | Mob | 1 | Duplicate | [Ericsson-Tony] Please check X121 |  | In current procedure, before the UE determines whether measReselectionValidityDuration is configured, the UE needs to determine whether UE has valid reselection measurements available, which may cause some issue for UE behaviour. | Suggest to remove “valid” |  |
| C145 | CATT (Rui) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] I think that the current field description does not allow the network to do a normal SpCell change and, at the same time, provide a new conditionalReconfiguration. However, the network can also provide a new conditionalReconfiguration after the SpCell change was done (in another RRC message). This is not forbidden and thus current text is in line with the agreement. |  | It was agreed that it is up to the NW to guarantee a valid SCPAC configuration after normal PCell change/legacy PSCell change, which means the network can reconfigure the S-CPAC configuration upon perfroming the PCell change/legacy PSCell change, however, this is not allowed according to the current spec as follow. |  |  |
| M024 | MediaTek (Li-Chuan Tseng) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] I am okay to remove this field description |  | Field description for ltm-Config does not provide any useful info. As per RAN2#125 agreement, such field description should not be introduced. |  |  |
| E231 | Ericsson (Tony) | Mob | 1 | ToDisc | [Ericsson-Tony] This is an issue that was discussed in the last meeting, but was not completely resolved (postponed) | Ericsson (to coordinate with the other interested companies) | In the last RAN2 meeting we discussed the possibility that the network is able to distinguish which LTM candidate cell configuration is applied by the UE as the transaction IDs included within the RRCReconfiguration message may collide. The easiest solution to avoid this problem would be to include the applied LTM candidate cell configuration index within the RRCReconfigurationComplete message. This will avoid any misalignment between the UE and the network. | Add the LTM candidate cell configuration index within the RRCReconfigurationComplete message. |  |
| E238 | Ericsson (Tony) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | From the RAN1 parameter list, it seems that only ssb-index is allowed within PathlossReferenceRS. This should be clarified in the field description. | Clarify in the field description that only ssb-index can be included within PathlossReferenceRS-Id-r17. |  |
| E239 | Ericsson (Tony) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | From the RAN1 parameter list, it seems that only ssb-index is allowed within PathlossReferenceRS. This should be clarified in the field description. | Clarify in the field description that only ssb-index can be included within PathlossReferenceRS-Id-r17. |  |
| E209 | Ericsson (Cecilia) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | There seems to be no other reference to "CHO with target SCG" so better not to include it only here. This is a CHO configuration, which happens to include an SCG as well. It is a bit different for "CHO with candidate SCG(s)", which have different configurations (an additional execution condition) and which is described in stage-2 (37.340).. [Proposed Change]: Remove "CHO with target SCG". | Remove "CHO with target SCG". |  |
| H0097 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | ToDisc | [Ericsson-Tony] i have some sympathy for the comment as it not crystal clear the association between the security set ID and a candidate. Nevertheless, we should not tight the presence of this field only to the inter-SN case as the security may be changed also for the intra-SN case. It should be up to the network to decide. | Huawei (to coordinate with the other interested companies) | If this is configured for certain candidates but not others, the UE behaviours is totally inconsistent (see discussion). | Make it either configured for all SCPAC candidates, or not configured for any. It looks simpler to make it always configured for SCPAC (for intra-SN, it is not difficult for the network to set a single value). |  |
| E210 | Ericsson (Cecilia) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] Before we had a definition of "complete configuration" but this was deleted in a late stage of the WI. I think it makes sense to spell out what we mean with "complete configuration" in the field description. |  | "Complete configuration" might be a bit unclear to people who have not worked with the feature before. [Proposed Change]: Add something saying that is it is not present the configuration is "...a delta configuration on top of the reference configuration in scpac-ReferenceConfiguration". | Add something saying that is it is not present the configuration is "...a delta configuration on top of the reference configuration in scpac-ReferenceConfiguration". |  |
