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# 1 Introduction

This paper addresses the following email discussion:

* [AT119-e][017][IAB17] Control Plane (Ericsson)

 Scope: Treat R2-2206929, R2-2206935, R2-2207190, R2-2207783, R2-2208642, R2-2208101,

 Determine agreeable parts. For agreeable parts, agree CRs.

 Intended outcome: Report, Agreed CRs, Reply LS if applicable

 Deadline: Schedule 1

According to the schedule:

A first round with Deadline for comments W1 Friday Aug 19th 1400 UTC to settle scope what is agreeable etc.

A final round with Final deadline W2 Thursday Aug 25th 1200 UTC to settle details / agree CRs etc.

# 2 Contact information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email address |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Discussion of control plane contributions

## 3.1 [R2-2208101](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_119-e/Docs/%0DR2-2208101.zip) – Rapporteur miscellaneous RRC corrections

The CR includes few miscellaneous editorial corrections. Companies are invited to comment on the proposed changes plus suggest more, if identified:

**Q1**: Do companies agree with the changes proposed in R2-2208101?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Detailed comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.2 [R2-2207190](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_119-e/Docs/%0DR2-2207190.zip) – Correction on the release of BAP configuration

The CR proposes to clarify that when bap-Config is set to release the UE should release the BAP configuration.

Rapporteur´s view:

Rapporteur notes that the *bap-config* is a setup/release type, and thus it seems obvious that when the UE receives a release indication for a CG, the UE should release the BAP configuration previously configured in that CG. Since the release happens already for a parent UE, it does not seem necessary to specify it also for a child IE.

Rapporteur also notes that the original intention of the legacy text was to clarify that the UE should not release the entire BAP entity if there is a BAP configuration still configured in the MCG or SCG.

**Q2**: Do companies agree that the changes proposed in R2-2207190 are not necessary?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Detailed comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.3 [R2-2207783](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_119-e/Docs/%0DR2-2207783.zip) – Corrections on availabilityCombinations and IAB-ResourceConfig for eIAB

The CR includes two proposed changes:

1. If the new table availabilityCombinationsRBGroups-r17 is configured, the legacy availabilityCombinations table configuration should be ignored
2. It is proposed to clarify in the field description of slotListSubcarrierSpacing that the new Rel.17 IAB MAC CEs only applies to the BWP with the same subcarrier spacing as this field, associated with the IAB-ResourceConfigID included in the MAC CE

Rapporteur´s view:

*On the first change*: RAN1 agreed in RAN1#109 that “An IAB node can be configured with two availabilityCombinations tables, one for TDM and one for FDM”.

There is no RAN1 agreement saying that the new FDM availabilityCombination tables (provided in availabilityCombinationsRBGroups-r17) should override the legacy TDM availabilityCombination tables (provided in the legacy availabilityCombinations). Rapporteur´s view is that if a slot applies TDM H/S/NA, the legacy TDM availabilityCombination table should be used; if a slot applies FDM H/S/NA, the new Rel.17 FDM availabilityCombination table (in availabilityCombinationsRBGroups-r17) should be used. Right now, there seems to be no RAN1 agreement supporting the proposed correction.

*On the second change*: Rapporteur´s note that the IAB-ResourceConfig is for the sake of DU operations not for the sake of MT operations. Since the RRC specification is written from the point of view of the UE/MT, this change would imply that the MT needs to do something, but this would not be correct. In our view, the IAB resource configurations just provide a bunch of possible configurations that are activated via the MAC CE. Obviously, the DU will make sure to apply a configuration which is compatible with the BWP in use towards a UE. There seems to be no need to specify DU behaviours in RRC specifications.

**Q3**: Do companies agree that the changes proposed in R2-2207783 are not necessary?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Detailed comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.4 [R2-2208642](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_119-e/Docs/%0DR2-2208642.zip) - Corrections to the AI index configuration

The CR proposes to introduce a new positionInDCI-AI-RBGroups which is applicable only to the new configuration provided in the availabilityCombinationsRB-Groups table.

Rapporteur´s view:

As indicated in the LS R2-2206929 (second agreement indicated therein), RAN1 agreed in RAN1#109 that “if an IAB node is configured with two availabilityCombinations tables, both shared and separate AI index fields are supported by introducing positioninDCI-AI-rel17”. According to this, the current RAN2 specification just includes the legacy positionInDCI-AI-r16, hence it is aligned with the above RAN1 agreement.

**Q4**: Do companies agree that the changes proposed in R2-2208642 are not necessary?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Detailed comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 4 Handling of received LSs

RAN2 received two LSs by RAN1 in [R2-2206929](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_119-e/Docs/%0DR2-2206929.zip) and by RAN4 in [R2-2206935](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_119-e/Docs/%0DR2-2206935.zip). However, rapporteur thinks that both LSs can be noted as in one RAN2 is only in Cc, and in the other previous contribution already address the new RAN1 agreements.

**Q5**: Do companies agree to note LSs in R2-2206929 and R2-2206935 (no reply needed)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Detailed comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 5 Conclusion

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

[Proposal 1 To be updated.](#_Toc509923397)