sr-ProhibitTimerExt **X610, X806**

On X610, we agree with QC that sr-ProhibitTimer (without suffix) is need S, it means that it cannot be de-configured or not configured. Then we have to clarify that if sr-ProhibitTimerExt-r17 is configured, UE shall ignore sr-ProhibitTimer (without suffix).

On X610, The sr-ProhibitTimer (without suffix) is need S, then see in the field description, there is term “both”. So We support to change X610 to PropAgree.

We think we should also follow what RAN2 AdHoc agreement “Remove the “Ext”, and use -v1700 (NCE with only new values) and apply this consistently”.

On X608, we suggest to PropAgree to change the need code of sr-ProhibitTimerExt-r17 from Need S to Need R, as network can choose not to configure this field. And RAN2 adHoc meeting has agreed to use Need R if there are conditions that network does not configure a field.

* P3: Use Need R (instead of Need S) for fields for which there are some conditions when network does or does not include the field.

**Rapp resolution**

Indeed, from ASN1 notes:

H020 Suffix v1700 or r17

*ConfiguredGrantConfig: noOfHARQ-ProcessesExt-r17*

*[Description]: This extends an existing field, so the suffix should be v1700*

 *[Proposed Change]: Change the suffix to v1700.*

DISCUSSION

* Ericsson think we havent been completely consistent, have a weak preference for removing the “Ext” and using the -v1700. Intel support to remove the Ext.
* Remove the “Ext”, and use -v1700 (NCE with only new values) and apply this consistently.

This is now enforced for

 sr-ProhibitTimer in IE *SchedulingRequestConfig*

*noOfHARQ-ProcessesExt-r17 in SPS-Config*

*SchedulingRequestConfig in ConfiguredGrantConfig*

Corresponding change to (Need S to Need R) for:

allowedHARQ-mode in IE LogicalChannelConfig

nrofHARQ-ProcessesForPDSCH in IE PDSCH-ServingCellConfig

nrofHARQ-ProcessesForPUSCH in IE PUSCH-ServingCellConfig

Change reverted to back Need R for:

cellSpecificKoffset-r17 and kmac-r17 in IE NTN-Config

In the first versions of NTN running CR the NCE with only new values but that got changed to these Ext due to RAN2 UP agreements. I suggest UP folks to review the above suggested resolutions which are based on ASN1 meeting agreements. *Particularly, is there MAC specification reason to use Ext instead of NCE.*

**E017**

On E017, we think there is some confusion. It is NOT “across different PLMN-IdentityInfoLists”. There is just one PLMN-IdentityInfoList. It should be “across different PLMN-IdentityInfo”. In addition, it should be clear the limit of maxTAC is only within trackingAreaList-r17 or with (trackingAreaList-r17 + trackingAreaCode).

It would have been cleaner if we had this in the field description of ***trackingAreaList***. “If this field is present, the network does not configure ~~UE shall ignore~~ *trackingAreaCode*~~,~~ ~~if present~~.”

**Rapp resolution**

I made both changes, InfoLists to Infos, and changed to ”network does not configure”. With this, is there room for confusion on this maxTAC is only within TrackingareaList? (cannot be +areacode as we dont have both at same time). To me it seems clear as we specify this limit in it’s field description but please elaborate more in case I’m missing a detail.

**Q304**

I wanted to clarify Q304 for need condition. The pci-List-r17 in SSB-MTC4 can be Need M as in SSB-MTC2 and SSB-MTC3. Not sure if this is what you wanted to discuss in the next meeting.

SSB-MTC4-r17 ::=             SEQUENCE {

    pci-List-r17                 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrofPCIsPerSMTC)) OF PhysCellId                          OPTIONAL,  -- Need R

    offset-r17                   INTEGER (0..159)

}

**Rapp resolution**

Yes this was the unclear point.Thanks for clarification. I change the RIL to PropAgree.

**X618**

Regarding X618, we think this entire description hidden within the field description is rather weird. It states what the ‘’network shall’’ (which is what we normally avoid writing) and also inserting such NTN-specific details into the field description for eventId, used for plenty other cases, is not advisable. Thus, we support to label X618 with PropAgree and describe what the NW may configure the UE to report in the procedural section (i.e. not within the field description).

For X618, we tend to agree that “shall” is not necessary.

**Rapp resolution**

Have asked input to suggested procedural text

**L013, O355**

Similarly, if we use SIB9 as the example, there’s no need to mention specific exceptions here at all – we could simply delete “, satellite ephemeris, common TA parameters and epoch time ” if it is clarified in the field description, as with SIB9. Even with the change suggested by LGE, the text still refers to the entire SI message so not sure it really helps.

