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# 1 Introduction

This document is to kick off the following email discussion:

* **[AT111-e][007][NR15] Inter Node and NR Misc (Ericsson)**

Scope: Treat [R2-2006884](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2006884.zip), [R2-2006885](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2006885.zip), [R2-2007674](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2007674.zip), [R2-2007675](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2007675.zip), [R2-2007643](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2007643.zip), [R2-2007644](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2007644.zip), [R2-2006999](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2006999.zip), [R2-2007000](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2007000.zip) (proponents to drive)

Part 1: Decision whether to make corrections, identify agreeable parts. Identify Controversial issues for on-line treatment (if any).

Deadline: Aug 20, 0900 UTC.

Part 2: For agreeable parts, continuation to agree CRs.

Deadline: Aug 26, 0900 UTC.

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 Inter-Node RRC messages

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).

### 2.1.1 Clarification on CG-ConfigInfo for NR-DC and NE-DC

[R2-2006884](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2006884.zip) Clarification on CG-ConfigInfo for NR-DC and NE-DC Google Inc. CR Rel-15 38.331 15.10.0 1745 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2006885](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2006885.zip) Clarification on CG-ConfigInfo for NR-DC and NE-DC Google Inc. CR Rel-16 38.331 16.1.0 1746 - A NR\_newRAT-Core

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes or No) | Comments |
| Huawei | Yes, but | The change is informative and does not affect ASN.1, we support the motivation.  However, the change is not very articulate by using the slash:  NOTE 3: The following table indicates per source RAT and target RAT whether RAT capabilities are included or not in *ue-CapabilityInfo*.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Source RAT/Target RAT | NR capabilities | E-UTRA capabilities | MR-DC capabilities | | E-UTRA/NR | Included | Not included | Included | | NR/E-UTRA | Not included | Included | Included | | NR/NR | Included | Not included | Included |   We suggest adding a new column for target RAT or using “&”:  NOTE 3: The following table indicates per source RAT and target RAT whether RAT capabilities are included or not in *ue-CapabilityInfo*.   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Source RAT | Target RAT | NR capabilities | E-UTRA capabilities | MR-DC capabilities | | E-UTRA | NR | Included | Not included | Included | | NR | E-UTRA | Not included | Included | Included | | NR | NR | Included | Not included | Included |   Or  NOTE 3: The following table indicates per source RAT and target RAT whether RAT capabilities are included or not in *ue-CapabilityInfo*.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Source RAT&Target RAT | NR capabilities | E-UTRA capabilities | MR-DC capabilities | | E-UTRA&NR | Included | Not included | Included | | NR&E-UTRA | Not included | Included | Included | | NR&NR | Included | Not included | Included | |
| Nokia | Yes | Okay to support this as others indicated.  Our comments is for NR DC, EUTRAN capability should be Not Applicable instead of what is currently proposed? |
| ZTE | Yes | Regarding the suggestion from Huawei, we prefer to add a new column for “target RAT”. |
| NEC | Yes | prefer to go with ZTE proposal |
| Ericsson (Tony) | Yes (but we should align with RACS) | We are okay with the principle, but we are also aware that there is a CR coming from RACS that is proposing the same change. Therefore, it would be good to align the terminology between the 2 CRs in order avoid additional polishing in the next meeting.  We are also okay with ZTE proposal. |
| Apple | Yes | We are okay with adding target RAT as well. |
| Intel | Yes | Agree with Ericsson to align also with RACS changes in Rel-16. And to add target RAT separately. |
| vivo | Yes | ZTE would be fine |
| CATT | Yes | Prefer ZTE proposal. |
| Samsung | Yes | Agree with Ericsson we need to align with RACs. Fine to have separate column. Source and target terminology can maybe be clarified (to reflect this concerns information exchanged from MN to SN) |
| Google | Yes | Thanks for all companies’ comments. We will update the CR by adding a new column for target RAT and also avoid clash with the RACS CR. |

### 2.1.2 Clarification on scg-RB-Config

[R2-2007674](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2007674.zip) Clarification on scg-RB-Config Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-15 38.331 15.10.0 1877 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2007675](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2007675.zip) Clarification on scg-RB-Config Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 38.331 16.1.0 1878 - A NR\_newRAT-Core

