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# 1 Introduction

This document pertains to the following e-mail discussion:

* [AT110-e][062][NR16] MAC updates (Ericsson)

 Scope: Treat R2-2005328, R2-2005501, R2-2005502, R2-2005562. Multi-WI MAC corrections.

 Wanted Outcome: Agreed CR

 Deadline for first round: June 5, 0900 UTC

 Deadline for second round: June 11, 0700 UTC

During the first round the intention is to decide which CRs to pursue for the second round. The second round will be used for updating and merging the CRs which continue from the first round.

The rapporteur invites companies to provide input well in advance of the deadline in order for a productive discussion to take place.

# 2 First round of discussion

## 2.1 Discussion

[R2-2005501](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005501.zip) 38321 CR Clarification on eLCID LG Electronics Inc., MediaTek CR Rel-16 38.321 16.0.0 0752 - F TEI16

Companies are invited to state their opinion on the CR above (R2-2005501).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Opinion** |
| LG | Support the CR. This CR is produced based on the outcome of the e-mail discussion at the last meeting [AT109bis-e][060][NR16] MAC eLCID and RACH stopping. |
| Ericsson | Support the CR. |
| ASUSTeK | Support. |
| MediaTek | Support.  |
| OPPO | Support |
| Fujitsu | We are fine. |
| CATT | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Agree with the change. |
|  |  |

[R2-2005562](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005562.zip) Handling of unexpected eLCID values. ASUSTeK discussion Rel-16 38.321

Companies are invited to state their opinion on the CR above (R2-2005562).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Opinion** |
| LG | Support the CR. |
| Ericsson | Not sure this is stricly needed. Suppose this depends on if we consider eLCID an LCID or not. Perhaps this can be a general clarificaiton in the specification?  |
| ASUSTeK | Support the CR. Since LCID and eLCID are specified separately in the specification, the change is needed. |
| MediaTek | Support the CR. |
| OPPO | Agree the intention of the discussion paper. We tend to have one sentence to clarify LCID including eLCID instead of adding it in every sentence with LCID. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine. The generalization have impact on pure LCID description e.g. “ The LCID field size is 6 bits“, which needs to be avoided. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | We share the same view as OPPO |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Agree with the changes.  |

[R2-2005328](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005328.zip) Alignment of SR clause Ericsson, Samsung CR Rel-16 38.321 16.0.0 0732 1 F NR\_unlic-Core, NR\_eMIMO-Core R2-2003833

Companies are invited to state their opinion on the CR above (R2-2005328).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Opinion** |
| LG | Agree with the intention.We need more time to check the actual changes. |
| Ericsson | Support the CR. It may need updating after the discussions on BFR in MIMO WI have settled down. |
| ASUSTeK | Generally agree with the CR, but whehter to stop sr-prohibittimer when a truncated BFR MAC CE is under discussion in MIMO offline, and updates may be needed afterwards. |
| MediaTek | Support the CR, and share same view with Ericsson. |
| OPPO | Would it be good to also align the text for BSR with the updated ones? |
| CATT | This needs to be discuss in MIMO WI. Seems the procedure after change is not what has been agreed. Needs further checking. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposed changes.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support the intention, we need to check the actual text after the agreements in eMIMO session. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We are generally fine to merge these two cases for SR. Only a couple of comments:1/ I was told that the terminology of BFR MAC CE was agreed to replace SCell BFR MAC CE;2/ suggest to change “ if the SR was triggered according to the BFR procedure (clause 5.17) and prior to the MAC PDU assembly“ to “ if the SR was triggered according to the BFR procedure (clause 5.17) prior to assembly of the MAC PDU“;3/ further, in “ or truncated SCell BFR MAC CE which contains beam failure recovery information of that SCell“, it is not clear here “that SCell“ is which cell in this SR procedure context. |

[R2-2005502](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005502.zip) Stopping ongoing Random Access procedure LG Electronics Inc. discussion Rel-16 TEI16

Companies are invited to state their opinion on the TP in the contribution above (R2-2005502).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Opinion** |
| LG | Support the TP in R2-2005502.At least, it is asked for RAN2 to take some exercise to simplify the text on the UE optional behavior. |
| Ericsson | Do not support the TP as it is right now. We think it is important that the exceptional cases where a UE may cancel an ongoing random access procedure are clearly specified. Cancelled random access procedures need not be easy to detect and therefore it is important to have a limited set of cases in the UE to work from.However, if the text is perceived as complex and difficult to maintain we are open to discuss clarifications and restructuring but not simplifications as proposed above.  |
| ASUSTeK | We share the same view with Ericsson. |
| MediaTek | We are open to discuss this issue (spec text simplication), and we agree with Ericsson that we may need to enumerate the use cases in which an ongoing RACH procedure can be cancelled. |
| OPPO | We agree the intention to simply, but think it would be good to keep all the exceptional contions clearly specified. |
| Fujitsu | We are “in principle“ fine i.e. RAN2 needs to wait for the email discussion [103] on eMIMO, which is also discussing text update for 5.4.4. |
| CATT | Need MAC rapporteur work with the rapporteurs of 2s, NR-U, eMIMO to simplify the description. Current CR is not so precise.  |
| Qualcomm | We can agree in principle the proposed change. Agree with CATT that the current text can use improvement.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We don’t support the TP as is.Agree with Ericsson.  |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We agree with the intention of this CR and the wording can be further discussed.The NOTE is only to clarify the potential UE implementation, so it is not necessary to clarify the details of each case.  |

## 2.2 Conclusion

TBD