| E211 | Ericsson (Cecilia) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | This "MN initiated inter-SN..." does not make sense since the candidates can all be in the same SN also when it is MN initiated. This seems to be the only place where this is present now. It has been removed from the corresponding field description above. [Proposed Change]: Change to "...MN initiated subsequent CPAC...". | Change to "...MN initiated subsequent CPAC...". |  |
| C130 | CATT (Rui) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] Even if this field can be configured for Rel-17 CPAC, as far as this field is present and set to true then I think there is no issue right? Can't we leave this to the network to set this field with the correct value? |  | The condition is not correct. It may cause that it is allowed to configured “scpac-ConfigComplete-r18” for a R17 CPAC candidate cell configuration When both the R17 CPAC and R18 S-CPAC candidate cell configuration are provided in the same conditional reconfiguration message. e.g. the conditional reconfiguration include the configuration for cell 1 cell 2 and cell 3, and the cell 1 is configured as one legacy CAPC, cell 2 and cell 3 are configured for SCPAC, for cell 1 it could configured with the field of scpac-ConfigComplete due to the condition of “when the conditional reconfiguration includes at least one candidate PSCell supporting subsequent CPAC.” is fulfilled, but in fact the cell 1 should not be configured with scpac-ConfigComplete. Therefore, we suggest changing the description to “when the subsequentCondReconfig field is present corresponding to the same condReconfigId” to avoid the ambiguity. | the descrption of the condition needs to to changed.we will address it in our tdoc. |  |
| E212 | Ericsson (Cecilia) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | It is unclear what is meant by "initial conditional reconfiguration". Maybe CHO is configured first, and later S-CPAC. The S-CPAC would not be the intial configuration. | Change the wording (upon the intitial … subsequent CPAC) to "initial configuration of subsequent CPAC for inter-SN CPC or CPA". |  |
| E240 | Ericsson (Tony) | Mob | 1 | ToDisc |  | Ericsson (to coordinate with the other interested companies) | RAN2 has agreed to send an LS to RAN3 where it was mentioned that the RA-RNTI should be forwarded by the Candidate DU to the Source DU. However, this parameter is not useful to the Source DU as it not used anyway to delive the TA value within a RAR message. This has been discussed in RAN3 already and they agreed to wait for RAN2 to discuss this. | Send an LS to RAN3 to clarify that the RA-RNTI should be deleted in the F1AP message that is used to deliver the TA value. We will bring a contribution about this. |  |
| H092 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] I think it makes sense that the network set this field for all the candidates, otherwise we create inconsistency in the UE behaviour. |  | It seems allowed to configure this for certain candidates but not others. If so, according to current procedures, the UE behaviour will be inconsistent. | Capture that the network either sets this field for all candidates, or does not set it for any candidate. We will have a document to explain the issue can include the TP. | v1 |
| H091 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] I think it makes sense that the network set this field for all the candidates, otherwise we create inconsistency in the UE behaviour. |  | It seems allowed to configure this for certain candidates but not others. If so, according to current procedures, the UE behaviour will be inconsistent. | Capture that the network either sets this field for all candidates, or does not set it for any candidate. We will have a document to explain the issue can include the TP. |  |