[Helka-liina] Is your suggestion to not to anything related NTN SI there?

 [Brian] That’s what I’m saying. ETWS/CMAS use a specific update mechanism and this is why the sentence exists in Rel-15, while for NTN it is more like SIB9 (also Rel-15) behaviour i.e. use of SI update with some specific exceptions – in case of SIB9 it is clear, so should be also fine for NTN. Having said that, “positioning assistance” has also been added here so I guess either way is fine in the end, it is the field descriptions that truly clarify.

O355

There is a difference of opinion between this and L013 so we need to decide and make consistent changes.

[Helka-liina] L013 suggested to add:

(other than SI message for ETWS, CMAS, positioning assistance data, and some NTN-specific information as specified in the field descriptions),

I don’t see the conflict in the outcome independent of what happens with O355

[Brian] I can agree that if we just implement both suggestions the resulting text doesn’t conflict. However, the justification for L013 is that epoch time cannot be updated at any time, while O355 adds that epoch time can be updated at any time – so in principle we would need only one of the changes. This is actually a similar point as the previous one – we should make a conscious decision which way to go to resolve the inconsistency. (so rather than “PropAgree” they should really have “May meeting disc”)

**Rapp resolution**

Reverted the change and update RIL L013 list to May meeting disc. Please provide tdoc.

**O351 , X501**

We need to discuss – it’s not OK to simply remove the FFS, it may be beneficial to be able to update t-Service without SI notification (similar to other time information, including that in SIB9)

[Helka-liina] I’m not sure what should be correct reaction here. WI is closed, this topic has been discussed in RAN2 and ID view is brought up now after ASN.1 review meeting. It may be beneficial or then not, but is this bit late phase to start discuss? I will keep the proposed RIL resolution but you are welcome to contribute on it. After all, we are not agreeing on the any CR now.

[Brian] Are you saying we cannot resolve any FFS because the WI is now closed so we just remove and ignore them all? In my understanding many Wis have been considered complete with the understanding that we in practice have some open issues and FFSs to resolve in this quarter. In addition the ASN.1 review is still ongoing through RAN2#118, and the status is “PropAgree” – i.e. it’s proposed to agree, not yet agreed. I’m not actually saying that I disagree with the final conclusion here and have no intention to contribute on this, but the justification is wrong: it’s not just an ASN.1 correction but rather resolves an open issue in the spec and should be treated as such (so rather than “PropAgree” they should really have “May meeting disc”)

Regarding O351/X501, in our understanding t-Service will be rather static (if it is expressed as the time that has elapsed since the fixed reference point until another reference point) and in the typical scenario this won’t change (what circumstances can realistically make the NW reconfigure the value of time parameter indicating when the coverage will disappear, assuming satellites typically move in a predictable way?). But obviously, if someone has a credible scenario where different behavior is expected and justified, we can discuss at the meeting, e.g. based on the contribution😉 Otherwise, we are OK with the latest changes proposed by the Rapporteur.

Regarding O351/X501, we have similar view as Huawei, for now should be considered for the next meeting. If as Nokia mentioned it is static, then we can remove whole sentence (not only FFS). Otherwise you cannot simply claim t-Service will be rather static. Also, why it has to be different than that of referenceLocation-r17 as they are both anyway only for fixed cell scenarios?

**Rapp resolution**

Changed the status of these RILs to May meeting discussion. Please provide tdoc.

On nrofHARQ-Processesv1700

The ***nrofHARQ-Processes*** (without suffix) is mandatory present, then it has to be clarified if the nrofHARQ-Processesv1700 is present, the UE ignores the ***nrofHARQ-Processes*** (without suffix).

On harq-ProcID-Offset-v1700

Similarl confusion can happen here. The harq-ProcID-Offset-r16 is Need M. It cannot be released once configured. So later if network wants to configure harq-ProcID-Offset-v1700, then the UE should ignore harq-ProcID-Offset-r16.

**Rapp resolution**

These are fixed. Thank you for pointing it out.

**Other**

I still see several grammatical corrections such as

à3>      if *trackingAreaCode* are not

à ta-Report

When this field is included in SIB19, it indicates whether UE specific TA reporting is enabled during initial access and RRC connection reestablishment. When this field is included in DowlinkConfigCommon within dedicated signalling, it indicates whether UE specific TA reporting is enabled during handover (see TS 38.321 [3], clause x.x.x).

**Rapp resolution**

Thanks, will fix. I have still not had had change to go through the editorial input that may have editorials to correct for this CR. Any editorial correction that you still can see, can be pointed to me. That would be helpful.