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# 1 Introduction

This document is to collect companies comment in the following email discussion:

* **[AT112-e][009][NR15] RRC Misc (Ericsson)**

Treat R2-2009840, R2-2009842, R2-2009843, R2-2009074 - R2-2009077, R2-2009477

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

Please provide your comments by this **Thursday 5 Nov 1200 UTC** to give us time to converge in a 2nd phase later on.

Also, 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.*”

Please provide your email address in section Contact information.

# 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 Miscellaneous non-controversial corrections Set VIII (Rel-15)

[R2-2009840](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2009840.zip) Miscellaneous non-controversial corrections Set VIII Ericsson CR Rel-15 38.331 15.11.0 2133 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes or No) | Comments |
| QC | Yes | Need to remove a duplicate "previous" in the change. |
| MediaTek | In general ok | In 5.3.10.3, remove duplicate “previous” in “previous previous UEAssistanceInformation”  In field description of *supplementaryUplink*, it seems overlap with R2-2009698. We should discuss this in R2-2009698. |
| vivo | Yes | Agree with QC’s comment. |
| Samsung | Yes | 1/ Same view to fix duplicated word in 5.3.10.3.  2/ No strong view but the change on the field description of *supplementaryUplink* seems just an editorial issue so we are fine to fix it here. |
| ZTE(LiuJing) | Yes | Agree with QC’s comment. |
| Nokia | Yes | Agree |
| Lenovo | Yes partly | Beside the duplicate “previous” we think that the change in the field description of supplementaryUplink does not provide any further clarification. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Generally OK. We agree the clarification on SUL field description, and it seems overlapping with offline 006. Anyway our view is to have this clarification and the change in R2-2009698 can be merged into the rapportuer’s CR. |
| Ericsson | Proponent | 1. I will fix the duplicated „previous“ 2. Agree on the SUL-related changes, the changes proposed in change in R2-2009698 can be discussed in [006] and depending on result merged into the rapportuer’s CR. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes | Section 5.3.5.3, NOTE 4, duplicate occurrence of “previous” to be corrected. |

### 2.2 Correction to release of list elements using toReleaseList

[R2-2009842](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2009842.zip) Correction to release of list elements using toReleaseList Ericsson CR Rel-15 38.331 15.11.0 2135 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

[R2-2009843](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2009843.zip) Correction to release of list elements using toReleaseList Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 2136 - A NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes or No) | Comments |
| QC | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | No | Parent field is not necessarily a list (element), i.e. release of the parent field does not necessarily occur by elementsToReleaseList. It can just be a normal field with Need R, SetupRelease type of field, etc.  The intention of the spec is to say that whenever parent field is released (no matter the type of the parent field), child fields are released (no matter the type of the child fields).  So we think original wording if fine. If the intention of the CR is to clarify the “as normal fields” part, the following is our suggested wording  “Note that the release of parent field also releases all of the child fields, ~~regardless of whether they have been added via AddModList or as normal fields.~~  Including the child fields that are configured by ToAddModList.” |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes with comments | The intention is OK to us but why do we have yellow part (and why does it not say *elementsToAddModList)*? We think the yellow part could be removed.  “Note that the release of list element(s) using the *elementsToReleaseList* releases the values of all the fields of the list element(s), including lists configured by ToAddModList.” |
| ZTE(LiuJing) | Yes with comments | Same comment as Samsung, seems “all the fields of …” can already cover all sub element(s), there is no need to emphasize whether it is configured by ToAddModList or else. |
| Nokia (Amaanat) | Yes with comments | Mostly OK, but we would keep the “child” wording since UE doesn’t release the “values” of the fields but the fields themselves, i.e. like this: “Note that the release of list element(s) using the elementsToReleaseList releases all the child fields of the list element(s), including lists configured by ToAddModList.” |
| Lenovo | Yes with comment | The suggestion from Nokia looks ok to us. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We think the original sentence has the meaning that when a parent field is released, the corresponding child fields should also be released. With the change the original meaning seems not obvious anymore. So we prefer the original wording and did not see the change is essential. If companies have problems with the yellow part highlighted by Samsung, we are OK to remove it and this change can be merged into the articular’s CR as there is no functional change. |
| Ericsson | Proponent | Original sentence:  Note that the release of parent field also releases all of the child fields, regardless of whether they have been added via AddModList or as normal fields.  We do not think we should talk about parent/child field in this context. This is confusing. We should use the term “list elements“.  Further, the original text was introduced when we discussed a articular case with addModList inside an addModlist, and hence existing text focused on that particular case. So I propose to use Samsung proposal:  Proposal: Note that the release of list element(s) using the *elementsToReleaseList* releases the values of all the fields of the list element(s). |
| Intel | No/Yes | My recollection of the intention of the original sentence is a bit different. It was to say that when the parent field (this may not be a list) is released, all the add mode lists are also released and does not require an explicit releaselist. (I think same as what MediaTek said.)  The proposed text seem to cover (only) the case where the parent is a list.  We are OK to also add (rather than replace the current sentence) the clarification intended with the CR that all the the fields of an list are released with elementsToReleaseList. |
| CATT | Yes with comment | The wording of “ToAddModList” could be changed to “elementsToAddModList” or the highlighted part could be removed as Samsung’s comments. |

