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# 1 Introduction

In this document the following offline is discussed:

* [AT118-e][225][DCCA] RRC for CPAC (Ericsson)

      Scope: Discuss RRC corrections for CPAC marked for this discussion.

Intended outcome: Discussion report in [R2-2206168](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_118-e\R2-2206168.zip).

Deadline: Deadline 2

Contact information:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact Name, Email** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | David Lecompte (david.lecompte at huawei.com) |
| ZTE | Mengjie Zhang (zhang.mengjie@zte.com.cn) |
| Lenovo | Congchi Zhang (zhangcc16@lenovo.com) |
| MediaTek | Felix Tsai (chun-fan.tsai@mediatek.com) |
| Google | Jing-Rong Hsieh (jinghsieh@google.com) |
| ITRI | Nai-Lun Huang (NellenHuang@itri.org.tw) |
| Ericsson | Cecilia Eklöf (cecilia.eklof@ericsson.com) |
| NEC | Hisashi Futaki (hisashi.futaki @ nec.com) |
| LGE | Hongsuk Kim (hassium.kim@lge.com) |
| vivo | Chenli (Chenli5g@vivo.com) |
| CMCC | Xiaoxuan Tang (tangxiaoxuan@chinamobile.com) |
| Qualcomm | Punyaslok Purkayastha (punyaslo@qti.qualcomm.com) |
| CATT | Erlin Zeng (erlin.zeng@catt.cn) |
| Samsung | June Hwang (june77.hwang@samsung.com) |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 RIL E022

The following RIL was added:

**[RIL]**: E022 **[Delegate]**: Ericsson (Cecilia) **[WI]**: DCenh **[Class]**: 1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None **[Proposed Conclusion]**:

**[Description]**: It was agreed to support the combination of CHO + CPC. That means that also VarConditionalReconfiguration may have been configured when CHO was configured and VarConditionalReconfiguration then needs to be released as well. This applies to all cases where VarConditionalReconfig is released.

**[Proposed Change]**: Add one more line with the text “remove all the entries within *VarConditionalReconfiguration* as specified in TS 36.331 [10] clause 5.3.5.9.6, if any;”.

**[Comments]**:

[R2-2206116](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206116.zip), [Miscellaneous CPAC corrections related to RIL E022, E023, E024 and E029](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2206116%20Ericsson%20Miscellaneous%20CPAC%20corrections%20related%20to%20RIL%20E022,%20E023,%20E024%20and%20E029.docx), Ericsson, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

[R2-2205168](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205168.zip), [[E022] [V190] Discussion on conditional reconfiguration removal](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2205168%20ZTE%20%5bE022%5d%20%5bV190%5d%20Discussion%20on%20conditional%20reconfiguration%20removal.docx), ZTE Corporation, Sanechips, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

Question 1: Do you think RIL E022 is an issue which needs to be corrected? Any comments/proposals on the solution in such case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | The TP in R2-2206116 is a good basis (not R2-2205168).  However:  - if we introduce VarConditionalReconfigSCG, that also should be cleared in every place where VarConditionalReconfig was cleared when CPC was configured in Rel-16  - "remove all the entries for CPC": it is unclear how the UE is supposed to distinguish entries for CPC from other entries. |
| ZTE | Yes but | According to the current specs, the VarConditionalReconfig specified in TS 38.331 is used to store the conditional reconfiguration for CHO in NR SA or MR-DC with NR PCell, CPA or inter-SN CPC in NR-DC, or intra-SN CPC without MN involvement in NR-DC or EN-DC. The VarConditionalReconfiguration specified in TS 36.331 is used to store the conditional reconfiguration for CHO in LTE SA or EN-DC, CPA or inter-SN CPC in EN-DC.  Since a UE cannot be configured with NR PCell and EN-DC simultaneously, we think the removal of VarConditionalReconfiguration (specified in TS 36.331, for R17 CPA/CPC) in NR spec shall only be required in case where NR PSCell is involved in EN-DC case, e.g. NR PSCell addition/change (which has been captured in the current NR RRC spec) or SCG release. So no need to add the line for VarConditionalReconfiguration release in some cases where the remove action shall never happen in the realistic operation.  For LTE spec, since the removal of VarConditionalReconfig (specified in TS 38.331) is used for R16 CPC, it is needed in most cases where VarConditionalReconfiguration is released. But for the RRC re-establishment case, the UE will perform MR-DC release (including CPC release) before removing conditional reconfigurations. So it seems no need to specify the redundant removal of VarConditionalReconfig in such case. |
| Lenovo | Yes | It needs to be implemented in the spec in some way, although we agree with Huawei and ZTE’s concerns. |
| MediaTek | Yes | Prefer TP in R2-2206116 as baseline. |
| Google | Yes | Can take R2-2206116 as basis. |
| ITRI | Yes | Support the change. When conditional reconfigurations are to be released, the UE should release any configuration in both *VarConditionalReconfiguration* (from 36.331) and *VarConditionalReconfig* (from 38.331).  Regarding the TP in R2-2206116, agree with Huawei that it is unclear how the UE distinguish entries for CPC from other entries in current specification. |
| Ericsson | Yes (proponent) | Can take R2-2206116 as baseline and remove changes where they are not needed. |
| Nokia | yes | But we agree with others, commenting we need to have means to distinguish what type of conditional reconfigurations are stored inside this Var. |
| NEC | Yes | We do not have strong view on which is basis, while the clarifications from ZTE looks valid and should be taken into account. |
| LGE | Yes | TP in R2-2206116 can be a baseline to discuss but we have similar understanding that the remove action shall never happen in some scenarios. |
| vivo | Yes | The TP in [R2-2206116](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206116.zip) is preferred. |
| CMCC | Yes | This issue needs to be corrected. |
| Qualcomm | Yes, if coexistence of CHO and CPC is supported | If coexistence of CHO and CPC is supported, the Proposed Change above looks fine, e.g., the changes in the contribution R2-2206116. |
| CATT | see comments | We agreed with the following in the previous meeting. So our understanding is that no extra effort is spent on the co-exist. In our understanding there is a lot more to discuss than handling of UE variables. So our first preference is not to further discuss this.   (R16/R17 CHO/CPAC coex) If one conditional reconfiguration is executed, the other conditional reconfigurations should be released. Everything else is up to UE implementation.   No other specification efforts in Rel-17 on CPAC/CHO coexistence. |
| Samsung | Yes | We are ok to have R2-2206116 as baseline, and have the same view with what Huawei/ZTE commented above. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Summary question 1:

Most companies agree that RIL E022 is an issue that should be corrected. The TP in R2-2206116 can be used as baseline for further discussions.

