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# 1 Introduction

This contribution summarizes the following discussion:

* [AT115-e][027][NR16] CP Other & LTE (Ericsson)

Scope: Determine agreeable parts and agree CRs, For [R2-2107285](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107285.zip)-7288 await on-line treat remaining part if needed, Treat [R2-2108291](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108291.zip), [R2-2107129](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107129.zip), [R2-2107482](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107482.zip), [R2-2106911](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2106911.zip), [R2-2108268](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108268.zip), [R2-2107485](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107485.zip), [R2-2106996](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2106996.zip), [R2-2108434](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108434.zip), [R2-2108275](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108275.zip), [R2-2108189](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108189.zip), [R2-2108190](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108190.zip), [R2-2108569](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108569.zip), [R2-2108679](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108679.zip),

Intended outcome: Report, Agreed CRs.

**Deadline: A first round with Deadline for comments Thursday Aug 19 1200 UTC**

**CandidateBeamRSList**

[R2-2107285](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2\TSGR2_115-e\Docs\R2-2107285.zip) Report of email discussion [Post114-e][071][NR16] CandidateBeamRSList set to release (MediaTek) MediaTek Inc. discussion Rel-16 NR\_eMIMO-Core Late

[R2-2107286](file:///D:/Documents/3GPP/tsg_ran/WG2/RAN2/2108_R2_115-e/Docs/R2-2107286.zip) Handling of candidateBeamRSListExt-v1610 (option A1) MediaTek Inc. draftCR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 F NR\_eMIMO-Core Late

[R2-2107287](file:///D:/Documents/3GPP/tsg_ran/WG2/RAN2/2108_R2_115-e/Docs/R2-2107287.zip) Handling of candidateBeamRSListExt-v1610 (option B) MediaTek Inc. draftCR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 F NR\_eMIMO-Core Late

[R2-2107288](file:///D:/Documents/3GPP/tsg_ran/WG2/RAN2/2108_R2_115-e/Docs/R2-2107288.zip) Handling of candidateBeamRSListExt-v1610 (option C) MediaTek Inc. draftCR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 F NR\_eMIMO-Core Late

Misc Corrections

[R2-2108291](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108291.zip) Miscellaneous non-controversial corrections Set XI Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 2763 - F NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16

[R2-2108587](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108587.zip) Correction on RRC multiplicity and type constraint definitions Huawei, HiSilicon        CR       Rel-16           38.331 16.5.0  2782    -           F          NR\_newRAT-Core

**eCall over IMS**

[R2-2107129](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107129.zip) Early implementation of eCall over IMS in NR Qualcomm Incorporated, Ericsson, Vodafone CR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 2714 - F TEI16

NR-U

[R2-2107482](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107482.zip) Correction on description of lbt-FailureInstanceMaxCount in LBT-FailureRecoveryConfig ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 2727 - F NR\_unlic-Core

2-step RACH

[R2-2106911](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2106911.zip) LS on the description of RRC parameter p0-AlphaSets ([R1-2106168](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1//TSGR1_105-e/Docs//R1-2106168.zip); contact: ZTE) RAN1 LS in Rel-16 NR\_2step\_RACH-Core To:RAN2

[R2-2108268](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108268.zip) Correction to 38.331 on field description of the MsgA-TransMax ZTE Corporation, vivo, LG Electronic, OPPO, Samsung CR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 2760 - F NR\_2step\_RACH-Core

[R2-2107485](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107485.zip) Correction to description of po-AlfphaSets ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 2728 - F NR\_2step\_RACH-Core

[R2-2106996](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2106996.zip) Correction on msg1-SubcarrierSpacing and msgA-SubcarrierSpacing vivo CR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 2707 - F NR\_2step\_RACH-Core

Moved from 6.1.4.1.1

Redirection with MPS indication

[R2-2108434](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108434.zip) Correction on Redirection with MPS Indication Peraton Labs, CISA ECD, T-Mobile US, Ericsson , Qualcomm, NTT DoCoMo, AT&T, Verizon CR Rel-16 36.331 16.5.0 4714 - F NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16