### 2.3 Correction on UAI during handover (38.331)

[R2-2009075](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2009075.zip) Correction on UAI during handover vivo, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Intel Corporation CR Rel-15 38.331 15.11.0 2030 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

Moved from 6.1.1

[R2-2009074](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2009074.zip) Correction on UAI during handover vivo, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Intel Corporation CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 2029 - F NR\_newRAT-Core, 5G\_V2X\_NRSL-Core

Moved from 6.1.1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes or No) | Comments |
| QC | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | No | We don’t think this is useful clarification and it is not essential at all. There is no need to interpret current wording as that this UAI is transmitted by the low layer. It could just saying from RRC perspective that it is transmitted to low layer.  We prefer not to have this CR. |
| vivo | Yes | It is essential at least for Rel-16 with DAPS handover. For DAPS handover, the UE suspends the source SRB during the DAPS handover. Then, the UAI could get stuck in the L2-buffer (e.g. PDCP) when the SRB is suspended due to the reception of the DAPS handover CMD.According to the current RRC specification, the UAI which is stuck in the source SRB cannot be retransmitted to the target cell, as there is no transmission for this UAI during the last 1 second before the reception of *reconfigurationWithSync*.  For Rel-15, there is also similar issue for non-DAPS handover: network may also configure “*discardOnPDCP*” when handover. Then, the UAI-1 in source SRB could be discard due to the reception of the handover CMD. Thus, we would like to keep the same text as Rel-16. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| ZTE(Yuan) | Yes |  |
| Nokia (Amaanat) | No | We note similar issues are brought to DCCA and MobEnh AIs. Therefore, it is recommended to address them consistently (and in one place).   * For Rel-15, we believe the changes are not essential nor needed as we have no Dual Access Protocol Stack support. * While the CR is not critical for Rel-15, indeed for DAPS scenario, there may be some aspects to be clarified n Rel-16. However, we note the UAI message re-transmission around HO (<1sec) aims at repetition of the message content that has been previously identified by the UE. It should not result in sending Assistance Information "delta" content (compared to the last UAI). In case the UE detects a change in Assistance Information within the 1sec and detects new trigger for UAI transmission initiation, it should not be mixed with re-sending the previous content (due to HO).   We propose that Rel-16 could go to Rapporteur CR. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Proponent |  |
| Intel | Yes  (one of the proponent) |  |
| CATT | No | We share the same view as MediaTek. |
| Apple | Yes |  |

### 2.4 Correction on UAI during handover (36.331)

[R2-2009077](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2009077.zip) Correction on UAI during handover vivo, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Intel Corporation CR Rel-15 36.331 15.11.0 4455 - F NR\_newRAT-Core

Moved from 6.1.1

[R2-2009076](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2009076.zip) Correction on UAI during handover vivo, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Intel Corporation CR Rel-16 36.331 16.2.1 4454 - F LTE\_eV2X-Core, NR\_newRAT-Core