1. Correct RIL E022 and use R2-2206116 as baseline for the correction.

## 2.2 RIL E024

The following RIL was added:

**[RIL]**: E024 **[Delegate]**: Ericsson (Cecilia) **[WI]**: DCenh **[Class]**: 1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None **[Proposed Conclusion]**:

**[Description]**: As both CHO and CPC can be configured at the same time, both measConfig for MCG and SCG for conditional reconfigurations need to be released. It is not clear here that the UE needs to release both MCG measConfig and SCG measConfig if the reportType is set to condTriggerConfig. This issue is valid for all occurrences where the measurement configurations for condition reconfigurations are released.

**[Proposed Change]**: Clarify that both MCG and SCG measurement configurations for conditional reconfigurations are released.

**[Comments]**: Huawei (David): this would be consistent with the clearing of VarConditionalReconfig(uration) just above and aligned with R17 agreement but we would like to highlight the following scenario: if CHO and R16 CPC are configured, the R17 UE will release R16 CPC configurations upon CHO execution and vice-versa, while the R16 UE will not do that.

Ericsson (Cecilia): The issue is related to the release of the measurement configuration, not the release of the UE variable for conditional reconfiguration.

[R2-2206116](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206116.zip), [Miscellaneous CPAC corrections related to RIL E022, E023, E024 and E029](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2206116%20Ericsson%20Miscellaneous%20CPAC%20corrections%20related%20to%20RIL%20E022,%20E023,%20E024%20and%20E029.docx), Ericsson, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

Question 2: Do you think RIL E024 is an issue which needs to be corrected? Any comments/proposals on the solution in such case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Suggest adding "associated with the MCG, if configured, and associated with the SCG, if configured" to make it 100% clear. |
| ZTE | No strong view | I guess the current text “for each *measId* of the source SpCell configuration” can also cover both related MCG and SCG measurement configurations. But it is a bit strange to say “of the source SpCell configuration”, so it is fine to remove it. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Google | Yes |  |
| ITRI | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes (proponent) |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | We are fine with the TP in [R2-2206116](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206116.zip). |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| CATT | No strong view. |  |
| Samsung | Yes | We would like to have some clarification such as Huawei’s comment, too. |

Summary question 2:

Most companies agree that RIL E024 is an issue that should be corrected. The TP in R2-2206116 can be used as baseline for further discussions.

1. Correct RIL E024 and use R2-2206116 as baseline for the correction.

## 2.3 RIL E023

The following RIL was added:

**[RIL]**: E023 **[Delegate]**: Ericsson (Cecilia) **[WI]**: DCenh **[Class]**: 1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None **[Proposed Conclusion]**:

**[Description]**: In rel-17 there can be conditional reconfigurations both in MCG and the SCG at the same time. There then needs to be two variables for conditional reconfigurations, one for MCG and one for SCG. If this is not defined, there need to be additions in RAN3 specifications instead, such as coordination of condReconfigId.

**[Proposed Change]**: Define a new variable VarConditionalReconfig-SCG and add relevant procedure text and ASN.1 for it.

**[Comments]**:

[R2-2206116](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206116.zip), [Miscellaneous CPAC corrections related to RIL E022, E023, E024 and E029](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2206116%20Ericsson%20Miscellaneous%20CPAC%20corrections%20related%20to%20RIL%20E022,%20E023,%20E024%20and%20E029.docx), Ericsson, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

[R2-2205485](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205485.zip), [[E023] Introduction of UE variable for SN configured conditional Reconfigurations](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2205485%20Samsung%20%5bE023%5d%20Introduction%20of%20UE%20variable%20for%20SN%20configured%20conditional%20Reconfigurations.docx), Samsung R&D Institute UK, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

Question 3: Do you think RIL E023 is an issue which needs to be corrected? Any comments/proposals on the solution in such case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | It should no be difficult (and see comment to question 1) |
| ZTE |  | If we support the coexistence of R16 CPC and CHO/R17 CPC, yes, a separate variable for R16 CPC is needed. But how to specify this may need further discussion, e.g. whether need to specify how does the UE identify the received configuration corresponds to which variable? |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| MediaTek |  | We are okay with the TP from R2-2206116. Similar to measurement configuration, we assume the UE maintain two independent UE variables from MCG and SCG.  We disagree on original TP in R2-2205444 and R2-2205485. |
| Google | Yes |  |
| ITRI | Yes | Without two separate UE variables, there would be issues caused by condReconfigId conflict. |
| Ericsson | Yes | It is the TP from R2-2206116 that is the valid one. |
| Nokia | In principle OK | We are fine to introduce a new Var for this purpose, as it needs to be known if the config is MN or SN initiated and to avoid ID collisions. Alternatively, as we propose in our R2-2205524, a flag can be added into CondReconfigToAddMod to indicate if it is set by MN or SN. |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| LGE |  | No strong view but, in my understanding, there seems no problem to maintain single UE variables. This is because the UE have different procedure text for CHO and CPAC, so the UE can differentiate between two types of configuration regardless of the number of the UE variable. Also considering that having a separate UE variables are to have different handling for the UE variables for the CHO and CPAC coexistence scenarios, but according to the agreements, it is not necessary to have different handling:  *If one conditional reconfiguration is executed, the other conditional reconfigurations should be released. Everything else is up to UE implementation.* |
| vivo | Yes | We are fine with the TP in R2-2206116. |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | The solutions proposed in both the contributions above (R2-2206116, R2-2205485) look good. |
| CATT | See our response to section 2.1 |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

Summary question 3:

Most companies agree that RIL E023 is an issue that should be corrected. The TP in R2-2206116 can be used as baseline for further discussions.

1. Correct RIL E023 and use R2-2206116 as baseline for the correction.

## 2.4 RIL E050

The following RIL was added:

**[RIL]**: E050 **[Delegate]**: Ericsson (Cecilia) **[WI]**: DCenh **[Class]**: 1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None **[Proposed Conclusion]**:

**[Description]**: A UE can be configured with CPA when a DAPS HO is configured. In case of a fallback to the source cell, which is described here, the evaluation of the stored CPA configuration then needs to be restarted.