LTE changes - Mobility

[R2-2108375](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108375.zip) Correction on ULInformationTransferMRDC(R16) ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 36.331 16.5.0 4713 - F TEI16

LTE changes - ASN.1 on SCG Failure report

[R2-2108189](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108189.zip) ASN.1 misalignment for the SCGFailureInformationNR message Ericsson CR Rel-16 36.331 16.5.0 4709 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core, NR\_unlic-Core, NR\_IAB-Core, NR\_Mob\_enh-Core

Moved from 6.1.4.1.1

[R2-2108190](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108190.zip) ASN.1 misalignment for the SCGFailureInformationNR message Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 2758 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core, NR\_unlic-Core, NR\_IAB-Core, NR\_Mob\_enh-Core

Moved from 6.1.4.1.1

[R2-2108569](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108569.zip) Discussion on compatibility issue and solutions for Rel-15 failure type definition Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-16 TEI16

[R2-2108679](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108679.zip) Discussion on compatibility issue on failure type for NR SCG failure CATT discussion Rel-15

Contact person(s) for each participating company:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact Name, Email |
| Ericsson | hakan.l.palm@ericsson.com |
| MediaTek | nathan.tenny@mediatek.com |
| Lenovo | hchoi5@lenovo.com |
| Samsung | seungri.jin@samsung.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 Phase 1: Intended to determine agreeable parts

### 2.1.1 CandidateBeamRSList

[R2-2107285](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107285.zip) Report of email discussion [Post114-e][071][NR16] CandidateBeamRSList set to release (MediaTek) MediaTek Inc. discussion Rel-16 NR\_eMIMO-Core Late

[R2-2107286](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107286.zip) Handling of candidateBeamRSListExt-v1610 (option A1) MediaTek Inc. draftCR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 F NR\_eMIMO-Core Late

[R2-2107287](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107287.zip) Handling of candidateBeamRSListExt-v1610 (option B) MediaTek Inc. draftCR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 F NR\_eMIMO-Core Late

[R2-2107288](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107288.zip) Handling of candidateBeamRSListExt-v1610 (option C) MediaTek Inc. draftCR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 F NR\_eMIMO-Core Late

This topic was discussed at Monday online session. The following conclusions were captured in the chair’s notes:

* We go for option A1 (for this and future rel)

- MTK wonder if this is now the principle for the future (for other fields). Samsung think it is only for this case and current principle in RRC can be kept. Ericsson think we just discuss case by case, right now we don’ t need to discuss the future. Chair: seems that the interest to change/discuss principle is limited. Can disucss at later time, if found to be a general issue.

* CRs by email

**Q1. Companies are asked to provide their comments on the draft CR in** [R2-2107285](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107285.zip) (option A1).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | The unchanged sections in annex A can be deleted (they were provided in case we wanted to make modifications to capture the general case). |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.1.2 Misc Corrections

[R2-2108291](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108291.zip) Miscellaneous non-controversial corrections Set XI Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 2763 - F NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16

