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# 1 Introduction

This document is to kick off the following email discussion:

* [AT112-e][006][NR15] RRC Conn Control II (ZTE)

 Treat R2-2009580, R2-2009581, R2-20094~~5~~79, R2-2009697, R2-2009233, R2-2009234, R2-2009235, R2-2009698, R2-2009699, R2-2010492, R2-2010584, R2-2009236, R2-2009237, R2-2009582, R2-2009583, R2-2009478

 Intended outcome: Intermediate: Determine agreeable parts. Final: For agreeable parts, agreed CRs.

 Deadline: Intermediate deadline(s) by Rapporteur, Final: Discussion stop at Wed Nov 11, 1200 UTC

* Phase 1: collect companies’ view, by Friday 2020-11-06 12:00 UTC
* Phase 2: rapporteur will share summary report and TP based on input of phase 1 for review, by Monday 2020-11-11 12:00 UTC

Following the Guidelines of the chairman: “*For specific corrections when needed it may be valid to discuss whether to make such correction instead only for Rel-16. When/if applicable, email discussions shall determine Release applicablity for such corrections.*”

# Contact Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Email |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 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).

## Correction on rach-ConfigDedicated

[R2-2009580](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009580.zip) Correction on rach-ConfigDedicated ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-15 38.331 15.11.0 2092 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2009581](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009581.zip) Correction on rach-ConfigDedicated(R16) ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 2093 - A NR\_newRAT-Core

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Clarification on SCell RACH configuration

[R2-2009479](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009479.zip) Clarification on the SCell RACH configuration Apple CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 2183 - F NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Clarification on RRC Reestablishment procedure

[R2-2009697](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009697.zip) Clarification on RRC Reestablishment procedure Ericsson discussion Rel-15 NR\_newRAT-Core

In above contribution, it clarifies whether the first *RRCReconfiguration* message is required to re-configure SRB1. And whether the first *RRCReconfiguration* message after re-establishment needs to contain the *srb-Identity* value in the *srb-ToAddModList* for SRB1.

In the case of *fullConfig*, the UE is required to release/clear all current dedicated radio configurations. However, the NOTE 1 in TS 38.331 clearly says that the radio configuration does not include SRB1/SRB2 configurations i.e. SRB1 is not released. Moreover, when the text refers to the addition of an SRB, it says in NOTE 2 of TS 38.331 that this is to get the SRB2 for reconfiguration after re-establishment to a known state from which the reconfiguration message can do further configuration.

In the case of delta configuration, the srb-*ToAddModList* is OPTIONAL and is defined by the following condition *“-- Cond HO-Conn*” which says that the field is only mandatory when the *fullConfig* flag is included in the *RRCReconfiguration* message (but only for SRB2, as described above) and in *RRCSetup* for SRB1. In other words, SRB1 configuration is not required in the first *RRCReconfiguration* message after re-establishment.

**Proposal 1 RAN2 to confirm that SRB1 configuration is not required in the first RRCReconfiguration message after re-establishment in the case of fullConfig.**

**Proposal 2 RAN2 to confirm that SRB1 configuration is not required in the first RRCReconfiguration message after re-establishment in the case of delta signalling.**

**Question: Do companies agree with above Proposal 1 and Proposal 2?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

In addition, it further clarifies whether PDCP and RLC needs to be re-established in the first RRCReconfiguration after re-establishment. The field description of reestablishPDCP and reestablishRLC are copied/pasted as below:

|  |
| --- |
| ***SRB-ToAddMod* field descriptions** |
| ***[…]*** |
| ***reestablishPDCP***Indicates that PDCP should be re-established. Network sets this to *true* whenever the security key used for this radio bearer changes. Key change could for example be due to reconfiguration with sync, for SRB2 when resuming an RRC connection, or at the first reconfiguration after RRC connection reestablishment in NR. For LTE SRBs using NR PDCP, it could be for handover, RRC connection reestablishment or resume. Network doesn't include this field if any DAPS bearer is configured. |

|  |
| --- |
| ***RLC-BearerConfig* field descriptions** |
| ***[…]*** |
| ***reestablishRLC***Indicates that RLC should be re-established. Network sets this to *true* at least whenever the security key used for the radio bearer associated with this RLC entity changes. For SRB2 and DRBs, it is also set to *true* during the resumption of the RRC connection or the first reconfiguration after reestablishment. |

As mentioned in the contribution, it should be clear that a key change does not necessarily happen at the first reconfiguration after RRC connection reestablishment in NR, but it happens before i.e. upon reception of the *RRCReestablishment* message. So the field description makes the requirement not clear, and leading to different interpretations.

**Proposal 3 If SRB1 is included in the first RRCReconfiguration after re-establishment, RAN2 to clarify whether reestablishPDCP is required to be set to true for SRB1.**

**Proposal 4 If SRB1 is included in the first RRCReconfiguration after re-establishment, RAN2 to clarify whether reestablishRLC is required to be set to true for SRB1.**

**Question: Companies are invited to express your opinion on Proposal 3 & Proposal 4? (i.e. whether reestablishPDCP or reestablishRLC are required to be set to true? )**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Required? orNot required? | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Proposal 5 If network is not required to set reestablishPDCP and reestablishRLC to true, RAN2 to agree on the TP presented in Section 3.**

**Question: If you think network is not required to set reestablishPDCP and reestablishRLC to true, then any comments to the draft TP presented in section 3?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Clarify UE behaviour on Need S Need R fields

[R2-2009233](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009233.zip) Clarify UE behaviour on Need S Need R fields ZTE Corporation, Sanechips discussion Rel-15 NR\_newRAT-Core

The above contribution discussed the ambiguity issue of scramblingID related fields. Based on current TS38.331, these fields are defined as Need R or Need S with default values. So UE will apply PCI when the field is not signalled in RRC message. However, during handove procedure, if network does not include the parent field (Need M) for delta configuration, it is unclear which value will be applied by UE for the child field.