**[Proposed Change]**: Add text saying that the evaluation of stored CPA configurations needs to be restarted.

**[Comments]**:

[R2-2205445](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205445.zip), [CPA and DAPS handover correction of RIL E050](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2205445%20Ericsson%20CPA%20and%20DAPS%20handover%20correction%20of%20RIL%20E050.docx), Ericsson, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

Question 4: Do you think RIL E050 is an issue which needs to be corrected? Any comments/proposals on the solution in such case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Maybe | I actually can't see where it would be specified that "the UE shall not trigger execution of another procedure that is included in a stored conditional reconfigurations" or that "the UE is not required to continue evaluation of any conditional reconfigurations that it may have stored"  The TP for proposal 3 would be fine. |
| ZTE | Maybe | Slightly prefer to not support the coexistence of CPA and DAPS (i.e. the NW releases CPA configuration before sending DAPS configuration). Anyway DAPS with DC is not supported, so it seems no much need to keep CPA configuration during DAPS HO.  The TP for proposal 3 would be fine. |
| MediaTek |  | We also prefer not to support the coexistence of CPA and DAPS. So, TP from P3 is also fine to us. |
| Google |  | Prefer not supporting the coexistence of CPA and DAPS. |
| ITRI | Maybe | We share the same view with Huawei and prefer P3. |
| Ericsson | Yes (proponent) | We are fine with P3. |
| Nokia | No | RAN2 needs to decide first whether DAPS and CPA can be configured jointly. Seems in Rel-16 we have decided to drop everything prior to DAPS (e.g. DC/CA) and we did not allow simultaneous CHO + DAPS. So our preference would be to also avoid such CPA and DAPS coexistence. |
| NEC | Maybe | Same as others above. We prefer not to support CPA and DAPS, so are fine with the TP for P3. |
| LGE | No | According to the current specification, DAPS and DC cannot be configured together. That is, releasing CPA should be first from the network when the network is about to command DAPS handover to the UE. Thus we think there is no issue to be changed. |
| vivo | No | We prefer the network to avoid configuring CPA and DAPS HO simultaneously to one UE.  CPA allows UE to add a SN based on its own decision, i.e. the network may not know whether a UE is DC or SA when the network reconfigures the UE to perform DAPS HO, which violates the design principle that DAPS HO is not applicable to DC UE. |
| CMCC | No | We don’t see much benefits of this coexistence and prefer P3. |
| Qualcomm | No strong opinion. Please see comments. | If CPA with DAPS handover is not supported, then we think changes are required in the specifications as described in the contribution R2-2205445 above. |
| CATT | Yes | Ok with TP in Proposal 3 |
| Samsung | No | Same view with Nokia that to now allow CPA and DAPS, and P3 can be a realization of this. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Summary question 4:

Most companies think that CPA and DAPS should not be configured together. The TPs related to proposal 3 can be used to as baseline for further discussions to clarify this in the specifications.

1. CPA and DAPS are not supported together. The TP for proposal 3 in R2-2205445 is used baseline for the correction.

## 2.5 RIL H110

The following RIL was added:

**[RIL]**: H110 **[Delegate]**: Huawei (David) **[WI]**: DCenh **[Class]**: 2 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: R2-22xxxxx **[Proposed Conclusion]**: v197

**[Description]**: For Rel-17 CPC, one issue raised was the "unsynchronized reconfiguration", i.e. the UE will apply a conditional reconfiguration that can change the MCG configuration at a time not known by the network and send an RRCReconfigurationComplete message. One way to solve this problem could be to use reconfigurationWithSync of the MN, but this is forbidden because the UE will then consider the PCell as the applicable cell.

**[Proposed Change]**: Discuss possible solutions, e.g.

- if the PCell of the conditional configuration is the current PCell, the UE considers the applicable cell to be the PSCell of the conditional configuration

- the network can indicate explicitly that the applicable cell is the PSCell

- allow the network to indicate explictly the applicable cell (i.e. PCI, and from the MO of the measId the UE the UE can know the carrier), as was proposed in Rel-16 but too late

-

**[Comments]**:

[R2-2206139](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_118-e\R2-2206139.zip) [38.331 - H110] Applicable cell for a conditional reconfiguration Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-17 LTE\_NR\_DC\_enh2-Core

Question 5: Do you think RIL H110 is an issue which needs to be corrected? Any comments/proposals on the solution in such case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes (Proponent) | As in R2-2206139 |
| ZTE | No | We agreed that it’s up to the NW implementation to handle the “unsynchronized update of MCG configuration” issue at last meeting. A possible solution is that the NW ensures the contained MCG configuration for each candidate PSCell will not include the SRB configuration to update the SRB or lower layer configuration of the MN. So we think that the reconfigurationWithSync for MCG should not be included. And then there is no applicable cell issue. |
| Lenovo | No | Upon implementation. |
| MediaTek | Maybe | We are fine to support “MCG reconfiguration with sync” in the reconfiguration message for “MN-initiated inter-SN CPC”. To clarify, if the intention to do reconfiguration with sync to the same PCell. Or is it really intend to do MCG change based on evaluation of SCG cells ?  Please note that if we agree to support this scenario, the TP also impact the discussion #036 CHO with SCG in TEI-17. |
| Google | No | Up to implementation. |
| Ericsson | No | We think the problem is more related to that the MN doesn’t know when the reconfiguration will take place. It could also be a reconfiguration which doesn’t require reconfigurationWithSync. We think it would be good to solve the problem, but there was another proposal before which we think was better, e.g. the use of UL Transfer message. |
| Nokia | No | If something needs to be specified (and cannot be left to NW implementation, like commonly supported at the previous meeting), then we suggest to pursue the solution we had in our R2-2202469.  From the options in 6139, P3 is kind of OK. |
| NEC | No | Our understanding is also to leave this up to NW implementation as per the agreement. |
| LGE | No | Up to N/W implementation. |
| vivo | No | The following was agreed in RAN2#117e:   * 2: It is up to NW implementation how to handle the “unsynchronized update of MCG configuration” issue.   In our understanding, the SRB configuration is unlikely to be modified during CPAC even MCG reconfiguration is required for CPAC.  It’s a little late for such an optimization. |
| CMCC | No | Up to implementation. |
| Qualcomm | No | It was agreed in the last RAN2 meeting (#117-e) that “It is up to NW implementation how to handle the “unsynchronized update of MCG configuration” issue”. We are not in favour of revisiting this issue.  However, we do agree with Proposal 1 of the contribution R2-2206139 – this seems necessary. |
| CATT | No | RAN2 already agreed to avoid such cases via NW implementation, i.e., the contained MCG configuration for each candidate PSCell will not include the SRB configuration to update the SRB or lower layer configuration of the MN, at least network can guarantee that MN can receive the RRC Reconfiguration Complete message upon CPAC execution. |
| Samsung | No | We agreed on the NW implementation, and NW can handle this like what ZTE said. Otherwise, there would be a consumption of time again for which solution is better. At least, there would be no critical problem by relying on the NW. |
|  |  |  |

Summary question 5:

Most companies do not think that H110 needs to be corrected, it can be solved by network implementation.

1. RIL H110 is not corrected. The issue is solved by network implementation.

## 2.6 RIL H111

The following RIL was added:

**[RIL]**: H111 **[Delegate]**: Huawei (David) **[WI]**: DCenh **[Class]**: 1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: R2-22xxxxx **[Proposed Conclusion]**: v197

**[Description]**: This procedure will be executed upon every addition/modification of conditional reconfiguration (5.3.5.13.3), but it applies for each condReconfigId in VarConditionalReconfig, i.e. including previous configurations.