**Q2. Companies are asked to provide their comments on the proposed changes in the draft CR, and provide further findings on typos etc.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | One additional typo: in section 5.3.13.2, third level 3 bullet, „resumeCause“ and „mps-PriorityAccess“ should be in italics. |
| Lenovo | The changes are ok but further issues can be fixed as well:   1. R15 issue:   In 6.4 the description of maxBarringInfoSet is not correct, it should say "Maximum number of access control parameter sets“.  maxAccessCat-1 INTEGER ::= 63 -- Maximum number of Access Categories minus 1  maxBarringInfoSet INTEGER ::= 8 -- Maximum number of Access Categories   1. R16 issues:  * 5.5.5.1: in the condition below there is a typo, should say „average“.   1> if avareage uplink PDCP delay values are available:   * 5.5.2.10: typo in the paragraph below, missing letter „t“ to be added in the word "reselecion":     If *smtc2-LP* is present, for cells indicated in the *pci-List* parameter in *smtc2-LP* in the same frequency (for intra frequency cell reselection) or different frequency (for inter frequency cell reselection), the UE shall …   * 5.5.2.10a: in the paragraph below, „measDuration” to be replaced by “measDurationSymbols”:   On the frequency configured by *rmtc-Frequency*, the UE shall not consider RSSI measurements outside the configured RMTC occasion which lasts for *measDuration* for RSSI and channel occupancy measurements.   * 6.2.2, LoggedMeasurementConfiguration field descriptions: in the description of reportType the word should say “configuration”.   Parameter configures the type of MDT configuration, specifically Periodic MDT conifguraiton or Event Triggerd MDT configuration.   * 6.2.2, ConnEstFailReport field descriptions: the description of numberOfPreamblesSent can be removed since the field does not exist in IE ConnEstFailReport.   ***numberOfPreamblesSent***  This field is used to indicate the number of random access preambles that were transmitted.   * 6.3.2, RSSI-ResourceConfigCLI field descriptions: "scs" in field name rssi-scs should be set in capital letters to be aligned with ASN.1.   ***rssi-scs***  Reference subcarrier spacing for CLI-RSSI measurement. …     * 6.3.2, ServingCellConfig field descriptions: "iab-mt" in field name tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated-iab-mt should be set in capital letters to be aligned with ASN.1.     ***tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated-iab-mt***   * 6.3.2, SlotFormatCombinationsPerCell field descriptions: in the description of enableConfiguredUL the word "channels" should be added as shown below (PUCCH and CG-PUSCH are channels).   ***enableConfiguredUL***  If configured, the UE is allowed to transmit uplink signals/channels (SRS, PUCCH, CG-PUSCH) in the set of symbols of the slot when the UE does not detect a DCI format 2\_0 providing a slot format for the set of symbols (see TS 38.213 [13], 11.1.1). |
| Samsung | Fine for the changes but I want to know the intention of CatF for this CR.  It seems this CR has more minor corrections than Rel-15 CR. In this case, we think Rel-16 CR category could be A instead of F based on the MCC guideline i.e. If there are more substantial changes in the later release CR, we should normally split the CRs to Cat A + Cat F parts so this is clear. But in this case the changes are anyway mostly editorial so we think it’s fine to just use Cat A for all of them.  BTW, it is not really ciritical, we are fine either way. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Clauses affected needs to be populated in the final CR. |
| vivo | Editorial changes, agree |

[R2-2108587](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108587.zip) Correction on RRC multiplicity and type constraint definitions Huawei, HiSilicon        CR       Rel-16           38.331 16.5.0  2782    -           F          NR\_newRAT-Core

**Q3. Companies are asked to provide their view on the need of the draft CR, and comments on the changes in the draft CR.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **CR needed?** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Yes | The CR has no normative impact, but it’s good to have from a spec cleanliness perspective. We should normalise on one convention or the other (-1-r16 or -r16-1). |
| Lenovo | Yes | For consistency reasons it might be good to fix the suffices of the „minus one“ constants. However, we think that the correct format is „-1-r16“, i.e. the opposite to what is proposed in the CR. This format is also used in LTE. As result, the suffices of the following constants need to be fixed (and can be merged into the rapporteur CR):   * maxAI-DCI-PayloadSize-r16-1 * maxNrofAvailabilityCombinationsPerSet-r16-1 * maxNrofCG-SL-r16-1 * maxCI-DCI-PayloadSize-r16-1 * maxNrofCLI-RSSI-Resources-r16-1 * maxNrofConfiguredGrantConfig-r16-1 * maxNrofConfiguredGrantConfigMAC-r16-1 * maxNrofSPS-Config-r16-1 |
| Samsung | Yes, but | Intention for consistency in RRC spec would be fine.  But, it should be kept the legacy cases in 36.331 (i.e. use the suffix of “-1-r16” instead of the suffix of “-r16-1”.  This change can be merged in the Rap CR. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Proponent |
| vivo | Yes, but | Agree with Lenovo and Samsung that we should stick to the legacy convention by using „-1-r16“. |

### 2.1.3 eCall over IMS

[R2-2107129](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107129.zip) Early implementation of eCall over IMS in NR Qualcomm Incorporated, Ericsson, Vodafone CR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 2714 - F TEI16

