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# 1 Introduction

This document is to kick off the following email discussion:

* [AT109bis-e][008][NR15] Conn Control Miscellaneous I (Nokia, Ericsson, CATT, Huawei)

Scope: Treat R2-2002681, R2-2002682, R2-2002683, R2-2003071, R2-2003386, R2-2003196, R2-2003197, R2-2002787, R2-2003480, R2-2003483,

Part 1: Determine which issues that need resolution, find agreeable proposals. Deadline: April 23 0700 UTC

Part 2: For the parts that are agreeable, discussion will continue to agree on CRs.

# 2 Discussion

Companies are requested to add their comments for each of the treated CRs of this email discussion in the boxes below (one for each CR to be treated).

### 2.1 Discussion on recursion in RRC ([R2-2002681](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2002681))

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Ericsson | Disagree | Our understanding is that there is no such a issue for Rel-15. Even if in Rel-16 we assume that a possible network implementation will implement the scenario described by Nokia, such scenario has never been described in any stage 2 and stage 3 spec. Therefore, we think that this should not be a problem. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Agree | Rel-15 already allows recursion as the document explains, and the recursion has already been discussed under CHO for Rel-16. This may create hard-to-track cases for UE behaviour and create potential difficulties in the field.  Hence, it would be better to clarify the topic now and we would at least like to understand if UEs support the recursion up to an arbitrary level?  Additionally, having the references inside OCTET STRINGs can cause issues with some ASN.1 tools in case they check the contents, as the recursion requires manual removal of the "CONTAINING XXX" to work. Having the note in the field description allows finding those cases more easily. |
| ZTE | Need time to check | We haven’t seen any problem so far, in our understanding, at least the problematic scenarios mentioned by Nokia is not supported in Rel-15 (e.g. the RRCReconfiguration in mrdc-SecondaryCellGroup will not contain another contained message).  For Rel-16, if such recursion is required (e.g. CHO), we are not sure whether there is issue with ASN.1 tools, it is better to allow more time to check. But even if the problem exists, we are wondering whether adding restriction to spec is the only way to solve it? |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### 2.1.1 Clarification on recursion in RRC messages ([R2-2002682](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2002682), [R2-2002683](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2002683), [R2-2003071](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003071))

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Ericsson | Disagree | Our understanding is that there is no such a issue for Rel-15. Even if in Rel-16 we assume that a possible network implementation will implement the scenario described by Nokia, such scenario has never been described in any stage 2 and stage 3 spec. Therefore, we think that this should not be a problem. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Agree | Rel-15 already allows recursion as the document explains, and the recursion has already been discussed under CHO for Rel-16. This may create hard-to-track cases for UE behaviour and create potential difficulties in the field.  Hence, it would be better to clarify the topic now and we would at least like to understand if UEs support the recursion up to an arbitrary level?  Additionally, having the references inside OCTET STRINGs can cause issues with some ASN.1 tools in case they check the contents, as the recursion requires manual removal of the "CONTAINING XXX" to work. Having the note in the field description allows finding those cases more easily. |
| ZTE | Need time to check | We haven’t seen any problem so far, in our understanding, at least the problematic scenarios mentioned by Nokia is not supported in Rel-15 (e.g. the RRCReconfiguration in mrdc-SecondaryCellGroup will not contain another contained message).  For Rel-16, if such recursion is required (e.g. CHO), we are not sure whether there is issue with ASN.1 tools, it is better to allow more time to check. But even if the problem exists, we are wondering whether adding restriction to spec is the only way to solve it? |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.2 Piggybacking of NAS PDUs including Service Accept ([R2-2003386](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003386))

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Nokia | Disagree | This seems potentially related to the earlier discussion with CT1/RAN3. We do not see a concrete proposal so difficult to say what is broken and what is the intended fix for that. Indeed, the list size may in very theoretical cases be limiting but the real issue just seems to stem from a matter of implementation choice? We do not support this as there is no real show-stopper. It would be better to discuss this at CT1 first and get their consensus. |
| Ericsson | Agree | Nothing is broken and we (Ericsson) do not propose to change the specification in any way.  The intention of the paper is for RAN2 to confirm that it is possible to piggyback the NAS PDU containing Service Accept. It is our understanding that this is allowed, and we want to hear other companies views on whether they think it is allowed or not.  As said, we dont propose to change the specification in any way, so we think it is sufficient to capture in MoM that piggybacking of Service Accept is allowed. |
| ZTE | Agree | We agree with the two proposals. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.3 Correction related to RRC reconfiguration complete ([R2-2003196](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003196), [R2-2003197](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003197))

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Nokia | Disagree | Cannot see what is broken from the current specification as the packing of the reconfiguration complete is quite basic functionality and even for EN-DC this is quite clear. |
| Ericsson | Agree | We just want to clarify that the first change it concerns NR-DC and, in this case, there may be confusion as both the MCG RRCReconfiguration and the SCG RRCReconfiguration are both NR. For this reason, we would like to make clear which message is embedded in which one.  For the second change, the word ”submit” is wrong as the actual submission of the message is done in the LTE specification. Therefore, is order to not create any measleading behaviour would be good to align the terminology to that one that is used in 36.331. |
| ZTE | Disagree | We understand the intention, but seems the original wording hardly causes misunderstanding, because it is common understanding that MCG’s RRC Complete cannot be contained in SCG’s RRC Complete message.  If we really need to make this clear enough in spec, we are afraid the current CR does not cover all the cases yet. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.4 Correction on CSI-ResourceConfig ([R2-2002787](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2002787))

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Nokia | Disagree | Do not see a need to update the field description here. What is the exact problem and what is broken with the current text? |
| Ericsson | Disagree | We do not see any issue with the original text and thus we think the CR is not needed. |
| ZTE | Disagree | Agree with Nokia and Ericsson. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.5 Correction on PUSCH-less uplink carrier ([R2-2003480](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003480), [R2-2003483](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003483))

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Nokia | Disagree | The definition was introduced based on the same company’s contribution we do not see any good reason to agree to this. The current specification text is fine, and we can live with the current definition and the "ambiguity" simply doesn't exist. |
| Ericsson | Disagree | This CR has been already treated in RAN2#108 and not pursued. Therefore, we should not discuss this again.  **From RAN2#108**  R2-1916081 Correction on PUSCH-less Scell Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-15 38.331 15.7.0 1417 - F NR\_newRAT-Core  - Nokia think we don’t need to clarify as this is not used anywhere else.  - Oppo agrees the change is not needed.  - Ericsson think we don’t use the word carrier in such contexts.  Comeback, check other related discussions  - Huawei indicate that for UP language was not changed  Not pursued |
| ZTE | Disagree | Agree with Ericsson. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion

In the previous sections we made the following observations:

Based on the discussion in the previous sections we propose the following:
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