| H086 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] I would be fine to remove the remaining of the field description, even if for me is good to clarify what this fields are, as they are new.  About creating new IE for the SSB-periodicity and other, I tought about this but then it would be a bit complicated as e.g., there a field SSB-ToMeasure which is exactly as the SSB-PositionInBurst but for some strange reason was called diffently. I guess that in this case we can leave with some repetition. |  | 1) None of the field descriptions bring any information that is not already in ASN.1 or in procedure text. 2) ssb-PositionInBurst is identical to the field with the same name in ServingCellConfigCommon, probably the description in ServingCellConfigCommon also applies this, so an IE should be created and used in both places 3) same thing for ssb-Periodicity and ssb-PeriodicityServingCell in ServingCellConfigCommon (and it could be Need S like there) 4) same thing for ss-PBCH-BlockPower | Remove the useless field descriptions (all current ones), create IEs SSB-Periodicity, SSB-PositionsInBurst and SS-PBCH-BlockPower, move existing descriptions (currently in ServingCellConfigCommon) there and use the IEs in every place. |  |
| M025 | MediaTek (Li-Chuan Tseng) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | (re-wording to align with others) | This field identifies the PCI of the SpCell of the LTM candidate configuration contained in ltm-CandidateConfig. |  |
| M026 | MediaTek (Li-Chuan Tseng) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | (re-wording) | This field identifiesindicates an LTM candidate configuration. |  |
| M027 | MediaTek (Li-Chuan Tseng) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | (re-wording) | The IE LTM-Config is used to provide LTM configurationcandidate configurations. |  |
| F036 | Fujitsu (Takako) | Mob | 1 | Duplicate | [Ericsson-Tony] I think this is linked to H091 and H092. Initially we had a conditional presence where it was indicated what is proposed in this RIL, but companies decided to take it out. Maybe a mistake… |  | This field is mandatory for the first LTM configuration. It may be better to be specified in LTM-Config field description. |  |  |
| N134 | Nokia (Jedrzej) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] We need the "+1" for the case on when the serving cell is not one of the LTM candidate cells. |  | The maximum value of "LTM configurations plus one" is not justified for the UE-based TA. | Set the maximum value of ltm-ServingCellUE-MeasuredTA-ID to maxNrofLTM-Configs-r18 |  |
| M029 | MediaTek (Li-Chuan Tseng) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | (re-wording) | This field indicates whether the UE shall include a L1 measurement report associated to the current SpCell. This field can only be configured if the current SpCell is configured as an SpCell of an LTM candidate configurationcell. |  |
| M028 | MediaTek (Li-Chuan Tseng) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree |  |  | (re-wording) | LTM candidate configurationcell IDs |  |
| E241 | Ericsson (Tony) | Mob | 1 | PropAgree | [Ericsson-Tony] I think MAC associate the received TCI to this IE, but it does not hurt to clarify for what this IE is used for. Maybe this can be already inferred by the procedure in MAC, but is not really immediate. |  | It would be to clarify that these list of TCI states and TCI-state related configuration are used for both the TCI state pre-activate and for the LTM cell switch procedure. | Add the following change: The IE LTM-TCI-Info is used to configure TCI related information for an LTM candidate configuration to be used during pre-activation of TCI state(s) and/or during the activation upon the reception of the LTM Cell Switch procedure. | Huawei: In 38.321, the MAC CE descriptions normally refer to the RRC field names, so maybe we can just do that in 38.321 and there is not need to duplicate it here. |
| H095 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] I think that the latest RAN1 agreement says that this list and the legacy TCI list are indepenent and UE will continue to use the LTM TCI after the LTM cell switch until the network will not change this TCI with one of the legacy TCI list. Therefore, I guess RAN1 somehow reverted what they agreed before. |  | RAN1 agreed that this list of TCI states is a subset of the list in the initial DL BWP, but this is not captured. The same applies to UL TCI states for the UL BWP. Consequently, this should also be the case of Pathloss Reference RS and for the NZP CSI-RS that are used in TCI states. | We discuss possible solution in a Tdoc. |  |
| H094 | Huawei (David) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] This comes from the RAN1 parameter list. If this should be removed I expect RAN1 to inform us. |  | Items in this list are not used anywhere. | Remove this field and the next one. |  |