Moved from 6.1.1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes or No) | Comments |
| QC | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | No | Similar comment as previous one.  Also please note that this kind of wording has been used in earlier release for feature like MBMS, IDC, etc. There is no problem in previous SPEC, we are not sure why this is needed. |
| vivo | Yes | As we mentioned above, it is essential at least for Rel-16 with DAPS handover. For Rel-15 with non-DAPS handover, there is similar issue.  Actually, there is also problem for earlies release of LTE specification. But we think products have already implemented these features. Thus, we could accept not to change them. But we are open to it if companies think it should be discussed.  At least, we should have the correct behavior for 5G products. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| ZTE(Yuan) | Yes |  |
| Nokia (Amaanat) | No | We note similar issues are brought to DCCA and MobEnh AIs. Therefore, it is recommended to address them consistently (and in one place).   * For Rel-15, we believe the changes are not essential nor needed as we have no Dual Access Protocol Stack support. * While the CR is not critical for Rel-15, indeed for DAPS scenario, there may be some aspects to be clarified n Rel-16. However, we note the UAI message re-transmission around HO (<1sec) aims at repetition of the message content that has been previously identified by the UE. It should not result in sending Assistance Information "delta" content (compared to the last UAI). In case the UE detects a change in Assistance Information within the 1sec and detects new trigger for UAI transmission initiation, it should not be mixed with re-sending the previous content (due to HO). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Proponent |  |
| Intel | Yes  (one of the proponent) |  |
| CATT | No | Similar comment as previous one. We don’t think it’s essential. |
| Apple | Yes |  |

### 2.5 Clarification on optional feature without UE AS capability

[R2-2009477](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_112-e\Docs\R2-2009477.zip) Clarification on optional feature without UE AS capability Apple CR Rel-16 38.331 16.2.0 2081 - F NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16

Moved from 6.16

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree?  (Yes or No) | Comments |
| QC | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | No strong view. We are fine to clarify that the two function is optional without capability signaling. If agreed, we think the clarification should started from Rel-15. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Fine with some comments | It seems reasonable but on the other hand it’s somewhat strange that NW configures deprioritisationReq without knowing UE support. We are not sure whether need for capability was discussed or overlooked. |
| ZTE(LiuJing) | Yes | Agree with MTK’s comment. If agreed, the calrification should start from Rel-15. For deprioritisationReq, it is inherited from LTE, and seems there is no capability in LTE as well. Not sure whether this was done intentionally, but at least the proposed wording is aligned with LTE spec. |
| Nokia (Amaanat) | Yes | This is aligning with LTE spec and we are okay to have this clarification. We also agree with MTK and ZTE’s comments. |
| Lenovo | Yes but | Although the changes are applicable from Rel-15, it is ok for us to clarify it from Rel-16 as the issue is not critical. However, we wonder whether there is a strict rule to specify “If the UE supports …” only for features w/o capability signaling and not for all the optional features with capability signaling. In general when it comes to implementation, you have to take the complete set of specifications into account, so a smart UE implementation should know when to act on certain configurations or not. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We are OK with the change, and as this seems editorial, we think it could be merged into the rapportuer’s CR. |
| Ericsson | Yes/No | We do not see a strong motivation for this CR, since already clear from 38.306 that feature is optional (already indicated by Lenovo above). |
| Intel | Yes | Regarding (absence of) deprioritisation capability: My (vague) recollection is that deprioritisation was done in LTE without capability to allow deprioritistation configuration during the connection establishment phase before UE capability is available in RAN. This is not the case with NR as it can be used only after security activation and a capability could have been considered but too late to change that now. |
| CATT | Yes | We are fine to clarify that the two functions are optional without capability signaling. |
| Apple | Yes  (Proponent) | Our primary motivation is that UE which do not support this feature, should not apply this configuration. We would like to clarify that part clearly. |

# 4. 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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| ZTE | liu.jing30@zte.com.cn  gao.yuan66@zte.com.cn |
| Lenovo (Hyung-Nam) | hchoi5@lenovo.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | zhaoyang@huawei.com |
| Ericsson | [hakan.l.palm@ericsson.com](mailto:hakan.l.palm@ericsson.com) |
| Intel | sudeep.k.palat@intel.com |
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