In Rel-16, either there are only CPC configurations configured by the SN, or only CHO configuration configured by the MN, so whether "it is configured" is considered to be "the current RRC message that includes the conditionalReconfiguration" or "the message by which this condExecutionCond was added" makes no difference.

However, in Rel-17, it is no more the case, i.e. different conditional configurations may be configured differently and it depends on which message the configuration was added.

**[Proposed Change]**: Discuss how to clarify that the UE shall store how each conditional configuration was added. Note that it applies not only for this procedure, but also in 5.3.5.3 for the sending of the complete message.

**[Comments]**:

[R2-2206140](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_118-e\R2-2206140.zip) [38.331 - H111] Handling of conditional configurations Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-17 LTE\_NR\_DC\_enh2-Core

Question 6: Do you think RIL H111 is an issue which needs to be corrected? Any comments/proposals on the solution in such case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes (proponent) but | this is purely a clarification, it is not critical to come with a final text right now. |
| ZTE | No | The current procedural text is clear. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Not sure | There is no TP in R2-2206140. We do not fully understand the proposal and the issue. The change seems require careful review. Maybe we should postpone it as proponent indicated this is not critical? |
| Google | Not sure |  |
| Ericsson |  | Isn’t this solved by RIL E023? |
| Nokia | yes | Perhaps what we suggest in TP in section 2.1 of R2-2205524 can be considered as an indication here. |
| NEC | Not sure | maybe the issue can be discussed with TP later (postponed?) |
| LGE | Not sure | It would be better to discuss later with TP |
| vivo | Maybe | The current text is correct but a little complex. We are open to discuss the issue. |
| CMCC | Not sure | This could be discussed later with more clarifications and TP. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Seems like this is a similar issue as RIL E023. Please see our response to Question 3.  Once companies agree on the issue RIL E023 and its proposed solutions, this issue can be revisited. After introducing separate state variables for MN-configured and SN-configured conditional configurations and making the changes proposed in the solutions to RIL E0123, it is not clear whether any further changes are required in the specifications. |
| CATT | Not sure |  |
| Samsung | Not sure | We also cannot fully understand the problem here without TP. Just guessing that this tries to solve how to link the measurement Id to be referred to the appropriate measConfig. If so, introducing separate Var, and letting independent behaviour on each Var seems can resolve this? Like E023 solution ? |
|  |  |  |

Summary question 6:

Several companies are unsure of whether this needs to be corrected. There is no TP provided and E023 is proposed to be corrected, which may solve the issue.

1. RIL H111 is not corrected. Can be revisited if TP is provided.

## 2.7 RIL Z003

The following RIL was added:

**[RIL]**: Z003 **[Delegate]**: ZTE (Mengjie) **[WI]**: DCenh **[Class]**: 1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: xxx **[Proposed Conclusion]**:

**[Description]**: For CPAC addition, the NW always configures either *triggerCondition* or *triggerConditionSN* (not both) for a *condReconfigurationId*. But for CPAC modification, the NW is allowed to include none of the fields *triggerCondition* and *triggerConditionSN* (i.e. when the execution condition is not changed). However, according to the current field description, the NW should always configures either one of fields in any cases.

*CondReconfigExecCondSN* should be *CondReconfigExecCondSCG* as specified in TS 38.331.

**[Proposed Change]**: Change the Need code for *triggerCondition* and *triggerConditionSN*, update the field description and explain the presence condition as follows:

CondReconfigurationAddMod-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {

condReconfigurationId-r16 CondReconfigurationId-r16,

triggerCondition-r16 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..2)) OF MeasId

OPTIONAL, -- ~~Need ON~~Cond CondReconfigurationAdd1

condReconfigurationToApply-r16 OCTET STRING (CONTAINING RRCConnectionReconfiguration)

OPTIONAL,-- Cond CondReconfigurationAdd

...,

[[

triggerConditionSN-r17 OCTET STRING OPTIONAL -- ~~Need ON~~Cond CondReconfigurationAdd2

]]

}

|  |
| --- |
| ***triggerCondition***  The condition that needs to be fulfilled in order to trigger the execution of a conditional reconfiguration for CHO, CPA or MN initiated inter-SN CPC. When configuring two triggering events (MeasIds) for a candidate cell, the network ensures that both refer to the same *measObject*. ~~For each~~ *~~condReconfigurationId~~*~~, the network always configures either~~ *~~triggerCondition~~* ~~or~~ *~~triggerConditionSN~~* ~~(not both).~~ |
| ***triggerConditionSN***  Includes the NR *CondReconfigExecCondS~~N~~CG* as specified in TS 38.331 [82]. ~~For each~~ *~~condReconfigurationId~~*~~, the network always configures either~~ *~~triggerCondition~~* ~~or~~ *~~triggerConditionSN~~* ~~(not both)~~. The field is applied to the case of SN initiated inter-SN CPC. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Conditional Presence | Explanation |
| *CondReconfigurationAdd* | The field is mandatory present if a *condReconfigurationId* is being added. Otherwise it is optional, need ON. |
| *CondReconfigurationAdd1* | The field is mandatory present if a *condReconfigurationId* is being added and the *triggerConditionSN* is absent. For each *condReconfigurationId*, the field is absent when the *triggerConditionSN* is configured. Otherwise it is optional, need ON. |
| *CondReconfigurationAdd2* | The field is mandatory present if a *condReconfigurationId* is being added and the *triggerCondition* is absent. For each *condReconfigurationId*, the field is absent when the *triggerCondition* is configured. Otherwise it is optional, need ON. |

[R2-2205170](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205170.zip), [[Z003] Correction to CondReconfigurationToAddModList](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2205170%20ZTE%20%5bZ003%5d%20Correction%20to%20CondReconfigurationToAddModList.docx), ZTE Corporation, Sanechips, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

