3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #128 R2-24xxxxx

Orlando, USA, 18th – 22nd of November 2024

**Agenda item: 7.4.1**

**Source: Nokia**

**Title: Report from [AT128][103][MOB] (Nokia)**

**WID/SID: NR\_Mob\_enh2-Core - Release 18**

**Document for: Discussion and Decision**

# 1 Introduction

This is to discuss the following aspects:

**[AT128][103][MOB] (Nokia)**

**Scope:** Discuss R2-2410442 and R2-2410449 and update 38.300 if needed. Note 38.300 CR will be updated based on the endorsed version.

**Intended outcome:** 38.300 CR in R2-24010925. Email approval is applied.

**Deadline: Until Thursday CB session.**

The details are given in the following sections.

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 Stage 2 changes in R2-2410442

[1] continues on the topic which has been discussed at RAN2#127bis regarding the RAN4 requirements when it comes to L1-RSRP reporting to the NW prior to Early TA acquisition or TCI state activation for LTM. As noticed in [1], Figure 9.2.3.5.2-1 and the corresponding description in TS 38.300 are not aligned with RAN4 requirements which state the following:

* TCI state activation can be done only for a known TCI state (i.e. UE has recently reported L1-RSRP for the RS associated to the TCI state) or, in case of FR1, for an unknown TCI state if the UE has reported L3 measurement result with the associated SSB index of the TCI state
* PDCCH-ordered RACH requirements in TS 38.133 apply only for the UE that has provided L1- or L3-RSRP report (for FR1) or L1-RSRP report (for FR2).

During the discussion at RAN2#127bis [3] companies were reluctant to insert too many RAN4-related details into TS 38.300. Thus, [1] now suggests just to add a reference to TS 38.133 to the description of steps 4a and 4b underneath Figure 9.2.3.5.2-1.

Companies are invited to share their view on this simple update below Figure 9.2.3.5.2-1.

**Question 1: Do you agree to introduce a reference to TS 38.133 to the description of steps 4a and 4b underneath Figure 9.2.3.5.2-1, as suggested in R2-2410442?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer (Yes/No)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary for Q1:**

## 2.2 Stage 2 changes in R2-2410449

The authors of [2] discuss the coexistence of Conditional Handover (CHO) and LTM for SCG. The topic has been also discussed at RAN2#127bis [3] and it was agreed we do not pursue changes for suspending the evaluation of execution conditions for CHO when LTM for SCG is triggered. Now the authors of [2] changed the TP and suggest to agree that “simultaneous execution of CHO (e.g. CHO without SCG configuration, CHO with SCG configuration, CHO with candidate SCG) and Intra-CU SCG LTM is not supported in Rel-18. (see TP for TS37.340)”. As can be noticed, the change is proposed to TS 37.340, not TS 38.300. Thus, if agreed, should be merged with the CR discussed in another thread.

Companies are invited to express their view on whether such change is correct and needed in TS 37.340, as shown in [2].

**Question 2: Do you agree to capture in TS 37.340 that simultaneous execution of CHO (e.g. CHO without SCG configuration, CHO with SCG configuration, CHO with candidate SCG) and Intra-CU SCG LTM is not supported in Rel-18, as shown in R2-2410449?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | No | We have not captured similar aspect for legacy PSCell change + CHO, so there is no need to capture it for SCG LTM + CHO either.  Practical UE implementation can be assumed to perform single mobility procedure at a time, not execute them in parallel, as discussed during RAN2#125. Also, in general, the network should ensure that the UE configurations are reasonable, in terms of procedures which may not co-exist successfully. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary for Q2:**

## 2.3 Issues with in-principle-agreed CR (R2-2409936)

During online discussion there were few comments raised regarding IPA CR [4]. E.g. it was underlined that “Consequences if not approved” are filled incorrectly. It was also pointed out that some rewording might be needed to other suggested changes. Thus, we would like to ask companies to share what kind of changes are needed to IPA CR (R2-2409936).

**Question 3: What kind of changes, besides updating “Consequences if not approved” are required for IPA CR (R2-2409936)?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Summary for Q3:**

# 3 Conclusion

In this document the following proposals have been made:
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