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# 1 Introduction

This document is a summary of the following offline discussion:

**[AT110-e][071][DCCA] New Cases (Huawei)**

Scope: Treat R2-2004573, R2-2005239, R2-2005616, R2-2005629. Determine agreeable parts if any, and and make corresponding agreements.

 Expected Outcome: Agreements

 Deadline: June 5 0700 UTC

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 Idle/inactive measurements

There are the two following proposals.

[R2-2004573](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_110-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2004573.zip) Discussion on NR-U frequency in early measurement OPPO discussion Rel-16 LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

This document is having two proposals:

**Proposal 1: RAN2 is kindly asked to confirm the *carrierFreqNR* for SSB frequency in early measurement configuration can be NR-U frequency.**

**Proposal 2: RMTC configuration can be configured for NR-U frequency in early measurement configuration. The RSSI and channel occupancy ratio measurement results are also included in early measurement results.**

Proposal 1 may not have any impact to current specifications.

Proposal 2 is to provide additional

**Q1: Do companies think that idle/inactive measurements of SSB measurements on NR carrier in unlicensed spectrum is currently supported?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| OPPO | Yes  | From current spec, NR-U frequency is not excluded.  |
| Google | Yes | We don’t see why not to support it. The current specification does not exclude it.  |
| Nokia | Yes for P1 | But we do not try to optimize support in anyway. It may be supported as is |
| CATT | Yes | It seems ok to include the NR-U measurement in early measurement as the current spec includes the NR-U frequency and related measurements. |

**Q2: Do companies support introducing in 38.331 idle/inactive measurement and reporting of RSSI and channel occupancy ratio measurements for NR carriers in unlicensed spectrum?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| OPPO | Yes  | For NR-U frequency is configured in the early measurement configuration, it is worth to report RSSI and channel occupancy ratio measurements. |
| Google | Maybe | Even without reporting of RSSI and channel occupancy ratio measurements, the MN can still to configure SN based on RSRP/RSRQ. No strong views on this. |
| Nokia | No | As said above |
| CATT | Yes  | If the NR-U frequency is configured in the early measurement configuration, we consider reporting the RSSI and channel occupancy ratio measurements in early measurement results  |

[R2-2005239](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_110-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2005239.zip) Using NR early measurements with network sharing Huawei, HiSilicon, BT CR Rel-16 36.331 16.0.0 4308 - C LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

This document is considering the case of an LTE cell shared between multiple PLMNs, while NR carriers may not shared between the PLMNs. In order that UEs measure NR carriers on which they are allowed, it is proposed to add, for each NR carrier, a bitmap indicating for which of the PLMN indicated in SIB1 it is accessible.

**Q3: Do companies support introducing in 36.331 an indication per NR carrier for idle/inactive measurement, to indicate its applicability for each of the PLMNs in LTE SIB1, so that the UE only measures NR carriers applicable for the PLMN that it has selected?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| OPPO | No | It means that the UE will read the SIB1 for PLMN checking during idle measurement period? It impacts the UE idle measurement behaviour a lot. |
| Google |  | The *RRCConnectionRelease* message can exclude the NR carrier frequency not shared by the selected PLMN so that the UE does not measure that NR carrier frequency. So we wonder why this bitmap is needed. |
| Nokia | No | Dedicated signalling handles this sufficiently well |
| CATT | No | Dedicated signalling can indicate which NR carriers should be measured, the bitmap looks redundant. |

## 2.2 Fast recovery

[R2-2005616](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_110-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2005616.zip) Introduction of transmitting NAS messages on SCG Google Inc. draftCR Rel-16 36.331 16.0.0 F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

[R2-2005629](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_110-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2005629.zip) Introduction of transmitting NAS messages on SCG Google Inc. draftCR Rel-16 38.331 16.0.0 F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core

These documents are proposing to allow transmission of UL NAS messages on split SRB2 or SRB3 while T316 is running (i.e. during fast MCG recovery).

 **Q4: Do companies support introducing in 36.331/38.331 the possibility to transmit UL NAS messages and DL NAS mesages on split SRB2 or SRB3?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| OPPO | No | we do not think it is necessary to deliver the NAS message when MCG failure is ongoing. If there is NAS message is delivered to the gNB, the gNB will repose with “NAS Non Delivery Indication” message. |
| Google | Yes | We are the proponent company. Here are some clarifications:* While T316 is running, the UE may need to send NAS messages to establish an emergency PDN connection for an emergency call or make a voice call with CS fallback in EN-DC. Similarly, while T316 is running, the network may need to send NAS messages to the UE, e.g., to initiate a voice call with CS fallback for the UE in EN-DC. Split SRB2 or SRB3 can be configured, so there should be no restriction to exchange NAS messages on split SRB2 or SRB3 while T316 is running.
* A typo in changes in section 5.6.2.3 in 36.331 CR in R2-2005616: “SRB1” should be replaced by “SRB2”.

1> if T316 is running (i.e., MCG failure):2> if SRB2 is configured as split SRB:3> submit the *ULInformationTransfer* message via SRB2 to lower layers for transmission using the new configuration; |
| Nokia | No | This needs to be understood and checked more generally, not only for SRB3. This requires more discussions. |
| CATT | No | We don’t think it is necessary, and it is too late to introduce such a new case without further discussion |

# 3 Conclusion

…