| X124 | Xiaomi (Yi) | Mob | 2 | ToDisc | [Ericsson-Tony] I think the proposal can be discussed during the meeting | Xiaomi (too coordinate with the other interested companies) | In current spec, the indication validityStatus is added to MeasResultsPerCellIdleNR, which includes the idle/inactive measured results per cell. However, in the procedure of EMR/IMR, if X is configured, only valid measurement results can be reported to network. And a per UE indication is enough, the new indication shall be per MeasResultIdleNR or MeasResultIdleEUTRA indication and added to MeasResultIdleNR and MeasResultIdleEUTRA. | See TP in Tdoc. |  |
| F031 | Fujitsu (Meiyi) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] How the UE handles this should be already clear in the MAC spec when the LTM cell switch MAC CE is received. Therefore, there is no need to further clarify this in RRC. |  | According to the field description for cfra, the UE performs contention based random access if cfra and cfra-TwoStep are absent. However, CFRA resources can be provided in the LTM cell switch MAC CE and refer to rach-ConfigCommon. It means that the UE performs contention free random access when the CFRA resources from rach-ConfigCommon is indicated in the MA CE. | To modify the field description of cfra: If this field and cfra-TwoStep are absent and if the random access is not initiated for LTM cell switch, the UE performs contention based random access. |  |
| F033 | Fujitsu (Meiyi) | Mob | 1 | PropReject | [Ericsson-Tony] If this is already mentioned explicitly in stage2, I don't see the point to re-iterate this also in RRC. Network know that 2-step RA is not supported for LTM, so it should not add such configuration. |  | According to TS38.300, CFRA resources for 2-step RA type should not be configured for LTM cell switch. | To add the following description in the field cfra-TwoStep: Network doesn't include this field if the IE RACH-ConfigDedicated is part of an RRCReconfiguration message within the LTM-Config IE. |  |
| F032 | Fujitsu (Meiyi) | Mob | 1 | Duplicate | [Ericsson-Tony] See F031 |  | same as F031 | To modify the field description of cfra-TwoStep: If this field and cfra are absent and if the random access is not initiated for LTM cell switch, the UE performs contention based random access. |  |
| E068 | Ericsson (Tony) | Mob | 2 | ToDisc | [Ericsson-Tony] This is an issue that was discussed in the last meeting, but was not completely resolved (postponed) | Ericsson (to coordinate with the other interested companies) | When providing a RadioBearerConfig for an LTM candidate cell configuration, we needs to clarify that the SecurityConfig should not be provided (except for the keyToUse field), even if, in this case, the radio bearer may be considered as the first addition. An exception for LTM need to be added. | Add an exception that, in case this field is used for LTM, in this case its presence is not mandatory (at least for the field condition of securityAlgorithmConfig). We are planning to submit a contribution about this. |  |
| E250 | Ericsson (Tony) | Mob | 1 | ToDisc | [Ericsson-Tony] This is a new issue discovered about the capabilities agreed in RAN1 and agreed in RAN2 | Ericsson (to coordinate with the other interested companies) | In current capability signalling, if the UE supports LTM (at the MCG or SCG), the UE should also support in a mandatory way the L1 measurements for LTM. According to what was agreed in RAN1 this was not the intention and the UE should be able to report the support of LTM (at the MCG or SCG). Also, if we want to keep the current text of this capability in 38.306 the capabilities for the intra- and inter-frequency measurements become useless, so what is the point of having them? | We will bring a contribution for this. |  |
| E250 | Ericsson (Tony) | Mob | 1 | Duplicate |  |  | In current capability signalling, if the UE supports LTM (at the MCG or SCG), the UE should also support in a mandatory way the L1 measurements for LTM. According to what was agreed in RAN1 this was not the intention and the UE should be able to report the support of LTM (at the MCG or SCG). Also, if we want to keep the current text of this capability in 38.306 the capabilities for the intra- and inter-frequency measurements become useless, so what is the point of having them? | We will bring a contribution for this. |  |
| C126 | CATT (Rui) | Mob | 2 | ToDisc | [Ericsson-Tony] The field description it seems to hint that only A4 event can be included in this IE. But maybe this can be discussed. | CATT (to coordinate with the other interested companies) |  |  |  |