**Q4. Companies are asked to provide their view on the need of the draft CR, and comments on the changes in the draft CR.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **CR needed?** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Not necessarily | We are ok to allow early implementation of eCall over IMS in NR. However, this can be always done acc. to Annex D in TS 38.331. There is no stringent need to add the original CR to the table in Annex C. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | The support of eCall has been discussed previously in Rel-16 triggered by the LS in R2-2002549 and it was decided to support it since Rel-16 as cited below "TSG SA believes that the changes required in order to allow support for eCall over IMS (NG-eCall) over NR are minimal. CRs should be prepared for TSGs #88 in June 2020 in order to maximise the possibility of including this in Release 16." Thus we don't see need to have early implementation. |
| vivo | Yes |  |

### 2.1.4 NR-U

[R2-2107482](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107482.zip) Correction on description of lbt-FailureInstanceMaxCount in LBT-FailureRecoveryConfig ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 2727 - F NR\_unlic-Core

**Q5. Companies are asked to provide their view on the need of the draft CR, and comments on the changes in the draft CR.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **CR needed?** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Y | We understand this aligns with the MAC spec. |
| Apple | Y | We agree. |
| Samsung | Yes | Fine with the change. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Maybe not | The coversheet contains an error that “Related RAN1 LS in R2-2106911”is not true.  The field description already links to TS 38.321 for more details, so we can live without this text enhancement, as we see no room for ambiguity. |
| vivo | Yes |  |

### 2.1.5 2-step RACH

[R2-2106911](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2106911.zip) LS on the description of RRC parameter p0-AlphaSets ([R1-2106168](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1//TSGR1_105-e/Docs//R1-2106168.zip); contact: ZTE) RAN1 LS in Rel-16 NR\_2step\_RACH-Core To:RAN2

[R2-2107485](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2107485.zip) Correction to description of po-AlfphaSets ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 2728 - F NR\_2step\_RACH-Core

**Q6. Companies are asked to provide comments/questions on the RAN1 LS, their view on the need of the draft CR, and comments on the changes in the draft CR.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **CR needed?** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | We are fine to follow RAN1 recommendation and the CR looks ok. However, on the cover page the typos in the title (po-AlfphaSets) should be fixed to “p0-AlphaSets”. |
| Apple | Yes | Ok as per LS. |
| Samsung | Yes | This CR is in line with RAN1 understanding. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |

[R2-2108268](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108268.zip) Correction to 38.331 on field description of the MsgA-TransMax ZTE Corporation, vivo, LG Electronic, OPPO, Samsung CR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 2760 - F NR\_2step\_RACH-Core

**Q7. Companies are asked to provide their view on the need of the draft CR, and comments on the changes in the draft CR.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **CR needed?** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Yes | Agree |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not needed | The change in this CR changes nothing at the moment as the only place where msgA-TransMax is configured in RACH-ConfigDedicated is cfra-TwoStep, so there is no confusion. The change in MAC agreed last meeting was actually relevant as it changed the UE behaviour, but this one is not needed in our opinion. |
|  |  |  |
| vivo | Yes | Proponent |

[R2-2106996](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2106996.zip) Correction on msg1-SubcarrierSpacing and msgA-SubcarrierSpacing vivo CR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 2707 - F NR\_2step\_RACH-Core

