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# 1 Introduction

This document is to kick off the following email discussion:

* [AT109bis-e][012][NR15] Inter Node Coord (Ericsson, Google)

Scope: Treat all docs under AI 5.4.1.4

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 Remaining issues on MN-SN measurement coordination in INM ([R2-2003195](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003195))

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Nokia | Yes, but… | The issue is valid while it seems the enhancement is not essential. There are currently other shared aspects where it is up to MN implementation for example to allocate the right amount of measurement identities between MN and SN independently. It is thus the MN that takes priority to reserve needed measurement identities no matter if the SN request is supported or not. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### 2.1.1 Correction on MN-SN measurements coordination in INM – Stage 3 ([R2-2003193](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003193), [R2-2003194](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003194))

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Nokia | Yes, but… | The issue is valid while it seems the enhancement is not essential. There are currently other shared aspects where it is up to MN implementation for example to allocate the right amount of measurement identities between MN and SN independently. It is thus the MN that takes priority to reserve needed measurement identities no matter if the SN request is supported or not. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### 2.2.2 Correction on MN-SN measurements coordination in INM – Stage 2 ([R2-2003191](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003191), [R2-2003192](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003192))

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Nokia | Yes, but… | The issue is valid while it seems the enhancement is not essential. There are currently other shared aspects where it is up to MN implementation for example to allocate the right amount of measurement identities between MN and SN independently. It is thus the MN that takes priority to reserve needed measurement identities no matter if the SN request is supported or not. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.3 Introduce RRC version for source configuration ([R2-2003753](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_109bis-e/Docs/R2-2003753))

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Nokia | Disagree for now | Not sure we understand the reason for proposing an OCTET STRING. Is the proposal to do something similar to:  HandoverPreparationInformation-v920-IEs ::= SEQUENCE {  ue-ConfigRelease-r9 ENUMERATED {  rel9, rel10, rel11, rel12, v10j0, v11e0,  v1280, rel13, ..., rel14, rel15} OPTIONAL, -- Cond HO2  nonCriticalExtension HandoverPreparationInformation-v9d0-IEs OPTIONAL  } |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 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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