Question 7: Do you think RIL Z003 is an issue which needs to be corrected? Any comments/proposals on the solution in such case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | "configured" does not mean "included", the text is clear and correct. |
| ZTE | Yes (proponent) | We understand that the current description “For each condReconfigurationId, the network **always** configures ...” may cause the ambiguity that the NW must configure/include one of the fields every time the NW (re)-configures something for the condReconfigurationId. But for CPAC modification, the NW is allowed to include none of the fields triggerCondition and triggerConditionSN (i.e. when the execution condition is not changed). So we think it is better to use the Cond code to explain detailed conditions for the present/absence of the corresponding fields, which has also been used in R16 specs.  But if the majority thinks the current text is clear enough, we can also accept it. |
| Lenovo | Yes | ZTE’s proposal seems clearer. |
| MediaTek | No | Same view as Huawei. We think that current text is fine. |
| Google | No strong view | The current text is fine though. |
| ITRI | Yes | ZTE’s change removes ambiguity. |
| Ericsson | No | Not needed. |
| Nokia |  | Somehow share the view from both ZTE and Huawei. Some clarifications can be made, but it is true the word ‘configured’ means something else than ‘included’. |
| NEC | Maybe | This may cause ambiguity issue later (in future), while instead of adding some changes, we are wondering whether “always” can be removed? |
| LGE | No | Agree with Huawei and the current text is clear |
| vivo | No | The current text in the field description is clear. |
| CMCC | No |  |
| Qualcomm | Please see comments. | Yes to RIL Z003 and the solutions proposed in R2-2205169 and R2-2205170.  We are not fine with the proposal in R2-2205171, as the motivation and the benefit of the proposal is not clear to us, and it seems not necessary. |
| CATT | No |  |
| Samsung | No | Same view with Huawei. Even without actual including the field, network can configure something by using need code. So agree with the difference between configuration and including. |
|  |  |  |

Summary question 7:

There is some support for Z003, but more companies think that the correction is not needed as “configured” is not the same as “included”. Therefore, it is proposed to not address the issue in Z003.

1. RIL Z003 is not corrected.

## 2.8 RIL Z004

The following RIL was added:

**[RIL]**: Z004 **[Delegate]**: ZTE (Mengjie) **[WI]**: DCenh **[Class]**: 1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: xxx **[Proposed Conclusion]**:

**[Description]**: It’s not clear whether the events (i.e. EventA3, EventA4, EventA5) for normal RRM measurement can also be reused for the execution conditions. Suggest to clarify this.

**[Proposed Change]**: If it is confirmed that the events for normal RRM measurement can be reused, the following change is needed:

3> if the *condEventId* is associated with condEventA3, condEventA4 or condEventA5, or if *EventId* is associated with EventA3, EventA4 or EventA5, and if the leaving condition(s) applicable for this event associated with the *condReconfigId*, i.e. the event corresponding with the *condEventId(s)* or *EventId(s)* of the corresponding *condTriggerConfig* within *VarConditionalReconfig*, is fulfilled for the applicable cells for all measurements after layer 3 filtering taken during the corresponding *timeToTrigger* defined for this event within the *VarConditionalReconfig*:

**[Comments]**:

[R2-2205171](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205171.zip), [[Z003][Z004] Discussion on applicable events for execution conditions](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2205171%20ZTE%20%5bZ003%5d%5bZ004%5d%20Discussion%20on%20applicable%20events%20for%20execution%20conditions.docx), ZTE Corporation, Sanechips, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

Question 8: Do you think RIL Z004 is an issue which needs to be corrected? Any comments/proposals on the solution in such case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | It is clearly captured already that only conditional events can be used.  The proposal is actually a functional change, so that normal events can be used for execution conditions.  This would mean that there would be two types of measIds in execution conditions, one type that will be cleared in case of mobility and another type that won't be cleared. This increases the complexity a lot. |
| ZTE | Yes (proponent) | We see some benefits to allow the normal Events configured for execution condition, e.g. reusing the measIds for normal RRM measurements as execution conditions. Anyway the UE just removes the measIds whose reportType set to condTriggerConfig when the release is needed (the current spec has supported this). So we do not see the extra complexity.  Besides, if only CondEvents can be used for execution conditions, the NW must include source SN configuration in the MN RRC reconfiguration message for SN initiated inter-SN CPC, to reconfigure the source SCG measurement configuration for execution conditions. It revises our previous agreement that the MN RRC reconfiguration for CPC **may** include the source SN configuration. |
| Lenovo | No | Nothing seems broken from existing text? It seems optimization and does have different implications. Prefer to stick with the existing text. |
| MediaTek | No | This is clear NOT a bug fixing. We should not introduce more function at this stage. |
| Google | No | The current text is fine. |
| ITRI | No | The current specification captures clearly that only conditional events can be used. |
| Ericsson | No | This is not an error, but new functionality which increases the complexity. |
| Nokia | No | We are a bit puzzled with this proposal to use the normal events for conditional reconfiguration execution, especially as there are separate conditional events? |
| NEC | No | This should not be done now in Rel-17, as this is like a small enhancement. |
| LGE | No | Seems no problem in the current text |
| vivo | No | It is not necessary to reuse the events (i.e. EventA3, EventA4, EventA5) for normal RRM measurement for the execution conditions, given condEventA3, condEventA4 or condEventA5 are already defined. |
| CMCC | No |  |
| Qualcomm |  | Please see our response to Question 7. |
| CATT | No |  |
| Samsung | No |  |
|  |  |  |

Summary question 8:

There is no support to introduce the changes proposed in Z004.

1. RIL Z004 is not pursued.

## 2.9 RIL V197

The following RIL was added:

**[RIL]**: V197 **[Delegate]**: vivo-Chenli **[WI]**: DCenh **[Class]**:1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None **[Proposed Conclusion]**: v128

**[Description]**: Should this note also apply for NR SCG?

**[Proposed Change]**: Assuming this note also applies for NR SCG, then, this note should be also added into 5.3.5.13.4. But it could be considered after we determine the below FFS.

Editors Note: FFS If EN-DC support in 5.3.5.13.4a should be merged to 5.3.5.13.4.

**[Comments]**: vivo-Chenli/v143: update the WI code

Question 9: Do you think RIL V197 is an issue which needs to be corrected? Any comments/proposals on the solution in such case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No strong view |  |
| ZTE | No strong view |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | We understand that this applies also for NR SCG |
| Google | No strong view |  |
| ITRI | No strong view |  |
| Ericsson | No strong view |  |
| Nokia |  | Either way is fine. |
| NEC | No strong view |  |
| LGE | No strong view |  |
| vivo | Yes | The issue is valid.  But a similar note is also included in 5.3.5.13.5(Conditional reconfiguration execution), hence we propose to remove the note 5.3.5.13.4a(Conditional reconfiguration evaluation of SN initiated inter-SN CPC for EN-DC). |
| CMCC | No strong view |  |
| CATT | No strong view |  |
| Samsung | Yes | Seems need for the consistency. |

Summary question 9:

Most companies do not have a strong view on V197, but two companies support the change and no company is against the change. Therefore, it is proposed to correct the issue.

1. Correct RIL V197.

## 2.10 RIL E029

The following RIL was added:

**[RIL]**: E029 **[Delegate]**: Ericsson (Cecilia) **[WI]**: DCenh **[Class]**: 1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None **[Proposed Conclusion]**:

**[Description]**: The MN may configure the UE with CPC before informing the S-SN which candidate PSCells that were accepted. Hence, if not all candidates were accepted by the target candidate SN(s) the UE may end up being configured with an SCG MeasConfig for CPC which includes one or more instances of MeasIdToAddMod(s) with a measId associated to a reportConfigId whose ReportConfigNR has a reportType set to ‘condTriggerConfig-r16’, with that MeasId not being referred in any execution condition i.e. not in any condExecutionCond-r16.

