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# 1 Introduction

This document is to collect comments on the following proposals:

* [AT119-e][038][NRTEI17] Comments on New proposals (Chair)

Scope: Collect a round of comments on the new TEI proposals in R2-2208241, R2-2207434, R2-2208430, R2-2208668, R2-2207938 in order to determine if any of these could be agreeable.

Intended outcome: Report for CB W2 Friday

Deadline: W2 Thursday 1800 UTC

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 Inclusion of the CSI reports in MDT framework

[R2-2208241](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_119-e\Docs\R2-2208241.zip) Inclusion of the CSI reports in MDT framework Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Deutsche Telekom, Verizon discussion Rel-17 TEI17, NR\_ENDC\_SON\_MDT\_enh-Core R2-2206144

Proposal 1: UE CSI reporting is added to the MDT framework to allow for advanced network optimization procedures as part of TEI17.

Proposal 2: RAN2 is asked to agree to TS37.320 changes as provided in the Annex.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Support / CanAccept / Oppose / Question | Comments and justification for the expressed opinion (and/or question). |
| Chair |  | Chair initial comments (open ended): no impact to the UE, impact to the base-station. CSI can map reasonably to achievable L1 bitrate so it may be useful. Could be a low hanging fruit, but may have impact in other groups, so not clear if TEI is the best WI? |
| Nokia | Support | Proponent |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.2 SDAP end-marker in RLC UM

[R2-2207434](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_119-e\Docs\R2-2207434.zip) SDAP end-marker in RLC UM Apple, Futurewei, Spreadtrum, FGI, Asia Pacific Telecom, T-Mobile USA, ZTE Corporation discussion Rel-17 TEI17 R2-2205679

*Proposal 1: RAN2 to study how the handling of PDUs carrying SDAP end-marker or RDI can be enhanced to mitigate against potential message loss in RLC UM in Rel-17.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Support / CanAccept / Oppose / Question | Comments and justification for the expressed opinion (and/or question). |
| Chair |  | Chair initial comments (open ended): This was discussed in Rel-15 and was left as is, assuming an impl timer will resolve the situation, and indeed the timer brings some delay. Proposal to study is not optimal for TEI type work, but can check the level of interest. |
| Apple | Support (Proponent) | Moving on from Rel-15 the NR feature set has been enhanced to support new services, many of which facilitate a lower end-to-end latency. As a consequence, later releases are expected to use RLC UM more widely. For example, RLC UM on a dedicated DRB is a likely deployment in use-cases such as IIoT, URLLC, advanced interactive services and gaming in Rel-17.  When a DRB is configured with RLC UM, the end-marker in UL or the RDI in DL can get lost and introduce unwanted side-effects.  **•** In the UL, a lost end-marker may cause the gNB to buffer data for a long time, hampering user experience and adding delay.  **•** In the DL, a lost RDI packet from the gNB would cause the UE not updating the QoS flow to DRB mapping. Thus, the UE would continue sending UL packets of the QFI on the old DRB while the gNB buffers packets waiting for the end-marker.  Therefore, we would like to see if companies are open to revisit some of the SDAP procedures with the aim to reduce unintended delays in scenarios where the RDI or end-marker can get lost. Our intention is to check how to potentially address these issues. We are open to a range of solution options. By “study” we mean that suitable approaches could be sorted in an email discussion, but no extensive study phase.  Depending on which option is chosen we do not think a timer is necessarily needed. Some of the options can be lightweight without too much impact on specs and implementation. A quick comparison of the solution options:  **• Option 2** may be straightforward by having the UE to (provisionally) repeat the end-marker, which is not allowed in current specifications.  **• Option 1** could latch upon the survival time feature. Alternatively, RAN2 could simply increase the reliability of the initial transmission.  **• Option 3** perhaps is a clean approach, but it may need a new DL control PDU or some form of an ACK, so the spec impact could be slightly higher.  **• Option 4** is also relatively straightforward at least from a UE perspective, and to identify when to repeat the RDI it could be up to network implementation. |
| Nokia | Can Accept | We are fine with having the end marker on the old bearer for both RLC AM and RLC UM, but we would question the need to improve its reliability for RLC UM.  In general, we believe it would be more important to give the old bearers (or the packets of that QoS flow in the old bearer) the same priority as the new bearer so that the delay impacts of the packets from the relocated QoS flow remaining in the old bearer are minimised. |
| Samsung | Oppose | We believe gNBs can predict the loss of an end-marker, and if it becomes an issue, gNB could simply not trigger QF-DRB remapping. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.3 Remote access issue

[R2-2208430](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_119-e\Docs\R2-2208430.zip) Discussion on remote access issue CMCC, vivo, Huawei discussion Rel-18 TEI

*Proposal 1: RAN2 is kindly asked to confirm the remote access issue, that UE may access to a remote cell due to the radio signal transmitted and reflected by atmospheric and seawater with tiny propagation loss at some certain temperature and humidness conditions.*

*Proposal 2: RAN2 is kindly asked to confirm that the current implementation solutions cannot completely address the remote access issue.*

*Proposal 3: RAN2 is kindly asked to discuss the potential solutions, e.g.:*

*– Introduce a TA threshold in the system information to indicate the maximum Timing Advance to access the cell.*