Moved from 6.1.4.1.1

**Q8. Companies are asked to provide their view on the need of the draft CR, and comments on the changes in the draft CR.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **CR needed?** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | See Comments | Regarding the 1st change, this may cause backward compatible issue. Legacy r15 UE does not expect msg1-SubcarrierSpacing to be configured if prach-RootSequenceIndex is not L139. So configuring msg1-SubcarrierSpacing when prach-RootSequenceIndex is not L139 and msgA-PRACH-RootSequenceIndex is L139 may cause problem, as legacy UE may consider the configuration as incorrect.  In our view there are two possible ways to handle:  Option 1: msgA-PRACH-RootSequenceIndex is set to L139 only if prach-RootSequenceIndex is L139.  Option 2: msgA-SubcarrierSpacing is also configured if msgA-PRACH-RootSequenceIndex is set to L139 and if prach-RootSequenceIndex is not L139. Note that currently msgA-SubcarrierSpacing is configured if msgA-PRACH-RootSequenceIndex is set to L139 and 4 step RA is not configured.  Option 1 restricts the network configuration whereas option 2 does not. So we prefer option 2 and change can be as follows:  ***msgA-SubcarrierSpacing***  Subcarrier spacing of PRACH (see TS 38.211 [16], clause 5.3.2). Only the values 15 or 30 kHz (FR1), and 60 or 120 kHz (FR2) are applicable. The field is only present in case of 2-step only BWP or in case msgA-PRACH-RootSequenceIndex L = 139 and prach-RootSequenceIndex L is not equal to 139. If absent, the UE applies the SCS as derived from the *msg1-SubcarrierSpacing* in *RACH-ConfigCommon* in case of *msgA-PRACH-RootSequenceIndex* L=139, otherwise, the UE applies the SCS as derived from the *msgA-prach-ConfigurationIndex* in *RACH-ConfigGenericTwoStepRA* (see tables Table 6.3.3.1-1, Table 6.3.3.1-2, Table 6.3.3.2-2 and Table 6.3.3.2-3, TS 38.211 [16]). The value also applies to contention free 2-step random access type (*RACH-ConfigDedicated*).. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not sure | We are wondering whether RAN1 really considered the case that L=839 for 4-step RA while L=139 for 2-step RA, which is the configuration which causes the issues. If RAN1 intention was to support this case (which cannot be derived directly from the current agreements), then perhaps RAN1 should discuss whether for this case msgA-SubcarrierSpacing or msg1-SubcarrierSpacing should be used to indicate the SCS. We think this needs to be confirmed by RAN1 first.  Also, the current CR seems to cause an issue that in case msg1-SubcarrierSpacing is only configured by the network to indicate SCS for msgA, then the UE will mistakenly apply it also for msg1 SCS, even though the intention was to use SCS indicated by prach-ConfigurationIndex for 4-step RA. |
| vivo | Yes with comments | Thanks Samsung and Huawei for pointing out the backward compatible issue raised in the draft CR.  To resolve this problem, we are fine with Samsung’s revision.  Regarding Huawei’s concern on the potential case where L=839 for 4-step RA while L=139 for 2-step RA (i.e. 4-step RA with the long sequence for coverage performance and 2-step RA with the short sequence for radio-efficiency performance), in our memory, this case was not excluded during the previous RAN1 discussion. If companies think we should check with RAN1, we are also okay to send an LS to RAN1 for further confirmation. |
|  |  |  |

### 2.1.6 Redirection with MPS indication

[R2-2108434](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108434.zip) Correction on Redirection with MPS Indication Peraton Labs, CISA ECD, T-Mobile US, Ericsson , Qualcomm, NTT DoCoMo, AT&T, Verizon CR Rel-16 36.331 16.5.0 4714 - F NR\_newRAT-Core, TEI16

**Q9. Companies are asked to provide their view on the need of the draft CR, and comments on the changes in the draft CR.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **CR needed?** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Y | We are not sure the CR exactly matches the problem. In our reading, the access attempt for MPS redirection will be allowed if \*any one\* of the ACs 12..14 is not barred, even if the actually assigned AC is barred. So in order to effectively bar access for MPS redirection, it seems that the network needs to bar all of ACs 12..14. We understand this may be unavoidable since the UE does not know what the assigned AC is, but it is still a bit counterintuitive and should perhaps be captured in a NOTE. |
| Lenovo | Yes but | We are ok to extend the applicable AC to 12, 13. However, on the proposed change we wonder how it is meant to work:   1. If the UE is configured with AC 12, 13, 14 and the NW sets any of the corresponding bits in the ac-BarringForSpecialAC to „0“ then the UE considers the access to the cell as not barred. 2. If the UE is configured with e.g. AC 12 only and the NW sets AC 12 to „1“ and AC 13, 14 to „0“ in the ac-BarringForSpecialAC, then does this UE still consider the access to the cell as not barred?   Proponents should clarify whether scenario 2 is valid or not acc. to the CR. |
| Samsung | Yes | MPS service can be offered in a number of possible Access Classes (e.g. AC 12-14). |
| vivo | Yes, but | Not sure why the cases when AC = 11 or 15 are excluded from the description, as the TS 22.011 clause 4.4a states that:  *“4.4a Multimedia Priority Service*  *Multimedia Priority Service (TS 22.153 [16]) shall be assigned its own unique access class value (i.e., one of the special access classes 11 to 15). The assigned access class value for Multimedia Priority Service is based on regional/national regulatory requirements and operator policy.”* |