For instance, the below “hoppingId” field, if network first sends RRCReconfiguration by not including hoppingId, the UE is supposed to apply the PCI of serving cell based on RAN1 spec. Then during handover procedure, if the target cell does not include PUCCH-ConfigCommon field (Need M) in handover command, for hoppingId field, will UE continue use source PCI? or the UE assumes the hoppingId field is still absent, and then applies the default value, e.g. PCI of target cell?

PUCCH-ConfigCommon ::= SEQUENCE {

 pucch-ResourceCommon INTEGER (0..15) OPTIONAL, -- Cond InitialBWP-Only

 pucch-GroupHopping ENUMERATED { neither, enable, disable },

 hoppingId INTEGER (0..1023) OPTIONAL, -- Need R

 p0-nominal INTEGER (-202..24) OPTIONAL, -- Need R

 ...

}

In order to support delta configuration for the parent field. In R2-2009233, it is proposed to clarify the UE shall assume the field is still absent, and then applies the default value after handover.

**Proposal 1: For the scramblingID related fields (e.g. defined as Need S or Need R with default values), in case the network does not signal the field before, during RRC reconfiguration, the UE shall assume the field is still absent if the parent field (Need M) is not included.**

**Question: Do companies agree with the clarification in Proposal1? (If no, please provide your comments?)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[R2-2009234](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009234.zip) CR to clarify UE behaviour on Need S Need R fields ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-15 38.331 15.11.0 2044 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2009235](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009235.zip) CR to clarify UE behaviour on Need S Need R fields ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 2045 - A NR\_newRAT-Core

**Question: If the answer to above question is “Yes”, do you have any comments to the Rel15/16 CRs?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## SUL terminology

[R2-2009698](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009698.zip) Correction on terminology for when the UE is configured with SUL Ericsson CR Rel-15 38.331 15.11.0 2105 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2009699](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009699.zip) Correction on terminology for when the UE is configured with SUL Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 2106 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2010492](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2010492.zip) Clarification on the terminology ‘serving cell is configured with a supplementary uplink’ Fujitsu discussion Rel-16 NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2010584](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2010584.zip) Clarification on the terminology ‘serving cell is configured with a supplementary uplink’ Fujitsu CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 1772 1 F NR\_newRAT-Core R2-2007020

There are four contributions clarifing the terminology “when the UE is configured with SUL”, and “serving cell is configured with a supplementary uplink” in TS 38.331. In general, rapporteur thinks the motivations are the same.

Although [R2-2010584](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2010584.zip) is a Rel-16 CR, it is clarified in R2-2010492 that the 2nd change is also applied for Rel-15 specification. While, in [R2-2009698](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009698.zip), it also includes other changes. Comparing the two set of CRs. For Rel-15 overlapping part, the main difference is:

--Modification on ***SI-SchedulingInfo*** in [R2-2009698](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009698.zip):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *SUL-MSG-1* | The field is optionally present, Need R, if *supplementaryUplink* is configured in *ServingCellConfigCommonSIB*and if *si-BroadcastStatus* is set to *notBroadcasting* for any SI-message included in *SchedulingInfo*. It is absent otherwise. |

--Modification on ***SI-SchedulingInfo*** in [R2-2010584](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2010584.zip):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *SUL-MSG-1* | The field is optionally present, Need R, if *supplementaryUplink* is present in *servingCellConfigCommon* and if si-BroadcastStatus is set to *notBroadcasting* for any SI-message included in *SchedulingInfo*. It is absent otherwise. |

Similarly, for Rel-16 overlapping part in [R2-2009699](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009699.zip) and [R2-2010584](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2010584.zip), the main difference is:

--Modification on ***PosSI-SchedulingInfo*** in [R2-2009699](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009699.zip):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *SUL-MSG-1* | The field is optionally present, Need R, if *supplementaryUplink* is configured in *ServingCellConfigCommonSIB* and if *posSI-BroadcastStatus* is set to *notBroadcasting* for any SI-message included in *PosSchedulingInfo*. It is absent otherwise. |

--Modification on ***PosSI-SchedulingInfo*** in [R2-2010584](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2010584.zip):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *SUL-MSG-1* | The field is optionally present, Need R, if *supplementaryUplink* is present in *servingCellConfigCommon* and if *posSI-BroadcastStatus* is set to *notBroadcasting* for any SI-message included in *PosSchedulingInfo*. It is absent otherwise. |

As we can see, one refers to the field name, the other refers the name of IE definition. Companies are invited to show your preference to above two versions.

**Question: For the modification on SI-SchedulingInfo and PosSI-SchedulingInfo, which version do you prefer? (use ServingCellConfigCommonSIB, or servingCellConfigCommon)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preferred name | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question: Any comments to the other changes in R2-2009698/9699?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Clarify smtc field in SCell addition w/o SSB

[R2-2009236](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009236.zip) CR to clarify smtc field in case of SCell addition ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-15 38.331 15.11.0 2046 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2009237](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009237.zip) CR to clarify smtc field in case of SCell addition ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 2047 - A NR\_newRAT-Core

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Clarify essential system information

[R2-2009582](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009582.zip) Correction on essential system information ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-15 38.331 15.11.0 2094 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2009583](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009583.zip) Correction on essential system information(R16) ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 2095 - A NR\_newRAT-Core

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Clarify AS configuration during HO

[R2-2009478](file:///D%3A%5CDocuments%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2%5CTSGR2_112-e%5CDocs%5CR2-2009478.zip) Clarification on AS configuration during HO Apple CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 2082 - F NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?(Yes or No) | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 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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