**[Proposed Change]**: Make the following update:

5.5.3.1            General

[…]

The UE shall:

[…]

1> for each *measId* included in the *measIdList* within *VarMeasConfig*:

[…]

~~2> if the~~ *~~reportType~~* ~~for the associated~~ *~~reportConfig~~* ~~is~~ *~~periodical~~*~~,~~ *~~eventTriggered~~* ~~or~~ *~~condTriggerConfig~~*~~:~~

2> if the *reportType* for the associated *reportConfig* is *periodical* or *eventTriggered*; or

2> if the *reportType* for the associated *reportConfig* is *condTriggerConfig*, and the *measId* is set to at least one *condExecutionCond* associated to a *condReconfigId*;

3> if a measurement gap configuration is setup, or

3> if the UE does not require measurement gaps to perform the concerned measurements:

4> if *s-MeasureConfig* is not configured, or

4> if *s-MeasureConfig* is set to *ssb-RSRP* and the NR SpCell RSRP based on SS/PBCH block, after layer 3 filtering, is lower than *ssb-RSRP,* or

4> if *s-MeasureConfig* is set to *csi-RSRP* and the NR SpCell RSRP based on CSI-RS, after layer 3 filtering, is lower than *csi-RSRP*:

5> if the *measObject* is associated to NR and the *rsType* is set to *csi-rs*:

6> if reportQuantityRS-Indexes and maxNrofRS-IndexesToReport for the associated reportConfig are configured:

7> derive layer 3 filtered beam measurements only based on CSI-RS for each measurement quantity indicated in *reportQuantityRS-Indexes*, as described in 5.5.3.3a;

6> derive cell measurement results based on CSI-RS for the trigger quantity and each measurement quantity indicated in *reportQuantityCell* using parameters from the associated *measObject*, as described in 5.5.3.3;

5> if the *measObject* is associated to NR and the *rsType* is set to *ssb*:

6> if reportQuantityRS-Indexes and maxNrofRS-IndexesToReport for the associated reportConfig are configured:

7> derive layer 3 beam measurements only based on SS/PBCH block for each measurement quantity indicated in *reportQuantityRS-Indexes*, as described in 5.5.3.3a;

6> derive cell measurement results based on SS/PBCH block for the trigger quantity and each measurement quantity indicated in *reportQuantityCell* using parameters from the associated *measObject*, as described in 5.5.3.3;

[…]

2> perform the evaluation of reporting criteria as specified in 5.5.4, except if *reportConfig* is *condTriggerConfig*.

NOTE 1: The evaluation of conditional reconfiguration execution criteria is specified in 5.3.5.13.

[…]

~~Editors Note: FFS to specify that the UE ignores measId(s) that were not indicated in the condExecutionCond/triggerCondition.~~

**[Comments]**:

[R2-2206116](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206116.zip), [Miscellaneous CPAC corrections related to RIL E022, E023, E024 and E029](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2206116%20Ericsson%20Miscellaneous%20CPAC%20corrections%20related%20to%20RIL%20E022,%20E023,%20E024%20and%20E029.docx), Ericsson, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

Question 10: Do you think RIL E029 is an issue which needs to be corrected? Any comments/proposals on the solution in such case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | We expect that this is not needed because the MN will inform the source SN if not all candidate target cells are prepared.  However, the change is simple so would be ok. |
| ZTE | No strong view | We assume that the NW can remove the useless measIds before sending CPC configuration to the UE. But if the NW dose not do it (e.g. not perform source SCG configuration update before sending CPC configuration), it is fine for the UE to not measure those measIds. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | No strong view | We are not sure if NW will have this kind of configuration. But anyway, the change is fine. |
| Google | No strong view |  |
| ITRI | Yes | This change makes the UE behaviour clearer, i.e. the UE need not perform measurements on *measId*(s) with *reportType* set to *condTriggerConfig* that are not linked to any conditional reconfigurations. |
| Ericsson | Yes (proponent) | We actually agreed to make this change if the MN was allowed to configure the UE before informing the S-SN which candidates that were accepted. Then the agreement was put on hold until we had agreed on which option to use for inter-SN CPC and whether the second step to the S-SN would be mandatory or not. Later we agreed that the second step is optional and then this change should be made. |
| Nokia | No | We agree with Huawei and ZTE. Our understanding is that if the target SN has not acknowledged all candidates, then S-SN needs to be informed before configuring the UE (to avoid exactly this scenario of the UE having measIDs not associated with candidate PSCell configuration). |
| NEC | No | Similar view as Huawei, ZTE and Nokia. We think that normally the MN does not configure the UE with CPC before informing the S-SN of accepted candidate PSCells, if not all candidates were accepted. So, network can remove the useless measID. |
| LGE | No strong view |  |
| vivo | No | We share the same understanding with Huawei that the MN will inform the source SN if not all candidate target cells are prepared.  Hence, we think SN can remove the *measId* no associated to a *condReconfigId* and the modification is not needed. |
| CMCC | No | If we have the reconfiguration after the ack from S-SN, S-SN could modify the SCG configuration based on the accepted CPC candidates. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We are fine with the solution proposed in R2-220616. |
| CATT | No strong view |  |
| Samsung | No strong view | Basically we believe that NW will inform first to S-SN, but if not, there seems to be a procedure to handle this. |
|  |  |  |

Summary question 10:

Many companies have no strong view and there are split views among the companies who have an opinion. The conclusion in e-mail discussion [Post114-e][233][R17 DCCA] Uu Message design for CPAC (CATT) was that RAN2 should make this change. It was however put on hold until RAN2 had agreed on whether the second procedure back to the S-SN should be mandatory or not. As the procedure to the S-SN was agreed to be optional, it is proposed to stick to the previous conclusion and correct the issue.