### 2.1.7 LTE changes - Mobility

[R2-2108375](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108375.zip) Correction on ULInformationTransferMRDC(R16) ZTE Corporation, Sanechips CR Rel-16 36.331 16.5.0 4713 - F TEI16

**Q10. Companies are asked to provide their view on the need of the draft CR, and comments on the changes in the draft CR.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **CR needed?** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Maybe | We think the intention is fine. I guess we can just remove the word „only“ here as below.    NR *RRCReconfigurationComplete* (transmitted upon CPC execution if ~~only~~ SRB1 is configured and the UE is operating in EN-DC) messages.  Note 1 - WI code should be LTE\_feMob-Core as it is mainly CR for CPC.  Note 2 – There is typo „SBR1“ in the proposed text. Should be SRB1. |
| Samsung | Maybe yes | It seems good to be in line with the procedural texts of TS38.331. |
| vivo | Maybe | Similar view with MTK. |

### 2.1.8 LTE changes - ASN.1 on SCG Failure report

[R2-2108189](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108189.zip) ASN.1 misalignment for the SCGFailureInformationNR message Ericsson CR Rel-16 36.331 16.5.0 4709 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core, NR\_unlic-Core, NR\_IAB-Core, NR\_Mob\_enh-Core

Moved from 6.1.4.1.1

[R2-2108190](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108190.zip) ASN.1 misalignment for the SCGFailureInformationNR message Ericsson CR Rel-16 38.331 16.5.0 2758 - F LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA\_enh-Core, NR\_unlic-Core, NR\_IAB-Core, NR\_Mob\_enh-Core

Moved from 6.1.4.1.1

[R2-2108569](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108569.zip) Discussion on compatibility issue and solutions for Rel-15 failure type definition Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-16 TEI16

[R2-2108679](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108679.zip) Discussion on compatibility issue on failure type for NR SCG failure CATT discussion Rel-15

The above-listed documents deal with an issue postponed at RAN2#114e

**– SCGFailureInformationNR**

FailureReportSCG-NR-r15 ::= SEQUENCE {

failureType-r15 ENUMERATED {

t310-Expiry, randomAccessProblem,

rlc-MaxNumRetx,

synchReconfigFailureSCG, scg-reconfigFailure,

srb3-IntegrityFailure, other-r16},

measResultFreqListNR-r15 MeasResultFreqListFailNR-r15 OPTIONAL,

measResultSCG-r15 OCTET STRING OPTIONAL,

...,

[[ locationInfo-r16 LocationInfo-r10 OPTIONAL,

logMeasResultListBT-r16 LogMeasResultListBT-r15 OPTIONAL,

logMeasResultListWLAN-r16 LogMeasResultListWLAN-r15 OPTIONAL,

failureType-v1610 ENUMERATED {t312-Expiry, scg-lbtFailure,

beamFailureRecoveryFailure, bh-RLF-r16, spare4,

spare3, spare2, spare1} OPTIONAL

]]

}

The rapporteurs understanding is that the code point *other-16* does not exist in in 36.331 Rel-15 (not even as a spare value), and will result in a transfer syntax error if received by eNb based on Rel-15 ASN.1.

In the following, the rapporteur tried (based on [R2-2108679](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108679.zip)) to list the proposed solutions (sourcing companies are asked to verify and add/correct where needed).

Solution 1-1  
Add a new code point into the *failureType-r15* field in 36.331 Rel-15 SCGFailureInformationNR, e.g. “reserved”.   
Further, add a code point into the *failureTyp-15* field within the TS 38.331 *CG-ConfigInfo* structure, e.g. “reserved”.

