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# Introduction

This contribution provides a summary of the following email discussion:

[103-e-NR-IAB-02] Issue with IAB-DU “serving” cell terminology – Thomas (AT&T)

-       Determine whether the term “serving cells” should be removed for IAB-DUs in 38.213

-       Discussion and decision by 10/27, TPs (if needed) by 10/29

# Issue with IAB-DU “serving” cell terminology

**Source**: R1-2008742

**Background:** In 38.213 Section 14, multiple references to a “serving cell” in relation to an IAB-DU are made, which are consistent with the terminology used for UEs and IAB-MTs. However, this is inconsistent with other specifications where gNB-DUs do not use the term “serving” for associated cells, including for IAB-DUs (see 38.331 and 38.401 for examples from RAN2 and RAN3 respectively). Unless a clear motivation is made for keeping the term “serving cells,” since the IAB-DU hosts gNB-DU functionality, it seems more appropriate to remove the instances of “IAB-DU serving cell(s)” or “serving cell(s) of an IAB-DU.” Since there does not appear to be any functional impact, an editorial correction of the specification could be used to make the update instead of a CR.

**FL Proposal 2.1:** Remove all references to “serving” in relation of IAB-DU cell(s) in TS 38.213 Section 14.

Note: This will be done via editorial update of the alignment CR

**Discussion:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with FL Proposal 2.1?** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Yes | A serving cell is a cell from a UE or IAB-MT perspective. It has no bearing on the IAB-DU side. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | None. |
| LG | Yes | None |
| Huawei | Yes | This was agreed before. |
| Samsung | Yes | None |
| Nokia | Yes | None |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | After checking 38.331, the term “serving” is also used for a IAB DU related cell in the following text:  ----------------------------------------------------  - *AvailabilityCombinationsPerCell*  The IE AvailabiltyCombinationsPerCell is used to configure the AvailabiltyCombinations applicable for a serving cell of the IAB-node DU (see TS 38.213 [13], clause 14).  -----------------------------------------------------  The inconsistent issue may still there if just RAN1 chooses to remove all references to “serving” in relation of IAB-DU cell(s) in TS 38.213. Given both RAN1 and RAN2 spec have used term “serving” for IAB DU, the following either way is OK for us:  **Option 1:**  Remove all references to “serving” in relation of IAB-DU cell(s) in TS 38.213 Section 14, also inform RAN2 to update its spec accordingly.  **Option 2:** Do nothing, since current text does not cause any misunderstanding. |
| Vivo | Yes | As commented by ZTE, RAN1 and RAN2 should align the name. |
| Intel |  | Agree with ZTE’s comments. Either Option 1 or Option 2 is Ok. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**FL Proposal 2.2:** **Remove all references to “serving” in relation of IAB-DU cell(s) in TS 38.213 Section 14.**

**Note 1: This will be done via editorial update of the alignment CR**

**Note 2: It is RAN1’s understanding that the description of *AvailabilityCombinationsPerCell* in 38.331 should also remove a reference to a “serving” cell of the IAB-node DU and recommends the following update:**

**“The IE AvailabiltyCombinationsPerCell is used to configure the AvailabiltyCombinations applicable for a ~~serving~~ cell of the IAB-~~node~~ DU (see TS 38.213 [13], clause 14).”**

# Summary

TBD