1. Correct issue RIL E029. The TP in R2-2206116 is used as baseline.

## 2.11 RIL H067

The following RIL was added:

**[RIL]**: H067 **[Delegate]**: Huawei (David) **[WI]**: DCenh **[Class]**: 2 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: R2-22xxxxx **[Proposed Conclusion]**: v038

**[Description]**: RAN2 also defines fields to release the candidate target cell.

**[Proposed Change]**: Remove the ToReleaseList. Discuss about the ToAddModList.

**[Comments]**:

[R2-2206141](file:///C:\Users\terhentt\Documents\Tdocs\RAN2\RAN2_118-e\R2-2206141.zip) [38.331 - H067] Update of candidate target cell and configuration Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-17 LTE\_NR\_DC\_enh2-Core

Question 11: Do you think RIL H067 is an issue which needs to be corrected? Any comments/proposals on the solution in such case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes (proponent) |  |
| ZTE | No strong view | The PSCell Change Information Update IE defined in RAN3 message informs a list of PSCells prepared at the target SN. With the updated list, the MN can know which cells have been canceled. So it is also fine to not have the ToReleaseList. But the ToAddModList is still useful for the candidate cell configuration update. |
| Lenovo | No strong view | Same view as ZTE. |
| Google | No | The CG-CandidiateList (i.e., the ToReleaseList and ToAddModList) is used between the T-SN and MN and with the structure the T-SN is allowed to release and modify some PSCells using the RRC container alone. There was no procedural text or semantics description for the PSCell ID list in the SN Modification Required message or SN Modification Request Acknowledge message that the absence of some PSCell means no change or cancellation. |
| ITRI | No | Same view as Google. |
| Ericsson | No | We think it is clearer to use the lists. |
| Nokia | No | We think both approaches (i.e. Huawei’s and the existing one, with ToAddMod and Release lists) can work. So we are fine to keep the current one, we do not think H067 is essential. |
| NEC | partially No | We have similar understanding a ZTE/Lenovo that ToAddModList should not be removed. For ToReleaseList, no strong view. |
| LGE | No strong view |  |
| vivo | Maybe not | We think the IE “Conditional PSCell Change Information Required” only includes T-SN node id. The target cell to be remove/add/modify still exchanged via INM. |
| CMCC | No strong view | The ToAddModList in the current spec should be kept. And we don’t have strong view to add the ToReleaseList. |
| CATT | No strong view |  |
| Samsung | No | Even with release field, nothing is broken. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Summary question 11:

There is no support to correct RIL H067, so it is proposed not to correct it.

1. RIL H067 is not corrected.

## 2.12 RIL E021

The following RIL was added:

**[RIL]**: E021 **[Delegate]**: Ericsson (Cecilia) **[WI]**: DCenh **[Class]**: 1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: None **[Proposed Conclusion]**:

**[Description]**: The max number of CPC candidates is already coordinated in XnAP signalling, see agreed RAN3 CR R3-222909, so there is no need to coordinate it in the inter-node message as well.

**[Proposed Change]**: Remove this IE.

**[Comments]**:

Question 12: Do you think RIL E021 is an issue which needs to be corrected? Any comments/proposals on the solution in such case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | No | The indicator introduced in RAN3 signalling is for coordinating the maximum number of PSCells that the target SN may prepare. The RAN2 indicator here is for indicating the maximum number of PSCells that the source SN is allowed to configure for SN initiated CPC in case of the coexistence MI-CPC+SI-CPC and CHO+CPC. These two indicators are introduced for different usages. |
| Lenovo | No | As ZTE explained, this is for the cooridination for coexistence case. But maybe some clarification is needed for the field discription,e.g.,  ***maxNumberCPCCandidates***  Indicates the maximum number of candidate cells that can be preparedduring the overall SN initiated CPC, if triggered by the source secondary node.  And a relevant question, we suppose when ***maxNumberCPCCandidates***  is absent, that means source SN cannot trigger the SN initiated CPC, or? Shouldn’t it be clarified? |
| Google | No | Share the same understanding as ZTE by the current field description. |
| ITRI | No | We share the same understanding as ZTE and think the current field description of ***maxNumberCPCCandidates*** is ok. |
| Ericsson | Yes (proponent) |  |
| Nokia | No | ZTE is right, these are different indications. |
| NEC | No | RAN3 signaling is for different purpose. |
| LGE | No | Same view as ZTE |
| vivo | No | With the clarification from ZTE, we agree they are different. |
| CMCC | No | Share the same view with ZTE. |
| Qualcomm | Yes, the issue seems valid | We would like to see the CR/TP before commenting further on the solution. |
| CATT | No | Agree with the comment of ZTE. |
| Samsung | No | Agree with ZTE. The meaning and motivation is different. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Summary question 12:

There is not enough support to correct issue E021, so it is proposed not to correct it.

1. RIL E021 is not corrected.

## 2.13 RIL Z007

The following RIL was added:

**[RIL]**: Z007 **[Delegate]**: ZTE (Mengjie) **[WI]**: DCenh **[Class]**: 1 **[Status]**: ToDo **[TDoc]**: xxx **[Proposed Conclusion]**:

**[Description]**: For CPAC addition, the NW always configures either *condExecutionCond*

or *condExecutionCondSCG* (not both) for a *condReconfigId*. But for CPAC modification, the NW is allowed to include none of the fields *condExecutionCond* and *condExecutionCondSCG* (i.e. when the execution condition is not changed). However, according to the current field description, the NW should always configures either one of fields in any cases.

**[Proposed Change]**: Change the Need code for *condExecutionCond* and *condExecutionCondSCG*, update the field description and explain the presence condition as follows:

CondReconfigToAddMod-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {

condReconfigId-r16 CondReconfigId-r16,

condExecutionCond-r16 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..2)) OF MeasId OPTIONAL, -- ~~Need M~~Cond condReconfigAdd1

condRRCReconfig-r16 OCTET STRING (CONTAINING RRCReconfiguration) OPTIONAL, -- Cond condReconfigAdd

...,

[[

condExecutionCondSCG-r17 OCTET STRING (CONTAINING CondReconfigExecCondSCG-r17) OPTIONAL -- ~~Need M~~Cond condReconfigAdd2

]]

}

| *CondReconfigToAddMod* field descriptions |
| --- |
| ***condExecutionCond***  The execution condition that needs to be fulfilled in order to trigger the execution of a conditional reconfiguration for CHO, CPA, intra-SN CPC without MN involvement or MN initiated inter-SN CPC. When configuring 2 triggering events (Meas Ids) for a candidate cell, network ensures that both refer to the same *measObject.* If network configures *condEventD1* or *condEventT1* for a candidate cell network configures a second triggering event *condEventA3, condEventA4* or *condEventA5*. Network does not configure both *condEventD1* or *condEventT1* for the same candidate cell. For CPAC, the *RRCReconfiguration* message contained in *condRRCReconfig* cannot contain the field *scg-State*. |
| ***condExecutionCondSCG***  Contains execution condition that needs to be fulfilled in order to trigger the execution of a conditional reconfiguration for SN initiated inter-SN CPC. The Meas Ids refer to the *measConfig* associated with the SCG. When configuring 2 triggering events (Meas Ids) for a candidate cell, network ensures that both refer to the same *measObject*. ~~For each~~ *~~condReconfigurationId~~*~~, the network always configures either~~ *~~triggerCondition~~* ~~or~~ *~~triggerConditionSCG~~* ~~(not both).~~ |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Conditional Presence | Explanation |
| *condReconfigAdd* | The field is mandatory present when a *condReconfigId* is being added. Otherwise the field is optional, need M. |
| *condReconfigAdd1* | The field is mandatory present when a *condReconfigId* is being added and the *condExecutionCondSCG* is absent. For each *condReconfigId*, the field is absent when the *condExecutionCondSCG* is configured. Otherwise the field is optional, need M. |
| *condReconfigAdd2* | The field is mandatory present when a *condReconfigId* is being added and the *condExecutionCond* is absent. For each *condReconfigId*, the field is absent when the *condExecutionCond* is configured. Otherwise the field is optional, need M. |