Solution 1-2:

Add a new code point into the *failureType-r15* field in 36.331 Rel-15 SCGFailureInformationNR, e.g. “reserved”.

*CG-ConfigInfo* is not updated, an hence MeNB should instead trigger a release of SCG.

Solution 2-1:   
The value *other-r16* should not be used for any case. The UE should always include a “similar” r15 failure type. There are two variants.

1. Setting of failureType-r15 is specified in 38.331 procedure text.
2. Setting of failureType-r15 is left to UE impl. This solution is covered in [R2-2108569](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108569.zip).

Solution 2-2:   
For the case of BFR failure, the Rel-16 UE should set the value failureType-r15 to *randomAccessProblem* Other cases are prevented by network implementation (“prevent Rel-16 UEs from encountering T312 expires, LBT failures and BH RLFs when connecting to a Rel-15 MeNB “).

Solution 3  
Introduce a new field *failureTypeOther* in 36.331 Rel-16 SCGFailureInformationNR message, and dummify existing *other-r16* code-point. Corresponding procedure text changes in 38.331 Rel-16. (This solution is covered by draft CRs in [R2-2108189](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108189.zip)/[R2-2108190](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108190.zip)).

In this Phase 1, companies are asked to provide their views on preferred solution alternatives. In a Phase 2, we can discuss CR details.

**Q11. Companies are asked to provide their view on preferred solution alternative.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred Solution** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | See comment | This is an unfortunate bug in R16 ASN.1. We should never add new UL enum value in legacy field. We recognize this is a real problem and there is no backward compatible way to solve.  Our Suggestion   * Dummify the *other-r16* code-point (The R16 UE shall never use it, note that it is NBC) * No need to add new *failureTypeOther-r16* as proposed in solution 3. The existing *failureType-v1610* will provide enough information to R16 eNB. * The UE set failureType-r15 to any legacy code-point (or some predefined code-point, e.g. *randomAccessProblem,* no strong view) while including the R16 field *failureType-v1610.* |
| Lenovo | See comment | We recall that when the value “other-r16“ was agreed to be introduced in failureType-r15 for a previously unknown codepoint it was assumed that legacy eNBs need to be upgraded to comprehend the “other-r16“. We wonder why it is not possible to do that. We understood that solution 2-1 and 2-2 also require an upgrade of legacy eNBs to comprehend the new mapping of the legacy R15 failure types. |
| Apple | Aligned with Mediatek’s view. |  |
| Samsung | Solution 3 or the variant of solution 3 | We share the problem so indeed it should be corrected. The cleanest solution could be the Solution 3 so we think it is better if all other solutions have NBC problem as well. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Solution 2-1 | This is aligned with our solution in [R2-2108569](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_115-e/Docs//R2-2108569.zip).  We think the first thing is to handle the value other-r16 in failureType-r15, as it results in a transfer syntax error according to 3GPP common rules.  If the value other-r16 is to be disabled, removed or dummied, how the UE sets the failureType-r15 (when failureType-v1610 is included) needs discussions.  In our paper R2-2108569, we think it can be left to UE implementation. We suggest that the UE should set an appropriate value, and then Rel-15 eNB can do the appropriate actions based on the value.  We are also open for alternatives, e.g. define explicit mapping between some R16 failure types and R15 failure types. |
| Ericsson | Option 3 (proponent) | In general, we agree that whatever solution we go the change it may be NBC. However, with out Option 3 we want to keep the procedural text as semantically correct as possible. In this sense, we are basically trying to re-use the text that is already there.  Of course the UE can randomly set a failure cause for the Rel-15 IE, or define a mapping between Rel-16 and Rel-15 failure causes but from a procedural point of view it will look quite strange. |
| NTTDOCOMO | Solution 2-1 or solution3 | * Either dummify other-r16 code-point or restrict UE shall not set other-r16 is fine. * The benefis of new failureTypeOther-r16 seems limited as existing failureType-v1610 already provides the information for r16 eNB, while agree it can mostly re-use the exisiting UE procedure * For solution2-1, a) is more preferable. |
| vivo | Solution 3 | Prefer to go with solution 3. |

# 3 Conclusion

- To be updated after discussion on Phase 1 -