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# 1 Introduction

This document is to kick off the following email discussion:

* [AT111-e][610][POS] RRC miscellaneous CR (Ericsson)

 Scope: Generate a positioning update RRC CR:

* Review R2-2006942 and capture RAN2 agreements from P1 and P2 of R2-2007581
* Discuss P8, P10, P11 of R2-2007581 and capture agreeable aspects

 Intended outcome: Agreeable CR

 Deadline: Thursday 2020-08-27 1200 UTC

# 2 Discussion

In R2-2007078, it is mentioned that posSIB-MappingInfo is forwarded to upper layers upon reception of SIB1. However, if the cell is barred based on contents of received SIB1, posSIB-MappingInfo should not be forwarded to upper layers.

Hence, R2-2007078 proposes to move the forwarding of the field *posSIB-MappingInfo* to the upper layer only after the corresponding cell barring check, similar to the position where *SI-schedulingInfo* locates in the spec.

**Proposal: posSIB-MappingInfo is forwarded to upper layers upon reception of SIB1 only if the cell from which SIB1 is acquired is not barred**

Companies are requested to provide their view

* Propoal Agree
* Proposal Disagree
* Any other view

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Ercisson | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree | The placement of the sentence that forwards the *posSIB-MappingInfo* to upper layers probably need to come at the end of other sentences that forward some information to upper layers. There are style formatting issues in R2-2007078. Many of the lines with B4 or B5 styles are formatted wrong. This need to be fixed when implementing the change. |
| Lenovo | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |

It is observed in [**R2-2006755**] that T350 is stopped twice for RRC re-establishment. **R2-2006755** proposed to remove the duplicated one.

**Proposal: Delete the duplicated behaviour of stopping timer T350 for RRC re-establishment. [R2-2006755]**

Companies are requested to provide their view

* Propoal Agree
* Proposal Disagree
* Any other view

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Proposal Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Ericsson | Agree | This is more editorial correction. Agree with the changes |
| Nokia | Agree | R2-2006755 also has style formatting issues that needs to be fixed when implementing the CR. |
| Lenovo | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree | The change avoids the duplication of starting T350 twice which is not just the text enhancement of duplication. Here is a situation that UE may include on demand request for SIB and/or posSIB(s) in the same DedicatedSIBRequest message. UE includes on demand request for SIB and/or posSIB(s) in the same DedicatedSIBRequest message with starting T350 twice under this situation without this correction. |

In R2-2006844, it was mentioned that in Rel-16, it was discussed the need of unicast tag. There was support from several companies. However, it was agreed that in Rel-16 it will not be introduced but considered for Rel-17 for use case targetting latency reductions. Hence, the ellpisis based extension marker could be added for easier future extension. Otherwise, it would take more bits to extend without having the ellipsis extention marker

Hence, R2-2006844 proposed to add an extension marker to the field posSI-BroadcastStatus in posSchedulingInfoList.

Proposal11: Add an extension marker to the field posSI-BroadcastStatus in posSchedulingInfoList. [R2-2006844]

Companies are requested to provide their view:

* Propoal Agree
* Proposal Disagree
* Any other view

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Proposal Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Ericsson | Agree | The extension marker should be provided where it may be considered an extension is needed and where signalling bits can be saved |
| Nokia | Disagree | Unlike the other 2 CRs in this discussion, which are essential corrections, this CR is not really an essential correction. It is creating a placeholder for introducing a future enhancement, an enhancement which was not agreed in Rel-16. During discussion of R2-2006749 about Rel-16 leftover issues it was not agreed that there are any leftover issues from Rel-16, including the enhancement to extend the *posSI-BroadcastStatus-r16* field. |
| Lenovo | Disagree | We understood that discussion on unicast tag may be continued in Rel-17 (as part of TEI17?). However, discussion has not started yet and it is unclear whether there is really a need for introducing this feature. Therefore, we are hesitant to add a placeholder for something that may or may not come in the future. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | There is no need for this even considering forward-compatibility.  |
| Intel | Disagree | Anyway, there will be impact on legacy UE, even if extension mark is reserved since we need to clarify what legacy UE behavior is.  |
| CATT | Disagree | It is not an essential correction. No need for the extension. |

# Conclusion

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