[R2-2205169](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205169.zip), [[Z007] Correction to CondReconfigToAddModList](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2205169%20ZTE%20%5bZ007%5d%20Correction%20to%20CondReconfigToAddModList.docx), ZTE Corporation, Sanechips, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

Question 13: Do you think RIL Z007 is an issue which needs to be corrected? Any comments/proposals on the solution in such case?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | As commented before, "configured" does not mean "included" and the text is correct. In addition, the proposed text is very complicated, in such case, it is better to use the field description. |
| ZTE | Yes (proponent) | See the same comment as Q7. |
| Lenovo | Yes | ZTE’s proposal seems clearer. |
| MediaTek | No | Same view as Huawei. |
| Google | No strong view | The current text is fine though. |
| ITRI | Yes | ZTE’s change removes ambiguity. |
| Ericsson | No | Not needed. |
| Nokia | Not necessary | As we have commented to Z003. |
| NEC | Maybe | same answer as to Q7 |
| LGE | No | Same view as Huawei. |
| vivo | No | The current text is clear. |
| CMCC | No |  |
| Qualcomm |  | Please see our response to Question 7 (RIL Z003). The issue seems to be the same as RIL Z003. |
| CATT | No |  |
| Samsung | No | Same view with Huawei as commented in Q7. |
|  |  |  |

Summary question 13:

There is not enough support to correct issue Z007, so it is proposed not to correct it.

1. RIL Z007 is not corrected.

# 3 Summary

Based on the discussion in the previous sections the following is proposed:

[Proposal 1 Correct RIL E022 and use R2-2206116 as baseline for the correction.](#_Toc103256338)

[Proposal 2 Correct RIL E024 and use R2-2206116 as baseline for the correction.](#_Toc103256339)

[Proposal 3 Correct RIL E023 and use R2-2206116 as baseline for the correction.](#_Toc103256340)

[Proposal 4 CPA and DAPS are not supported together. The TP for proposal 3 in R2-2205445 is used baseline for the correction.](#_Toc103256341)

[Proposal 5 RIL H110 is not corrected. The issue is solved by network implementation.](#_Toc103256342)

[Proposal 6 RIL H111 is not corrected. Can be revisited if TP is provided.](#_Toc103256343)

[Proposal 7 RIL Z003 is not corrected.](#_Toc103256344)

[Proposal 8 RIL Z004 is not pursued.](#_Toc103256345)

[Proposal 9 Correct RIL V197.](#_Toc103256346)

[Proposal 10 Correct issue RIL E029. The TP in R2-2206116 is used as baseline.](#_Toc103256347)

[Proposal 11 RIL H067 is not corrected.](#_Toc103256348)

[Proposal 12 RIL E021 is not corrected.](#_Toc103256349)

[Proposal 13 RIL Z007 is not corrected.](#_Toc103256350)

# 4 References

1. [R2-2205168](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205168.zip), [[E022] [V190] Discussion on conditional reconfiguration removal](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2205168%20ZTE%20%5bE022%5d%20%5bV190%5d%20Discussion%20on%20conditional%20reconfiguration%20removal.docx), ZTE Corporation, Sanechips, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

1. [R2-2205169](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205169.zip), [[Z007] Correction to CondReconfigToAddModList](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2205169%20ZTE%20%5bZ007%5d%20Correction%20to%20CondReconfigToAddModList.docx), ZTE Corporation, Sanechips, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

1. [R2-2205170](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205170.zip), [[Z003] Correction to CondReconfigurationToAddModList](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2205170%20ZTE%20%5bZ003%5d%20Correction%20to%20CondReconfigurationToAddModList.docx), ZTE Corporation, Sanechips, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

1. [R2-2205171](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205171.zip), [[Z003][Z004] Discussion on applicable events for execution conditions](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2205171%20ZTE%20%5bZ003%5d%5bZ004%5d%20Discussion%20on%20applicable%20events%20for%20execution%20conditions.docx), ZTE Corporation, Sanechips, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

1. [R2-2205444](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205444.zip), [Miscellaneous CPAC corrections related to RIL E022, E023, E024 and E029](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2205444%20Ericsson%20Miscellaneous%20CPAC%20corrections%20related%20to%20RIL%20E022,%20E023,%20E024%20and%20E029.docx), Ericsson, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

1. [R2-2205445](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205445.zip), [CPA and DAPS handover correction of RIL E050](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2205445%20Ericsson%20CPA%20and%20DAPS%20handover%20correction%20of%20RIL%20E050.docx), Ericsson, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

1. [R2-2205485](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205485.zip), [[E023] Introduction of UE variable for SN configured conditional Reconfigurations](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2205485%20Samsung%20%5bE023%5d%20Introduction%20of%20UE%20variable%20for%20SN%20configured%20conditional%20Reconfigurations.docx), Samsung R&D Institute UK, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

1. [R2-2206116](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206116.zip), [Miscellaneous CPAC corrections related to RIL E022, E023, E024 and E029](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2206116%20Ericsson%20Miscellaneous%20CPAC%20corrections%20related%20to%20RIL%20E022,%20E023,%20E024%20and%20E029.docx), Ericsson, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

1. [R2-2206139](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206139.zip), [[38.331 - H110] Applicable cell for a conditional reconfiguration](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2206139%20Huawei%20%5b38.331%20-%20H110%5d%20Applicable%20cell%20for%20a%20conditional%20reconfiguration.docx), Huawei, HiSilicon, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

1. [R2-2206140](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206140.zip), [[38.331 - H111] Handling of conditional configurations](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2206140%20Huawei%20%5b38.331%20-%20H111%5d%20Handling%20of%20conditional%20configurations.docx), Huawei, HiSilicon, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022

1. [R2-2206141](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2206141.zip), [[38.331 - H067] Update of candidate target cell and configuration](file:///c:\3GPP_RAN1\RAN2_118e_e\6.2.3\R2-2206141%20Huawei%20%5b38.331%20-%20H067%5d%20Update%20of%20candidate%20target%20cell%20and%20configuration.docx), Huawei, HiSilicon, RAN2#118e, e, May 2022