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes or No) | Comments |
| Huawei | Yes | RAN3 has agreed to support delta configuration for SN terminated bearer during SN initiated SN release procedure for EN-DC.  The CRs are just capturing the omission in RAN2 and will not bring backward compatible issues. |
| Nokia | Yes | This is in alignment with RAN3 decision. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| Ericsson (Tony) | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | Seems needed for MN to takes final decision on how to proceed with RB |
| Google | Yes |  |

## 2.2 NR Other

### 2.2.1 Rapporteur Misc CR

[R2-2007643](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2007643.zip) Miscellaneous non-controversial corrections Set VII Ericsson CR Rel-15 38.331 15.10.0 1871 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2007644](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2007644.zip) Miscellaneous non-controversial corrections Set VII Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.331 16.1.0 1872 - A NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes or No) | Comments |
| Huawei | Yes | The changes are editorial. |
| Nokia | Yes | No problem. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Google | Yes |  |

### 2.2.2 Correction based on the rule of field and IE usage

[R2-2006999](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2006999.zip) Corrections Based on the Rule of Field and IE Usage CATT CR Rel-15 38.331 15.10.0 1765 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2007000](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_111-e\Docs\R2-2007000.zip) Corrections Based on the Rule of Field and IE Usage CATT CR Rel-16 38.331 16.1.0 1766 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes or No) | Comments |
| Nokia | Prefer not to have this, but | This is partly correct but not so necessary: Sometimes we have used IE name to refer to entries in a list to be generic, sometimes not. We don't see this as critical but it could be considered as part of rapporteur CR. The room for error is quite small, though, but some parts would increase readability and consistency. |
| ZTE |  | Similar view as Nokia. In addition, by setting this rule, companies have to keep in mind when drafting CRs in the future, not sure if this is easy to achieve. |
| MediaTek | No strong view | The CR looks correct but not essential. It would be ok to include in rapporteur’s CR. |
| NEC | No strong view | however, as changes are not essential, Rapporteur CR seems better by including where really necessary. |
| Ericsson (Tony) | Disagree | It looks really unneccesary to align each name in the RRC specification. This may also produce a number of unnecessary CR.  We prefer to go have changes like this at this later stage of Rel-15 as the room for any misunderstanding is very little. |
| Apple | No strong view as well | We think there will not be any mis-understanding, but if companies prefer to make the changes, we are ok as well. |
| Intel | No strong view | The main problem here is that there is no field name to use. When the original text was agreed, this issue was understood. The suggested text uses generic words which is not so good either. It is a matter of preference. We understand there are similar proposals in PRN as well. We should be consistent – both changes should be agreed or not agreed together. |
| vivo | No strong view | It is better to have tings in good shape, but do not think very essential |
| CATT | Yes, but | Actually these 2 CRs are about the changes to standardize the IE and field names in the text procedure/field description to increase readability and consistency and to align with the definitions and usages in Annex A. Since there have large number of places use the wrong wording, we only change the places about PLMN and a part of FeatureSet.  If most companies thought these changes are not essential, for not increasing the CR numbers about this issue, we can choice one of the options:   * Option1: only change the PLMN related wording already included in R2-2006999/R2-2007000 for a better readability, which will not increase the workload for check and modification; * Option2: stay them as they were, **but** one mistake in the field description of “***plmn-IdentityList***” need to be changed, since the field of *plmn-IdentityList* contain a set of “*PLMN-IdentityInfo*” but not a set of “*PLMN-IdentityInfoList*”:   ***plmn-IdentityList***  The *plmn-IdentityList* is used to configure a set of *PLMN-IdentityInfo~~List~~* elements.  plmn-IdentityList PLMN-IdentityInfoList,  PLMN-IdentityInfoList ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxPLMN)) OF PLMN-IdentityInfo |
| Samsung | No | Seems not really needed (might be considered in Rap CR, possibly from R16 only) |
| Google | No strong view | We see no confusion in the current specification. If most companies agree to do so, we prefer including the changes in the Rapporteur’s CR. |

# 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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