*– If the received TA is larger than TA threshold, UE should apply Qoffsettemp for R criteria when UE goes back to idle/inactive mode. No change to the existing RA procedure.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Support / CanAccept / Oppose / Question | Comments and justification for the expressed opinion (and/or question). |
| Chair |  | Chair initial comments (open ended): In my experience, this kind of “strangeness” in the network is quite normal, i.e. for deployments that has significant shadowing effects or open water etc, the best coverage for a UE may indeed be by a distant cell rather than the closest base-station, but RAN2 usually assumes that from radio perspective (interference etc) it is good to keep the UE on the best cell, distant or not. For very distant cells, it has been recognized in the past that there are issues with the resulting camping or connection being very unstable. For this purpose it is possible today to exclude or deprioritize cells from UE evaluation, by neighbor cell lists. |
| Nokia | Question | A solution affecting UE implementation is only a partial fix.  Furthermore how can we ensure that TA is long in this case as the error scenario is straightline ? In general we are not convinced that chiba lake issues (which this is) cannot be solved by qoffesttemp.  The most straightforward solution would be to fix the tracking app in order log the location of the UE. |
| Samsung | Oppose | We believe RAN2 already have a solution (i.e., *connEstFailCount*, *connEstFailOffset*, *connEstFailOffsetValidity* in 38.331) for this issue. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.4 DRX correction for DCI controlled bundling

[R2-2208668](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_119-e\Docs\R2-2208668.zip) Correction to DRX operation with bundling controlled in the DCI Ericsson, Nokia, T-Mobile USA, Verizon, Docomo discussion Rel-17

*Proposal 1 Introduce a configurable parameter drx-LastTransmissionUL that enables the start of the drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerUL after the end of the last transmission (within a bundle) instead of after the end of the first transmission (within a bundle).*

*Proposal 2 Introduce a new UE capability and corresponding RRC signalling for drx-LastTransmissionUL.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Support / CanAccept / Oppose / Question | Comments and justification for the expressed opinion (and/or question). |
| Chair |  | Chair initial comments (open ended): This was briefly discussed before, with a mix or positive and negative comments. Anyway the proposal is limited, clear and could be implemented asap (as required for TEI) - in case there is more support / less objections now. |
| Apple | CanAccept | We agree that the proposed handling may reduce UE active time in cases where the HARQ RTT timer is (much) shorter than the time required to transmit all (many) TB repetitions. However, there are also other aspects to consider:  1. The updated handling is targeting a subset of services/scenarios only, but a UE may have multiple active services of different characteristics at the same time.  2. The network can configure the HARQ RTT timer to a value that is longer than the max TB repetition time, e.g., in a typical setup. In this case, the updated handling proposed may lead to a slight increase in UE power consumption since it removes opportunities for micro-sleep in between TB repetitions.  3. From a UE perspective, we would like to be able to terminate TB repetitions early, for example, there is no point continuing TB repetitions if already the first transmission was successful. Moreover, if the TB was not received correctly then the NACK would typically come after the last TB.  Since there is a capability and Rel-17 is a new release we can accept if majority of companies supports, otherwise, we’d tend to rely on the legacy handling. |
| Nokia | Proponent |  |
| Samsung | Oppose | As indicated in the previous meeting, we think the proposal is an optimization for infrequent case, so it may not be essential. That is, this enhancement might be useful only if UE supports the eURLLC feature (*pusch-RepetitionTypeB-r16*), and network configures the feature for e.g. voice service (as illustrated in the contribution), and network configures DRX with short *drx-onDurationTimer* and *drx-InactivityTimer*. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2.5 Priority based inter-freq measurement reporting

[R2-2207938](file:///C:\Users\mtk65284\Documents\3GPP\tsg_ran\WG2_RL2\TSGR2_119-e\Docs\R2-2207938.zip) Priority based inter-freq measurement reporting Apple discussion Rel-17 TEI17

*Moved from 6.21.2*

*Proposal: Consider a reporting priority based mechanism to address the problem.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Support / CanAccept / Oppose / Question | Comments and justification for the expressed opinion (and/or question). |
| Chair |  | Chair initial assessment (open ended): I understand that there is some interest for this, but as RAN4 is the group for detailed measurement behavior, it is somewhat difficult to see that this should be a RAN2-only topic (in order to arrive at a function that makes sense). Same comment applies for the referenced R2-2202436. |
| Ericsson | CanAccept if… | We are generally fine with enhancing the inter-frequency measurement configuration and reporting and we would like also to clarify that in our contribution in [R2-2205832](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205832.zip) submitted in the last RAN2 meeting we propose solutions that are confined only to RAN2 and do not require any RAN4 work.  According to this, we are ok to discuss this but also the solutions proposed in [R2-2205832](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205832.zip) should be part of the discussion. |
| Nokia | Question | Seems like a RAN4 topic. |
| BT | CanAccept including [R2-2205832](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205832.zip) proposals | Currently, UEs perform HO measurements in a vendor specific way. That difficult the network engineering and its maintenance, e.g. load balancing when HO can cause an undesirable extra.  As Ericsson mention, our contribution [R2-2205832](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205832.zip) in last RAN2 proposes several RAN2 self-contained solutions. For this problem and being realistic, we need to avoid any impact on RAN4.  We understand this topic is sensible for UE vendors and chipset manufacturers. For that reason, our idea is to discuss a signalling based solution that suit everyone.  We are fine to discuss Apple proposal but in addition, we consider [R2-2205832](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205832.zip) proposals needs to be added to the discussion. |
| Samsung | Oppose | In general, we think that the issue can be addressed by NW implementation i.e. NW can configure appropriate frequencies to be measured by UE accordingly.  If NW wants to configure more frequencies than UE supports currently, we think RAN4 should discuss first about UE requirements, similar as what we have done in LTE. Thus, we are not sure whether this enhancement lies in RAN2-only topic. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Conclusion

TBD